This article is forthcoming in *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*

**The Religious Right in the United States and Canada:
Evangelical Communities, Critical Junctures, and Institutional Infrastructures¹**

Tina Fetner²

McMaster University

Why has the religious right been more influential in the United States than in Canada? Traditional approaches to the study of social movements focus only on the life of the movement, from emergence to decline. Instead, I conduct a historical, comparative analysis on the pre-movement activities of evangelical Christian communities in these two countries from 1925-1975. Employing insights from historical institutionalism, I identify two critical junctures in the historical development of evangelical communities that suppressed the entrepreneurship and institution-building activities of Canadian evangelicals relative to those in the United States. I find that these divergences in institution building affected the size and strength of the institutional infrastructures—supportive organizations, networks, and resources—of the religious right movements in these countries. I argue that historical, comparative analysis in general, and historical institutionalism in particular, is useful to social movement scholarship's understanding of cross-national movement comparisons.

¹ I gratefully acknowledge Carrie B. Sanders and Allyson Stokes for research assistance on this project. Having worked on this project for some time, I am thankful for the opportunities to share early and incomplete versions in numerous workshops, conferences, and invited talks. I thank Rima Wilkes, Catherine Corrigan-Brown, Howard Ramos, Kathleen Rodgers, Nancy Christie, Michael Gauvreau, Greg Maney, Rachel Kutz-Flamembaum, Deanna Rohlinger, Jeff Goodwin, and Jackie Smith for offering opportunities to develop my thinking on this project. I thank Edwin Amenta for his sage advice over several conversations. I am especially grateful for helpful feedback from Neal Caren and two anonymous reviewers.

² Tina Fetner is Associate Professor of Sociology at McMaster University. Please direct correspondence to tina.fetner@mcmaster.ca.

On its face, the religious right movement looks very similar in Canada and the United States. It draws on similar communities composed in large measure of socially conservative evangelical Christians. It has similar policy goals, including elimination of abortion rights, denial of equal rights to lesbians, gay men, bisexual and transgender communities, and the diminishment of policies that support women's access to the workplace, such as funding for childcare centers, all-day kindergarten, and parental leave. In each country, the movement uses similar framing and rhetoric to communicate its claims, emphasizing traditional family forms and an implied universality of a conservative Christian identity. However, the success of the religious right in the United States has not been duplicated in Canada (Bean 2014).

The movement in Canada is not nearly as strong in the United States, as measured by policy outcomes or cultural influence (Farney 2012). Why is this the case? Some of the obvious differences between these movements are disparities in the resources available to activists, the number and size of social movement organizations, and in the institutional infrastructure that supports religious-right activism. While all of these factors are fairly standard explanations for why some movements are more influential than others, the question of how these disparities came to be remains. In such similar countries, with overlapping, intertwined cultures, why is the Canadian social movement weaker than the U.S. movement? Given that Canada has a rich, evangelical Christian tradition (Christie and Gauvreau 2010), why was the social movement that represents the interests of this community unable to establish a similarly large and resource-rich set of movement organizations?

Research puzzles such as these are common to social movement scholarship, and they are the basis of a rich tradition of comparative analysis. This body of work examines similarities across movements (e.g., Almeida 2014), considers barriers to diffusion of movement tactics (e.g., Wood 2012), and considers the role of national political contexts in social movements (e.g., Ferree 2012). However, scholarship on social movements is primarily concerned with movements

over their lifespan: from emergence to decline. In this case, though, the answers to these questions lie in large part in the historical record prior to movement emergence. I argue that the development of evangelical Christian communities took divergent paths in Canada and the United States. I identify two critical junctures that set Canadian evangelicals onto a historic path of less entrepreneurial organizational development than their counterparts in the United States. The U.S. evangelical community, by establishing a large number of market-based parachurch organizations over the middle of the twentieth century, created a strong and resource-rich institutional infrastructure that supported the emergence of the religious right social movement in the 1970s. In Canada, fewer parachurch organizations were established, and when the religious right social movement emerged there around the same time, its institutional infrastructure was much weaker than that of the United States.

Below, I use historical sources to demonstrate that two key historical developments in Canadian evangelicalism over the 1920s restricted the institution-building capacity of conservative evangelicals, marking critical junctures from the historical development of evangelical Christian communities in the United States. The first, in 1925, is the consolidation of most Canadian evangelicals into a single denomination. The second, in 1928, is the establishment of a Canadian policy regulating radio broadcasting by religious groups. Then, I demonstrate how these two critical junctures set these like-minded communities on different historical paths of institution building by offering an overview of evangelical entrepreneurship in each country between 1925 and 1975. I argue that these differences in institution building have affected the size and strength of the religious right social movements that emerged in Canada and the United States. I discuss the relationship between institution building and the financial, personnel, and cultural resources of social movement organizations at the end of the twentieth century. Finally, I consider the lessons this case offers to social movements theory. In drawing attention to the impact of the historical processes of institution building on movements, I argue that scholarship on social movements should

pay greater attention to historical forces and contingencies that produce varying levels of material resources, organizational supports, and cultural resources for movements in different contexts. This approach is particularly useful to understanding the relative strength of movements across national contexts.

Movements and Institutional Support

Scholarship in the sociology of social movements has long understood that organizational support is important to the mobilization, longevity, and success of social movements (McCarthy and Zald 1977). Social movements rely on an institutional infrastructure of organizations, networks of leaders, and the cultural and material resources they produce to influence publics, to press politicians on social issues, to mobilize protesters, and to carry the ideas and narratives of their activism over time (Andrews 2004). These organizational resources can come from within movement organizations, or they can exist as standalone institutions, with purposes distinct from the movements they support (Morris 1984). The stronger the organizations that support movements are, the better the movements are able to take advantage of political opportunities and weather storms, and the likelier they are to survive over the long haul.

Social movement organizations can be networked with other institutions to act as mobilizing structures to facilitate the activism of a social movement (McCarthy 1996). In the way that black churches in the South supported the civil rights movement by offering a space to gather, to develop narratives of justice and social change, to train leaders and to plan protest actions (Polletta 1998), a group of organizations can become the foundation for movement activity (Edwards and Foley 2002; Van Dyke and Dixon 2013). The networks among these organizations facilitate communication across large groups (Diani 2003). The communities built around organizations such as businesses, bars, and issue-specific presses can build a sense of collective identity that movements deploy strategically (Armstrong 2002; Bernstein 1997). These mobilizing

structures can hold or even produce resources for movements, including space, equipment, volunteers, or money (Morris 1984). Taken together, these organizations, networks and resources are understood to form the institutional infrastructure of social movement activity. The strength of this field of organizations and the networks between them are more important to understanding social movement influence than the strength of any single social movement organization (Campbell 2005).

Religious organizations have been singled out by social movements scholars, due to their rich and diverse history of supporting an array of social movements. The role of black churches in the civil rights movement is the most commonly cited case, but there is a rich history of religious organizations of all stripes offering material and cultural resources to many movements (e.g., Gahr and Young 2014; Naples 2014). Religiosity has been shown to negatively correlate with support for progressive social change (Scheve and Stasavage 2006), and religious organizations have been central to right-wing activism, including pro-slavery and white supremacist movements (Budros 2011; McVeigh 2009), anti-feminist activism (Mansbridge 1986), and the religious right (Fetner 2008; Stone 2012). Religious institutions, with their steady revenue streams and their physical gathering spaces throughout local towns and cities, are well positioned to offer material resources to social movements. With their strong organizational networks, their routinized communications, and their role as moral leaders, these institutions have cultural resources for social movements as well.

Comparative approaches to institutional infrastructures reveal that not all institutional infrastructures are as strong or as supportive to movements as others. The more that organizations facilitate contact among members, build community, and develop a sense of connection within a movement, the more useful the institutional infrastructure is to a movement. In a comparative analysis of different locations in the civil rights movement, Kenneth T. Andrews (2004: 25) finds that the most useful infrastructures have strong leaders and a complex leadership structure,

multiple, linked organizations, and a base of resources that includes both labor and funds (see also, Andrews 2001). These characteristics allow movements to achieve influence in various arenas and through multiple strategies. Building an effective institutional infrastructure can be a purposeful strategy of social movement actors (Andrews 2004). In other cases, activists take advantage of existing infrastructures (e.g., Diamond 1995).

