Nova Britannia Revisited:

Canadianism, Anglo-Canadian Identities and the Crisis of Britishness, 1964-1968

C. P. Champion

Department of History

McGill University, Montreal

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History

February 2007

© Christian Paul Champion, 2007

Table of Contents

Dedication ………………………………………………………………………..2

Abstract / Résumé …………………………………………………………………3

Acknowledgements…………………………………………………………………5

Obiter Dicta…………………………………………………………………………6

Introduction ………………………………………………………………………. 7

Chapter 1 Canadianism and Britishness in the Historiography..………..…………33

Chapter 2 The Challenge of Anglo-Canadian ethnicity …..……..……….……….. 62

Chapter 3 Multiple Identities, Britishness, and Anglo-Canadianism ………..… 109

Chapter 4 Religion and War in Anglo-Canadian Identity Formation..…..……. 139

Chapter 5 The celebrated *rite-de-passage* at Oxford University ………...…… 171

Chapter 6 The courtship and apprenticeship of non-Wasp ethnic groups….….. 202

Chapter 7 The “Canadian flag” debate of 1964-65……………………...…… 243

Chapter 8 Unification of the Canadian armed forces in 1966-68……..…..……. 291

Conclusions: Diversity and continuity……..……………………………..…….. 335

Bibliography ……………………………………………………….………347

Index……………………………………………………………………...384

For Helena-Maria, Crispin, and Philippa

Abstract

The confrontation with Britishness in Canada in the mid-1960s is being revisited by scholars as a turning point in how the Canadian state was imagined and constructed. During what the present thesis calls the "crisis of Britishness" from 1964 to 1968, the British character of Canada was redefined and Britishness portrayed as something foreign or "other." This post-British conception of Canada has been buttressed by historians depicting the British connection as a colonial hangover, an externally-derived, narrowly ethnic, nostalgic, or retardant force. However, Britishness, as a unique amalgam of hybrid identities in the Canadian context, in fact took on new and multiple meanings. Historians have overlooked ethnic and cultural nuances among the various ethnicities—English, Scots, Irish, etc. The role of Britishness as a constitutive and animating element embedded in the Canadianism of hybridized individuals and groups, and not only those of British ethnicity, has been neglected. Significantly, it was members, almost all male, of an Anglo-Celtic core ethnie*, some of whom had made the pilgrimage to Oxford University, who carried out the othering process, the portrayal of Britishness as something that was not truly Canadian—introducing a new national flag, for example, with French Canadians and non-British ethnic groups largely sidelined. At the same time, the neo-aristocracy within this core* ethnie *did not so much abandon its heritage as assign to it a new and less public role that they regarded as "distinctively Canadian." If the overt Britishness of the Red Ensign was downgraded, the new flag was a less dramatic break with the past than is commonly assumed. In a sense, Anglo-Canadians implemented the kind of local change and development foreseen by liberal theorists of Empire, who saw in the* Res Britannica *an evolving association of diverse elements and nationalisms that represented a fulfillment, rather than a rejection, of Britishness. With all of its fusions, hybridities, and continuities, the* Res Canadiana*, envisioned as distinctively Canadian, remains the product of a British world.*

Résumé

Les spécialistes repensent la confrontation avec la britannicité au Canada au milieu des années 60, la considérant comme un tournant dans la façon dont l'état canadien a été imaginé et construit. Entre 1964 et 1968, pendant ce que ce thèse nomme « la crise de britannicité », le caractère britannique du Canada fut redéfini et la britannicité envisagée comme quelque chose étranger ou « autre ». Cette conception post-britannique du Canada fut soutenue par des historiens qui représentaient le lien avec la Grande-Bretagne comme reliquat de l'époque coloniale, une force dérivée de l'externe, étroitement ethnique, nostalgique, ou retardataire. Cependant, la britannicité, comme fusion unique des identités hybrides dans le contexte canadien, a en fait pris des significations nouvelles et multiples. Les historiens ont négligé les nuances ethniques et culturelles parmi les diverses appartenances ethniques, anglais, écossais, irlandais, etc. Le rôle de la britannicité comme un élément constitutif et animant comme élément du

« Canadianisme » des individus et des groupes hybridés, et non seulement ceux de l'appartenance ethnique britannique, ne fut pas pris en considération. Fait révélateur, ce furent des membres, presque tous mâles, dont l'ethnie centrale était anglo-celtique, bon nombre desquels ont fait le pèlerinage à l'université d'Oxford, qui furent responsables de ce processus de transformation en autre, de la représentation de la britannicité comme quelque chose de ne pas vraiment canadien; par exemple, en introduisant un nouveau drapeau national, tout en tenant à l'écart les canadiens français et les groupes ethniques non-britanniques. En même temps, la néo-aristocratie de cette *ethnie* centrale n'abandonna pas son héritage comme tel mais plutôt lui assigna un rôle nouveau et moins public qu'ils considérèrent « distinctement Canadien ». Si la britannicité manifeste du Pavillon rouge était dévalorisée, le nouveau drapeau était une rupture avec le passé moins dramatique qu'en est généralement supposé. Dans un sens, les anglo-canadiens ont mis en application le genre de changement local et de développement prévu par les théoriciens libéraux de l'empire, qui ont vu dans le *Res Britannica* une association d'éléments et de nationalismes divers en évolution qui représenta une réalisation, plutôt qu'un rejet, de la britannicité. Avec toutes ses fusions, ses hybridations, et ses continuités, le *Res Canadiana*, envisagé comme distinctement Canadien, demeure le produit d'un monde britannique.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the several librarians and archival assistants who retrieved materials for me at institutions in Ottawa, Toronto, Kingston, Vancouver, and Montreal. John Zucchi and Carman Miller, my thesis supervisors, have been helpful throughout. I am also grateful to have been able to discuss the ideas in this thesis with Hereward Senior, formerly of the History Department. Thanks also to Jonathan Vance, the external examiner, for his helpful comments. A thesis is seldom the work of one person; the suggestions and advice of friends and colleagues become merged in the finished product.

I should like to acknowledge the comments and corrections of a dozen anonymous readers of versions of Chapters 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 in the peer review and editing process for publication in the *Canadian Historical Review*, *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, the *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, the *Journal of Canadian Studies*, and the *British Journal of Canadian Studies* during 2005-07.

To my wife, Helena-Maria, is owed the greatest debt for her patience and encouragement during the three and a half years in which my Ph.D. field work and this dissertation were completed. I am grateful to my father, Paul Champion, and my late mother, Tineke, both immigrants to this particular Nova Britannia, for instilling an interest in the subject. Thanks also to my parents-in-law, Jean and Bernard Pothier, for their hospitality during many research visits to Ottawa.

To maintain a sense of proportion, so easily lost sight of in the academic setting, I quote from the Divine Office: *Benedicamus Domino. Deo Gratias*.

C.P. Champion
Montreal
February 2007

Obiter Dicta

The task of those [living] today is the development of the heritage already secured by those who went before.

—King George VI in Canada, 1939

Canada is perpetually divided between the forces of history and geography, tradition and environment. All the public symbols, such as flag and king, represent tradition…

—A.R.M. Lower

We first saw light in Canada, the land beloved of God; / We are the pulse of Canada, its marrow and its blood; / And we, the men of Canada, can face the world and brag / That we were born in Canada beneath the British flag.

—Pauline Johnson

What if four-colour flags fly over Johannesburg, and Kangaroos over Canberra, and Maple Leafs over Ottawa? The Union Jack floats beside every one of them.

—Stephen Leacock

Education in England spoils so many Canadians—except Rhodes Scholars who come back and get Government jobs right away.

—Robertson Davies

A native of Kingston, Ont./ —two grandparents Canadian … / for three years he attended / Oxford / Now his accent / makes even Englishmen / wince, and feel / unspeakably colonial.

—Irving Layton

The issue lay between those who wanted Canada's symbols to be British and those who wanted them to be Canadian.

—Blair Fraser

All states that claim to be nations have skeletons in their cupboards, stained with fratricidal blood.

—John Lonsdale and Atieno Odhiambo

The natural place of an exceptional man is to be leading his own people and helping them to bear their burdens. Your exceptional brain is serving the nation best if it remains racy of its own particular soil.

—Sir Halford Mackinder

Introduction

When John Diefenbaker wrote to a supporter, in November 1964, that the Liberals were "a government determined to bring down all of our traditions,"[1] he was only half right. The minority government of Lester B. Pearson was inventing new traditions to replace the old. Pearson said the proposal for a new Canadian flag that he had put forward in May, with three red maple leaves on a white background with blue bars, did not entail a rejection of the past. According to Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, "all invented traditions, so far as possible, use history as a legitimator."[2] The flag was derived, Pearson said, from the heraldic symbol adopted by Ottawa when official colours were assigned and an official coat of arms granted by King George V in 1921. The blue bars were inspired by the motto "from sea to sea" that originated, ultimately, with the adoption of the term "dominion," from Psalm 72, as Canada's name and style in 1867.[3] What was novel about the new flag design, and long overdue, in Pearson's view, was that it was "distinctively Canadian." It omitted the symbolism of a dominant ethnic group. It "could not be mistaken for the flag of any other country." However, in private, Pearson said that his choice of colours was based on the old song, "Hurray for the red, white, and blue"—the Union Jack—a fact that points to the rootedness of Pearson's design in the British past and in the popular imagination of the Victorian era. In his youth, after all, to wave the Union Jack was to express pride in Canada and the Empire. While critics

[1] John Diefenbaker, Letter to a constituent, November 17, 1964, quoted in *One Canada*, vol. III, 226.
[2] Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*, (Cambridge: Canto, 1983), 12.
[3] W.L. Morton, *The Critical Years: The Union of British North America* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1964), 212. The motto "A mari usque ad mare" was officially adopted in 1921 with the grant of arms.

derided the prime minister's three-leaf proposal as "instant heritage,"[4] a modified version of it, the single red Maple Leaf with red bars, went on to become one of Canada's most successful, and popular, invented traditions.

