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ABSTRACT
In 1885, a decade after the creation of the denominational school system in Newfoundland, Rev. Moses Harvey published his Text-book of Newfoundland History: For the Use of Schools and Academies. The book was embraced by the denominational superintendents and used in denominational schools. Two factors made Harvey’s book successful: his treatment of churches and his positive characterization of the potential of Newfoundlanders and Newfoundland. This article analyzes Harvey’s characterization of Newfoundland’s history, his imagining of Newfoundlanders as a people, and the significance of the book’s acceptance within an educational system that has often been depicted as divisive and partly responsible for undermining national development. Harvey’s book had significant appeal because of its heroic colonial narrative and because it cast churches as partners in nation building, giving rich insight into the texture of an emerging settler nationalism in nineteenth-century Newfoundland and its place within Newfoundland’s denominational school system.

RÉSUMÉ
En 1885, une décennie après la création du système scolaire confessionnel de Terre-Neuve, le Révérend Moses Harvey publie son Text-book of Newfoundland History: For the Use of Schools and Academies. Le livre est dès lors adopté par les surintendants et utilisé dans les écoles confessionnelles. Deux facteurs ont contribué au succès de l’ouvrage de Harvey : sa façon de traiter des églises et sa caractérisation du potentiel de Terre-Neuve et des Terre-Neuviens.

Cet article analyse cette caractérisation de l’histoire de Terre-Neuve propre au Révérend, sa perception des Terre-Neuviens en tant que peuple et la portée de l’accueil positif réservé à cet ouvrage dans un système éducatif qui a souvent été dépeint comme source de division et partiellement responsable d’entraver le développement national.

Le livre de Harvey est particulièrement attrayant en raison de l’épopée coloniale que l’auteur y met en scène et du rôle qu’il attribue aux églises qu’il considère comme des partenaires...
de l’édification nationale, offrant un riche aperçu du nationalisme émergent des colons à Terre-Neuve, au 19e siècle et de sa place au sein du système scolaire confessionnel terre-neuvien.

The story of this ancient colony is, therefore, neither unimportant nor uninstructional. To its own people, in particular, a knowledge of the struggles and vicissitudes through which it has passed cannot fail to be of deep interest and importance. This is especially true regarding the young, on whom the hopes of its future largely depend.¹

In 1885 Rev. Moses Harvey published the first edition of his Text-book of Newfoundland History for the Use of Schools and Academies and declared that his book was vital to the future of the colony. Harvey was optimistic about Newfoundland’s future and an ardent Newfoundland nationalist. He was born in Armagh, Ireland, to Scottish Presbyterian parents and educated at the Royal Academical Institute in Belfast; he was ordained in 1844. Harvey pursued a career as a clergyman, serving first in England before migrating to St. John’s in 1852 with his wife, Sarah. He was the minister at St. Andrew’s Free Church for twenty-six years and was additionally an amateur naturalist and prolific writer.² Though Presbyterians accounted for less than 1 per cent of Newfoundland’s population,³ Harvey was no marginal figure. In his textbook, he boldly declared that the popular depiction of Newfoundland’s history as an uninteresting story of a rock surrounded in fog and inhabited by few was profoundly mistaken. He argued instead that Newfoundland was historically significant, both as an important self-governing colony and as a part of the broader British Empire, and that its people needed their history. This article is an examination of Harvey’s argument in his school textbook for Newfoundlanders to proudly embrace a nationalist identity and the social and political context in which it was made and resonated.

Harvey wrote at a time of significant change for Newfoundland. The colony was attempting to industrialize, while also weighing the potential benefits and dangers of joining Canada, a development that would complicate the region’s place in the British Empire. Though a Newfoundland nationalist, Harvey supported confederation with Canada as a good potential path. Harvey was also one of many “boosters” of Newfoundland, a group that, according to both Patrick O’Flaherty and J. S. Armour, promoted the idea that the colony would find prosperity via investing in industrialization and technologies such as the railway.⁴ The late nineteenth century saw Newfoundland reject confederation with Canada and develop a political attachment to nationalist rhetoric, which was also characterized by the cultural discourse of settler colonialism. As Korneski has shown, settler colonialism with its logic of domination was present, albeit with its many complexities and contradictions, in nineteenth-century Newfoundland.⁵ Nationalist rhetoric, while obscuring the many divisions in colonial society, was an important and familiar discourse embraced by local elites who imagined Newfoundland as a successful colonial nation-state.⁶ Harvey’s use of settler-colonial rhetoric is evident in his imagining of Newfoundlanders as a unified, economically successful, white, settler people. Furthermore, his use of this
discourse indicates his engagement with a vital political empire-wide discourse about the potential and character of emerging colonial nation-states, which is part of why his text was well received in the 1880s.

