

**Fraught with Wonderful Possibilities:
Father Jimmy Tompkins and the Struggle for a Catholic
Progressivism, 1902 - 1922***

Michael Welton

 **NALL** the
research network for New
Approaches to Lifelong
Learning

**Le Réseau de recherche sur
les nouvelles approches de
l'éducation permanente**

“Dismal and Abysmal Apathy”

Any impartial observer invited to report on the economic and cultural possibilities of the little Nova Scotian town of Antigonish and its surrounding county of the same name in the early 20th century would not have drafted an impressive report. Although the 1880's had been a relatively prosperous time for the eastern counties of Nova Scotia outward migration had been continuous, with an estimated loss of 24, 000 rural inhabitants between 1901 and 1911 alone. The “vacant farm” symbolized the desperate situation confronting anyone at all concerned with the plight of rural society. The plight of the farmer was exacerbated, too, by the significant shift of population to the burgeoning industrial towns, particularly coal mining towns like Springhill, Inverness or Glace Bay (which grew from 6, 945 to 16, 562 between 1901 and 1910). Many fewer young people than in earlier decades were staying down on the farm, lured to the booming West, or into waged work in the mines, steel factories and subsidiary industries like the Eastern Car Company in New Glasgow which advertised for 500 jobs in July, 1913. To the social critic's penetrating eye, the farm community seemed sunk into a “dismal and abysmal apathy”.¹

The merchant class in the town of Antigonish focussed on its rather narrow concerns and was widely perceived in the county as having little interest in the revitalization of farming. The Antigonish merchants did not appear to encourage any kind of industrial development in the county. Buildings needed painting in the town of Antigonish, the harbour was inadequate and needed dredging, railway transportation was scarcely adequate to transport farm goods and roads were generally appalling. For whatever private and social reasons, the town's merchants did not imagine innovative ways of breaking with Antigonish's entrenched traditions of “commercial pessimism” and “backwardness”. All the dynamism and excitement of progress was happening elsewhere, in the booming and enterprising West, or in the chaotic, troubled, and energetic coal and steel towns of industrializing Nova Scotia. The people of Antigonish County, Father Jimmy Tompkins declared, needed to be “wakened up from their deep slumber”.²

The convulsive changes precipitated by global corporate capitalism in the late 19th and early 20th century sent shock waves through both the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches. The Roman Catholic Church, in particular, had been very reluctant through most of the 19th century to respond to the urgent new questions posed by industrialism and modernity. Still recovering from the shock of the anti-clericism of the French Revolution and the Enlightenment “cult of reason”, the Roman Catholic Church hesitated to respond unequivocally to the social questions and learning challenges posed by industrialism throughout the 19th century. The Roman Catholic Church's social ethics had been crafted largely in the context of a rural, patriarchal, and hierarchical society. Traditional forms of social solidarity (a fusion of religion, rurality and Anglo-Celtic identity) were being rent by the new class and gender divisions of industrial society. Catholics also had to make sense of a world in which God seemed to have receded to the outer edges of space. Church dogma, homilies, and charity for the individual poor seemed utterly inadequate responses to the new kinds of spiritual,

economic and political problems 20th century men and women were facing. The Catholic Church desperately needed to provide a new cultural synthesis for changed times.

Moving Forward: Awakening the People from their Apathy

For most of the 19th century, the Diocese of Antigonish was **ultramontanist** in spirit. The Catholics of the Diocese, comprised mainly of Scottish Highlanders (75% of the parishioners were Scottish, 13% Irish and 9% Acadian), had forged an identity rooted in subsistence farming and sustained by their isolation from outside influences. The Catholic hierarchy watched over its constituency, and Catholicism became almost inseparable from a rural, poor, patriarchal, anti-modernist, subservient existence. The Church leaders also acted as kind of filter for outside subversive ideas. The diocesan newspaper, **The Casket**, aggressively condemned far-off events and offer shallow commentary on local events at best. The Casket's defensively polemical stance continued almost unabated into the 20th century through the anti-modernist reign of Pius X. In 1913, the year of Pius X's death, on the eve of the Great War, **The Casket** condemned the evils of socialism, suffragettes, Protestants and assorted infidel movements. Suffragettes were depicted as "wild creatures", who, if given the vote, "would raise problems not yet thought of..."³ (July 17, 1913). The death of the German socialist leader August Bebel occasioned this commentary: "August Bebel, who died last month, had 20, 000 people at his funeral, and there was no religious service not even one prayer. He was the leader of the German parliament. People who care to know the drift of Socialism might reflect on the manner in which its most prominent advocate in Europe was buried - - his body was cremated"⁴. The Orange Protestant movement was constantly criticized, and the non-Catholic politicians were labelled "infidel politicians"⁵, and pope-bashers acerbically denounced. The modern world, be it women's fashion⁶ - - too scanty - - or the growing religious indifference - - a present day peril - - was perilous indeed. Along with this bold pitting of Christ against modern culture, one notices a new spirit creeping into **The Casket**. References to the Catholic social Guild, a British Catholic social action organization formed in 1909, begin to appear, and while the anti-feminist and anti-socialist themes are still present⁸, the Church was now moving forward, offensively, with its own counter-program. The flavour of the new spirit is captured in several excerpts from the Rev. Andrew Egan's article, "The Catholic Church the Friend of the Working Man".⁹ "On all sides to-day, in every quarter of the civilized world, there is a cry for social uplifting, or the social betterment, and we have only to look at the social condition of things to know that the conflict is going on..." Egan identified the "potent factors in the social problems of today" as "political, economic and moral", and distinguished "Catholic socialism" from secular versions. "This doctrine in the main is that the Church must enter into this social problem, and solve it by the principles at once natural and supernatural." Egan called Catholics to stand for the "right of the employed against injustice from all sides, and for any movement that makes for social betterment, that tends to enable man to live with an honest competence..."

It is not surprising that such views, salient to the emergent Catholic social gospel, would creep into **The Casket** in 1913. St. Francis Xavier University, the educational hub of the Diocese, was

exhibiting a new spirit of optimism and hope from around 1906. Much of the buoyant energy was being generated by Father James Tompkins. Born in 1870 in idyllic Margaree Forks, Cape Breton, Tompkins had graduated from St. Francis Xavier University in 1888. He went on to Rome, studying at Urban College, in October, 1897, and was ordained in May 24, 1902. He was assigned to teach at St. Francis in that same year. In November, 1906, Hugh P. MacPherson, who had been ordained in 1892 and honoured with a doctorate even though he had not completed his course at Laval University, assumed the rectorship of the university. In 1908 Tompkins became vice-president and Perfect of Studies. The years between 1906 and 1922 are generally known as the “Tompkins-MacPherson period”.¹⁰

During the first decade of the 20th century, St. Francis had faced serious financial problems (which had plagued the college since its inception as a seminary in Arichat in 1853). The constituency was relatively small and poor, with 80, 000 Catholics, served by 83 parishes, priests in 1900 (by 1928 there would be 70 parishes, served by 93 priests with an additional 15 teaching at the university).¹¹ Tompkins was instrumental in obtaining huge sums of money for the time from Neil McNeil, a wealthy contractor who was living in Boston, and Dr. John E. Somers of Cambridge. They were responsible in the main for the building of MacNeil Engineering Hall (1911), the University Chapel (1912), the Mockler Hall residence (1916) and the Gymnasium (1916).

But Tompkins’ main passion from 1902 to 1912 was the acquisition of more well prepared professors. Tompkins believed Catholic higher education lagged terribly behind the modern world; in its revitalization lay at least some answers to the desperate economic and political situation facing Nova Scotians. He encouraged C. J. Connolly to go to Munich in 1907 to study biology (Connolly’s thoughtful essays on the fisheries would turn up in 1919 in the epochal “For the People” column in **The Casket**). He also played a role in sending Fr. D. J. MacDonald to the Catholic University of Washington for doctoral work in Economics, as well as Fr. Miles Tompkins to the Ontario Agricultural College for his BSCA (Miles Tompkins, who served as a chaplain in World War I, would become one of the pioneering leadership cadre of reform-priests). P. J. Nicholson was delivered to Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, where he received his doctorate in Physics. But perhaps the most significant appointment to St. Francis in this pre-World War I period was that of Hugh (“Little Doc”) MacPherson. A man of great brilliance, charm and self-effacing personality, Dr. Hugh came to the college in 1900 after pursuing scientific studies at Lille, France. He was a very good friend of Jimmy Tompkins and was instrumental in helping St. Francis Xavier become a “university of the people”.¹² These two men of contrasting personalities embodied the new wind of progressivism beginning to blow in the Diocese of Antigonish at the onset of the second decade of the twentieth century.

One of the central tenets of progressivism was the implacable commitment to achieving social efficiency through the application of science to social problems. Dr. Hugh (“Little Doc”)

MacPherson would be the first Nova Scotia “adult educator” to take the new scientific approach to agriculture to the people; between 1912 and 1914 he began to be interested in the problems of local wool growers, providing them with technical knowledge about the preparation of high grade wool,

and introducing them to ideas about co-operative marketing. And the visionary and zealous Tompkins would begin to shape his “theory of bringing people together for the purpose of learning”¹³ in the same period that Dr. Hugh was experimenting with wool growing.

After attending a world conference on adult education in England in 1912, Father Tompkins was ablaze with desire to awaken Catholics to address the urgent questions and social issues of the day.

Although he did not yet know how to respond pragmatically to the plight of fishers, farmers and industrial workers, he was becoming aware the adults could “learn their way out” of their dilemmas.

Tompkins was an incredibly well-connected, well-travelled and informed man; he conversed with communists, socialists, agrarian radicals, leading Catholic social thinkers, politicians, business people, lawyers, doctors, journalists, sisters and ordinary folk. By 1912 he was aware of currents of thought in two areas of keen interest: Catholic social thought and Catholic higher education.

