

CHAPTER 2
AFSA's STORY

Beginnings

AFSA grew out of the progressive mood in the Church generated by the Malvern Conference. The first "official" responses to Malvern in Montreal were similar to those of the National Church. The *Montreal Churchman* did not report on Malvern, perhaps because its editor was confident that this was already being done adequately by the secular papers and the *Canadian Churchman*. The Bishop of the Diocese, Arthur Carlisle, referred to Malvern in his charge to Diocesan Synod on April 22, 1941. He commended the meeting of Churchmen, saying, "their conclusions and the course of their deliberations are worthy of respectful consideration and respectful study."¹ While he acknowledged that a few of Malvern's resolutions would be found unacceptable to some Churchmen, he nonetheless asked that Synod appoint a committee to study "The Findings" and encourage the establishment of study groups throughout the Diocese. In due course, the Bishop was requested to establish such a "committee on post-war problems".² The committee consisted of four priests and three laymen under the chairmanship of the Dean of the Cathedral, John Dixon. The Bishop did not participate.

The Committee's first report was presented to Synod in 1942. It shows an obvious dependency on the Malvern "Findings": the issues discussed, the order of their presentation, and even much of the language used were identical.³ The "Ten Points" were also quoted and endorsed. The differences between the Committee's Report and the Conference's "Findings" lay primarily in the few Canadian applications made (e.g., "conservation of our forests", "New Canadians" as opposed to wartime exiles in Britain) and in the omission of any reference

1. *SDMJP* 1941, p.24

2. *Ibid.*, p.38

3. *SDMJP* 1942, pp.88-90.

to the controversial "Acland amendment" on private ownership. The Bishop's Committee also laid less stress on the definition of principles, seeing its purpose more holistically and practically in terms of "an effort to determine how by its life, its worship, and its teaching the Church can help to interpret and translate into reality the social principles found in the Gospel of Christ."⁴ Despite these differences, the tendency to repeat the concerns and formulae of the English Church again leads one to question the degree to which the perspective of Malvern was being integrated.

The influence of Malvern can also be seen in the Report of the Committee for Social Service to the Synod of 1942. The previous Report (1941) had spoken of the work done by the Committee in petitioning the Quebec government to work towards better control and compulsory treatment of venereal diseases, and in notifying Montreal rectors of the presence of any British children evacuated to Canada and living within their parishes. The 1941 Report had also contained expressions of concern about juvenile delinquency, future veterans, and liquor control. It had ended with a vague reference to the war which read,

Your committee draws attention to the need for a full understanding of our Christian duty in international affairs, and specifically of the obligation to think and act in those terms of common fellowship and common care which, after past failures, we have now accepted as our reason for going to war. The Committee hopes that serious study groups will be promoted and guided in order that a reasoned faith may continuously support us through to victory, and may increase in us the wisdom without which no true and lasting peace can be made.⁵

By the Synod of 1942 the mood of the Committee for Social Service had changed. This is most evident in the motion to create a Diocesan Council for Social Service (DCSS), an action which formalized and legitimized social concern by

4. *Ibid.*, p.4

5. *SDMJP 1941*, p.95

placing it in the hands of a permanent body.⁶ While the actual Report of the Committee for that year dealt with issues similar to those mentioned a year earlier (child abuse, compulsory education, penal institutions, temperance, motion pictures), the rationale for the DCSS betrayed the influence of Malvern and Temple. For instance, the proposal read:

It is necessary for the Church to speak clearly, fearlessly and honestly on a Social Order which likes to call itself Christian. Clearly such a society cannot be run on principles that contradict the Christian faith, and still call itself Christian.⁷

Here we see an implicit understanding of the need to become critical of the inner principles of social organization. The tasks of the proposed Council also reflected Malvern's call to study and local action: the Council would study local conditions in the social, industrial, and cultural spheres with a view to influencing opinion, both in the Church and in society, and directing that opinion "towards the correction of wrong conditions and the setting up of proper and just conditions of living."⁸

The Reports of the Bishop's Committee and the Social Service Committee delivered to Synod in 1942 were the first signs of Malvern's influence in the Diocese of Montreal.⁹ Just before Synod met that year, the movement for social justice had received an important boost. On March 31, 1942, Cosmo Lang had retired as Archbishop of Canterbury and William Temple was translated from York to the primatial see. His enthronement in the seat of St. Augustine took place on St. George's Day, April 23, 1942. Temple's views on social issues

6. *SDMJP* 1942, p.34

7. *Ibid.*, p.99

8. *Ibid.*

9. As the Social Service Committee's Report for 1941 was dated February 28 and the Malvern document was not published by the *Canadian Churchman* and the CSS before February 20 and 25, respectively, it is not surprising that Malvern's influence was not apparent until 1942

were by this time very well-known, not only because of his ecumenical involvements and his chairmanship at Malvern, but especially because of the appearance earlier in 1942 of his little book *Christianity and Social Order*. The book sold so well that, by May, 1942, a reprint was needed, only to be followed by another in August of the same year.¹⁰ In the year between the Synod of 1942 and 1943, there appeared within the Diocese of Montreal several indicators of the influence of Temple and Malvern. In September of 1942, the "sociology group" at the Church of St. John the Evangelist began its fourth winter of activity with a series of studies related to Temple's new book.¹¹ Similar events dealing with issues related to a Christian social order were held in the parishes of St. Columba, St. Aidan, and St. Clement.¹² Even the Westmount parish of St. Matthias had a "social service group".¹³ During Advent, 1943, a series of sermons at Christ Church Cathedral focused on the ten point programme advocated by the Bishop's Committee on Post-War Problems.¹⁴ This series was, no doubt, initiated by the Dean, John Dixon, who was chairman of the Bishop's Committee and, at this time, perceived to be a disciple of Temple. His affinity to Temple had been apparent in his address to the 1942 Convocation of Montreal Diocesan Theological College, in which he expounded his view of Christian duty in society.¹⁵ He had also expressed progressive views in an address on "The Church's Right to Speak" delivered to a conference of clergy and laity sponsored by the Bishop's Committee and titled "Christianity or

10. Edward Heath, in a "Foreward" to William Temple, *Christianity and Social Order*, (London: Shephard-Walwyn, SPCK, 1976) p.5

11. *Montreal Churchman* (April 1943) p.17

12. *SDMJP 1943*, p.112

13. *CC* (Feb. 12, 1942) p.108

14. Cooper, *Blessed Communion*, p.199

15. *Montreal Churchman*, (June, 1942) pp.4-5

Chaos."¹⁶ Thus it was that social concern was highlighted in the Diocese of Montreal. If one can gauge the level of interest in a Christian approach to social issues by the size of the Social Service Committee, then it is significant that the membership of the Committee grew from about 30 men in the years before the Malvern Conference to 54 in 1941-42, 50 in 1942-43, and 68 in 1943-44.

Malvern's point of view was promoted within the Diocese by individual members of Synod and its committees. While it may be somewhat tendentious to say that those who later became AFSA members were the decisive influence on the Social Service Committee, it is fair to assume that those who declared themselves to be progressive late in 1944 were already leaning in that direction two or three years earlier. With respect to "Flynn" Flanagan and Sam Pollard, this was certainly the case, as both had been members of the FCSO since before the war. Early in 1942, Flanagan became the chairman of the Social Service Committee and it was under his leadership that the DCSS was conceived and proposed. In addition to Sam Pollard, the other future AFSA members on the Committee in 1941-42 were E.S. Reed, Ken Brueton, John Kirby, and John Peacock. In 1942, Percy Powles and M.A. Stephens joined the Committee, and in 1943, Roland Bodger and Ray Corbett also joined. Flanagan, a dentist, and Corbett, an insurance agent, were the only laymen among the "ginger group" at this time. "Flynn" Flanagan had also been a member of the Bishop's Committee on Post-War Problems from its creation in 1941. Ernie Reed and M.A. Stephens joined him on that committee in 1942. There were also at this time, other progressive members of Synod who were very supportive of Malvern and Temple, although they never become AFSA members. The most notable among these, besides Dean John Dixon, was Canon W.H. Dawson, rector of the Anglo-Catholic parish of St. John the Evangelist, who served on the Bishop's Committee from 1941.

16. *Ibid.*, (Feb. 1943) p.7; (March 1943) pp.8-9; (April 1943) pp.8-12

On January 5, 1943, Bishop Arthur Carlisle died. A new diocesan bishop was to be elected by Synod in March. Some of the more progressive members of Synod, such as Flanagan and Pollard, decided to support Dixon's candidacy for the episcopacy because of the attitudes and values he had been expounding. A critical factor in their decision to opt for the Dean had been the address he delivered at the conference "Christianity or Chaos", just three weeks after Carlisle's death. Dixon was elected bishop on March 2 and was enthroned on the first day of Diocesan Synod, May 3, 1943.¹⁷

The Synod of 1943 began its debates in the wake of these three significant developments in diocesan life: the point of view represented by Malvern had been disseminated and reflected upon; a new bishop with apparently pro-Temple leanings had been elected; and, most important in terms of the growth of AFSA, several progressive priests and one or two laymen had begun to work together on the Bishop's Committee on Post-War Problems and the Social Service Committee. These factors, especially the latter, influenced the 1943 Reports of the two committees. The Bishop's Committee pointed to the restatement of Christian principles found in its previous Report and proposed several organizational changes which would ensure continued reflection and action on the principles declared. Among these were the changing of the Committee's name to "The Bishop's Committee on the Christian Social Order", the organization of a follow-up conference to "Christianity or Chaos", close co-operation with the educational and social service programmes of the diocese to initiate and promote study groups, and the establishment of a "Board of Information" to propagate the faith and its application to "everyday human affairs."¹⁸

17. *SDMJP 1943* pp.22 & 35f

18. *Ibid.*, pp.112-113

The Bishop's Committee also advocated ecumenical co-operation "for an effectual proclamation of the Social Implications of the Gospel."¹⁹ The Report of the Social Service Committee for 1943 also proposed organizational reforms which would serve to promote study of and action on social issues by the Church. For instance, a full-time secretary was requested to oversee the establishment of study groups throughout the diocese. Co-operation with other communions was also urged.²⁰

The Reports of the two Committees differed in one important respect. The Social Service Committee was obviously critical of the Church and society, identifying those areas of the ecclesiastical and secular order which were not in accordance with Christian principles. It claimed that the economic structure of the Church was not based on Christian fellowship and the equality of each in the eyes of God. They expressed the principle of equality thus: "from each congregation and individual according to their ability to give and to each according to their need."²¹ In order better to approximate the ideal, the Committee urged the adoption of one basic clerical stipend with allowances. By such a scheme, all priests and deacons would receive salaries based on the same scale, with incremental increases according to years of service, the number of family members being supported, and the amount of travel required to care for the parish. The purpose of the plan was an equalization of salaries, so that rectors in poorer rural parishes would receive stipends approximately equal to those received by rectors of large urban parishes. The Committee's motion was debated at length and the discussion was resolved when an amendment endorsing the principle of the basic stipend and establishing a

19. *Ibid.*

20. *Ibid.*, p.100

21. *Ibid.*, p.101

committee to explore ways and means was introduced and passed. The bishop was asked to appoint the committee and the Synod was asked to report to General Synod regarding the proposed plan.²²

In addition to the resolution on basic stipend, the Social Service Committee moved that, in order to secure a wider representation of the church at Synod and on its committees, the Executive Committee of Diocesan Synod make possible the payment of expenses incurred by both clerical and lay delegates to Diocesan, Provincial, and General Synods. The significance of this motion was its implicit attack on what some AFSA members have called the "rotten borough" system by which smaller, rural parishes were represented at Synod by businessmen and lawyers who had summer homes in the country. As each delegate was responsible for his own accommodation and meals while attending Synod in Montreal, it appeared to be simply convenient that those with homes in the city should represent their summer-time churches at Synod. The result was that farmers and workers in rural areas were not able to represent themselves and their interests at Synod, while the business community was, in a sense, over-represented. This resolution was adopted.²³

These resolutions on basic stipend and the payment of Synod delegates' expenses represent the first public appearance of issues around which AFSA organized itself. Although the group did not emerge as such until the spring of 1944, it is apparent that a group of progressive churchmen had already begun to work together by the Synod of 1943 and before the first Arundel Conference held in August of that year. This fact is supported by others.