Harvey’s settler-colonial, nationalist narrative, while drawing on common literary themes and motifs such as the heroism of agents of imperialism and the promise of colonial economic development, is marked by his decision to fold into his narrative stories that addressed sectarianism in the colony. Sectarianism was an important contemporary issue, and while there were outbreaks of violence along sectarian lines in nineteenth-century Newfoundland, these incidents were few and occurred in specific political contexts. For example, brewing tension between the Catholic-led Liberal Party and Bishop John Mullock boiled over in 1861, resulting in an election riot. Bishop Mullock, angry with the hostile Governor Bannerman, became disillusioned with Liberal leader John Kent; his initial withdrawal of support fractured the Catholic vote and his subsequent political meddling alienated Methodists from the Liberals. Anglican Bishop Feild openly supported the Conservative Party. When the election returned the Conservatives, fear of Protestant ascendency and discontent with local electoral processes relating to the Catholic voter split led to a riot, which was only completely quelled by Mullock’s personal call for peace. Another example was the 1883 Harbour Grace affray, a riot connected to a rise of Orangeism.

These incidents and earlier sectarian tensions during the forming of representative government led to the sectarian thesis, which was articulated by both Gertrude Gunn and John Greene, that churches undermined Newfoundland’s development. For example, scholars such as Phillip McCann argued that churches were motivated to provide schools by greed for converts and desire for power. Yet, while there was popular anxiety about violent sectarianism, there were direct efforts to bridge the political divide between Catholics and Protestants by including all denominations as partners in nation building. Following these incidents, there was a direct effort by clergy to retreat from overt political meddling, though clergy and churches maintained they had a right to be actively engaged in politics and consulted about government policy decisions that affected their interests. Furthermore, sectarianism, as Jerry Bannister has written, is a much used but often un-useful term to understand relations between denominations in Newfoundland, because it implies significant violence and discord, and so has led scholars to miss evidence of collaboration and co-operation. This makes understanding Harvey’s historical discussion of sectarianism important in relation to considering how this book and its acceptance challenges the sectarian thesis.

Harvey styled himself as a progressive, and advocated for Christian, or at least Protestant, reunification. His *Text-book* was written in an era when churches were actively engaged in the public sphere. Christianity was embedded in the social and political worlds of the British Empire, and different Christian denominations built networks of people and shared ideas to compete for social and political influence throughout the empire.

In 1874, Newfoundland’s school system became a fully denominational school system. It consisted of multiple separate church-run systems funded by a combination of government grant money, fees, and church contributions. Included in the system in the 1880s were schools run by Anglicans, Roman
Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists. The Presbyterians had a few schools for children and maintained a joint academy with the Congregationalist church in St. John’s. By 1885, when Harvey published his textbook, denominational education was ten years old, and the settling in of sectarian division in education caused many people concern. Furthermore, navigating the rise of secularism as an ideology, which was being embraced by emerging settler nation-states as a way to gain control over social infrastructure, meant that states saw churches as undesirable partners. This caused great anxiety for many church leaders and church-tied educators, which led to much debate over how churches should participate in state-building.

Harvey’s text, like all textbooks, was embedded in the social and political discourse of both its local, colonial, Newfoundland context and the larger global context of the British Empire. Harvey openly hoped for the disappearance of denominational identities within Newfoundland society, and his textbook reflected this concern. Harvey’s call for Christian reunification in schooling in the 1880s fell flat, but his embrace of a nationalist Newfoundland identity that was inclusive of all denominations resonated and resulted in his book being included in the denominational school system. Its adoption both challenges the sectarian thesis that churches undermined Newfoundland’s development, but also shows that sectarianism was an important characteristic of Newfoundland society that needs a nuanced understanding.

The Development of a Sectarian Institution: Understanding the Educational Context of Harvey’s Book

To understand the significant sectarian concerns evident in Harvey’s book requires a consideration of how Newfoundland ended up with a denominational school system and its connection to the colony’s political history. In 1832, after significant political lobbying by a coalition of men that included Catholics and Protestants, the colony of Newfoundland was granted representative government. The advent of representative government came on the heels of England’s 1829 Catholic Relief Act, and Catholic participation was controversial, especially given the meddling of Catholic Bishop Michael Fleming in early elections. But while there was tumult, there was also recognition of Catholics. In the 1830s, Catholics made up 48.6 per cent of the population, while Protestants, although somewhat unified, were split in terms of proportion of the population—Anglicans accounted for 35.6 per cent, Methodists for 14.8 per cent, and other Protestants, including Presbyterians, accounted for about 2 per cent. Religious identities were significant to many throughout the colony, and they influenced society and politics because denominations formed voting blocks and the laity, while not always deferent, were influenced by the views of their respective clerical hierarchies.

Churches in Newfoundland were recognized by the colony’s burgeoning political class and celebrated for building schools to provide a religion- and literacy-focused education to children. For example, in 1836, Governor Henry Prescott won the enthusiastic approval of the representative assembly for the first education act, which was celebrated for its potential to foster “… such a system of public education, as may best tend to improve the morals and religious habits, encourage and direct industry,
and ensure the happiness and tranquillity of the people….” The act did two things: it gave funding to schools run by religious and secular organizations, and it created school boards to set up and run public schools in communities. While scholars have characterized the early system as non-denominational, the act mandated that clergy serve on boards based on a district’s denominational proportions, which made the system interdenominational.