The ideological justification for an invented tradition, according to Hobsbawm and Ranger, whether it be a flag, ceremony, song, or institution, often appears to be aimed "consciously … against tradition," and in favour of "radical innovation." Invented traditions are usually surrounded by an "emotionally and symbolically charged" atmosphere and rhetoric.[5] One enthusiastic journalist in 1964 compared Pearson (favourably) to Genghis Khan, a "commander determined to sweep all before him" with his Canadianizing hordes.[6] That the new Canadian flag was "radical" and "against tradition" was certainly how critics perceived it. Its implementation between May 1964 and February 1965 was perhaps the most forceful blast in a four-year storm of Canadianization of public symbols from 1964 to 1968 under Pearson's leadership, much of it brought forward in anticipation of the Canadian Centennial of 1967. During this period, two minority Liberal governments (1963-65 and 1965-68) conducted an extensive and controversial public confrontation with certain outward forms of "Britishness" in Canadian life. Hugh Keenleyside, a longtime External Affairs official, associate of Liberal cabinet ministers, and chairman of the B.C. Hydro and Power Authority, praised Pearson's "adoption at last of a distinctive Canadian flag,"[7] a prelude to the "magnificent triumphs of the Centennial year." Paul Hellyer, the minister of national defence from 1963-67, described the government's military reforms, which included an overhaul of

[4] Winnipeg *Tribune*, 7 March 1964.
[5] Hobsbawm and Ranger, 8, 11, 6-7.
[6] Walter Stewart in *The Star Weekly*, 4 July 1964, 1-7.
[7] Hugh L. Keenleyside, *Memoirs of Hugh L. Keenleyside,* Vol. 1: *Hammer the Golden Day* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart 1981), 227.

symbols, titles, ranks, and uniforms, as “my fight,” and defiantly entitled his memoirs, *Damn the Torpedoes*.[8] Triumphalistic and belligerent language has coloured the accounts of protagonists and sympathetic observers. For both sides, the confrontation with Britishness was an emotive controversy about the meaning of Canada and Canadianism, and the role of memory, history, and heritage in imagining the Dominion and “the nation.” Canada was not unique in this regard. As was the case during the emergence of distinctive African nationalisms in the postwar era, and because “people’s memories provide security, authority, legitimacy, and finally identity in the present,” struggles over the possession and interpretation of memory can be “deep, frequent, and bitter,” as James Ogude has written of Kenya’s Mau Mau and the “struggle over history.”[9] In the Canadian context, this controversy reached a climax during the second half of the 1960s.

In that brief period, a significant number of British-looking identifiers of the federal state were replaced by what were said to be “truly Canadian” symbols, from the flag and the national anthem, “O Canada,” to the creation of a “Canadian” honours system including the Order of Canada and other decorations in 1967.[10] At this time, “the British definition of Canada was quickly discarded” during what José Igartua, in the most recent scholarly account of the “decline” of British Canada, has evocatively called the “other quiet revolution.”[11] Phillip Buckner concluded, also in 2006, that any “lingering sense of a shared [British] identity seems to have vanished remarkably quickly in the

---

[8] Paul T. Hellyer, *Damn the Torpedoes: My Fight To Unify Canada’s Armed Forces* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987).

[9] James Ogude, “The Nation and Narration: ‘The Truths of the Nation’ and the Changing Image of Mau Mau in Kenyan Literature,” in E.S. Atieno Odhiambo and John Lonsdale, eds., *Mau Mau and Nationhood: Arms, Authority, and Narration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 268.

[10] Christopher McCreery, *The Order of Canada: Its Origins, History, and Development* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005); idem, *The Canadian Honours System* (Toronto: Dundurn, 2005).

[11] José E. Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-71* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006), 13.

1960s."[12] The redefinition of Canada's national symbols at this time, or "restructuring of the symbolic order," as Raymond Breton called it,[13] has usually been seen as part of a broader attempt to strengthen Canadian federalism by reaching out to include "previously alienated groups."[14] Pearson himself said in 1964 that the new flag was intended to accommodate French-speaking Quebecers and non-British, non-French ethnic groups, and to "ensure the survival of the Confederation." [15] A major corollary was the 1966-68 unification of the Canadian Army, Royal Canadian Navy, and Royal Canadian Air Force as the rebranded "Canadian Armed Forces," which were given a new and "distinctively Canadian" appearance. Looming in the background was the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, the long-promised and anticipated *deus ex machina* for the recovery of national unity. The Commission's first research reconnaissance in 1963 was the apparent lack of opportunity for francophone members in the three armed services, which were seen by their critics as perhaps the most reactionary and exclusive "British" bastions among all of Canada's institutions.[16]

The confrontation with Britishness of the mid-1960s is now being revisited by scholars as a turning point in how Canadians conceived of and constructed the overarching Canadian state, formerly "the Dominion" or "la Puissance," after 1967-68. In Benedict Anderson's terms, new symbolic understandings of the country at the time of the Centennial were a key factor in the substitution of a new, post-British imagined

[12] Phillip Buckner, "The Long Goodbye: English Canadians and the British World," in Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, eds., *Rediscovering the British World* (Calgary: Calgary University Press, 2005), 201.
[13] Raymond Breton, "The production and allocation of symbolic resources: an analysis of the linguistic and ethnocultural fields in Canada," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 21, 2 (1984), 123-144.
[14] Gary Miedema, "For Canada's Sake: The Centennial Celebrations of 1967, State Legitimation and the Restructuring of Canadian Public Life," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 34, 1 (Spring 1999), 139-60.
[15] *Hansard*, 15 June 1964.
[16] See Chapter 8, pp. 316-17.

community for the old – in some sense inventing or reinventing the nation.[17] Although these events have not been described as such before, one of the most significant accomplishments of the two Pearson governments was to engineer what may be called a *crisis of Britishness* from 1964 to 1968 in which overtly British identifiers, symbols, and the assumptions and attitudes that went with them, were dramatically confronted, dislodged, and replaced.

Defining Britishness

Britishness in mid-20th century Canada is commonly depicted as a kind of colonial hangover or nostalgia, the lingering influence of external connections with Britain, of British immigrants and British-oriented associations and groups. It was, according to many historians, rooted in a conservative, reactionary understanding of the country that failed to take into account the aspirations of contemporary society and of future generations. Canadian historians have not entered into the question deeply, and when the literature turns to the subject of Britishness at all, it is often reduced to an external loyalty or dependency: a mark of immature Canadianism, a passing stage on the road to complete nationhood, in the rise from colony to nation.[18] The "sense of 'Britishness' as defined from a Canadian perspective," Philip Massolin has written, was based on the "British connection" or "British nexus" and "implied a set of moral virtues that placed the Anglo-Canadian world above other civilizations," an "Anglo-superiority" directly inherited from 19th century imperialism through "family ties and loyalist

[17] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983, 1991), 6-7.
[18] A.R.M. Lower, *Colony to Nation* (Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946).

surroundings."[19] Others limit Britishness in some way to blood, to Anglo-Celtic ethnicity, to the dominant core *ethnie* of English Canada, or to an elite or regional segment of it. By extension, Britishness can be depicted as an imagined community imposed complacently and presumptuously by Wasps (white Anglo-Saxon Protestants) upon a British-dominated nation-state, at least prior to the 1960s and 1970s. Igartua's account is the most recent iteration of this perspective.

As in much of the Australian historiography, a Canadian variant of "British race patriotism" encompasses an outmoded ethnic and nostalgic identification with the British Empire, the Commonwealth connection, the superiority of British institutions, and even with "the spectre of an oppressive white monolithic Britishness" that produced the White Australia policy.[20] In Canada, a similar British-descended majority imposed "Anglo-conformity" on non-British immigrants,[21] reserving for themselves a dominant, inclusive universalism presented as "natural," "true," and "authentic," according to Jo-Ann Lee and Linda Cardinal.[22] For many Australian scholars, Britishness is assumed to be something *pre*-Australian from which true Australianness emerged with the experience of two world wars and the mid-20th century "break with Britishness."[23] Much of the Canadian historiography is framed by similar assumptions and teleological nationalism: what is

---

[19] Philip Massolin, *Canadian Intellectuals, the Tory Tradition, and the Challenge of Modernity, 1939–1970* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 6.
[20] Frank Bongiorno, "The Price of Nostalgia: Menzies, the 'Liberal' Tradition and Australian Foreign Policy," *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 51, 3 (2005) 400-17; Neville Meaney, "The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography," in Symposium on "Britishness and Australian Identity," *Australian Historical Studies* 116 (2001), 89.
[21] Howard Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts: Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century," *Multiculturalism as State Policy* (Ottawa: Secretary of State, 1976), 81-118.
[22] Jo-Anne Lee and Linda Cardinal, "Hegemonic Nationalism and the Politics of Feminism and Multiculturalism in Canada," in Veronica Strong-Boag, Sherrill Grace, Avigail Eisenberg, and Joan Anderson, eds., *Painting the Maple: Essays on Race, Gender, and the Construction of Canada* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1998), 215.
[23] Neville Meaney, "Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections," in Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich, *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity* (London: Frank Cass, 2003), 121-133; Deborah Gare, "Britishness in Recent Australian Historiography," *Historical Journal*, 43, 4 (December 2000), 1145-55.

truly Canadian has escaped from colonial shackles in the midst of a struggle for independence, and is therefore "post-British." Britishness is antecedent to what emerged as pure Canadianism, and is thus "pre-Canadian." In the chapters that follow, the various definitions of Britishness will be considered and elaborated on. Few existing accounts have effectively come to grips with the significance of Britishness in the Canadian context—largely because most Canadian historians have either adopted one of the foregoing perspectives or, alternatively, and in contrast to their Australian counterparts, have shown little interest in the subject.[24]

Britishness as a *Canadian* amalgam

The argument here is that in most respects the standard Canadian assumptions about Britishness as an externally-derived, narrowly ethnic, nostalgic, or retardant force are inadequate. Britishness meant more to Canada than a passing phase or a colonial legacy. Not only is a new recognition needed that Britishness was the essence of 19th century Canadianism, as Buckner has claimed,[25] but that, in turn, it took on new and multiple meanings in the post-1945 era. A new understanding is required of what Britishness meant and continues to mean in the Canadian context and why it is relevant to a better comprehension of Canadianism down to the present day.

In Australia, Neville Meaney has suggested that the "British inheritance is not the same as Britishness."[26] In reality, that inheritance, in Canada as in Australia, took on a

---

[24] M. Dixson, *The imaginary Australian: Anglo-Celts and identity, 1788 to the present* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1999); J. Stratton; "Not just another multicultural story," *Journal of Australian Studies* 66 (2000), 23-47.
[25] Phillip A. Buckner, "Presidential Address: Whatever happened to the British Empire?" *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 4 (1993), 3-32.
[26] Meaney "Britishness and Australia," 133.

life of its own, independent of the mother country, operating in changing, evolving ways not easily confined to a narrow definition of Britishness as a racist, imperialist ideology. As John Rickard wrote of Australia, Britishness was "a kind of British 'amalgam' which did not exist in Britain itself." In contrast to the British Isles, where an English, and, significantly, *southern* English ascendancy prevailed, in Australia the British identity was a "mixture" of Anglo-Celtic "ethnic identities" (Protestant English and Catholic Irish) that was "unique,"[27] a composite structure that incorporated class, gender, race, and memory. In Canada, the English and Irish elements were most numerous (as in Australia), but the Scottish were commercially and politically preponderant and the Irish were mostly Protestant rather than Catholic. This unique Canadian "British amalgam," superimposed on and co-existing with that of the Atlantic Provinces and with the French enclave of Lower Canada, and reinforced by generations of British immigrants, was foundational in the development of a sense of Canadianism incubated in the *Nova Britannia*, or neo-Britain, of the 19th century.[28] Because this British amalgam was so influential in the stamp it placed upon the Dominion, the many ethnic and cultural nuances among various "British" ethnicities—English, Scots, Irish, Scots-Irish, Manx, etc.—have been blurred. Distinctions among these groups have been masked by the preoccupation with an overarching Britishness, by the overseas British connection, and by grouping them all as "Wasps" or, in French Canada, as "les anglais" or "les Brits."

