

1742

"WITNESS AGAINST WAR": PACIFISM IN CANADA, 1900-1945

"WITNESS AGAINST WAR": PACIFISM IN CANADA, 1900-1945

By

THOMAS PAUL SOCKNAT, B.A., M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

January 1981

1742

"WITNESS AGAINST WAR": PACIFISM IN CANADA, 1900-1945

"WITNESS AGAINST WAR": PACIFISM IN CANADA, 1900-1945

By

THOMAS PAUL SOCKNAT, B.A., M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

January 1981

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1981)
(History)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: "Witness Against War": Pacifism in Canada, 1900-1945

AUTHOR: Thomas Paul Socknat, B.A. (Wayne State College)
M.A. (University of Nebraska)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Richard Allen

NUMBER OF PAGES: x, 621

ABSTRACT

The twentieth century has been a time of world wars, violent revolutions and radical social movements. Conversely, perhaps in response to the former, there has also been an upsurge in the phenomenon of pacifism, especially in the English speaking world. This thesis examines the development of pacifism in Canada in the first half of this century and describes its radicalization in conjunction with the trend towards radical social change. However, although pacifism in Canada, as elsewhere in the Western world, was in a state of transition during this period, the manner and degree of its transformation reflected its peculiar composition.

Canadian pacifism can trace its origins to a varied European, British and American past inspired by religious belief. However, unlike the British pacifist movement which was also heavily secular, and the American, with its enlightenment and isolationist tendencies, the Canadian pacifist heritage was rooted in two distinct but complementary traditions, both of which were heavily religious in character. One was the historic non-resistance of pacifist religious sects which tried to remain separate from the social mainstream. The other was the liberal Protestant and humanitarian tradition associated with the progressive reform movement. Both traditions underwent an important transition in the course of maintaining a pacifist witness against war during the twentieth century.

Although sectarian pacifists, by far the largest and most consistent element in Canadian pacifism, made a far-reaching adjustment within Canadian society, it was liberal pacifists who experienced a general radicalization. From the time of the First War increasing numbers of those who wished to exercise a pacifist witness were forced to abandon liberal reformism for some variant of the socialist creed. In effect, liberal pacifist ideals were combined with radical criticism of Canadian social, political and economic structures. Although liberal pacifist hopes resurfaced in post-war enthusiasm for the League of Nations and the disarmament campaign, the inter-war peace movement, including such groups as the Society of Friends, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order, reflected the socially radical pacifism the Great War had bred. This became especially evident during the depression and for a time it appeared a pacifist-socialist alignment was in the forefront of Canadian social thought. Increased international violence by the mid-thirties, however, placed pacifists in a serious crisis -- their pursuit of social justice came into direct conflict with their commitment to non-violence. Consequently, as social radicals began to abandon pacifism for the fight against fascism, the Canadian peace movement was severely weakened.

With the exception of the Quakers, who bridged the primary division in the Canadian peace movement, the historic peace sects were not as open to view, but once confronted with the renewed

challenge of conscription in the 1940's, sectarian pacifists joined with socially active pacifists in a concerted effort to preserve the right of individual conscience and to resist compulsory military service. Some pacifists, especially those with liberal roots, went further and sought and found a realistic pacifist response to wartime conditions, over and above moral indignation or isolation. Regardless of their precise actions, however, Canadian pacifists successfully exercised their witness against war.

The chronological development of pacifism and pacifist organizations discussed in the thesis reflects the historical evidence gathered from primary sources across Canada, from private papers and government records to files of organizations. Moreover, much of the record has been confirmed, enhanced and extended through personal correspondence and numerous oral interviews with Canadian pacifists of the period.

The thesis concludes that Canadian pacifists were a small but forceful minority who exercised a dual function in Canada: prophecy of an ideal of peace and justice and reconciliation of wartime tensions in society. Above all, however, in its uncompromising emphasis upon questions of conscience, the pacifist witness against war both directly and indirectly helped preserve enduring moral principles underlying Canadian culture.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to numerous individuals and organizations for their assistance in the preparation of this thesis. First, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Richard Allen, for his patient guidance and careful scrutiny of the manuscript. His insight into the nature of Canadian social and intellectual development often provided me with a clearer understanding of the historical problems I encountered. His advice has been invaluable. The same is true of Dr. C. M. Johnston, my committee chairman, who offered detailed criticisms as he read and re-read the early drafts. He has been a source of consistent encouragement not only with this thesis but throughout my graduate career. Likewise, my thanks are extended to the other members of my committee: Dr. David J. Russo, with whom I have enjoyed a rewarding working relationship in the Department of History, and Dr. Louis Greenspan, Department of Religious Studies.

I thank the Graduate School at McMaster University for four years of financial assistance, and the History Departments at McMaster and Brock Universities for the part-time teaching positions which helped ease the financial strain of the last few years. In that same regard, I am grateful to Phi Alpha Theta, International Honour Society in History, for awarding me their Pine Memorial Scholarship in 1978.

I am also thankful for the support of my fellow graduate students through the years, particularly that of Dr. Jeanne Beck, my former officemate, who first suggested the general topic of this thesis. The topic has proven to be a rich and stimulating one and I am sincerely grateful to all those, too numerous to mention here, who assisted me with my research, especially those who welcomed me into their homes and offices to share their memories. I am indeed fortunate, for example, to have interviewed the late Arthur G. Dorland and the late Fred Haslam, both of whom were prominent in the Canadian peace movement.

Finally, my most heartfelt appreciation is reserved for my wife, Carmen, whose criticisms, encouragement and enthusiastic support have aided the preparation of this thesis through its various stages to a successful conclusion.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I. EARLY PACIFIST TRADITIONS IN CANADA	17
CHAPTER II. THE DISRUPTION OF THE LIBERAL PEACE MOVEMENT	81
CHAPTER III. CONSCRIPTION AND THE CONSCIENCE OF RADICAL PACIFISTS	116
CHAPTER IV. A RESURGENT PEACE MOVEMENT: THE 1920'S	182
CHAPTER V. CEMENTING THE BONDS WITH SOCIAL RADICALISM IN THE EARLY DEPRESSION YEARS	252
CHAPTER VI. THE CRISIS OF CONSCIENCE, 1935-39	331
CHAPTER VII. THE INITIAL STURGGLE TO MAINTAIN A PACIFIST WITNESS DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR	388
CHAPTER VIII. CONSCRIPTION AND CONSCIENCE: ACT TWO	454
CHAPTER IX. THE PACIFIST SEARCH FOR WARTIME REALISM	512
CONCLUSION	562
APPENDICES	584
BIBLIOGRAPHY	591

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASW:	Alternative Service Work
BCFS:	British Columbia Forest Service
CCF:	Co-operative Commonwealth Federation
CCYM:	Christian Commonwealth Youth Movement
CFCC:	Canadian Federation for Cooperative Community
CFSC:	Canadian Friends Service Committee
CHPC:	Conference of Historic Peace Churches
CLPD:	Canadian League for Peace and Democracy
CLWF:	Canadian League Against War and Fascism
CNCR:	Canadian National Committee on Refugees
C.O.:	Conscientious Objector
CPC:	Canadian Peace Congress
CYC:	Canadian Youth Congress
FAU:	Friends Ambulance Unit
FCSO:	Fellowship for a Christian Social Order
FOR:	Fellowship of Reconciliation
IFOR:	International Fellowship of Reconciliation
LSR:	League for Social Reconstruction
MSA:	Military Service Act, 1917
MCRC:	Mennonite Central Relief Committee
MCSO:	Movement for a Christian Social Order
NCW:	National Council of Women

NRMA: National Resources Mobilization Act, 1940
SCM: Student Christian Movement
WCTU: Women's Christian Temperance Union
WIL: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
WRI: War Resisters' International

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a study of the manifestation of pacifism in Canada within the context of the Canadian reaction to war and social change during the first half of the twentieth-century. It does not attempt to analyze the larger philosophical aspects of pacifism nor to develop any specific biographical studies of individual pacifists. It proposes instead to trace the changing role of the pacifist idea in the recent Canadian past. In doing so, numerous individuals, groups and organizations come to the fore, but their true significance lies in their interaction -- in the composite picture -- and in their collective and distinctive contribution to the Canadian response to the social violence and wars of this century.

Most historians are agreed that pacifism is basically a Christian phenomenon with roots in the early Christian Church. War has always been an inescapable social reality and ethical problem for Christians, resulting in both pacifists and anti-pacifists searching the New Testament for support. The most relevant passages of New Testament pacifism are the Sermon on the Mount (Matt: 5: 38-48) with its non-resistant overtures and the Beatitudes (Matt: 5: 5-9) but C. J. Cadoux, probably the leading scholar on the early Christian attitude to war, has emphasized that the pacifism of Jesus is expressed more in the spirit of his teachings than in his words.¹

Pacifists have formed a minority in the Christian Church since about the fourth century although the early Christians universally had been pacifists for almost two centuries.² Early Christian pacifism was expressed by a withdrawal from political and military affairs alike. The pacifist period of the Church was finally terminated with the accession of Constantine and the appearance of the theory of the just war, formulated by St. Ambrose and amplified by St. Augustine. According to this doctrine the Church approved of war as long as the end was just and the intention to restoring peace.³ In time this conception of just war with the Church promoting peace was joined by the idea of the Crusade, a holy war in which the Church actually promoted war for religious ends. Medieval reactions to the Crusades appeared in the pacifism of Anabaptism during the radical reformation and in the humanist pacifism of Thomas More and Erasmus, forerunners of the liberal rational rejection of war.

Christian pacifism, therefore, survived primarily among the sectarian pacifist enclaves scattered across Europe and later in North America, while generally disappearing from the mainstream of Christian society. Although these peace sects promoted a conservative, withdrawn, quiet lifestyle, they offered at times what seemed a radical challenge to the established order. In fact, steadfast pacifism and radicalism reinforced one another. The subsequent growth of liberal rationalism, however, also promoted the idea of humanitarian pacifism and war-prevention, primarily through organized peace societies, and by the late nineteenth century the liberal ideals of peace and progress

merged with elements of evangelical Christianity in the liberal peace movement.

It was these two distinct but complementary traditions which formed the basis of pacifism in Canada: the historic, absolute non-resistance and non-participation in the worldly state which Peter Brock has called "separational pacifism", characteristic of sectarian pacifist groups like the Mennonites and Hutterites, and the liberal pacifism or "integrational pacifism" associated with the Quakers and later with the Protestant social gospel and the progressive reform movement (and ultimately with social radicalism).⁴

Pacifists in both traditions underwent a far-reaching transition and adjustment to social reality during the first half of the twentieth century. Two world wars, the social and economic upheaval of the depression years, and the popularization of socialism and the fear of fascism and communism all left their mark on the entire Canadian community. Pacifists were no exception and even the meaning of the word pacifism changed accordingly.

Since its initial usage shortly before the Great War, the word pacifism has often referred to both the belief that war is absolutely and always wrong and the assumption that war, though sometimes necessary, is always inhumane and irrational and should be prevented. The former applied mainly to the sectarians while the latter was representative of the liberal-progressive pacifists at the turn of the century who still reflected Victorian social attitudes: forcefulness of character, a militaristic patriotism and hero worship.

Their advocacy of international harmony for peace was quite different from pacifist non-resistance or opposition to all wars. The subsequent growth of violence, death and destruction between nations and within them, however, gave birth to a specific twentieth century pacifism defined by Brock as an ideology of "personal non-participation in wars . . . or in violent revolution with an endeavor to find non-violent means of resolving conflict."⁵ In effect, pacifism was adjusting to the challenges of a new age of mass international warfare and social revolution.

As a result of this etymological evolution, the exact meaning of pacifism in the twentieth century has often been vague. In his recent history of pacifism in Britain, Martin Ceadel has admirably attempted to clear the air by separating the liberal internationalists and other "quasi-pacifists" from the pacifists proper. Although successful in defining the absolute faith of pacifism in Britain's recent past, his typology is rather artificial and confining to the study of the full impact of the pacifist phenomenon.⁶ Applied to the Canadian experience, it is somewhat misleading.⁷

In terms of contemporary historical usage the word pacifist usually narrowed during times of war to mean only those opposed to all wars, but during times of peace it broadened again to include all those working on behalf of peace. This thesis often uses the word pacifism in its broadest sense to reflect its common usage and meaning in Canada's past. On the other hand, distinctions are drawn between sectarian pacifism and the various expressions in the liberal tradition: first, the liberal-progressive reformers at the turn of the

century who advocated international arbitration as the rational solution to international conflicts; second, the liberal internationalists of the inter-war era who, while displaying a new awareness of the social and economic roots of war, reaffirmed their faith in the perfectability of man and world peace through support for the League of Nations and disarmament, but stopped short of endorsing total pacifism; and third, the post-war breed of socially radical pacifists who blended liberal pacifist ideals with the socialist attack upon the economic and political superstructure, thereby demanding both peace and radical social change. Since pacifist as well as social thought was in a state of transition and individual adherents held varying degrees of pacifist sympathies, differences between liberal internationalists and pacifists proper were often blurred, with the result that it is difficult, and historically somewhat inaccurate, to separate completely those two strands of the Canadian peace movement.

Furthermore, despite an overall resemblance, the Canadian pacifist experience did not exactly mirror that of the United States or Britain. The Socialist basis of pacifism, for instance, was more evident in Britain while in Canada the pacifism of social radicals was most often grounded upon religious conviction. That is not to say, however, that Canadian pacifism was without its radical dimension. In fact, it was thought initially that this thesis might show the merger of both the sectarian and liberal pacifist traditions into one broad radical movement but research proved that this did not happen. Although

both traditions underwent a notable transition, sectarian pacifism remained separate and aloof from radical social movements. Consequently, while not minimizing the role of sectarian groups, this thesis has focused most heavily upon the radicalization of liberal pacifist thought. Neither did a specific pattern arise to explain the transition of pacifism, unless it was simply the struggle for survival of the individual conscience in a society victimized by war and depression. Rather than propose a specific theory, therefore, this thesis describes and documents the process of this radicalization of pacifism in Canada. ✓

For the most part, the sectarian pacifists remained the constant factor in the survival of the pacifist idea in Canada, particularly in times of war, and their communal societies served as models for those Canadians seeking new methods of social organization. Because they attempted to remain withdrawn from society, and, hence, from the larger peace movement, the peace sects were probably less noticeably affected by world events. Nevertheless, their experience during the two world wars ultimately resulted in a degree of accommodation with the state and a tendency towards assimilation into society.

The central core of this thesis, however, concerns the leftward transition of the "integrational" liberal pacifists in their search of political realism. As they examined the social and economic roots of war during and after the Great War, committed pacifists abandoned liberal reformism for a socially radical outlook. The

merger of the pacifist means of non-violence and the radical ends of social justice into one broad movement, however, also posed a dilemma. In contrast to traditional non-resistance, socially radical pacifists increasingly sanctioned forms of social coercion such as strikes which threatened to compromise their pacifist rejection of the use of force. ✓ Sectarian pacifists had recognized the danger and it was one of the reasons they avoided all contact with the peace movement. The crisis finally came to a head during the late thirties when, under the pressure of increasing international tensions, liberals and social radicals rallied to the armed defense of Western democracies, thereby abandoning the pacifist ideal. Their defection left the peace movement much weakened and resulted in the gradual retreat of committed pacifists behind the confines of a strictly Christian ideal not entirely unlike their sectarian brothers. But, although socially radical pacifists were forced by renewed warfare to shed their utopian vision and offer their pacifist witness in terms of the world as they found it, they did not entirely abandon a radical social criticism or cease to labor for social change. They attempted, therefore, to combine a pacifist witness with a meaningful confrontation with social reality and, in doing so, they, too, experienced a measure of accommodation with the state and were assimilated in their turn into the nation's war effort. Nonetheless, the assimilation was substantially on their own terms, and the war and post-war years found them opposing the state in a very notable campaign in defense of civil liberties.

In a larger sense this thesis reveals that pacifism had become an important ingredient in Canadian social activism and social criticism. As it developed in the course of the century the peace movement encompassed a broad campaign for disarmament, international harmony and social and economic reorganization. Furthermore, pacifists were not typical men and women. As a prophetic minority, they were influential beyond their numbers. Canadian pacifists, for instance, exercised leading roles in the development of radical Christian social ethics, in the building of a social democratic political alternative and in the struggle for economic justice and civil liberties. Above all, however, pacifists lobbied against all types of militarism in Canadian society from conscription and cadet training in the schools to armament increases and nuclear weaponry. During the interwar years pacifists tried to create an anti-war public but, while they succeeded in broadening the public to which they appealed, they failed to increase substantially the adherents of pacifism itself. Thus, as in the case of most social movements, their efforts did not always yield desired results, but in the end the peace movement and the pacifist witness of sectarian groups had important consequences for the changing nature of Canadian society.

As a phenomenon of the twentieth century, pacifist resistance to war has been largely confined to the English-speaking world. Its dimensions coincided with a North Atlantic culture based upon a similar religious, philosophical and political heritage. Both the

non-conformist conscience and radical political individualism were common in the Anglo-American past while absent in most of Europe.⁸ Great Britain, the United States and Canada became important outposts in the struggle of the individual conscience against war and violence; against official government positions and the respectable but subservient role of social institutions. It is no surprise, therefore, that most historical literature on the topic has concerned pacifist movements in Britain and the United States. Some of this work, however, resembles hagiography more than historiography since it is written by committed pacifists intent on expressing their particular faith or canonizing their own heroes. But there are also sound scholarly studies. For the most part, British scholars have tended to concentrate on the First World War and interwar periods while the American pacifist experience has been more evenly explored.⁹ Indeed, bursts of American scholarship appear to be related to periods of actual U. S. involvement in war.¹⁰ In any case, historians generally agree that the peace movement in both Britain and the United States became linked with social radicalism and faced a serious internal crisis as pacifists confronted the reality of fascist aggression in the mid-thirties. That is the opinion, for instance, of Peter Brock, one of the most important historians of pacifism in both Europe and the United States and one often mentioned in the course of this thesis.

In contrast to British and American historiography, the historical study of pacifism has been largely ignored in Canadian history. This is partly because the pacifist movement was not large, but also because historians in both the liberal nationalist and Laurentian traditions, and certain social historians as well, were committed to more political, collective, international solutions, and finally to war itself as the least of evils. As Arthur Lower and Donald Creighton have demonstrated, these historians were not unaware of the pacifist tradition in Canada's past although they viewed pacifists, like native peoples, as largely irrelevant in the flow of history. The continuing experience of war and the questionable state of international order, however, gives significance once more to the pacifist ideal in its preservation of the moral imperative central to our culture.

Despite the limitations of Canadian historiography important observations have been made concerning pacifism in Canada. Some of the best sources are the various monographs on specific pacifist groups such as Frank Epp's treatment of Mennonites in Mennonites in Canada, 1786-1920: The History of a Separate People and M. James Penton's study of the Jehovah's Witnesses in Canada.¹¹ Still another view of pacifism can be found in church histories such as the well known theses by E. A. Christie and M. V. Royce, which contrast the Presbyterian and Methodist attitudes to war, and J. M. Bliss's article "The Methodist Church and World War I."¹² The relationship between

liberal pacifists and internationalists is explored in the thesis by Donald Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations Before the Manchurian Crisis."¹³ Although Page tends to view the peace movement from the perspective of the internationalists, he provides a good introduction to the Canadian peace movement, particularly on the prairies. ✓

The most important basis for the further study of Canadian pacifism, however, was laid by Richard Allen in The Social Passion.¹⁴ Allen claims the resurgence of pacifism in the twenties sublimated the crisis of social gospel reform and actually inhibited the development of a more profound Christian ethic of war or of peace, thereby leaving the whole question unresolved for a later generation. But in contrast to this evasion of social reality, Allen argues that some social gospellers had already begun to reflect an international realism which ultimately helped give birth to a new radical Christianity the following decade.

Roger Hutchinson examines some of these radical Christians in his study of the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order.¹⁵ He claims the social radicals in the FCSO were realistic in that they had a clear vision of the world as it was and yet idealistic in their determination to improve the social order. The same thing could be said of most socially radical pacifists in the thirties. Hutchinson emphasizes that pacifism was an important part of FCSO social thought but he does not adequately analyze that pacifism. He fails to put

FCSO pacifism to the same scrutiny as he does its social radicalism. Likewise, Michiel Horn emphasizes the mixture of pacifism and socialism in the League for Social Reconstruction but he largely ignores the concomitant role of LSR radicals in the peace movement and tends to associate pacifism with isolationism.¹⁶ This mixture of pacifism and socialism is also recognized by Kenneth McNaught in his biography of J. S. Woodsworth.¹⁷ But in the end McNaught overstates the socialist influence at the expense of the Christian basis of Woodsworth's pacifism.

The pacifist if not the socialist ethic of many social radicals was rooted in Christianity but, as Thomas Sinclair-Faulkner argues in his study of the response of Canada's churches to the Second World War, the churches themselves had no trouble supporting the war because, despite pressure from a vocal pacifist minority, they had never endorsed outright pacifism.¹⁸ Faulkner, however, fails to examine the pacifist churchmen in conjunction with the wider interwar peace movement. Neither does he adequately explain the fate of United Church pacifists after 1939. In fact, his claim that United Church pacifists ceased to act as a pacifist front after 1939 is a gross overstatement if not entirely misleading. Nevertheless, Faulkner, as well as Allen, Hutchinson, Horn and a few others, have begun the process of examining pacifism in the context of Canadian social history which this thesis attempts to develop further.

While most historians in the mainstream of Canadian historiography have made no more than passing references to pacifists in Canada,¹⁹ some, like Ramsay Cook, James Eayrs and an older Donald Creighton, have shown an appreciation of the pacifist phenomenon.²⁰ For instance, in The Forked Road: Canada 1939-1957, Creighton refers to Canadian churchmen who professed a naïve pacifism before 1914 but ended up supporting the war as a righteous crusade. The interwar years, he writes, resulted in a bitter disillusionment.

Some clergymen confessed their tragic mistake and re-confirmed their pacifism. Others, together with a good many laymen, placed their hopes for the future in the League of Nations. It was a long drawn-out and painful experience which ensured that English Canadian churchmen would look at the Second World War in a fashion very different from that in which they viewed the First. It was also an experience which passed by the clergy of French Canada almost completely.²¹

This "long drawn-out and painful experience" mentioned briefly by Creighton and discussed separately by Allen, Hutchinson and Faulkner is the core of this thesis.

FOOTNOTES

¹See C. J. Cadoux, The Early Christian Attitude to War (1919) and The Early Church and the World (1925). Other important works on New Testament pacifism are: G. H. C. Macgregor, The New Testament Basis of Pacifism (reprint ed. New York: Fellowship Publications, 1954), Roland H. Bainton, Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1960), Jean Lasserre, War and the Gospel (1962); Lasserre is the son of the Canadian Henri Lasserre later mentioned in this thesis.

²Peter Brock, Pacifism in Europe to 1914 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), p. 4.

³Bainton, Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace, p. 95.

⁴Brock, Pacifism in Europe, pp. 474-475. Brock divides pacifists into six classifications, the most important of which in the Canadian context are the separational and integrational pacifists and the "eschatological pacifists" such as Jehovah's Witnesses.

⁵Peter Brock, Twentieth-Century Pacifism (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1970), p. 5.

⁶Martin Ceadel, Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980). Ceadel actually admits his typology is "somewhat contrived." Ibid., p. 5.

⁷For instance, Ceadel disregards Brock's "separational pacifism" or sectarian pacifism as "quasi-pacifism" because it was largely based upon birthright and orientation towards society rather than personal inspiration. Such a generalization is untenable in the Canadian context where sectarian pacifists such as the Mennonites have been in the forefront of defending personal pacifist beliefs.

⁸Brock, Twentieth-Century Pacifism, p. 6. An exception was Tolstoy.

⁹The standard British scholarship includes: David Boulton, Objection Overruled (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1967), John W. Graham, Conscription and Conscience (London; George Allen and Unwin, 1922), David A. Martin, Pacifism: An Historical and Sociological

Study (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), Keith Robbins, The Abolition of War: The 'Peace Movement' in Britain, 1914-1919 (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1976), and most recently, Ceadel, Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945. A complete view of the American pacifist experience is provided in the following: Peter Brock, Pacifism in the United States: From the Colonial Era to the First World War (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), Charles Chatfield, For Peace and Justice: Pacifism in America 1914-1941 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1971), Lawrence S. Wittner, Rebels Against War: The American Peace Movement 1941-1960 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969).

¹⁰One of the most important bursts of this scholarship, for instance, occurred during the era of the Vietnam war, such as Brock, Chatfield, Wittner and John K. Nelson, The Peace Prophets: American Pacifist Thought, 1919-1941 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1967) and Roland C. Marchand, The American Peace Movement and Social Reform 1898-1918 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972).

¹¹Frank H. Epp, Mennonites in Canada, 1786-1920: The History of a Separate People (Toronto: Macmillan, 1974); M. James Penton, Jehovah's Witnesses in Canada (Toronto: Macmillan, 1976). Others include: David Fransen, "Canadian Mennonites and Conscientious Objection in World War II," M.A. Thesis, University of Waterloo, 1977; Victor Peters, All Things Common: The Hutterian Way of Life (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1965), John W. Bennett, Hutterian Brethren (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1967), George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, The Doukhobors (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1968), Arthur G. Dorland, The Quakers in Canada, A History (Toronto: Ryerson, 1968).

¹²E. A. Christie, "The Presbyterian Church in Canada and Its Official Attitude Towards Public Affairs and Social Problems, 1875-1925," M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1955; M. V. Royce, "The Contribution of the Methodist Church to Social Welfare in Canada," M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1940; J. M. Bliss, "The Methodist Church and World War I," Canadian Historical Review, XLIX (September, 1968).

¹³Donald Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations Before the Manchurian Crisis," Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1972.

¹⁴Richard Allen, The Social Passion (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973).

¹⁵Roger Hutchinson, "The Fellowship for a Christian Social Order: A Social Ethical Analysis of a Christian Socialist Movement," Th.D. Thesis, Victoria University, Toronto, 1975.

¹⁶Michiel Horn, "The League for Social Reconstruction: Socialism and Nationalism in Canada, 1931-1945," Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1969, recently published as: Horn, The League for Social Reconstruction: Intellectual Origins of the Democratic Left in Canada 1930-1942 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980).

¹⁷Kenneth McNaught, A Prophet in Politics (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959).

¹⁸C. T. Sinclair-Faulkner, "'For Christian Civilization': The Churches and Canada's War Effort, 1939-1942." Th.D. Thesis, University of Chicago, 1975.

¹⁹These include such recent works as H. Blair Neatby, William Lyon Mackenzie King. Vol. III: 1932-39: The Prism of Unity (1976); Jack L. Granatstein, Canada's War: The Politics of the Mackenzie King Government 1939-1945 (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1975).

²⁰See: Ramsay Cook, "Francis Marion Beynon and the Crisis of Christian Reformism," in The West and the Nation, ed. Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976), James Eayrs, In Defense of Canada, 2 vols. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964). Others include John H. Thompson and Ross McCormack.

²¹Donald G. Creighton, The Forked Road: Canada 1939-1957 (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976), p. 27.

CHAPTER I
EARLY PACIFIST TRADITIONS IN CANADA

The Canadian pacifist tradition evolved during the nineteenth century from both the heritage of radical religious dissent and the liberal reform movement. The gradual immigration into Canada of pacifist religious groups strengthened the principle of passive non-resistance within Canadian society while the simultaneous growth of the liberal peace movement popularized the cause of world peace and order. The non-conformism of the peace sects paralleled a marginal position on the fringes of Canadian society while the broader peace movement was part of the established, mainline liberal reform tradition largely represented by the middle class. These liberal peace advocates were broadly labeled pacifists but not because they all adhered to genuine pacifist non-violent principles; most simply favored arbitration and the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Overall the Canadian pacifist movement was a Christian tradition reflecting the combined influences of the radical reformation and liberal protestantism and was closely related to the activities of various Christian communities and small liberal peace organizations up to the First World War.

The Sectarian Pacifists

By far the largest element in the Canadian pacifist tradition has been the sectarian pacifism of the Anabaptist sects born during the radical reformation, the Society of Friends founded in the seventeenth century, and some other more recent Christian sects. The Anabaptists belonged to the radical wing of the reformation since they rejected the ethic of the Old Testament as having been superceded by that of Christ. The Anabaptist belief in the complete separation of church and state and the condemnation of war and killing as contrary to Christ's ethic of love and respect for human life, were exemplified in their pacifistic lifestyle, separate from the secular world. One group of Anabaptists in Moravia organized their communities along communistic economic lines under the leadership of Jacob Hutter and thereafter became known as Hutterites. Chief among their beliefs were adult baptism and non-violence.¹ Another wing came under the influence of Menno Simmons who emphasized passivity and non-resistance as the basic tenet of their faith. "'The regenerated do not go to war,'" wrote Simmons, "'nor engage in strife. They are the children of peace who have beaten their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and know of no war.'" His followers became known as Mennonites.

Although Anabaptists were pacifists, their lifestyle represented a radical revolutionary threat in the minds of authorities and large scale persecutuion of Anabaptists occurred.² From the very

beginning, therefore, pacifists were linked to radicalism and Anabaptists began their search for a new home where they could live according to their conscience.

It has been argued that Anabaptism was the parent of Quakerism.³ Certainly, Quakers resembled the Anabaptist protest against the un-Christian state, but whereas sects like the Mennonites were, in Peter Brock's words, "separational pacifists" who urged withdrawal from the world, Quakers were "integrational pacifists" who sought to transform the world. They were part of the large non-conformist tradition in the seventeenth century. Founded by George Fox in the early 1650's, the Society of Friends based their spiritual life on the belief in the presence of the "Inner Light" of Christ in all men. They were also apocalyptically minded and supported Cromwell's war and victory as a sign of the coming of the Kingdom. The persecution of Friends under the Commonwealth, however, shattered their millenarian hopes and after their early hesitation Quakers concluded that war and violence were against their beliefs and incorporated non-resistance into their basic testimony.⁴

Down through the centuries that followed Mennonites and Quakers remained true to their pacifist beliefs although, admittedly, individual Mennonites in Holland and Germany abandoned the principle of non-resistance as they integrated into society. But in Switzerland and Russia and then in North America, "separational" sects like the Mennonites remained withdrawn from contemporary society and faithful

to the doctrine of non-resistance. The "integrational" Quakers on the other hand, regarded politics as compatible with the pacifist stance. But they largely maintained a quietistic mood until the nineteenth century, when, under evangelical influences, Quaker pacifism became "an outreaching creed and sought to find expression in both domestic politics and international relations."⁵

Both these groups entered Canada as early as the eighteenth century and their pacifist beliefs were officially recognized in militia acts and immigration guarantees. English legal precedents respecting non-conformity and religious dissent dating back to the seventeenth century provided a secure atmosphere that attracted both Mennonites and Quakers to Canada from the United States during the American Revolution.

Although there were some Mennonite settlements reported in the Maritimes during the mid-eighteenth century the first significant migration of pacifist sects coincided with the coming of the United Empire Loyalists. While their doctrine of non-resistance forbade participation in British wars or political revolution, many felt a certain loyalty to the British due to official recognition of their freedom. The Militia Bill of 1757, for instance, allowed for the exemption of Quakers, Mennonites and Moravians from the bearing of arms.⁶ The emigrating sects mainly included the Pennsylvania centered Quakers, Mennonites, Dunkards (German Baptists) and Tunkers (later known as Brethren in Christ), a revivalistic group of partly Mennonite origin.

The principles of the radical pacifist Christian conscience and military exemption recognized in British legal precedents were introduced into Canada with the migration of these sects. Upper Canada's first Lieutenant-Governor, John Graves Simcoe, personally invited Mennonites, Quakers and Tunkers to settle in Upper Canada with the promise of the customary exemptions from militia duties. This promise was officially recognized by the First Upper Canada Parliament in the Militia Act of 1793 which provided for exemption of Quakers, Mennonites or Tunkers, on condition of the payment of annual fines ". . . the sum of 20 shillings per annum in time of peace, and five pounds per annum in time of actual invasion or insurrection."⁷

The pacifist sects, however, were dissatisfied with the thought of paying fines. The Mennonites objected more for financial than moral reasons and usually paid the tax in line with past precedents in Pennsylvania and Prussia.⁸ The Quakers, on the other hand, usually refused to pay the fine reasoning that the proceeds would support the militia. Those who did pay the fines were disciplined by their brothers as if they had joined the militia. The Quaker non-compliance resulted in some retaliatory incidents such as the confiscation of \$1,000 worth of goods from the Yonge Street Monthly Meeting in 1810 and the jailing of eight members for one month.⁹

There followed what Frank Epp has called "one of the most active lobbies in the half-century of Upper Canada" on behalf of

Quakers and Mennonites to change the law.¹⁰ This movement was briefly interrupted by the war of 1812-14 which witnessed the impressment of pacifists' horses and carriages. While Mennonites agreed to comply with "extreme reluctance," Quakers remained adamant and accepted fines and imprisonment rather than render any assistance to the military.¹¹ Actually to enroll in the militia was a serious offense for a Friend and resulted in disownment by the Meeting, as in the 1813 case of Peter Hunter, a Quaker who attended military training in order to save his fine.¹² Following the war the pacifist groups again petitioned the government until a new militia law passed under a reform administration in 1849 removed the principle of fining.

A tradition of Christian pacifism, therefore, was firmly rooted in the early settlement of British North America and its practical protection through military exemption was reconfirmed in the first military service act of the new Canadian confederation in 1868. This act provided for the exemption of Quakers, Mennonites, Tunkers and persons of any religions denomination if their religious doctrine forbade the bearing of arms and personal military service.¹³ With this important step Canada officially recognized the principle of religious pacifist dissent and military exemption characteristic of British law and continued to make similar legal provisions for newly immigrating groups in the late-nineteenth century through a series of Orders-in-Council.

In 1793 at the very time when the first Mennonites migrated to Canada from the United States, European Mennonites were moving into Russia. Nearly a century later, when the Tsar began to withdraw the Privilegium protecting Mennonite rights, a mass migration to North America resulted. The majority of these Russian Mennonites chose the United States as their new home, probably due to the prospect of better land, while those that chose Canada held their German culture and conscientious non-resistance in paramount importance.¹⁴ Only after a Mennonite delegation visited Canada in 1873 and received a Canadian version of the Privilegium, including an entire exemption from military service, was the Mennonite exodus ensured.¹⁵ A special Order-in-Council was issued in 1873 providing an entire exemption from military service for Mennonites.¹⁶

This was the first of the special Orders-in-Council based upon the earlier statutes exempting Quakers, Mennonites and Tunkers. There followed an Order-in-Council in 1898 granting exemption to Doukhobors and one in 1899 exempting Hutterites, the two other pacifist groups immigrating into western Canada. Other than their pacifism, all three groups shared a common Russian background and a type of communal organization. Thus, by the beginning of the twentieth century the old "pacifist trinity" of eastern Canada -- Quakers, Tunkers and Mennonites -- was joined by a strange new grouping of Mennonites, Doukhobors and Hutterites in western Canada and the non-conformist pacifist traditions of all were protected by Canadian law.¹⁷

In the 1870's the Hutterites had immigrated from Russia to the Dakotas but by 1898 with the threat of the Spanish-American War they looked northward to Manitoba. The Canadian government, favoring settlement of the West, eagerly granted them permission to establish their communal colonies along with an exemption from military service.¹⁸ In 1899 a Hutterite colony was established on the Roseau River east of Dominion City, Manitoba, but, after only a five year stay, the colony returned to South Dakota. They had suffered hardships with unsatisfactory land and flood damage, and in the meantime the war involving the United States had ended.¹⁹ Although it was not until 1918 that large numbers of American Hutterites, fleeing from the threats of another war, migrated to western Canada, the legal precedent had already been set recognizing both their pacifism and the communal ownership of property.

Both Mennonites and Hutterites share common Anabaptist roots to their faith and their withdrawn and separate lifestyles, but each reacted differently to the modern age. Whereas large numbers of Mennonites began to participate within society but eschewed modern technology, Hutterites accepted modern technology but remained isolated from society.²⁰

By far the most contentious of the new immigrant pacifist groups to arrive in Canada were the Doukhobors. Because of the persecutions of Tsarist Russia, influential supporters, from Leo Tolstoy to British Quakers, encouraged the exodus of these strange Russian

peasants to a new homeland in Canada. They injected a host of unorthodox social, political and religious views into Canadian society, adding yet another variant to the pacifist tradition building within Canada.

The Doukhobor movement originated in South Central and southern Russian during the eighteenth century but did not crystallize until the early 1800's. It was an undogmatic faith that abandoned traditional Christianity and rejected all outward rites and forms such as sacraments, ikons, liturgy, and a separate priesthood. Love and brotherhood became the central principles of the sect while the Bible was of secondary importance. They were living examples of a messianic and millenarian Christianity dying out elsewhere in the world.²¹ The Doukhobors, in their rejection of baptism, were more radical than Anabaptists and, in their rejection of the doctrine of redemption and denial of the authority of the scriptures, they were more radical than the Quakers.²²

Similar to that of Quakers, their faith is based upon a radical belief in the presence of Christ's spirit in each man -- a voice within which directs his actions. This presence was supreme in the man Jesus.²³ "Since the direction of their behaviour must come from within," write George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, "they naturally deny the right of the state or other external authority to dictate their actions. And, since all men are vessels for the divine essence, they regard it as sinful to kill other men, even in war: hence springs the pacifism

that is the most durable and widespread of Doukhobor attitudes. . . ."24
 From the very beginning, Doukhobor faith has been "a strange blend of religious anarchism and theocratic autocracy."²⁵ While denying the need for government they elevate a semi-divine leader as head of their community.

The Doukhobor philosophy present in the twentieth century, however, did not appear until the fusion of their old traditions with Tolstoyan ideas in the late-nineteenth century. When Tolstoy first heard of the Doukhobors he thought he had found the natural peasant anarchists of his dreams, "'the germinating of that seed sown by Christ eighteen hundred years ago: the resurrection of Christ himself.'"26 He failed to understand their mystical and prophetic side with its support of theocratic authority but from what he knew he found their philosophy generally in line with his own.

Tolstoy's conversion to pacifism occurred during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 and in A Confession (1879) he first expressed the concept of "non-resistance to evil" that formed an important part of his broader program of social ethics.²⁷ His philosophy was one of individual ethics, stressing personal responsibility for actions and the importance of taking a moral stand, similar to the Kantian absolute moral imperative.²⁸ According to Tolstoy, non-violence was an ethical imperative evident in the moral rules laid down by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount.²⁹ Tolstoy's goal was Christian perfection. Since the realization of the law of brotherly love and sacredness of human life, however, was blocked by the existence of

the state and its law of violence, Tolstoy advocated the total transformation of society. Hence, anarchism is an essential element of Tolstoy's Christian pacifism.³⁰ His complete opposition to authoritarian forms including the state clearly classifies this thought as anarchistic even though Tolstoy preferred to call himself a literal Christian.³¹ His attitude is best expressed in his own words of advice to the Doukhobors:

The Christian teaching cannot be taken piecemeal: it is all or nothing. It is inseparably united into one whole. If a man acknowledges himself to be a son of God, from that acknowledgement flows the love of his neighbour; and from love of his neighbour flow, equally, the repudiation of violence, of oaths, of state service, and of property.³²

In a display of civil disobedience in 1895 members of the Doukhobor community endured imprisonment and punishments under the Tsar rather than submit to conscription. Tolstoy thought of them as Christian martyrs and appealed to British Quakers and other pacifists on their behalf. The Quakers responded with a special assistance fund to help resettle the Doukhobors in a new land while Tolstoy completed his last work, Resurrection (1899) and donated the royalties to the same cause.³³ If the Doukhobor emigration to Canada in 1899 meant survival for their particular way of life, it also meant the addition of a peculiar, anarchistic type of Christian pacifism to the Canadian scene.³⁴ By Order-in-Council, 1898, Doukhobor pacifism was guaranteed by Canadian law.

Quite apart from his link with the Doukhobor influx Tolstoy's considerable influence upon the development of pacifism and social criticism in the twentieth century would make itself felt in Canada in its own right as the century passed. Tolstoy was among the topics discussed at the annual Queen's Theological Alumni Conference in the 1890's where Christian ministers and laymen advocated broad goals of Christian social action, though few if any were persuaded pacifists.³⁵ It was Tolstoy who criticized the liberal peace societies of his day for concentrating on secondary issues while avoiding the fundamental issue of individual witness against war.³⁶ Another of his contributions ✓ was his influence on Mahatma Gandhi and the latter's doctrine of non-violent resistance. Tolstoy, therefore, was instrumental in the formulation of a new pacifist idea built upon individual moral responsibility with a universal application to all mankind rather than just a sectarian Christian approach; a pacifism concerned with the extent to which war and violence are rooted in the social environment.³⁷ Few pacifists in the twentieth century followed Tolstoy to the final repudiation of the state, but he obviously made a powerful contribution to the socially radical pacifism that, in Canada as elsewhere, emerged in the century of the world wars.

In addition to groups now designated as "Historic Peace Churches," various fundamentalist and millennial sects holding radical objections to war entered Canada during the late-nineteenth century from Britain and the United States.³⁸ The Plymouth Brethren, one of the most significant of the British groups, was organized around 1820-30.

Their objection to war was based upon the well-known passage on non-resistance to evil in the Sermon on the Mount. The Brethren were strict literalists and remained aloof from politics and secular activities.³⁹ Together with several other sects, including Christadelphians, Seventh Day Adventists and Jehovah's Witnesses, they advocated an apocalyptic non-combatancy conditional upon the coming of the millennium. Thus, again to use Brock's classification, they were "eschatological pacifists" who professed a kind of interim ethic. While non-combatant in the present world, they foresaw the possibility of fighting under Christ's banner at Armageddon.⁴⁰

The most important of these "eschatological pacifists" in Canada were the Jehovah's Witnesses, also known as International Bible Students, Millennial Dawnites and Russellites, founded by Charles Taze Russell, a Pittsburg businessman, in the 1870's. Within a decade Pastor Russell had founded the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society and written numerous books and articles espousing his beliefs.⁴¹ According to Russell, human history is a struggle between Jehovah and Satan's forces of evil. Although Satan rules the world, including the religious, political and economic institutions, eventually Christ will come again to destroy the world's wicked system. Therefore, Russell urged Bible students to "' . . . honour all men and be obedient to earthly authorities in matters not contrary to divine Law.'" They should also "' . . . refrain from participating in politics, voting, and killing their fellow men in the wars of the nations.'"⁴² On the one hand, Witnesses are strict Biblicists, but they keep reassessing

the Bible in order to move from spiritual darkness to spiritual light. They also believe that every member in good standing should be a preacher.

Jehovah's Witnesses began to penetrate Canada soon after Pastor Russell began his activities. Watch Tower literature reached Ontario as early as 1881 while Pastor Russell's first visit to Toronto in 1891 was followed by frequent appearances in Canada before his death in 1916. At that time there were eighteen congregations in Ontario alone as well as Bible student representations in all the Maritime provinces and throughout the West.⁴³

The absolute refusal of Jehovah's Witnesses and other recently organized "eschatological" sects to participate in the wars of the state further enlarged the religious minority in support of pacifist non-violence. Indeed, Jehovah's Witnesses, Doukhobors and the more traditional peace sects, Mennonites, Hutterites and Quakers, formed the backbone of pacifist dissent in Canadian society and would provide the major resistance to compulsory military service in the course of the twentieth century.

The Liberal Pacifists

Outside the religious sects there was little pacifist activity in Canada's early past, although liberal, non-sectarian peace societies that appeared in the United States after 1812 also began to move into British North America and by 1826 there were twelve such societies

in Upper Canada and several in the Maritimes. This non-sectarian interest in peace was based upon the enlightenment's emphasis on rationalism and humanism, with Biblical teachings used as further support for establishing the ideal of peace.⁴⁴ Canadian peace societies, however, were short lived, disappearing by mid-century, but the same philosophical approach appeared again in the late-nineteenth century in conjunction with the reform spirit.

Besides this movement there were also a few early cases of pacifists such as Rev. Nathaniel Paul, a Baptist minister at Wilberforce Settlement in Upper Canada, who converted to a completely pacifist position in 1835 after hearing a lecture presented by George Pilkington, pacifist apostle and former captain of the Royal Engineers in Britain.⁴⁵ Another rather unusual case concerned the Canadian, Henry Wentworth Monk, a self-proclaimed peace prophet. A descendant of a distinguished Canadian family from the Ottawa area, Monk turned into a Christian mystic in reaction to industrialism and the "barrenness of ecclesiastical Christianity."⁴⁶ During the second half of the nineteenth century he travelled regularly to Britain to publicize various schemes for world peace, including the cause of Zionism. To avoid the series of world wars which he had predicted, he advocated the creation of a world council centered in Jerusalem with power to enforce world peace. But the absence of enthusiasm for his plans and his failure to become a successful mediator for peace in the American Civil War was personally discouraging and damaged his credibility among supporters in Britain.⁴⁷ By the 1880's Monk returned to the

Ottawa area and spent the last twelve years of his life writing a barrage of peace propaganda, in pamphlet and letter form, urging the codification of international law, permanent international arbitration, establishment of a sort of League of Nations and Anglo-American leadership in the movement towards peace.⁴⁸ Thus, although he started his career as a mystical peace prophet, he ended it taking the same rational approach common to nineteenth century peace organizations.

The major rise of non-sectarian pacifism in late nineteenth century Canada occurred within the framework of the North American liberal reform movement. The participants in this peace movement, both pacifists and non-pacifists, were affected by religious inspiration as well as philanthropic and reform impulses. For most active supporters peace activities were just one of their reform concerns. This peace movement, therefore, was inextricably tied to other causes such as the movement toward Anglo-American rapprochement, the campaign for woman suffrage, and the social gospel. Since most social reformers shared the belief that their individual domestic concerns were affected by the international climate, the peace movement was elevated to a position of key importance and common interest.⁴⁹

Although the non-sectarian North American peace movement eventually produced a socially radical wing, the pre-war peace movement was predominantly a conservative and moderate attempt to achieve order and stability within the world through the practical goals of international arbitration and an international court.⁵⁰ "Peace,"

writes Robert Wiebe, "connoted order and stability, the absence of violence, the supremacy of reason and law. It suggested the disappearance of militarism and all other vestiges of a barbaric past."⁵¹ The liberal progressive rhetoric expressed a faith in progress to carry civilization beyond war.⁵²

The North American liberal reform tradition, including the non-sectarian peace movement, expressed the pragmatic institutional approach but was largely indebted to religious inspiration, particularly to Quaker and social gospel influences. While the impact on Canadian society of sectarian pacifism was extremely limited, liberal Quakerism emerged to bridge the gap between historic Christian pacifism and the liberal progressive ideology. Quakers went beyond negative anti-militarism and in conjunction with social gossellers began to relate war to socio-economic conditions and encouraged interest in international affairs. This was a gradual development, however, and the full impact of Quaker leadership was not felt in Canada until after the First War when the three separate branches of the Society of Friends in Canada began to co-operate with one another.⁵³ But, as early as the 1880's, the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends established contact with Canadian evangelical churches in foreign mission work, and it was the influence of evangelical Methodism among orthodox Quakers that resulted in the separation and organization of the progressive branch of the Canadian Society of Friends in 1891.⁵⁴ In that same year Canadian Quakers also became involved in North American peace activities when all three Canadian Yearly Meetings of Friends

became affiliated with "The Peace Association of Friends in America."⁵⁵ And Canadian Friends were shortly involved in the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, an annual affair initiated by a Quaker in New York State in 1895, which provided links with the turn of the century spirit of liberal pacifistic internationalism and which attracted a wide range of adherents from politicians to businessmen and journalists. It was symptomatic of broadening Quaker concerns that in 1896 the Hicksite branch of Canadian Friends sent a deputation to Ottawa to present the Quaker position on "The Responsibilities of Public Men, Militarism, Temperance, Judicial Oaths, and Capital Punishment." During the course of their meeting in the office of the Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier praised Canadian Quakers for their advocacy of reforms.⁵⁶

In the meantime, the evangelical spirit credited with broadening Quaker activities in society also affected the larger Protestant world, resulting, in one of its phases, in the liberal social gospel movement of the latter nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. The social gospel was a social religious outlook concerned with the realization of the Kingdom of God on earth. It represented liberal Protestantism's optimistic faith in an evolutionary progression towards the perfect Christian society. The evangelical creed of personal perfection was planted in Canada by the Baptists, Congregationalists, and Methodists and later by the Free Kirk movement within Presbyterianism. Their belief in an immanent God, free will, and restrictive personal and social morality had become a dominant feature of Canadian Protestantism

in the course of the nineteenth century.⁵⁷ Canadian national expansion and the hope of a Christian society in the northern half of the continent, the growing awareness of social problems, and the spread of liberal and social conceptions after 1867 pressed evangelicals to reinterpret their gospel in terms of a social as well as a personal creed. The need to Christianize the world blossomed into a program of social salvation, in the course of which the Christian doctrine of peace became inextricably linked with the hope of attaining the Christian social order.⁵⁸

One of the first Canadians to relate the social gospel to international affairs was C. S. Eby, a Methodist missionary to Japan in the 1870's and 1880's. While in Japan, Eby edited the Mission's Chrysanthemum Magazine and in 1883 he delivered a series of lectures on "Christianity and Civilization" to foreign and native scholars at the Meiji Kuaido in Tokyo. His experience as a missionary had made him aware of the inability of the Christian Church, "entombed in institutions and anachronistic forms of thought," to compete with secular forces shaping the destiny of the world.⁵⁹ His message, therefore, called for a Christianity that could lead towards the triumph of the Kingdom of God on earth. Once back in Canada, Eby founded the Peoples' Institute, a socialist church in Toronto, in 1909, the same year he became secretary of the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society.⁶⁰ He also wrote a series of pamphlets on "The Word of the Kingdom" which were later incorporated into his book, The World Problem and the Divine Solution.

The world problem according to Eby was that the "so-called Christian nations" were rotten within and world plunderers without, ". . . a travesty of the thing for which the Bible stands."⁶¹ But Canada, being part of the new world, had a choice and the opportunity to set an example for the rest of the world. He wrote:

Canada is beginning a career which is bound to be epoch-making in the history of the world. Is Canada to be carried into this destructive flood, under which all old nations have perished? Must we keep up the dance of death with all mature nations now heading in the same direction of moral failure? Or is it possible that we may find a better way and influence other nations for the common good? Underneath the bad in every land there is the fundamental desire for the good: underneath the war-attitude there is the everlasting profession of a desire for peace: underneath the universal exploitation of man by man there is the universal protestation of the desire to do right. . . .⁶²

Eby claimed the solution to the world problem did not lie in just practical socialist planning since socialism alone was a "modern paganism" lacking intellectual and spiritual strength. The only solution was a world renaissance of Christianity; a revival of the spiritual and practical rules laid down by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount.⁶³ If all Christian Churches, claimed Eby, "were followers of Jesus, they could and would say 'Peace, be still,' and there would be universal peace and a new earth."⁶⁴ Thus, the Sermon on the Mount was the Charter to govern future actions of Canadians.

The social gospel concern for peace and human justice, as voiced by Eby and others, became enmeshed in the liberal reform movement and the peace movement in particular. The altruistic spirit of most Canadian reformers, whether they were journalists, ministers,

politicians or trade unionists, was based upon social gospel principles. Their faith in the Messianic quality of a peaceful Kingdom on earth, however, diverted their attention away from the consideration of the possibility and consequences of actual warfare. It was only once World War I struck that social gossellers faced squarely the issue of absolute pacifism. Until that time early social gospel rhetoric reflected the general faith that world peace and social justice would be the ultimate rewards for following the word of Christ, especially the Sermon on the Mount.

The first direct challenge to Canadian pacifists and peace advocates came with the outbreak of the Boer War in 1899, but, although it interrupted the growth of the peace movement, it did not seem to have any detrimental effect on its subsequent development. A Canadian contingent left for South Africa soon after the outbreak of hostilities and by Christmas, 1899, Protestant churches in Toronto offered special prayer services for the success of the British cause in bringing the blessings of civilization to South Africa.⁶⁵ Opposition to the war, however, did exist in isolated instances among certain segments of Canadian society, such as the Protestant clergy, radical labor, farmers, and anglophobic minority groups. Their stand remained far from popular in the tide of emotional imperialism that swept the country.⁶⁶ Recalling the gruelling episode of his father's pacifist stand while a minister in Vancouver, Roland Bainton claimed that it was more difficult to criticize the Boer War in Canada than in Britain.⁶⁷

Rev. James Herbert Bainton, newly arrived from Ilkeston, England, no sooner took charge of the Congregational Church in Vancouver when a controversy erupted concerning his pacifism. He sometimes referred to the Boer War in his public prayers and asked God to look with compassion on the British and Boer alike. Such prayers incensed the "super-patriots" of the congregation and they demanded a forthright statement from their new minister on the war. The elder Bainton answered this request in a sermon in which he confided that he thought the war was deplorable and hoped all agreed.⁴⁸ It was deplorable for both physical and moral reasons, claimed Bainton, since it had a deleterious moral effect upon the participants. He continued:

War blunts the moral feeling of the nation because it slays sympathy. We grow insensitive to human feeling and we hear of the slaughter of hundreds, perhaps thousands with less sorrow than we do of the death of a single friend. Compassion is in danger of dying when a nation is at war.⁶⁹

Rev. Bainton concluded his remarks with the assertion that any war was incompatible with Christianity. "No, in my heart of hearts," he said, "I do not believe Jesus Christ would have countenanced war of any description."⁷⁰

Reaction to the sermon split the congregation and while the majority continued to support Bainton, the "super-patriotic" faction seceded. Such a small congregation of around 125 persons could not long afford such a division so when the war was over Bainton decided to leave, hoping the dissidents would then return. The experience proved

to be a sobering ordeal for the Bainton family. Mrs. Bainton ". . . took it very intensely and the worry permanently impaired her health." It was decided that since all of Canada had been involved in the war it was best to emigrate to the United States.⁷¹ The Bainton experience was one example of a Christian minister's pacifist conscience in conflict with the popular position accepted by a significant part of his congregation and was to be repeated in Canada again and again during the course of the century.

There were numerous other cases of anti-war statements by clergymen for denunciations of the Boer War came from the ranks of each major Protestant denomination in Canada. The Rev. Dr. William Wright, Anglican priest of St. John the Evangelist parish in Montreal, preached that war was inconsistent with Christianity on the very Sunday designated by Anglicans as a day to support the war.⁷² Also, the sermons of Rev. J. C. Herdman, pastor of Knox Presbyterian, Calgary, expressed pro-Boer sentiments and condemned the wickedness of war. While Herdman's anti-war statements received wide press coverage, the widest public notice was won by Rev. Morgan Woods, minister of Bond Street Congregational Church, Toronto, whose pacifist protests appeared in The Globe, a dozen Ontario weeklies and some out-of-province papers. His proposed peace movement, however, never got off the ground.⁷³ There were also isolated cases of anti-war pronouncements by Methodist clergymen although the majority were somewhat ambivalent.⁷⁴ The hierarchy of the Methodist Church, on the other hand, openly supported the war.

A major Protestant body sympathetic to pacifism was the Women's Christian Temperance Union. The various provincial sections adopted resolutions favoring peace and arbitration, such as the Ontario union's resolution which read:

Resolved, that we place on record our deep regrets that our country has recently deemed it necessary to engage in war, that we earnestly recommend the women of our country to proclaim the principles of peace, and that we do all in our power to discourage the fostering of the military spirit in our families, in our schools and in our churches and also resolved, that we favor the settlement of international disputes by arbitration instead of war.⁷⁵

The annual convention of the Dominion WCTU in 1899, however, side-stepped the war issue and merely expressed regret over it.⁷⁶

An example of a liberal pacifist in Canada at the time was J. E. Atkinson, editor of the Toronto Star. His pacifism was founded upon social gospel principles and reflected the contemporary reform spirit, but it is doubtful that he was an absolute pacifist. According to his biographer, Atkinson believed Canada was stampeded into participating in the war by British newspapers and the Montreal Star but he tried to keep his head.⁷⁷ "As a newspaper man," claims Harkness, "Mr. Atkinson had to report the war, as a pacifist, he was determined not to glorify it."⁷⁸ When Atkinson advocated a negotiated peace with honor he was buried in an "avalanche of vituperation."⁷⁹

While the Star remained neutral, an anti-war position was expressed by the occasional radical labor and farm journal. The Voice, a weekly endorsed by the Winnipeg Trades and Labor Council, at first adopted the radical critique of war as a capitalist creation and urged

men to refuse to fight. Within a month, however, it changed its course and supported the British cause, due to the political aspirations of one of the editors, Arthur W. Puttee, a leading Winnipeg "labourite."⁸⁰

In the 1900 by-election, Puttee defeated the independent Liberal candidate, Edward D. Martin, by only ten votes to become the first labor member elected to the Canadian House of Commons. Although the basic issue in the election appears to have been the question of independent representation for labor, the war assumed an "inordinately important" role in the closing days of the campaign as a result of mounting British losses in South Africa and Martin's accusation that Puttee and The Voice were pro-Boer. In response The Voice began to rephrase its position in line with the militant mood of the city and Puttee actually pledged himself to vote for war supplies. His apostasy aroused considerable criticism within radical labor circles and contributed towards the mounting suspicion among the more radical socialists that Puttee was an opportunist.⁸¹

A more faithful radical position was expressed by the Toronto weekly, The Citizen and Country, official journal of the Toronto Trades and Labor Council under the editorship of George Wrigley. From its inception in 1898, Citizen and Country advocated the Christian socialist position against war and in favor of social, moral and economic reform common to the more radical element within the Canadian social gospel movement. The journal's content ranged from discussions of the benefits of Christian socialism and the single tax to the curse of militarism and

the question of peace. It also reprinted British anti-war articles since the editor reflected generally the attitude representative of Keir Hardie's Independent Labour Party and the British pro-Boer faction.

George Wrigley had made a career of editing labor and reform journals⁸² and as secretary of the Direct Legislation League of Canada he actively promoted the Social Progress League, a citizen's discussion group in Toronto, and the Canadian Socialist League which advocated reforms and public ownership.⁸³ His pacifist position, based upon the Christian socialist conception of the brotherhood of man, was evident in his relentless denunciations of the Spanish American War and the South African War. War was not only a setback for social progress, claimed Wrigley, but also led to a moral degeneration within Canada affecting the government, the press and the Church. He believed that the Canadian people would have condemned England's policy in South Africa if it were not for a "purchased metropolitan press" that distorted the truth and misled the public.⁸⁴ "We regret exceedingly," wrote Wrigley, "that Canada has a jingo press and jingo politicians. We fear, too, that her pulpits are jingoistic. Mammon is King, and War is her Minister."⁸⁵ In one editorial he asked if clergymen were voiceless on the matter and on another occasion he warned that ". . . the clergyman who prays for his country when he knows it to be wrong is standing on the brink of hell."⁸⁶ Above all, Wrigley feared that the war unleashed a violent attitude that could brutalize Canadian

society and possibly create a dangerous cultural cleavage in the country.

During the course of the war Wrigley expressed the pro-Boer viewpoint and ran such articles as a biography of Paul Kruger. In October, 1899 he noted with pride that:

Citizen and Country has a large constituency of thoughtful readers, and we are glad that no one has complained because we have championed the cause of the Boer. Canadians are not all jingoes.⁸⁷

But Wrigley was not complacent and the paper consistently contained warnings on the danger of militarism in Canada as in the following alarm sounded by a contributor from Brandon, Manitoba:

Canadians, wake up! or the Maple Leaf will wither. Almost every newspaper, especially the subsidized press . . . are howling for militarism. Why is this? Even in the schools they are preparing for the same thing, they preach patriotism and invite the military spirit. . . .⁸⁸

Such individual contributors often added fuel to the fire of Wrigley's personal anti-war campaign. In another instance, working-class opposition to war was expressed in an article on "Anglo-Saxon Jingoism" by Phillips Thompson of Toronto, left-wing intellectual and author of the book Politics of Labor (1888), the first Canadian socialist critique of North American capitalism. Thompson echoed the classic British pro-Boer labour argument that workers gained nothing from war but a further setback in the realization of social progress.⁸⁹

Wrigley never faltered as a war critic, even when threatened with the resignation of Rev. Elliot S. Rowe, the popular president of the Social Progress Company, Citizen and Country's publisher, in

protest over Wrigley's anti-war stand. Wrigley countered that Rowe was the only one of the five directors to complain and argued that the journal was actually gaining in popularity.⁹⁰ In its critical assessment of the Boer War, Citizen and Country held capitalist and imperialist exploitation responsible and concluded there were ". . . few Canadians better able to correctly state the motives governing the Parliament of Great Britain in the South African question than Prof. Goldwin Smith."⁹¹

Goldwin Smith, arch-supporter of Anglo-American unity and anti-imperialist, became the best known English-Canadian opposed to the Boer War. His version of world peace was based upon the Manchester Liberal idea of order and stability rooted in laissez-faire economics. His arguments against the war reflected those of the British anti-imperialist Liberals. Of all Canadian anti-war spokesmen, he alone ". . . deplored British 'atrocities,' the concentration camps, and the use of dum-dum bullets."⁹² In his two small Toronto weeklies Smith carried on a steady campaign against the imperial war, especially Canadian enthusiasm. "'Most repulsive,'" he lamented, "'is the sight of volunteers going . . . to slaughter people who have done them no wrong in a cause about which they know nothing.'"⁹³

Smith's paper, The Farmers' Weekly Sun was one of four Canadian rural weeklies firmly to oppose the war. The others were: The Bobcaygeon Independent, The Canadian Gleaner and The Standard.⁹⁴ They all sympathized with the poor Boer farmers and appealed to the anti-militarism and strong morality common to Canadian farmers.

In contrast to Goldwin Smith, Robert Sellar, editor of The Canadian Gleaner of Huntington, Quebec, appealed to farmers' isolationist sentiments. The Gleaner also posed as the last bulwark of Quebec's English Protestant farmers and expressed fear that Quebec nationalists would press for greater provincial autonomy due to English-Canadian zeal for war.⁹⁵

Threats of internal cultural divisions were evident in the anglophobic/anti-imperialist sentiments expressed by German Canadians, Irish Canadians and most particularly, French Canadians. Anti-war sentiment ran rampant in Quebec resulting in student riots in Montreal in March, 1900.⁹⁶ The press in Quebec interpreted the war as imperial aggression and French Canadian nationalists demanded Canada prove her independent nationhood by refusing to fight in an imperialist war. Their leading spokesman was Henri Bourassa, father of modern French Canadian nationalism, who resigned his seat in Parliament to emphasize his convictions.⁹⁷

In 1900 Bourassa suggested to Goldwin Smith the creation of an anti-imperialist party. But no coalition of French-English dissidents was formed; no peace party was created. The anti-war factions failed to move from "verbal protests to concerted action."⁹⁸ They lacked the numbers necessary for political force and were divided in their motives and on the issues, including that of pacifism.

For a time the war fever in Canada more or less paralyzed the peace movement. The Superintendent of the Dominion Women's Christian Temperance Union reflected in 1901 that:

The din of the war was such that for a time it seemed useless to call attention to this work, as we feared but little heed would be paid to the small voice of peace. . . .

Imperialism, patriotism, heroism and loyalty have been continuously before us, and the military craze has been carried to such an extent that those who did not bow down as hero-worshippers were looked upon as disloyal.⁹⁹

The Dominion WCTU had made one of the first efforts to involve Canadians in the peace movement with its establishment of a Peace and Arbitration Department in the early 1890's. This department's aim was to ". . . mould public opinion up to a higher standard; to lead all to believe that arbitration and reconciliation are better for a nation than war and conquest."¹⁰⁰ The results of the new department's work, however, were discouraging. The WCTU soon discovered it was much easier to voice platitudes than actually to enlist support against cadet training or the sale of war toys.¹⁰¹ Although most of its activity centered upon the Montreal area, an active department was established in Nova Scotia in 1908.¹⁰² Overall the WCTU concentrated their attack on the growth of militarism in Canada and worked in conjunction with other organizations such as the National Council of Women.

It was Mrs. Ada Courtice, WCTU peace activist and wife of the founder of the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society, who suggested the creation of a Peace and Arbitration Committee by the National Council of Women in 1904.¹⁰³ Mrs. Courtice echoed the feminist argument that women should take the lead in peace work since they suffered the most from the effects of war on family life, but the response to Mrs. Courtice's call was disappointing. By 1908 only six

out of twenty-four local councils appointed representatives to the national peace committee.¹⁰⁴ Although some local councils did take part in circulating a petition endorsing international use of the Hague Court, the National Council of Women, from the national peace and arbitration committee to the local councils, was not ready to commit itself to any specific proposals for arbitration and disarmament. Nor could they penetrate the general apathy of Canadian women concerning war and peace.

In theory, however, all women's organizations in Canada were supposed to be pacifist due to the general acceptance of the nineteenth century stereotype of women as the morally superior sex. The central assumption was that

women were free from aggressive instincts, a freedom which made them men's moral superiors at all times. Woman as the nurturer of life could have no warlike emotions and should she receive her political rights it followed that society would be cleansed of conflict and nation states would no longer go to war.¹⁰⁵

The special interest of Canadian women in peace, therefore, was closely allied to the wider middle-class movement for suffrage and temperance. According to the feminist solution, once women received the vote they could prevent war and prohibit drink, resulting in both international and domestic peace and Christian progress.

One such Canadian feminist was Flora Macdonald Denison, columnist for the Toronto World. In a biennial presidential address to the Canadian Suffrage Association she claimed ". . . the male through centuries upon centuries has been combative and war has resulted."

Only with political freedom and equality, she argued, could women effectively combat militarism and foster peace.¹⁰⁶

The same message was echoed by the suffragist and social reformer Nellie McClung when she condemned Canada's national policies of unjust taxation, legalized liquor traffic and militarism as the result of "male statecraft."¹⁰⁷ She insisted that war was not inevitable:

War is not of God's making. War is a crime committed by men and, therefore, when enough people say it shall not be, it cannot be.¹⁰⁸

At the core of McClung's feminism, a product of the social gospel, was the faith in women as redeeming agents in a militaristic civilization.¹⁰⁹ Peace would not arrive until:

. . . women are allowed to say what they think of war. Up to the present time women have had nothing to say about war, except pay the price of war -- this privilege has been theirs always.¹¹⁰

A close friend and associate of Nellie McClung and a leading figure in the Canadian women's movement was Judge Emily Murphy of Edmonton. Among her various civil endeavors, Judge Murphy organized the Women's Canadian Club of Edmonton, served as president of the Canadian Women's Press Club for several years and headed the Canadian National Council of Women's Peace and Arbitration Committee in 1914, the year its membership more than doubled.¹¹¹ In this latter capacity she praised the work of the Hague Court and predicted "a world without war" in the twentieth century.¹¹²

Contrary to the popular impression, however, Canadian women were not committed pacifists. The most support for a women's peace movement came from the WCTU but by 1914 even it was concentrating on such innocuous activities as persuading ministers to celebrate Peace Sunday, an annual commemoration of the first Hague Conference used to re-emphasize Christian principles of peace. It was evident that such a policy, lacking any serious commitment for an active pacifist program, would not accomplish much to secure peace. Even Nellie McClung lamented:

Once a year, of course, we hold a Peace Sunday and on that day we pray mightily that God will give us peace in our time and that war shall be no more. . . . But the next day we show God that he need not take us too literally, for we go on with the military training, and the building of the battleships, and our orators say that in time of peace we must prepare for war.¹¹³

Rather than women's organizations, the major representative of liberal pacifists was the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society, the first non-denominational peace society organized in Canada. The creation of such a non-denominational peace committee was initiated by a group of Hicksite Friends in Toronto in 1904.¹¹⁴ But the task of enlisting other Christian pacifists was undertaken by Andrew Cory Courtice, a former editor of the Christian Guardian and a Methodist minister in Toronto. The Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society, quickly endorsed by the Farmers Convention of Ontario and several churches, counted among its membership such prominent men as Professor Adam Shortt of Queen's University, Professor J. McCurdy of the University of Toronto, Professor Lewis E. Horning of Victoria College and Sir William Mulock,

Chief Justice of the Ontario High Court of Justice.¹¹⁵ The support of the business community was also enlisted, largely through the efforts of Elias Rogers, a prominent Quaker businessman and Liberal politician who was a Toronto alderman and the unsuccessful reform candidate for Mayor of Toronto in 1888.¹¹⁶ Eventually there were members scattered across Canada, but the center of the Society's activities always remained in Toronto. From their periodic meetings in Mulock's home, the Society concentrated its efforts, as did the WCTU, in promoting peace education in schools, pledging support for international arbitration and denouncing militarism, whether it was cadet training or an increase in defense expenditures.¹¹⁷ Overall, therefore, Canada's liberal pacifists were pragmatic and promoted a generally inoffensive campaign for peace based upon broad Christian principles and international goodwill rather than upon a strict interpretation of pacifism.

An example of this practical approach was the unified attack by liberal pacifists upon the question of militarism, especially the practice of cadet training in public schools. Ever since the Boer War the equation among English-speaking Canadians of Canadian patriotism with the British Empire resulted in a blossoming cadet movement. A huge cadet parade became the high point of Empire Day celebrations in Toronto as imperial fervor continued to build.¹¹⁸ In fact, the injection of the martial spirit into Empire Day celebrations actually increased public support for the day.¹¹⁹ Nevertheless, nearly all

pacifist groups opposed such militia training and used it to good advantage in relating the issue of militarism to the local community. Pacifist pressure as well as escalating costs eventually restrained the spread of military training into several school districts and excluded it entirely in others, particularly in Nova Scotia and the West.¹²⁰

Although small, the Canadian peace movement was not without its vocal champions of peace. One prominent pacifist speaker was Lewis G. Horning, a professor of classics and teutonic philology at Victoria College and president of the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society. On the eve of the Great War he undertook a vigorous speaking tour to arouse the nation to the growing menace of militarism and an escalating trend towards war. In an address before the Canadian Club of Hamilton, Horning declared his greatest hope for world peace lay not with commercial, educational or religious forces but with the common man and personal interaction and friendship between England and Germany.¹²¹ Horning's emphasis upon the survival of teutonic ideals made war between German and Anglo-Saxon unthinkable. He concluded that peace among teutonic peoples was of special concern to Canadians:

I believe that we here in Canada are especially favored by fortune . . . we are becoming a melting pot out of which will come a new race combining the political sagacity of Anglo-Saxon, imagination of the German, the polish and tact of the French, the adaptability of the Southeast, the patience of the East, an unequalled and unbeatable combination. Therefore, we ought to be profoundly interested in the first step towards the realization of that ideal . . . the fostering of peace and amity between the great sisters, England and Germany.¹²²

Horning also reiterated the popular call for Anglo-American unity. "We in Canada and the United States," he boasted "have a mission in this world. We have no entanglements in our alliances. We have the chance to show the best of all civilization."¹²³ Again in an article in the Christian Guardian, Horning continued his assault on those "upholders of war" who claimed war produced training for heroic conduct or survival of the fittest. "How can war result in survival of the fittest," he asked, "when the flower of our young men are led away to death?" He concluded that rivalry among nations, rather than finding expression in war and armaments, should be expressed in work towards the "uplifting of humanity and . . . in the increasing of opportunity for each individual to round out his life in the highest and noblest service." "If we believe these things," claimed Horning, "then we must work for peace and goodwill upon the earth."¹²⁴

Another leading exponent of the liberal peace movement influenced by the social gospel was James Alexander Macdonald, Managing Editor of the Toronto Globe and a representative of various United States based peace organizations in pre-war Canada.¹²⁵ As one of the directors of the World Peace Foundation, the philanthropic research organization endowed by the American publisher Edwin Ginn, Macdonald travelled, lectured and wrote on peace as well as one of his favorite topics -- the "North American Idea." This idea, which Macdonald viewed as almost a prerequisite for world peace, drew upon the North American example of peaceful relations and the eventual spread of their "liberty, democracy and fraternity to a world community of free nations."¹²⁶

In his book, The North American Idea, Macdonald wrote:

The Anglo-Saxon idea, the British idea, the North American idea, the World idea, that a free people must be left free and be kept free -- that idea cannot live merely as an abstract idea alone. It must find release in life. It must dominate the thinking and organize the service and direct the activities of all who would be free.¹²⁷

Canada and the United States, Macdonald claimed, were the trustees of the hope for all humanity.

As the world situation began to worsen in 1912 the Globe urged Britain, Germany and America to lift themselves above the barbarism that still disfigured international relations. "The new and critical world situation which this decade faces," ran one editorial, "is a challenge to Christendom to Christianize the ideals and motives of all the world and to do it in this generation."¹²⁸

The breeding ground for the North American idea of peaceful international relations was the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration. These annual conferences were attended by a wide variety of individuals interested in international affairs from politicians to business leaders and church leaders. The Lake Mohonk Conferences, however, concerned arbitration and the practical side of the peace movement, not pacifism. Indeed, the Conference actually applied selectivity of membership and prescribed rules prohibiting references to the horrors of war, absolute pacifism or specific alarming realities, in order to maintain an air of genteel demeanor.¹²⁹ What was characteristic of the Lake Mohonk Conference was also true of the larger pre-war peace movement. The support of businessmen and

other non-pacifists was believed to add prestige but, in reality, it weakened the movement and made it unlikely that peace organizations would take a controversial stand.

Canadian involvement in the Lake Mohonk scene began when Oliver A. Howland, Member of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, was invited to attend the Conference in 1904. As President of the International Deep Waterways Association, Howland had advocated the creation of a permanent International Court of Appeal to settle all disputes between Canada and the United States, thus capturing the attention of the American arbitration sympathizers.¹³⁰ Canadians were invited to each succeeding Conference thereafter, and at its close in 1915, thirty-one prominent Canadians -- businessmen, politicians, justices, lawyers, clergymen and journalists -- had visited Lake Mohonk. These Canadian participants assured the Conferences that Canada definitely supported their movement for peace and, on one occasion, cited an endorsement by Prime Minister Laurier.¹³¹ Reflecting the overriding theme of most speeches, three-fourths of all Canadian addresses were devoted to praising the idea of arbitration as promoted by the Conference.¹³²

Indeed, arbitration was hailed as the sure-fire remedy for all international ills. It was not only "practically infallible" in preventing war but also effective in removing a desire for war. This was the reasoning used by the Lake Mohonk Conference's appeal to businessmen in their circulars: "Why Business Men Should Promote International Arbitration" and "How Business Men Should Promote

International Arbitration."¹³³ Support for this idea among the Canadian business community was encouraged by Elias Rogers, a frequent delegate to Lake Mohonk representing the Toronto Board of Trade. By 1907 the principle of arbitration was endorsed by the Retail Merchants Association of Canada, the Canadian Manufacturers Association, and the Winnipeg, Hamilton, Toronto and Montreal Boards of Trade.¹³⁴

Besides Rogers, other frequent Canadian participants included John Murray Clark, a Toronto lawyer; John Lewis, editor of the Toronto Star; William Lyon Mackenzie King and Senator Raoul Dandurand. In his address to the 1909 Conference, Clark drew attention to the uses of arbitration and conciliation by the Canadian Government in settling labor disputes. The following year William Lyon Mackenzie King, Minister of Labour, was present at Lake Mohonk to share his experience in the practical application of arbitration in domestic quarrels. "The greatest contribution to the cause of international peace," claimed King, "will be the furtherance of industrial peace."¹³⁵ If workingmen accept the appeal to reason in settling disputes, why can not nations? The successful application of arbitration in the industrial world, he concluded, was a preview of its possibilities on the international scene.¹³⁶

Upon their return home, Canadians eagerly spread the faith in international arbitration and the hope for peaceful international relations. Although they failed to organize many Canadian branches of American peace organizations, they were more successful in arousing interest in arbitration. In 1907 the Ontario Legislative Assembly

endorsed a resolution to turn the Hague Conference into a permanent international congress with powers of arbitration.¹³⁷

Another endorsement of international arbitration among Canadian parliamentarians was Senator Raoul Dandurand's effort to form a Canadian group of the Interparliamentary Union for Peace in 1907. After persuading over 100 parliamentarians to subscribe to the principle of arbitration in settling international disputes, however, he was not able to obtain official membership for colonials until 1913. In the meantime interest waned and it never did excite much more than enthusiasm for the general idea of arbitration.¹³⁸

A further endorsement of arbitration came from the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Meeting in Ottawa in 1911, the Presbyterian Assembly issued the following statement on the Church's attitude toward war:

We believe that war is contrary to Christian morals, and that international disputes should be settled by conciliation and arbitration. We protest against the patent injustice of submitting questions of right and wrong to trial by force, as well as against the enormous cost, destruction and cruelty entailed. We believe that the Church should support every wise effort to restrain and abolish war. We believe that the great Commandment: "Thou shalt love" is binding upon nations as well as individuals.¹³⁹

This was quite a switch from the previous Presbyterian statements during the nineteenth century in support of British wars and the use of force.¹⁴⁰ Canadian Presbyterianism had never questioned warfare from a Christian viewpoint until the popularization of peace rhetoric following the Boer War. Thereafter the Church accepted the liberal peace movement, as exemplified in an article entitled "Canada and the

Peace Movement" by Rev. R. W. Dickie of Montreal. "Canadians can do nothing better for the Peace Movement," declared Dickie, "than to do some hard thinking about the fruit of past wars and the present burden of armaments . . . as Christians it is our duty to stand against the war idea. . . ." ¹⁴¹ The Presbyterian, an unofficial church weekly in Toronto, also endorsed the movement for disarmament and peace arguing that the most significant consequence of the international arms rivalry was moral rather than economic. "The effect of all this military preparation and enthusiasm," claimed the editor, "is to enthrone force rather than justice as arbiter of international disputes." ¹⁴² The ideals of Christ were being replaced by those of paganism.

Similar arguments were raised by Methodists, especially those participating in the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society. The official organ of the Methodist Church, The Christian Guardian, expanded its pacifist-oriented approach to include specific proposals for the prevention of war through direct strike action by unions and occupational groups. Dr. W. W. Andrews, an ordained Methodist minister and unorthodox evolutionist working in scientific research at the University of Saskatchewan, suggested that various groups within society could prevent war: banks could do so by refusing to make loans; labor could do so with an international strike; popular enforcement of a commercial boycott was possible through world-wide press services; while commercial interests naturally favored peace and uninterrupted international trade. There was never a time when the promise of peace was so strong, he concluded, than the present. ¹⁴³

Despite such optimism the Canadian churches overall gave little serious attention to the problems of peace.¹⁴⁴ Of course, there were the usual resolutions endorsing the Hague principles of arbitration but only a small proportion of Canadian clergy were actually involved in peace work. Canadian churches held divergent views on the role of the Church in promoting peace and they were as uncertain as the general public on how best to maintain peace. Even the Methodists, the most vocal advocates of peace, had their supporters of armed preparedness.¹⁴⁵

But this did not mean that there were not strong statements from clergymen on behalf of peace. Once such message was an address entitled "Canadian Churches and Peace" delivered to the Lake Mohonk Conference in 1911 by Rev. William Sparling, pastor of St. James Methodist Church in Montreal. Sparling had social gospel leanings but his speech also showed how the older evangelism of the heart persisted, even in peace rhetoric. He claimed that what was needed in Canada was a strong public opinion upon the moral question of peace:

At bottom the forces that make for peace are moral forces, and those moral forces reside in the heart of the individual: hence, the responsibility that rests upon all our churches in creating the national opinion that will bring about the day of peace.¹⁴⁴

The war spirit, Sparling continued, was the arch enemy of Jesus Christ; war and Christianity were mutually destructive forces. As a course of action, therefore, he proposed that

the Christian church must preach that love is the all-conquering force in the world; a love which will drive out the belligerent spirit from our hearts and will help us that we may never stimulate that spirit in other hearts. . . . If we could only get the Thirteenth Chapter of First Corinthians written upon the hearts of people, we would have no war.¹⁴⁷

Sparling concluded by warning the Conference that "there are people who profess to point out some good things of war in history but I do not think that war can possibly bring Canada anything but what is bad."¹⁴⁷

The attacks on militarism which surfaced in the peace movement at Lake Mohonk and among such churchmen as Sparling, were directly challenged by the Canadian Defense League, a rival organization that mounted a public campaign to increase military expenditures and encourage military training in the nation's schools, with future aims at compulsory militia service. The strongest reaction to this renewed defense of militarism came from the Quakers. In an article in The Canadian Friend entitled "Militarism in Canada" Arthur G. Dorland, a young Quaker destined to become the leading spokesman for Canadian Friends, claimed the military propagandist was attempting to recover ground recently lost to the "phenomenal progress of the Peace Movement." He warned Canadian pacifists not to lapse into a "condition of self-congratulatory inaction" since their success ". . . has aroused just as determined an effort on the part of the militarists to recapture public opinion."¹⁴⁹ He accused the militarists of using periodic war-

scare talks to prepare people for universal military training and compulsory military service. "If the militarists can win over the younger generation to their propoganda," he warned, "they will have set back the cause of peace for over a century and have won Canada for militarism."

Dorland proceeded to point out that military conscription had recently become law in Australia and New Zealand. If the Minister of Militia, Colonel Sam Hughes, and the Canadian Defense League could have their way, this would happen in Canada too. The most immediate danger, according to Dorland, stemmed from military training in schools.

Many of our big collegiate institutes and high schools have cadet corps in which attendance is practically compulsory. For several years it has been the policy of the Government to subsidize schools which give military training, thus discriminating against those where it was not taught. And all this with a definite purpose. To pretend that the purpose of all this military training in the schools and colleges is the physical development of the students, will not do, "Uniforms and guns have a definite significance. They minister to the war passion. They signify War."¹⁵⁰

In 1913 the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends sent a resolution to Ottawa condemning increased military expenditures and its accompanying war system and urged the creation of a National Peace Commission. Such a Commission, or Department of Peace, was to help eliminate distrust between nations, promote the feeling of brotherhood and understanding among all peoples and help stem the tide of militarism within Canada.¹⁵¹ Although nothing came of the suggestion, Friends were thankful for what they considered an advance in the peace movement.

At the same time, however, they were saddened at the prospect of peaceful peoples "being sucked into the vortex of military preparations" and, despite their hope for peace, they were candidly warning their membership by 1913 that the time might not be distant when they would be called upon to defend their pacifist principles "at heavy cost."¹⁵²

Although Quakers and other pacifist organizations were centered in Ontario, pre-war pacifist declarations emanated from the West as well. In March 1914, for instance, Professor S. M. Earlman of the University of Calgary sounded a note of isolationist innocence when he warned an Alberta Rural Municipalities meeting that: "It is not our duty to squander our fair heritage in aggravating Old World ills."¹⁵³ From Regina the temperance crusader C. B. Kennleyside, later a Methodist chaplain during the war, proposed that spending 30,000,000 dollars to spread the gospel would be a greater national protection than the same amount for defense expenditures.¹⁵⁴ Also, by 1914 two small independent peace societies functioned in Regina and Victoria.¹⁵⁵

On the whole, pacifist warnings found a sympathetic audience in the farm community, but, as John H. Thompson suggests, the most common reaction of Westerners tended to be "pacifism of the pocketbook as much as of principle."¹⁵⁶ Although the National Grange had earlier endorsed the idea of disarmament and international peace, it was not until the Canadian naval debate in 1910 that Canadian farmers joined in the discussion of foreign affairs and the prospects for peace. The Grain Grower's Guide, the leading voice of Canadian farmers, always

considered the question of international affairs and armaments within the context of free trade and lower taxes.¹⁵⁷ According to this formula free trade and lower taxes would lead to international co-operation disarmament and peace; while protectionism led to higher taxes, increased defense expenditures and war. It was obvious, therefore, that farmers would benefit from free trade and international peace. A poll conducted by the Guide in 1913 revealed that a majority of those who replied agreed that Canada should divert defense funds marked for naval armaments towards the realization of disarmament and arbitration.¹⁵⁸

Leading Canadian farm journals, including the Guide, Weekly Sun and the Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine, presented a consistent denunciation of militarism and increased defense spending throughout the pre-war years.¹⁵⁹ Some farm leaders like W. C. Good of Ontario also addressed these problems but, overall, most Canadian farmers resembled the rest of Canadian society. They shared the illusion of a peaceful and secure North American continent while generally remaining apathetic to international affairs. It was difficult, in the isolation of rural life, to think about the horrors of war.¹⁶⁰

Labor opposed the trend towards militarism and war as well and the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada (TLC) passed numerous resolutions condemning war as a capitalist ploy. As early as 1911 the TLC convention in Calgary passed a resolution supporting a general strike to help prevent the outbreak of war and for the three succeeding years the Congress reiterated its opposition to international conflicts

with the argument that wars resulted in the degradation of the working class. In May, 1914, James Simpson, Vice-President of the TLC, warned a labor meeting in St. Thomas, Ontario, that workers could not be faithful to both their unions and the militia at the same time, an idea which posed a real dilemma later that year.¹⁶¹ But in pre-war Canada, the TLC and Canadian labor, like farmers, were not deeply concerned with the prospects of world peace and were content merely to pass resolutions in favor of international arbitration. Nevertheless, the fact that they did anything at all reflected some growth of anxiety about world affairs in farm and labor circles.

When the Canadian public did think about peace or internationalism during the immediate pre-war years, they usually thought of the upcoming centenary celebrations commemorating one hundred years of peace between Canada and the United States. It was this single event that fired the imaginations and enthusiasm of the Canadian public; joined the forces of Canadians interested in peace; and diverted attention away from the more serious and controversial questions of peace and pacifism.

The idea to celebrate the Anglo-American Peace Centenary was first suggested by Mackenzie King. He was successful in persuading both the Americans and British to establish committees to organize the celebrations but found the Canadian Government reluctant to act until the British Government indicated its final support of the idea in 1912. Prime Minister Borden then proceeded, with the assistance

of Sir George Perley and Sir Joseph Pope, to organize an "unofficial" Canadian Peace Centenary Association.¹⁴² An international conference in 1913 coordinated the efforts of the committees and decided that the public festivities would be held in 1915.¹⁴³ The object of the celebrations was to instil in the public mind "the value of international goodwill".¹⁶⁴

Since the Canadian Government wished to avoid any broad international commitments, the Association confined its activities to the usual praise of Anglo-American harmony and internationalism. The Association also co-ordinated the centenary projects of their local affiliations scattered across Canada. Most communities confined their plans to classroom studies of Canadian-American relations, thanksgiving church services and the erection of memorials. The more ambitious international proposals included a centenary monument in each of the three capitals; archways over international highways at the British Columbia-Washington State border and at Rouses's Point, Quebec; a bridge across the Niagara River; and watergates between Detroit and Windsor.¹⁶⁵

As the time for the celebration approached, however, the carefully laid plans for commemorating peace in North America were interrupted by the stark reality of war in Europe. The Executive Committee of the Canadian Peace Centenary Association decided that although the Association should be kept alive to carry on some quiet work, the public festivities in Canada should be postponed.¹⁶⁶

And so ended the momentum of the heralded peace celebrations, as well as the liberal peace movement in Canada. The non-sectarian peace movement was composed largely of "fair-weather pacifists" and once war became a reality they, with the majority of Canadians, eagerly or sorrowfully supported the new cause. The pre-war peace movement therefore, was not a pacifist movement as such, although it did contain some resolute pacifists. It was an example of the liberal, rational approach to international affairs; the belief that reason and arbitration could prevent war. The absolute pacifists among them, mainly Quakers, shared in this hope but also adhered to a pacifist creed they founded upon Christian scripture. The dilemma of the pre-war peace movement arising from its semi-pacifist composition was clearly defined by Arthur G. Dorland a year before the war:

. . . the phenomenal advance of the Peace Movement has tended to make us as Friends feel less responsible for the advocacy of our peace principles . . . some of us have come to believe that our position in regard to war has been pretty generally accepted, in theory, at least by the majority of thinking persons today. But . . . the position adopted by many of the recent advocates of peace differed fundamentally from the position of Friends. For the former, while they condemn the disastrous results of war, still believe that many wars are under certain circumstances justifiable and right. But Friends believe that since war is inherently immoral, it can never be right; and that therefore peaceable methods are the only right and just methods of settling international disputes. 167

In other words, the pre-war peace rhetoric in Canada was not truly representative of the pacifist principles in the radical Christian tradition. As Dorland warned, the neo-pacifists stressed

the futility of war rather than its immorality. In fact, the various liberal reformers largely avoided the moral issues and concentrated, instead, on the generalized threat of militarism, something upon which they could all agree. Little or no thought was given to prepare pacifists for the reality of war nor to formulate some sort of contingency plan of action for pacifists in time of war. No system or international machinery existed to allow Christian goodwill to be expressed in action. Instead, pacifism was viewed by many as negative and passive. As J. M. Bliss has succinctly stated: "Ripples from the world tide of peace sentiment increased the volume of pacifist rhetoric in Edwardian Canada. They did not produce a serious re-examination of the ethics of war."¹⁴⁸ It was this absence of a moral stand that weakened the effectiveness of the liberal peace movement throughout the pre-war years and ultimately led to its disruption during the Great War. Rather than wither completely, however, liberal pacifism began to show signs of an important transition towards a social radicalism which would reflect something of the non-conformist tradition of radical Christian dissent exemplified in Canada by the historic peace sects. ✓

During the late nineteenth century Canada inherited a rare legacy of Christian pacifism from an assortment of immigrant religious sects with radical roots. Their religious radicalism, however, had overall a socially conservative cast deriving from the separatism of the Mennonites, Hutterites, and Doukhobors and the early quietism of the Quakers. ✓ Although these and the later fundamentalist groups

developed their own peculiar beliefs and ways of life, they all shared, in principle, the millennial ideal of a perfect society. "In the Judaeo-Christian tradition," writes J. W. Bennett, "the millennial ideal has played an important role as a revolutionary force and as an impetus for renewal and reform. It has led some men towards a utopian vision, and others toward the active reform of contemporary institutions."¹⁶⁹ The majority of the sectarian pacifists did not follow the latter course and remained "separational pacifists" aloof from politics and society. But the "integrational" Quakers exerted an increasing influence in the liberal reform movement and in the adaptation of Christian pacifism to the realities of a new age.¹⁷⁰ During the course of the war and the immediate post-war years a socially radical pacifism was to take shape which blended the progressive optimism of the liberal creed and the moral radicalism and millennialism of the peace sects. It was this regenerated pacifist idea which would capture the imagination of a notable minority of Canadians during and after the Great War.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹Peters, All Things Common, p. 9.
- ²Epp, Mennonites in Canada, p. 34.
- ³R. A. Knox, Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), p. 169.
- ⁴Brock, Twentieth-Century Pacifism, p. 5; Knox, Enthusiasm, p. 147.
- ⁵Brock, Twentieth-Century Pacifism, p. 7.
- ⁶Epp, Mennonites in Canada, p. 51. "This exemption, however, required service in other capacities such as extinguishing fires, suppressing the insurrections of slaves, caring for the wounded, and transporting food and information." Ibid., p. 51.
- ⁷Ibid., pp. 100-101.
- ⁸Ibid.
- ⁹Dorland, The Quakers in Canada, p. 317.
- ¹⁰Epp, Mennonites in Canada, p. 101. Especially noteworthy were the numerous Mennonite petitions. Ibid., p. 102.
- ¹¹Ibid., pp. 104-105.
- ¹²"Quakers Opposed War Preparations in Upper Canada," The Canadian Friend, 1973, pp. 10-11.
- ¹³31 Victoria Chap. 40 Sect. 17 (1868) as quoted in Epp, Mennonites in Canada, p. 193.
- ¹⁴Ibid., p. 195.
- ¹⁵Ibid., p. 192.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 374.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 315.

¹⁸Peters, All Things Common, p. 46.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 48.

²⁰Bennett, Hutterian Brethren, p. 35.

²¹Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, p. 11.

²²Ibid., pp. 19, 49.

²³The doctrine is common to other Christian groups also, such as Quakers. The presence of Christ refers to the external, expressive element of the trinity, distinct from the man Jesus of Nazareth.

²⁴Woodcock and Avakumovic, Doukhobors, p. 20.

²⁵Brock, Pacifism in Europe, p. 446.

²⁶Woodcock and Avakumovic, Doukhobors, p. 95.

²⁷Brock, Pacifism in Europe, p. 454. Tolstoy's pacifism is expressed in The Kingdom of God is Within You.

²⁸Ibid., p. 461.

²⁹Ibid., p. 456.

³⁰Ibid., p. 454; George Woodcock, Anarchism, A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements (London: Penguin Books, 1963), p. 18.

³¹Ibid., pp. 18, 207.

³²Letter, Tolstoy to Doukhobors, 27 February 1900 as quoted in Woodcock and Avakumovic, Doukhobors, p. 167.

³³Ibid., p. 112; Brock, Pacifism in Europe, p. 452.

³⁴Brock, Pacifism in Europe, p. 464; Anarchist pacifists and neo-Tolstoyan communities did not even surface until the Second World War. Woodcock, Anarchism, p. 218.

³⁵Allen, The Social Passion, p. 10.

³⁶Brock, Pacifism in Europe, p. 461.

³⁷Ibid., p. 470.

³⁸The use of the term fundamentalist refers to those groups within Protestantism which adhere to orthodox religious beliefs based on a literal interpretation of the Bible.

³⁹Brock, Pacifism in Europe, p. 401.

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 403-405; other pacifist sects included the Disciples in Christ and various pentecostal groups.

⁴¹Penton, Jehovah's Witnesses in Canada, p. 9; among his books were the six volume Millennial Dawn series. At Russell's death in 1916, Joseph F. Rutherford became the new President of the Watch Tower Society. Ibid., p. 10.

⁴²Ibid., p. 16; Russell's The Divine Plan of the Ages (1884) presents his view of history.

⁴³Ibid., pp. 35-38.

⁴⁴Donald Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations Before the Manchurian Crisis," Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1972, pp. 9-10.

⁴⁵Peter Brock, Radical Pacifists in Antbellum America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 28.

⁴⁶R. S. Lambert, "Forgotten Peace Prophet," Macleans, March 1, 1945, p. 18.

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 18, 31.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 31: Monk's portrait by Holman Hunt hangs in the National Gallery in Ottawa.

⁴⁹Marchand, The American Peace Movement, p. X.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. IX.

⁵¹Robert H. Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967), p. 260.

⁵²Ibid., p. 262.

⁵³The three branches of Friends in Canada were the following: Genesee Yearly Meeting (Hicksite), Canada Yearly Meeting (Conservative) and Canada Yearly Meeting (Orthodox or Progressive). The three branches began to cooperate after the First War and finally united together in 1955.

⁵⁴Dorland, The Quakers in Canada, p. 133.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 327.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 326.

⁵⁷Allen, The Social Passion, p. 5; Richard Allen, "The Social Gospel and the Reform Tradition in Canada, 1890-1920," Canadian Historical Review, December, 1968, p. 384.

⁵⁸Allen, "The Social Gospel", p. 384, also The Social Gospel in Canada, Ottawa, 1975, "Background to the Social Gospel in Canada," pp. 2-34.

⁵⁹C. S. Eby, God-Love, The Word of the Kingdom Series, Study I (Toronto: 1906), pp. 7-8; C. S. Eby, Christianity and Civilization, Tokio Lectures I, January 6, 1883; Henry James Morgan, Ed., The Canadian Men and Women of the Time: A Handbook of Canadian Men and Women of the Time: A Handbook of Canadian Biography of Living Characters (Toronto, 1912), p. 363.

⁶⁰Morgan, Canadian Men and Women, p. 363; Charles S. Eby was born in Goderich, Ontario in 1845 and spent his early boyhood in Elora. He received his B.A. from Victoria Univeristy of Coburg and attended the Theological University at Halle, Germany. He served as superintendent of the Methodist Church's German Mission at Preston, Ontario before leaving for Japan. After his return to Canada he served as the first secretary of the Canadian Anti-Tuberculosis Association form 1900-1902. Charles S. Eby Biography File, United Church Archives.

⁶¹C. S. Eby, The World Problem and the Divine Solution (Toronto, 1914), p. 27; Eby, God-Love; C. S. Eby, Sermon on the Mount, the Charter of the Kingdom, The Word of the Kingdom Series, Study II (Toronto, 1907).

⁶²Eby, The World Problem, pp. 24-25.

⁶³Ibid., pp. 284, 314; Eby, God-Love, p. 53; Eby, Sermon on the Mount, p. 13.

⁶⁴Eby, The World Problem, p. 29.

⁶⁵The Globe (Toronto), December 25, 1899, p. 10.

⁶⁶Dorland, The Quakers in Canada, p. 327.

⁶⁷Roland H. Bainton, Pilgrim Parson, the Life of James Herbert Bainton (1867-1942) (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1958), pp. 61-62.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 63-64.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 66.

⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 69-69.

⁷¹Ibid., pp. 69-70.

⁷²Carman Miller, "English-Canadian Opposition to the South African War as Seen Through the Press," Canadian Historical Review, December, 1974, p. 432.

⁷³Ibid., pp. 432-433.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 433.

⁷⁵As quoted in ibid., p. 434.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 434.

⁷⁷Ross Harkness, J. E. Atkinson of the Star (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), p. 50.

⁷⁸Ibid.

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Miller, "English-Canadian Opposition to the South African War," pp. 430-431; the term "labourite" as borrowed from A. Ross McCormick, refers to the moderate radicals or reformers who based their indictment of capitalism on Gladstonian radicalism, Marxism and Christian ethics. British-born Puttee settled in Winnipeg in 1891 and became a leading figure in this labourism modelled on Britain's Labour Party. A. Ross McCormick, Reformers, Rebels, and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement 1899-1919 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), pp. 16, 79.

⁸¹Miller, "English-Canadian Opposition to the South African War," p. 431; McCormick, Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries, p. 86; there was a basic ideological conflict between Puttee's brand of labourism and the revolutionary Socialist Party of Canada and eventually the SPC regarded Puttee as "an enemy of the proletariat in league with the capitalist parties." Ibid. Puttee's loss of credibility as a pacifist during the Boer War weakens McCormick's general characterization of him and other labor radicals as "pacifists" during the Great War.

⁸²Prior to his position with Citizen and Country Wrigley was editor of Canada Labor Council, St. Thomas, Ontario; Canada Farmer's Sun, Toronto; and The Templar, Hamilton.

⁸³Citizen and Country, Toronto, March 11, 1899, p. 2; McCormick, Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries, p. 23.

⁸⁴Citizen and Country, July 29, 1899, p. 1.

⁸⁵Ibid., October 7, 1899, p. 1.

⁸⁶Ibid., November 25, 1899, p. 1; ibid., July 29, 1899, p. 1.

⁸⁷Ibid., October 7, 1899, p. 1.

⁸⁸Ibid., August 12, 1899, p. 1.

⁸⁹Ibid., December 9, 1899, p. 4; Desmond Morton, Mayor Howland, the Citizens' Candidate (Toronto, 1973), pp. 97-98. Thompson, a Bellamyite socialist and resident intellectual in the Toronto Theosophist group, supported North American continentalism, as did Goldwin Smith, but, contrary to Smith, based his conviction on working class rather than racial solidarity. Although Thompson and Smith were poles apart in their analysis of and prescription for the crisis facing late-nineteenth century Canada, they both condemned involvement in imperialist wars. See Ramsay Cook, "The Professor and the Prophet of Unrest," Paper presented at the Colloquium on Canadian Society in the Late Nineteenth Century, January 17-18, 1975, McGill University.