22. *Ibid.*, p.45

23. *Ibid.*

In an interview, Flanagan referred to a group of progressive clergy and laymen who had supported Dixon in the episcopal election of March, 1943.²⁴ In *Canada and Christendom* #10 (July, 1943) Charles Feilding discussed a letter received from a Montreal correspondent who spoke of a "group of younger clergy who have been thinking along radical lines for some time."²⁵ Part of the letter quoted by Feilding read,:

We have an informal nucleus of young men who believe in this "root and branch" reform. We meet together and discuss things very freely once in awhile and out of this freedom springs many things and especially the determination to act; but no resolution finding! and no minutes!²⁶

This group was clearly linked with Synod's resolution on basic stipend. The letter also referred to "an unofficial clergy group called the Society of Mutual Help" which met monthly. During the winter, the group occasionally involved "three fine young laymen" and they met together "to talk over policy and strategy" in relation to Synod.²⁷ From Feilding's comments it would appear that the group considered a strategy based on working within the official structure of the Church to be more effective than "wasting effort on new and unofficial organizations."²⁸

24. Interview with Dr. J.C. "Flynn" Flanagan, at his home in Arundel, Quebec (August 5, 1980)

25. *Canada and Christendom*, #10, p.3

26. *Ibid.*

27. This may be the same group referred to in the following announcement printed in *CC*, (Feb. 5, 1942) p.94: "The Clergy Mutual-Help was entertained by the ladies of St. Thomas' Church on Monday, January 12th. A paper on 'Clergy Pooling of Salaries in Japan' was read." No doubt the paper had been prepared by Percy Powles, who had been in Japan from 1916 to 1941

28. *Canada and Christendom* #10, p.3. It is unfortunate that Feilding's correspondent is unnamed. It could have been Sam Pollard, as he received *Canada and Christendom* from the start (interview with Sam Pollard at McGill University, Montreal, August 6, 1980.)

Organization

The Anglican Fellowship for Social Action grew out of this "informal nucleus" between the Synods of 1943 and 1945. On May 1 to 3, 1943, the FCSO sponsored a conference in Montreal titled "Toward a Christian Society".²⁹ The main speaker was Joseph Fletcher, who at that time was Dean of the Graduate School of Applied Religion in Cincinnati, Ohio, and an associate editor of *The Witness*, *Christendom* (U.S.) and the *Anglican Theological Review*. He delivered two talks dealing with "The Duty of the Church to speak" and an "Analysis of Social Forces." The conference participants were mostly labour unionists, academics, and members of the FCSO and the CCF. The workshops were to deal with "Growing Forces in Rural Society", "Struggle for Industrial Democracy", "Training Youth for a Christian Society" and "Necessity for an Adequate School System". Sam Pollard, who was to be one of the discussion group leaders, and Ernie Reed convinced Flynn Flanagan that he should attend the conference to hear Fletcher. After the conference, Reed and Pollard thought it would be a good idea to invite Fletcher to return to Montreal to address a group of Anglicans. Flynn offered the use of his home on Bevan's Lake, near Arundel in the Laurentians, for such a meeting and the first of several Arundel Conferences was held in August, 1943.³⁰ The Conference was attended, at least in part, by Bishop Dixon, 21 clergy, and three laymen. The majority of the participants sat on the Social Service Committee of the Diocese. Twelve of those present later became members of AFSA: Percy Powles, Cyril Powles, Roland Bodger, Ken Brueton, John Kirby, John Peacock, Sam Pollard, Ernie Reed, M.A. Stephens, Ray Corbett, D.B. Harrison, and Flynn Flanagan.

29. *Montreal Churchman* (May, 1943) p.5

30. The first Arundel Conference was reported in the *Montreal Churchman* (October, 1943) pp.15-16; (November, 1943) pp.27-28; (December, 1943) pp.20-21

Fletcher spoke about the church's right to speak on political and economic issues, Temple's goals for social reconstruction, Christian Sociology, the Christian understanding of human-ness and its implications for politics, and some of the Church's social teachings in the past regarding property, work, just price, and profit. In his lectures, as reported in the *Montreal Churchman*,³¹ the influence of the point of view developed by Temple in *Christianity and Social Order* is evident. This is true, not so much of the detail of Fletcher's argument, but in his general approach. As did Temple, Fletcher stressed the social nature of personhood; he used "natural law" to condemn excessive profits, and he referred to the social teachings of the pre-modern Church. It is significant that this was the point of view presented at the first Arundel Conference, as it was the Temple-Fletcher "line" which became the mainstream in AFSA's thought and action.

A different, but complementary point of view was presented at the second Arundel Conference in August of 1944. The speaker that year, invited on Fletcher's recommendation, was Frederick Hastings Smyth, the founder and superior of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth (SCC) at Cambridge, Massachusetts. Smyth was the son of a wealthy family, well-established in the Hudson Valley.³² He was a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in chemistry and, during the First World War, he had served as a captain in the Chemical Warfare

31. *Ibid.*

32. Unless otherwise noted, information on Frederick Hastings Smyth and the SCC was shared by Cyril Powles in an interview at Trinity College, Toronto, March 2, 1981. See also *Montreal Churchman* (August, 1944) p.4

Department of the United States Army. After five years in research following the war, Smyth went to Europe where he became associated with various left-leaning artists and writers. He studied for the priesthood in Rome and was ordained in Malta in 1931. The report of the second Arundel Conference in the *Montreal Churchman* described the SCC as "a society within the Anglican Communion whose primary purpose is, under God, to bear intensive witness to the Incarnational, Sacramental and therefore Social essence of the Christian religion."³³ It apparently saw itself as a group dedicated to liturgical and social revolution.³⁴ Smyth's theme at the Conference was "The Church as the Organ of Social Redemption" and he covered five basic areas: the Incarnation of the Word in Jesus; the church as the transformed society by which the whole social order is transformed; the concept of "metacosmesis" or "transordering"; the offertory at the Eucharist and liturgical reform; and the need for structural changes in the existing order. These elements of Smyth's thought can be found in his books *Manhood into God* and *Discerning the Lord's Body*.³⁵ While AFSA never adopted a theology as systematic as Smyth's some of his significant ideas were adopted, particularly his emphasis on the offertory and his understanding of the role of the church in the world. The SCC influence became the "radical Anglo-Catholic" and secondary stream of AFSA's thought and action.³⁶

The earliest record of AFSA is a "suggested reading list for A.F.S.A. members"

33. *Montreal Churchman* (October, 1944) p.17

34. The SCC was described in these terms by Vince Goring, in an interview in his home in Toronto, July 23, 1980

35. Frederick Hastings Smyth, *Manhood into God* (New York: Round Table Press, 1940) and *Discerning the Lord's Body: The Rationale of a Catholic Democracy* (Louisville, Ky: The Cloister Press, 1946)

36. On the relationship of AFSA and the SCC, see below, pp.89-94 and 155-157.

dated May 1944. Some of the publications recommended were *The Christian Newsletter*, *Christendom*, *The Social Christian* (Journal of the Socialist Christian League in Britian), *Christianity and Crisis*, and *The Malvern Torch* (published by the Industrial Christian Fellowship).³⁷ The earliest copy of the group's "Principles and Rules" is a typescript filed with the final announcement of the 1944 Arundel Conference in the papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.³⁸ This suggests that AFSA developed its Principles and Rules about the time of the second Arundel Conference. It was not until later in that year that the group took on a public profile. On Novemeber 4, 1944, the Montreal Gazette published a letter which protested against the inadequate coverage given the death of William Temple on October 26. The letter was signed by ten priests and two laymen who identified themselves as the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action.³⁹ In December, 1944, an editorial in the *Montreal Churchman* mentioned an "Arundel group" and described the "informal gatherings" at the Flanagans as "a clearing house for ideas on religious questions and an encouragement for Christian Social Action."⁴⁰ The editorial also said that this group had been "already named from the public platform."⁴¹ Before Synod of 1945, AFSA

37. "Suggested reading list - for A.F.S.A. members. May 1944." Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth. (author unkown)

38. "The Anglican Fellowship for Social Action" and "The Arundel Conference, August 21-25, 1944. Final Notice." Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

39. Reprinted in *AO* 11,1 (Nov. 1955) p.2.

40. *Montreal Churchman* (Dec. 1944) p.7.

41. *Ibid.*

emerged with a "Manifesto" announcing its principles and rules.⁴² The twelve charter members listed in the Manifesto were those who had signed the letter to the Gazette: Rev. W.J. Bishop; Rev. R. Bodger; Rev. K.N. Brueton; Mr C.J. Champion; Dr. J.C. Flanagan; Rev. J.C. Kirby; Rev. J.O. Peacock; Rev. S.L. Pollard; Rev. C.H. Powles; Rev. P.S.C. Powles; Rev. E.S. Reed, and; Rev. M.A. Stephens.

On the cover of the Manifesto, AFSA described itself as "an unofficial group of clergy and layfolk pledged to advocacy of Christian social principles." In the body of the Manifesto, four principles were proclaimed. The first of these read:

1. We believe that the Church ought to proclaim that it is God's Will that men should live together on this earth in brotherhood, holding the natural resources of the earth as a common trust for all mankind.

The two imperatives in this statement relate to the dual focus of AFSA's work: the Church and the world. The group's concern with the Church related to its teaching (what the Church "ought to proclaim") and to its exemplary witness in the world. This role was developed in the fourth principle, which

42. The "Principles and Rules" were reprinted in an editorial in the *Montreal Churchman* (April, 1945) p.7. There are two copies of the "Manifesto" in the papers of C.H. Powles. One lists 12 "Charter Members of the Fellowship", therefore it is likely it was published in the winter of 1944-45. The second lists 24 members. Pulker (p.251, n.52) dates the same list in 1946 without explaining why. An "earlier" copy can also be found in the papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

The document carries no name or title except that of the Fellowship. However, I use the term "Manifesto" advisedly, as the AFSA members interviewed referred to it as such. This term may have been coined by the *Montreal Churchman*, which referred to the "Principles and Rules" as AFSA's "inaugural manifesto" (op. cit.).

All these copies of the "Principles and Rules", including that referred to in n.38, above, are identical. In *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws of the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action* (papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth) there are two minor changes: a note appended to Rule 6 and a change in Rule 7 (See below, p.75 and p.72, respectively). Internal evidence suggests that this document dates from 1947 or later.

read:

4. We recognize the need for church reform voiced in the following resolution passed by the 308 archbishops and bishops of the Anglican Communion throughout the world at the Lambeth Conference in 1930: that "if the Church is to witness without reproach for justice and brotherhood in the world, it must show itself serious and insistent in reforming abuses within its own organization, and in promoting brotherhood among its own members."

AFSA's concern with the world was developed in the second and third principles, which read:

2. We affirm that our present economic system frustrates brotherhood, as its appeal is primarily to self-interest and its basis is competition: therefore this system is unchristian and immoral.

3. We maintain that the present social order cannot be changed without a change in heart and mind and will in the individual, and a corresponding change in the political and industrial arrangements.

These principles reflect the Malvern "Findings". The emphasis on brotherhood as God's will parallels Malvern's focusing on the status of persons as children of God. Malvern also identified the need for reform in the economic and administrative life of the Church and the necessity of both personal and systemic transformation in society. Furthermore, Malvern and Temple were also critical of capitalism's denial of human fellowship, although Malvern was not as explicit as was the AFSA Manifesto. On the other hand, the AFSA Manifesto represents something more than selective restatement of the positions developed by Malvern and Temple. The particular ways in which AFSA acted upon its values sets it apart from its British antecedents and from other Canadian groups. For instance, the commitment to collectivism implied in AFSA's first principle and the alienation from a competitive and individualistic economic system explicit in principle two led AFSA to identify itself, or to allow itself to be identified with, other groups, movements, or causes which posed a threat to the *status quo* in North America following the Second World War. These included not only the labour movement, but

resistance to the suppression of civil liberties by the Duplessis regime in Quebec, to the Western support of Chiang Kai Shek, and to the American intervention in Korea. Similarly, with respect to AFSA's commitment to change in the life of the Church, the group advocated adoption of one basic clerical stipend with allowances, increased "democratization" of church government, and liturgical reform. While elements of the above may be found in other groups or movements, this particular blend sets AFSA apart as a Canadian expression of an incarnational socialism.

Some of AFSA's specific concerns were expressed in the seven Rules printed in the Manifesto, which read,

We pledge ourselves:

1. To bear together the burdens involved in the advocacy of these principles.
2. To meet at regular intervals for Holy Communion and discussion
3. To read at least one book on social problems each month.
4. To produce and distribute literature in support of our principles and to advocate them publicly.
5. To work for a system of clerical stipends based upon the Christian doctrine of brotherhood.
6. To co-operate with other groups, religious and secular, on fundamental issues of social righteousness.
7. To pay a minimum membership fee of two dollars a year.