Ideological nuances and differentiations have also been overlooked. Britishness was not limited to a narrow "race patriotism" or zeal for Empire but also included a range

[27] John Rickard, "Response: Imagining the Unimaginable?" in Symposium on "Britishness and Australian Identity," *Australian Historical Studies* 116 (2001), 129.
[28] Alexander Morris, *Nova Britannia; or, Our New Canadian Dominion Foreshadowed* (Toronto: Hunter, Rose, 1884).

of liberal imperialist and anti-imperialist ideas and sentiments. A broad, inclusive Britishness that recognized and valued regional and ethnic differences must also be taken into account. As Douglas Francis has suggested, such academics as F.H. Underhill and A.R.M. Lower drew a distinction between "two Britains,"[29] one that was Tory Imperialist and the other more liberal: on the one hand a "swaggering and intolerant Little English patriotism," as Linda Colley described 18th century John Bull Englandism,[30] which later merged into an imperial pan-Britishness associated with "Britannia Rule the Waves," "propaganda" the "trumpets of empire." At a local level this is, perhaps, reflected in the bullying of the "English gang" in 1920s Winnipeg's north end that chased the Hungarian lad Sandor Hunyadi home from school in John Marlyn's novel *Under the Ribs of Death*, and the Anglo-conformity that obliged Hunyadi to change his name to "Alex Hunter" in hopes of being accepted as a good Canadian.[31] But there was also for Underhill and Lower, in contrast, a "second" Britain, a comprehensive liberal Britishness that valued broadmindedness, diversity, the "liberal empire," fair play—a "pan-Britishness" characterized by a strong dislike for any kind of race-pride. In Canada, W.L. Morton celebrated "unity in diversity" under a Crown that demanded allegiance rather than conformity.[32] Vincent Massey, too, subscribed to a species of Britishness that he conceived of as something more liberal and expansive than the "too-provincial Anglo-Saxon[ism] in Canada and in England."[33]

---

[29] R. Douglas Francis, "Historical Perspectives on Britain: The Ideas of Canadian Historians Frank H. Underhill and Arthur R.M. Lower," in Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, eds., *Canada and the British World* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006), 309-21.

[30] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 106.

[31] John Marlyn, *Under the Ribs of Death* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1957).

[32] W.L. Morton, *The Canadian Identity* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961).

[33] Massey, *What's Past is Prologue*, 38.

These broad and narrow interpretations of Britishness coexisted, overlapped, clashed, and complemented each other. Britishness might be sufficiently broad in its appeal to recruit Empire volunteers from all over the world to fight on the Western Front, but at the same time narrow enough to insist that Canadian troops of Methodist, Presbyterian, and Roman Catholic backgrounds be served in some cases by Church of England padres because the military hierarchy espoused Anglicanism.[34] To be sure, in painting an apparently all-embracing portrait of broad and narrow Britishness, there is the risk of presenting it as a catch-all, a repository for all that is, seen and unseen, and therefore meaningless. However, it may be conceded that the British World was vast, and Britishness in various forms influenced much of the globe, both English- and non-English speaking. On the other hand, boundaries may be discerned on the geographical and (sometimes overlapping) conceptual borderlands between Britishness and, for example, Russianness, Frenchness, *Americanité*, or *Hispanidad*. In the Canadian context, at least, the difficulty is not so much in locating and defining Britishness as in *avoiding*, as have many historians, a phenomenon that is as pervasive as it has been in Canadian history.

Britishness and Canadian Hybridity

Britishness was, and in some ways remains, a constitutive and animating element deeply embedded in the Canadianism of hybridized individuals and groups of a variety of ethnic backgrounds, and not only those of British ethnicity. According to Homi Bhabha, "national identity" in the post-Enlightenment era is a construct incorporating the "other" and characterized by the imposition of an imagined unity over a great deal of hybridity

[34] Duff Crerar, *Padres in No Man's Land: Canadian Chaplains in the Great War* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995), 38, 40, 50.

and ambivalence.[35] From its origins in the 19th century, the developing sense of Canadianism was no different, an imagined identity centred around the British tradition in North America. Michael Ignatieff, a second-generation Canadian whose grandfather was a government minister in Tsarist Russia, found that "even an ersatz phoney" kind of Britishness, such as the caricature he experienced at Upper Canada College, "was the fulcrum around which a distinctive Canadian identity was formed. … It's not been clear what we replace it with as a guiding official public culture."[36] For Ignatieff, the "loss of that Britishness, that strange, phoney cult of Britishness of the 1950s in Canada … has been a real loss. … People say it is phonily derivative of Britain, but that's to misunderstand it totally." Ignatieff's regret, like his uncle George Grant's *Lament for a Nation* (1965), assumes that Britishness was, in fact, discarded and abandoned. For Grant, "one small result" of the carnage of the Western Front "was to destroy Great Britain as an alternative pull in Canadian life."[37]

Most scholars have shared this assumption of a "destroyed" British identity. But was the quality, trait, or "underlying essence" of Britishness truly discarded *tout court*, or were there aspects that were not so easily uprooted? As O.D. Skelton wrote of the Montreal Tories who signed the Annexation Manifesto of 1849, quoting Lord Durham, they were resolved that "Lower Canada must be *English*, at the expense, if necessary, of not being *British*."[38] Significantly, this suggests a relatively early sense of Englishness in Canada that was not attached by the apron strings to the Mother Country and this, too,

[35] Homi K. Bhabha, *Nation and Narration* (London: Routledge, 1990); A.D. Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism* (London: Routledge, 1998), 202.
[36] James FitzGerald, *Old Boys: The Powerful Legacy of Upper Canada College* (Toronto: Macfarlane Walter & Ross, 1995), 163.
[37] George Grant, *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism* (Ottawa: Carleton Library, 1978), 72.
[38] O.D. Skelton, *The Canadian Dominion: A Chronicle of our Northern Neighbor*, Chronicles of America Series, ed. Allen Johnson, Vol. 49 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920), 107.

was somehow part of the unique British amalgam that came to be labelled "English Canadian." To the extent that it has survived in the present day, perhaps, Britishness was not limited by ethnic origins or by attachments outside the country but based on an awareness of and attachment to "English" traditions as well as "British" multiple identities that have grown up within Canada and have evolved into something fundamentally Canadian. Canadian Britishness—or some form of it—was thus not dependent on an external connection with Britain. If, in the post-1960s era, Canadians' imagination has made little place for Britishness, it remains a constitutive and, in a sense, inescapable element of Canadian hybridity. Just as it would be fruitless to try to separate those elements of Latin American cultures that could be described as "Spanish" from those that are "truly" Latin American—Spanishness, or *Hispanidad*, itself being a subject rich in complexity as it applies to Spain, Latin America, and parts of Africa and Asia[39]—it would be a distortion to isolate the multi-layered element of Britishness from what is truly "Canadian."

Defining Britishness as Other

The construction and imagining of cultural differences is a binary process in which "we define ourselves in the context of how we define others."[40] Linda Colley has shown how, in the 18th and early 19th centuries, a British identity was constructed in part by consciously opposing and defining as "other," the French Revolutionary and

[39] [Unsigned], "Redefining Hispanidad," *Hispanic* 19, 2 (February 2006), 11; John Lipski, "The Spanish of Equatorial Guinea: Research on La Hispanidad's Best-Kept Secret," *Afro-Hispanic Review* 21, 1/2 (Spring 2002), 70-97; Meindert Fennema, "Hispanidad and National Identity in Santo Domingo," *Journal of Political Ideologies* 3, 2 (June 1998), 193-212; Bailey W. Diffie, "The Ideology of Hispanidad," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 23, 3 (1943), 457-82.
[40] Dane Kennedy, "Imperial History and Post-Colonial Theory," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 24 (1996): 345-63.

Napoleonic enemy.[41] Ironically, although the fact has not been recognized before, the exercise of reimagining Canada in the crisis of the mid-1960s entailed a good deal of othering of the British element. The official Canadian conception of Britain and the Empire had been, well into the postwar era, that it was an association of states that were not foreign to each other. Canada did not send an "ambassador" to Britain, Australia, India, South Africa, Nigeria, Pakistan, New Zealand, Fiji, and other Commonwealth states, but a High Commissioner; Canada's foreign office was called "External Affairs" in order to make clear that fellow Britons were not "foreigners." But there were always elements in Canada that disliked these distinctions and strove to remove them from the Canadian lexicon.[42]

At times the redefinition of Britain as a "foreign" country took on the character of an ideology.[43] When the Order of Canada was created in 1967, one of the first recipients, Thérèse Casgrain, remarked that it was no longer fitting that Canadians should receive honours only from "foreign" countries, implying that Britain, the source of most decorations and honours awarded to Canadians hitherto, was among them.[44] This is more easily understood coming from a French Canadian, for whom Britain represented the historic Conqueror. Yet even among francophones, it was alien to earlier generations to imply that Britain was a foreign place—and suggests that a unique othering process was at work among nationalists of the time. In the 1960s, the construction of a "new

---

[41] Linda Colley, "Britishness and Othernesss: an Argument," *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992), 309-329.

[42] In 1993, with the election of the first Jean Chrétien government, External Affairs was renamed as the Department of *Foreign* Affairs.

[43] As defined by Marx, Weber, and Mannheim, an ideology is "the form or manner in which social reality is reflected and "reconstituted" at the level of consciousness … a point of view from which the actor/observer … defines his total situation." Cf. Jitendra Mohan, "A Whig interpretation of African nationalism," *Journal of Modern African Studies* 6, 3 (1968), 406.

[44] CBC Radio interview, re-broadcast on CBC Radio 2, on 31 October 2006. Cf. McCreery, *Order of Canada*, op. cit.

nationalism," as Pearson described it, called for the *inclusion* of certain categories of "other," as predicted by Bhabha. New national symbols and institutions were designed, or at least intended, to include French Canadians and non-British ethnic groups.

However, at the same time, the Canadian case presents a difference. At least on the level of public policy, the new approach included the French and ethnic other but *excluded*, or reduced the overt participation of, the symbols of a third other—the previously dominant Wasp core *ethnie*, whose traditional "British" symbols were dramatically downplayed. In short, the heritage of the Wasp group that had constituted the dominant culture of Canada was now defined as "other." As we will see in Chapters 7 and 8, some nationalists implied a kind of excommunication directed at longstanding Canadian institutions that were deemed to be too British, a certain censoriousness represented in the 1920s by *The Canadian Republic*, a monthly that billed itself as "the *only* [sic] Canadian magazine."[45] Renamed *The Canadian Independence Magazine* in 1930, it declared in its "credo" that "Canadians must become Canadians and nothing else," and that, "excluding the [French-language] *Canadien*, there are no Canadian [sic] newspapers in Montreal," an assertion that implied that English-language dailies were un-Canadian.[46]

The redefinition of Britishness as a foreign influence was a key component of the reimagining of Canadianism in the 1960s. Ironically, it was largely members of the Anglo-Celtic core *ethnie* who carried out this othering process, the portrayal of Britishness as something that was not truly Canadian. At the same time, they did not seek to abandon their heritage but to assign to it a new and less dominant role in national life.