Co-operation within an interdenominational framework proved difficult, because boards were responsible for hiring teachers and setting curriculum. By the 1840s, using the Bible as a textbook became an issue, which resulted in a “No Popery” crusade that pushed Catholics off boards and led to a separate Catholic system. The 1843 act did not grant the right to a separate Catholic school system, but a right to funding for schools based on proportion of the population. The fragile Protestant alliance quickly fractured with the arrival of Tractarian Anglican Bishop Edward Feild in 1844. There were efforts to pull the Protestants together. For example, a General Academy was created in 1844 that included Catholics, and in 1851, a Central Protestant Board was created. However, both these endeavours were fraught and ultimately failed because Catholics and Protestants, including Methodists, acted to create denominational institutions. There was no violence connected to either the creation or dissolution of those bodies as was seen in the Canadas and New Brunswick over schooling rights issues.

Control over schools was important to both governments and non-state actors seeking to influence societies, because schools were envisioned as agents that could support nation and empire building. There were calls to reform schools to make them more uniform throughout the 1860s and 1870s. But the process was fraught with obstacles, and for example, John Haddon, a Methodist who had taken up the new role of Protestant school inspector in 1858, lamented that resistance to his non-existent authority by boards and especially Anglicans rendered him ineffective. By 1873, the debate about subdivision of the Protestants to enable acceptable and efficient administration came to a head. A Methodist board appointed a teacher to an Anglican community, which became a hot issue, and which combined with the simmering knowledge that since 1869 Anglicans had nearly equalled Catholics and led to calls from Bishop Feild for the subdivision of the Protestant education grant. The government hesitated, but acquiesced in 1874 when clergy in St. John’s agreed on how division would work. Denominationalists argued that this change would improve administration, since boards would not accept centralized control tied to a different denomination.

By 1876, the new, fully denominational system saw the creation of the office of denominational superintendent, which was given powers over boards and teachers. The task of managing the new Methodist and Anglican systems fell to the Reverends George Milligan and William Pilot. These men, along with their Roman Catholic colleague, envisioned a benevolent rivalry and set about reforming the system(s) by improving both teacher’s qualifications through examinations for grades and setting up a shared curriculum to support Newfoundland’s development and position churches as partners in nation building.
fractured into multiple systems, was now being guided by men who shared a sense of nationalism, which pushed them to coordinate to bring coherence to education for all students throughout the colony.

**Embracing a Nationalist Curriculum: Understanding the Adoption of Harvey’s Textbook**

Harvey’s book was unabashedly nationalist in its character and is a cultural product of Newfoundland’s rejection of joining Canada. As Blake and Baker show, the elite of colonial society developed a positive nationalist vision that focused on economic development. Railway fever gripped Newfoundland and excitement for mining swept through society. In this context, the superintendents sought new nationalist educational materials to support their broader reform efforts. Harvey’s book was not the first shared nationalist curriculum item; instead, the first shared effort to create a Newfoundland curriculum item by all three superintendents resulted in a map for schools in 1881. The map was based on Alexander Murray’s 1879 geological survey map; it depicted geological features and industries and infrastructure such as mines, mills, and telegraph lines. Methodist Superintendent George Milligan noted that a classroom map was sought after by the superintendents due to their shared sense of the importance of geography lessons. Indeed, geography was considered so important that Superintendent Canon William Pilot wrote a short book on Newfoundland geography in 1883 for schools. These men felt that it was vital that the colony’s children know their homeland, especially its industries and resources, because they thought that mining and other industrial developments would be better supported if there was more knowledge about these subjects. Catholic Superintendent Maurice Fenelon remarked that by 1885 the map was not being well used and that teachers favoured European geography, which he saw as misguided and not benefiting pupils. He saw the map as important and urged that more Newfoundland content be taught. The choice to include a version of Murray’s map in the classroom was part of a rise in nationalist discourse in this period. Newfoundland educators thought Newfoundland had the potential to transform itself into a nation-state through development, and they encouraged teachers and students to embrace these values. Coinciding with the surge in support for nationalism broadly and for nationalist local geography lessons, Harvey wrote and published his textbook.