Comparative approaches to infrastructures allow social movement scholars to identify the strengths and weaknesses of movement supports. They tell us what various institutional infrastructures are like and how they help movements to a greater or lesser extent. However, they pay less attention to questions about the process through which an organizational field develops into a stronger or weaker institutional infrastructure. To understand how one country produces a more robust infrastructure than another, a historical, comparative approach is required. In particular, a historical institutionalist approach is useful for this purpose, because of its focus on the historically contingent, path dependent nature of social change (Thelen 1999). A historical institutionalist approach considers long-term process as well as critical junctures that change the paths of long-term processes (Capoccia and Kelemen 2007; Pierson and Skocpol 2002). The self-reinforcing dynamics of long-term social and political processes make it difficult to turn back after a critical juncture (Béland 2005; Weaver 2010). In the case of the religious right in the United States and Canada, a historical, comparative approach is particularly necessary, since on the surface, the movements are so similar in the timing of their emergence, in their strategies and rhetoric, and in their political agendas. To understand differences in movement outcomes, it is necessary to understand the historical contingencies that affected each movement.

Case Selection, Data and Methods

I employ a historical, comparative case study of the religious right movement in Canada and the United States. These movements emerged in the 1970s first as countermovements to issue-specific

movements on the Left. For example, the pro-life movement, the anti-feminist movement, and the anti-gay movements each organized more or less independently around specific policy issues (for details on these movements, see Ginsburg 1989; Mansbridge 1986; Smith 2008; Staggenborg 1991). In the 1980s, multi-issue organizations representing socially conservative policy change writ large emerged, framing their issues in terms of evangelical Christian principles (Fetner 2008). As these organizations began to gain public recognition and advocate social change in the political sphere, the movement became known as the religious right. Although the movement gained greater renown in the United States than in Canada in these early days, organizationally the movement was developing at about the same time (Anderson and Langford 2001; Erwin 1993; Steuter 1992). However, as I point out below, the movement did not grow at the same rate. Nor did they have equal political influence, despite their similar strategies to align their interests with conservative political parties in the 1990s (MacKenzie 2005). In selecting this pair of movements in neighboring states, I follow Lipset's (1990) approach of selecting cases that are similar to reveal variation between them. I focus on the period crucial to this case: 1925-1975, when evangelicalism was redefining itself in both of these countries.

This historical, comparative analysis relies on secondary sources in history, religious studies, and sociology of religion that document the development of evangelical communities in the United States and Canada. Although a few key resources are comparative, for the most part these historical sources are limited to one country or the other. They include works that focus on individual religious figures, the growth of particular churches and denominations, general histories of the politics of the twentieth century, as well as monographs that chronicle the development of religious communities over time. Among these are sociological analyses of the development of religious institutions and cultures. In poring over these histories, I pay close attention to the geographic spread of evangelicalism, to movement between church denominations, and to the

emergence of new denominations and non-denominational churches. I focus on patterns of shared belief as well as the sources of theological conflict among evangelicals.¹

To supplement these secondary historical accounts, I refer to primary materials, including historical records from the Canadian census and denominational data collected by the U.S. government (Canada Year Book 1967; U.S. Bureau of the Census 1931, 1975). These sources offer the most accurate data available on denominational affiliation in each country at several points in time. To understand which denominational affiliations should be characterized as "evangelical," I adopt the categories published by the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada (EFC) for the Canadian case (Hiemstra 2008). In the United States, I rely on two sources: the congregational data from the U.S. Religious Congregants and Membership Study, 1990 Report (ARDA 1990), and the self-reports of "born again or evangelical Christian" status collected by Gallup to estimate the size of the evangelical community (Newport and Carroll 2005). In addition, for my analysis of policy differences, I rely on original regulatory documents (Aird, Bowman, and Frigon 1929).

Finally, to understand the scope of organizational resources, I conducted a web search of organizations affiliated with the religious right in Canada and the United States. To compile this list, I began with a reference list of U.S. organizations (Utter and Storey 2007). I cross-referenced this list with records compiled by People for the American Way (2016a). In the absence of a similar list for Canadian religious-right affiliated organizations, I conducted an Internet keyword search for "pro-family organization" using Google.ca and Yahoo! search engines. Using the advanced search feature, I limited the results to web pages located in Canada. This produced a list of 879 U.S. organizations and 169 Canadian organizations. Then, I searched each organization individually to find annual revenue on or about the year 2002, a high point of religious right activity in the United States. In many cases, these reports published in annual reports posted on the organization's website. For Canadian organizations, I searched Canada

Revenue Agency's online "List of Charities" (Canada Revenue Agency 2006). I was able to locate revenue data for 438 U.S. and 66 Canadian organizations. The twenty organizations with the highest revenue in each country are listed in Table 2. While this approach will not have produced a comprehensive list of organizations, it is presented here as supplementary evidence to the historical analysis of secondary materials and as an example of the scale of difference between the movements in these two countries.

Evangelical Christianity in the United States and Canada

Christian evangelicalism was redefining itself in the first half of the twentieth century. As secularism increased in prominence and scientific advances undermined religious bases of knowledge, those who believed that the bible was the literal word of God and the source of all truth were pressed to reconcile their beliefs with information in the news, in schools, and in the political sphere. Many held fast to their belief in the inerrancy of the bible. When scientific evidence came into conflict with the bible's lessons on how the world began or on the relationship between humans and animals, this information was rejected by these biblical literalists as an attack on their way of life and their salvation (Rawlyk and Noll 1994). Known as the "fundamentalist-modernist controversy," this dispute forced denominations to consider their stance on science, secularism, and the changing relationship between church and state resulting from the pressures of modernity (Finke and Stark 2005).

Although Canada and the United States both experienced fundamentalist-modernist controversies, there were important differences in context to note. First of all, a smaller proportion of Canadians are Protestant. The United States has consistently had a Protestant majority, but this is not the case in Canada, where a substantial Roman Catholic and Anglican presence exists. In 1901, forty-two percent of Canadians were Roman Catholic, twelve percent were Anglican, and forty-two percent were Protestant (Canada Year Book 1967:155). In contrast, the 1906 Census

of Religious Bodies reports that only seventeen percent of Americans were Catholic in that year, and this was consistent through at least 1936 (Finke and Stark 2005). However, most of Canada's Roman Catholic population lived in French-speaking Lower Canada (now Québec), so populations of English-speaking parts of Canada were more similar to the United States (Canada Year Book 1967).²

The experiences of evangelicals in these countries were very similar at the turn of the century and through the First World War. The economy of Canada was closely tied to that of the United States then as it is now, and hard times were relieved by religious revivals that offered a chance to sing, worship, and experience personal conversion and salvation (Christie and Gauvreau 2010; Young 2007). Revivalist evangelicalism was on the rise in both countries, and some traveling evangelists, like American Billy Sunday, travelled between the countries to welcoming audiences, delivering the same message to both groups (Christie and Gauvreau 2010: 157). Given these strong similarities, what happened to shift the path of evangelicals in Canada away from the path that U.S. evangelicals took? In particular, why did Canadian evangelicals build fewer community organizations and institutions to hold their community together, like their American neighbors? Below, I discuss two factors in the Canadian experience that serve as critical junctures in the historical paths of evangelical communities: a move to denominational unity in 1925, and a new policy restricting religious radio broadcasts in 1928.