---

[45] *The Canadian Republic* (Montreal), April 1930, cover.
[46] *The Canadian Independence Magazine*, June 1930, 2.

In turn, many historians downplayed the significance of Britishness in post-1945 Canada. Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond, and John English wrote in their 1981 survey text that "a visitor seeing Canada for the first time since 1939 might well conclude that Canada, even more than nations devastated by war, has become another country."[47] Truly, with the British element defined as other (and largely *omitted* by Bothwell et al. from their book), Canada after the 1960s could well be imagined as a place in which the British background played little role, and where the Union Jack and Red Ensign had never flown as "Canadian" flags. To the reader of such a book, there might never have been a British fact in Canada at all.

Britishness in perspective

There is a larger context to these episodes of the mid-1960s. The transformation of Canadian identity, and particularly of the Anglo-Canadians' ideas about themselves, was in the largest sense a gradual development throughout the 20th century, especially in the post-1945 period up to the present day. According to Raymond Breton, the "restructuring" of the once British-oriented state, "represented in the multiplicity of symbols surrounding the rituals of public life, the functioning of institutions, and the public celebration of events, groups and individuals," was a decades-long process.[48] The attempt to emphasize what was distinctively Canadian represented the Canadian equivalent of Australia's decisive mid-20th century "break with Britishness." Change had been too long delayed by conservatism, hesitancy, excessive attachment to the British connection, and outmoded visions of the past. The postwar transformation in Canadian

[47] Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond and John English, *Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics, and Provincialism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), xi.
[48] Breton, 125; Miedema, 140.

symbols was, according to this account, the natural culmination of a nationalist movement that had long been building towards change, and a reaction to public sentiments that had long been gaining strength in the country. In short, it was merely the recognition of a popular consensus that was only fully recognized in the 1960s—the inevitable completion of the rise from colony to nation.

To accept this account would be to grant that "all history has been directed towards fulfilling the destinies of unique peoples, or achieving their self-realisation," and to adopt, as have some Australian historians, a "teleological view of the past."[49] To a certain extent, protagonists in Canada's crisis of Britishness such as John Matheson, Pearson's parliamentary secretary and a keen supporter of the project for a distinctive Canadian flag, did just that. They believed that a flag without British symbols was a natural fulfillment of patriotic aspirations—and this belief does at least provide one explanation as to the Maple Leaf's popular success. The flag can be seen as an expression of the popular will or of "national" sentiment. However, scholars are obliged to scrutinize nationalism not only as possibly the "destiny" of a "people," but also as a constructed, historically contingent interpretation of the nation. It was also part of the quest for "a secure and usable past," in J.H. Plumb's words, that could be invoked to support current policy decisions.[50] Pearson and Matheson's assumptions included an interpretation of Canadian history that qualified as "their own relevant past," as Hobsbawm and Ranger's theory suggests.

Britishness and "Eminent Pearsonians"

[49] Meaney, "Britishness and Australia," 122.
[50] J.H. Plumb, *The Death of the Past* (London: Macmillan, 1969), 41.

Because some nationalists did advocate a clean break with a past that was burdened with the British connection, conservatives tended to portray the Canadianizers as anti-British anglophobes.[51] "Anglophobia is an old phenomenon in Canada—along, of course, with an equally irrational Anglophilia," wrote John Holmes, the diplomat and historian of Canadian diplomacy.[52] Both sentiments were felt by many Canadians—but they were not mutually exclusive. The curious interplay of Anglo-Celtic ethnicities with pro- and anti-British feelings that characterized the "Ottawa Men" recruited by O.D. Skelton has been noted in the statesmen of other dominions,[53] and will be examined below in Chapters 2 through 5. Yet a biographical-intellectual approach, as exemplified by Carl Berger's *The Sense of Power* (1970),[54] and by J.L. Granatstein's *The Ottawa Men* (1982),[55] has its limitations.

The term "Eminent Pearsonians," in the present thesis, is a conscious evocation of Lytton Strachey's iconoclastic 1908 study *Eminent Victorians*, because, in part, these pages attempt to revisit the influence of a group of quasi-iconic nationalist figures for whom Lester Pearson was a common denominator, in an effort to understand the complexity of their intertwined Canadianness and Britishness. The *dramatis personae* of such a study could always be reduced or enlarged, but for the purposes of this thesis the cast of characters is built around two or three generations of men and women who were either Pearson's contemporaries at Oxford University or who studied there before or after

---

[51] Norman Hillmer, "The Anglo-Canadian Neurosis: The Case of O.D. Skelton," in Lyon, ed., 61-84.
[52] John W. Holmes, *The Better Part of Valour*, 103. Idem, "The Anglo-Canadian Neurosis," *The Round Table* 223 (July 1966), 251-60.
[53] Kosmas Tsokhas, *Making a Nation State: Cultural Identity, Economic Nationalism and Sexuality in Australian History* (Carlton South: Melbourne University Press, 2001).
[54] Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970).
[55] J.L. Granatstein, *The Ottawa Men: The Civil Service Mandarins, 1935-1957* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1982).

Pearson; allies, associates, and opponents of Pearson in Parliament, the military, the media, such as Graham Spry, or among the public; political operatives such as Andrew Thompson, the Liberal Party liaison to ethnic groups, whom Pearson named to the Senate in 1967; prominent Pearson supporters such as the cross-bench Senator Hartland Molson; and critics of Pearson's approach to the flag question such as Charlotte Whitton, the mayor of Ottawa; contemporary literary personalities such as Hugh MacLennan and Robertson Davies; public service figures (i.e., "Ottawa Men") including Norman Robertson, Arnold Heeney, and J.W. Pickersgill; and historians such as F.H. Underhill and the non-Oxonian A.R.M. Lower, who personally associated themselves with Pearson's parliamentary mandates and nationalist policies. In short, they were influential contemporaries of Pearson revered in varying degrees by posterity, and hence both "eminent" and "Pearsonian."

But what justification can there be for revisiting a select group of predominantly white male elitists, the "government generation" of "true patriots?"[56] First, it is long overdue that the pantheon of Canadian Liberalism, celebrated by Granatstein and others, be revisited from a less reverent perspective—historians have already begun to do so.[57] Skelton's lieutenants "were not representative of [Canada's] population," even if "they did exemplify the qualifications and abilities which Skelton thought important."[58] Philip Massolin has recently revisited the revival of Tory "myth-making" in the 1950s and the attempt by anti-modernists to resist the "ascendancy of modernity." The explanation for

---

[56] Doug Owram, *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986); David Jay Bercuson, *True Patriot: The Life of Brooke Claxton, 1898-1960* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1993).
[57] Adam Chapnick, *The Middle Power Project: Canada and the Founding of the United Nations* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2005).
[58] Hector Mackenzie, quoted in Andrew Cohen, *While Canada Slept: How We Lost Our Place in the World* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2003), 123.

their failure, according to Massolin, was "the emergence of the fully modernist consciousness, a new world-view that embraced change as a defining characteristic. As such, the age was hostile to the values of permanence and stability."[59] Liberals embraced modernity more readily. As the Conservative Party of the 1970s distanced itself from Diefenbaker's association with British traditions, the Tory brand of nationalism represented by George Grant "continued only in fragmented form in the theory and rhetoric of the New Left," emphasizing the anti-American elements of nationalist thought and ignoring the old preoccupation with Britishness. "Amid the chaos and intellectual ferment," Canadians "became inured to values rooted in history and tradition," as the latter became marginalized. For Massolin, intellectuals like Grant and W.L. Morton were the true successors of the imperialists, their dreams ending in failure, a "depressing footnote" to the Imperial dream, as Berger put it.[60] Historians have begun to revisit such figures; as Massolin says, "the vanquished in Canadian history must be given their due."

But were *Tory* intellectuals the sole heirs to Bergerite imperialism? After all, they represent only one side of the coin. Perhaps there is a flip side to Berger's contention that "the imperialists are excellent examples, not of men who quested for Canadian identity, but of those who had already found it and who tried to bring reality into alignment with their vision."[61] Was this not the Eminent Pearsonians' objective in the 1960s—to bring Canada's identity into alignment with reality? If Grant's *Lament* was a depressing footnote, was not the "new nationalism" an *exhilarating coda* showcasing a "new" Canada at the Centennial. If so, it was one that masked a great deal of ambivalence and

[59] Massolin, 240, 19, 267, 271.
[60] Berger, 265.
[61] Ibid.

hybridity grafted onto British roots. If Skelton's protégés represent the rejection of Tory Imperialism, they also represent, in some sense, the *fulfillment* of liberal imperialism.

Liberal imperialists believed that the true British tradition was not to impose one ethnic or political framework upon other peoples, but to encourage the emergence of local nationalisms and traditions—within the ambit, of course, of their own liberal assumptions. Bernard Porter, the imperial historian, has defined liberal imperialism as a "cluster" of "internationalism, a belief in racial equality, 'culturism' (as opposed to racism), libertarianism, paternalism, altruism, and even pacifism, at a pinch."[62] Diversity in the implementation of British ideals, in the eyes of liberal imperialists, was a sign not of dissolution but of strength. Sir Halford Mackinder predicted in 1919 that British principles would survive in an organic federative system in which local leadership would emerge throughout the Commonwealth. "The natural place of an exceptional man" in a given geographical location, he wrote, "is to be leading his own people and helping them to bear their burdens. Your exceptional brain is serving the nation best if it remains racy of its own particular soil." Imperial Federation did not materialize as Mackinder expected, but he seems to have been correct on another level. As he himself added, "The real freedom of men requires a scope for a full life in their own locality,"[63] implying that British values would organically perpetuate themselves in diverse local settings in which local and regional characteristics would flourish. One example might be the National Assembly of Québec, which, like the other provincial legislatures, operates according to British parliamentary procedure. Despite liberalism's claims about itself it has been

[62] Bernard Porter, *The Absent-Minded Imperialists: Empire, Society, and Culture in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 137.
[63] Halford J. Mackinder, *Democratic Ideals and Reality* (London: Constable, 1942), 136-8.

suggested that, in fact, liberalism (and by extension, liberal imperialism) imposed its own brand of uniformity, referred to by some as the "liberal order framework."[64]

A focus upon Eminent Pearsonians raises the question of "Who matters?" and the contention that conservative "national" and "male narratives" have been preserved at the cost of female-generated, community narratives."[65] Even studies of "how the elites used their power to ensure the dominance of white, Anglo-Saxon men," such as John Porter's *Vertical Mosaic*, have paid little attention to gender. With its market-based assumptions about the "objective" nature of skills and educational criteria among socially mobile ethnic groups, Porter's analysis made it "difficult to integrate the complex character of women's subordination" into the analysis, according to Pat Armstrong.[66] Recent studies in gender, religion, and ethnicity, and the notion of "gender collusion"[67] have opened up our understanding of the role of women as *agents* of change and continuity. Ukrainian-Canadian women, for example, were "wedded to the cause" of constructing and perpetuating a Ukrainian identity in Canada.[68]