While Harvey’s text is significant for its breadth and adoption, it is not an anomaly but part of a long-standing local tradition of writing Newfoundland history. The first Newfoundland history textbook for schools was written by William Charles St. John and published in St. John’s in 1835, before the first education act of 1836. It is a short, fifty-five-page history for schools titled *A Catechism of the History of Newfoundland, From the Earliest Accounts to the Close of the Year 1834, For the Use of Schools*, which St. John stated was based on John Reeves and Louis Anspach’s works and correspondence he had read between colonial officials. St. John was born in 1807 in Harbour Grace, and worked as a clerk for a merchant house, as a schoolteacher, and was later a consular agent for Newfoundland in Boston. His *Catechism* had a
second edition published in 1855, which added commentary about the Vikings. St. John wrote in a catechetical style and focused on facts such as when important individuals like governors arrived (he also mentions some clergy), key legal developments, industries, geographical characteristics, and events. Like Harvey, he thought there was value in teaching local history, which he felt would support patriotic attachment to the colony and empire. He also argued that history must be paired with geography and lamented that he did not have a map-insert.28

Harvey’s textbook was the first Newfoundland history adopted by the denominational system, and notably had a map insert, which included details such as electoral districts, most settlements, geographical features, and projected rail lines. Prior to publishing the textbook, Harvey acted as a booster of Newfoundland in his journalistic endeavours, and his writing was well represented in newspapers and the Encyclopedia Britannica. Additionally, he had recently, in 1883, published Newfoundland—The Oldest British Colony with co-author Joseph Hatton, which was similarly a celebratory colonial history. His textbook was his first major monograph.

The adoption of Harvey’s book was supported by all the superintendents, who trumpeted his positive take on Newfoundland’s history and potential. Harvey was himself ecstatic about the potential of his new monograph to shape teachers and students. He predicted a bright future for Newfoundland within the British Empire and instructed...
teachers on the importance of pairing his colonial history with geography to “fix the knowledge permanently in the memory and rend it useful.” Harvey strongly felt he had important things to teach young Newfoundlanders and their teachers, demonstrating the need to carefully consider his narrative efforts to engender attachment to the colony.

**Rev. Harvey’s Settler-Colonial History of Newfoundland**

Harvey stated that “The story of this ancient colony is… neither unimportant nor uninstructive,” which begs the question: what was the character and content of Harvey’s historical narrative? Harvey tells the story of Newfoundland as an island moulded by male colonial heroes and settlers who struggled against extractive British policies. This narrative, however, is in part a historical myth that has been disproved by historians working in the path blazed by Keith Matthews, C. Grant Head, and others. Yet for Harvey, this partially mythic narrative of struggle is taken as truth, and furthermore, he uses it as a way to apologize for the extractive nature of colonialism while simultaneously celebrating it. For example, his noble heroes supposedly overcame the fact that “while capital, skill and labour were directed to the improvement of the other colonies, the adventurers to Newfoundland extracted millions from its resources, without expending anything on its internal improvement.” Harvey’s heroes were men who spearheaded European colonialism such as Christopher Columbus, Amerigo Vespucci, Sebastian Cabot (John Cabot is discussed in glowing prose, but curiously there is no image included), Jacques Cartier, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, and Lord Baltimore, all of whom were depicted in illustrations throughout the book, as well as imagined noble male settlers. He wrote about the good deeds of men connected to Newfoundland, such as Governors Hugh Palliser, John Campbell, and Thomas Cochrane and religious leaders such as the first Catholic bishop, Rev. Dr. James Louis O’Donel. He included these men and others to craft a narrative of Newfoundland as connected to the heart of the European and British colonial enterprise. He also sought to craft a narrative that Newfoundlanders were a mixed people racially, comprising Anglo-Saxons and Celts. Slavery is completely absent from the textbook’s celebratory narrative of imperialism and colonization.

Harvey’s colonial, white, male-centric narrative erases important groups who also lived on the island, namely women and Indigenous peoples. In Harvey’s second and shortest chapter (ten pages), titled “The Red Indians, or Aboriginal Inhabitants of Newfoundland,” he discussed the Beothuk genocide as a tragedy brought about by the sinful and cruel acts of settlers who did not understand the impact of their actions. Settler-colonial histories were a prominent genre in the nineteenth century, and as colonial nations built public education systems, the need to tell national histories led settler elites to craft Eurocentric narratives that justified colonial violence and erased Indigenous peoples who contested emerging settler society’s claims to their land. Harvey’s book is a settler-colonial history, and although he was critical of some settlers whom he characterized as “rude fishermen and trappers… an immoral, lawless order of men…” who viewed “the Indian as vermin to be hunted
down and destroyed,” he differentiated between these settlers and the heroes of his narrative. For example, he glowingly discussed colonial elites like Governor John Guy, who, in the seventeenth century, reportedly had friendly relations with unidentified Indigenous people near Harbour Grace, and those who supposedly tried to protect (using edicts) and rescue the Beothuk in the early nineteenth century. His chapter ends with a one-page opaque discussion of the capture of two Beothuk women (Demasduwit—whom he refers to as Mary March—and Shawanadithet) and their eventual unfortunate but tragic deaths while in settler captivity in the early nineteenth century.37 Indigenous history is compartmentalized within the book and the chapters that follow go back in time to discuss the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries. Harvey’s discussion of Indigenous people, a theme also present in William St. John’s textbooks, is used in the book to create a sense of rupture in the early nineteenth century between a complex and flawed past and an exciting new present dominated by good settler men who were focused on building up the colony.