⁹⁰Citizen and Country, November 4, 1899, p. 4.

⁹¹Ibid., July 22, 1899, p. 1.

⁹²Miller, "English-Canadian Opposition to the South African War," p. 424.

⁹³Craig Brown, "Goldwin Smith and Anti-Imperialism," in Carl Berger, ed., Imperial Relations in the Age of Laurier, Canadian Historical Readings (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), p. 13.

⁹⁴Miller, "English-Canadian Opposition to the South African War," p. 423.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 424. The Standard (Regina) moderated its stand soon after the war began and refrained from criticizing the British cause. Ibid., p. 426.

⁹⁶Robert Craig Brown and Ransay Cook, Canada, 1896-1921, a Nation Transformed (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974), p. 42.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 41.

⁹⁸Miller, "English-Canadian Opposition to the South African War," p. 436.

⁹⁹"Report of the Peace and Arbitration Department," Report of the Convention of the Dominion Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1901, p. 67.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., 1893, pp. 56-59.

¹⁰¹Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 13.

¹⁰²The department in Nova Scotia was established under the direction of Mrs. Mary R. Chesley, wife of Justice Samuel A. Chesley, Vice-President of the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society. Ibid., p. 19.

¹⁰³Mrs. Courtice opened a private school in Toronto after the death of her husband and as a member of the Toronto Board of Education she founded the Home and School Movement in 1914 that eventually spread throughout Canada. W. Stewart Wallace, Ed., The Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Third Edition (Toronto: Macmillan, 1963), p. 157; as early as 1894 the Canadian National Council of Women adopted a resolution approving the principle of international arbitration in the settlement of international disputes. Report of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration (Lake Mohonk: Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, 1895), p. 68.

¹⁰⁴Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 17.

¹⁰⁵Jill Conway, "The Women's Peace Party and the First World War," War and Society in North America, edited by J. L. Granatstein and R. D. Cuff (Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1971), p. 52.

¹⁰⁶Flora MacDonald Denison, War and Women (Toronto: Canadian Suffrage Association, 1914), p. 6.

¹⁰⁷ Nellie McClung, In Times Like These, with an Introduction by Veronica Strong-Boag (c. 1915; reprinted Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), p. 9.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. xiv.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 15.

¹¹¹ Byrne Hope Sanders, Emily Murphy, Crusader (Toronto: Macmillan, 1945), pp. 345-347; Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 28.

¹¹² Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1914, p. 134.

¹¹³ McClung, In Times Like These, p. 15.

¹¹⁴ Dorland, The Quakers in Canada, p. 327.

¹¹⁵ Sir William Mulock served as president of the Toronto Reform Association in 1903 and later as president of the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society in 1907. Morgan, Canadian Men and Women, p. 833.

¹¹⁶ Dorland, The Quakers in Canada, p. 328; Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 16; Elias Rogers, a close friend and political protege of William H. Howland, reform mayor of Toronto from 1886 to 1888, was defeated in his bid for mayor in 1888 due to a coal ring scandal in which he figured as the architect of a conspiratorial coal monopoly. Although he never returned to politics, the scandal did little damage to Rogers' prestige or personal finances. Other than his civic and peace activities, Rogers later became president of the notorious Crowsnest Pass Coal Company; director of several life assurance companies and trust companies; director, China Inland Mission; honorable treasurer of the Canadian Bible Society and vice president of the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society in 1912. Morton, Mayor Howland, pp. 86-107; Morgan, Canadian Men and Women, p. 962. Elias and Albert Rogers were members of one of the most prominent Quaker families in Canada and descendent from Timothy Rogers, the first white settler in the Newmarket Ontario area. Besides his well known business interests in coal, Elias and his brother Samuel

founded the Queen City Oil Company in Toronto. In time, Samuel's son Albert S. Rogers took over the firm which later became the Imperial Oil Company. While Elias was a flamboyant and colorful character, Albert led a more simple lifestyle and eventually became the most prominent member of the Society of Friends in Canada during the early twentieth century. Dorland, The Quakers in Canada; interview with Arthur G. Dorland, 29 January 1976; phone conversation with Arthur G. Dorland, 7 December 1977.

¹¹⁷Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 16.

¹¹⁸Robert M. Stamp, "Empire Day in the Schools of Ontario: The Training of Young Imperialists," Journal of Canadian Studies, August, 1973, pp. 32-38.

¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 39.

¹²⁰Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 29.

¹²¹Lewis E. Horning, "England and Germany," Addresses Delivered Before the Canadian Club of Hamilton, 1913-1914 (Toronto: Canadian Club, 1914), p. 112.

¹²²Ibid., p. 114.

¹²³Victoria University Archives, Lewis Emerson Horning Papers, Vault 9, J.

¹²⁴Lewis E. Horning, "Some Aspects of the Questions of World Peace," Christian Guardian, May 13, 1914, pp. 8-9.

¹²⁵Macdonald was editor of two Presbyterian newspapers, The Presbyterian and The Westminster before becoming editor in chief of The Globe in 1913, succeeding J. S. Willison, The Presbyterian, January 10, 1913, p. 37.

¹²⁶Marchand, The American Peace Movement, p. 112.

¹²⁷James A. Macdonald, The North American Idea (Toronto: Fleming H. Revell, 1917), p. 93.

¹²⁸The Globe (Toronto), November 11, 1912, p. 6.

- ¹²⁹ Marchand, The American Peace Movement, p. 19.
- ¹³⁰ Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations;" p. 12.
- ¹³¹ Report of the Lake Mohonk Conference, 1907, p. 114.
- ¹³² Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 44.
- ¹³³ Report of the Lake Mohonk Conference, 1903, p. 77.
- ¹³⁴ Ibid., 1906, p. 86; ibid., 1907, p. 113; Dorland, The Quakers in Canada, p. 328.
- ¹³⁵ W. L. Mackenzie King, "The Bearing of Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration on International Peace," Report of the Lake Mohonk Conference, 1910, p. 107.
- ¹³⁶ Ibid., pp. 102-105.
- ¹³⁷ Report of the Lake Mohonk Conference, 1907, pp. 114-115.
- ¹³⁸ Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," pp. 45-46.
- ¹³⁹ Edward A. Christie, "The Presbyterian Church in Canada and Its Official Attitude Toward Public Affairs and Social Problems, 1875-1925," M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1955, p. 119.
- ¹⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 101-103, 115, 117.
- ¹⁴¹ Ibid., p. 120; quoted from The Record, December, 1912.
- ¹⁴² The Presbyterian (Toronto), February 19, 1914, p. 127.
- ¹⁴³ Christian Guardian, January 21, 1914, p. 5; January 28, 1914, pp. 7-8; August 20, 1922, p. 21; Wilbur William Andrews advocated an unorthodox theology encompassing evolution and emphasizing considerations affecting "Christian living." He taught science at Mount Allison College from 1891-1911, served as secretary of the Board of Education of the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Canada in 1907 and was the first president of Regina College (1911-12) before entering into scientific research "of a very absorbing kind" for the Saskatchewan Government. He died in 1922. UCA, W. W. Andrews

to Revl J. D. Simpson, Superannuation Fund, April 22, 1922; Twenty-Eighth Annual Report of the Educational Society of the Methodist Church, 1911-1912 (Toronto: Methodist Book Publishing House, 1922), p. 21; Minutes of Board of Education and of Executive Committee, September 24, 1906-April 26, 1910. United Church Archives.

¹⁴⁴Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 34.

¹⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 34-35.

¹⁴⁶Rev. William Sparling, "Canadian Churches and Peace," Report of the Lake Mohonk Conference, 1911, p. 163.

¹⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 163-164.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., p. 165.

¹⁴⁹Arthur G. Dorland, "Militarism in Canada," The Canadian Friend, July, 1913, pp. 14-15; Arthur G. Dorland was born in Wellington, Ontario in 1887. After receiving a B.A. from Queen's University in 1910, an M.A. from Yale in 1911 and a Ph.D. from the University of Toronto in 1927, he made a career of university teaching, first at Queen's and then at the University of Western Ontario. During the first half of the twentieth century he was one of the most prominent members of the Society of Friends in Canada. ✓

¹⁵⁰Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁵¹"Memorial of the Religious Society of Friends to the Government and People of Canada," Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1913, pp. 23-25; Orthodox Friends created a special committee on Canadian military and naval propoganda. Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1913 (Toronto: Society of Friends, 1913), p. 6.

¹⁵²Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1913, p. 28.

¹⁵³Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1914, p. 134.

¹⁵⁴Ibid.

¹⁵⁵Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations." p. 58.

¹⁵⁶John H. Thompson, The Harvest of War the Prairie West, 1914-1918 (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978), p. 19.

¹⁵⁷Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 22.

¹⁵⁸Ibid., p. 23.

¹⁵⁹Ibid., p. 24.

¹⁶⁰Ibid., p. 25.

¹⁶¹Martin Robin, "Registration, Conscription and Independent Labour Politics, 1916-1917," Canadian Historical Review, XLVII (June 1966) in Conscription 1917, ed. Carl Berger (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), pp. 60-61; Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1914, p. 135.

¹⁶²Ibid., p. 51; the executive committee of the Canadian Peace Centenary Association consisted of Sir Edmund Walker, Hon. Senator Raoul Dandurand, Traver Lewis and C. A. Magrath. Canadian Peace Centenary Association, Circular #5, p. 3.

¹⁶³Ibid., p. 2.

¹⁶⁴Ibid., Circular #3, p. 8.

¹⁶⁵Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 52; Canadian Peace Centenary Association, Circular #5, p. 3.

¹⁶⁶Ibid., Circular #7, p. 1.

¹⁶⁷Dorland, "Militarism in Canada," p. 14.

¹⁶⁸J. M. Bliss, "The Methodist Church and World War I," Canadian Historical Review, XLIX (September, 1965), in Conscription 1917, ed. Carl Berger (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), p. 42.

¹⁶⁹Bennett, Hutterian Brethren, p. 40.

¹⁷⁰Brock, Twentieth-Century Pacifism, p. 267.

CHAPTER II

THE DISRUPTION OF THE LIBERAL PEACE MOVEMENT

On the eve of the Great War Canadians were relatively comfortable and confident of what the future would bring. As historians have noted elsewhere it was a time of optimism. And perhaps no Canadians were more enthusiastic and optimistic than the large numbers who vaguely thought of themselves as pacifists. The popular commitment to peace was visible across Canada in churches affected by the social gospel and in women's clubs and business, farm and labor organizations concerned with international affairs. Although its members were often associated with various reform causes, the peace movement had become a particularly attractive outlet for the middle class reform impulse. Respectable and uncontroversial, it associated pacifism with order, stability and the status quo. "Peace, prosperity and progress" was the call of the day.

On the whole, however, the generalities and moving platitudes characteristic of peace rhetoric were somewhat ambiguous, causing that perennial observer of Canadian affairs, J. Castell Hopkins, to comment that it was "difficult to oppose and hard to discuss," but "easy of presentment and popular acceptance."¹ "Peace," noted Hopkins, "had become a habit of thought with many minds in Canada and, in some cases, was almost a religion."² Hopkins, himself an ardent imperialist, claimed that the "peace school of thought" had always been a strong factor in tempering Canadian responses to imperial obligations, national

responsibilities and support of the militia. The degree of such pacifist influence is questionable but, certainly, the antagonism of the nation's farmers toward increased military expenditures and the French Canadian "passive" and "instinctive" opposition to imperial entanglements were well known and formed an additional aspect of the general clamour for peace.

The threatening climate of world events preceding August 1914, increased the tempo of pacifist rhetoric concerning the need for the peaceful settlement of international disputes through arbitration and international courts of justice. Canadians poured into crowded meetings to hear prominent pacifists like J. A. Macdonald, Lewis E. Horning and Goldwin Smith, as well as such international figures as Andrew Carnegie and Norman Angell.³ Riding the crest of his popular book, The Great Illusion, Angell advised the Canadian Club of Toronto that the best service Canadians could render for British ideals was to push for the rule of international law over force, but not, he warned, to supply aid to the British navy.⁴ On the contrary, all measures of military preparedness were condemned dogmatically by pacifists as militarism.

It was in this charged atmosphere that Principal Maurice Hutton of Toronto's University College warned a Toronto audience that "the air is so full of pacifism that it is necessary to urge upon the country the duty of national defense." Another critic predicted that "the debauch of pacifism now sweeping over the country will be followed by a rude awakening."⁵ Indeed, pacifists -- even more than the nation at large -- did have a "rude awakening": August 1914.

Liberal pacifists, like most Canadians, were surprised and totally unprepared for war. Just as they were about to celebrate one hundred years of peace with the United States, peace advocates found themselves in an unthinkable position. To them war was an atavism, contrary to their faith in Christian progress. In fact, the whole basis of Christian civilization seemed to be crumbling before their eyes. In shock and dismay they attempted to gather up the pieces and keep their pacifist goals intact, but few succeeded. The liberal peace movement was shattered, never to be quite the same again.

Canada's liberal pacifists splintered off into various responses to the war. Some attempted to maintain a moderate stance recognizing the necessity to support the war effort while, at the same time, striving towards pacifist ideals and a hopeful post-war era. This was perhaps the most difficult position to maintain. Others gradually came to think of the war as the crucible in which Christianity and the ideal of Christian peace were in danger of extinction at the hands of enemy forces and joined in a crusade against German "barbarism." At the opposite extreme were radical pacifists irrevocably opposed to any involvement in war and militarism. Although some, like the historic pacifist sects, rejected the worldly social order and attempted to remain relatively withdrawn from society and its wars, there were other radical pacifists within society who began to broaden their attack to include the whole social and economic system they believed produced war in the first place. These socially conscious pacifists represented new groups of women suffragists, social workers,

labor organizers and social gossellers who not only found war and militarism antithetical to the Christian basis of their social philosophy but also threats to their particular reform concerns. Contrary to earlier peace advocates, they came to view radical social change as essential for world peace and thereby began a far-reaching transition that ultimately changed the intrinsic nature of pacifism from that of an ideal liberal reform into a new form of social radicalism. Naturally, liberal peace advocates re-emerged in the post-war era but the synthesis of pacifism and radical social change, even if not articulated fully, was forged during the first war.

While the pre-war peace movement more or less disintegrated with the shock of war, the immediate reaction of most peace advocates was temperate. On the whole they agreed with the majority of their fellow Canadians that the war was unfortunate but necessary to rid the world of European militarism and they supported the British cause. As this initial critical acquiescence in the war gradually developed into a militant crusade some pacifists attempted to maintain a moderately realistic position by combining support for the war with a continuing struggle against militarism and its brutalization of society. To avoid open contradictions in their stand they aimed most of their pacifist remarks at future post-war society rather than the current conflict.

Probably the most serious attempt to maintain such a moderate approach was displayed by the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society,

primarily through its wartime president, Lewis E. Horning. Although recognizing the benefits of victory, the Society attempted to remain calm and to keep the whole situation in perspective, thereby resisting the growing war frenzy. Its aim was to support the imperial position in the war while taking some kind of constructive action in line with pacifist principles. As a start in that direction members of the Society made financial contributions, through the Canadian Society of Friends, to the Friends' Ambulance Corps organized by British Quakers.⁶

Despite the failure of peace societies to prevent war, Horning hoped the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society could weather the storm and become a valuable agent for instilling new moral values in the post-war world. According to Horning the peace movement failed because it was very young in an old world accustomed to the tradition of war but not, as so many charged, because it encouraged unpreparedness.⁷ Although he realized war conflicted with the law of love and basic Christian thought, Horning agreed that the current war was a just struggle between democracy and militarism. He exclaimed:

I believe thoroughly that England has never entered into any war in which she has had a juster cause, in which she has in this war; but at the same time . . . this whole war, and all war, is barbarism that denies civilization.⁸

The position of the Peace and Arbitration Society, wrote Horning, was to carry the war through "to a successful conclusion in the hope that good shall be the final goal of ill."⁹ The perplexing problem was to reconcile the war with Christianity. One tactic, Horning concluded, was for peace-loving Christians to waste no time

in building a new Christian spirit to supplant war. "We will have to see to it," he declared, "that out of this conflict of the Nations, this degradation of civilization -- this terrible war -- shall come up in this land, a new Christianity."¹⁰ Addressing a Methodist congregation in Mimico, Ontario, he continued:

Our new Christianity will have to drop all ideas of the past. We will have to put the "Law of Love" . . . into practice . . . and then we will bring about those things which will come out of this terrible conflict -- "the Brotherhood of Man" -- that parliament of man, that confederation of the world of which our Poet sang. We must make "Love" the law of life, the Law of Social and Political Life, and National Life. Are we ready to do it?¹¹

An affirmative answer to this question, he claimed, demanded that people think "soberly, righteously and fairly" about the events occurring around them.

Shortly after the outbreak of war, the views of the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society were articulated clearly by Horning in a letter to Dr. T. Albert Moore, Secretary of the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Canada. He explained that although it was not an "opportune time" to talk of what was usually associated with pacifism, the members of his small society felt it was a proper time to plan that coming generations think "more sanely and soundly than the past and present generations" and he appealed to the Methodist Church for support in this endeavor. "A great many of us are saying 'never again,'" he wrote, "but to make sure of this, we ask your sympathy, wholehearted co-operation and active support."¹²

As a course of action, Horning suggested combatting the martial spirit which had infiltrated daily lives and language by building a new vision of patriotism free from the taint of militarism and war.

He argued that

the old Patriotism is altogether too often associated with the soldiers life. The language of our everyday life and of our past literature smacks very much of the martial, that is, it is a language based upon old ideals and old habits. "Patriotic Fund". . . . Why not Soldiers fund?¹³

Conversely, the word patriotism was to be reserved for references to peace, self-sacrifice and brave service for one's fellow man. "The New Patriotism," claimed Horning, "calls for life and opportunity for life, not death and destruction, and vandalism and horrors." He claimed such arguments were based on "reason and science" rather than the "fallacious arguments" of militarists.¹⁴

The Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society also maintained that its members and sympathetic friends had a special duty to perform regarding Canada's own peculiar problems such as French-English relations, further complicated by the war, and the question of state ownership and control of the nation's productive wealth. "On all sides," Horning warned, "we need new light, new thought, a new spirit . . . we should believe in another destiny, that of the saving of the nations." In conclusion Horning made a final appeal to the church:

Preachers of Peace and believers in Goodwill, help us . . . by your heartfelt sympathy, cordial co-operation and willing openmindedness . . . we can be of great service to each other.¹⁵

Despite this eloquent plea, the Church hierarchy flatly ignored Horning's suggestions for a "New Patriotism" in favor of the old patriotic call to arms. On the other hand, the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society and fellow moderates continued to sponsor pacifist oriented meetings and addresses at least as long as the United States remained neutral. In October 1915, for instance, Chrystal MacMillan, a British pacifist, addressed a meeting of the Canadian National Council of Women in Toronto with Horning and other members of the Peace Society in attendance. The lecture was organized by two Toronto pacifists, Mrs. Hector Prenter of the Political Equality League and Mrs. Wesley Barker, past president of the Business Women's Club, who had resigned over the club's war work.¹⁶

Gradually, however, members of the Peace Society and others with moderate pacifist leanings grew passive and silent. They had tried in vain to prevent the development of an overzealous war mentality but in the end they were not ready to go as far as to endorse radical dissent. Accordingly, Horning ceased his attempt to organize a pacifist program of action and retreated to safer pursuits. In keeping with his personal desire to educate the public, for instance, he delivered a nationwide series of lectures during the summer of 1918 concerning problems of war and Canadian citizenship.¹⁷

The editors of two of Toronto's leading newspapers were also examples of a moderate pacifism and its wartime transition. Dr. J. A. Macdonald, the managing-editor of the Toronto Globe and one of the leading spokesmen of the liberal peace movement in Canada

before the war, announced that the outbreak of war meant "the union of all Canadians for the defense of Canada, for the maintenance of the Empire's integrity, and for the preservation in the world of Britain's ideals of democratic government and life."¹⁸ A few months later during a Toronto address Macdonald again defended Canada's role in the war:

In the ghastly brute-struggle at the front and in the trenches, Canada must take its place and do its share. . . . Enlist? Yes. Drill? Yes. Arm? Yes. Fight? Yes. Shell against shell: bayonet against bayonet: man against man. There can be no turning back in this awful struggle until armed force has vanquished armed force.¹⁹

Macdonald combined such statements of patriotic duty with his familiar peace rhetoric, since a time of war, he claimed, was also a time to prepare for peace and disarmament. In one editorial Canadians were asked to look to the future and choose between militarism and war or disarmament and peace. The argument was that

either the New World idea of reason and international faith must be pushed to the limit of disarmament or the old world idea of brute force and international distrust must be accepted by all countries: either we must all stand with Christ or all stand with Caesar.²⁰

Confident of future peace, Macdonald reported that from the "trenches and dugouts of the battlefields and from the battalions who have faced war's stern realities, men send back one strong resonant, unfaltering testimony: 'Not Caesar but Christ'."²¹

At first the Globe exercised a moderating influence on the public as its editorials protested against building anti-German

sympathies in Canadian youth and argued that "no Canadian cadet should be allowed to think of a German or any other man as a target for his marksmanship."²² Overall the paper reflected Macdonald's two distinct lines of thought but given the circumstances this dual approach was impossible to maintain for long and in 1915 Macdonald resigned as editor, thus freeing the Globe to assume a more ardent patriotic position. Macdonald himself became absorbed in lecturing and writing. At the close of 1915, for instance, he addressed a series of patriotic meetings in Ontario, urging young men to enlist. By 1917 he called upon Canadians to stand, to fight and, if need be, to die in the defence of "the North American idea, the inalienable and priceless right of a free people to govern themselves."²³ In the end he had accepted the war as a means to create a new world order based upon liberty and freedom. But the idea of armed peace or preparedness Macdonald still denounced as "doomed to the rubbish heap of the world's barbarism." "Another idea must be set free," he claimed, "a world idea, the idea not of international strife, but of international partnership."²⁴ Macdonald's final sanction of war as a means to an end was indicative of his nineteenth century pacifist thought which stressed world order and the futility of war rather than moral questions.

A more extreme transformation was made by J. E. Atkinson, managing-editor of the Toronto Daily Star. Atkinson had long felt war was wrong and he initially adopted a moderate approach, but within a year he switched to all-out support for the war effort. Atkinson reasoned that war was the ultimate and logical conclusion of the

worship of materialism, especially in Germany. He accepted the war, therefore, as an attempt to secure the liberal goal -- that of protecting the liberties and rights of all peoples. In an address before the Canadian Club of Toronto during the second year of the war he even claimed that the war was a crusade "to secure the possession to mankind of Christinity itself."²⁵ Such a remark was indicative of the growing support for the war effort among former peace advocates.

Although a moderate pacifism was displayed for a time, moderation in defense of the war or pacifism succumbed to more extreme, vocal positions as emotional events of the war unravelled and a deeper commitment was made by Canadians. While some moderates were converted to one extreme or the other, most were simply silenced into oblivion by the rising tide of militant Christian patriotism.

Almost all groups of liberal reformers came to reflect this militant patriotism one way or another. Women's groups, for instance, quickly redirected their energies towards more respectable pursuits in Red Cross work and patriotic activities. Indeed, it is ironic that the women who helped popularize the expectation that women would react differently to war than men because of their moral superiority, were the very ones who contributed substantially to the disintegration of this myth during the war through their various wartime endeavors. Initially, Canadian women agreed with Flora MacDonald Denison, columnist for the Toronto World, that "the women of England have no quarrel with the women of Germany."²⁶ In a matter of months, however, most women

were actively involved in war support activities. The most important of these groups were the IODE and the Women's Institutes. In fact, the effectiveness of the latter's co-ordinated war effort led to the federation of Women's Institutes in Canada under the guidance of Judge Emily Murphy; an idea that spread ultimately to Britain and the United States.²⁷ The National Council of Women, altering their pre-war stand, organized a Khaki League in Montreal to operate a convalescent home for sick and wounded officers and a number of recreation centers near army barracks. Numerous other women's patriotic activities were founded, including Queen Mary's Needlework Guild, which provided garments for incapacitated soldiers and sailors of the Empire and their dependents; the National Ladies Guild for British sailors in Canada, and the Lady Jellicoe's Sailors Fund, a committee in Toronto.²⁸ Contrary to their early pacifistic assumptions, therefore, women's war work became the greatest organizational aid for the women's movement.²⁹ Certainly, long before women voted for a Union government and supported conscription they shared responsibility in the war.

The most vocal expression of this moral transformation, however, was provided by the nation's churches. Overall, the response of Protestant forces representative of pre-war, social gospel pacifism reflected the dilemma of the patriotic Christian in time of war.³⁰ The war became the supreme challenge to their idea of the partnership of Church and State in developing the national culture. Anxious to prove themselves, they gradually identified almost totally with

national policy. As a result, the church press became champions of the war as a righteous cause.

This was the unqualified position from the beginning of the war of the Baptist and Anglican journals, the Canadian Baptist and the Canadian Churchman as well as the official periodicals of the Presbyterian Church, The Presbyterian Record and The Presbyterian Witness.³¹ The Presbyterian, an unofficial Toronto weekly, however, was more cautious and maintained its pacifist tendencies for some months before finally succumbing to the pressure for an "all-out war effort." The Presbyterian blamed European militarism rather than Germany as the cause of hostilities and condemned war, above all else, for sowing seeds of hatred among men. "We Canadians and Britons everywhere," wrote the editor, "should guard against unchristian and unreasoning feelings of hatred."³² Another editorial urged that the "irrational blasphemy of war" be replaced by arbitration and "tribunals of peace and justice." The Manitoba Presbyterian Synod adopted a resolution deploring the war while absolving Britain of any responsibility for the calamity and reaffirmed the righteousness of the Empire's cause. But the resolution concluded that war might never have been if European Christian Churches "had been more under the sway of the Prince of Peace."³³

This critical acquiescence was also expressed by the Methodist Church's Christian Guardian, previously a leading peace organ. Its editor, Dr. W. B. Creighton was well-known as a pioneer in social reconstruction and a promoter of missions as well as a crusader for

world peace. Shortly after the outbreak of war Creighton warned that God must not be asked for victory but only for forgiveness and guidance as he condemned the war as foolish, costly and unchristian:

There is nothing like war to demonstrate the inexcusable folly of war. As a method of settling national differences it is foolish, wasteful, irrational and un-Christian, and can only be tolerated when it seems to be absolutely inevitable as a means of escaping still greater calamities.³⁴

In the same issue Creighton also reaffirmed his belief that Christian pacifism was still on its way. "A mighty inspiration is coming over men," he wrote, "and a vision of brotherhood that will eventually kill war and stop battleship building and army recruiting . . . it will take a while . . . but it will be done."³⁵ Towards the end of the first month of the war the Christian Guardian summed up its general position of support for the war:

We hate war, but this is not a war of conquest, but is a struggle which has been forced upon us by a military autocracy which appears to have become so intoxicated with a belief in its own greatness that it is prepared to defy a whole continent. That this unprovoked war may result in the uprising of the peoples and the overturning of tyrannical and autocratic governments is our earnest hope.³⁶

By autumn the Guardian began to promote the war effort with increasing zeal. The General Superintendent of the Methodist Church, Samule Dwight Chown, for instance, urged Methodists to enlist in the Canadian army and "go to the front bravely as one who hears the call of God."³⁷ The passionate call to arms soon became a familiar plea and within a year the war which Chown had originally described as

"just, honorable and necessary" was transformed into an apocalyptic crusade, an eschatological confrontation between good and evil, between Christianity and the anti-Christ epitomized in Germany.³⁸ The traditional concept of the just war, prescribing justice and moderation in warfare, gave way under various wartime pressures to the crusading spirit characterized by the extremely dangerous qualities of self-righteousness and fanaticism.³⁹

The conflict that began as a necessary, if somewhat idealized campaign to safeguard national interests and rid the world of a military despotism was transformed under the pressure of events into a holy war, ending as a frenzied crusade against the Devil incarnate.⁴⁰

Albert Marrin's description of British war fever applies to the Canadian scene as well. Stories of German atrocities in Belgium and government controlled war propaganda triggered an emotional response and helped reinforce fears for the future of Christendom itself. The crusading war effort, in effect, became a new attempt to reach the old nineteenth century illusion of eternal peace, progress and prosperity by casting out the German devil.

To be sure, the conversion of liberal pacifists to such a passionate desire for victory required much rationalization, as well as a good deal of serious soul-searching. It was a complex internal struggle in which individual tensions were resolved in a variety of responses. For instance, the western feminist Nellie McClung successfully combined feminist demands with the war effort without abandoning her earlier faith in Christian peace and progress. In 1915 she could still condemn war as the antithesis of all her teaching. War, she

claimed, proved nothing while it twisted the whole moral fabric: hardening society to human grief and misery; taking the fit and leaving the unfit to perpetrate the race; and, the greatest inequity of all, setting aside the arbitrament of right and justice in favor of brute force.⁴¹ On the other hand, she could support the war as a purgative that would assist in the redemption of the world.⁴²

In retrospect McClung described her new perception of the world shared by like-minded Christians:

In the first days of panic, pessimism broke out among us, and we cried in our despair that our civilization had failed, that Christianity had broken down, and that God had forgotten the world. It seemed like it at first. But now a wiser and better vision has come to us, and we know that Christianity has not failed, for it is not fair to impute failure to something which has never been tried. Civilization has failed . . . we know how that underneath the thin veneer of civilization, unregenerate man is still a savage; and we see now . . . that unless a civilization is built upon love, and mutual trust, it must always end in disaster, such as this. Up to August fourth, we often said that war was impossible between Christian nations. We still say so, but . . . we know now that there are no Christian nations.⁴³

"No," she concluded, "the principles of Christ have not yet been applied to nations. We have only Christian people."⁴⁴

It was in this frame of mind that liberal reformers came to think of participation in the war as an act of "national regeneration."⁴⁵ The apocalyptic war hysteria demanded an all-out fight against all evil in society. The demon Hun, the demon rum, the scourge of venereal disease and other vices affecting humanity became prime targets of crusading zeal. As the temperance movement joined

forces with the war effort, the Christian Guardian maintained that "theoretically the church knows no peace -- she is always at war with evil."⁴⁶ The same line or argument was used by the Record when its editor equated war against Germany with the war against the liquor traffic and reflected: "War is never wrong when it is war against wrong."⁴⁷

Given this radical redefinition of war, former peace advocates went full circle and labelled pacifism itself as evil. The shifting perspective could be observed in November 1916, when W. B. Creighton, while praising pacifism as "one of the most hopeful signs of our time," claimed pacifists were guilty of "dull obstinacy," "bitter prejudice," and "plain stupidity" for the manner in which they attempted to apply pacifism to the war with Germany.⁴⁸ If pacifists were disappointed to read such words from a former sympathizer they were assuredly shocked to read the conclusion to that line of thinking in the April 3, 1918 issue of the Guardian. In the cover page editorial entitled "The Vice of Pacifism," Creighton retold the story of Moses killing the Egyptian slave driver for beating a fellow Israelite and concluded with the following analogy:

Moses' flashing eye and furious death-dealing blow has seemed to say to us that if a man doesn't react in anger and fierce resentment in the presence of injustice and cruelty and masterful evil-doing there is something wrong with him, very seriously wrong too. Under those circumstances pacifism is not a virtue and cannot be made into the semblance of a virtue, but is instead a vice revealing the terrible fact that the conscience has lost its sensitiveness and the soul has lost its courage.⁴⁹

As if this rejection of pacifism as a legitimate Christian doctrine was not harsh enough, the following month Creighton declared, in no uncertain terms, that there was no room in the Methodist Church for ministers with a pacifist conscience, even though the church had been pacifist in the past. "As a Church we have opposed war, and our preachers have denounced it most vehemently," explained Creighton, but now the situation was viewed in a "fresh light" especially when it was "clear beyond dispute" that the country was forced into war. As the state "rightly refuses to allow a peace propaganda to be carried on in its midst," so the church must prevent "unpatriotic sermons in her pulpits." Both the country and the church had a right to insist on the "truest patriotic utterances." "If a man cannot conscientiously declare himself a patriot," warned the editor, "he has no business in any Church which prides itself upon its patriotism."⁵⁰ Creighton concluded that the matter of conscience did not change the facts of war and that

where the man's conscience is of such a stubborn type that it refuses to admit that a victory for the allies is any more to be desired than a victory for the Germans, a Church has no choice, if such a man be in her pulpits, but to silence him, and no plea of Christian liberty and of freedom of speech can be allowed for a moment. . . . It is not a case of conscience, but a case of Christian morals, and the sin of unpatriotic speech and act is one which the church cannot afford to condone.⁵¹

The same sentiments were echoed by the official Presbyterian press:

To be at peace with evil-doing is to share in that evil-doing . . . to cease fighting the German wrong, while that wrong remains, is to be a partner in the wrong. In 'pacifism' we become sharers with Germany in her guilt. Such pacifism is a crime against humanity and against God.⁵²

Such wholesale condemnation of pacifism and denial of the right of conscience either silenced pacifists or drove them from the church entirely. It was after the publication of Creighton's remarks, for instance, that J. S. Woodsworth resigned from the Methodist ministry.⁵³ ✓

Most pre-war pacifists, such as Creighton, had not abandoned their nineteenth century concept of peace and Christendom as a fragile world order that bound men and nations to conduct themselves in accordance with Christian principles and understanding.⁵⁴ The pacifist ideal, therefore, was viewed more as an end than a means. Their concept of peace remained one of pure idealism with no room for compromise, only now it was peace at any price even if that price was war. The result, as J. M. Bliss states, was a paradox: idealized Christian pacifism produced an extreme zeal for a holy war.⁵⁵ The former peace advocates who could not rationalize support of a just war with their dedicated faith in the Christian gospel more easily accepted the idea of a holy crusade to save Christianity and peace from the diabolical German menace. In 1918 the editor of The Presbyterian Record concluded:

The world's real crusade is now on, and men in millions are thronging across the seas as did European legions to Asia a millennium gone, but with a more intelligent purpose and a higher, holier aim.⁵⁶

Before the end of the war the crusading zeal of these former peace advocates resulted in ardent support of the military but it would be unfair to classify them as militarists per se. Although they absorbed and reflected the martial spirit, their principal concern was not the development of militarism but a world safe for the realization of the Kingdom of God. Thus, some combined support for the war to end war with their commitment to social reform.

In the opposite extreme, a small minority of Canadians maintained radical opposition to the war and its accompanying infringements on individual rights and freedoms. One variety of this radicalism was the religious non-resistance expressed by the historic peace sects and fundamentalist groups. As seen in the last chapter, the right to live according to religious principles of non-violence was protected by several Orders-in-Council and by 1914 had become a tradition entrenched firmly in Canadian law and custom. Most of these religious communities, such as the Mennonites and the Hutterites, lived separate and withdrawn from the larger Canadian society and therefore remained more or less silent on the war until threatened directly with conscription.

The other committed pacifists were pre-war reformers who began to link pacifism with social radicalism. They included both confirmed social radicals who adopted pacifism during the war as part of their overall struggle against the existing social and economic system as

well as staunch pre-war pacifists such as the Quakers. From the very beginning of the war the Quakers attempted to maintain a program of pacifist activity. The Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society counted several Quakers, including W. Greenwood Brown and Elias Rogers, among its membership. Most Quaker concern, however, was expressed through the Society of Friends' own peace and arbitration committees which urged individual Friends to continue their public pacifist witness and waste no opportunity to "testify that all war is contrary to Christ's teaching." Friends condemned the moral effect of the war in creating a certain indifference to the destruction of human life and suggested pacifists assume the role of reconcilers in the war. All peace groups, proclaimed the Genesee Yearly Meeting, should "check and mitigate as far as possible the disastrous feeling of bitterness and hatred that is being intensified between the warring peoples, and thus prepare them sooner for the new regime of universal brotherhood."⁵⁸

Canadian Friends began searching for some type of positive service to be undertaken by pacifists in time of war and in this way bridged the gap between historic non-resistants and the non-violent activists of the twentieth century. Their general position was expressed by Arthur G. Dorland, chairman of the peace committee, in his report to Canada Yearly Meeting in 1917. The report urged Friends to extend "moral support to those who, though not members of our Society, nevertheless hold genuine religious objection against war."⁵⁹ Dorland then voiced the desire for worthwhile pacifist service:

During the present crisis we should endeavor consistently to observe our traditional attitude as Friends against active participation in war, it is therefore our special duty to exert ourselves as individuals and as a Society along those lines of work in which we can consistently engage so that we should render to our country and to those who have suffered because of the war some equivalent service and even sacrifice.⁶⁰

As an example of a practical service Dorland noted the loan of Pickering College, a Quaker institution, to the government as a convalescent hospital for returned soldiers. Other Quaker activities included a 1916 petition for physical training for boys and girls in schools in lieu of military training, and support of the English Friends' Ambulance Unit and the English War Victims Relief Committee.⁶¹ Through these various fields of service Friends demonstrated that social action was entirely consistent with their peace testimony.⁶²

Quakers, however, pressed further, extending their association of pacifism and social reform by insistently examining both the conditions that made for war and their own complicity in them. As the Genesee Yearly Meeting reflected:

This unfortunate and regrettable war has caused us to ask ourselves, "what part have we had in the making or maintaining of those conditions which have brought on the war?" Have we, either as Christians or as responsible citizens of our respective countries, done all that we might or should to remove these conditions?⁶³

Clearly, Friends were moving toward a synthesis of their historic radical Christian pacifism with a radical political outlook as well. Once they discovered the seeds of war sown within the existing social order, modern Quakers replaced their older emphasis upon mercy in a static society with a radical commitment to change that society.⁶⁴ Canadian Friends began to endorse government control

and possible ownership of all industries manufacturing war-related articles. Furthermore, anticipating the post-war years as early as 1917, they began to discuss the implications of their social philosophy in such national and international considerations as the future role of the state and the relationship between capitalism and war.⁶⁵

Another example of socially radical pacifism was a small group of radical feminists. Largely centered in Toronto, they worked through the Women's Social Democratic League and the Toronto Suffrage Association until the summer of 1915 when Miss Alice Chown, Miss Laura Hughes and Miss Elsie Charlton founded the Canadian Women's Peace Party, a branch of the International Committee for Permanent Peace.⁶⁶ Aware of the fact that the women of England and Australia were organized in this regard, Charlton and Hughes expressed concern that Canada should not lag behind. The conspicuous involvement of Alice Chown and Laura Hughes in wartime pacifism, however, proved to be a matter of some embarrassment to their uncles, the Reverend S. D. Chown, General Superintendent of the Methodist Church, and Colonel Sam Hughes, the Canadian Minister of Militia. Colonel Hughes even tried to bribe his niece to remove the disgrace.⁶⁷

The original Women's Peace Party was formed in the United States in January 1915 by Jane Addams and her feminist associates and the idea spread to other nations after the International Congress of Women first met at the Hague in the spring of 1915. It was here that Laura Hughes grasped the idea. Present in an unofficial capacity,

Miss Hughes was the only Canadian to attend the Women's Congress, billed as a Women's Peace Conference. The large majority of Canadian women's clubs rebuffed the invitation from the Congress as "untimely peace propaganda" and endorsed the public reply drafted by the National Committee of Patriotic Services of Canada, a federation of nationally organized women's societies. This letter, officially sent to Jane Addams as president of the Congress, explained that Canadian women felt they could not send delegates since they believed that "the time for peace has not yet arrived." The letter further argued that to do so would mean a peaceful acquiescence in the devastation of a country such as Belgium.⁶⁸ The Hamilton chapter of the National Council of Women agreed and condemned those women calling for a halt to the war as "guilty in the eyes of God."⁶⁹

Supplanting a planned meeting of the International Suffrage Alliance, the International Congress of Women provided a forum in which women from around the world discussed plans for ending the war. Besides the idea of forming women's peace societies at home, the most important achievement was a proposal for continuous mediation between the belligerent powers on the part of a group of neutral experts. Although presented to the Congress by Jane Addams, the plan for continuous mediation was the work of Julia Grace Wales, a Canadian from Quebec then teaching at the University of Wisconsin. Miss Wales conceived her plan for "Continuous Mediation without Armistice," or the Wisconsin Peace Plan as it became known after being endorsed by the Wisconsin Peace Society, in the hope of averting

a "prolonged, irrational and un-Christian war." The plan was unanimously accepted by the Congress and a scheme was devised for putting it into operation, but the worsening events of the war overshadowed any chance of its success.⁷⁰

Meanwhile, the Canadian Women's Peace Party, later rechristened the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WIL), based its program for a new international order upon the reforms outlined at the Hague, including compulsory arbitration, universal disarmament and a league of democratic nations.⁷¹ Upon closer examination, however, it appeared to be a "stop the war" movement, for privately, Laura Hughes actually desired an immediate unilateral Canadian withdrawal from the war. In public she had to be more discrete in order to avoid the charge of treason.⁷²

Generally, Hughes moved to an increasingly radical outlook. With the WIL she directed her wrath at the military-capitalist complex behind the war effort and joined with the labor-socialists in their attack on war profiteering by financial trusts and armament makers. Hughes was converted to the labor cause after touring armament factories as an inspector and decided an independent labor party was the only solution to the disgraceful working conditions she found.⁷³ At the 1916 TLC convention Hughes electrified the delegates with a stirring radical speech supporting an independent labor party and once the Ontario Independent Labor Party was formed in 1917 she served on its executive committee.⁷⁴

Alice Chown, the other founding member of the Women's Peace Party and WIL, was also no newcomer to radical activities. Somewhat of a free spirit who usually appeared barefoot to emphasize her free will, Miss Chown was committed to furthering the cause of women's suffrage and women's trade unions. Her early interest in socialism stemmed from social gospel influence and a religious hope for a new social order. She tried living in a social settlement when that was a fad, taking particular interest in the British utopian community, Garden City, where emphasis was placed on non-resistance and co-operation.⁷⁵ In 1910 she marched through the streets of London with the Women's League for Social and Political Equality carrying a Canadian banner. The following year she was horrified at the conditions she discovered while writing a series of articles for a Toronto newspaper on the life of an average working girl and entered into trade union activities as a result.⁷⁶ The evolution of her social outlook appeared to reach its final form when, after hearing an address by Emma Goldman, Chown became infatuated with the assault against special privilege and, although rejecting the anarchist approach, she recognized Goldman's ultimate goal as her own. Faith in laws, institutions and customs enforced by the state, church or some other external authority, she argued, must be replaced by faith in the life force present within all men.⁷⁷

By 1915 Chown turned her attention to the war, and, calling herself a "strenuous pacifist," criticized all violent methods for settling disputes, whether they be strikes, anarchistic actions or wars,

as too costly and only partially successful. Instead she suggested non-violent action as the best alternative:

I feel that non-resistance, not in the sense of acceptance of evil, but in the attempt to return good for evil, to substitute for the outgrown ideal of conflict a world-wide positive ideal of good in which all would share, is the only right path for a nation to follow.⁷⁸

Arguing that Christ was a better psychologist than men, Chown proposed that Germany be conquered through a new conception of brotherhood which included, first of all eliminating injustice and selfishness within Canadian society. Such public declarations as "to conquer your enemy is to love him" received a hostile reception in a country at war, resulting in public abuse and demands that Chown be confined in an asylum or a jail.⁷⁹ Undaunted, Chown continued to work towards "the brotherhood of nations," and "the abolition of special privileges for individuals and states." "But for the people around me," she recalled, "the most heroic thing that they could do was to throw themselves disinterestedly into the war."⁸⁰

Alice Chown also feared the war would have a brutal effect upon Canadian society in general. "I am positive," she wrote, "that the evils we go out to fight with violence we shall graft upon our own nations life." She explained:

Starting with hatred of our enemy's cruelty, we shall end by being cruel ourselves; detesting the subservience of the German people to their state, we shall become indifferent to the subservience of our people to our state. We shall lose our free institutions, free speech, free press, free assemblage, and have to struggle to regain them.⁸¹

Shortly after the armistice she explained to her uncle, S. D. Chown, how she had fought all through the war for a knowledge of facts, for justice to the enemy and for the allies to refrain from "acts of unrighteousness" in Russia, while he and his associates in the Methodist Church hierarchy had allowed themselves to become "dupes" of the militarists. "I kept my faith in the sermon on the mount," she exclaimed, "and you have put your faith in force and have acquiesced in the lies of the censored press."⁸²

The experience of the WIL and the Quakers during the first few years of the war, therefore, reveals that committed pacifists had moved a long way from the old progressive call for peace, order and stability characteristic of pre-war pacifism. Their blending of pacifism and social radicalism signified the beginning of an important transition in the Canadian pacifist tradition: the pacifist initiative had passed from the old coalition of progressive reformers to a developing re-alignment of pacifists with the political left. The liberal peace movement, itself disintegrated as the majority of its adherents deserted pacifism in favor of a new means to achieve peace -- a holy war. Even those who attempted to maintain a moderately realistic position were smothered in the process. Certainly, the ease and enthusiasm with which this reversal was made betrayed the narrowness of the pre-war liberal concept of pacifism.

But the death of the progressive peace movement early in the war was not the end of liberal pacifism in Canada. It would re-emerge in the post-war years among such groups as the League of Nations Society and, once again, attempt to ensure world peace without directly challenging the state. Amid the pressures of the escalating wartime crusade, however, liberal pacifism proved to be utterly untenable. Those who wished to maintain a pacifist protest found it necessary to adopt a radical critique of the social and economic roots of war and in doing so abandon their liberal reformism for some variant of the socialist creed. For some, that, too, would become almost an eschatological warfare against the existing social order not entirely unlike their erstwhile colleagues, no less committed to social change, who sought the reign of peace via the war to end war.

The Quakers and radical feminists were some of the first to exercise this shift but it was not until individual liberties were directly threatened by conscription and other repressive measures that the new socially radical pacifism was more fully expressed. Conscription became the catalyst in a radical pacifist response. Nevertheless, even before 1917 Canadian pacifism showed signs of survival as a moral and social alternative.

FOOTNOTES

¹J. C. Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review, 1914, p. 133.

²Ibid., p. 132.

³Ibid.

⁴Norman Angell, "Canada's Best Service for British Ideals," Addresses Delivered Before the Canada Club of Toronto, 1913-1914 (Toronto: Canadian Club, 1914); in The Great Illusion (1910) Angell made a critical analysis of war and economics concluding the popular belief that a successful war brings material gain was an optical illusion.

⁵The words of Lieutenant-Colonel J. T. Fotheringham in Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1914, p. 135.

⁶Minutes of the Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1915 (Toronto: Society of Friends, 1915), p. 25.

⁷Victoria University Archives (VUA), Lewis E. Horning Papers, Lewis E. Horning, "The Two Ideals," Acta Victoriana, October, 1915, p. 2.

⁸Ibid., Lewis E. Horning, "The New Citizenship," unpublished manuscript.

⁹United Church Archives (UCA), The Methodist Church of Canada, General Conference Office, General Correspondence, 1914, Box 3, file 59, Lewis E. Horning to T. A. Moore, September 26, 1914.

¹⁰Horning, "The New Citizenship."

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Horning to Moore, September 16, 1914, p. 2.

- ¹³Ibid.
- ¹⁴Ibid.
- ¹⁵Ibid.
- ¹⁶Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1915, p. 350.
- ¹⁷VUA, Horning Papers, Vault, 12 E. W566TP.
- ¹⁸The Globe (Toronto), 3 August 1914, p. 4.
- ¹⁹Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1914, p. 137.
- ²⁰The Globe (Toronto), 21 August 1914, p. 4.
- ²¹Macdonald, North American Idea, p. 37.
- ²²Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1914, p. 136.
- ²³Macdonald, North American Idea, p. 240.
- ²⁴Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1915, p. 351.
- ²⁵J. E. Atkinson, "The Aftermath of the War," Addresses Delivered Before the Canadian Club of Toronto, 1915-1916 (Toronto: Canadian Club 1916), pp. 60-61.
- ²⁶Denison, War and Women, p. 6.
- ²⁷Sanders, Emily Murphy, p. 286.
- ²⁸Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1915, pp. 334-335.
- ²⁹John H. Thompson, "'The Beginning of Our Regeneration': The Great War and Western Canadian Reform Movements," Historical Papers, Canadian Historical Association, 1972, pp. 238-239.
- ³⁰Christie, "The Presbyterian Church in Canada," p. 124.

³¹Ibid.; also see: Colm Brannigan, The Anglican Church in Canada and the Great War," graduate seminar paper for Professor A. R. Allen, Department of History, McMaster University, 1978 and Steven R. Ramlochan, "The Baptists of Ontario and World War I, 1914-1918," undergraduate paper for Professor C. M. Johnston, Department of History, McMaster University, 1973.

³²Christie, "The Presbyterian Church in Canada," p. 122; The Presbyterian, 13 August 1914; 20 August 1914, p. 148.

³³The Presbyterian, 26 November 1914, p. 496.

³⁴Christian Guardian, 19 August 1914, p. 5; W. B. Creighton was born in Dorchester, Ontario in 1864 and graduated from Victoria University, Coburg. He served as associate-editor of the Christian Guardian from 1901 to 1907 and then as editor until church union in 1925 when he became editor of the New Outlook. He retired in 1937 and died in 1946. UCA, W. B. Creighton Biography file.

³⁵Christian Guardian, 19 August 1914, p. 5.

³⁶Ibid., 26 August 1914, p. 5.

³⁷Ibid., 16 September 1914, p. 5.

³⁸Bliss, "Methodist Church and War," p. 42.

³⁹Albert Marrin, The Last Crusade: The Church of England in the First World War (Durham: Duke University Press, 1974), pp. 124-125.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 125.

⁴¹Nellie McClung, In Times Like These, with an Introduction by Veronica Strong-Boag (Toronto: 1915; reprint ed., Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), pp. 15-17.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Ibid., p. 18.

- ⁴⁴Ibid., p. 19.
- ⁴⁵Thompson, "'The Beginning of our Regeneration'."
- ⁴⁶Christian Guardian, 25 December 1914, p. 8.
- ⁴⁷The Presbyterian Record, October, 1914, p. 433; the same connection between the war effort and temperance was made by The Presbyterian, 12 November 1914, p. 436.
- ⁴⁸Christian Guardian, 1 November 1916, p. 5.
- ⁴⁹Ibid., 3 April 1918, p. 1.
- ⁵⁰Ibid., 1 May 1918, p. 5.
- ⁵¹Ibid.
- ⁵²The Presbyterian Record, June, 1918, p. 161.
- ⁵³Discussed in Chapter Three.
- ⁵⁴Marrin, The Last Crusade, pp. 253, 131.
- ⁵⁵Bliss, "Methodist Church and War," p. 57.
- ⁵⁶The Presbyterian Record, June, 1916.
- ⁵⁷Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1916, p. 18.
- ⁵⁸Minutes of the Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1915, pp. 24-33.
- ⁵⁹Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1917, pp. 23-24; during the first war Dorland was a graduate student at Yale University in the United States and then a lecturer in history at Queen's University. Although ready to take his stand as a C. O., the war ended before his classification group was called up. Arthur G. Dorland, Former Days and Quaker Ways (Picton, Ontario: The Picton Gazette Publishing Company, Ltd., 1965), pp. 178-191; interview with Arthur G. Dorland, 29 January 1976.

⁶⁰Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1917,
pp. 23-24.

⁶¹Ibid., 1918, p. 23; Minutes of the Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1916, p. 44; Pickering College was used by the government as a military hospital until July 1920. Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1920.

⁶²Dorland, A History of Quakers in Canada, p. 332.

⁶³Minutes of the Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1915,
p. 41.

⁶⁴Chatfield, For Peace and Justice, p. 54.

⁶⁵Minutes of the Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1915,
p. 33; 1917, p. 59.

⁶⁶Saskatchewan Archives Board, Saskatoon (SABS), S. V. Haight Papers, file A5.8, Elsie Charlton and Laura Hughes to S. V. Haight, n.d.; evidently Haight was one of the first women in Saskatchewan to be interested in the WIL. Other WIL women in Toronto included Flora Macdonald Denison and Mrs. Hector Prenter. See Carol Lee Bacchi-Ferraro, "The Ideas of the Canadian Suffragists, 1890-1920," M.A. Thesis, McGill University, 1970, p. 115.

⁶⁷Ibid.; Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 30.

⁶⁸The Daily Mail and Empire (Toronto), 23 April 1915, p. 9.

⁶⁹Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1915, p. 334.

⁷⁰Jill Conway, "The Women's Peace Party and the First World War," in War and Society in North America, ed. J. L. Granatstein and R. D. Cuff (Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1971), p. 58; Walter I. Trattner, "Julia Grace Wales and the Wisconsin Plan for Peace," Wisconsin Magazine of History, XLIV (1961); Julia Grace Wales was born in Bury, Quebec, graduated from McGill University in 1903 and taught English and Shakespearean literature at the University of Wisconsin from 1905-1919. She returned to Canada in 1946 and died in 1957. Ibid.

⁷¹Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 30; The Canadian Women's Peace Party was also briefly named the Women's Peace Organization and the Canadian League for International Construction before it became affiliated with the WIL. Ibid., p. 59; SABS, Haight Papers, file A5.8, Charlton and Hughes to Haight, n.d.

⁷²Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 31.

⁷³Martin Robin, "Registration, Conscription, and Independent Labour Politics, 1916-1917," Canadian Historical Review, XLVII (June 1966) in Conscription 1917, ed. Carl Berger, Canadian Historical Readings No. 8 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968), p. 72.

⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 72-73.

⁷⁵Alice Chown, The Stairway (Boston: The Cornhill Company, 1921), p. 81.

⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 103, 126.

⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 212, 336.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 294.

⁷⁹Ibid., pp. 260, 263.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 296.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 261.

⁸²UCA, S. D. Chown Papers, Box 10, file 214, Alice Chown to S. D. Chown, 17 December 1918.

CHAPTER III

CONSCRIPTION AND THE CONSCIENCE OF RADICAL PACIFISTS

By the time of the Great War pacifism and anti-militarism had become an important dimension of the Canadian radical movement, reflecting the increased influence of Marxist internationalism, Christian social ethics and the British labor tradition.¹ Indeed, a number of liberal pacifists from religious, farm, labor and feminist backgrounds moved toward the radical left as their wartime expression of pacifism blended with a socialist critique. As noted in the last chapter, the Society of Friends had become one of the leading exponents of this socialized pacifism, thereby bridging the gap between social radicalism and historic religious non-resistance. But Quakers and other sectarian pacifists, traditional dissenters with a long and recognized history of dissenting from the established social order whenever it intruded upon their religious belief and way of life, could capitalize upon their history and secure a grudging, even respected tolerance, while these new social radicals, arising more from the mainstream of society, were viewed as dissenters in a more directly political sense. Their pacifism may have been based on Christian ethics but it was also an expression of their general discontent with the whole social and economic system; thus, it led the suspicions of subversion and treason in the minds of militant patriots. Neverthe-

less, the new socially radical pacifists, as well as the traditional religious pacifists, faithfully exercised their witness against the war and thereby set important precedents for minority dissent within Canadian society in wartime.

Although a pacifist social critique began to take shape prior to 1917, conscription proved to be the catalyst in mounting opposition to the war. Following a prelude of national registration, conscription was established by the Military Service Act (MSA) in August 1917. The MSA provided for compulsory military service of all male inhabitants in Canada between the ages of eighteen and sixty unless otherwise exempted. The men were to be called up according to six classes, beginning with the young and single. Other than hardship cases, ill health, and conscience, most exemptions were to be limited to certain occupations considered to be in the national interest.²

Although readily acceptable to the vast majority of the English speaking population, these provisions irritated a variety of Canadians, and posed a direct challenge to pacifists. Young male pacifists, especially, were confronted with a traumatic decision of conscience. Consequently, a relatively silent pacifist minority was provoked to speak out against the war and the restrictions of individual liberties. In addition to its well-known effect upon other sectors of society, therefore, conscription triggered pacifist protests and resistance.

For most Canadians, however, the real crisis of conscription in 1917 concerned Quebec's nationalist and anti-imperialist opposition to war rather than pacifist stirrings or radical discontent. The introduction of conscription, further complicated by threatened linguistic rights of Franco-Ontarians, ignited an explosive reaction among French Canadians that resulted in violent anti-conscription riots. The most serious disturbance occurred in Quebec City during the Easter weekend of 1918 over the government's rigid enforcement of the MSA and Quebec's frustrating, powerless position after the 1917 election. When the violence finally subsided on Easter Monday, four civilians were dead and more than fifty civilians and five soldiers were injured.³

Although government authorities feared a nation-wide movement of resistance to conscription since anti-conscription disturbances occurred elsewhere in Canada, Quebec remained the most serious challenge to the MSA. The majority of Quebec registrants wished to be exempted, mainly for occupational reasons, however, rather than as conscientious objectors. According to rumor, once exemption attempts failed, French Canadian draft resisters fled either to the mountainous Laurentian countryside or to the United States.⁴ The effect of this resistance was that French Canada, accounting for forty per cent of the total Canadian population, supplied approximately only five per cent of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces during the war.⁵

In English Canada conscription also triggered an emotional response which, on the whole, intensified support for the war effort. The major churches, for instance, enthusiastically endorsed the MSA. In fact, at times the churches resembled auxiliary recruiting units for the government.⁶ A number of patriotic clergymen were appointed recruiting directors while the churches themselves seemed to be in competition for the most recruits. The Methodist emphasis on recruiting, for instance, was partly in response to government released recruitment figures which revealed that the Methodist Church had produced the lowest percentage of recruits of any Protestant denomination. Although those figures were later supported by the Methodist's own tabulations, the General Superintendent, Dr. Chown, publicly refused to accept the government's figures and maintained that Canadian Methodism was willing to do her share.⁷

The war effort of the Methodist Church was directed by the Department of Social Service and Evangelism until the creation of a Special Army and Navy Board during the winter of 1915. Besides the responsibility for Methodist enlistment and employment of chaplains, the Board became the official voice of the Church in consultation with military and government departments. Similar boards were established by the Presbyterian, Baptist and Congregationalist Churches.⁸

Once the voluntary method was officially recognized as insufficient, the churches quickly supported conscription as the necessary step "to enroll the man-power of the country in a final and decisive effort to secure a permanent peace."⁹ The Christian Guardian

reminded its readers that service to God and Country were closely allied and argued that the Church had a right to demand conscription since ministers and their sons were in uniform. "Yes," remarked the editor, "the Church has a right to inculcate patriotism and to rally her sons to the defense of the flag in the great world-war."¹⁰ The Presbyterian and Westminster also came out for conscription even though its editor suggested the bill might have been defeated if submitted to a national referendum.¹¹

Given the patriotic attitude of the churches and their lack of concern for pacifists, the possible alternative of conscientious objection was clearly inconceivable to most Canadians. The average young man was under almost irresistible pressure to enlist. In Canada, as in Britain, women as well as children were encouraged to shame men into uniform. Not to be in uniform labelled one a slacker or shirker, words not reserved just for men of the pacifist sects.

The Presbyterian Record defined the "slacker" as

not merely the able bodied of military age who prefers ease to duty, and will not give himself. The "slacker" is the self indulgent of either sex, and of every age and station, who does not lend every energy to help win the war.¹²

Likewise, the Christian Guardian claimed that, although the word slacker "had something of a nondescript quality" in the past, the war had given it a new meaning.

. . . we have added to it all the contempt that men ought to feel for the coward, the shirker, the man who refuses to stand up squarely to his duty. And we do well to put teeth into such a word as that, being sure always that we apply it to men who really deserve it.¹³

Although the incriminating term was directed most frequently against French Canadians, it was clearly intended to include all those opposed to the MSA and generally critical of the war effort.

Outside Quebec initial opposition to conscription came from farm and labor critics in reaction to the national registration scheme. Although alarmed, the national executive of the TLC eventually recommended compliance of trade unionists with the plan. Their recommendation met with general approval in eastern trades councils but the leadership of the western labor movement bolted. The trades council and socialists in Winnipeg established an Anti-Registration League and across the West trades and labor councils emphatically opposed the scheme as a prelude to conscription and urged workers not to fill out the registration cards.¹⁴

Conscription met with even stronger disapproval.¹⁵ Mass protest meetings organized by the national TLC and the Socialist Party of Canada aroused talk of a general strike. At first the TLC executive favored a national general strike to force the government to conscript wealth before manpower but finally decided that once conscription was the law they should yield to the increased clamour for political action rather than the direct action of a general strike or passive resistance.¹⁶ Some historians have argued that the entrance of organized labor into

independent politics in opposition to the Union Government was the culmination of labor's strong resistance to war regimentation but, as John H. Thompson has shown, the opposition of some labor leaders to the registration and conscription of manpower was not shared by the rank and file of the Canadian labor movement.¹⁷ On the contrary, most workers and farmers, including those in the West, wholeheartedly supported the war effort. Nevertheless, some militant workers viewed the military draft as anti-democratic, especially since radical leaders complained that workers' applications for exemptions were routinely rejected.

The most notable incidents of labor opposition to the war effort occurred in the West. For instance, the British Columbia Federation of Labor assumed the function of political party and issued a manifesto calling for the repeal of the MSA and the abolition of the capitalist system which it believed to be at the root of all wars.¹⁸ It was the Winnipeg Trades and Labor Council, however, that took the lead in opposing both registration and conscription and continued to press for a general strike even after their National Congress had decided otherwise.¹⁹ When the 1917 TLC convention endorsed the executive recommendation that the Congress not oppose the implementation of conscription, the western delegates remained openly defiant.²⁰

At times western radicals protested violently.²¹ And, as in Quebec, some workers fled into the woods to avoid induction, thus giving birth to "rag-tag colonies" of draft resisters on Indian

reservations in Southeastern Manitoba, on British Columbia's lower mainland and on Vancouver Island. In August 1918 the western radical movement became outraged when one of these resisters, the socialist leader of the miners' union named Ginger Goodwin, was killed by a Dominion police officer.²²

Overall, labor opposition to conscription was based on the fear that it would result in industrial conscription, government control of workers in specific industries, and thereby the destruction of collective bargaining and trade unionism itself. Despite these larger concerns, however, the radical labor anti-war position "certainly had a doctrinal dimension" and remained sympathetic to pacifism.²³

Labor's insistent demand for the conscription of wealth before men was echoed by farmers and was officially endorsed by the United Farmers of Ontario. In effect, conscription became the catalyst in mounting agricultural grievances over urbanization, rural depopulation and the accompanying shortage of farm laborers. Confronted with the MSA, farmers demanded exemptions for their sons in order to keep them on the farms, especially since farm work was considered essential in the war effort. With the 1917 election on the horizon, the government temporarily agreed to their request, but in April 1918 cancelled all special exemptions except for conscientious objectors. About five thousand Ontario farmers, feeling angry and betrayed, marched on Ottawa on May 15, 1918, to voice their displeasure.²⁴

Despite their opposition to conscription, however, most farmers strongly supported the war effort and denounced implications that they were in any way unpatriotic. This sensitivity was clearly reflected in the following message sponsored by the Citizens Union Committee prior to the 1917 election:

The Man is a slanderer who says that
 the Farmers of Ontario
 will vote with
 Bourassa, Pro-Germans,
 Suppressors of Free Speech
 and Slackers.
 Never
 They will support Union Government.²⁵

Western farmers were no less committed and, contrary to their eastern counterparts, they quietly accepted the cancellation of exemptions as "inevitable."²⁶ Those who did protest usually did so on the grounds that "conscription of farmers would reduce the Canadian contribution to the allied cause." It appears that initial western opposition to the MSA was not so much anti-war as it was against the uneven enforcement of conscription. Eventually their overall support for the war effort overcame their reluctance to accept conscription as a military necessity.²⁷

Despite some initial anti-conscription sentiment, the mainstream of Canada's church, labor and farm communities accepted conscription, as well as the whole war effort, as compatible with their broad goals of social reform. Within their ranks, however, there remained a small minority of radical pacifists critical of the war.

The introduction of conscription further intensified their pacifist inclinations. As with the protests of radical labor, the center of this pacifist activity was Winnipeg, the home of such notable radicals as J. S. Woodsworth, William Ivens, F. J. Dixon, A. Vernon Thomas and Francis Marion Beynon. These western reformers challenged the gospel of wealth and materialism with a philosophy of social reform based upon the social and ethical spirit of Christianity as well as socialism.

F. J. Dixon, a Single Taxer and organizer of the Direct Legislation League of Manitoba, was one of these reformers committed to gradual peaceful change and a pacifist during the war. As early as the 1912 naval debate, for instance, Dixon wrote Prime Minister Sir Robert Borden protesting strenuously against the growing spirit of militarism in Canada. He asked Borden to pause and consider if it was wise to ". . . in any way assist in drawing Canada into the maelstrom of militarism which is the curse of Europe at the present time." "You may ignore this letter or you may not," he concluded, "but I do hope that you will receive a large number of letters from the peace advocates in Canada."²⁸

During the war years Dixon was denied a hearing on many platforms and became a prime target of public abuse when he aired his pacifist anti-war views. An independent member of the Manitoba Legislature since 1914, Dixon was almost the only member of the House to speak out strongly against the war. In a particularly stormy session Dixon denounced the proposed national registration scheme as

the first step towards conscription and declared he would not sign the card. When Premier T. C. Norris proposed that those who opposed the scheme should be put in jail, Dixon responded:

Any tyrant would allow the expression of opinion with which he agreed. But freedom demanded the right of expression for minorities. The way to meet a weak argument was to refute it, not to imprison the upholders of it.²⁹ ✓

Dixon's remarks were interrupted with cries of "traitor" and "throw him in jail" and resulted in a movement to impeach him. It, as well as a recall campaign, failed and Dixon continued to blast away at conscription, maintaining it was absurd and morally wrong to force a man to place his life at the disposal of the state.³⁰

Once the Winnipeg Trades and Labor Council declared its unyielding opposition to conscription and called for a national referendum on the issue, Dixon and other prominent socialists and labor leaders organized the Anti-Conscription League. Its purpose was to circulate petitions, publicize their views and hold meetings to rally anti-war support. Sometimes these league meetings were broken up by the Returned Soldiers' Association and their supporters and at one gathering Dixon and other speakers were mobbed.¹³¹

One of the casualties of the anti-war campaign was the Winnipeg reformer and journalist, A. Vernon Thomas. Thomas was attracted to the Free Press from the Manchester Guardian and became involved in Winnipeg reform circles soon after his arrival. In time the journalist became good friends with J. S. Woodsworth and one of his main allies in the establishment of the People's Forum. Thomas' wife,

Lillian Beynon, was a leading Winnipeg reformer and suffragist and also a journalist, as was her sister Francis Marion Beynon. All three were radical pacifists.³² For a journalist to demonstrate such views publicly, however was dangerous and Thomas was quickly fired from his job at the Free Press after he walked onto the floor of the Legislature to congratulate F. J. Dixon on one of his anti-war speeches. Shortly afterward the Thomases, bitterly disappointed, left the country and spent the duration of the war in New York.³³

Writing to Woodsworth from his self-imposed exile, Thomas confessed that the sacrifice in their "little attempt at freedom" seemed contemptible compared to the personal vigil of Woodsworth and other pacifists in Canada. "So far we have been comfortable," he reported, "and I have in fact had a larger salary than I had in Winnipeg. But we have felt very much being cut off from our friends and then our position has been and still is one of uncertainty."³⁴ Thomas found most of his office colleagues fairly tolerant of his pacifist views but never felt secure in his new job due to continual pressure by liberty loan campaigns. "I may get it put up to me very unpleasantly before the campaign is over," he wrote, ". . . however, I shall stand to my guns and take whatever comes along."³⁵ Although Thomas continued to contribute anti-war articles to Winnipeg's Labor paper, The Voice, he often wondered if he could not make a greater protest. "I don't think the pacifist note of my articles can be mistaken," he wrote. "But it ends there and my position is

simply that I am not extolling the war in my daily work, which is a great satisfaction."³⁶

On the other hand, Thomas maintained there would be plenty to do once the war was over and "immediate fear is removed from the hearts of the people." He looked forward to the day when he could return to Canada and join Woodsworth in the work "of absolutely challenging the present constitution of society and its ideals."³⁷

Confident the future would be with them he cautioned:

Frankly, until then I do not see what we can do. The only thing, as I see it, would be to ensure ourselves a speedy removal to prison, and we may get there anyway before this horror is over.³⁸

Thomas had considered the possibility of prison seriously and decided he would certainly go to prison rather than enlist if called up; a distinct possibility since he was in the last class but one in Canada. But to do more active propaganda work would also mean prison and he did not feel he had the reserve of physical strength necessary for such a vigil.³⁹

Despite his attempt to remain optimistic about the post-war era, Thomas became depressed over the increasing toll the war was taking in Canadian society. The evil fruits of war, he warned, were growing every day:

We cannot think the war out of existence. People are not what they were. Their minds have become militarized and we shall have to deal with people of that kind. The workers have not been spared. A good deal of the labor movement is now war. It is all a tragedy and we can only make the best of it.⁴⁰

Thomas' sister-in-law, Francis Marion Beynon, stayed behind for a time in Winnipeg as the editor of the women's page of the Grain Growers' Guide and carried on the anti-war struggle. Social discontent was on the rise in wartime Winnipeg and Francis Beynon exemplifies the transition of pre-war liberal into radical. Like most liberals before 1914, Beynon subscribed to the usual anti-militarist, pacifist sentiments. But as Ramsay Cook has explained, the war raised serious questions about fundamental liberal intellectual assumptions, exposing a naive faith in moral progress.⁴¹ Although she believed women had a greater interest in social and ethical questions than men, Beynon questioned the validity of feminist comments on the pacifist influence of women.⁴² In a short time her growing skepticism seemed justified by the thorough involvement of women in various war activities and the intolerant, conformist attitude associated with their patriotism. Beynon's conviction mounted that there was something radically wrong with the whole social order that demanded correction.⁴³ Patriotism and nationalism merely defended the established order, she argued, while its intolerant, militaristic spirit was the same spirit that crucified Christ and continued to threaten those preaching His pacifist doctrine.⁴⁴

The super-patriotic atmosphere of the country strengthened Beynon's individualism as well as her radical commitment to pacifism and social reconstruction. Initially, however, the popular association of dissent with subversion cautioned Beynon to restrain her pacifist sentiments in favor of safer demands like the conscription of wealth

as well as men. But unlike those who associated this proposal with some form of graduated income tax, Beynon made it clear she favored the actual "taking over by government of all real property."⁴⁵ As she became more outspoken she also echoed the familiar charge that the most fervent patriots were those getting rich from "sweated labor and war profiteering."⁴⁶ Such regular anti-war statements and the whole radical tone of her column, she suspected, had aroused the wrath of the Press Censor and ultimately placed her at odds with her editor, George F. Chipman, who had moved towards support of conscription and Union government. Consequently, rather than restrain her pacifist and radical beliefs, Beynon resigned in the summer of 1917 and joined the Thomases in exile.⁴⁷

Francis Beynon became convinced that the war was the result of capitalist, economic conflicts and a militant mentality and that it would create more problems than it would solve. Like other radical pacifists, for example, she feared that wartime mobilization was causing Canadian society to become increasingly insensitive to social injustices.⁴⁸ The only way to solve world problems and prevent future military conflicts, she asserted, was through a social and intellectual revolution.⁴⁹ Previously social reformers had legitimated their campaigns by appealing to the rationality of man and the theology of liberal Protestantism but it now appeared the progressive social gospel lacked the intellectual depth required to support a major movement of social and moral reconstruction.⁵⁰ What was necessary, according to the radicals, was a synthesis of the moral and ethical

aspects of Christianity with an intelligent, dynamic philosophy for radical change. The radicalized social gospel was partly an attempt in the direction. ✓

According to historian Richard Allen, by 1914 the social gospel began to crystalize into three wings: conservative, progressive and radical, each conflicting with the other throughout the following decade. At the same time, however, there was a general leftward movement of the social gospel as a whole, reflected in increased radicalism during the war years.⁵¹ The majority of social gospellers found reform -- and some radical reform -- quite in harmony with the war effort. Nevertheless, a committed minority, including some leading radicals, separated from the mainstream of the social gospel over the issue of pacifism. By taking the pacifist stand they believed they were remaining faithful to pre-war social gospel pronouncements on the necessity of world peace for the coming of the Kingdom.

Among these dissidents was C. S. Eby, one of the earliest proponents of the social gospel who continued to voice anti-war sentiments while calling for a "great spiritual revolution" based upon the Sermon on the Mount or the "Charter of the Kingdom." Unless such a change occurred, he believed the war would be but a prelude to still greater struggles. "The obscene vermin of vice, degeneracy and more war, that will rise out of this war, as they always rise out of every war," warned Eby, "can be met . . . only by the positive creative spirit of Christ."⁵²

The newer breed of radicals in the Church generally agreed with Eby's diagnosis, but when they sought to put their pacifist preaching into practice a crisis resulted in which some either lost their charges or left the ministry entirely. The latter was the case of J. S. Woodsworth, a radical Methodist reformer who ultimately became Canada's most famous pacifist.

Representative of the pacifist strain in the social gospel, Woodsworth favored the practical extension of the gospel of love during wartime, both as an ideal and a method of reform. His pacifism was an integral part of his larger concern for social justice based upon the ethical demands of Christianity. According to his biographer, Kenneth McNaught, Woodsworth represented a complex mixture of the moral doctrine of religious pacifism with the pragmatic arguments of socialism.⁵³ He and other radicals suspected that the established social order was based on the same ethic of force which produced war; consequently they united their opposition to the war with a call for social reconstruction.

Woodsworth's pacifist convictions evolved slowly. His student life at Oxford and the Boer War started him thinking along new lines but he still accepted "the existing order of things."⁵⁴ Then gradually, as he examined the cruelty of war and its disastrous effect upon private and public morality, his pacifist sympathies grew stronger and were reflected in his speeches and writing. As chairman of the Canadian Welfare League in 1914, Woodsworth compiled Studies in Rural Citizenship, a book authorized as the basis for adult study courses by

the Canadian Council of Agriculture. In it he suggested a number of controversial resolutions for debate, including the following: "Resolved that commercial interests are at bottom of modern wars" and "Is war justified by the teachings of Jesus?" The book also contained a pacifist statement by Nellie McClung and Salem Bland's proposal for the moral transformation of Canadian politics.⁵⁵

The outbreak of war began a time of "heart searching" for Woodsworth. He later recalled attending a Sunday night service in St. James Methodist Church, Montreal, in which a military man reviewed the atrocities in Belgium while the President of McGill University made a patriotic appeal to youth;

then the pastor of the Church in approved evangelistic style **appealed** for recruits, urging that the young men give their name to sergeants in uniform stationed at the door. This in the name of Jesus! The whole performance seemed to me absolute sacrilege. I walked the streets all night.⁵⁶

Throughout the following year Woodsworth corresponded with numerous pacifists and became increasingly adamant in his own pacifist convictions. By June 1916 he was labelled a pacifist by the Manitoba press following an address to the Young Men's Club of Winnipeg's Grace Church in which he expressed doubt that moral issues could be settled by military force.⁵⁷ It was not until conscription became the issue of the day, however, that Woodsworth made a public pronouncement. In the meantime he was deeply absorbed in social welfare work.

His pioneering work with Winnipeg's All Peoples' Mission and his work with the Canadian Welfare League earned Woodsworth the reputation of a Canadian authority in the field of social welfare. In 1916 he was appointed director of the Bureau of Social Research, an agency established by the three prairie governments. It promised to be an eventful enterprise but within a year the Bureau was closed following Woodsworth's protest against the introduction by the federal government of a national registration scheme. Woodsworth decided the time had come to take a public stand and in a letter to the Manitoba Free Press condemned national registration as a prelude to conscription:

This registration is no mere census. It seems to look in the direction of a measure of conscription. As some of us cannot conscientiously engage in military service, we are bound to resist what -- if the war continues -- will inevitably lead to forced service.⁵⁸

He also raised the labor-socialist argument that "conscription of material possessions should in all justice precede an attempt to force men to risk their lives and the welfare of their families."⁵⁹ Woodsworth later recalled that, following the closing of the Bureau, he was bitterly denounced as a fool, even by his closest associates.⁶⁰

Although Woodsworth's action coincided with the protests of organized labor, it appears evident, as Richard Allen maintains, that Woodsworth's dismissal was due to his pacifism rather than to his social and economic radicalism. The three provincial governments were aware of his radical political outlook before appointing him but his pacifism represented an "unknown potential" in the context of talk

in labor circles of passive resistance to the registration scheme.⁶¹ At any rate, considering the patriotic feeling within the country, the prairie provinces were in no mood to endorse a pacifist.

After his dismissal Woodsworth for a time contemplated joining a Doukhobor community and even made active inquiries in that direction. The Doukhobors were sympathetic but wondered if Woodsworth could really adapt to their ways. Perhaps Woodsworth agreed, for he finally accepted another charge in Gibson's Landing, British Columbia, a small coastal mission. His outspoken pacifist views, however, were no more welcome in British Columbia than in Manitoba and the following year the British Columbia Stationing Committee complied with a request by the congregation that he be removed. In response, J. S. Woodsworth resigned from the ministry and for the remainder of the war he worked as a longshoreman on the west coast while his wife Lucy organized the Vancouver chapter of the Womens' International League for Peace and Freedom.

Among the reasons for his resignation, Woodsworth emphasized that the war policy of the church and the issue of pacifism were of central importance. Although there was little opportunity to protest against participation in the war at first, he confided, "as the war progressed, I have protested against the curtailment of our liberties which is going on under the pressure of military necessity and the passions of war."⁶²

Woodsworth's letter of resignation, even more than Beynon's protest, revealed a new socially radical pacifism -- a synthesis of absolute Christian social ethics with a radical political critique -- that was to become more common in the twentieth century. For instance, he claimed war was the "inevitable outcome of the existing social organization with its undemocratic form of government and competitive system of industry." A murder in Serbia or the invasion of Belgium was not the cause of the war, he argued, and to claim they were was a product of "ignorance or a closed mind, or camouflage, or hypocrisy."⁶³ Woodsworth warned that, rather than solve any problems, the war would have a brutalizing effect upon society. "The devil of militarism cannot be driven out by the power of militarism," he wrote, "without successful nations themselves becoming militarized. Permanent peace can only come through the development of good-will."⁶⁴

Above all, however, Woodsworth emphasized the Christian point of view that the spirit and teachings of Jesus were "absolutely irreconcilable with the advocacy of war." "Christianity may be an impossible idealism," he declared, "but so long as I hold to it, ever so unworthily, I must refuse, as far as may be, to participate in or to influence others to participate in war." He explained:

When the policy of the State -- whether that state be nominally Christian or not -- conflicts with my conception of right and wrong, then I must obey God rather than man. As a minister I must proclaim the truth as it is revealed to me. I am not a pro-German; I am not lacking, I think in patriotism; I trust that I am not a slacker or a coward. I had thought that as a Christian minister I was a messenger of the Prince of Peace.⁶⁵

In closing his letter, Woodsworth criticized church leaders for their intolerant and militaristic attitude; they denounced pacifism as a vice, tempered love with hatred and turned churches into recruiting agencies. "A minister's success seems to be judged by the number of recruits in his church," he quipped, "rather than the number of converts." To support his accusations, Woodsworth quoted the Christian Guardian's editorial silencing all pacifists in the church. "Apparently the Church feels that I do not belong," he lamented, "and reluctantly I have been forced to the same conclusions."⁶⁶

Woodsworth's brand of pacifism was also shared by William Ivens, pastor of McDougall Methodist Church, Winnipeg. A British immigrant and former student of Salem Bland at Wesley College, Ivens was already a radical social gospeller in 1914 but had shown no sign of pacifist conviction. He had come to McDougall with the hope of establishing a labor-oriented church.⁶⁷ His increased radicalism after the introduction of conscription paralleled that of organized labor with whom he sympathized. Rather than his radicalism, however, it was his pacifism that led to his crisis in the church.⁶⁸

Although he refrained from voicing pacifist views from the pulpit, Ivens felt free to express himself on the outside. Consequently, he contributed several anti-war articles to The Voice and became involved in trade union activities. Iven's actions split his congregation and in the spring of 1918 Church officials made an urgent appeal to the Manitoba Stationing Committee for his removal. Rather than be

intimidated, however, Ivens immediately embarked on a speaking tour of the prairies.⁶⁹ Vernon Thomas wrote Woodsworth that Ivens' tour of western Canada was greatly encouraging, demonstrating that it was possible for one with his reputation to speak publicly.⁷⁰ Thomas praised Ivens for fighting a tremendous fight and "winning his way into the hearts of people."⁷¹ "I am sure," he wrote, "a great many must admire him in their hearts who dare not speak out. We must not forget that there is a tremendous intimidating force at work now in all countries to crucify any opinions except those of the powers that be. . . ."⁷²

Despite numerous letters and petitions supporting Ivens, the Methodist Stationing Committee removed him from McDougall and yet offered him a different station in Winnipeg. Ivens declined the offer, claiming his pacifist views would only cause more difficulties, and assumed the editorship of the Western Labor News, the official organ of the Winnipeg Trades and Labor Council.⁷³

The most visible example of Ivens' radicalism, however, was his labor church founded in July, 1918, as a creedless church aimed at the "establishment of justice and righteousness on earth, among all men and nations."⁷⁴ Linking ethical Christianity and social radicalism, the church was also a protest against war, as J. S. Woodsworth, shortly to be associated with Ivens' new enterprise, later commented:

We believe that physical force settles nothing . . . what is won by physical force must be maintained by physical force. Physical force is a deceptive shortcut. "Moral" ends can be attained only by "moral" means . . . education, then, not the sword, is to be the instrument of our emancipation.⁷⁵

A new pacifist ethic clearly emerged as Woodsworth, Ivens and other social radicals voiced their opposition to conscription and to the war. By linking war and capitalism, they combined socialist anti-war critique with the radical Christian belief in the moral necessity of pacifism in any meaningful social revolution. Thus, they staunchly opposed the existing social order, the state's war effort in particular, and, as a result, pacifist ministers lost their churches while others were forced from their jobs.⁷⁶ In the end, however, the war resistance of a small number of social radicals strengthened not only the principle of minority dissent but the idea of a socially radical pacifism as well.

Despite the protests of social gospel radicals, the most ardent pacifist opposition to conscription was exhibited by the historic peace sects, especially the Society of Friends which, by this time, had come to represent radical social change as well as traditional religious non-resistance. As early as May 1917 a joint committee representing all three branches of Canadian Friends met in Toronto to outline Quaker resistance to an anticipated conscription bill. An executive sub-committee composed of Albert S. Rogers, Charles A. Zavitz and George Clark, representing each of the three branches, forwarded a resolution to Prime Minister Borden in which they reaffirmed the two

and one-half century old opposition of Friends to bearing arms and requested that the exemptions allowed under the old militia act be continued in any new measure. Furthermore, reflecting a radical concern with individual rights of conscience, the Quakers urged that the new exemption clause should be broadened to include not only recognized pacifist sects but all those "whose conscience forbade them to carry arms regardless of their membership in any particular church or society."⁷⁷

Once the conscription bill became law, Albert S. Rogers interpreted the Military Service Act to all members of the peace committee, explaining the division of classes and list of possible exemptions. Friends of military age were advised to report to the proper authority in plenty of time to process their applications for exemption and then be prepared to appear before the local tribunal to explain their claims and present the certificates of membership issued by the clerk of their Monthly Meeting.⁷⁸ The certificate forms were devised by the peace committee and distributed to the clerks of the various Monthly Meetings in order to help organize Friends along uniform lines.⁷⁹

As the defenders of their faith the young men in question received enthusiastic support from their fellow Quakers. For example, the Genesee Yearly Meeting sent the following letter to all members of military age:

As we have gathered together in our Yearly Meeting, our hearts have been drawn towards you in loving sympathy, praying that you may be continually and renewedly conscious of the Divine Guidance, in whatever field of service you may be led.⁸⁰

It was expected, however, that young Friends would claim exemption as absolute pacifists and when a few enlisted or, as LeRoy Cody, joined the non-combatant military corps, they were highly criticized. One of Elias Rogers' sons actually joined the Royal Flying Corps and was killed in action in June 1916.⁸¹ A few other Canadians, including Albert Rogers' nephew David and Edwin Zavitz joined the Friends Ambulance Unit in Italy and France respectively, an acceptable though still unfamiliar alternative for active pacifist service.⁸²

Just as most young Quakers conscientiously refused to bear arms, many older Friends were conscientiously unable to subscribe to war loans since they believed such money was used solely for the destructive purposes of war. They contributed instead to the Friends' Ambulance Unit fund in order to support C.O.s in constructive service.⁸³

At first, the majority of Quakers, as well as Mennonites and Hutterites, found it less complicated to receive exemptions from military service as farmers rather than as pacifists, especially since the Military Service Act was somewhat ambiguous on the question of religious objectors. Contrary to the Militia Act or the Order-in-Council providing pacifist exemptions, the MSA failed to name the pacifist sects specifically while it included them in general under

either an exemption clause, offering exemption from combatant service only, or an exception schedule, excepting some from the Act altogether. The grounds of exemption for conscientious objectors were

that he conscientiously objects to the undertaking of combatant service and is prohibited from so doing by the tenets and articles of faith, in effect on the sixth day of July, 1917, of any organized religious denomination existing and well recognized in Canada at such date, and to which he in good faith belongs.⁸⁴

On the other hand, the exception schedule applied to those men holding a certificate of exemption, on grounds other than conscientious objection, and to

those persons exempted from Military Service by Order-in-Council of August 13th, 1873 and by Order-in-Council of December 6th, 1898.⁸⁵

It appeared that except for the Mennonites and Doukhobors ✓ referred to in the above mentioned Orders-in-Council, Canadian religious pacifists were to be exempted only from combatant service unless they could receive exemption on one of the other possible grounds: work in the national interest, education postponement, serious personal hardship, and ill health or infirmity.⁸⁶ As farmers, therefore, it was possible for religious pacifists to receive exemptions from all service, even non-combatant work. Other pacifists, even less protected by the act, undoubtedly perceived that loophole as well. As an escape from military service, however, it was by no means simply a pacifist device, for ninety-five per cent of all those

called up across Canada in October 1917 claimed exemption for one reason or another.⁸⁷ Faced with such wholesale evasion, the government, in April 1918, cancelled all exemptions except those for conscientious objectors.

Various religious groups remained uneasy over the lack of any specific guarantees and some, such as the Seventh Day Adventists and Christadelphians, petitioned the House of Commons with respect to their opposition to military service.⁸⁸ Their worst fears were realized when the Ontario registrar wrongly ruled that Tunkers, fellow religious pacifists, were not exempted; thereby exposing Tunker men to military discipline for remaining faithful to their beliefs. One such case involved Ernest J. Swalm, later a Canadian Tunker bishop. After being denied exemption as a Tunker or as a farmer, Swalm refused military duty and was sentenced to two years hard labor. Within a month, he was released and the Tunker Church was recognized;²⁹ nevertheless, other pacifist groups feared similar experiences. Finally, the Central Appeal Judge, in an effort to help clarify a confusing situation, ruled that Mennonites, Dunkards or Tunkers, Christadelphians, Seventh Day Adventists and the Society of Friends all qualified as bona fide pacifist sects eligible for exemptions.⁹⁰

As far as the Mennonites were concerned, however, their legal status under the MSA remained inconsistent and confused until the end of the war. At first a temporary problem arose concerning the proper identification of young men as Mennonites since their official baptism did not occur until around age 21. The issue was settled

when government authorities accepted the argument of the Mennonite Church that unbaptized children were as much Mennonites as baptized adults and that their earlier petitions for exemption from military service had always intended that to be the case.⁹¹

The main point of contention for Mennonites involved the interpretation of the provisions for exemptions and exception. All the Mennonites of western Canada, those who immigrated in 1873 as well as those who migrated from Ontario, were excepted from the MSA while the Mennonites of Ontario were exempted from combatant service only. At times it appeared that all Canadian Mennonites would be excepted, at least this was the attitude the Justice Department conveyed to a Mennonite delegation headed by Bishop S. F. Coffman in November 1917. Yet in Ontario district registrars continued to insist that eastern Mennonites were exempt only from combatant service. Their judgement was upheld by the Central Appeal Judge five weeks before the war ended.⁹² In practice, however, Ontario Mennonites escaped all service when granted a "Leave of Absence," a special procedure arranged by Bishop Coffman in conjunction with friends in the House of Commons. The "Leave of Absence" became automatic with proper Mennonite identification and allowed tribunals to avoid the question of exemption and exception.⁹³

One of the reasons for the reluctance of administrators to grant a blanket exception to Mennonites was the public concern over the influx into Canada of Mennonite and Hutterite conscientious objectors from the United States. Once the United States entered the

war and enacted compulsory military service, war hysteria swept that country, creating an oppressive, intolerant atmosphere for pacifists, especially those of German ancestry. Contrary to the situation in Canada, religious objectors in the U.S. faced the real possibility of military induction, maltreatment and prison terms. Added to this, the Germanophobia of the Midwest and the vicious harrassment of Hutterite communities in South Dakota produced a crisis for Mennonites and Hutterites in the U.S. Glowing reports from their Canadian brethren of the tolerance and freedom of religious practice extended by the Canadian government resulted in a mass emigration to Canada that increased as the war progressed.⁹⁴ While some Hutterite communities resettled en masse, most Mennonite youths emigrated alone. With the encouragement of their families, they slipped across the border in underground fashion throughout the war years.⁹⁵ In 1918 alone, approximately 500-600 Mennonites and 1,000 Hutterites entered Canada according to the Hon. J. A. Calder, Minister of Immigration.⁹⁶

The exaggerated figures of 30,000 to 60,000 quoted in the press and the House of Commons, however, reflected a growing nativist reaction against Germans, shirkers, and "slackerism" in the Canadian West. Westerners, particularly, resented the ease with which pacifists received exemptions from military service. They argued that, while their own sons were away in the military, the new settlers or "dirty shirkers" were acquiring the most desirable farm land. Singled out as "one-man exemption tribunals," Mennonite ministers such as Bishop David Toews were accused of signing exemption certificates indiscrimin-

ately regardless of the bearer's citizenship.⁹⁷ Political organizations, major Protestant denominations and veterans groups, such as the Great War Veterans Association, all denounced the Mennonites. The Great War Next-of-Kin Association even suggested they be drafted and anglicized. During the autumn of 1918, the mounting public hostility erupted in demonstrations against the new Mennonites at Swift Current, Moose Jaw and Regina.⁹⁸ In October 1918, shortly before the end of the war, the Governor-General-in-Council ruled that immigrant Mennonites and their descendants not covered by the 1873 Order-in-Council would neither be exempted nor excepted from military service.⁹⁹

Although Canadian Mennonites were at first ill prepared in terms of organization and structure to cope with government bureaucracy and adverse public opinion, they began to pull together during the war in order to secure their common pacifist goal. The various groups of Mennonites also began to unite in an attempt to undertake some active, constructive, humanitarian service during wartime. Early in 1917 the western Mennonites made financial contributions to the Canadian Patriotic Fund for the support of war victims, invalids, widows and orphans.¹⁰⁰ The next year the various factions of Ontario Mennonites and Tunkers joined together to form the "Non-Resistant Relief Organization" through which funds were collected for relief and charitable purposes.¹⁰¹ The crises of war and threatened liberties produced among Canadian Mennonites a new awareness of themselves, their unique position within Canadian society and their possible future role in non-violent constructive action in this world. The lessons

they learned in the first war eased considerably their adjustment to the second.

From Mennonites to Quakers, regardless of their perceived roles within society, the historic peace sects were largely responsible for exercising the ultimate in pacifist dissent -- the steadfast refusal on the part of individuals to undertake military service for reasons of conscience. The question of pacifism in twentieth century Canada was purely academic until young men were directly challenged by conscription; thereafter it was in the personal response of pacifists to conscription that pacifism left its mark upon Canada during the Great War.

The actual process of applying for conscientious objector status was relatively simple, even though the climate of public opinion hindered the chances of success. The religious pacifist would report to the authorities, claim exemption as a conscientious objector and then report to his local tribunal to present his case and prove his membership in a recognized pacifist denomination. The Military Service Act provided for three tribunals: Local Tribunals, Appeal Tribunals and a Central Appeal Judge. Each Local Tribunal was composed of two members, one appointed by a Board of Selection and the other a county court or district court judge. The Chief Justice of the Court of Last Resort in each province acted as the Appeal Tribunal while the Central Appeal Judge was one of the justices

of the Supreme Court of Canada.¹⁰² The Local Tribunals, of course, were the most important in determining a young man's status as a conscientious objector.

The attitude of Local Tribunals varied from one locality to the next but over all, in Canada as in Britain, they represented the patriotic elements of society and tended to look askance at claims for conscientious objections. They and the majority of Canadians were not well acquainted with religious pacifism and neither understood nor trusted the variety of claimants. It was much easier for a young man to receive an exemption for occupational reasons such as farm work. Whatever the reasons, however, ultimately half of the men registered under the MSA, were granted exemptions.¹⁰³

An exemption for a religious pacifist depended most upon the religious denomination to which he belonged. If he did not claim membership in a denomination recognized by authorities as a legitimate pacifist sect, and yet persisted in his pacifist stand, the claimant faced military discipline and possible imprisonment. At first the government did not know quite what to do with conscientious objectors. Since the religious groups qualifying for exemptions were not specifically named in the M.S.A., registrars depended on rulings by the Central Appeal Judge in determining the legitimacy of certain claims.

Initially those individuals who did not belong to one of the required religious affiliations and those whose exemptions were

refused, were tried by district courts martial and punished by imprisonments of up to two years.¹⁰⁴ While some military districts reported that a short period of detention produced a "complete cure" and discouraged further conscientious objections, the military district headquarters in Toronto argued that such sentences failed to provide a sufficient deterrent to conscientious objections and claimed that many men preferred "a short sentence of imprisonment at the Burwash Industrial Farm to military duty."¹⁰⁵ Consequently, commanding officers of units receiving C.O.s were ordered to determine the sincerity of a man's conscientious objections. Under this system, if a pacifist's objections were recognised as bona fide he was transferred to a non-combatant unit, but if it was decided he was insecure or if he refused non-combatant duty he was given a general court-martial resulting in sentences from five years' imprisonment to life.¹⁰⁶ According to a memorandum issued by the office of the Judge Advocate General in October 1918, the imposition of longer sentences proved "very effective" in discouraging claims as C.O.s. Of approximately 130 alleged C.O.s punished, only around 25 cases involved a general court-martial.¹⁰⁷

Following a clumsy beginning, the Justice Department and the Department of Militia and Defense settled in with its task of enforcing the MSA and handling the problem of conscientious objectors refusing non-combatant service. Although their prime concern remained always to discourage conscientious objections, military and government authorities began to take a more tolerant and imagina-

tive attitude. By the summer of 1918 the Chief of the General Staff suggested several possible courses of action regarding the absolute pacifists. The first option, just to continue sending them to ordinary jails and penitentiaries, raised the most serious objections since it was recognized that the men were not, "properly speaking, criminals, and to punish them adequately in this way may arouse public criticism."¹⁰⁸ The idea of congregating the C.O.s in one place of detention, on the other hand, was offset by the loss of their possible services to the community. Finally, serious consideration was given to the idea of organizing a forestry unit in British Columbia, especially since labor was needed in getting out the white spruce timber for airplane manufacturing. Also, it seemed to offer the possibility of constructive service for C.O.s who "would otherwise spend their time uselessly in the penitentiary."¹⁰⁹ Another suggestion involved the use of C.O.s in non-combatant duty as cooks in the Naval Service. The Deputy Minister of Militia and Defense had no objections to this idea but doubted if any imprisoned C.O.s would agree.¹¹⁰ Although the war ended before any of these plans formalized, the idea of a forestry unit was reintroduced during the second war.

Government and Military authorities were besieged with requests and petitions regarding specific problem cases from a wide variety of religious groups including Quakers, Doukhobors, and Moravians plus some unusual sects such as the "Holiness Movement Church" and the "Community of the Son of God." The Unitas Fratrum or United Brethren in Alberta claimed that they were excepted from all military service

by virtue of Statute 22, George 2nd, Chapter 30,¹¹¹ but the Director of Military Service disagreed and maintained that a man's status in regard to military service was determined by the legislation of the Dominion only and not "ancient Imperial Statutes."¹¹² A different sort of problem arose concerning C.O.s performing non-combatant service. Canadian Seventh Day Adventists argued that, although they were willing to serve in any non-combatant capacity, that outlet might be closed if they were forced to perform drills and unnecessary labor on their Sabbath.¹¹³ It was a difficulty the authorities had not foreseen but remedied quickly when the Adjutant General ordered all military districts to relieve all Seventh Day Adventists from duty on Saturdays.¹¹⁴

A different and more difficult question of the status of young pacifist members from churches supporting the war was raised by the Reverend Fred F. Prior, pastor of the Free Methodist Church, St. Boswells, Saskatchewan. He claimed that a C.O. in his church was "an intelligent, consistent-living young man, objecting a hundred times more intelligently, and with far more conscience in the matter, than many members of exempted Churches." It was a tragedy, the pastor concluded that this young man and others like him were forced into either the "category of criminals" or into what was to them "Treason against Jesus Christ."¹¹⁵ This dilemma could have been avoided if the Quakers' radical suggestion that individual conscience rather than religious affiliation had been adopted as the basis of exemption. But as it stood, the MSA made no provision for C.O.s within the established churches or for individual

belief. The Central Appeal Judge further limited the possibilities of conscientious objection when he ruled in 1918 that the Church of Christ or Disciples, Pentecostal Assemblies, Plymouth Brethren and the International Bible Students Association failed to meet the necessary qualifications for conscientious objections.¹¹⁶

Restricting the numbers of conscientious exemptions was clearly in harmony with the mood of the country. While some communications to authorities complained against even Quakers being exempted or let out of prison,¹¹⁷ most private citizens were more general and directed their venom against all "slackers." On the part of a few people it became an obsession, as in the following letter to the Commanding Officer of the Military District of Montreal:

I have reason to say I am positive that many young men which are fit for service to the Country will try to elude undercover of night from Military Service, as the majority of them are called Night Birds. They are never seen in the day-time, but if you will take my advice and give me a special commission I will do everything to bring these slackers to serve the country.¹¹⁸

This reference to "Night Birds" undoubtedly included French Canadian resisters as well, since very few men claimed C.O. status in Quebec. Most religious exemptions were granted by tribunals in the districts of London and Toronto, Ontario, and in western Canada. Out of 636 such exemptions granted between February and March 1918, 278 were from Regina alone but very few, if any, were from Quebec or the Maritimes.¹¹⁹ In a confidential report prepared in December 1918, the military district of Montreal estimated that it encountered no more than twelve conscientious objectors during the war and of these

the majority were International Bible Students or Jehovah's Witnesses.¹²⁰ As early as 1916 several of these International Bible Students applied for conscientious exemptions by submitting prepared affidavit forms in which they claimed they were obligated by conscience to "'follow peace with all men' and to do violence or injury to none."¹²¹ The commanding officer of the district, at first perplexed by the sudden appearance of form letters all properly notarized by a justice of the peace, remarked angrily that he would like to ". . . take damn good care that every one of these fellows would be enlisted."¹²² Following a brief inquiry he discovered the men were advised by J. F. Rutherford, editor of the Watch Tower magazine, to complete the forms, legal proof of their membership and beliefs as Bible Students, as protection from conscription.¹²³

Rutherford must have been unaware that the Central Appeal Judge supported the government's contention that the International Bible Students Association was not an "organized religious denomination" as required in the MSA. If Bible Students could not obtain a different form of exemption, therefore, they had to serve when conscripted or suffer the consequences. Although there were members of other denominations in the same position, as a group, Jehovah's Witnesses proved to be the most radical and stubborn in their passive resistance and therefore experienced the worst treatment accorded Canadian conscientious objectors in World War One and later in World War Two. ✓

The most scandalous mistreatment of C.O.s occurred during the winter of 1917-1918 at the Minto Street Barracks, Winnipeg, where, it was alleged, conscientious objectors were tortured into accepting authority. While serving a sentence of three days confinement in the barracks for refusing to obey a lawful command, two Bible Students, Robert Clegg and Frank Naish and a Pentecostal, Charles Matheson, were forcibly undressed and held under ice cold showers until they either accepted military authority or collapsed.¹²⁴ Matheson broke down after several hours' resistance and agreed to obey orders. Later in his testimony to a court of inquiry, he described his encounter with Provost Sergeant Simpson:

. . . it was very cold, and as I stood under it, it got colder, till it became icy cold. My whole body began to heave . . . when I would stand with my back to it, he would make me turn around and face it, and make me turn my face up to it. I was shading my face with my hand . . . he made me take my hand down . . . I was beginning to get dazed, and I was tumbling around. . . . He asked me, "Will you give in now?" I said no. He put me in again . . . this went on three or four times. . . . He said "We will either break you or break your heart" . . . I was put into my undershirt and things, and I was dragged away. My body was wet, my hair was wet, I was taken up to the guard room and put in there. . . .¹²⁵

The firm resistance of Clegg and Naish to such punishment ended with Naish in a state of nervous collapse and Clegg, reportedly unconscious, admitted to hospital. In a sworn affidavit published in Winnipeg newspapers, Clegg charged that he was stripped of his clothes and ". . . subjected to a violent treatment of ice-cold water, which was from time to time directed at my neck, shoulders, spine, kidneys,

forehead, chest."¹²⁶ Clegg then claimed he was violently lashed dry before being subjected to a second cold shower treatment.