From his travels to England and his wide-ranging scrutiny of Catholic literature (newspapers, periodicals, books), Tompkins knew that the Catholic Social Guild had been formed by a “ginger group” of reformers within English Catholicism at the annual conference of the Catholic Truth Society in Manchester in September 1909.¹⁴ This ginger group propagandized through study groups and settlement houses. One of the key figures in the English Catholic Social Guild movement was Henry Somerville. Tompkins encouraged him to write for **The Casket** and to teach at the People’s School in 1922. Somerville would go on to play a major role in fostering the new Catholicism in Ontario, under the leadership of Archbishop Neil MacNeil, a Nova Scotian, former St. Francis professor (during Jimmy Tompkins and Little Dr. Hugh MacPherson’s time), and fellow progressive, from 1915 - 1918 and 1933 - 1953. Tompkins was also intimately acquainted with developments in American Catholicism. Leading American Catholics for almost two decades after *Rerum*

Novarum had interpreted it mainly in status quo maintaining ways and not as charter for social justice. But Tompkins was attracted particularly to the exceptional Fr. John Ryan, who had been known as a progressive Catholic since the 1906 publication of his popular book, **A Living Wage** (The important text of the American Protestant social gospel, Walter Rauschenbusch’s **Christianity and the Social Crisis** was published in 1907). Ryan was widely known by many non-Catholics for his support of progressive causes, and was dubbed “Right Reverend New Dealer” by the reactionary radio preacher, Fr. Charles Coughlin in the 1930’s.

One of the ways of understanding more precisely the thought of Jimmy Tompkins - - who was not exactly a systematic thinker - - is through understanding the ideas of those thinkers whom he affirmed and honoured through inviting them to speak at major educational conferences in St. Francis. Both men, Somerville (born in 1889) and Ryan (born in 1869), had been influenced by radical ideas: Ryan, by the populism of the National Farmer’s Alliance in Minnesota, and Somerville, by the British socialist movement (he joined the Independent Labour Party in 1907).

Both men had turned away from “socialism” but not the problems induced by the mass industrial society. Both men accepted the authority of Catholic beliefs about faith and the authority of the Church in spiritual matters. They were, however, deeply troubled by the isolation of Catholics from public life and the ignorance of clergy and laity on matters pertaining to the social mission of the Church. Believing that the ideal social order was rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition as

interpreted by the Church, Ryan and Somerville spent their lives helping Catholics become familiar with Catholic social principles. For Somerville, a man after Tompkins own heart, Catholics were falling behind and the fundamental way to develop leadership talent was through the organization of study clubs. “Through their indifference”, wrote Somerville pointedly in 1918, “Catholics in Canada are letting themselves be out-classed by their Protestant fellow-citizens”.¹⁶

Like Somerville (who wrote a series of articles in **The Casket** on guild socialism), Ryan was attracted to the argument that “working conditions in industry would improve only when all who worked by hand or brain shared in the organization of production and in the profits”.¹⁷ Guild socialism was appealing to pinkish social Catholics like Ryan and Somerville because they wanted to reconstitute an organic, communitarian society in new, industrial circumstances. Ryan, Somerville, and Tompkins accepted the papal condemnation of socialism as “evil”; however, socialism in this context always meant ownership of all property by the state. Thus, paradoxically, Catholics were in no way restricted from embracing various co-operative organizational forms. Ryan and Somerville believed that one could be Catholic and progressive. There was no “Catholic way to fish”, and their natural-law approach (through reason one could discover laws inherent in human nature) opened the way for socially progressive Catholics to join with non-Catholic others in the search for social justice. Ryan, Somerville and Tompkins believed that a new, worldly Catholicism was called for by the modern age. If Catholics did not heed the call, the pews would empty even more and the modern world would be without moral rudder or Christian ballast. The plight of the Church and the plight of the poor were intertwined for these Catholic reformers.

Tompkins returned from the British Universities Conference in 1912 where he had heard Dr. Barrett of Melbourne, Australia speak of the University of Wisconsin extension program. Established as a land-grant university, the University of Wisconsin flew the banner of “service the people.” President Van Hise spoke of the mission of extension - - “to help each individual to develop his talent in the interest of maximum social efficiency and progress”.¹⁸ Through correspondence, instruction, public discussion and a department of information and social welfare, Wisconsin sought to overcome “social inefficiency through developing the “undeveloped talent of the masses”.¹⁹ The Wisconsin model captured the imagination of American and Canadian universities alike; the three new Western Canadian universities (Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba) were inspired by Wisconsin’s goal of “carrying the university to the homes of the people”.²⁰ Here Tompkins found support for the idea that the university could synthesize study and action. From his study of the Irish university question, one of his many passions, Father Jimmy learned from Bishop O’Dwyer’s writings on the educational struggle in Ireland how closely allied poverty was with lack of education. For O’Dwyer and the fiery and impatient Tompkins, the cause of the “torpor and decay”²¹ of Irish and Nova Scotian rural life could be laid at the doorsteps of institutions of higher learning. He also found

support for the unusual idea that a vital, dynamic, just society depended on adult learning from the Workers Educational Association (WEA) of Great Britain. Tompkins thought that the WEA had originated in the belief that “Education [was] the way to power.” Adult education, it was slowly dawning on Tompkins, could precipitate a cultural awakening in men and women’s hearts and souls.

The Antigonish Forward Movement

On October 29, 1914, Jimmy Tompkins wrote to his cousin, Moses Coady, who was studying at the Catholic University in Washington, D. C.: “I am afraid,” he told the younger man who was reflecting upon the problems of Catholic higher education, “I am too anxious for results, too impatient of delay, and too practical to appreciate its importance. It may supply material for a greater quantity of noble theorizing but I fear I am more interested in seeing Catholics ... *doing something* (italics Tompkins). “Of course,” he went on to say, “I am quite earthy and scarcely a proper subject of inspiration”.²² Beginning in late 1913, impatient of delay indeed, Tompkins plunged into feverish social action on two fronts. He opened a column on the “Forward Movement” in **The Casket** and began to orchestrate action to boost civic awareness and responsibility.²³ The period of the Antigonish Forward Movement from its beginnings in late 1913 to its gradual dissipation by the end of 1915 or so is particularly important for our understanding of adult education and the new social Catholicism. By the out break of WWI, Tompkins believed that the plight of rural society had to be central to any reform agenda. Second, the old sectarianism - - “The Casket’s ‘History of Hatred’”²⁴ had to be rejected and a new era of dialogue with Protestants opened up. Third, Tompkins’ populist leanings manifest in scathing denunciations of local political bosses. Fourth, most significant, Tompkins begins to organize a self-conscious, vanguard of reform-minded priests.

It is not exactly clear who initiated the Antigonish Forward Movement. But Tompkins was one foremost promoters from its beginnings in November, 1913. In early November letters had been written to businessmen, friends of the town and county of Antigonish to foster and promote the Forward Movement. **The Casket** referred to a letter from a businessman who claimed that the “people down by the sea” were asserting themselves, and that Antigonish had the possibility of becoming a “place to be reckoned with.” This letter called for an active Board of Trade (BOT), imploring it to “find out the urgent needs of your county.”²⁵ There was, however, widespread perception that “commercial pessimism” was the “chief cause of the backwardness of Antigonish”,²⁶ reinforced, in Tompkins’ view, by the “lack of intelligent [political] leadership”²⁷

The December 12, 1913 meeting of the Antigonish BOT was pivotal. Both Tompkins and Coady were present at this meeting, with Tompkins advocating that closer bonds be established between town and county, and Coady insisting that the vacant farms be filled up so we could “keep at home the young people who are now growing up”. This latter theme was, of course, shared by Tompkins, who wrote to Dr. J.W. Robertson, chair of the Royal Commission on Technical Education, several months later that what the Forward Movement wished to do was “put some confidence and optimism into our people and to induce some of them to come back to us, and above all to keep what we have

here”.²⁸ Speaker after speaker rose at this meeting to identify “problems” and “issues”. A rough consensus was evident: the town and county lagged behind the booming West, mercantile industry was in a low state, farms and farming were in a bad way, the local economy was being undermined by both business (investing in unimproved real estate outside the province) and consumer practice (mail order stores in Ontario), and the county lacked dynamic leadership. Over the next year or so

it would gradually be revealed that there were serious tensions between town and county, as well as significant opposition to the progressive agenda.

By early March, 1914, a reform program had crystallized through debate and discussion.²⁹ The Forward Movement advocated that the county be populated, the town beautified, manufacturing started, the harbour dredged, an advertising and immigration committee be formed and an agricultural representative be found and appointed. Three of these solutions, dredging the harbour, populating the county and getting an agricultural representative were Tompkins' special projects, and he campaigned ceaselessly toward these ends.

References to the Danish "people's high school" and the "agricultural high school" appear in **The Casket** in March, 1914. Under the simple title, "The Antigonish Forward Movement," the anonymous reformer referenced Denmark as an inspirational model for Nova Scotia. "How was [Denmark's] great prosperity brought about? It was brought about by rural education, cooperation and organization, and the application of modern methods - - things in which we have been hitherto conspicuously lacking in every field of endeavour." The article then boldly exclaimed: "Is it not high time for the people of the county of Antigonish to advocate the establishment of some sort of Agricultural School for the county? Ought we not to engage at the earliest possible date a couple of competent men to carry on an agricultural educative campaign in every district in the county, and who will devote their whole time to this work".³⁰ Something was stirring, and Father Tompkins wrote to St. Francis Xavier rector, Dr. Hugh P. MacPherson, who was in the Caribbean, that the "Forward Movement is developing into a whirlwind".³¹

On March 23, 1914, the BOT voted to hire a competent agriculturist "to give lectures and demonstrations", and on June 25, 1914 **The Casket** announced that an appointment would be made in August or September. During May, Tompkins entered into discussions with President Cumming of the Agricultural College in Truro about the appointment of the "man who is to take charge of demonstrating in agriculture. He is going to provide us with a building for winter courses... Never was Antigonish in its history in a fairer position to forge ahead".³³ On May 25, Tompkins wrote to Dr. M. Cuning: "Your scheme to improve agriculture and ours to fill up the farms should transform the face of Antigonish in a few years".³⁴ On October 18, 1914, a headline in **The Casket** announced boldly: "First Tangible Fruits in Antigonish. Great Steps in Advance.". "Little Doc" Hugh MacPherson was appointed as district representative, taking leave from his university post, and a new Agricultural School building in Antigonish, financed by the Agricultural College, was promised. The new scientific agriculture could now, legitimately, be taken to the people. "It was the first appointment of the kind," P. J. Webb acknowledged, "that has been made in the Maritime

Provinces, and marks a departure which is bound to have far-reaching effects upon Agriculture in Eastern Nova Scotia".³⁵

From the beginning of May 1914, Tompkins agitated to get the controversial and flamboyant P. J. Webb to come to fill up the vacant farms. Webb, a well-worn Tory and Catholic before he left Nova Scotia to take up a position with a prominent real estate firm in Victoria, B. C., wrote to Tompkins

on May 12, 1914: “It has been for years an accusation levelled against our people that they are behind the age, non-progressive and a brake on the wheel of advancement, in fact wherever Catholicity predominated its members were labelled reactionary”.³⁶ Webb exemplified an aggressive, western style boosterism that Tompkins, and many rural folk, could not have been completely comfortable with. Tompkins’ interest in Webb was primarily strategic he thought that Webb had the expertise to fill the vacant farms. Webb arrived in Antigonish in the first week of June to set up shop and bring some of the “numerous children in exile” back to the land.³⁷ Tompkins set out to tap into his political network, particularly Senator Girroir of Ottawa, to secure funding for Webb for an extended period of time.