Membership in AFSA consisted in acceptance of and commitment to these Principles and Rules, although this appears to have become formalized and diversified as the group grew. The By-Laws identified a four-step process in the admission of members which led to an "initiation" according to the form developed for use by the Montreal Unit in 1947.⁴³ The By-Laws also provided for an Associate Membership for those who accepted the Principles

⁴³. *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws*, p.5

and Rules but could not participate in the discipline of income sharing.⁴⁴ Associates had all the rights and privileges of Full Members, but they could not hold office in the Fellowship.

The AFSA members met once a month to pray, study, and strategize. Attendance at these meetings was considered very important. The By-Laws state that,

The meeting of the Unit shall have the first priority on the member's time. Members who unavoidably must be absent must notify the secretary in advance and give the reason. Any member absent from two meetings in succession without a reason acceptable to the Unit will be asked to resign.⁴⁵

Each meeting began with a Eucharist. AFSA received the permission of Bishop Dixon to use its own liturgy⁴⁶ and, perhaps as early as 1946, the group had a liturgical committee which attempted to develop a socially responsible eucharistic liturgy based on ancient practice.⁴⁷ Following the liturgy, there was a short business meeting to deal with matters relating to finances, membership, and the Arundel Conferences, followed by discussion. The By-Laws refer to minutes of the meetings, but I have not been able to locate copies of these records.

The Manifesto and By-Laws give us some idea of the structure of the AFSA organization. The original copy of the Manifesto identified three executive

44. *Ibid.* On income sharing, see below pp.71f.

45. *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws* p.6

46. Interview with J.C. Kirby at McGill University, Montreal, August 6, 1980.

47. See E. Cecil Royle, "To the Liturgical Committee of AFSA: A Proposed Order of Holy Communion," n.d., papers of C.H. Powles. Royle put "Hudson Heights" under his name. Hudson Heights is in the Parish of Vaudreuil, where Royle worked from 1946. His name is also on the later, "1946" copy of the "Manifesto".

officers: a President (J.C. Kirby), a Vice-President (C.J. Champion), and a Secretary (M.A. Stephens). According to Vince Goring, who joined AFSA in 1947, these positions existed, but they were not considered very important.⁴⁸ Elected officers are alluded to in the By-Laws, but it is not clear what positions existed. The By-Laws are more concerned with the national structure of AFSA. Priests from outside the Diocese of Montreal attended the second Arundel Conference and, by the middle of 1945, AFSA was attracting attention farther afield.⁴⁹ By the fall of 1946 there were AFSA Units in the Dioceses of Montreal, Toronto, Nova Scotia, and Newark, New Jersey.⁵⁰ These groups were joined together by common acceptance of the Principles and Rules. Organizationally, they were related through a liason committee which met at least twice a year and was composed of one member from each of the Units. The responsibilities of this committee, as described by the By-Laws, were to "see that the principles and rules of the Fellowship are upheld by all units" and to "act as a clearing house for problems, projects, and ideas affecting the Fellowship as a whole."⁵¹

In addition to the monthly meetings, a major focus of the life of the group was the annual Arundel Conference. The documentation suggests that there were

48. Interview with Vince Goring.

49. F. Hastings Smyth to John Peacock, July 10, 1945. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth

50. "Anglican Fellowship for Social Action at the Oratory," *Bulletin of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth*, II,5 (Twentieth Sunday After Pentecost, 1946, Feast of Our Lord Jesus Christ the King) p.2

51. *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws*, p.6

at least ten Conferences between 1943 and 1955.⁵² They offered the members of the Fellowship a valuable opportunity to reflect together, to sharpen their analysis of the situation, and to develop new theological images and understandings with which to support their common effort. The Conferences also allowed AFSA to build relationships with those outside the Diocese of Montreal, as Arundel attracted sympathetic individuals from Nova Scotia, Ontario, and the Eastern United States.

It is typical of AFSA that all those attending Arundel paid the same fee for registration, accommodation, and transportation, regardless of the distance travelled. This way, those farther away were not discouraged from participating as those within the Diocese subsidized them. As the group developed, this kind of voluntary sharing of resources became more important. In the earlier version of the Rules, members were required to pay a membership fee of

52. On Arundel 1943 (led by Joseph Fletcher) see: *Montreal Churchman*. (Oct. 1943) pp.15f; (Nov. 1943) pp.27f; (Dec. 1943) pp.20F.

On Arundel 1944 (led by Frederick Hastings Smyth) see: *Montreal Churchman*. (Aug. 1944) p.4; (Oct. 1944) pp.17f; (Nov. 1944) pp.9f; "The Arundel Conference August 21-25, 1944," Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

On Arundel 1945 (led by Gordon C. Graham of Brooklyn, N.Y.) see: *CC* (Sept. 20, 1945) p.4; *Montreal Churchman*. (July 1945) p.20; (Aug. 1945) p.23; (Oct. 1945) pp.8f.

On Arundel 1946 (led by Gilbert Cope of Coventry, England) see: *Montreal Churchman*. (April 1946) p.25; (Aug. 1946) p.4; (Nov. 1946) pp.23f; *AO* 1,2 (Oct. 1946) p.6; "The Arundel Conference, August 19-23, 1946) Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

On Arundel 1947 (led by Frederick Hastings Smyth) see: *AO* 2,12 (Oct. 1947) p.4; "The Arundel Conference, August 18-22, 1947," Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

On Arundel 1948 (led by Joseph Fletcher) see: *AO* 3,10 (Aug. 1948) p.8; "The Arundel Conference" (announcement of the 1948 Conference), Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

On Arundel 1951 (led by Leslie Hunter, Lord Bishop of Sheffield, England) see: *AO* 6,12 (Oct. 1951) p.2 and 7,2 (Dec. 1951) pp.13f.

On Arundel 1953 (led by C.E. Raven) see: *AO* 8,10 (Oct. 1953) p.3. This report says the Arundel Conference had been held "almost annually for the past decade."

In addition to these eight, two other guest speakers at Arundel Conferences are mentioned: William H. Melish and Alastair McKinnon (*AO* 11,1 [Nov. 1955] p.10). The same article claims that the Conferences were held "each August".

two dollars a year.⁵³ By the time *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws* was published, members were required to "pay a graded levy as made by the Fellowship."⁵⁴ This levy was part of an income equalization scheme in which all contributed to a common fund out of which poorer members' incomes were supplemented.⁵⁵ The increased importance of this discipline among AFSA members is underscored by the quotation from the Acts of the Apostles on the cover of *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws*: "They had all things in common....and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need". (Acts 2:44,45). This sharing in AFSA was, no doubt, inspired by the Iona Community in Scotland, the members of which pooled their resources and received stipends equal to the national average income.⁵⁶

The monthly meetings and annual conferences constituted AFSA's re-creation. They were the means by which the members of the groups were strengthened to "take on" others in the advocacy of their point of view. In the next section I will discuss the various ways in which AFSA attempted to realize its principles and rules in society and in the Church.

Ways and Means: Social Action

There were three broad social issues which engaged the members of AFSA: labour and the right to collective bargaining; the suppression of civil liberties by the Duplessis regime, and; international relations in the context of the Cold War. In these issues, AFSA members worked with others. This was in

53. "Manifesto", Rule 7.

54. *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws*, p.2.

55. Interview with Cyril Powles

56. AO 2,5 (March 1947) p.9 and 2,12 (Oct. 1947) p.6.

accordance with the rule stated in the Manifesto: "To co-operate with other groups, religious or secular, on fundamental issues of social righteousness."

AFSA's concern for labour was reflected in two of the "Christian Axioms" proposed in the AFSA pamphlet, "*A Christian Economic System*."⁵⁷ These were:

3. Every person is entitled to a living according to his need and must bear his full share of responsibility according to his ability.
5. Undemocratic regimentation of people for any reason is prohibited and no person may be exploited or wasted in the interests of commerce, industry, trade or the professions.

In the Valleyfield textile workers' strike of 1946, some AFSA members were involved in a Citizen's Committee which protested the use of the provincial police in breaking the strike.⁵⁸ This Committee also sponsored an attempt to deliver food to the strikers' families which was aborted by the police.⁵⁹ Working conditions and salaries in textile mills were still an issue for AFSA members in 1950.⁶⁰ Some members supported the famous Asbestos strike of 1949 by joining the picket line.⁶¹ Here, again, the police were used in union busting.⁶² In addition to action in support of specific strikes, *Anglican Outlook* regularly featured the labour movement in its September issue with articles by labour leaders and editorials on the church's relationship to working people.⁶³

57. John Peacock, *A Christian Economic System* (also known as "AFSA Bulletin #1"), n.d., 4pp. Papers of C.H. Powles.

58. Several AFSA members signed a letter to the editor of the *Montreal Standard* protesting Duplessis' arresting of union officials. See "Duplessis Action is Protested," *Montreal Standard* (January 18, 1947.)

59. See Arthur Elcombe and Cyril and Marjorie Powles, "The Quebec Textile Dispute," *AO* 2,1 (Nov. 1946) pp.14f.

60. See Don Heap, "New Textile Pay Contract Needed," *AO* 5,11 (Sept. 1950) p.13.

61. Interview with Vince Goring and Flynn Flanagan.

62. See *AO* 4,8 (June, 1949) p.6; 4,9 (July, 1949).

63. See, e.g. *AO* 5,11 (Sept. 1950) pp.12f. and 11,9 (Aug.-Sept. 1956) pp.7f.

The issue of abuses of human rights by the Quebec government under Duplessis was also addressed through articles and editorials in *Anglican Outlook*.⁶⁴ In addition to the use of the police in strike-breaking, AFSA protested the harassment of minority religious groups, such as Jehovah's Witnesses, Baptists, and Jews, and the notorious Padlock Law by which the Attorney General of the Province (who also happened to be the Premier, Duplessis) was empowered to padlock for up to one year any premises suspected of being used for the promulgation of "communism" or "bolshevism". The law allowed for action without trial and it did not define "to propagate communism or bolshevism." AFSA members participated with other groups in numerous protests against the Duplessis government and Flynn Flanagan acted as a trustee of a fund to support a test case against the law.⁶⁵ The religious leadership of the major Protestant denominations soon realized that, if smaller non-Roman Catholic groups were being suppressed by the police and were becoming the victims of red-baiting, they might be next. This was also AFSA's concern, as the Fellowship was perhaps more vulnerable than other groups within the Churches. AFSA was particularly concerned that the Padlock Law would begin to be used against pacifists and pro-Russian speakers such as Hewlett Johnson, the "Red Dean" of Canterbury.⁶⁶ In the general atmosphere of anti-Communism which accompanied the first stages of the Cold War, AFSA took a dangerous prophetic stance in denouncing the "Red scare" and American foreign policy as the preparations for another world war. Through *Anglican Outlook*,

64. See Cyril and Marjorie Powles, "The Civil Liberties -- of Others," *AO* 2,10 (Aug. 1947) p.12; Roland Bodger, "The Right to Speak -- in Quebec," *AO* 5,5 (March, 1950) p.12; also, *AO* 4,7 (May, 1949) p.7; 5,7 (May, 1950) p.4; 5,12 (Oct. 1950) p.5; 11,4 (Feb. 1956) p.3

65. See *AO* 5,7 (May, 1956) p.4; 11,4 (Feb. 1956) p.3

66. See *AO* 5,5 (March, 1950) p.12.

AFSA criticized the ideological biases of the secular and Church papers in their coverage of the Chinese Revolution and it denounced the regime of Chiang Kai Shek as repressive of human rights.

In taking these stands, AFSA left itself open to charges of "communism". AFSA did co-operate with communists. The Fellowship was committed to working with others to achieve social change, as stated in Rule 6 of the Manifesto: "to co-operate with other groups, religious and secular, on fundamental issues of social righteousness." However, the danger existed that AFSA would become too closely identified with the organizations with which it worked, such as labour unions, the CCF, and the Communist Party. A note appended to Rule 6 in *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws* re-emphasized AFSA's co-operation with others as strategic and based in a common commitment to a particular goal. It reminded members that,

... when any particular issue in social righteousness has been settled to the satisfaction of the Unit concerned, then that co-operation is at an end. The Anglican Fellowship for Social Action is not a means of furthering the ends of any other group as such. Its sole purpose is to work for the extension of God's Kingdom in Christian Fellowship.⁶⁷

In fact, it would have been impossible for AFSA as a whole to support any one group wholeheartedly. The AFSA members belonged to a variety of progressive organizations representing different, sometimes incompatible, political opinions.