Fractured vs. United: Denominational Cohesion, 1925

The first critical juncture that moved Canada and the United States onto different historical paths is the divergence of Protestant denominations. The fundamentalist-modernist controversy resulted in a reorganization of denominations in both countries, but in different directions. In the United States, evangelical denominations multiplied and fractured, and many evangelical Christians moved away from denominations altogether (Smith 1998). In Canada, most evangelical

denominations unified into a single denomination: the United Church of Canada (McIntire 2012). As I explain below, this unification of evangelicalism provided denominational supports that suppressed the institution-building activities of Canadian evangelicals, as it nudged its congregations slowly to the left politically and, eventually, away from evangelicalism altogether (Bean 2014). In contrast, in the United States, evangelicals became fractured, dispersed and isolated from each other, even as their numbers remained plentiful (Finke and Stark 2005). A number of denominations retained an evangelical theology and praxis, many new evangelical denominations were founded in this period, and many evangelical individuals and families moved away from denominations altogether into standalone churches led by independent preachers.

Part of the fracturing of evangelical Christianity was the expansion of denominations. Wuthnow (1988:20) reports that by the turn of the twentieth century, American worshipers had choices of 200 denominations, which had been born out of "sectarianism, sectionalism, immigration, and revivalism." Schisms among leading voices in evangelism widened. In the period between 1917 and the early 1920s in the United States, disputes over theological beliefs about end times, over worship practices like glossolalia, and over the stridency with which they attacked modernism and liberalism, split groups apart (Marsden 1980). In addition to being fractured, many evangelicals in the United States were isolationist. After 1925, those who were most concerned with the dangers that science, technology, and other aspects of modernity turned away from secular civil society and retreated into separatism, removing their children from public schools and withdrawing from politics, especially after the failure of several anti-evolution campaigns. As Christian Smith (1998: 7) notes, the dedication to separatism from all sources of modernity was sometimes extreme:

the doctrine of "double separation" became the litmus test of purity: a good fundamentalist had to separate not only from modernists and liberals but also from any otherwise-orthodox believer who refused to break all ties with liberals.

In this context, the characteristic of "worldliness" became a marker of sin, used to maintain a rigid separation between true believers and everyone else.

At the same time that American evangelicalism was fracturing and retreating from the secular sphere, Canadian evangelicals were offered the choice to unify into a new denomination that would consolidate major existing evangelical denominations and independent evangelical churches, into a single denomination. In 1925, the United Church of Canada (UCC) was established by reorganizing all Canadian Methodists, almost all Canadian Presbyterians, as well as the Congregational Union into a new, national denomination (Eddy 1963).³ This reorganization was intended to ensure the survival of evangelical Protestant traditions. With a single UCC church in each small town, rather than two or three Protestant churches competing against each other, this reorganization pooled resources and addressed pastor shortages (McIntire 2012).

The establishment of the United Church of Canada in 1925 marks a critical juncture from the path of U.S. denominations, as it had three key effects on the landscape of evangelicalism in Canada. First, the United Church of Canada was highly successful in capturing the lion's share of Canadian evangelicals at the time, leaving only a small number of evangelicals to form independent churches outside of this denomination. Second and related, this small number of outsiders to denominations created only a small market in Canada for materials and services normally addressed by denominations, and thus far fewer for-profit and non-profit organizations to sell their goods to evangelicals. Finally, although the ministry of the United Church of Canada at its inception was evangelical in its practices and welcoming to literalists in the pews, the denomination shifted culturally to the center and then the left, toward both modern theology and social activism over the middle of the twentieth century (Christie and Gauvreau 1996; Flatt 2013). Each of these three consequences of the denominational landscape in Canada is addressed below.

From its inception in 1925, the United Church of Canada dominated the evangelical landscape of Canada (Noll 1992). By 1931, over 2,000,000 Canadians were affiliated with the

UCC, making it the third largest denomination in Canada, behind Catholics and Anglicans (Canada Year Book 1967:155). After the UCC was established, the number of evangelicals in denominations other than the United Church was very small, especially relative to the United States. As Table 1 shows, in 1931 less than seven percent of Canadians—about 670,000 individuals—were affiliated with evangelical churches other than the UCC (Canada Year Book 1967:155). As historian Mark A. Noll (1992: 284) observes, Christianity in Canada at this time was "less fragmented,...more ecumenical, and less prone to separate evangelical theology from social outreach."

Table 1
RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS OF THE POPULATION, CANADA CENSUS YEAR 1931

<u>RELIGION</u>	<u>INDIVIDUALS</u>
Adventist	16,026
Anglican	1,635,615
Baptist	443,341
Brethren	13,472
Buddhist	15,784
Christian	11,527
Christian Science	18,436
Church of Christ, Disciples	15,811
Confucian	24,087
Congregationalist	694
Doukhobor	14,913
Evangelical Church	22,213
Free Methodist Church of Canada	7,730
Friends	2,424
Gospel People	6,355
Greek Orthodox	102,389
International Bible Students	13,552
Jewish	155,614
Lutheran	394,194
Mennonite	88,736
Mormon	22,005
No religion	21,071
Pagan	5,008
Pentecostal	26,301
Plymouth Brethren	6,983
Presbyterian	870,728
Protestant, nes	23,296
Roman Catholic	4,285,388
Salvation Army	30,716
Unitarian	4,445
United Church	2,017,375
Other	44,515
Not stated	16,042
Total	10,376,786
Evangelical (in bold)	2,688,995
Non-UCC evangelical	671,620
% of population in non-UCC evangelical	0.065

Source: Canada Year Book (1967), page 155.

The reorganization of Canadian evangelicalism had a suppressive effect on the development of parachurch organizations that market to evangelical Christian families. As the establishment of the United Church of Canada provided large numbers of Canadian evangelicals with a denominational home, it offered to them the usual denominational supports and provisions. For example, the UCC offered Sunday School for children, social activities for families, community outreach and social services. While this may not seem remarkable, it is relevant because in the United States, evangelicals developed organizations to fill the gaps left by a lack of denominational provisions there. In Canada, in contrast, by providing denominational supports to its millions of members, the United Church of Canada significantly diminished the demand for these services in the marketplace, and this limited the entrepreneurial possibilities for building successful parachurch organizations of the sort that became common in the United States.

The third way that the denominational consolidation of evangelical Protestantism thought the United Church of Canada affected Canadian evangelicalism was culturally. The United Church of Canada succeeded in merging Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists by establishing an ecumenical version of evangelicalism that allowed for a breadth of interpretation on some matters (for example, dispensationalism), but was very clear on its adherence to key tenets of evangelicalism, such as biblical inerrancy (Chown 1930). In the 1920s and 1930s, the UCC embraced an evangelical practice of religion that included revivals and a focus on personal salvation. Church leaders, many of whom were more modernist in their theology than the laity, painted over their differences largely by avoiding the topic. Historian Kevin Flatt (2013: 20) characterizes this early UCC approach as "a 'quiet' modernism that avoided affirming evangelical doctrines though generally without repudiating them in public statements." According to Flatt (2013), these "quiet" modern beliefs were coupled with "loud" evangelical practices that, over time, nudged this large evangelical flock toward modernist beliefs (and therefore out of

evangelicalism) slowly over several decades, until the denomination formally shifted into modernism in the 1960s.

Numerous groups of anti-modernist evangelicals carried on outside the United Church of Canada, under small denominations and in standalone churches, but their influence did not grow over time. By 1991, about 1,400,000 Canadians belonged to evangelical churches, about five percent of the Canadian population (Hiemstra 2008). Later work estimates up to 10% of Canadians are evangelical, suggesting that evangelicalism has grown in Canada since the emergence of the religious right (Bibby 2012; Reimer and Wilkinson 2015). In the United States, by contrast, there are just under 45,000,000 congregants at conservative evangelical churches according to the Religious Congregants and Membership Study, or about eighteen percent of the population (ARDA 1990). Whether or not they attend church, forty-one percent of Americans reported that they consider themselves "born again or evangelical Christian" according to a 1991 Gallup poll, or just over 100,000,000 people (Newport and Carroll 2005). Canada's small evangelical community did not have the institution-building capacity of its U.S. neighbors.