Webb immediately swept into a whirlwind of activities. In his own boisterous way, he was a kind of inspirational, popular educator. He spoke around the county at endless meetings (particularly at Knights of Columbus gatherings, an organization he apparently revitalized), constantly urging people to break out of their lethargy and complacency. Tompkins wanted to have the federal government provide Webb with a salary for at least six months so that he could “take charge of our immigration scheme and to advertise Antigonish and Nova Scotia in general”.³⁸ Tompkins and other Forward Movement advocates wanted to start an Immigration Bureau at Antigonish for eastern Nova Scotia. As it turned out, the provincial government did not agree, pleading the stringencies of War and jurisdictional considerations. Simultaneously, Tompkins was also seeking funding from Ottawa, through Senator Girroir for his third project, the dredging of the harbour, as well as funding for Webb. There, too, he was finding bureaucratic sclerosis. Girroir seemed receptive, but Tompkins had to mildly threaten him with lost votes if support was not forthcoming. Later, Girroir would concede that supporting Webb would be smart politics. In a letter to A. E. Blount, Girroir wrote: “Webb is a stalwart Conservative and a particularly shrewd fellow and I believe he could do a lot to help out the party if he gets this appointment!” He continued: “You can understand that this position would keep him in close touch with clergymen of all denominations, with municipal and other organizations in every nook and corner of eastern Nova Scotia”.³⁹

Tompkins’ perpetual scheming and the resistance to his projects, was, however, creating some personal distemper. At the end of May, 1914, he wrote to John A. MacDonald that: “Between me and you we have such a contemptible lot of penny half penny politicians around here that its simply disgusting. But they are going to find themselves so far in the woods before long that the probabilities are that they will never find their way out . . . They have for so long confided in their own infallibility and in their ability to fool the people and look wise for their own profit that they can’t understand how anybody should arise to disturb their peaceful slumbers”.⁴⁰ By September,

Webb was meeting with some opposition in the county, those few merchants and political bosses (provincial and municipal) who were benefiting from a lethargic citizenry. Fr. Tompkins wrote to Dr. Thompson of Glace Bay on September 9, 1914 defending Webb; Webb was developing into a fine “stump orator” and was inspiring “enthusiasm and optimism”. He was also proving capable of engaging in a good fight, confronting the “peanutiers who swaggered around this county as if they owned it and who thought it was sufficient honour for the ordinary man to be allowed to lick the ground where their shadows fell, thought the could pooh-pooh Webb and those who were trying to

lift the country out of the sink into which they have allowed it to drop.” According to Tompkins, Webb gave his detractors a “ferocious hearing at the Court House at a public meeting last night”. Tompkins confided in Dr. Thompson the Webb was well connected to the French community, and had managed to keep his politics “religiously out of the campaign, as he ought to do.” Tompkins thought there was some opposition from the Grits, but they “don’t go behind the bush to applaud Webb when he exposes the antics of some of the bosses - - taking care of their own pockets and letting the devil look after the rest of us”.⁴¹

The Antigonish Forward Movement precipitated important social learning processes in a lethargic cultural milieu. Slowly it began to dawn on people that underdevelopment was not a natural condition; that their cultural awareness was responsible, in large part, for their current predicament and misery. This emerging awareness did not preclude serious debate among county folk over the best way forward. The most contentious issue, debated openly in the pages of **The Casket**, was that of tension between town and farm. On February 26, 1914, an Antigonish county farmer wrote to **The Casket** claiming that farmers had “almost lost faith” in the town’s citizens to “make any move towards the development of the town.” He went on to applaud the move to deepen the harbour, develop gypsum mines and open a sawmill at Williams Point. W. D. Cameron, a passionate active citizen, offered astute commentary in **The Casket** under the pseudonym, “Drummer on Foot”. On December 3, 1914, Cameron argued that the BOT seemed to have “assumed at the outset an attitude of dictating to the country.” Cameron, while supportive of the agricultural rep project, thought that some farmers had remained aloof from the Forward Movement because they were being blamed for the “lack of progressiveness” in the county (they weren’t scientific” enough in approach). Cameron thought that a truly “progressive movement” had to eradicate this “rotten, deep-rooted old system” and be replaced by a “radically new system, patriotically designed to keep the money earned in the country within it, and applied to its own internal improvements”.⁴² In subsequent letters, Cameron maintained that the dredging of the harbour was primarily of interest to town merchants. The BOT’s failure to heed the farmers’ request for a survey for a railway from Antigonish to County Harbour reflected their limited interests. “We are not opposed to the opening of the harbour. We would be pleased to see it opened, but we maintain it would not be so useful to nearly all the districts of the county as a railway from some point on its northern shores to County Harbour.”⁴³

On February 25, 1915, Mr. C. E. Gregory, K. C., confronted the BOT with the pointed question of what they had actually accomplished. The Board had been instrumental in creating an agricultural school, and had contributed significantly to increasing general awareness within the county. The

Forward Movement had “given rise to a spirit of optimism”⁴⁴ The agitational work of Webb, Tompkins and others had created an ethos of hopefulness, had sparked some new enterprises here and there (like creameries) as well as spurring into existence branches of the Forward Movement in other towns like Inverness. “Little Doc” MacPherson’s work was lighting a small fire in the heather - - “amply evidenced by the interest so strongly apparent at the meetings, lectures and demonstrations taking place . . .”.⁴⁵ Short courses were underway as well (one was held in the first week of March 1915).

In the end, though, the Antigonish Forward Movement turned out to be mainly a story of “surely something could be done . . .”.⁴⁶ Webb’s scheme to bring Belgian farmers to Antigonish county never went anywhere; not did other ideas, like encouraging more Scottish Highlanders to emigrate to Nova Scotia. The town was spruced up, goaded by the women’s Antigonish Civic Improvement League, but the harbour was not dredged. In the summer of 1914, **The Casket** reported that 60 farms had been listed with Webb. How many came to work them? The Antigonish Forward Movement had not gone very far forward, shading into the tribulations of World War I: Webb vanishes without a trace in **The Casket** or Tompkins’ writings at the end of 1915 .

Where had Tompkins, the Catholic social gospeller, travelled in his thinking during the frenetic period of the Forward Movement? In a letter written to J. A. MacDonald on December 7, 1914, Tompkins wrote: “We must make the county in general prosperous. That largely means the farmer. Make him happy and prosperous and his sons will stay with us. Everything else will follow naturally. In the past, almost everything and everybody here in the East conspired against the farmer either directly or indirectly, and hence our population has been practically stationary for fifty years.”⁴⁷ While cognizant of the plight of the industrial worker in strife-ridden Cape Breton, Tompkins (at least until the out break of WWI) had focussed mainly on the rural question. His correspondence with Father A. R. MacDonald reveals that he thought that Catholic social action had to begin in the rural areas. Tompkins based his argument on the belief that the urban centre was not hospitable to Catholicity.⁴⁸ His correspondence with Father A. R. MacDonald speaks of revolutionizing the whole county and manifests a strong millenarian streak. Although MacDonald was reluctant to embrace Tompkins’ utopianism, he was clearly committed to inaugurating a “system of cooperation” in which the farmer would “reap the benefit of his labours.”⁴⁹ But the most significant development in this period is the formation of a self-conscious cadre of priests committed to reform. Tompkins, it will be hypothesized, was welding his vanguard “party” together. In a historically important letter to Coady in January 24, 1915, Tompkins anticipated that the late blooming Coady (who was now 33) would become an “inspiring leader” well able to hold his own (the elder mentor once again encouraged Coady to learn “elocution” and “good talking”). Tompkins believed that it was “only a matter of a short time that a few good men here can recreate our people.” He was now confident that the “young priests are getting together as never before in the history of this diocese. They are aggressive and their faces are turned toward the light. All we want now are the leaders and enthusiasts before us. The trench digging and the spade work are practically completed.”⁵⁰

“For the People”: Rerum Novarum Comes to Nova Scotia

The trench digging and the spade work may well have been completed, but the battles had scarcely begun. The Antigonish Forward movement had shown Tompkins that a much more concerted, systematic educational effort was imperative if the reform project was going to make any headway. From 1918 to 1928 the reform cadre of priests, spearheaded by Tompkins, would engage in a “massive attempt to resolve the problem engendered by industrialization”.⁵¹ During this fractitious period within the Church and without, the reform cadre articulated a new Catholic discourse and social program. They skilfully wove modernist themes (efficiency, progress, liberalism, democracy)

into a Catholic social framework. They applied liberal principles of educational opportunity for all in a sharply critical manner; they embraced the new sciences that are emerging, natural and social; they argued that workers must not be raw material in the service of wealth, production and private profit and argued for the co-operative form of organization informed by scientific principles of production; they insisted that this latter type of economic progress demands that the common people must learn how society operates and direct their action based on this knowledge. What particularly marks off this new discourse from that of others was the fervent emphasis on adult education as pivotal to the process of enlightenment.

Jimmy Tompkins entered the cultural battle for the heads and hearts of Catholics as part of a over-all strategy to play a leading role in the affairs of Nova Scotia with canalized intensity in January, 1918.