Yet gender is not limited to recapturing the lost narratives of women. As Terry Crowley has suggested, Isabel and Oscar Skelton's gender identities, male and female, played a complementary and contrasting role in "re-inventing Canada."[69] The contribution of white Anglo-Saxon *males* to the construction of British-Canadian

---

[64] Ian McKay, "The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History", *Canadian Historical Review* 81, 4 (2000), 617-645.
[65] Frits Pannekoek, "Who Matters? Public History and the Invention of the Canadian Past," Acadiensis, XXIX, 2 (Spring 2000), 205-217.
[66] Pat Armstrong, "Missing Women: A Feminist Perspective on The Vertical Mosaic," in Rick Helmes-Hayes and James Curtis, eds., *The Vertical Mosaic Revisited* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 120.
[67] Dixson, 57.
[68] Frances Swyripa, *Wedded to the Cause: Ukrainian-Canadian Women and Ethnic Identity 1891-1991* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993).
[69] Terry Crowley, *Marriage of Minds: Isabel and Oscar Skelton Reinventing Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003).

ideologies takes on a new light in view of the ethnic, educational background, and gender of the Eminent Pearsonians. These, too, were contributing factors in the crisis of Britishness in the 1960s and in the construction of British and British-Canadian identities. As Frances Swyripa has said of Ukrainian women, "Being female and Ukrainian also resulted in group-imposed behaviour models and obligations that tied Ukrainian-Canadian women to Ukraine and emphasized their membership in the Ukrainian nation."[70] By substituting "Anglo-Celtic" and/or "British" for Ukrainian; and by substituting "men" for "women," it becomes apparent that there is a nexus of gender and ethnicity in Anglo-Canadian identity-formation that merits closer attention. (The sentence with substitutions would read as follows: "Being male and Anglo-Celtic also resulted in group-imposed behaviour models and obligations that tied Anglo-Canadian men to Britain/Anglo-Canada and emphasized their membership in the British Empire/Anglo-Canadian nation.")

If further justification were needed, the hybridity and sexuality of Australian anglophile males has recently come under scrutiny. According to Kosmas Tsokhas, "psychological mechanisms and cultural processes" enabled "key politicians," all of whom happened to be males, "to simultaneously separate and reconcile" their pro-Australia nationalism "with an imperial orientation, an idealization of the British monarchy and fantasies leading to an identification with British history and institutions."[71] Tsokhas's analysis suggests that the "contradictions and interrelations between the British imperial and Australian national aspects of their ideas, outlooks and

---

[70] Swyripa, 257.
[71] Tsokhas, 20.

actions were representative of a wider public."[72] In the present thesis, it would seem that elements of the Canadian public shared the hybrid Canadianism and Britishness (if not the privileged education) of the predominantly male, Oxford- and Ivy League-educated elite who claimed to speak for them. Like their Canadian counterparts, Australian anglophiles such as W.M. Hughes, J.A. Lyons, R.G. Menzies, and S.M. Bruce embodied "different forms of Britishness" coloured by class, religious, military, and educational backgrounds. "The more contact Australia's leaders had with the British the greater their self-esteem," Tsokhas writes. "This is not to deny that initial encounters aroused some doubts and anxieties,"[73] he adds—an experience that was shared by eminent Pearsonian Canadians.

Time-frame, themes and chapters

The chapters that follow attempt to integrate these approaches to inquire into the interplay of ethnicity, identity-formation, and *mentalités* that incorporated mimicry, hybridity, alienation and the development of the sense of Canadian ambivalence and otherness. The crisis of Britishness from 1964 to 1968 offers to the scholar a time-frame and two case studies (Chapters 7 and 8) in which to examine these attitudes in the policy-making sphere, with the deconstruction and restructuring of Canada's "old" and "new" imagined communities. Was it all an inevitable accompaniment to the emergence of a "new nationalism"?[74] Or was it not also the result of deliberate and specific policy decisions at a given time, by certain means, and sponsored by specific individuals in politics. For example, the desuetude of the term "Dominion" was effected by quiet

[72] Ibid., 119.
[73] Ibid., 150.
[74] Kenneth McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada: The Struggle for National Unity* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1997), 31 ff.

omission, rather than by law, during the mid-1950s; the new flag enacted by a bill in Parliament in 1964; and the change to "Canada Day" in 1982 by a snap vote when there was only minimum quorum in the House of Commons. Most recently, the omission of the Vice-Regal Anthem ("God Save the Queen") in the swearing-in of the federal Conservative cabinet in 2006 was quietly arranged by officials in the Office of the Governor General: it was the first time the anthem had been omitted since 1867.[75]

This thesis is not a narrative of decisions and *coups d'essai* to change Canadian symbols since 1945. It is not a work primarily of ethnic history, a catalogue of the "other quiet revolution," or a commentary on the "decline of the Wasp." Nor will the reader find a sterile rumination on winners and losers. The identity and nationalism of Pearson and his associates are no more or less significant than the views of their opponents, taking a page from Sydney F. Wise's argument that "historians have a particular duty toward the losers, not out of mere perversity, but because much is to be learned from them."[76] Whether men or women, theirs, too, represent "lost narratives" and each played a role in defining the other. A fresh look at Canadian Britishness, and a new interpretation that reflects current international scholarship, are overdue. The changing Anglo-Canadian consciousness, ethnic and otherwise, and *mentalités* of individuals and groups (Chapters 2 and 3) can be traced in a variety of contexts: in their religious background and at war (Chapter 4); at Oxford University where, according to George Grant, prominent Anglo-Canadian nationalists acquired the "twilight scepticism of Oxford liberalism"[77] (Chapter 5); in the political courtship and apprenticeship of non-Wasp ethnic groups (Chapter 6);

[75] For the last point, I thank Christopher McCreery in the office of Senator Noël Kinsella, the Speaker of the Senate, and a close observer of vice-regal affairs in Ottawa.
[76] S.F. Wise, *God's Pecular People* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1993), 170.
[77] Grant, 49.

in the flag debate (Chapter 7) and in the reform of military culture (Chapter 8) in the 1960s.

Sources consulted

Evidence has been drawn only in part from politicians or "professional intellectuals" such as representatives of the academy or editorial writers. In order to avoid some of the pitfalls of "intellectual history," the net is cast widely to capture ideas and sentiments of citizens and soldiers, students, a broad reading public (such as newspaper readers and letter-writers); government ministers, opposition members, and their staff; newspapermen and editors; Parliamentarians who mediated, interpreted, and implemented ideas that were the result of exchanges among the public and the political and academic worlds; political party operatives at the grassroots level, and, where they are available, private correspondence, interviews, published and unpublished memoirs, and exchanges between ethnic group leaders and their contacts. This approach is limited by the available material, but the breadth of sources attempts to compensate, as far as possible in the written medium, for the distorting tendency among intellectual historians to focus on a few individuals and themes. It is also hoped that this methodology will result in more evocative and thought-provoking conclusions about the *mentalités*, hybridity, and individual and collective memory that were in play.

Material for this dissertation was drawn from the Arthur Reginald Marsden Lower Fonds at Queen's University, Kingston; the Vincent Massey Papers at the University of Toronto Archives, with permission from the Master and Fellows of Massey College; the Harvey Reginald MacMillan Papers and the Mitsuru Shimpo Papers at the University of

British Columbia's Rare Books and Special Collections Division, Vancouver; and the Hugh MacLennan Papers at McGill University's Rare Book Division, Montreal. Also consulted were the papers of O.D. Skelton, L.B. Pearson, N.A. Robertson, A.D.P. Heeney, J.W. Pickersgill, F.H. Underhill, Graham Spry, Alan Beddoe, Paul T. Hellyer, Gordon Churchill, J. Waldo Monteith, Terry Nugent, Wally Nesbitt, Davie Fulton, Maurice Lamontagne, Gordon Robertson, King Gordon, Georges P. Vanier, Roland Michener, and Senator Hartland de Montarville Molson in the National Archives at Library and Archives Canada (LAC), Ottawa, which has a small collection of John Ross Matheson's Papers. I have drawn on the collection of ethnic periodicals and Newspapers at Library and Archives Canada (LAC), including the *Corriere Canadese*, *Der Courier*, *Kanadai Magyar Ujság*, and *Nederlandse Courier*, among others, as well as the LAC's collections of English and French-language newspapers, ranging from the *Ottawa Journal* to the *Montréal-Matin*. I made use of the library collections at McGill, Concordia University, and Westmount Library; the Côte-des-Neiges branch of the Montreal Public Library, the University of British Columbia, Carleton University, the University of Ottawa, the University of Toronto, Queen's University, and the Université de Montréal. I consulted the R.L. Raymont Papers and the Jean-Victor Allard Papers, among other records, at the Directory of History and Heritage (formerly D.Hist.) in the Department of National Defence, Ottawa. I also made extensive use of the National Library of Canada's collection of Canadiana. Finally, I read the papers of Canon Lionel Groulx, Anatole Vanier, André Laurendeau and Gérard Filion at the Archives du Centre de Recherche et Fondation Lionel-Groulx, in Outremont, Montreal.

Chapter 1

Canadianness and Britishness in Historiographical Context

The crisis of Britishness from 1964 to 1968 emerged against the backdrop of a broader sweep of events that, in turn, engages the historian in a wider historiographical context. The most widely accepted explanation for the trajectory of the postwar "search for identity"[1] is that Canada and Britain were already drifting apart politically and economically during the interwar years and that this trend accelerated after the Second World War. The emergence of distinctive Canadian symbols, founded upon and growing out of the incipient Canadianism of French and English Canada since the early 20th century, flowed naturally from this distancing. Until 1945, Blair Fraser wrote in 1967, "Canada was preoccupied with her emergence from the status of colony." Badges of independent nationhood were achieved only through struggle: "Those last survivors of the era of British imperialism, the professional armed services in Whitehall, had grudgingly conceded the existence of a Canadian army, navy, and air force," Fraser notes, a key symbol of autonomous nationality. One result was that, "For a brief but glorious period after victory in Europe, Canadians enjoyed the feeling that they could do anything." Soon, however, as British influence waned and American imperium waxed in its place, Canadians embarked on a period of "uncertainty" that "eroded the very roots of the new self-assurance."[2] Only in the 1960s, Fraser implied, did Canadians truly emerge from colonialism and erect the symbols of national identity and self-assurance.

---

[1] Blair Fraser, *The Search for Identity: Canada Postwar to Present* (Toronto: Doubleday, 1967).
[2] Ibid., 2-4.