I was in a semi-conscious state during the greater period of the second treatment, and when taken out, I was seated upon a cold stone slab, which caused me to lose control of myself and became absolutely incapable of any control of my limbs or muscles . . . while still wet and in a condition of complete nervous prostration, and helplessness, I was dressed . . . dragged on the concrete floor, upstairs, through the drill hall, to the place of detention. . . . Subsequently, while unconscious, I was removed to St. Boniface hospital.¹²⁷

Although the military authorities claimed the affair was greatly exaggerated, the C.O. allegations were supported by several witnesses including a statement by Private Paul E. Case, a member of the depot battalion. Writing on behalf of fellow soldiers, Case substantiated the report of cold showers and harsh treatment and reported that the soldiers of the barracks were ". . . highly incensed over such cruel treatment and have questioned if even Germany can beat it." "We, as men," Case affirmed, "regret there are those so debased who would tolerate such treatment on human beings when it would be unlawful to mete out such treatment even to a dog."¹²⁸

F. J. Dixon, the voice of radical anti-war protest, raised the matter in the Manitoba Legislature and demanded an immediate investigation from authorities.¹²⁹ In a letter to T. A. Crerar, federal Minister of Agriculture, Dixon maintained there was no doubt about the facts of the case and suggested the Minister of Militia and Defense, Major-General S. C. Mewburn, issue a general order regarding the treatment of conscientious objectors. "The day of torture should

be past," argued Dixon. "If there is no other way of dealing with these men, it would be more humane to shoot them at once than to submit them to torture which endangers their reason."¹³⁰

The Manitoba Free Press was also aroused by the incident and, in an editorial entitled "Stop it!", declared that the Canadian people would "simply not stand this sort of thing." Convinced there was conclusive evidence of "hazing" and "physical coercion," similar to the British experience, the Free Press warned against the repetition in Canada of the "very serious mistakes made across the water." "It is idle to pretend," the editor concluded, "that, in cases like this, the hazing is the result of spontaneous indignation by the companions of the recalcitrant; these things happen because some one in authority is desirous that they shall happen."¹³¹

Joining in the protest, the Roaring River Branch of the Manitoba Grain Gowers' Association drafted a resolution condemning the mistreatment of conscientious objectors at the Minto Street Barracks as "German Frightfulness methods."¹³² The public outcry reached all leading government officials, including Prime Minister Borden who favored an immediate investigation.¹³³

The court of inquiry, which has been described as "little more than a judicial farce,"¹³⁴ took no action regarding the future treatment of conscientious objectors. Neither did government or military authorities. In his report to the Prime Minister, Major-General Mewburn supported his subordinates in Winnipeg and concluded the affair was greatly exaggerated.¹³⁵ The Militia Council merely

ordered that future C.O.s who refused military orders be court-martialed and sent to civil prisons. Consequently, Clegg, Naish and another Jehovah's Witness, Frank Wainwright, were convicted by district courts martial of wilful disobedience of a military order and sentence to two years imprisonment. Shortly afterward, their sentences were interrupted by an overseas draft and they were shipped to England.¹³⁶

Meanwhile, within a month of the Minto Street incident, public attention was focused again on the treatment of conscientious objectors in Manitoba with the death in February 1918 of David Wells, a pentecostal C.O. A month earlier Wells was sentenced by Sir Hugh John Macdonald to two years' imprisonment in the Stoney Mountain Penitentiary for refusing military service. Within two weeks, however, Wells was declared "violently insane" and was moved to Selkirk asylum where he died approximately a week later.¹³⁷ The public outcry was led by the radical pacifist Reverend William Ivens who wrote T. A. Crerar that "the time had come for protest on the part of the people and effective action on the part of authorities." Ivens reiterated the radical pacifist demand that individual conscience be given full and proper respect rather than the type of maltreatment that led to Wells' death. "It may be that his death was necessary," Ivens remarked, "to convince the Government that there are Conscientious Objectors in the Dominion outside the Pacifist Organizations who are prepared to die for their convictions rather than submit to perform military service." Although the Justice Department reported that Wells was a manic-depressive

overcome with shame, Crerar evidently agreed with Ivens and submitted the matter to Borden for consideration.¹³⁸

The Prime Minister also received a petition from the Winnipeg Trades and Labor Council requesting an immediate investigation into the treatment and death of Wells and into the treatment of C.O.s generally. Their resolution criticized the MSA's unequal application of C.O. status resulting in the imprisonment of those not belonging to certain sects and concluded:

We request that the Act be so amended as to apply equally to all bonafide Conscientious Objectors and that those Conscientious Objectors now suffering incarceration under the Act be immediatley released by being placed in the same category as those belonging to the recognized sects.¹³⁹

Such protests did not seem to have much of an effect on the government, however, and in March 1918 the Military Council issued a routine order that C.O.s sentenced to civil prison were to be sent overseas. Among the first group shipped to England in April were Clegg, Naish and Wainwright, all released from penitentiary for the draft.¹⁴⁰ The remainder of the first group included two more Bible Students from Winnipeg, John Gillespie and Claude Brown; a Baptist, N. S. Shuttleworth; and two Plymouth Brethren, W. Bagnall and E. W. McAulay. All had appealed to tribunals for conscientious exemptions but were rejected for not belonging to recognized sects.¹⁴¹ The second group, which sailed from Halifax on 20 June 1918, comprised four C.O.s from Fort Henry, Kingston, Ontario: J. L. Adams, J. Running,

O. K. Pimlott and Syndey Ralph Thomas. Pimlott, from Belleville, Ontario, and Thomas, from Haliburton, Ontario, were Bible Students.¹⁴²

Once in England the C.O.s were sent to Seford Camp, Sussex where they were subjected to brutal punishment in an attempt to force them to obey military commands. Pimlott reported he was dragged over knolls and dales by the feet, beaten over the head, kicked with heavy boots until unconscious and finally taken to Eastbourne Hospital for an X-ray examination. The other C.O.s reported similar experiences.¹⁴³ Thomas claimed he was "dragged, shoved and kicked several miles into the country to the edge of a 150 foot precipice and threatened to be thrown over." He also charged that "ten officers took turns in beating him, threatened to bayonet him . . . shoved him against a target and fired at him from the other end of the range, tried to shoot him at close range and cursed because the gun would not go off." Finally he was pounded with the butt of a gun until unconscious.¹⁴⁴ In one of his beatings Clegg received a broken rib.

While at Seford Camp, Shuttleworth abandoned his Baptist faith to become a Bible Student convert. He then joined the other Jehovah's Witnesses from Manitoba: Clegg, Naish, Wainwright, Gillespie and Brown in their transfer to Wandsworth Prison, where they received the usual harsh treatment.¹⁴⁵

Meanwhile, as protests mounted in Canada against sending C.O.s overseas, both Canadian and British authorities began to recognize the action was a mistake, especially since the C.O.s were considered a "constant menace to other soliders undergoing detention with them."¹⁴⁶

Consequently, on April 22, 1918 the Military Council issued a new order that conscientious objectors would no longer be sent overseas but would be obliged to serve in Canada in the Canadian Engineers, Army Service Corps, Army Medical Corps, Canadian Ordnance Corps or on clerical duties.¹⁴⁷ Evidently the second group of C.O.s had been sent in error.¹⁴⁸ In August the government began to arrange for the return of all Canadian C.O.s except for three who agreed to perform non-combatant service in England. The young absolutists arrived back in Canada on Armistice Day, November 11, 1918 and shortly thereafter were released from the army with dishonorable discharges.¹⁴⁹

The end of the war, however, did not necessarily mean the automatic release of the radical pacifists imprisoned in Canada and by January 1919, there were still 117 C.O.s in custody.¹⁵⁰ In an attempt to alleviate this situation the government appointed a special committee composed of the Solicitor-General, the Judge Advocate General and the Deputy Minister of Justice to consider the sentences being served by C.O.s and military defaulters on a case by case basis. The committee decided that, regardless of religious affiliation, conscientious objectors who were found to be bona fide objectors would be released after serving a six month term.¹⁵¹

Meanwhile, private citizens protested the continued punishment of religious pacifists and in the spring of 1919 the issue was raised in the House of Commons.¹⁵² On March 24, the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux introduced the following motion for amnesty:

That, in the opinion of this House, amnesty should now be granted to religious conscientious objectors to military service.¹⁵³

Lemieux reminded the House that Great Britain had always led the world in the protection of religious and civil freedom and urged the government to be "merciful to these honest and sincere young men, law-abiding citizens in every other respect, who did not default but presented themselves boldly before the tribunals and stated their objections." "I have received many letters on this subject from different parts of the country," he stated, "and I say that the least we can do, now that the war is over . . . is to act generously."¹⁵⁴

Lemieux withdrew his motion, however, following Solicitor General Hugh Guthrie's explanation that a general amnesty was unnecessary since all C.O.s would be released before summer. In his closing statement Lemieux praised the active, non-violent service undertaken by Quakers in France and Belgium and suggested strongly that the Military Service Act be amended to provide more liberal provisions for conscientious objectors in the future.¹⁵⁵ Above all, the amnesty motion reminded the House of the staunch resistance to military service of young pacifists in Canada.

Besides the right of individual conscience, other basic liberties were also suppressed in Canada during the war. Various religious groups, radical dissenters and enemy aliens were among those either threatened or persecuted in the name of patriotism by the government and society in general. Just as radical pacifists had warned,

the war hysteria that swept the country had a brutalizing effect upon Canadian society; it hardened the nation's insensitivity to the rights and problems of human beings. The erosion of Christian compassion and disregard for human rights were just as costly to society in the long run, claimed the pacifists, as the death and destruction of war itself.

The War Measures Act of 1914 provided the government with broad powers to censor, control and suppress free speech and to arrest, detain, exclude and deport individuals. A few years later any public statements that could weaken the war spirit were specifically prohibited. The result was a list of banned organizations and publications and the harassment of those citizens opposed to the war.

In a letter to Woodsworth, Vernon Thomas predicted that the government's vicious attempts to prohibit public criticism of the war effort, although aimed at Bourassa, would silence pacifist protests.¹⁵⁶ Phillips Thompson, an elderly radical pacifist and well-known labor spokesman, came out of retirement to protest publicly government suppression of free speech. Thompson criticized the treatment accorded Bourassa, Lavergne and others for exercising their rights as free citizens. "To ostracize and hound down every man who opposes Canada's participation in the war," he declared, "is a practical demonstration of the fact that our boasted self-government is a sham."¹⁵⁷ Thompson also criticized the government's effort to prevent Pastor Russell of the Jehovah's Witnesses from preaching in Canada. "If you had any sense of consistency or even a sense of humour," he

quipped, "you would be ashamed to ask Canadians to fight for 'freedom,' 'justice,' etc. when free speech at home is a thing of the past."¹⁵⁸

Radical labor organizations were especially vulnerable to government infringements on civil liberties. From the beginning of their anti-war activities, radical organizations were monitored by Canada's various security agencies: the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, military intelligence and the press censor. This surveillance increased considerably as the radicals launched their campaign against conscription in 1917 and as a result of the Russian revolution and the supposed threat of Bolshevism.¹⁵⁹ In effect, radicals came to be feared in the same way as enemy aliens.¹⁶⁰ Consequently, dossiers were prepared on several hundred western radicals, raids were conducted, arrests made, and the radical labor press was censored.¹⁶¹ The Chief Press Censor, Ernest Chambers, became particularly disturbed with the views of radical labor and recommended the suppression of several radical publications. In the autumn of 1918 Chambers warned William Ivens, the radical pacifist editor of Western Labor News, that his paper would be outlawed unless he restricted revolutionary and pacifist articles.¹⁶²

Among those publications prohibited in Canada were The New World, a radical Christian pacifist magazine from New York later retitled The World Tomorrow, and Jehovah's Witnesses materials including several Watch Tower Society tracts, the Bible Students Monthly, and the book, The Finished Mystery. Police in many cities conducted raids on Jehovah's Witnesses' meeting halls, homes and places of business,

searching for illegal publications. When such material was found in their possession, Bible Students were fined and sentenced to brief jail terms.¹⁶³

Official censorship of the German language press was the most vigorous. All German oriented papers were prohibited from entering Canada, including Christlicher Brundesbote, the weekly organ of the General Conference Mennonites. Canadian German language newspapers continued to be published, subject to censorship, until 1918 when an Order-in-Council prohibited the printing, publication or possession of all enemy language publications without a license from the Secretary of State.¹⁶⁴ Shortly afterward the use of the German language in group meetings was also banned.

Such action by the government was clearly in harmony with the mounting anti-German sentiment abroad in the land. Some Canadians suspected pacifist organizations were part of a vast German espionage system.¹⁶⁵ Since pacifists were assumed to be pro-German, the German speaking Mennonite and Hutterite communities were guilty on two counts in the eyes of groups like the Great War Veterans Association. The fervor of their prejudices was exemplified in the formation of an Anti-German League in Toronto in 1916 and with the change of the name Berlin, Ontario, to Kitchener. A further infringement on individual liberties of pacifists and Canadians of enemy ancestry occurred when the Wartime Elections Act disenfranchised conscientious objectors, persons of German speech and all enemy aliens, including those naturalized since 1902. At the same time, however, the Act extended

the franchise to women who had relatives in the armed forces. Even at the time it was criticized as a political manoeuver by the Borden government to silence those opposed to the war.

The most glaring example of a society brutalized by war was the harrassment and internment of enemy aliens. More than 8,500 men of enemy alien origin were interned in twenty-three prison camps across Canada.¹⁶⁶ The official program began as mandatory registration of all aliens with possible internment in cases of any breach of the regulations, depending on the discretion of the registrar. By the end of the war, however, any person could file a complaint in county or district court to have a particular enemy alien interned.¹⁶⁷ The war, as Desmond Morton states, "was rapidly legitimizing anti-alien prejudices which hitherto had been muted. . . ." ¹⁶⁸

The stirring up of such hatreds was symptomatic of the type of violent society pacifists had hoped to prevent. Having failed that, they attempted to perform constructive humanitarian service to help offset the violence and insensitivity of a world at war.¹⁶⁹ British pacifists, for instance, organized an Emergency Committee to Aid Aliens headed by Fenner Brockway, and, since there was no equivalent effort in Canada, a Quaker from British Columbia, Robert W. Clark, spent over three years with the Committee ministering to the needs of interned aliens in Britain.¹⁷⁰ Some pacifists, however, did protest the treatment of enemy aliens in Canada but, given the War Measures Act and the temper of the time, there was little they could say or do to

halt the growth of prejudice and the erosion of individual liberties of either conscientious objectors or citizens of enemy ancestry.

The Great War and the conscription issue in particular had confronted Canadian pacifists with a crisis. The majority of pre-war pacifists responded by supporting the war measures, but others, such as Quakers and some feminists and social gospellers, remained stalwart pacifists and began to formulate a new pacifist ethic as they united their opposition to war and violence with a left critique of the capitalist social and economic system as the breeding ground for violence, whether international or domestic. In addition, a complementary though more traditional pacifist witness was exhibited by Canada's sectarian pacifists. Except for the Society of Friends, the historic peace sects and the more recent pacifist groups, like Jehovah's Witnesses, maintained an adamant isolation from war and society alike, but their staunch resistance to compulsory military service reinforced the principle of conscientious objection and pacifist dissent in general within Canadian society and encouraged individual resistance to warfare.

It would be too much to suggest that the radical pacifism of the historic peace groups cross-fertilized with a radicalized liberal reformist pacifism in the war years. As a historic development that did not happen. But in the pacifist front that extended from the Quakers to Woodsworth there was an ideological configuration that reflected elements of both traditions: the radical sectarian

adherence to the principle of non-resistance to evil while awaiting the millennium and the liberal faith in man's destiny to actively bring about this millennial ideal of a perfect society. At best it was an unstable alliance, but the tension could help propel the activism of social dissent.

For the most part, however, the synthesis of radical pacifism with radical social change was still in its infancy in Canada. Contrary to Britain, where the Union for Democratic Control and the No-Conscription Fellowship organized a socialist-pacifist base, there was no practical coalition of Canadian pacifist forces. Nor was there an active peace party. In fact, at the war's end there was little understanding of the pacifist ethic in Canada and little evidence of inquiry into the ethics of war or Christian pacifism in the centers of theological training.¹⁷¹ Also, in both Britain and the United States, a newly formed Christian pacifist organization, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, was engaged in activities on behalf of aliens, conscientious objectors and the promotion of a radical vision of social and moral reconstruction. The Fellowship did not enter Canada, however, until after the war. Nevertheless, despite these handicaps, Canadian pacifists were already expressing a radicalized pacifism born of the wartime experience.

Although the new pacifist ethic was not yet fully articulated at the close of the war, radical pacifists like Woodsworth, Beynon and Thomas, had clearly recognized the necessity for far-reaching social

and economic reconstruction in order to prevent the occurrence of another war. Friends had also come to the conclusion that the real cause of war lay in the realm of economics. No permanent peace could be secured, they warned, without ending economic injustice first. Thus, they called for a "revolution, not necessarily violent, and an edifice of new design" which would guarantee labor "shorter hours, more of the product it produces, larger opportunities, a different interpretation of justice."¹⁷²

Furthermore, when the Quakers in 1919 came to reflect on the war and its causes in the context of post-war unrest, their rhetoric manifested a merging of opposition to war and the struggle for social justice, something which was central to the new socially radical pacifism the war had bred:

The crime, the wickedness, the deceit, the hypocrisy that stood at the back of the conditions that produced the first war, remain. The interests of Capital, Labor and the Public must be considered, and proper understandings of a mutual and just character must prevail all round, or the second war, the revolt we are now in, will be equal to the first in horror. We must watch and pray and work.¹⁷³

Despite such prophetic warnings of future violence unless social and economic justice was realized, socially radical pacifists failed to foresee a serious dilemma awaiting them beyond the horizon: their momentum towards radical reform and social change to secure peace and justice was on a long term collision course with their pacifist rejection of the use of violence in any cause.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹McCormick, Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries, p. 118.
- ²Canada, Statutes, 1918, 7-8 George V, Chapter 17, The Military Service Act, pp. 107-119.
- ³Elizabeth Armstrong, The Crisis of Quebec, 1914-1918 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1937; reprinted Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, Ltd., 1974), pp. 226-230; Brown and Cook, A Nation Transformed, p. 306.
- ⁴Armstrong, Crisis of Quebec, pp. 226-227.
- ⁵Ibid., p. 250.
- ⁶Christie, "The Presbyterian Church in Canada," p. 133.
- ⁷Bliss, "Methodist Church and War," p. 44.
- ⁸UCA, The Methodist Church of Canada, The Army and Navy Board, 1915-1919, Box 2, file 17,
- ⁹Christian Guardian, 20 June 1917, p. 5.
- ¹⁰Ibid.
- ¹¹Presbyterian and Westminster, 6 September 1917, p. 230.
- ¹²The Presbyterian Record, March 1917, p. 65.
- ¹³Christian Guardian, 29 March 1916, p. 1.
- ¹⁴Robin, "Registration, Conscription and Independent Labour Politics," pp. 64-65; McCormick, Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries, pp. 124-127.

¹⁵McCormick, Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries, p. 138.

¹⁶Robin, "Registration, Conscription and Independent Labour Politics," p. 70.

¹⁷Thompson claims that historians such as Charles Lipton and Martin Robin have overdrawn their generalizations concerning the anti-war sentiment of the trade union movement and he argues instead that anti-conscriptionists were unable to create "a working class based opposition to conscription within the West." See Thompson, The Harvests of the West, p. 117.

¹⁸Robin, "Registration, Conscription and Independent Labour Politics," pp. 64-65, 71, 76; labor had long adopted the radical critique. Prior to the war Keir Hardie toured Canada denouncing war as a capitalist device to check democracy. Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1912, p. 163.

¹⁹Robin, "Registration, Conscription and Independent Labour Politics," pp. 71, 76.

²⁰McCormick, Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries, pp. 131-132; following the 1917 TLC Convention it was apparent that the Canadian labor movement was split between the eastern establishment and western radicalism. Ibid.

²¹Ibid., p. 138; as an example of violent protests McCormick cites the strike of Vancouver dockworkers when a stevedore was challenged for not carrying his registration papers and the riot of loggers at Big River, Saskatchewan when military authorities tried to collect draftees. Ibid.

²²Ibid., pp. 138-139.

²³Ibid., p. 129.

²⁴W. R. Young, "Conscription, Rural Depopulation, and the Farmers of Ontario, 1917-19," Canadian Historical Review, LIII (September 1972).

²⁵Presbyterian and Westminster, 13 September 1917.

²⁶Thompson, The Harvests of the West, p. 151.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 153-156.

²⁸Roy St. George Stubbs, Prairie Portraits (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1954), p. 99.

²⁹Manitoba Free Press, 19 January 1917, p. 1.

³⁰Ibid., p. 2.

³¹David J. Bercuson, Confrontation at Winnipeg, Labour, Industrial Relations, and the General Strike (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1974), p. 42.

³²Ramsay Cook, "Francis Marion Beynon and the Crisis of Christian Reformism," in The West and the Nation, Essays in Honour of W. L. Morton, ed. Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1976); Lillian Beynon Thomas was the founder and first president of the Winnipeg Political Equality League as well as chairman of the speakers bureau. C. L. Cleverdon, The Woman Suffrage Movement in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950), pp. 55-56.

³³Cook, "Francis Marion Beynon," p. 198.

³⁴Woodsworth Papers, Correspondence, A. V. Thomas to Woodsworth, 18 June 1918.

³⁵Ibid., and Thomas to Woodsworth, 24 April 1918.

³⁶Ibid., Thomas to Woodsworth, 19 June 1918.

³⁷Ibid., and Thomas to Woodsworth, 24 April 1918.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Ibid., Thomas to Woodsworth, 18 June 1918.

⁴⁰Ibid., Thomas to Woodsworth, 16 January 1919.

⁴¹Cook, "Francis Marion Beynon," pp. 197-199.

⁴²Grain Growers' Guide, 24 November 1915, p. 10.

⁴³Ibid., 3 March 1915, p. 10.

⁴⁴Ibid., 7 March 1917, p. 10.

⁴⁵Ibid., 2 July 1917, p. 9.

⁴⁶Ibid., 13 June 1917, p. 10.

⁴⁷Ibid., 27 July 1917, p. 10; Cook, "Francis Marion Beynon," p. 200; once in New York, Francis Beynon worked with her sister Lillian at the Seamen's Church Institute and wrote the novel Aleta Day, a fictional autobiography. The novel, set in wartime Winnipeg, reveals the various currents of thought prevalent among reformers, especially with regard to militarism, Christianity and socialism. Through two of the main characters in the book, Beynon argues that traditional Christianity or "Churchianity" has failed. Rather than abandon religion completely, however, Beynon proposed a new radicalized Christianity as the best hope for the future. Ibid.; Francis Marion Beynon, Aleta Day (London: W. C. Daniel Ltd., 1919).

⁴⁸A case in point was the treatment of enemy aliens described below. For Beynon's reaction see: Grain Growers' Guide, 6 June 1917,

⁴⁹Cooke, "Francis Marion Beynon," p. 199.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 203.

⁵¹Allen, The Social Passion, p. 61.

⁵²Eby, The World Problem, pp. 394-396.

⁵³Kenneth McNaught, A Prophet in Politics: A Biography of J. S. Woodsworth (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959), p. 67.

⁵⁴J. S. Woodsworth, "My Convictions about War," Vox (December, 1939), p. 4.

⁵⁵J. S. Woodsworth, ed., Studies in Rural Citizenship (Winnipeg: The Canadian Welfare League and the Canadian Council of Agriculture, 1914), p. 87.

- ⁵⁶Woodsworth, "Convictions about War," p. 5.
- ⁵⁷McNaught, Prophet in Politics, p. 75.
- ⁵⁸Manitoba Free Press, December 28, 1916.
- ⁵⁹Ibid.
- ⁶⁰J. S. Woodsworth, Following the Gleam (Ottawa: 1926), p. 4.
- ⁶¹Allen, The Social Passion, pp. 47-48.
- ⁶²Woodsworth, Following the Gleam, p. 9.
- ⁶³Ibid.
- ⁶⁴Ibid.
- ⁶⁵Ibid.
- ⁶⁶Ibid., p. 10.
- ⁶⁷Allen, The Social Passion, p. 50.
- ⁶⁸Ibid., p. 51.
- ⁶⁹Ibid.
- ⁷⁰Woodsworth Papers, Correspondence, V. 2; Thomas to Woodsworth, April 24, 1918.
- ⁷¹Ibid., Thoams to Woodsworth, June 18, 1918.
- ⁷²Ibid., Thomas to Woodsworth, April 24, 1918.
- ⁷³The Western Labor News was established by the Winnipeg trades council as part of their joint campaign with the Socialist Party of Canada to break the power of Arthur Puttee, editor of The Voice, whom they now considered too moderate and therefore dangerous to their cause. McCormick, Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries, p. 146.

⁷⁴J. S. Woodsworth, The First Story of the Labor Church,
Winnipeg, 1920, pp. 7-8.

⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 12-13.

⁷⁶Two other representatives of the social gospel left wing, William Irvine and Salem Bland, were also dismissed from their posts during the war. Although neither were pacifists, Irvine's problems did concern criticism of the war effort. Bland, on the other hand, supported the successful prosecution of the war effort as harmonious with his radical reform objectives. But he may have been a little too radical for the Board of Directors of Wesley College. See Allen, The Social Passion, pp. 46-56.

⁷⁷Minutes of the Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1917,
p. 54; The Canadian Friend, October 1917, pp. 6-7.

⁷⁸The Canadian Friend, October 1917, p. 7.

⁷⁹Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1917,
p. 24.

⁸⁰Minutes of the Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1918,
p. 55.

⁸¹B. M. Greene, ed., Who's Who and Why, 1919-1920 (Toronto:
International Press, Ltd.), p. 759.

⁸²Interview with Arthur G. Dorland, 29 January 1976; the F.A.U.
was organized by Phillip Noel Baker, British Quaker and son of the
former Canadian Quaker, Joseph Allen Baker. Ibid.

⁸³The Canadian Friend, November, 1917, pp. 10-11.

⁸⁴Canada, Statutes, 1918, 7-8 George V., Chapter 19,
"The Military Service Act, 1917," Section 11, para. f, p. 8.

⁸⁵Ibid., Schedule: 7, p. 13.

⁸⁶Ibid., Sect. 11, pp. 7-8.

⁸⁷Epp, Mennonites in Canada, p. 378.

⁸⁸Canada, Department of National Defense (DND), V. 5953, HQ 1064-30-67, v. 3; "Petition Presented to the Honourable the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament Assembled, 1917;" ibid., V. 2029, HQ 1064-30-67, "Declaration by the Seventh-Day Adventists of the Dominion of Canada and the United States Concerning Bearing Arms."

⁸⁹Epp, Mennonites in Canada, p. 384.

⁹⁰Canada, DND, R.G. 24, V. 4498, MD4-60-1-2, Canadian Expeditionary Force Routine Order, 22 July 1918.

⁹¹Epp, Mennonites in Canada, pp. 381-382.

⁹²Ibid., pp. 384-385.

⁹³Ibid., p. 385.

⁹⁴Allen Teichroew, "World War I and the Mennonite Migration to Canada to Avoid the Draft," Mennonite Quarterly Review, July, 1971.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 230.

⁹⁶Frank H. Epp, ed., I Would Like to Dodge the Draft-Dodgers But (Waterloo: Conrad Press, 1970), p. 13.

⁹⁷Teichroew, "Mennonite Migration," p. 244.

⁹⁸Ibid.

⁹⁹Epp, Mennonites in Canada, p. 385.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 371.

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 337.

¹⁰²Canada, Statutes, 1918, 7-8 George V, Chapter 19, "The Military Service Act, 1917," Sections 5-8, pp. 4-6.

¹⁰³Brown and Cook, A Nation Transformed, p. 221.

¹⁰⁴Canada, DND, R.G. 24, V. 5953, HQ 1064-30-67-v3, Judge-Advocate General, Memorandum: "Treatment of Conscientious Objectors in Canada."

¹⁰⁵Ibid.

¹⁰⁶Ibid.; generally, most of the longer sentences were mitigated to ten years imprisonment. Ibid.

¹⁰⁷Ibid.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., V. 2029, HQ 1064-30-67, Memorandum, Chief of the General Staff to Militia Council, August, 1918.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., V. 5953, HQ 1064-30-67-v3, Judge-Advocate General, Memo, "Treatment of Conscientious Objectors in Canada."

¹¹⁰Ibid., V. 2029, HQ 1064-30-67, Deputy Minister, Department of Militia and Defence to Deputy Minister, Department of Naval Service, July 11, 1918; Deputy Minister, Department of Militia and Defense to Deputy Minister, Department of Naval Service, 9 August 1918.

¹¹¹DND, R.G. 24, V. 2029, HQ 1064-30-95, Captain O. S. Tyndale, Secretary, Military Service Sub-Committee, 28 August 1918.

¹¹³Ibid., V. 2028, HQ 1064-30-67, C. F. McVagh, President, Western Canada Union Conference of Seventh Day Adventists to T. M. Tweedie, House of Commons, 12 May 1918; J. L. Wilson, President, Maritime Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists to Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister, 23 May 1918.

¹¹⁴Ibid., Adjutant General to G.O.C. Military District #6, 4 June 1918.

¹¹⁵Ibid., Rev. Fred F. Prior, St. Boswells, Saskatchewan, to Minister of Militia, 8 June, 1918.

¹¹⁶Ibid., Central Appeal Judge to Captain O. S. Tyndale, Secretary, Military Service Sub-Committee, 20 May 1918.

¹¹⁷Ibid., V. 5953, HQ 1064-30-67-v3, L. Clark, Ildeston, Ontario, to Minister of Militia, (nd).

¹¹⁸Ibid., V. 4498, MD4-60-1-2, Louis Friedenber, Montreal, to Major-General E. W. Wilson, G. O. C. Military District No. 4, 27 September 1917.

¹¹⁹DND, R.G. 24, D2, V.36, file 105, Sessional Papers No. 105, "Report of the Military Service Council on the Administration of the Military Service Act, 1917," 1918.

¹²⁰DND, R.G. 24, V. 4498, MD4-60-1-1, "Report on the Administration of the Military Service Act in Military District No. 4," Montreal, 16 December 1918.

¹²¹Ibid., V. 4498, MD4-60-1-2, Cyril Heath to Brig General E. W. Wilson, March, 1916.

¹²²Ibid., Brig-Gen. E. W. Wilson to H. J. Ross, 6 March 1916.

¹²³Ibid., H. J. Ross to Brig-Gen. E. W. Wilson, 4 March 1916.

¹²⁴Winnipeg Evening Tribune, 24 January 1918.

¹²⁵DND, R.G. 24, V. 2028, HQ 1064-30-67, "Proceedings of a Regimental Court of Enquiry Assembled at Winnipeg, Manitoba, 24, January 1918," p. 35.

¹²⁶Winnipeg Evening Tribune, 24 January 1918.

¹²⁷Ibid.

¹²⁸Ibid.

¹²⁹Ibid.

¹³⁰DND, R.G. 24, V. 2028, HQ 1064-30-67, T. A. Crerar, Minister of Agriculture, to Maj-Gen. S. C. Mewburn, Minister of Militia and Defense, 28 January 1918.

¹³¹Manitoba Free Press, 25 January 1918. For the British experience see John Rae, Conscience and Politics.

¹³²DND, R.G. 24, V. 2028, HQ 1064-30-67, John Livesey, Sec. Treas., Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, Swain River, Manitoba, to Minister of Militia and Defense, 21 February 1918.

¹³³Sir Robert L. Borden Papers, RLB 2309, Borden to Mewburn, 8 February 1918.

¹³⁴Penton, Jehovah's Witness in Canada, p. 59.

¹³⁵Borden Papers, RLB 2309, Mewburn to Borden, 9 February 1918.

¹³⁶DND, R.G. 24, V. 2028, HQ 1064-30-67, G.O.C. Winnipeg to Judge Advocate General, 8 April 1918.

¹³⁷Borden Papers, RLB 2309, Rev. William Ivens to T. A. Crerar, 25 February 1918.

¹³⁸Ibid., RLB 2309, Justice Department Memo, 25 March 1918; Penton, Jehovah's Witnesses in Canada, p. 61.

¹³⁹Borden Papers, RLB 2309, E. Robinson, Sec. Winnipeg Trades and Labor Council to Borden, 8 April 1918.

¹⁴⁰DND, R.G. 24, V. 2028, HQ 1064-30-67, G.O.C. Winnipeg to Judge Advocate General, 8 April 1918.

¹⁴¹Ibid., ADCANEF, London to Militia, Ottawa, 4 May 1918.

¹⁴²Ibid., V. 2029, HQ 1064-30-67, ADCANEF, London to Militia, Ottawa, 22 August 1918.

¹⁴³The Golden Age (29 September 1920), p. 710.

¹⁴⁴Ibid.

¹⁴⁵Ibid.

¹⁴⁶DND, R.G. 24, V. 2028, HQ 1064-30-67, F. Heap, Winnipeg, to Department of Militia, 4 May 1918; ibid., V. 5953, HQ 1064-30-67-v3, ADCANEF, London to ACONTICONE, Ottawa, 11 September 1918.

¹⁴⁷Ibid., V. 4498, MD4-60-1-2, Canadian Expeditionary Force Routine Order, 471, 22 April 1918.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., V. 2028, HQ 1064-30-67, Judge Advocate General to ADCANEF, London, 10 May 1918.

¹⁴⁹Penton, Jehovah's Witnesses in Canada, p. 62.

¹⁵⁰DND, R.G. 24, V. 5953, HQ 1064-30-67-v3, Deputy Minister, Militia to Deputy Minister, Justice, 7 December 1918.

¹⁵¹Canada, Debates of the House of Commons, 1919, V. I, p. 781.

¹⁵²DND, R.G. 24, V. 5953, HQ 1064-30-67-v3, C. B. St. George, Parry Sound, Ontario to Minister of Militia, 15 February 1919.

¹⁵³Canada, Debates of the House of Commons, 1919, V. I, p. 781.

¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 782.

¹⁵⁵Ibid., p. 784.

¹⁵⁶Thomas to Woodsworth, April 24, 1918, Woodsworth Papers, Correspondence, V. 2.

¹⁵⁷The Globe (Toronto), June 14, 1916, p. 4.

¹⁵⁸Ibid., July 27, 1916, p. 4.

¹⁵⁹McCormick, Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries, pp. 130-131.

¹⁶⁰Ibid., p. 152.

¹⁶¹Ibid., pp. 131, 152.

- ¹⁶²Ibid., p. 153.
- ¹⁶³Penton, Jehovah's Witnesses in Canada, p. 63.
- ¹⁶⁴Joseph A. Boudreau, "The Enemy Alien Problem in Canada, 1914-1921," Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1965, p. 42.
- ¹⁶⁵Hopkins, Canadian Annual Review, 1915, p. 354.
- ¹⁶⁶Boudreau, "Enemy Alien Problem," p. 34; Desmond Morton, "Sir William Otter and Internment Operations in Canada During the First World War," Canadian Historical Review, LV (March, 1974):32.
- ¹⁶⁷Morton, "Otter and Internment Operations," p. 57.
- ¹⁶⁸Ibid., p. 34.
- ¹⁶⁹The Globe (Toronto), March 29, 1918, p. 6.
- ¹⁷⁰Anna Braithwaite Thomas, et. al., St. Stephen's House: Friend's Emergency Work in England 1914 to 1920 (London: Emergency Committee for the Assistance of Germans, Austrians, and Hungarians in Distress, n.d.), p. 48.
- ¹⁷¹Christie, "The Presbyterian Church in Canada," p. 137; Canadian theological colleges had not yet expanded or liberalized their curriculums to include a serious examination of war in the light of the Christian conscience even though courses for the study of Christian ethics, moral philosophy and social problems had been added a decade earlier. Such courses, which might have encompassed international problems and the issue of war, were rather centered on rural and urban problems. Charles M. Johnston, McMaster University, vol. 1: The Toronto Years (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), pp. 123-124, 133, 141-144; McMaster University, Calendar, 1888-1894, 1899-1917; Vox Wesleyan, Wesley College, Winnipeg, 1899-1909; Wesleyan Theological College, Montreal, Calendar, 1894-1895, 1899-1919; The Methodist Church of Canada, The Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Church in Canada, 1910, 1914.

¹⁷²"Report of the Peace and Arbitration Committee," Minutes of the Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1919, p. 21.

¹⁷³Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

A RESURGENT PEACE MOVEMENT: THE 1920'S

The years following the Great War were filled with discontent in Canada as elsewhere in the western world. Physical and spiritual exhaustion and the economic strains associated with post-war readjustment were aggravated by the fact that the terrible scale of wartime sacrifices had produced an apocalyptic sense that the war might purge the world of evil and thereby result in a more just social and economic order. Many Canadians had shared this expectation. Liberal social gossellers and conservative imperialists alike had convinced themselves that the postwar world would be a new era. When the desired changes did not materialize, however, initial disappointment turned to disillusionment, frustration and protest. In both Britain and the United States strikes by labor unions were endemic. In Canada the mounting wave of labor and farm unrest evident during the war began to be felt on a new scale.

Within a year of the cessation of hostilities in Europe, the largest labor demonstration to date in Canadian history, the Winnipeg General Strike, ended in violence as strikers and returned war veterans battled special police forces while the military stood by at the ready. Probably few Canadians at the time connected such domestic violence with international warfare but, earlier, pacifists had warned their fellow countrymen that their support of the war would ultimately

unleash the same type of violence upon the domestic scene. Militarism and war, they had argued, legitimized violence, a condition which would be reflected in the future values and responses of Canadian society. Furthermore, by 1919 Canadian Quakers viewed the Winnipeg Strike as the possible beginning of a violent social revolt, equal to the war in horror, unless there was a radical reconstruction of the social and economic structures of Canadian society.¹ That analysis as well as the active support for the labor cause displayed in Winnipeg by F. J. Dixon, J. S. Woodsworth and William Ivens were indicative of the socially radical pacifism the war had bred.

Canada's committed non-sectarian pacifist minority emerged from the war convinced of the urgent need for radical social and economic change in order to eliminate war and violence from the world. But like their counterparts in Britain and the United States, they remained suspicious of a socialist workers state, preferring the idea of a decentralized co-operative commonwealth similar to the tradition of guild socialism in Britain and based upon the moral conscience as stressed in the social gospel.² Woodsworth and Ivens, for instance, had become leading spokesmen for democratic socialism and popularized the cause in the political arena. As a pacifist Woodsworth also emphasized that the people's enemy was not just "Capitalism" but ✓ capitalism in league with militarism and imperialism, the deadly mixture which caused war.³

Canada's socially radical pacifists agreed that without a more equitable distribution of wealth neither domestic nor international tranquility could be maintained for long. The cultivation of public awareness of this fact, however, was not easily accomplished in the postwar era. In fact, as Richard Allen has suggested, support for social reform and pacifism developed somewhat inversely in the nineteen twenties.⁴ Rather than a commitment to radical social action, the initial resurgence of pacifism resembled an act of national repentance built upon both disillusionment with war and hope that international peace would be secured by the League of Nations. Once again Canadians began to rally to the peace movement and by the late twenties there was a great upsurge in pacifist feeling. But the mere abhorrence of war and desire for a peaceful world were not the equivalent of pacifism, especially a socially radical pacifism. The relationship between war and social injustice, although recognized during the twenties, was not very profoundly explored in Canada until the great depression and international crises of the thirties. In the meantime Canadian peace advocates felt free to fight militarism without directly challenging the state.

Post-war pacifism first surfaced in Britain. In 1921 a central pacifist organization, the No More War Movement, was formed around a core of left wing intellectuals and members of the labor movement. Socialism as well as pacifism were part of its program.⁵ But the No More War Movement never attracted widespread labor support. Nor

did it succeed in mobilizing the various forms of anti-war sentiment which were manifested near the end of the decade.⁶ During most of the twenties, therefore, the British peace movement remained a loose coalition of religious as well as non-religious pacifists, socialists and anti-militarists.

Contrary to this pragmatic and largely secular bias, the peace movement in the United States was closely associated with the social gospel pursuit of a new social order. By the late twenties, for instance, the American movement was dominated by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the radical Christian organization which united both Christian pacifists and Christian socialists in a struggle against capitalism and war.⁷

Like that in the United States, the resurgence of pacifism in Canada did not gain momentum until mid-decade, after the fortunes of early postwar protests had begun to wane. The principal one, although not as dramatic as the Winnipeg Strike, was the political revolt of farmers in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. In provincial elections from 1919 to 1922 and the federal general election of 1921, agrarian progressives were swept to the threshold of national political power.⁸ Although it was mainly a political revolt against the financial establishment, the farmers' action also reflected long standing anti-war sentiment and social grievances. Farmers had become especially critical of war as a result of the conscription of their sons and in reaction to the related problem of rural depopulation and reports of war profiteering

and graft.⁹ As a result, agrarian discontent remained strongly in support of the anti-militarist and anti-imperialist designs of a broadly based peace movement.

Anti-imperialism, indeed, was an important factor in generating support for a Canadian peace movement. One of the lessons of the Great War appeared to be that it was the British imperial connection which had propelled Canada into the European war and might do so again unless counteraction was taken. Consequently, the liberal nationalist argument for Canadian autonomy found eager converts throughout Canada, especially among peace advocates.

Regardless of their particular motivation, most Canadians appeared to be interested in Canadian autonomy. At the Imperial Conference of 1921, for instance, the Conservative Canadian Prime Minister, Arthur Meighen, warned British delegates that Canada would not support Imperial policy unless the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was abrogated. Popular sentiment across Canada was heavily against any international agreement which might involve Canada in another war, or strained relations with the United States.¹⁰ Again, in 1922, the Liberal government of Prime Minister William L. Mackenzie King refused to assist Great Britain against the Turks in the Chanak affair and repudiated any responsibility for the resulting Treaty of Lausanne. In such a manner, official government policy continued to reflect anti-military and anti-imperial sentiment throughout the 1920's, attitudes pacifists could in some measure exploit.

Canadian nationalists and pacifists, however, did not intend autonomy to mean isolation on the North American continent. Rather, they were internationalists who had tasted international power as part of the British Empire and now desired to remain a constructive force within the international order but without imperial military obligations. Hence, the League of Nations captured the imagination of most Canadians interested in international affairs during the twenties.¹¹ Pacifists rallied to its support. For instance, as early as 1919 Canadian Quakers were encouraged to work hard for the "education and enlightenment of public opinion" on the subject of the League. "We have stood together through the war for the service of peace, under all sorts of limiting and restrictive conditions," reported The Canadian Friend, "let us now stand together for the international practice of peace, even though it be circumscribed by many limiting human circumstances and conditions."¹² The problem for pacifists was just how this was to be done.

Despite their general approval of the League, in 1919 former wartime pacifists "had neither the respectability nor the energy" to launch a major pro-League movement, in part because their move towards social radicalism had further tarnished their public image.¹³ The churches, on the other hand, while sympathetic, became engrossed in more immediate social problems.¹⁴ In the end it was a new grouping of like-minded internationalists, both pacifist and non-pacifist, who established the Canadian League of Nations Society in 1921. One of the major problems faced by the new Society was the struggle between

those who favored armed-preparedness and the out-right pacifists. At first the Society tried to present a respectable facade by excluding wartime pacifists from membership but when the practice did not prove feasible and they were admitted, the imperialists indiscriminately branded all pro-Leaguers as pacifists.¹⁵

Although the leadership of the League of Nations Society carefully emphasized the distinction between themselves and pacifists, in reality they both shared a common desire for disarmament and world peace. Through their own separate experiences, however, both groups ultimately discovered that the post-war Canadian public was largely uninterested or unwilling "to accept any responsibility for the creation of a peace mentality throughout the world."¹⁶

Pacifists could take comfort, however, in the fact that on the international scene itself the question of disarmament had become a major issue of the decade. Not only did the League of Nations endorse the idea but several international conferences wrestled with the problem as well. The Washington Naval Conference of 1921-22, the Geneva Conference of the mid-1920's, and later the London Disarmament Conference all reflected an urgent view of the problem and confident hope for its solution. This post-war interest in disarmament and the rational approach to peace associated with the League of Nations revived the remnants of the pre-war progressive peace movement in Canada. By the mid-twenties these liberal internationalists joined with pacifists in a broad inter-war peace movement.

During the first few years of peace Protestant churches in Canada devoted little serious discussion to international affairs and, instead, concentrated their efforts on such areas as progressive politics, evangelism and church union. There was a general consensus among the Protestant press, however, in support of the League of Nations and the International Disarmament Conference at Washington. Presbyterian publications, for example, gave lengthy coverage to the League and related international questions. They presented the positions for the cancellation of war debts and against allied punishment of war criminals.¹⁷ Following the example of the 1920 Lambeth Conference in Britain, the Anglican Church of Canada in General Synod praised the League and adopted a resolution in support of international peace and goodwill. The Anglican Council for Social Service, believing the Church could help create and mobilize public opinion in favor of the League, distributed a pamphlet to the clergy which contained a detailed examination of the League and its embodiment of Christian principles.¹⁸ When attention was focused on the International Disarmament Conference in Washington, Anglicans were joined by Presbyterians and Methodists in their prayers for the success of the meeting and similar attempts at international co-operation.

Overall, however, the post-war resurgence of pacifism was a reassertion of social gospel concern for the international order. Social gossellers, having led the churches into new areas of social concern, were by mid-decade increasingly disillusioned with the prospects

of social reconstruction and diverted their crusading spirit to a new outlet -- the peace movement.¹⁹ It was not a complete diversion, however, since both social inequities and war were considered to be caused by the same competitive economic system. More than merely complementary, the ideals of social justice and peace became the double-edged purpose of the more socially radical inter-war pacifists. Nevertheless, by diverting their energies to the cause of peace, social gospellers avoided and therefore failed to absorb the meaning of the crisis confronting their programs of social reform.²⁰

When Canadian churchmen began to lend support to a nascent peace movement most of them had gone full circle from their pre-war pacifist rhetoric through enthusiastic support of the war and back again to an anti-war, pro-peace position. Among those exhibiting this reversal none were more apparent than some of the leading social gospellers in the Methodist Church, particularly the Reverend S. D. Chown, since 1914 the General Superintendent of his church, and William B. Creighton, editor of the Christian Guardian. In his quadrennial address to the General Conference of the Methodist Church in October 1922, Chown called upon all nations "to cease their moral insanity" and to settle all future difficulties "on terms of Christian equity."²¹ The following summer Chown sent a manifesto to all Methodist ministers in Canada asking them to set aside July 29 as "Anti-War Sunday" in order to emphasize the "folly of war as a means of settling international disputes" and to create a "no more war" sentiment in the church.²² Chown became a staunch supporter of the

League, and after his retirement as General Superintendent in 1925 he devoted himself to the campaign for peaceful settlement of international disputes.²³

The most dramatic change of heart was exhibited by Creighton, whose earlier editorials in the Guardian had literally driven some pacifist ministers out of the Church. By the time of the so-called Chanak Crisis, however, Creighton was condemning the spectacle of "Christian and enlightened men" in Canada urging vehemently that Canadians "pledge themselves without reserve to stand back of the Motherland should she decided that war was inevitable." "God forgive us," wrote Creighton, "that our first reaction was not of such a character that there would go up from a united people one thunderous, mighty NO. . . ." ²⁴ He insisted that Canadians must learn to feel and to think in different terms and to remember "how cruel and wicked and unchristian and inhumane war is." "We must learn to think peace, to talk peace, to insist on peace, because anything else is a horrible anachronism."²⁵ If anyone had missed the meaning of these words it was difficult not to notice Creighton's dramatic announcement on the cover page of the Guardian, February 20, 1924. As if to cancel his wartime cover page editorial on the "Vice of Pacifism" Creighton now declared:

There is surely not an intelligent, civilized man left in all the world who thinks that there is any virtue or goodness or saving grace in war. And most of us have been driven far beyond that negative position to the very positive and inescapable belief that war is, for our day and time, a hideous, utterly unchristian, unforgivable crime.²⁶

Referring to the Church's pro-war position a few years before, Creighton confessed that "many of us are ready to acknowledge our fault in truest humility, and seek pardon for our ignorance and our lack of the Spirit of our Master." In regard to the future he declared: "never again, under any condition, will war have our sanction or our blessing." The editor then concluded:

We have made up our minds that in this matter we must try to be Christians, whatever else we are, for if we are not in this way then we surely are not worthy to bear the Christian name at all. In the name of Christ we would set our face forever against war.²⁷

Creighton's testimony to peace initiated a serious discussion in the Guardian and its successor, The New Outlook. One of the first responses questioned the basis of Creighton's new sympathy with "the once despised brotherhood of pacifists." The enquirer was Douglas Hemmeon, a pacifist minister from Wolfville, Nova Scotia, who described himself as one who had "paid a bitter penalty in suffering and loss which will never be regained."²⁸ Hemmeon suggested that Creighton's announcement was plainly pacifism "without reservation and without qualification" and therefore he demanded to know "by what processes, intellectual and emotional, and by what methods, historical, scientific, philosophical, religious. . . ," Creighton had arrived at such a "radical and significant conclusion."²⁹ The question was a valid one since Creighton had reversed his position without offering his readers any type of reasoned explanation. In reply to Hemmeon, Creighton confessed that his "changed viewpoint and conviction" had been the result

of "a slow disillusioning process that has been going on every since the close of the war," rather than a study of "Jesus' attitude and teaching as to non-resistance." Furthermore, the sad experience of the war had underlined the clear confrontation of the "whole issue of war" with Christian teaching, particularly with the coming of the Kingdom. The principle of brotherhood, he argued, left no "place in the world for war among nations."³⁰

Although Creighton's explanation left much to be desired it was an honest attempt to come to grips with the issue of Christian responsibility and war.³¹ In the years to follow Creighton refined his thinking but continued to steer away from the question of passive resistance. In fact, neither Creighton nor Chown ever embraced outright pacifism, even in the twenties; they continued to allow the possibility of "just war": "Just and inevitable wars have come into the world," wrote Creighton, "it is even conceivable that they may still come."³² In order to help Christians make such wars impossible, however, Creighton concentrated his thinking on the prevention of future war through education and international co-operation. He thought of war as a "state of mind" resulting from preparedness and traditional ways of thinking, and therefore concluded that the task of the Church was "to educate the public mind for peace."³³

The return to pacifistic categories by Canadian churchmen like Creighton and Chown reflected, in part, the strong influence from an outspoken pacifist minority in American Protestantism. Although a few Canadians attended peace rallies in the United States, American

pacifist thought reached most Canadian ministers through such avenues as the Christian Century, an American religious journal which aligned the social gospel with pacifism. Its editor, Clayton C. Morrison, became well-known among his Canadian readers and addressed the first General Council of the United Church of Canada in June 1925. The previous year the Social Service Council of Canada invited the famous American pacifist, Kirby Page, to address its annual meeting.³⁹ Page was the editor of the journal, The World Tomorrow, which had some Canadian readers. By and large, the American peace movement provided the major inspiration for Canadian pacifism in the early twenties.

Following the American lead, Canadian churches recognized that peace had become a vital issue to be considered in their conferences. The Methodist Church, for example, adopted several anti-war resolutions supporting the League and the peaceful settlement of international disputes, but stopping short of a true pacifist position.³⁵ Although the Department of Evangelism and Social Service was instructed to arouse public opinion on the issue, the most important discussion of pacifism continued in The Christian Guardian with the encouragement of its editor. The 1924 May and June issues of the Guardian carried a series of feature articles on "the Struggle for Peace" by Archibald F. Key. Following a survey of past peace movements and international conferences, Key concluded that the best hope for future peace lay in the education of the people in international affairs.³⁶ "It is only when the people of the world begin to take an active interest in international affairs," he wrote, "that war will cease to exist."³⁷

To accomplish this end he endorsed the peace movement but lamented the fact that according to the Peace Year Book of 1923 only one peace organization in Canada had survived the war -- the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

In the months to follow a controversy on the issue of pacifism developed in the "Readers' Forum" of the Guardian. W. R. McWilliams of Grafton, Ontario, suggested that if the church really wanted to do away with war it would announce its position to the world just as the Society of Friends had done.³⁸ J. A. Hart of Truro, Nova Scotia, doubted that Canadians possessed the "spiritual control" of the state necessary to prevent a reversion to war.³⁹ When Herbert S. Cobb wrote from Griffin, Saskatchewan, that there were "more logical, as well as Christian ways" other than pacifism to accomplish peace, he was challenged by the editor to explain himself.⁴⁰ Creighton also criticized an article by Alfred E. Lavell which presented the case for preparedness. It was a faulty argument, charged the editor. "It leaves us just where we were before the last war broke out and as a scheme it will work just as ineffectively the next time as it did the last time."⁴¹

Throughout the twenties Creighton remained determined to encourage full discussion of the peace issue even though he was aware that some of his readers had grown more than tired of his campaign against war. "While in some ways it might be more comfortable if we were all to decide that we would leave this whole perplexing problem in the lap of the gods. . . ," he confessed, "we cannot get away from

the conviction that as intelligent Christian men and women it still remains our problem." A problem that demanded "the most careful and honest investigation at this very hour."⁴² The editor heard from several unsympathetic correspondents who "appeared to think that they settled the whole thing by a few strong sentences," and left nothing more to be said. Creighton disagreed and declared that there was more yet to be said and some decisions to be reached. "As Christian men and women," he wrote, "the time has fully come when we must do some very hard and very honest thinking." Accordingly, Creighton welcomed the entry of R. Edis Fairbairn into the fray with the hope that he would help a little "in that thinking and toward the making of those decisions."⁴³ With this enthusiastic endorsement from the editor, Fairbairn began a long series of provocative articles ✓ which marked him as "one of the most able and certainly the most contentious pacifist writer in the church."⁴⁴

Fairbairn was one of several prominent Canadian churchmen who began to articulate the pacifist argument during the early and mid-1920's. He originally hailed from England where he had entered the Wesleyan Ministry in 1904. Fairbairn was never completely satisfied with the Wesleyan Methodists, particularly because of what he considered their increasing dogmatism, and finally in 1914 he left England for Canada.⁴⁵ During the First World War the Army and Navy Board of the Methodist Church assigned Fairbairn to Bermuda where he acted as a chaplain under the British Admiralty. It was this wartime experience

in Bermuda, especially his first-hand exposure to the reaction of young men in bayonet drill, which launched Fairbairn on the road towards pacifism.⁴⁶

It was also in Bermuda where Fairbairn first demonstrated his impetuous and outspoken manner over a matter of principle. The controversy, or so-called Bermuda scandal, concerned Fairbairn's public criticism of the moral conditions at the Sailor's Home on Ireland Island without first reporting to the Commandant of the Dockyard.⁴⁷ The British Admiralty and the Wesleyan Methodist Church "took a very strong line" and demanded Fairbairn's removal or, at the very least, an apology but left the final decision up to the Army and Navy Board in Canada.⁴⁸ Fairbairn, on the other hand, adamantly refused to render an apology "except on the explicit instructions of the Board, and even then most unwillingly."⁴⁹ In the end the Board decided that rather than an apology, Fairbairn should offer nothing more than an "expression of regret at having made public statement before making official complaint"; thereby taking issue with only the method and not the content of Fairbairn's remarks.⁵⁰ When Fairbairn complied the matter was closed. Nevertheless, the incident served as a preview of Fairbairn's stormy career in the ministry.

By the time Fairbairn began his examination of "Christianity and War" in The Christian Guardian he had become a committed pacifist and a radical. His pacifist argument incorporated a socialist analysis of western capitalism as the "war system", a system which compelled

"otherwise honourable" men to perform unscrupulously and which made future war inevitable.⁵¹ The root cause of modern wars, he argued, was the monopolistic expansion of international commerce with the support of military force. It was the same war mentality which still characterized domestic industrial relations and posed "possibilities of civil war within the nation, and of a class war extending over all the nations."⁵² Furthermore, militarism and imperialism were natural allies with capitalism since all three "isms" promoted the selfish belief "that it is your duty to yourself to assert your power over others to your advantage."⁵³ The alternative to this whole unchristian "war system", argued Fairbairn, was for the world to organize for peace "as in the past it has been organized for war."⁵⁴ Pacifism and a campaign for the institutionalizing of pacifistic relations in social life, therefore, was man's best hope of averting future war.

Fairbairn rejected the claim that Jesus made no condemnation of war since the whole message of Jesus, and not just His references to non-resistance to evil, was an indirect rejection of war. "It is literally true," wrote Fairbairn, "that for Jesus there were but two alternatives -- a Messianic war, or the Cross. That He chose the Cross is demonstration of what He thought of war."⁵⁵ At the heart of Fairbairn's pacifism was the social gospel belief in the immanence of the Kingdom of God on earth. Consequently, war, as the greatest sin, had to be stopped in order to pave the way for that Kingdom.⁵⁶ ✓

Unlike some other social gossellers who were attracted to pacifism, Fairbairn became a dedicated and radical pacifist and remained so for the rest of his life. He was a prolific writer, mainly of articles in church journals, and earned a reputation as the most vocal if not the most radical pacifist in the United church of Canada.⁵⁷ As long as he felt something needed to be said on the war issue, Fairbairn refused to remain silent, at times enraging his readers and stirring a host of critics. But in the end, although Fairbairn developed a careful analysis of the past war and how it should have been avoided, he devoted little imaginative thought to the application of pacifism to the international problems of the twenties.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, Fairbairn and other churchmen helped greatly to revitalize Canadian interest in pacifism.

The regenerated peace campaign was stimulated further with the immigration to Canada of one of the leading pacifists of the day. Richard Roberts, pacifist Presbyterian minister and co-founder of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, came to Canada from England via the United States. From the time Roberts assumed the pulpit of the American Presbyterian Church of Montreal in 1922, his presence exerted a gentle but important influence upon young Canadians in the United Church and the Student Christian Movement in particular. Although it probably went unnoticed at the time, Roberts arrival provided an awakening Christian pacifist consciousness with important intellectual depth and a direct link to the Anglo-American pacifist experience.

Shortly after the outbreak of the Great War, Roberts and the British Quaker Henry Hodgkin agreed upon the necessity of forming some organized body which would maintain a Christian pacifist front during the war. Through their efforts the Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) was born at Trinity College, Cambridge, in the last four days of 1914.⁵⁹ According to original members of the FOR it was Roberts who chose the word "Reconciliation" in the Fellowship's title. Roberts thought peace was more than just the absence of war; it was something to be waged, as war was waged. "Peace is not a passivity . . . a lull between wars," he wrote. "It must be conceived as an activity; and the name of that activity is Reconciliation, . . . the act and practice of turning enemies into friends."⁶⁰

By the spring of the following year Roberts' pacifist stand necessitated his resignation from Crouch Hill Presbyterian Church and that July he accepted the secretaryship of the new FOR and became the first editor of its monthly periodical, The Venturer. In 1917, after Hodgkin had planted the roots of the FOR in the United States, Roberts accepted a call to the Congregational Church of the Pilgrims in Brooklyn, New York, where he remained for the duration of the war.

In New York, Roberts maintained close connections with the FOR and served on the editorial board of the World Tomorrow, a radical Christian journal at that time banned in Canada.⁶¹ It appears that his radical pacifist activities were of some concern to United States Government authorities and at least on one occasion Roberts was questioned by the United States Attorney's Office about his communica-

tions with the anti-war radicals: Floyd Dell, Max Eastman and the Masses Publishing Company.⁶² Despite his apparently important reputation in New York as a leading Christian pacifist it is not known if Roberts had any contact with the Canadian pacifists, Vernon and Lillian Thomas of Winnipeg, who had exiled themselves to New York at that time.

Roberts did continue his correspondence with British pacifists such as Hodgkin and Fenner Brockway and to some extent strengthened their liaison with such American pacifist figures as Rufus Jones. Hodgkin kept Roberts informed on the development of the FOR in Britain and in return expected his advice, particularly on the role of pacifists in the post-war world. "Very often do I wish that you were here again," wrote Hodgkin, "in order that we might think out together some of these questions, and . . . to prepare for the situation which we can, in some measure, foresee."⁶³

Roberts' major concern during these years, however, was the "problem of conscience" and the personal dilemma faced by conscientious objectors. In a letter to Fenner Brockway, he confessed his sympathy for the absolutist position but warned that absolutists must be exceedingly careful not to allow their own position to dominate their thinking and cause them to believe that "what is right for us might be right for everybody. . . ." The only safe and right principle, he argued, was: "Go so far -- neither more nor less -- as your conscience compels you."⁶⁴ Shortly after the war, in an article in the International Journal of Ethics, Roberts praised conscientious

objection as a healthy exercise of the individual conscience and therefore invaluable to the stability and growth of democracy. "The ultimate battleground of democracy is in men's hearts;" he wrote, "and its appeal must at last ever be to men's consciences."⁶⁵

Even in time of war, it is safer for democracy to let a hundred shirkers go scot-free rather than run the risk of penalizing an honest conscience.⁶⁶

Roberts hoped that the pacifist witness in the last war might have begun a new reign of personal idealism and individual conscience in the western world. Indeed, he believed it was

only by a frank recognition of the moral autonomy of the individual that we can establish any kind of moral order in the world. There are, of course, other ways of securing a quiet world -- for a time; but in any case a quiet world is not necessarily a moral world.⁶⁷

For a time in 1920 it appeared as if Roberts would assume the presidency of the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, California, but when opposition arose to his pacifism and labor sympathies he withdrew his name.⁶⁸ Finally, in 1922 he left the United States for Canada and the prestigious American Presbyterian Church in Montreal. And then in 1926 Roberts joined with other members of the Protestant Ministerial Association of Montreal to produce The Christian and War, the definitive Canadian pacifist statement of the inter-war period.

Although The Christian and War was the consensus of several Montreal clergymen, including Roberts, M. F. McCutcheon, T. W. Jones, W. D. Reid and Cannon A. P. Shatford, its major author was W. A. Gifford, a professor of ecclesiastical history at United Theological College

in Montreal.⁶⁹ The signatories, all Canadians by birth or adoption, contributed little original thought to the question of the church and war but they recognized the vital necessity for a new Christian ethic of war and, through Gifford's hand, made a sweeping appeal for a pacifist state of mind. "Our object," wrote Gifford, "is to present the Christian view of society, to judge war in the light of that view, to indicate ways of making the Christian view effective against war."⁷⁰ In language becoming to a pacifist, Gifford talked of armed preparedness, secret diplomacy and national fears as immediate causes of war while the ultimate causes he found to be economic imperialism and militarism, especially "the education of childhood for war."

Unlike absolute pacifists such as Fairbairn, Gifford distinguished between the question of war and the more general question of the admissibility of force as in international police actions. "We conceive that there are circumstances," he wrote, "in which force can be made to serve the ends of love, reverence and service."⁷¹ The use of force, therefore, was admissible as long as it was kept subsidiary to, controlled by and exercised in accordance with moral ends. This could not apply to war, he argued, since war "obscures all moral ends, and never can be a Christian weapon, even when waged in a righteous cause."⁷² The Christian alternative to war, therefore, was the active promotion of peace. The conscience of the Christian Church was awakened, reported Gifford, and many Christians were ready to stand with the Quakers for pacifism and strive towards a warless world.

As practical measures in this regard he endorsed the League of Nations, treaties of arbitration and disarmament, and the whole concept of international co-operation. Particular emphasis was placed upon the promising roles of such associations as the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, the War-Resisters International and the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

The book did not completely ignore the ultimate question of what Christian men should do in the event of a future war. In fact, Gifford's most important message concerned the heavy responsibility of the individual Christian conscience when confronted with the "immediate presence of war." Although the authors had left the door open for the use of force in certain situations, he asserted: "We who make this appeal cannot conceive any future war in which Christian men can participate."⁷³ Regardless of this belief, Gifford recognized that the final decision was up to each individual and, in the following passage, he lent strong words of encouragement to the principle of individual conscientious objection to war:

If some men and women should have to stand alone in their resistance to war, let them remember that the "City of Man-soul" has but one citizen. . . . Let them remember too that by suffering for their cause they will accredit it. Those who think out the great human issues in advance of mankind, and endure the reproach of dissent, help to clarify the thoughts of others and thus become creative factors in progress. Being lifted up from the earth, they draw others unto them.⁷⁴

On the one hand, Gifford almost elevated conscientious objectors to the level of sainthood, but on the other he failed to give serious consideration to alternative decisions of conscience in the event of a future conflict. The omission was understandable since the underlying premise of The Christian and War was the social gospel faith in the "coming of the ultimate order of history" in which there was no room for war.⁷⁵ If Gifford and his associates ever really considered war a future possibility once more, they found it difficult to follow to its end a train of thought contrary to their whole frame of mind; consequently, they missed the opportunity to develop a viable Christian response to war and left the matter unresolved for a later generation of Canadians.

The authors of The Christian and War also failed to recognize an important new dimension of liberal pacifism. Their qualified approval of force for moral ends and controlled by moral means ruled out complete non-resistance but they did not go as far as to develop this qualified use of moral force into a method of pacifist social action. In other words, they failed to bridge the gap from liberal pacifism to the idea of non-violent force or resistance then taking root within the pacifist outlook of the Quakers and the more radical Anglo-American Protestants. Nevertheless, The Christian and War was welcomed by pacifists in Canada and helped justify a fledging Canadian peace movement.⁷⁶

The active organization of a more rigorous peace campaign in Canada was undertaken by the small group of liberal pacifists who had survived the war and some enthusiastic converts from farm, labor, religious, student and women's groups. The wartime pacifists had kept alive the ongoing tradition of pacifism in Canada; now their contribution would be central to a much expanded peace movement. Except for the historic peace sects, however, the only organized peace group still functioning in Canada after the war was the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, popularly known as the WIL. During the war the WIL assumed the pacifist role discarded by other women's groups, and although the WCTU and the National Council of Women later revived their respective peace and arbitration committees, the WIL remained dominant in post-war women's peace activities and a major element in the Canadian peace movement in general.

Although the WIL was not formally organized on a national scale until the late twenties, several branches and affiliated groups sprang up across the country, including major chapters in Toronto and Vancouver. The original women's peace organization in Toronto had been the sole representative of the WIL in Canada until the Vancouver branch was established in 1921. At the war's end, however, the Toronto section appeared to be a "factious" group of women who devoted their energies to negative attacks on the military and the celebrations of Empire and Armistice Days.⁷⁷ The Vancouver branch, on the other hand, began with a fresh post-war approach which involved educating the public towards peace.

The organization of the Vancouver section was largely the work of its first president, Lucy Woodsworth, and secretary, Judge Laura Jamieson.⁷⁸ Mrs. Woodsworth, wife of Canada's most renowned pacifist, was active in the WIL both in the early Vancouver days and later in Winnipeg. Mrs. Jamieson succeeded Mrs. Woodsworth as president of the Vancouver branch and became one of the most prominent and influential pacifists in Western Canada. Through her initiative the Vancouver branch co-operated with other civic groups in sponsoring public lectures on peace, a peace library, peace pageants and an annual international fair during armistice week.⁷⁹ Mrs. Jamieson, like Fairbairn, thought of peace not merely as the absence of war but as "a way of life built on cooperative human relationships which provided for the interchange of ideas and emotions."⁸⁰ In her opinion, this pacific spirit was already visible in the international friendship and co-operation of women in the WIL. Peace would be assured, she maintained, when the co-operative spirit of peace-loving people replaced the aggressive, competitive spirit of the capitalist economic system.⁸¹ When she spoke of peace as the extension of the co-operative idea to international affairs, farm women on the prairies, already attuned to internationalism through the progressive movement, were attracted to the peace campaign, and by the mid-twenties several local chapters of the United Farm Women of Alberta had become affiliated with the Vancouver branch of the WIL.⁸²

One of Jamieson's earliest and most important disciples was Mrs. Violet McNaughton, women's editor of the Western Producer in Saskatoon. Mrs. McNaughton was well known in Saskatchewan for her role in the founding of the Women's Section of the Canadian Council of Agriculture and the Saskatchewan Women's Grain Growers Association. She was first attracted to pacifism and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom while a suffragette during the war.⁸³ Subsequently, she began to combine the WIL's pacifist principles with the co-operative idea then popular on the Prairies, arriving at a peace philosophy similar to that of Mrs. Jamieson. Indeed, she was indebted to Mrs. Jamieson for major concepts and inspiration. The two women became close friends and remained regular correspondents throughout the inter-war period.

As editor of the women's page for one of western Canada's most widely read farm newspapers, McNaughton popularized Mrs. Jamieson's brand of pacifism and became a regular propagandist for the WIL and the peace issue.⁸⁴ The pacifist slant of the women's page actually reflected the official policy of the newspaper. The publisher of the Western Producer, Harris Turner, was a disabled war veteran who was intent upon educating the public on the causes of war and the necessity for an effective peace campaign. He not only encouraged McNaughton in her pacifist views but hoped that her message would help create a broad movement for world peace among western farmers.⁸⁵

McNaughton presented her readers with the usual pacifist and labor view of international diplomacy and the cause of the last war,

but her major emphasis was placed upon the co-operative spirit of pacifism. Considerable space was also devoted to reviews of books with a pacifist message and to those issues dear to the WIL such as the struggle against cadet training in schools and militarism in school textbooks.⁸⁶ McNaughton's commitment to the WIL and the peace issue was a personal one and not just that of a journalist and feminist. In Saskatoon, for instance, she organized a peace group and sponsored "peace evenings" which consisted of debates, addresses, discussions and plays. One of the more popular events were poetry readings featuring such pacifist works as Siegfried Sassoon's war poetry.⁸⁷ Gradually through the twenties, McNaughton raised the consciousness of her readers on the issues surrounding world peace and, more directly, introduced prairie women to the WIL.

The growth of Canadian interest in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom did not really gain momentum until after the fourth International Congress of the WIL met in Washington in 1924. This was partly because previous WIL conclaves had been largely inaccessible to most Canadian members. For instance, there was no Canadian representative at the 1921 Vienna conference and when the WIL met at the Hague in 1922, Dr. Rose Henderson, member of the Toronto Board of Education and the Toronto branch of the WIL, was the sole Canadian delegate.⁸⁸ Once the international body gathered in North America, however, it drew a larger response from Canadians.

Organized around the theme "A New International Order," the Washington WIL conference was attended by representatives of twenty-two national sections of the WIL including large delegations from the United States and Canada. Among the most notable Canadian delegates were Lucy Woodsworth from Winnipeg and Agnes Macphail, federal Member of Parliament from Ontario. One of the first female politicians in Canada, Miss Macphail provided important encouragement and inspiration to the organization of a strong Canadian section of the WIL and was a key spokesman for peace advocates in Ottawa. It was Macphail who invited the European delegates at the Washington conference to include Canada in their tour of North America.⁸⁹

In June the "much heralded" train dubbed the "Pax Special" pulled into Toronto carrying the distinguished delegation of twenty-five women including the German pacifist, Lida Gustava Heymann; Marcelle Caby, editor of the radical French magazine La Vague; and Lady Claire Annesley, British pacifist and member of the No-Conscription Fellowship.⁹⁰ Following advance publicity in The Christian Guardian and Toronto newspapers, the WIL delegation received an enthusiastic reception in Massey Hall with Toronto's religious and labor leaders in attendance. They also addressed a large gathering at Parliament House in Toronto under the auspices of the Prime Minister.⁹¹ Despite a generally favorable reception there was some noisy opposition to the presence of the WIL women, particularly those from Austria and Germany. The Toronto Evening Telegram attacked the visit and persuaded the Toronto Board of Education to denounce

their gesture of goodwill as a "sinister attempt to undermine British patriotism." The Telegram was also accused of creating the "vicious vehemence" that earlier had blocked an appearance at the University of Toronto by Jane Addams, the noted American social reformer and president of the International WIL.⁹²

Despite the occasional hostile atmosphere, Toronto was the usual site of peace demonstrations in Canada. The previous summer, for instance, the "No More War" campaign staged a mass demonstration at Queen's Park complete with a parade, banners and a series of speakers. The participants included WIL members such as Agnes Macphail, leading religious figures like Rev. Father Minehan and Rev. Dr. Pidgeon, and labor leaders from Toronto such as Rollin Brickner and James Simpson. A special appearance was made by G. Stanley Russell, representative of the British Council of the No More War Society and shortly to take up residence as a Toronto cleric of note.⁹³ The following year a World Peace Rally held in London, Ontario, attracted a wide variety of civic representatives as well.⁹⁴

The Society of Friends was so impressed by this new surge ✓
of peace activity, which seemed at the same time to indicate a
growing popularity of peace sentiment, that it suggested the slogan
of the year 1924 in Canada should be: "Stop War! Co-operate!"⁹⁵
They themselves added to the new impetus by co-operating with the WIL
in the formation of a Toronto branch of the Fellowship of Canadian ✓
Youth for Peace, a body which had been first organized in Montreal.

The Toronto membership included a wide diversity of religious and ethnic groups. The purpose of the organization was "to strive for the removal of the cause of war . . . and to foster a positive spirit of goodwill and co-operation among all nations, races, religions and classes."⁹⁶ The participation of young people in peace work continued during the following years and in 1928 ten young delegates with varied religious backgrounds represented Canada at the World Youth Congress of Peace in Holland.⁹⁷

The increasing international awareness and pacifist commitment of students was, indeed, an important element in the resurgence of pacifist concern in Canada. In The Christian and War, for instance, Gifford recognized students as one of the groups most supportive of the new internationalism,⁹⁸ and W. B. Creighton claimed his conversations with returned war veterans and students were decisive in his return to the pacifist fold.⁹⁹ The leading force in developing this internationalism and peace sentiment among university students was the Student Christian Movement (SCM). Its organization in 1921 was initiated by those veterans (to whom Creighton referred) who had returned from the war profoundly dissatisfied with the existing world order and determined to eliminate the social and economic injustices which caused wars.¹⁰⁰ Consequently, they emphasized the need for a new moral force to prevent war, and for intellectual guidance on this issue they called upon Richard Roberts, who had just arrived in Canada in 1922. From then on Roberts figured prominently in the movement and became a frequent speaker at SCM gatherings.¹⁰¹

After a few years the SCM members who had had direct contact with the war began to be succeeded by a new generation of students,¹⁰² but the general interest in the peace question continued to gain momentum and in 1923 the SCM concluded that

the way of peace can only be discovered if ordinary people have a reasoned and passionate belief in the creative possibilities of peace and give themselves in a conscious effort to establish international solidarity.¹⁰³

Later that year pacifism became the focal point of debate at the Student Volunteer Convention in Indianapolis and, while not the predominant view to emerge from the conference, it made a profound impression upon the Canadian delegates.¹⁰⁴ N. A. Mackenzie, Maritime secretary of the SCM and one of those in attendance, regarded the pacifists "by far the most aggressive, determined, convincing group" present and he returned to Canada hopeful that the "war cursed world" could be transformed if a sufficient number of young people were convinced of the "invariable futility of war" and would refuse to fight.¹⁰⁵ The pacifist debate, itself, received full coverage in a special supplement to the University of Toronto student newspaper, The Varsity.¹⁰⁶ For the balance of the decade it was primarily through student newspapers and its own journal, the Canadian Student, that the SCM focused student attention on such issues as the Christian and war and disarmament, and campaigned against the Officers' Training Corps in universities.¹⁰⁷

By the mid-twenties university students joined an increasing number of Canadians attracted to the pacifist idea. The resurgence

of pacifism was particularly evident within the nation's Protestant churches and was articulated by several spokesmen, including Fairbairn, Roberts and Gifford. But it was also reflected in the growing popularity of pacifist groups like the WIL which dated back to the war years. Together, this wide range of individuals and groups, from WIL activists and Quakers to social gospellers and liberal internationalists, had begun to forge a broad Canadian peace movement.

The increased peace activities on the part of students, Quakers and the WIL, especially the visit to Toronto of the international delegation from the WIL Conference in Washington, brought the whole issue of peace much closer to Canadians and heightened public interest. The second half of the decade, for instance, was marked by an increased tempo in WIL activities and its growth in membership across the country. By the late twenties there were three branches of the WIL in Canada -- Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver -- and several affiliated groups in Saskatchewan and Alberta. However, since there was no single national organization with elected officers during the twenties, Laura Jamieson took it upon herself to serve as the Canadian secretary of the WIL and designated the Vancouver branch the office of the Canadian section as well.¹⁰⁸ In the fall of 1927 she further publicized the WIL peace program during a speaking tour she made through Western Canada under the auspices of the Canadian Club, a sign that pacifists were no longer persona non grata to the establishment.¹⁰⁹

The following year, with the aid of several women's organizations and the League of Nations Society, Jamieson co-ordinated the various peace activities in Vancouver into a one day peace conference during armistice week. The idea spread and in April 1929 a similar conference was held in Winnipeg in which thirty-seven different societies co-operated.¹¹⁰ Saskatoon followed with a peace conference in June. The program featured talks by Mrs. Jamieson on "How to make the Kellogg Pact a Reality," J. B. McGeachy on "Economic Aspects of War and Peace," G. W. Simpson on "Arbitration and International Law," Claude Lewis on "Practical Educational Steps towards Peace," and J. S. Woodsworth on "Armaments." At the same time, the Saskatoon Farm Women's University week concluded by passing various resolutions concerning peace. They suggested, for example, that the Saskatchewan Peace Conference Committee not only hold an annual peace conference but work towards a national conference as well. They also recommended that every women's local lodge and women's section of the United Farmers of Saskatchewan take out membership in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom through the Vancouver branch, a suggestion which was later followed by the Regina peace society. Furthermore, the Saskatchewan women endorsed the WIL proposition that "for every hundred dollars now devoted to preparations for a possible war, one dollar should be given to establish a fund . . . to provide in each university in Canada a chair and Scholarships for the study and development of better International relationships."¹¹¹ This was one

of the WIL's pet projects; a similar proposition was introduced into the House of Commons by Agnes Macphail in 1930.

The popularity of the peace conferences alone spoke for the commanding influence of Mrs. Jamieson and the Vancouver branch of the WIL in Western Canada. Vancouver's second annual peace conference was staged in November 1929, with over thirty societies co-operating. The theme of the conference was "Education and Peace." According to Jamieson the whole tone of the conference was "practical and realistic" rather than visionary. "Peace was spoken of, not as a pious hope," she wrote, "but as an objective which must have some assurance of attainment if any other form of social service is to be worth while." It was useless to work for human betterment, she added, if another war was to wipe out civilization.¹¹² Although most of those in attendance were already converted to the cause of peace, the conference was considered a huge success.¹¹³ It was a notable advance in mobilization and, no doubt for many, the occasion of crystallization of thought and revitalizing of commitment. Accordingly, the one day peace conferences, usually held during armistice week, became popular events as the inter-war peace movement continued to build momentum across Canada.

One of the high points in the WIL activities occurred in 1929 when Agnes Macphail, Violet McNaughton and Laura Jamieson represented Canada at the International Congress of the WIL in Prague, Czechoslovakia. The presence of a Canadian delegation representative of three regions

of the country was symbolic of both the growing influence of the WIL in Canada and the desire for closer co-operation between the various Canadian branches. While in Europe the Canadian delegates discussed future plans for peace work at home and agreed that the time had come to co-operate on a national basis. Jamieson and McNaughton noted that the United Farm Women of Saskatchewan already favored such a move.¹¹⁴ The three women returned fully inspired by their international experience and hopeful that a stronger WIL could be built in Canada. As acting Canadian secretary, Jamieson began to circulate monthly WIL newsletters in which she reiterated the plea for unity.

Within a year the move for nation-wide co-ordination of the WIL was completed with the formal organization of a Canadian section with official branches in Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver and affiliated groups on the prairies. In Alberta, for instance, seventeen locals of the United Farm Women of Alberta and the Alberta WCTU joined the WIL. On the other hand, neither the WIL nor the peace movement in general were successful in organizing a base east of Montreal.¹¹⁵ Vancouver remained the national headquarters, probably because Jamieson was maintained as the Canadian secretary. Other national officers included Agnes Macphail as president, Lucy Woodsworth as treasurer and vice-presidents from each of the five provinces with WIL representation: Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. Mrs. McNaughton headed a publicity committee while Mrs. Alice E. Loeb of Toronto chaired a committee on militarism and Beatrice Brigden of Brandon, Manitoba handled the committee on education.¹¹⁶

In their publicity brochure the Canadian women advertised the WIL as an active organization in touch with reality. The aim of the WIL, it was explained, was to "unite women of all countries, and of all parties and classes, who are opposed to war, exploitation and oppression."¹¹⁷ Their overall peace philosophy was revealed in the stated "plan of work" for the Canadian section. Although the program included the usual support for the League of Nations and the principle of arbitration and conciliation, its major aspect concerned the education of Canada's youth. Without being specific, the WIL hoped to ensure that teachers were properly instructed on the League "so that our youths may learn to solve international problems by peaceful and constructive methods." They also reiterated their well-known demand that a University course in International Relations be offered in each Province, along with the creation of appropriate libraries and international scholarships. This could easily be accomplished, they insisted, if the Canadian Government would show its good faith in the Kellogg Peace Pact by financing the preparation for peace as it did the preparation for war. Central to the Canadian program was the abolition of cadet training in the schools and the substitution of physical education courses. Another suggestion called for the creation of peace activities which would catch the imagination of young people, "thereby making Peace as interesting as War." The practice of holding one-day peace conferences across Canada was also endorsed, as was the desire for a stronger emphasis on Peace and "less military display" during Armistice Day observances.¹¹⁸

Overall, the WIL concentrated on what they considered practical steps for world peace, emphasizing the futility of war rather than religious or moral non-resistance. Thus, most WIL women were not pacifists in the true sense of the word, but they eagerly accepted the label and, by doing so, tended to blur any real distinction in the general make-up of the inter-war peace movement. Their broad pacifist sympathies were reflected in their suggested reading list which recommended leading pacifist publications such as The Christian and War, the Canadian pacifist statement by Gifford and his Montreal associates, and the radical Christian journal, The World Tomorrow. The Canadian section also suggested two new publications of their own entitled: "Military Training in Canadian Schools" and "World Federation Takes a Stand on Military Training."¹¹⁹

The primary objective of the WIL as well as other Canadian pacifists during the twenties was the elimination of militarism in education, whether in school textbooks or in cadet training. It became a burning issue among various pacifist groups throughout the country; thus, it was the catalyst in uniting pacifists and in building a stronger more cohesive peace movement in general. As evident from their pamphlets on the subject, the WIL provided the initial impetus in the campaign. Central to their attack was the glorification of the military and war in Canadian school textbooks. The WIL and their pacifist supporters favored a complete revision of textbooks in Canada in order to supplant a militaristic bias with

lessons on the prevention of war, international goodwill and the economics and spiritual unity of mankind. J. S. Woodsworth was one of the first to join in the attack on textbooks. "Unless our children are taught the futility and suicidal tendency of modern war," he wrote, "they will as adults find themselves engaged in another war which experts tell us will almost certainly wipe out western civilization."¹²⁰ Woodsworth reported "a good deal of interest" in the issue across central and western Canada as early as 1924. In Toronto the Society of Friends waged a successful campaign with the support of the Toronto Globe against the use of Flag and Fleet in Ontario schools.¹²¹ The whole issue came to a head at the end of the decade when the Toronto branch of the WIL sponsored an independent survey by fifty-seven history teachers of all history textbooks used in Canadian schools. Although the report of the survey committee concluded that between seventeen and thirty per-cent of the content of most texts was devoted to military history, it provided no evidence that a militaristic bias prevailed throughout the books.¹²² However, the percentage devoted to military history was certainly excessive and the WIL remained convinced that a revision of history books was necessary in order to curb the growth of militarism.¹²³

The other major target of pacifist derision, and the one which aroused the most interest and debate, was cadet training in the schools. The widespread practice of military training in Canadian schools began with the creation of a special trust fund for that

purpose by Lord Strathcona in 1907. From that time its growth accelerated, particularly during the war.¹²⁴ Ironically, the greatest increase in the number of cadets occurred in the twenties when opposition to military training was stirring. For instance, the number of cadets in Canada jumped from 47,000 in 1913 to 112,000 in 1926 while the national expenditure on cadet training rose from \$74,000 in 1920 to \$412,000 in 1926.¹²⁵ Alarmed, pacifist groups publicized the statistics as further evidence of the trend towards a militaristic society. When the annual grant to cadet services was debated in the House of Commons, farm and labor opposition was voiced repeatedly by J. S. Woodsworth and Agnes Macphail. Farm organizations in particular passed numerous resolutions condemning the cadet program while farm journals such as the Western Producer publicized the Woodsworth-Macphail speeches against military training in schools.¹²⁶ Macphail painted such a lurid picture of school boys being sent to a bloody slaughter that there was a general outcry from the public.¹²⁷ In 1924 she made her first of many ill-fated motions in the House protesting cadet training. "Why should we take our boys," she asked, "dress them in uniforms and teach them to strut along to martial strains with their foolish little guns and swords at their sides?"¹²⁸ The same line of argument was used by Macphail's colleagues in the WIL. For instance, the Toronto WIL, through the efforts of its post-war presidents, Alice Loeb and Berta Hamilton, continually raised the issue in public meetings and lectures and, by mid-decade, was effective

in placing an anti-cadet resolution before every trade union in Toronto, with satisfying results.¹²⁹

Officially, cadet training consisted of military drill, rifle shooting and physical training, but its opponents maintained it also included psychological conditioning in the desirability of war in settling disputes and the glorification of war as an ideal.¹³⁰ The alternative, they proposed, was proper instruction in physical education. According to a 1927 report of the educational committee of the Toronto WIL, however, even physical training programs had come under military influence. The WIL found that three-fourths of all instructors of physical training courses at teacher training institutions were officers of the permanent militia. In Ontario only men with a cadet instructor's certificate issued by the Department of Militia and Defense could be granted certificates as specialists in physical culture by the Ontario Department of Education.¹³¹ Furthermore, although military training was not compulsory in Canadian schools and colleges, the report maintained that strong pressure was exerted upon boys to join the cadets, "sometimes taking the form of an indication that preference will be given to cadets in the choice of boys to place on the sport teams." The report concluded that Canada was "in great danger of becoming a militaristic country" with schools as the culture ground for "an embryo army."¹³²

The WIL pamphlet on military training received a hearty endorsement from the Society of Friends for use in their study groups.¹³³ Historically opposed to military training for reasons of conscience,

the Quakers criticized the post-war cadet program as antagonistic to the progressive reconstruction of the world and argued in favor of alternative physical training courses in schools.¹³⁴ In 1920 the Canada Yearly Meeting reaffirmed their position that:

the training of the body in physical exercise is a valuable part of any educational system for our young people, but any instruction that inculcates in a boy at such a time in his life the ideals of militarism is not only in its tendency contrary to the spirit of love and brotherhood which the Society of Friends desire to follow, but would inevitably cause them to forget or miss the lessons of the horror and futility of war. . . .¹³⁵

From resolutions to individual actions, Quakers struggled to support the campaign against the cadet program and militarism in education. In 1924, for example, Edgar Zavitz of the Genessee Yearly Meeting tried to organize a letter-writing campaign in support of Agnes Macphail's stand in Parliament against increased cadet expenditures.¹³⁶ A few years later, Raymond Booth, secretary of the Toronto monthly meeting, suggested that favorite device of all causes, an oratorical contest, to help combat the spirit of militarism in Toronto schools.¹³⁷ The Canadian Friend followed the issue closely and excited its readers with such rhetorical questions as:

Are we as a people being militarized? Are our sons and daughters being trained for war? Are we taking any steps to check the insidious propaganda of those interested in shackling the youth of this land with the blight of the war-mind?¹³⁸

Despite the united determination of the Society of Friends, the Women's International League and other pacifists, the campaign against cadet training was largely ineffective during the twenties. The cadet corps in Canadian schools continued to drill and grow, and by 1927 the government expenditure on military training had risen to a half million dollars.¹³⁹ Arthur Dorland, one of the leading Quaker spokesmen, attributed this dilemma to the fact that it was simply more convenient for school officials and boards of education to continue militia training considering the strong incentive of the government grants.¹⁴⁰ Indeed, the average cadet instructor had a vested interest in the program since he received at least an additional \$140 per year for every ninety cadets.¹⁴¹ Local school boards were also reluctant to abolish the cadet corps because "they liked the cheap means of providing for physical education."¹⁴² Finally, the WIL appealed to the United Church to condemn the cadet corps as unchristian.¹⁴³

The first General Council of the United Church in 1925 had considered a resolution favoring the abolition of cadet training but had postponed a final decision.¹⁴⁴ William Creighton, as editor of the New Outlook, took up the WIL cause, arguing that

if it can be shown that military training in our schools tends to foster the military spirit among our youth, and lends itself to a sympathetic attitude towards war as an established institution of our world order, the church cannot consistently give it her approval.¹⁴⁵

Although sympathetic, United Churchmen remained noncommittal on the issue until the 1927 General Council appointed a special commission

on the cadet corps and officers' training corps. The investigation revealed that Church membership was divided over the issue but more than ninety per-cent of those answering a questionnaire reported they found no evidence of militarism in the schools and approved of the cadet corps.¹⁴⁶ Ernest Thomas, perhaps a little too easily, declared that the commission narrowed the issue down to one question:

Is the presence within the school life of the national government in the person of an inspecting officer on one day in the year such an infringement of Christian obligation that the Church should call for its abolition?¹⁴⁷

The commission thought not and ultimately the Church agreed that cadet training was not contrary to the Christian conscience. The decision, while a severe blow to pacifists, far from settled the issue and the anti-cadet campaign persisted into the thirties when it met with some limited success.

The co-operation of the Society of Friends in the broad campaign against cadet training was indicative of both the broad make-up of the inter-war peace movement and the general transition in Quaker thought. By the end of the war Friends around the world had revised their interpretation of pacifism to give it an active rather than a passive meaning. In keeping with their belief in the perfectibility of the world, Friends adopted a more dynamic approach to removing the evils obstructing the achievement of the Kingdom of God on earth. They opposed not only the violence of war but all forms of social oppression. Thus, the new goal of twentieth century Quakers was not

merely a peaceful way of life but a complete, radical reconstruction of the political and economic order both within and among nations. Furthermore, their acceptance of the State and the use of force to sustain it, such as a police force, allowed Friends to broaden their historic tradition of passive resistance into an active but non-violent resistance as a means with which to achieve the new social order.¹⁴⁸ Twentieth-century Quaker pacifism became synonymous with non-violent resistance and not just a philosophic attitude. Quaker acceptance of non-violent force to bring about social change challenged traditional religious pacifism and, although rejected by the other historic peace sects, the idea received considerable support from liberal Protestants in the peace movement. For Friends, however, their new creed posed a special dilemma: once pacifism became an instrument of radical social change and Quaker concern centered on the achievement of a new social order, they faced the constant temptation to sacrifice the purity of their non-violent means in order to reach their goals.¹⁴⁹ Nevertheless, the transition among Quakers from passive resistance to a more active pacifism, although gradual, was an important factor in the growth of the peace campaign in Canada.

Canadian Friends were kept abreast of the changing interpretations of "Quakerism" largely through the efforts of Albert S. Rogers, chairman of Canada Yearly Meeting, Professor Arthur G. Dorland, chairman of the peace committee, and Fred Haslam, treasurer of the finance committee and later the leading figure in the service committee. In August

1920 Dorland and Rogers were among the Canadian delegates to the first World Conference of All Friends in London. The purpose of the conference was to clarify and deepen the peace testimony of the Society as well as to "bind together its scattered branches in common work for the coming of the Kingdom of God."¹⁵⁰ The conference produced various pamphlets for publication, including "The Fight Against War," a new statement of the Quaker position. Upon his return Rogers reported that the London discussions were primarily concerned with the implications of pacifism in "civic and international relations . . . in personal and social relations . . ." and in the "life of the society." He also noted that the general tone of the conference emphasized individual responsibility in the building of "a new world order through practical application of the Teachings and Spirit of Jesus."¹⁵¹ The Canadian delegates returned from England with a host of mental and spiritual impressions concerning their peace testimony. "We must have much quiet time at home," reported Rogers, "to sort them, to make them more fully our own and to show as much of them to our friends as we can."¹⁵² Canadian Friends had always thrived on Anglo-American inspiration but it appears to have been the post-war influx of ideas and people which propelled them further on the road to social activism.

The post-war attitude of the Society of Friends in Canada came to reflect the dependence of the cause of peace on the successful quest for social and economic justice. The Canadian Friend publicized

the correlation between the two ideals and reprinted numerous articles on the subject by internationally-known pacifists. The November 1926 issue, for instance, carried an article by Mahatma Gandhi, the famous Indian pacifist and social activist, which had been originally printed in the World Tomorrow. Gandhi praised non-violence as the greatest force available to man in the struggle against evil. Then, following an endorsement of the peace movement, he confessed: "I cannot help the growing fear that the movement will fail if it does not touch the root of all evil -- man's greed."¹⁵³ A similar note was struck when Arthur Dorland explained the wider implications of the Quaker peace testimony to his fellow Friends:

It means a peaceable and loving spirit in our home circle, in our neighborhood, a proper sense of economic and social justice, a consideration for the rights of others in all the manifold relations of life.¹⁵⁴

The most important expression of this philosophy by Canadian Friends in the early twenties was their support for post-war relief work in Europe. In the two years from 1919 to 1921 Canadian Quakers contributed almost five thousand dollars to the American Friends Service Committee for Friends' Famine Relief in Poland, France, Germany and Austria.¹⁵⁵ Apparently they agreed with Dorland that European relief work presented the opportunity ". . . to send our Quaker message of goodwill to those who have so recently been called our enemies, and so help to heal the wounds of war."¹⁵⁶ Some young Canadians who had served with the Friends' Ambulance Unit in Europe during the war remained to assist in the relief program. The tragedy

of the Russian famine in 1922 prompted Albert Rogers to organize a drive for emergency aid to Russia. With the support of John Lewis, editor of the Toronto Globe, and Charles D. Gordon, manager of the head office of the Dominion Bank, over \$60,000 in public donations were collected in Toronto alone. As treasurer of the Canada Yearly Meeting finance committee, Fred Haslam administered the national appeal. Initially the Canadian funds were sent to the American Friends Service Committee for use in their relief work in Russia, but later, "in the interest of wider appeal," the Friends directed their funds for Russian famine relief through the Canadian Save the Children Fund.¹⁵⁷

The direct co-operation of Canadian Quakers with other religious groups in furthering the cause of peace was accelerated when the Canada Yearly Meeting authorized Arthur Dorland to contact "other churches in order to organize some form of peace association in Canada."¹⁵⁸ The association Dorland had in mind was the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches founded by Joseph Allen Baker, a Canadian born Quaker then residing in Britain and personal friend of the Dorland family.¹⁵⁹ The World Alliance was the re-organized post-war version of the Associated Councils of Churches in the British and German Empires for Fostering Friendly Relations between the Two Peoples. Prior to the war the Associated Councils of Churches had enlisted the support of over 1,000 Canadians with the Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society acting as the official

Canadian section.¹⁶⁰ Since the Peace and Arbitration Society disintegrated during the war, however, Canadians had no contact with the new World Alliance until Dorland took the initiative to restore the connection.