Ways and Means: Church Reform

Although action in secular society was an integral part of AFSA's work, the greater part of the Fellowship's energies were devoted to the advocacy of its principles within the Church. Diocesan Synod, General Synod, and the

⁶⁷. *Principles, Rules, Prayers, and By-Laws*, p.2. On AFSA and "Red scare", see also below, pp.

pages of *Anglican Outlook* were important instruments for this work, but they were not the only ones used. AFSA members were able to affect the Diocese through teaching at Rexford Layman's College. The College offered courses in theology, biblical studies, and pastoral psychology to layreaders and other interested lay people. During the winter of 1945-46, Sam Pollard lectured on the prophets of Israel,⁶⁸ John Kirby lectured on Christian Worship,⁶⁹ and Ernie Reed taught a course on "Implications of the faith".

The ten lectures of Reed's course had the following titles:

God's Fatherhood and the Individual
 God's Fatherhood and Society
 God's Creatorship and the Individual
 God's Creatorship and Society
 The Incarnation and the Individual
 The Incarnation and Society
 Christ's Sacrifice and the Individual
 Christ's Sacrifice and Society
 The Holy Spirit and the Individual
 The Holy Spirit and Society.⁷⁰

This outline and Kirby's lectures demonstrate an attempt to relate the faith of the church to the life of society and so point to a means by which AFSA's point of view was propagated within the Diocese. While it is possible that AFSA members taught courses at Rexford after 1946, we cannot be sure of this as the College advertised in the *Montreal Churchman* and that paper ceased publication in December 1946. *Anglican Outlook* published Rexford lectures after 1946, but none of those published were by AFSA members dealing with the issue of the church in society.

AFSA's principles were also advocated as clerical members raised social issues and acted upon them in their parishes. An outstanding example in this

68. *Montreal Churchman* (Oct. 1945) p.11.

69. *Ibid.*, Sept. 1945, p.17. These lectures were also published in *AO* (1,9 - 2,1).

70. *Montreal Churchman* (Feb. 1946) p.22.

respect can be found in the Deanery of Bedford in the Eastern Townships where Ken Brueton and John Peacock helped to initiate a series of conferences on the church and rural life in which issues relating to stewardship of the land were discussed. The first of these meetings was held in 1943 and it was followed by several more in the next two years. While AFSA, as a group, was more concerned with industrial and economic issues, its belief that the earth's resources should be held as a common trust quite naturally led to concern for the use and ownership of the land. AFSA did advocate socialization of the land and individual members of the group supported Peacock and Brueton in their rural work. Percy Powles spoke on the topic, "Has the Church a Social Gospel for the Farmer?" at the first Conference on Rural Life in 1943 and Flynn Flanagan was the speaker at a conference in 1945.⁷¹ Other examples of parish action by AFSA members were the Regent Credit Union started by John Wagland with the support of H.H. "Nick" Walsh in 1943,⁷² and the parish mission organized by Roland Bodger at St. Cuthbert's in 1946. The theme of this mission was "God in Action in the World Today" and the topic of the addresses were: "The Drama of Redemption, Social Judgement, Social Grace, Social Sin, Social Redemption, Social Resurrection, and Social Action: the Reigning Christ."⁷³

While these activities through the Rexford Layman's College and at the parish level were important, they were not the primary means by which AFSA attempted to act on its rule, "to produce and distribute literature in support of our principles and to advocate them publicly." As we have already noted, it

71. *Ibid.*, (Nov. 1943) p.3; (June, 1944) p.16; (July, 1944) p.4; (Nov. 1944) p.20; (July, 1945) p.22; (Dec. 1945) p.22. See also *Canada and Christendom*, #15 (Sept. 1944) p.2.

72. AO 5,4 (Feb. 1950) p.17

73. AO 1,10 (March 15, 1946) p.15.

was in Diocesan Synod and through General Synod and *Anglican Outlook* that the group sought to make an impact on the life of the Church on the local and national level. Within the Diocese, AFSA attempted to have its members appointed or elected to Synod committees dealing with social issues in order that a progressive report might be submitted, debated, and implemented through Synod. In the years following the group's formal organization, the Diocesan Council for Social Service, the Bishop's Committee on the Christian Social Order, and the Basic Stipend Committee were of special interest to AFSA. The group had some success in getting its members on these various committees, but they were never in possession of an absolute majority in any of them. They also had some success in raising important and controversial issues. Unfortunately, we cannot tell exactly what happened in debate at Synod, as only the reports, motions, and decisions are recorded in the Synod Journals. AFSA did manage to introduce and pass a resolution calling on the provincial government to repeal the Padlock Law.⁷⁴ But the group never succeeded in having adopted the measures of reform which it considered most important. Only in the case of the basic stipend was "success" a real possibility. In 1948, a motion to adopt the basic stipend was passed by the clergy but blocked by the laity. The same decision was reached in 1955 when all but one opponent of the scheme were laity.⁷⁵ A similar situation obtained in AFSA's attempts to influence the whole Canadian Church through General Synod and its committees. Again, AFSA was able to have some of its members elected as delegates to General Synods between 1946 and 1959, and some of these were appointed to important committees, but their efforts would appear to have been negligible in terms of the substantive resolutions passed. In

74. AO 4,8 (June, 1947) p.2

75. Cf. Morgan, *Anglican Church and Social Action*, p.50f.

conclusion it must be said that, while the group may have been successful in initiating discussion of critical issues, in the decision-making bodies of the official Church, the record of motions passed and actions taken proves AFSA to have been ineffective in nurturing actual change in the short term. This does not negate the positive influence the group may have had on individual priests and laymen, nor does it depreciate the value or importance of AFSA for us. Rather, I would say that the significance of AFSA's work in Synods lies not in its direct influence on the daily life of the institutional Church, but in its function as a medium for the expression of an alternate vision of the church and the world.

This function was also performed by *Anglican Outlook*. *The Anglican Outlook and News Digest* was founded by the Rev. Gregory Lee and Charles Inder, both of Ottawa. They began the paper in response to weaknesses in the *Canadian Churchman* and "a need in our Canadian Church for a national news magazine which is modern and attractive in format, which is efficient and up-to-date in news coverage, which is broad and comprehensive in outlook, and which is interesting and instructive in its articles and features."⁷⁶ The issue of one national Church paper had been discussed on the editorial pages of the *Churchman* during the war,⁷⁷ and an advisory editorial committee had been established by the Executive Council of General Synod in the Fall of 1942 to support the privately-owned paper in presenting the "news and views" of the whole Canadian Church.⁷⁸ Even the editor of the *Churchman* was critical of the state of the Church press, saying

76. AO 1,1 (Nov. 1, 1945) p.7.

77. See, e.g., CC (Feb. 19, 1942) p.120; (March 5, 1942) p.151; (March 12, 1942) p.168; (March 19, 1942) p.184; (April 2, 1942) p.215; (April 23, 1942) pp.264f.

78. *Ibid.*, (Oct. 22, 1942) p.594.

there were too many papers (as each diocese attempted to publish its own monthly), most of which operated at a loss, requiring subsidies.⁷⁹ It is likely that Lee was familiar with these issues, as he had been a regular contributor to the *Churchman* during the war.⁸⁰ When *Anglican Outlook* published its first number in November, 1945, the editor of the *Churchman* welcomed the appearance of a second national paper. At the same time, he informed his readers that the *Churchman* had been considering a change in format "for some time" and that this would be forthcoming.⁸¹

In June, 1946, just eight months after it had begun publication, *Anglican Outlook* raised the issue of a "Church paper of Church papers."⁸² It was clear that one national Church paper would be more efficient and economical, but *Anglican Outlook* feared that official sponsorship might lead to censorship, albeit "amiable and informal". The issue at stake was editorial policy, for *Anglican Outlook* did not want to support the move to one national paper if it meant endorsing "an editorial policy which consists only in a nervous effort to echo the opinions or to flatter the prejudices of readers -- particularly influential readers." This was seen to be "only an inexcusable waste of our limited pulp-wood resources." There would appear to have been a similar fear among the paper's readers. One correspondent, obviously tongue-in-cheek, wrote, "I hope you will not be amalgamated into an official journal -- a sort of ecclesiastical *Pravda*."⁸³ The issue of one national paper was raised at General

79. *Ibid.*, (Oct. 22, 1942) p.594.

80. Gregory Lee wrote "Radio Column" for CC until May, 1942, and "Side-glances" from May, 1942 until July, 1945.

81. CC (Nov. 15, 1945) p.2.

82. *Ibid.*, 1,16 (June 15, 1946) p.11.

83. *Ibid.*, 2,1 (Nov. 1946) p.19.

Synod in September, 1946, on the assumption that "the limited size of our constituency precludes the adequate support of two papers."⁸⁴ The motion eventually passed by the Synod recognized the 75 years of service given to the Canadian Church by the *Canadian Churchman* and called upon the Executive Committee to negotiate with the editors of both papers in the process of establishing "a Church paper as can serve as the organ of the whole Church."⁸⁵ It also deemed it "inadvisable" for General Synod to assume responsibility for the publication and editorship of such a paper. This concern would appear to have been forgotten by the Fall of 1947, when the Executive Committee of General Synod decided to support the *Canadian Churchman*.⁸⁶ Early in the next year it was decided that the *Churchman* should come under the direction of the General Board of Religious Education, a department of General Synod.⁸⁷

It is not surprising that *Anglican Outlook* failed to woo the Executive Committee, for the paper had become very critical of General Synod. This had not been its initial purpose. In its first number, *Anglican Outlook* announced that it had "no axe to grind" and that it would attempt "simply to be representative of and to serve the WHOLE of the Church of England in Canada."⁸⁸ The result was that, in its first dozen issues, *Anglican Outlook* published rather innocuous and platitudinous editorials on the family, the church, and social issues. This was sensed by at least one AFSA member who wrote to the paper in the spring of 1946. John Peacock had received *Canada and Christendom* and,

84. *GSJP* 1946, p.45.

85. *Ibid.*, pp.67 & 80.

86. *AO*, 2,12 (Oct. 1947) p.14

87. *AO*, 3,5 (March 1948) p.14.

88. *AO* 1,1 (Nov. 1, 1945) p.1.

as Feilding had given his subscription list to Lee and Inder, he had been receiving *Anglican Outlook* from its start. Peacock said that when the new paper had appeared, he had hoped that it would be "at least progressive if not radical", but it had become clear to him that *Anglican Outlook* was "most anxious to be and stay conservative in its statements." He wished to cancel his subscription. Lee responded, saying that the paper represented neither "the Conservative Party at prayer" nor "the Communist Party at Mass."⁸⁹

Within a couple of months, however, there was an obvious change. The editorial of the May 1, 1946 issue dealt with religion and politics. The editor dismissed the hope that the two could somehow be separated and he made his point with a series of rhetorical questions:

Finally, it must be asked: how can a Church deeply involved in the social order, escape responsibility for that social order, and how can it discharge its responsibility without taking action which its enemies will immediately denounce as "political"? How can a Church which owns lands, invests its funds, invokes the law for its protection, and preaches about Christian vocation, claim to live in a world of its own serenely aloof from the sordid problems of property, finance, legal systems and industrial relations? It is significant that in the modern world, with its dangerous drift toward totalitarianism, that the voices grow even louder which urge Christians to keep out of politics -- which is, in effect to ask them to shut their eyes, deaden their minds, and drug their consciences. Even if the Church could be persuaded to ignore politics, there is no guarantee -- indeed, there is no likelihood -- that politics would ignore the Church. There is no haven to which the pious can fly in order to escape the hounds of modern secularism.⁹⁰

The shift in editorial policy was formalized in October, 1946. The editor noted that *Anglican Outlook* had begun to arouse concern because it had published

89. *AO*, 1,9 (March, 1946) pp.6 & 15.

90. *Ibid.*, 1,13 (May 1, 1946) p.9.

unpopular points of view. The editorial announced that the paper would not be muzzled, and said,

Beginning with Volume II (Nov. 1st issue), the *Outlook* will deal editorially and in specially chosen articles with some of the live issues before the Church and the World today. We shall exercise our prerogative to deal with these issues fearlessly and without consideration for what is considered "safe" or "official".⁹¹

The editorial which established *Anglican Outlook* as a paper "against the stream" appeared just a few months later, in February, 1947. An outspoken and sweeping criticism of the official Church was published under the title "Timocracy -- or Fence-Sitting." In it, the Church press, the Council for Social Service, and General Synod came under attack for their failure to speak courageously on social issues from a Christian point of view. The editor wrote,

Timocracy, fear for its respectability as an institution, fence-sitting on important and immediate issues, are robbing the church of its rightful heritage of leadership in opinion and action. Prayer demands performance; faith demands works. Let the church and its leaders stand vigourously and unafraid for righteousness for the common people everywhere, and let the church and its press slough off their timidity to present the right courageously and apply⁹² their platitudes to specific current situations.