Laissez-faire vs. Restrictive Regulation: Radio Broadcast Policy, 1928

Intersecting with this important historical moment for evangelical communities was the technological advance of broadcast radio. Evangelicals in the United States and Canada were early adopters of radio, and this led to the second critical juncture in evangelical development: the stark contrast of U.S. and Canadian policies regulating religious broadcasting. Canadian bureaucrats retained direct control over who was allowed to broadcast on the radio and what they were allowed to say, while the United States left the development of radio mostly to market logic (Fetner, Stokes, and Sanders 2015; Johnston 1994). This one policy difference allowed the entrepreneurial efforts of U.S. evangelical radio broadcasters to flourish, producing hundreds of millions of dollars in revenues and bankrolling the development of many evangelical organizations. In

contrast, Canadian religious broadcasting of all kinds was strictly limited and prevented from making much profit. This regulatory policy, written in the early days of radio, produced a critical juncture in the growth of evangelical organizations by suppressing the free speech of Canadian evangelicals, reducing their capacity to recruit followers, and impeding the profitability of radio broadcasting in that country from its earliest days.

In the United States, the federal government did little to regulate religious radio programming. The Federal Communications Commission issued no prohibitions on the content of religious broadcasts, nor on advertising or direct solicitations of funds. Evangelical radio broadcasts were very popular and financially successful; early programs reached millions across the country (Finke and Stark 2005: 219). There seemed to be a station devoted to Christian radio in every small town across the country. When mainline churches tried to squeeze evangelicals out of radio networks, evangelicals invented syndication and began mailing tapes of their programs directly to independent radio stations across the country (Finke and Stark 2005: 223). Many of these endeavors blossomed into highly successful businesses, such as Charles E. Fuller's *Old Fashioned Revival Hour*, which was broadcast over 128 stations to an audience of 5,000,000 people by 1938 (Hangen 2002: 88).

The profitability of many of these early radio shows and the media legacies they created cannot be overstated. Records of revenues of individual broadcasters in the early days of radio are difficult to come by, but the general success of evangelical broadcasters in the United States, both in absolute terms and relative to other religious broadcasters, has a broad consensus in the scholarly literature. For example, Quentin J. Schultze (1990: 177) estimates that the audience size of Fuller's *Old-Fashioned Revival Hour* alone was twenty million in the 1940s. Dr. Walter A. Maier's *The Lutheran Hour* is reported to have received 125,000 letters of support from listeners in 1928 (Ellens 1974: 45). Aimee Semple McPherson turned her successful tent revival ministry into

a radio broadcast show, with so much success that she established one of the first Pentecostal megachurches in the country at a cost of \$1,500,000 in 1923 (Ellens 1974: 71).

In Canada, evangelical radio entrepreneurs did not operate in the same, market-friendly, laissez-faire policy framework as their U.S. counterparts. The 1928 Aird Report, well known in Canada for establishing the Canadian Broadcast Company, also placed severe restrictions on radio programming in general, and religious radio in particular (Nolan 1989). Two of its restrictions are particularly relevant. First, it restricted most forms advertising, eliminating direct requests for donations, which were the primary basis of profitability among U.S. evangelical radio broadcasts (Bird 1988). Second, the policy called out religious broadcasting in particular, requiring that all religious broadcasts be ecumenical and "prohibiting statements of a controversial nature" (Aird, et al., 1929: 13). These policy restrictions clearly sought to shape Canadian culture directly, setting it apart from the United States (Faassen 2011; Vipond 2000).

These restrictions did not preclude evangelical Christian radio altogether (Cook and Ruggles 1992). One important figure in Canadian evangelical radio was William "Bible Bill" Aberhart, a radio broadcaster who used his popularity to launch a political career, becoming Premier of Alberta from 1935 until his untimely demise in 1943 (Stackhouse 1999 [1993]). His legacy is a key piece of Canadian political history that laid the groundwork for much of socially conservative party politics in Canada to the current day. Aberhart's success is largely due to his early start; he began his fiery, revival-style broadcasts in 1925, three years prior to the regulatory restrictions of the Aird Report. He did solicit donations from his listeners in those days, with great success. After only a few weeks of broadcasting, Aberhart had over 500 paying members of his "radio club" (Johnson and MacNutt 1970: 64). Within a few months, Aberhart's profits supported the \$50,000 expansion of his church and Bible Institute into a new, larger facility with seating for 1,500 and housing for fifty students (Johnson and MacNutt 1970: 67).

The restrictive regulations of the Canadian government, then, were understood by historians and legal scholars to be at least in part a response to Aberhart, both in terms of his controversial style and his practice of requesting donations (Johnston 1994; Lacalamita 1984). Although Aberhart continued his radio broadcasts into the 1930s, he became less sectarian and, according to one historian, his sermons "lost their edge" (Johnston 1994: 399). Moreover, the broadcast radio success of Aberhart was not reproduced by other Canadian evangelicals. Some, like T.T. Shields of the Toronto Baptist Seminary, tried and failed to establish a financially viable radio program (Johnston 1994). Others had some modest successes broadcasting their sermons, or serving small communities. In the end, even Aberhart only experienced only modest financial success, though his lasting political influence was substantial (Elliott and Miller 1987). While some evangelical programs were carried by Canadian broadcasters, Canadian regulators refused to issue any licenses to religious broadcasters through much of the twentieth century. This also restricted the growth of televangelism in Canada, limiting the number of dedicated Christian television programs in Canada until these regulations were lifted in 1983 (Faassen 2011).

The Divergence of Evangelical Institution Building in Canada and the United States, 1925-1975

After these two critical junctures in the 1920s, the development of conservative evangelicalism in both the United States and Canada carried on without much thought to social movements and politics over the next several decades. Evangelicals in each nation built organizations to support evangelical communities in maintaining their beliefs and identity and to recruit new members. However, the critical junctures identified above shifted the path of Canada away from that of the United States, producing a sizable difference in the scale of these efforts. In the United States, parachurch organizations were developed to stand in for the services of denominations (Chaves 2002). This set of emergent, parachurch organizations defined American evangelicalism at this time (Marsden 1980). Consisting of both private businesses and non-profit organizations, many of

these parachurch organizations were financially successful, propelling the growth of this organizational sector further (Scheitle 2010). Among the most successful were numerous media organizations, including print shops, radio programs, and later, television shows and stations. Over time, several of these organizations grew large and profitable enough to support grand visions of evangelicalism.

Historians and scholars of religion agree that in the United States, the growth of parachurch organizations was substantial between 1925 and 1975 (Wuthnow 1988). They also agree that these organizations were inherent to evangelicalism, structuring their approach to humanitarianism and worship, as well as political activism (Turner 2008). Neither sects nor churches, these groups are devoted to particular religious purposes, such as coordinating missionary work, distributing bibles, or programming youth activities. While such groups existed throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the proliferation of these groups across the middle of the twentieth century and into the era of the religious right has been profound, escalating in 1925, to some degree in response to the Scopes trial, a cultural moment that was embarrassing to evangelicals (Marsden 1980: 125). Several organizations were founded then to fight the teaching of evolution in schools, and dozens of evangelical bible schools were founded in the 1930s (Marsden 1980: 194). Evangelical universities were established, including Bob Jones University, Dallas Theological Seminary, and Wheaton College, the fastest growing liberal arts college in the nation at the time (Carpenter 2000). Sociologist Christian Smith (1998) has argued that this proliferation of parachurch organizations was directly connected with the fractured state of evangelical denominations. This and the mass market of evangelical Christians created entrepreneurial opportunities in the United States. Indeed, throughout the 1920s and in the decades that followed, U.S. evangelical entrepreneurs seized the opportunity to start new businesses to cater to conservative, evangelical families across churches (Kruse 2015).

One of the most important sets of parachurch organizations to come out of U.S. conservative, evangelical communities was a profoundly resource-rich set of media empires dedicated to religious programming. Indeed, conservative, evangelical media stars—televangelists, as they are popularly called—such as Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson sit atop media empires that include television studios, dedicated television stations, radio programs and stations, and international media organizations (Fetner, Stokes and Sanders 2015). Revenues generated by these organizations have created and supported universities, missionary programs, and of course many of the activist organizations that comprise the religious right. This media industry in general, and many of the specific organizations that are prominent today, trace their roots back to the advent of radio, when evangelical Christian programs first became a raging success. Below, I offer a few examples of the architects of these evangelical organizations.

