

their family in India and, later, the Harkness' term at Rasulia, are our more recent experiences of this bond. Alma Dale also sent letters stating her ties to Friends in Canada and the world through *The Canadian Friend*. (Today, the CF reports of Friends around the world arrive mostly via reports from Friends World Committee for Consultation, the Quaker United Nations Office, and various individual Friends.)

Times changed after WWII. The urban movement continued; many rural Meetings closed; the new Meetings practiced silent worship. Growth came to Friends through the Peace movement, as well, and through postwar immigration, swelling during the Vietnam years, with arriving conscientious objectors.

There was no regular editor from the summer of 1974 until Dorothy Chapman began in 1977. In 1979, she began using her maiden name, Dorothy Parshall. She served as editor (1977–1994) for a record of 18 years! Working from her retreat and studio in Bancroft, Ontario, Dorothy used the CF to keep communication lines open — from Atlantic Friends in the east to Victoria Friends in the west. It was a time of transition for the form and the content of *The Canadian Friend*.

Caroline Balderston Parry, of Ottawa, was next to serve as editor, during the last half of 1994.

In 1995, Anne-Marie Zilliacus (1995–2001), based in Ottawa, again moved the hub of the CF from Toronto. She brought her gifts and dedication to the CF, encouraging Friends to write on announced topics, such as prayer, forgiveness and denial, the ministry, etc. During

this period, a balancing humour entered in with Granny Rat sketches. The Persian Gulf War began. Anne-Marie encouraged Friends to contribute their thinking. That, along with desktop publishing, and the decision by HMAC and CYM to send the publication free of cost to all Canadian Friends, were important services that expanded the CF impact. The issues became larger, and it went out five times a year, rather than monthly.

At the beginning of 2002, June Etta Chenard became editor, bringing her own gentle approach as she encouraged Friends to share their thoughts and experiences, and as she sought increased Francophone participation.

The CYM Archives at Pickering College, which contain the complete collection of *The Canadian Friend*, were a major resource for this article. I have read the CF since 1949, and find each issue to be a time capsule. Burton Hill passed a treasure trove to the CYM Friends' Archives, from William Harris' attic in Rockwood, Ontario, where he had saved every issue from 1905 to 1955.

The Canadian Friend continues to connect and strengthen the cause of the Religious Society of Friends in Canada. Through its pages, we continue to seek that of the Infinite God in each other, better prepare ourselves to minister in today's world, and keep in touch with each other. It has connected us for a full century now. We are grateful to each and every one who has shared in this endeavour. ♥

Jane Zavitz-Bond is a member of Yarmouth Monthly Meeting.

Reflections on Finding a Contemporary Quaker Peace Query

By Dick Preston

Friends whom I have known very well for many years are unable to find unity on the matter of permissible levels of violence in preventing greater violence, and responding where prevention is too late. Of course people will see things differently. Things and events

really do look different from different points of view.

This diversity of views has a spiritual source — consider the great variety of perspectives we are privileged to share with actors, musicians, painters, writers, theologians,

philosophers, and the everyday folks we meet and exchange ideas with. And with people of other cultures. Our lives may be enriched by this.

But this diversity is also a source of violent perspectives and actions, of contempt or hatred that is destruc-

tive of love and life. How are we to respond to these destructive perspectives and actions?

- In the mid-1600s days of Cromwell and King Charles, men with bows, spears, and other person-to-person weapons drew the first Quaker response of denying, for themselves, the perspectives of wars and avoiding these actions, and exhorting people to seek the divine in themselves and, person-to-person, in each other. What an excellent response that was. But George Fox did not deny “the magistrate’s sword” to deal with evildoers in society, or even with the right of secular rulers to engage in war with a moral purpose (destroying the Inquisition, by sending an army into Spain and Italy; bringing the Turks to Christianity). He simply refused to be personally involved, and exhorted other Quakers to abstain from the army.

- In the mid-1900s days of the World War, the Cold War, and the conflict of political ideologies, men with gas chambers or with nuclear bombs, or fleets of bombers with tons of incendiary bombs, or rockets with multiple warheads, sought quite impersonally to destroy huge categories of non-military people in many places in the world. And within the military, aimed fire, person-to-person, was replaced by ‘blanketing’ the target. Overwhelming force leading to detente or else to massive destruction was believed to be the solution to international conflict. The American commanding general (MacArthur) during the Korean war wanted, with nuclear capability, to invade Manchuria and thereby

China, and was prevented because the President (Truman) fired him. That was a very close call. Then there was the Cuban Missile Crisis. That, too, was a very close call. Although some Quaker young men chose to fight, most Quakers held to the response of the 1600s.

- Now, the world seems to be going into two warlike directions. There are many civil wars over access to natural resources that compare, in scale but not in the technology of destruction, with Britain in the 1600s. And at the global scale, overwhelming force is becoming more and more accessible to smaller groups of violence-bent men, who can avenge their feelings of personal humiliation and moral desperation by destroying increasingly large numbers of other people, quickly, easily, unexpectedly. In my children’s lifetime, or perhaps even in my own lifetime, nuclear, chemical and biological weapons will be small and portable enough to be taken by one or a few people just about anywhere and used to destroy hundreds of thousands or millions of people, on the scale of the holocaust, or AIDS.

QUERY: The very nature of war has changed radically in the scale of destruction and the ease and speed of its execution. Should our peace response also change radically? Is the 1600s Quaker response of refusing to personally take part in wars, and exhorting people to seek the divine in themselves and, person-to-person, in each other, still an excellent response? Is secular use of weapons in policing within societies still acceptable? Are rulers still given

the mandate to engage in just wars? Can we support the use of armed United Nations peacekeepers to prevent large scale violence to civilians? Is ‘The Responsibility to Protect’ a loving response only if it is limited to unarmed acts of prevention? What is an adequate response to the increasing scale of destruction we all, as part of humanity, face?

Is the categorical denial of the use of weapons, by anyone, a withdrawal from the contemporary world, in principled hopes that the destroyers and the survivors will somehow be led to listen more effectively to the divine? And what of the millions of victims? Are they loved, but worth less than our abstract principles of utter non-violence? Do we support the use of force by police in stopping crimes of violence? Do we refuse to condone actions like those of guards who shoot the driver of an explosives-laden vehicle, to keep it from reaching its goal and killing very many more? Can we find some gradient of active response to threats of violence, where we can face the ugly realities in our world and draw our Quaker line? What are we called to do? What canst I say?

This troubles me very deeply,
Friends. 🍀

Dick Preston is a member of Hamilton Monthly Meeting.

Note: Some current Quaker articles on this topic are: John Spears, “How would George Fox respond to terrorism?” *Friends Journal*, January 2005, p. 5; and Paul Hamell, “Police and community: building peace” *Friends Journal*, January 2005, pp. 18-21.