The Montreal AFSA had been actively supporting the change in editorial policy announced in October, 1946. Lee had met several AFSA members at General Synod in September of that year, and since then, the editorial board of *Anglican Outlook* had been meeting in Montreal under Lee's chairmanship.⁹³ Evidence of AFSA's influence on the paper can be seen in the editorials published. Between

91. *Ibid.*, 1,20 (Oct. 1, 1946) p.20.

92. *Ibid.*, 2,4 (Feb. 1947) p.9.

93. Cf. *Ibid.*, 11,1 (Nov. 1955) p.7.

October, 1946 and March, 1949, the paper published "Timocracy -- or Fence-sitting", called upon the Church to move beyond generalizations and statements of principle to specific condemnations of social evils, and condemned the Church of England in Canada for its failure to live out Christian principles in its own life.⁹⁴ The paper also began to speak to American foreign policy, international militarism, and the popular fear and suspicion in North America of anything related to Russia or socialism.⁹⁵ These two areas of concern were held together in the conviction that "the only way open to us to preserve international peace is to be whole-heartedly committed to the cause of social justice in our own country."⁹⁶ The paper also reflected AFSA's theological concerns. *Anglican Outlook* was critical of the Church's pre-occupation with individual salvation and the doctrine of God, and it advocated attention to the Incarnation and Resurrection as the safeguards against the view that the material world is of no consequence. It also emphasized the "Christian doctrine of man" as the true foundation of action in the world. The paper consciously identified with "the great sacramentalists who practised social action" and so placed itself within the English tradition of incarnational socialism.

Anglican Outlook continued to be printed in Ottawa until February, 1949. When Gregory Lee retired from the venture, the editorial board, already in Montreal, came under the chairmanship of H.H. "Nick" Walsh, who was Professor of Church History at McGill and an AFSA member. Beginning with the March, 1949 issue, the paper was printed in Montreal. Editorials printed after this date

94. *AO*, 2,4 (Feb. 1947) p.9; 2,9 (July, 1947) p.10; 2,8 (June, 1947) p.10.

95. *AO*, 2,2 (Dec. 1946) p.11; 2,3 (Jan. 1947) p.11; 2,6 (April, 1947) p.10; 2,7 (May, 1947) p.10; 2,11 (Sept. 1947) p.10.

96. *AO* 2,7 (May, 1947) p.10.

can be considered representative of AFSA's point of view, for while they were written by one person, they were reviewed by the editorial board to ensure that they reflected its views.⁹⁷ When this statement of editorial process was published in the *Anglican Outlook* of March, 1950, the board consisted of 23 men, at least 16 of whom were AFSA members.⁹⁸ Articles written by AFSA members were subject to a similar process of revision. Manuscripts were submitted to the editor who would raise points of concern in an AFSA meeting and changes were made if the group wanted certain ideas stated differently.⁹⁹

By the late 'fifties, the editorial board was having difficulty managing the paper. *Anglican Outlook* was never able to depend solely on its income from subscriptions and advertising. Although Flynn Flanagan had managed to solicit financial assistance from some of his wealthier boyhood friends, such as John Molson, this was not enough to sustain the paper over the long term.¹⁰⁰ Finally, the decision to move the paper to a wider base was taken, and in the Fall of 1960, *Anglican Outlook* became the *Christian Outlook* under the editorship of an ecumenical board.¹⁰¹

97. *AO*, 5,5 (March, 1950) p.7.

98. Those listed as members of the editorial board of *AO* in 5,5 (March, 1950) p.2 were: (Montreal AFSA) Roland Bodger, R.H. Corbett, J.C. Flanagan, D.B. Harrison, J.C. Kirby, S.L. Pollard, E.S. Reed (then living in Gaspé), M.A. Stephens, H.H. Walsh; (Montreal SCC) J.F. Wagland; (Other AFSA members) R.C. Elliott (N.S.) D.C. Candy (Toronto), J.E. DeWolf (N.S.), W.M. Weber (New Jersey), G.S. Tanton (N.S.), K.H. Tufts (N.S.), and; (others) K.C. Bolton, W.A. Ferguson, W.H. Davison J.F. Fletcher, W. McKenna, W.E. Powles, R.V. Metcalfe. (Ferguson, Davison, and Fletcher, although sympathetic, were never members of AFSA; some of the others may have been members.)

99. Interview with Vince Goring.

100. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

101: See *AO* 15,8 (June-July 1960) p.6.

Anglican Outlook was the most important aspect of AFSA's work because it was the means of greatest influence. Through it the group was able to share its perspective with many more people than would ever have been possible in Synods and at Arundel. *Anglican Outlook* also allowed AFSA to support others across the country who shared the group's alienation from the ecclesiastical and social *status quo*. The underside of this greater influence, however, was that the paper also became the arena in which AFSA engaged an opposition which grew in proportion to the paper's profile.

Allies

The responses of the official Church to the Christian Sociology presented by Malvern point to a fairly progressive atmosphere in the Canadian Church during the last half of the war. This apparent openness to creative social thinking within the Church also provided the opportunity for more critical individuals and groups, such as Charles Feilding and the correspondents of *Canada and Christendom*, to express their judgement upon the Church and its failure to disassociate itself from the *status quo*. As a product of this dynamic, AFSA was able to draw on support from others within the Church still under the influence of Temple and Malvern and from other progressive groups outside the Church.

Within the Diocese of Montreal, AFSA received support from a few other clergy. The most notable example is Canon W.H. Davison, who had been the Rector of the Anglo-Catholic parish of St. John the Evangelist since 1917. In an interview, Flynn Flanagan said,

The most outstanding man for his time, to me, was Canon Davison. He stood up against the whole establishment on our behalf and it took a hell of a lot of courage at Synod. He cut his own throat.

He could have been a bishop for sure instead of Dixon, if he hadn't been an outspoken, real Christian.¹⁰²

Davison had supported the consideration of social questions in his parish during the war,¹⁰³ and he had served on the Bishop's Committee on the Christian Social Order (formerly the Bishop's Committee on Post-War Problems). Beginning in the fall of 1943, he had served as the chairman of the Montreal Council on the Christian Social Order, an ecumenical group which, by 1945, had representatives from the Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Russian Orthodox Churches and five Protestant denominations. The Council's work seems to have been limited to the passing of resolutions and the issuing of public statements.¹⁰⁴ Another supportive priest in the Diocese was Kenneth Naylor, who also served on the Montreal Council. Naylor supported AFSA in the Diocesan Synod of 1945.¹⁰⁵ At the General Synod in 1949, he supported AFSA's criticisms of the suggestion that General Synod meet less frequently and with fewer delegates.¹⁰⁶ In general, however, the support of Davison and Naylor was neither constant nor unequivocal. Both were critical of articles in *Anglican Outlook*¹⁰⁷ and Davison was opposed to the basic stipend.¹⁰⁸

AFSA received the indirect support of Cannon Judd and the Council for Social Service as the *Bulletin* continued to legitimize Christian concern for the life

102. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

103. See, *Montreal Churchman* (April, 1943) p.17.

104. On the Montreal Council on the Christian Social Order, see, Cooper, *Blessed Communion*, p.199; *Montreal Churchman*, (Jan. 1946) p.19; (Feb. 1946) p.9; (June, 1945) p.23.

105. *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1945) p.20.

106. *AO*, 5,1 (Nov. 1949) p.12.

107. See Davison's letter in *AO* 2,11 (Sept. 1947) p.14 and Naylor's letter in *AO*, 2,4 (Feb. 1947) p.17.

108. *Montreal Churchman* (Oct. 1943) p.20.

of society. Generally speaking, however, AFSA was too radical in its critique of capitalism and its condemnations of the Church's economic life to win the support of the CSS. The converse would also hold, that the Council was too cautious and conservative to endorse AFSA's position. Judd was especially reserved on the issue of Christian advocacy of specific social alternatives, as he held that it was not the role of the church to support "blueprints" for society.¹⁰⁹

While it has not been possible to investigate fully AFSA's relationships to other groups, it is clear that AFSA received moral support from at least two other groups in Montreal: the FCSO and the McGill SCM (Student Christian Movement). Flynn Flanagan had been involved in the League for Social Reconstruction, the CCF, and the FCSO since the thirties, and was a friend of the socialist professors at McGill: Frank Scott, Eugene Forsey, and R.B.Y. Scott.¹¹⁰ Another member of the FCSO who was very supportive was Alex Cameron, a United Church minister from the Eastern Townships. Cameron and other former members of the FCSO participated with AFSA in supporting the textile workers' strike in Valleyfield in 1946.¹¹¹ There was also a relationship between the Montreal FCSO and the McGill SCM, as some of the students occasionally did leg-work, such as ushering at meetings, for the FCSO.¹¹² Several AFSA members had belonged to the SCM, notably Cyril and Marjorie Powles, Vince Goring, W.J. Bishop, and, in Toronto, Doug Candy. Bishop and Goring both left parish work to serve as SCM

109. AO 1,7 (Feb. 1946) p.12. See also, AO 2,8 (June, 1947) p.18.

110. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

111. Interview with Cyril Powles. Cameron signed a letter protesting Duplessis' treatment of labour with six AFSA members. See "Duplessis Action Is Protested," *Montreal Standard* (Jan. 18, 1947).

112. Interview with Cyril Powles.

secretaries. Another priest and former member of the McGill SCM, Don (or Dan) Heap, was supportive of AFSA, although he never became a member.

One group with which AFSA had a close relationship was the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth, although it must also be said that this relationship was not always supportive. Contact with the SCC was first made through Joseph Fletcher, who recommended Frederick Hastings Smyth as the speaker for the second Arundel Conference. Hastings Smyth's early correspondence regarding AFSA communicates hope for a close relationship with the Montreal group. Shortly before the 1944 Conference, he wrote to Sam Pollard,

... I hope that the Conference may contribute to a closer consolidation of our ranks so that we may find ways of taking organized part in the advancing world revolutionary enterprise. Plans for organization -- this should be the practical fruits of such a conference as you propose.¹¹³

His initial impression of AFSA was very positive. He described the Conference as a "success" and said,

They have got together a perfectly swell bunch of Montreal Priests (sic) as a little nucleus for proper Catholic Action. I only wish that we had anything like them around here.¹¹⁴

While he described the majority of the AFSA members as "Low Church" liturgically, Smyth said they retained "a kind of Sacramental sense" which he had experienced in England and found lacking "even in the so-called 'high' quarters of the (Protestant Episcopal) Church" in the U.S.A.¹¹⁵ In the same letter he expressed the hope that two or three members of the group might visit the Oratory of

113. Frederick Hastings Smyth to the Reverend S.L. Pollard, n.d. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth. Reference to the upcoming conference and Smyth's preaching engagement on Sunday, August 24, 1944, indicate the letter was written sometime in the summer of that year.

114. F. Hastings Smyth to Peter Ruderman, September 11, 1944. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

115. Ibid.

the SCC in Cambridge and said, "It is even suggested that there may be a nucleus here for the formation of a unit of the S.C.C. We shall see."