The first example of a major institution builder is Bob Jones, Sr., a revival evangelist in the early 1900s who preached to large audiences throughout the United States (Dalhouse 2012). Jones became one of the earliest evangelicals to broadcast his sermons on the radio in 1925, producing daily and weekly shows on network programming across the country for thirty-five years (Johnson 1982). He also founded a publishing company in 1928, which today remains a leading producer of homeschool curriculums and textbooks reflecting biblical literalism. Jones's most prominent legacy, Bob Jones College (now University), was founded in 1927, has dedicated itself in part to producing new leaders of evangelicalism. A second example is Billy Graham, a student at Bob Jones College for a short while, before attending the Florida Bible Institute and later Wheaton College (Pollock 1985). In 1950, Graham started his own radio program, the *Hour of Decision*, which was broadcast to 150 radio stations across the country and quickly amassed the largest audience of any religious broadcast in the country (Pollock 1985: 57-58). Graham founded an evangelical film company, World Wide Pictures, which produced feature films. He founded the influential magazine, *Christianity Today*, as well as *Decision* magazine, one

of the most widely circulated religious publications in the world (Noll 1992: 511). By 2012, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association was reporting over \$200,000,000 in annual revenues to the Internal Revenue Service (Foundation Center 2017).

With the advent of television, the success of U.S. evangelical entrepreneurs grew larger still. Some, like Billy Graham and Oral Roberts, transitioned from radio to television. Others, like Jerry Falwell and Jimmy Swaggart, entered directly into televangelism. The audience size and revenue that many U.S. televangelists would achieve was massive. For example, Oral Roberts in 1957 was broadcasting to 135 television stations at a time when only 500 stations existed in the United States (Harrell 1985). By the 1980s, his company employed over 2,300 people and reached peak annual revenues of \$110,000,000 (Schneider 2009). James Dobson's influential organization, Focus on the Family, reported revenue of \$126,000,000 in 2001 (People for the American Way 2016b). Similarly, Pat Robertson's Christian Broadcasting Network reported annual earnings of \$230,000,000 in 1986 (Oldfield 1996: 99).

These examples of evangelical businesses built, networks of volunteer organizations established, and leadership training programs set in place can be repeated over and over in the United States between 1925 through the remainder of the twentieth century (Scheitle 2010). For example, in 1988, there were 1,393 commercial Christian radio stations in the United States, as well as 259 Christian television stations, the vast majority of which are evangelical (Hadden 1990: 222). Estimates for total viewership in the 1980s range from 7,200,000 to 70,000,000 (Hadden 1990: 222). Each entrepreneurial success story involves massive revenues generated, lasting organizations developed, and a strong network of individuals and organizations collectively producing a culture of evangelicalism that includes a collective identity, a sense of purpose, and a shared set of values—all the ingredients for a successful social movement, much of which developed prior to the emergence of the movement itself. The wealth amassed by these giant media empires, combined with their mass appeal to a large portion of the electorate,

placed Christian broadcasting corporations and especially their charismatic on-screen leaders, in a powerful political position.

Canadian evangelicals did have entrepreneurial efforts, but with the United Church of Canada denomination dominating the landscape and radio policy dampening the profitability of their endeavors, their businesses were fewer, smaller, and less successful. Importantly, William Aberhart successfully transitioned from radio to politics. His tenure as Premier of Alberta and his establishment of an evangelically oriented political party has been an important institution-building exercise for Canadian evangelicalism (Elliot and Miller 1987). However, Aberhart did not amass the wealth of his U.S. counterparts. Plus, his success at building an audience through radio was not duplicated by many other Canadian evangelicals. Although a handful of evangelical leaders of the time left important legacies (T.T. Shields and Henry Aline are particularly notable), their institution-building efforts were limited, especially in the private sector.

This is not to say that there were no parachurch organizations in Canada. Indeed, The Salvation Army, imported from Britain in 1822, continued to be an important evangelical organization through the 1940s (Airhart 1994). The Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Canada, established in 1919, set up student groups on universities across Canada (Wright 1994). And the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada, founded in 1964, established a unified voice for evangelicals of all stripes (Gauvreau 1991). A number of bible schools and missionary organizations were also established between 1925 and 1975. However, these efforts can be characterized as sparse and scattered, part of an increasingly pluralistic religious landscape that included everything from socially conservative biblical literalists to liberal-minded social justice activists (Bibby 1987). Since 1940, evangelicals in the Canadian context have continued to be a steady but small minority, with institutions that are sufficient to sustain community, but without the large-scale resources of a profitable national industry of evangelical businesses and non-profit organizations.

Table 2

EVANGELICAL PARA-CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS, UNITED STATES AND CANADA

<u>UNITED STATES</u>			<u>CANADA</u>
ORGANIZATION	ANNUAL REVENUE (\$ USD)	ORGANIZATION	ANNUAL REVENUE (\$ CAD)
Campus Crusade for Christ, USA	514,449,000	Focus on the Family Canada	9,458,635
Operation Blessing	407,040,094	Evangelical Fellowship of Canada	2,971,188
Liberty University	395,898,255	Campus Crusade for Christ, Canada	2,758,793
Christian Broadcasting Network	295,140,001	Christian Broadcast Associates	1,515,841
Southern Baptist Convention	205,716,834	Estevan and District Pro-life Association	1,382,360
Focus on the Family	126,251,827	Couples for Christ Pro-life Ministry	868,825
Regent University	102,741,261	Right to Life, Toronto & Area	204,077
Coral Ridges Ministries Media Inc.	36,647,553	League for Life in Manitoba Inc.	184,232
Christian Advocates Serving Evangelism	34,733,151	Action Life Ottawa	159,204
Alliance Defense Fund	30,127,514	Right to Life Association, New Brunswick	139,938
American Family Association	21,408,342	St. Joseph's Workers for Life & Family	115,856
Christian Coalition of America	21,321,774	Right to Life, Cambridge	99,447
American Center for Law and Justice	14,650,162	Antigonish Right to Life	89,090
Family Research Council	12,069,081	Priests for Life, Canada	87,013
Concerned Women for America	11,383,635	Christian Legal Fellowship	84,386
National Right to Life Committee	11,323,141	Abbotsford Right to Life Society	76,114
Intercollegiate Studies Institute	10,669,218	Right to Life, Guelph & Area	75,338
Focus on the Family Action	10,544,226	Kelowna Right to Life Society	73,310
Traditional Values Coalition	9,005,947	Saskatchewan Pro-life Association	73,223
Christian Research Institute	7,983,756	Halton Pro-life	70,280

Even efforts by U.S. evangelicals to expand into Canadian markets have been limited. Focus on the Family Canada is perhaps the largest evangelical parachurch organization in the country, reporting revenue of \$9,500,000 CAD (equivalent to \$5,800,000 USD) in 2002 (see Table 2). This organization's revenue reports are over three times greater than the biggest Canadian-born organization, The Evangelical Fellowship of Canada, but this figure is very small relative to its parent company in the United States, which reported over \$126,000,000 that year. Pat Robertson's multi-national corporate empire is similar. The headquarters of Robertson's Canadian Christian Broadcasting Network affiliate resides in a small strip mall in Scarborough, Ontario, and its Facebook page has fewer than 2,000 "likes" (in the United States, Robertson's *700 Club* has almost 2,000,000).

Even after accounting for the tenfold difference in population between these countries, the self-reported revenue streams flowing into religious right organizations in the United States is one or two orders of magnitude larger than those in Canada. Table 2 offers a window into the field of evangelical parachurch organizations with ties to the religious right. This list does not include some of the largest U.S.-based parachurch organizations, such as World Vision, which coordinates donations of \$1,000,000,000 per year, because while they might be closely networked to the organizations supporting the religious right, their organizational orientation is not toward activism. It also does not include other massive evangelical businesses like Hobby Lobby and Amway because they are not parachurch organizations, though perhaps their link to the religious right is sufficient to warrant consideration. Even with these omissions, the difference between U.S. and Canadian evangelical organizational development is striking.