The “Bolshevik Revolution” had occurred just three months earlier triggering fear amongst many Canadians, particularly rural Catholics, that “it” could happen here, and joy amongst many industrial workers, from Vancouver to Winnipeg to Glace Bay. The World War, its end another ten months away, was already radically infecting the consciousness of the masses of people with desire for the end to elitism and privilege. Tompkins’ first educational initiative was to use **The Casket** in a systematic way to awaken the slumbering and set out the reformers’ agenda. Early in January, 1918, he wrote to H. H. MacDonald that he was “interested at the present time in starting a new page in **The Casket** - - the second page”.⁵² On January 24, he launched “For the People” column, and came out swinging. The first column called for the organization of “social study clubs” and explicitly thematized the plight of the industrial worker. Workers were “being saturated with socialism and worse evils”, and this problem could not be counteracted by the “weekly sermon” or “the sacraments”.⁵³ The second column argued that people needed ideas, the “moving force” that would serve as “antidotes to the false economic, social and moral teachings of the day”. Ordinary citizens needed desperately “better knowledge of social conditions” as well as the “causes of these conditions”.⁵⁴

On February 14, Henry Somerville began his journalistic work for Tompkins’ column. Over the next few months Somerville presented the reformers’ case, and as might be anticipated, this message was not universally accepted. For Somerville and the Antigonish, the old order was giving way to a new one. This epochal transition had confronted the Church with fundamental learning challenges. Drawing inspiration from Leo XIII’s **Rerum Novarum** encyclical, Somerville argued that it was

now “imperative that the people be educated along right social, economic and Christian lines. If we do not assume leadership, others will”.⁵⁵ But Catholics were sunk into a dismal and abysmal apathy, and their educational institutions were hopelessly backward. Catholics needed to be educated in the new social philosophy so that they could increase the power and influence of Catholic principles, forestall the adoption of unCatholic principles and secure respect for Catholicism as a constructive, intellectual and practical force.⁵⁶ Catholics also had to learn a new spirit of dialogue with those who were often perceived as the enemy. They had to actively learn from the world itself to see the points of intersection with their deep concerns.

By early March, Somerville’s hard-hitting articles had provoked some negative responses. The

Sydney “rags”, as Tompkins scathingly labelled them, were attacking the critique of Catholic deficiencies in higher education, and Somerville himself was being castigated for being “unusually severe”⁵⁷ (TC, March 7/18). One critic was troubled by Somerville’s challenge to Catholics to commit themselves to “secular efficiency”. Our first aim, the reader countered, should be the cultivation of personal piety - - the “knowledge and practice of those principles that made the lives of the early Christians so powerful an antidote to sin and corruption”.⁵⁸ Did Christians need anything more? Somerville retorted that the cultivation of personal piety duties could not “excuse us for negligence in social service or in public duties. Love of neighbour meant “social service” and the efficient taking of “our full part in the nation’s life”.⁵⁹

Tompkins was enraged at these sorts of reactions. They simply reinforced his pre-War conviction that too many ecclesiastics and lay people did not “appreciate the value of higher education”.⁶⁰ In a candid letter to Donald F. MacDonald, Tompkins acknowledged that the “efficiency campaign” was really “camouflage” for the “real object” of wakening up the people. Leaders were desperately needed, and serious engagement with the new world required lay leaders who were broadly educated. But few Catholics seemed to recognize that the modern university professor needed graduate education. “The man who wrote the letter yesterday,” Tompkins opined, “thinks that the McGregors and the Chisholms, etc., who had an indifferent high school education and half-baked theological training were better professors of Chemistry, Physics, History, etc. than men who have devoted three or four years to post-graduate work in these subjects . . .”. Several weeks later, in a letter to Archbishop McNeil of Toronto, Tompkins dismissed many of the professors teaching at St. Francis as incompetent and lamented the fact that “many poor innocent Catholics are having their legs pulled by educational bluffers” and wondered out loud: “Is it not time also for St. FX to get a band of extension men at work on the line of the University of Wisconsin. That might be a subject for you - - to tell us what Wisconsin is doing”.⁶¹

For the remainder of 1918, the “For the People” column expounded on the core theme of the deep threat to Catholic identity posed by modern developments. Catholics were told that they were falling behind the modern world and reminded that there was a way of regaining influence. An article entitled “Catholics! Wake up! Typifies the spirit of reformer journalism in 1918: “Conditions are not what they were formerly, and unless we wish to see future generations of Catholic people

become the hewers of wood and drawers of water to their wide-awake Protestant fellow-citizens, they must get busy.”⁶² As we ease into 1919, there is a decided shift in tone and emphasis in **The Casket**. One can almost feel the tension pulsating in every issue. Increasingly, **The Casket** editorialist R. F. Phalen, no friend of Tompkins, laced his commentary with strident anti-modernist and bitter anti-socialist rhetoric, only to be counterpointed by the more moderate columns of “For the People”. One also notices a sense of alarm creeping into the writings of Henry Somerville. Unrest spilled out into many countries after the end of World War and a spirit of democracy and revolution had been released into the cultural atmosphere. Somerville thought that “all of our civilization” was in “peril”,⁶³ and was particularly disturbed at the social crises of England. The “comradeship of men of all classes in the trenches” had not seemed to have led to “greater social

harmony There never was a time when labour unrest was more threatening than it is today".⁶⁴ Somerville railed at the way class hatred was undermining community. Could not "Catholic working men subordinate their personal and class interests to the interests of the country?"⁶⁵

On May 1, 1919, on the eve of the Winnipeg General Strike, Somerville argued that the great labour problem was the "control of industry" and insisted that the chance of "successful labour control" existed in proportion to worker "knowledge, education and ability".⁶⁶ But both Somerville and Tompkins were uncomfortable with the communist-led National College of Labour and Plebs League. They were more comfortable with the liberal enlightenment approach of the WEA and Ruskin College, then affiliated with Oxford University. On the other hand, they were decidedly ill at ease with **The Casket** editorialist's denunciations of the Winnipeg strike led by red revolutionaries who were "working on a scheme which would deliver Canada bound and gagged to an international directorate who are atheists, and are intent on destroying every institution we have, social, political, and religious".⁶⁷ On July 10, 1919, one of these red revolutionaries replied to the anti-socialist attacks. The writer accused the editorialist of not being conversant with the reasons for the conditions he deplored and with the way worker appeals to the government were rejected time and time again. The correspondent concluded: "(L)et me say that unless the powers that be pay more attention to the evils that beset us, instead of living in a fool's paradise as at present, a situation will arise - - that will shake our present system to its very foundation, if not destroy it altogether".⁶⁸ The spirit of dialogue was strained to its limits. Fortress Catholicism was asserting itself, and those reformers who were open to the suffering of the industrial worker treaded gingerly, unable to join hands with "state socialists" but troubled by the exploitative nature of capitalist relations of production.

By late 1920, Father Tompkins' deep reflections on the plight of the rural, and now the industrial worker, as well as the plight of his Church in a world with a new democratic spirit in evidence everywhere were congealing into plan of action. Tompkins continued with his commitment to revitalize a farm life - - as did other contributors to **The Casket** and the participants in the "Education and Social Conferences" of 1918 and 1919. But now he was more consciously thematizing the labour question as an integral part of a larger reform strategy. He was convinced that the "hour has struck" to launch a "People's School" to demonstrate the practical potential of adult

education and to address labour issues in the Education and Social conference of 1921. In the fall of 1920 Tompkins revealed his innermost thoughts to Fathers John A. Ryan and Thomas Shahan, the rector of the Catholic University of America. On October 11, 1920, Tompkins, who had been very impressed with Ryan's lecture on "Industrial Democracy" when he was in New York earlier in the year, informed him that "labour" was to be placed on the agenda for the for the Education and Social Conference of 1921. He hoped that they would be able to gather together a "number of intelligent Labour leaders from the various industrial centres." Nine days later, Tompkins told Ryan that: "The Labour element in our industrial centres is getting out of hand and their leaders are a bad sort. They are, of course, desirous of helping the men and are actually helping them."⁶⁹ Three weeks later, he told him that "the Church in these parts has been extremely slow and most of the

labour leaders are atheists and infidels - - they know more about the subject than anybody else around here".⁷⁰ The Church may have been slow in responding, but Tompkins was attempting to make up for lost time. He moved in two directions in his effort to enter into dialogue with the industrial workers of Cape Breton. At the fourth annual Education and Social Conference, held during the first week of August 1921, discussion focussed dramatically on labour themes. This meeting was thoroughly progressive in tone and agenda rather shocking for conservative, rural-oriental Catholics. Attendees listened to presentations on "The History of Labour Unionism in Nova Scotia" by John Joy of Halifax, who told the gathered that the history of trade unionism was a "history of unjust social and economic conditions." They engaged in discussions about the way reactionary forces were labelling "Bolshevism" as root cause of Canadian unionism, the need for social insurance, remedies to unemployment, developments in labour legislation. They heard W. P. Delaney, moderate vice-president of the United Mine Workers, denounce compulsory arbitration as undemocratic. And they listened to the doyen of progressive Catholicism, John A. Ryan, deliver the keynote on "Industrial Autocracy vs. Industrial Democracy." Ryan's ideas precipitated a spirited debate in **The Casket** (Nov. 3, 10, and 17, 1921), with the Catholic socialist Joe Wallace arguing that his views were very similar to those of Ryan, and **The Casket** editorialist countering vehemently that Catholics could not be socialists.⁷¹

Tompkins second strategy was to open up dialogue with labour leaders about the possibility of creating a labour college, which would be a constituent college in the proposed federation of Maritime universities. Archival records do not indicate clearly when Tompkins began talking up the idea of a labour college. But in a letter to W. S. Learned of the Carnegie Corporation on September 25, 1922, he claimed that: "The Labour idea is growing like a snowball. It is going to get *the people* on the run and will result in a decent grant from the government."⁷² On October 4, 1922, communist organizer J.B. McLachlan, secretary-treasurer of United Mine Workers of America, No. 26, Glace Bay, wrote to Tompkins. "Of course you must understand that our Labour College is just a dream as yet, however we are conducting what we call an Educational Club, and hope that some day in the near future it may develop into a school." He went on to tell Tompkins that at present there were 72 members in the Glace Bay club, and he hoped to "establish similar clubs throughout the industrial counties in the Province." He also told him that the social reformer J. S. Woodsworth had lectured in Glace Bay during the previous week, that he wanted to start small libraries for the

workers and he hoped that Tompkins would give one lecture. This is an important letter. Radicalism from the 1890's to around 1922 or so generated much interest in different kinds of workers' education, especially the establishment of a permanent Provincial Labour College. Tompkins' agenda was to deflect McLachlan and other "reds" from developing a Labour College of the United Kingdom.⁷³ He apprized Learned on October 17, 1922, that his "labour connections in Cape Breton are developing fine. They are going along the WEA and Ruskin College idea which is very fortunate . . . I had a very nice letter from one of the *reddest* of them. They have . . . advertised this week very prominently in their paper."⁷⁴ Nothing much would come of this self-interested dialogue until 1933 when Saint Francis Xavier University Extension opened an office in Glace Bay.