AFSA did not move to form an SCC cell. In a letter to John Peacock of July, 1945, Smyth said he was "somewhat disappointed" that this had not happened, but he understood that the SCC's radicalism might be a hinderance to AFSA in some of its practical work.¹¹⁶ He recognized that AFSA had a wider appeal than the SCC. Nonetheless, as a Marxist he was very critical of the CCF influence in AFSA and realized, as early as January, 1946, that AFSA would be incompatible with the SCC if the Social Democrats became the dominant force in the group. His point of view was clearly expressed in a letter to Sam Pollard when he said,

I don't like this infiltration of S.D.'s (Social Democrats). I don't trust the theoretical basis of the C.C.F. and I wish that AFSA had nothing to do with it. It's too bad that Flynn F. is so mixed up with it, and, as I understand, with AFSA's blessing. We must never get entangled with anti-communists, and I've never heard worse red-baiting than from C.C.F. members in Canada. ...one cannot escape the objective truth that the Marxian basis of social change is scientifically sound, and that reformists are the stooges (sometimes wittingly, more often, unwittingly) of the worst kind of social reaction.¹¹⁷

Despite these reservations, Smyth moved to bring AFSA closer to the SCC. As some AFSA members later joined the SCC, it is likely that Smyth was acting with the support of the more radical members within the Montreal group. He attended the Arundel Conference in August, 1946, and a liason meeting between the two groups was planned for October of that year. Another point on which AFSA and the SCC differed was worship, and Smyth and Peacock both hoped that

116. F. Hastings Smyth to John Peacock, July 10, 1945. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

117. F. Hastings Smyth to Sam Pollard, January 24, 1946. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

AFSA's liturgical sense and especially its understanding of the offertory of the Mass would be sharpened through this meeting.¹¹⁸

Three AFSA members (one each from Montreal, Nova Scotia, and Newark, New Jersey) visited the Oratory on October 15, 1946. While Smyth wrote positively of the meeting in a letter to Ray Corbett,¹¹⁹ his other letters reveal his deeply-felt reservations concerning AFSA. To one SCC member he wrote,

... the present organization, so far as I can discover, is on nothing like the level of our own S.C.C. In fact they seem to have members who are very anti-Communist and who know nothing of Marxism, and others who are terribly afraid of being "High Church." Now such an organization can be of great use if it gets going. So far, all that I have seen of it gives me the impression of great enthusiasm and earnestness of purpose. It can include I think a great many more people than would come all the way into the S.C.C. But what I am trying to discover at this point is just how we may conceivably work in close contact with them, while at the same time we in no way equivocate our position. This I don't yet know exactly. I only do know that when the bunch first organized in Montreal, they did not think it possible to organize themselves as an actual unit of this Society. Our conditions are too extreme, so they thought, to enable a sufficiently wide membership. ... I am not yet convinced that Membership in the S.C.C. is entirely compatible with membership in AFSA.¹²⁰

At the same time, an article in the *Bulletin* of the SCC said that, while AFSA was not as advanced as the SCC in matters of dogma, liturgy, and politics, it was hoped that the two groups might move closer together in the future. At this

118. F. Hastings Smyth to John Peacock, September 30, 1946. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

119. F. Hastings Smyth to Ray Corbett, October 19, 1946. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

120. F. Hastings Smyth to the Rev. Frank V.H. Carthy, October 16, 1946. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

point, the idea of AFSA as a "front" for the SCC was proposed in the following terms:

For while the S.C.C. can help the AFSA in the clarification of its concepts both in Liturgy and in scientific secular analysis, AFSA, being as it is more broadly based within the parish membership of the Church, can be of great value in mediating our theories and analyses to a wider Church public than the S.C.C. is apt to reach with its more demanding theoretical basis.¹²¹

This vision probably had the support of those AFSA members who were attracted to Smyth's theology of the church in history. However, as the adoption of the SCC's theoretical framework implied the displacement of the CCF or Social Democratic influence in AFSA, attempts to forge this unity of opinion naturally met with opposition. Smyth's letters to Ray Corbett and John Peacock in the Spring of 1947 refer to "difficulties" in AFSA. Smyth attributed these to "a difference of understanding and of analysis of the nature of the social process in history" and said,

For myself I am convinced of the general validity of the dialectic analysis of all history. And I think that any Incarnational group, if it is to sustain its inner unity and is to act effectively within its environment, must come to agreement in this basic matter of scientific belief. I can imagine instructed dialecticians working along with those who are more or less ignorant of the theory: but I cannot imagine them working for very long with those who *deny* it. Because affirmation and denial of the dialectic is precisely the division between reformists and revolutionaries.¹²²

Smyth had an opportunity to address this problem of "orthodoxy" when he

121. "Anglican Fellowship for Social Action at the Oratory," *Bulletin of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth* 11,5 (Twentieth Sunday After Pentecost, 1946, Feast of Our Lord Jesus Christ the King) p.2. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

122. F. Hastings Smyth to Ray Corbett, April 2, 1947. Cf. F. Hastings Smyth to John Peacock, April 2, 1947. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

spoke on the theme "Dialectics for Christians" at the 1947 Arundel Conference. However, it would appear that he failed to win over the majority in AFSA, for he returned from the conference "more convinced than ever" that leadership from the SCC was necessary to keep AFSA from falling entirely under the influence of the Social Democrats. He began to propose the establishment of an SCC cell in New Jersey whose members would work within the AFSA group there.¹²³ Smyth's correspondence does not make clear the success or failure of this strategy in New Jersey.

Smyth did have some success in gaining SCC members from the Montreal AFSA group, but his strategy of infiltration failed. When John Wagland and John Rowe joined the SCC in July, 1948, they were "kicked out of AFSA." According to Smyth, "the AFSA bunch decided that they could not tolerate what they called a 'divided loyalty'."¹²⁴ Unfortunately, there is no documentation available presenting AFSA's understanding of the conflict. Two of the AFSA members I interviewed said that the SCC members left voluntarily.¹²⁵

Despite the controversy between the SCC and AFSA, Hastings Smyth played an important role in shaping AFSA's thought. In general, he was an exponent of sacramental socialism and so contributed to AFSA's understanding of the centrality of the Incarnation and the church's revolutionary role in history. Specifically, he impressed on AFSA the importance of the liturgy as a focus

123. F. Hastings Smyth to the Rev. Frank V.H. Carthy, August 30, 1947. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

124. F. Hastings Smyth to Marshall Swan, July 22, 1948. Papers of Frederick Hastings Smyth.

125. Interviews with Vince Goring and Flynn Flanagan.

for social change and convinced the group of the need to recapture, in the offertory of the Mass, a sense of the transfiguration or "trans-ordering" of the whole of human existence. The great attraction of the SCC for some AFSA members was the theology of Hastings Smyth, for it filled a gap in AFSA's position. AFSA never produced a systematic theology, but relied on an informal synthesis of ideas and images borrowed from other progressive groups and thinkers. The lack of a comprehensive and consistent theological position was considered by Smyth to be one of AFSA's great weaknesses. The SCC, on the other hand, offered a clear and systematic apologetic for radical social action built upon a Catholic framework. While AFSA used elements of Smyth's thought to support its action, the group was not willing to adopt his system as a whole. I believe this was Smyth's real frustration with AFSA. In the end, there were only four AFSA members who joined the SCC: Marjorie and Cyril Powles, John Wagland, and John Rowe.

I have already mentioned the AFSA groups outside Montreal, in Toronto, Nova Scotia, and New Jersey. Unfortunately, the details of the inter-relationships of these groups are obscure, and more research is needed to bring them to light. At this point, it would simply be appropriate to note that the Montreal group had *some* support outside the Diocese, although it is not clear when or how this solidarity was expressed.

Opposition

Some support would have been helpful as the Montreal AFSA encountered opposition in the ecclesiastical hierarchy and from laymen in the business community. Shortly after John Dixon was elected Bishop of Montreal, a group of businessmen, concerned about the views being expressed by the more radical members of Synod, invited Dixon to lunch at the St. James Club. They explained that, if this "red" group persisted in its activities, the Church would begin

losing money.¹²⁶ This kind of intimidation would appear to have had a rather direct effect. In the early years of his episcopate Dixon moved away from his identification with Temple to a much more cautious, restrained, and pious attitude to social issues. This movement is obvious from a comparison of his address on "The Church's Right to Speak" at the "Christianity or Chaos" conference of January, 1943, with the trite and almost smarmy letters he published each month in the *Montreal Churchman*. At the conference Dixon was critical of the individualism latent in the Reformation which undermined the tradition of Christian social responsibility and he denounced the "fatal compromise of Christian idealism for private life and pagan realism for public life, false principles left to work their evil results while individuals and groups try to ease the sores by Christian Charity."¹²⁷ His letters in the *Montreal Churchman* following his enthronement reflected none of these attitudes. Most of them centred on little expositions of Scripture, anecdotes, or the administrative and organizational needs of the institution -- funds, manpower, and returning war veterans. The first time he touched on social issues was in the June, 1944 edition, where he wrote about the "New Order" and the Kingdom of God. In this article, Dixon minimized the relationship between the will of God and social justice by stressing the "spiritual" character of the Kingdom and the soothing, inner peace which it implies. He wrote,

When the Messiah comes, the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the poor -- have employment and better houses and

126. Interview with Flynn Flanagan. Flynn knew of this meeting as one of those present later told him about it.

127. *Montreal Churchman*, (March, 1943) pp.8-9.

more food? No. The poor have the gospel preached to them.¹²⁸

Because of his movement from support of moderate reform to resistance to change, from criticism to passivity, Dixon emerges as an analogue of the general shift in popular attitudes from openness to retrenchment. The issue on which Dixon's opposition to AFSA was most obvious was the basic stipend. He is reported to have said that, even if the plan were passed by Synod he would veto it.¹²⁹ The reasons for his disapproval are not clear, but he would appear to have believed that the plan would lead to "lying and hypocrisy among the clergy."¹³⁰ It is also possible that Dixon did not give jobs to some progressive priests.¹³¹

The Bishop was not AFSA's most successful opponent. The accommodation to the *status quo* prevalent in post-war North America found its strongest expression in the Diocese in the loosely-organized group of businessmen and lawyers which emerged to resist AFSA. Some of these were Judd McKinnon, Jackson Dodds, R.P. Jellet, H.L. Cross, and B.M. Hallward.¹³² The most visible member of the group and the one who became their unofficial spokesman was P.C. Armstrong, "a consultant economics adviser (sic) and public relations executive in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway."¹³³ It is probable that his first contact with AFSA was made in 1947 when he became a member of the Diocesan Council for

128. *Ibid.*, (June, 1944) p.5.

129. Interview with Flynn Flanagan and Vince Goring.

130. *AO*, 5,8 (June, 1950) p.2.

131. Interview with Sam Pollard.

132. Interview with Flynn Flanagan

133. *AO*, 4,3 (Jan. 1949) p.9.

Social Service, serving with Sam Pollard, Flynn Flanagan, M.A. Stephens, Nick Walsh, and Ray Corbett. It was a year later, in May 1948, that P.C. Armstrong began his lively correspondence with the *Anglican Outlook*. His letters and the *Outlook's* replies dealt with the basic stipend, pensions, Diocesan politics, economic ideology, and international peace.

P.C. Armstrong entered the debate over basic stipend with an article in *Anglican Outlook* titled "A Layman Looks at Basic Stipend."¹³⁴ He correctly noted that the arguments in favour of basic stipend were based on moral considerations and aimed at a brotherly sharing of material rewards among the clergy. His major objection was to the assumption that the Church could move from the present practice of congregationally-based stipends to a centrally-organized system. Armstrong held that, because stipends are paid by the congregation from voluntary donations by the laity, they cannot be considered guaranteed payments which could simply be transferred to a central, diocesan fund. He said it was unrealistic to assume that a congregation which paid a stipend of \$4,000 to its rector would raise the same sum in order to donate it to a central fund. Furthermore, he noted that stipends are only a part of a clergyman's financial reward and he feared that the basic stipend system would forbid the donation of personal gifts or the provision of special amenities to the rector by individual lay people, or that it would lead to a system of basic rectories. In his argument, Armstrong focused on the congregation as the basic expression of the church and he emphasized the relationship of the congregation to the parish priest. He held that the basic stipend would entail "a revolutionary change in the constitution of the church." As an alternative, he proposed that the problem of poor stipends could be dealt with

¹³⁴. AO, 5,9 (July, 1950) pp.10-11.

by "trying to increase the spirit of giving" and suggested that any clergy who wished to enter into a voluntary pooling of their salaries might do so immediately.

The next issue of *Anglican Outlook* contained letters from a couple of correspondents who disagreed with P.C. Armstrong.¹³⁵ "Parish Priest" stressed the "morally intolerable" dilemma faced by married clergy who must choose between their vocation and the economic needs of their families, and he attempted to meet some of Armstrong's specific objections. He argued that the laity make donations to the church, and denounced P.C. Armstrong's congregational bias as a "low opinion of our people." His letter said, "It is not one particular man they are supporting unless the deity they worship is the local parish god." He noted the system of paying missionary clergy from a central fund, saying this proved the willingness of the laity to support the Church beyond the parish. He also noted that this mission system was also denounced as unrealistic and utopian when it was first proposed. With respect to forbidding personal gifts to the clergy, "Parish Priest" suggested that the clergy need to be exposed to "the stresses and strains of life" and not "wrapped in cotton wool and protected.": "To forbid 'extras' may make for a better, because more understanding, priesthood."

In the same issue, a letter from Roland Bodger accused P.C. Armstrong of assuming that the laity were not as Christian as the clergy. Bodger's letter was very short and his point not well-argued, but it would appear that he was basing his accusation on Armstrong's suggestion that the clergy should enter into a voluntary sharing of their stipends because their congregations are much too selfish and tight-fisted to support anyone but "their man". This was the

¹³⁵. AO 5,10 (Aug. 1950) p.14

crux of the argument which P.C. Armstrong refined and reiterated in a long letter to the *Outlook*, published in October 1950.¹³⁶ He said that, of the two available means of implementing the basic stipend, only voluntary adoption by the clergy was possible because adoption by the laity through Church legislation would lead to a disruption of the relationship between incumbents and their congregations.