After meeting with the American Council of the World Alliance in 1921, Dorland was convinced that the first step was to get Canadians into the World Alliance and then to organize a separate Canadian section. Subsequently, with assistance from the British Council, over 300 Canadian clergymen were persuaded to join the American Council.¹⁶¹ At first the World Alliance had little impact in Canada, primarily because Canadian members were merely part of an American organization. Dorland's efforts to organize a Canadian council, however, were rejected by the other denominations who were suspicious of Quaker pacifism.¹⁶² The reluctance on the part of Canadian clergymen to co-operate with the Quakers was overcome only when the Archbishop of Canterbury, president of the International World Alliance, endorsed the idea of a Canadian section.¹⁶³ Quakers, Anglicans and other major Protestant denominations finally joined together to form the Canadian Council of the World Alliance in November 1926. The most active members were those already prominent in the peace debate. They included: Dorland, Albert Rogers and Fred Haslam, all Quakers; Archbishop Matheson of Halifax, Primate of the Anglican Church in Canada; S. D. Chown, the former General Superintendent of the Methodist Church; and Professor P. V. Pilcher

of Trinity College, Toronto. Pilcher became particularly active in the Canadian Council and on several occasions had to assure his Anglican colleagues that the World Alliance was not strictly a pacifist organization, "but a means of promoting world peace by both pacifists and non-pacifists who hoped to discover mutually acceptable means of furthering Christian goodwill and friendship."¹⁶⁴

The effectiveness of the World Alliance in Canada was hampered by the fact that its staunchest supporters, the Quakers and Anglicans, represented the two extremes of pacifism and armed preparedness. Consequently, the World Alliance avoided the controversial topics of the day such as cadet training and became involved instead in more mundane efforts such as the promotion of the League of Nations or the celebration of Peace Sunday.¹⁶⁵ By 1930 the primary Canadian role in the World Alliance appeared to be the promotion of Anglo-American co-operation, reminiscent of pre-war Canadian peace societies. Regardless of their particular activities, however, the creation of a Canadian Council of the World Alliance further broadened the base of a Canadian peace movement and focused attention on the moral necessity of international co-operation. Its most important purpose, according to Dorland, was simply to provide the

means by which the Church could be aroused to its opportunity and duty to create that enlightened, Christian, public opinion in which the peace of the world and the success of any machinery designed to secure it, ultimately rest.¹⁶⁶

One of the most important contributions of Friends to the peace movement was their attempt to create an "intelligent public sentiment" and a sense of public responsibility for domestic and international peace.¹⁶⁷ Furthermore, Friends promoted Canadian membership in various pacifist or peace-oriented associations, including: the League of Nations Society, the World Alliance, the Women's International League and the Fellowship of Reconciliation. The peace committee of the Canadian and Genesee Yearly Meetings maintained a peace library of current pacifist publications and encouraged their membership to read important new books.¹⁶⁸ The Canadian pacifist publication, The Christian and War, for instance, was recommended highly by Dorland to readers of The Canadian Friend.¹⁶⁹ Although Canadian Friends had begun to radicalize their thinking in terms of the real social and economic prerequisites for world peace, they also maintained their faith in the power of a public peace mentality and therefore welcomed the Kellogg Peace Pact as a great step in that direction.¹⁷⁰

Throughout most of the twenties the other historic peace sects in Canada were relatively silent on the public issue of international conflict and the popular movement for world peace. Contrary to Quakers, the Mennonites, Hutterites and Doukhobors remained faithful to the principle of non-resistance and tried to maintain the separation of their communities from the mainstream of Canadian society. Although Mennonites in the United States actively opposed the Quaker "heresy"

of non-violent resistance, Canadian Mennonites were too pre-occupied with more immediate problems confronting their communities, such as the immigration of more Mennonites from Russia, to mount any opposition to new Quaker ways, even if they were disposed to do so. Indeed, there was an unintended collaboration when the humanitarian work of Friends in Russian Famine Relief in 1922 coincided with the efforts of Canadian Mennonites to resettle Russian Mennonite refugees in Canada. ✓

Ever since the Bolshevik Revolution, large numbers of Russian Mennonites wished to join their North American brethren, but the immigration into Canada of "Mennonites, Hutterites and Doukhobors" had been specifically banned by a 1919 Order-in-Council. The discriminatory measure was passed in response to widespread public reaction against the Hutterian communal lifestyle, the Mennonite resistance to learning the English language and their common German background and conscientious objections to military service. Following the war Mennonites carried on an active lobby to get the Order-in-Council rescinded and solicited the support of William Lyon Mackenzie King who had been raised in Ontario's Mennonite country. Finally, in 1922, when King and the Liberal party were returned to power, the Order-in-Council was repealed and the door was open for Russian Mennonites to enter Canada once more. In conjunction with the colonization program of the Canadian Pacific Railway, annual waves of Mennonites reached Canada in the 1920's. The largest movements occurred between 1923 and 1927. By the time immigration was

again restricted in 1929 over 20,000 new Russian Mennonites had flocked to the Canadian prairies.¹⁷¹ The newcomers who arrived from Russia after 1920 became known as Russländers, while the Canadian Mennonites who had left Russia in the 1870's identified themselves as Kanadier.¹⁷² Although the influx of Mennonite immigrants increased the number of those in Canada opposed to military service and warfare, the Mennonites themselves recoiled from the pacifist debate until they were again directly threatened by conscription and the Second World War. Hutterites, as well, remained withdrawn from Canadian society and concentrated on protecting the integrity of their communal colonies from local prejudice and discriminatory legislation designed to prevent their further expansion.

The resentment of Western Canadians to the idea of conscientious objectors profiting at the expense of those in uniform also plagued the Doukhobors in British Columbia. Although relatively unmolested during the war, they were the victims of post-war discontent and suspicion. In 1919 British Columbia deprived Doukhobors of their right to vote in provincial elections, while the citizens of Nelson and Grand Forks passed resolutions demanding deportation of Doukhobors to Russia and the expropriation of their lands for re-distribution to returned soldiers.¹⁷³ Dissatisfaction and uneasiness mounted among the Doukhobors, and in 1922 a new confrontation with the state was triggered when they began to withdraw their children from the schools. Attempts by authorities to seize property in payment

of fines levied against the parents were followed by a wave of school burnings. From 1923 to 1925 nine schools were destroyed by arson along with Peter Verigin's own house and other Doukhobor property in Brilliant, British Columbia. "Peter the Lordly" himself was killed in October 1924 when the railway coach in which he was riding exploded.¹⁷⁴ The mysterious series of violent acts notwithstanding, most Doukhobors remained adamantly opposed to military force and war. Their pacifist beliefs, however, allowed the exercise of physical protests such as the boycott of schools and nude marches, tactics in keeping with non-violent resistance. Contrary to most liberal pacifist practices, however, Doukhobor protests were tied to their anarchistic rejection of the authority of the state. Above all, Doukhobor concern centered on the maintenance of their freedom and peculiar way of life; therefore they remained aloof from the general clamour for world peace during the inter-war years. An exception was Peter Makaroff, a Doukhobor lawyer who played an important role as a pacifist and socialist in Saskatchewan before and during the Second World War.¹⁷⁵

As the 1920's came to a close, the Canadian peace movement reached an important stage in its growth and development. Although some of the historic peace sects remained aloof, the movement had become a "broad front of groups and activities" made up of both absolute pacifists, those adamantly opposed to all wars and violent

revolutions, and liberal internationalists and other peace activists who believed war, though sometimes necessary, was always irrational and inhumane and, therefore, should be prevented. This inter-war coalition was made possible when, with the absence of an immediate threat of war, "the social hope of the social gospel fused with the world hope of pacifists and a broad range of internationalists."¹⁷⁶ Once this merger of social gospel and pacifist groups began, a wide variety of social and political activities were brought under the banner of the peace movement with the result that the larger social outlook and political action of people such as W. B. Creighton, R. Edis Fairbairn, Richard Roberts, Laura Jamieson, Violet McNaughton, Agnes Macphail or J. S. Woodsworth became inseparable from their pacifism. But that is not to say that the broad range of individuals associated with the movement agreed on one philosophical approach. Not all, for instance, shared the pacifist belief in total war renunciation or a radical commitment to social change. Indeed, the pacifist alignment with socialism which had begun during the war evolved slowly during the twenties. Socially radical pacifists like Woodsworth or Fairbairn continually emphasized the relationship between war and capitalism but most of the liberal internationalists and social reformers who rallied to the peace movement felt free to display both their revulsion against war and militarism and their generally progressive reformism without engaging in a radical challenge to the political and economic order. Consequently, the socially radical dimension of pacifism was hardly fully demonstrated in the

twenties and would only become more apparent in both declaration and action under the pressure of the social and economic plight of the depression years.

In the meantime, socially radical pacifists united with the rest of the peace movement in a campaign to redirect the thinking of Canadian society towards peace and international co-operation. Although they could "hardly hope to exercise any very great influence in the international field," wrote Woodsworth to the British pacifist E. D. Morel, Canadian pacifists were doing "whatever is possible in the interests of peace."¹⁷⁷ Given the broad nature of the pacifist coalition, its members evaded questions which might have provoked disagreement in their ranks and joined forces, instead, in endorsing the League and disarmament and in combating the various manifestations of militarism in society, from the sale of military toys to military appropriations and cadet training in the schools.¹⁷⁸ The expansion of the WIL into a national organization and the effort by the SCM to keep Canadian university students interested in both pacifism and social action were the type of accomplishments which contributed to an upsurge of pacifist feeling in Canada by the end of the twenties.¹⁷⁹

Indeed, no event better characterized the Canadian peace movement than its reaction to the signing of the Kellogg Peace Pact in 1928. Culminating a decade of pacifist activity dedicated to the condemnation of war, the Pact was heralded as proof that the pacifist idea had taken root. The enthusiastic response of Canadians ranged

from endorsements by numerous organizations and churches to the ritual hanging of the Pact in schools across the country.¹⁸⁰ The importance of the Pact in Canada was underlined further by the fact that the Canadian Prime Minister, W. L. Mackenzie King, had been the Canadian representative in Paris. Rather than a concrete plan to guarantee the peaceful settlement of international disputes, the Kellogg Pact was a mere statement of intention not much different than any other peace resolution; nevertheless, to pacifist forces it was the spirit of the Peace Pact which seemed to promise "a new and better day."¹⁸¹

On the other hand, as peace advocates looked to the future they were painfully aware of the existence of conditions in the world which contained the threat of war. In his report for a United Church sessional committee on war and peace, Newton W. Rowell, father of the League of Nations Society in Canada, reflected this realism of the movement when he warned that

the presence of immense standing armies, the development of great navies and the creation of mighty air-fleets cannot but be an occasion of unrest and constitute an every present reminder that we have not yet passed from the menace of war.¹⁸²

As a course of action, Rowell urged the Church to enter a new crusade in order "to lead and to develop the peace purpose of the nations," especially the creation of "a Christian public opinion and the obliteration from the national life of such continuing evils as racial antipathies, selfish nationalism and international jealousies." The United Church, Rowell concluded confidently, had declared her will

for peace and consecrated herself to its attainment.¹⁸³ The same determination characterized the entire peace movement as it accelerated its campaign for both peace and social justice amid the crises of the thirties.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹Minutes of the Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1919, p. 21.
- ²Brock, Twentieth-Century Pacifism, p. 122.
- ³Norman Penner, The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis (Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall of Canada, Ltd., 1977), p. 181.
- ⁴Allen, The Social Passion, pp. 313-330.
- ⁵Brock, Twentieth-Century Pacifism, p. 109.
- ⁶Ibid.
- ⁷Ibid., pp. 108-109.
- ⁸For a full account of post-war agrarian politics see: W. L. Morton, The Progressive Party in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960) and L. D. Courville, "The Conservatism of the Saskatchewan Progressives," CHA Historical Papers, 1974, pp. 183-212.
- ⁹W. R. Young, "Conscription, Rural Depopulation, and the Farmers of Ontario, 1917-19," Canadian Historical Review, September 1972, pp. 289-320; throughout the war farm journals criticized the cost of the war, treatment of conscientious objectors, and repeatedly denounced militarists and armed preparedness. See Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 373.
- ¹⁰Thomas P. Socknat, "Canada, Imperial Foreign Policy and the Abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1921," M.A. Thesis, University of Nebraska, Omaha, 1967.
- ¹¹Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 374.
- ¹²The Canadian Friend, January 1919, p. 10.
- ¹³Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 164.
- ¹⁴An exception was S. D. Chown's effort to promote the League in local congregations of the Methodist Church.

430. ¹⁵Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," pp. 185,
- ¹⁶Ibid., p. 261.
- ¹⁷Allen, The Social Passion, pp. 314-315.
- ¹⁸Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 362.
- ¹⁹Ibid., p. 368; Allen, The Social Passion, pp. 196, 313.
- ²⁰Allen, The Social Passion, p. 313.
- ²¹The Christian Guardian, October 4, 1922, p. 12.
- ²²The Globe (Toronto), 4 July 1923.
- ²³Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 366.
- ²⁴The Christian Guardian, 11 October 1922, p. 6.
- ²⁵Ibid.
- ²⁶Ibid., 20 February 1924, p. 1.
- ²⁷Ibid.
- ²⁸Ibid., 2 April 1924, p. 13.
- ²⁹Ibid.
- ³⁰Ibid., 9 April 1924, pp. 4-5.
- ³¹Allen, The Social Passion, p. 318.
- ³²Christian Guardian, 11 October 1922, p. 6.
- ³³Allen, The Social Passion, pp. 319-320.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 322-323; Kirby Page was the secretary of the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order in the United States, a socialist-pacifist organization.

³⁵Allen, The Social Passion, pp. 323-324; Christian Guardian, 4 June 1924, p. 4.

³⁶Christian Guardian, 28 May 1924, p. 5; 4 June 1924, p. 6; 18 June 1924, p. 7.

³⁷Ibid., 16 June 1924, p. 7.

³⁸Ibid., 23 July 1924.

³⁹Ibid., 28 May 1924, p. 14.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Ibid., 3 September 1924, pp. 4, 7.

⁴²Ibid., 7 January 1925, p. 4.

⁴³Ibid., 23 July 1924, p. 4.

⁴⁴Ibid.; Allen, The Social Passion, p. 324.

⁴⁵R. Edis Fairbairn, Apostate Christendom (London: Ken-Pax, 1948).

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷United Church of Canada Archives (UCA), Army and Navy Board, Box 24, file 507.

⁴⁸Ibid., Rev. J. H. Bateson, Secretary, Wesleyan Army and Navy Board to Rev. T. A. Moore, Secretary, Army and Navy Board of the Methodist Church of Canada, May 27, 1916.

⁴⁹Ibid., Fairbairn to Moore, 17 June 1916.

⁵⁰Ibid., Moore to Fairbairn, 1 August 1916.

⁵¹Christian Guardian, 23 July 1924, pp. 5, 23; 24 September 1924, p. 5.

⁵²Ibid., 7 January 1925, p. 6.

⁵³Ibid., 25 March 1925, p. 5.

⁵⁴Ibid., 3 December 1924, p. 5.

⁵⁵Ibid., 20 May 1925, p. 11.

⁵⁶Ibid., 24 September 1924, p. 6; Allen, The Social Passion, p. 326.

⁵⁷During the inter-war years Fairbairn wrote over sixty-five articles for the Christian Guardian and its successors the New Outlook and the United Church Observer.

⁵⁸Allen, The Social Passion, p. 344.

⁵⁹Richard Roberts, "How the Fellowship Began," Fellowship, IX (January 1943), p. 4.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 5; UCA, Richard Roberts Papers, file 31, Gwen R. P. Norman, "Richard Roberts," unpublished manuscript, 1966.

⁶¹Norman, "Richard Roberts," pp. 73, 82.

⁶²Richard Roberts Papers, Box 2, file 39, M. A. Coffey, U. S. Attorney to Roberts, 13 December 1917.

⁶³Ibid., Hodgkin to Roberts, 9 November 1917.

⁶⁴Ibid., Roberts to Brockway, 19 September 1916.

⁶⁵Richard Roberts, "The Problem of Conscience," International Journal of Ethics (April 1919), p. 337.

⁶⁶Ibid.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 338.

⁶⁸Norman, "Richard Roberts," p. 91.

⁶⁹W. A. Gifford, et. al., The Christian and War (Toronto, 1926).

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 18.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 90.

⁷²Ibid., p. 96.

⁷³Ibid., p. 219.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 221.

⁷⁵Allen, The Social Passion, p. 330.

⁷⁶Among those pacifists who endorsed The Christian and War were Arthur Dorland in The Canadian Friend, R. Edis Fairbairn in The New Outlook, and Violet McNaughton in the Western Producer.

⁷⁷Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 380.

⁷⁸Saskatchewan Archives Board, Saskatoon (SABS), Violet McNaught Papers A1.E95(2), Laura Jamieson, WIL circular letter, 26 March 1931; Woodsworth Papers, Manuscript Group 27, III, C7, Vol. 2, J. S. Woodsworth to Hattie, 25 August 1921.

⁷⁹McNaughton Papers, A1.H.32(1), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Vancouver Board, pamphlet, n.d.

⁸⁰Donald M. Page, "The Development of a Western Canadian Peace Movement," The Twenties in Western Canada, edited by S. M. Trofimenkoff (Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1972), p. 90.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 91.

⁸²McNaughton Papers, AL.H.32(1), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Vancouver Branch, pamphlet, n.d.

- ⁸³Page, "Western Canadian Peace Movement," pp. 89-90.
- ⁸⁴McNaughton Papers, A1. E. 95 (1), McNaughton to Jane Addams, 4 October 1927.
- ⁸⁵Page, "Western Canadian Peace Movement," pp. 89-90.
- ⁸⁶Ibid., p. 93.
- ⁸⁷McNaughton Papers, A1. E. 52, Laura Jamieson to McNaughton, 20 October 1924.
- ⁸⁸Ibid.; Gertrude Bussey and Margaret Tims, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915-1965 (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1965), p. 39.
- ⁸⁹Ibid., p. 49.
- ⁹⁰Christian Guardian, 18 June 1924, pp. 11, 22.
- ⁹¹Ibid., 21 May 1924, p. 3; Bussey and Tims, Women's International League, p. 49.
- ⁹²Evening Telegram (Toronto), 6 June 1924, p. 15; Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 103.
- ⁹³Margaret Stewart and Doris French, Ask No Quarter (Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company, 1959), pp. 140-141.
- ⁹⁴The Canadian Friend, July 1924, p. 7.
- ⁹⁵Minutes of the Genessee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1924, p. 25.
- ⁹⁶The Canadian Friend, August 1926, p. 17.
- ⁹⁷Ibid., April 1928, p. 15.
- ⁹⁸Gifford, et. al., The Christian and War, p. 207.

⁹⁹The Christian Guardian, 9 April 1924, p. 5.

¹⁰⁰Ernest A. Dale, Twenty-One Years A-Building, A Short History of the Student Christian Movement of Canada, 1920-1941 (Toronto: SCM, n.d.), p. 5.

¹⁰¹Allen, The Social Passion, p. 321.

¹⁰²Dale, Twenty-One Years A-Building, p. 21. An exception was J. Davidson Ketchum, a returned war veteran who had been a German prisoner of war. Ketchum remained prominent in the SCM leadership.

¹⁰³Margaret Beattie, A Brief History of the Student Christian Movement in Canada, ed. by the SCM (Toronto: SCM, 1975), p. 16.

¹⁰⁴Ibid. The Student Volunteer Movement was a parent organization of the SCM devoted to the study of Foreign Missions for the purpose of encouraging students to become missionaries.

¹⁰⁵Canadian Student, February 1924, p. 151. N. A. Mackenzie later became a Canadian authority on international law.

¹⁰⁶The Varsity (University of Toronto), 11 January 1924, special supplement.

¹⁰⁷Beattie, The SCM in Canada, p. 19.

¹⁰⁸WILPF, Vancouver Branch, pamphlet, n.d.

¹⁰⁹McNaughton Papers, A1. E. 95 (1), McNaughton to Jane Addams, 26 October 1927.

¹¹⁰Laura Jamieson, "How Did the Peace Conference Turn Out," The Church Review, n.d., p. 8, McNaughton Papers, A1. E. 52 (2).

¹¹¹McNaughton Papers, A1. E. 52 (1), "Addresses Given at the Peace Conference Held on June 28th 1929," and "Resolutions Passed at the Farm Women's University Week."

¹¹²Ibid., Jamieson, "How Did the Peace Conference Turn Out?", p. 8.

¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹⁴Page, "Western Canadian Peace Movement," p. 100; McNaughton Papers, A1. E. 95 (1), Agnes Macphail to McNaughton, 1 March 1929; Jamieson, WIL newsletter, 7 September 1929.

¹¹⁵Despite their anti-war and anti-imperialist prejudices, French Canadians were not receptive to pacifism, probably because of their conservative Catholicism. On the other hand, there is no clear explanation for the general lack of support for the peace movement in the Maritimes; perhaps it is related to a possible conservative pro-imperial spirit.

¹¹⁶McNaughton Papers, A1. H.32 (1), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Canadian Section, pamphlet; Beatrice Bridgen was to become an influential exponent of social radicalism as well as pacifism in the interwar era. For more on her see: Beatrice Bridgen, "One Woman's Campaign for Social Purity and Social Reform" in Richard Allen, ed., The Social Gospel in Canada (Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1975), pp. 36-62.

¹¹⁷Ibid.

¹¹⁸Ibid.

¹¹⁹Ibid.

¹²⁰McNaughton Papers, A1. D. 69, J. S. Woodsworth to McNaughton, 4 March 1924.

¹²¹Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 393; Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1921, p. 22; ibid., 1926, p. 12.

¹²²Isa M. Byers, Report of the Canadian School History Textbook Survey Committee (Toronto: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Toronto Branch, 1931).

¹²³Ibid.; Page, "Western Canadian Peace Movement," p. 93.

¹²⁴James Willis Howard, "A Study of Cadet Training in the Dominion of Canada," Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell University, 1936, Abstract.

¹²⁵Military Training in Canadian Schools and Colleges
(Toronto: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom,
Toronto Branch, 1927).

¹²⁶Page, "Western Canadian Peace Movement," p. 93.

¹²⁷Stewart and French, Ask No Quarter, p. 140.

¹²⁸Ibid., p. 88.

¹²⁹McNaughton Papers, A1. E.95(1), Alice Loeb to McNaught,
6 May 1925.

¹³⁰Howard, "A Study of Cadet Training," abstract.

¹³¹Military Training in Canadian Schools.

¹³²Ibid.

¹³³The Canadian Friend, May 1929, p. 1.

¹³⁴Minutes of the Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1917.

¹³⁵Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1920,
p. 23.

¹³⁶Minutes of the Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1924,
p. 11.

¹³⁷The Canadian Friend, September 1928, p. 12.

¹³⁸Ibid., May 1929, p. 1.

¹³⁹Military Training in Canadian Schools.

¹⁴⁰The Canadian Friend, September 1928, p. 12.

¹⁴¹Military Training in Canadian Schools.

- ¹⁴²Page, "Western Canadian Peace Movement," p. 95.
- ¹⁴³Ibid., p. 97.
- ¹⁴⁴New Outlook, 3 January 1926, p. 11.
- ¹⁴⁵Ibid., p. 4..
- ¹⁴⁶Page, "Western Canadian Peace Movement," p. 97.
- ¹⁴⁷New Outlook, 17 October 1928, p. 4.
- ¹⁴⁸Nelson, Peace Prophets, p. 8.
- ¹⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 8-10.
- ¹⁵⁰Albert S. Rogers, "The London Conference," The Canadian Friend, October 1920, p. 18.
- ¹⁵¹Ibid.
- ¹⁵²Ibid.
- ¹⁵³Mahatma Gandhi, "Non-Violence -- the Greatest Force," The Canadian Friend, November, 1926, p. 7.
- ¹⁵⁴Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1920, p. 22.
- ¹⁵⁵Ibid., 1921, p. 7.
- ¹⁵⁶Ibid., 1920, p. 21.
- ¹⁵⁷Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1922, p. 8; The Canadian Friend, March, 1922, p. 11; Fred Haslam, 1921-1967 A Record of Experience with Canadian Friends (Quakers) and the Canadian Ecumenical Movement (Toronto: Society of Friends, 1970), pp. 12-13.

- 158 Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1921,
p. 22.
- 159 Interview with Arthur G. Dorland, 29 January 1976; Arthur
G. Dorland, Former Days and Quaker Ways, A Canadian Restrospect,
p. 192.
- 160 Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," p. 364.
- 161 Ibid., pp. 364-365.
- 162 Ibid., p. 365.
- 163 The Canadian Friend, August 1923, p. 8.
- 164 Page, "Canadians and the League of Nations," pp. 365-366.
- 165 Ibid., p. 367.
- 166 The Canadian Friend, December 1923, p. 8.
- 167 Minutes of the Canada Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1920,
- 168 Minutes of the Canadan and Genesee Yearly Meetings, 1930,
- 169 The Canadian Friend, January, 1927, p. 11; July, 1927,
p. 21.
- 170 Ibid., September, 1928, p. 12.
- 171 Frank H. Epp, Mennonite Exodus (Altona, Manitoba:
D. W. Friesen and Sons, Ltd., 1962), p. 146.
- 172 Ibid., p. 139.
- 173 Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, p. 253.
- 174 Ibid., pp. 255-257.

¹⁷⁵Makaroff's contributions are discussed in the following chapter.

¹⁷⁶Allen, The Social Passion, p. 339.

¹⁷⁷Woodsworth Papers, M. G. 27, III, c7, v. 2, J. S. Woodsworth to E. D. Morel, 12 May 1924.

¹⁷⁸Nelson, The Peace Prophets, p. 122, Nelson claims this became the typical approach of British and North American pacifists in the twenties.

¹⁷⁹Brock, Twentieth-Century Pacifism, p. 128, Brock notes that this general upsurge in pacifist feeling throughout the English-speaking world at the end of the twenties was illustrated in a whole spate of popular anti-war novels, plays, and memoirs which appeared in the years 1928-30. One such Canadian novel was Charles Yale Harrison, Generals Die in Bed (London, 1930, reprint ed., Hamilton, Ontario: Potlatch Publications, 1975).

¹⁸⁰The idea of framing the Peace Pact and hanging it in schools seems to have been originated by Rev. Harold T. Allen, a United Church minister in British Columbia, and thereafter gained the support of the Dominion government through the effort of Dr. Hugh Dobson, the western field secretary of the United Church Department of Evangelism and Social Service. Hugh Dobson Papers (in personal file of A. R. Allen), William Deans to Dr. Hugh Dobson, 19 August 1929; Dobson to W. L. Mackenzie King, 23 December 1929; interview with Harold T. Allen, 18 May 1976, Hamilton, Ontario; for more on Harold T. Allen see: Harold T. Allen, "A View from the Manse: The Social Gospel and Social Crisis in British Columbia, 1929-1945," in Richard Allen, ed., The Social Gospel in Canada, pp. 154-185.

¹⁸¹The New Outlook, 19 September 1928, p. 2.

¹⁸²Ibid.

¹⁸³Ibid.

CHAPTER V
CEMENTING THE BONDS WITH SOCIAL RADICALISM
IN THE EARLY DEPRESSION YEARS

While an inter-war peace coalition gained momentum after the mid-twenties, Canadians enjoyed a period of economic prosperity marked by the largest wheat harvest on record in 1928. As the 1920's drew to a close, however, the short-lived boom collapsed and Canada, along with the United States, Great Britain and most other industrial nations, found herself in the great depression, the social and economic upheaval which characterized Canadian life for the next decade. Following the great Wall Street Crash of 1929 the Canadian situation grew steadily worse. The price of wheat tumbled while unsold grain surpluses increased each year. Years of crop failure spelt economic disaster for Canada, a crisis further aggravated by severe drought on the prairies. Meanwhile, unemployment mounted in urban areas and by 1933, with approximately one out of every two wage earners out of work, Canada was in the middle of the most serious challenge to her social and economic structure.

Canada was not alone in her despair, however, and Canadians became increasingly aware of the international ramifications of the depression. Industrial capitalism was face to face with the deepest crisis of its history, and liberal democratic regimes and ideology

were thrown on the defensive before collectivist and racist solutions. In partial reaction to economic plight, for instance, Japan was the first to defy the post-war ideal of collective security by moving into Manchuria in 1931, and by 1933 Hitler's Third Reich had replaced the Weimar Republic in Germany, promising simple solutions to colossal economic confusion and unemployment. The international situation gradually deteriorated and by mid-decade the optimism of the peace movement was severely shaken by increased fascist aggression.

In the meantime, amid the depression years of the early thirties, Canadian pacifists strengthened their alliance with League of Nations internationalists and the radical left in the quest for both peace and social justice at home and abroad. In regard to international tensions pacifists continued to place their faith in disarmament, but on the domestic scene, as new groups promoting radical solutions to the economic crisis proliferated, pacifist sentiment became closely linked with social radicalism, particularly since the new radical social gospel with its pacifistic sympathies had socialist inclinations. Since the Great War liberal pacifists had come to appreciate the positive uses of the state to secure greater social welfare and, hence, they believed, the institutionalizing of more pacifistic arrangements in society. That did not, of course, run counter to their belief that human nature was essentially good -- just that new social and economic circumstances required a more collective response to social needs. Consequently, pacifists were influential in the

various socially radical groups organized in response to the depression; especially during the first half of the thirties, the peace movement became unequivocally allied with the movement for radical social change.

The new decade of peace activities began with the organization of socially concerned Toronto pacifists around a small nucleus of activists. One was Richard Roberts. Since his arrival at Toronto's Sherbourne United Church in 1927, Roberts had become an influential force within both the Student Christian Movement and the wider peace movement.¹ By the Spring of 1930 Roberts and Dr. W. P. Firth, a Quaker, succeeded in organizing the first chapter of the Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) in Canada, and within a year the Toronto organization attracted approximately 300 members from varied religious, political and social affiliations.² Afterward, various peace groups across the country adopted the name of the Fellowship but Canadian pacifists did not attempt to affiliate with the international parent organization until the late thirties.

One of the first activities of the new FOR was its cooperation with affiliated Toronto peace groups, such as the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in sponsoring an "All Day Peace Conference" on Armistice Day, 1930.³ The Primary organizers of the event were Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the FOR, and G. Raymond Booth, executive secretary of the FOR and chairman of the Toronto Monthly Meeting of Friends.⁴ Ceremonies began on a

religious note with the decoration of graves of "Heroes of Peace" at Mount Pleasant Cemetery by a variety of religious and political leaders, including the Venerable Archdeacon J. C. Davidson of the Anglican Church, Rabbi Samuel Sachs, Controller James Simpson and the poet Wilson Macdonald. A young people's program featured a showing of "High Treason," a British film with a peace lesson, to hundreds of high-school pupils followed by a discussion led by Earl Lautenslager, a theological student at Victoria College.⁵ The main speaker of the peace conference was J. S. Woodsworth. In the afternoon he led a series of group discussions on the "psychological, political, and economic causes of war" and proposals for pacifist action in light of the social and economic problems of the day.⁶ The Canadian Forum, emphasizing the radical tone of the pacifists, later reported a general conviction of the conference that

war has its roots in almost every branch of human activity, but the taproot feeds upon social injustice, and the economic insecurity of great masses of people in every part of the world.⁷

The climax of the conference was Woodsworth's address to a public meeting on disarmament sponsored by the Toronto branch of the WIL and chaired by Dr. Salem Bland. Delivered at Yorkminster Church, Woodsworth's address was broadcast over the Toronto radio station CFRB.⁸

Also on the program was a poetry reading by Wilson Macdonald. Macdonald's poems, especially those concerning war and human nature, were popular among Canadian pacifists.⁹ An example is the following poem entitled "War":

His feet are rotting
 From a slow gangrene;
 His tusks are yellow
 And his eyes are green.
 But the church of god
 Calls him sweet and clean.

His flesh is livid
 With copper-hued sores.
 He ravishes lads
 And he sleeps with whores.
 But the church of god
 Lets him in her doors.

His eyes are founts
 Of greed, hate, lust.
 And he killed high freedom
 With a quick, cold thrust.
 But the church of god
 Has declared him just.

O Church of god,
 Where the great hymns roar,
 Is that man, Jesus,
 Going from your door?
 Is he going to make room
 For your red saint, War?¹⁰

The WIL took advantage of the Toronto conference to begin circulation in Canada of the "International Declaration of World Disarmament," a petition in support of disarmament which was being distributed in forty-seven different countries.¹¹ Initiated by Lord Robert Cecil, joint president of the League of Nations, the Declaration was publicized by the WIL in Great Britain where it received the official support of the League of Nations Union, many churches, political parties, labor organizations and peace societies.¹² As in Toronto, the WIL groups in Winnipeg, Regina, Edmonton and Vancouver began circulating the Declaration during their respective peace conferences in 1930. Within a few months the Declaration for

Disarmament had been endorsed by the Annual Convention of the United Farmers of Ontario, the Federated Women's Institutes of Toronto, the Board of the Women's Missionary Societies of the United Church, the Women's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of Western Ontario, Eastern Ontario and Quebec, the National Women's Missionary committee of the Church of Christ (Disciples), the Women's Auxilary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada, the National WCTU and the National Council of the YWCA.¹³

The enthusiastic response of Canadian women's groups to the Declaration for Disarmament suggests that disarmament had become one of the major international issues of the day. Indeed, the world-wide petition for disarmament was intended to consolidate public support for the International Disarmament Conference scheduled to commence at Geneva in February 1932. Since an earlier conference had ended in failure in 1927, the new prospect for disarmament had become the major hope of pacifists in the early thirties and was viewed with both anxiety and urgency. In Canada, the campaign for disarmament received the dedicated support of all major pacifist groups, particularly the WIL who told its members that it was "imperative that public opinion be thoroughly educated, and that the peoples be pledged to give every support to the cause of Disarmament, both before and when the Conference begins."¹⁴

As part of their preparation for the upcoming disarmament conference, the Toronto branch of the WIL held a special "Summer School" or "Institute" for the American and Canadian WIL sections

at the end of May 1931. The Institute was held at Wymilwood, the women's union of Victoria College and was the first summer school in which the Canadian WIL had a direct part.¹⁵ Prime initiator of the event was Anna Sissons, wife of Professor C. B. Sissons of Victoria College (cousin of J. S. Woodsworth). As the new president of the Toronto branch she was instrumental in WIL activities throughout the decade. Organized around the theme "The Economic Basis of Peace," the Institute was attended by representatives from Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit and seven Canadian cities. Among the guest speakers were Emily G. Balch, president of the United States section of the WIL and Jane Addams, the international president. Agnes Macphail, honorary president of the Canadian section, chaired a timely discussion on "Preparing for the Disarmament Conference in 1932".¹⁶

By the summer of 1931 the WIL was actively joined in the campaign for disarmament by the Canadian National Council of Women, reflecting the united demand for disarmament by the member organizations of the Women's International Organizations. The Canadian local councils were particularly motivated in this regard by Lady Aberdeen, the president of the International Council of Women and original founder of the National Council of Women in Canada.¹⁷ Lady Aberdeen noted with pride the enthusiastic response of the Canadian National Council and its local councils to the disarmament campaign and wrote:

It will be a great satisfaction to me to be able to report to the International Council of Women, and the other National Councils of Women, how energetically the Canadian Women are promoting this great world campaign for promoting peace.¹⁸

An example of this peace work was the resolution passed by the Toronto Local Council of Women urging the Canadian Government to insist that any disarmament convention reached at Geneva require all signatories to assume control of industries in their respective countries which manufactured the "primary equipment of war".¹⁹ In another vein, Miss M. Winnifred Kydd, president of the Canadian National Council of Women, conducted a speaking tour of Eastern Canada in support of the Disarmament Conference and urged local councils to take an active interest in international affairs.²⁰ The following year when Miss Kydd was appointed an official member of the Canadian delegation to the Disarmament Conference, Lady Aberdeen was overjoyed with the achievement of the Canadian National Council of Women. "I always feel it was Canada," she confessed, "that taught me the practicality of both N.C.'s and of the I.C.W. and prepared me for the further development with which I have been identified."²¹ In a broadcast from Geneva made through the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting Company, Miss Kydd reported to the Canadian public on the progress of the Conference and praised the work of Canadian women for peace:

I am convinced that you, who have laboured so devotedly to have these petitions signed and placed before the Conference, are largely responsible for this more friendly atmosphere in which our work is proceeding. I appeal to you not to relax your efforts.²²

The world-wide promotion of the International Declaration on Disarmament was successful in collecting over eight million signatures from fifty-six countries.²³ In Canada the disarmament petition and the Geneva Conference in general received both encouragement and publicity from pacifist and internationalist elements. Violet McNaughton, for instance, reported that over 2,000 signatures were collected in Saskatoon alone, while The New Outlook devoted the cover of its February 10, 1932 issue to Lord Cecil and his disarmament petition circulated by the WIL.²⁴

The United Church was a strong supporter of the peace campaign and disarmament in particular. While international discussions took place in Geneva, a special committee of the General Council of the United Church was appointed to consider the issue under the leadership of Richard Roberts. Asserting that "war is contrary to the mind of Christ," the committee called upon ministers and members of the Church to "redouble their efforts everywhere to stir up such a conviction in these matters as has never been known before."²⁵ Concerning disarmament, the committee advocated the abolition of the private manufacture of armaments but confessed that it would take "something sterner and more influential than mere resolutions" to influence one of the largest and richest of industries.²⁶

A year later when it became apparent that the Geneva Conference was headed for failure, Roberts wrote Prime Minister R. B. Bennett that the Disarmament Conference was bound to miscarry "because of the absence of a thorough-going realism in its proceedings."²⁷ Roberts argued that the basis for disarmament discussions at Geneva were "far too much occupied with questions that are hardly more than academic in view of the new and awful possibilities" of the one dominant threat in any future war -- the bombing aeroplane. Since there was little defense against air attacks and "no means of defending a city from a night attack by air," the new military strategy would concentrate upon the element of surprise -- striking the first blow -- "in which case such a formality as a declaration of war would hardly be considered." The ultimate significance of this revolutionized theory and practice of war, Roberts concluded, was that the brunt of the next war would fall upon non-combatant populations, "and in particular upon the dwellers in cities."²⁸ Consequently, traditional arms and the strategy and tactics appropriate to them were no longer relevant to meaningful disarmament talks. Given this "prevision of future war," Roberts urged that Canadian representatives of the League of Nations take the lead in organizing another disarmament committee

for the single purpose of getting the nations to look frankly at the actual facts bearing upon the production and development of arms and materials for aerial warfare, and in that light to endeavour to envisage the situation which would immediately be created in the event of an outbreak of war.²⁹

Not only did Prime Minister Bennett fail to act upon Roberts' suggestion, the popularity of disarmament itself began to wane by mid-decade as the attention of the peace movement turned to the question of imposing sanctions against aggressor nations. Roberts was one of the few pacifists who came close to articulating the stark reality of the disarmament question; the peace movement as a whole sublimated the failure to disarm nations in an upsurge of interest in individual war resistance and the quest for social justice.

As evident from the disarmament campaign, one of the most active groups in the Canadian peace movement was the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. For the most part the WIL emphasized practical issues such as the question of cadet training in the schools. The campaign launched during the 1920's to substitute the cadet system with classes in physical education met with some success in the thirties, particularly in Winnipeg and Toronto.³⁰ In both instances the final outcome resulted from a concerted effort by WIL women to separate militarism from education. One of the tactics of the Toronto branch was to nominate members as candidates for the board of education.³¹ Once a member of the board, however, it was not easy to persuade Toronto's civic leaders, many with imperialist sympathies and military memories, to abolish the cadet system. The issue finally came to a head when Mrs. Ida Siegel, member of the Toronto board of education for Ward Four and WIL activist, publicized

the practice of financially rewarding teachers according to the number of cadets in their classes, which in turn resulted in favoritism shown to cadets over other students.³² When the Toronto board of education discontinued cadet training in 1931 the cadet uniforms were distributed among boys in the poor areas of the city.³³

The moving spirits of the Toronto WIL during the thirties were Anna Sissons, president, and Alice Loeb, secretary.³⁴ Under their guidance, the Toronto WIL organized annual peace demonstrations on Armistice Day with numerous organizations participating.³⁵ Such demonstrations, often featuring a parade of banners and posters renouncing war, were characteristic of pacifist efforts to keep alive the public demand for peace. In 1936 the Toronto WIL and the Society of Friends sponsored a one-day national conference concerning the special Geneva Conference on peace called by Lord Robert Cecil. Their special guest was the well-known British pacifist, Maud Royden.³⁶ Dr. Rose Henderson, member of the Toronto board of education and the Toronto WIL, was selected to represent Canada at the International WIL Congress also slated to meet in Geneva.³⁷ Dr. Henderson, who had also served as the Canadian delegate to the WIL Congress at the Hague in 1922, had been instrumental in organizing a competition for peace posters in Toronto's technical schools.³⁸ Over 150 posters were submitted and exhibited in a new art gallery opened by Arthur Lismer, the Canadian artist and member of the famous "Group of Seven".³⁹ Other school competitions in the interest of peace included the writing of essays and peace plays.

Violet McNaughton remained a leading figure in the western WIL and it may have been under her inspiration that a school girl from Saskatoon won second prize in an international peace essay competition. Throughout the thirties McNaughton maintained regular correspondence with WIL women across Canada and was in "fairly constant" contact with Katherine D. Blake, chairman of the Committee on International Relations for the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs.⁴⁰ Through Blake, McNaughton was kept abreast of the current drift of international peace activities.⁴¹

The growth of the WIL in western Canada in the 1930's, however, was hardly spectacular. In 1930 the Edmonton Peace Study Group, under the leadership of Nellie McClung, became a full-fledged branch of the WIL, increasing the number of Canadian branches to four as well as peace groups in Brandon, Regina, Saskatoon and Calgary. As a direct result of McNaughton's influence, a peace group in Moose Jaw became affiliated with the WIL in 1934 and by 1938 two new WIL groups were formed in Jasper and Edson, Alberta.⁴²

The women of the WIL, however, had other rows to hoe in the 1930's. McNaughton continued to draw much of her inspiration and many of her ideas on the discussion of current affairs from the dynamic Vancouver WIL branch and their president, Laura Jamieson.⁴³ By 1932, however, Jamieson devoted less time to the WIL than to radical political pursuits. She was particularly active in the Vancouver section of the League for Social Reconstruction (LSR), a newly formed national organization dedicated to the establishment of socialism in

Canada.⁴⁴ Jamieson joined a co-operative, mainly composed of the unemployed in Burnaby, British Columbia, because she felt strongly that "co-operative associations are the intermediate steps between the present order and the socialist state."⁴⁵ The Social Reconstruction clubs, however, were not radical enough for McNaughton who described them as "fifty years behind the time." "The crisis is so acute here," she confided to Jamieson, "that one hardly feels like studying academic measures when what we need is something dynamic and immediate."⁴⁶ Similar sentiments were echoed in Toronto where numerous WIL members were active in radical politics. Alice Loeb, for instance, headed a CCF membership drive under the slogan: "Socialism for Canada in Our Time."⁴⁷ The increasing sympathy of Jamieson, McNaughton, Loeb and other WIL women for radical social change was fairly typical of the transition of the entire Canadian peace movement during the depression.

The worsening economic situation in Canada, with its accompanying personal hardships and widespread discontent, increased the popularity of radical social, economic and political alternatives throughout most levels of Canadian society. Those Canadians deeply involved in the peace movement found socialism to be a natural extension of their desire for a new social order, and in effect, mixed the basic ingredients of both pacifism and socialism together in their dream of a peaceful, co-operative and just society. But the association

of pacifism and socialism carried with it the responsibility for a new level of social criticism and once authorities began to persecute those, such as Communists and "Communist sympathizers," who advocated radical social alternatives, pacifists were quick to speak out in defense of free speech and endangered civil liberties. ✓

In January 1931, for instance, the Toronto branch of the Fellowship of Reconciliation planned to hold an open forum on the topic of free speech.⁴⁸ Speakers for the occasion were to be Dr. Salam Bland and Rev. John Lowe of Trinity College, Toronto. Invitations were also sent to General Draper, the Toronto Chief of Police and Judge Coatsworth, a member of the Police Commission, to present their case to the audience. Instead, the Police Commission blocked the meeting under the pretense that FOR members were "thinly-veiled Communists."⁴⁹ Once the FOR learned it would be denied the use of a hall, its Executive Secretary, Richard Roberts, complained to Judge Coatsworth and warned General Draper that the police department would be in a "wholly indefensible position" if it forbade the proposed meeting of the FOR. "There will be no more communism there," he assured Draper, "than in your own office."⁵⁰ Since Roberts' plea was ignored by the authorities, the FOR sent a delegation to the Toronto City Council demanding the restoration of their rights of free speech and assembly which had been denied by the Police Commission. They also presented a petition asking for a judicial enquiry into the activities of the Commission.⁵¹ In its report, the editors of the

Canadian Forum suggested that the inference that the FOR was communist inspired was so "manifestly absurd" that

even those who would give their moral support to the campaign for 'stamping out the reds', will be inclined to doubt whether the Commission has sufficient intellectual ability to distinguish between the 'disruptive' and 'respectable' elements in the community.⁵²

The Police Commission, charged the Forum, represented an alliance of militaristic and religious fundamentalist bodies while the FOR was backed by liberal elements, and the clash between the two groups reflected the economic developments of the depression.

At no time in the past history of Canada has there been such an accumulation of wealth at the top of the social scale, and such an accumulation of distress on the lower levels. This sudden increase of inequality must inevitably produce unrest on the one hand and uneasiness on the other.⁵³

Inevitably, the defense of the liberal tradition of free speech had a radicalizing effect upon Canadian liberal pacifists. One of the earliest manifestations of radical social criticism in Canada was the formation of the League for Social Reconstruction (LSR) by two small groups of intellectuals, mainly university professors, in Montreal and Toronto.⁵⁴ The new organization was formally launched in January 1932 following the adoption of a manifesto or plan of action which described the LSR as

an association of men and women who are working for the establishment in Canada of a social order in which the basic principle regulating production, distribution and service will be the common good rather than private profit.⁵⁵

Largely modeled on the Fabian Society in Britain, the LSR was designed primarily as a research and education organization. By 1933, for instance, seventeen LSR branches with a total membership of five hundred met monthly across Canada.⁵⁶ Besides their branch activities, the LSR also sponsored public meetings with guest speakers such as Fenner Brockway, the British pacifist and socialist, and Reinhold Niebuhr and Harry F. Ward, the radical American theologians representative of the pacifist-socialist bias of the Union Theological Seminary in New York.⁵⁷ In this manner, perhaps inadvertently, the LSR not only spread the gospel of socialism but of pacifism as well.

In addition to their educational activities, the LSR also engaged in important research work. By 1934 four pamphlets were produced by the research committee while the following year marked the appearance of their monumental book, Social Planning for Canada, the first comprehensive blueprint for democratic socialism in Canada. The book presented a survey and analysis of the Canadian economic system as well as the application of socialist reconstruction to the Canadian scene, advocating both public ownership of major capitalist industries and the reform of the remaining private sector. Concerning international affairs, the authors reflected the socialist view that war was the "inevitable outcome of capitalist imperialism." Not surprisingly, the book was generally condemned as a "major heresy" by those in government and in the business community.⁵⁸

Beside J. S. Woodsworth as honorary president, the LSR national executive included Frank Underhill, J. F. Parkinson and Eric Havelock, all professors at the University of Toronto, Frank R. Scott, a professor of law at McGill and J. King Gordon, a professor of Christian ethics at the United Theological College in Montreal. Probably the strongest pacifist statements of an LSR member came from G. M. A. Grube, a professor of classics at Trinity College, Toronto. In the pages of the progressive journal, The Canadian Forum, Grube proposed that pacifism was "the only solution" to the economic and psychological difficulties that were driving the world towards another war.⁵⁹ He defined pacifism as "the refusal to resort to arms accompanied by a sincere willingness to solve international problems by genuine and friendly co-operation between nations," a positive approach not to be confused with passive resistance. He explained:

It should be clear that the advice to turn the other cheek means something far nobler and far more active than merely not to strike back. . . . It clearly refers to an attitude of mind, and the exercising of a positive, restraining influence. . . .⁶⁰

Grube also maintained that to be a pacifist required a great deal of will power and "not being afraid of being thought afraid." "It is far less of an effort to follow the crowd into uniform," he wrote, "than to stand out against it."⁶¹ The modern pacifist received the strength for his convictions from religion as well as social utilitarianism, argued Grube. Pacifism, above all else, was a religion of the individual conscience. Rejecting the charge that pacifism was contrary

to human nature, Grube asserted that it was war that was incompatible with both human nature and the Christian civilized world.⁶²

Grube also had a word of warning for his fellow socialists. In reference to the growing approval of the use of violence in the movement for social change, Grube defended pacifism as the best course of action in a class war as well as an imperialist war. In fact, he thought the power of the proletariat would be irresistible if organized into a pacifist program of non-co-operation, including the general strike and refusal to bear arms or pay taxes.⁶³ Overall, despite a fairly realistic analysis of international conflicts, Grube shared the liberal pacifist faith that it was "quite possible" that wars would disappear from the face of the world in a few generations.⁶⁴

Meanwhile, the demand for social reconstruction had been given political expression in 1932. Under the leadership of J. S. Woodsworth, representatives of the Farmer and Labor parties of the four western provinces and the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees formed the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF). The new political movement aimed to establish a co-operative economic system in Canada whereby "the basic principle regulating production, distribution and exchange, will be the supplying of human needs instead of the making of profits."⁶⁵ From the very beginning, the basic philosophy of the CCF incorporated Woodsworth's particular blend of socialism and pacifism. The Regina Manifesto, for instance, called for a foreign policy dedicated to international economic co-operation,

disarmament and world peace. The new CCF agreed that "Canada must refuse to be entangled in any more wars fought to make the world safe for capitalism."⁶⁶ Some members even looked upon the CCF as the political expression of pacifism.⁶⁷

Indeed, pacifism and socialism were inseparable in the general movement for social democracy in Canada during most of the 1930's. In his study of the League for Social Reconstruction, historian Michel Horn explains the LSR's "inter-related commitment to peace and socialism" as follows:

The introduction of socialism in Canada required peace; peace required non-involvement in international capitalist rivalries which the League of Nations was doing nothing to resolve. And the best service which Canada could render to the cause of peace abroad was to introduce socialism at home.⁶⁸

Similar sentiments also characterized the more radical elements of the Canadian left including the Communist Party in Canada which supported the thesis that war could be prevented by the "might of the people."⁶⁹ According to the Marxist view, to work for peace was to oppose capitalist imperialism; therefore, the radical left supported the peace movement and actually joined pacifist societies. In the eyes of the authorities, however, the association of the radical left with anti-war activities tended to discredit the entire peace movement. In this same regard, both the moderate and radical left were considered a common threat even though there were fundamental differences between them. For instance, neither the LSR nor the CCF adopted a Marxian approach; instead, they made a broad appeal to

"industrial workers, farmers and the 'middle classes'" by using a mixture of liberal humanitarian, democratic socialist and Judaeo-Christian arguments that capitalism was immoral because it exploited, for personal gain, other peoples and nations.⁷⁰ Although not directly affiliated with the CCF, the LSR became an unofficial "think tank" responsible for the "core ideology" of the CCF.⁷¹ Besides this unofficial advisory role, however, individual LSR members took an active part in CCF activities.

Representative of their social gospel roots, many LSR members, including some key figures, also held dual memberships in the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order (FCSO), a newly formed Canadian organization which viewed socialism not only in political and economic terms but as the practical application of radical Christianity as well.⁷² Christian socialists believed that the social crisis confronting Canadians during the depression was ultimately a religious problem that required a religious interpretation and response. The social gospel movement which might have attacked this problem was, they believed, too infected with liberal optimism to provide a basis for the radical changes required by the crisis at hand.⁷³

The roots of the movement can be traced back to 1930 when J. King Gordon, R. B. Y. Scott and a Vancouver study group which called itself "The Fellowship" began to work for the replacement of capitalism with Christian socialism.⁷⁴ Subsequent communication between the Vancouver activists and a Toronto group headed by John Line,

a professor of history and religion at Victoria College, resulted in the formation of the Movement for a Christian Social Order (MCSO) in 1931, and further consolidated in January 1932 as a "Christian Socialist Movement."⁷⁵ The British Columbians were now organizing themselves as the League for Christian Social Action under the presidency of Harold T. Allen, and a Christian Commonwealth Youth Movement was being promoted by Warwick Kelloway of Dominion United Church, Ottawa, and later of Calgary. As J. Russel Harris, secretary of the MCSO, confided to Allen, the objective was to establish "a left wing group within the Church to arouse a new conscience."⁷⁶ Finally, in April 1934, a number of United Churchmen, both lay and clerical, met at Queen's University in Kingston to found a national Fellowship for a Christian Social Order.⁷⁷ The founders, familiar names in the LSR and the peace movement, described the FCSO as

an Association of Christians whose religious convictions have led them to the belief that the creation of a new social order is essential to the realization of the Kingdom of God.⁷⁸

In order to convert fellow Christians to their cause, FCSO members organized study groups and social action groups across Canada, released statements on various social and economic problems, gave lectures to public gatherings and summer schools, contributed articles to the religious and secular press and published a bulletin, Christian Social Action, which reached a circulation of 3500.⁷⁹

The FCSO hoped to attract young people through the Christian Commonwealth Youth Movement (CCYM) founded by Kelloway. As president of the CCYM national council, Kelloway urged Canadian youth to help

Christianize the social order and thereby avoid the dangers of "violent revolution or Fascist dictatorship."⁸⁰ The FSCO helped initiate CCYM units across the country and co-operated with them in joint projects. By 1933 the bulk of the CCYM membership was centered in Montreal and Ontario under an Eastern Council in Ottawa and in Alberta under a Western Council in Calgary. The Calgary group also served as the National Council and sponsored a weekly radio program entitled "The Voice of Youth."⁸¹

Central to the Movement was its "unqualified opposition to war," and, in order to further that cause, the CCYM advocated two types of action. First was the call of support for the League of Nations, qualified, however, by refusal to approve the use of military sanctions. Such sanctions were believed to be identical with the methods of war and therefore would result in "mass murder and destruction." According to the CCYM, peace could only be built on a foundation of social health but sanctions were merely "an attempt to repress from without the irruption of disease from within." That disease was imperialism, economic nationalism, militarism and anarchy.⁸²

Secondly, the CCYM urged affiliation with the War Resisters' International (WRI) and endorsed the WRI declaration:

War is a crime against humanity. We therefore are determined not to support any kind of war and to strive for the removal of all causes of war.⁸³

Those Canadians who wished to join the CCYM were asked to complete a pacifist-oriented questionnaire in which they were asked if they would bear arms or otherwise support war, if they favored the use of military or economic sanctions by the League of Nations, if they would use violence in a class war or strike, and if they favored the socialized state.

The CCYM's joint emphasis upon pacifism and socialism reflected the particular radical approach of the FCSO, as well as that of the LSR and the CCF. Indeed, in his study of the FCSO Roger Hutchinson agrees that the "radical ethic of absolute ends -- the Kingdom of God as an immanent possibility; and the pacifist ethic of absolute means -- non-violence and the abolition of war, co-existed in the same movement."⁸⁴ The FCSO constitution, for instance, condemned the capitalist economic system as not only responsible for war but as entirely contrary to the Christian ethic and suggested salvation rested in the creation of a new society which would offer the "opportunity to practice the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount."⁸⁵ Rather than the historic "non-resistance to evil" of Jesus, however, the pacifism extolled by the FCSO was the modern version of non-violent resistance or, as they called it, "non-co-operative action." The FCSO maintained that only the "pressure of publicly-expressed non-cooperation" would force capitalist governments to settle international disputes peacefully. Therefore, FCSO members pledged themselves to "the most effective non-co-operative action in which

we can engage in the event of war and in times of peace."⁸⁶ Their declaration was nothing less than a united commitment of Christian socialists to the contemporary pacifist ethic and it represented one of the first direct calls for non-violent resistance as a realistic means of social action in Canada.

In another vein, pacifism was also viewed as the best method by which the Church could ease the impact of radical change upon society. According to the FCSO's first chairman, J. King Gordon, the function of religion was "to mitigate acts of violence in social change by introducing ethical aspects to offset hatreds, cruelty, etc. which are inevitably associated with social conflicts."⁸⁹ Thus, the radical Christianity proposed by the FCSO included inseparably intertwined aspects of socio-political radicalism and pacifism.

This overall radicalism was underlined when Gordon was dismissed under controversial circumstances from his position at United Theological College. A bright young Christian socialist, King Gordon had studied under both Reinhold Niebuhr and Harry Ward at Union Theological Seminary in New York.⁸⁸ After joining United Theological College in Montreal, Gordon became noticeably active in both the LSR and the FCSO, at times extremely vocal in his criticisms of the capitalist order.⁸⁹ In 1932 he joined Eugene Forsey and J. A. Coote on a social and economic research committee for the Montreal Presbytery of the United Church. The committee publicized their findings on civil liberties, unemployment, penitentiaries and wages and dividends in the Quebec textile industry. The last area was extremely sensitive

since the chairman of Canadian Cottons, A. O. Dawson, and other prominent businessmen like William Birks, were members of the Board of Governors of United Theological College.⁹⁰

In 1933 the Board dismissed King Gordon on the grounds that they were implementing a decision of the General Council to economize.⁹¹ As a result, many ministers, particularly those in the FCSO, rushed to his defense on the grounds of academic freedom. The College finally agreed to keep him on for one more year when his supporters raised fifteen hundred dollars to pay his salary.⁹²

Among those who defended Gordon was Richard Roberts, former spiritual leader in Montreal but now in Toronto. Putting his pacifism into practice, Roberts renewed contacts with his old Montreal acquaintances in order to help reconcile the hostile atmosphere that resulted between the business community and the young social activists within the Church. In a letter to A. O. Dawson of Canadian Cottons, Roberts warned that "profound changes in the social structure" could not be averted. "But it is still open to us," he argued, "to say what changes are to come and how they will come." Then he continued:

And it is for Christian men to see to it that so far as possible the changes will come in a Christian way and take a Christian direction.⁹³

Roberts appealed to Dawson to bring together "those leaders in commerce and industry who are Christian men of good will" in order to reason together and discuss the subject of social change and the Church's role in "the ethical aspect of social processes whether economic or political."⁹⁴ The person in Montreal Roberts suggested Dawson approach

in order to begin this dialogue was R. B. Y. Scott, a professor of Old Testament literature at United Theological College and chairman of the FCSO.⁹⁵

Other than Scott, the central figures in the FCSO included John Line and Gregory Vlastos, a professor of philosophy at Queen's University. Philip Matthams, a pacifist minister from Montreal, served as FCSO national secretary until 1937. Another prominent member of the national executive was the radical pacifist, R. Edis Fairbairn.

Following his last year at United Theological College, King Gordon became the travelling secretary for the FCSO. Later, similar duties were assumed by J. Stanley Allen, a professor of natural sciences at Sir George Williams University. Known to his friends and associates as the "pamphleteer of Canada," Allen operated the Associated Literary Service from the basement of his home in Montreal and distributed FCSO and pacifist literature throughout Canada. Allen, like so many others in the FCSO, leaned towards the pacifist position in the early 1930's.⁹⁶

In 1936 the intellectual leadership of the FCSO pooled their resources to produce the book Towards the Christian Revolution.⁹⁷ Something of a religious counterpart to Social Planning for Canada, the book was a symposium of radical Christian thought which spanned the spectrum from liberal utopianism to a new radical realism. In one important respect, the authors promoted socialism as a natural derivative of Christian social ethics. In his analysis of contemporary

economics, for instance, Eugene Forsey emphasized that there was no "painless substitute for socialism." "Until Christians learn to understand and apply the lessons of Marxism," he wrote, "they cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven -- nor, probably, can anyone else."⁹⁸

The FCSO's alignment of socialism with pacifism was underlined when King Gordon suggested the political task of his generation was to organize the socialist state in order to save civilization "from the devastation of war brought on by the desperate imperialist excursions of the fascist states." "It is a matter of ironic interest," he added, "that the reactionary opponents to the Church's participation in the field of social reform . . . are the same individuals who applauded so lustily the Church's activity in furthering the war aims of modern nations."⁹⁹ In the same vein, R. Edis Fairbairn emphasized the revolutionary evangelism of the Christian gospel, arguing that the distinct function of the Judaeo-Christian religion was to generate "the negative dynamic of indignation, resentment, and revolt against the immoral and insane elements in our social structure."¹⁰⁰ To Fairbairn the most "immoral and insane" element was war.

The authors agreed, therefore, that Christianity was essentially revolutionary and that the duty of the Christians was to follow the revolutionary spirit which originated in God and demonstrate their faith through the transformation of society.¹⁰¹ Indeed, in the closing chapter Eric Havelock suggested the ideal socialized state was finally within man's reach, thus concluding on a note of liberal optimism.

But Havelock did not speak for all the contributors.¹⁰²

John Line, for instance, recognized the need for a new radical realism in Christian theology and philosophy that would move beyond religious liberalism and conservative orthodoxy, especially the need to speak more deeply to the roots of sin in both the individual and society. Very well aware of the depths of human sin, Line, Forsey and Gordon no longer viewed the Kingdom of God as a realizable historic social order, although they still believed a prophetic minority could help transform society in such a way as to bring about human fulfillment in the real world. Thus, not all the authors could be classified as liberal. They themselves rejected the label. But neither did they represent a neo-orthodoxy and the basic alienation of man from the ideal. What emerged from Towards the Christian Revolution was a radical concept of Christian social ethics based upon the realization of man's struggling existence in a sinful world. Line himself explained that outwardly their approach was similar but inwardly different from the liberal social gospel. ✓

In the "Forward" Richard Roberts endorsed the book as an important contribution to Christian thinking in a time "of strange and rapid transition." Most reviewers were also favorable. Gordon A. Sisco, executive secretary of the United Church, for instance, praised the book as "a notable contribution to radical Christian teaching" and claimed it contained a "more profound theology" than the old social gospel liberalism.¹⁰³ In 1937 the Left Book Club adopted Towards the Christian Revolution as an optional monthly book selection. In his

review in The Left News the British socialist John Strachey claimed that Towards the Christian Revolution was the book "for which many Socialists and Communists outside Church circles have been eagerly waiting." "If I may say so without offense," he wrote, "this is the first intellectually adult work, in the full sense, on the social crisis from the pens of churchmen. Its publication will leave no one of the churches untouched."¹⁰⁴ According to Strachey, Towards the Christian Revolution marked the FCSO radicals as the leading spokesmen for Christians in the modern world and he predicted it would have "profound repercussions" throughout Christendom including strong opposition from the right wing of the Church.¹⁰⁵

One of the most important critics to appear, however, was not a conservative churchman but the American theologian Reinhold Niebuhr whose earlier Marxism was increasingly qualified by his thesis in Moral Man and Immoral Society. Although he described the book as "an able presentation of the faith by which these young radicals live," Niebuhr claimed the book revealed "little understanding for the more difficult issues of the relation of Christianity to radicalism."¹⁰⁶ Contrary to Sisco's observations, Niebuhr maintained that the authors shared the same illusion characteristic of the older social gospel that the socialist commonwealth was identical with the Christian vision of the Kingdom of God.¹⁰⁷ Basically, Niebuhr agreed that Christians must recognize the necessity of an economic and political revolution for the sake of justice, but he also argued that these same Christians must "not imagine that any perennial problem of the human spirit is solved by such a revolution."¹⁰⁸ The authors of the book were deeply dis-

appointed by Niebuhr's reaction, especially those like Gordon who thought they had absorbed Niebuhr's particular brand of Christian radicalism including his cautions about reducing the Kingdom of God simply to a social order.¹⁰⁹ Perhaps the main difficulty was that the book did not represent one distinct view. Thus, the liberal illusion criticized by Niebuhr was not precisely the same radical vision espoused by Line and others.

Regardless of its international reception, however, Towards the Christian Revolution had important implications for pacifists in Canada. The authors had clearly linked pacifism and socialism in their interpretation of Christian social ethics and the pacifist witness was viewed as an important contribution to world peace. On the other hand, pacifists also began to reflect the philosophic differences separating the FCSO leadership. Some pacifists shared Fairbairn's faith that a prophetic pacifist minority would help society attain the socialist and pacifist ideal. Further along the spectrum, were those, like Forsey, with a lingering sense that the pacifist way was an important social witness but, like the perfect society, probably not historically realizable. It was a split which would become more apparent once pacifists confronted the realities of the later thirties. In the meantime, Towards the Christian Revolution boosted the stature of both the FCSO and a socially radical pacifism in Canada.¹¹⁰

It was not the FCSO, however, but an agency known as the "Alberta School of Religion" that provided the center for most radical Christian activity on the prairies. Found in 1924 by Henry M. Horricks,

a Calgary United Church minister, the Alberta School of Religion was designed as a summer refresher course of about one week to ten days duration for United Church ministers and their families.¹¹¹ During the early years, the annual sessions of the Alberta School of Religion were held at Mount Royal College in Calgary but the lack of an appropriate lecture hall necessitated the move in 1928 to St. Stephen's College in Edmonton. After a few years, however, the Board of Governors of the College became alarmed at the radical nature of the summer sessions and assumed the right to censor the program. In response the Alberta School of Religion moved its 1932 sessions to St. Joseph's College in Edmonton and then settled at the Morley Indian Industrial School in Morley, Alberta.¹¹⁵ When opposition again arose to the radical tone of the sessions, the Alberta School of Religions finally found a more permanent home at the Fairweather Christian Fellowship Camp on the Bow River approximately twelve miles from Calgary.¹¹³ Although somewhat primitive, the camp meetings provided a congenial and informal atmosphere for the discussion of radical Christian ideas.

The annual sessions were financed on a shoe-string budget which usually just barely covered the travelling expenses of the guest lecturers, but over the years the Alberta School of Religion attracted some of the best speakers available and some of the most radical Christians in the country.¹¹⁴ For instance, among the Canadians featured were Woodsworth, William Irvine, Richard Roberts, T. C. Douglas, the CCF politician from Saskatchewan, Professor John Line of the FCSO, Watson Thomson, "self-styled guru of co-operative

living," Carlyle King, the radical socialist and pacifist professor from the University of Saskatchewan, James G. Endicott, radical United Church missionary in China, and Charles H. Huestis, United Church minister and pacifist journalist.¹¹⁵ Furthermore, the impressive international guests included: H. Richard Niebuhr, Harry F. Ward, Sherwood Eddy, Scott Nearing, Leyton Richards, Cannon Stricter and A. J. Muste. Reinhold Niebuhr and the Japanese Christian pacifist leader Toyohiko Kagawa were both interested but unable to attend because of conflicting commitments.¹¹⁶

Other than Horricks, the leading forces behind the Alberta School of Religion were Charles H. Huestis, Arthur H. Rowe and Stanley Hunt, all United Church ministers from Alberta. The chief concern of the Alberta radicals was to "find some Christian economic solutions for a sick world" and to "try to do something toward a peaceful way of living together."¹¹⁷ Although the Alberta School of Religion became affiliated with the FCSO in 1935 and was therefore the representative of the FCSO in Alberta, the Horricks movement tended to place more direct emphasis on pacifism than did the FCSO. Those who joined the "Horricks Fellowship," for instance, agreed not only to refrain from the use of all "intoxicating liquors, tobacco and drugs" but made the following pacifist pledge:

I will endeavor as far as my influence goes to discourage the use of violence as a method of settling disputes among nations but will rely on love and good will as the most powerful force in all life.¹¹⁸

Despite its slightly stronger emphasis on a personal pacifist stand, the Alberta School of Religion remained affiliated with the FCSO until the pacifist issues assumed priority during the Second World War; thereafter it affiliated with the pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation in Canada.¹¹⁹

Having involved themselves so fully in the creation of new religious and secular radical movements like the LSR, the CCF and the FCSO, it is not surprising that the depression stimulated pacifists to explore the idea of experimental co-operative communities modeled on the order of the communities built by the historic peace sects. This renewed interest among liberal Protestants in Christian communal living began in Europe in partial reaction to the Great War. Among its leading proponents was Eberhard Arnold, the General Secretary of the Student Christian Movement for Germany, who founded an experimental community, first at Sannerz and later in the Rhoen hills of the Black Forest.¹²⁰ The community was based upon a communal lifestyle characteristic of the early Christians and Arnold was interested in uniting with similar Christians, particularly the Hutterian Bruderhofs of North America, in a common network of Christian co-operative communities. Accordingly, after careful consideration and months of negotiations, Arnold traveled to Canada in 1930 and lived among the Hutterian Brethren for several months. During that time he was not only received into the Hutterian Brotherhood but confirmed as a minister of the Hutterian faith as well.¹²¹ Subsequently, he reorganized

the Rhoen hills community into the "Society of Brothers", another Bruderhof in which members shared Hutterian practices and beliefs, including communal property and unconditional non-violence. Their goal was to establish "some place in the world, however small, where people actually live in brotherhood, justice and peace. . . ."122

But contrary to the rigid other-worldliness of historic peace sects like the Hutterites, the Society of Brothers fostered a more worldly hope, calling "all men to an utterly different way of life . . . a joyous aggression against all wrong."123 The days of the Rhoenbruderhof, however, were numbered. Within a year of the rise of Hitler and the National Socialists, the majority of the Brothers had fled, first to a settlement in Liechtenstein and then in 1936 to Ashton Keynes, Wiltshire, in the Cotswald district of England.

The birth of the Cotswold Bruderhof coincided with a growing interest and experimentation in communal living in Britain, especially among pacifists. Vera Brittain, for instance, appears to have shown some interest in the Society of Brothers and their radical attempt to put the "gospel of the new kingdom into practice."124 Overall, most pacifists had welcomed intentional communities as the practical expression of the "spiritual, social and economic aspects of peace-making" and therefore the first step in re-ordering society.125 The Peace Service Handbook, for example, characterized communities as "not so much an end in themselves as a means to the end" of a reconstruction of the social order based on co-operation and sharing rather

than competition and possession.¹²⁶ It was this ethical aspect of a complete communal lifestyle rather than just the economic role of producer or consumer co-operatives which was the key element of intentional communities.

The contemporary movement for co-operative communities, which had developed parallel to the Bruderhofs, was promoted in Canada by Henri Lasserre. A descendant of a wealthy Swiss family, Lasserre had embraced Christian socialism and the co-operative ideal; thereafter using his personal fortune to finance various experimental communities. As early as 1911 Lasserre and Paul Passy, the leader of the French Christian-Socialists, had founded Terre Libre, an association designed to give moral and financial support to Passy's Liéfra colony.¹²⁷ Later, in association with men like Réne Thury, Adolphe Ferrière and Paul Biru^kff, the Tolstoyan protégé who later assisted the Doukhobors in Canada, Lasserre organized the Société de Coopération Intégrale and founded the short-lived Peney co-operative colony in Switzerland.¹²⁸

Despite his disappointment in the failure of these early experiments, Lasserre remained dedicated to the idea of a wholly co-operative community, a concept he called coopératisme intégral. By integral co-operation Lasserre meant the total integration of consumer with producer co-operatives and agricultural with industrial co-operatives in order to form a truly co-operative community. He believed this radical application of the co-operative principle was both

a creative and non-violent means towards the transformation of economic society and also as moral and psychological preparation for, and partial anticipation of the new social relations of brotherhood and justice which must replace the older order.¹²⁹

In effect, Lasserre believed integral co-operative communities would lay the moral foundations necessary for the realization of a new social ethic. But where would such communities best survive? Following the collapse of the Peney Colony, Lasserre looked to North America, free from the constraining traditions and prejudices of Europe, as a fertile field for the cultivation of integral co-operatives; accordingly he emigrated to Canada in May 1921. Following several years in the Hamilton area, he finally settled in Toronto as an assistant professor of French at Victoria College.

Lasserre's arrival in Canada coincided, as it were, with labor and agrarian unrest and an increased interest in the co-operative solution. During the 1920's Lasserre established contacts with two co-operative experiments at that time flourishing in the United States -- the Llano Colony, a socialist republic in miniature, and the Columbia Conserve Company, a radical industrial co-operative -- and as a result he had high hopes of creating an international foundation for the support of similar co-operative projects.¹³⁰ He soon discovered, however, that Americans were preoccupied with the more conventional movement for consumers' co-operatives and trade unions. This lack of enthusiasm in the United States for the co-operative community idea as well as the legal and constitutional difficulties arising from international boundaries finally convinced Lasserre to confine his

plans to a strictly Canadian foundation.¹³¹ Subsequently, in association with a few kindred spirits in Toronto like E. J. Urwick, Murray Brooks, J. O. Leitch and Spencer Clark, Lasserre established the Robert Owen Foundation.¹³² The stated purpose of the Foundation ✓ was to assist in the establishment and operation of co-operative enterprises, whether producers' co-operative associations, industrial co-operatives or integral co-operative communities, and to promote interest in the co-operative movement. In effect, the Robert Owen Foundation was to act as a holding company in order to allow the co-operative group to complete ownership without jeopardizing the co-operative principle.¹³³

Lasserre found that those most receptive to his philosophy of integral co-operative communities and the Robert Owen Foundation were the radical Christians and pacifists he met through the FCSO and the Toronto FOR. With their support, the Robert Owen Foundation searched for worthy projects in Canada, especially industrial experiments, in the hope of applying the co-operative solution to the industrial disruption caused by the Depression. Although Canadian farmers had become imbued with the co-operative spirit, labor was not so inspired and the Foundation's sole attempt in sponsoring an industrial co-operative was the ill-fated Work Togs Limited of Toronto. The overalls manufacturing company operated for less than a year and with its closing the Robert Owen Foundation rapidly lost its initial enthusiasm for industrial co-operatives and turned to other co-operative pursuits.¹³⁴

For a time it appeared the Foundation could best help in establishing Christian communities such as the Society of Brothers in Britain. Following a visit to the Cotswold Bruderhof in 1938, for instance, Lasserre was so impressed with their living example of a "Christian-communist community" that he arranged for the Robert Owen Foundation to grant them a substantial loan. Although he was attracted to the spirit of co-operation and brotherhood that prevailed in the Bruderhof, Lasserre was critical of its theoretical basis, particularly with regard to the relationship between the individual and the community. Instead of sacrificing individuality to a narrow interpretation of Christianity, Lasserre argued, community life should provide the "greatest possible opportunity" for individual freedom and the creative expression of a new social ethic.¹³⁵ This attitude was largely shared as well by the Canadian pacifists who had gradually become the core membership of the Robert Owen Foundation, particularly since it reflected the gulf between themselves and the historic peace sects in Canada.

Canadian pacifists were attracted to the utopian communalism promoted by the Robert Owen Foundation because it seemed to promise the ideal socialist and pacifist lifestyle at a time when they were searching for experimental alternatives. The same attitude was shared by pacifists in Britain and the United States. In Japan, the co-operative idea was advocated by the Christian pacifist and evangelist, Toyohiko Kagawa. Kagawa, himself, was extremely popular in North

America and in the early thirties the Kagawa Co-operating Committee, an interdenominational group of Canadian churchmen, was formed in Toronto under the direction of Richard Roberts.¹³⁶ The group of approximately thirty men often met in retreats where they combined oriental meditation and prayer in privacy and in fellowship. Roberts wrote Kagawa that their program was radical and experimental for Canadians, especially since "nothing of the sort had been tried in Protestant circles in Toronto within living memory."¹³⁷

Such an experiment was typical of Roberts, however, who had advocated "radical religion" since he was first attracted to socialism as a youth in the eighteen-nineties.¹³⁸ Now the author of more than twenty books and pamphlets and various articles in religious journals, he enjoyed an important American and British readership and was known as one of the leading socially concerned intellectuals in the Church.¹³⁹ Perhaps for this reason he was chosen to become the Moderator of the United Church of Canada in 1934. As Moderator, Roberts turned his attention to the devastating effects of the depression upon Canadian life and the need for radical social and economic change. Speaking to a meeting of unemployed men at Toronto's Church of All Nations in April 1936 he proclaimed that the Church was committed to the establishment of a new social order based upon economic and moral prerequisites.¹⁴⁰ It was not only the Church's business, he argued, but also its right to guarantee that society allow man to rise to "his full spiritual height," a condition denied by the capitalist order. Roberts admitted he was skeptical of Canadian political

processes to achieve social and economic justice but he warned against the use of violent revolution. Roberts was hardly a marxist, and had actually opposed the FCSO position in 1933. Although he endorsed the Antigonish Co-operative Movement in Nova Scotia as a step in the right direction, he left future social and economic reconstruction rather open ended.

Nevertheless, the socialist and pacifist views of the Moderator were unmistakable and Toronto newspapers publicized Roberts' "cry for a new social order" as well as his call for a united Protestant declaration against the furtherance of any future war effort.¹⁴¹ Again, in the closing address of his Moderatorship, Roberts warned the General Council that general resolutions condemning war were not adequate and called upon the United Church to join with other Protestants in a specific stand against war.¹⁴² The opportunity for such common action, he hoped, would be provided by the Oxford Conference of the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work scheduled for 1937.

The important influence of churchmen such as Roberts and those in the FCSO notwithstanding, pacifists remained a minority in Canada's Protestant churches. In fact, neither the Baptists nor the continuing Presbyterians showed much interest in pacifism.¹⁴³ After T. T. Shields of Toronto's Jarvis Street Baptist Church and his arch-fundamentalists were purged from the Baptist Convention in 1927, Ontario and Quebec Baptists began to show "a more unreserved interest in social questions," but they remained somewhat wary of such a

controversial issue as pacifism.¹⁴⁴ The Anglican Church, on the other hand, did address the issue of war and the Christian conscience.

For the most part, Anglicans reflected the general declaration of the 1930 Lambeth Conference in England that war was incompatible with the teachings of Jesus, but they stopped short of adopting a strictly pacifist approach. For instance, although they criticized and opposed all defense programs, Anglicans specifically recognized the right of Christian citizens to bear arms while serving their country.¹⁴⁵ Despite the uneasiness of most Anglicans with pacifism, there were a few leading Anglican pacifists in Canada, such as John Frank, rector of Trinity Anglican Church, Toronto and father-in-law of the British pacifist organizer, Dick Sheppard. Another was Frank's assistant at Trinity, John F. Davidson, who had been influenced by the SCM and was associated with Upper Canada College during the 1930's and 1940's.¹⁴⁶

Of all the Protestant churches in Canada, however, the United Church was the one most profoundly affected by pacifism and the one which ultimately became seriously divided over the issue.¹⁴⁷ Because of its close association with the social gospel and its concern with contemporary social ills, the United Church was naturally attracted to the peace movement as another field for responsible Christian action. Not only did the left wing of the church supply the peace movement with leading radical spokesmen, but the General Council, as well, encouraged the growth of pacifism without itself adopting

a strictly pacifist position. In each of their sessions during the thirties the General Council openly debated the issue of peace and passed successive resolutions condemning war as contrary "to the mind of Christ."¹⁴⁸

In 1934 the Sixth General Council of the United Church declared:

We believe armed warfare between nations to be contrary to the spirit and teachings of Christ, and that it is the duty of the Church to promote a Christian public opinion in opposition to war, to seek a complete abolition of national armaments and the placing under international control of whatever armed forces may be necessary to protect the world's peace in an emergency, with the cultivation of true international conscience.¹⁴⁹

Furthermore, all ministers were "earnestly requested" to promote the concern for international peace within their congregations, especially among young people.¹⁵⁰

Ernest Thomas later reported that the most difficult task faced by the Council was not the consideration of its opposition to war, but the question of conscientious objection to military service. Two proposals were presented for debate: one favored "an official register of those who will pledge themselves in advance to render no military obedience;" the other suggested that "membership in the United Church should be a guarantee of conscientious objection to armed service."¹⁵¹ While the latter was quickly rejected, the first idea raised the question of sanctioned civil disobedience and resulted in a lengthy debate. In the end, the Council over-ruled a vocal minority and decided the Church could not "take a step which savored of organized 'concerted disobedience'."¹⁵² The General Council did,

however, uphold the principle of conscientious objection as long as the conscientious objector was a person who "is so clearly governed by conscience as supreme that he will accept the civil consequence of disobedience."¹⁵³

Regardless of whether they shared these views or were "unable, as yet, to take a thoroughgoing pacifist position," the Council expressed thankfulness for the "amazing outburst of hostility to war, particularly in colleges, which has of late startled the English-speaking nations."¹⁵⁹ In conclusion, the General Council suggested that the peace movement "may be the agency through which war may be made impossible, at least among Christian peoples. . . ."¹⁵⁵

Despite repeated resolutions, the United Church hesitated to provide their members with a more specific sense of direction concerning Christian responsibility in time of war. In 1936, W. A. Gifford, leading author of The Christian and War, the Canadian pacifist statement of the twenties, accused the United Church of not having the "moral authority to implement her declarations of principle" and suggested that the public was "paying less and less attention to them."¹⁵⁶ In reference to the deteriorating international situation, Gifford challenged the Seventh General Council, which was about to convene, to "guide the public mind" on the question of war and more specifically: "What shall we say to our boys?"¹⁵⁷ Concerning the chaplaincy, Gifford urged the Council to take immediate action to receive government assurance that ministers would be free to serve men at war "in the habiliments of the priesthood, not of the military" and therefore not compromise their personal witness against war.¹⁵⁸

Rather than produce any specific prescriptions for Christian action in time of war, however, the Seventh General Council merely adopted the general declaration that

in view of the extremely critical world situation, and the numerous evidences that the present policy of many nations is leading -- towards war, this General Council, on behalf of the United Church of Canada, reaffirms its loyalty to the pledged word of Canada and the British Commonwealth in the Pact of Paris, "renouncing war as an instrument of national policy." We accept as solemn and urgent responsibility the necessity of defining and demonstrating in our faith and life the things that make for peace, and our determined opposition to war.¹⁵⁹

On the other hand, in a proposal of outright pacifist dimensions, the Council suggested that Christians "must be prepared to follow Christ in turning from war" Furthermore, in regard to the interdependence of peace and social justice, the Council echoed the pacifist argument that the roots of war could be destroyed "only as we humanize commerce, moralize society, spiritualize education, and built an international order of equity and love."¹⁶⁰

While encouraging the pacifist ethic and the Canadian search for peace, the United Church never really endorsed an outright pacifist position. Neither did it provide clear guidelines for Christians confronting the issue of war. In reference to the General Council's numerous declarations condemning war, J. S. Woodsworth asked: "Precisely what is meant by these statements? . . . In the event of war -- which may not be so removed as many imagine -- what is to be the attitude of the Church?"¹⁶¹ As one who shared a certain responsibility in the formation of Canadian policy, Woodsworth wondered where the

Church would stand in the event of an international crisis. "General statements are not enough," he stated. "What concretely should be the policy of Canada?"¹⁶² He particularly wished to know if the Church would advocate civil disobedience and if so if such a policy would extend to active participation in war, the making of munitions and assistance to those engaged in war. Woodsworth called upon the Church to "give some guidance in these definite matters of national policy."¹⁶³

In some respects the United Church had attempted to offer this guidance, particularly in their open discussions of the peace issue in their Councils, in the Church press and in its general support for the peace movement. One of the leading spokesmen for the Church in this regard was Ernest Thomas. Since the resurgence of pacifism in the mid-twenties, Thomas had demonstrated "a notable sense of realism" in his appraisal of international questions.¹⁶⁹ Contrary to Fairbairn's radical condemnation of the "war system" as the root cause of war, for instance, Thomas blamed "exclusive nationalism directed by fallible men" and suggested that this danger could be overcome by the slow and painful process of building what he called institutions of social determination, included among which were those of international co-operation and goodwill.¹⁶⁵ Thomas welcomed the prophetic role of pacifists within the church but he also warned that "no one should lightly assume that his passionate revolt against some existing evil guarantees prophetic insight. . . ."¹⁶⁶ Nevertheless, Thomas believed that there was "little doubt as to the obligation

of the Church to release such spiritual energies as make for the elimination of war."¹⁶⁷ The proper responsibility of the church, he argued, was to provide the "spiritual forces" which would help man "withstand the tendencies which made for war."¹⁶⁸

In the thirties Thomas continued this line of thinking in The Quest for Peace, a pamphlet issued by the Board of Evangelism and Social Service of the United Church in order to help study groups focus attention on the Christian basis for the abolition of war.¹⁶⁹ Thomas defined peace as the "co-operative effort to bring about changes." "Peace is much more than absence of fighting," he wrote.

There is not so very much difference in moral quality between the spirit which fights to prevent another people achieving some required change, and that which tells the other people that their anxieties are no concern of ours. The latter is no more peaceful than the former -- indifference or contempt is no better than hate.¹⁷⁰

In regard to the responsibility of Christian citizens in time of war, Thomas claimed he "dare not assume responsibility for formulating the decision of his readers" since conscientious objection to military service, something which affected the very foundations of society, was a matter of individual conscience.¹⁷¹ Thomas did suggest, however, that prospective conscientious objectors base their convictions upon Christian belief rather than the utilitarian view that private or concerted refusal of military service would be an effective political tool to prevent war. In conclusion, he cautioned his readers not to mistake the "glorious impatience with war" character-

istic of the peace movement, "for a deep-seated change of attitude and an abiding determination that, no matter what the issue may appear to be, war shall not be recognized." While in sympathy with the latter aim, Thomas argued that, in the reality of another world crisis, "it will take more than an emotional dislike to overcome the new urge."¹⁷²

In contrast to the prevailing pacifist mood of the social gospel, Thomas represented a new outlook of "internationalism realism" similar to what was later called Niebuhrian.¹⁷³ At times he was sharply critical of outright pacifism and those who espoused it. In 1934 Thomas criticized "quite adversely" Kirby Page's plea to the Federal Council of Churches for "an out-and-out pacifist pledge", and claimed pacifists were guilty of "philosophical anarchism."¹⁷⁴ The opposite view was taken by William B. Creighton, editor of The New Outlook. Creighton accused Thomas of being caught up in the "argumentative soundness" of the pacifist campaign for an anti-war enlistment when what was really important was whether or not it "would help to make war less possible."¹⁷⁵ Creighton questioned Thomas' criticism of Christians for "striving to reach what they believe to be their high principle touching this issue" and suggested that if a large percentage of Christians shared the pacifist stand of Quakers, "a world war would become very shortly an impossibility."¹⁷⁶

Creighton's enthusiasm for the peace movement was characteristic of The New Outlook during most of the inter-war period. The editorial page, for instance, often endorsed pacifist works by such writers as A. A. Milne, Max Plowman and Aldous Huxley.¹⁷⁷ Huxley's "The Case

for Constructive Peace" was hailed as a "sane pacifist philosophy" built on a "firm and convincing base."¹⁷⁸ In another vein, the popular British pacifist Vera Brittain adorned the cover of the November 21, 1934 issue of The New Outlook when it featured her article on "Youth and War."¹⁷⁹

Overall, Creighton believed that the Christian Church was the best force to undertake a "powerful and desperate" campaign against war, but he wondered

if the church had it left in her to do that sort of thing any more -- to fight against vested interests and strongly entrenched prejudices and popular follies and inconsistencies with a strong and persistent and somewhat ruthless hand.¹⁸⁰

Instead, Creighton suggested that organizations and movements outside the Church possessed these qualities and were using them "in campaigning for just and righteous causes more aggressively and effectively than the Church. . . ." In Creighton's view the Church was "called to militancy and an aggressive activity in the interests of world peace" and he warned that

it will be a sorry thing for her, and for the world before which she is supposed to bear her witness, if she should fail to engage in her task with a heroic courage and a noble enthusiasm.¹⁸¹

For the most part, Creighton, as well as many other Canadian Protestants with pacifist sympathies, condemned war as unchristian without implying absolute pacifism and sidestepped the whole issue of the Christian duty in the event of war.¹⁸²

There was a strong pacifist element within the United Church which had been nurtured throughout the interwar years. Many of these pacifists were involved in radical organizations such as the LSR, CCF and FCSO where they combined their work for peace with that for social justice. Through these and other activities, United Church pacifists became some of the leading proponents of the peace movement in Canada.

One such pacifist was Charles Herbert Huestis, the Alberta School of Religion promoter who served as the executive secretary of the Canadian Lord's Day Alliance in the nineteen thirties. During that time, Huestis became well-known for his column in the Toronto Daily Star in which he discussed current topics of interest from a radical pacifist viewpoint. For instance, in reference to the whole question of armament manufacturers reaping huge profits, Huestis reported that Canadians were "getting all fused up emotionally over the matter" and were in "danger of missing what ought to be the real lesson . . . namely, that the armament business is a quite legitimate product of our political and economic system."¹⁸³ He warned that the arms industry and war, like the liquor trade, were representative of modern capitalism. On another occasion Huestis proposed that churches and educational institutions canalize the fighting instinct of man to oppose nationalism.

Here, one would say, is a better job for the church and the school and one more sure of success than organizing pacifist movements which deal with the symptoms only of war rather than with the disease.¹⁸⁴

Huestis admitted that he was impressed with the "pragmatic" base for pacifism which blamed war on capitalism, imperialism and nationalism, but he was not fully persuaded by that argument alone. In the end, he told his readers, pacifism is the Christian way. When confronted by challenges from Mussolini and Hitler, however, Huestis confessed that pacifists like himself were in a dilemma: Could they remain pacifists and Christians if the Nazis attempted to impose their will upon mankind by force?¹⁸⁵

The reference to Hitler and Mussolini reflected the attitude of the Star's publisher, J. E. Atkinson. Despite his pacifist sympathies, Atkinson feared that the rise of fascism would ultimately lead to a world war, a fear strengthened by the fact that the Star was one of the first publications to be banned from Germany by Hitler.¹⁸⁶ Nevertheless, he remained conscientiously averse to inflaming war passions and throughout the thirties the Star published gruesome photographs from the First World War as graphic proof of the horror of war and regularly carried pacifist articles by Huestis on the editorial page.¹⁸⁷

At the same time, W. B. Creighton was urging his readers to wage peace "as men have waged war." The editor of The New Outlook, maintained that the peace movement had been "too long confined to the halls of academic discussion, and to the pulpits and platforms of the churches." What was needed was to take the discussion into the crowd. "We need to get down to individual study of the causes and effects of war," he wrote, "and individual enlistment in the cause of peace."¹⁸⁸

To this end The New Outlook endorsed Dick Sheppard's peace pledge petition in Britain and urged Canadians to sign a similar pledge initiated in Canada by J. Lavell Smith, minister of Westmount Park United Church, Montreal.¹⁸⁹

Lavell Smith, one of the leading figures in Montreal's pacifist circle, had served in the army during the First World War with the army of occupation on the Rhine. Upon his return to Canada, Smith completed his university training at Victoria College. During the 1920's he attended Union Theological Seminary in New York. There, under the influence of Harry Emerson Fosdick and other pacifist theologians, he embraced pacifism.¹⁹⁰ As a member of both the FCSO and the Fellowship of Reconciliation in Montreal, Smith was representative of the concern for peace and social justice among young radical ministers.

The peace movement in Canada took a new turn in the autumn of 1934 when Smith called upon his fellow members of the United Church, both lay and clerical, and his fellow Canadians to join him in a peace pledge modeled after Dick Sheppard's famous pledge of war renunciation. "I am convinced that the time is more than ripe for such an appeal here in Canada," he wrote, "and now, after long hesitancy, I am acting in accordance with my convictions in making such an appeal."¹⁹¹ Smith lamented that the international situation kept getting worse while the peace movement had failed to "prevent anything approaching thoroughgoing action for peace." "What can we do about this?" he asked. His suggestion was the individual pacifist stand:

I have for some years been convinced that the greatest service I can render to the cause of peace is that I shall declare myself to be utterly and unalterably opposed to war. The evils flowing from war are as terrific that I am determined that war shall never again have my support. No international situation can possibly be so serious as to call for the employment of the agency of warfare whose proven results are so thoroughly evil.¹⁹²

What was needed, claimed Smith, was "some convincing demonstration" of public opinion in favor of pacifism and for that reason he initiated a peace pledge in Canada borrowing the very phraseology of Sheppard's Peace Pledge Union: "I renounce war and never again, directly or indirectly, will I support or sanction another war."¹⁹³ Smith urged all who were willing to take the pacifist stand to sign the pledge and sent it to him without delay in order that Canadians "may have the encouragement of knowing that many others stand with them, and in order that our Government may be aware of this body of opinion."¹⁹⁴ In the end, Smith collected from three to four thousand signatures.

Prior to public disclosure, Smith had shown his pacifist pledge to his FCSO associate, Professor John Line of Toronto. Line agreed "heartily with every word" and agreed that the refusal of individuals to participate in war was the "only means finally to prevent its recurrence." Moreover, Line suggested that "the people who will never again assist in war are now a large body, and I think it only right that our rulers should know of this."¹⁹⁵ If war came again, Line declared, he would not only have no part in it himself but would also urge that course upon others, "including potential combatants." In

conclusion Line suggested that the pledge would serve as a warning to the Canadian government not to get involved in war.¹⁹⁶

Another who publicly endorsed the pledge was the social gospeller, Stanley Knowles. "It is my feeling," he wrote, "that our governments ought to know something of the extent of pacifism amongst individual citizens."¹⁹⁷ While he agreed with Line that the awareness of wide-spread pacifist sentiment would "have some effect as a deterrent" to Canada entering war, Knowles felt there was "something further that our governments ought to know." There were hundreds of pacifists, he claimed, who would not only withhold their support in the event of war but would actually do all within their power, without violence, to hinder the war effort. What specific action would pacifists take? Knowles suggested they

would seek to persuade others, including potential combatants, to desist. We would be strike-organizers at munitions plants, and would encourage the crippling of domestic economic processes. We would use our pulpits, or whatever means might be available, to put barriers in the way of carrying on the war.¹⁹⁸

A declaration of war, Knowles insisted, would be "a signal for drastic, positive action on the part of pacifists prepared to pay any personal price for peace."¹⁹⁹

This general concern in 1934 with the individual pacifist commitment also affected Canadian youth. That autumn the World Student Christian Federation, the international SCM, sponsored a questionnaire among Canadian university students to determine what students thought

about war and "under what circumstances, if any, they would support their country in a war."²⁰⁰ The survey, headed by the McGill Daily, was conducted through student newspapers across Canada. Students were asked if they believed there would always be wars and whether they would support the Canadian government in any war, only in certain wars or in no war at all. The questionnaire also attempted to discover what specific actions students would take in the event of war, such as enlisting voluntarily, refusing all service or actively opposing the war in other ways.²⁰¹

The results of the poll indicated that, of those students who responded, the majority did not believe that wars were inevitable.²⁰² Out of 497 responses at McGill, 233 reported they would support the Canadian government in a just war, 134 would not support any war, while only 83 would support Canada in any war she declared.²⁰³ At McMaster University the anti-war position was even more noticeable. Out of a total of 275 students, only eight declared unreserved support for Canadian participation in war. Otherwise, 148 agreed to support a just war, while 89, or 35% of those polled, definitely refused to support Canada in any future war.²⁰⁴ At both McGill and McMaster the majority of respondents revealed that in the event of war, they would either "refuse military but render humanitarian service" or refuse all service. A large number of the students also agreed to actively oppose a war effort by refusing to pay taxes, engaging in a general strike or, the most popular action, organizing peaceful mass protests and petitions.²⁰⁵

Overall, the war questionnaire circulated in 1934 revealed that Canadian university students were, indeed, in sympathy with the general peace movement abroad in the land. In fact, the campaign for disarmament and war renunciation captured the attention of students as much as the effects of the depression. While not necessarily radical, student opinion was strongly opposed to war.

During the thirties, as during the twenties, university students were most often drawn into the peace movement through the Student Christian Movement. In order to create public support for disarmament in 1931, for example, student committees across the country organized public meetings and circulated an SCM initiated petition to R. B. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada. Signed by ten thousand Canadian university students, the petition urged the Prime Minister to "ensure that Canadian influence will be exerted vigorously on behalf of significant reduction of armaments" at the 1932 Geneva Conference.²⁰⁶ Indicative of their radical orientation, SCM students often linked war with capitalism and argued that, as long as that condition remained, there would be a continuous, de facto war.

In the end of the day, having done all we can to mitigate or avoid an open holocaust, we peace-makers are exactly what the militarists say we are -- naive visionaries -- unless we are willing to kill war where it is born. That is the private ownership of machines.²⁰⁷

A similar argument was raised in the McGill student magazine The Echo. The author, C. T. Howell, blamed war on nationalism, war debts, capitalism and the breach between capital and labor. "For the safety of civilization and the survival of humanity," he wrote,

"present world economic relations must change . . . the war-system has got to be smashed."²⁰⁸ Howell suggested that a peace spirit recognized

that true pacifism does not merely involve non-resistance in war time; but it also means that, in times of peace, specific programmes, concrete and constructive, will be created and applied in education, religion, and industry to try remove the basic causes of war, and to strengthen the permanent peace-system now growing -- a challenge anything but simple, cowardly, or negative. This is the expression of true patriotism stripped of its flags and bayonets.²⁰⁹

In 1935 the SCM unit at the University of Toronto initiated an annual Armistice Day Peace Service as an alternative for those students who did not wish to participate in the traditional military remembrance. The first SCM Service drew a capacity crowd of 700.²¹⁰ Also in 1935 the SCM National Council appointed a special committee to formulate the SCM position on peace and war. The committee report affirmed the SCM's opposition to war "as contrary to the mind of God and his purpose for man as revealed in Jesus Christ" and endorsed the "power of Love as expressed in and operative through human relationships" as the means to bring about the new social order.²¹¹ The logical implication of this position, the committee claimed, was the personal renunciation of war. In recognition of the SCM's responsibility for peace education, the report recommended several courses of action for local SCM units: co-operation with the League of Nations Society; protests against militarism, narrow patriotism and fanatic nationalism; the utilization of Armistice Day for meetings and parades to arouse peace consciousness; the use of questionnaires and peace ballots.²¹²

The SCM also supported another peace activity of North American youth known as the "Peace Caravan." Begun by the American Friends Service Committee in the 1920's, peace caravanning was an annual summer custom of university students who toured the United States, stopping in small towns to hold public meetings on peace and international issues.²¹³ In 1934 Canada was added to the tour and John Copithorne, a young Canadian Friend and member of the Toronto Youth Council, joined the Caravan. Following two weeks of training at the Institute of International Relations in Durham, North Carolina, Copithorne teamed up with a young American and toured Ohio, New York and Ontario. They spent the summer spreading the gospel of pacifism to political, social and religious groups meeting in churches, clubs and on street corners.²¹⁴ The New Outlook praised the peace caravan for its enthusiasm and idealistic spirit and suggested it would give the peace movement "a little of the glamour or romance that great and good movements sometimes lack." "It is quite true that idealism and romance may not be able to establish world peace and far-reaching international goodwill on a secure and safe basis," wrote the editor, "but they may be used, and used very effectively, toward that end."²¹⁵

Although it was not always an annual event in Canada, the Peace Caravan remained a popular activity throughout the thirties and received the financial support of Canadian Friends and the SCM.²¹⁶ Besides his role in the Peace Caravan, Copithorne was secretary of the Toronto branch of the League of Nations Society and contributed to a monthly column to The Canadian Friend entitled "Peace Parade" in

which he reported on the general progress of the peace movement in light of international crises.

Whether in the peace caravan or the SCM, Canadian youth had assumed an important role in the inter-war peace movement. The personal pledges of university students to resist war and their growing demands for social change were further evidence of the revolutionary potential of a socially radical pacifism. And no group was more committed in this regard than the Society of Friends which had moved further towards the left under the impetus of the depression. ✓ To be sure they continued some fairly traditional activities and attitudes but they were also deeply in tune with the student peace movement. They could hardly object to the deepening interest in peace issues manifested in the lively debate in the United Church. The communal aims of the Robert Owen Foundation was too much like a page from their own past to be ignored, and increasingly their own statements sounded like those of the FCSO. Thus, the Quakers were central to the growth of a socially radical peace movement in Canada.