The hour for the People's School finally struck in January, 1921. In the fall of 1920 Tompkins had explained to Thomas Shahan that he had in mind the setting up of an organization for reaching the people that may be fraught with wonderful possibilities. You can hardly imagine what a change has come over the out-look of the people all through this county within the last few years. The air is recently charged with Education unrest - - with Bolshevism of the Better Sort." ⁷⁵ One month later, Tompkins wrote to principal Dr. M. M. Cumming of the Agricultural College in Truro, a fellow progressive and advocate of the Danish folk high school movement, "I think we have come to the people's school at last". ⁷⁶

Tompkins needed this school to demonstrate that the "extension" idea would work in refluent Nova Scotia: a two month course running from January 15 to March 15, 1921, for men [sic] over seventeen who will do some "elementary work" in English, Mathematics, Science, Economics and Agriculture. They were to be taught by "Little Doc" Hugh MacPherson (Agriculture), Miles Tompkins (Chemistry and Stock breeding), W. Bucknell (English literature), Moses Coady (Mathematics),

D. J. MacDonald (Economics), W. P. Reynolds (Commerce and Finance), J. Boyle (Debating and Public Speaking), D. A. MacIsaac (Veterinary Hygiene), C. J. Connolly (Biology and Natural Resources), John R. MacDonald (Grammar). Classes were to be held in the Celtic Hall and Agricultural building. On December 2, 1920, The Casket advertised "Courses for Grown-up Men".

No tests were to be given. Potential students were told that the school would "furnish an excellent opportunity for young men to perfect themselves in the elements of a general education and to lay the foundation of a scientific training in Agriculture and Industry." Fifty-one men, aged seventeen to fifty-seven, most of whom had left school at about the sixth grade, attended the historic People's School at Saint Francis Xavier College. The men who had nurtured this school to its birth were almost overwhelmed by this event. Writing only two weeks into the School, Father Tompkins exuded to Rev. Gerald B. Phalen of St. Mary's Cathedral in Halifax that "it is a perfect joy to see the avidity with which these men are striving after knowledge". ⁷⁷

The teachers at the People's School responded to their experience with great enthusiasm, in Tompkins' case, with typical inflated rhetoric. Principal Cumming of the Agricultural College, who spoke to the students one evening, recommended that the School gain a permanent place in the life of the province; if it did, like the people's high schools of Denmark, might revitalize Nova Scotia.

D. A. MacIsaac said that "our experience with the people's school showed what a great loss this county is sustaining by our laxity in bringing knowledge to the common people." Miles Tompkins thought it "our duty to see that the People's School be the nucleus of a great educational campaign which will help the farmer to help himself to a position where he can be as efficient and as happy in his own industry as he is entitled to be." C. J. Connolly, who had been conducting investigations into the state of the Nova Scotia fishery (the situation was miserable), was advocating that fishermen form co-operatives to learn their out of their misery the observed that it was a fact that "few realize to what extent scientific research has affected the daily life of the individual". W. H. Bucknell, the English literature professor Tompkins had lured to Antigonish from England, believed that the students had gone away from the People's School "fortified with greater self-confidence and

endowed with a large fund of refreshing inspiration.” Rev. John R MacDonald, speaking no doubt for every one, noted that the People’s School was an experiment that revealed that “our education methods have not been satisfactorily democratic; that the vast majority of the people have not been receiving the educational opportunities which are their right.” Moses Coady found the people “anxious for knowledge and desirous of improvement The time is ripe, it would seem, for a vigorous program of adult education in this county.” And “Little Doc” Hugh MacPherson noted that the People’s School was “intended to afford an opportunity for education to citizens who have already found their life’s work. It is for the farmer who intends to farm, for the mining man who intends to follow his avocation, for the fisherman who wins his livelihood by garnering the harvest fo the sea.” Each of them, the stalwart Doctor observed, had the right to know the world, be enriched with the stories and poetry of life, be inspired and shown the way to the wholesome life. This was not quite what J. B. MacLachlan and the Cape Breton reds had in mind.

What did the students think of their unique learning experience? HFM, a nineteen year old farmer from Richmond, Cape Breton, claimed that he need not be ashamed of his profession of farming, which he had previously hated. S. J. MacKinnon, a farmer, age twenty-nine, from Beaver Cove, Cape Breton, said that their minds had been opened to “new lines of thought and study we never dreamed of before. It aroused in us a self-confidence and an ambition to keep on studying along these lines.” MacKinnon went on to note that the great war had “demonstrated that one man is about as good as another. . . .This has caused a great wave of democracy to spread over the county and as a consequence a great desire for education has arisen among the common people.” J. J. S., a twenty-six year old farmer from Fredericton, NB , believed that in the school “ will be found the force that will change a thoughtless into a thinking public.” And R. A. B., age twenty-one, from Afton, NS, spoke of his experience as the “biggest and most progressive step ever taken towards forward movement in Nova Scotia”.⁷⁸

Many outside commentators were in agreement with the young man from Afton. The **Sydney Post** (May 18, 1921) thought that St. FX University represented the “most progressive educational institution in the Maritime Provinces”, and that it had broken new ground by inaugurating the People’s School to bring “educational advantages” to those who had not completed their school training. The progressive **Halifax Herald** (May 28, 1921) used the occasion to criticize the

universities once again. “For many years universities everywhere have been, and most of them still are, labouring under the misconception that they by divine right, shall serve the wealthy and privileged classes, and in no degree promote popular education.” The **Herald** continued very much in the spirit of Tompkins’ populist crusade to democratize knowledge. “But the cry of our age, the demand of the public conscience today, is for the universities to cease their selfish and ‘privileged’ conception of education, and to be servants of the people as such.” The “plain people” were hungering for knowledge, and the “new cornerstone of the edifice of popular education in the province” had “come to stay.” The editorialist insisted that Dalhousie and Acadia promote this “new form of popular education”; if not, they would suffer the “penalty of withdrawn suffrage.” **The United Farmers Guide**, the Maritime farmers’ newspaper, thought the success of the School “so phenomenal that there will be no question of continuing.”⁷⁹

Tompkins' little pamphlet, **Knowledge for the People: A Call to SFX's College** (KFTP), was published in 1921 to coincide with the launch of The People's School. Plain in appearance and presentation, it is nonetheless a remarkable document, resonant with buoyant optimism and belief in the liberating power of knowledge. Like many thoughtful reformers of his time, Tompkins believed that the first world war had precipitated "momentous changes . . . Old ways of thinking and acting have been broken up and a new spirit has gone abroad".⁸⁰ Tompkins believed that the "terror and tragedy" of World War I had quickened in men and women a desire for an "equal share in opportunity and in the good and worth while things of life". This "new spirit" was nowhere more evident than in the field of Education. "No other idea has so gripped the people of the whole world as the desire for more knowledge, better intellectual training, and better organized effort in their various callings. It has gripped them **en masse**, and without regard to condition, class or circumstances." The end of the war had accelerated the demands from below for the end to privilege and elitism, and the real war was now fought on the battlefield of ideas. In his meditation upon the signing of peace on June 28, 1919, Tompkins maintained that "those who carry within them the hopes and hates of man are the real combatants. The thunder of guns is but an echo of the resistless march and the clash of ideas. Those who are able to think and are willing to think will govern in the councils of the world".⁸¹

By the end of the war Tompkins was confident that the new social Catholicism could enter into combative dialogue with other ideas circulating within the cultural field of eastern Nova Scotia. Tompkins, who in 1914 had identified himself, somewhat enigmatically, as a "Mosaic radical - - I am for God and the people,"⁸² believed that Maritimers were "industrially and financially, living under a despotism. Our money and our resources should not be handed over to any group or any class, no matter how benevolent or however inspired by high purpose, because it is not good for the country - - and it is not democratic. It is the very opposite of democracy". Maritimers had lost control over their banking system, control of industry had moved west, with Maritimers left to do the "servile work." Consequently, profits were not distributed locally, the county was impoverished, the local economy ruined.

In an article written for a special Labour day issue of the **Halifax Herald** in 1920, Tompkins admitted candidly that "men of his class - - professors and clergymen" - - had not taken a "serious and enlightened interest in the problems and perplexities" and the "hopes and aspirations of the labouring man." Now he was, however, and he drew upon **Rerum Novarum**, and recent publications of progressive Catholic social thought (The British Cardinal Bourne's Lenten pastoral (1918), "Catholics and Social Reform," and the "Program of Reconstruction" by the American Catholic Bishops (January 1919), to speak to labouring men. These documents, Tompkins contended, laid out the deep flaws of a "rapacious capitalism" in which a "small number of very rich men had been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the labouring poor a yolk little better than slavery itself." The "wage system" had to go, and the worker had to be made partner "so that he [sic] may get a proper share of the income earned by his work." Tompkins imagined that worker ownership could be reached gradually "through co-operative, productive societies and co-partnership

arrangements.” The idea of “state ownership of private property” disturbed social Catholics like Tompkins, Somerville and Ryan very deeply. They preferred a “social economy” within which the various social components could function to sustain a just and orderly world. For those who were farmers, especially, any notion of the collectivization of agriculture was psychologically debasing. Tompkins’ roots were in the world of the small proprietor, with their affiliative identity with the land.

“The remedy,” Tompkins declared, “cannot lie in revolution.” Comfortable with the parliamentary route to righting social wrongs, Tompkins insisted that social justice could be achieved through the “ordinary and orderly process of education, organization, and legislation.” This latter program would have been condemned as liberal reformist and ameliorative in intention by the radical miners of Cape Breton. Yet Tompkins’ populist convictions placed extraordinary emphasis on education as the “first and most necessary remedy - - education in the broadest and most comprehensive sense.”