There is an extensive external relations literature surrounding the interwar years and the transition to Commonwealth.[3] George Woodcock said the Canadian innovation of "dominion status" in the 1860s, eventually adopted by South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and later India, contained the seeds of independence—the freedom to "dissent" from the Mother Country—and thus autonomous nationhood.[4] The post-1945 period in Canada-United Kingdom relations has received less attention than Canada-United States relations. According to Francine McKenzie, there are so few accounts of Anglo-Canadian diplomacy that Canadian foreign policy since 1945 is usually told as the story of Canada-U.S. relations.[5] The increasing importance of the United States and of Canada's continental destiny is another frequently cited factor. For J.L. Granatstein, "Britain's weakness" obliged Canada to seek economic and military security in a closer relationship with the United States as early as 1917 and decisively in 1940.[6] "Canada attempted to move toward autonomy within the Empire," but not until the Second World War did we "put aside the trappings of a colony."[7] Others put the date after 1940, concluding that the "decisive break" from Britain, for Australia and New Zealand, and "even in the case of Canada, did not occur until the 1950s."[8] By 1957, C.C. Eldridge says, it was "quite clear" that Canada's trade patterns made it a North American country "whose trade and

---

[3] James Eayrs, *In Defence of Canada*: *Growing Up Allied* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980); C.P. Stacey, *Canada in the Age of Conflict: A History of Canadian External Policies*, 2 Vols. (Toronto: Macmillan, 1977-1981); Philip G. Wigley, *Canada and the Transition to Commonwealth: British-Canadian Relations 1917-1926* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
[4] George Woodcock, *Who Killed the British Empire? An Inquest* (Toronto: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1974).
[5] Francine McKenzie, *Redefining the bonds of Commonwealth 1939-48* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 264.
[6] J.L. Granatstein, *How Britain's weakness forced Canada into the arms of the United States* (University of Toronto Press, 1989), 38, 61.
[7] Idem, *Ottawa Men*, 275.
[8] A.G. Hopkins, "Back to the Future: From National History to Imperial History," *Past and Present*, 164 (1999), 220.

financial connections would henceforth be with the USA."[9] The small number of compilations on Canada-U.K. relations is one reason why the distancing of Canada from the British connection is not well understood.[10] By 1960, however, the British financial, military, and diplomatic nexus upon which, in part, Canada's "British" allegiance was based, had rapidly disintegrated, the Suez episode helping to discredit "bloody neocolonialist" elements in the United Kingdom as well as in Canada.[11]

Some saw in these trends not so much a diminution of Britishness in one country or another as the emergence of a broadly shared Anglo-American culture in Britain, Canada, and the United States that retained a shared transatlantic identity of culture and interests. The elites, and to a large extent the societies as a whole, of all three countries preserved various British characteristics, including what Grant called the "Lockean liberalism" of the United States, Britain, and Canada, that "has been the philosophy of those who have believed that English-speaking unity was the hope of the modern world."[12] To recent promoters of the concept of "Anglosphere," such as James C. Bennett, the particularisms of Canadian identity paled in significance alongside broadly shared cultural, political, judicial, and linguistic heritage. What mattered was that the larger Anglo-American association of "English-Speaking Peoples," with transplanted British origins celebrated by the ethnically Anglo-American Sir Winston Churchill,

---

[9] C.C. Eldridge, *Kith and Kin: Canada, Britain and the United States from the Revolution to the Cold War* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1997) , xiii.
[10] Peter Lyon, ed., *Britain and Canada: Survey of a Changing Relationship* (Frank Cass, London, 1976); D.K. Adams, ed., *Britain and Canada in the 1990s: proceedings of a UK/Canada Colloquium*, (Ottawa: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1992).
[11] Robert Bothwell, "Canada's Moment: Lester Pearson, Canada, and the World," in Norman Hillmer, ed., *Pearson: the Unlikely Gladiator* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999), 26.
[12] Grant, 62.

remained at the centre of the Western alliance.[13] According to this interpretation, Britishness did not "disappear" but metamorphosed into an international understanding, a common culture among the financial, military, and diplomatic elites of a shared Anglo-American civilization—the "North Atlantic Triangle" in a changing world.[14]

This debate, however, is largely concerned with "external relations" and foreign policy, and not with development and change in the context of an internal or "inherent" Britishness in the "domestic" sense. As Francine McKenzie has written, the question of Anglo-Canadian relations involves "power, identity, alliance," and not merely economics and the reorientation of trade.[15] Most existing accounts have been concerned with external relations rather than what was happening inside Canada. Whether by omission or implication, the definition of Canadian Britishness is reduced to the overseas "British connection," the "transatlantic link," Commonwealth conferences, and commercial, family, and sentimental ties to the United Kingdom. As Doug Owram put it, "Canada's sense of its own identity was closely connected to its British ties," which he defined not as something inherently Canadian but as an external factor: the country's "main link to the wider world."[16] "The Empire," Owram continued to assert in 2005, "really means Anglo-Canadian relations."[17] According to David Mackenzie, "the British Empire in

---

[13] James C. Bennett, *The Anglosphere Challenge: Why the English-Speaking Nations Will Lead the Way in the Twenty-First Century* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004).
[14] B.J.C. McKercher and Lawrence Aronsen, *The North Atlantic Triangle in a Changing World: Anglo-American-Canadian Relations, 1902-1956* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996).
[15] McKenzie, 265.
[16] D.R. Owram, "Canada and the Empire" in Robin W. Winks, ed., *Oxford History of the British Empire*, Vol. V: *Historiography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 146, 162.
[17] Idem, review of Phillip Buckner, ed., *Canada and the End of Empire* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004), in *American Review of Canadian Studies* 35, 4 (Winter 2005), 766.

Canada meant one thing: relations with Britain."[18] And if this connection peaked in the years before 1914, enjoyed a brief revival after 1939, and declined after 1945, then by 1957, it was "already dying, a vestigial organ in an increasingly North Americanized body politic."[19]

The term "vestigial organ" implies that the British character and identity were something *internal* to Canada as well as an external force. Yet insofar as historians have emphasized external relations and ignored the "inside" story, they have dealt only superficially with Britishness and its relationship to the construction of Canadianism. The consensus has been that Britishness was merely a foreign connection and, in some cases, an extraneous impediment to full nationhood. In effect, this approach to Britishness is a form of defining the other, or what could be called "Britishness-as-Other." H.V. Nelles, in a popular survey of Canadian history published in 2004, wrote of the post-1945 period: "There remained a good deal of sentimental attachment to things British—especially royalty—among recent British immigrants and older English-speaking Canadians. But economically and politically Canada had clearly drifted away from British influence" and "the few remaining formal ties between Canada and Great Britain … dropped away at this time."[20] Thus, recent immigrants and elderly monarchists, in Nelles' account, were the chief remnants of Britishness; only the Queen, the Union Jack in the corner of the old flag, and the unpatriated B.N.A. Act prior to 1982 "remained as links to the old Empire." Nelles is only one of the recent exponents of the view that the fading of "British

[18] David Mackenzie, "Canada, the North Atlantic Triangle, and the Empire," in Judith M. Brown and Wm. Roger Louis, eds., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, Vol. IV: *The Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 575.
[19] Andrew Potter, "Introduction to the 40th Anniversary Edition," in George Grant, *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005), xviii.
[20] H.V. Nelles, *A Little History of Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2004), 210-11.

influence" sums up the meaning of Britishness. Even a reputed Tory such as W.L. Morton could imply that the British connection was primarily an *external* factor, referring to "the fact of the decline, not only of British influence but also of British interest in Canada." As Morton wrote in 1972, "since 1961 the tie had weakened, the window darkened."[21]

Because the post-1945 Canada-U.K. relationship evolved on many levels at different speeds, it may well be "futile," as Francine McKenzie has said, to try to locate a "decisive" moment when Canada ceased to "be British."[22] In 1939 the Royal Tour and the Canadian public's response to the outbreak of war suggested that the British connection was as strong as ever.[23] By 1945, however, although Canadians and British had fought side by side and Mackenzie King had flown the Union Jack over Parliament, there had been a marked change in attitudes. Creighton pointed the finger at Liberal prime ministers for "squandering" the British counterweight and subordinating Canada to the United States, the deliberate work of a succession of Liberal anglophobes from King to Pearson.[24]

However this reading of King was challenged by C.P. Stacey, who concluded that the prime minister's complex identity as a lifelong anglophile was really anti-imperialist and anti-Tory rather than anti-British, and coloured by his admiration for English liberalism, which he believed to be an overwhelmingly positive force in the world.[25] Britishness was therefore not synonymous with pro-Imperialism; there were many forms

[21] Morton, *Canadian Identity*, 124-5.
[22] McKenzie, 268.
[23] Phillip Buckner, ed., *Canada and the End of Empire* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004), Introduction, 5.
[24] D.G. Creighton, *The Forked Road: Canada 1939-1957* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1976); "Macdonald and the Anglo-Canadian Alliance," in *Towards the Discovery of Canada: Selected Essays* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1972); *Canada's First Century 1867-1967* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1970).
[25] C.P. Stacey, *Mackenzie King and the Atlantic Triangle* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1976).

of Canadian Britishness, of which King's pro-English anti-Imperialist liberalism was only one manifestation, and which represented varying intersections of ethnicity, ideas, habits, and multiple identities.

Nor did the desire to develop distinctively Canadian symbols and identifiers of nationhood necessarily imply a dislike of Britain. "The effort has invariably been made in Canada to convict anyone stressing national sentiments of being 'anti-British,'" wrote Arthur Lower in 1946, himself an anglophile nationalist of self-consciously English origins. While Lower maintained that pro-Canadianism and pro-Britishness were compatible, he also believed that the Britishness of Canada's traditional symbols militated *against* the emergence of a distinctive Canadianism. If there was anti-modernism on the Tory benches, perhaps there was such a thing as "anti-traditionalism" on the nationalist side. Significantly, however, while Lower equated the replacement of historic symbols with the achivement of full maturity and true nationhood, something that must be encouraged if Canada was to emerge fully from "colony to nation," it did not follow that he was anti-British. As Douglas Francis has suggested, Lower and Underhill perceived "two" Britains, the "imperial" and the "liberal"—and found it quite easy to identify with the latter while opposing any vestige of the former.

Lower and others' assumption that Canada should be understood as a colony-turned-nation has had a persistent hold on the historiography as well as the public imagination in the postwar era. John Holmes wrote of the 1960s: "Some of the difficulty between Britain and Canada is the unforeseen problem of the normal child." Even in "the perfect family there is the neurotic element," Holmes said, attributing this to "the very

idea of Britain as the mother country and Canada as the eldest daughter."[26] Hugh MacLennan wrote in 1965 that "nationhood is the collective equivalent of manhood … just as a mature man must seek to discover what his destiny is, so also must a mature nation."[27] Granatstein wrote, in 1986, that from the mid-1940s on, "startlingly … Canada had begun to grow up."[28] In his biography of Pearson, John English entitled his chapter on the Korean War "Becoming Adult"[29] (even though Canadian troops in Korea served in the Commonwealth Division).