The involvement of Quakers in the movement for peace and social reconstruction was now the responsibility of the Canadian Friends Service Committee (CFSC), founded in 1931. At first the CFSC only ✓ represented the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meetings but subsequent support from the Conservative Friends meant that for the first time all three branches of Canadian Quakers were united behind one committee and spoke with a unified voice.²¹⁷ One of the first actions of the

new committee was an appeal to Prime Minister Bennett for the appointment of suitable Canadian delegates to the Geneva Disarmament Conference in 1932.²¹⁸ The second annual meeting of the CFSC reaffirmed the Quaker Peace Testimony and emphasized that pacifism was a "positive, practical recognition of the universal fatherhood of God, brotherhood of man and sacredness of human personality." Pacifism, the committee declared, was the full and practical application of the Sermon on the Mount.²¹⁹

An example of a practical activity was the creation of a Toronto Peace Library and reading room in the Toronto Friends Meeting House. With the assistance of G. Raymond Booth, secretary of the Toronto Monthly Meeting, an interdenominational committee representing Toronto's religious and social organizations was formed in 1931 in order to establish a special library offering free circulation of books dealing with peace and war to the general public.²²⁰ Instrumental in the Toronto Peace Library Committee was Norman Mackenzie, Professor of International Law at the University of Toronto who had been active in SCM peace activities during the twenties, and several Friends, such as Booth and Fred Haslam.²²¹ In addition to its facilities in Toronto, the Peace Library mimeographed articles and sent copies to interested study groups, particularly in the rural districts of Ontario.²²² By 1938 approximately 1055 copies of articles and 116 books had been distributed across Canada.²²³ That peace literature together with an annual subscription to Goodwill, the publication of the World Alliance for Friendship Through the Churches, accounted

for the major expenditure in the section of the CFSC budget allocated to peace work.²²⁴

In conjunction with the Peace Library, the CFSC issued several pamphlets of concern to pacifists.²²⁵ One such leaflet entitled "An Alternative to Sanctions" proposed the "reconsideration of the common rights of nations and peoples to share equitably in the resources of the world." It was sent to Members of Parliament and to the press only to receive a limited but critical response.²²⁰ Another pamphlet was "The Economic Crisis" by Fred Haslam, the general secretary of the CFSC. Haslam's call for fundamental social and economic changes in Canadian society was described as "the most intelligent and also as the most radical statement thus far produced by Canadian Friends."²²⁷

A major part of Quaker activities during the thirties was their co-operation with a broad range of Canadians in the consideration of radical solutions to economic and international problems. Through the initiative of Arthur G. Dorland and G. Raymond Booth, for instance, Friends joined with several other organizations to found the annual Institute of Economic and International Relations. The first Institute was held in August 1932 at the YMCA camp at Geneva Park, Lake Couchiching, Ontario.²²² The annual event received particularly good support from the United Church, FCSO and LSR, and in the summer of 1933 Eugene Forsey joined the staff of the Institute.²²⁹

Since the idea of inherent violence in capitalism pervaded pacifist thought during the inter-war years, Canadian Friends instinctively related their pacifism with the need for radical economic change. Such radical sympathies were evident in Quaker praise of the CCF as being "in the vanguard of the great forward advance" of mankind.²³⁰ Another commendation went to the Antigonish Co-operative Movement under Father M. M. Cody, an experimental but promising socio-economic reorientation of Nova Scotian farmers, fishermen, miners and industrial workers.²³¹ Pacifists were particularly interested in the adult education phase of the movement.²³² From their support of radical alternatives to specific activities like the Toronto Peace Library and the Institute for International Relations, Canadian Quakers were instrumental in the quest for peace and social justice during the thirties. ✓

During the first half of the nineteen-thirties pacifist feeling thrived in Canada and pacifists cemented their bonds with social radicalism. Although specific peace organizations were largely limited to the Society of Friends, the Women's International League and the Toronto Fellowship of Reconciliation, the peace movement in general was composed of a broad range of groups and individuals, and peace activities received wide popular support, from League of Nations internationalists to Communists. The large majority of these peace advocates, therefore, were not strictly pacifists but they eagerly accepted the label which had become synonymous with the abhorrence of

war and the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Disarmament continued to receive the enthusiastic support of peace advocates as one of the best ways of relieving international tensions. Otherwise, the peace movement was largely pre-occupied with the domestic crisis caused by the depression, and pacifists joined in the growing demand for radical solutions to the social and economic ills facing the nation.

The alignment of pacifism and socialism had been building since the Great War but it was not until the urgency of the depression years that pacifists concentrated on the necessity to eliminate or reform capitalism in order to secure both peace and social justice. Accordingly, pacifist influence was present within the various groups promoting radical alternatives: the League of Social Reconstruction, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order and its western affiliate, the Alberta School of Religion. All these groups attempted to grapple with ways to effect radical social and economic change as well as the pacifist alternative.

Churches also endorsed the movement for peace and social justice, as did student groups such as the Student Christian Movement and the YMCA and YWCA. During the thirties hundreds of young people were attracted to the peace movement and toyed with the idea of refusing to fight in any future war. In fact, the personal pledge of individual war resistance was an important pacifist tactic in Canada, although never as popular as in Britain.

The exuberance of the peace movement in the thirties, however, was short-lived. By mid-decade, as national attention again turned to the international scene, the ideals of peace and social justice were threatened by increased fascist aggression. As a result, the liberal democracy which had seemed the route to world peace was increasingly in need of defense, ultimately, it would be argued, by armed resistance. Liberal and socially radical pacifists would find it difficult to evade the crisis looming just beyond their threshold.

FOOTNOTES

¹Norman, "Richard Roberts," p. 134.

²The Canadian Friend, December 1930, p. 8.

³McNaughton Papers, E. 52 (1), "All Day Peace Conference," poster. For a copy of the poster see Appendix A.

⁴Ibid.; The Canadian Friend, December, 1930, p. 8.

⁵Ibid.; "All Day Peace Conference," poster.

⁶The Canadian Friend, December, 1930, p. 85.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., p. 8; "All Day Peace Conference," poster.

⁹For instance, R. Edis Fairbairn and several of his correspondents were particular fans and friends of Wilson Macdonald.

¹⁰Wilson Macdonald, "War," in A Flagon of Beauty (Toronto: Peace Tree Publishing Co., 1931), p. 137.

¹¹McNaughton Papers, H. 32 (1), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Toronto Branch, "Newsletter," April 1931.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Ibid., E. 95 (2), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Canadian Section, "Newsletter," 19 January 1931.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid., Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, "Preliminary Programme of an Institute on 'The Economic Basis of Peace'."

¹⁷PAC, National Council of Women Papers, Manuscript Group 28, I.25, V. 69, Lady Aberdeen to Presidents of National Women's Organizations, 24 July 1931.

¹⁸Ibid., Lady Aberdeen to Mrs. Bundy, 17 August 1931.

¹⁹Ibid., "Resolution of the Toronto Local Council of Women," proposed by Mrs. J. A. Maitland.

²⁰Ibid., M. Winnefred Kydd to All Peoples Association, London, England, 27 October 1931.

²¹Ibid., Lady Aberdeen to M. Winnefred Kydd, 14 January 1932.

²²Ibid., M. Winnefred Kydd, "Broadcast from Geneva," 28 February 1932.

²³Ibid., Statement by the Disarmament Committee of the Women's International Organizations.

²⁴McNaughton Papers, H. 32, (1); The New Outlook, 10 February 1932, p. 1.

²⁵The New Outlook, 12 October 1932, p. 940.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Richard Roberts Papers, Box 2, file 47, Roberts to Prime Minister R. B. Bennett, 12 December 1933; both J. S. Woodsworth and W. L. Grant charged that Canada had helped to undermine the success of the World Disarmament Conference by sending professional militarists like the General Staff officers General A. G. L. McNaughton and Colonel H. D. G. Crerar to Geneva as technical advisors to the Canadian delegation. See James Eayrs, In Defense of Canada, Vol. I: From the Great War to the Great Depression (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), pp. 118-119.

²⁸Richard Roberts Papers, Box 2, file 47, Roberts to R. B. Bennett, 12 December 1933.

²⁹Ibid., this passage was underlined in the original.

³⁰McNaughton Papers, E. 95 (2), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Canadian Section, "Newsletter," 19 January 1931.

³¹Interview with Ida Siegel, Toronto, 5 February 1976.

³²Ibid.

³³Ibid.

³⁴PAC, C. B. Sissons Papers, Manuscript Group 27, III, F3, V. 5, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Toronto Branch, "Newsletter," 1 November 1935.

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶McNaughton Papers, E. 95 (4), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Toronto Branch, "Newsletter," July 1936.

³⁷Ibid.

³⁸Also a well known socialist, Rose Henderson was on the executive of the Ontario Labour Party in the early thirties. See: John Manley, "Women and the Left in the 1930's: The Case of the Toronto CCF Women's Joint Committee," Atlantis, 5 (Spring, 1980): 100-117.

³⁹McNaughton Papers, E. 95 (4), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Toronto Branch, "Newsletter," July, 1936.

⁴⁰Ibid., McNaughton to Anna Sissons, 13 November 1934. Eventually Jamieson became a CCF member of the British Columbia Legislature.

⁴¹Ibid., Blake to McNaughton, 20 September 1936.

⁴²Ibid., M. Cousineau to McNaughton, 15 October 1934.

- ⁴³Ibid., McNaughton to Sissons, 13 November 1934.
- ⁴⁴Ibid., D. 34, Jamieson to McNaughton, 3 July 1932.
- ⁴⁵Ibid..
- ⁴⁶Ibid., McNaughton to Jamieson, 6 July 1932.
- ⁴⁷Ibid., E 95 (4), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Toronto Branch, "Newsletter," July 1936.
- ⁴⁸The Canadian Forum, February 1931, pp. 167-168.
- ⁴⁹Ibid., p. 168; Judge Coatsworth claimed this conclusion was based on an article sympathetic to Russia written by Rabbi Eisendrath, President of the FOR.
- ⁵⁰Richard Roberts Papers, Box 2, file 45, Roberts to General Draper, 8 January 1931 (letter mistakenly dated 1930).
- ⁵¹The Canadian Forum, February 1931, p. 168.
- ⁵²Ibid.
- ⁵³Ibid.
- ⁵⁴The Research Committee of the League for Social Reconstruction, Social Planning for Canada (Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1935; reprint ed. with an Introduction by F. R. Scott, et. al. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), p. vi.
- ⁵⁵Ibid., p. ix.
- ⁵⁶Ibid., p. xi.
- ⁵⁷Ibid., p. xii.
- ⁵⁸Ibid., p. xxiii: government and business leaders were still very suspicious and even antagonistic towards the idea of socialism.

⁵⁹G. M. A. Grube, "Pacifism: The Only Solution," The Canadian Forum, June 1936, p. 9.

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Ibid.; G. M. A. Grube, "Pacifism and Human Nature," The Canadian Forum, July 1936, p. 14.

⁶³The Canadian Forum, October 1936, p. 9.

⁶⁴Grube, "Pacifism: The Only Solution," p. 10.

⁶⁵F. R. Scott, et. al., Social Planning for Canada, p. xiii.

⁶⁶Michiel Horn, "Frank Underhill's Early Drafts of the Regina Manifesto 1933," Canadian Historical Review, 54 (December 1973): 416.

⁶⁷Interview with Carlyle A. King, Regina, 29 September 1977.

⁶⁸Michiel Horn, "The League for Social Reconstruction: Socialism and Nationalism in Canada, 1932-1945," Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1969, p. 517.

⁶⁹Tim Buck, Thirty Years (Toronto: Progress Publishing Co., 1952).

⁷⁰Michiel Horn, "The League for Social Reconstruction and the Development of a Canadian Socialism, 1932-1936," Journal of Canadian Studies, November 1972, p. 11.

⁷¹Walter Young, The Anatomy of a Party: The National CCF 1932-61 (Toronto, 1969), p. 39.

⁷²Horn, "The League for Social Reconstruction and the Development of a Canadian Socialism," p. 11. The FCSO had no connection to the former American organization of the same name.

⁷³Roger Hutchinson, "The Fellowship for a Christian Social Order: A Social Ethical Analysis of a Christian Socialist Movement," Ph.D. dissertation, Victoria University, Toronto, 1975, p. 23.

⁷⁴Interview with R. B. Y. Scott, Toronto, 9 November 1976.

⁷⁵Ibid., The New Outlook, 27 January 1932, p. 81.

⁷⁶J. Russel Harris to H. T. Allen, 11 February 1932, FCSO file in possession of Professor Richard Allen; Harold T. Allen, "A View from the Manse: The Social Gospel and the Social Crisis in British Columbia, 1929-1945" in The Social Gospel in Canada, ed. by Richard Allen (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1975), p. 162.

⁷⁷Christian Social Action, 11 (March 1940): 1.

⁷⁸Ibid.

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Norman A. Colley, ed., The Handbook of the Christian Commonwealth Youth Movement (Calgary: National Council of the CCYM, 1932).

⁸¹Ibid., pp. 15-18.

⁸²Ibid., p. 21.

⁸³Ibid., p. 22.

⁸⁴Hutchinson, "The Fellowship for a Christian Social Order," p. 24.

⁸⁵Ibid., Appendix 1, "The Fellowship for a Christian Social Order, Basis of Agreement and Constitution, 1935," p. 273.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 275.

⁸⁷Minutes of the Western Institute on Social and Economic Affairs, 1-10 July 1973, summarized version in possession of Professor Richard Allen.

⁸⁸J. King Gordon, "A Christian Socialist in the 1930's," in The Social Gospel in Canada, ed. by Richard Allen, p. 125.

⁸⁹For example see: J. King Gordon, "Capitalism -- A Played Out Creed," The Echo, 4 (Winter 1932): 15, McGill University Archives, Montreal.

⁹⁰Gordon, "A Christian Socialist in the 1930's," p. 131.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 140; Norman, "Richard Roberts," p. 156.

⁹²Gordon, "A Christian Socialist in the 1930's," p. 143.

⁹³Richard Roberts Papers, Box 2, file 47, Roberts to A. O. Dawson, 30 November 1933.

⁹⁴Ibid.

⁹⁵Ibid.

⁹⁶Interview with J. Stanley Allen, Hamilton, 4 August 1976.

⁹⁷R. B. Y. Scott and Gregory Vlastos, ed., Towards the Christian Revolution (New York, Willett, Clark and Co., 1936).

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 139.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 164.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 182.

¹⁰¹Ibid.

¹⁰²In The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethics in Canada (Toronto: Ryerson, 1961), p. 90, Stewart Crysdale uses Havelock's contribution to claim the entire FCSO leadership gave a "renewed Christian sanction" to the liberal idea of inevitable progress. A careful study of the book, however, reveals that the authors did not speak with one mind. A fairer analysis made by Roger Hutchinson in his thesis is presented here.

- ¹⁰³The New Outlook, 19 February 1937.
- ¹⁰⁴John Strachey, "The Churches Speak at Last," The Left News, May 1937, p. 369.
- ¹⁰⁵Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁶Radical Religion, Spring, 1937, p. 42.
- ¹⁰⁷Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 44.
- ¹⁰⁹For a detailed study of the relation of Niebuhr's views and those of the FCSO see Hutchinson, "The Fellowship for a Christian Social Order," especially Chapter V.
- ¹¹⁰By 1937 the FCSO included at least 265 active and associate members, many with pacifist persuasions, and FCSO study groups were organized in every province of Canada and Newfoundland. Gordon, "A Christian Socialist in the 1930's," p. 139.
- ¹¹¹Saskatchewan Archives Board, Regina (SABR), H. M. Horricks Papers, I. 2, Mrs. H. M. Horricks to Richard Allen, 22 June 1963.
- ¹¹²Ibid.
- ¹¹³Ibid.; interview with Carlyle King.
- ¹¹⁴Interview with Carlyle King.
- ¹¹⁵Horricks Papers, I. 2, Alberta School of Religion, Program of Annual Sessions, 1928-1946.
- ¹¹⁶Ibid., Mrs. H. M. Horricks to Richard Allen, 22 June 1963; T. Kagawa to Horricks, 4 September 1931; R. Niebuhr to Horricks, 16 September 1929.
- ¹¹⁷Ibid.

- 118 Ibid., "The Horricks Fellowship Pledge."
- 119 Ibid., Mrs. H. M. Horricks to Allen, 22 June 1963.
- 120 Henri Lasserre, "The Birth of a Christian Community," The United Church Observer (1 December 1941), p. 11.
- 121 Ibid. (15 December 1941), pp. 16-17.
- 122 McMaster University, Special Collections, Vera Brittain Papers, Society of Brothers file, Society of Brothers, "Men and Brothers, What Shall We Do?".
- 123 Ibid.
- 124 Ibid.
- 125 Norman Whitney, Experiments in Community (Wallingford, Pennsylvania: Pendle Hill, 1966), pp. 3-9; Peace Service Handbook, pp. 33-35.
- 126 Ibid., p. 34.
- 127 Watson Thomson, Pioneer in Community. Henri Lasserre's Contribution to the Fully Cooperative Society (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1949), pp. 9-10.
- 128 Ibid., pp. 13-15.
- 129 Ibid., p. 2.
- 130 Ibid., p. 41.
- 131 Ibid.
- 132 Ibid., p. 42.
- 133 Ibid., p. 43.

¹³⁴Ibid., p. 59; Ian MacPherson, Each for All: A History of the Co-operative Movement in English Canada, 1900-1945 (Toronto: Macmillan, 1979), pp. 144-145.

¹³⁵Thomson, Pioneer in Community, p. 82.

¹³⁶Norman, "Richard Roberts," p. 144.

¹³⁷Roberts Papers, Box 2, file 47, Roberts to Kagawa, 13 October 1933.

¹³⁸Ibid., Richard Roberts, "'Radical Religion' Forty Years Ago."

¹³⁹For a complete list of Roberts' publications see: Richard Roberts Papers, finding aid.

¹⁴⁰Norman, "Richard Roberts," p. 163; The Globe (Toronto), 25 April 1936, p. 1; The Mail and Empire (Toronto), 26 April 1936, p. 1.

¹⁴¹Ibid.

¹⁴²The Globe (Toronto), 24 September 1936, p. 2.

¹⁴³Thomas Sinclair-Faulkner, "'For Christian Civilization': The Churches and Canada's War Effort, 1939-1942," Th.D. Thesis, University of Chiago, 1975, pp. 24-26.

¹⁴⁴Ibid.; Allen, The Social Passion, p. 301.

¹⁴⁵Sinclair-Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," p. 27.

¹⁴⁶Interview with John F. Davidson, Toronto, 26 October 1976.

¹⁴⁷Sinclair-Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," p. 28.

¹⁴⁸Ibid.

¹⁴⁹The United Church of Canada, On Peace and War, Statements of the Sixth and Seventh General Councils held at Kingston 1934 and Ottawa 1936 (Toronto: Board of Evangelism and Social Service, United Church of Canada, 1936), p. 2.

¹⁵⁰Ibid.

¹⁵¹Ernest Thomas, "General Council of War and Peace," The New Outlook, 9 January 1935, p. 30.

¹⁵²Ibid.

¹⁵³Ibid

¹⁵⁴United Church of Canada, On Peace and War, p. 3.

¹⁵⁵Ibid. For peace activity in colleges and universities see below.

¹⁵⁶W. A. Gifford, "May We Hope in the General Council?" The New Outlook, 23 September 1936, p. 871.

¹⁵⁷Ibid.

¹⁵⁸Ibid.

¹⁵⁹United Church of Canada, On Peace and War, p. 1.

¹⁶⁰Ibid.

¹⁶¹The New Outlook, 17 February 1939, p. 158.

¹⁶²Ibid.

¹⁶³Ibid.

¹⁶⁴Allen, The Social Passion, p. 343.

¹⁶⁵Ibid., p. 344.

¹⁶⁶Ernest Thomas, "Should the United Church Condemn War?"
The New Outlook, 12 August 1925, p. 5.

¹⁶⁷Ibid.

¹⁶⁸Ibid., p. 6.

¹⁶⁹Ernest Thomas, The Quest for Peace (Toronto: Board of Evangelism and Social Service, United Church of Canada, n.d.), United Church Archives, Toronto.

¹⁷⁰Ibid., p. 3.

¹⁷¹Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁷²Ibid., p. 32.

¹⁷³Allen, The Social Passion, pp. 343-346.

¹⁷⁴The New Outlook, 26 December 1934, p. 1165.

¹⁷⁵Ibid.

¹⁷⁶Ibid.

¹⁷⁷Ibid.; 4 March 1936, p. 204; 28 October 1936.

¹⁷⁸The New Outlook, 28 October 1936.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., 21 November 1934, pp. 1030-1046.

¹⁸⁰Ibid., 16 May 1934, p. 352.

¹⁸¹Ibid.

¹⁸²Sinclair-Faulkner, "'For Christian Civilization'," pp. 34-37.

¹⁸³Charles H. Huestis, Biography File, United Church Archives, Toronto; The Toronto Daily Star, 1 June 1934, p. 6.

- 184 The Toronto Daily Star, 19 June 1934, p. 6.
- 185 Ibid., 18 May 1937, p. 6.
- 186 Harkness, Atkinson of the Star, p. 300.
- 187 Ibid., pp. 241, 310.
- 188 The New Outlook, 23 August 1933, p. 612.
- 189 Ibid., 21 November 1934, p. 1028.
- 190 Interview with Mrs. J. Lavell Smith, Toronto, 23 November 1976.
- 191 The New Outlook, 21 November 1934, p. 1033.
- 192 Ibid.
- 193 Ibid.
- 194 Ibid.
- 195 Ibid.
- 196 Ibid.
- 197 Ibid., 12 December 1934.
- 198 Ibid.
- 199 Ibid.
- 200 The McMaster Silhouette (McMaster University), 20 November 1934, p. 3.
- 201 Ibid.
- 202 Ibid.; Eayrs, In Defense of Canada, Vol. 1: From the Great War to the Great Depression, p. 110.

- 203 Eayrs, In Defense of Canada, I, pp. 110-111.
- 204 The McMaster Silhouette, 4 December 1934.
- 205 Ibid.; Eayrs, In Defense of Canada, I, pp. 110-111.
- 206 Margaret Beattie, A Brief History of the Student Christian Movement in Canada, ed. by the SCM (Toronto: SCM, 1975), p. 19.
- 207 Ibid., p. 21.
- 208 The Echo, Winter 1932, pp. 17-18.
- 209 Ibid., p. 18.
- 210 Beattie, The SCM in Canada, p. 21.
- 211 Ibid.
- 212 Ibid., p. 22.
- 213 The New Outlook, 2 July 1930, p. 632.
- 214 The Canadian Friend, August 1934, p. 7.
- 215 The New Outlook, 2 July 1930, p. 632.
- 216 As late as 1938 a young Canadian from Saskatchewan was caravanning for peace. Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meeting, 1938, p. 57.
- 217 The Canadian Friend, November 1931, p. 7; Haslam, Canadian Friends, p. 49.
- 218 Ibid.; Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meetings, 1932, p. 59.
- 219 The Canadian Friend, March 1938, p. 5.
- 220 Haslam, Canadian Friends, p. 50; Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meetings, 1935, p. 9.

²²¹The Canadian Friend, May 1939, p. 7.

²²²Haslam, Canadian Friends, p. 50; Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meetings, 1936, p. 56.

²²³Ibid., 1938, p. 58.

²²⁴Ibid., 1931, p. 46.

²²⁵Ibid., 1934, p. 7.

²²⁶Ibid., 1936, p. 56.

²²⁷Ibid., 1935, p. 9.

²²⁸Ibid., 1932, p. 59; Haslam, Canadian Friends, p. 50.

²²⁹Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meetings, 1933,
p. 46.

²³⁰The Canadian Friend, July 1934, p. 4.

²³¹Ibid., May 1937, pp. 8-9.

²³²Chatfield, For Peace and Justice, p. 178.

CHAPTER VI
THE CRISIS OF CONSCIENCE, 1935-39

During the latter half of the 1930's increasing international violence challenged the viability of the peace movement. The civil war in Spain, the Sino-Japanese War and German aggression all placed pacifists in an agonizing position of choosing between the preservation of democracy and social progress in the world or their pacifist ideal of non-violence. To many pacifists recently won to a new social conscience the two goals seemed so closely interrelated that choice was impossible; yet, the ineluctable march of events appeared to force the impossible choice. Concurrent with the challenge of world events, and aggravating their dilemma, was a transition in the world of theology which was now beginning to have its effect upon the theological underpinning of twentieth century pacifism. As a result of these combined influences many leading liberal and modernist Protestants began to doubt, and some abandon, their theological position in favor of neo-orthodoxy and to adopt what they considered a more realistic approach to international violence. Following such heart searching over a period of years a large number of these persons fell out of the peace movement. A more general slippage in public support became evident as the latter half of the decade progressed and, in reaction, those Canadians who remained pacifists attempted to consolidate their forces and prepare for approaching world disaster.

A rift within the peace movement separating pacifism from its temporary alliance with League of Nations internationalists and left wing anti-imperialists began to develop in response to the increase in fascist aggression at mid-decade and, in particular, to the Spanish Civil War. The debate in the former case largely centered on the use of economic and military sanctions to enforce the principle of collective security. Some pacifists like J. S. Woodsworth approved the use of economic sanctions against aggressors and for a brief time, in response to the Italian invasion of Abyssinia in 1935, it appeared the Canadian government had agreed.¹ But as the "Riddell incident" eventually proved, government officials, perhaps reflecting somewhat of an isolationist tinge in popular peace sentiment, were not ready to take such a decisive action.² Accordingly, Canada joined with member nations in removing the League's economic sanctions against Italy. The League's failure to employ economic sanctions successfully meant that internationalists who still valued collective security as the route to world peace now looked to military sanctions. On this point, however, they definitely lost the support of committed pacifists and the fissure in the peace movement widened.

A more serious question arose, however, in response to the Spanish Civil War in 1936. Besides being another instance of fascist aggression, the civil war in Spain also posed a threat of extinction for all left wing groups struggling in a newly established democracy.³ Predictably, the radical left rallied to the support of Spanish democracy and began to call for a military response. The peace move-

ment on the whole, especially that element in the vanguard of the quest for social and economic justice, found itself in an inescapable dilemma; its commitment to non-violence was in danger of being compromised by its commitment to social justice, which some inter-war pacifists had already begun to equate with the necessity to resist fascism, if need be, by armed resistance. Failure to resolve that dilemma left the pacifist movement severely weakened.

The first arm of the peace movement to adopt a more militant stance in the campaign against fascism was the radical left. The rather tenuous alliance between pacifists and radical leftists and Communists was exemplified by the League Against War and Fascism under the direction of A. A. MacLeod, a Canadian radical and former executive editor of The World Tomorrow. Reflecting a strong Christian background, MacLeod had served as the YMCA Secretary in Halifax and Chicago before first joining the staff of The World Tomorrow as business manager in 1929.⁴ Based in New York City since before the First World War, The World Tomorrow had become the leading exponent of the pacifist-socialist alignment among radical Christians. Its editors included such leading radicals as Devere Allen, Kirby Page and Reinhold Niebuhr. Their call for a militant pacifism reflected the popular view of pacifism as the best means to achieve a socialized state. Although published in the United States, the journal maintained an international flavor with regular foreign correspondents, including Canadian contributors such as Agnes Macphail and Jack Duckworth, a

young pacifist from Montreal.⁵ The World Tomorrow also followed closely the progress of the CCF and the Antigonish Movement in Canada.⁶

Since MacLeod had been born and raised amid the coal mines of Nova Scotia he was in direct sympathy with the plight of idle miners there, and in 1933 he returned to Cape Breton for a time to establish a worker's school.⁷ Two years later, following his resignation as executive editor of The World Tomorrow, MacLeod arrived in Toronto to assume the chairmanship of the Canadian League Against War and Fascism (CLWF).⁸ Launched by Canadian Communists in 1934, the League Against War and Fascism was the Canadian branch of a worldwide movement "to mobilize intellectuals prepared to combine opposition to war and fascism with support of Soviet foreign policy."⁹ It was, in MacLeod's view, an organized effort to steer the peace movement away from pure pacifism and towards a "more realistic understanding of the struggle for peace" characteristic of the Soviets.¹⁰ Support for the League formed around a nucleus of intellectuals: professors at the University of Toronto, Protestant clergymen and pacifists in the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Members of the League's National Council, for instance, included Dr. Salem Bland, the social gospel spokesman; T. C. Douglas and William Irvine, the CCF MP's; John Line and J. W. L. Nicholson of the FCSO; Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Toronto FOR and Peter G. Makaroff, the pacifist Doukhobor lawyer from Saskatoon.¹¹ The Communists stayed out of the limelight as much as possible in order to reassure skeptical liberals

and socialists. For a time, T. C. Douglas and Frank Underhill, history professor and socialist intellectual in the LSR, were vice-presidents of the League. Overall, however, MacLeod was the moving spirit behind the League and its nationwide campaign against fascism as the major threat to peace and democracy.¹²

It is doubtful that MacLeod ever embraced pacifism, but, as a socialist and one of Canada's leading Communists, he was active in the general peace movement of the time. In the summer of 1935, for instance, MacLeod embarked on a national tour that included peace rallies, protest meetings on the persecution of Jews, and conferences on the CLWF advocacy of the use of sanctions against Italy. Most meetings were held in co-operation with other organizations such as the WIL or FOR. In August the League co-operated with the Canadian Youth Congress in organizing a torch light parade for peace through downtown Toronto which ended with a speech at Queen's Park by John Copithorne of the student peace caravan.¹³ Over the years the League also sponsored visits to Canada by such international figures as André Malraux, Thomas Mann, Harry Ward and Lord Robert Cecil. In 1936 MacLeod headed a fourteen man Canadian delegation to the First World Peace Congress in Brussels. There he was elected to the General Council of the International Peace Campaign inspired by Lord Cecil.¹⁴

In that same year, however, the League's sympathy with Canadian pacifists began to change as MacLeod and others in the League adopted a more militant response to fascist aggression. Their support for military sanctions and their disregard for proper demo-

cratic procedures in meetings ultimately resulted in a breach between the League and other peace organizations such as the WIL.¹⁵ The Toronto WIL, in particular, discontinued all association with the League Against War and Fascism while other branches continued to work with the League for a time but without affiliation.¹⁶

In order to project a more positive image, the League changed its name in 1937 to the League for Peace and Democracy and claimed its aim was to: "Protect democratic rights for all sections of the Canadian people. Save Canada from war by helping to restore world peace."¹⁷ Regardless of its exact name, however, the League's position remained clear-cut support for a military victory of the International Brigades over General Franco's fascists. While obviously never a pacifist organization, the League for Peace and Democracy capitalized on popular peace sentiment by equating their fight against fascism with the preservation of peace and democracy. As a result, pacifists were tempted to support the fight for international justice at the expense of their pacifist beliefs.

Although an indirect endorsement of international violence, the call to aid Spanish democracy succeeded in attracting considerable support within the peace movement. Leading liberal and socialist peace advocates joined with the League for Peace and Democracy to establish the Canadian Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy under the honorary chairmanship of Salem Bland. Later, the same coalition lent support to the group of young Canadian men who joined the International Brigades in Spain as the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion.¹⁸

The Canadian Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy also received enthusiastic support from the various youth organizations, including the CCYM, SCM, YMCA and YWCA, which had recently joined forces to form the Canadian Youth Congress (CYC).¹⁹ The first Canadian Youth Congress was organized in Toronto in May 1935 with approximately 600 observers and delegates from over 200 organizations, largely from Toronto, in attendance. Discussions centered on the topics of peace, unemployment and education, and the Congress elected a continuing committee known as the Canadian Youth Council to pursue peace activities and educational forums in Toronto as well as in other cities.²⁰ Within several months the idea of the CYC began to spread and local youth councils sprang up in most of the larger centers of population across the country. From their beginning the local councils supported peace activities and staged youth peace parades in various cities during the summer of 1935.²¹

The Canadian Youth Council also invited all candidates in the 1935 general election to complete a questionnaire designed to provide a profile of the candidates vis-à-vis pacifism, the question of sanctions and social welfare programs. Although he complied with the request, J. S. Woodsworth appeared somewhat annoyed by the tactic and commented critically:

Why does the Canadian Youth Congress stand on the sidelines and content itself with cheering and booing those in the game? Resolutions not fierce enough
-- Get into action!²²

Perhaps with Woodsworth's challenge in mind, the CYC councils began to take steps to form a national body which could co-ordinate their various activities into an effective program of action. This plan was accelerated further when the Canadian League of Nations Society asked the Canadian Youth Council to call a national convention of all youth organizations in order to select a broad range of delegates to represent Canada at a World Youth Congress scheduled to meet at Geneva in the fall of 1936 under the auspices of the International Federation of League of Nations Societies.²³

In May 1936 the first national meeting of the Canadian Youth Congress convened in Ottawa with 455 delegates from across Canada representing over twenty different youth organizations.²⁴ The major goal of the young delegates was to draft a program to improve the living conditions of all young people through education and affirmative action on such issues as unemployment, social justice and peace. Accordingly, the main topics of discussion were "Canadian Youth and World Peace" and "Youth in the Canadian Economy." One delegate, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, reported that the impressive fact of the conference was the overriding spirit of co-operation and compromise in spite of some incompatible attitudes. Even the Communists, he wrote, "were conspicuous by their mildness."²⁵ Smith also reported that the tenor of discussion was radical "in the sense that the delegates were trying to get at the root of things," but he refuted the rumor that the Congress was merely an attempt by extremists to attain respectability:

Revolutionary suggestions were not disputed but laughed at merrily; the absolute pacifist, though applauded, was voted down.²⁶

The Congress endorsed a proposed Canadian Youth Act, which recommended government sponsored youth projects, and adopted several resolutions, including one that condemned war as primarily an economic issue and urged Canadian participation in international discussions and action to eliminate war's causes. While most motions received virtual unanimous approval, a resolution which supported military sanctions by the League of Nations was opposed by twenty per-cent of the delegates.²⁷ In the end, the Congress issued a "Declaration of Rights of Canadian Youth" which explained CYC demands for work, security, recreation, knowledge, training, freedom and justice.

Concerning peace the CYC declared:

We want our country continually, and with all its resources, to struggle to promote collective security and peace among all the nations and peoples. This will be the best guarantee of our peace. We want our government to establish responsibility to the people in matters of foreign policy, and demand that on these matters the people shall be asked to decide by vote. We also declare intolerable any and all acts, bills and laws which would or do provide the breach of the state of peace either within or without our borders.²⁸

The issue of peace was considered to be of primary importance to Canadian youth and, to a certain extent, the CYC pronouncements on peace served as an indication of youth opinion for the delegates selected to attend the World Youth Congress, also billed as the International Congress against War.

In September over seven hundred delegates from thirty-six nations gathered in Geneva, including one of the largest delegations of thirty-two delegates and observers from Canada. The Canadians, representative of every section of Canada, were members of the YMCA, YWCA, the United Church, the Baptist Church, CCYM, SCM, Communist Youth League and several sectional groups. Among them were William Kashtan, secretary of the Communist Youth League, Paul Martin, a future member of the Liberal government and T. C. Douglas, the future CCF Premier of Saskatchewan.²⁹ Kenneth Woodsworth, the Chairman and chief spokesman of the CYC and one of the Canadian delegates, felt that the Canadian delegation gave "constructive leadership" to the World Congress and became more confident from the experience.³⁰ The proposed Canadian Youth Act, for example, was used as a model by the world youth movement.³¹

The major accomplishment at Geneva was the establishment of the World Youth Congress as a "permanent continuing body" in order to achieve "unity of action on an international scale." In regard to world peace, the Congress issued a call for a collective peace system which would provide real security against aggressors,

a system having its roots deep in the mass movement of the people for peace; not in support of an abstract ideal of collectivism, but to create a potent instrument to maintain the peace of the world.³²

The hope of the young delegates was to direct the enthusiasm of youth away from Fascism towards a constructive peace movement. Peace could be established, they believed, "through the unified will of the whole people, organized in their own popular movements, con-

sistently directed against any and every force which might lead to war."³³ The World Congress concluded that economic reform was essential to lasting peace and therefore outlined specific proposals which delegates might adopt in their respective countries, particularly in regard to the economic distress of young people.

Upon his return home, Kenneth Woodsworth boasted that the Canadian delegates were infected with a "spirit which will blossom forth in still greater accomplishments."³⁴ During the next few years the CYC accelerated its campaign on behalf of a Canadian Youth Act and took the lead in organizing Youth Peace Day demonstrations across the country every Armistice Day.³⁵

Despite these displays of enthusiasm, the CYC had also begun to re-evaluate the proper response for Canadian youth to increasing fascist aggression and by 1937 the CYC was instrumental in organizing a special Canadian Youth Committee to Aid Spain. National CYC Chairman Ken Woodsworth welcomed the new activities like assisting war refugees in Spain, as the type of practical peace work needed by the youth councils.³⁶ Later, during the Sino-Japanese conflict, the CYC broadened its appeal to include refugees in China as well and called for a boycott of Japanese goods. It was inconsistent on the part of the Canadian government, charged the CYC, to build up defense on the Pacific coast but at the same time to permit the shipment of war materials to Japan, Canada's only potential enemy in the Pacific.³⁷

Under the pressure of continued international aggression, the CYC had begun to argue that a meaningful movement for peace demanded

sterner measures than mere demonstrations and humanitarian services. In a letter to local youth councils in November 1938 Ken Woodsworth lamented the impotence of the peace movement.³⁸ Despite another year of peace rallies by youth, Czechoslovakia had fallen and Canton and Hankow were destroyed. "The crisis through which we are now passing," he wrote, "has tried the peace movement severely and has found it wanting in many respects."³⁹ Woodsworth challenged the local councils to seek a new approach of practical activity for the peace movement. Furthermore, while reaffirming its faith in the principle of collective security, the CYC called upon Canadian authorities to formulate a peace policy for Canada which would include the type of action necessary to halt fascist aggression.⁴⁰ Clearly, in the eyes of the CYC, the popular peace movement had come to be associated with something quite different from pacifism.

The crisis in the peace movement marked by the abandonment of non-violence by the CLPD and the CYC was also reflected within the CCF and its gradual move away from a strictly neutral foreign policy position.⁴¹ From its inception the CCF closely followed J. S. Woodsworth's pacifist-socialist philosophy and endorsed a strict neutralist foreign policy for Canada. In effect, the CCF echoed the socialist argument that the best way to rid the world of war was through the elimination of capitalism with its social injustice and imperialist aggression. For a time there appeared to be no conflict between pacifism and socialism since it was generally assumed that future wars would be

primarily capitalist wars. The outbreak of civil war in Spain, however, severely challenged the socially radical pacifist analysis and triggered a shift among socialists away from a neutral or pacifist position. Certainly, once CCF members became instrumental in the Canadian Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, the party was in a dilemma. On the one hand, it opposed Canadian participation in any foreign war, but, on the other, it championed the individual right of Canadians to go to Spain to fight fascism.⁴² The ambiguity of this stand was underlined further in 1937 when the CCF National Council rephrased its 1936 foreign policy resolution which urged neutrality in the event of "any war" to read "any imperialist war."⁴³ Did this mean the CCF would support a war to resist fascist aggression, as in Spain? Woodsworth, of course, continued to call for a policy of strict neutrality, and the CCF endorsed that position in regard to the Sino-Japanese conflict. Nevertheless, unrest continued to mount and in 1938 the CCF reversed an earlier stand and recognized the need for home defense as the struggle intensified between the pacifists and non-pacifists within the party. The neutralist platform was doomed.

Thus, the Spanish Civil War pre-eminently among the events of mid-decade was prompting a crisis of major proportions in the peace movement. Relations with the League for Peace and Democracy were strained; the CYC response to the Spanish Civil War pressed hardly upon pacifists; and the CCF foreign policy alliance of anti-imperialists, anti-militarists, neutralists and pacifists was threatened and a wide-

spread re-evaluation of the use of armed force to defend liberal democracies from the encroachments of totalitarian regimes was underway. The threat of fascism had shaken, to its very foundations, the pacifist convictions of many social radicals, including M. J. Coldwell, Stanley Allen and Eugene Forsey, and resulted in their defection from the peace movement. ✓

To some extent the change of heart exemplified by many Canadian pacifists during the later thirties followed the lead of the American theologian, Reinhold Niebuhr. Former chairman of the Fellowship of Reconciliation in the United States and one time editor of The World Tomorrow, Niebuhr left the FOR in 1934 because its pacifist membership refused to declare total allegiance to the class struggle.⁴⁴ Soon afterward he rejected pacifism altogether as an ineffective and unrealistic philosophy of social change. ✓ As Niebuhr moved towards Marxism on political and social questions he launched a far-reaching critique of theological liberalism and moved towards a reformulation of theological orthodoxy. Niebuhr concluded that only a neo-orthodoxy which emphasized the depth and continuity of the sinfulness of man in human history could come to terms with the realities of the twentieth century and provide the philosophic base for radical social thought.⁴⁵ He looked on liberal Protestantism and pacifism as heretical developments that had substituted faith in man for faith in God. Although individual man was moral, he argued, society on the whole was immoral and therefore incapable of perfection.⁴⁶ Neither the perfect

means nor the perfect end were real options in social action, and to act as if they were so was not only unrealistic, it was to invite disaster. Contrary to the absolutism of pacifists and many social radicals, the moral relativism of Niebuhr required Christians to choose the least possible evil relative to their particular situation. ✓

Although the real impact of Niebuhr in Canada was not until after the Second World War, his changing philosophy was already being publicized in Canadian religious journals. Thus, Niebuhr's rejection of pacifism and his call for a more realistic Christian approach to international conflicts was an important influence upon those Canadian pacifists re-thinking their pacifism in response to the anti-fascist mood of the late thirties. On the other hand, the loss of his support was a major setback to the peace movement and, coupled with the emotional issue of Spain, revealed the vulnerability of the socially radical pacifism of the twentieth century.

There was no serious attempt by a Canadian pacifist to answer Niebuhr directly until the Second World War⁴⁷ but the dilemma of the Christian pacifist was clearly recognized in 1937 by Arthur G. Dorland. ✓ In an article in The Canadian Friend, Dorland urged his fellow pacifists to maintain their trust in the redemptive power of love in bringing about the Kingdom of God. Many Christians, he warned, were abandoning this faith with the excuse that "man is fundamentally wicked and untrustworthy." That attitude may have been in line with the teachings of Calvin but was not according to the teaching of Jesus.⁴⁸ Dorland recognized, however, that Christian pacifists who did rely on

spiritual forces and who sought to apply the principles of the Kingdom of God to "every relationship of life" found themselves in a particular dilemma. "This dilemma is of far greater complexity," he wrote, "than just the question as to whether shooting out the brains of an opponent -- either individually or in mass -- is a Christian or reasonable way of settling a dispute."⁴⁹ Rather, the dilemma of war included the pressing social and economic problems of the day. On this point Dorland made himself perfectly clear:

. . . those Christians who seek to dodge the dilemma of economic and social justice in a Christian society and who refuse to do anything to remove these injustices or to construct a more equitable and truly Christian order, actually become by their timidity and inertia the upholders and defenders of the existing injustices and social evils.⁵⁰

On the other hand, Christians could face the dilemma and seek to remove the causes of injustices and evils in contemporary society. What was needed, suggested Dorland, was the establishment of a form of society "in which man will live by something better than the rule of profit and self-aggrandisement."⁵¹

The heart of the dilemma, however, concerned the extent to which the Christian pacifist should pursue the new social order, especially since there was a real danger that pacifism would be sacrificed if the end goal of social and economic justice was carried to the extreme. Dorland particularly noted that, in their dedicated campaign for social and economic reform, some social gospel radicals had already lent support to persons and causes that were "activated

by hate and revenge against those who control our present social and economic system" and who favored class warfare.⁵² There were a "rapidly growing number" of Canadians, he reported, "who have been so won by the avowedly idealistic appeals of the . . . Fascist or Communist as the case may be . . . that they are ready to go out to kill their fellowmen to secure these desirable social ends in a class war, if not in an international war."⁵³ Dorland hoped that his fellow pacifists would recognize the hidden danger in supporting radical alternatives. In reality, Christian pacifists were being asked to support causes "that would justify the use of the war method in a bloody class war to attain . . . particular economic and social ends."⁵⁴ In conclusion, Dorland reminded his readers that if they wished to bring in the Kingdom of God they would have to use the methods of the Kingdom and not violence and hate, "however praiseworthy or desirable the end to be attained may appear to be." "We cannot further Heaven's end," he wrote, "by breaking Heaven's laws."⁵⁵ But finally, that was to put the issue once more in terms of absolute means and ends.

Dorland was realistic up to a point. He had absorbed the need to pursue peace through social and economic justice, and saw that if followed to extremes that approach could compromise pacifism. What he did not seem to have absorbed was that it was not extremists who were drifting away from pacifism, but committed liberal, labor and social democrats who had had pacifist inclinations but now

feared the defense of their primary values might entail a war they could not reject. Dorland did not state that dimension of the crisis. He remained a committed absolute pacifist and, still basically liberal in his thinking, he was unable to turn the last screw in analyzing the dilemma. Niebuhr remained to be reckoned with.

The question raised by Niebuhr and Dorland concerning the proper Christian response to war also became one of the major issues considered by the world's leading Protestants at the Oxford Conference of the Universal Council for Life and Work. Over four hundred delegates as well as four hundred associate members and visitors representing almost every branch of the Protestant Church throughout the world gathered at Oxford in 1937 to consider the relationship between the Church and the social and economic order. On the whole, the Conference reflected a growing realism in Christian social thought, "and a more resolute determination that the Church should bear its witness in the world as it was, rather than remain in the realm of utopian idealism."⁵⁶ This was especially true concerning the issue of pacifism, perhaps in response to the worsening international situation.

As one of the Canadian delegates to the Oxford Conference, Richard Roberts was primarily concerned with the question of war. In fact, prior to his departure for England, Roberts confided to John Nevin Sayre, the international chairman of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, that he felt the most urgent question at Oxford would be that of peace. "I am not at all sure," he wrote, "whether it isn't the

most immediately critical issue for the Church at this moment. Anything short of a stark condemnation of war, root and branch, will stultify the church in the face of the world."⁵⁷ As a member of the Group on International Order and War, Roberts worked in close association with the British pacifist Canon Charles Raven in drafting the statement on war. It was not a pacifist document but he thought it was "the strongest thing that has yet come from a church body on war."⁵⁸ In effect, the Oxford pronouncement recognized three possible positions for a Christian in time of war: Christian submission to the state's declaration of war, support for only a just war waged according to Christian principles, and the pacifist rejection of all wars.

Roberts was particularly pleased with the official recognition of absolute pacifism as a legitimate Christian stand because he realized the report of the Oxford Conference would influence subsequent declarations of Canada's churches. Indeed, when the General Council of the United Church reiterated its opposition to war in 1938 it mentioned only two of the three possible Christian alternatives upheld by the Oxford Conference: absolute pacifism and selective abstention from war. Omitted altogether was any reference to legitimate grounds by which the state or Christians might wage war.⁵⁹ In effect, the General Council reached a compromise between absolute pacifism and the growing Christian realism regarding international affairs.⁶⁰

When Roberts returned to Canada he became the center of a controversy arising from the Oxford pronouncement on war. While

speaking at the Twentieth Annual Pastors' Conference at the Hartford Seminary in Connecticut, he made an impromptu statement that if the Oxford report on war was to sink into the mind of the Church, there would be "no more recruiting and drumbeating in the pulpits and no more prayers for victory."⁶¹ Once his comments were reported in Toronto newspapers a furor broke loose with all sorts of people writing to the correspondence columns of the papers. Roberts' most venomous critic was H. A. Kent, Principal of Queen's University. In a letter to the editor of The Globe and Mail, Kent branded Roberts' statement as "foolish utterance . . . only possible in the mouth of someone who sits by while other people may be in agony." "The tongue is a little member," Kent concluded. "In the mouth of Moderators and ex-Moderators it should be bridled against foolish utterance."⁶²

The controversy that resulted from Roberts' speech and Kent's rejoinder lasted for several months. Most contributors either cursed Roberts or spoke out whole-heartedly on his behalf. One of the most penetrating comments came from the radical pacifist, R. Edis Fairbairn. Fairbairn agreed with Kent that Roberts' statement was "foolish utterance" since, regardless of an anti-war position by the Church, individual ministers would "certainly recruit from the pulpit and pray for victory . . . in the next war, as in the last." "Dr. Roberts' misguided optimism," he wrote, "seems to me as dangerous as Dr. Kent's naive unrealism."⁶³ Fairbairn predicted that Mammon and Mars, the twin gods of civilization, would have no difficulty swinging the churches into line in time of future crisis. Another well-known

pacifist minister, G. Stanley Russell of Deer Park United Church, argued that it was not Roberts but Kent who needed to defend his position.⁶⁴

In a personal letter to Roberts, Gordon Sisco, General Secretary of the United Church, wrote that he felt Kent had missed the point and then continued:

What I do want to say is that in this difficult time, when many of us are trying to think our way through to a Christian conclusion, and the relation of Church to state, especially in times of war, we are heartened by what you said at Hartford, Connecticut. There are many of us who know exactly what you mean when you speak of the Church as a body of believers who must be true to the Christian ethic as far as possible in time of international strife. I do hope you will be encouraged to feel that many are with you. Don't budge a damn bit!⁶⁵

Roberts did not move from his pacifist position in the years to come. He left Toronto in 1938 after having worked there slightly over a decade, and in that time had become well-known and respected for his constant but reserved call for pacifism and social action both within the United Church and throughout Canada as a whole. Nevertheless, the response to the Oxford pronouncement on war, the Kent-Roberts controversy in particular, underlined a growing dilemma within the church, the peace movement and Canadian society in general concerning the proper role for Canadians in a war against fascism.

The latter half of the thirties was indeed a time of crisis for the peace movement as numerous Canadians drifted away from pacifism in order to support the fight against fascist injustice. Alarmed, committed pacifists, especially those in the Society of Friends, the

Women's International League and the Fellowship of Reconciliation began to re-group and consolidate their particular organizations. In 1938, for instance, all three branches of the Society of Friends in Canada issued a joint statement reaffirming their ancient peace testimony and sent copies to the Prime Minister, Minister of National Defense, and the leaders of both opposition parties.⁶⁶ Since Canadians were again pre-occupied with the thought of war, Quakers felt impelled to remind the government of Christ's message:

But I say unto you that ye resist not evil,
but overcome evil with good.⁶⁷

To oppose force with more force, they argued, would accomplish nothing; "it is like using frost to destroy frost, hate to destroy hate, or evil to destroy evil." Although they offered their loyal assistance in arriving at crucial decisions, Friends warned that "under no circumstances" would they take part in war or preparation for war. Rather, they placed their faith in "the spirit and principle of love" to bring about real peace on earth.⁶⁸

Such pleas might suggest that Canadian Quakers were entirely out of touch with the enormities of political and racial persecution that were becoming a hallmark of the 1930's, but they were among the first to respond with humanitarian services in response to the suffering in war-torn countries and under fascist regimes. After the outbreak of civil war in Spain, for instance, the Canadian Friends Service Committee and the Canadian Committee of the Save the Children Fund issued a joint appeal for assistance for Spanish children. Likewise, with the outbreak of war in China the following year, the two organiza-

tions acted together again.⁶⁹ Already, however, as early as 1933, Friends had voiced their concern for the growing number of those fleeing Nazi Germany and pledged their assistance. It was believed that most of the exiles were German pacifists, Jews or Christians of Jewish descent.⁷⁰ By 1936 Friends joined a group of Toronto churchmen in a demand that the Canadian government offer asylum to the refugees. Canada, they proposed, could become a sanctuary for those escaping Nazi terror.⁷¹ Friends followed the issue closely and warned that Hitler and his Nazi supporters would never restrain their sadistic persecution of German Jews.⁷² In order to create an effective network of refugee work, Quakers co-operated with other religious or pacifist organizations such as the Canadian Conference of Christians and Jews and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

The WIL took a keen interest in the problem and was particularly instrumental in the movement to assist German refugees in Canada during the war. In fact, the Toronto branch of the WIL received credentials from a few refugees seeking permanent residence in Canada as early as 1936.⁷³ Most refugee work required careful personal attention to each individual being considered. It proceeded slowly, without publicity, and generally did not meet with much success until the problem directly involved Canada during the Second World War.

Other than refugee work, the WIL launched an active opposition to increased military spending and the shipment of war materials to Japan.⁷⁴ In February 1937 the Toronto branch sponsored an emergency peace meeting in an attempt to organize sentiment against increased

military expenditures. The meeting sent five thousand cards to members of parliament requesting them to vote against any such increases.

Anna Sissons, president of the Toronto WIL, urged other branches to take similar action.⁷⁵

The majority of WIL activity in the late thirties, however, was devoted to national reorganization and consolidation in light of the growing challenge to world peace. During the course of the decade national co-ordination of the WIL had fallen into disarray, especially since Laura Jamieson, the leading national figure, devoted more and more of her time to CCF political activities in British Columbia. Consequently, Anna Sissons, made an effort to keep the organization together by assuming the duties of the national secretary and distributing a national WIL newsletter.⁷⁶

Following the international events of the mid-1930's, however, it was evident that closer national organization was necessary if the WIL was to lead an effective peace program. In 1936 Violet McNaughton of Saskatoon and Lila Phelps of Winnipeg agreed on the urgent need for national leadership and in June of the following year the Winnipeg branch of the WIL sponsored a national organization conference.⁷⁷ The conference delegates included Anna Sissons from Toronto, Laura Jamieson from Vancouver, Mrs. V. A. McConkey from Edmonton, Mrs. L. G. Salverson and Miss Coutes from Calgary, Mrs. G. Hartwell and Mrs. G. W. Hutchinson from Regina and Beatrice Brigden, Mrs. F. L. Lloyd and the chairman of the conference, Lucy Woodsworth, all from Manitoba.⁷⁸ Judging from this list of prominent members the WIL appears to have been the women's peace arm of the CCF.

Reports of the conference on the various activities of local branches revealed that WIL women across Canada were involved in the sponsorship of local peace conferences, radio programs, essay and poster contests in schools, theatrical productions, and Goodwill Day celebrations. The Regina women were particularly proud of their recent success in removing cadet training from schools.

Following enthusiastic agreement to organize on a strong national basis, the new Canadian Section passed resolutions in favor of numerous issues ranging from birth control to peace. One example was the following proposal for a national referendum to decide Canadian participation in an imperial war:

Resolved: That the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Canadian Section, urges the Government to take necessary steps to ensure to Canada her right to decide as to participation or non-participation in any war in which the United Kingdom may become involved.⁷⁹

The WIL also declared its support for the creation of a select standing committee in the House of Commons to investigate the entire question of the manufacture, purchase and sale of armaments in Canada and its effect upon the Canadian economy.⁸⁰

Although unable to attend the National WIL Conference in Winnipeg, Violet McNaughton actively promoted WIL objectives in Saskatchewan and was instrumental in the creation of the Saskatoon Peace Group, a forerunner of the Fellowship of Reconciliation in Saskatoon. WIL efforts in Saskatoon, however, appear to have met only limited success. Depressed about their rather poor showing, McNaughton complained in April 1937 that ninety per-cent

of the inhabitants of Saskatoon did not have the least interest in the peace question "and yet we've tried all kinds of methods of reaching them."⁸¹

Pacifists in Toronto appeared to have fared a little better. In May 1937, for instance, the WIL joined with the FOR, LSR, and FCSO and sponsored a special Peace Day Celebration, featuring the American pacifist Harry Emerson Fosdick, in order to commemorate 120 years of peace between Canada and the United States.⁸²

As popular support for the peace movement began to wane, pacifist groups accelerated their effort to unite their members and to maintain some semblance of pacifist activity. The organization of the Women's International League on a national basis was an important step in that direction. Likewise, the Fellowship of Reconciliation began to organize on an official national basis and before the end of the decade the FOR became the leading inter-pacifist organization in Canada. Prior to 1938, however, small FOR groups in various Canadian cities functioned without national co-ordination or even affiliation with the international organization. What little contact they did have with the official FOR was largely through the American branch and its publication, Fellowship, and other journals such as The Christian Century and The World Tomorrow.

During the thirties the largest FOR group was in Toronto. It was a popular but loosely organized society through which a variety of pacifists co-operated in the promotion of peace demonstrations

and other events. Its wide range of supporters included members of the Society of Friends, the United Church, the WIL, the Jewish community and various interested parties. For years major leadership was exercised by Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath of Toronto's Holy Blossom Temple and G. Raymond Booth, Chairman of the Toronto Monthly Meeting of Friends.

In Montreal a small FOR group functioned under the leadership and guidance of J. Lavell Smith of Westmount Park United Church, Clarence Halliday of Montreal's West United Church, Philip Matthams, National Secretary of the FCSO, J. M. C. (Jack) Duckworth, General Secretary of the Notre Dame de Grace YMCA and various McGill University students. Eugene Forsey, a professor of economics at McGill, J. Stanley Allen, an FCSO travelling secretary and other members of the FCSO were also active in the Montreal pacifist circle, although they began to re-evaluate their pacifist stand in reaction to the Spanish Civil War.⁸³

On the West coast the FOR developed primarily around University of British Columbia students and counted among its membership the Western Secretary of the United Church Department of Evangelism and Social Service, Hugh Dobson.⁸⁴ In Alberta and most of the prairies the major inter-war Christian pacifist organization was still the Alberta School of Religion, the FCSO affiliate. By the late 1930's, however, the FCSO had become clearly divided over the pacifist issue and its pacifist members, while not bitter, became uncomfortable and gradually gravitated towards the FOR. In fact, FCSO members desiring

a more specifically pacifist affiliation were largely responsible for the active FOR groups across Canada. Likewise, under the developing rift, and sensing the need for a closer bond among pacifists, the Alberta School of Religion finally cut its official ties to the FCSO in favor of affiliation with the FOR.

The FOR in Saskatchewan developed out of the Saskatoon Peace Group, a small society devoted to the study and discussion of the current questions of concern to pacifists, such as the reorganization of the League of Nations, Canada's defense policy and conscription. The Saskatoon Peace Group also sponsored public forums for the discussion of topics relevant to world peace and endorsed numerous resolutions favoring such measures as the nationalization of the munitions industry, conscription of all wealth in the event of war and a national referendum on the question of Canadian participation in war.⁸⁵

The leading figures in the Saskatoon pacifist circle were John and Violet McNaughton, Peter Makaroff, the Doukhobor lawyer, Nelson Chappel of Westminster United Church, Carlyle King, Professor of English at the University of Saskatchewan, Cleo Mowers, a theological student and various other university students.⁸⁶ The group met regularly in Makaroff's law office, usually fortnightly for two hours, where they studied pacifist works, such as Richard Gregg's The Power of Non-Violence, chapter by chapter, learned about the peace movement abroad and organized their activities for Saskatoon.⁸⁷

According to Carlyle King, the group began to call themselves the Fellowship of Reconciliation chiefly because they "liked the sound of it" and because it seemed more positive than War Resisters' International or Peace Pledge Union. "We had no written statement of purpose," wrote King, "but we had unity of purpose although we had come to pacifism by a variety of roads. There were Doukhobors who had left the faith, Friends who had no meeting, Bahaists, Jews, Mennonites, United Church people, and others without formal church or religious connection."⁸⁸ With a membership roll of thirty in 1937, Saskatoon boasted one of the largest FOR groups in the country.⁸⁹

Although a number of Canadians were members of the American FOR, increased correspondence between the various pacifist groups revealed the growing desire to organize the FOR on a national basis within Canada. The move towards this end was initiated by the Montreal group and accelerated when Percy Bartlett and John Neven Sayre, secretary and chairman, respectively, of the International FOR, toured Canada in the summer of 1937 under the auspices of the Canadian Friends.⁹⁰ By autumn of that year, Sayre, chairman of the American branch as well as the international organization, assured the Montreal spokesmen, J. Lavell Smith and Jack Duckworth, that he would personally endorse their application for affiliation with the International FOR if there was a "satisfactorily functioning Canadian section." "I must certainly favor it," Sayre wrote Smith, "provided you find that there are convinced and capable converts of Christian Pacifism in several Canadian cities who favor the move."⁹¹ It appears

Sayre had co-operated on several occasions with the Canadian League of Nations Society and appreciated their support, but he warned Smith that it was "not a good thing to have most of the organized peace movement in Canada under the League of Nations Society."⁹² Experience in both the United States and England, he wrote, demonstrated that Christian pacifism could not be propagated adequately under League auspices. Consequently, it was Sayre's wish that

there might one day be in Canada a variety of peace organizations, each fulfilling the function and spreading the message for which it is fitted, but all of them sending their executive to such meetings for continuing conference and consultation. . . . Perhaps such a development would be hastened if there was a Canadian FOR strong enough to put its case against sanctions and for completely peaceful measures, before your Country.⁹³

On the other hand, Sayre was not in favor of "purely a paper organization" and, therefore, recommended that the Montreal group establish a national office and select officers who were known and trusted. If this minimum organization could not be affected, he concluded, "it would probably be best for the F.O.R. headquarters in the United States to continue serving members in Canada as at present."⁹⁴ In any case the American FOR was ready to send their literature to Canada and route some of their speakers to various Canadian cities.

Sayre's presumptuous attitude that a Canadian FOR should affiliate with and thus become an arm of the American branch annoyed the Montreal group. Lavell Smith, in particular, rejected the idea in favor of a Canadian organization independent of both American

or British connections. Consequently, the Montreal group shelved Sayre's proposal and turned their attention to more immediate issues. In July 1938, for instance, they distributed a leaflet, framed by Smith, Halliday and Duckworth, protesting the proposed multiplication of training centers for military aviators and construction plants for fighting and bombing planes as contrary to the Canadian government's claim to be rearming for defense only.⁹⁵ As far as the consolidation of Canadian pacifists was concerned, Halliday and Duckworth admitted that the job was too much for their small group and they suggested it be assumed by a larger FOR unit, preferably the one in Saskatoon.⁹⁶

The first step in that direction occurred when a National FOR Organization Conference convened in Toronto during the sessions of the General Council of the United Church in September 1938. Approximately thirty people, representing Toronto's peace groups and pacifists within the United Church and the FCSO in particular, gathered at Toronto's Diet Kitchen on September 27 and resolved to establish an official Canadian Section of the FOR.⁹⁷ The meeting named a national committee consisting of three from Toronto: Booth, Joseph Round and Ted Mann; three from Montreal: Smith, Halliday and Thelma Allen; three from Saskatoon: King, Mowers and F. Blatchford Ball; two from Alberta: W. F. Kelloway and W. H. Irwin and two from Northern Ontario: C. Clare Oke and J. W. E. Newbery. The meeting announced that the Saskatoon unit was "willing to co-operate in organizing a National F.O.R. Movement" and concluded by instructing the new committee to communicate with Carlyle King in that regard.⁹⁸

Although King and Mowers did not attend the meeting and, therefore, were named to the committee without their knowledge or consent, it appears the Mowers had implied their willingness to undertake the task while he was in Montreal earlier that year.⁹⁹ Thus, King and Mowers accepted the challenge.

Since they received no further word from the national committee, King and Mowers appointed themselves chairman and secretary respectively and then sought committee approval of their unilateral action. It turned out that the other committee members "were only too happy" with the new national executive and a November meeting of these members from Ontario and Montreal adopted the following resolution:

That this group, representative of Montreal, Toronto and North Bay, concur in the suggestion that there be set up a National Council of the Canadian Fellowship of Reconciliation with the following Executive Officers: President: Professor Carlyle A. King, University of Saskatchewan. Secretary: Mr. C. W. Mowers, University of Saskatchewan, and that these Executive Officers proceed to complete the formation of the Council. It was further moved that steps be taken to secure the ratification of local units of the F.O.R. in Canada, of these appointments.¹⁰⁰

It was also recommended that one of the first tasks of the executive should be the formulation of a Statement of Purpose acceptable to groups across Canada. King had already begun to draft a Statement of Basis and Aims and by late November he sent copies to the various units for approval.¹⁰¹ Since the response of council members was completely favorable, King proceeded to incorporate the Basis and Aims in a leaflet describing the Canadian FOR for use in a membership drive.¹⁰²

From the very beginning, King's most ardent support came from Smith, Halliday and Duckworth in Montreal. They were always prompt with suggestions and offers of assistance. In January 1939, for instance, Smith sent King a list of approximately three to four thousand names of Canadians who had signed the War Renunciation Pledge of 1934. Smith confessed that the list was not one hundred per-cent reliable in view of the fact that many addresses had probably changed and undoubtedly some had renounced pacifism, but he hoped it would be of some use.¹⁰³

Elated over the prospect of an organization incorporating a thousand or more prospective pacifists in Canada, King and Mowers launched a membership drive. In the spring of 1939 Mowers recalled their experience:

First we compiled a list of about one hundred names of people in all parts of the nation, people whom we thought were sure bets. We sent each of them copies of our printed leaflet. Only a very few replied. We wrote many personal letters and still very few replied. We sent circular letters, with the leaflets, to 120 United Church ministers who signed the Peace Pledge about four years ago, and still only a very few replied.¹⁰⁴

Disheartened with their enrollment of only sixty new members in four months, King and Mowers concluded that they had made a "gross error in judgement" concerning the popular demand for a Canadian FOR. Clearly, the heightened international tensions of the latter thirties were taking their toll of pacifist sentiment.

On the other hand, King and Mowers were encouraged by the formation of some new units, especially among FCSO members.

J. W. E. Newbery of All Peoples' Mission in Sudbury organized an FOR unit, and in the North Bay area the Fellowship for Constructive Peace under C. Clare Oke of Sundridge, Ontario, announced its support for the FOR.¹⁰⁵ On the East coast, Fred Young, a United Church minister in Tryon, Prince Edward Island, promoted both the FCSO and the FOR as the means to convince people of the underlying economic causes of war.¹⁰⁶ Young was one of the few FOR supporters in the Maritimes.

In their leaflet entitled "Our Battle for Peace", the Toronto branch of the FCSO endorsed the FOR as well as other peace organizations in an urgent appeal for all Christians to work for peace in spite of the "apparently unbridgeable gulf of opinion as to the methods of peace-making" within the FCSO.¹⁰⁷ Some members like Eugene Forsey and Stanley Allen, for instance, had begun to move away even from the FCSO in light of their CCF commitments on the one hand and the FCSO's willingness to continue a broader front of operations, including support for MacLeod's League for Peace and Democracy which Forsey and Allen among others viewed through MacLeod's communist ties as a Communist Party front. Obviously, the pressure of international events of the latter half of the decade was fragmenting the peace movement once more, and there was now quite a string of options for achieving an ultimately peaceful world; thus, the FCSO could hardly hold together and pacifists were bound to look for another home. Indeed, their non-pacifist colleagues such as R. B. Y. Scott and Gregory Vlastos

supported the validity of the absolute pacifist position for some people and encouraged pacifists to join the FOR.¹⁰⁸ But division was deepening. In the spring of 1939, Clare Oke reported that the Peace Committee of the FCSO had decided that the best contribution a divided FCSO could make to world peace laid in the effort to bring about a better social order rather than pacifism. "I have a growing conviction," Oke concluded, "that the F.O.R. with its pacifistic method is perhaps the wiser in its policy even in relation to the evolving of a better society."¹⁰⁹

A similar criticism of the FCSO's retreat from pacifism was leveled by Stanley Knowles, CCF MP from Winnipeg. In regard to the FOR Knowles welcomed "the possibility of uniting and consolidating pacifist opinion" and pledged his support. He also predicted that the majority of the FCSO unit in Winnipeg would join the FOR since they were in "full sympathy" with its basis and aims.¹¹⁰

The prospect of a new FOR unit in Winnipeg as well as the report of similar action in Edmonton was welcome news to Canadian pacifists in 1939. In addition, a stronger FOR unit was being organized in Vancouver, largely through the efforts of Robert Tillman, SCM chairman in British Columbia, and Ernest Bishop, a theological student. What seemed to be the most encouraging news, however, came from Toronto where an FOR unit of approximately thirty-five pacifists elected R. J. Irwin, an FCSO minister, and G. Raymond Booth, chairman and vice-chairman respectively. According to the secretary, Joe Round, the Toronto group planned to launch a "militant! pacifist effort."

"I would like to express the private hope," Round wrote King, "that you will bombard us with all sorts of proposals for pacifist action. . . ." ¹¹¹ Despite Round's pledge to "drop all other activities in favor of the peace work," his optimistic appraisal of the Toronto organization and rumors of a thousand pacifists active there, Mowers feared that the Toronto unit was "practically dead." ¹¹² To be sure, the FOR in Toronto was disorganized and beset with dissension until well into the war years.

Although finally organized on a national basis, the Canadian FOR was still a relatively small, weak organization. Moreover, the gradual defection of their FCSO allies further heightened the sense of isolation among pacifists. It was not surprising, therefore, that the national organization in Canada sought a closer association with fellow pacifists in other countries, particularly the neighboring United States. The move in that direction was apparent by autumn 1938 when the American FOR publication Fellowship began to feature a regular report on the Canadian movement with the help of an official Canadian correspondent, Jack Duckworth. ¹¹³ It was also at that time that efforts were renewed to affiliate the Canadians with the American branch, an arrangement favored by John Nevin Sayre for several years. In November the executive secretary of the FOR in the United States, Harold E. Fey, reminded Duckworth that the American Council planned to consider the affiliation of the Canadian group the following month and, therefore, needed a copy of the Canadian Statement of Purpose. If it was "sufficiently near" to the American statement he

foresaw no objections to the idea.¹¹⁴ Fey also outlined what he thought would be the basis of such affiliation. The Canadian Fellowship would receive a special group membership in the American FOR with official representation at American meetings and, in return, the American branch would continue to supply various services and guest speakers as well as their magazine Fellowship.¹¹⁵ A few days later, Sayre reassured Carlyle King that, despite the failure of the Montreal group to act upon his proposal the previous year, "the way is open today, as it always has been, at this end for some form of affiliation, if that is what our Canadian brothers want."¹¹⁶

It appears that most of the Canadian members did favor affiliation with the American branch, perhaps because they were already familiar with the American organization or because they felt the need to consolidate pacifists in North America. In any case, King informed Sayre that the Canadian council had agreed to affiliate with the American FOR on the basis of Fey's letter to Duckworth and he enclosed a copy of the Canadian Statement of Basis and Aims for American approval.¹¹⁷

The Canadian statement, however revealed a conflicting difference between the Canadian and American sections. The statement in question identified the Canadian FOR as "an association of men and women who believe in the non-violent settlement of all conflicts" and listed several ways in which they could express their faith, from personal relationships to the refusal to sanction war. The most controversial part concerned the omission of a predominantly Christian

basis of belief. Instead, the statement read:

Many of the members have joined because of their desire to follow unswervingly the way of life exemplified by Jesus; some have received their inspiration from other religious leaders, and some have reached their faith in love and non-violence in still other ways.¹¹⁸

In his letter to Sayre, King had particularly pointed out that Canadians desired a broad statement in order to attract all pacifist groups. "We have felt," he wrote, "that there is room in Canada for only one pacifist organization and accordingly have drafted our statement of Basis and Aims in such a way as to make it acceptable not only to Christian pacifists but to people who are pacifists on other grounds."¹¹⁹ Since the statement closely followed the American version in all other respects, King felt there was no reason to fear there would be a problem.

Nevertheless, in his response, Sayre was dubious about the Canadian movement and criticized the Canadian statement for its lack of sufficiently Christian content.¹²⁰ He advised Canadians to revise their statement, especially since Canadian-American affiliation was contingent upon the International FOR granting official recognition to their group. As it stood, Sayre warned, the International FOR Executive Committee, of which he was chairman, might wonder if the Canadian statement "does not relegate Jesus to the periphery of the Canadian Fellowship instead of having him at the center."¹²¹ What Sayre wished to see inserted in the Canadian statement was some reference to Jesus such as the sentence in the American statement that FOR members:

believe that love, such as that seen preeminently in Jesus, must serve as the true guide for personal conduct under all circumstances; and they seek to demonstrate this love as the effective force for overcoming evil and transforming society into a creative fellowship.¹²²

Sayre closed by reminding Canadians that the International FOR was convinced that its affiliated branches "must be definitely and predominantly Christian."

Annoyed and offended at the tone, if not the content, of Sayre's letter, King shared his thoughts on the matter with the other members of the national council, Booth, Duckworth, Halliday, Oke and Smith:

Mr. Sayre insists that the F.O.R. should be primarily a Christian pacifist movement. Our Council agreed that in Canada we should try to unite Christian and non-Christian in a pacifist program, and agreed to a statement of basis and aims which should be acceptable to both. We have been able, as you know, to work out such a statement -- a statement which embodies a whole philosophy of life embracing personal, social, national and international conduct. That is, we have been about our business of reconciling diverse points of view and uniting people of differing religious attitudes around a program of good will to all men. We have succeeded in that, only to be told by Mr. Sayre that we ought to be sectarian. He asks us to revise our statement to make it specifically Christian.¹²³

King also maintained Sayre's letter, "politely but clearly," implied a lack of confidence in the Canadian chairman, underlined by the fact that copies of the letter were sent directly to the other members of the National Council. Consequently, King felt compelled to resign as chairman unless he was reassured of the continued support of the Council.¹²⁴

Reports from the National Council unanimously supported King as chairman and expressed surprise at the whole affair. The Montreal group was particularly puzzled and wrote Sayre asking him if there was not some mistake and if he had received the final form of the Canadian Basis and Aims. As far as their statement relegating Jesus to the periphery, Duckworth emphasized that they did "not so interpret it."¹²⁵ In reply, Sayre reiterated his view that the Canadians should demonstrate that they regarded Jesus as "more authoritative for the Fellowship than other teachers of non-violence -- for instance, Gandhi."¹²⁶ Sayre also reported that he had been assured by Raymond Booth that the Canadian Fellowship was "definitely and certainly Christian." If that was indeed the case, he argued, "in the interests of frankness and clarity, it should be so indicated in your statement of basis."¹²⁷

After meeting with Sayre in New York, Booth notified King that he was in sympathy with Sayre's demand for a strictly Christian statement since it stemmed from the past experiences of the American FOR being infiltrated with "Communists and other borers-from-within."¹²⁸ Booth confided that the Toronto group had suffered a similar experience when it was first organized. "Our Toronto F.O.R. was organized upon such a broad basis," he wrote, "and for this I am quite largely responsible, that we attracted to ourselves all the people who were itching for a fight."¹²⁹ Booth concluded that he agreed with Sayre that only those with "an abiding conviction of the fundamentally spiritual nature of the universe" would be loyal to the pacifist cause.¹³⁰

Despite assurances from Canadian members of their strong Christian bias, Sayre remained skeptical of the Canadian movement and King's leadership in particular.¹³¹ Since it appeared King did not wish to revise the Canadian statement, Sayre suggested Canadians try for something more like the Peace Pledge Union or the War Resisters' International. "But, obviously . . . if you want your organization to be the all-inclusive pacifist type," wrote Sayre, "you should not use the name 'Fellowship of Reconciliation,' which stands for something different."¹³² On the other hand, Sayre reminded King that a Christian pacifist organization such as the FOR could also include a minority margin of non-Christian members as long as its statement of purpose was appropriately Christian.

Although Booth favored amending the Canadian statement in line with Sayre's suggestions, most of the other members on the National Council did not. Neither did they consider the Peace Pledge Union or War Resisters' International as real alternatives to the FOR. Sayre obviously did not understand conditions in Canada where the peace movement was predominantly Christian and yet so small in numbers that it required no more than one national organization to consolidate pacifists. Canada's Christian pacifists wanted that organization to be the FOR but they agreed with King as well on the importance of sheltering all those who embraced pacifism, regardless of their particular beliefs. Ironically, Sayre's pressure for a Christian statement could hardly serve a time when Christians in Canada were in

fact dividing precisely over the Christian response to the looming prospect of war.

In May 1939, Clare Oke wrote King that the members of his local group in the North Bay-Sundridge area recommended that "the Canadian F.O.R. apply for affiliation with the International F.O.R. at once on the basis of our present statement of principles and aims."¹³³ They felt that any revisions should be considered only if the International Council indicated its dissatisfaction. King was also encouraged in this regard when Halliday reported that the British pacifist leader, Canon Charles Raven, had intimated he saw nothing wrong with the Canadian statement.¹³⁴

Consequently, on May 19, 1939, King formally applied for affiliation of the Canadian organization with the International FOR. In his letter to Percy Bartlett, secretary of the IFOR, King expressed the hope for a favorable reception despite Sayre's doubts concerning the Canadian statement.¹³⁵

The Canadian request was laid before the International FOR executive Council meeting at Fanø, Denmark on June 9. A few weeks later Bartlett reported that the IFOR Council rejected the Canadian bid for affiliation because the Canadian statement of basis "did not approach quite closely enough to the definitely Christian phrasing required of an officially recognized branch of the International Fellowship."¹³⁶ Although not present at the Fanø meeting, Sayre reported that the IFOR Council did desire fellowship with the Canadians; therefore, he patronizingly expressed the hope that the

Canadian group would overcome their difficulty with their statement in the near future.¹³⁷

The response of the Canadian Council, while disappointed, generally favored revision of the Basis and Aims. Lavell Smith wrote King that he believed the majority of Canadian FOR members now supported the idea of a specifically Christian movement.¹³⁸ Smith also warned that pacifists who lacked a religious foundation for their convictions were already falling out. As an example he cited Professor G. M. A. Grube, editor of The Canadian Forum and a founding member of the LSR, who had penned numerous articles in support of pacifism during the thirties. By the end of the decade, however, Grube confessed to Smith that he lacked the type of religious conviction necessary to sustain a pacifist stand in light of contemporary
139
problems.

Despite Smith's interest in a revised statement, Council members failed to take any action in that regard or to make further suggestions to King.¹⁴⁰ Instead, pacifists began to turn their attention to more immediate issues such as plans to unite conscientious objectors in Canada -- a hint of what was on the horizon.¹⁴¹ As far as the Canadian FOR was concerned, its statement remained unchanged as it hobbled along, with King's assistance, in an attempt to serve Canadian pacifists in the face of approaching international disaster.

Besides the loss in prestige, the FOR's failure to become an official part of an international pacifist network left Canadian pacifists rather isolated and loosely organized at the close of the decade. The last display of pacifist solidarity before the war occurred during the summer of 1939 as representatives of various pacifist and youth organizations gathered on the shore of Lake Simcoe for a weekend peace conference. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss ways and means of spreading the pacifist answer to modern violence and war. Conference participants, largely young people, expressed the conviction that it was "high time pacifists made overtures to producer groups, co-operatives, and labour unions, as well as campaigning in the churches. . . ." ¹⁴² Dr. Willard Brewing of St. George's United Church in Toronto reminded the pacifists that they were "pledged to refuse participation in all wars, whether civil, class, or imperialist." ¹⁴³ Other participants argued that the major task of pacifists was to work for a new social order without the competitive profit-motivated tensions that lead to war. The suggestion was also made that "sincere pacifists should express their sympathy with the underprivileged, by living on a minimum allowance and giving away the rest of their salary."

Speaking in a personal vein, Professor G. M. A. Grube emphasized how difficult it was to be active in politics and still hold pacifist ideals. He told the crowd that pacifists "could have little influence in politics and should be content to play the role of the social

prophet in society."¹⁴⁴ His critical analysis of the weakness of the pacifist answer to current political and international tensions, however, sparked considerable discussion among the delegates.

By the time it closed, the conference was credited with arousing "enthusiasm and renewed vigour" in the peace movement. Plans were formulated to begin training people in the ideas and methods of non-violence and a motion was passed to encourage the Fellowship of Reconciliation to organize an even larger pacifist convention in Toronto the following year in order to launch an extensive peace campaign. Although these ambitious plans were later curtailed by the outbreak of the war, The United Church Observer, caught up in the spirit of the moment, concluded that

Toronto pacifists have a close knit body who mean to translate their theories into action, and have decided to move from the realm of talking, into the realm of action!¹⁴⁵

At about the same time, a controversy was raging in the Observer's reader's forum which pointed out the sharp divisions within the United Church on the pacifist issue and the proper Christian attitude to war. The barrage of letters were incited by a statement by William Iverach of Isabella, Manitoba, that war was not unchristian. One contributor argued that war "in defense of international law and order or in resistance to lawless aggression" was the proper Christian response. Another writer suggested that Christians could participate in war but not in the name of Christ. Still another accused Iverach of a "great sin" in attempting to link the New Testament with war.¹⁴⁶ Cleo Mowers, the National FOR Secretary from Saskatoon, maintained

that pacifists did not need Biblical authority since it was enough that the hate and killing of war was contrary to the spirit of Jesus.¹⁴⁷ The radical pacifist, R. Edis Fairbairn, suggested that Iverach had inadvertently "rendered a service to the whole Church in expressing bluntly and forcibly the average man's reaction to the Church's repudiation of war." He was not to be blamed, Fairbairn argued, because the pulpit had failed to explain the latest developments in Christian thinking on the problem of war. In particular, Fairbairn referred to the Oxford pronouncement's allowance of the absolute pacifist position.¹⁴⁸

In his response to the controversy, Iverach thanked the Observer for opening the "all-important question" for discussion, thereby showing "the every-day members of the United Church where a section of its ministers stand on some great national questions." "It exposes, too," he charged, "the attempt of the pacifist section of our ministry to set themselves up as a sort of super-Christian."¹⁴⁹ Despite the eleventh hour surge of enthusiasm among Toronto pacifists, Iverach's defense of Christian participation in war probably more clearly reflected the public mood at the end of the decade.

During the latter half of the thirties, the Canadian peace movement was reduced to a shadow of its former self. This wholesale abandonment of pacifism occurred as the suppressed inner divisions inherent in any broad movement surfaced in response to increased

international tensions and the theological search for political realism. The fascist threat to world peace began to sort out the supporters of collective security and possible military action from the pacifists proper, while the Spanish Civil War further disrupted the alliance between pacifists and the radical left. Consequently, internationalists and social radicals began to abandon their pacifist ideals, particularly as they re-evaluated the proper Christian response to war. The churches, themselves, had refused to endorse a strictly pacifist position and some churchmen again began to defend the armed defense of Christian civilization.

In response to this crisis, committed pacifists in the Society of Friends, the WIL and the FOR reorganized and consolidated their forces. Furthermore, since the political relevance of pacifism appeared to dwindle with each instance of international violence, socially radical pacifists gradually retreated to the position that war was absolutely and always wrong, not entirely unlike the sectarian creed of the historic peace churches. Indeed, by the end of the decade the once broadly-based peace movement had contracted to the point where it often resembled a quasi-religious sect. This was especially true of the FOR as its membership moved towards a strictly Christian basis of organization. Nevertheless, the Canadian FOR was destined to become the central core around which Canada's non-sectarian pacifists would coalesce during the war years.

FOOTNOTES

¹Woodsworth, however, wanted oil sanctions to be accompanied by a demand for disarmament. See Agnes Jean Groome, "M. J. Coldwell and C.C.F. Foreign Policy 1932-1950," M.A. Thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Regina, 1967, pp. 17-20.

²The Canadian government withdrew its support for the proposal for oil sanctions against Italy initiated by the Canadian Advisory Officer in Geneva, Walter Riddell. For a full discussion of this incident see: Eayrs, In Defense of Canada, Vol. II: Appeasement and Rearmament, pp. 12-27; Robert Bothwell and John English, "'Dirty Work at the Cross-Roads': New Perspectives on the Riddell Incident," CHA Historical Papers, 1972, pp. 263-286.

³Brock, Twentieth-Century Pacifism, p. 130.

⁴Interview with Mrs. A. A. MacLeod, Toronto, 30 March 1976.

⁵The World Tomorrow (1931-1934).

⁶Ibid., 25 January 1933.

⁷Chatfield, For Peace and Justice, p. 178.

⁸Interview with Mrs. A. A. MacLeod.

⁹Avakumovic, The Communist Party in Canada, p. 128.

¹⁰A. A. MacLeod Papers (in possession of Mrs. A. A. MacLeod, Toronto).

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Avakumovic, The Communist Party in Canada, pp. 127-128.

¹³McMaster University, Special Collections, Canadian Youth Congress (CYC) Papers, Box 1, file 2, Minutes of the Canadian Youth Congress, Toronto, 24 July 1935.

¹⁴MacLeod Papers, League for Peace and Democracy, Agenda of Events.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶McNaughton Papers, E. 95 (4), Report of the Canadian Women's International League for Peace and Freedom National Convention, June 1937.

¹⁷MacLeod Papers.

¹⁸For a full account of these activities see Victor Hoar, The Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1969).

¹⁹CYC Papers, Box 1, file 1, Continuing Committee of the Canadian Youth Congress and the Toronto Youth Council, Why a Canadian Youth Congress? (Toronto: April 1938); Memorandum on the Canadian Youth Congress Movement, n.d.

²⁰Ibid., Memorandum on the Canadian Youth Congress Movement.

²¹Ibid., Box 1, file 2, Minutes of the Canadian Youth Congress, Toronto, 5 June 1935, 10 July 1935 and 24 July 1935.

²²Ibid., Box 12, file 3, CYC 1935 Questionnaire file. Quote comes from Woodsworth's completed questionnaire.

²³Ibid., Box 1, file 1, Memorandum on the Canadian Youth Congress Movement.

²⁴Ibid.; The Silhouette (McMaster University), 1 October 1936, p. 1.

²⁵Wilfred Cantwell Smith, "The Canadian Youth Congress," The Canadian Forum, July 1936, p. 16.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸CYC Papers, Box 1, file 1, Canadian Youth Congress, "Declaration of Rights of Canadian Youth" (Ottawa: May 1936), p. 7.

²⁹Ivan Avakumovic, The Communist Party in Canada (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1975), p. 125.

³⁰Kenneth Woodsworth, "The World Youth Congress," The New Outlook, 14 October 1936.

³¹CYC Papers, Box 1, file 1, Memorandum on the CYC Movement.

³²Woodsworth, "The World Youth Congress."

³³Ibid.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵CYC Papers, Box 1, file 1, Memorandum on the Canadian Youth Congress Movement; Box 12, file 1, Youth Peace Day file. In November 1937 the CYC received numerous messages of support and encouragement for their work on behalf of Youth Peace Day from members of parliament, senators, principals of universities, church officials and the Governor-General Lord Tweedsmuir.

³⁶CYC Papers, Box 1, file 3, Minutes of the National Committee Meeting, Kingston, November 1938.

³⁷Ibid., Minutes of the National Committee Meeting, Montreal, 25 September 1938; Toronto, 5 February 1939; Canadian Congress Journal, June 1938, p. 10.

³⁸CYC Papers, Box 3, file 6, Ken Woodsworth to Local Councils, 16 November 1938.

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰The CYC also endorsed the "Vassar Peace Pact" adopted by the Second World Youth Congress meeting at Vassar College in New York State in August 1938, and was in regular contact with the British Youth Assembly and the American Youth Congress.

⁴¹For much of this information I am indebted to Groome, "M. J. Coldwell and C.C.F. Foreign Policy."

⁴²Ibid., p. 52.

⁴³This is also related in McNaught, A Prophet in Politics, p. 286.

⁴⁴Reinhold Niebuhr, "Why I Leave the F.O.R.." The Christian Century, 51 (3 January 1934): 17-18.

⁴⁵Nelson, The Peace Prophets, p. 95.

⁴⁶Reinhold Niebuhr, Moral Man and Immoral Society (New York: Scribners, 1932).

⁴⁷For Richard Roberts' response to Niebuhr see Chapter VII.

⁴⁸Arthur G. Dorland, "Some Dilemmas of Christian Living and of Pacifism Today," The Canadian Friend, May 1937, p. 6.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 7.

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Ibid., p. 8.

⁵³Ibid., p. 7.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 8.

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶John Oliver, The Church and Social Order: Social Thought in the Church of England, 1918-1939 (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1968), p. 190.

⁵⁷Roberts Papers, Box 2, file 49, Roberts to Sayre, 27 May 1937.

⁵⁸Norman, "Richard Roberts," pp. 176-177.

⁵⁹Sinclair-Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," p. 28.

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Norman, "Richard Roberts," pp. 177-178; The Globe and Mail (Toronto), 20 September 1937.

⁶²Ibid., 21 September 1937.

⁶³The Christian Advance, 15 November 1937, p. 15.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 13.

⁶⁵Roberts Papers, Box 2, file 49, Sisco to Roberts, 22 September 1937.

⁶⁶Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meetings of the Society of Friends, 1938, p. 57.

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹Haslam, Canadian Friends, pp. 64-65.

⁷⁰The Canadian Friend, June 1933, p. 11; (December 1935), p. 13.

⁷¹Ibid., March 1936, p. 6.

⁷²Ibid., December, 1938, p. 6; McNaughton Papers, E. 95 (5). According to Violet McNaughton's contact in New York, Katherine Blake, one-third of the refugees were Christians.

⁷³Ibid., Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Toronto Branch, "Newsletter," 1936.

⁷⁴McNaughton Papers, E. 95 (4), the WIL petitioned Prime Minister King for an embargo on Japan.

⁷⁵Ibid., Anna Sissons to McNaughton, Telegram, 16 February 1937.

- ⁷⁶Ibid., Lila Phelps to McNaughton, 9 April 1936.
- ⁷⁷Ibid.; ibid., McNaughton to Phelps, 22 April 1936.
- ⁷⁸Ibid., Minutes of the Organization Conference, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Canadian Section, Winnipeg, 1-2 June 1937.
- ⁷⁹Ibid.
- ⁸⁰Ibid.
- ⁸¹Ibid., McNaughton to Jamieson, 27 April 1937.
- ⁸²Ibid., E. 95 (4).
- ⁸³Gordon K. Stewart to Thomas P. Socknat, 7 March 1978; interview with J. Stanley Allen.
- ⁸⁴Interview with Harold T. Allen, Hamilton, 18 May 1976.
- ⁸⁵Ibid., Interim Statements of Aims of the Saskatoon Peace Group.
- ⁸⁶Interview with Carlyle King.
- ⁸⁷Saskatchewan Archives Board, Saskatoon, Carlyle King Papers, 27:152, Carlyle King to J. M. C. Duckworth, 31 January 1938.
- ⁸⁸King to Mildred Fahrni, 1 November 1961, copy enclosed in King to Thomas P. Socknat, 29 November 1976.
- ⁸⁹Ibid.
- ⁹⁰Carlyle King Papers, 27: 151, John Nevin Sayre to Carlyle King, 29 November 1938.
- ⁹¹Ibid., Sayre to J. M. C. Duckworth, 29 October 1937; Sayre to J. LaveII Smith, 23 November 1937.

⁹²Ibid.

⁹³Ibid.

⁹⁴Ibid., Sayre to Duckworth, 29 October 1937.

⁹⁵Ibid., 27: 153, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Montreal Unit, "A Protest" leaflet, 30 July 1938.

⁹⁶Ibid., Cleo Mowers to R. Edis Fairbairn, 20 April 1939.

⁹⁷Ibid., Minutes of the F.O.R. Meeting Held in the Diet Kitchen, Toronto, 27 September 1938.

⁹⁸Ibid.

⁹⁹Ibid., 27: 151, Mowers to P. G. Makaroff, 29 August 1938; Mowers to R. Edis Fairbairn, 20 April 1939; King to Farhni, 1 November 1961.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., 27: 152, Lavell Smith to King, 4 November 1938.

¹⁰¹Ibid., King to Members of the National Council, Canadian FOR, 28 November 1938.

¹⁰²Ibid., King to Lavell Smith, 27 December 1938; Fellowship of Reconciliation, Canadian Section, "Basis and Aims," leaflet, 1939.

¹⁰³Ibid., Lavell Smith to King, 20 January 1939.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., Mowers to Fairbairn, 20 April 1939.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., Lavell Smith to King, 4 November 1938.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., 27: 153, King to Fred Young, 14 May 1937.

¹⁰⁷Fellowship for a Christian Social Order, Toronto Branch, "Our Battle for Peace" (Toronto: FCSO, 1939). The leaflet also recommended a bibliography of popular pacifist books, pamphlets and periodicals.

¹⁰⁸Carlyle King Papers, 27: 152, Mowers to Fairbairn, 20 April 1939.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., C. Clare Oke to King, 16 May 1939.

¹¹⁰Ibid., Stanley Knowles to King, 17 February 1939.

¹¹¹Ibid., Joseph Round to King, 17 February 1939.

¹¹²Ibid., Mowers to Fairbairn, 20 April 1939.

¹¹³Ibid., Mowers to Tillman, 21 November 1938; Duckworth to King, 3 January 1939.

¹¹⁴Ibid., 27: 151, Harold E. Fey to Duckworth, 22 November 1938.

¹¹⁵Ibid.

¹¹⁶Ibid., Sayre to King, 29 November 1938.

¹¹⁷Ibid., King to Sayre, 27 December 1938; Oke to King, 14 February 1939.

¹¹⁸Ibid., Fellowship of Reconciliation, Canadian Section, "Basis and Aims," 1939. For the complete statement see Appendix B.

¹¹⁹Carlyle King Papers, 27: 151, King to Sayre, 27 December 1938.

¹²⁰Ibid., Sayre to King, 23 January 1939.

¹²¹Ibid.

¹²²Ibid.

¹²³Ibid., King to Booth, Duckworth, Halliday, Oke and Smith, 6 February 1939.

¹²⁴Ibid.

¹²⁵Ibid., Duckworth to Sayre, 15 February 1939.

¹²⁶Ibid., Sayre to Duckworth, 24 February 1939.

¹²⁷Ibid.

¹²⁸Ibid., Booth to King, 15 February 1939, King to Oke,
21 May 1939.

¹²⁹This statement referred to Communists and the FOR's confrontation with the Toronto Police Commission over the issue of free speech in the early thirties.

¹³⁰Carlyle King Papers, 27: 151, Booth to King, 15 February 1939.

¹³¹Ibid., Sayre to King, 11 May 1939.

¹³²Ibid.

¹³³Ibid., 27: 152, Oke to King, 16 May 1939.

¹³⁴Ibid.; ibid., Halliday to King, 31 March 1939.

¹³⁵Ibid., 27: 151, King to Percy Bartlett, 18 May 1939.

¹³⁶Ibid., Bartlett to King, 26 June 1939.

¹³⁷Ibid., 27: 152, Sayre to King, 6 July 1939.

¹³⁸Lavell Smith to King, 30 August 1939.

¹³⁹Ibid.

¹⁴⁰Ibid., 27: 154, King to Fairbairn, 25 June 1941.

¹⁴¹Ibid., 27: 151, R. Tillman to King, 24 August 1939.

¹⁴²The United Church Observer, 15 July 1939, p. 11.

¹⁴³Ibid.

¹⁴⁴Ibid.

¹⁴⁵Ibid.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., 1 April 1939, p. 18; 15 August 1939, p. 19; 15 September 1939, p. 19.

¹⁴⁷Ibid., 15 May 1939, p. 21.

¹⁴⁸Ibid.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., 15 July 1939, p. 16.

CHAPTER VII

THE INITIAL STRUGGLE TO MAINTAIN A PACIFIST WITNESS DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The Second World War began on September 1, 1939. Germany invaded Poland and two days later Britain declared war. Legally, Canada was also at war, but unlike the "Ready, aye, ready" attitude of 1914, the Canadian government symbolically maintained a policy of neutrality for a week before it committed Canada to the world conflict.¹ From the pacifist perspective the worst had happened; he was isolated in a world that had turned to war despite his own best efforts. The consequences in terms of human suffering were nightmarish to contemplate. But as a suspect member of the national community, what could he now do? The depression had sharply honed his social conscience. But what could now be accomplished on that front? The first two years of war were therefore especially agonizing for Canadian pacifists: they would protest and debate in the columns of the Church press, outspoken pacifist clergy would find their pastorates challenged, even in the FCSO there was a hardening of lines, and they would have to confront anew the slings of Niebuhrian neo-orthodoxy. Much of their time, one suspects, was spent in silent agony, to which they occasionally gave expression. Of necessity they leaned on each other for mutual support and summoned what courage they could to meet what the future might bring. Survival was a critical concern, but their

conscience told them that survival was not a sufficient role in such a time.

Canadian pacifists also discovered that the experience of the Second World War was to be quite different from that of the First War. For one thing, there was a noticeable coolness in the Canadian response to the thought of war in 1939. As Donald Creighton has recorded, "Canadians had lost, or were losing, some of their moral extremism as well as their evangelical zeal."² In the end Canada did go to war in part because Britain went to war, but also because most Canadians were convinced by four years of international turmoil and fascist aggression that war was unavoidable. In both respects, a sober reluctance hung over the land:

there were no crowds around newspaper offices, no bands in the streets, no impassioned singing of God Save the King or La Marseillaise. The memories of 1914-18, the terrible casualties of that war, and the divisions it left in the fabric of the nation were still too deep for that. The disillusionment over the failure of the 1930's, over the collapse of the League of Nations, and over the weaknesses of British policy -- all were too clear. . . . Above all, the great depression had sapped the will of the people. For the first time many Canadians might even have wondered if the system was worth fighting for.³

In that connection, O. D. Skelton, Under Secretary for External Affairs, noted at the time that there was little enthusiasm even among the war supporters.⁴ He doubted if the majority of Canadians would have voted for war in a free plebiscite and observed that the main reason the anti-war forces failed to muster a more significant opposition to Canada's entry into the war was because they lacked effective leadership.⁵ To be sure, support for the once popular

peace movement had dwindled in response to the growing Nazi menace. Nevertheless, the lack of Canadian enthusiasm for war reflected to a certain extent the growth of pacifist, isolationist and socialist sentiment during the thirties.

By the eve of the Second World War, pacifists and isolationists and some socialists had aligned themselves in the demand for Canadian neutrality. Neutrality was urged by pacifists as a last ditch effort to keep Canada out of war despite their strong belief in the necessity to build a new social order on an international scale. On the other hand, more isolationist minded Canadians recoiled from international entanglements in an effort to preserve peace and protect Canada from European and imperialist violence. The League for Social Reconstruction, for example, demanded a plebiscite on the question of Canada's participation in war, similar to the referendum proposed earlier by the WIL and the Saskatoon Peace Group.⁶

The LSR's isolationist rather than pacifist stance was exhibited by Frank Underhill, professor of history at the University of Toronto.⁷ Underhill suggested that Canadians should refrain from lending military support to Britain in a European struggle since such action would only assure

the burying of 60,000 more Canadians somewhere across the ocean. It may be that another such mass burial service will assure world peace, or democracy, or freedom -- after the next war. But our experience during and since the last war should have made us skeptical to such claims.⁸

A slightly different type of anti-war sentiment existed in Quebec. Formed along neutralist and Quebec nationalist lines, French Canadian opposition to the Second World War lacked any pretense of a pacifist nature. As in the First War, Quebec was primarily worried about conscription rather than the principle of non-violence.⁹ A similar stand in favor of neutrality was taken by Canada's communists, especially after the Hitler-Stalin Pact of August 1939.

The political reaction to Canadian entry into war was varied. The Liberal party was divided, primarily because of French-Canadian opposition to war, but the Cabinet, including the ministers from Quebec, was solidly behind the Prime Minister. Likewise, consistent with their Tory heritage, the conservatives vigorously supported the decision to go to war and their leader, Dr. R. J. Manion, pledged his co-operation with the government.¹⁰ The party most seriously torn by the war issue was the CCF. As early as 1937, for instance, the CCF had begun to modify its pacifist policy; a committee of the National Council rephrased the party's foreign policy statement so as to urge neutrality only in the event of an "imperialist" war.¹¹ The leading spokesman of the anti-pacifist elements in the CCF was George Williams, president of the party in Saskatchewan.¹² Williams and his followers formed an undercurrent of opposition to a party policy of pacifism and neutrality which finally surfaced in the CCF debate on the war in 1939.

Meeting in emergency session from the sixth to the eighth of September, the CCF National Council was sharply divided over the issue. In the end a committee worked out a compromise between the all-out war effort advocated by Williams' faction and the absolute neutrality of Woodsworth and his fellow pacifists; the result was qualified support of the war but opposition to sending men overseas.¹³ The decision of the party was a complete reversal of its previous official policy of neutrality and a repudiation of Woodsworth's pacifism. The new position was tempered, however, with the party decision that it would be stated in the House of Commons by the National Chairman, M. J. Coldwell, thus freeing Woodsworth to voice his unyielding personal opposition to war.

The CCF Council was in the midst of reaching its compromise position when the special war session of Parliament was convened on September seventh. In the Speech from the Throne the government sought approval for Canadian entry into the war.¹⁴ It was no surprise to the House, and, assured of the support of both the Conservatives and the CCF, the Prime Minister knew there would be little opposition to the request. In the brief debate that followed there was a steady stream of support for war; even one-time peace activists like Agnes Macphail sided with the government. Despite almost two decades of pacifist rhetoric and pledges of "never again", Canada was at war three days after the special session opened.