⁸³ Like his contemporary American progressives John Dewey and Eduard Lindeman, articulated a moderate developmental vision of democracy. Any truly democratic society could not permit humanity’s “vast possibilities” to lie “dormant”. ⁸⁴ If a developmental democratic culture and society were to be built, Tompkins wrote in **The Casket**, “We must strike the adult population, because it is only through their enlightenment that we can hope to hold what we got, and for that matter it rests upon them what type of education and how much will be given to the rising generation.” ⁸⁵ Indeed, how could one count on the children to save the world? High school and college education was undemocratic (half of the pupils left school at the sixth grade, 9% of Nova Scotia’s school-going population were in high school and 1% in college). “It is useless to talk of training the social and economic understanding and of developing those qualities that make for leadership and efficient citizenship before the 14th or 15th year,” he exclaimed shortly after the first People’s School had ended, “and before a certain amount of high school education has been received.” He lamented the fact that the “great bulk of our people is composed of the ‘rejects’ and ‘derelicts’ of our glorified and so-called democratic educational system” which had led to a “sixth-rate citizenship and sixth-rate leaders”. ⁸⁶

Education could no longer be thought of as a ladder with only a few reaching the top rung. “The

newer idea represents education as a broad ‘highway’ along which all men should be encouraged to travel abreast as far as their powers can carry them. Let us have done with the ‘ladder’ and take our stride on the broad ‘highway’”. ⁸⁷ The “submerged 70% to 80% that had prompted the establishment of the People’s School” were now creating a fertile field for educational extension. Many of the returned soldiers had experienced the power of adult education in the trenches of the Khaki University and University of Vimy Ridge in World War I, were “eager for instruction”. ⁸⁸ People had more leisure time, and this opened up opportunities for “self-improvement”, many 16 to 25 year-olds had missed opportunities to become formally educated and with prohibition people had more time for “self-improvement and intellectual pursuits.” But the most significant forces breaking the silence, Tompkins contended, were the people’s movements. The farmer’s movement and the programs of the various branches of Labour showed “clearly that the people as a whole are seeking for better living and more active and dignified part in the nation’s life.” Women were his third

important social movement. They had received the franchise, and this obligated them to understand the “many complex and difficult problems which they will help to solve by their vote if intelligently cast.” Tompkins thought that their active participation in the war had made them “especially eager for self-improvement”⁸⁹ and education was the way to power.

Roman Catholic education, lower and higher was in Tompkins’ acerbic judgment radically unprepared to meet the needs of both the submerged seventy or eighty percent of Canadians and the new professional middle classes. In two candid letters written to Henry Somerville (probably during the latter war years), Tompkins articulated his view that the world was “moving forward”, science was “making marvellous progress, but Catholic colleges remain [ed] in the same old rut.” In his view, Catholics did not figure in the public life of the country because there was practically no such thing as Catholic higher education among us”⁹⁰ (L1). Rather than flourishing, “self-satisfied, self-deluded Catholic educators” starved the people intellectually. Catholic colleges were not producing scientists; Catholic scholarship was not even advancing in areas one might expect, such as Anglo-Saxon literature; the clergy could scarcely even talk “intelligently on current questions” or even present “elementary Catholic doctrine in an intelligible manner”.⁹¹ The prophetic voice of Tompkins blamed the frightened church hierarchy. They were simply afraid of the “truth”, and gave up the “modern materialistic theories” to secular thinkers. In a modernizing university culture, various domains of study - - the natural and “new” social sciences - - were slipping out from the tutelage of theocentric or moral totalizing viewpoints, and Father Jimmy did not believe that theologians had the authority to preside over educational and scientific matters. The solution clearly lay in the direction of paying “less attention to the imaginary ‘existentia’ of our philosophical text-books and more to the real ‘existentia’ that confronts our people in actual life.”⁹² This meant that if Catholic higher education were to play its role in Canadian society it had to embrace scholarly specialization. “Let it not be said,” he cried out, “that you know excellent professors of Physics who never attended a postgraduate school, and that you know other professors of Physics who have excellent degrees but who are simply not worth their salt. These are the exceptions. As a rule postgraduate training is indispensable for efficiency in the teaching profession. We should not expect Divine Providence to make exceptions for us and lead us to success along any but the ordinary way.”⁹³ Without this

solid graduate training of the Catholic professoriate, it was not possible to provide either the kind of scientific instruction for farmers or for professional men. Tompkins had very high expectations of professional men he was convinced that the lost influence of the Church had much to do with the way the professional middle classes had embraced secular and materialist norms and values.

Although Father Tompkins believed in the final analysis that a “real Catholic university - - not the make-believe sham university” - - was essential for the social Catholic project, he committed himself, heart and soul, to the pragmatic goal of getting a “real centre and St. Francis Xavier would become a kind of people’s community college and collegiate institute (as would Mount Allison and Acadia). In Halifax, a Catholic college, akin to St. Michael’s in Toronto, would be established. Tompkins did not fear the secular world of the natural and social sciences. He believed, one can conjecture, that there was no contradiction between God’s revealed truth and the natural laws governing natural and human affairs. Both “truths” converged, and the well-equipped Catholic

professor of any of the natural sciences could place his scholarly work in the service of more socially efficient practices, be they in the fishery or on the farm, and the equally well-trained social scientist could shape his insights into different dimensions of social reality in dialogue with others, guided by the social ethical teachings of the Church. This latter view, it would turn out, was rejected outright by Bishop Morrison of the Diocese of Antigonish and Dr. Hugh P. MacPherson, the old rector of St. Francis Xavier.

Tompkins had had a long association with the Carnegie Foundation of New York. In 1921 they were predisposed to support the “lasting interests of higher education” in the Maritimes.⁹⁴ Leaping through this window of opportunity, Tompkins plunged into action to gather support amongst Catholic clerics and laity for the merger. William S. Learned, assistant secretary of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and K. C. M. Sills, president of Bowdoin College in Maine, departed for the Maritimes in October 1921, and released their scathing critique of higher education in May, 1922. The report recommended that higher education in the Maritimes be centralized in a single university in Halifax. Present arrangements - - small endowment funds, underpaid faculties, poor library holdings, inadequate facilities - - could not continue if there was to be any hope at all for higher education in the Maritimes.

In the second week of January, 1922, with the second People’s School about to begin, feeling rather upbeat but a little harried, Tompkins wrote to Dr. Learned that the core faculty members (Boyle, Gillis, Connolly, Coady, Nicholson, Fr. J.R. MacDonald, “Little Doc” Hugh MacPherson as well as even the rector himself) were embracing enthusiastically the merger scheme. Bishop Morrison, typically, was proceeding cautiously. “It is for us to set the pace. He never opposes anything the people want. That is good enough policy for us”. In fact, Tompkins was ecstatic about the potential of the Carnegie scheme. “This is a great thing you have started and the good that will come from it will be incalculable. We shall have no Catholic opponent. As for non-Catholics - - I can’t see how any one can build up a shadow of a case against the proposal.”⁹⁵ Tompkins viewed the merger and the People’s School project as inseparable. “If the men of the corporation could come to Antigonish and look into the faces of the 70 men at the people’s school it would be sufficient proof to them that the rank and file of this county is splendid in brain and character - - what is left of it after 50 years of the leadership of the blind, the foolish and the useless. The Confederationists have it in their power to save us. If they do not, I don’t know who can or who will.”⁹⁶ Tompkins was clearly at hope’s end.

Even though the faculty of St. Francis had given strong support for the merger scheme in January, 1922, Tompkins’ bold declaration that there would be “no Catholic opponent” would not turn out to be false. In early February Tompkins counselled Learned that the best way to proceed was indirectly, skirting around the “formal ecclesiastical authorities”. Dr. Hugh MacPherson, St. Francis rector, had tried to defeat the faculty resolution and, according to Father Tompkins, was doing what he could to counsel people against the merger - - using “religious, financial and sentimental” reasons.⁹⁷ By early April, Tompkins still thought the report would be “irresistible”, but the “great difficulty will be apathy, indifference and a lack of ability in High Places.” Despite resistance from high places, Tompkins thought he was within “sight of the goal after 15 years of dreadful uphill

By the end of May, 1922 the first signs of serious reaction register in Tompkins' discourse. Cloaking himself in the prophetic mantle, Tompkins wrote to Learned that the “powers of darkness and reaction” had been “making a dead set upon us” and that he was the “bad man”.⁹⁹ The “acute stage” was approaching now, and he welcomed the Report. What had been happening? The anti-merger group - - characterized vitriolically by Tompkins as an “ignorant spasm of a few backwoods fellows”¹⁰⁰ - - were conducting a propaganda campaign (described as “vicious” and “unscrupulous” by Tompkins). Local merchants were told that if St. FX their businesses would decline; the Scots, Irish and Acadians were told that without their own “Catholic” university they might lose their ethnicity; mothers and fathers were informed that secular universities like Harvard were breeding grounds for syphilis and atheism. If this were not troubling enough, Tompkins felt that Bishop Morrison and Dr. Hugh MacPherson were destroying St. Francis Xavier. This year, Tompkins instructed Learned, we have lost “Smith, Gautherson, Connolly, Thibear, Boyle, J. R. Mac Donald and they were anxious to drop Dr. Hugh MacPherson . . . Boyle was put out - - as a warning I suppose to the temerous.”¹⁰¹ The reform cadre was under siege.

Trouble and open dissent flared into the open at the priest's annual retreat in May. Still, Tompkins thought that despite trouble in high places that the anti-merger arguments were not very powerful and could be overcome. The Carnegie Corporation shared this later view, believing that “little by little existing opposition will be overcome”.¹⁰² Indeed, the tide seemed to be flowing along Tompkins and Carnegie's favoured pathway at the seminal special conference of Maritime universities and colleges, held in Halifax on July 7, 1922. To be sure, some concern was expressed regarding questions of finance and local merchant opposition. According to Fred Pearson, a level-headed Halifax lawyer, president Cutten of Acadia had “behaved in a most unmannerly way”, apparently accusing Dalhousie of wanting to absorb the other colleges.¹⁰³ More darkly, Pearson hinted to Learned that President Cutten, scanning Mt. Allison's severe financial difficulties, saw an opportunity to become the only rural college representing Protestants. Old sectarian sensibilities and struggles die hard.