Harvey’s choice to focus on certain topics over others is purposeful, both in terms of how he characterizes certain peoples and the length of his discussion. The chapters that follow from the introduction to the discovery period and then the violence of contact takes up forty-one pages, and the rest of the narrative—136 pages—is a heroic-styled tale of how good settlers and good colonial administrators struggled against ignorant and exploitative colonial powers to build up a society. For example, the book discusses the Seven Years War and spends a significant amount of time on France’s use of Newfoundland. He characterized the French as foreign aggressors in a period when British governance was portrayed as improving. He tried to construct a master narrative with clear heroes and villains that told a linear story of progress highlighted by important military, political, and economic events and developments.38

Harvey’s history is a classical Whig-style history of Newfoundland comparable to the more well-known history of Newfoundland by Judge Daniel Prowse, who, like Harvey, focused on—albeit with many historical errors about colonial abuses, policies, and actions—narrating the story of a hearty people emerging from great struggle with a promising future. Both authors, Harvey and Prowse, focused on good governors who built up local industries and supported settlement policies. Governors John Campbell and Hugh Palliser are well discussed for their wisdom in terms of policies. Another key figure who both discuss positively is Chief Justice John Reeves, who wrote a history of the colony in 1793 that villainized his predecessors. Their engagement with and discussion of Reeves and other figures is important because it indicates the existence of shared historical narratives and shared focus on telling a story that resonated with the political elites of the late nineteenth century who viewed themselves as inheriting a noble legacy of struggle. This discourse about struggle, rooted in false historical narratives about conflict over settlement, identified by Keith Matthews and shown by scholars building on his work, was flawed, yet it was familiar to nineteenth-century colonial elites like Harvey, and it was enthusiastically embraced by many in the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century. Harvey’s textbook and other writings engaged in this discourse and contributed to its place in
Newfoundland society, including within its school system.39

Critical to understanding Harvey’s book is how he constructs a sense of rupture with a flawed past to foster hope and excitement for the current era, while not undermining attachment to empire. According to Harvey, Newfoundland was most severely neglected during the eighteenth century, with its people harassed frequently by French and American pirates, but his story of the nineteenth century was more optimistic and focused on the present. For example, he discussed Newfoundland’s improved place in the British Empire and its gains of freedom in the form of representative (1832) and then responsible (1854) government, though he also discussed setbacks caused by the Napoleonic Wars, local fires, and other commercial disasters. In this section (chapters 8, 14, and 15), where he focused on charting the build-up of Newfoundland, Harvey notably vilified pauper relief as “a demoralizing effect, destroying men’s self-respect and self-reliance, and rendering them reckless and improvident.”40 He felt that people devastated by loss of markets during imperial conflicts, bad fishery years, fires, and poor harvest seasons should not receive charity, which showed his low opinion of fishers and the working poor, whom he felt needed to be compelled to improve their situation. He characterized the misery of the 1810s and early 1820s as being rooted in the fact that Newfoundland lacked liberal values and democracy. He contrasted that era with the one to which he belonged, which was marked by the arrival of representative and later responsible government and reportedly saw liberal values begin to take hold in Newfoundland society.

Harvey broadly celebrates the lobbying for representative government in the 1830s and responsible government in the 1850s, but individuals aside from governors are not directly mentioned in the main narrative, though some are included in the terms/key people identification sections at the end of chapters. His focus on governors is notable and contributes to his argument that the Empire is a force for good, though admittedly it needs local prodding. He trumpeted the actions of Governor Sir Thomas Cochrane because he made land grants, built roads, and enabled locals to gain representative government in 1832. He does not mention Cochrane’s reservations about the grant of representative government or his difficult personal relations with Catholic Bishop Fleming. Government was a boon according to Harvey, and he charted the build-up of government infrastructure via various governors and local politicians and lauded the advent of responsible government in 1854. He was excited for a new era for the colony post-1832 characterized by relegating to history the rule of Newfoundland by “knaveish and despotic fishing admirals,” captains and commodores of royal navy, and merchants more loyal to English than Newfoundland’s interests.41

Teaching Religious Tolerance: Harvey Tackles Sectarianism in Newfoundland History

Harvey’s historical discussion is problematic, however, the key point to consider is why his textbook’s narrative resonated in the mid-1880s. He carefully argued that Newfoundlanders, Catholics, and Protestants, were struggling together. He discussed
political conflicts with sectarian dimensions, including the battle for power in the 1830s and 1840s, but he omitted any discussion of the controversial politicking of Bishop Fleming, who put the sign of the cross on his newspaper endorsement of political candidates. Instead, he insisted in opaque language that sectarian conflicts were something stirred up by bad unnamed actors and a licentious press, despite citing the press as an important and good social development. His focus on writing a nation-building narrative meant he carefully addressed denominational division, a social and political reality in the colony.