Leaving aside for the moment the ideological dispute underlying this controversy, I believe the differences of opinion between AFSA and P.C. Armstrong on basic stipend can be related to a fundamentally different experience of "church". For Armstrong, the church was the local congregation whereas for AFSA, the church was understood in more global, catholic and trans-historical terms. This difference in perspective is also evident in the positions held by AFSA and P.C. Armstrong on the question of pensions.

Early in 1950, the Parish of St. Matthias, the wealthy Westmount congregation of which both P.C. Armstrong and Flynn Flanagan were members, established a retirement fund for its incumbent. At the parochial meeting at which this action was moved and voted upon, only Flynn Flanagan dissented and he later expressed his disapproval in *Anglican Outlook*. AFSA's basic concern with stipends was the inequality of remuneration which encouraged clergy to "sell-out" the Gospel for the sake of wealthier parishes and the economic security they offered. AFSA was pleased, therefore, that pensions were based on years of service and not on contributions made to the pension fund, for thus a priest's income in retirement would reflect his labour, not his "success" in climbing the ladder of ecclesiastical hierarchy. However, because AFSA was fundamentally opposed to unequal pay for equal work, the St. Matthias retirement fund was seen to be

¹³⁶. AO 5,12 (Oct. 1950) p.13.

the worst that could be produced by an unjust system. In his response to *Anglican Outlook's* criticism of the fund, P.C. Armstrong said there was no reason why a parish which paid its own bills and contributed to diocesan funds should not provide for the needs of its rector.¹³⁷ He told the paper not to interfere in what was essentially an internal matter for the parish alone to decide. Unfortunately for Armstrong, Diocesan Synod decided that the issue was important to the whole Church and passed a resolution which disapproved of "the setting up of Parochial Pension Funds for the Clergy."¹³⁸ In the June 1950 issue of *Anglican Outlook*, a letter from J.C. Kirby attacked Armstrong's misunderstanding of Anglican polity and his implicit understanding of the Church.¹³⁹ Kirby argued that the Diocese, with its bishop, (and not the congregation and its pastor) is the basic unit of the Church and that Armstrong's "self-sustaining autonomous parish" is an anomaly in Anglican polity. He criticized Armstrong's tacit suggestion that "those who pay the most money to the general funds of the whole church have the greatest right to be heard," and he defended *Anglican Outlook's* right to criticize St. Matthias saying that in the Church, as in a family, "what effects (sic) one is the concern of all."

With these two issues, basic stipend and pensions, and in the underlying issue of congregational autonomy, P.C. Armstrong entered into conflict with AFSA's concern that the economic life of the Church reflect the fellowship proclaimed by the Gospel. A related "ecclesiastical" issue on which Armstrong corresponded with *Anglican Outlook*, was the politics of Synod. In a letter published in June, 1951, he responded to Sam Pollard's charge that there was

137. *AO*, 5,7 (May, 1950) p.13.

138. *AO*, 5,8 (June, 1950) p.2.

139. *Ibid.*, p.15.

circulated at Synod a blacklist of persons not to be voted for.¹⁴⁰ Armstrong insisted that no such list had been circulated, although he was aware that members often discussed whom they would elect to the various committees of Synod. In the same letter, however, Armstrong also complained about a "small but highly organized minority" which had been having its members elected to committees and delegations "by concentrating their votes on the names of a few individuals." This was, of course, a reference to AFSA, as the group had been employing such a strategy since the war. A further letter from Armstrong published in December, 1951, revealed that a similar strategy had, in fact, been used by AFSA's opponents.¹⁴¹ In this letter, he again complained that "a small but highly organized group" had been "plumping" in elections, and said:

Others in the Synod, impatient at this obvious thwarting of the normal process of election, have agreed among themselves to select a complete slate for various committees and delegations, and have had no difficulty in obtaining large majorities for that slate.

On this point, both AFSA and its adversaries from the business community employed a strategy based on control of Synod's committees. By keeping AFSA members out of such positions, Armstrong and "the boys" (as they were called by Flynn Flanagan) could ensure that progressive or radical motions would not be presented for debate and "red" opinions would not be aired.

The other issues on which AFSA and P.C. Armstrong entered into conflict related to AFSA's general resistance to the "McCarthyism" of the late 'forties

140. AO 6,8 (June, 1951) pp.14-15.

141. AO 4,4 (Dec. 1951) pp.12-13.

and early 'fifties. As we have already noted, progressive attitudes became quite unpopular following the war and criticisms of the *status quo* were met with charges of "communism" or treason. AFSA and *Anglican Outlook* became the targets of such red-baiting because of their views on the relationship of socialism and Christianity, their critique of Christendom, and their unwillingness to support American foreign policy.

In its response to the Red scare, AFSA tended to proceed *via negativa*; that is, the group tended not to emphasize their positive advocacy of a socialist alternative to the existing order, but, rather, criticized the assumption that capitalism and America are essentially "Christian". In so doing, AFSA attempted to identify and emphasize the contradictions in the dominant ideas of the day. This strategy employed many different arguments. For instance, in response to various correspondents who had accused *Anglican Outlook* of expressing communist views, the editor denied as a false dichotomy the division of the world into two antagonistic camps, claiming that both Communists and the Western democracies share a common bondage to determinism.¹⁴² Then, quoting Berdyayev, he presented Christianity as a third power capable of bringing faith and order to the chaos of the industrialized world. The essence of this apologetic is clear when the editor writes,

May we humbly suggest to our critics that when we take issue with what we believe to be a horrible caricature of Christianity (i.e., the Christian society of Western democracies) that we are not "going Communist", but that we are endeavouring to hold before our readers an Incarnational view of society that stands in sharp contrast to the deterministic creeds of Western Capitalism and Russian Communism.¹⁴³

142. AO 4,4 (Feb. 1949) p.8

143. *Ibid.*

A similar argument used in addressing the popular mood was based on the exhortation, "Judge not, that you be not judged " (Mt. 7:1). AFSA attempted to point to instances in which capitalism was guilty of the same offences used to discredit communism. In November, 1948, Sam Pollard wrote,

Before accusing others of lying propaganda we should be quite certain that our tongue is clean and our pen is accurate; before swallowing the newspaper headlines on the perfidity of other countries, we should be prepared to pass judgement on our own instead of taking it for granted that we alone, whether as individuals or nations, manifest charity, nobility, truth, goodness and a devotion to peace and democracy.¹⁴⁴

This kind of argument was used to condemn prejudice on the basis of political opinion in North America¹⁴⁵ and to relativize condemnations of practices in Communist countries.¹⁴⁶ A variation on this theme was presented by J.C. Kirby who wrote,

(One) wonders what difference there is between taking sides in a class war and in an international war; most ecclesiastics bless the latter and curse the former.¹⁴⁷

In so reasoning, AFSA was attempting to overthrow the rigid definition of the international situation which saw communism and the West in simple terms of black and white. This argument was extended and developed to become a challenge to some of the basic assumptions underlying the popular vision of Western democracy as the well-spring and guardian of freedom and

144. AO 4,1 (Nov. 1948) p.13

145. See, e.g., AO 7,5 (March, 1952) p.8

146. See, e.g., AO 4,7 (May, 1949) p7; 5,11 (Sept. 1950) pp.6-7

147. AO 2,7 (May, 1947) p.18.

truth. The orthodoxy of democracy was portrayed as a denial of freedom of speech and attempts to muzzle those who presented unpopular progressive views was compared with the medieval Inquisition and Calvinist witch-burnings.¹⁴⁸ The public denunciation of those who had been associated with groups labelled "subversive" by the Attorney General in the United States was condemned as fascist allegiance to the idea of a totalitarian state.¹⁴⁹ The tacit support given such activities by the media, and especially the very obvious endorsement by *Life Magazine*, was considered evidence of an ideological bias which contradicted the freedom and objectivity of the press.¹⁵⁰ AFSA accused *Life* of pandering to American hysteria and using Christianity as an ideological crutch in order to boost circulation.¹⁵¹ The group also attempted to destroy the image of the United States as a highly-principled white knight engaged in a cosmic struggle against the forces of evil by denying the reality of any so-called ideological war between East and West. AFSA saw the conflict between the two camps to be a war of power politics aimed at control of resources and manpower.¹⁵²

AFSA employed a similar tactic of "myth-breaking" with respect to the Church's role in supporting the *status quo* and sustaining the mood of McCarthyism. By attempting to expose the ways in which the Church and its faith was being used to defend certain political and economic motives, AFSA was, in a sense, driving a wedge between the Church's accommodation to the

148. AO 5,11 (Sept. 1950) pp.6-7

149. AO 4,8 (June, 1949) p.6.

150. AO 3,10 (Aug. 1948) p.13; 4,8 (June, 1949) p.6.

151. AO 6,1 (Nov. 1950) p.6.

152. AO 5,10 (Aug. 1950) pp.6-7; 6,1 (Nov. 1950) p.6.

status quo and the popular understanding of the Church as a "spiritual" body that is somehow "above and beyond" "the changes and chances of this fleeting world."¹⁵³ AFSA believed that Western civilization was in decline because of its loss of faith in God and the Christian vision of human-ness. One editorial in *Anglican Outlook* said,

We are perfectly well aware that Western civilization is sick unto death because it has moved off its Christian foundations, and that the consequent enfeeblement of Christianity is the cause of the rise of totalitarian systems -- they are moving into a spiritual void.¹⁵⁴

AFSA also understood, however, that a totalitarian system in North America would take the guise of Christian faith in order to fill this void. Just as Constantine had used the Church to prop up a falling empire, Christianity would be used to legitimize a decadent capitalism.¹⁵⁵ The period offered some very obvious examples of this dynamic. One of these came from *Life Magazine*, whose editor, Henry Luce, attempted to create an ideological foundation for the American way of life from a synthesis of Christian and Jewish beliefs.¹⁵⁶ The most crass example appeared in 1951, when the National Association of Manufacturers in the United States published this incredible statement:

CREDO OF HOPE

We believe that American business can and must save the world.

We believe that political, social and economic chaos exists because, while we nominally are a Christian nation, we have forsaken Christian philosophy

153. "An Order for Compline," Book of Common Prayer (Canada, 1962) p.727.

154. AO 6,1 (Nov. 1950) p.7.

155. AO 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.8.

156. AO 6,1 (Nov. 1950) p.6.

to such an extent that we are now predominantly a materialist nation.

We believe that in every chaos there is the seed of rebuilding and that in this present chaos one of the seeds of rebuilding is the fear in the heart of we materialists that we will lose our material gains.

We believe that political leaders have demonstrated that they are unable to mount an offensive in an ideological war.

We believe that in a materialist nation economic forces are the potent forces. We believe that the American business associations are the only groups that can and will put the money on the line to re-sell Christian philosophy to America, and thus smother out communism and other false ideologies. We believe that, except for the federal treasury, the economic power joined by the American business associations is the only force equal to the task of waging and winning a national and international ideological war.

We believe that the American business organizations are the only agencies that can co-ordinate and thus make effective all of the movements that are now selling partial or watered-down portions of the Sermon on the Mount.

We believe that business organizations such as the National Association of Manufacturers, the Committee for Economic Development, The Advertising Council, the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Bankers Association, can and must spearhead the effort to wage and win an ideological war.

We believe that the National Association of Manufacturers can and should call together the heads of the principal business organizations and organize an Ideological War Council.

We believe that the Council should call in three outstanding ideological leaders, one Catholic, one Protestant and one Jew and commission them to confer and come forth with a statement of simple truths commonly accepted in a Judeo-Christian civilization. These truths should be given to a staff of five top men in the advertising industry of America and those top men should be commissioned to prepare them for sale.

We believe that then these truths should be sold by all the modern means of advertising, through all modern means of communication, on a mass production scale.

We believe that such an ideological offensive can be launched immediately, that it can spread rapidly throughout the nation and can then be extended throughout the world.