The tempest at the priests' retreat in May had become a raging blizzard by July, perhaps the “dark month of the soul” for James J. Tompkins. Tompkins thought that Dr. MacPherson and the Bishop were “using every means to keep down discussion in favour of the federation and have closed our Catholic weekly to any parts of the scheme.”¹⁰⁴ Discussion about the merger was censored in **The Casket**; more seriously, at the special clergy retreat to discuss the merger question, Bishop Morrison rejected clergy requests for more information about the merger. At this meeting Tompkins arose and said that since he was the “chief villain” perhaps he ought to have a hearing. The Bishop denied Tompkins this right. Tompkins saw this a “sorry exhibition” and reflected on this event to Dr. Learned. “The little fellows were frightened to death and this ignorant hubbub is the result of a panic in Antigonish on the part of the people who think they will sell less shoestrings, etc. They have used the Scotch cry a great deal too, forgetful of the fact that the Scotch will be the largest element in the combination. They have also tried to stir up the French . . .” Tompkins concluded

with this statement. “We are not living in Russia among aristocrats and man has a right to a hearing. Men left the meeting crying with rage and excitement”.¹⁰⁵ The Bolshevists of the worst sort were now his superiors now Tompkins’ struggle for a mere democratic culture had moved inside the Church, where he confronted resistance Bishop and Rector. The handwriting was on the wall for the embattled Irishmen from the lovely Margaree Valley in Cape Breton. Father Jimmy Tompkins could perhaps take some comfort from the words of Father Michael Gillis, one of the pioneering reform cadre from Boisdale, Cape Breton, who spoke for the others. There was, he said, “general sympathy and admiration for you in the painful situation in which you were placed”.¹⁰⁶

But there was no comfort whatsoever to be taken from ensuing events. On July 26 St. Francis called a board meeting to consider the proposed Federation of Colleges. The anti-merger forces had the majority on the board, and voted against federation. A totally disgusted Tompkins told Learned that it didn’t really matter anyway because the Bishop had said that the “governors had no say in the matter”.¹⁰⁷ He thought that the college was gone. However, he maintained his optimism that despite revulsion toward the present leadership’s “aristocratic and crooked” ways,¹⁰⁸ the movement “simply **cannot** [italics JT] be headed off”.¹⁰⁹ Seemingly against the odds, Tompkins persisted in his political-educational work in support of the federation. His strategy was to work through Halifax, where he had support from the Archbishop, and Newfoundland, where he also had support. Even after St. Francis had decided to boycott the reconvened conference of the universities on October 24, 1922, Tompkins persisted in thinking that the “federation has gone through”.¹¹⁰

Tompkins was bitterly opposed to Bishop Morrison’s fortress Catholicism, which he thought typified St. Dunstan’s seminary in Prince Edward Island, where Morrison had studied. “You were ‘up against’ the St. Dunstan’s spirit,” he told Learned, “and you know what it means, well Bishop Morrison is ‘one of them’ with a vengeance and he is ably assisted by Dr. MacPherson”.¹¹¹ Around the end of October or the first week in November, the St. Dunstan’s spirit materialized in the

appearance of “A Report on the Proposed Federation of the Maritimes Universities submitted to the Governors of St. Francis Xavier’s College by a Committee Appointed by His Lordship Bishop Morrison”. This document will not take its place in the “intellectual history” of Canadian Catholicism. But it does provide insight into the kind of counter-progressive discourse circulating in the diocese and deep-seated fears no doubt present among many Catholics. The anti-federationists were profoundly afraid of the modern, secular university and of losing control of the keystone of Catholicity, the college. They perceived the merger as an “invitation to get gobbled up” and were opposed to “efficiency” advocates like Tompkins. The document was clearly in the ultramontanist tradition of 19th century Catholicism.

The Report argued that the “purpose of education” was to “help men live well”. In order for Catholics to live well, “all education from the lowest to the highest must be guided by Christian truth. Any education that leaves it out of account is imperfect and dangerous to faith and morals.” Maritime Catholics were “forbidden by common sense and the natural law to give up their distinctively Catholic liberal arts work for a diluted, semi-Catholic, semi-pagan course of instruction in this proposed non-sectarian university.” The Report’s author contended that the modern, secular

university was thoroughly materialist in orientation, and much of the teaching was “dangerous to faith and morals.” Modern professors viewed Catholicism, so it was thought, as “superstitious and as a relic of the dark ages”, and weak and vulnerable Catholic students would either be directly indoctrinated with secularism, or would “unconsciously imbibe false teaching without knowing it.”

All of this was utterly abhorrent to the anti-federationists. Any university that left Christianity out of consideration was deficient, for the fundamental purpose of Catholic education was not so much what was actually taught or how many subjects. Rather, Catholic graduates had to be “strong to serve, and powerful enough to battle the evil of the world, and construct virtue in the character of men and women.” What the world needed was “not efficiency, but fewer knockers and more boosters of Catholic education”. In a passage obviously directed at Father Tompkins, the Report mocked those who camouflaged their “bad cause” with shibboleths such as patriotism, efficiency, etc”. It has been done to such an extent as to deceive even the very elect. Such arrogance! Patriotism indeed! If patriotism consists in lessening Catholic teaching; if it consists in lessening the strength of the only secure foundation of society; if it consists in minimizing the only force that can bring peace to a distracted economic world; if it consists in substituting modern pagan and materialistic teaching for Christianity, then surely the federalists are the very quintessence of patriotism.” The Report concluded in the spirit of a fortress Catholicism triumphant. “Do not say that we are a small people, remote from the great centres of New World population and activities. The history of education abounds with precedents of powerful schools established in places that seemed unpromising, but where [sic] in reality happily adapted to the views of Divine Providence.”¹¹²

Writing to Learned on November 5, 1922, Tompkins thought that decent Catholics would pity this the “great apologia” at the anti-federationists. Most would be utterly ashamed of it. Nonetheless, Tompkins remained hopeful that Catholics could learn that in “general educational movements, nothing sinister [was] intended against religion.” The time was ripe, he informed Learned, for a

“campaign among Catholics to take their place as citizens of this country and to give up peeping through key holes and around corners wondering who is trying to poison them.”¹¹³ Two weeks later, Tompkins revealed in a letter to Dr. Kandel of the Carnegie Corporation that his spirits were still high. He wanted to investigate further the questions of state universities, state support of higher education and democratic movements in education. He was encouraged by the “sympathetic reception the People’s School idea (had) received all over the country,” and he informed Kandel that his name had “become linked up with progressive educational movements and the education of the masses.”¹¹⁴ But Tompkins, the educational radical and proponent of progressive ideas, was about to hear some startling news.

In mid-December of 1922 Bishop Morrison of the Diocese of Antigonish removed the fifty-two year old Father James J. Tompkins from his position at St. Francis Xavier College and sent him to Canso, a small and rather desolate fishing village, where he would become a parish priest for the first time in his religious life. The Attorney General of Nova Scotia, A. R. MacDonald, consoled Tompkins on December 20th. “I did not think that they would fly so directly into the very teeth of all logic and all sense of decency as to take you away from the College and condemn you to a Canso exile. The worst feature of the whole affair is their display of ingratitude.” MacDonald condemned the “dark

stupidity” of the whole business and took some comfort from the old proverb about the gods making mad those whom they would destroy. He hoped it would repeat itself in the case of the “Russians of Antigonish.”¹¹⁵ One day later, clearly distraught, Tompkins told Learned that he had “been turned out into the wilderness to a place called Canso (CANSO) - - a terrible place I understand, where, among other things, the sun is not seen for 9 months on account of fog. It is not likely I shall be able to stand it - - men who know me tell me the move is unthinkable.”¹¹⁶ Tompkins remained resolute in his conviction that his departure from St. Francis would spur on his friends. Three days later, with the dust settling somewhat, Tompkins confided in his old Carnegie friend that it was difficult to tell what might happen at St. Francis. “There might be an uprising headed by the laymen at anytime and a delegation to the Bishop. As far as he and the Rector are concerned - - they are hopeless. They are utterly ruining SFX, and putting it and themselves deeper in the mire by each progressive move. Their utter lack of sense and scruple and their manifestly unfair tactics are daily adding great strength to our cause”. Tompkins underscored an earlier theme: he thought he had a “good reason to believe that my exile . . . gives the movement quite an impetus”.¹¹⁷ On Boxing Day, Tompkins’ friend Learned consoled the exiled and troubled father. “I feel certain that your sojourn in the desert will be brief, since the pressure of public opinion cannot fail to react vigorously to such ill-judged and arbitrary action.” Learned counselled him to place his “irresistible determination” to organize the “liberal forces” and get the “movement under way”.¹¹⁸

Integrists versus Progressives

From the beginning of the Antigonish Forward Movement in 1913 to his exile to Canso in December, 1922, Father Tompkins and the determined reform band had engaged in a bitter struggle within their Church to articulate a new “social philosophy” and “course of action”.¹¹⁹ Both sides –

- the Catholic integrists and the Catholic progressives - - occupied common ground in affirming that the Roman Catholic Church had lost much of its influence in secular affairs. They differed radically, though, over their analysis of the causes of the lost influence. The integrists targeted secular, materialist ideology as chief enemy and retreated inside their fortresses to protect the faith. Lowering the drawbridge to the world, the progressivists placed the blame on ultramontanist Catholicism’s unwillingness to embrace the new social theory of education. The integrists set Christ against culture, and were strongly Manichean in world-orientation; for the progressives, Christ was the transformer of culture acting through the agency of the faithful who had to be fully engaged in and with the world.

For the integrists, the merger symbolized the dissensus and strife that was tearing at the fabric of Catholicity in eastern Nova Scotia. One can sympathize somewhat with Bishop Morrison. As guardian of the faith and keeper of the peace, he had experienced first-hand the hostility manifest in the assembly of priests at retreats and education conferences, listened to reformers denounce the quality of education received at St. Francis Xavier (and the rural schools that had produced the Antigonish elites), observed Tompkins’ flirtation with radical ideas and witnessed the recriminatory debates around the merger issue. From his standpoint, the progressivist opening up to the world (both to learn from and struggle with) threatened the Church’s hegemonic rule over all domains of

life. Modernizing forces had introduced serious disturbances into the lifeworld domains of Catholic cultural reproduction, social integration and socialization. The industrialization of the mode of production, in factory (mines), on farm (scientific agriculture and technology) and sea (trawlers), had precipitated a crisis in orientation and education. The integrists found their interpretive scheme, anchored in revealed truth and moral prescription, countered by the progressive embracing of rational forms of explanation. The integrists rightly perceived “socialism” and “communism” as surrogate meaning systems which provided a new “meaning perspective” for workers who were confronting new “disorienting dilemmas”.¹²⁰ Modernizing forces also unsettled traditional forms of Catholic solidarity. The perceived threat to a pre-modernist version of Catholic identity was complicated further by ethnicity (which intertwines with Catholicity in fascinating ways). The formation of the Scottish Catholic Society in 1919 provides powerful evidence that many Scots perceived their Scottish identity to be threatened. The core of this identity - -“family farm, language (Gaelic), and kinship relations”¹²¹ - - was being unsettled by the increased use of the English language, out-migration and the centralization of education in large centres. The merger would clearly have been perceived by some Scots and Irish (and Acadians) as a sort of last straw: their college removed from their own community, an argument dismissed outright by Tompkins. Finally, modernization was disrupting traditional patterns of socialization. Urban life, and the beginnings of consumer capitalism (symbolized perhaps in the Eaton’s catalogue), were undermining old patterns of personality formation. The traditional scripting of the self was slowly eroding, and the progressivists were alert to the need to provide new motivational structures for youth and adults. The appearance of the discourse of self-realization in the writing of Jimmy Tompkins and other progressives signals a shift in the way personal development is understood in the modern world. The development of the person begins to move on its own axis, apart from the theological-moral scripting

of the Church. This issue is behind, to a great extent, the traditionalist’s fear of the city and secular university where a plethora of life-patterns confronted the unwary Christian.