Discussion

From 1925-1975, the institution building and networking efforts of conservative Christian evangelicals produced a highly integrated, densely networked set of parachurch organizations,

churches and denominations to a much greater extent in the United States than in Canada.

Although the shared goal of entrepreneurs and leading this institution-building project was to support conservative evangelicals' ability to live apart from the secular political sphere, this major project of building Christian evangelical institutions apart from the secular world resulted in a firm foundation of institutional support for the conservative evangelical activism that emerged several decades later. As Sara Diamond (1995) argues, by the late 1970s, many of these parachurch organizations had knitted together into a nationally coordinated set of social movement organizations that became known as the religious right.

Early efforts by single-issue movement organizations in the United States, such as Phyllis Schlafly's anti-feminist Eagle Forum (Mansbridge 1986) and Anita Bryant's anti-gay Save Our Children (Fetner 2008) demonstrated that conservative evangelical activism could be successful. When Jerry Falwell's Moral Majority emerged in 1980 to solidify several socially conservative positions into a multi-issue social movement, this group harnessed the resources, networks, identity and values of a large American evangelical subculture.⁴ The evangelical organizations formed a substantial institutional infrastructure to support mass mobilization, communications, lobbying efforts, and electoral political strategies from the earliest days of the movement (Andrews 2004). Much of the work of building these infrastructures, and the related cultural work of establishing identities and frames, had been done before the social movement emerged.

In Canada, an evangelical, socially conservative movement emerged at about the same time as the religious right in the United States. Social movement organizations like Campaign Life, founded in 1977, and REAL Women of Canada, 1983, protested abortion policy and state support for feminist organizations (Farney 2012). The Evangelical Fellowship of Canada expanded its mission to lobbying around this time as well (Malloy 2009; Noll 1997). Although the EFC did provide a strong network of evangelical churches, their numbers were not massive. By this time, the United Church of Canada had moved completely out of evangelicalism, rejecting biblical

literalism and embracing one of the most liberal, modern theologies in Canadian Protestantism (Flatt 2013). Relative to the United States, this community is small, and given the relative lack of parachurch organizations, the community produced far fewer resources over time. As such, these groups did not have as significant an impact on the political landscape, especially relative to their U.S. counterparts (Bean 2014; MacKenzie 2005).

By the 1980s, when the religious right social movement was active in both countries, the proliferation of evangelical organizations in the United States had produced conditions favorable to social movement emergence. For example, the religious right had access to a wealth of resources, in the form of financial contributions, organizational infrastructure, professional leadership, and millions of participants. The movement had a dense network of connected institutions through which to communicate their agenda, coordinate protests, and mobilize constituents. Though there was work to do to connect evangelicals to political action, the evangelical community had produced a collective, Christian identity (Reimer 2003). As Bean (2014) demonstrates, the evangelical cultures produced by these communities differed in the extent to which their Christian identity was politicized. In addition, U.S. evangelicals had acquired cultural competencies in forming small groups for discussion and letter-writing, knowledge of how to transport protesters to locations, hold rallies and so on (McGirr 2001).

The radio and television programs that produced so much organizational growth and expansion were also important elements of the U.S. religious right's infrastructure; it is no coincidence that many of the movement's leaders were also radio and television personalities. Evangelical media's ability to merge activism with entertainment gave the movement access to existing audiences of millions of viewers and listeners on a daily basis for years and years. The U.S. religious right was able to speak directly through the media corporations that were developed by evangelicals in the middle of the twentieth century, whereas most movements struggle to get the attention of sympathizers and potential constituents through news media

coverage of protest (see, for example, Amenta, Elliott, Shortt, Tierney, Türkoglu, and Vann 2017; Andrews and Caren 2010; Rohlinger and Brown 2013; Sobieraj 2011).

The Canadian religious right's lack of a similarly strong institutional infrastructure handicapped it relative to that of the United States. Although, like the U.S. movement, the Canadian religious right had elite ties to political party insiders, there was little else in the way of resources, networks, communications, or cultural resources available to this movement (Bean, Kaufman and Gonzalez 2008; Farney 2012). The Canadian government loosened its broadcasting regulations in 1983, but the fledgling media industry was not in a strong position to support evangelical activism (Faasen 2011). Although the movement has been a consistent voice in Canadian political discourse since the 1980s, it is one voice among many. Its policy achievements are negligible, even when sympathetic political parties hold office (Rayside and Wilcox 2011).

Conclusion

For reasons quite unrelated to political activism, U.S. conservative evangelicals largely separated from both church denominations and from the secular world. This community developed through entrepreneurship in creating parachurch organizations, through church involvement, and through the building of networks specifically designed to connect and sustain a community of like-minded families away from the influence of popular culture and secular institutions. Canadian evangelicals were more likely to stay with their denominations and choose a moderate vision of evangelicalism that moved away from isolationism and an anti-modern theology. Restrictive media regulations prevented evangelical Christians from reaching wide audiences through radio and television, and from amassing wealth to support new institutional development. As a result, evangelicals in Canada built far fewer parachurch organizations and networks.

I argue that the disparity in organizational size and strength impacts the effectiveness of the religious right movements in each of these nations, even though the work of establishing these

organizations was underway long before the movements' emergence. The relative success of the U.S. religious right is built upon the work of the evangelical entrepreneurs who established these organizations and networks. It was supported by massive investments of resources produced with revenues generated by these organizations. Its claims resonated with large swaths of the American public because of the cultural groundwork performed by these U.S. evangelical entrepreneurs. On the flip side, the hard work of activists in the Canadian religious right will not produce the same results as similar activism in the United States, because the relative lack of organizational strength, resources, constituents and cultural resonance hampers their ability to produce social change.

The lessons for social movement scholars are twofold. First, this case is an example that the insights of historical institutionalism are relevant to social movement scholarship. I argue that the impact of the same social movement in two neighboring countries was substantially different because of two critical junctures that occurred decades prior to the movement emergence, and that these critical junctures shifted the path of institutional development between 1925 and 1975. This historical institutionalist approach brings more light to the puzzle of why the religious right is weaker in Canada than the United States than traditional analytic tools of social movement scholarship. With careful attention to historical processes, this approach reveals that historical contingency and path dependence are as important to the size and strength of social movements as they are to the policy outcomes that movements may produce. By identifying the critical junctures in the historical paths of Canadian and American evangelicals, this comparative analysis offers a partial answer to the question of why these movements are more or less effective in their national contexts, as well as a set of analytic tools to apply to other movements in other contexts.

Second, this case contributes to the discussion within social movement scholarship on the effect of institutional infrastructures on social movements. This body of work makes a convincing case that organizations and networks outside movements are important for facilitating

communication, providing space to meet, developing leaders, and enhance movement capacity in numerous ways. The case of the U.S. and Canadian religious right calls upon social movement scholars to consider the historical processes through which institutional infrastructures develop and the effect that they have on the material and cultural resources, networks, and constituents upon which movements rely. Like the movements themselves, the infrastructures that support movements are produced through social processes in particular historical contexts. As this case shows, the size and capacity of institutional infrastructures can vary substantially in ways that affect movement outcomes. It also reveals the material and cultural resources that can be produced by institutional infrastructures in some cases, but not in others. Only a historical perspective, one that is willing to examine social processes that precede movement emergence, can reveal the social processes of institution building that explain comparative movement strength.