A variant of the colony-to-nation thesis has been the continentalist school associated with Underhill, for whom Canada's increasing association with the United States, its "North American destiny," was natural and inevitable. Joseph Levitt surveyed overlapping generational groupings of "visions" from "Colonial Canada of the 19th century to "autonomous" and "uncertain" Canada in the first half of his book; and from "middle power" and "satellite" to "endangered" Canada in the second half—colony to nation. The first set of Levitt's themes (what might be called the "colonial" section) is grouped under the heading "The British Period," ending in the 1930s, and the second set under the title, "The Continentalist period" (the "national" sequel), which begins with the Second World War and, once again, the Ogdensburg agreement of 1940.[30] Desmond Morton put this viewpoint succinctly: "Ogdensburg represented Canada's transfer from one empire to another."[31] Whatever role may be attributed American influence, the

---

[26] Holmes, "Anglo-Canadian Neurosis," 104.
[27] Hugh MacLennan, "The Crisis of Canadian Nationhood," typescript (c. 1965) in Hugh MacLennan Papers MS 466 c. 5 file 7.
[28] Granatstein, *Ottawa Men*, 131.
[29] John English, *The Worldly Years: The Life of Lester Pearson,* Vol. 2, *1949-1972* (New York: Knopf, 1992), 29.
[30] Joseph Levitt, *A Vision Beyond Reach: A Century of Images of Canadian Destiny* (Ottawa: Deneau, 1982).
[31] Desmond Morton, *A Short History of Canada* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2001), 234.

absorption of colony to nation assumptions is commonplace: a history of the flag published in 2002 described the Canada of *1964* as "a former colony that had not quite finished growing up to adult nationhood."[32] Attachment to traditional Canadian symbolism in use prior to 1965 has been dismissed as "dependence on colonial paternalism."[33]

Others have associated the emergence from colony to nation with an inevitable transition to modernity. It followed that resistance or dissent was backward and out of step with the times. It is not surprising, then, to find the "reactionary" Britishness of Anglo-Canadian Tory intellectuals depicted as a manifestation of anti-modernism. Philip Massolin placed such thinkers' attempt to shore up the British connection in the context of socio-cultural paternalism, an appeal to nostalgia, and resistance to the advent of modernity. "The re-emphasis on the Crown, the Commonwealth, and the Anglo-Canadian constitutional inheritance, along with other elements of the British cultural nexus, characterized their efforts to contest Americanization, the Liberal interpretation of Canada's past, and other aspects of modernity," Massolin wrote of the 1950s.[34] The "British nexus remained central to the conservative vision of the nation,"[35] more "necessary" than ever after the Second World War, according to traditionalists, as a counterweight to American influence. For George Grant, for example, British ties helped to preserve English Canada and acted as a buffer for the culture of French Canada in a

---

[32] Rick Archbold, *I Stand for Canada: The Story of the Maple Leaf Flag* (Toronto: Macfarlane, Walter & Ross, 2002), 5.
[33] Neil Bissoondath, *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism* (Toronto: Penguin, 1994), 69.
[34] Philip Massolin, *Canadian Intellectuals, the Tory Tradition, and the Challenge of Modernity, 1939-1970* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 235.
[35] Ibid., 240-1.

U.S.-dominated hemisphere.[36] Britishness for Grant, together with the old school Catholicism of French Canada, represented a valiant if futile local resistance to "technology" and the "mass age" and the "universal homogeneous state" driven by American imperialism, consumerism, and materialism. Karen Finlay emphasized the Anglo-Canadian resistance to Americanization in her study of the Liberal "elitist" Vincent Massey, injecting a note of democracy and public-spiritedness[37] into what had previously been dismissed as Massey's paternalism.[38]

Anti-modernism was one prism through which to interpret the Tory critique of Grant, Creighton, W.L. Morton, Judith Robinson, Hilda Neatby, John Farthing, Scott Symons, and Tom Symons.[39] But they also implied that Britishness was something internalized in the Canadian identity rather than alien to it. For them, the British connection represented not a foreign tie, but the organic "meaning" of Canada—a culture that seemed to be waning in the 1950s and 1960s, prompting Tory publicists to sustain a "conservative myth-making" campaign to reinforce the British-oriented understanding of Canada and its history.[40] Contrary to Lower's teleology, burgeoning Canadian nationhood had not been stifled by the British connection. On the contrary, what was distinctive about Canada was that its Britishness was inherent, and Canadians grew into national confidence and prosperity in a British context that placed few, if any, limits on Canadianism. It did not contradict diversity and tolerance. The Loyalist motto "unity in

---

[36] George Grant, *The Empire: Yes or No?* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1945) rpt. in William Christian and Sheila Grant, eds., *The George Grant Reader* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 50.
[37] Karen Finlay, *The Force of Culture*: *Vincent Massey and Canadian Sovereignty* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004).
[38] Paul Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992).
[39] D.G. Creighton, Presidential Address, Canadian Historical Association *Historical Papers*, 1957, 4; Charles Taylor, *Radical Tories*: *the Conservative Tradition in Canada* (Toronto: Anansi, 1982).
[40] Massolin, 255.

diversity" could be taken as the foundation of what would become known as multiculturalism, the latter being a fulfillment, not a rejection, of the liberal imperialist heritage. The "Canadianized" Crown demanded allegiance, not conformity, and represented fairness and opportunity for all ethnic and linguistic groups, as W.L. Morton wrote.[41] Watson Kirkconnell propounded a Tory anticipation of multiculturalism in his promotion of Central and East European poetry.[42] According to Jacques Monet, S.J., a French Canadian monarchist,[43] francophone conservatism found expression in Eugène Taché's praise for English liberty, "Je me souviens né sous le lys, je crois sous la rose," the loyalism of a Sir Etienne-Paschal Taché and Sir George-Etienne Cartier in the 19th century, and by extension of Boer War and Great War figures such as Sir Percy Girouard (1867-1932) and F.L. Lessard (1860-1927).[44]

The latter represented a French-Canadian Britishness whose exemplars rapidly dwindled in the 20th century, perhaps dying out with Georges Vanier (1888-1967), but suggestive of an interesting hybridity—one way that the French and British traditions might be reconciled. Talbot Papineau, a 1905 Rhodes Scholar from Quebec and predominantly "English" in his culture, is the example usually cited. A separate study could be made of francophone Rhodes Scholars—a unique category that included Marius Barbeau (Oriel 1907), the anthropologist; Gustave Lanctot (Oriel 1909), the historian;[45]

[41] Morton, "The Meaning of Monarchy in Confederation," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 1, IV (June 1963), ii, 271-82.
[42] N.F. Dreisziger, "Watson Kirkconnell and the cultural credibility gap between immigrants and the native-born in Canada," in M.L. Kovacs, ed., *Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education* (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1978), 87-96. Watson Kirkconnell, *Seeing Canada Whole* (Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1994).
[43] Jacques Monet, *The Canadian Crown* (Vancouver: Clarke, Irwin, 1979).
[44] Jacques Monet, *The Last Cannon Shot: A Study of French Canadian Nationalism 1837-1850* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969); John MacFarlane, "Lessard, François-Louis," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Vol. XV, *1921-30* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005).
[45] Lawrence Nowry, *Man of Mana: Marius Barbeau* (Toronto: NC Press, 1995), 72, 85.

Paul Gérin-Lajoie (Brasenose, 1945); Marcel Joseph Aimé Lambert of Alberta (Hertford 1947), who served in the King's Own Calgary Regiment, fought at Dieppe, and became Speaker of the House of Commons in 1962; Yves Fortier (1958), the diplomat and last Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company (1997-2006); and a Rhodes scholar *manqué*, Louis-Stephen Saint-Laurent, Prime Minister from 1948-57.[46]

Among Anglo-Canadians of British stock, Scott Symons argued in 1963 that there was no need to "search" for an authentic identity because there already existed "a common culture to all the English-speaking Canadas,"[47] rooted in a shared British-American past. Despite attempts over the years, there is no adequate synthesis of this "Tory interpretation" of Canada, and the only book-length study of postwar Toryism (Massolin's) overlooks the Symons.[48] The journalist Charles Taylor's impressionistic *Radical Tories* locates the "Red Tory" tradition in the moderate, *deux-nations* Toryism of a Robert Stanfield, and in the paternalistic, left-leaning, anti-American conservatism of Grant and the Symons. ("Left-leaning" because many Red Tories viewed the socially progressive New Democratic Party as preferable to the inept Progressive Conservatives or the chameleon-like Liberals[49]). Most existing studies, however, are at a loss to explain the significance of Britishness for contemporary Toryism: it disappears from the scene, its irrelevance, in the 1970s and afterwards, unexplained. What happened to Britishness in this country's brands of Conservatism after the 1960s is something of a hanging thread of Canadian historiography.

---

[46] The young Louis-Etienne, in 1905, was offered a Rhodes Scholarship but declined. Robert Bothwell, "Saint Laurent, Louis-Stephen," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (DCB), Vol. XX.
[47] Scott Symons, "The Meaning of English Canada" [originally published in 1963], in Christopher Elson, ed., *Dear Reader: Selected Scott Symons* (Toronto: Gutter Press, 1998), 37.
[48] Symons was described as the "number one Tory myth-maker of his time," by Stephen Patrick (cited in Scott Symons, "Selection from Diary" in Elson, ed., 184.
[49] Symons and a like-minded Tory friend voted for the NDP in the 1965 election, cf. *Combat Journal for Place d'Armes* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1967), 14.

The notion of a special, particular Canadian or "British American" society and culture, and that this was increasingly forgotten or "lost," was seen in the work of John Farthing during the 1950s. The prime minister of the day, Louis Saint Laurent, Farthing said, assumed that Britishness was a "foreign" imposition and that only those traditions that predated the Conquest of 1759 were truly Canadian. Everything after 1760 was merely a foreign imposition by the forces of British imperialism. Only "French Canada is pure Canada," Farthing wrote:

> According to the peculiar logic of the new pure Canada cult, it is only British traditions which are in any sense un-Canadian … The one tradition that must be jettisoned, as something quite distinct from the country that gives us our existence, turns out to be the British tradition. … The method by which English-speaking Canadians are now to seek national unity is to scrap their traditions entirely and submit to what others assert to be compatible with national unity.[50]

Canadian traditions inherited from Britain were thus "something that belongs only to the British Isles and is therefore an alien influence in the life of a people who should have their own traditions and should admit nothing in their national life that is not wholly and purely of Canada."[51] Farthing's was one of the first diagnoses, although he did not anticipate postcolonial scholarship, of the tendency to define Britishness as *other*.