Both the integrist and the progressive world outlooks can be usefully characterized as forms of communitarianism. For the conservative communitarians, the merger symbolized the radical destabilizing of a way of life with a “long history of cultural survival, community advancement, local self-determination, and successful practice”.¹²² They knew who they were, and were very reluctant to gamble away their heritage. Catholic integrists believed that the solution to lifeworld problems lay not in institutions reform but in value regeneration. By contrast, progressives like Tompkins viewed problem of modernity less as “loss of sense of belonging and solidarity,” and more as a “loss of **political agency and efficacy**”(it.SB).¹²³ Tompkins and the reform cadre were not bemoaning the social differentiation process as such. They accepted the separation of spheres (the differentiation of modern society into the political, the economic, and the civic and the familial-intimate domains). But they did not accept the loss of Catholic efficacy in these differentiated spheres. Thus, for the integrationists, one pathway open for them would be to defend the rural order as the only solid basis to solve the problem of anomie and lack of solidarity. The participationists, on the other hand, would be willing to fight for a Catholic presence within the newly differentiated domains (the secular university and the factories). It should not surprise us to see vacillation

NALL Working Paper # 57 – Fraught with Wonderful Possibilities: Father Jimmy Tompkins and the Struggle for a Catholic Progressivism, 1902 – 1922 27

between integrationist (which privileges rurality) and participationist impulses (which either privileges urbanity or argues for an agrarian-industrial synthesis) in the discourse and struggles of the Catholic social reformers through the 1920's, on into the depression and war years, and perhaps well into the 20th century.

End notes

- *>To appear in Acadiensis. Other publications related to this NALL project include the following:
- > Jim Lotz and Michael Welton, Father Jimmy: the life and times of Jimmy Tompkins. Wreck Cove: Breton Books, 1997.
 - > Michael Welton. "A New and Disturbing Presence," in B. Fairbairn, Ian MacPherson, Nora > Russell, eds. Canadian Co-operatives in the year 2000: memory, mutual aid and the millennium. Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives,2000.
 - > Michael Welton, Little Mosie from the Margaree: a biography of Moses
 - > Michael Coady. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishers, 2001
 - > Michael Welton. "Decoding Coady: Masters of their own destiny under critical scrutiny."> Studies in Continuing Education, forthcoming.

1. The Casket, February 14, 1918
2. J. J. Tompkins to Sister St. Margaret, April 27, 1914. J. J. Tompkins Papers, Correspondence 1912 - 1922. Beaton Institute Archives, University College of Cape Breton, Sydney, Nova Scotia. All correspondence citations are from this collection.
3. The Casket, July 17, 1913
4. Ibid., September 4, 1913
5. Ibid., August 21, 1913
6. Ibid., August 28, 1913
7. Ibid., August 21, 1913
8. Ibid., July 24, 1913
9. Ibid., October 23, 1913
10. James Cameron, For the People: A history of St. Francis Xavier University Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.
11. Daniel MacInnes, Clerics, fishermen, farmers, and workers: The Antigonish Movement and identity in Eastern Nova Scotia, 1928 - 1939. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, McMaster University, 1978, pp. 136ff.
12. George Boyle, Father Tompkins of Nova Scotia. New York: P.J. Kenedy and Sons, 1953, pp. 56 - 58.
13. Ibid., p.57
14. Jean Beck, Henry Somerville and the development of Catholic social thought in Canada: Somerville's role in the Archdiocese of Toronto, 1915 - 1943. Unpublished Ph. D, McMaster University, 1977.
15. S. Ahlstrom, A religious history of the American People. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.
16. "Progress or stagnation," The Catholic Register, April 25, 1918.
17. Beck, op. cit., p. 209.
18. K. Rockhill, Academic excellence and public service: a history of university extension in California. New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1983, p. 54.
19. Ibid.

20. Ibid., p. 50.
21. Boyle, op.cit., p.50; see O'Dwyer, "A university for Catholics in relation to the material interests of Ireland". Dublin: Catholic Truth Society, 1900.
22. J. J. Tompkins to Moses Coady, October 29, 1914.
23. J. J. Tompkins to Moses Coady, February 27, 1914.
24. J. J. Tompkins to McDougall, February 21, 1914.
25. The Casket, November 13, 1914.
26. The Casket, December 4, 1913.
27. Tompkins to J. W. Robertson, February 25, 1914.
28. Ibid.
29. Tompkins to Corrigan, March 3, 1914
30. The Casket, March 26, 1914.
31. Tompkins to Dr. Hugh P. MacPherson, March 14, 1914.
32. The Casket, March 26, 1914.
33. Tompkins to Senator Girroir, May 24, 1914.
34. Tompkins to M. M. Cumming, May 25, 1914.
35. The Casket, October 18, 1914.
36. P. J. Webb to Tompkins, May 12, 1914.
37. The Casket, June 18, 1914.
38. Tompkins to John A. MacDonald, May 28, 1914.
39. Girroir to Blount, January 3, 1915.
40. Tompkins to John A. MacDonald, September 9, 1914.
41. Tompkins to Thompson, September 9, 1914.
42. The Casket, December 3, 1914.
43. Ibid., December 31, 1914.
44. Ibid., February 25, 1914.
45. Ibid., March 4, 1915.
46. Ibid., September 24, 1914.
47. Tompkins to John A. MacDonald, December 7, 1914.
48. The Ecclesiastical Review (January, 1915) had articulated a strong anti-urban bias, and Tompkins approved. See his letter to A. R. MacDonald, February 7, 1915.
49. Rev. A. R MacDonald to Tompkins, February 5, 1915.
50. Tompkins to Coady, January 24, 1915.
51. MacInnes, op. cit., p. 140.
52. Tompkins to H. H. MacDonald, January 4, 1918.
53. The Casket, January 24, 1918.
54. Ibid., January 31, 1918.
55. Ibid., March 21, 1918.
56. Ibid., February 14, 1918.
57. Ibid., March 7, 1918.
58. Ibid., March 14, 1918.

59. Ibid.

60. Tompkins to Donald F. MacDonald, March 9, 1918.
61. Tompkins to McNeil, April 5, 1918.
62. The Casket, August 15, 1918.
63. Ibid., April 24, 1919.
64. Ibid., March 6, 1919.
65. Ibid.
66. Ibid., May 1, 1919.
67. Ibid., July 3, 1919.
68. Ibid., “Correspondence”, July 10, 1919.
69. Tompkins to John A. Ryan, October 20, 1919.
70. Tompkins to Ryan, November 17, 1920.
71. See the November 19, 1921 issue of the Maritime Labour Herald on religion and socialism.
72. Tompkins to W. S. Learned, September 25, 1922.
73. The Casket, December 15, 1921.
74. Tompkins to Learned, October 17, 1922.
75. Tompkins to Thomas Shahan, October 22, 1920.
76. Tompkins to M. M. Cumming, November 24, 1920.
77. Tompkins to Gerald B. Phalen, January 27, 1921.
78. The Casket, March 31, 1921.
79. Ibid., April 21, 1921.
80. Knowledge for the People, p. 1.
81. “On signing of peace,” January 28, 1919. Tompkins writings. J. J. Tompkins Papers. Beaton Institute.
82. Tompkins to Girroir, March 10, 1914.
83. Untitled and undated ms. 1912 - 1921. J. J. Tompkins Papers. Beaton Institute.
84. The Casket, March 31, 1921.
85. Ibid., March 11, 1920.
86. Ibid., March 31, 1921.
87. Ibid.
88. Knowledge for the People, p. 5.
89. Ibid., p. 6.
90. Letter 1, undated, to Henry Somerville.
91. Letter 2, undated, to Henry Somerville.
92. Ibid.
93. Letter 1, undated, to Henry Somerville.
94. Carnegie Foundation to Sills, August 24, 1921.
95. Tompkins to Learned, January 9, 1922.
96. Ibid., January 21, 1922.
97. Ibid., April 7, 1922
98. Ibid.

99. Ibid., May 23, 1922.
100. Ibid, May 25, 1922.

101. Ibid., c. May 21, 1922.
102. Learned to Tompkins, May 29, 1922.
103. Pearson to Learned, July 19, 1922.
104. Tompkins to Learned, July 19, 1922.
105. Ibid.
106. Gillis to Tompkins, July 21, 1922.
107. Tompkins to Learned, August 2, 1922.
108. Ibid., October 22, 1922.
109. Ibid., August 2, 1922.
110. Ibid., November 1, 1922.
111. Ibid., October 22, 1922.
112. “ A Report on the proposed federation of the Maritimes universities submitted to the governors of St. Francis Xavier’s College by a committee appointed by His Lordship Bishop Morrison,” 1922. In author’s possession.
113. Tompkins to Learned, November 5, 1922.
114. Tompkins to Kandel, November 9, 1922.
115. A. R. MacDonald to Tompkins, December 20, 1922.
116. Tompkins to Learned, December 21, 1922.
117. Ibid., December 24, 1922.
118. Learned to Tompkins, December 26, 1922.
119. MacInnes, op. cit., p. 160.
120. J. Mezirow, *The transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1991.
121. MacInnes, op. cit., p. 182.
122. Ibid., p. 176.
123. S. Benhabib, *Situating the Self*. New York Routledge, 1992.

**the research network for
New Approaches to Lifelong Learning
(NALL)**

OISE/UT

252 Bloor St. W., Room 12-254

Toronto, ON M5S 1V6

Phone: (416) 923-6641 x2392

Fax: (416) 926-4751

Website: www.nall.ca