For Harvey, Newfoundlanders were a people united, but his textbook shows that their unity was fragile. By addressing sectarianism in Newfoundland, he crafted a narrative that knit Newfoundlanders together, which appealed to the denominational superintendents. Coincidentally—or perhaps conveniently—there is no political history of the creation of the denominational system in the text. The Protestants’ pushing out of Catholics in 1843 is omitted, as is Bishop Feild’s politicking and the 1874 decision to subdivide the Protestant grant. His discussion of schooling is brief and limited to an appendix item that details school history, but division is not discussed. Instead he lists the efforts by religious groups and leaders to build schools, with specific information about the numbers of schools and positive comments about the quality of the academies in St. John’s and the current upswing in graduating new, well-trained teachers. This discussion implies praise for the reform efforts of the denominational superintendents. While sectarian politicking relating to education gets no discussion, he did discuss sectarianism and the importance of religious tolerance. He celebrated the arrival of churches in Newfoundland as a force for good, but he also discussed sectarian strife in politics. He consistently explained sectarianism away and focused on evidence of tolerance and Christian unity.

One of the most important topics that he encouraged students to reflect on was the history of Roman Catholic persecution in the colony and the empire. In referencing Ireland, he stated that the Irish Catholics were greatly mistreated in their homeland and in England. For example, he included a discussion of the 1780 anti-Catholic Gordon riots in London. While official toleration of Catholics came when Britain passed the Catholic Relief Act in 1829, Harvey proudly declared that in 1784 Governor John Campbell had allowed for toleration in Newfoundland. This was somewhat true, though it was not full legal emancipation. For example, he recounted the legally permitted arrival in 1784 of the first Catholic bishop, James Louis O’Donel, as a happy outcome of Newfoundland Governor John Campbell’s proclamation of religious tolerance for the island of the same year. His reflection on this last quarter of the eighteenth century is best understood through the lens of the questions at the end of chapter 11, which had focused on the Seven Years War era and discussed extensively the shameful treatment of Catholics in the colony and restrictions on priests prior Campbell’s proclamation in 1784. He asked students to respond to the following:

10. What form did religious persecution take, and who suffered by it? Who inflicted it? When did it cease?
11. What led to this religious intolerance? What is the meaning of religious freedom?
12. How is good-will to be maintained among those who differ in religion?44

Harvey’s choice of questions shows his advocacy for tolerance by Protestants in the present and his efforts to teach students that anti-Catholicism was bad for Newfoundland society.

Harvey characterizes Catholics as part of Newfoundland society as opposed to contributors to sectarian animosity. For example, he spent a significant paragraph discussing how in 1800, Catholic Bishop O’Donel, upon finding out about plans for mutiny among the recently and locally formed Royal Newfoundland Fencible Regiment—which consisted of mainly lower-class Irish Catholics—reported the matter, which resulted in the mutineers being court-martialed, with some executed.45 As scholars have shown, O’Donel faced numerous challenges to his efforts to build up the Catholic Church from colonial officials, but he was successful in part because of his strategic loyalty to the upper-class contingent of Newfoundland society.46 What is significant is that Harvey’s text casts the first Roman Catholic bishop as a hero to all of St. John’s, one who saved the colony from the disaster of a violent mutiny; he portrays the toleration of his arrival and his role in elite society as an outcome of Newfoundland’s pioneering religious tolerance. Furthermore, he used O’Donel to position Newfoundland Irish Catholics as pro-Empire.

In reflecting on the history of Catholic persecution, he kept his eye firmly on the future.

Emigrants continued to arrive from Ireland in spite of the disabilities under which the adherents of Catholicism laboured…. In 1784 a royal proclamation ended forever religious persecution…. In judging of these errors of the past let us remember that the principles of religious freedom are of very slow growth, and even yet are far from being fully recognized…. Our condemnation of these acts of intolerance in the past should be mingled with pity for those who were so blinded as to be guilty of them. Those who now enjoy a clearer light should never lose sight of the great truth that men should be free to hold their own religious views, and to worship in the way which their consciences approve. If this be acted on, harmony, kindness, and mutual good-will among all classes of worshippers will prevail, and sectarian strifes and persecutions will be unknown.47

The significance of his discussion of Governor Campbell’s proclamation and the subsequent inclusion of upper-class Catholics in politics, in connection with his reflection on the history of Catholic persecution, lies in his desire that teachers use this history as a foundation to promote a harmonious society.

His second major discussion of churches explored how sectarianism negatively shaped politics during the early years of representative government. He blamed a licentious press for these tensions. There were no accusations aimed at any particular
denomination, as Harvey wrote with a focus on contemporary concerns about inter-church relations and stated that Catholic fears about mistreatment given historical abuses directed at them were understandable. He also remarked that while sectarian tensions arose after the institution of representative government in 1832, they only really flared around elections, and that the different denominations gradually learned to trust that the political process would not lead to persecution, which was a concern since political parties tended to be dominated either by Catholics or Protestants. He characterized these divisions as akin to petty squabbles that could be forgotten by all churches focusing on nationalist issues to foster unity, which he argued was the ethos that characterized present politics.