Other than a few disgruntled comments only one voice was raised in the House in opposition to Canada's entry into the war.

J. S. Woodsworth, freed the constraints of his party's position, spoke out for his own conscience as well as for the pacifist minority in Canada. His address was a lonely but eloquent appeal for neutrality and pacifism. Woodsworth began by questioning the meaning of the government's statement. He argued that the House had a right to know every aspect of government policy. For instance: Would an expeditionary force be sent to Europe? Would wealth be conscripted? Woodsworth also maintained that if Canada was not already at war there was no reason to have reinstated the War Measures Act.¹⁵

The gist of Woodsworth's remarks, however, were devoted to his unswerving pacifist conviction. In his biography of Woodsworth, Kenneth McNaught argues that in "the final analysis" it was Woodsworth's "estimate of capitalism that produced his pacifism."¹⁶ While McNaught admits that this pacifism "came to have a high emotional content not dissimilar to that of a religious pacifist", he seems to overstate the material aspect of Woodsworth's beliefs.¹⁷ To be sure Woodsworth's socialism and pacifism were probably inseparable; nevertheless it appears that in "the final analysis", at least from his famous address to the House, the basis of Woodsworth's pacifism was more religious than not. For while it is true he argued war was "the inevitable outcome of the present economic and international system with its injustices, exploitations and class interests," Woodsworth also emphasized that pacifism, although not necessarily Christian, was a religious and moral force.¹⁸ In reference to his own pacifism Woodsworth recalled:

I left the ministry of the church during the last war because of my ideas on war. To-day I do not belong to any church organization. I am afraid that my creed is pretty vague. But even in this assembly I venture to say that I still believe in some of the principles underlying the teachings of Jesus and the other great world teachers throughout centuries. For me at least, and for a growing number of men and women in the churches . . . war is an absolute negation of anything Christian. . . . It requires a great deal of courage to trust in moral force. But there was a time when people thought that there were other and higher types of force than brute force . . . that is what the church fathers used to call faith. It requires a great deal of courage to carry out our convictions; to have peace requires both courage and sacrifice.²⁰

At another point Woodworth lent support to the idea of conscientious objection to military service:

I do not care whether you think me an impossible idealist or a dangerous crank, I am going to take my place beside the children and those young people, because it is only as we adopt new policies that this world will be at all a livable place for our children who follow us . . . yes I have boys of my own, and I hope they are not cowards, but if any one of those boys, not from cowardice but really through belief, is willing to take his stand on this matter and, if necessary, to face a concentration camp or a firing squad, I shall be more proud of that boy than if he enlisted for the war.²¹

Interrupted at this point with a cry of shame, Woodsworth emphasized that it was not only his belief but the belief of a growing number of Canadians as well. Then he concluded:

I must thank the house for the great courtesy shown me. I rejoice that it is possible to say these things in a Canadian parliament under British institutions. It would not be possible in Germany, I recognize that, but it is possible here; and I want to maintain the very essence of our British institutions of real liberty. I believe that the only way to do it is by an appeal to the moral forces which are still resident among our people, and not by another resort to brute force.²²

And so ended Woodsworth's last major speech in the House. In a sense it was his formal farewell to his party and his country, neither of which followed him on the pacifist trail he had blazed in Parliament. Within two years the pacifist-socialist pioneer was dead. While he had not assumed the role of Canadian pacifist leader during his last years, Woodsworth had maintained his warnings against conscription and his demand for the nationalization of war industries.²³ Above all, however, his address to the special war session became an inspiration to Canadian pacifists in a time of crisis. As an advisor to prospective conscientious objectors within the Society of Friends, for instance, Fred Haslam kept a copy of Woodsworth's speech on hand throughout the war. ✓

In his address Woodsworth had expressed confidence, from the scores of telegrams and letters he had received, that there were "thousands upon thousands" of Canadians who shared his pacifist conviction;²⁴ he felt he had voiced their feelings as well as his own. A further avalanche of mail followed the speech, the bulk of which, if not in complete agreement with his pacifism, at least commended Woodsworth's stand.²⁵ For example, C. C. Annett of Winnipeg wrote Woodsworth that he approved heartily of his stand and added that many others also agreed with him "even though they may lack the moral courage to stand up and say so. . . ."²⁶ From the Canadian Legation in Washington, Escot Reid wrote:

I have read with the greatest admiration your most moving speech in the House of Commons. That is a speech of which you and your friends will always be proud. Their pride will increase as time goes on and we can see the events of these days in better perspective.²⁷

A young man from Calgary experienced admiration and appreciation of Woodsworth's pacifist stand and offered his assistance in furthering the cause of peace. The writer, Howard Patton, claimed he shared similar pacifist convictions as did the majority of young people with whom he had associated within the last two years.²⁸ A somewhat different letter of praise came from H. G. L. Strange, Director of Agricultural Research for the Searle Grain Company of Winnipeg. Although Strange was not a pacifist, he found himself in "complete agreement with almost everything" Woodsworth said. "Just as I feel it my duty to do all I can to win this war," wrote Strange, "so likewise do I feel it my duty to do everything I possibly can to respect and esteem the stand that true Christians like you take. . . ."²⁹ Strange concluded on a note of deep admiration for Woodsworth's moral courage and faith.

The assumption that Woodsworth's pacifism was an admirable stand was not reflected in the official reaction to the war of Canada's churches. Prior to the war pacifism was a popular issue of debate among Canadian Protestants but it was a muddled debate because few churchmen were prepared to argue forcefully that war was unchristian without implying absolute pacifism. In effect they tended to condemn war per se while at the same time sidestepping the whole issue of what to do "when the bombs begin to fall."³⁰ Despite their concern with peace, therefore, they largely remained unprepared to support a pacifist or

even semi-pacifist course of action for Christians confronted with the reality of war. In the autumn of 1939, therefore, Protestants began to repudiate their "unrealistic" flirtations with the pacifism of the thirties.³¹ In his study of the churches and Canada's war effort, C. T. Sincalir-Faulkner has shown that the major churches in Canada, Protestant and Roman Catholic alike, accepted the war as a fight "for Christian civilization." Shortly after the beginning of the war, Canada's major Protestant denominations -- Anglican, Baptist, Presbyterian and United Church -- issued a joint statement on the war.

. . . we believe that our cause is the cause of Christian civilization, and that Divine power and guidance will be given to us to win victory for it, however hard the road we must first travel. . . .³²

The Roman Catholic Church, generally, abided by the doctrine expounded by Bishop Briand in 1775 of obedience to oath and King. Nevertheless, although it did not believe the war raised the issue of pacifism or even of "just war," the Catholic Church in Quebec displayed little enthusiasm for the war. For instance, Cardinal Villeneuve, Archbishop of Quebec and head of the Canadian hierarchy, remained relatively silent on the question of war.³³ English Canadian Catholics, by contrast, were more vocal in their support and criticized isolationist sentiment.

The major Protestant churches, Baptist, Presbyterian, Anglican and United, all supported the nation's declaration of war but they differed in their reasons for doing so and in degrees of enthusiasm. Contrary to their extreme zeal during the latter years of the First War,

most Protestant newspapers urged respect for pacifists even while they lent encouragement and support to those who chose to fight in a just war.³⁴ Baptists, especially fundamentalists like T. T. Shields of Toronto's Jarvis Street Baptist Church, were the most vocal in their demand for a maximum Canadian war effort and even advocated conscription.³⁵ Anglicans and Presbyterians supported the war with a little less enthusiasm but, like the Baptists, their decision was never really complicated by pacifist consideration.

It was the United Church which was the most deeply torn between support for the war and pacifist sympathies. The mid-depression posture of the United Church was somewhat difficult to reconcile with an all-out war effort. Throughout the interwar years the General Council had adopted successive resolutions condemning war, but its open debate over pacifism "offered little practical help in giving leadership during actual war conditions."³⁵ Apparently aware of the confusion, J. R. Mutchmor, Secretary of the United Church's Board of Evangelical Social Service, called a series of meetings the week before Hitler invaded Poland in order to consider a proper course of action for the United Church in the impending crisis. The members of these meetings agreed with Mutchmore that war was "contrary to the mind of Christ" but questioned the "practical value of such an ultimate ethic" as pacifism under present circumstances. Furthermore, while they agreed that citizens had a duty to disobey "unjust and tyrannical" governments

they were strongly against basing such civil disobedience solely on an individual's private judgement.³⁷ The result of these deliberations appeared to weaken the 1938 General Council's sanction of conscientious objection to military service. A week later, however, the Moderator of the United Church, John W. Woodside, sent a pastoral letter to the clergy concerning the Church's response to the war in which he reiterated official Church support for the right of conscientious objection:

. . . we must affirm for ourselves and our brethren the paramount authority of conscience under the leadership of Christ. We are at war with a power which seems to disregard conscience; and we must not fall into what we hold to be its error.³⁸

At first, the Moderator's letter appeared to calm those who feared the worst for the United Church's attitude towards war, including the well known pacifist, Richard Roberts. Roberts wrote his daughter that he was particularly hopeful over the Moderator's stand.

It is very cheering to me . . . I had to resign from my congregation in 1914 for saying the things that apparently all the United Church ministers are saying these days. It is not that they have become pacifists, but that they have come to see that the Gospel and war are at extreme antipodes from one another.³⁹

Furthermore, Jack Duckworth, general secretary of the Notre Dame de Grace YMCA, told Roberts that a group of laymen and YMCA directors in Montreal had agreed that, rather than formenting the war spirit, the business of the church in wartime was to preach peace and goodwill.⁴⁰ Perhaps because of its earlier pacifist inclinations, the United Church

appears to have been somewhat uncomfortable in its internal support of the war. But the optimism of Roberts and Duckworth was not completely warranted, especially in light of the Church's ambiguity in defining its exact position with regard to pacifist dissent. Nevertheless, shortly after the Canadian declaration of war on 10 September 1939 the Presbyteries of the United Church unanimously endorsed the General Council's expression of loyalty to the Government of Canada.⁴¹ Unlike similar statements by the other major churches, however, the United Church action was not without repercussions.

Although clearly in a minority, pacifists within the United Church were in a defiant mood, especially since it appeared as if their Church was about to surrender to the war spirit and perhaps repudiate its declared support for the pacifist alternatives, if not repeat its over zealous crusade during the Great War. In addition to the apparent abandonment of their cause, however, pacifists were also repelled by the behaviour of the Church during the first few weeks of war, particularly when a newly formed War Services Committee actually met four days before Canada officially declared war.⁴² Consequently, the likely prospect of the United Church's war effort ultimately leading to a complete apostasy compelled the pacifist minority to speak out against the war in radical defiance of the authority of their Church.⁴³ Their protest took the form of a letter to the editor of The United Church Observer, appearing in the Sunday October 15, 1939 issue.⁴⁴ It was the first instance of an organized public declaration of pacifist dissent within a Canadian church denomination.

Entitled "A Witness Against War," the pacifist manifesto was signed by sixty-eight United Church ministers, mostly from Toronto and Montreal but representative of the whole country. It included an invitation to others to forward their names for later publication. A month later the Observer published an additional sixty-four names, lay and clerical, which brought the total of published signatories to one hundred and thirty-two.⁴⁵

The manifesto began with reference to the declaration of the General Council of 1938, which officially recognized pacifism as a legitimate Christian alternative in time of war. Accordingly, the ad hoc committee of ministers felt they were merely exercising their right as pacifists to disapprove of the war. They recognized that other ministers and church members, "equally sincere," felt duty bound to support the war and they respected right of their brethren to do so. Nevertheless, they believed their pacifist convictions, "characteristic of the earliest Christian Church, and of many reform movements throughout the centuries," was a truer Christian position.

It is generally agreed and confessed that Christendom has through the centuries sadly and seriously fallen short in faithfulness to Christ. We are convinced that at no point has Christendom departed so radically from the mind of Christ and its own original faith as in its acceptance of war.⁴⁶

As to the question of war itself they stated forcefully that "the will and Kingdom of God must take precedence over the national convenience or policy" and emphasized that the nature of modern warfare was especially incompatible with Christianity. Apart from the religious

argument, the manifesto cited British Prime Ministers Baldwin and Chamberlain on the futility of war.⁴⁷ The most important point of the "Witness Against War" concerned the signatories' desire to preserve the soul of the Church especially since they remembered that "the Churches lost heavily in spiritual authority because of their general surrender to the war spirit" during the First War.

We think it ought to be placed on record now, in view of the further loss of spiritual authority probable if the Church sanctions this present war, that at least some representatives of the Christian Churches disapproved and uttered their protest.⁴⁸

Rather than taking the form of a passive or unpatriotic opposition to war, however, the manifesto concluded by emphasizing the desire on the part of the signatories to perform some constructive pacifist action in the days ahead.

We affirm that we are not seeking escape from the burden or sacrifice, and we profess our readiness to implement our citizen loyalty in some form of service equally as taxing, difficult, and dangerous as military service, providing it does not contribute directly to the war effort.⁴⁹

Although it was publicized as a joint effort, the drafting and circulation of the "Witness Against War" was almost entirely the work of R. Edis Fairbairn of Bracebridge, Ontario. He was assisted by his Montreal and Toronto associates in the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order and the Fellowship of Reconciliation but several of these men later reported that their final statement was virtually identical with Fairbairn's original draft.⁵⁰ Well known for his radical pacifism, Fairbairn was also acquainted with the nature of Church politics. He had long realized that the United Church was

not pacifist but, at the same time, he was dismayed by the speed with which Church officials were diverting their energy into moral support of the war. The manifesto was intended to "force the Church to recognize the moral dilemma posed by the war and to advertise the conscientious commitment he and some others shared."⁵¹ Despite Fairbairn's radical nature, the "Witness Against War" was a temperate pacifist statement. It made no attempt to undermine the authority of the General Council of 1938. Nor did it advocate any type of civil disobedience.

Following initial approval of the statement, Fairbairn and his FCSO and FOR associates like James M. Finlay and R. J. Irwin of Toronto and J. Lavell Smith and Clarence Halliday of Montreal set out to collect as many signatures as possible. Twenty-two pacifists from the Toronto-Ottawa-Montreal area were the first to sign the manifesto before it was circulated under a cover letter signed by Finlay to other clergymen across Canada. Since the manifesto was given the widest possible circulation, it seems evident that the "Witness Against War" was also part of a continuing effort to consolidate or "bring into fellowship" all Christian pacifists in the United Church as well as to organize some type of appropriate emergency pacifist action.⁵² In order to pursue that goal, a meeting of the signatories of the "Witness Against War" within the Toronto area was held on October 20, 1939, at Carlton Street United Church, Toronto. Under its pacifist minister, James Finlay, the Carlton Street Church, known as

the "House of Friendship," often served as an unofficial meeting place for Toronto pacifists during the war. The meeting was held behind closed doors "for freer discussion" with Finlay presiding, assisted by R. J. Irwin, minister of Donlands United Church and president of the Toronto FOR, and Gordon Lapp, assistant minister of Westminster-Central United Church, Toronto.⁵³ The meeting succeeded in obtaining several more signatories to the list, boosting the total number of signatories to over seventy-five. Thereafter, the manifesto became known as the "protest of the seventy-five." Among the names added was that of Richard Roberts who had mailed in his signature from Pine Hill Divinity School in Halifax.

In regard to some specific pacifist action, the meeting decided to send a deputation, composed of Fairbairn, Finlay, Irwin and S. T. Martin of Hamilton, to the War Services Committee of the United Church. The delegation was to urge the committee to redirect the Church's war effort so as to focus attention on the future peace, to be completely honest about the causes and evils of war and

to take action to conserve civil liberties, to provide a service for refugee aliens both in the war and at home, and to initiate conferences with the Society of Friends and similar groups with a view to co-operating with them.⁵³

In effect, the pacifists offered an alternative stance for the Church in time of war. Before the pacifist challenge could be completely articulated, however, a nation-wide controversy erupted over the "Witness Against War" manifesto.

Other than condemnation from their peers within the Church, the signatories also risked criminal prosecution under the section of the Defence of Canada Regulations pertaining to "Subversive Teachings." Somehow, the office of the Attorney-General of Ontario Received a copy of the "Witness Against War" on October 10, 1939, five days before its publication, but the Attorney-General, Gordon D. Conant, did not order an official investigation until the matter made the front pages of Toronto's three daily newspapers.⁵⁵ Press reaction in Toronto and throughout the rest of the country was generally unsympathetic, at times arguing that the war was actually caused by such pacifism.⁵⁶ The fact that the Toronto signatories met behind closed doors fueled further suspicion.

The Ontario Attorney-General's staff finally concluded that the "Witness Against War" signatories did, indeed, violate the Defence of Canada Regulations on two counts: the publication of the manifesto was "likely to prejudice the recruiting of His Majesty's forces" and would be "prejudicial to the efficient prosecution of the war."⁵⁷ Rather than launch a full-scale prosecution of the pacifist ministers, however, Conant referred the matter to the Federal Minister of Justice. The reply from Ottawa doubted if the pacifist statement would prejudice military recruiting and consequently recommended against prosecution. Accordingly, the Attorney-General decided not to act. Instead he called a press conference on November 1, and in the presence of representatives of the United Church Sub-Executive and their legal counsel, he condemned the pacifist "Witness" but announced that the Government would leave it up to the governing body of the Church to "render a sufficient verdict and provide the effective remedy."⁵⁸

The Sub-Executive of the General Council had already met on October 25 to consider the "Witness Against War." Their statement, published the very day of the Attorney-General's press conference, steered a middle course that appeased neither the Attorney-General's office nor the pacifist dissidents.⁵⁹ In effect, the Sub-Executive sidestepped the basic question concerning the right of Christian pacifists to conscientiously object to the war. Instead, they concluded that too much attention had been given to a document which did not emanate from an official body of the Church and then seized the opportunity to reaffirm that the Church as a whole was completely loyal to the King and was ready "to support him in the present dire struggle in every way which is open and proper to the Church."⁶⁰ As far as the "Witness Against War" was concerned the Sub-Executive expressed regret that the signatories had made their manifesto public, and then stated:

The Church is determined to adhere to its previous declarations that it will protect the individual conscience, but in our judgement, by acting collectively and inviting signatures "for later publication", the signatories of this manifesto, however sincere, have gone far beyond the limits of what is wise and proper in time of war.⁶¹

Overall, the statement of the Sub-Executive appeared to be a prudent attempt to disassociate the Church from pacifist dissent, and inconsistent with the Moderator's pastoral letter which had urged tolerance and respect for the "paramount authority of conscience under the leadership of Christ."⁶² Indeed, R. B. Y. Scott, one of those who

helped draft the Moderator's letter, publicly registered his dis-
appointment:

The text of the Sub-Executive's statement is . . . not quite the complete repudiation suggested by the press, but in effect it is a desertion of our comrades who are under fire because they have made an unpopular witness for conscience sake. The whole tenor of the official statement suggests that the Church's reputation for loyalty to the military enterprise of the State is a more important consideration than that of loyalty to religious conviction.⁶³

In reality, the Sub-Executive was badly split over the pacifist issue and following a heated debate, apparently approved the final statement by only one vote.⁶⁴ According to a report Fairbairn received from a member of the Sub-Executive, there were "threatenings of a split in the church" unless the Sub-Executive disowned the pacifists and supported the war.⁶⁵ In such a charged atmosphere the Sub-Executive could hardly settle the question of pacifist dissent but it did attempt to protect individual conscience as long as it remained prudent. This action, together with the decision of the Attorney-General's office not to intervene, calmed the fears that some type of disciplinary or legal action would be taken against the signatories.

Perhaps the presence of such a well respected churchman as the former Moderator, Richard Roberts, on the list facilitated that result. While it is true that his name had lent a certain credibility to the manifesto, Roberts himself had not been in favor of its publication. In fact, he had advised Fairbairn not to make a public declaration at that time, primarily because he considered the Moderator's letter "far in advance in its Christian temper of any

comparable document in 1914."⁶⁶ On the other hand, he felt that if a pacifist statement was publicized, he could not afford to let anyone suppose that he had "ratted" from a conviction that he had held and publicly avowed since 1914 and which he had reaffirmed as recently as Canon Raven's visit to Toronto in March 1939.⁶⁷ In any case, Roberts expected to see the final draft and receive further word before definite action was taken; however, Fairbairn and his associates had already "taken the plunge."⁶⁸ In a letter to Lavell Smith, Roberts remarked that the soundness of his "caveat" was borne out by the fact that the "Witness" had "the effect of provoking the action of the sub-executive which virtually throws the Church on the side of war."⁶⁹ Nevertheless, once the Sub-Executive released their statement, which he described as "feeble" and "cowardly", Roberts expressed gratitude that his name was on the "black list". "The Sub-Executive", he wrote, "should, in addition to 'regretting', have affirmed the right of its ministers to hold and express dissenting convictions."⁶⁹ Furthermore, from the deluge of letters he received following the publication of the "Witness," Roberts concluded that many others were in agreement with him.

. . . there is much more support in the church for the forthright Christian position on the matter than the sub-executive and the "patriotic" suppose. I wonder how long Christian churchmen are going to allow their nationalism to prevent their churchmanship -- especially when the Ecumenical Church is beginning to enter into our calculations.⁷¹

Roberts' reaction was shared by others. Lavell Smith, for instance, expressed disappointment that the Sub-Executive repudiated the pacifist witness "without so much as a hint that the Church has ever denounced war." At the same time, however, he was encouraged to find several men in Montreal who were "standing staunchly" for the right of pacifists to make such a statement.⁷²

The reluctance on the part of the Sub-Executive to come out in defence of pacifist dissent was also reflected in the general attitude of other committees as well as a sizeable portion of the church membership at large. The War Services Committee, for instance, sought no alternative ways to allow pacifists to perform non-military service related to the war crisis. Lavell Smith criticized the committee's stand as "a trumpet call with but a single note" and pressed for some type of pacifist participation.⁷³ The delegation from the "Witness Against War" group made a similar plea when they attended the third meeting of the War Services Committee in October. Among their specific proposals was the recommendation that local congregations minister to the peculiar social, moral and spiritual problems caused by the war among military personnel and their families. The pacifists also emphasized the need to maintain normal church services and recommended that the Church provide pastoral care for interned aliens and hospitality for refugee children from enemy nations.⁷⁴

The response of the Committee was generally unsympathetic. Most of the pacifist requests were either ignored completely or merely acknowledged as unimportant and occasionally passed to other administrative divisions for consideration. The suggestion that the United Church ask the Government to send Canadian pacifists overseas in order to help with reconstruction in Poland was dismissed outright as "impractical".⁷⁵ When the pacifists complained that the name "War Services Committee" implied the Church's "wholesale support for the war" they came close to the truth. It was soon evident that the aim of the Committee was to maximize support for the war effort and to minister to soldiers -- not pacifists. Having failed to convince the War Services Committee to create some type of pacifist service, the "Witness Against War" group ceased to function as an organized group.⁷⁶

Other than the threat of legal conviction, angry denunciations in the press and virtual dismissal by the church hierarchy, the major fallout from the "Witness Against War" manifesto occurred within the individual congregations of the signatories. While generally unsympathetic, specific reaction varied according to congregation. In most cases, however, it was usually a corps of wealthy congregational leaders who most forcefully denounced the pacifist ministers and demanded their resignation. In the end several of the signatories were forced out of their churches; some accepted new stations, usually small northern posts, while others left the church entirely.

Montreal's pacifists were seriously affected since both Clarence Halliday and Lavell Smith were forced to resign from their respective churches, West United and Westmount Park United. During the first few years of the war, Halliday served as a voluntary chaplain to German refugees interned in camps outside of Montreal. Then, following a brief station up North, he left the ministry for social work, ultimately becoming the head of the Children's Aid Society in Ottawa.⁷⁷

The case of Lavell Smith was slightly different. By the time of the war, Smith had become known as one of the most promising young radical ministers within the United Church and, although he also lost his church because of the "Witness Against War", he continued as one of the leading pacifist spokesmen within the church throughout the war years and after. Almost immediately following the outbreak of war but prior to the publication of the pacifist manifesto, Lavell Smith had reiterated his pacifism and outlined what he thought constituted a pacifist ministry in time of war.⁷⁸ Smith's outspoken pacifism had never been representative of the membership of Westmount Park United, one of the most imperialist-minded establishment congregations in the country. Following the publication of the "Witness Against War" a powerful minority of the congregation, mainly composed of former Presbyterians, began to organize, quietly and secretly, against Smith and appointed a local War Services Committee in order to prove their loyalty to King and country.⁷⁹ At one point a poll taken of the congregation revealed that eighty per-cent of the church members desired Lavell Smith to remain as their pastor despite his pacifist views.

An engaging, earnest man, and a forceful preacher, Smith stayed on a few more years and unlike some of his co-signers showed remarkable resistance to a mounting undercurrent of opposition. Finally, after nearly sixty of the wealthiest members had left the congregation and many others refused to attend or to participate in their accustomed activities, Smith decided to resign.⁸⁰ On April 27, 1942, hundreds of Montreallers crowded into "every corner of Webster Hall", which adjoined Westmount Park United Church, to bid farewell to Lavell Smith and his wife Emily. Even at that late hour Smith received an enthusiastic show of support.⁸¹ Nevertheless, four days later he assumed his new duties as Superintendant of Toronto's Church of All Nations where he would remain for the next seventeen years.

Despite the obvious respect of many, however, the Smiths endured their last few years in Montreal only at the price of much strain and discomfort. They were snubbed by numerous members of the congregation, closely watched by the authorities and visited by the RCMP. Lavell Smith himself suspected that his phone was tapped.⁸² Through it all, he continued to speak out according to his conscience and, like Halliday, became interested in the problems of German refugees interned in Quebec. But his was not a one-sided approach and throughout the war he kept in regular communication with the enlisted men of his congregation.⁸³

This practice of writing men overseas was also shared by Jack Duckworth, general secretary of the Notre Dame de Grace YMCA (NDGY)

and another of Montreal's active pacifists. Duckworth sent circular letters to all the NDGY boys he knew in the military. His intention was merely to keep up their morale; therefore he avoided any mention of his personal pacifism.⁸⁴ Those who knew Duckworth, however, were well aware of his pacifist and socialist inclinations. He had studied under Reinhold Niebuhr and Harry Ward at Union Theological Seminary in New York. Furthermore he and his wife, Muriel, were noticeably active in the SCM, FOR, FCSO and various radical concerns. Once he joined the staff of the NDGY in the early 1930's Duckworth became a leading moral influence upon teenage boys in Montreal. He never attempted to indoctrinate the boys but his activism and his outspokenness on his radical beliefs, including pacifism, made him somewhat unpopular with the Montreal business community which controlled the YMCA board.⁸⁵ The Board was particularly displeased, for instance, with his opposition to the Boy Scouts which he viewed as a paramilitary organization, uniforms and all. Evidently Duckworth aroused enough antagonism to cause someone to fire a gun shot through his office window.⁸⁶ Despite a somewhat tense relationship with the YMCA Board, however, Duckworth endured the war years in Montreal and only in 1947 was he transferred to Halifax.

Some among the signatories to the "Witness" met a sterner fate. In Ontario, for instance, both R. Edis Fairbairn and E. Harold Toye lost their churches at the insistence of their congregations. Fairbairn, the instigator of the "Witness Against War" protest, was officially rebuked and ejected from his church in Bracebridge. But Fairbairn

refused to leave the ministry altogether and accepted what was ecclesiastically known as an "undesirable charge" at Winderemere, a small rural community in the Muskoka region of Ontario.⁸⁷ Fairbairn had realized for some time that he would always be relegated to the so-called "undesirable charges" because of his outspoken radicalism and impetuous nature. In fact, it appears that he even looked upon his rather undistinguished career in the ministry as a form of martyrdom -- the penalty he had to pay for remaining true to Christianity while the Church floundered.⁸⁸ At any rate, although his new congregation at Winderemere did not necessarily approve of his pacifism, they were grateful for his presence and encouraged him to stay there until his retirement in 1948. In Winderemere Fairbairn enjoyed a certain amount of freedom for his various pacifist pursuits. He even found "farmers on the back concessions whose total indifference to religion dated from the shock they received when the Churches recruited for the first World War,"⁸⁹ a discovery, he felt, which proved what he had been saying for years and supported his more recent criticisms of the Church.

The case of E. Harold Toye was similar but, unlike Fairbairn, Toye did leave the parish ministry. Toye's trouble at Toronto's Kingston Road United Church began before the "Witness Against War" and was directly related to his overall radicalism.⁹⁰ For example, Toye had always employed the social gospel in his pulpit ministry but, like other members of the FCSO, his radicalism increased in response to the social conditions of the depression years. At one point, the

Official Board of the Kingston Road Church succeeded in bringing him before a special Presbytery Commission for examination. Although the Presbytery ruled in Toye's favor the officials continued in their effort to have Toye removed as their pastor. On two occasions Toye tendered his resignation only to have it refused by the majority of the congregation.⁹¹ When Toye's wartime pacifism was added to his labor sympathies and socialist politics, however, the dissatisfied minority seized the opportunity to respond to his signature on the "Witness Against War." The eleven largest contributors launched a concerted campaign to have Toye removed, employing tactics ranging from withholding their church contributions to severing completely their connections with Kingston Road Church.⁹² Confronted with a now helplessly divided congregation on the one hand and what he considered the failure of the United Church to relate ethical and spiritual ideals to the social order on the other, Toye finally resigned in 1941 and asked to be left without station in order to engage in the work of industrial evangelism.

Although pacifism was the immediate issue surrounding Toye's resignation, it was but one expression of his radicalism. Within the next few years he joined with a small group of kindred spirits -- labor representatives, professional people and social workers -- in an attempt to make religion relevant to industrial society. At first Toye was urged to found a Toronto Labor Church but he did not agree with that approach.⁹³ Instead he strove to create a dialogue between organized

religion and organized labor, whose co-ordination and co-operation, Toye believed would promote social change within a moral framework. Organized religion, he argued, had failed to recognize that unions, collective bargaining and industrial strikes were all part of the true revolutionary character of the Hebrew-Christian religion.⁹⁴

Organized labor, on the other hand, had to function within the framework of a moral order prescribed by the ethical and spiritual demands of religion.⁹⁵ The time had come, claimed Toye, "to lift the whole struggle of the workers from the mere level of class struggle . . . and view it in relation to the moral integrity of the universe. . . ."⁹⁶

In order to develop this spirit of co-operation between religion and labor Toye and his associates founded the Religion-Labor Foundation (RLF). It was a small organization composed of clergymen, laymen and active unionists who thought of themselves as "The Brotherhood of Church, Farm and Factory."⁹⁷ While most Canadians at the time were concerned with the war, this small group turned their attention to the social, economic and moral problems of industrial society, anticipating the post-war era. But that is not to say that they ignored or overlooked the war; rather, they viewed war as an important problem of industrial peoples. Toye, for instance, believed the whole war effort of the 1940's was a humiliating and devastating experience for Canadian workers.⁹⁸ He saw the need for a great moral crusade and hoped the Religion-Labor Foundation would help bring about some necessary radical changes.

The Religion-Labor Foundation is convinced that we are due for a New Reformation. The recovery of traditional revivalism, in whatever form, is not likely to help much. It will have to be truly radical . . . and provide salvation from sin, not merely in the theological sense, but from specific sins, monopoly control, unfair employment practices, starvation wages, unethical and unjust profits, racial discrimination and war.⁹⁹

Small in number and experimental in approach, the Religion-Labor Foundation progressed slowly, at first receiving more cooperation from labor than from the Church.¹⁰⁰ Nevertheless, it made its impact, or "Christian witness", in Canada's industrial society, from mediating in industrial disputes and strikes to lobbying for specific legislation designed to recognize and protect ethical and spiritual values in labor-management relations.¹⁰¹ The Foundation was also successful in holding regular joint sessions of clergy and unionists in many Ontario communities. As the executive secretary of the RLF, Harold Toye was largely responsible for directing this experimental work in industrial evangelism. It was a new outlet for his radicalism once wartime pacifism forced him out of the parish ministry, and he remained devoted to the task for the rest of his life.

Other signatories to the "Witness Against War" suffered fewer repercussions because of their pacifist witness. For example, Fred Smith, a "stop-gap" national secretary of the FCSO, was never confronted with a campaign to oust him. Nor was J. W. E. Newbery.¹⁰² In St. John, New Brunswick the congregation of the Reverend H. McLean unanimously repudiated his pacifism but asked him to keep his pulpit.¹⁰³

This was also the experience of Douglas Smith who stayed on in Belleville, Ontario.¹⁰⁴ One of the most prominent cases involved James M. Finlay, an organizer of the "seventy-five", who, with the support of his congregation, withstood a serious challenge from the Official Board of Toronto's Carlton Street United Church. A small but influential minority of the congregation had been unhappy about Finlay's role in the "Witness Against War" and by the spring of 1940 church officials called for the resignations of Finlay and his two deaconesses, Miss Bessie Irwin and Miss M. Clapham, who also betrayed pacifist leanings.¹⁰⁵ But Finlay refused, arguing that since he accepted his pastoral duties at the invitation of the congregation it was a matter for them to decide.¹⁰⁶ Accordingly, on Monday evening of June 17, the congregation, both "members" and "adherents", as well as sympathetic guests crowded into the Carlton Street Church to put an end to the controversy. John Coburn, president-elect of the Toronto conference of the United Church, opened the meeting by urging the congregation to "recognize the right of other people to hold opinions diametrically opposed to ours", and reasoned:

We have sent our boys to fight Hitler. Hitlerism is a force that crushes individualism, freedom of thought and even the human soul. If we are fighting it in Europe, we must exemplify it [freedom] at home.¹⁰⁷

Testimonials on behalf of Finlay and the deaconesses poured in from every side including many people from across the country who listened to Finlay's weekly radio broadcasts.¹⁰⁸ While the meeting unanimously pledged its support to the allied cause and Canada's war effort,

Finlay was accorded a sweeping vote of confidence. By a vote of 361 to 80 the members of the congregation adopted the following resolution:

. . . while we may not all agree with our minister, we assure him of our confidence in him as a minister of Christ and our whole-hearted co-operation in his efforts to win souls for Christ and to advance the Kingdom of God on earth.¹⁰⁹

A further motion to have the contentious matter brought before presbytery was defeated by the same wide margin. Following a standing ovation, Finlay thanked the meeting and expressed the hope for a unified congregation in the future. But the eighty wealthy members who had opposed Finlay remained unimpressed. Many of them left the congregation in the belief that the absence of their support would force Finlay to resign.¹¹⁰ Instead, young couples and sympathetic people from across Toronto came flocking to Finlay's side, and the Carlton Street United Church, in keeping with its reputation as the "House of Friendship," was "reborn".¹¹¹

Finlay himself felt a particular loyalty to the young pacifists brought up during the "Never Again" attitude of the 1930's and therefore completely bewildered by the Church's support of the war effort and condemnation of the "Witness Against War".¹¹² The previous year, for instance, a group of Victoria College students had signed their own pacifist manifesto in which they reaffirmed their belief that peace could be achieved by one method: "the absolute renunciation of war by individuals, by the church, and the State."¹¹³ They also called upon the United Church to formulate an alternative program to

military service in which conscientious Christians could take "a positive stand without compromising their Christian faith."¹¹⁴ By 1940 many of these young pacifists sought refuge in Finlay's church and advice on the proper role of Christians in time of war.

Overall, the United Church had offered little guidance on the question since its exact teaching on war was unclear. For this reason both pacifists and non-pacifists urged the Church to justify its action in condemning the "seventy-five" pacifists and "to show how its members could at the same time avow an allegiance to Christ while doing the necessary deeds of warfare."¹¹⁵ The 1940 General Council did appoint a special committee to produce such a statement but "for some unstated reason it never reported."¹¹⁶ Frustrated and angered by the "stony silence" of church leaders, Edis Fairbairn unleashed his wrath on the pages of The United Church Observer and stirred up another storm. His statement, entitled "Indictment", condemned the United Church as "incompetent and unworthy to serve the cause of God."¹¹⁷ In reference to the Church's often repeated anti-war statements of the previous decade, Fairbairn charged that Church leadership lacked the courage of its convictions and registered particular disappointment at the way the 1940 General Council "boldly slunk around" the war issue.

I am therefore heartily ashamed of the United Church. Because of its cowardly failure to confess its errors and clear its standards it has brought about the farcical situation that while volubly expressing itself in support of the war, its official statement is, "we positively reject war."¹¹⁸

What Fairbairn objected to most was the "unreality" or inconsistency in the situation. "Much as I differ in conviction," he explained, "I could have retained my respect for the effective leader-

ship of the Church if it could have brought itself to the point of clearly declaring its change of mind and its present approval of war."¹¹⁹ On the other hand, Fairbairn accused the Church of allowing its ministers to speak out on social evils only as long as their prophesying was not accompanied with a demand for action. "It is possible in this way" he observed, "to gain great repute for eloquent but harmless radicalism." As one who had lost his church, Fairbairn testified that there was no freedom in the Church for "any utterance that annoys the good contributors to the local or general Church funds." In other words, argued Fairbairn, the United Church was "fundamentally a financial institution" since first and foremost its ministers had to avoid upsetting their contributors.¹²⁰

The most damaging result of the Church's position, however, may well have been a loss of creditability with the average man. Fairbairn claimed that men were already asking, "Is there any issue upon which The United Church will take a stand and act on it regardless of consequences?" Besides the fact that an affirmative answer was in doubt, the real tragedy, he wrote, was that

. . . the average man does not believe in the Christianity of the Churches because he is unable to believe that they believe in it. And all the revivals or preaching missions in the world will not convince ordinary men, that we Christians believe in Christianity. Only a faithfulness to Jesus Christ and his Gosepl of the Kingdom of God could do that . . . in reality the acid test is not, Will you die for your faith? but, Will you cheerfully suffer financial loss for it?¹²¹

The Observer received so many letters in response to Fairbairn's "Indictment" that the editor found it impossible to publish them all. Instead he used only those "communications covering various shades of opinion" as well as a brief synopsis of others.¹²² Among those in support of Fairbairn were two members of the Alberta School of Religion, William Irwin and Charles Huestis. Huestis endorsed every word of the article and pointed out that it was quite appropriate that the Moderator's endorsement of the War Savings Certificates Plan was printed on the same page as Fairbairn's statement since "it so fully supports the indictment." "Having found that people will not adequately support the schemes of the Church from loyalty to Christ," he wrote, "we promise to implement their loyalty to the State in its war plans."¹²³ Praise also came from Fairbairn's former FCSO colleague, Gregory Vlastos, now at Queen's University. Vlastos did not share Fairbairn's pacifism, and he eventually supported the war effort, but for the moment he opposed the war on other grounds. He agreed with Fairbairn that people lost their religion because of "glaring contradictions between the faith we profess and the way we live." He suggested that all those who considered themselves followers of Christ should "read and re-read" Fairbairn's "Indictment" and ask themselves: "What are we to do about it?"¹²⁴

R. B. Y. Scott, Vlastos' co-editor of Towards the Christian Revolution, however, was not so kind. He argued that Fairbairn's wholesale indictment was "as unfair and untrue as it is sweeping."¹²⁵

More specifically, he claimed Fairbairn misrepresented the Church's attitude to war. According to Scott there was no inconsistency in the United Church's past anti-war statements and its support of the war effort since no General Council ever equated rejection of war with complete pacifism. On the contrary, he argued, "multitudes" in the United Church and many in its leadership still rejected war as genuinely as Fairbairn but that did not mean they adhered to doctrinaire pacifism. They could not escape their responsibility in the war by simply washing their hands.

We have not chosen war and do not willingly participate in it; we reject it, but cannot now avoid it.¹²⁵

The way to world peace, Scott concluded, was not necessarily Fairbairn's way. And there the issue rested for the readers of the Observer.

Perhaps the most notable feature of the debate in the Observer was the disagreement between principal members of the FCSO which revealed the tragic fragmentation of the Christian left in the face of the war. Such a development could only spur the growth of the FOR, but both groups worked at keeping doors open to the other. Scott, Vlastos and other non-pacifist FCSO members did not wish their disagreement on the war issue to overshadow the FCSO's overall goal of radical social change.¹²⁷ Hoping, therefore, that the FCSO could continue to encompass both pacifists and non-pacifists, the National Executive encouraged freedom of conscience and expression among its members. In response to the "Witness Against War" controversy, FCSO spokesmen argued that although the Church had decided to support the State at

war, "the prosecution of the war must never become its peculiar task."¹²⁸

Furthermore, they urged the Church to "refrain from even appearing to conceal divergence of opinion among its ministers" and suggested that when a conflict arose between loyalties to God and State the Church should:

- 1) recognize the conflict as essentially religious whatever the decision finally reached. . . .
- 2) try to make clear to the public as well as to its members that the difference of opinion is merely one of method in driving towards the one supreme end.
- 3) widen the scope of its war time service to have it provide worthy occupations not only in non-combatant war-service but also in services which in no way contribute to war.¹²⁹

Overall the FCSO was quite sympathetic and tolerant towards their pacifist members and tried to accommodate them, even to the point of advocating some type of pacifist alternative service. Nevertheless, it was also clear that most members of the FCSO had divorced pacifist means from Christian socialist action. For instance, the Annual FCSO Convention in 1940 was presented with two positions on the war, the pacifists being in the minority. The majority of delegates were of the opinion that the vital task of the FCSO during the war was to preserve civil liberties at home while supporting the cause of freedom, equality and brotherhood throughout the world.¹³⁰ Without mentioning the challenge to Christian pacifism, they suggested the war "verified and intensified" the need for radical social change and agreed that

the Christian force is moving in the direction of socialism, and that only when productive resources in every nation are owned and controlled by its people will war be securely outlawed and peace established.¹³¹

Although they shared this passion for radical social change, even socialism, pacifists could hardly believe that peace could be established without commitment to pacifism, the way of peace. Pacifism and socialism were part and parcel of radical Christianity and therefore inseparable, but with the FCSO now visibly rejecting pacifism as a realistic alternative, pacifists already uneasy in the FCSO on the eve of the war, were increasingly isolated and in need of the separate fellowship, assurance and strength provided by the Fellowship of Reconciliation.¹³² The FOR, however, was still a weak reed and it was the good fortune of pacifists that their FCSO associates were still sympathetic. Eugene Forsey, Stanley Knowles and Stanley Allen, for example, had changed their minds on pacifism but still showed an interest in their pacifist brothers.¹³³ Whenever he was in Toronto during the war years, Forsey visited Carlton Street United Church to converse with Finlay. The two men obviously held each other in the deepest respect.¹³⁴

There was an increasing sense of isolation among Canadian pacifists during the first two years of the war. It was visible in the Church, created in part by the "Witness Against War" Manifesto, in the Observer debate and within the ranks of the FCSO. Only the Canadian Fellowship of Reconciliation seemed to promise pacifists

some solace but, after the Canadian group lost its initial bid for affiliation with the International FOR in 1939, it remained weak and loosely organized until well into the war years.¹³⁵ Until then the first National Chairman, Carlyle King, carried on as best he could to offer leadership to the various FOR groups scattered across the country. Almost single-handedly he kept the sole Canadian pacifist organization afloat during its darkest days. Once the War Measures Act was in force the FOR could do little "in a public way to advance the cause of peace."¹³⁶ Nevertheless, within a few weeks of Canada's entry into the war, FOR members in Vancouver, Toronto and Montreal began organizing opposition to the possible introduction of conscription and the curtailment of civil liberties.¹³⁷ King had singled out conscription as the most immediate danger and he urged all FOR units to draw together religious, political, labor, youth and other groups in order to pressure the government to stand by its word that conscription would not be introduced.¹³⁸ The Vancouver group took the lead when they set up a "Committee for the Maintenance of Peace Time Liberties" comprised of representatives from the FOR, WIL, YWCA, CCF and CCYM. A similar scheme was organized by the Toronto FOR with assistance from the WIL, FCSO, CCYM, CCF, Quakers and pacifist students from the University of Toronto.¹³⁹ Their activities were described by a WIL member in the following report:

While we have to keep fairly under cover -- no publicity of any kind -- we are having weekly meetings, with a study group every other week. We send letters of congratulations and of protest to various government officials, and keep in touch with CCF and other left-wing groups, to cooperate wherever possible. We are also in touch with the American WIL and are urging them to work for American intervention to call a world conference [on peace]. . . . Other groups, such as the League for Social Reconstruction, the League of Nations Society, and the Social Workers, seem to favor our position, too.¹⁴⁰

Another project already under discussion among Toronto pacifists was their possible co-operation with the Friends in some type of humanitarian relief project similar to the work done by the American Friends Service Committee in the Great War and the Spanish Civil War. The idea was to provide Canadian pacifists with "an alternative to military service and a chance for a positive witness to their idea of human brotherhood in wartime."¹⁴¹

As for the role of the individual pacifist, King offered the following advice:

. . . his main task is to keep sane and preserve in himself and his friends the spark of friendship and decency. He must guard against hysteria, hatred, and indignation; he must be an island of sanity in the midst of surrounding chaos, so that when the madness passes there may be some people who can give us leadership in seeking to establish human unity, understanding and good-will. Perhaps he can damp down the hatred of the "enemy" in the people he meets, minimize atrocity stories, and check harsh treatment of alien folk in his own community. In a quiet and private way he can give sympathy and counsel to young people perplexed and harassed by "patriotic" pressure.¹⁴²

King also suggested that pacifists meet regularly in small groups to discuss peace literature and its relation to the war. He felt such a practice would not only strengthen and encourage their pacifism but would provide as well an opportunity for them "to exchange ideas and feeling frankly." Above all, however, he reminded Canadian pacifists not to speak out publicly against the war and to refrain from arguing with the "belligerently minded."¹⁴³

King was well aware of the dangers of making unpopular public statements. The previous year he himself had been under fire because of his own outspokenness. Speaking at a meeting of the Saskatoon Young Communist League on March 28, 1938, King advised Canadian youth to "refuse to fight to maintain the profits of the British plutocracy" and expressed his opposition to Canada entering war merely because of its connections with the British Empire.¹⁴⁴ Given front page coverage in the press, his remarks triggered a minor furor as organizations and individuals throughout the province condemned his unpatriotic utterance. Some like the Moose Jaw branch of the Canadian Legion and numerous parents of university students demanded King's dismissal from the University of Saskatchewan faculty and called for an investigation into the overall teachings of the University.¹⁴⁵ Others labeled him anti-British, anti-Canadian and Communist.¹⁴⁶ The Regina Daily Star, for instance, condemned King as dangerous and dogmatic and suggested that the Young Communists who had arranged the meeting must have been pleased.¹⁴⁷ In his defence King released a statement in which he declared that he was not and never had been a Communist

and did not accept their philosophy. Rather, as a member of the FOR he rejected the use of violence in settling disputes between nations or between classes, creeds or races within nations.¹⁴⁸ Secondly, King suggested that his criticism of British imperialism was not necessarily anti-British and definitely not anti-Canadian. On the contrary, he maintained that his brand of patriotism or nationalism, although the exact opposite of blind allegiance to the British Empire, was entirely sincere.

My love of Canada takes the form of working to see that every Canadian has good food, good clothes, good housing, a permanent job and an income that will permit him to enjoy those forms of recreation and culture he likes; of urging our Government to co-operate with other nations to remove the causes of war and to establish a just peace; and of being willing to make personal sacrifice toward those ends. I leave it to candid minds to say which form of patriotism is more Canadian or more in harmony with our professed religion.¹⁴⁹

Support for King's right to free speech and academic freedom poured in from all sides. Numerous individuals praised King's stand in letters to the press.¹⁵⁰ University students, while not necessarily endorsing his specific opinions, pledged their support for King and lauded his "unbiased views."¹⁵¹ Tracing the history of opposition to free speech back to Biblical times, W. G. Brown, minister of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church in Saskatoon, defended the right of a University professor, such as King, to offer criticisms.¹⁵² The Leader-Post of Regina helped defuse the issue by observing that "the core of his speech was an attack on war." The editor emphasized the necessity to protect free speech and concluded:

If the present social order and its views on war cannot stand up against the views, here and there, of a pacifist or of a Communist, then it will collapse sooner or later of its own weakness.¹⁵³

The issue appeared to settle down when the University Board of Governors refused to take action but flared up again six months later when King, addressing the Kinsmen Club of Saskatoon, was critical of the Chamberlain Government of Britain.¹⁵⁴ A new round of attacks and demands for King's dismissal erupted almost immediately. In order to prevent further embarrassment to J. S. Thompson, President of the University and staunch defender of academic freedom, King voluntarily decided to refrain from speaking publicly on the subject of peace. Accordingly, on September 29, 1938, he cancelled his plans to speak that evening to a meeting sponsored by the Saskatoon branch of the Canadian Legion for Peace and Democracy. In his letter to the local secretary of the League, King blamed his decision on the harrassment of President Thompson and accused his critics of condemning him from inaccurate newspaper reports. The major question raised by the whole affair, he argued, was why a professor in Saskatchewan could not repeat what members of the House of Lords stated freely in England.¹⁵⁵ In the first draft of the letter, but omitted altogether from the public statement, was King's personal interpretation of his public utterances:

For two years my public speeches have had one object, and one only: to keep my Country out of European war: I had thought to do what I could to keep Canadian boys, particularly my students, from the moral iniquity of burning and torturing the women and children, the aged

and the infirm, of 'enemy' nations. I had hoped to use my knowledge and my ability to that end. In my speeches I have never once objected to Canada's membership in the free and voluntary association of Nations. Would that there were more such associations!¹⁵⁶

King faithfully refrained from speaking out on international issues, even though he was implicated in bitter attacks upon the FOR and its leadership. In a front page and lengthy article appearing December 9, 1939, and in subsequent articles, the Toronto Financial Post attacked the Canadian FOR alleging that its leaders were either Communists or Communist-inspired,¹⁵⁷ charges which the Vancouver Financial Post readily echoed.¹⁵⁸ As a result of such accusations, King's assistant, Cleo Mowers, was forced to resign as National Secretary of the FOR and sever all connections with the organization in order to save his job as a journalist for the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix.

Mowers' resignation placed King in a difficult position since he could not find a suitable replacement for Mowers and could not carry on the executive work of the FOR alone. He therefore offered his resignation to the National Council.¹⁵⁹ In doing so he recommended strongly that the executive work be assumed by either the Toronto or Montreal organizations. By this time, however, the other members of the National Council were caught up in their own troubles stemming from the "Witness Against War" controversy and were unable or unwilling to assume further responsibility in the FOR. With the promise of extra money for stenographic assistance, Lavell Smith once again persuaded King to continue as National Chairman.¹⁶⁰ Smith also added

that, however lamentable, the policy of silence was "the only one which can now be followed."¹⁶¹

Although it was not exactly the silence that Smith had in mind, the National Chairman seldom heard from other members of the National Council over the next year.¹⁶² King was aware, however, that the Canadian FOR was not in the healthiest of conditions. Other than the loss of Mowers, both Thelma Allen of Montreal and F. Blatchford Ball of Saskatchewan reneged on their pacifism and therefore resigned from the National Council.¹⁶³ Furthermore, the Toronto group, supposedly one of the most important units in Canada, was weak and disorganized. For all practical purposes, the Toronto FOR came to a standstill once its president R. J. Irwin resigned on the heels of the "Witness Against War" controversy.¹⁶⁴ To some extent, however, the slack was taken up by the work of the Toronto Pacifist Council, an alliance of twelve groups including the FOR, WIL, Friends, United Church Youth, and the CCYM. Under an executive which included James M. Finlay, Anna Sissons and Ted Mann, the Toronto Pacifist Council counted approximately two hundred pacifist members.¹⁶⁵ Its major activities were devoted to lending assistance to German aliens in Toronto, supporting the No-Conscription League and lobbying to amend the Defense of Canada Act so as to protect the rights of pacifists.¹⁶⁶

Such activity on behalf of civil liberties notwithstanding, the majority of Canadian pacifists appeared for a time to have followed Lavell Smith's advice for a policy of silence. As FOR National

Chairman, Carlyle King remained the official voice of Canadian pacifists ✓ and single-handedly maintained correspondence with would-be pacifists and prospective conscientious objectors scattered across the country. He never received the promised financial help for stenographic assistance.¹⁶⁷ Then in June 1941 King was encouraged by an inquiry from Fairbairn about the possibility of reorganizing the FOR. "I had begun to think that nobody was going to take any interest any more in the infant," King replied. "Now that some people feel a definite [need] for a fellowship of war resisters, perhaps the under-nourished babe can be revived."¹⁶⁸ After providing Fairbairn with a brief history of the Canadian organization, King expressed his feeling that the time was "ripe for a new deal and a new slate of officers" and suggested that Fairbairn and others in Eastern Canada who were "close enough to work together easily" should take over the organization. Accordingly he sent Fairbairn the FOR membership lists and other lists of contacts, the balance in the treasury, no more than fifteen dollars, and a bundle of FOR statements.¹⁶⁸ Concerning the Canadian statement of Basis and Aims King conceded that, after all, the other scheme having failed, the Canadian group should conform to the regular pattern of the International FOR and "make our body a specifically Christian one."¹⁷⁰ As King finally relinquished the National Chairmanship he advised Fairbairn that if he was really serious about reviving the FOR he should elect himself "president, or dictator or what have you, pro tempore, and afterwards conduct a ballot by mail at your leisure."¹⁷¹

It appears Fairbairn's interest in the FOR coincided with a renewed concern among remaining members of the FOR National Council to strengthen the fledgling pacifist organization. In the spring of 1941, for instance, Lavell Smith, James Finlay and Clarence Halliday sent a letter to those on their old mailing list in an attempt to renew contacts and "keep alive a sense of fellowship" among Canadian pacifists.¹⁷² Forty of the forty-six who replied were standing firm in their pacifism. Again, in September, Claire Oke distributed a similar letter in which he suggested the desirability of revising the Canadian Statement of Basis and Aims according to IFOR guidelines. While only twenty-four individuals replied, two-thirds agreed that the Canadian statement should be made more specifically Christian.¹⁷³ No further initiative was taken to reorganize the FOR, however, until the beginning of the new year when Lavell Smith again called for a renewed commitment from "Canadian Lovers of Peace". In reference to the rather poor response to Oke's letters he asked: "Does that mean we ought to stop writing? Some of us think not, for there is all too little here in Canada to hold us together."¹⁷⁴ Contrary to the American FOR which numbered over 10,000 members, the Canadian organization faced peculiar problems which he outlined as follows:

Here in Canada our members are few; great distances separate us; some are cut off from fellowship with sympathetic spirits; the columns of our journals are largely closed to "peace propaganda"; many of us are under too great pressure to venture to express ourselves in print. It would appear that we ought at least to circulate an occasional letter in the interests of fellowship.¹⁷⁵

Furthermore, since the Canadian FOR no longer had either an executive or a complete National Council, Smith emphasized the need for a total reorganization and proceeded to request nominations for a new National Council, "as representative as possible of the various Provinces."¹⁷⁶

Despite the plea for national representation, the revived FOR was largely dominated by United Church pacifists in Ontario, especially after Lavell Smith's move to Toronto in May 1942. It also appears that they desired a specifically Christian pacifist organization following the suggestion made by Richard Roberts to organize pacifist cells within the Church for fellowship and prayer, with the prospect of leading toward the spiritual renewal of the Church.¹⁷⁷

James Finlay, for example, concurred that the brand of pacifism most likely to endure was that based upon the Christian faith rather than some other foundation. The focal point of pacifist thinking, words, and deeds, he emphasized, should not be their pacifism as such but their overall "positive dynamic witness in all situations" as Christians.¹⁷⁸

By September 1942 the reorganization of the Canadian FOR was complete. Despite the fact that the National Council was expanded in order to encompass representatives from across the country, the hub of the revived organization was Toronto. The new executive included Lavell Smith as Chairman, J. W. E. Newbery as Secretary, and Claire Oke as Treasurer, all of whom had resettled in the Toronto area.¹⁷⁹ While Carlyle King's continued membership on the National Council offered a certain element of continuity with the early days,

the new organization clearly reflected a stricter Christian bias. The Canadian Basis and Aims, revised by Oke and renamed the Statement of Purpose, adhered more closely to the Christian format of the International statement.¹⁸⁰ Included was a version of the Christian basis specifically requested by John Nevin Sayre in 1939 as a prerequisite for international recognition of the Canadian group:

That Love, as revealed and interpreted in the life and death of Jesus Christ involves more than we have yet seen, that it is the only power by which evil can be overcome and the only sufficient basis of human society.

That, therefore as Christians, we are forbidden to wage war, and that our loyalty to our country, to humanity, to the church Universal and to Jesus Christ, our Lord and Master, calls us instead to a life service for the enthronement of Love in personal, social, commercial and national life.¹⁸¹

The remainder of the statement outlined the specific responsibilities of members in the movement to abolish war and build a new social order. With this revised statement and apparent encouragement from Sayre, the Canadian FOR proceeded to reapply for affiliation with the International organization. Finally, almost four years after their initial bid, Canadian pacifists were accepted into the International FOR fold.¹⁸²

At long last Christian pacifism in Canada had begun to gel, from the public protest of United Church ministers in the "Witness Against War" manifesto to the long-awaited affiliation of Canadian pacifists with the International FOR. In effect, this surfacing of

a Christian pacifist front, weak as it still was, was a tribute to one of its most devoted proponents, Richard Roberts. A co-founder of the original FOR in 1914, Roberts had become a perennial pacifist influence in Canada since his arrival in 1922. First in Montreal and then in Toronto, where he also served as Moderator of the United Church during the depth of the depression, Roberts aroused public interest in Christian pacifism and social action. By 1940 he had retired from the active ministry and accepted a lectureship at Pine Hill Divinity School in Halifax. As the Canadian port most directly involved in the war, Halifax was an uncomfortable place for a pacifist, especially one like Roberts who, in "both sentiment and judgement," was in complete sympathy with the Allied cause and yet remained committed to pacifism. "The ethical disparity of the two sides is hardly measureable," he wrote. "But I am sure the church should stick to its own job -- if everything is not to go with the flood."¹⁸³ Perhaps because of this personal dilemma Roberts became particularly annoyed with what he called the "hoity-toity pacifism" professed by such people as Muriel Lester. What he specifically missed in their attitude was

any realization of the actual and tragic failure of pacifism which the war indicates; and that the proper wear of pacifists at this time is sackcloth and ashes.¹⁸⁴

Roberts was convinced that in the world as it was in 1940 anything that seemed easy was suspect, including pacifism.

Nevertheless, while aware of the specific weaknesses of pacifists, Roberts spoke out strongly in defense of radical pacifism in response to the challenge of Reinhold Niebuhr's "Christian realism," which seemed to him more like "moral relativism." In fact, his major contribution to the pacifist debate during the war was his open dialogue on the topic with Niebuhr himself. It began in the winter of 1940 when Niebuhr, writing in Radical Religion, castigated the pacifist position as "self righteous."¹⁹⁵ In response Roberts took Niebuhr to task in an open letter published in Christianity and Society. The use of the word "self righteous", claimed Roberts, was a boomerang since it betrayed that unpleasant condition in Niebuhr himself and raised as well the suspicion that he was not too sure of his own position.¹⁸⁶ Although Roberts admitted that there were "all sorts of faults and perversities in the pacifist movement", he argued there was a larger proportion of them in the case for Christian participation in war. He confessed, however, that he could not find an easy answer to Niebuhr's arguments and consequently was "caught in a lacerating conflict of loyalties":

Frankly, I would give a good deal to be able to accept your [Niebuhr's] doctrine. It would make life a good deal easier for me; there's the sense of alienation from my people, the coolness of friends, the suspicion of disloyalty, the spite of the intolerant, and the like, all which hurt me deeply.¹⁸⁷

To Roberts, pacifism was a difficult complex principle; it was neither the "simple Christian moralism" as Niebuhr had charged nor the "equally simple" moral relativism which Niebuhr professed. For

Roberts warned that, contrary to the strict Christian basis of the pacifist doctrine, "moral relativism" made a "virtue or a sort of philosophy" out of the failure to follow Christ. While it appeared to solve a momentary and isolated problem, Roberts questioned if moral relativism was not the "first step down a very slippery slope." In effect he suggested that Niebuhr's dialectic had led to what Plato called "making the worse appear the better reason."¹⁸⁸ Although he himself detested "Hitlerism and all its works" Roberts argued that the chief duty of Christians was not to discriminate between parties in the present war but to judge the "whole business of war" against the "revealed righteousness of God." Unless that was done, he warned, the evil of war would perpetuate itself throughout society:

Nations at war tend to grow like each other; and the restoration of civil rights and liberties suspended in wartime has generally been slow and grudging. The longer this war lasts and the more fiercely it is fought, the more dangerous will become the menace of Hitlerism, even though Hitler be destroyed.¹⁸⁹

In reply Niebuhr praised Roberts' letter as the first communication he had received from a pacifist which had not been "ill-tempered" and claimed it neatly revealed the theological gulf between pacifism and non-pacifist Christianity. Roberts' casual reference to war as an "incident" in history, conflicted with Niebuhr's view of it as "a final revelation of the very character of human history."¹⁹⁰ Although Niebuhr conceded that Roberts was quite right in his observations that moral relativism could easily degenerate into opportunism and "unprincipled conduct", he retorted that at times it was the duty

of Christians to "preserve some relative decency and justice in society" and thus participate in war despite the sinful character of the action. In effect, Niebuhr accused Roberts and his fellow pacifists of trying to reach the impossible dream of living in history without sinning.¹⁹¹ The bulk of Niebuhr's criticism, however, was directed toward isolationism and those American pacifists "inclined to identify neutrality with the 'Sermon on the Mount'." On the whole, the dialogue between Roberts and Niebuhr revealed little that was new and yet it served as an important reminder that, despite the loss of Niebuhr, Christian pacifism was not intellectually stalemated by the war.

Nevertheless, Niebuhr had seriously challenged liberal and socially radical pacifists to face reality rather than to retreat behind the confines of a religious ideal like a millennial peace sect. For the most part, Canadian pacifist leaders were sensitive to Niebuhr's criticism. None were more aware than they of a menacing irrelevance. They realized that pacifist protests alone were not a satisfactory answer, but neither could they condone what Roberts called Niebuhr's dangerous policy of "moral relativism." Instead, pacifists attempted to face reality in their own way, and what could be more real than the heightened experience they had been through by 1941. Although the "Witness Against War" manifesto appeared to have cast United Church pacifists into the role of rebels, for instance, it was primarily an attempt to provide a realistic pacifist alterna-

tive within the existing framework of their church.¹⁹² Failing in that, they began to rebuild pacifist solidarity through the FOR and turned to the implementation of the pacifist witness within the historical context in which they found themselves. Thus, during the remaining war years pacifists would respond to Niebuhr's challenge to face the reality of the times by assuming an active role in various humanitarian activities, the defense of civil liberties and, above all, the struggle for alternative pacifist service for conscientious objectors. If it did not meet the demands of Niebuhr's neo-orthodoxy, the course they would take required its own heroic assumption of the tragic burden of the war.

FOOTNOTES

¹C. P. Stacey, ed., Historical Documents of Canada, vol. V: The Arts of War and Peace 1914-1945 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972), pp. 601-602. Although the War Measures Act was immediately reinstated, it was not until the tenth of September that Canada officially declared war on Germany. The delay, which allowed time for the country and the government to consider the ramifications of the action, was caused primarily, no doubt, by the post-war upsurge of Canadian nationalism which had held Canada aloof from British foreign policy in the 1920's and in 1931 had issued in giving Canadians a still greater control of their own destiny.

²Donald Creighton, The Forked Road, Canada 1939-1957 (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976), p. 28.

³J. L. Granatstein, Canada's War, The Politics of the Mackenzie King Government, 1939-1945 (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 20.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Horn, "The League for Social Reconstruction: Socialism and Nationalism in Canada," p. 108.

⁷Unlike Grube and a few others in the LSR, Underhill had never endorsed outright pacifism.

⁸Frank H. Underhill, "Keep Canada Out of War," Maclean's (15 May 1937) in Frank H. Underhill, In Search of Canadian Liberalism (Toronto: Macmillan, 1960), p. 184.

⁹Granatstein, Canada's War, pp. 20-21.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 13-18.

¹¹McNaught, A Prophet in Politics, p. 286.

¹²Williams was perturbed by the pacifism within the CCF and was extremely vocal in his opposition to an isolationist or neutralist foreign policy which he believed could only hurt the CCF in Saskatchewan. On the whole his provincial party was much cooler to pacifism than the federal CCF. See Friedrich Steininger, "George H. Williams: Agrarian Socialist" (M.A. Thesis, University of Regina, 1976), pp. 353-356.

¹³McNaught, Prophet in Politics, pp. 306-307.

¹⁴Canada, Debates of the House of Commons, Special Session,

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 42-43.

¹⁶McNaught, Prophet in Politics, p. 298.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 299.

¹⁸Debates of the House of Commons, Special Session, 1939, pp. 45-46.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 46.

²⁰Ibid., p. 47.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid.

²³McNaught, Prophet in Politics, pp. 313-314.

²⁴Debates of the House of Commons, Special Session, 1939, p. 42.

²⁵McNaught, Prophet in Politics, p. 313.

²⁶J. S. Woodsworth Papers, Correspondence 7, vol. 3, C. C. Annett to J. S. Woodsworth, 16 September 1939.

- ²⁷Ibid., Escot Reid to Woodsworth, 13 September 1939.
- ²⁸Ibid., Howard Patton to Woodsworth, 16 September 1939.
- ²⁹Ibid., H. G. L. Strange to Woodsworth, 13 September 1939.
- ³⁰Sinclair-Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," p. 30.
- ³¹Ibid., p. 227.
- ³²The United Church Observer, 15 January 1940, p. 1.
- ³³Sinclair-Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," pp. 28-40.
- ³⁴Ibid., p. 50.
- ³⁵Ibid., pp. 42-43.
- ³⁶Ibid., p. 44.
- ³⁷Ibid., pp. 44-45.
- ³⁸Woodside to United Church Clergy, 8 September 1939, as quoted in ibid., p. 46. The Moderator's letter was chiefly the work of J. R. P. Schater and R. B. Y. Scott.
- ³⁹Norman, "Richard Roberts," p. 184.
- ⁴⁰Ibid.
- ⁴¹David R. Rothwell, "United Church Pacifism, October, 1939," The Bulletin (United Church of Canada) XX (1973): 37.
- ⁴²Ibid.
- ⁴³Ibid., p. 38.
- ⁴⁴The United Church Observer, 15 October 1939, p. 21.

⁴⁵Ibid., 15 November 1939, p. 25; while the manifesto revealed a rift within the United Church on the issue of pacifism, the fact remains that the signatories represented a small minority within the total of approximately 3,497 United Church ministers in Canada in 1939. The United Church of Canada, Yearbook, 1939, pp. 148-149.

⁴⁶The United Church Observer, 15 October 1939, p. 21.

⁴⁷Ibid.

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Rothwell, "United Church Pacifism," p. 38.

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Ibid., p. 39.

⁵³Ibid., p. 40.

⁵⁴Ibid.; Globe and Mail (Toronto) 21 October 1939, p. 4.

⁵⁵Rothwell, "United Church Pacifism," p. 47.

⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 47-49. Rothwell quotes freely from all three Toronto dailies.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 50.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 51.

⁵⁹Sinclair-Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," p. 54.

⁶⁰The United Church Observer, 1 November 1939, p. 4.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Sinclair-Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," p. 46.

⁶³The United Church Observer, 15 November 1939, p. 17.

⁶⁴Norman, "Richard Roberts," p. 185.

⁶⁵Richard Roberts Papers, Box 2, file 51, Fairbairn to Roberts, 27 March 1940.

⁶⁶Ibid., Box 2, file 50, Roberts to Lavell Smith, 27 October 1939.

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Ibid., Box 3, file 64, Roberts to Margaret P. MacVicar, 28 October 1939.

⁶⁹Ibid., Box 2, file 50, Roberts to Lavell Smith, 27 October 1939.

⁷⁰Ibid., Box 3, file 64, Roberts to Margaret P. MacVicar, 28 October 1939.

⁷¹Ibid., Roberts to Margaret P. MacVicar, 20 November 1939.

⁷²Ibid., Box 2, file 50, Lavell Smith to Roberts, 27 October 1939.

⁷³The United Church Observer, 15 October 1939, p. 2.

⁷⁴United Church of Canada, War Services Committee File, Minutes of Meetings of 31 October 1939 and 29 November 1939.

⁷⁵Ibid., 29 November 1939.

⁷⁶Sinclair-Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," p. 83.

⁷⁷Interview with Mrs. J. Lavell Smith, 23 November 1976.

⁷⁸The United Church Observer, 15 September 1939, p. 18.

⁷⁹Interview with Mrs. J. Lavell Smith; Reconciliation, 1 (October 1943): 12.

⁸⁰Ibid.

⁸¹The United Church Observer, 15 May 1942, p. 24.

⁸²Interview with Mrs. J. Lavell Smith.

⁸³Reconciliation, 1 (October 1943): 12; in explaining his position to a leading member of the congregation Smith wrote: "On the positive side: I have given my blessing to the Red Cross and Refugee work. I have communicated both to the Chief Chaplain and the Commanding Officers of two military units my readiness to have their troops attend Divine Service in our Church. I have expressed no single doubt as to the sincerity of purpose of young men donning the uniform. My attitude to any who have consulted me has been that their going or remaining at home must be a matter of their own individual conscience. It is not for me to determine pro or con. I have communicated with every enlisted man belonging to the congregation, so far as known to me, and with others who have had only the loosest sort of connection. I have had replies from several of these men and quite a number of them have made it a point to see me before leaving. I am now in process of sending out "Commendation Cards" to these men to be used by them as an introduction to churches or chaplains wherever they may be going." UCA, Lavell Smith Biography File, Smith to H. S. Cheesbrough, 5 Jan 1940.

⁸⁴Telephone Conversation with Mr. Beverly Bailey, Montreal, 12 November 1976; interview with Muriel Duckworth, Toronto, 7 November 1976.

⁸⁵Telephone Conversation with Mr. Beverly Bailey.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷Sinclair-Faulkner's assertion that "R. Edis Fairbairn and Harold Toye parted company with the United Church during WWII" is not correct. Fairbairn remained in the parish ministry while Toye entered industrial evangelism but both remained in the Church.

⁸⁸Fairbairn relates his experience in his book Apostate Christendom.

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 35.

⁹⁰United Church Archives, Harold Toye Papers, Box 1, file 6, miscellaneous papers.

⁹¹Ibid.

⁹²Ibid.; Rothwell, "United Church Pacifism," p. 52. Rothwell based his information on an interview with Toye.

⁹³"The Religion-Labor Foundation", Miscellaneous Papers, Toye Papers, Box 1, file 6.

⁹⁴E. Harold Toye, Trifling with Destiny (Toronto: Religion-Labor Foundation, 1948), p. 18.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 14.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 17.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 1.

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 29.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 67.

¹⁰⁰"The Religion-Labor Foundation," Miscellaneous Papers, Toye Papers.

¹⁰¹Ibid.

¹⁰²Rothwell, "United Church Pacifism," p. 52.

¹⁰³Sinclair-Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," p. 57.

¹⁰⁴Interview with Ernest Nix, Toronto, 9 November 1978. Another signatory, Nelson T. Chappel of Westminster Church, Saskatoon, changed his mind and became a chaplain in the RCAF, ibid.

¹⁰⁵Toronto Daily Star, 18 June 1940.

1976. ¹⁰⁶Ibid.; interview with James M. Finlay, Toronto, 21 October

¹⁰⁷Toronto Daily Star, 18 June 1940.

¹⁰⁸Ibid.

¹⁰⁹Ibid.

¹¹⁰Interview with James M. Finlay.

¹¹¹Ibid.

¹¹²Ibid.

¹¹³United Church Observer, 15 April 1939.

¹¹⁴Ibid.

¹¹⁵Fairbairn, Apostate Christendom, p. 31.

¹¹⁶Ibid.

¹¹⁷R. Edis Fairbairn, "Indictment," The United Church Observer, 1 February 1941, p. 11.

¹¹⁸Ibid.

¹¹⁹Ibid.

¹²⁰Ibid.

¹²¹Ibid.

¹²²United Church Observer, 15 March 1941, p. 16.

¹²³Ibid.

¹²⁴Ibid.

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 17.

¹²⁶Ibid.

¹²⁷Interview with R. B. Y. Scott. According to Scott all FCSO members were anti-militarists.

¹²⁸Christian Social Action, I (December 1939): 1.

¹²⁹Ibid., p. 2.

¹³⁰Ibid., II (July 1940): 3.

¹³¹Ibid.

¹³²Interview with James M. Finlay. The FCSO "more or less broke up" following its annual convention at Toronto's Carlton Street United Church in 1942. One the main causes for the discord was that the newer breed of Christian leftists, newly arrived from Britain, aligned with the communists. Interview with R. B. Y. Scott.

¹³³Interview with Stanley Allen.

¹³⁴Interview with James M. Finlay.

¹³⁵Ibid.

¹³⁶Carlyle King Papers, 27:153, King to Miss Marguerite Corner, Gypsenville, Manitoba, 24 September 1939.

¹³⁷Ibid.

¹³⁸Ibid.; King specifically suggested that FOR units communicate with Mennonites, Quakers, Doukhobors, Latter Day Saints, Jehovah's Witnesses, Ministerial Associations, trades and labor councils, CCF, CCYM, SCM, FCSO, WIL, WCTU and the Canadian Civil Liberties Union. Carlyle King Papers, 27:153, King to Mrs. N. A. Fraser, Winnipeg, 15 October 1939.

¹³⁹Ibid.

¹⁴⁰Ibid.

- ¹⁴¹Ibid.
- ¹⁴²Ibid., King to Miss Corner, 24 September 1939.
- ¹⁴³Ibid.
- ¹⁴⁴The Star-Phoenix (Saskatoon), 29 March 1938, p. 1.
- ¹⁴⁵Ibid., 9 April 1938, p. 1; 3 October 1939, p. 4.
- ¹⁴⁶Ibid., 2 April 1938.
- ¹⁴⁷Regina Daily Star, 30 March 1938, p. 4.
- ¹⁴⁸The Star-Phoenix (Saskatoon), 9 April 1939, p. 1.
- ¹⁴⁹Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁰Ibid., 30 April 1938, p. 4.
- ¹⁵¹Ibid., 11 April 1938, p. 1.
- ¹⁵²Ibid., p. 4.
- ¹⁵³The Leader-Post (Regina), 11 April 1938, p. 4.
- ¹⁵⁴The Star-Phoenix (Saskatoon), 29 September 1938, p. 1.
- ¹⁵⁵Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁶University of Saskatchewan Archives, Saskatoon, C. A. King Papers, III, 3, rough draft of letter.
- ¹⁵⁷SABS, Carlyle King Papers, 27:152, King to Canadian FOR National Council, 3 January 1940.
- ¹⁵⁸McNaughton Papers, A1 E 95 (5).

¹⁵⁹ Carlyle King Papers, 27:152, King to Canadian FOR National Council, 3 January 1940.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., Lavell Smith to King, 11 January 1940.

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁶² Ibid., 27:154, King to Fairbairn, 25 June 1941.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 27:152, Ted Mann to King, 3 April 1940.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., Mann to King, 10 September 1939; 27:153, Mann to King, 12 December 1939.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 27:152, Mann to King, 3 April 1940.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 27:154, King to Fairbairn, 25 June 1941.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., King to Fairbairn, 27 July 1941.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., King to Fairbairn, 25 June 1941.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., King to Fairbairn, 27 July 1941; despite Fairbairn's apparent interest in reviving the FOR, he failed to take an active role in the reorganization and although an FOR member throughout the war years he preferred to carry on his pacifist pursuits free of the confines of any organization.

¹⁷² UCA, Fellowship of Reconciliation Papers, Box 1, file 3, Lavell Smith to "Canadian Lovers of Peace", 3 January 1942.

¹⁷³ Ibid.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

176 Ibid.

177 Ibid.

178 Ibid., Box 2, file 24, Finlay circular letter to Friends of Peace, April.

179 Ibid., Box 1, file 3, Newbery to Canadian FOR members, 7 September 1942.

180 Ibid.

181 The Fellowship of Reconciliation, Canadian Section, "Statement of Purpose", leaflet, post-1943.

182 King to Mildred Fahrni, 1 November 1961.

183 Richard Roberts Papers, Box 3, file 64, Roberts to Margaret P. MacVicar, 1 June 1940.

184 Ibid.

185 Norman, "Richard Roberts," p. 188.

186 Richard Roberts Papers, Box 3, file 91, Roberts to Niebuhr, n.d.

187 Ibid.

188 Ibid.

189 Ibid.

190 Ibid., Niebuhr to Roberts, n.d.

191 Ibid.

192 Sinclair-Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," p. 58.

CHAPTER VIII

CONSCRIPTION AND CONSCIENCE: ACT TWO

Despite the initial shock of war, despite their attempt to witness against war and for the pacifist alternative, and despite the debate and the rejection of the many and the praise of the few, Canadian pacifists faced one major threat from the moment the gunfire began: conscription. Also from the first, they recognized the necessity of making a positive response as pacifists to the conditions war brought in its train. Perhaps the latter was construed as the means of coping with the former. Whether it was or not, it was necessary to discover -- more, to help determine that Canada show some measure of moral advance over the Great War in the question of conscientious objection. For many non-pacifists freedom of conscience was what the war was about -- the pacifist at home stood at the crux of the matter. Many more saw it quite differently and there for pacifists lay the danger.

Particularly mindful of the potentially explosive opposition of Quebec, the Liberal government of Mackenzie King tried to avert a repetition of the 1917 crisis by introducing compulsory military service gradually in two stages. At first limited to home defense, it was broadened to include overseas service only at the eleventh hour. Such a course of action generally reflected the mood of the House of Commons prior to the outbreak of war. In March 1939 for instance, both King and the leader of the opposition, R. J. Manion, had declared

their opposition to conscription for overseas service.¹ At that time the Prime Minister actually promised that as long as his government was in power no such measure would be enacted, a pledge he later repeated in the House during the special war session.² Accordingly, the King government pursued an initial war policy of "limited liability" emphasizing home defense and thus keeping the participation of Canadian forces abroad to a minimum. Canadians were told their major responsibility would be the provision of munitions, raw materials and foodstuffs rather than men.

Gradually, however, government policy began to change. Alarmed by the end of the so-called "phoney war" and the collapse of France in the spring of 1940, the government initiated a more aggressive war effort marked by the adoption of the National Resources Mobilization Act (NRMA) in June. In effect, the NRMA authorized conscription but only of a restricted variety since, in accordance with the government's pledges, it was limited to home defense. Thereafter, the debate centered on the question of conscription for overseas duty as well.

Again, government policy reflected the course of the war. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and their defeat and capture of Canadian forces at Hong Kong in December 1941 increased demands for "Total War Now" and for an end to the restrictions on the service of NRMA men, derisively known as Zombies.³ By spring, 1942 King decided to ask the Canadian public in a plebiscite to release the government from former pledges "restricting the methods of raising men for military service."⁴ It was at this point that French Canadian opposi-

tion to conscription solidified in La Ligue Pour la Defense du Canada under the leadership of its secretary, André Laurendeau.⁵ The League appealed to all Canadians to vote "No" in the plebiscite but it was no surprise when Quebec stood alone in opposition to releasing the government from its past commitments.⁶ Despite the favorable outcome of the plebiscite, King remained reluctant to force conscripts into regular service and continued to insist that such changes occur on a voluntary basis. Ultimately, however, the voluntary system failed to meet the needs of the army and the King government finally succumbed to overseas conscription in November 1944, only a few months before the end of the war in Europe.⁷

In the long run the government's five year delay in adopting conscription for overseas duty was relatively successful in defusing an historically explosive issue. It was also effective in undermining any possible development of an anti-war coalition by dividing, along philosophical lines, those chiefly opposed to military service overseas from those opposed to military service in any form. As long as conscripts were not sent outside Canada many Canadians initially opposed to conscription were mollified. But to pacifists the question was settled in June 1940 with the National Resources Mobilization Act and the rest of the conscription debate concerning overseas service, including the plebiscite, was never really relevant to their personal dilemma.

Instead, they sought ways in which to reconcile their pacifism with the reality of war. For instance, while the nation at large was

debating the pros and cons of the plebiscite, pacifists were arguing for an expansion of alternative service, and while the question of overseas service for conscripts was still under discussion, Canadian conscientious objectors were already serving overseas in a humanitarian capacity.

Although the National Resources Mobilization Act authorized the government to adopt conscription it was the National War Services Regulations (Recruits) which defined the groundrules for the actual call-up of men.⁸ According to the Regulations the country was divided into thirteen administrative districts, each with a divisional registrar responsible to the Minister of National War Services for selecting men for military training.⁹ In keeping with historical precedent provision was also made for the exemption from service of those with special occupations such as judges, clergymen, policemen, firemen and prison and mental asylum workers as well as for the deferment of Doukhobors, Mennonites and conscientious objectors.¹⁰ Contrary to the Military Service Act of 1917, however, which either exempted or excepted the historic peace sects, the 1940 Regulations merely provided for their postponement from military training. In order to be granted such a postponement order Mennonites, Doukhobors and others with conscientious objections were required to submit a written application to their divisional registrar and to appear before the National War Service Board (often referred to as the Mobilization Board) in their military administrative district. If the Board was

satisfied that the applicant conscientiously objected by reason of religious training or belief to war in any form his military training was postponed.

The first step in the implementation of the conscription regulations, however, was the program of national registration begun in each federal election district in August 1940.¹¹ On the whole, Canadians complied with registration in an "atmosphere of calm and resignation".¹² The only major incident occurred when the mayor of Montreal, Camillien Houde, publicly declared his opposition to national registration as "'unequivocally a measure of conscription'" and was swiftly seized and shipped off to an internment camp by federal authorities.¹³ This draconian reaction on the part of the government served as a clear indication that public criticism of the nation's war effort would not be tolerated and pacifists took heed.

During the first war registration had been denounced passionately by such radical pacifists as J. S. Woodsworth and F. J. Dixon but in 1940, except for some Doukhobors, particularly the Sons of Freedom, ✓ pacifist groups accepted national registration without protest. They concentrated instead on securing two major concessions from the government: the right to conscientious objector status of all individuals who conscientiously opposed military service regardless of religious affiliation and the establishment of some form of alternative service in the national interest. Although of minor importance during the first war, both demands had become crucial by 1940 because

of the increased number of pacifists within Canada's regular Protestant denominations and because of the strengthened determination of pacifists to assume an active role during the world's hour of need. Consequently, pacifists were quick to express this attitude to proper government authorities.

By August the Chief Registrar in Ottawa had received several communications to that effect, all copies of a form letter devised and circulated by Lavell Smith in an effort to represent the interests of United Church pacifists. The various senders, including Smith, qualified their willingness to co-operate in the matter of national registration with their religious objection to assisting in the prosecution of any war; therefore, they appealed to the government to provide all conscientious objectors the same privileges as provided in Britain, including alternative forms of national service.¹⁴

Likewise, the same concern was exhibited by the more traditional pacifist groups. As early as 1937, for instance, the Christadelphian Service Committee of Canada had reminded the Minister of Justice, Ernest Lapointe, of its historic religious objections to military service or military training and had argued that, in the event of a serious national crisis, some provision be made for alternative service of national importance.¹⁵ Similar statements were made by other religious groups as well but the Society of Friends more or less took the lead in organizing a pacifist front for alternative service. ✓

In reaffirming its peace testimony at the outbreak of war the Canadian Friends Service Committee (CFSC) assured all Canadian political

party leaders of the readiness on the part of Friends to serve in "any constructive civilian capacity".¹⁶ The Committee also circulated a questionnaire among its members to ascertain the exact types of humanitarian service Friends of military age would be willing to perform¹⁷ and by mid-summer 1940 specific recommendations were made. In a letter to Prime Minister King CFSC General Secretary Fred Haslam proposed the following forms of alternative service work under civilian supervision: ✓

1. Reforestation or other constructive work.
2. Maintenance of roads which might otherwise be neglected under pressure of this national emergency.
3. Social service work in distressed areas.
4. Non-competitive agricultural work, the produce from which might be devoted to designated social welfare organizations.
5. Participation in post war rehabilitation plans.
6. Any practical combination of the above.

Furthermore, the Committee did "not necessarily feel that the length of service in such work should be limited to that of the military training. . . ." ¹⁸

Haslam claimed he was writing not only on behalf of Quakers but all those with "religious or moral objections to participation in war" and therefore he requested a personal interview with the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister's Office promptly replied that since the problem of conscientious objection fell under the Department of National War Services, Haslam's communication had been passed to the Minister of National War Services, J. G. Gardiner, for further action. Subsequently, all further negotiations on the issue were conducted through that department.

In his letter Haslam had also referred to the desire of Friends to join with the other historic peace churches in representing the interests of conscientious objectors in Ottawa. With this goal in mind the CFSC contacted the Mennonite and Brethren in Christ (Tunker) Churches in Ontario.²⁰ The Ontario peace churches, already in the process of organizing a united response to the challenge of conscription, after "due consideration" accepted "in principle" the Quaker proposal for alternative service and invited the Society of Friends to join the newly formed Conference of Historic Peace Churches (CHPC) as well as its special subcommittee concerned with C.O.s, the Military Problems Committee.²¹ Friends accepted the invitation eagerly and their association with the Conference of Historic Peace Churches throughout the war proved to be an important link between socially-conscious, liberal pacifists and those from the traditional religious sects.

By September 1940 the Military Problems Committee sent its first delegation to Ottawa on behalf of conscientious objectors. In a meeting with Justice T. C. Davis, Associate Deputy Minister of National War Services, CHPC chairman Ernie J. Swalm, Military Problems Committee Chairman J. B. Martin and Haslam (as well as David Toews, a representative of western Mennonites) reaffirmed their concern for the official recognition of all C.O.s and presented specific proposals for alternative forms of "constructive civilian service".²² Davis responded sympathetically and promised his department would consider

the recommendations, but he strongly suggested that in the meantime the peace churches should proceed with national registration and refrain from attracting publicity.²³

Although dissatisfied with this response, the Military Problems Committee agreed that its first priority, in view of existing regulations, was to launch an immediate campaign to register its members as well as to safeguard their claims to conscientious objector status. Accordingly, a special registration card and form letter of "application for postponement of military training" were drafted and circulated among the various churches.²⁴ As for the Quakers, Haslam distributed the forms to monthly meeting clerks with instructions that all men of military age complete the registration questionnaire at once and send the letter of application for postponement to the divisional registrar of their administrative district within twelve days of the call up of their particular age group.²⁵

With this procedure underway the Committee again turned its attention to the question of alternative service. Within a few weeks it organized the Canadian Fellowship Service, a new subcommittee of the CHPC responsible for co-ordinating a wide variety of proposed pacifist public services under the direction of government welfare agencies.²⁶ The Committee informed the Department of National War Services of this plan in mid-October and the following month it was presented in Ottawa by a CHPC delegation in conjunction with representative of western Mennonites.²⁷

Although Mennonite groups on the prairies were not initially members of the Conference of Historic Peace Churches, they had already undertaken to unify their response to questions raised by the war. In fact, the first move by Mennonites in that direction actually began at Winnipeg with the founding of the Mennonite Central Relief Committee (MCRC) in March 1940. The MCRC became the most important wartime organization of western Mennonites but complete unity was hampered by the split between the Kanadier and Russlaender factions, particularly in relation to conscientious objector status and the question of alternative service.²⁸

The Kanadier group, Russian Mennonites who emigrated to Canada in the late nineteenth century, had set historical precedents as C.O.s in Canada and were the only Mennonites specifically deferred from military training in the 1940 regulations. Relatively assured of their rights to C.O. status, therefore, the Kanadier Mennonites initially opposed the idea of alternative service. On the other hand, Russlaender Mennonites, those who immigrated to the prairies from the Soviet Union during the 1920's, received no guarantee of conscientious objector status; consequently, they believed that status would best be achieved by offering to perform alternative service, even non-combatant duty, as they had done in Russia under the Tsar.²⁹ Furthermore, Russlaenders had come to view alternative service as an expression of their faith rather than a compromise in principle.³⁰

As a result of these philosophic differences, the Kanadier block in Manitoba formed their own relief committee and the

Aeltestenkomitee, or committee of elders, remained aloof from the initial negotiations in Ottawa concerning alternative service.

The most important of these discussions occurred in mid-November when a joint delegation composed of four western representatives of the MCRC and four eastern representatives from the CHPC launched a series of meetings with the Associate Deputy Ministers of National War Services, Justice T. C. David and Major General L. R. LaFlèche. The pacifists repeatedly argued for the introduction of civilian alternative service under civilian supervision but Davis and LaFlèche rejected the idea as impractical and too costly. They urged the delegation to reconsider the government proposal for non-combatant service, possibly in civilian clothes but under military control.³¹ The pacifists replied that the young men they represented "would not respond favourably to the suggestion that they should work in military camps" regardless of whether or not uniforms would be worn. Thus they reiterated their demand for strictly civilian alternative service and forwarded the following suggestions for such a program:

1. That the work should be of an agricultural or forestry nature combining if possible re-forestation, setting up of nurseries as needed, land reclamation and farm improvement.
2. That first aid courses might be given as part of the training of the men while in camp in order to equip them to render service in the event of epidemics or other emergency resulting from the war.
3. That this work be done on government-owned land, in order that the benefit from labor expended should accrue to the Country as a whole.
4. That sites might be chosen after consultation with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Lands and Forests; and that supervisors might be selected from such departments.

5. That for this purpose, the Dominion be considered as having three divisions.

- (a) British Columbia - Alberta
- (b) Saskatchewan - Manitoba
- (c) Ontario and the East.³²

With these specific proposals, far in advance of government planning, the delegation rested its case.

At one point, however, B. B. Janz, an Albertan, intimated to LaFlèche that the western Russlaender Mennonites would be willing to accept non-combatant medical service under the Red Cross, but he was quickly overruled by the other delegates, who proceeded to make it clear that the peace churches were united in their demand for nothing less than civilian service under civilian supervision.³³ When LaFlèche retorted with the "obviously bluffing" question, "What'll you do if we shoot you?", Jacob H. Janzen's emotional response erased any doubts as to the sincerity of pacifist determination:

Listen, Major-General, I want to tell you something. You can't scare us like that. I've looked down too many rifle-barrels in my time to be scared that way. This thing's in our blood for 400 years and you can't take it away from us like you'd crack a piece of kindling over your knee. I was before a firing squad twice. We believe in this. It's deep in our blood.³⁴

On this note the negotiations ended in a stalemate. Nevertheless, the pacifist delegation had made some significant accomplishments. Most importantly, the pacifists had received a full hearing in Ottawa during which time they exerted considerable influence upon government authorities, even if that was not completely visible until many of their specific recommendations for alternative service were later incorporated into government policy. Furthermore, a different type of pacifist alternative resulted from their suggestion to Dr. D. C. Clark,

Deputy Minister of the Department of Finance. In order to allow the pacifist community to purchase war bonds without assisting the war effort, the government authorized a special series of non-interest bearing certificates, Series B, with its funds earmarked for the relief of war victims.³⁵

Regardless of government decisions, however, the joint pacifist delegations to Ottawa in November 1940, as well as subsequent visitations, came to symbolize pacifist unity.³⁶ The various Mennonite groups in particular were encouraged to work together and overcome their differences -- differences which had been aggravated initially by the law itself.

The Conference of Historic Peace Churches and other pacifist spokesmen successfully represented pacifist interests with a strong voice in Ottawa but prospective conscientious objectors still faced a number of uncertainties and restrictions. For instance, although the National War Services Regulations had specifically guaranteed Doukhobors and Mennonites an indefinite postponement from military training, it had restricted the term "Mennonites" to include only the descendants of the 1870's immigration wave. In other words, to achieve postponement the Kanadier had only to prove membership in the Mennonite Church and that they had been residents in Canada continuously, whereas all other Mennonites such as the Russlaender fell under the general category of "conscientious objectors" and were required, therefore, to articulate their religious objections to war individually.

This distinction was applied in the beginning, but as the war progressed mobilization boards began to require all Mennonites to articulate their conscientious objections.³⁷ Moreover, since each mobilization board was autonomous, the ease or difficulty in obtaining a postponement as a C.O. varied from one division to another and depended on a variety of factors such as the personality of the board chairman or the attitude of the local populace. For example, the chairman of the Manitoba Board, Justice J. E. Adamson, had a reputation as a stern administrator who at times acted more like a recruiting agent.³⁸ His refusal to recognize numerous young Russlaender Mennonites as bona fide C.O.s posed a particular problem for the Mennonite Central Relief Committee in Winnipeg.³⁹

Another factor of uncertainty surrounding the question of C.O. status concerned the clause within the 1940 regulations requiring all conscientious objectors to belong to a religious denomination which definitely, as a tenet of faith, prohibited the bearing of arms. Thus, despite pacifist pleas to the contrary, those Canadians from major Protestant denominations, or any church other than the historic peace sects, were initially denied C.O. status.

The first test of this restriction occurred in November 1940, when the War Services Board in Saskatoon under the chairmanship of Justice J. F. L. Embury, refused the applications for postponement from military service of eight young men, most of them theological students at St. Andrews College, the University of Saskatchewan, on the grounds that members of the United Church and the Church of England

could not be considered C.O.s within the meaning of the regulations.⁴⁰ Although they had admitted there was no tenet or article of faith in their church which prohibited the bearing of arms or the undertaking of combatant service, the applicants argued the United Church left the final decision on such matters to the individual conscience of its members.⁴¹ At one point the board "tried very hard," but in vain, to get the students to confess they were under the direct influence of Professor Carlyle King, popularly known by this time as a radical socialist and pacifist.⁴²

Official reaction to the board's decision was completely favorable. For instance, in a letter to LaFlèche the Deputy Adjutant General of Division "M", Brigadier George H. Cassels, expressed confidence that it would "do a lot to keep down applications for postponement or exemption on this ground" and suggested a copy of the decision be distributed to the chairmen of all other boards as a precedent.⁴³

On the other hand, the response of pacifists, as well as the churches directly affected by the decision, was one of alarm and protest. From his earlier discussions with officials in the Department of National War Services, Fred Haslam was under the impression that "it was going to be the intention at Ottawa to judge conscientious objectors individually, regardless of and apart from church connections". It was later suggested to him by a fellow pacifist, however, that perhaps the judgement of the Saskatchewan board could be explained

best by the fact that "the churches your committee represents have been pestering Ottawa and that the Anglican and United have made no representations on behalf of their members, except through the Christian Social Council, which has not kept at the job. . . ."44

Although this charge contained a certain element of truth it was not entirely accurate, especially since Haslam and the CFSC had made every attempt to represent the interests of all pacifists regardless of church affiliation. As for the Christian Social Council of Canada, its executive passed a resolution asking the Canadian government to adopt the British procedure of basing C.O. exemptions solely on individual conscientious convictions.⁴⁵ Likewise, a similar resolution was passed and forwarded to the government by the Ninth General Council of the United Church.⁴⁶

Along with these demands to amend the War Service Regulations and the pressure of pacifist groups for alternative service, government officials also faced increasing public resentment, particularly in the West, over the whole question of exemptions. Prime Minister King raised the issue for consideration by the Department of National War Services in reference to a letter by George McDonald, a former member of the House from Souris, Manitoba.⁴⁷ After reporting that "many of our people do not like it when they find that the young Mennonites here do not have to take this [military] training," McDonald echoed the familiar complaint:

These young Mennonites are getting married and setting up homes for themselves. Many of our boys will have to take up arms, many will not return. While our sons are fighting these men will be building up good homes. It certainly isn't fair and I would like to know how they got into our country. . . .⁴⁸

"Our people here are going to be very bitter about this," he warned, "and the government would be justified in compelling all our people to prepare themselves for at least home defense."⁴⁹

Such expressions of anger and suspicion were viewed in Ottawa as a matter for serious consideration and, consequently, came to play a part equal to, if not greater than, pacifist influence in the formulation of plans for alternative service. Indeed, both military and government officials had agreed that the main reason to use C.O.s in some type of non-combatant service was to "placate the Westerners".⁵⁰

Finally, under fire from all sides, the Minister of National War Services, James G. Gardner, announced that due to numerous requests the government had decided to amend the section of the National War Service Regulations concerning conscientious objectors.⁵¹ Accordingly, an Order-in-Council passed on Christmas Eve deleted the requirement that C.O.s belong to a recognized peace church, thus making the individual conscience the sole ground for exemption as a C.O.⁵² In addition to the usual letter of application for postponement, however, the amendment also required the prospective C.O. to forward to his board a "certificate" stating "that he belongs to a religious denomination and that, in the opinion of the proper authorities of that denomination, the man has sincere conscientious scruples against the

bearing of arms."⁵³ Furthermore, all C.O.s found to be medically fit were required to perform one of three basic alternatives: non-combatant training in a military camp, non-combatant first aid training in other than a military camp, or civilian labor service at other than a military camp. The period of such training or service as well as the rate of pay were to be identical to that of those in the military.⁵⁴ Within a little over a year of war, therefore, Canadian authorities officially recognized the right to conscientious objection by all individuals regardless of church affiliations and began to incorporate pacifist alternatives into the national war effort.

Whatever the major impetus behind this action, it was to the credit of pacifist persistence that the provision for civilian service under civilian supervision appeared as a possible form of alternative service. Accordingly, most pacifist groups were pleased with the changes, but not the Aeltestenkomitee, the Kanadier bishops. Up to that point, they had boycotted all negotiations with federal authorities, but, alarmed by the new provision for alternative service, the Aeltestenkomitee finally approached Ottawa and registered a desperate plea for the complete exemption of Kanadier youth from all types of service. But it was too late. In effect, the Kanadier had gambled that by remaining silent they would continue to enjoy the same type of exemption they had enjoyed during the First World War, and they had lost.⁵⁵ Thereafter the Kanadier Mennonites modified their absolutist stand and joined their brothers in insisting upon civilian

alternative service under civilian supervision. Their acceptance of ✓ alternative service marked the end of absolutism among Canadian pacifists except, of course, for the stubborn resistance of Doukhobors and Jehovah's Witnesses to the authority of the state.

Having won concessions on the question of conscientious objector status and the principle of alternative service, pacifists now concentrated on the nature of pacifist service itself. Although it had been decided in principle that all persons exempted from military service would be required to render some form of alternative service, no definite plan was reached until the spring of 1941. Initially, the government favored sending C.O.s to military camps for non-combatant training and service, especially since the original period of training was to be for only thirty days. The military authorities, however, were against having C.O.s in their camps "under any condition" and once the training period was lengthened to four months the Department of National War Services was finally swayed by the pacifists' recommendation for a civilian-oriented program. Accordingly, in May 1941 the Associate Deputy Ministers of National War Services, T. C. Davis and L. R. LaFlèche outlined plans for the creation of Alternative Service Work (ASW) camps in national parks across western Canada under the supervision of the Parks Board of the Federal Department of Mines and Resources.⁵⁶ ASW camps were established at Kootenay National Park, British Columbia;

Banff and Jasper National Parks, Alberta; Prince Albert National Park, Saskatchewan and Riding Mountain National Park, Manitoba, as well as at two Forest Experimental Stations: Kananaskis Camp, Seebe, Alberta and Petawawa Camp, Chalk River, Ontario.⁵⁷

Mennonites and other conscientious objectors were directed to these ASW camps as their particular age groups were called up for military training, but Doukhobors, "so far as possible", were segregated and assigned to separate road building projects such as the construction of the Lac la Ronge Highway, a mining road in northern Saskatchewan.⁵⁸ Unlike their Independent brothers in Saskatchewan, however, the Doukhobors in British Columbia, particularly the Sons of Freedom, were extremely hostile to the idea of alternative service and many even refused to report for medical examinations. Their pacifism, ironically, was accompanied by a reputation for dramatic and sometimes violent resistance, from nude marches to bombings and burnings. As a result the initial plan to utilize them in the construction of the Nelson Nelway Highway, a road from Nelson, B.C. to the American border, fell victim to the government's uppermost desire to avoid a potentially explosive confrontation.