Taken together, these lessons can be extended to comparative analyses of social movements. In the current context of global activism and cross-national social movements, one should not assume that mobilization is equally likely, or will have similar outcomes, across national borders. Instead, research should investigate the historical contingencies that produce variation in movement success, keeping in mind that much of the work of supporting activism may occur well in advance of the emergence of the movement itself. Social movement scholarship can gain important insights by tracking the historic contingencies and path dependencies of communities, institutions, and activism. Disparities in the size and strength of mobilizing structures and the networks that connect them may have a substantial impact on the ability of social movements to be successful across national borders. The historical contingencies of the development of institutional infrastructures are an important component of movement outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Aird, John, Charles A. Bowman, and Augustin Frigon. 1929. *Report of the Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting*. Ottawa: Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting.
- Airhart, Phyllis D. 1994. "Ordering a New Nation and Reordering Protestantism, 1867-1914." Pp. 98–138 in *The Canadian Protestant Experience, 1760-1990*, edited by George A. Rawlyk. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Almeida, Paul. 2014. *Mobilizing Democracy: Globalization and Citizen Protest*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Amenta, Edwin, Thomas Alan Elliott, Nicole Shortt, Amber Celina Tierney, Didem Türkoglu, and Burrell Vann. 2017. "From Bias to Coverage: What Explains How News Organizations Treat Social Movements." *Sociology Compass* 11(3):1–12.
- Anderson, Gillian and Tom Langford. 2001. "Pro-Family Organizations in Calgary, 1998: Beliefs, Interconnections and Allies." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 38(1):37–56.
- Andrews, Kenneth T. 2004. *Freedom Is a Constant Struggle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Andrews, Kenneth T. 2001. "Social Movements and Policy Implementation: The Mississippi Civil Rights Movement and the War on Poverty, 1965 to 1971." *American Sociological Review* 66(1):71–95.
- Andrews, Kenneth T. and Neal Caren. 2010. "Making the News: Movement Organizations, Media Attention, and the Public Agenda." *American Sociological Review* 75(6):841–66.
- ARDA. 1990. "U.S. Religious Congregants and Membership Study, 1990 Report." *The Association of Religion Data Archives*. Retrieved June 19, 2018
(http://www.thearda.com/rcms2010/r/u/rcms2010_99_us_tradition_1990.asp).
- Armstrong, Elizabeth A. 2002. *Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Francisco, 1950-1994*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bean, Lydia. 2014. *The Politics of Evangelical Identity: Local Churches and Partisan Divides in the*

- United States and Canada*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bean, Lydia, Jason Kaufman, and Marco Jesus Gonzalez. 2008. "Why Doesn't Canada Have an American-Style Christian Right? A Comparative Framework for Analyzing the Political Effects of Evangelical Subcultural Identity." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 33(4):899–943.
- Béland, Daniel. 2005. "Ideas and Social Policy: An Institutional Perspective." *Social Policy & Administration* 39(1):1–18.
- Bernstein, Mary. 1997. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(3):531–65.
- Bibby, Reginald W. 1987. *Fragmented Gods: The Poverty and Potential of Religion in Canada*. Toronto: Stoddart Publishing.
- Bird, Roger, ed. 1988. *Documents of Canadian Broadcasting*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press Inc.
- Budros, Art. 2011. "Explaining the First Emancipation: Social Movements and Abolition in the U.S. North, 1776-1804." *Mobilization* 16(4):439–454.
- Campbell, John L. 2005. "Where Do We Stand? Common Mechanisms in Organizations and Social Movements Research." Pp. 41–68 in *Social Movements and Organization Theory*, edited by Gerald F. Davis, Doug McAdam, W. Richard Scott, and Mayer N. Zald. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Canada Revenue Agency. 2006. "List of Charities." Retrieved July 10, 2017 (<http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/chrts-gvng/lstngs/menu-eng.html>).
- Canada Year Book. 1967. *Canada Year Book: 1948-49*. Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics.
- Capoccia, Giovanni and R. Daniel Kelemen. 2007. "The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism." *World Politics* 59(3):341–69.
- Carpenter, Joel A. 2000. "Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism, 1929-1942." Pp. 259–73 in *More Money, More Ministry: Money and Evangelicals in Recent North American History*, edited by Larry Eskridge and Mark A. Noll. Grand Rapids, MI:

- William B. Eerdmans.
- Chaves, Mark. 2002. "Religious Organizations: Data Resources and Research Opportunities." *American Behavioral Scientist* 45(10):1523–49.
- Chown, Samuel Dwight. 1930. *The Story of Church Union in Canada*. Toronto: Ryerson Press.
- Christie, Nancy and Michael Gauvreau. 1996. *A Full-Orbed Christianity: The Protestant Churches and Social Welfare in Canada, 1900-1940*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Christie, Nancy and Michael Gauvreau. 2010. *Christian Churches and Their Peoples, 1840-1965: A Social History of Religion in Canada*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
- Cook, Peter G. and Myles A. Ruggles. 1992. "Balance and Freedom of Speech: Challenge for Canadian Broadcasting." *Canadian Journal of Communications* 17(1):37–59.
- Dalhouse, Mark Taylor. 2012. *An Island in the Lake of Fire: Bob Jones University, Fundamentalism, and the Separatist Movement*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Diamond, Sara. 1995. *Roads to Dominion: Right-Wing Movements and Political Power in the United States*. New York and London: The Guilford Press.
- Diani, Mario. 2003. "Networks and Social Movements: A Research Programme." Pp. 299–319 in *Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action*, edited by Mario Diani and Doug McAdam. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eddy, Earl B. 1963. "The Congregational Tradition." Pp. 25–37 in *The Churches and the Canadian Experience: A Faith and Order Study of the Christian Tradition*, World Council of Churches Theological Study Commission on Tradition and Traditions, edited by John Webster Grant. Toronto: Ryerson Press.
- Edwards, Bob and Michael Foley. 2002. "Social Movement Organizations Beyond The Beltway: Understanding The Diversity Of One Social Movement Industry." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 8(1):87–107.
- Ellens, J. Harold. 1974. *Models of Religious Broadcasting*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

- Elliott, David Raymond and Iris Miller. 1987. *Bible Bill: A Biography of William Aberhart*.
Edmonton, AB Canada: Reidmore Books.
- Erwin, Lorna. 1993. "Neoconservatism and the Canadian Pro-Family Movement." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 30(3):401–20.
- Faassen, Mark. 2011. "A Fine Balance: The Regulation of Canadian Religious Broadcasting." *Queen's Law Journal* 37(1):303-37.
- Farney, James. 2012. *Social Conservatives and Party Politics in Canada and the United States*.
Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
- Ferree, Myra Marx. 2012. *Varieties of Feminism: German Gender Politics in Global Perspective*.
Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fetner, Tina. 2008. *How the Religious Right Shaped Lesbian and Gay Activism*. Minneapolis, MN:
University of Minnesota Press.
- Fetner, Tina, Allyson Stokes, and Carrie B. Sanders. 2015. "Evangelical Radio: Institution Building and the Religious Right." Pp. 44–60 in *Protest and Politics: The Promise of Social Movement Societies*, edited by Howard Ramos and Kathleen Rodgers. UBC Press.
- Finke, Roger and Rodney Stark. 2005. *The Churching of America, 1776-2005: Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Flatt, Kevin N. 2013. *After Evangelicalism: The Sixties and the United Church of Canada*. Montréal, QC: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Foundation Center. 2017. "Form 990, 990 Tax Forms | Foundation Center." *990 Finder*.
Retrieved July 9, 2017
(<http://990finder.foundationcenter.org/990results.aspx?action=Find&fn=billy+graham+evangelistic+association&st=&ei=>).
- Gahr, Joshua and Michael Young. 2014. "Evangelicals and Emergent Moral Protest." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 19(2):185–208.

- Gauvreau, Michael. 1991. *The Evangelical Century: College and Creed in English Canada from the Great Revival to the Great Depression*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Ginsburg, Faye D. 1989. *Contested Lives: The Abortion Debate in an American Community*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hadden, Jeffrey K. 1990. "Televangelism and Political Mobilization." Pp. 215–29 in *American Evangelicals and the Mass Media*, edited by Quentin J. Schultze. Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books/Zondervan.
- Hangen, Tona J. 2002. *Redeeming the Dial: Radio, Religion & Popular Culture in America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Harrell, David Edwin Jr. 1985. *Oral Roberts: An American Life*. Bloomington, IA: Indiana University Press.
- Hiemstra, Rick. 2008. "Evangelicals and the Canadian Census." *Church and Faith Trends: A Publication of The Centre for Research on Canadian Evangelicalism* 1(2):1–13.
- Johnson, LeRoy Peter Vernon and Ola J. MacNutt. 1970. *Aberhart of Alberta*. Edmonton, AB: Co-op Press.
- Johnson, R. K. 1982. *Builder of Bridges: A Biography of Dr. Bob Jones, Sr.* Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University Press.
- Johnston, Russell. 1994. "The Early Trials of Protestant Radio: 1922-1938." *Canadian Historical Review* 75(3):376–403.
- Kruse, Kevin M. 2015. *One Nation under God: How Corporate America Invented Christian America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lacalamita, John. 1984. "The Equitable Campaign: Party Political Broadcasting Regulation in Canada." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 22(3):543–79.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1990. *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*. NY and London: Routledge.