Sectarianism was explained away as significant but insignificant at the same time. This term is complicated and should be understood in the context of both the violent events of the 1883 Harbour Grace Affray and the 1861 election riot. Generally, both are seen by scholars as significant events, but they were also isolated events. They occurred due to unique circumstances, such as Bishop Mullock’s personal desire to meddle in politics. They do not constitute a recurring pattern of violence, and while they showed the explosive potential for sectarian conflict, both events also saw concerted efforts by church and political leaders to find ways forward and compromises, including unwritten norms about appointments and consultation. These incidents are not included in the book, showing Harvey’s careful crafting of Newfoundland’s history focused on shaping an ecumenical present.

In his concluding chapter, alongside his exuberantly hopeful vision for Newfoundland’s future, he included images of major churches in St. John’s and Harbour Grace from all the denominations, except the Congregationalists. The images are purposeful and position the churches as merit their social position in 1885 and in Newfoundland’s future. The book also featured flattering brief portrayals of the many churches in its appendix, which outlined their arrival and building up of ecclesiastical and education infrastructure. He clearly avoided negative depictions and aimed for broad appeal.

Overall, Harvey’s book was vigorously nationalistic and optimistic about the ability of all people in the colony to work together. In his closing section about the present day, he wrote that

Many of the troubles of the past have arisen from differences in race and religion among the people. Thence have come at times, jealousies, antipathies, and injurious contentions. In the better spirit which now prevails these will gradually disappear. The distinctions of English, Scotch, and Irish, Protestants and Catholics, will merge in the common name of Newfoundlanders, which all will be proud to bear; and the love of a common country will obliterate the differences and rivalries of the past.

Harvey was no doubt overly optimistic in terms of hoping for a broad Christian coming together without denominational identity distinctions; however, the significance of this cannot be understated, since his discussion was used to encourage teachers
and students to take pride in being Newfoundlanders, and while he expected them to be Christian, he positions nationalism as more important. Furthermore, this discussion shows his knowledge of the ongoing discourse and developing habits of
Harvey’s Vision for the Future and the Entrenchment of Denominationalism

The last chapter of Harvey’s text summarized the progress being made. In concluding with descriptions of buildings in St. John’s, such as schools, factories, and the construction of gasworks and waterworks, Harvey celebrated what he thought were important institutional and capitalist developments based on white settler nationalism. He knew that Newfoundland faced challenges, and the solution he proposed for the colony’s economic woes was to increase economic diversity by supporting the development of mining, lumbering, and agriculture. He took pride in the fact that revenue had doubled in the past twenty years, with an increase in imports and exports, and that even the cod fishery was growing. He further exclaimed that Newfoundland had more mineral wealth than Mexico or Peru and that its racial heritage, Celtic and Saxon, primed it for success. This racial discourse was common in British settler colonies, and the additional mention of Celtic persons was a direct effort to include Irish Catholics. His questions at the end of the chapter showed his commitment to an optimistic vision. One asked “Why may we believe in a great future for Newfoundland?”

Harvey’s optimism was shared by others, including the three denominational superintendents. These men felt their education reform efforts were bearing fruit by the 1880s. Their students, primarily in St. John’s, were qualifying for colonial institutions via the London University matriculation exams. Also, due to new required grade exams, many teachers were gaining new abilities, though the examination process also deprived many of their livelihoods when they failed and led to out-migration of the newly certified for higher wages elsewhere. But despite issues, the superintendents felt that things were working well. For example, the Anglican Synod in 1885 expressed the view that denominationalism—admittedly a bit unfortunate but necessary—was working well, and that the harmony created was so valuable as to be a force for good in the colony. While Harvey’s book expressed hope for an end to rivalries, others in high positions felt that the rivalry was, as Milligan and Pilot had proposed in 1876, wholesome and beneficial. Catholic sentiments, which were shared by Milligan, were in favour of Harvey’s text. Fenelon, in writing about the book’s introduction into schools, argued that “Mr. Harvey placed before the minds of the rising generation the duties of liberality, forbearance and patriotism, in their social and political relations.” Fenelon felt the textbook did much good for the classroom and that local historical knowledge was vital for students. He also speculated that soon Harvey’s book would be a source for questions for teacher examinations. While the archival record does not offer insight into the classroom level reception of the textbook, its content appealed to the architects of Newfoundland’s...
denominational school system.\textsuperscript{57} This marked recognition that the book’s historical narrative was vital and useful knowledge for moulding the current generation of students of all denominations.

The book was so successful that Harvey published a second edition in 1890, also seemingly adopted for use in Newfoundland, and furthermore, recommended by the \textit{Halifax Herald} and \textit{Montreal Gazette} and other papers and magazines.\textsuperscript{58} Harvey’s preface revelled in the success of his first edition and stated that the second edition was requested. Two short chapters were added titled “Education,” which lists schools built and accomplishments but with no discussion of the political dimension of denominationalism, and “How We Are Governed,” which he hoped would “impart to the young a knowledge of the vicissitudes through which their country has passed, and the struggles and toils by which freedom has been won and constitutional rights secured.”\textsuperscript{59} The narrative is more concise and is still focused on depicting colonial heroes and the noble struggle of select settler men, with erasure of enslaved persons, women, and Indigenous peoples.