In a cleverly worded rationalization, Davis and La Flèche actually recommended that Doukhobors in British Columbia not be asked "to render any alternative service" since they were already

subject to the penalty proposed for those who failed to report for alternative service -- disenfranchisement in both the Dominion and Provincial levels. By using this criterion, they argued, the government was justified "in doing nothing with the Doukhobors in British Columbia and avoiding trouble there."⁵⁹ In time, the Cabinet War Committee agreed and issued a secret directive halting enforcement of the regulations against Doukhobors, since it was felt "that to compel universal compliance in the communities in question would involve a very heavy undertaking and that no substantial effect could be anticipated from the Doukhobors so drafted for alternative service."⁶⁰

Despite the general acceptance of this "hands off" policy, publicly the government remained committed to bringing all Doukhobors into alternative service.⁶¹ In practice, however, the only serious attempt in that direction was the Lac la Ronge project. Although later described by the authorities as having attained a "considerable degree of success",⁶² in reality the project was a dismal failure. For example, compared to the seventy Doukhobors who put in an appearance at the camp ninety-two were imprisoned for refusing to report, and after only one season the experiment was abandoned.⁶³

Another attempt at road building was conducted at the Montreal River Camp, one of the earliest and largest ASW camps, located at an old logging camp eighty miles northeast of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, at the mouth of the Montreal River. Unlike those in the West, this camp was under the direction of the Surveys and

Engineering Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources since the work consisted almost exclusively of construction on the trans-Canada highway along the north shore of Lake Superior.⁶⁴ The first group of C.O.s arrived there in July 1941 and for the next few years the Montreal River Camp became the main depot for C.O.s from eastern Canada. In effect, the Montreal River Camp was the mother of all other ASW camps. It was here where Canada's ASW program was inaugurated. As the major C.O. reception center, it contained a good mixture of religious backgrounds in addition to the Mennonite majority. It was also here where the largest variety of C.O.s were first introduced to one another and to alternative service; and much of their experience here became the basis for camp organization on the west coast.

Undoubtedly the camp provided a good deal of pacifist cross-fertilization, reinforced by the fact that life at Montreal River was hard, especially during the winter, and most of the young pacifists shared a common sense of isolation. The only way into the camp was by truck from the "Soo" and once there the "conchies" were almost completely cut off from the rest of society. Although they waited eagerly for letters and parcels from home, even the camp post office was eighty miles away.⁶⁵ As a result the C.O.s spent much of their free time in group activities. Bible study and other religious functions were under the direction of Rev. J. Harold Sherk, Secretary of the Conference of Historic Peace Churches, who travelled to the camp about once a week. During the first few years at Montreal

River Sherk established the pattern for religious supervision later followed in other camps.⁶⁵

The majority of the C.O.s in the camp were members of either millennial sects or the Conference of Historic Peace Churches; consequently, they viewed alternative service as simply the price they had to pay to remain true to their faith. On the other hand, a smaller number of Quakers and liberal pacifists from the larger Protestant denominations viewed the work camps as experiments in Christian communal living and welcomed the opportunity to perform some "disinterested service". As one of these C.O.s wrote, we "are trying to take our position as COs seriously. We believe it lays responsibilities on us."⁶⁷ Some were attracted to the War Resisters' International in the belief that the effect of pacifism upon their personal lives would also produce some change in the structure of social institutions.⁶⁸

The enthusiasm of the small group of activists was reflected in the birth at Montreal River of the first Canadian C.O. publication, The Northern Beacon. Edited by Wes Brown, a C.O. from Toronto with a United Church background, the mimeographed newsletter was primarily intended to boost the morale of the C.O.s in the various camps scattered across Canada as well as to publicize camp life to pacifists at home.⁶⁹ One of those in Toronto, James Finlay, commended the editor on the idea. "You can well imagine," he wrote, "that some of the lads who may succeed you were greatly interested to learn something of the situation."⁷⁰

Indeed, young pacifists such as Gordon Stewart, a student at McGill University, were not only anxious to learn about the work camps and other possible alternatives to military service but they emphasized, as well, the need for even closer communication between C.O.s in Canada.⁷¹ Consequently, Stewart and fellow pacifists in Montreal launched The Canadian C.O., another newsletter designed to keep Canadian pacifists "posted on what their isolated fellows and groups are doing" and in this way to help dispel the "almost inevitable" feeling of loneliness among C.O.s in such an immense country as Canada.⁷² The paper also reserved space for contributions from women C.O.s since it was felt "their pacifist stand can and is being expressed conscientiously in many different ways, seeking to ennoble life and relieve human suffering."⁷³ Above all, however, the main theme of The Canadian C.O. was "pacifist action" in various fields of service at home and abroad.

By the spring of 1942 this call for more pacifist action had become the major goal of liberal pacifists. R. Edis Fairbairn, for instance, reminded the "campers" at Montreal River that

beyond the work camp experience we still have to find some way of demonstrating our Christian citizenship by a sacrificial service comparable in risk and costliness to that service given, willingly or unwillingly, by the enlisted men.⁷⁴

As an example he referred to the humanitarian service of Quakers and he suggested that perhaps the Conference of Historic Peace Churches would be able to arrange something similar in Canada.

The whole question of pacifist service had become a popular matter of speculation in the camp. There was a growing resentment among C.O.s that the government had shipped them up to Montreal River merely to keep them out of the public eye. Their work, especially during the winter, seemed to be of minimal value and some of them yearned to make a more useful contribution than swinging a pick and shovel. Even the work in the ASW camps out West appeared more attractive. There in the National Parks alternative service personnel were responsible for the prevention and suppression of forest fires and throughout the war years they formed the nucleus of firefighting crews. Silviculture, the control of forest insect infestation, was another of their endeavors and the alternative service men in the Banff and Kootenay Parks were credited with saving large quantities of saw-timber and mine props.⁷⁵

The demands from pacifist groups and C.O.s for more worthwhile work than that offered at Montreal River coincided with two other factors which, taken in combination, caused the government to expand the deployment of C.O.s to forest areas. Namely, by April 1942 the authorities had come to recognize that C.O. labor was to be a permanent and important resource for the duration of the war. At the same time there were increased warnings of forest fire emergencies on the West Coast because of the danger of Japanese attacks with incendiary bombs. Consequently, the Minister of National War Services entered into an agreement with the province of British Columbia whereby up to one thousand C.O.s were made available to the British Columbia Forest

Service (BCFS) for forest protection duties on Vancouver Island and the adjacent mainland.⁷⁶ For the next few years the West Coast was the center of ASW activity.

The new ASW camps under the BCFS, approximately twenty in all, were established in three main project areas: the lower mainland camps were called G.T. (green timber) camps, those on southern Vancouver Island were known as "C" (Cowichan) camps and those north of Nanaimo were designated as "Q" (Quinsam) camps. Where possible, the ASW camps utilized existing camp sites and buildings, including those that had served as relief camps during the thirties; otherwise new camps were hurriedly built with prefabricated huts and sometimes even tents, both of which added to the mobility of the workers to meet fire emergencies.⁷⁷

The main responsibility of ASW crews in the BCFS was fighting forest fires. The "campers" in all three project areas were fully trained in firefighting measures and during the summers of 1942 and 1943 they fought a total of 234 fires.⁷⁸ None of the fires, however, was caused by "enemy action". Aside from actual firefighting work the alternative service men also accomplished valuable and essential forest protection improvement work such as snag-falling, truck trail construction and reforestation.⁷⁹

The alternative service workers who first reported for these new duties in June 1942 were largely transferred from other camps, particularly from Montreal River. In fact, by the following month all but a few of the Montreal River "campers" had been reassigned to

the BCFS.⁸⁰ The men from Montreal River exerted much of the leadership and influence in the new camps. Even The Northern Beacon resurfaced in British Columbia at Campbell River Camp under a new name, The Beacon, but the same editor, Wes Brown.⁸¹ The mixed bag of C.O.s from Ontario, therefore, generated much of the early enthusiasm in the camps.

Initially the C.O.s welcomed the idea of the B.C. camps as a worthwhile and exciting adventure, especially since prior to the war many of them had never travelled more than a short distance from their homes. But it was not long before dissatisfaction set in. Faced with the prospect of life in the ASW camps for the duration of the war, the Mennonites yearned to return to the work on their farms. The liberal activists, on the other hand, complained that chopping wood and planting trees was not the type of wartime humanitarian service they had hoped to perform. Although they recognized the value of the work, they wondered if better use could not be made of their respective skills.⁸²

The issue came to a head when Wes Brown, editor of The Beacon, circulated a questionnaire asking C.O.s in the various BCFS camps for their reaction to the idea of diversified alternative service in private industry and in such fields as agriculture, coal mining, logging and hospital and ambulance work.⁸³ The committee of C.O.s at Campbell River responsible for the questionnaire suggested that an acute labor shortage in Canada would ultimately necessitate releasing

C.O.s from ASW camps for employment in more important fields of service.⁸⁴ Regardless of the validity of this statement, the authorities viewed the questionnaire as premature and feared it would raise false expectations and only result in bitter discontent among a generally passive lot. The Assistant Chief Forester in British Columbia reprimanded the questionnaire committee for not having first obtained the permission of the BCFS and he ordered the confiscation of all complete questionnaires so the Conference of Historic Peace Churches could use them.⁸⁵ Nothing ever came of the questionnaire, however, and as a result of his role in the fracas Wes Brown was forced to resign as editor of The Beacon.⁸⁶ Despite its overall failure, the questionnaire episode dramatized the intensified effort on the part of Canadian pacifists to convince the government to provide conscientious objectors with legitimate alternatives within society rather than hiding them in the nation's forests.

As dissatisfaction mounted among the interned conscientious objectors, government authorities also began to reassess their entire approach to the mobilization and utilization of manpower. By September 1942, for instance, the administration of the National War Service Regulations, including that governing alternative service, was transferred from the large, cumbersome Department of National War Services to the Department of Labour, and within a few months the Regulations themselves were revoked and replaced by the National Selective Service Mobilization Regulations.⁸⁷

Under these new Regulations the nature of alternative service largely remained the same but the change in the administration of that program meant that pacifists had to familiarize a whole new set of bureaucrats with their peculiar position. Accordingly, pacifist spokesmen were quick to protest Section Twelve of the new Mobilization Regulations which stipulated that conscientious objectors would no longer be recognized as students in Canadian universities, colleges or preparatory schools. On the contrary, all male students found to be physically fit were required to enroll in a Canadian Officer Training Corps contingent at the educational institution or to report for military training.⁸⁸ The Military Problems Committee of the CHPC charged that this regulation, as well as the requirement that all students for the ministry be willing to serve as military chaplains, was "a discrimination on religious grounds" that was "not in keeping with the general principle and practice of religious liberty in Canada." If this restrictions were allowed to stand, the Committee argued, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for the peace churches to recruit and properly train candidates for the ministry.⁸⁹ Instead, the pacifists requested an alternative program within the universities "which would be applicable to students in the same way that alternative service camps provide for non-students," but the Department of Labour felt that implementing such a plan would be difficult due to public opinion and the relatively small number of students involved.⁹⁰ Eventually, therefore, students ended up in the ASW camps.

The Military Problems Committee also raised objections to the power of the various mobilization boards whose decisions, it was argued, had caused serious inequities in the administration of the Regulations which could be remedied only by allowing C.O.s to appeal the decisions of the boards.⁹¹ (The most glaring example of this was the large number of Russlaender Mennonites denied C.O. status by the Manitoba board.) Furthermore, the Committee criticized the remuneration of alternative service workers at the basic rate of fifty cents a day with no allowance for clothing or dependents as insufficient, and it suggested that provisions be made for the dependents of AS workers similar to that provided for the dependents of military personnel. Concerning the ASW program itself the Committee registered the familiar call for more diversified forms of alternative service, especially since a number of AS men were trained specialists -- doctors, dentists, teachers and engineers. Only a broader range of service, they argued, would "enable each person to make the largest possible contribution to the good of Canada and of all mankind."⁹²

Support for diversified alternative service also came from the spokesmen for United church pacifists. Lavell Smith, for instance, personally vouched for the ability of a number of C.O.s "to do work of much more urgent importance than snag-felling and road building" and he urged the Minister of Labour to follow the British example and utilize them as hospital orderlies or as attendants in mental hospitals, both of which were in short supply in Canada. "I trust, Sir," Smith concluded, "that I may have from you, in answer to this letter, some-

thing more than the all-too frequent stock reply . . . surely this is a matter of sufficient importance to warrant the most careful investigation and necessary action."⁹³

A similar plea was entered by Harold Toye on behalf of a delegation of United Church ministers.⁹⁴ Moreover, Toye argued the discrepancy between the allowance and privileges granted to alternative service men compared to those granted military personnel created the general impression that Canadian ASW camps were "concentration or internment camps" rather than respectable alternatives to military service.⁹⁵ In order to help rectify this unhappy situation the delegation urged the government to recognize desired pacifist alternatives such as dental and medical service, education and farm work and possible civilian ambulance service in war-devastated areas.

To a large extent the arguments raised by pacifist spokesmen in Ottawa reflected the frustration they discovered during their personal tours of the ASW camps. For instance, in most of the eleven camps they visited, J. B. Martin and Ernie Swalm of the Military Problems Committee found "a lot of anxiety" and reported:

Some of the boys were discouraged. A number even thought maybe after all the best way out would be to enlist in some corps of the military.⁹⁶

Likewise, during his swing through the camps, James Finlay conferred with a number of C.O.s anxious to "test" their pacifist convictions outside the camps. Although they felt it was probably easier for pacifists to live in the ASW camps than to mingle in society, they yearned to perform some other form of service within society.⁹⁷

In response to the various demands from pacifist quarters as well as part of its overall effort to make the most efficient use of manpower, the government finally reorganized the alternative service program in the spring of 1943. Basically the action merely continued the movement already begun the previous year with the transfer of alternative service responsibilities to the Department of Labour. The new directive further shifted alternative service from the mobilization section of National Selective Service to the civilian section under a Chief Alternative Service Officer, L. E. Westman, and with alternative service officers in each military district.⁹⁸ Most important from the pacifist standpoint, however, was the broadening of alternative service to include essential work in agriculture and industry. This change, which became effective in May 1943, was a turning point in the struggle of pacifists for a proper role within Canadian society in wartime. Certainly, once conscientious objectors were allowed to perform a wide range of alternatives to military service, the pacifist alternative, itself, gained credibility as a legitimate and valuable part of the Canadian response to war.

Following concerted pressure by pacifists and re-thinking by government authorities, diversified pacifist service was finally a reality. On the whole the broadening of alternative service was effected easily but not without some disapproval. Initial news of the government's decision to utilize C.O.s in work outside the camps was greeted by a barrage of protests, chiefly from lumber men in British

Columbia and B.C. government officials concerned with the prospect of losing their best source of low-paid labor for forest protection.⁹⁹ Other complaints, not surprisingly, came from irritated members of the Canadian Legion and the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire.¹⁰⁰ On the other hand, there were also some favorable responses, particularly from the farm organizations, industries and politicians, such as John Diefenbaker, who had been lobbying for such a move for some time.¹⁰¹ For the most part, however, the government policy of silence concerning the allocation or treatment of C.O.s meant that the general public was not aware that C.O.s were employed outside the camps.¹⁰²

Under the new arrangement, alternative service officers in each military district screened C.O.s and assigned them to jobs where their skills were most needed.¹⁰³ Although a considerable number were assigned to laboratories, hospitals and certain industries not directly involved in the war effort such as saw-mills and food processing plants, the majority of the C.O.s, largely Mennonites, with farm experience, were directed to agricultural work. The employment of C.O.s in agriculture and industry was conditional upon their agreement to contribute part of their earnings to the Canadian Red Cross Society. Under the terms of a special contract with their employers C.O.s were paid at the "prevailing wage rate" but received only twenty-five dollars monthly while the remainder of their earnings, less taxes, was diverted to the Red Cross.¹⁰⁴ The C.O.s in agricultural work also received free board and lodging while those in urban industries

were paid an additional monthly allowance of thirty-eight dollars to cover living expenses.

Within a year, however, amid mounting protest from various pacifist groups that the financial reimbursement for alternative service was not only insufficient but totally unfair compared to that for military service, the government authorized additional allowances for dependents and for medical and dental services; thereafter the government continued to take steps to ease the financial burden on alternative service workers and their families.¹⁰⁵ Pacifist organizations such as the Canadian Friends Service Committee were also instrumental in assisting the dependents of C.O.s and in finding jobs for the C.O.s themselves, although the actual placement of men in AS jobs was made by the divisional alternative service officers through local employment offices.¹⁰⁶

By summer 1943 the transfer of C.O.s to the newly approved fields of service was in full swing. The number of AS men in the BCFS camps alone dropped from 750 to approximately 450.¹⁰⁷ Those that remained in the camps were either newly postponed C.O.s entering alternative service for the first time or those, such as Jehovah's Witnesses, who were unwilling to enter an employment contract or to allocate funds to the Red Cross.¹⁰⁸ The Montreal River Camp, which had already lost most of its workers to the BCFS camps the previous year, was closed entirely in May 1943. The 196 AS men there at the time were either returned to farms in the Kitchener-Waterloo area or sent to work in the sugar beet fields of southern Ontario near

Chatham.¹⁰⁹ An experiment using Jehovah's Witnesses in the sugar beet work ended in failure because they regularly left the fields in order to spread the "Gospel" in near-by towns. As a result the offenders were sent to the Chalk River camp for the duration of the war and Jehovah's Witnesses as a whole were denied employment outside the camps.¹¹⁰

From the beginning Jehovah's Witnesses had resisted the principle of alternative service as part of their refusal to recognize the authority of the state. Consequently, of the 687 C.O.s prosecuted in Canada for failure to report for alternative service, thirty per cent were Jehovah's Witnesses. Following brief jail terms they were taken to ASW camps under police escort. Once in the camps they were the last to leave. For all practical purposes they were more like prisoners than voluntary workers.¹¹¹ Perhaps for this reason Jehovah's Witnesses viewed the ASW camps as internment camps not far removed in principle from the German camps at Buchenwald and Dachau.¹¹² The frustrated alternative service authorities, on the other hand, were "quite definitely sure" that Jehovah's Witnesses were not conscientious objectors in the true sense of the term and concluded that "they should not be so classified in the event of another war."¹¹³

By and large the transition from camp life to the farms, factories and hospitals was carried out smoothly and enthusiastically by the C.O.s affected. Nevertheless, the feeling persisted that the government had not gone far enough to offer C.O.s real alternatives

for humanitarian service in war zones. For instance, C. F. Klassen, Secretary of the Mennonite Central Relief Committee in Winnipeg, reminded the Labour Minister that Russlaender Mennonites had always been willing to perform non-combatant medical work and he urged that a field ambulance corps be created as soon as possible.¹¹⁴ Likewise, a group of six to eight C.O.s at Banff also proposed to form a civilian ambulance service "to be used in whatever zone of war assigned by the authorities." In a letter to J. W. Noseworthy, the newly elected CCF MP from Ontario, they reported that the five Toronto churches they represented were prepared to provide the necessary equipment for such a service, including a new ambulance. "We are desirous to be of more valuable service to our country in this time of urgent need," they wrote, "than at our present occupation."¹¹⁵

Despite the obvious willingness on the part of pacifists, government authorities remained hesitant to deploy C.O.s overseas in a non-combatant or humanitarian capacity. A precedent for such service, however, had been set the previous year with the inclusion of C.O.s in the Civilian Corps of Canadian Firefighters sent to the United Kingdom.¹¹⁶ Eventually twenty Canadian C.O.s, mainly Mennonites and United Churchmen, enlisted and served overseas as junior firemen, the same status as other untrained members.¹¹⁷ Following some preliminary training, the Canadian firefighters assumed full responsibility for fire stations in Southampton, Portsmouth, Plymouth, Bristol and London, where they not only extinguished fires but carried on salvage and rescue operations as well. The young pacifists wel-

comed this opportunity to leave ASW camps in Canada in order to help save life and property amid the destruction of war.¹¹⁸ Nevertheless, they feared that perhaps a compromise had been made since the Firefighting Corps appeared to be in danger of becoming nothing more than a "Fourth Arm" of the military.¹¹⁹ A thin line obviously separated the concept of alternative service from indirect support of the war effort and in the end most of the C.O.s concluded that service in the Corps did not directly conflict with their conscience.¹²⁰

The Firefighting Corps was an example, therefore, of the type of relief work a growing number of young pacifists wished to perform but the Corps could only absorb a few C.O.s. Consequently, their cohorts had to press for other possibilities, the most likely of which was the type of non-combatant medical service provided for C.O.s in Britain and the United States but initially opposed in Canada by military authorities.¹²¹ By the spring of 1943, however, the government appeared more receptive to the pacifist minority, as when the Prime Minister's assistant J. W. Pickersgill remarked:

it seems to me that anything we can do to meet any group of conscientious objectors half-way so that they can participate in the national effort, will go a long way to remove one serious cause of disunity and of poor civilian morale, particularly in certain parts of Western Canada. I admit that these considerations are social and broadly political rather than military.¹²²

Finally, in September of that year an Order-in-Council authorized the enlistment of C.O.s for overseas service as non-combatants in the Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps and the Canadian Dental Corps.¹²³

Before the end of the war over two hundred C.O.s joined the non-combatant units and many of them served overseas in various theaters of the European war.¹²⁴ Russlaender Mennonites, in particular, were attracted to the new service but others, such as liberal Protestants, were less interested.

Although enlistment was voluntary and the service was to be strictly non-combatant, those who joined became subject to military law, and reports soon circulated that once overseas only Mennonites and Seventh Day Adventists were recognized as C.O.s while others were ordered to undertake infantry training.¹²⁵ A number of C.O.s also criticized participation in the non-combatant units as direct support for the war machine. What was needed, they insisted, was some type of relief and rehabilitation work conducted completely separate from the military.¹²⁶ Consequently the idea for a civilian ambulance unit overseas manned by C.O.s gained in popularity. It more than any other proposal captured the imagination of pacifists seeking to translate the principle of non-violence into a realistic and meaningful response to the tragedy of world war.

The model for such an ambulance unit was the Friends Ambulance Unit (FAU) first organized by British Quakers during the Great War and revived by British and American Friends during the Second World War. The FAU was active in Europe, the Mid-East and North Africa, but it was the lure of the Far East, China in particular, which aroused the most enthusiasm among young conscientious objectors. Those in Canada were no exception and from their first discussion of a possible

ambulance unit pacifists had set their eyes on China as the field of service. The prospect of adventure as well as of humanitarian service aroused considerable excitement in the ASW camps and numerous men expressed their willingness to volunteer.¹²⁷

One of the leading spokesmen for the AS men was Gus Harris, a Toronto C.O. attached to Spray River Camp number three near Banff and editor of The Canadian Pacifist, the newest C.O. monthly. In a letter to Prime Minister King, Harris expressed the desire of C.O.s for "more humanitarian work without avoiding danger." He and his associates at Spray River had earlier volunteered to the Department of Pensions and National Health to serve as human "guinea pigs" for nutritional experiments in the clinical study of wartime and post-war illnesses, but their offer was rejected because of the lack of laboratory facilities. Now they were asking for permission to organize an ambulance unit for China.¹²⁸ In response, J. W. Pickersgill remarked that it was "completely out of the question" in view of Canada's many other commitments.¹²⁹ Nevertheless, the Prime Minister's office referred Harris to a similar effort undertaken by Canadian Friends.¹³⁰

By the summer of 1943 the Canadian Friends Service Committee through its general secretary, Fred Haslam, had begun preliminary negotiations for a Canadian contingent to join the FAU in China. The major task was to secure government permission for Canadian C.O.s to travel abroad with the FAU and the initial response from authorities

was not encouraging. In reply to Haslam's inquiry, for instance, the Chief Alternative Service Officer, L. E. Westman, doubted that C.O.s under alternative service could go to China since "nothing within present regulations would seem to make this possible." Rather, he suggested interested C.O.s join the newly created non-combatant units in the Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps and the Dental Corps. The only C.O. he thought might be allowed to go to China would be one who had applied to a non-combatant unit but had been turned down for physical reasons. In any event, he concluded, the question would have to be raised with numerous authorities including alternative service officers, Mobilization Boards, Labour exit authorities, the Department of External Affairs and the Armed Forces.¹³¹

Despite the obvious reluctance on the part of authorities, Haslam plodded ahead with plans for a Canadian contingent. During the winter 1943-44 he, James Finlay and several other pacifists formed a special personnel selection committee to process applications, interview candidates and finally select those Canadians to go to China. In keeping with the government policy of secrecy regarding C.O.s, the Friends Service Committee agreed to conduct its arrangements in a discreet "personal way and not make a national issue out of it."¹³² Accordingly, the Chinese Consulate was asked to make an official request to the Department of External Affairs for the services of Canadian C.O.s.¹³³ The authorities also required that prospective unit members be recruited on an individual basis, thereby blocking the normal practice of simply posting notices at ASW camps.¹³⁴

The momentum towards making the unit a reality was accelerated in the spring of 1944 by the visit to Canada of Dr. Robert B. McClure, the Canadian missionary doctor who headed the FAU in China. McClure not only helped publicize the value of the FAU work but also assisted the Friends Service Committee in final negotiations with the Canadian government. Following a few meetings in Ottawa, McClure was assured that alternative service men would be granted exit permits. Subsequently, in the summer of 1944 twenty Canadian volunteers recommended by the selection committee were granted permission to travel to China as the Canadian contingent to the FAU.¹³⁵ While the Canadian Red Cross agreed to furnish uniforms and equipment for the Canadians, the best news came from the Chinese War Relief Fund, a Canadian charitable organization, which agreed to contribute approximately 500,000 dollars towards the support of the Canadian contingent and FAU medical work in China.¹³⁶

Once in China the Canadians took their place alongside one hundred other FAU members from Britain, the United States, China and New Zealand, and they performed various tasks in medical, mechanical and administrative work. Some were stationed at hospitals and warehouses while others were on the road hauling supplies. It was this task of distributing drugs and other medical supplies to the various mission hospitals scattered across inland China that earned the FAU "China Convoy" its reputation as the lifeline of China during the war.¹³⁷ Canadian pacifists were especially proud of their role in this international relief effort and the Canadian contingent to

the China Convoy came to symbolize the rich possibilities of active pacifist service in assisting civilian populations in a time of war. Most of the Canadian volunteers had returned home before the end of 1947 pleased that they had finally made an important contribution not only to humanitarian service within China but to the broadening of the humanitarian spirit within their own country as well.

During the last few years of the war there were quite a few options open to conscientious objectors. Other than working in ASW camps they could now assume diversified jobs on farms and in factories. There were also possibilities of humanitarian and relief work overseas in the non-combatant corps, the firefighters corps in England and the FAU in China. This broad range of alternative service may have posed some new dilemmas for individual C.O.s but on the whole pacifists were pleased with the government's response to their demands for a meaningful role in the world crisis. Only the question of post-war demobilization still worried pacifists. Although the war officially ended with the Japanese surrender in August 1945, the men in alternative service were not completely demobilized until August of the following year.¹³⁸ The main reason for this delay appears to have been the reluctance on the part of the government as well as some pacifists to take an action which could have aroused adverse public opinion. L. E. Westman, the Chief Alternative Service Officer, had actually recommended the quick release of all alternative

service men at the end of the war but other influential individuals and groups warned that the Canadian public would resent the release of conscientious objectors before all military service personnel were home.¹³⁹ The Conference of Historic Peace Churches agreed and its spokesmen made a number of recommendations (later adopted by the authorities) for the gradual demobilization of alternative service men.¹⁴⁰

Although there was some displeasure among pacifists with this arrangement, the strongest protests came from Jehovah's Witnesses, the group which accounted for the majority of the C.O.s kept in the ASW camps and in prison following the war.¹⁴¹ Despite their cries of religious persecution, the government adhered to the policy of gradual demobilization while easing the restrictions on the men. In order to deal with those men who refused diversified forms of alternative service, however, selected ASW camps remained open until July 1946 when all camps in the National Parks were closed officially. The following month, exactly one year after the end of the war, remaining government control over C.O.s finally came to an end.¹⁴²

During the war well over twelve thousand young Canadian men had been classified as conscientious objectors. But of these close to one thousand had enlisted in the armed forces both as combatants or non-combatants and another 540 had either died or had their C.O. status revoked by mobilization boards, so that by January 1946 there was a total of 10,851 conscientious objectors in Canada.¹⁴³ While approxi-

mately two hundred remained in ASW camps for the duration of the alternative service program, the great majority of C.O.s eagerly accepted employment in agriculture and miscellaneous essential industries and by the time the AS program ground to a halt they had contributed \$2,222,802.70 to the Canadian Red Cross Society.¹⁴⁴

On the whole, therefore, Canada's first experiment in alternative service was considered a huge success, particularly by the pacifists who had helped shape it. Not only had they achieved the right to refrain from military service on grounds of individual conscience; they also made various alternative contributions in keeping with their religious beliefs as well as their growing social consciousness. In effect, alternative service set an important precedent by allowing pacifists to assume an active role within wartime society, which in turn helped conscientious objection, itself, become recognized as a legitimate, constructive option in the Canadian response to war. Clearly, however, it could only be legitimate to the state as an option exercised by a tiny minority.

The most vocal demands for active non-violent service had come from the more socially radical Quakers and United Churchmen but that is not to underestimate the staunch pacifist witness of the more traditional historic peace sects. In sheer numbers alone, for instance, Canada's Mennonites dominated pacifist resistance to military service in the second war as in the first. Although the more conservative Mennonites continued to refrain from social involvement, others, particularly the Russlaender out West, were more than willing to demon-

strate their religious beliefs through social action. In Ottawa the Conference of Historic Peace Churches took the lead in negotiations on behalf of C.O.s and the Quaker representative, Fred Haslam, credited his Mennonite cohorts with much of their success. "I cannot be too grateful," he wrote, "for the way in which the Mennonites have stood firm on this matter of peace. It would have been difficult indeed to accomplish what has been done but for their gentle firmness in dealing with the Government."¹⁴⁵

Besides encouraging close co-operation between pacifists as in the Conference of Historic Peace Churches, the C.O. episode had a unifying effect upon the individual peace sects themselves. Canadian Mennonites, for instance, reached a new level of understanding among themselves and their pacifist witness helped forge a new spirit of unity and inter-Mennonite co-operation. In the case of Doukhobors, the wartime pressures enhanced the pacifistic as opposed to the nihilistic element in their philosophy; consequently, the bitterly divided factions of the previous decade began to consolidate and by 1945 they joined together to form the Union of Doukhobors of Canada. ✓ Nevertheless, this unity among Doukhobors, based as it was upon the necessity for a united response to the threat of conscription and to other outside hostilities, did not long outlast the war.¹⁴⁷ As for the Society of Friends, their unified response to conscription and other wartime problems through the Canadian Friends Service Committee resulted in the first joint meeting of all three Canadian branches in 1944 and in subsequent Quaker initiative in the Canadian ecumenical movement.¹⁴⁸

Above all, the C.O. episode revealed that pacifists were anxious to undertake some real response to wartime circumstances -- a personal witness that went beyond mere words. At the time, alternative service for conscientious objectors appeared to be an answer to the dilemma of the pacifist in wartime, and most pacifists, including many in the historic peace sects, were satisfied, if not pleased with the arrangement. In the long run, however, alternative service, as prescribed in Canada, failed to overcome the pacifists' moral problem of separating themselves from implication in the war effort. This was especially true once government authorities came to view conscientious objectors as an important source of manpower in the overall national effort. Thus, despite their initial satisfaction in achieving a realistic alternative to military service, conscientious objectors failed to escape the total mobilization of society that modern war entailed. In this sense, rather than securing a pacifist option, alternative service could be seen as providing a precedent for the totally isolated internment of war resisters in any future war or in their complete assimilation in a diversified war effort.

Some conscientious objectors had recognized this dilemma but under immediate wartime pressures they could hardly resolve it. Instead, exercising their own version of Christian realism, they chose what they perceived as the least possible evil -- performing worthwhile humanitarian service without taking up arms. The degree of their implication in the war effort varied according to specific activities,

from the almost complete separation of the ASW camps to the thinly disguised military function of the non-combatant corps. Perhaps for this reason, the Canadian contingent to the Friends' Ambulance Unit in China was viewed as a promising venture. It allowed C.O.s to minister to the needs of mission hospitals and the civilian population behind enemy lines without directly assisting the military; certainly, in such special circumstances C.O.s temporarily avoided the dilemma almost inevitably awaiting those performing other forms of alternative service.

Nevertheless, the state recognition of an individual's right to conscientious objection and its provision for alternative service under civilian supervision appeared to be appropriate concessions for the time and a tribute to the persistence of pacifist resistance to compulsory military service. It was certainly a notable moral advance for Canadians, but one that would always need defending. Conscription, however, was by no means the only issue facing pacifists during the war. There were other concerns, such as the treatment of Japanese-Canadians and the plight of refugees, and in response to them, as in the case of conscientious objectors, pacifists searched for a realistic witness over and above moral indignation and dissent.

FOOTNOTES

¹Canada, House of Commons Debates, 30 March 1939.

²Ibid., 8 September 1939.

³J. L. Granatstein, Conscription in the Second World War 1939-1945 (Toronto: McGraw Hill-Ryerson Ltd., 1967), p. 39 ff.

⁴Ibid., p. 43.

⁵See André Laurendeau, Witness for Quebec, edited by Philip Stratford (Toronto: Macmillan, 1973).

⁶The vote in the country at large was 2,945,514 to 1,643,006 in favor of release while the Quebec vote was 993,663 to 376,188 against. C. P. Stacey, ed., Historical Documents of Canada, Vol. V: The Arts of War and Peace 1914-1945 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972), p. 631; outside Quebec the constituencies voting "no" were populated by French-Canadians, Ukrainians, Germans, Mennonites and other ethnic groups. For plebiscite results see Canada Gazette, 23 June 1942.

⁷For a thorough discussion of conscription debates during the Second World War see Granatstein, Canada's War and J. L. Granatstein and J. M. Hitsman, Broken Promises, a History of Conscription in Canada (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1977).

⁸The National War Services Regulations, 1940 (Recruits) were issued shortly following the creation of the Department of National War Services in July 1940. Canada, Statutes of Canada, 4 George VI, Chapter 22, The Department of National War Services Act, 1940.

⁹National War Service Regulations, 1940 (Recruits).

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Two Privy Council Orders (P.C. 3086, 9 July and P.C. 3156, 12 July) called for national registration to begin in August. Granatstein and Hitsman, Broken Promises, p. 144.

¹²Ibid., p. 145.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴PAC, Labour, RG 27, v. 624, file 35-6-9-7-5, J. Lavell Smith to Chief Registrar, 17 August 1940.

¹⁵PAC, DND, RG 24, V. 5953, HQ 1064-3267, v.3, H. W. Smallwood, Chairman, The Christadelphian Service Committee, to Ernest Lapoint, Minister of Justice, 6 January 1937.

¹⁶PAC, Privy Council, RG 2, 18, V. 5, D-27, Fred Haslam to Prime Minister King, 31 July 1940.

¹⁷CFSC Papers, CO file, Voluntary Peace Registration Form.

¹⁸Ibid., Haslam to King, 31 July 1940. In order to ensure that the Prime Minister thoroughly understood their position the CFSC also sent him a copy of Arthur Dorland's history of the Society of Friends in Canada.

¹⁹PC, RG2, 18, V.5, D-27, J. W. Pickersgill to Haslam, 3 August 1940.

²⁰Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, 1941. Tenth Report of the Canadian Friends Service Committee, p. 57; David Warren Fransen, "Canadian Mennonites and Conscientious Objection in World War II," M.A. Thesis, University of Waterloo, 1977, p. 45.

²¹Ibid.

²²CFSC Papers, CO file, Haslam to Monthly Meeting Clerks, 11 September 1940; Fransen, "Canadian Mennonites," pp. 46-47.

²³Ibid.

²⁴CFSC Papers, CO file, Haslam to Monthly Meeting Clerks, 11 September 1940; see Appendix C and D for copies of the registration form and letter of application for postponement of military training.

²⁵Ibid.; a copy of each completed registration questionnaire was filed with the Military Problems Committee since questions concerning occupational skills and training were included specifically in order to assist the Committee in negotiating the question of alternative service.

²⁶Fransen, "Canadian Mennonites," p. 48; Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meeting, 1941, p. 57; Mennonite Archives of Canada, Conference of Historic Peace Churches Papers, XV, 11.1.1.

²⁷Ibid., XV. 11.6.1.

²⁸Fransen, "Canadian Mennonites," pp. 25-37.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Ibid., p. 36.

³¹Ibid., p. 95.

³²J. A. Toews, Alternative Service in Canada During World War II (Winnipeg: Christian Press, Ltd., 1959), pp. 35-36.

³³Fransen, "Canadian Mennonites," pp. 100-101.

³⁴As quoted in ibid., p. 102.

³⁵Ibid., pp. 105-106.

³⁶Ibid., p. 107.

³⁷Toews, Alternative Service in Canada, p. 45.

³⁸Fransen, "Canadian Mennonites," p. 139.

³⁹Labour, RG 27, V. 131, 601.3-6, v. 1, C. F. Klassen, Secretary/Treasurer, MCRC, to Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labour, 2 February 1943.

⁴⁰DND, RG 24, V. 6573 HQ 1161-3-4, Report of J. L. Embury, Chairman NWS Board, Division "M". The other members of the board included George Bickerton, President of the Saskatchewan Section of the United Farmers of Canada and Carl Stewart, MLA for Yorkton, The Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, 14 November 1940, p. 3; the young men in question included Ian Kenilo, O. A. Olsen, Harvey Moats, W. Vernon Barker, J. Douglas McMurtry and Keith and Clyde Woollard, all members of the United Church, as well as the lone Anglican, John M. Marshall. Marshall was the nephew of Saskatoon Doukhobor pacifist Peter Makaroff and his grandfather, John Marshall, had left Queen's University during the Boer War over the same issue. Once these men were recognized as C.O.s, Moats and Keith Woollard joined the Canadian Firefighter Unit in Britain while McMurtry joined a Canadian contingent to the Friends Ambulance Unit in China.

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²Interview with Carlyle King.

⁴³DND, RG 24, V. 6573, HQ 1161-3-4, G. H. Cassels, Deputy Adjutant General, Division "M" to Major-General L. R. LaFlèche, Associate Deputy Minister of National War Services, 21 November 1940.

⁴⁴CFSC Papers, CO file, Frank Wadge to Haslam, 21 November 1940.

⁴⁵Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meeting, 1940, p. 61.

⁴⁶PC, RG 2, 18, V. 5, D-27, James G. Gardner, Minister of National War Services, Press Release, 6 December 1940.

⁴⁷Ibid., H. R. L. Henry, Private Secretary to PM, to James G. Gardner, 22 November 1940.

⁴⁸Ibid., extract from letter from George McDonald, nd.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰DND, RG 24, V. 6573, HQ 1161-3-4, G. H. Cassels to Adjutant General, 7 October 1940.

⁵¹Gardner, Press Release, 6 December 1940.

⁵²Order-in-Council P.C. 7215.

⁵³Gardner, Press Release, 6 December 1940. See Appendix D for a copy of the Application for Postponement.

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Fransen, "Canadian Mennonites", pp. 110-111.

⁵⁶PC, RG 2, 18, V. 5 D-27-(1941), Davis and LaFlèche, Memorandum to Cabinet War Committee, 19 May 1941.

⁵⁷Ibid.; the initial proposal also called for an ASW camp in Cape Breton Park for C.O.s from the Maritimes and for one in Gatineau Park for those from Quebec and Ontario but this plan was later rejected.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Ibid.

⁶⁰PC, RG 2, 18, V. 16 M-5-6, P. Heeney to H. Mitchell, 7 February 1944.

⁶¹PAC, Interdepartmental Committees, RG 35, Series 7, V. 21, J. F. Mackinnon, "Historical Account of the Wartime Activities of the Alternative Service Branch," Department of Labour, Unpublished, 11 April 1946, p. 26.

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, pp. 320-321.

⁶⁴Toews, Alternative Service in Canada, p. 76.

⁶⁵Paul L. Storms, "Life at Montreal River Camp," The Canadian Friend, 33 (April 1942): 11-12.

⁶⁶Ibid.; Toews, Alternative Service in Canada, p. 76.

- ⁶⁷Roy Clifton Papers, Clifton to Sid, 16 January 1943.
- ⁶⁸Ibid., Clifton to H. Runham Brown, Secretary, WRI, 26 December 1942.
- ⁶⁹John L. Fretz, "An History," The Beacon, 1 March 1945, p. 1.
- ⁷⁰The Northern Beacon, 4 April 1942, p. 5.
- ⁷¹Ibid., 30 May 1942, p. 5.
- ⁷²The Canadian C.O., August 1942, pp. 2-5.
- ⁷³Ibid.
- ⁷⁴The Northern Beacon, 9 May 1942, p. 1.
- ⁷⁵Toews, Alternative Service in Canada, p. 78.
- ⁷⁶MacKinnon, "Alternative Service Branch," p. 9.
- ⁷⁷Toews, Alternative Service in Canada, pp. 83-84.
- ⁷⁸Ibid., p. 86.
- ⁷⁹Ibid.
- ⁸⁰Ibid., p. 76.
- ⁸¹Ibid., p. 101; The Beacon, 1 March 1945, p. 1.
- ⁸²United Church Archives, FOR Papers, Box 2 file 24, "Implications of the Use of Force Today," notes of a conference at ASW camp Q 6 with James M. Finlay, nd.
- ⁸³CFSC Papers, CO file, "Questionnaire on Alternative Service."

⁸⁴Ibid., Questionnaire Committee to Fellow C.O.s in BCFS Camps, nd.

⁸⁵Ibid., Military Problems Committee file, G. P. Melrose, Assistant Chief Forester, to Wes Brown, 18 March 1943.

⁸⁶Toews, Alternative Service in Canada, p. 101. In a letter to the CHPC Brown reported that the "Questionnaire Committee had in mind only good purposes" and asked for their help in securing releases from the camps. CFSC Papers, Military Problems Committee file, Brown to CHPC, 28 March 1943.

⁸⁷MacKinnon, "Alternative Service Branch," p. 1. These changes were effected through Order-in-Council P.C. 8800, 26 September 1942 and Order-in-Council P.C. 10924, 1 November 1942.

⁸⁸National Selective Service Mobilization Regulations, P.C. 10924; CFSC Papers, CO file, Student Conscientious Objector Memo.

⁸⁹CFSC Papers, Military Problems Committee file, Memorandum to Ottawa, nd.

⁹⁰Ibid., CO file, Student Conscientious Objector Memo.

⁹¹Ibid., Military Problems Committee file, Memorandum to Ottawa.

⁹²Ibid.

⁹³Labour, RG 27, V. 131, 601.3-6 v. 2, Lavelle Smith to Humphrey Mitchell, 20 March 1943.

⁹⁴Ibid., Harold Toye to Mitchell, 13 April 1943.

⁹⁵Ibid.

⁹⁶CFSC Papers, CO file, J. B. Martin and E. Swalm, "Report of Alternative Service Workers in B.C. and Alberta."

⁹⁷FOR Papers, Box 2, file 24, "Implications of the Use of Force Today," notes of a conference with James M. Finlay at BCFS ASW camp Q6.

⁹⁸MacKinnon, "Alternative Service Branch," pp. 2-3. Under authority of Order-in-Council P.C. 2821, 1 May 1943.

⁹⁹RG 27 V. 131, 601.3-6 v. 1, W. H. McLallen, President, Canadian Forestry Association to Mitchell, 24 February 1943; G. S. Raphael, Consolidated Red Cedar Shingle Association of British Columbia to Mitchell, 25 February 1943; L. R. Andrews, B. C. Lumber and Shingle Manufacturers Association to Mitchell, 25 February 1943; Robert McKee, B. C. Loggers Association, to Mitchell, 23 February 1943; W. C. Mainwaring, Provincial Civilian Protection Committee, to Ian Mackenzie, Minister of Pensions and National Health, 22 February 1943; A. Wells Gray, Minister of Lands, B.C., to LaFlèche, 29 January 1943.

¹⁰⁰Toews, Alternative Service in Canada, pp. 59-60.

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 58.

¹⁰²MacKinnon, "Alternative Service Branch," p. 13a.

¹⁰³Ibid., p. 13.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., pp. 14-17. This also applied to C.O.s allowed to return to their own farms.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 4; RG 27, V. 131, 601.3-6, v. 2, T. C. Douglas to Mitchell, 26 May 1943. On June 1, 1945 the maximum monthly payment to the Red Cross was reduced and set at five dollars for those in agriculture and fifteen dollars for those in industry. Furthermore, all married C.O.s over thirty years of age were released entirely from Red Cross payments but remained under the jurisdiction of the alternative service officers.

¹⁰⁶CFSC Papers, McNinch file, Haslam to A. S. McNinch, Divisional Alternative Service Officer, 29 July 1944; FOR Papers, Box 1, file 3, James Finaly to MacKinnon, 29 September 1943.

¹⁰⁷Toews, Alternative Service in Canada, p. 87.

¹⁰⁸Penton, Jehovah's Witnesses in Canada, p. 169.

¹⁰⁹MacKinnon, "Alternative Service Branch," pp. 8-9.

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 25.

¹¹¹Ibid., pp. 25, 28; Penton, Jehovah's Witnesses in Canada, pp. 164-171. The authorities steadfastly refused to recognize the main argument of Jehovah's Witnesses that all baptized Witnesses were ministers entitled to exemption from military service and alternative service.

¹¹²DND, RG 24, V. 6573, HQ 1161-3-4, G. J. Hill to Prime Minister King, 3 July 1945.

¹¹³MacKinnon, "Alternative Service Branch," pp. 25-26.

¹¹⁴RG 27, V. 131, 601.3-4 v. 1, C. F. Klassen to Mitchell, 2 February 1943.

¹¹⁵Ibid., Allen Rayner Reesor, ASW Camp, Banff, to J. W. Noseworthy, July 1943.

¹¹⁶RG 35, 7, V. 27, "History of the Corps of (Civilian) Canadian Firefighters," p. 16.

¹¹⁷Ibid.; among those were Keith Woollard and Harvey Moats, two of the Saskatoon boys originally denied C.O. status because they were members of the United Church and Gordon Stewart, former McGill student and editor of The Canadian C.O.. A breakdown of the C.O.s according to denomination follows: 7 Mennonites, 8 United Churchmen, 1 Presbyterian, 1 Roman Catholic, 1 Brethren, 1 Brethren in Christ and 1 Church of Christ.

¹¹⁸The Canadian C.O., August 1942, p. 1.

¹¹⁹Ibid., December 1942, p. 3.

¹²⁰Ibid.; interview with Keith Woollard, Toronto, 25 March 1976; recorded letter, Gordon K. Stewart to author, received 7 March 1976. The C.O. firefighters served overseas until the Corps was demobilized in 1945. At that time most Canadians returned home but some of the C.O.s entered relief work in Europe. Keith Woollard on the other hand, remained in England in order to assist Donald Soper in the London Mission.

¹²¹The Canadian C.O., December 1942, pp. 1, 6.

¹²²RG 24, V. 6573, HQ 1167-3-4, J. W. Pickersgill to Major-General H. F. G. Letson, Adjutant General, 4 May 1943.

¹²³Order-in-Council, PC. 7251.

¹²⁴Toews, Alternative Service in Canada, pp. 95-96.

¹²⁵FOR Papers, Box 1, file 3, James Finlay to L. E. Westman, 26 July 1944; RG 24, V. 6573, HQ 1161-3-4, Manley J. Edwards, MP, to Prime Minister King, 16 February 1943. Edwards charged that even Seventh Day Adventists were forced to undertake basic training.

¹²⁶Reconciliation, 1 (December 1943): 7-8.

¹²⁷For a more in-depth discussion of this topic see Thomas P. Socknat, "The Canadian Contribution to the China Convoy," Quaker History, Autumn, 1980.

¹²⁸DND RG 24, V. 6573, HQ 1161-3-4, Harris to Prime Minister King, 23 April 1943.

¹²⁹Ibid., J. W. Pickersgill to Letson, 4 May 1943.

¹³⁰Ibid., H. R. L. Henry, Private Secretary to PM, to Harris, 9 June 1943.

¹³¹CFSC Papers, Westman file, Westman to Haslam, 11 November 1943.

¹³²Ibid., Tennant file, Gordon Keith to Peter Tennant, 13 January 1944 (excerpt).

¹³³Ibid., McClure file, McClure to Dr. Liu Shih Shun, 6 April 1944.

¹³⁴Ibid., Tennant file, P. Tennant to FAU Headquarters, 24 February 1944, p. 3.

¹³⁵Although organized in Toronto by the Canadian Friends Service Committee, the Canadian contingent was comprised of volunteers from almost every section of Canada and represented various religious denominations: six United Churchmen, five Anglicans, five Friends, one Presbyterian, one Disciple of Christ and two with no religious affiliation. They included Ed Abbott, Walter Alexander, Joe Awmack, Russell Beck, Wes Brown, Al Dobson, Jack Dodds, Albert Dorland, Terry Dorland, Delf Fransham, Elmer Hobbs, Wilf Howarth, Russell

McArthur, Vernon Mjolsness, Stan Outhouse and Francis Starr, as well as United Church ministers Doug McMurtry and George Wright and two women, Harriet Brown and Kathleen Green.

¹³⁶CFSC Papers, G. Pifher files, D. H. Clark, Executive Secretary, Chinese War Relief Fund, to G. Pifher, Department of National War Services, 18 May 1944.

¹³⁷Socknat, "The Canadian Contribution to the China Convoy."

¹³⁸Toews, Alternative Service in Canada, p. 70.

¹³⁹Ibid., pp. 70-71.

¹⁴⁰Ibid.

¹⁴¹Penton, Jehovah's Witnesses in Canada, pp. 178-179.

¹⁴²Toews, Alternative Service in Canada, p. 73; PAC, National Parks Branch, RG 84, V. 218, U-165-2-8, J. D. B. MacFarlane, "Operation of ASW Camps in National Parks, Report, July 1946."

¹⁴³MacKinnon, "Alternative Service Branch," p. 19.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., p. 23; for an exact breakdown of men in alternative service see Appendix E and F.

¹⁴⁵CFSC Papers, CO file, Haslam to Andrew Petrie, 24 September 1943.

¹⁴⁶Fransen, "Canadian Mennonites," p. 163.

¹⁴⁷Woodcock and Avakumovic, The Doukhobors, p. 320.

¹⁴⁸Haslam, Canadian Friends, p. 24.

CHAPTER IX

THE PACIFIST SEARCH FOR WARTIME REALISM

In light of their own commitment to radical social change on the one hand and the challenge of Christian realism on the other, Canadian liberal pacifists were ever mindful of the necessity to confront the reality of wartime circumstances if they were to exercise a meaningful role in reshaping society. Thus, throughout the war they searched for ways in which to translate pacifism into practical action. Their response to conscription and endorsement of alternative service for conscientious objectors was one example. Others involved their co-operation with a variety of concerned Canadians in reconciling wartime tensions in society through the defense of civil liberties and in refugee and relief work.

Pacifist efforts on behalf of refugees actually began in the mid-1930's. Both the WIL and the Society of Friends, in conjunction with their counterparts throughout the world, had displayed an active interest in assisting primarily Jewish refugees fleeing Nazi persecution but had received little support from Canadian authorities. While several countries, including Great Britain, the United States, Australia, France, Belgium and Holland, had opened their doors to some of the refugees, Canadian immigration regulations permitted the admission only of those Europeans who had immediate relatives residing in Canada or agriculturists with sufficient money to farm in Canada, thus excluding the majority of the refugees.¹ In

fact, the government explicitly restricted Jewish immigration and refused to allow into Canada 10,000 Jewish refugees over a five year period even though the Canadian Jewish Congress had agreed to assume financial responsibility for the newcomers.²

Such a response, claimed the Canadian activists, was not only a national disgrace but demanded immediate counter-action. Accordingly, in 1938 a number of Canadians representing various church, liberal and pacifist organizations formed the Canadian National Committee on Refugees (CNCR) under the auspices of the League of Nations Society of Canada. The first task of the Committee was to publicize the refugee problem in order to mount public pressure for a change in government policy, particularly, but in vain, with regard to the urgent question of Jewish refugees.³ The Committee also took the initiative in securing special immigration permits for individual refugees and in providing assistance in the readjustment and resettlement of refugees in Canada throughout the war years.⁴

Headquartered in Toronto, the CNCR was directed by an executive composed of Senator Cairine R. Wilson, President of the League of Nations Society of Canada, as chairman, Constance Hayward as executive secretary, and Sir Robert Falconer and Sir Ellsworth Flavelle as the honorary chairman and treasurer, respectively.⁵ From its beginning, the Committee contended that the admission of selected groups of refugees would constitute a sizeable contribution to the economic and cultural development of Canada, an argument later supported with specific examples. A promotional leaflet distributed

in 1941, for instance, described the individual cases of several refugees who, with the help of the Committee, had become constructive new residents of Canada.⁶ Although the Committee admitted that it had become increasingly difficult for refugees to escape from German dominated countries, it nevertheless maintained that a few did "trickle through", including engineers and experts valuable to Canada's war effort. Other than the occasional patriotic reference, however, the Committee usually emphasized the humanitarian side of the issue and argued that its major goal during the war as well as the post-war years was to create a national attitude favorable towards "the great problem of immigration."⁷

One of the Committee's major efforts during the war concerned the "friendly aliens", particularly the refugee students, who had interned in Great Britain and then transferred to internment camps in Canada. Once British authorities began to reappraise the fate of these refugees, the Refugee Committee was successful in enlisting the financial support and personal sponsors necessary for the release of the younger refugees from camps in order to continue their studies in Canada. To deal with this problem specifically, the Canadian National Committee on Refugees, in conjunction with the United Jewish Refugee and War Relief Associations, formed the Central Committee for Interned Refugees in November 1940.⁸ Headquartered in Montreal, this joint organization benefited from the services of Senator Cairine Wilson and Constance Hayward, chairman and secretary, respectively, as well as Stanley Goldner, liaison officer to the camps, and Mr. C. Raphael,

a co-ordinating officer representing the British refugee committees at Bloomsbury House, London.⁹

Of the Canadians who worked on behalf of the refugees interned in Canada, none were more involved than pacifists, particularly those in the WIL and Society of Friends. In effect, the problem of interned refugees offered pacifists another opportunity to perform a constructive humanitarian service at a time when outlets for pacifist action were limited. Largely because of its failure to attract younger women in the late 1930's the WIL had gradually lost most of its base across the country.¹⁰ In fact, outside of a few women in Vancouver, Edmonton and Winnipeg, the only office really active during the war was the WIL's national headquarters in Toronto. There the national president Anna Sissons and secretary Laura Davis, continued to promote the WIL's humanitarian interests. Alice Loeb, another long time WIL activist, became the national chairman of a special refugee committee, representative of the WIL's general orientation during the war.

The concern with the refugee problem was also shared by Canadian Quakers. As a result of their experiences in the First War as well as their transition towards social activism, Friends considered their primary responsibility during war was not only to maintain their ancient peace testimony but also to help relieve the personal suffering and hardships caused by war. Accordingly, in 1940 the Canadian Friends Service Committee (CFSC) maintained that it was indeed possible for ". . . those who cannot condone war as a method, to be truly loyal

to their country, and to help in the work of preservation and healing of the stricken peoples of the world."¹¹ Under the direction of the general secretary, Fred Haslam, the Committee successfully organized Quaker activity on behalf of conscientious objectors and was quick to create a War Victims Relief Fund through which contributions were solicited for overseas relief projects conducted by British and American Friends. It was also through Friends in Britain that Canadian Quakers first learned of the plight of the refugees interned in Canada.

Canadian involvement in the internment operations began in the summer of 1940 when Britain, fearing a Fifth Column danger at home, transferred thousands of interned enemy aliens to Canada and Australia for further detention. Among those sent to Canada were a number of so-called "Nazi sympathizers" as well as approximately 2400 German and Austrian males classified as "refugees from Nazi oppression." Included were boys as young as seventeen years of age, many with partial Jewish ancestry.¹² After escaping from Germany and Austria many of these aliens had sought refuge in England with the hope of eventually emigrating to the United States. Suddenly in the spring of 1940 they were interned and then transported across the sea together with regular prisoners of war.¹³ In most instances families were split up with some cases of one brother going to Canada and another to Australia while the father or mother remained on the Isle of Man or in some other British camp. For its part the Canadian government agreed to take approximately 6700 prisoners of war and

internees from the United Kingdom for future internment in camps administered by the Internment Operations Branch of the Department of State.¹⁴

The first ship of evacuated POW's and internees reached Quebec City on July 1, 1940. Upon their arrival they were immediately rushed "through long lines of Canadian bayonets" to trains waiting to whisk them off to especially prepared camps. These internment camps, the Canadian public was assured, were well guarded and situated "far from civilization".¹⁵ A few days later another group of enemy aliens bound for Canada met disaster when their ship the Arandora Star was sunk by German torpedoes. While Canadian seamen managed to rescue one thousand survivors that same number of German and Italian prisoners perished at sea.¹⁶ Although the incident aroused little immediate sympathy in the British or Canadian press, the tragedy of the Arandora Star ultimately stirred public criticism in Britain of the whole internment operation.¹⁷ This was especially true once it was revealed that other than Nazis, the victims also included anti-Nazis and German Jewish refugees.

Initially, the procedure of mixing actual prisoners of war with the other interned enemy aliens was followed in Canada as well. All the internees who arrived in Canada, from the pro-Nazi aliens to the "refugees from Nazi oppression" were herded together into camps and accorded the treatment of prisoners of war.¹⁸ Despite a concerted effort by the Canadian Committee on Refugees to remedy the situation of

"friendly" aliens, they remained isolated as prisoners of war throughout the winter of 1940-41. Finally, under unremitting pressure from the Central Committee for Interned Refugees, the Canadian government segregated the refugees from the dangerous aliens and bona fide POW's and on July 1, 1941 an Order-in-Council removed the alien refugee camps from the prisoner of war administration and placed them under the control of a Commissioner of Refugee Camps.¹⁹ The two camps were both situated in Quebec: Camp "N" outside Sherbrooke and Camp "A" at Farnham, thirty miles from Montreal. The change in Canadian policy followed the relaxation of the internment policy in Britain where a special tribunal had ordered the release of close to ninety-five per cent of the interned refugees, many of whom thereafter entered useful war work or joined the Pioneer Corps. While approximately 900 of those interned in Canada returned to England for release under this amnesty, 1,389 men remained in the Canadian camps, chiefly because of immigration technicalities.²⁰ As part of their new refugee policy, however, Canadian authorities did provide for the possible release of refugee students under twenty-one years of age in order to continue their studies in Canada provided they received sufficient financial support from Canadian individuals or groups acting as sponsors.

It was at this point that the Canadian Friends Service Committee ✓ as well as the WIL and other pacifists became more directly involved. Friends in particular received appeals from British and American Quakers to minister to the needs of the boys and help secure their

release from the camps.²¹ Apparently a substantial number of the young refugees had been registered with the Germany Emergency Committee of the Friends' Service Council while in Britain. Once interned in Canada the refugees maintained communications with British Friends who in turn contacted Canadian Quakers on their behalf.²² By summer, 1940, however, the Canadian Friends Service Committee also began to receive letters from the young internees themselves. Following usual references to the fact that the majority of the men in their camp were "refugees from Nazi oppression" who had to leave Germany or Austria for "racial, religious or political reasons", the internees turned to their anxiety over the chance of being released and pleaded for assistance in that regard. The letters from the camps also indicated that those who had associated with the Society of Friends in Britain desired to meet with Canadian Friends.²³ For instance, in a letter to the CFSC general secretary Fred Haslam, Ernst-Ludwig Landsberg, a spokesman for a group in camp "N", wrote that he and his friends were anxious for Haslam or some other Canadian Friend to arrange a visit to the camp. "This would enable us to discuss our problems with you," he wrote, "and I can assure you that your advice would be appreciated very much."²⁴ Following similar requests from Friedrich Hoeniger and Ulrich Weil at Camp "A", Haslam sought permission from the authorities to visit the refugee camps in Quebec.²⁵ The Commissioner of Refugee Camps, Lieutenant-Colonel R. S. W. Fordham, replied that before such an application could be approved he would need to know the nature of Haslam's proposed visit and warned:

It is very easy to upset refugees, and it is regarded as a duty here to make sure that the representatives of any organizations desiring to communicate with them are not engaged in missions that might prove upsetting to the Camp administrative system.²⁶

Once he was assured of the sincerity of the CFSC's intentions, however, Fordham agreed to Haslam's visits subject to the stipulation that only "matters of welfare be discussed, but not questions relative to release. . . ." ²⁷

Consequently, in October 1941, Haslam visited both the Farnham and Sherbrooke camps on behalf of the CFSC. He met the several young men with whom he had corresponded and at Sherbrooke he found a "Society of Friends group" organized by thirty-five men who had been helped by the Germany Emergency Committee while in Britain.²⁸ In accordance with the ground rules for his visit Haslam concentrated on the welfare and educational needs of the men in the camps but he found the refugees most eager to learn something of release possibilities, a topic he had agreed not to discuss. Although initially frustrated by the restriction, he discovered that the authorities were merely determined not to build up false hopes and thus avoid a possible repeat of the bitter disappointment experienced by the internees following the collapse of their efforts to emigrate to the United States.²⁹ The large majority of those refugees had registered for American visas years before their internment. In fact, statistics on Camp "N" personnel showed that out of 422 prospective emigrants to the United States, 60% had registered in 1938 and 13% in

1939.³⁰ Once prisoners in Canada, however, they discovered they were no longer eligible. The Camp "N" survey also revealed the following set of statistics: 45% of the refugees were under the age of twenty-five while a huge 87% were under thirty; 94.3% had been classified by British Tribunals as "refugees from Nazi oppression"; 34.6% had been imprisoned in German concentration camps such as Dachau and 32% had lived in transit camps on the Continent and in England.³¹

As a result of Haslam's tour of the camps, those Canadians interested in assisting the refugees were better acquainted with their individual needs and better prepared to deal with specific problems in the future. Haslam was particularly hopeful that others, perhaps pacifists in Montreal, would undertake similar visits on a regular basis.³² Among those who answered the call to the camps were John Hobart, a Montreal Quaker, and Clarence Halliday, the United Church pacifist who traded his church in Montreal for the unofficial duties as chaplain/welfare officer to the refugees. Visits were also made by Friends from outside Canada, including Mary M. Rogers from Philadelphia and Emma Cadbury from London.³³ For their part the Canadian Friends Service Committee organized a nation-wide drive for winter clothing and books for the camps and within a few months donations of books arrived from as far away as Kootenay Bay, British Columbia.³⁴ Arrangements were also made for Queen's University to offer correspondence courses to the refugees at reduced fees while the remaining tuition as well as the textbooks were subsidized by the Student Christian Movement.³⁵

Meanwhile, Haslam had been co-operating with Constance Hayward, v secretary of the Committee for Interned Refugees, and Dr. Jerome Davis, Canadian Director of the War Prisoners' Aid of the YMCA, in an attempt to secure the release of interned students. There were approximately 300 such youths between the ages of seventeen and twenty-four who had been admitted to English schools and colleges prior to their internment and transfer to Canada. Since then a number of them had continued their studies in camp and a few had actually written matriculation examinations for entrance to Canadian universities.³⁶ According to government regulations, however, release of the students was contingent upon Canadian citizens acting as sponsors and thereby accepting full responsibility for the cost of the student's education and maintenance for the duration of the war or until their education was completed. More specifically, sponsors were required to prove their ability to pay one thousand dollars a year for each student released.³⁷ This requirement, while viewed by authorities as a fair estimate of the annual costs of student support, made it exceedingly difficult for individuals to sponsor interned students without extra help. Consequently, various groups such as the CFSC, WIL and the National Council of Women, pooled their resources to create a central sponsorship fund administered by the Central Committee for Interned Refugees. Other than merely co-ordinating the sponsorship scheme, the Committee launched a national appeal on behalf of the refugee students. Families and organizations were urged either to sponsor refugees individually or to contribute to the Committee's sponsorship fund.³⁸

The CFSC was particularly interested in assisting two young men in Camp "A": Friedrich Hoeniger and Ulrich Weil, both of whom were well-known to Friends in Britain.³⁸ Hoeniger, for example, had attended a Quaker school in Ommen, Holland, and a Quaker camp in Cornwall, England, prior to internment.⁴⁰ In order to secure Hoeniger's release, Haslam successfully sought the support of the WIL refugee committee.⁴¹ In the final arrangement the CFSC made financial contributions to the Hoeniger fund but it was the WIL president, Anna Sissons, who acted as Hoeniger's official sponsor.⁴² In April 1942, nearly ten months after the initial move to secure his release, Hoeniger wrote Haslam that he was "now happily sheltered" at Professor and Mrs. Sissons' home in Toronto.⁴³ Although not always a popular move, it was not unusual for pacifists to open their homes to the refugees; for instance, Professor Arthur Dorland, chairman of the Friends Yearly Meeting, also arranged for a young interned student to live at his home in London, Ontario, as did Lavell Smith while he was still living in Montreal.⁴⁴

Once successful in securing the release of students the CFSC and the Committee for Interned Refugees shifted their attention to the prospect of doing the same for some of the older men with useful professions or trades. While visiting the camps Haslam had discovered that other than students many of the men were skilled in medicine, research, engineering and tool-making.⁴⁵ Consequently, the Committee for Interned Refugees exerted considerable pressure on their behalf

until the government gradually began to approve the release of men to work in essential war industries and agriculture. The first of such men to be released were tool-makers such as Alexander Horak. Haslam immediately set out to find Horak a job with Rogers Radio Tubes Limited in Toronto.⁴⁶ In co-operation with Constance Hayward and Jerome Davis, Haslam also represented the interests of Alois Zockling, an engineer, and Hans Loewit, a former medical student at the University of Vienna. The release of skilled refugees progressed through the winter and in the spring of 1942 arrangements were made with farmers to place some of the men in agricultural work. For instance, Reinhold Grischkat was offered a farm job in Burgessville, Ontario, upon his release from the Farnham camp.⁴⁷

During the next few years Canadian pacifists, including the WIL, FOR and Friends, continued to co-operate in a national effort to aid wartime refugees at home and abroad, but by the autumn of 1941 they also began to consider the prospect of post-war relief work overseas. Since most European refugees had been barred from entering Canada, pacifists claimed the best way Canadians could lend their support was to contribute to the Friends War Victims Relief Fund or a special fund collected by FOR Chairman Lavell Smith for European Relief Work administered by War Resisters' International.⁴⁸ Accordingly, pacifists began a program of relief work that continued well into the post-war era, and a number of Canadian Friends joined the relief teams. For instance, Barbara Walker, Haslam's one time assistant in

the CFSC office, was attached to a Friends Relief Service team in Germany while Naomi Jackson, a future McMaster University Professor of Fine Arts, served in Finland and Paul Zavitz of Sparta, Ontario, worked in Poland, both under the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee.⁴⁹

Perhaps because of their close association with Quakers and other pacifists during the war, particularly with respect to the problems of conscientious objectors, Canada's Mennonites also became involved in their own relief projects in China, India and Poland. Unlike the Quakers, however, who had become social activists, the more traditional historic peace sects generally remained a separate people withdrawn from the mainstream of Canadian society. Although the issue of conscription during the two world wars and state regulations concerning education often forced them into a confrontation with the earthly world, the historic peace sects, whether Mennonite, Hutterite or Doukhobor, strove to maintain their particular versions of Christian living independent of a hostile world. As noted above, their example of isolated communities had become increasingly popular among socially conscious Christian pacifists during the inter-war period and had resulted in the birth of Christian co-operative communities like the Society of Brothers' Cotswold Bruderhof in Britain. ✓

By the 1940's Canadian pacifists had become active in the movement for co-operative communities, largely through the efforts of Henri Lasserre and the Robert Owen Foundation. Lasserre and his pacifist associates were particularly enthusiastic about the Cotswold experiment; thus, they were frantic though helpless when they learned of the plight of the Society of Brothers during the war.

With the internment of German aliens in Britain in 1940 the Cotswold Bruderhof, largely comprised of Germans or German-speaking members, came under direct attack from the local populace and was pressured to leave Britain. In July of that year the head of the Bruderhof, Eberhard C. H. Arnold, appealed to Lasserre and the Robert Owen Foundation to help persuade the Canadian government to allow the migration to Canada of the Bruderhof en masse.⁵⁰ Since exit permits from England had been secured and the Hutterian Brethren of Canada had offered the necessary financial guarantees only the negative response of Canadian Immigration officials blocked their way. Lasserre and pacifist friends in Canada made numerous appeals to Ottawa on behalf of the Bruderhof but to no avail. Given the wartime atmosphere in Canada it was difficult, to say the least, for a handful of Canadians to plead the cause of a pacifist community like the Bruderhof. In the end, gravely disappointed by their rebuff from Canada, the Cotswold Bruderhof emigrated to Paraguay.⁵¹

For their part, Canadian pacifists remained attracted to the way of life proposed by the Society of Brothers and hoped to emulate similar experiments in community in Canada. For instance, near the

end of his long pilgrimage Fairbairn endorsed the movement for co-operative communities as the best way to bring in a new social order. Before Christian socialism could be successfully introduced on a large scale, he argued, people must first build model communities isolated from the prevailing world system.⁵²

Although Lasserre was not an active pacifist during the war years, he associated with pacifists more than any other group because it was socially-minded pacifists and conscientious objectors who were the most attracted to the idea and practice of integral co-operative communities. Such a way of life appeared to promise the "completest realization of . . . their religious devotion to non-violence, simplicity and brotherly fellowship"; thus providing a living example of a new social ethic for the future.⁵³

In March 1943, a nucleus of pacifists including Fred Haslam, George Tatham, Professor of Geography at the University of Toronto, and several conscientious objectors like Leslie Johnson, Walter Alexander and Roy Clifton, joined with Henri and Madeline Lasserre in the formation of the Canadian Fellowship for Cooperative Community (CFCC).⁵⁴ The CFCC assumed the educational, research and library functions of the Robert Owen Foundation, published a small newsletter as well as pamphlets and generally renewed Canadian interest in the movement for co-operative communities. The CFCC Statement of Principles explained the need for such community as follows:

The Fellowship believes that a cooperative democratic social order, freed from competition greed and war, must sooner or later be brought about by the voluntary efforts of cooperatively-minded people, to replace existing individualistic and acquisitive society or any totalitarian system which may follow the present structure. There can be no durable peace until such a cooperative order has been established. This order cannot be imposed by compulsion, but requires for its establishment the free and general acceptance by the people of the new human relationship implied. The Fellowship believes that the formation of cooperative communities where these new relationships are experienced, practised and witnessed, is one of the factors required at the present stage of the world's crisis for the preparation of this new social order.⁵⁵

One of the first actions of the CFCC was the creation of a land based community on a farm at Aurora, Ontario.⁵⁶ Those associated with the Aurora experiment included leading CFCC members and several conscientious objectors as well as the poet Wilson Macdonald. Although brief, the Aurora years were a valuable introduction to co-operative living in Canada, and throughout the war pacifists remained enthusiastic about the idea. The Fellowship of Reconciliation, for instance, developed a close relationship with the CFCC and the Robert Owen Foundation and promoted the co-operative communities as not only a non-violent lifestyle but the "first cells . . . of the social structure of the future."⁵⁷

Although the WIL and the Society of Friends assumed the lead in refugee work and the Canadian Fellowship for Cooperative Community provided an outlet for more idealistic experiments, the Fellowship of Reconciliation dominated pacifist activities in Canada. Following its reorganization early in the war, the FOR attempted to broaden its membership base to include more than primarily United Church pacifists. A small but important step in that direction was taken in December 1942, when two Toronto Anglicans, John Frank, Rector of Holy Trinity Church, and John F. Davidson of Upper Canada College, declared their support for the revived group of reconcilers. In doing so they expressed openly the hope that the addition of their names would encourage other Anglicans to do likewise.⁵⁸ Despite an intensive membership drive, the FOR membership of 350 remained overwhelmingly dominated by United Church pacifists.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, the FOR quickly became the principal inter-pacifist organization in Canada and took the lead in advocating practical action in response to the serious issues confronting wartime society. In effect, the FOR executive believed their primary function was not just to comfort and consolidate fellow pacifists but, at the same time, to provide them with the direction and courage necessary to act upon their principles individually and in groups. Such unity of purpose, it was felt, would replace the individual's lonely consciousness of insufficiency with the strength and wisdom gleaned from co-operative action.⁶⁰

With this task in mind the Canadian FOR embarked upon a simple, but to date its most daring enterprise -- the publication

of its own magazine. Launched in October 1943, and usually published at least six times a year, Reconciliation was more than merely the official organ of the Canadian FOR. Rather, its emergence marked a significant milestone in the development of the pacifist movement in Canada. Until that time the expression of Canadian pacifist thought has been confined to several small mimeographed newsletters, usually issued monthly by the FOR National Council and at irregular intervals by a few industrious individuals with regional interests.⁶¹ As the various newsletters merged into one, the new publication aimed at representing all pacifists in Canada. The Canadian FOR Chairman, Lavell Smith, claimed the need for such a pacifist journal was greater in Canada than in either Britain or the United States. In Canada, he reasoned,

our numbers are fewer, the distances that separate us are greater, many of us are unable to meet often with like-minded folk and the sense of isolation is often overpowering.⁶²

Furthermore, although British and American pacifists had been more vocal and effective, their journals such as The Christian Pacifist, Peace News, The Conscientious Objector, and The Catholic Worker were not easily accessible to Canadians during the war. "It is a strange commentary upon our Canadian conception of freedom of the press," wrote Smith, "that journals which circulate freely in Britain are frowned upon here."⁶³ Moreover, the situation was aggravated further by the fact that Canadian papers, both religious and secular, had "failed almost completely to give space to pacifist writers or to

allow their readers to judge for themselves the pacifist argument."⁶⁴ Therefore, if the pacifist argument was not to be left largely unstated in Canada, Canadian pacifists would have to publish their own journal. Considering these alternatives, Smith boastfully predicted that the launching of Reconciliation would prove to be "a more significant event than the launching of an aircraft carrier or the taking of Naples."⁶⁵ In any case, he added, it was the right of Canadian pacifists, as a resolute and law abiding minority, to express their "conscientious views and to circulate news nowhere else available."⁶⁶

One of the first to congratulate the Canadians on their new pacifist magazine was the Chairman of the International FOR, John Nevin Sayre. While noting with satisfaction the witness of Canadian pacifists since the beginning of the war, Sayre praised the renewed commitment demonstrated with the publication of a magazine and added as "not beginning a day too soon." Furthermore, Sayre suggested conciliation succeeded in fusing Canadian pacifists into a community" knowledgeable in the practice of non-violence, it achieved a significant goal.⁶⁷

An incident with the birth of Reconciliation was the appointment of "Abe" Watson as the new Executive Secretary of the FOR and, consequently, the Managing Editor of their new journal. Watson had been active in the United Church and YMCA and had spent a year as a conscientious objector in an Alternative Service Unit in British Columbia prior to assuming his duties with the journal. He worked closely with Watson in the production of the journal

committee of several people, most notably Edith
 reen and Roy Clifton, responsible for writing as well
 anizational work.⁶⁹ Other than the material from
 staff, however, the journal usually depended upon
 ious contributors scattered across the country,
 th in Montreal, Fairbairn in Windermere, Ontario,
 , Huestis in Edmonton and several conscientious
 rnative Service Work camps in British Columbia. In
 adian content was supplemented with original and
 s by popular internationally known pacifists as
 ichard B. Gregg, thus providing Canadian readers with
 world's leading pacifist thought.

, the editors of Reconciliation featured articles
 pics of pacifism and the FOR as well as their regular
 the pacifist movement in Canada. In the first issue,
 Canadian Chairman, Lavell Smith, explained the
 OR. While granting full recognition and respect to
 ched by a logical, political or historical approach
 that the FOR advocated a religious pacifism based
 hat warfare was "contrary to the will of God, as
 t."⁷⁰ Such a pacifist conviction, Smith argued, must
 anaticism" since it was merely obedience to the word
 ore, contrary to "passivism", the pacifism of the FOR
 plication of Christ's message in all circumstances.⁷¹

Another regular feature of Reconciliation during its first few years was a column entitled "Rev. R. Edis Fairbairn Says . . ." in the course of which Fairbairn wrote a series of articles on "The Elements of Sound Thinking."⁷² After the appearance of Fairbairn's fourth article, however, the editor of Reconciliation decided to stop publication of the series and ignored Fairbairn's numerous inquiries on the fate of his column.⁷³ Although the reason for this move is not clear, it appears to have reflected a growing opposition in the FOR to the acid tone of Fairbairn's criticisms.⁷⁴ At first disappointed, Fairbairn appeared satisfied when an "atheist-radical-pacifist editor in Scotland" promised to publish "The Elements of Sound Thinking" in booklet form.⁷⁵ Nor was he particularly upset that he was no longer contributing to Reconciliation. Although he had agreed to support the new pacifist publication he did not do so at the expense of his own independent newsletter, as did other individuals. Instead, he turned his small newsletter into a monthly bulletin with an international readership.

Originally entitled "To Maintain Courage By Sharing Conviction" but shortened in 1946 to read simply "To Share Conviction", the bulletin was the product of a true one-man operation. At his home in Windermere, Fairbairn wrote, typed and mimeographed the bulletin, usually one to two pages in length, and then distributed several hundred copies at his own expense. He continued the practice until his retirement in 1948 and then, less regularly, until November 1951. Fairbairn's reason for this undertaking was two-fold. First, he was

"solidly convinced" of a fundamental need for radical pacifist journalism among Canada's conscientious objectors, as well as other pacifists, farmers and "ordinary religious people".⁷⁶ His bulletin, he believed, would help them clarify and justify a pacifist stand they may have taken originally upon a "blind but commanding impulse."⁷⁷ Secondly, he was delighted with the prospect of having complete freedom of expression, especially once other avenues for pacifist writing were largely closed.⁷⁸

Within his bulletin Fairbairn aimed to "probe the implications of the anti-war stand from the Christian point of view."⁷⁹ He often reiterated the same basic arguments he used in the past, particularly in his "Indictment" of the United Church, and which he later repeated in his book Apostate Christendom published in 1948. Christendom, he claimed, was astray -- apostate. The Church had "compromised supreme loyalty to Christ with the State" and could never again justify its existence "until and unless it humbles itself, confesses its tragic forsaking of the way of Jesus, and sets out once again to do what Jesus asked it to do."⁸⁰ The way of Jesus, wrote Fairbairn, was the way of the Cross, the alternative to Messianic war; nevertheless, although Jesus died as a pacifist, His insight went far beyond the mere repudiation of war. "He did not so much repudiate war as affirm the reverse of it . . ." argued Fairbairn, the model for pacifists who placed their faith in the power of love to bring in a new era of social and economic justice.⁸¹ But a peaceful and successful economic

system was endangered, he warned, when the Church supported the war and therefore endorsed the essential use of violence.⁸² As an example he cited the FCSO, a movement which exposed the "economic wickedness of the world" and then "wilted suddenly" when it committed itself to the war.⁸³ Above all, at the heart of Fairbairn's criticisms was his frustration with the Church leadership, not only for abandoning the pacifism of Jesus, but also for supporting the war without producing a reasoned Christian ethic of war.⁸⁴

On the whole, most responses to Fairbairn's bulletin were sufficiently encouraging to convince him of its justification. Some readers, for instance, offered unsolicited financial assistance to help Fairbairn meet the increasing number of subscriptions from across Canada as well as from Britain and the United States.⁸⁵ Fairbairn always sent a copy of the bulletin to the office of the American FOR in New York City and A. J. Muste "not infrequently" responded appreciatively. Furthermore, certain of the bulletin's "hotter issues" were used by similar American and British newsletters and on several occasions Fairbairn was quoted in the "English Community Broadsheet."⁸⁶

In the British Isles the bulletin was distributed to well over a hundred readers under the auspices of the Movement for a Pacifist Church of "Pax Christi."⁸⁷ This movement was a scheme promoted by Reverend Albert D. Belden of England to remobilize the great churches of Christendom around a "New Universal Christian Agreement" on pacifism. Hailed as the ultimate pacifist movement, the plan was to recruit all those Christians who felt they could take the pacifist stand only

when supported by the authority of the Church.⁸⁸ It was Belden's hope that once thousands of Christians signified their willingness to refuse to participate in war the churches would be reborn on a pacifist basis and thereafter save mankind from the worst of sins.⁸⁹

Initially, Fairbairn was keenly interested in the Pax Christi Movement and publicized it as possibly the most "practical way in which the present ineffective pacifist minority could become, if not a majority, at least a much more effective minority."⁹⁰ In the final analysis, however, Fairbairn rejected the idea of a pacifist church as too narrow an application of the word and spirit of Jesus and too optimistic a faith in the ordinary churches. "Indeed," he wrote, "it looks increasingly dubious whether any church integrated in the capitalist economy can do other in a pinch than fire a radically Christian minister."⁹¹ If the hope of the future was not a pacifist church, however, he intimated it may lie in the movement of religious co-operative communities.⁹²

Belden was somewhat disappointed with Fairbairn's attitude, especially since he had hoped the outspoken Canadian pacifist would organize the Pax Christi Movement in Canada.⁹³ Nevertheless, following the war Belden personally toured Canada on behalf of his movement. Although he received a courteous reception, the Canadian FOR appears to have agreed with A. J. Muste's negative critique of Belden's scheme and declined to give it a favorable endorsement.⁹⁴ Muste had rejected the Pax Christi idea on the grounds that there was something "basically wrong" with the suggestion that individual Christians should

not act on an issue of principle "until a majority of his fellows are ready to do likewise." Pacifism, he argued, was not a matter of arithmetic.⁹⁵

On the whole, the Canadian FOR adhered to A. J. Muste's philosophy that pacifism was the "one adequate revolutionary movement in the world" since it was based upon the spiritual revolution of mankind as well as a non-violent social revolution.⁹⁶ In the pages of the Canadian magazine Reconciliation, Muste reminded pacifists they had a "positive responsibility to develop techniques of non-violence that can be used by mass organizations."⁹⁷ If pacifists failed in their revolutionary job, he warned, the masses would have no choice except "to submit to injustice or to try to break their chains by the self-defeating method of violence." In closing, Muste emphasized that the only alternative to total war in the future was total pacifism in the present.⁹⁸

In an attempt to translate this revolutionary pacifism into practical action Canadian pacifists concentrated on what they considered the most immediate issue on the home front -- the protection of civil liberties in wartime. Other than the threat of conscription, pacifist emotions were most deeply aroused over the government's forced evacuation and relocation of Japanese Canadians from the west coast region and their eventual dispersal throughout Canada.

Shortly after the official entry of Japan into the war with their bombing of Pearl Harbor in December 1941, the Canadian Govern-

ment evicted 20,000 Japanese Canadians from the British Columbia coast, confiscated their property, both real and personal, and herded them into "relocation centres" hurriedly set up at old "ghost towns" in the British Columbia interior: Greenwood, Slocan City, Roseberry, New Denver, Sandon, Kaslo, Lemmon Creek and Tashme.⁹⁹ Although originally confiscated under the excuse of protective custody, all Japanese property was subsequently sold at prices far below its actual value. The Japanese Canadians themselves, mostly Canadian citizens, either lived out the remaining war years as refugees in the "relocation camps" or were dispersed to other areas of Canada in order to perform essential work in sugar beet camps, domestic and nursery service, steel plants, foundries and chemical works. Approximately 3,500 were directed to the prairies alone while others resettled in Ontario and Quebec.¹⁰⁰

In addition, Japanese Canadians were subjected to restrictions not imposed upon those of German, Italian or other "enemy" ancestry. They were forbidden, for example, to buy or rent property without the permission of their provincial Minister of Justice and Attorney General and were prohibited from crossing provincial boundaries without a special permit. Therefore, rather than merely being considered suspect because of their "enemy" origin, it appears that Japanese Canadians were also victims of an official policy of racial discrimination. Later generations of Canadians would condemn the government's arbitrary action as one of the most glaring violations of civil rights in the nation's history but at the time most Canadians, especially

those in British Columbia, either remained silent or generally approved of the discriminatory measures. It was a clear example, claimed the pacifists, of the kind of brutal, insensitive response of a society at war, similar but even more pronounced than the internment of enemy aliens during the First War.

By June 1943, a number of pacifists, representative of the FOR, WIL and Society of Friends, joined with other concerned Canadians to found the Co-operative Committee on Japanese Canadians.¹⁰¹ Although initially designed to help resettle the Japanese Canadians in Toronto and other parts of the country, the Co-operative Committee eventually became the instrument through which a number of conscientious citizens, working closely with the Japanese Canadians themselves, directly challenged the official discriminatory policies, particularly the government's attempt to repatriate those of Japanese ancestry after the war.

Since few ordinary citizens were aware of the situation, the first task of the Committee was to publicize the plight of Japanese Canadians with the hope of arousing the national conscience. The Committee also began to fight local opposition to the resettled Japanese Canadians and called upon the Canadian public to display a new level of tolerance. The editors of Reconciliation urged their readers to take the lead in working towards community acceptance of Japanese Canadians and the achievement of practical goals such as finding them decent living accommodations and jobs, organizing English language training classes and relocating Japanese Canadian students

in schools and colleges.¹⁰² Furthermore, pacifists were urged to register their opposition to repatriation with their federal Members of Parliament.

Basically, it was the government's threat of deportation or "repatriation" of the Japanese Canadians, including those born in Canada, that infuriated pockets of Canadians and increased support for the work of the Committee. By June 1945 the Co-operative Committee had expanded into a federation of thirty-three groups and organizations interested in securing justice for Japanese Canadians.¹⁰³ Among the co-operating groups were the FOR, WIL, Society of Friends, Student Christian Movement, National Council of Women, Civil Liberties Association of Toronto, Toronto Labour Council, YMCA, YWCA and various churches. The task of co-ordinating the activities of these various groups into a unified front belonged to the Committee executive: James Finlay, chairman, Mrs. Hugh MacMillan, secretary and Miss Constance Chappell, treasurer.¹⁰⁴ As the pacifist pastor of Carlton Street United Church in Toronto and executive member of the FOR, Finlay personally ensured that the struggle on behalf of Japanese Canadians was a popular outlet for pacifist social activists. For instance, among the pacifists particularly active in the work of the Committee were Albert Watson and Edith Fowke of the Reconciliation editorial staff.¹⁰⁵ Other than committee work, however, a number of FOR people also worked directly with the Japanese Canadians in the relocation centers. Among these were Mildred Fahrni, Helen Lawson, Ella Lediard ✓ and three conscientious objectors, Ernest Best, Donald Ewing and

John Rowe, all of whom taught at Japanese Canadian schools in New Denver and Tashme.¹⁰⁶

The work of the Committee went into high gear in September 1945, when the Canadian Government announced its plans to proceed with repatriation on the basis of its survey conducted earlier that year at the detention centers.¹⁰⁷ At that time over 6,000 had agreed to voluntary repatriation of what amounted to 10,347 people, mostly Canadian citizens, as the alternative to moving East of the Rockies. Since then, however, many of those who had signed revealed that they had done so only because of direct threats of separation from their families or the loss of their livelihood.¹⁰⁸ Rather than a true measure of those who desired to return to Japan, the Co-operative Committee argued that the government survey merely indicated the dissatisfaction and frustration of a restricted people.¹⁰⁹

In response to the imminent threat of deportation the Committee distributed 75,000 copies of a leaflet entitled "From Citizens to Refugees -- It's Happening Here!"¹¹⁰ The editors of Reconciliation had previously reprinted a thousand copies of their issue on Japanese Canadians of which 250 were sold before printing.¹¹¹ In addition, some individual groups such as the Canadian Friends Service Committee cabled Prime Minister King and selected Members of Parliament urging suspension of the repatriation scheme.¹¹² Despite such pleas and personal deputations to Ottawa by Finlay, Mrs. MacMillan and other Committee members, the government proceeded with its plans and in December 1945, tabled three Orders-in-Council providing for the

deportation of all persons of Japanese ancestry and their families who had signed requests for repatriation and had not revoked their action prior to September 1, 1945.¹¹³

The Co-operative Committee then decided its only recourse was to take legal action. Accordingly, Andrew Brewin, a Toronto lawyer who had been representing the Civil Liberties Association on the Committee, was appointed as legal counsel and argued the Committee's case before the Supreme Court once the Ministry of Justice agreed to test the legality of the Orders. Popular support for the Committee's effort to stop repatriation began to build and donations came pouring in from across the country. In Toronto nearly a thousand people gathered to show their support and hear addresses by Senator Cairine Wilson, Senator Arthur Roebuck, Rabbi A. Feinberg and Andrew Brewin. The meeting passed a resolution urging the Prime Minister to abandon plans for the expulsion of Japanese Canadians. Similar resolutions had already been passed at meetings in London, Brantford, Ottawa, Montreal, Winnipeg and Vancouver.¹¹⁴ National opposition to forced repatriation continued to mount once the Supreme Court ruled that the Orders were legal simply because of the government's power under the War Measures Act.

In response, the Co-operative Committee appealed the case to the Privy Council, but recognizing that the Privy Council's decision would only deal with the legal and constitutional question involved, it also renewed representation to the government to suspend the policy of wholesale deportation, even if it was legal. The Committee also

distributed fifty thousand copies of a new leaflet entitled "Our Japanese-Canadians -- Citizens, not Exiles" in order to help bolster their support among the Canadian public.¹¹⁵ It appears the committee anticipated the decision of the Privy Council, handed down on December 2, 1946, that the Orders-in-Council were, indeed, valid under the War Measures Act. Under increasing public pressure, however, the government finally backed down and on January 24, 1947, Prime Minister King announced that the Orders-in-Council providing for the repatriation of Japanese Canadians had been repealed.¹¹⁶

While overjoyed that its long campaign for social justice and civil liberties had succeeded at least in suspending repatriation, the Co-operative Committee quickly turned its attention to the remaining issues, such as compensation for property loss, and continued to function in the post-war era until 1951 when all restrictions on Japanese Canadians were finally removed and all their claims were settled.¹¹⁷

In the end, pacifists came to view the practical achievements of the Co-operative Committee on Japanese Canadians as a clear example of pacifism in action. Together with sympathetic representatives of other sectors of society they successfully challenged wartime injustice as part of their overall effort to secure decency and justice for all citizens. James Finlay, chairman of the co-operating groups for six years and member of the FOR executive, later recalled that the plight of Japanese Canadians became the overriding concern of Canadian

pacifists during the war and immediate post-war years.¹¹⁸ In effect, it was their battleground for peace and justice.¹¹⁹

Meanwhile, members of the FOR also investigated other avenues for countering the increasing insensitivity of Canadian society to the moral problems accompanying war. In January 1944, for instance, Lavell Smith questioned the morality of Allied strategic bombing of German cities, the issue which had come under considerable attack from pacifists and churchmen in Britain. Smith condemned Canada's churchmen for remaining silent.¹²⁰ He reminded the Church that during the days of the London blitz it condemned the very practice of indiscriminate bombing that it apparently tolerated when turned on German cities. "Is it to be concluded that bombs dropped upon us are murderous and inhuman while bombs dropped by us are remedial or salutary?"¹²¹ The inconsistency of such a moral stand was aggravated further, he argued, as news dispatches revealed that more bombs were being dropped on Berlin in a single night than ever fell on London in a month.

Our bombers are described as cutting swaths of utter destruction clear across a city. Our political leaders promise the enemy worse things to follow. Yet I listen in vain for the voice of the Canadian Church to condemn such indiscriminate bombing.¹²²

The silence of the Church, he suggested somewhat inconsistently, was indicative of the "dulling of moral sensitivity" during wartime and as a result pacifist opinion within Canada was growing day by day. In the long run, however, Canadian pacifists were never successful in arousing much opposition to strategic bombing, even though Vera Brittain,

one of the leading spokesmen for the Bombing Restriction Committee in Britain, spoke in Canada on several occasions at the invitation of the FOR.¹²³

When over a hundred FOR members gathered in their first annual conference in July 1944, it was evident that Canadian pacifists were primarily concerned with the immediate problems confronting those Canadians directly affected by the war and the larger economic issues underlying world peace.¹²⁴ Thus the conference delegates recommended that the National Council set up a Committee on Race Relations including members of the Negro, Japanese Canadian and Jewish communities of Canada. Although primarily concerned with youth education and personal counselling the Committee would also be responsible for publishing news of race problems, providing speakers on the race question and organizing a letter writing campaign in order to keep the problem before the public.¹²⁵ The conference also endorsed several proposals for action in respect to economic problems, emphasizing that, as Christian pacifists, the FOR "must be prepared to give courageous leadership in the field of social and economic reform."¹²⁶ Among the suggestions was a call for the socialization of the Canadian economy as well as recommendations that the FOR work with the Religion-Labor Foundation in the struggle for industrial democracy, promote closer co-operation between agricultural and industrial workers, encourage the establishment of credit unions and consumers' and producers' co-operatives and advocate the immediate creation of public housing centers. In the international field the conference urged

the creation of a co-operative world organization to guarantee fair distribution of the world's raw materials to all nations.¹²⁷

Overall, the FOR conference reflected a renewed optimism among Canadian pacifists. In an effort to broaden its outreach for instance, the FOR decided to affiliate with the War Resisters' International as well as the IFOR. The FOR executive also began to develop closer co-operation with American pacifists. The previous year, for instance, John Nevin Sayre, Chairman of both the American and International FOR, visited Toronto for a two-day conference with the Canadian section.¹²⁸ In succeeding years, the annual conferences usually followed the practice of featuring internationally known pacifists such as A. J. Muste in 1945, John M. Swomly in 1946, Muriel Lester in 1947, and G. H. C. MacGregor in 1948.¹²⁹ This international exchange was balanced by Canadian representation at American conferences when in later years, for instance, Lavell Smith attended an FOR conference in New York City,¹³⁰ and James Finlay addressed the National Conference of the American FOR on the progress of the Canadian Fellowship.¹³¹

As well as extending its international associations, the Canadian FOR underwent an internal reorganization at the war's end. The National Council was expanded to include twenty-four members, twelve from Toronto and twelve from outside Toronto; and Albert Watson, who had served as executive secretary on a part-time basis the previous year, was reappointed on a full-time basis with an annual

operating budget of sixteen hundred dollars.¹³³ As the FOR's first paid executive secretary, Watson devoted himself to promoting an effective FOR program as well as assuming related responsibilities as a member of a Toronto inter-racial committee and as an advisor to the Japanese Canadian credit union. Within a few years the FOR successfully organized Canadian pacifist action on a wide variety of fronts.

Since the FOR was centered largely in Toronto one of its major problems was that it lacked effective co-ordination of those pacifists more or less isolated in other areas of the country. In fact, the difficulty of uniting a small minority of citizens scattered across a vast, sparsely populated country remained the Canadian FOR's most intractable problem. In an attempt to minimize this handicap the executive decided to send Watson on a cross-country trip in the fall of 1945.¹³⁴ Since the initial plans were made before the end of the war it was intended originally that one of Watson's primary goals would be to elicit the support of Canadians for the FOR's Campaign for a Constructive and Democratic Peace, a version of the petition sponsored by the National Peace Council in England which called for a peace settlement built upon a radical reconstruction of society rather than upon national guilt, racial inferiority or preponderant power as in 1919.¹³⁵ By the time Watson embarked on the trip, however, the war had ended and the attention of Canadian pacifists had shifted to the future of the FOR in Canada and post-war challenges such as the issue of peactime conscription.

Watson first toured Quebec and helped reorganize an FOR unit in Montreal under the leadership of Jack Duckworth.¹³⁶ Then in August he set out for the west coast claiming the journey had a five-fold purpose: to meet with as many FOR members and friends as possible, to organize new FOR units, to publicize the work of the FOR, particularly its "Forerunner" program for teenage youth, and to promote the magazine Reconciliation.¹³⁷ Upon his return to Toronto Watson was confident that after addressing over forty-six meetings and delivering several radio broadcasts he had succeeded in making valuable new contacts as well as contributing to a greater sense of unity between Western members and the national office in Toronto. He proudly reported that "for the first time in its history" the FOR was organized on a truly national basis with active groups not only in Toronto, Hamilton and Montreal but also across the country in Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Regina, Edmonton, Medicine Hat, Calgary and Vancouver.¹³⁸ According to Watson, one of the highlights of his journey was his visit with the leaders of the co-operative Mennonite Community of Altoona, south of Winnipeg. He left convinced of the necessity to maintain and extend FOR co-operation with Mennonites during the post-war years.¹³⁹

The value of Watson's personal diplomacy notwithstanding, the magazine Reconciliation remained the most valuable link between Canadian pacifists as well as a stimulus for pacifist action. Within a year of its initial publication, the editorial staff modified the

magazine's format to produce specific problem-oriented issues. From July 1944, approximately two-thirds of each issue was devoted to a single topic, such as anti-semitism, Canadian immigration policy, Canadian unity, industrial relations, Japanese Canadians, conscientious objectors, refugees and the movement for co-operative communities in Canada. In so doing, the editors not only focused attention on the various ways in which the pacifist ethic of non-violence was breached within Canadian society but reflected as well the primary concerns of Canadian pacifists and their co-operation with non-pacifist groups in working towards practical solutions to controversial problems related to the war.

Throughout the war years pacifists in Canada strove to make a realistic response to actual wartime circumstances in such a way as to move society further toward their desired end. First and foremost they were concerned with liberty of conscience, and strove to implant the right of conscientious objection more deeply in Canadian soil. This was more than just a self-protective device, however, for they organized relief efforts to assist the victims of war overseas and worked on behalf of those groups in Canada who were victimized by internment, and the plight of refugees and Japanese Canadians became a prime concern. Moreover, using the communal lifestyle of the historic peace sects as an example, liberal pacifists began to take steps to build experimental co-operative communities which they hoped would serve as practical models for a future co-operative, peaceful

society. Another important action was taken when the FOR began to publicize these issues through their own magazine, Reconciliation. From the areas of race relations to industrial relations, its pages explored the dynamic potential for Canadians of non-violent action and the humanitarian response. The Christian pacifist argument, itself, was also publicized in personal newsletters such as Fairbairn's bulletin. All in all, pacifists actively promoted the non-violent alternative for building a new social order, and by the end of the war they were confident they had successfully adapted their pacifism to the reality they faced.