- MacKenzie, Chris. 2005. *Pro-Family Politics and Fringe Parties in Canada*. UBC Press.
- Malloy, Jonathan. 2009. "Bush/Harper? Canadian and American Evangelical Politics Compared." *American Review of Canadian Studies* 39(4):352–63.
- Mansbridge, Jane J. 1986. *Why We Lost the ERA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marsden, George M. 1980. *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCarthy, John D. 1996. "Constraints and Opportunities in Adopting, Adapting and Inventing." Pp. 141–51 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framings*, edited by D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, and M. N. Zald. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6):1212-1241.
- McGirr, Lisa. 2001. *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- McIntire, C. T. 2012. "Unity among Many: The Formation of the United Church of Canada, 1899-1930." Pp. 3-38 in *The United Church of Canada: A History*, edited by Don Schweitzer. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- McVeigh, Rory. 2009. *The Rise of the Ku Klux Klan: Right-Wing Movements and National Politics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Morris, Aldon. 1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: Free Press.
- Naples, Nancy A. 2014. *Grassroots Warriors: Activist Mothering, Community Work, and the War on Poverty*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Newport, Frank and Joseph Carroll. 2005. "Another Look at Evangelicals in America Today." *Gallup News Service*, December 2.

- Nolan, Michael. 1989. "An Infant Industry: Canadian Private Radio 1919-36." *Canadian Historical Review* 70(4):496–518.
- Noll, Mark. 1997. "Canadian Evangelicalism: A View from the United States." Pp. 3–20 in *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience*, edited by George A. Rawlyk. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Noll, Mark A. 1992. *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada*. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans.
- Oldfield, Duane M. 1996. *The Right and the Righteous: The Christian Right Confronts the Republican Party*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- People for the American Way. 2016a. "Focus on the Family | Right Wing Watch." Retrieved August 9, 2016 (http://www.rightwingwatch.org/content/focus-family?_ga=1.169007393.1877482324.1470755115).
- People for the American Way. 2016b. "Right Wing Watch." *Right Wing Watch*. Retrieved July 10, 2017 (<http://www.rightwingwatch.org/organizations/>).
- Pierson, Paul and Theda Skocpol. 2002. "Historical Institutionalism in Contemporary Political Science." Pp. 693–721 in *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, edited by Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Polletta, Francesca. 1998. "'It Was Like A Fever...' Narrative and Identity in Social Protest." *Social Problems* 45(2):137–59.
- Pollock, John. 1985. *To All the Nations: The Billy Graham Story*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Rawlyk, George A. and Mark A. Noll, eds. 1994. *Amazing Grace: Evangelicalism in Australia, Britain, Canada and the United States*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Rayside, David and Clyde Wilcox. 2011. "The Difference That a Border Makes: The Political Intersection of Sexuality and Religion in Canada and the United States." Pp. 3–25 in *Faith, Politics and Sexual Diversity in Canada and the United States*, edited by David Rayside and

- Clyde Wilcox. Vancouver & Toronto: UBC Press.
- Reimer, Sam. 2003. *Evangelicals and the Continental Divide: The Conservative Protestant Subculture in Canada and the United States*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Rohlinger, Deana and Jordan Brown. 2013. "Mass Media and Institutional Change: Organizational Reputation, Strategy, and Outcomes in the Academic Freedom Movement." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 18(1):41–64.
- Scheitle, Christopher P. 2010. *Beyond the Congregation: The World of Christian Nonprofits*. Oxford University Press.
- Scheve, Kenneth and David Stasavage. 2006. "The Political Economy of Religion and Social Insurance in the United States, 1910–1939." *Studies in American Political Development* 20(2):132–59.
- Schneider, Keith. 2009. "Oral Roberts, Fiery Preacher, Dies at 91." *New York Times*, December 15, A-1.
- Schultze, Quentin J. 1990. "The Invisible Medium: Evangelical Radio." Pp. 171–95 in *American Evangelicals and the Mass Media: Perspectives on the Relationship between American Evangelicals and the Mass Media*, edited by Quentin J. Schultze. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Corp.
- Smith, Christian. 1998. *American Evangelicalism: Embattled and Thriving*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, Miriam. 2008. *Political Institutions and Lesbian and Gay Rights in the United States and Canada*. London: Routledge.
- Sobieraj, Sarah. 2011. *Soundbitten: The Perils of Media-Centered Political Activism*. New York: NYU Press.
- Stackhouse, John G., Jr. 1999 [1993]. *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century: An Introduction to Its Character*. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing. Reprint of 1993

- edition, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1991. *The Pro-Choice Movement: Organization and Activism in the Abortion Conflict*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Steuter, Erin. 1992. "Women against Feminism: An Examination of Feminist Social Movements and Anti-Feminist Countermovements." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 29(3):288–306.
- Stone, Amy L. 2012. *Gay Rights at the Ballot Box*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2(1):369–404.
- Turner, John G. 2008. *Bill Bright & Campus Crusade for Christ: The Renewal of Evangelicalism in Postwar America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1975. *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970, Bicentennial Edition, Part 2*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1931. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Utter, Glenn and John W. Storey. 2007. *The Religious Right: A Reference Handbook*. 3rd ed. Millerton NY: Grey House Pub.
- Van Dyke, Nella and Marc Dixon. 2013. "Activist Human Capital: Skills Acquisition and the Development of Commitment to Social Movement Activism." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 18(2):197–212.
- Vipond, Mary. 2000. *The Mass Media in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Lorimer.
- Weaver, Kent. 2010. "Paths and Forks or Chutes and Ladders?: Negative Feedbacks and Policy Regime Change." *Journal of Public Policy* 30(2):137–62.
- Wood, Lesley J. 2012. *Direct Action, Deliberation, and Diffusion: Collective Action after the WTO Protests in Seattle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Wright, Robert A. 1994. "The Canadian Protestant Tradition, 1914-1945." in *The Canadian Protestant Experience 1760-1990*, edited by George A. Rawlyk. Burlington, ON: Welch Publishing Company, Inc.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 1988. *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Young, Michael P. 2007. *Bearing Witness against Sin: The Evangelical Birth of the American Social Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ENDNOTES

¹ I use the term "evangelical" here to reflect the current terminology adopted by this group today.

In doing so, I purposely impose an anachronism onto the communities of anti-modernists of the 1920s, many of whom would have called themselves fundamentalists at that time, but have rejected that term in the years since because it gained negative connotations. By evangelical I refer to people who attend evangelical churches or self-identify as evangelical. Although evangelicals have diverse worship practices and theological beliefs, one common thread that ties them together—and distinguishes them from mainline Protestants—is a belief in the true meaning of the bible as the word of God (biblical literalism). I use the term "conservative evangelical" to refer to self-identifying evangelicals who also hold socially conservative views on moralism; it is important to note that this group is distinct from the community of liberal or left evangelicals, whose evangelism is focused on social justice goals.

² While the English-French divide is an important factor in Canadian politics along many lines that are outside the scope of this analysis, evangelical community building was largely limited to English-speaking Canada.

³ A small minority (seven percent) of Presbyterian congregations voted to remain outside the United Church of Canada, continuing on as the Presbyterian Church in Canada, a mainline denomination.

⁴ I should note that from the outset, the Moral Majority was linked with and supported by the Republican Party.