Harvey’s Whiggish historical narrative contributed to a cultural discourse that became normative in Newfoundland educational history literature.\textsuperscript{60} For example, in 1929, Leo E. F. English—a Catholic born (1887) and educated locally who worked as a teacher and school inspector—wrote his \textit{Outlines of Newfoundland History}, which included two image plates from Harvey and Hatton’s 1883 book.\textsuperscript{61} English consulted with the superintendents and members of the History Committee of the Council for Higher Education, which was an interdenominational body created in 1893 through collaboration by multiple denominations to enable churches to control and improve educational standards.\textsuperscript{62} English’s book was fiercely nationalistic; he quoted the Newfoundland national anthem and focused on the colony’s promising industries of pulp and paper, mining, and aviation.\textsuperscript{63} English did not explore Newfoundland’s fraught religious history, and in his short chapter on education, he presented the institution of denominational education as a straightforward outcome of clergy’s school building efforts in the outports.\textsuperscript{64} Harvey’s and other nineteenth- and early twentieth-century school textbooks’ narratives and choice of topics demonstrate the political nature of historical education literature, and crucially, while all authors noted denominationalism, no work expanded on its history other than to comment on the good work of churches’ efforts to build schools.

Telling national histories to schoolchildren was important for nineteenth-century educators. In Canada, while the history of national textbooks and their adoption is a story that belongs primarily to the twentieth century, there are histories such as John Alexander Boyd’s \textit{Summary of Canadian History} published in 1860, which were created to shape students and teachers in response to political anxiety by the settler elite over how to, and the need to, develop a colonial nation-state. Developing a national curriculum was of paramount concern to Egerton Ryerson, who would lead Ontario’s education system and influence other provinces. A focus on finding textbooks that avoided inculcating young minds with American interpretations of history mattered and led to the adoption of the Irish National Readers in Canada and in Newfoundland. Textbook history, as demonstrated by W. E. Marsden and John
Issitt, is important because this specialist literature constructs and politicizes knowledge in specific ways that are useful to educators and state officials. Canadian educators worried about potential lessons about geography or history from a pro-American expansionist perspective because American textbooks could undermine students’ attachment to Canada. Furthermore, textbooks, by including religious subject matter, as did the Irish Readers, were also a source of moral lessons, which state officials and educators sought in order to inculcate students, soon to be citizens (who, if they were male, would vote), with important religious and cultural values. Creating and selecting educational materials in Canada, the United States, and Great Britain and its settler colonies were heated issues inseparable from the debates about the purpose, character, and goal of building public education systems because they were of vital interest to developing nation-states.

History textbooks, like other works of history in the nineteenth century — and indeed in the present — imagine and construct the past to make it useful. In the case of Harvey’s history, its intended usefulness was clear; he was constructing Newfoundland by giving the colony’s teachers and children their history. They would be made to understand that they were part of a long lineage of hearty imperialists and become properly attached to the colony and work for the betterment of both the colony and British Empire. He was imagining Newfoundland as an industrialized, white, settler, Christian nation. Also, it is important to note that Labrador and the inclusion of its peoples in the text is murky at best, and Harvey clearly viewed Labrador as a source of resources and a rightful possession of Newfoundland. Pedagogical choices reflect value judgments on the part of educationalists, and in the case of denominational schools, the value judgment of church leaders. The theme of nationalism and development was not unique to Newfoundland — in fact, it was a global discourse that many governments sought to encourage in schools — but its embrace and character in this context demonstrates the agreement between churches that nationalist rhetoric could be denominationally inclusive and aid churches in holding on to power and influence in the public sphere. The leading denominations broadly embraced shared nationalist curriculum materials reflecting their comfort with co-operation on points of nationalist ideology.

Harvey’s decision to write an inspiring settler-colonial narrative that showed Newfoundlanders as a hearty people of Anglo-Saxon and Celtic heritage who had the potential to build a modern industrialized nation resonated with local elites. This narrative defines the character of Newfoundland through the select qualities of some settler men; however, it omits the role of women and erases the significance of Indigenous people on the island and in Labrador. Harvey’s Text-book of Newfoundland History was adopted and celebrated for its usefulness and enthusiastic nationalist rhetoric. However, Harvey’s aspiration to inspire a decline in the prominence and inherent division of denominational identities was for naught. Rather, his history resonated because it recognized and fit into the politically conservative paradigm being developed by the churches and church-tied educators who were developing collaborative habits and relationships to ensure control over education and legitimate their place in the public sphere by positioning themselves as nation builders.
Ecumenical tone was acceptable because it positioned the churches as positive actors who had a rightful place in building up the colony, and as a Presbyterian, he was a member of a minority that was not a threat to the status quo of denominationalism. Instead, his history was useful to churches and church-tied leaders for his promotion of nationalist rhetoric that legitimized their place in the public sphere, justifying their control over education and supporting their efforts to embed nationalism within the denominational school system.
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