But contrary to Niebuhrian realism which rejected utopian ideals and demanded that Christians assume responsibility for the fight against the harsh realities of fascism, the realism of the pacifist response was confined within the limits of the pacifist ideal. Although prevented therefore from sharing responsibility in the direct outcome of the war, pacifists considered their role a serious and important one. They attempted to make constructive contributions to wartime society, acting both as prophets, judging the war and its efforts from the standpoint of the Kingdom of God, and as reconcilers, enlarging the ground of civil liberties in Canadian society. Some among the liberal-radical pacifists, as among the historic peace sects, were inclined to one or the other pole. Fairbairn, for example, was clearly more the prophetic judge than the reconciling agent. On the other hand, the perception of one role often depended upon the other;

thus, Fairbairn could not see reconciliation short of the total re-organization of the structure of society. Even the more withdrawn Mennonites emerged to help through their own relief organizations. In the end, the pacifist activities begun in response to the war continued well into the post-war era and served as a constant reminder of the non-violent alternative in a world conditioned by war.

FOOTNOTES

¹Constance Hayward, "The Canadian National Committee on Refugees," Reconciliation, 2 (November 1944):7.

²Irving Abella and Harold Troper, "'The Line must be Drawn Somewhere': Canada and Jewish Refugees, 1933-9," Canadian Historical Review, June 1979, p. 201; see the above for an account of Canada's response to the Jewish refugee problem before the war.

³Hayward, "The Canadian National Committee on Refugees," p. 7.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Canadian National Committee on Refugees, New Homes for Old, leaflet, 1941; J. R. Mutchmore, Secretary of the United Church's Board of Evangelism and Social Service represented the United Church on the CNCR while Raymond Booth of the Society of Friends served as secretary of the CNCR's promotion campaign. The United Church of Canada, Yearbook, 1939, p. 34.

⁶Canadian National Committee on Refugees, New Homes for Old, leaflet, 1941.

⁷Ibid.

⁸PAC, National Council of Women (NCW) Papers, I:25, v. 80, Canadian National Committee on Refugees, Bulletin No. 14, 8 April 1941.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Interview with Ida Siegel.

¹¹Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meetings of the Society of Friends, 1941, p. 55.

¹²Canadian Friends Service Committee (CFSC) Papers, Internees File, "Refugee Students."

¹³C. E. Silcox, "Young Refugees Interned in Canada," The Canadian Friend, January 1942, pp. 8-9.

¹⁴The Globe (Toronto), 11 July 1940, p. 1.

¹⁵Ibid., 2 July 1940, pp. 1-2.

¹⁶Ibid., 4 July 1940, p. 1.

¹⁷Ibid., 5 July 1940, p. 1; Austin Stevens, The Dispossessed: German Refugees in Britain (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1975), pp. 202-204.

¹⁸Interview with Ida Siegel; Silcox, "Young Refugees Interned in Canada," p. 9.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰CFSC Papers, Internees File, "Refugee Students."

²¹Ibid., Mary S. Milligan, London, to Barbara Walker, Toronto, 25 October 1940; Sara Bright Skilling, Winnipeg, to Haslam, 4 February 1941; Haslam to Horace G. Alexander, Birmingham, England, 22 October 1941; Raymond Booth to Haslam, 16 June 1941; and other letters.

²²Ibid.

²³For numerous such letters see CFSC Papers, Internees File.

²⁴Ibid., E. L. Landsberg to Haslam, 26 September 1941.

²⁵Ibid., Haslam to Horace G. Alexander, 22 October 1941; Haslam to Lt. Col. R. S. W. Fordham, 6 October 1941; U. Weil to Haslam, 11 August 1941.

²⁶Ibid., Fordham to Haslam, 3 October 1941.

²⁷Ibid., Fordham to Haslam, 7 October 1941.

²⁸Ibid., Haslam to Mrs. J. M. Garner, 22 October 1941; Haslam to Mrs. C. B. Sissons, 23 October 1941.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰NCW Papers, I:25, v. 80, C. Raphael, "Report on Emigration of Interned Refugees," 24 June 1941.

³¹Ibid.

³²CFSC Papers, Internees File, Haslam to Fred J. Tritton, Friends Service Council, 22 October 1941.

³³Haslam to John H. Hobart, 17 December 1941.

³⁴Ibid., H. Graham Brown, Kooteney Bay, to Haslam, 24 January 1942.

³⁵Ibid., Haslam to Mrs. J. M. Garner, 22 October 1941.

³⁶Ibid., "Refugee Students;" for example Ulrich Weil had taken the matriculation exam for McGill, Weil to R. Booth, 31 July 1941.

³⁷NCW Papers, I:25, v. 80, Constance Hayward to Mrs. E. D. Hardy, 4 July 1941; CFSC Papers, Internees File, Haslam to Mrs. J. M. Garner, 5 August 1941; Jerome Davis to Haslam, 25 July 1941.

³⁸Ibid., Hayward to Mrs. E. D. Hardy, 4 July 1941.

³⁹Ibid., Haslam to Jerome Davis, 1 August 1941.

⁴⁰Ibid., Hoeniger to Haslam, 23 July 1941.

⁴¹Ibid., Haslam to Mrs. C. B. Sissons, 13 August 1941; Haslam to Mrs. J. M. Garner, 5 August 1941.

⁴²Ibid., Mrs. C. B. Sissons to Haslam, 3 September 1941; Laura Davis, WIL Treasurer, to Haslam, 7 March 1942.

⁴³Ibid., Hoeniger to Haslam, 12 April 1942.

⁴⁴Interview with Arthur G. Dorland; interview with Mrs. J. Lavell Smith; interview with Ida Siegel. Another who was interested in sponsoring a refugee student was the FCSO spokesman, Gregory

Vlastos, George J. Hoeniger, Chicago, to Haslam, 1 July 1941, Internees File, CFSC Papers.

⁴⁵Fred Haslam, "Refugee Camps," The Canadian Friend, 38 (December 1941): 9; CFSC Papers, Internees File, Haslam to John H. Hobart, 17 December 1941.

⁴⁶Ibid., Haslam to Kathleen A. Bell, Victoria, B.C., 15 August 1941; Haslam to F. J. Cluett, Rogers Radio Tubes Ltd., Toronto, 15 August 1941.

⁴⁷Ibid., Haslam to C. Hayward, 6 May 1942; Haslam to J. Davis, 7 October 1942.

⁴⁸Reconciliation 1 (September 1944): 4.

⁴⁹Haslam, A Record of Experience with Canadian Friends, p. 66; a group of Canadian conscientious objectors, including Friends, also served in the Friends Ambulance Unit in China. A full discussion of this Unit appears in Chapter VIII.

⁵⁰Thomson, Pioneer in Community, p. 91.

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²UCA, FOR Papers, Fairbairn, "To Maintain Courage by Sharing Conviction," Bulletin No. 4; in 1946 Fairbairn confided to a friend: "I wish very much that the Fellowship for Cooperative Community could see its way to initiate something in Canada like the Bruderhof. In another two years I would be superannuated and free, perhaps, to participate from the woodcraft end!", ibid., Box 1, file 12, Fairbairn to Howey, 20 April 1946; for the interest of other pacifists see: Reconciliation, 1 (May 1944): 13.

⁵³Thomson, Pioneer in Community, p. 91.

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵"Statement of Principles of the Canadian Fellowship for Cooperative Community," quoted in Thomson, Pioneer in Community, p. 115.

⁵⁶Interview with George Tatham, Toronto, 12 February 1976.

⁵⁷Reconciliation 1 (May 1944): 13.

⁵⁸FOR Papers, Box 1, file 3, John Frank and John F. Davidson to Canadian FOR members, 16 December 1942. A one time member of the National Executive of both the FCSO and the SCM, Davidson advocated what he called a "socially conscious pacifism." Interview with John F. Davidson, Toronto, 26 October 1976.

⁵⁹Ibid., Fellowship of Reconciliation, Canadian Section, "Newsletter," May 1943. In May 1943, the Canadian FOR membership list included 111 members, mainly United Church, but not all exhibited a lively interest. Ibid.; by October 1943, Canadian membership was 250. J. Lavell Smith, "We Launch Our New Magazine," Reconciliation, 1 (October 1943): 1.

⁶⁰FOR Papers, Box 1, file 3, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Canadian Section, leaflet (n.d.).

⁶¹Smith, "We Launch Our New Magazine," p. 1.

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 11.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶Ibid.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 9.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 12.

⁶⁹Others on the editorial committee included Isabel Alexander, Edna Barnett, Peter Gorrie, Gus Harris and Frank McPhee, the first business manager.

⁷⁰Smith, "We Launch Our New Magazine," p. 11.

⁷¹Ibid.

⁷²Reconciliation, 1 (May 1944): 10.

⁷³FOR Papers, Box 1, file 12, Fairbairn to Harvey Howey, 1 May 1945.

⁷⁴Ibid., Fairbairn to J. M. Finlay, 10 March 1948; Fairbairn to Howey, 3 May 1948.

⁷⁵Ibid., Fairbairn to Howey, 1 May 1946. It is not known if the booklet was ever published.

⁷⁶Ibid., Fairbairn to Howey, 20 April 1946; R. Edis Fairbairn, "To Maintain Courage by Sharing Conviction," Bulletin, 19 January 1943.

⁷⁷Fairbairn, Bulletin No. 37, 20 February 1946. Although the Bulletins were numbered consecutively, Fairbairn was inconsistent in this practice. Some issues were both dated and numbered while others included only a number or a date.

⁷⁸In addition, Fairbairn apparently attributed a kind of Divine importance to his bulletin, arguing that "God still needs a human voice to utter to men His indignation" and over the years he eventually came to think of himself as a "modern day prophet" with an obligation to preach the unwelcome truth. Fairbairn, Bulletin, 12 February 1944; 20 June 1948.

⁷⁹Ibid., 20 February 1946.

⁸⁰Ibid., No. 45, 20 October 1946.

⁸¹Ibid., No. 6, 22 July 1943; No. 20, 20 March 1945.

⁸²Ibid., No. 9, 28 October 1943.

⁸³Ibid., 1 March 1943.

⁸⁴Ibid., No. 25, 20 February 1945.

⁸⁵Ibid., No. 8, 24 September 1943.

⁸⁶FOR Papers, Box 1, file 12, Fairbairn to Howey, 6 March 1944.

- ⁸⁷ Fairbairn, Bulletin, No. 37, 20 February 1946.
- ⁸⁸ Albert D. Belden, Pax Christi, 2nd ed. (Wallinton: Corwal Publications, 1944), pp. 34-46.
- ⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 72.
- ⁹⁰ Reconciliation, 1 (October 1943): 8.
- ⁹¹ Fairbairn, Bulletin, No. 29, 20 June 1945.
- ⁹² FOR Papers, Box 1, file 12, Fairbairn to Howey, 30 April 1946.
- ⁹³ Ibid., Box 1, file 3, Belden to Howey, 17 February 1944.
- ⁹⁴ Ibid., Box 1, file 4, Fairbairn to Finlay, 11 October 1946; FOR Notice, 24 October 1946.
- ⁹⁵ Ibid., A. J. Muste to Executive Committee and Staff, 8 February 1946.
- ⁹⁶ Reconciliation, 1 (September 1944): 7.
- ⁹⁷ Ibid.
- ⁹⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹⁹ Edith Fowke, They Made Democracy Work: The Story of the Co-operative Committee on Japanese Canadians (Toronto: Garden City Press, n.d.), p. 3.
- ¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 4.
- ¹⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 4-5.
- ¹⁰² Reconciliation, 1 (March 1944): 13.
- ¹⁰³ Fowke, They Made Democracy Work, p. 11.

¹⁰⁴In 1946 Donald Macmillan was succeeded as secretary by her husband Hugh, a former missionary in Japan.

¹⁰⁵While a student at the University of Saskatchewan, Fowke was attracted to the FOR by Professor Carlyle King but she did not completely agree with its Christian bias. Nevertheless, once in Toronto during the war she maintained her membership in the FOR, helped edit Reconciliation and became deeply involved in the effort to aid Japanese Canadians.

¹⁰⁶Reconciliation, 1 (March 1944): 15.

¹⁰⁷Fowke, They Made Democracy Work, pp. 10-12.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 10; 16.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 16.

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 13.

¹¹¹Reconciliation, 1 (September 1944): 6.

¹¹²CFSC Papers, Japanese Canadian File, Fred Haslam to Mackenzie King, John Bracken and M. J. Coldwell, Telegram, 15 October 1945.

¹¹³The Orders-in-Council were P. C. 7355, 7356 and 7357. Fowke, They Made Democracy Work, p. 18.

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 20.

¹¹⁵Ibid., pp. 20-22.

¹¹⁶Ibid., p. 24.

¹¹⁷Ibid., pp. 25-31.

¹¹⁸Interview with James M. Finlay.

¹¹⁹FOR Papers, Box 1, file 4, The Co-operative Committee on Japanese Canadians, Bulletin No. 7, 14 September 1946.

¹²⁰The United Church Observer, 1 January 1944, p. 17.

¹²¹Ibid.

¹²²Ibid.

¹²³Vera Brittain made Canadian appearances in 1937, 1940 and 1946. Reconciliation, 1 (December 1943): 10; The Canadian Friend, November 1946, p. 13; McMaster University Special Collections, Vera Brittain Papers, Lecture Contracts.

¹²⁴Reconciliation, 1 (September 1944): 5.

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 11.

¹²⁶Ibid., p. 14.

¹²⁷Ibid.

¹²⁸FOR Papers, Box 1, file 3, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Canadian Section, "Newsletter," April, 1943.

¹²⁹Ibid., Fellowship of Reconciliation, Canadian Section, Suggested Program for Two Day Seminar, 16-17 August 1945; ibid., Box 1, file 4, Program for Annual Conference, February, 1946; Box 1, file 1, Program for Annual Confernece, June, 1947; FOR Meeting Agenda, 2 April 1948.

¹³⁰Ibid., Box 1, file 3, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Canadian Section, "Newsletter," May, 1943.

¹³¹Ibid., Box 1, file 4, A. J. Muste to Finlay, 19 July 1946.

¹³²Ibid., 10 September 1946.

¹³³Reconciliation, 1 (September 1944): 6.

¹³⁴FOR Papers, Box 1, file 3, Lavell Smith to FOR National Council, 18 January 1945.

¹³⁵Ibid.; National Peace Council, London, England, "National Petition for a Constructive Peace," August, 1944.

¹³⁶Reconciliation, 2 (April 1945): 2.

¹³⁷Ibid., 2 (December 1945): 3.

¹³⁸Ibid., pp. 3-5.

¹³⁹Ibid., pp. 4-5.

CONCLUSION

The atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in early August 1945 finally brought the Second World War to an end, but, in light of the new awesome threat of mass nuclear destruction, tranquility was hardly secured. On the contrary, it was the beginning of an era of bewilderment and frustration, and, more specifically, a time of increased international tensions as a new armaments race escalated between the United States and the Soviet Union. A sense of impending doom hung in the air. The imminent threat of atomic warfare imbued pacifism with a sense of urgency which ultimately altered the character of the post-war peace movement in Canada.

In contrast to the initial hopelessness surrounding the news of the atomic weapon, pacifists were encouraged to maintain their optimism by continuing the kind of humanitarian activities begun during the war. For instance, Lavell Smith urged his fellow FOR members to pursue the new channels that had begun to open for pacifist action:

Millions of people face death from cold and hunger in Europe. Hundreds of thousands are on picket lines in Canada and the United States. Victims of racial prejudice suffer under grievous disabilities. Others who were true to the dictates of conscience are still discriminated against. In all these situations, as in others, the word of brotherhood and reconciliation needs to be spoken. It may even be that there are increasing numbers ready to hear it.¹

Post-war relief and reconstruction proved to be one of the most popular areas of pacifist activity. Canadian Quakers, in particular, launched a massive drive for refugee relief following the war and, with the permission of the Canadian government, the CFSC issued its first public appeal for funds in February 1946.² As the donated funds became available the CFSC purchased supplies and shipped them directly to the needy areas of Central Europe and the Far East where relief teams were organized by the American Friends Service Committee. From January to August 1947 the Friends War Victims Relief Fund had raised over thirty-two thousand dollars and by October fifty thousand dollars worth of supplies had been sent overseas.³ The shipments included bulk supplies of cod liver oil and powdered milk as well as medical supplies, blankets and clothing.⁴

The appeal of Canadian Friends for relief funds received the staunch support of the entire pacifist community especially that of James Finlay who used his weekly radio broadcast to publicize the Quaker cod liver oil program.⁵ Such enthusiastic support for the Friends Relief Fund was typical of the co-operation between pacifists and the whole network of Canadian relief agencies such as the Canadian Save The Children Fund, Canadian Church Relief Abroad, representing the large Protestant denominations, and the Ontario Committee for Relief in Japan.⁶ The CFSC maintained its program of overseas relief well into the 1950's and after.⁷

Following the war pacifists also continued to display an active interest in experimental co-operative communities through the Canadian Fellowship for Cooperative Community (CFCC). Although the death of Henri Lasserre in 1945 severely weakened the movement, both the CFCC and the Robert Owen Foundation were kept alive by a small nucleus of pacifists. They not only continued to publish the CFCC Newsletter but also organized small experiments like Dale House, a co-operative house in Toronto.⁸ Those attracted to co-operative living included a number of conscientious objectors who had viewed life in Alternative Service Work Camps as an introduction to communal organization. Ultimately, several of these C.O.s joined Bruderhofs in the United States.⁹ The CFCC's major though still modest experiment in co-operative pacifist living was the Winterbrook Community near Hornby, Ontario.

Other than Christian pacifists, however, the CFCC also encouraged co-operative farming experiments in the West such as the co-operative farm for veterans at Matador, Saskatchewan. Still another side of the CFCC was its support for the Jewish Chabitzim, a group which maintained a collective residence in Toronto and a collective farm at Prescott, Ontario, as training for collective settlements in Palestine (forerunners of the Israeli Kibbutzim).¹⁰ Thus, the CFCC succeeded in uniting a wide range of Canadians -- farmers, laborers, professionals, pacifists, Jews and Gentiles -- in a common quest for a new social order which would guarantee justice and peace.

To some extent, however, the post-war pacifist response, such as support for co-operative communities, was viewed as irrelevant to the realities of the atomic age. In a Reconciliation article entitled "Pacifism After Hiroshima" Dr. J. J. Brown, Director of the Canadian Association of Physicists, claimed the atomic bomb had placed pacifism in a dilemma.¹¹ Before Hiroshima, he argued, realistic pacifists did not expect to see much change in the common attitude towards war in their lifetime but they believed their efforts would ultimately be brought to fruition. After 1945, however, the traditional pacifist approach of educating public opinion or building model communities was no longer relevant since the world had run out of time. Thus, Brown concluded, pacifism and its corollary, pacifist action, was in need of an urgent and "thorough overhauling."¹²

In reply, Clare Oke argued that the pacifism of the FOR was unaffected by the possibility of imminent disaster since it was based upon Christian conviction rather than rational, political considerations.¹³ Nevertheless, recognizing the need for some realistic pacifist response, the FOR appealed to the Canadian government to "renounce war for all time," to ban the atom bomb and work for a world-wide halt in the production of atomic weapons, and to place an immediate embargo on the further export of uranium ore.¹⁴ The FOR executive also formulated a detailed program of pacifist strategy for the atomic era in which pacifists were urged to convert people to religious pacifism and to take the lead in working for various actions designed to ensure peace.¹⁵ Among the specific

FOR proposals were campaigns to stop the atomic arms race and to achieve universal disarmament, to put an end to imperialism and to promote understanding and friendship between Canada and the Soviet Union, to work for a more liberal immigration policy in Canada, and to abolish cadet training in high schools.¹⁶

Indeed, much of the FOR's post-war energy was directed against the old issue of cadet training in the schools. During the twenties and thirties the campaign against the cadet corps actually succeeded in removing the practice from various school systems throughout the country but in September 1944 it was again made compulsory in the nation's secondary schools.¹⁷ By the end of the war, however, the cadet corps was either placed on a voluntary basis, as in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Quebec and Prince Edward Island, or eliminated from the school program altogether, as in Manitoba. The glaring exception was Ontario where cadet training remained on a compulsory basis.¹⁸ In response, the FOR launched an all out campaign to disband the Ontario cadet corps labeling it "Mr. Drew's Army" after the Premier of Ontario, George A. Drew. The FOR revealed that the Drew government required all boys in Ontario high schools to devote the majority of their physical and health education periods to cadet training and military drill.¹⁹ In reference to the government's defense of the cadet system as valuable training in "good citizenship" FOR critic Albert Watson argued that the only way to train youth in "good citizenship" was "to educate them from their childhood in Canadian ideals and privileges of democratic living."

"It is not possible to train boys in democratic citizenship," wrote Watson, "by compelling them to submit to the authority of a military system."²⁰ Furthermore, instead of recruiting an army of boys, Drew was challenged to support alternative measures that would help achieve lasting peace such as the improvement of race relations, jobs for all at adequate wages, decent labor legislation and improved social services.²¹

As part of their campaign to abolish cadet training the FOR distributed flyers presenting a point by point case against the cadet system and urging the people of Ontario to actively voice their opposition to cadet training in letters to the editors of local papers, to local school boards, to MLA's and, most of all, to Premier Drew himself. "ACT NOW," warned the FOR, "THERE IS NO TIME TO LOSE!"²²

In an angry reaction, Premier Drew charged that the FOR was a "crypto false front communist organization."²³ The FOR was also criticized by an old liberal ally, B. K. Sandwell, editor of Saturday Night. In an editorial entitled "Pacifism Again" Sandwell accused the FOR of being inconsistent in supporting Canada's role in the United Nations, which included the possibility of supplying military forces, on the one hand, while advocating the undermining of Canadian preparedness on the other.²⁴ Although he agreed that a good argument could be made for the exemption of students from compulsory cadet training for reasons of conscience, Sandwell was not prepared to share the logical conclusion to the pacifist line of thinking -- the complete disarmament of Canada. Considering the inconsistency in

the FOR position, he also wondered if pacifists really desired that end, implying that perhaps FOR members wanted "to be defended while doing nothing for defense."²⁵

The FOR National Council attempted to refute the unfavorable allegations through an explanation of the campaign.²⁶ The heart of the issue, they argued, was that compulsory cadet training was not only an unwarranted form of conscription in itself, but a prelude to national military conscription during peacetime. The solution was to nip militarism in the bud. Thus, only by first abolishing cadet training in the high schools could Canadians finally put an end to militarism in Canada.²⁷

Following a few years of an intensive campaign, the compulsory cadet system in Ontario was replaced by a new Citizenship Corps Training course. Although not completely satisfactory to pacifists, it was greeted by the FOR as a "vast improvement and a step in the right direction."²⁸ In this instance the FOR met limited success but in the long run it was unable to escape the type of criticism leveled by Sandwell that its brand of pacifism was unrealistic for the time.

By 1947 the FOR, as well as the entire Canadian peace movement, had reached a critical juncture. Plagued by a lack of financial resources, a dwindling membership and public apathy, the future for pacifism looked bleak even though world peace was increasingly in need of defense. The previous summer while attending the Alberta School of Religion, Scott Nearing, the American anti-war

radical, recognized the crisis and blamed the failure of pacifists and anti-war socialists to attract young converts.

The pacifists and socialists who come out to meetings are seldom under forty. Many of them are past sixty. They are the stalwarts who learned to hold the torch on high before World War I. They have gained few loyal adherents since. Meanwhile death and disaffection have decimated their ranks. It is a rebel remnant, still rebellious, but thinning out with the years.²⁹

As a last resort, James Finlay, the post-war FOR chairman, appealed to the American FOR for a grant of eleven to twelve hundred dollars a year over a two year period.³⁰ Finlay proposed to use the funds for an office secretary, thus freeing Abe Watson, the executive secretary, for field work in broadening and consolidating FOR membership across Canada.³¹ But American financial assistance was not forthcoming. John Nevin Sayre replied that, although he and A. J. Muste were one hundred per-cent behind Abe Watson, the needs of the FOR in Europe were far greater than in Canada. Accordingly, he suggested Finlay begin with a less ambitious program for Watson, particularly since, he implied, Canada might prove to be a "financially arid country" for pacifist fund raising.³²

One of the first casualties of the financial crisis was the FOR publication, Reconciliation. The magazine already appeared less and less frequently but by October 1947 the National Council was forced to suspend its publication permanently.³³ In its place the American FOR journal, Fellowship, was distributed to Canadian subscribers. Rather than merely a magazine, however, Reconciliation had been viewed as a special bond between Christian pacifists in

Canada. The breaking of that bond further weakened that part of the Canadian movement. Shortly afterward, for instance, Reconciliation's editor, Abe Watson, resigned as FOR executive secretary and left for a new position with the American FOR.³⁴ He was succeeded by Mrs. Mildred Fahrni, eventually one of the leading figures in the post-war FOR, first as executive secretary and then as western secretary in Vancouver.

For the next decade the FOR would continue to emphasize the theme of non-violent social action in such areas as race relations, labor disputes and penal reform. Above all, however, the FOR represented the last major vestige of a liberal Christian pacifism founded upon faith in a Divine force working on its behalf. Thus, it was believed that, in time, religious pacifism would lead to a peaceful and just social order. The threat of atomic warfare, however, undermined the social hopes of liberal pacifism. Carlyle King, the first National Chairman of the FOR and the post-war President of the Saskatchewan CCF Party, was one of those who concluded that the pacifism of the FOR was outmoded by the realities of the atomic age.³⁵

Indeed, the ranks of the peace movement eventually swelled with a whole new group of adherents, known as nuclear pacifists or neo-pacifists, who were not willing to follow the lead of the FOR. Since these nuclear pacifists believed it was the new dimension of atomic power which made war unthinkable, they were primarily concerned with removing the threat of atomic weapons and easing tensions between the Soviet Union and the West. Moreover, rather than the strictly

Christian character of the FOR, the new wing of the peace movement forged a renewed alliance with the radical left and endorsed the Marxist revolutionary hope as the way out of the nuclear dilemma.

The move in that direction was accelerated with the founding of the Canadian Peace Congress in 1948. The initial stimulus for the Congress came when Harry Ward, of Union Theological College fame, addressed a Toronto meeting which included a number of his former students such as A. A. MacLeod, the Communist head of the League for Peace and Democracy before the war, and James Finlay and I. G. Perkins of the FOR. Ward urged his audience to take some type of non-violent political action on behalf of peace and, in response, a provisional committee was established to set up a peace congress in Canada.³⁶ To organize the congress on a national basis the committee enlisted Dr. James G. Endicott, the radical United Church missionary who had resigned from his missionary post in China and from the ministry because of the Church's disapproval of his outspoken support for the Chinese Communists.³⁷ Endicott soon discovered that a number of like-minded peace councils had already been formed, such as the Vancouver Assembly for Peace founded by Norman Mackenzie, an SCM activist in the twenties and then the President of the University of British Columbia, H. H. Stevens, leader of the Reconstruction Party during the thirties, and Watson Thompson. Within a year a national conference was called to co-ordinate the various peace councils and the Canadian Peace Congress (CPC) was officially launched.³⁸

In the years to follow, Endicott and the Peace Congress would become embroiled in a concerted condemnation of United States foreign policy as part of a rather stormy campaign to halt the nuclear arms race and germ warfare. Much of the support for the Congress came from former members of the defunct, Communist inspired, League for Peace and Democracy, but it also came from other wings of the peace movement, including the FOR.³⁹ Endicott himself emphasized the ideal of openness in the CPC and claimed it "did not exclude anyone, right, left or centre."⁴⁰ Nevertheless, the emergence of the Canadian Peace Congress marked the abandonment of the liberal tradition in the Canadian peace movement. In a desperate attempt to reach some semblance of harmony in a world threatened by nuclear destruction, the main activist force of pacifism moved onto more radical ground, thus culminating a leftward transition which had begun before the Great War, and which had received a major impetus from the depression. Reluctant liberal pacifists, remnants of mainline Christian pacifism, and the historic peace sects were left to one side by the force of the new movement.

From the time of the Great War, Canadian pacifism showed signs of a secular, socialist basis already a major tradition in the British and American movements but it was not until the dawn of the atomic age that a substantial number of Canadian pacifists were inspired more by humanitarian and political considerations than by religious belief. Thus, other studies which emphasize that type of

pacifism before the war, such as Ceadel's recent analysis of British pacifism, hardly apply to the Canadian experience. Rather, despite various divisions of discreet pacifist groups, the major force of Canadian pacifism during the first half of the twentieth century was rooted in two basic traditions. One was the liberal tradition associated with the peace movement. The other was the historic religious non-resistance of sectarian pacifist groups like the Mennonites and Hutterites. Since these historic peace sects tried to remain aloof from war and society alike, they had little impact on the peace movement, but, their steadfast refusal to submit to compulsory military service during the two world wars indirectly reinforced the principle of pacifist dissent, particularly that of conscientious objection, within Canadian society on the whole. Furthermore, their peaceful co-operative communities served as living examples for the pacifist hope of building a new social order along communal lines.

Although the sectarian pacifists largely remained withdrawn from Canadian society, they also underwent a slight transition towards accommodation with the state. This adjustment was less evident among the Doukhobors and Jehovah's Witnesses, but on the whole the peace sects, especially some Mennonite groups, became more involved in social problems because of the need of defending their pacifist lifestyle. ✓

The valuable witness of the historic peace sects, notwithstanding, the peace movement in Canada more directly reflected the liberal Christian tradition of pacifism. From their first appearance as part

of the progressive reform movement in the late nineteenth century, liberal, non-sectarian pacifists underwent a slow transition towards the political left. Initially, the liberal-progressive peace movement reflected a complex set of Victorian social attitudes -- forcefulness of character, imperialism and hero worship -- which made a real assertion of pacifism somewhat difficult. Amid the pressures of an escalating wartime crusade this liberal pacifism proved to be utterly untenable. Those who wished to maintain their pacifist protest found it necessary to adopt a radical critique of the social and economic roots of war and, in doing so, to abandon their liberal reformism for some variant of the socialist creed. For some, that, too, became almost an eschatological warfare against the established social order, not entirely unlike their erstwhile colleagues who sought the reign of peace via the war to end war. Thus, following in the path of anti-war socialism, a new socially radical pacifism emerged in the wake of the disruption of the progressive peace movement during the Great War.

Liberal pacifism, on the other hand, re-emerged in the post-war years among such groups as the League of Nations Society and again attracted a wide range of public support. In effect, the resurgent peace movement of the twenties, representing a broad front of groups and activities, resembled an act of national repentance built upon revulsion against the Great War and the belief that world peace could be ensured without directly challenging the state. In one sense, this resurgence of liberal pacifism served as a diversion from

the crisis confronting liberal reformism as well as from the task of developing a more profound Christian ethic of war.

Rather than strictly an expression of liberal pacifism, however, the post-war movement was colored by the socially radical pacifism the war had bred. This became increasingly evident during the depression years as socially radical pacifists allied with the political left in an effort to maximize justice through radical reforms and social change. For a time the quests for both peace and social justice appeared to be compatible but pacifists were soon confronted with a dilemma when, in the light of increased fascist aggression, their pacifist rejection of the use of force came into direct conflict with the struggle for social justice. By mid-decade, particularly with the outbreak of the Civil War in Spain, social radicals began to abandon pacifism in favor of the fight against fascism. It was a process that continued during the latter thirties and which tended to rob pacifism, even a socially radical pacifism, of any sense of political realism.

Consequently, those who remained committed pacifists retreated behind the confines of a narrower Christian pacifism, not entirely unlike the historic peace sects. Some among them assumed the role of the Christian prophet, exercising social protests, such as the "Witness Against War" manifesto and conscientious objection to military service, and judging the war and its effects from the standpoint of the Kingdom of God. Unlike their sectarian brothers, however, they could not escape the Niebuhrian challenge for a

realistic response to the wartime situation. Thus, another role of the pacifist during the Second World War became one of reconciling the wartime tensions in Canadian society at large by exercising realistic pacifist alternatives, including alternative service for conscientious objectors, refugee and relief work and the defense of civil liberties. In this way, pacifists like the Quakers sought to prove that they were not just idealists or politically irrelevant dreamers, but their sense of realism was confined within the framework of the pacifist hope for the dawning of a new peaceful world in contrast to Niebuhr's argument that that type of peace would never exist in history.

The wartime experience also had a unifying effect upon the various pacifist groups themselves and encouraged a new level of co-operation between the historic peace sects and the more socially active pacifists. In the end, pacifists of all stripes successfully maintained a witness against war, some merely by refusing, as much as possible, to co-operate with the state, others by exercising state-approved alternatives. Indeed, the pacifist witness was not effected without some accommodation to the state.

Despite the continued commitment of pacifists to a new social order, the disaffection of radical colleagues shortly before and during the war tended to undermine the radical social prophecy of Christian pacifism and left it unprepared to lead a more politicized peace campaign in response to the urgent threat of atomic weapons. Instead, the post-Second World War initiative was seized

by the radical left, forging a renewed alliance between the Marxist ideal and the pacifist search for harmony among all peoples of the world. Every stage of the peace movement in its leftward transition represented the religious quest to realize this ideal vision of an ordered, peaceful world. Pacifists who joined the Canadian Peace Congress of the 1950's believed they had reached the point where they had become part of the ultimate movement towards that kind of social order. They moved beyond liberalism as the best way to achieve their particular rendezvous with destiny.

But it was neither an easy nor complete transition. Critics charged the Canadian Peace Congress, as the League for Peace and Democracy before it, was largely an instrument of Soviet foreign policy and, despite Endicott's insistence to the contrary, the reputation of the new peace movement was tarnished. Pacifists, themselves, criticized Endicott's inconsistency in working for peace while at the same time supporting the cause of the People's Liberation Army in China. It was all too familiar to the pacifist dilemma of the thirties when the pursuit of social justice came into conflict with the pacifist commitment to non-violence; thus, tragedy once again awaited pacifists as the CPC broke apart over conflicting international policies of the post-war Communist states.

At mid-century pacifism in Canada was represented by both the historic non-resistance of sectarian groups, slightly accommodated to the state but struggling to maintain their separate communities,

and a radicalized peace movement including both socialists and Christian idealists. Other than the rural-oriented peace sects, those Canadians attracted to pacifism over the years represented a cross section of Canadian society, especially once the business and community leaders who had dominated the early progressive peace movement gave way to a new alignment from farm, labor and professional backgrounds. Many were educated, a few were intellectuals. Most were religious pacifists with roots in the social gospel and much of the leadership in the Canadian movement was provided by clergymen. In fact, when compared to the variety of political and humanitarian pacifists in Britain and the United States, Canadian pacifists as a whole were more religiously motivated in their beliefs. Although its universal appeal blurred any sense of Canadian nationalism in the pacifist movement, the religious factor was characteristic of Canadian pacifists and, despite a good deal of influence from the British and American movements, Canadian pacifism developed in its own distinctive way. Above all, however, pacifists tended to be individuals of exceptional quality and in nearly all areas of social concern they sought ideal solutions for harsh realities. Whether liberal or radical they were determined to help bring about a new peaceful social order built upon social and economic justice. That they were not entirely successful in this quest does not minimize the importance of their attempt to shape Canadian social attitudes.

The fact remains, however, that throughout the first half of the twentieth century only a small number of Canadians became pacifists. At best, the peace movement enjoyed its widest popularity during times of peace, particularly in the early thirties, when it embraced a broad range of individuals and groups, but still, true pacifists remained a small minority. The ranks of conscientious objectors in both wars were primarily filled by sectarian groups rather than from the mainstream peace movement. The leading inter-pacifist organizations such as the WIL and the FOR never attracted a large number of members. Whether measured against the Hutterites or Canadian society at large their communitarian ventures were pitifully small. But surely, in the final analysis, the pacifist phenomenon must be measured on some scale of judgement other than size. If this is the historian's task, then the history of the pacifist witness speaks for itself.

Regardless of numbers, for instance, pacifism was an important ingredient in Canadian social thought and for a time a pacifist-socialist alignment offered creative leadership. On the other hand, the gradual radicalization of pacifism as a political as well as a moral commitment resulted in a strengthened idealism and determination which in turn inhibited the pacifist search for political relevancy. But more than offering a prophetic vision of an ideal, pacifism, in both the sectarian and liberal traditions, came to symbolize reconciliation and the priority of questions of conscience in a changing Canadian society. The mere survival of pacifism alone,

for instance, was a tribute to those very ideals of civil liberty and freedom of conscience for which pacifists worked. Indeed, their preservation and advancement of enduring moral principles underlying our culture -- regardless of social practice -- remains the real legacy of the pacifist witness against war during the first half of the twentieth century.

FOOTNOTES

¹J. Lavell Smith, "Whither the FOR?," Reconciliation, 2 (December 1945): 14.

²Haslam, A Record of Experience with Canadian Friends, pp. 65-66.

³Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1948, pp. 20-21; CFSC Papers, War Victims Relief File, "Canadian Friends and War Victims," newspaper clipping.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Haslam, A Record of Experience with Canadian Friends, p. 66.

⁶Ibid., p. 67; Reconciliation, 1 (September 1944): 2.

⁷Haslam, A Record of Experience with Canadian Friends, p. 67; CFSC Papers, War Victims Relief File.

⁸Ibid., CFSC Papers, Alexander file, Barbara Walker to Walter Alexander, 5 January 1946.

⁹FOR Papers, Box 1, file 2, Minutes of the FOR National Council Meeting, March 1951.

¹⁰Thomson, Pioneer in Community, pp. 92-93.

¹¹J. J. Brown, "Pacifism After Hiroshima," Reconciliation, 3 (July 1946): 1.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Clare Oke, "Pacifism Unaffected by the Possibility of Imminent Disaster," Reconciliation, 3 (July 1946): 12.

¹⁴FOR Papers, Box 1, file 1, The Canadian Fellowship of Reconciliation, "The Atom Bomb Demands That War Be Abolished," n.d.

¹⁵Ibid., The Canadian Fellowship of Reconciliation, "Pacifist Strategy and Program in the Atomic Era."

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Ibid., "Memo on Cadet Training"; Children of Friends and other pacifist sects were excused from cadet training in Ontario, Minutes of the Canada and Genesee Yearly Meeting, 1945, p. 42.

¹⁸"Memo on Cadet Training."

¹⁹A. G. Watson, "Mr. Drew's Army Must Be Disbanded," Reconciliation, 3 (February-March 1947): 10.

²⁰Ibid., p. 11.

²¹Ibid.

²²Carlyle King Papers, 27:154, FOR flyer, "Abolish Cadet Training." This flyer is reproduced in Appendix G.

²³FOR Papers, Box 1, file 1, Minutes of FOR National Council Meeting, 9 May 1947.

²⁴B. K. Sandwell, "Pacifism Again," Saturday Night, 3 May 1947, p. 5. Apparently Sandwell wrote the editorial in response to a request by Watson that Saturday Night present an argument against the compulsory nature of cadet training in Ontario. FOR Papers, Box 1, file 1, Minutes of FOR National Council Meeting, 9 May 1947.

²⁵Sandwell, "Pacifism Again."

²⁶FOR Papers, Box 1, file 1, Minutes of FOR National Council Meeting, 9 May 1947.

²⁷Ibid., Fellowship of Reconciliation, Canadian Section, "Militarism Must End in Canada," n.d.

²⁸Ibid., Box 1, file 5, Draft of a letter on behalf of the FOR to the Chairman of the Chatham Board of Education, Chatham, Ontario, n.d.

²⁹ Scott Nearing, World Events, September 1946, p. 6; Although pacifism failed to attract much support, the question of world peace itself had become a dominant issue of public concern and even the theme of the Roman Catholic Congress of Cardinals meeting in Ottawa in June 1947. Henry Somerville, "Congress Takes Theme of Prayers for Peace," Saturday Night, 7 June 1947, p. 16.

³⁰ FOR Papers, Box 1, file 5, James Finlay to John Nevin Sayre, 19 July 1947.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid., Sayre to Finlay, 28 July 1947.

³³ Ibid.; Box 1, file 1, Minutes of FOR National Council Meeting, 3 October 1947.

³⁴ Interview with Albert Watson.

³⁵ Interview with Carlyle King.

³⁶ Stephen Endicott, James G. Endicott: Rebel Out of China (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), p. 262.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 262-263.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 264; Moffatt, The Canadian Peace Movement, p. 69.

³⁹ In June 1947 Charles Huestis, FOR activist and original member of the Alberta School of Religion, had already begun to argue that Canada should declare herself a neutral nation, refuse to allow U. S. military bases on Canadian soil, and develop lines of friendship with the Soviet Union. Saturday Night, 21 June 1947, p. 4.

⁴⁰ Endicott, Rebel Out of China, p. 264.

APPENDIX A

PEACE CONFERENCE POSTER, 1930*

All Day Peace Conference

Auspices of
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

and Affiliated Peace Groups in Toronto

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10th, 1930

PROGRAMME FOR THE DAY

Chairman: RABBI M. N. EISENDRATH, Pres., F.O.R.

9 A.M.—at Mt. Pleasant Cemetery, Yonge Street Entrance.

DECORATION OF GRAVES OF HEROES OF PEACE

Participants in flower-strewing ceremonies:

ARCHBISHOP NEIL McNEIL	RABBI SAMUEL SACHS
REV. E. CROSSLEY HUNTER	MR. JAMES SIMPSON
VEN. ARCH. J. C. DAVIDSON	MR. WILSON MACDONALD
DR. GEO. T. WEBB, presiding.	

10 A.M.—at Alhambra Theatre, Bloor, near Bathurst Street.

YOUNG PEOPLE'S PROGRAMME

Special showing of **"High Treason"** a British moving picture

with a Peace lesson. Discussion of picture will be led by
MR. EARL LAUTENSLAGER, of Victoria College.

3-5 P.M.—at Lecture Hall, Yorkminster Church, Yonge and Heath Streets.

Peace Conference - Discussion Groups

Conference will be opened by	Chairman: REV. G. R. BOOTH,
MR. J. S. WOODSWORTH, M.P.	Exec.-Sec. F.O.R.

8.00 P.M.—at Lecture Hall, Yorkminster Church, Yonge and Heath Street.

Public Meeting on Disarmament

under auspices of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Speaker: MR. J. S. WOODSWORTH, M.P. Chairman: DR. S. G. BLAND.
MR. WILSON MACDONALD will read his poetry.

Music

EVERYBODY WELCOME!

Book Exhibit

COME!



*McNaughton Papers, E. 52 (1).

APPENDIX B

CANADIAN STATEMENT REJECTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL FOR IN 1939*

Fellowship of Reconciliation

Canadian Section

Basis and Aims

The Fellowship of Reconciliation is an association of men and women who believe in the non-violent settlement of all conflicts between individuals, groups, classes, nations, races, and religions. Its members believe that hatred is increased through return of hatred; that peace is not achieved by fighting; that the use of violence raises more problems than it solves. They believe that only positive acts of good-will, justice, and generosity can overcome evil in human society and make possible an abundant life for all men. Many of the members have joined because of their desire to follow unswervingly the way of life exemplified by Jesus; some have received their inspiration from other religious leaders; and some have reached their faith in love and non-violence in still other ways.

In practice their faith expresses itself in the following ways:

- (1) They try to show respect for human personality -- in the home, in the education of children, and in their association with people of other classes, nationalities, and races;
- (2) They advocate the treatment of offenders against society, not by retaliatory punishment, but in ways calculated to restore the wrongdoer to co-operative citizenship with his fellows;
- (3) They strive to build a social order in which none will be exploited, but in which all will be assured of the means to realize a good life;
- (4) They refuse to sanction war preparations or to participate in any war; rather they work to remove the causes of war, by advocating policies of international justice and by supporting every effort of international conciliation.

The Fellowship is open to all who accept the above principles, wish to work for their realization in human society, and are prepared to take the risks involved.

* Carlyle King Papers, 27:151.

APPENDIX C

CONFERENCE OF HISTORIC PEACE CHURCHES REGISTRATION FORM, 1940*

WRITE CLEARLY

CONFERENCE OF HISTORIC PEACE CHURCHES—REGISTRATION

CARD FOR MEN

Date of Registration		Electoral District No. 	Name 	Polling Division No. 	Card No.
Month	Day				
1. Surname <small>(Print in block letters.)</small>		Given Names			
2. Permanent Postal Address (if away from usual residence when filling in card give name of usual residence)					
Street and Number					
Rural Route and Post Office		Town or City		Province	
3. Age last birthday	Date of birth		Year	Month	Day
4. Conjugal conditions: Single	Married	Widowed	Divorced		
5. Of what dependents (if any) are you the sole support:—					
(a) Father	(b) Mother	(c) Wife	(d) Number of children under 16 years		
(e) Number of other dependents		(f) Do you contribute partial support to any one			
6. Education. (a) Primary only					
(b) Primary and Secondary					
(c) Vocational Training (Business College, Technical High School)					
(d) College or University Degree?					
7. Is your general health (a) good? (b) fair? (c) bad?					
8. Occupation or Craft:			Years of experience in		
(a) Present occupation?			}	(a)	
(b) What is your regular occupation?				(b)	
(c) What other work can you do well?				(c)	
(d) If an employee, who is your present employer? Name					
Address		Nature of business where employed?			
(state precisely)					
9. (e) If experienced in a skilled industrial occupation or profession, describe specifically the type or types of work in which you are specially equipped by training or experience					
9. (a1) Were you brought up on a farm? (a2) Until what age?					
(b1) Have you worked on a farm?		(b2) How long		(b3) In what province or country	
(c1) Can you handle horses?		(c2) Drive a tractor?		(c3) Use farm machinery?	
(c4) Can you milk? (c5) Are you able to do other farm work?					
10. Is there any particular occupation in which you would like to be specially trained?					
11. What Denomination or Society are you associated with?					
As a (a) Member		How long		(b) Adherent	
				How long	
12. Do you intend to appeal for exemption from military training because of your conscientious objection to war?					
13. If so, are you willing to offer your services for civilian work under civilian control for a period (of possibly sixty days) without pay but with board and lodging provided?					

I affirm that I have verified the above answers and that they are true

Signature of Officer or Clerk

Signature of Registrant

* CFSC Papers, CHPC File.

APPENDIX D

APPLICATION FOR POSTPONEMENT OF MILITARY SERVICE, 1940*

APPLICATION

For an Order Deferring or Postponing Military Training

To the Divisional Registrar of the
Administrative Division.

Pursuant to the provision made for conscientious objectors to military training and service.

I,

of....., in the Township of
Post Office

in the County of and Province of.....

do hereby apply for an Order deferring or postponing military training as {a member of the
an adherent

..... Church,

whose tenets and articles of faith are opposed to the bearing of arms and to the performance
of military service in any form, to which faith and doctrine I personally agree.

Date

Signed
Name in Full

* CFSC Papers, C.O. File.

APPENDIX E

NUMBER AND DISPOSITION OF CANADIAN CONSCIENTIOUS
OBJECTORS AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1945*

NUMBER OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS UNDER ALTERNATIVE SERVICE	
Total referrals from Mobilization Boards since the commencement of Alternative Service Regulations	12,600
Deduct:	
inter-office transfers	433
enlisted as combatants	541
enlisted as non-combatants	227
C.O. status revoked by Mobilization Boards	500
died	<u>48</u>
Total Conscientious Objectors under Alternative Service	<u><u>10,851</u></u>

DISPOSITION OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS UNDER ALTERNATIVE SERVICE	
6655	employed in agriculture
1412	employed in miscellaneous essential industries
542	employed in sawmills, logging and timbering
469	employed in packing plants and food processing plants
269	employed in construction
86	employed in hospitals
63	employed in coal mining
15	employed in grain handling at the Head of the Lakes
170	employed in Alternative Service Work Camps
14	serving jail sentences
34	in hands of or being prepared for Enforcement Division
201	in hands of RCMP or other agencies to locate whereabouts
<u>921</u>	cases under review
<u><u>10,851</u></u>	Total Conscientious Objectors under Alternative Service

*Compiled from MacKinnon, "Alternative Service Branch," p. 19.

APPENDIX F

NUMBER AND DISPOSITION OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS BY PROVINCE AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1945*

NUMBER OF C.O.S	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	QUE.	ONT.	MAN.	SASK.	ALTA.	B.C.	TOTAL
Referrals from Registrars	6	33	2	41	3077	3400	2711	1318	2012	12,600
<u>Subsequent changes in status</u>										
Accepted enlistments/combat	-	-	-	2	168	107	162	33	69	541
Accepted enlistments/non-combat	-	2	-	3	55	31	49	27	60	227
Deaths	-	-	-	-	12	11	6	9	10	48
Revocations/other than enlist.	-	2	-	5	91	183	110	25	84	500
Transfers to other divisions	3	1	-	3	122	55	77	50	122	433
Total changes in C.O. status	3	5	-	13	448	387	404	144	95	1,749
C.O.s retaining status	3	28	2	28	2629	3013	2307	1174	1667	10,851
<u>DISPOSITION OF C.O.S</u>										
Under Red Cross in agric.	-	4	-	4	846	1446	1090	556	269	4,215
Under Red Cross/non-agric.	-	2	-	8	379	602	223	79	331	1,624
Relieved of Red Cross Agts./ phys. or compass.	3	12	2	4	800	281	305	195	141	1,743
Relieved of Red Cross Agts./ June 1st Regulation changes	-	3	-	2	442	507	529	123	270	1,876
In ASW Camps	-	5	-	9	83	13	67	36	28	241
Serving jail sentences	-	-	-	1	2	-	4	3	2	12
In hands of Enforcement Division	-	-	-	-	16	4	12	1	1	34
Can't locate/in hands of RCMP	-	2	-	-	15	12	61	15	112	217
Disposition pending/under review	-	-	-	-	46	148	16	168	513	889
Total C.O.s	3	28	2	28	2629	3013	2307	1174	1667	10,851

*Compiled from MacKinnon, "Alternative Service Branch," p. 20.

APPENDIX G

ANTI-CADET TRAINING FLYER, 1947*

ABOLISH CADET TRAINING!

*Do You Know That There Is Compulsory Cadet Training
In the High Schools of Ontario?*

*Do You Know that Ontario Is the Only Province In Which
Cadet Training Is Compulsory?*

Cadet Training MUST Be Abolished . . .

- Because it is not good training for citizenship. The only way to prepare young people to be good citizens is to educate them from their childhood to think for themselves and to cooperate with others in a democratic way.
- Because it is not the best way of meeting the need for healthful recreation. An intelligent and active community provides its young people with opportunities for recreation on a civilian basis.
- Because it substitutes for self-discipline the discipline of the military, which leads to the regimentation of mind and body. Self-discipline, on the other hand, develops individual freedom and initiative.
- Because it is, as part of a program of military preparedness, no protection in an atomic era. As Capt. Liddell Hart, famed British military expert, has said: "The atomic bomb makes nonsense of the conscript system."
- Because it offers no guarantee of security from war, but rather arouses the darkest suspicions between nations, thus driving them into a competitive armaments race.
- Because it is wrong to compel boys to submit to the authority of a military system. No government or person has the right to interfere with the conscience of the individual.

JOIN IN THE CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH CADET TRAINING . . .

HERE IS WHAT YOU CAN DO:

1. Write to Premier George A. Drew voicing your opposition to cadet training in the high schools and asking that it be abolished.
2. Write to your member of the provincial legislature, and to your local school board and high school principal, expressing similar views.
3. Keep writing letters to the editor of your local paper.
4. Organize a committee to abolish cadet training in your community. Write us for materials and suggestions.
5. Ask for speakers. Arrange programs on cadet training at as many groups as possible.
6. Send a contribution to help carry on this important work. We are working for the future safety of yourself and your children.

ACT NOW . . . THERE IS NO TIME TO LOSE!

Issued by The Committee to Abolish Cadet Training of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, 103 Charles St. W., Toronto 5, Ont., Albert G. Watson, Secretary. Additional copies of this leaflet may be obtained upon request.

*Carlyle King Papers, A 225; 27:154.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Manuscript Collections

Edmonton. University of Alberta Archives.

W. H. Alexander Collection

Hamilton. Professor A. R. Allen. Personal Files.

Hugh Dobson Papers (microfilm).

Fellowship for a Christian Social Order File.

Hamilton. McMaster Divinity College. Canadian Baptist Archives.

McMaster Officer Training Corps Papers.

Hamilton. McMaster University Special Collections.

Vera Brittain Papers.

Canadian Youth Congress Papers.

Montreal. McGill University Archives.

United Church of Canada Papers.

Ottawa. Public Archives of Canada.

R. B. Bennett Papers.

Sir Robert Borden Papers.

William Lyon Mackenzie King Papers and Diaries.

Agnes Macphail Papers.

Arthur Meighen Papers.

National Council of Women Papers.

James Layton Ralston Papers.

C. B. Sissons Papers.

J. S. Woodsworth Papers.

Regina. Saskatchewan Archives Board.

Henry Magee Horricks Papers.

J. M. and G. S. Telford Papers.

Saskatoon. Saskatchewan Archives Board.

S. V. Haight Papers.

Carlyle A. King Papers.

Peter G. Makaroff Papers.

Violet McNaughton Papers.

Saskatoon. University of Saskatchewan Archives.

C. A. King Papers.

Toronto. N. Roy Clifton. Personal Collection.

Roy Clifton Papers.

Toronto. Mrs. A. A. MacLeod. Personal Collection.

A. A. MacLeod Papers.

Toronto. Mrs. Emily Smith. Personal Collection.

J. Lavell Smith Papers.

Toronto. Society of Friends Meeting House.

Canadian Friends Service Committee Papers.

Toronto. United Church Archives.

Wilbur William Andrews Biography File.

S. D. Chown Papers.

W. B. Creighton Biography File.

Charles S. Eby Biography File.

Fellowship of Reconciliation Papers.

Methodist Church of Canada. The Army and Navy Board Documents, 1915-1919.

Methodist Church of Canada. General Conference Office. General Correspondence, 1914.

Richard Roberts Papers.
 Student Christian Movement Papers.
 E. Harold Toye Papers.

Toronto. University of Toronto Archives.

F. M. Denison Collection.

Toronto. Victoria University Archives.

Lewis Emerson Horning Papers.

Waterloo. University of Waterloo. Canadian Mennonite Archives.

Conference of Historic Peace Churches Papers.
 Oral History Collection. "WWII Alternative Service."

Government Records

Ottawa. Public Archives of Canada.

Department of Justice. Record Group 13.
 Department of Labour. Record Group 27.
 Department of National Defense. Record Group 24.
 Interdepartmental Committees. Record Group 35, Series 7.
 Military Service Act. Reports. Record Group 14, D2.
 National Parks Branch. Record Group 84.
 Privy Council Papers. Record Group 2.
 Secretary of State Papers. Chief Press Censor. Record Group 6, E1.

Documents

Canada. House of Commons Debates.

Canada. Sessional Papers (Commons), 1918-1919.

Canada. Statutes. 7-8 George V. Chapter 19, "The Military Service Act, 1917."

Canada. Statutes. 4 George VI. Chapter 13. "National Resources Mobilization Act, 1940."

Canada. Statutes. 4 George VI. Chapter 22. "The Department of National War Services Act, 1940."

Stacey, C. P., ed. Historical Documents of Canada. Vol. 5: The Arts of War and Peace 1914-1945. New York: St. Martin's, 1972.

Reports and Proceedings

Canadian Peace Centenary Association. Peace Centenary Circulars. Numbers 1-7 (circa 1913).

Chinese War Relief Fund. Report, 1942-1945. Toronto: Chinese War Relief Fund, 1946.

"History of the Corps (Civilian) Canadian Firefighters." Unpublished Report, Department of Labour, 1946.

United Church of Canada. Board of Evangelism and Social Service. Annual Reports. 1940-1942.

_____. Minutes of Conferences. 1934/1942.

_____. Yearbooks. 1926/1946.

MacKinnon, J. F. "Historical Account of the Wartime Activities of the Alternative Service Branch." Unpublished Report, Department of Labour, 1946.

Methodist Church of Canada. General Conference. Minutes of Board of Education and of Executive Committee, September 24, 1906-April 26, 1910.

_____. Journal of Proceedings of the General Conferences of the Methodist Church. 1914-1920.

_____. Twenty-Eighth Annual Report of the Educational Society of the Methodist Church of Canada, 1911-1912. 1912.

Presbyterian Church in Canada. Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. 1920-1924.

Report of the International Congress of Women. The Hague: 1915.

Reports of the Conventions of the Dominion Women's Christian Temperance Union. 1897/1901.

Reports of the Lake Mohonk Conferences on International Arbitration. 1895-1916.

The Society of Friends in Canada. Minutes of Canada Yearly Meeting (Conservative). 1913-1943.

_____. Minutes of Canada Yearly Meeting (Orthodox). 1913-1929.

_____. Minutes of Genesee Yearly Meeting. 1913-1929.

_____. Minutes of Canada and Genesee Yearly Meetings. 1929-1943.

_____. Minutes of the Canadian Yearly Meetings (Combined). 1944-1950.

Interviews and Correspondence

Abbott, Dr. Edwin. Willowdale, Ontario. Interview, 29 January 1976.

Alexander, Harriet. Rifton, New York. Letter, 3 March 1976.

Allen, Dr. A. Stewart. Cardinal, Ontario. Letter, 25 February 1976.

Allen, Rev. H. T. Victoria, British Columbia. Interview, Hamilton, 18 May 1976.

Allen, J. Stanley. Hamilton. Interview, 4 August 1976.

Allen, Thelma S. Montreal. Letter, 25 September 1976.

Awmack, Joseph. Vancouver. Interview, Toronto, 12 November 1977.

Bailey, Beverly. Montreal. Telephone Interview, 12 November 1976.

Best, Ernest. Toronto. Interview, 14 November 1975.

Boos, Margaret. Toronto. Letter, 10 May 1976.

Brock, Peter. Toronto. Interview, 20 February 1976.

Brown, G. Wesley. Toronto. Interview, 25 March 1976.

Clayton, Arthur. Toronto. Interview, 24 November 1975.

Clifton, Roy. Richmond Hill, Ontario. Interview, 17 March 1976.

Davidson, Rev. John F. Toronto. Interview, 26 October 1976.

Dobson, Rev. J. D. A. Combermere, Ontario. Letter, 2 June 1976.

- Dodds, Dr. Jack. Streetsville, Ontario. Interview, 18 May 1976.
- Dorland, Albert A. Carp, Ontario. Interview, 16 June 1976.
- Dorland, Arthur G. Toronto. Interview, 29 January 1976.
- _____. Telephone Interview, 7 December 1977.
- Duckworth, Muriel. Halifax. Interview, Toronto, 7 November 1976.
- Endicott, James G. Toronto. Interview, Hamilton, 20 November 1980.
- Fahrni, Mildred. Vancouver. Letter, 9 April 1976.
- Fairbairn Barnett, S. M. St. Marys, Ontario. Letter, 14 August 1976.
- Finlay, Rev. James M. Toronto. Interview, 21 October 1976.
- Forsey, Senator Eugene. Ottawa. Telephone Interview, October 1975.
- Fowke, Edith. Toronto. Interview, 18 February 1976.
- Harris, Gus. Scarborough, Ontario. Interview, 7 June 1976.
- Haslam, Fred. Toronto. Interview, 10 December 1975.
- Hobbs, A. Elmer. Scarborough, Ontario. Interview, 19 May 1976.
- Howey, Harvey. Owen Sound, Ontario. Letter, 2 March 1976.
- Hutchinson, Roger. Toronto. Interview, 11 February 1976.
- Kidd, J. R. Toronto. Interview, 4 October 1976.
- King, Carlyle A. Saskatoon. Letter, 8 November 1976.
- _____. Regina. Interview, 19 September 1977.
- McArthur, H. Russell. Nelson, British Columbia. Letter, 29 May 1976.
- _____. Taped Oral Letter, Received 2 January 1977.
- McClure, Dr. Robert B. Pucallpa, Peru. Letter, 27 February 1976.
- _____. Toronto. Interview, 13 May 1976.
- MacLeod, Mrs. A. A. Toronto. Interview, 30 March 1976.

McMurtry, J. D. St. Boniface, Manitoba. Taped Oral Letter, April 1976.

_____. Interview, Toronto, 12 November 1977.

Mjolsness, Verdine. Hollywood, California. Taped Oral Letter,
Received January 1977.

Newbery, J. W. E. Sudbury, Ontario. Letter, 20 February 1976.

Nix, Ernest. Toronto. Interview, 9 November 1978.

Outhouse, Stanley. Toronto. Interview, 21 April 1976.

Robert Owen Foundation Members. Toronto. Interview at Meeting,
24 March 1976.

Savin, Kathleen Green. Toronto. Interview, 26 October 1976.

Scott, Dr. R. B. Y. Toronto. Interview, 9 November 1976.

Showler, Frank L. Toronto. Interview, 12 February 1976.

Siegel, Ida. Toronto. Interview, 5 February 1976.

Smith, Emily. Toronto. Interview, 23 November 1976

Smith, W. Reg. Toronto. Interview, 20 May 1976.

Starr, Francis. Howe Island, Ontario. Interview, 30 June 1976.

Stewart, Gordon K. Sackville, New Brunswick. Taped Oral Letter,
Received 7 March 1976.

_____. Letter, 3 December 1976.

Tatham, George. Toronto. Interview, 12 February 1976.

Turner, Allan. Provincial Archivist, Victoria, British Columbia.
Letter, 21 May 1976.

Watson, Albert. Toronto. Telephone Interview, 28 January 1976.

_____. Interview, 4 February 1976.

Wolfenden, Louise. Toronto. Interview 5 February 1976.

Woollard, Keith. Toronto. Interview, 25 March 1976.

Wright, Rev. George W. Mount Forest, Ontario. Interview, 20 May 1976.

Yeomans, Nina. Toronto. Interview, 12 November 1977.

Zavitz, Jane. Newmarket, Ontario. Interview, Toronto, 12 November 1977.

Newspapers, Periodicals and Newsletters

The Beacon (ASW Camps, British Columbia).

Bulletin: To Maintain Courage by Sharing Conviction (R. E. Fairbairn).

Canadian Annual Review.

Canadian Baptist.

The Canadian C.O. (Montreal).

The Canadian Forum.

The Canadian Friend.

Canadian Student (SCM).

The Christian Century.

The Christian Guardian.

Christian Social Action (FCSO).

Citizen and Country (Toronto).

The Daily Mail and Empire (Toronto).

The Echo (United Theological College, Montreal).

Evening Telegram (Toronto).

FSU Chronicle (Shanghai, China).

Grain Growers' Guide.

The Globe (Toronto).

The Leader-Post (Regina).

Manitoba Free Press.

The New Outlook.

The New Trail (University of Alberta).

The Northern Beacon (ASW Camp, Montreal River).

The Presbyterian.

The Presbyterian and Westminster.

The Presbyterian Record.

Reconciliation (Canadian FOR).

Saturday Night.

The Silhouette (McMaster University).

The Star-Phoenix (Saskatoon).

The Toronto Daily Star.

The United Church Observer.

The Varsity (University of Toronto).

Vox Wesleyan (Wesley College, Winnipeg).

The World Tomorrow.

Books and Pamphlets

Addams, Jane. Peace and Bread in Time of War. New York: 1922.

Auden, W. H. and Isherwood, Christopher. Journey to a War.
New York: Random House, 1939.

Belden, Albert. Pax Christi. London: Allen and Unwin, 1942.

Beynon, Francis Marion. Aleta Day. London: C. W. Daniel, 1919.

Bland, Salem. The New Christianity. Toronto: 1920; reprint ed.
with an introduction by Richard Allen. Toronto: University
of Toronto Press, 1973.

Bowles, R. P. Socialism, Pacifism, Mysticism. Toronto: Ryerson, 1934.

- Brittain, Vera. The Rebel Passion. Nyack, New York: Fellowship Publications, 1964.
- Buck, Tim. Thirty Years: 1922-1952. Toronto: Progress Books, 1952.
- Byers, I. M. Report of the Canadian School History Textbook Survey. Toronto: WIL, 1932.
- Canadian National Committee on Refugees. New Homes for Old. Leaflet, 1941.
- Canadian Youth Congress. Declaration of Rights of Canadian Youth. Ottawa: CYC, 1936.
- Chown, Alice. The Stairway. Boston: Cornhill Company, 1921.
- Cochrane, Arthur C. The Church and the War. Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1940.
- Colley, Norman A., ed. The Handbook of the Christian Commonwealth Youth Movement of Canada. Calgary: National Council of the Christian Commonwealth Youth Movement, 1935.
- Creighton, W. B. All in the Day's Work. Toronto: Ryerson, 1923.
- Dale, Ernest A. Twenty-One Years A-Building: A Short Account of the Student Christian Movement of Canada, 1920-1941. Toronto: SCM, 1941.
- Durkin, D. The Magpie. Toronto: Hcdder and Stoughton, 1923; reprint ed. with an Introduction by Peter E. Rider. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.
- Eby, C. S. Christianity and Civilization. Toronto: United Church of Canada, 1883.
- _____. God-Love. The Word of the Kingdom Series, Study I. Toronto: United Church of Canada, 1906.
- _____. Sermon on the Mount: The Charter of the Kingdom. The Word of the Kingdom Series, Study II. Toronto: United Church of Canada, 1907.
- _____. The World Problem and the Divine Solution. Toronto: William Briggs, 1914.
- Fairbairn, R. Edis. Apostate Christendom. London: Ken-Pax, 1948.
- _____. The Appeal to Reality. New York: Abingdon Press, 1927.

- Fairbairn, R. Edis. Kingdom of God Evangelism. Toronto: Ryerson, 1935.
- Fellowship for a Christian Social Order. Our Battle for Peace. Toronto: FCSO, n.d.
- Fellowship of Reconciliation. Pacifist Handbook. New York: FOR, n.d.
- Fowke, Edith. They Made Democracy Work: The Story of the Co-operative Committee on Japanese Canadians. Toronto: Garden City Press Co-operative, 1951.
- Gifford, W. A. et al. The Christian and War. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1926.
- Gregg, Richard. The Power of Non-Violence. New York: 1936.
- Harrison, Charles Yale. Generals Die in Bed. London: 1930; reprint ed., Hamilton, Ontario: Potlatch Publications, 1975.
- Haslam, Fred. 1921-1967: A Record of Experience with Canadian Friends and the Canadian Ecumenical Movement. Toronto: Canadian Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, 1970.
- Johnston, P. Education For Peace. Saskatoon: United Farmers of Canada, 1929.
- King, William Lyon Mackenzie. Industry and Humanity. Toronto: 1918; reprint ed. with an Introduction by David Jay Bercuson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.
- Lasserre, Henri. The Communities of Tolstoyans. Translated by Purcell Weaver. Toronto: Rural Co-operative Community Council and Canadian Fellowship for Co-operative Community, 1944.
- _____. The Conscience of the Rich Confronted by the World Crisis. Montreal: FCSO, 1937.
- _____. Co-operatisme integral. Bale: U.S.C., 1928.
- League for Social Reconstruction, Research Committee. Social Planning for Canada. Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1935; reprint ed. with an Introduction by F. R. Scott et al. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.
- Leatherman, Noah. Diary Kept by Noah L. Leatherman while in Camp during World War I. Linden, Alberta: Aaron L. Toews, 1951.
- Lindsay, A. D. Pacifism as a Principle and Pacifism as a Dogma. London: SCM, 1939.

- Macdonald Denison, Flora. War and Women. Toronto: Canadian Suffrage Association, 1914.
- Macdonald, James A. Democracy and the Nations: A Canadian View. Toronto: S. B. Gundy, 1915.
- _____. The North American Idea. Toronto: Fleming H. Renell, 1917.
- Macdonald, Wilson. A Flagon of Beauty. Toronto: Peace Tree Publications, 1931.
- McClung, Nellie. In Times Like These. Toronto: 1915; reprint ed. with an Introduction by Veronica Strong-Boag. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.
- _____. The Stream Runs Fast. Toronto: Thomas Allen, 1945.
- McMaster University. Calendar. 1888-1917.
- _____. Faculty of Theology Calendar. 1934-1946.
- Methodist Church of Canada. The Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Church of Canada. Toronto: 1915.
- Military Training in Canadian Schools and Colleges. Toronto: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Toronto Branch, 1927.
- Morris, David. China Changed My Mind. London: Cursell, 1948.
- Muste, A. J. Nonviolence in an Aggressive World. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940.
- _____. Not by Might. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947; reprint ed., New York: Garland, 1971.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. An Interpretation of Christian Ethics. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935.
- _____. Moral Man and Immoral Society. New York: Scribners, 1932.
- _____. Why the Christian Church is not Pacifist. London: SCM Press, 1940.
- Peace Pledge Union. Peace Service Handbook. London: Peace Pledge Union, n.d.
- Raven, Charles E. War and the Christian. London: SCM Press, 1938; reprint ed., New York: Garland, 1972.

Russell, G. Stanley. The Church in the Modern World. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1931.

_____. The Road Behind Me. Toronto: Macmillan, 1936.

Scott, R. B. Y. and Vlastos, Gregory, eds. Towards the Christian Revolution. New York: Willett, Clark and Company, 1936.

Thomas, Anna Braithwaite et al. St. Stephen's House: Friends Emergency Work in England 1914 to 1920. London: Headley, n.d.

Thomas, Ernest. Christian Life in a Changing World. Toronto: Ryerson, 1937.

_____. The Church and the Economic Order. Toronto: LSR, 1934.

_____. The Quest For Peace. Toronto: Board of Evangelism and Social Service, United Church of Canada, n.d.

Thomson, Andrew. The Wars: What Can the Churches Do? Toronto: United Church Publishing House, 1938.

Toye, E. Harold. Some Impressions of a Parson After Two Years in the Religion-Labour Field. Toronto: Religion-Labour Foundation, n.d.

_____. Trifling with Destiny. Toronto: Thistle, 1948.

United Church of Canada. On Peace and War. Toronto: Board of Evangelism and Social Service, United Church of Canada, 1936.

The War and the Christian Church. Toronto: Presbyterian Assembly's Commission of the War, 1917.

Wesleyan Theological College (Montreal). Calendar. 1879-1919.

Woodsworth, J. S. The First Story of the Labor Church. Winnipeg: 1920.

_____. Following the Gleam. Ottawa: 1926.

_____. ed. Studies in Rural Citizenship. Winnipeg: Canadian Welfare League and the Canadian Council of Agriculture, 1914.

Woodsworth, Kenneth. Canadian Youth Comes of Age. Toronto: Ryerson, 1939.

Articles and Addresses

- Allen, Harold T. "A View from the Manse: The Social Gospel and Social Crisis in British Columbia, 1929-1945." In The Social Gospel in Canada, pp. 154-184. Edited by Richard Allen. Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1975.
- Angell, Norman. "Canada's Best Service for British Ideals." Addresses Delivered Before the Canadian Club of Toronto, 1913-1914. Toronto: Canadian Club, 1914.
- Atkinson, J. E. "The Aftermath of the War." Addresses Delivered Before the Canadian Club of Toronto, 1915-1916. Toronto: Canadian Club, 1916.
- Aubrey, Edwin E. Review of Towards the Christian Revolution, by R. B. Y. Scott and Gregory Vlastos. Journal of Religion, 17 (July 1937): 343-345.
- Bailey, Gerald. "A Strategy of Peace." The Canadian Friend, February 1931, pp. 12-14.
- Brigden, Beatrice. "One Woman's Campaign for Social Purity and Social Reform." In The Social Gospel in Canada, pp. 36-62. Edited by Richard Allen. Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1975.
- Dorland, Arthur G. "Militarism in Canada." The Canadian Friend. July 1913, pp. 14-15.
- Eastman, Samuel Mack. "The Hague, August, 1929." Socialist Review, June 1930, pp. 79-87.
- Einstein, Albert. "Militant Pacifism." The World Tomorrow, XIV (January 1931): 9.
- Fairbairn, R. Edis, et al. "A Witness Against War." United Church Observer, 15 October 1939, p. 21.
- Ferm, Vergilus. Review of Towards the Christian Revolution, by R. B. Y. Scott and Gregory Vlastos. International Journal of Ethics, 47 (July 1937): 504-506.
- Gandhi, Mahatma. "Non-Violence -- the Greatest Force." The Canadian Friend, November 1926, p. 7.

- Gordon, J. King. "A Christian Socialist in the 1930's." In The Social Gospel in Canada, pp. 122-153. Edited by Richard Allen. Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1975.
- Grube, G. M. A. "Pacifism and Human Nature." The Canadian Forum, July 1936, pp. 14-15.
- _____. "Pacifism: The Only Solution." The Canadian Forum, June 1936, pp. 9-10.
- Hayward, Constance. "The Canadian National Committee on Refugees." Reconciliation, 2 (November 1944): 7.
- Havelock, Eric A. "Canada and a European War." Christian Century, 3 (March 1937): 281-284.
- _____. "Peace Cranks." The New Outlook, 5 February 1936, p. 25.
- Hopkins, J. C. "German Propaganda: U. S. Aliens and Pacifists." Canadian Annual Review, 1918, pp. 251-261.
- _____. "Pacifism in Canada." Canadian Annual Review, 1916, pp. 445-446.
- Horning, Lewis E. "England and Germany." Addresses Delivered Before the Canadian Club of Hamilton, 1913-1914. Toronto: Canadian Club, 1914.
- _____. "The Two Ideals." Acta Victoriana, XL (October 1915): 2-9.
- Lasserre, Henri. "Towards Cooperative Industry." The Canadian Forum, March 1931, pp. 206-208; April 1931, pp. 249-252.
- McClung, Nellie. "The New Citizenship." Addresses Delivered Before the Canadian Club of Toronto, 1915-1916. Toronto: Canadian Club, 1916.
- Newbery, J. W. E. and Lasserre, Henri. "They Seek for a City." A Series on the Birth of a Christian Community. United Church Observer, 1941-1942.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. Review of Towards the Christian Revolution, by R. B. Y. Scott and Gregory Vlastos. Radical Religion, II (Spring 1931): 42-44.
- _____. "Why I Leave the FOR." The Christian Century, LI (3 January 1934): 17-18.

- Silcox, C. E. "Young Refugees Interned in Canada." The Canadian Friend, January 1942, pp. 8-9.
- Smith, W. C. "The Canadian Youth Congress." The Canadian Forum, July 1936, pp. 16-18.
- Storms, Paul L. "Life at Montreal River Camp." The Canadian Friend, April 1942, pp. 11-13.
- Strachey, John. "The Churches Speak at Last: being a Review of Towards the Christian Revolution." The Left News, May 1937.
- Thomas, Ernest. "Should the United Church Condemn War?" The New Outlook, 12 August 1925, pp. 5-6.
- Vlastos, Gregory. Review of Creative Society, by John Macmurray. Radical Religion, I (Winter 1936): 31-33.
- Wood, Lieutenant Colonel William. "War -- The Neglected Factor in Canadian Problems for a Hundred Years." Addresses Delivered Before the Canadian Club of Toronto, 1914-1915. Toronto: Canadian Club, 1915.
- Woodsworth, J. S. "My Convictions about War." Vox, December 1939, pp. 4-7.
- Zieglschmid, A. J. F. "Must the Hutterites Leave Canada?" The Christian Century, LXIV (22 October 1947): 43.

Secondary Sources

Books and Pamphlets

- Adachi, Ken. The Enemy that Never Was: A History of the Japanese Canadians. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.
- Addison, Paul. The Road to 1945: British Politics and the Second World War. London: Jonathan Cape, 1975.
- Allen, Richard. The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada 1914-28. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.
- _____. ed. A Region of the Mind: Interpreting the Western Canadian Plains. Regina: University of Saskatchewan Press, 1973.

- Allen, Richard, ed. The Social Gospel in Canada. Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1975.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth. The Crisis of Quebec, 1914-1918. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937; reprint ed., Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.
- Arnold, Emmy. Torches Together: The Beginning and Early Years of the Bruderhof Communities. Translated by the Society of Brothers. Rifton, New York: Plough Publishing House, 1964.
- Avakumovic, Ivan. The Communist Party in Canada: A History. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975.
- Bainton, Roland H. Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1960.
- _____. Pilgrim Parson: The Life of James Herbert Bainton (1867-1942). New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1958.
- Bamba, N. and Howes, John F. Pacifism in Japan: The Christian and Socialist Tradition. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1978.
- Beattie, Margaret. A Brief History of the Student Christian Movement in Canada. Toronto: SCM, 1974.
- Bennett, John William. Hutterian Brethren. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1967.
- Berger, Carl. The Sense of Power. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.
- Betcherman, Lita-Rose. The Swastika and the Maple Leaf. Toronto: Fitzherny and Whitside, 1975.
- Bercuson, David Jay. Confrontation at Winnipeg. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1974.
- Best, Ethelwyn and Pike, Bernard. International Voluntary Service for Peace, 1920-1946. London: Allen and Unwin, 1948.
- Boulton, David. Objection Overruled. London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1967.
- Brock, Peter. Pacifism in Europe to 1914. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

- Brock, Peter. Pacifism in the United States: From the Colonial Era to the First World War. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- _____. Twentieth-Century Pacifism. Toronto: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1970.
- Brown, Robert Craig. Robert Laird Borden: A Biography. 2 Vols. Toronto: Macmillan, 1975 and 1980.
- Brown, Robert Craig and Cook, Ramsay. Canada 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.
- Bussey, Gertrude and Tims, Margaret. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915-1965. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1965.
- Cadoux, C. J. The Early Christian Attitude to War. London: 1919; reprint ed. with an Introduction by W. E. Orchard. London: Allen and Unwin, 1940.
- Carter, Paul A. The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1956.
- Ceadel, Martin. Pacifism in Britain 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- Chatfield, Charles. For Peace and Justice: Pacifism in America, 1914-1941. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1971.
- Clark, S. D., Grayson, J. Paul and Grayson, Linda M., eds. Prophecy and Protest: Social Movements in Twentieth Century Canada. Toronto: Gage, 1975.
- Cleverdon, C. L. The Woman Suffrage Movement in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950.
- Coady, Father M. M. Masters of Their Own Destiny: The Story of the Antigonish Movement of Adult Education through Economic Co-operation. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939.
- Creighton, Donald. The Forked Road: Canada 1939-1957. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.
- Crysdale, Stewart. The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethics in Canada. Toronto: Ryerson, 1961.

- Davies, A. Tegla. Friends Ambulance Unit: The Story of the F.A.U. in the Second World War 1969-1946. London: Allen and Unwin, 1947.
- Davies, J. G. Christians, Politics and Violent Revolution. London: SCM Press, 1976.
- Davis, Morris and Krauter, Joseph F. The Other Canadians: Profiles of Six Minorities. Toronto: Methuen, 1971.
- Dawson, C. A. Group Settlement: Ethnic Communities in Western Canada. Toronto: Macmillan, 1936.
- Degen, Marie Louise. The History of the Woman's Peace Party. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1939.
- Dennis, Peter. Decision by Default: Peacetime Conscription and British Defense, 1919-1939. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.
- Dorland, Arthur G. Former Days and Quaker Ways, A Canadian Retrospective. Picton, Ontario: Picton Gazette, 1965.
- _____. The Quakers in Canada: A History. new ed., Toronto: Ryerson, 1968.
- Eayrs, James. In Defense of Canada. 2 Vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.
- Endicott, Stephen. James G. Endicott: Rebel Out of China. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.
- Epp, Frank H. Mennonites in Canada, 1786-1920: The History of a Separate People. Toronto: Macmillan, 1974.
- _____. ed. I Would Like to Dodge the Draft-Dodgers But Waterloo: Conrad Press, 1970.
- Farrell, John C. Beloved Lady: A History of Jane Addams' Ideas on Reform and Peace. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1967.
- Finn, James, ed. Protest, Pacifism and Politics. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Flint, David. The Hutterites: A Study in Prejudice. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1975.

- Francis, E. K. In Search of Utopia -- The Mennonites in Manitoba. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955.
- Forty Years for Peace: A History of the Fellowship of Reconciliation 1914-1954. New York: FOR, 1954.
- Fussell, Paul. The Great War and Modern Memory. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Gingerich, Melvin. Service For Peace: A History of Mennonite Civilian Public Service. Akron, Penn: Mennonite Central Committee, 1949.
- Graham, John W. Conscription and Conscience. London: Allen and Unwin, 1922; reprint ed., New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1969.
- Granatstein, J. L. Canada's War: The Politics of the Mackenzie King Government 1939-1945. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- _____. Conscription in the Second World War 1939-1945. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1969.
- Granatstein, J. L. and Hitsman, J. M. Broken Promises: A History of Conscription in Canada. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Grant, John Webster. George Pidgeon: A Biography. Toronto: Ryerson, 1962.
- Greene, B. M., ed. Who's Who and Why, 1919-1920. Toronto: International Press, 1920.
- Greenwood, John Ormerod. Quaker Encounters. Vol. I: Friends and Relief. York, England: William Sessions, 1975.
- Grubb, Edward. Social Aspects of the Quaker Faith. London: Headly Brothers, 1899.
- Grubbs, Frank L. The Struggle for Labor Loyalty: Gompers, A.F. of L. and the Pacifists, 1917-1920. Durham: Duke University Press, 1968.
- Harkness, Ross. J. E. Atkinson of the Star. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.
- Hayes, Denis. Challenge of Conscience: The Story of the Conscientious Objectors of 1939-1945. London: Sheppard Press, 1949.

- Hayes, Denis. Conscription Conflict: The Conflict of Ideas in the Struggle for and against Military Conscription in Britain Between 1901 and 1939. London: Sheppard Press, 1949; reprint ed., New York: Garland, 1973.
- Hentoff, Nat. Peace Agitator: The Story of A. J. Muste. New York: Macmillan, 1963.
- Hershberger, Guy Franklin. The Mennonite Church in the Second World War. Scottdale, Penn: Mennonite Publication House, 1951.
- Hill, Christopher. The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution. London: Penguin Books, 1975.
- Hoar, Victor. The Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1969.
- Houghton, Walter E. The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Hyatt, John, ed. Pacifism: A Selected Bibliography. London: Housmans, 1972.
- Innis, Mary Quayle, ed. The Clear Spirit: Twenty Canadian Women and Their Times. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.
- Johnson, Donald. The Challenge to American Freedom: World War I and the Rise of the American Civil Liberties Union. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1963.
- Johnston, C. M. McMaster University. Vol. I: The Toronto Years. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.
- Knox, R. A. Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- Laurendeau, André. Witness for Quebec. Edited and translated by Philip Starford. Toronto: Macmillan, 1973.
- Luckman, Thomas. The Invisible Religion. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- MacEwen, Grant. . . . and Mighty Women Too: Stories of Notable Western Canadian Women. Saskatoon: Western Producer, 1975.
- MacGill, Elsie G. My Mother the Judge: A Biography of Judge Helen Gregory MacGill. Toronto: Ryerson, 1955.
- MacGregor, G. H. C. The New Testament Basis of Pacifism. London: 1936; reprint ed., New York: Fellowship Publications, 1954.

- MacKay, J. I. and Smith, J. Lavell. One Lord, One Door, One People: The Church of All Nations, Toronto. Toronto: Board of Home Missions, United Church of Canada, 1963.
- MacLachlan, Lewis. C.P.F.L.U.: A Short History of the Christian Pacifist Forestry Land Units, 1940-1946. London: FOR, 1952.
- MacPherson, Ian. Each For All: A History of the Co-operative Movement in English Canada, 1900-1945. Toronto: Macmillan, 1979.
- Marchand, C. Roland. The American Peace Movement and Social Reform 1898-1918. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Marrin, Albert. The Last Crusade: The Church of England in the First World War. Durham: Duke University Press, 1974.
- Martin, David A. Pacifism: An Historical and Sociological Study. New York: Schacken Books, 1966.
- Marwick, Arthur. The Deluge: British Society and the First World War. New York: Norton, 1965.
- McCormick, A. Ross. Reformers, Rebels, and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement 1899-1919. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- McNaught, Kenneth. A Prophet in Politics: A Biography of J. S. Woodsworth. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959. Reprinted 1971.
- Mellanby, Kenneth. Human Guinea Pigs. London: Gollancz, 1945; reprint ed., 1973.
- Meyer, Donald B. The Protestant Search for Political Realism: 1919-1941. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
- Moffatt, Gary. History of the Canadian Peace Movement Until 1969. St. Catharines: Grapevine Press, 1969.
- Morgan, Henry James, ed. The Canadian Men and Women of the Time: A Handbook of Canadian Biography of Living Characters. Toronto: 1912.
- Morrison, Sybil. I Renounce War: The Story of the Peace Pledge Union. London: Sheppard Press, 1962.
- Morton, Desmond. Mayor Howland: The Citizens' Candidate. Toronto: Hakkert, 1973.

- Morton, W. L. The Progressive Party in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950; reprint ed., Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.
- Neatby, H. Blair. William Lyon Mackenzie King. Vol. III: 1932-1939: The Prism of Unity. Toronto: Macmillan, 1976.
- Nelson, John K. The Peace Prophets: American Pacifist Thought 1919-1941. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1967.
- Nickalls, John L., ed. Journal of George Fox. London: Society of Friends, 1975.
- Oliver, John. The Church and Social Order: Social Thought in the Church of England, 1918-1939. London: Mowbray, 1968.
- Park, Julian, ed. The Culture of Contemporary Canada. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957.
- Penner, Norman. The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Penton, M. James. Jehovah's Witnesses in Canada. Toronto: Macmillan, 1976.
- Peterson, H. C. and Fite, Gilbert C. Opponents of War, 1917-1918. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1957; reprint ed., 1971.
- Peters, Victor. All Things Common: The Hutterian Way of Life. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1965.
- Prang, Margaret. N. W. Rowell: Ontario Nationalist. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.
- Prasad, Devi and Smythe, Tony. Conscription: A World Survey. London: War Resisters' International, 1968.
- Rae, John. Conscience and Politics: The British Government and the Conscientious Objector to Military Service 1916-1919. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Ramsay, Paul. Basic Christian Ethics. New York: Charles Scribner's 1950.
- _____. War and the Christian Conscience. Durham: Duke University Press, 1961.

- Raven, Charles E. The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism. London: Fellowship Press, 1951.
- Regamey, P. Non-violence and the Christian Conscience. London: Dorton, Longmans and Todd, 1966.
- Reimer, David P. Experiences of the Mennonites of Canada During the Second World War, 1939-1945. Altona, Manitoba: D. W. Friesen and Sons, 1954.
- Robbins, Keith. The Abolition of War: The "Peace Movement" in Britain, 1914-1919. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1976.
- Rodney, William. Soldiers of the International: A History of the Communist Party of Canada, 1919-1929. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.
- Sampson, Ronald. The Anarchist Basis of Pacifism. London: Peace Pledge Union, 1970.
- Sanders, Byrne Hope. Emily Murphy, Crusader. Toronto: Macmillan, 1945.
- Scott, Munroe. McClure: The China Years. Toronto: Canec Publishing, 1977.
- Shortt, S. E. D. The Search for an Ideal. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.
- Sibley, Mulford Q. and Jacob, Philip E. Conscription of Conscience. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1952; reprint ed., New York; Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1965.
- Smucker, Dan E. The Theological Basis for Christian Pacifism. Scottdale, Penn: Mennonite Publishing House, 1953.
- Stevens, Austin. The Dispossessed. London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1975.
- Stewart, Margaret and French, Doris. Ask No Quarter. Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company, 1959.
- Stubbs, Roy St. George. Prairie Portraits. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1954.
- Swettenham, John. McNaughton. 3 vols. Toronto: Ryerson, 1969.
- Thompson, John Herd. The Harvests of War: The Prairie West, 1914-1918. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.

- Thomson, Watson. Pioneer in Community. Toronto: Ryerson, 1949.
- Toews, J. A. Alternative Service in Canada During World War II.
Winnipeg: The Christian Press, 1959.
- Underhill, Frank H. In Search of Canadian Liberalism. Toronto:
Macmillan, 1960.
- Wallace, W. Stewart, ed. The Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian
Biography. Third edition. Toronto: Macmillan, 1963.
- Wiebe, Robert H. The Search for Order, 1877-1920. New York:
Hill and Wang, 1967.
- Wilson, Barbara, ed. Ontario and the First World War, 1914-1918.
Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- Winter, C. F. Lt. Gen. Sir Sam Hughes: Canada's War Minister.
Toronto: Macmillan, 1931.
- Wittner, Lawrence S. Rebels Against War: The American Peace Movement,
1941-1960. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.
- Whitney, Norman. Experiments in Community. Wallingford: Pendle
Hill Press, 1966.
- Woodcock, George. Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and
Movements. London: Penguin Books, 1963.
- _____. Civil Disobedience. Toronto: CBC, 1966.
- _____. The Basis of Communal Living. London: Freedom Press, 1947.
- Woodcock, George and Avakumovic, Ivan. The Doukhobors. Toronto:
Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Young, Walter D. The Anatomy of a Party: The National C.C.F.,
1933-61. Toronto: University Press, 1969.
- Zahn, Gordon C. War, Conscience and Dissent. New York: Hamilton
Books, 1967.
- Zakuta, Leo. A Protest Movement Becalmed. Toronto: University of
Toronto Press, 1964.
- Zubek, John P. and Solberg, Patricia Anne. Doukhobors at War.
Toronto: Ryerson, 1952.

Articles

- Abella, Irving and Troper, Harold. "'The line must be drawn somewhere': Canada and Jewish Refugees, 1933-9." Canadian Historical Review, IX (June 1974): 178-209.
- Allen, Richard. "The Background of the Social Gospel in Canada." In The Social Gospel in Canada, pp. 1-35. Edited by Richard Allen. Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1975.
- _____. "The Social Gospel and the Reform Tradition in Canada, 1898-1928." Canadian Historical Review, XLIX (December 1968): 381-399.
- _____. "The Social Gospel as the Religion of the Agrarian Revolt." In The West and The Nation, pp. 174-187. Edited by Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.
- Bliss, J. M. "The Methodist Church and World War I." Canadian Historical Review, XLIX (September 1968). In Conscription 1917, pp. 39/59. Edited by Carl Berger. Canadian Historical Readings No. 8. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.
- Bothwell, Robert and English, John. "'Dirty Work at the Cross-Roads': New Perspectives on the Riddell Incident." Canadian Historical Association, Historical Papers, 1972, pp. 263-286.
- Brown, R. Craig. "Goldwin Smith and Anti-Imperialism." Canadian Historical Review, XLIII (June 1962). In Imperial Relations in the Age of Laurier, pp. 10-22. Edited by Carl Berger. Canadian Historical Readings No. 6. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.
- Chatfield, Charles. "World War I and the Liberal Pacifist in the United States." American Historical Review, 75 (December 1970): 1920-1937.
- Chomsky, Noam. "The Revolutionary Pacifism of A. J. Muste." Gandhi Marg, 12 (April 1968): 156-179.
- Cole, Alan. "The Quakers and the English Revolution." In Crisis in Europe, 1560-1660, pp. 358-376. Edited by Trevor Aston. New York: Doubleday, 1965.

- Conway, Jill. "The Women's Peace Party and the First World War." In War and Society in North America, pp. 52-65. Edited by J. L. Granatstein and R. D. Cuff. Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1971.
- Cook, Ramsay. "Francis Marion Beynon and the Crisis of Christian Reformism." In The West and The Nation, pp. 187-208. Edited by Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.
- Courville, L. D. "The Conservatism of the Saskatchewan Progressives." Canadian Historical Association, Historical Papers, 1974, pp. 183-212.
- Filene, Peter. "The World Peace Foundation and Progressivism, 1910-1918." New England Quarterly, 36 (December 1963): 478-501.
- Goldman, Aaron L. "Defense Regulations 18B: Emergency Internment of Aliens and Political Dissenters in Great Britain During World War II." The Journal of British Studies, 12 (May 1973): 120-136.
- Harkness, Georgia. "Roland H. Bainton: A Biographical Appreciation." In Reformation Studies: Essays in Honour of Roland H. Bainton, pp. 11-20. Edited by F. H. Littell. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1962.
- Horn, Michiel. "Frank Underhill's Early Drafts of the Regina Manifesto, 1933." Canadian Historical Review, XIV (December 1973): 393-418.
- _____. "The League for Social Reconstruction and the Development of Canadian Socialism, 1932-1936." Journal of Canadian Studies, VII (November 1972): 3-15.
- Kennedy, T. C. "Public Opinion and the Conscientious Objector, 1915-1919." The Journal of British Studies, 12 (May 1973): 105-119.
- Lambert, R. S. "Forgotten Peace Prophet." Macleans, 1 March 1945, pp. 18-26.
- MacPherson, Ian. "The Crisis of the Canadian Co-operative Movement, 1900-1914." Canadian Historical Association, Historical Papers, 1972, pp. 207-225.

- Manley, John. "Women and the Left in the 1930's: The Case of the Toronto CCF Women's Joint Committee." Atlantis, 5 (Spring 1980): 100-117.
- Martens, Hildegard M. "Accommodation and Withdrawal: The Response of Mennonites in Canada to World War II." Social History, 7 (1974): 306-327.
- Miller, Carman. "English Canadian Opposition to the South African War as seen through the Press." Canadian Historical Review, LV (December 1974): 422-238.
- Morgan, Kenneth O. Review of Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945, by Martin Ceadel. Times Literary Supplement, 8 August 1980, p. 887.
- Morton, Desmond. "Sir William Otter and Internment Operations in Canada during the First World War." Canadian Historical Review, LV (March 1974): 32-58.
- Nickel, J. W. "The Canadian Conscientious Objector." Mennonite Life, January 1948.
- Page, Donald. "The Development of a Western Canadian Peace Movement." In The Twenties in Western Canada, pp. 75-106. Edited by S. M. Trofimenkoff. Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1972.
- Page, Robert J. D. "Canada and the Imperial Idea in the Boer War Years." Journal of Canadian Studies, February 1970, pp. 33-49.
- Patterson, J. D. Review of For Peace and Justice, by Charles Chatfield. Journal of American History, 59 (June 1972): 201.
- "Quakers Opposed War Preparation in Upper Canada." The Canadian Friend, February-March 1973, pp. 10-11.
- Rempel, Richard A. "British Quakers and the South African War." Quaker History, 64 (Autumn 1975): 75-95.
- _____. "The Dilemmas of British Pacifists during World War II." Journal of Modern History, 50 (December 1978): D1223.
- Robin, Martin. "Registration, Conscription, and Independent Labour Politics, 1916-1917." Canadian Historical Review, XLVII (June 1966). In Conscription 1917, pp. 60-77. Edited by Carl Berger. Canadian Historical Readings No. 8. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

- Rothwell, David R. "United Church Pacifism -- October 1939." The Bulletin, XX (1973): 36-55.
- Shapiro, Stanley. "The Great War and Reform: Liberals and Labor, 1917-19." Labor History, 12 (Summer 1971): 323-44.
- Stamp, Robert M. "Empire Day in the Schools of Ontario: The Training of Young Imperialists." Journal of Canadian Studies, August 1973, pp. 32-42.
- Teichroew, Allen. "World War I and the Mennonite Migration to Canada to Avoid the Draft." Mennonite Quarterly Review, XIV (July 1971): 219-49.
- Thompson, John H. "'The Beginning of our Regeneration': The Great War and Western Canadian Reform Movements." Canadian Historical Association, Historical Papers, 1972, pp. 227-245.
- _____. "'Permanently Wasteful but Immediately Profitable': Prairie Agriculture and the Great War." Canadian Historical Association, Historical Papers, 1976, pp. 193-206.
- Trotter, William. "Julia Grace Wales and the Wisconsin Plan for Peace." Wisconsin Magazine of History, XLIV (1961): 203-61.
- Unruh, John D. "The Hutterites During World War I." Mennonite Life, July 1969, pp. 130-137. ✓
- Ward, W. Peter. "British Columbia and the Japanese Evacuation." Canadian Historical Review, LVII (September 1976): 229-308.
- Young, W. R. "Conscription, Rural Depopulation, and the Farmers of Ontario, 1917-19." Canadian Historical Review, LIII (September 1972): 289-320.

Unpublished Papers and Dissertations

- Bacchi-Ferraro, Carol Lee. "The Ideas of the Canadian Suffragists, 1890-1920." M.A. Thesis, McGill University, 1970.
- Barker, Ralph. "The United Church and the Social Question: A Study of the Social and Theological Outlook of the United Church after Thirty-five Years." Th.D. Thesis, Victoria University, Toronto, 1961.

- Beattie, Margaret Eileen. "Pressure Group Politics: The Student Christian Movement in Canada." Ph.D. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1972.
- Brannigan, Colm. "The Anglican Church in Canada and the Great War." Graduate seminar paper for Professor A. R. Allen, Department of History, McMaster University, 1978.
- Boudreau, Joseph Amedée. "The Enemy Alien Problem in Canada, 1914-1921." Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1965.
- Christie, Edward A. "The Presbyterian Church in Canada and its Official Attitude Toward Public Affairs and Social Problems, 1875-1925." M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1955.
- Cook, Ramsay. "Canadian Liberalism in Wartime: A Study of the Defense of Canada Regulations and some Canadian Attitudes To Civil Liberties in Wartime." M.A. Thesis, Queen's University, 1955.
- _____. "The Professor and the Prophet of Unrest." Paper presented at the Colloquium on Canadian Society in the Late Nineteenth Century, McGill University, January 17-18, 1975.
- Fransen, David Warren. "Canadian Mennonites and Conscientious Objection in World War II." M.A. Thesis, University of Waterloo, 1977.
- _____. "Debate on Alternative Service During World War II." Paper for Institute of Annabaptist-Mennonite Studies, Conrad Grebel College, University of Waterloo, 1975.
- Groome, Agnes Jean. "M. J. Coldwell and C.C.F. Foreign Policy, 1932-1950." M.A. Thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Regina, 1967.
- Horn, Michiel, "The League for Social Reconstruction: Socialism and Nationalism in Canada, 1931-1945." Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1969.
- Howard, James Willis. "A Study of Cadet Training in the Dominion of Canada." Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell University, 1936.
- Husemeyer, Elizabeth Turton. "The Treatment of Enemy Aliens in Britain During the First World War." Graduate seminar paper for Professor R. Rempel, Department of History, McMaster University, 1976.

- Hutchinson, Roger. "The Fellowship for a Christian Social Order: A Social Ethical Analysis of a Christian Socialist Movement." Th.D. Thesis, Victoria University, Toronto, 1975.
- Lutzker, Michael A. "The Practical Peace Advocates: An Interpretation of the American Peace Movement, 1878-1917." Ph.D. Thesis, Rutgers University, 1969.
- Newberry, J. "Bertrand Russell and the Pacifists in the First World War." Ph.D. Thesis, McMaster University, 1975.
- Norman, Gwen R. P. "Richard Roberts." Unpublished manuscript, 1966. In Richard Roberts Papers, United Church Archives, Toronto.
- Page, Donald M. "Canadians and the League of Nations Before the Manchurian Crisis." Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1972.
- Royce, M. V. "The Contribution of the Methodist Church to Social Welfare in Canada." M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1940.
- Sibley, Abigail. "The Response of British Teachers to the Ideological Issues of War and Peace during the Inter-war Period, 1920-1940." Paper presented at the Canadian Historical Association, Annual Meeting, Montreal, June 1980.
- Sinclair-Faulkner, C. T. "'For Christian Civilization': The Churches and Canada's War Effort, 1939-1942." Th.D. Thesis, University of Chicago, 1975.
- Sockett, Thomas P. "Canada, Imperial Foreign Policy and the Abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1921." M.A. Thesis, University of Nebraska, Omaha, 1967.
- Steininger, Fred. "George H. Williams: Agrarian Socialist." M.A. Thesis, University of Regina, 1976.
- _____. "War and the Crisis of Conscience, 1933-1939." Paper for Professor A. R. Allen, Department of History, University of Regina, 1969.