We believe that Almighty God will bless the effort.¹⁵⁷

In the case of statements such as this, AFSA had no difficulty supporting its claim that Christian faith was being used as a tool to support the economic and political interests of capitalism. Unfortunately, however, the Church of England in Canada's implication in the popular mood was harder to identify because it was more subtle. AFSA attempted to point out similarities between the editorial positions adopted by the *Canadian Churchman* and the attitudes expressed by *Life* and the National Association of Manufacturers.¹⁵⁸ The group also decried as passive capitulation the Church's failure to speak critically on the signs of the times. This argument against a silent church was put forward in an *Outlook* editorial which read,

It would appear that the Anglican Church in Canada through its local representative bodies, its synods, is deciding that eloquent silence shall give support to USA leadership in the field of international affairs ...¹⁵⁹

AFSA understood this silence to be a symptom of the Church's accommodation to the *status quo* and its timocracy or rule by fear. Another editorial said,

The official church is quite plainly conservative in its approach to controversial questions because it is subject to conservative pressure from its monetary constituency which is now operating under the fear motive and has become more reactionary.¹⁶⁰

The issue on which the Church was most easily convicted of collusion with American foreign policy was the Communist-Nationalist war in China. AFSA was critical of the caricatures presented by the secular press which portrayed the Nationalists as Christian and the Communists as un-Christian, despite ample evidence that both sides were guilty of brutal and violent acts against the Chinese people.¹⁶¹ Specifically, AFSA condemned the *Canadian Churchman*, for contributing to a popular view of Chiang Kai-Shek as a devout Christian,

158. AO 6,1 (Nov. 1950) pp.7-8

159. AO 6,8 (June, 1951) pp.8-10; cf. 5,11 (Sept. 1950) pp.6-7.

160. AO 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.8.

161. AO 2,11 (Sept. 1947) pp.5-6.

and the Missionary Society for the pro-Nationalist stand taken in its Bulletin of 1948.¹⁶² The general issue of war and peace was another issue on which it was easier for AFSA to criticize the Church. Given the fear of a war with Russia (which was, at least initially, the source of "Red scare") the advocacy of international peace and the voluntary limitation of arms by Western powers came to be denounced as "communist". AFSA was critical of the United States' aggressive policy of containment and the establishment of NATO because it considered these to be the preparations for a third world war.¹⁶³ In taking this position, the group again laid itself open to charges of communism and treason. AFSA's response was to emphasize peace as a Christian value and it condemned the Church's failure to take leadership in the movement for harmony in international relations as a further example of its bondage to the *status quo*.¹⁶⁴ This criticism was stated as follows:

The Christian Church -- and the church alone -- is the only thing that can give society what William James long ago pronounced "the moral equivalent for war". But the Church is too timid. Our synodical gatherings, conventions, conferences and assemblies are afraid to give this leadership because of the fear of misuse by the Kremlin, for fear of publication in *Pravda* and *Izvestia* that the Church of England in Canada stands for peace.¹⁶⁵

With respect to the Korean war, AFSA attempted to show that Christianity was again being used to further the interests of Western capitalism. An editorial

162. AO 4,5 (March, 1949) p.8.

163. See, e.g., AO 5,2 (Dec. 1949) pp.6-8

164. See e.g., AO 5,12 (Oct. 1950) pp.6-7; 7,8 (June-July, 1952) p.6; 8,10 (Oct. 1953) pp.14-15.

165. AO 7,8 (June-July, 1952) p.6.

published in *Anglican Outlook* in March 1951 read,

Christians, awake! Wipe the murky mists of propaganda from your eyes. Discern whether or not it is Christ that bids us extend his kingdom with tanks and jet planes, with flame-throwers and, if necessary, atom bombs, to blacken and annihilate hundreds of tiny Korean villages and to "liberate" their folk with mutilation and death ...

Bethink you, Christians, are you taking sides in a war between Christ's pure gospel and the sadistic materialism of the communists? ... Aren't you trying to propagate, in the name of Christ, a western civilization devoid of his spirit of serenity, of ardent love and selfless sacrifice; a civilization of profit motive, of burning competition, of abject devotion to supply and demand and laissez-faire? Do you want peace because peace is of God, or are you scared speechless at the word *Peace* because peacemakers are no longer called the children of God but communist stooges?¹⁶⁶

It is to AFSA's credit that, upon hearing of anti-American sentiments being expressed in Europe late in 1953, it warned that an irrational and hysterical anti-Americanism "can be just as dangerous to the peace of the world as an irrational fear of Communism."¹⁶⁷

Finally, in defending its critique of Western capitalism, AFSA sought to legitimize its position by quoting or citing well-respected theologians, such as Maurice or Temple. The group also reminded its opponents of the more progressive or tolerant attitudes being expressed by various synods or councils. The most important of these were the condemnations of both capitalism and communism pronounced by General Synod in 1949, by the Lambeth Conference in 1948, and by the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948.¹⁶⁸

^{166.} AO 6,5 (March, 1951) pp.6-7.

^{167.} AO 8,10 (Oct. 1953) p.6.

^{168.} See e.g., AO 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.6; 6,8 (June 1951) pp.6-8; 8,8 (June-July 1953) pp.7-8.

In general, AFSA was neither intimidated nor disturbed by the red-baiting of its adversaries. The group understood its role as a prophetic leaven and expected the rich and powerful within the Church to attempt to discredit them by whatever means were available. The charges of communism and treason deserved little more than the sarcasm they received in the editorial which read,

Perhaps we should not take too seriously the sniping that has been going on in the *Canadian Churchman* at *The Anglican Outlook*. But we can hardly refrain from expressing amazement at the assortment of associations in which we are now involved. The super-complacent writer of the article on the Diocese of Montreal in one of the July issues of the *Canadian Churchman* has seen fit to link us up with Higher Criticism, Modernism, Radical Socialism and Pan-Protestant pressure -- all of which the great "Conservative Diocese of Montreal is able to survive because "Montreal is cooler than Ottawa." In a later issue of the *Churchman*, *The Anglican Outlook* turns up again in an article on the Office of the Primacy. The author of the article, the Venerable R.C. Blaggrave accuses us of editorially blasting "the traditions and practices of the Church" in a "tissue of half-truths" which the good Archdeacon thinks "might have come straight from the Kremlin as a standard piece of propaganda to be used in all professedly Christian publications". It was with considerable alarm that we turned to our July editorials to see wherein we had committed this great crime. But the only blast we could discover which might in some remote way correspond to the Archdeacon's stricture was our disapproval of the National Association of Manufacturers' plan to sell Christian philosophy. It is difficult to take this sort of criticism seriously; ...¹⁶⁹

Given such silly attempts at defamation, AFSA continued, perhaps with some delight, to present its case using the arguments described above. The editorial policy of *Anglican Outlook* retained its critical edge.

169. AO 7,1 (Nov. 1951) p.7

Decline

The AFSA members I interviewed could not remember when the group had disbanded. This suggests that the Fellowship expired with a whimper, rather than a bang. *Anglican Outlook* continued to be published in Montreal until 1960, although it had become apparent by the middle of 1959 that the Montreal group was finding it very difficult to carry on.¹⁷⁰ It is likely that the AFSA group had ceased to be a decisive voice in diocesan affairs by the mid 'fifties. AFSA's influence was certainly absent from the 1958 report of the Diocesan Council for Social Service, of which Ray Corbett wrote,

In a day of perpetual cold war, surging nationalism, climbing interest rates, decline of the old order, a time of despair, frustration and uncertainty among God's children, with its alarming growth in nervous and mental disorders, days of surplus in rich countries, malnutrition in poor, space rockets, and over all the ever-present threat of mass annihilation, a time of dead silence by our House of Bishops and Church generally, a time crying out for guidance, courage, prophecy and counsel, in this tremendous age of peril and opportunity, the Council brought in a report to our last Synod, after a season's work, requesting that the slaughter of animals in packing houses be done in a more humanemanner!¹⁷¹

With respect to General Synod, AFSA members had not played an important role since 1949.

The reason for AFSA's decline can be related to a loss of energy, specifically to a loss of membership or manpower. This process took two forms: a failure or inability to attract new members and a diaspora of existing members. The first of these was recognized by the writer of *Anglican*

170. AO 15,8 (June-July, 1960) p.6-7.

171. AO 13,8 (June-July, 1960) p.6.

Outlook's last editorial. He said that it had been hoped that responsibility for the paper would be assumed by "a new ginger group" within the Anglican Church, but this was not possible as no such group existed. "The general attitude among the younger members of our communion appears to us complacently conformist," he said, "and conformity has made our synods so dull that they can hardly last out a day."¹⁷² The failure to attract new members was, no doubt, related to this general accommodation to the *status quo*, as AFSA so clearly represented a non-conformist reaction against the forces dominant in Church and society following the war. It is in this respect, then, that "McCarthyism" can be said to have acted as a force to destroy AFSA. The spirit of the age made participation in such a "cadre" unattractive. One wonders whether or not AFSA appeared to be an anachronism to the younger clergy of the Diocese who did not share the alienation experienced by men, like Flynn Flanagan and Sam Pollard, whose most fundamental understandings of society were shaped earlier in the century. At least it is very likely that, to anyone unfamiliar with the Christian Socialist tradition or the FSCO or the writings of Temple, AFSA was a complete enigma, an utterly foreign and unintelligible phenomenon. Thus as the reactionary mood came to be considered normative, participation in a fellowship rooted in a forgotten openness to creative change ceased even to be considered as a possibility.

Many who have heard about AFSA share a common assumption concerning the group's demise. This "folk history", evolved by oral tradition, holds that Bishop Dixon effectively "got rid of" AFSA, although it does not specify how he did this. There was no clear consensus on Dixon's role among the AFSA members I interviewed. Flynn Flanagan and Sam Pollard stressed his

172. AO 15,8 (June-July, 1960) p.6.

control of the clergy as the means by which he engineered a decline in AFSA's numbers. Flynn Flanagan said that a number of AFSA clergy were not rectors, but missionary clergy paid directly out of diocesan funds and, therefore, dependent on the bishop for their stipends. He claimed that Dixon denied employment to those priests he wished to remove from the diocese.¹⁷³ Sam Pollard mentioned three priests who may have been denied positions by the bishop. These were: Adolf Sargent, Jack Bishop, and Bernard Harrison. He also said, "If I had gotten stuck, I don't think the bishop would have given me a job."¹⁷⁴ On the other hand, Vince Goring put less emphasis on Dixon's role. His impression of the bishop was that, while he spoke out strongly against AFSA in public, he was not a very strong person and not the most reactionary of the clergy. He said that Dixon had no grounds for barring him or his contemporary in AFSA, John Rowe, from ordination. The only time Dixon mentioned AFSA to Goring was in a pre-ordination interview, when he said that his only concern with him was some of the company he kept. Goring sensed that nobody left the Diocese of Montreal because they had to, but because they felt there were other things they wished to do that were more important than remaining with AFSA in Montreal.¹⁷⁵ This understanding of AFSA's "diaspora" as voluntary, rather than imposed, is accurate in the cases of Percy Powles and Cyril and Marjorie Powles (who left the diocese to work in Japan), Ernie Reed (who became Archdeacon of the Gaspé in 1946), and Vince Goring (who became study secretary of SCM Canada in 1954). They all moved away from Montreal in order to

173. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

174. Interview with Sam Pollard.

175. Interview with Vince Goring.

pursue more interesting and challenging work elsewhere. This may also have been A.G. Elcombe's reason for moving to a hospital chaplaincy in Philadelphia in 1948. With respect to those who left Montreal for parochial work in other dioceses, it is impossible to distinguish whether they did so because of direct pressure from Bishop Dixon, a general sense of discomfort with the situation in Montreal, or an offer of more interesting or better-paid work elsewhere. Some of those who moved to other dioceses were: Jack Bishop (to New Westminster in 1944); M.A. Stephens (to Caledonia in 1949); and Ken Brueton (to Niagara in 1949).

Structurally, Dixon did have control, within certain limits, over the movement of clergy within the diocese. This is one reason why AFSA relied on Flynn Flanagan, a financially independent layman, to speak in Synod. He and Sam Pollard worked in a creative collaboration, as Sam wrote material for Flynn to deliver in debate.¹⁷⁶ The power was certainly available to the bishop, however it is difficult at this point to prove conclusively that Dixon did, in fact, use his authority to deny positions to missionary clergy. Even if he did so, the three cases mentioned by Sam Pollard do not represent a sufficient weakening of numbers to support the claim that the bishop "got rid of" AFSA. It is much more likely that Dixon's role was passive, rather than active. His public opposition to AFSA on controversial issues, as well as the opposition expressed by influential laymen, were probably factors in new priests' decisions not to join AFSA or in existing members' decisions to leave the Diocese of Montreal. It is clear that AFSA did lose members through moves to other parts of the Church. This fact was especially disturbing to Sam Pollard, as he had hoped that AFSA would

¹⁷⁶. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

eventually gain control of the diocese and make it an example of social righteousness to the rest of the Church.¹⁷⁷

One can speculate on other reasons for AFSA's decline in addition to those already mentioned, but these, too, would relate to a lack of energy and resources. It is most likely that, after a decade of the struggle, the members of the group were simply no longer capable of supporting each other to carry on. While the details of AFSA's last days remain, for the time being, somewhat unclear, it can be said in conclusion that the group's decline was abetted by the reactionary mood of the times and the personal needs and decisions of its members.

177. Interview with Sam Pollard.