Donald Creighton, also without anticipating postcolonial terminology, struck a similar chord, deploring the "gradual elimination" of such historic Canadian identifiers as

---

[50] John Farthing, *Freedom Wears a Crown* (Toronto: Kingswood House, 1957), 17-18.
[51] Ibid., 14.

the term “Dominion,” which “aroused in King and St. Laurent a curious, almost pathological resentment.” A succession of Liberal governments “since 1936,” Creighton added, “had been systematically removing [the term ‘Dominion’] from public documents,” despite the expression’s uniquely Canadian origins in 1867.[52] Eugene Forsey conducted a decades-long resistance in the press and in correspondence,[53] insisting that “Dominion” was a peculiarly Canadian term—originally “*our* word,” he said, “perhaps the only distinctive word we have contributed to political terminology.”[54] Even a career “Ottawa Man” such as John Holmes, himself something of an Eminent Pearsonian, wrote in 1980 that “Dominion” had “completely been misinterpreted as a badge of colonial shame.”[55] It did not help that those in power dismissed this emotional attachment to “Dominion” and “Royal Mail” as a “trivial fuss,” as J.W. Pickersgill put it, insisting reflexively and reductionistically that “Dominion” did, “*of course* [sic]” have “a colonial or quasi-colonial connotation.”[56] As recently as 2006, some historians have adopted as their own Pickersgill’s scornful tone towards those “trivially”-minded Canadians who perceived “Dominion” as a positive and expansive, rather than negative and subordinate, title for Canada.[57] The term never recovered its original meaning, and the othering of the title “Dominion” was complete.[58]

---

[52] Donald Creighton, *The Passionate Observer: Selected Writings* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1980), 198-99.
[53] J.E. Hodgetts, ed., *The Sound of One Voice: Eugene Forsey and his letters to the press* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 216-23; Frank Milligan, *Eugene A. Forsey: an intellectual biography* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2004), 199 ff.
[54] Creighton, *Passionate Observer*, 199.
[55] John Holmes, *Life with Uncle: The Canadian-American Relationship* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), 124.
[56] J.W. Pickersgill, *Seeing Canada Whole: Memoirs* (Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1994), 372.
[57] Igartua, *Other Quiet Revolution*, 29-33, 104-7.
[58] One of the reasons for this is that British and Commonwealth leaders appropriated the term in the 1900s as a generic expression to describe senior members of the Commonwealth. From then on, “dominion” lost

Creighton was not incorrect in perceiving a trend at work. The establishment of Canadian citizenship (1946); abolition of appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (1949); the downplaying and elimination of "Dominion" nomenclature, the "Royal Mail," and the coat of arms, efforts to change the name of Dominion Day and to make "O Canada" the official national anthem; and the appointment of a "Canadian-born" governor-general "representing Canadians" as well as the Queen (1951-52); the Royal Style and Titles Act enabling the Queen to be proclaimed "Queen of Canada" at her Coronation but retaining also the title of "Queen of the United Kingdom" in Canadian law in order to avoid confusion about the "divided Crown" (1953);[59] the introduction of a new national flag (1964); armed forces unification (1966-68); celebration of a "new Canada" at the Centennial (1967);[60] the abortive attempt to remove the prefix "Royal" from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (1971); and the renaming of the British North America Act as the "Constitution Act" (1982)—this lengthy catalogue shows the extent of (as well as some limitations to) the transformation that Canada underwent after 1945, most of it during the Liberal governments of King, St. Laurent, Pearson, and Pierre Trudeau. Still, only in recent years have a few historians, including Phillip Buckner and José E. Igartua, brought the "final" and decisive abandonment of Britishness forward from the early postwar period into the 1960s, arguing that it was the flag debate that marked the decisive psychological separation from "the British view of Canada."[61]

---

its unique Canadian meaning and, among nationalists, began to acquire pejorative connotations of subordination that were the reverse of what was intended in 1867.

[59] McCreery, *The Order of Canada*, 93.

60 J.M. Bumsted, "The birthday party," *The Beaver*, 76, 2 (April 1996), 4.

[61] Phillip Buckner, "The Long Goodbye: English Canadians and the British World," in Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, eds., *Rediscovering the British World* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2005), 181-208; José E. Igartua, "'Ready, Aye, Ready' No More? Canada, Britain, and the Suez Crisis in the Canadian Press," in Buckner, ed., *Canada and the End of Empire*, op. cit., 47-65; Igartua, *Other Quiet Revolution*, 192.

If there was a Canadian pull away from Empire, an abandonment or dismantling of the British connection, there was also a British "push" from the other side of the ocean. If Canadians were disillusioned with the British elite, there was also the disillusionment of British leaders in the metropole with imperial entanglements, a desire to be free of the pretensions of Colonials to interfere in British decision-making.[62] The Canadian experience of the 1960s did not occur in isolation, but had its British and American counterparts that can shed light on what happened in Canada.[63] In the 1960s, there was also irritation in British elite circles with the manner in which Commonwealth heads of government meetings had degenerated in the years after the Bandung Conference and the rise of outspoken Third World leaders, into forums dominated by "sterile expressions of anti-Western rhetoric." The attempt by Prince Philip and Lord Mountbatten to create an alternative elite discussion forum, a "Commonwealth 'Bilderberg Group'"—an idea that Prime Minister Harold Wilson raised briefly with Pearson in 1964—suggested a "fairly widespread sense of disillusionment with the newly expanded Commonwealth among the British political class."[64] British disillusionment with Canada in the pre-1914 period (a two-way process) has received some attention,[65] but there has been little study of interwar and post-1945 British perceptions. However, this question must be left to a future study

[62] Wigley, op. cit.
[63] Doug Owram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996); Litt, op. cit.
[64] Philip Murphy, "By Invitation Only: Lord Mountbatten, Prince Philip, and the Attempt to Create a Commonwealth 'Bilderberg Group', 1964-66," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 33, 2 (May 2005), 251, 261.
[65] R.G. Moyles and D.O. Owram, *Imperial Dreams and Colonial Realities: British Views of Canada, 1880-1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988).

as the present thesis is concerned with Canadians, and not “how others saw us”—itself a “British” preoccupation as much as it is a Canadian one.[66]

In recent years, the Mother Country has entered into its own post-British identity crisis. With the decline in the prestige of Empire and Commonwealth since the 1950s and the breakdown of conceptions of “the British” as an imagined community during the 1990s, there has been a fragmenting of the notion that Britain, or rather the United Kingdom, should continue to be regarded as a unitary state. Linda Colley showed that the British “nation” had been forged in the 18th and 19th centuries in the first place by war with the foreign other and by a common Protestant identity, and might therefore not survive without those unifying bonds.[67] Now on the agenda are the differentiation of the Irish, Scots, Welsh, Cornish, and Manx ethnicities from an historic English ascendancy; the relationship of this “Anglo-Atlantic archipelago” with Europe; and the meaning of post-British, post-Imperial and post-Commonwealth English history since J.G.A. Pocock’s “plea for a new subject” in 1973.[68] These developments have consequences for Canadians. If there is no longer consensus about a “British” identity in the British Isles, the implication is that the Canadian “amalgam” of Britishness either becomes an orphan, or must be reconsidered or reconstructed as something unique to Canada. As some of the recent Australian historiography has concluded, Britishness may have been “more pervasive in Australia than in Britain itself.”[69] The distinct Canadian variety of

[66] David Heald, “How Others Saw Us,” *The British Empire: The Story of a Nation* (London: Ferndale, 1981), 225-52.
[67] Colley, *Britons*, op. cit.
[68] J.G.A. Pocock, *The Discovery of Islands: Essays in British History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
[69] Meaney, “The Problem of Nationalism,” 79.

Britishness, like its Australian cousin, merits closer study, quite apart from its original sources across the Atlantic.

The "turning inward" in Britain by historians of the Anglo-Celts was paralleled from the 1960s to the 1980s in the "national" historiography of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Canadian historians trained in the 1970s had "little commitment to the monarchy or the empire-commonwealth, and … did not share the anglophilic sensibilities of those who often taught them." Instead, they wrote "about their own Canada: a multiethnic, multilingual, highly regionalized nation."[70] This "indigenization" played a part in obscuring Canada's legacy as a successor state of the Empire and as a product of the British World, as historians ignored the old "global" identity and focussed on a variety of limited identities.[71] A.G. Hopkins explained that this urge "is bound up with the achievement of independence and with the need, accordingly, to minimize imperial influences, or at least to shape them to fit a particular mould."[72] More recently historians have begun to emerge from this long period of introspective national history with the Commonwealth "left out," particularly with Ronald Hyam and Peter Henshaw's study of South Africa-U.K. relations and Margaret MacMillan and Francine McKenzie's volume on Canada and Australia.[73]

In the field of British imperial history, a generation of historians influenced by Ronald Robinson, John Gallagher, and their successors, devoted disproportionate

---

[70] A.B. McKillop, "Who Killed Canadian History? The View from the Trenches," *Canadian Historical Review* 80, 2, (1999), 282.
[71] J.M.S. Careless, "'Limited Identities' in Canada," *Canadian Historical Review* L, 1 (March 1969), 1-10.
[72] Hopkins, "Back to the Future," 216, n. 43.
[73] Ronald Hyam and Peter Henshaw, *The Lion and the Springbok: Britain and South Africa since the Boer War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Deborah Gare, "Britishness in recent Australian historiography," *Historical Journal*, 43, 4 (2000), 1145-55; Rosalind McClean, "'How we prepare them in India': British Diasporic Imaginings and Migration to New Zealand," *New Zealand Journal of History*, 37, 2, October 2003; Margaret MacMillan and Francine McKenzie, eds., *Parties Long Estranged: Canada and Australia in the Twentieth Century* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2003).

emphasis to the non-white Empire—partly in compensation for previous neglect—to the point that the editors of *The Oxford History of the British Empire* significantly underplayed the five volumes' coverage of the "white dominions" and, after completing the series as planned, were obliged to commission a series of unplanned volumes, the *Oxford History of the British Empire Companion Series*, to address various lacunae.[74] And in response to the relative neglect of the white settler empire since the 1960s, another strand of post-Pocock historians in the 1990s has attempted to bring the white Commonwealth "back" into the historiographical mainstream, adopting the term "British World" to describe a global society influenced by Britishness in the broadest sense, not merely in the successor states of the white settler empire, including the United States, but all over the world. In New Zealand, James Belich described the Empire's successor states as "neo-Britains,"[75] much as Alexander Morris referred to Canada as "Nova Britannia" in 1884. With the exception of P.A. Buckner, it is Australians and New Zealanders who have pioneered the new debate about Britishness, addressing questions of ethnic origin, allegiance, and migration in the context of "diaspora."[76] New Zealanders identified with the Empire not "because they were passionate in a sense of deference … so much as because it defined to them a global system within which they found their identity," as Pocock put it.[77]

---

[74] Phillip Buckner, "Was there a "British Empire"? *The Oxford History of the British Empire* from a Canadian perspective," *Acadiensis*, 32 (Autumn 2002), 111-28; Wm. Roger Louis, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, Vols. I-V (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998-99); Norman Etherington, *Missions and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Kevin Kenny, *Ireland and the British Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[75] James Belich, "Neo-Britains," a paper presented to the first British World conference, London, August 9, 1998, unpublished but cited in Buckner, "Was there a "British" Empire?' Cf. James Belich, *Making Peoples: A History of New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century* (1996) and *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000* (2002).

[76] Bridge and Fedorowich, op. cit.

[77] Pocock, "History and Sovereignty," cited in Buckner, "Presidential Address," 23.

In Canada, Buckner suggested in 1994 that the relationship to "Empire" had somehow disappeared from Canadian historiography, where it ought to have a prominent place. "Canadian historians have locked themselves into a ideological framework which is obsessed with the evolution of Canadian autonomy and the construction of a Canadian national identity," Buckner claimed, "and thus downplayed the significance of the imperial experience in shaping the identity of nineteenth-century British Canadians." A decade later, Buckner concluded that most Canadian historians continued to write as if the British Imperial "phase" of the Canadian experience was merely "pre-history." Even so, the literature generated by Buckner and other historians, according to which the white dominions were not colonies on the periphery of a single British Isles-centred metropolis, but part of a "globally-scattered" metropolis, a trans-national "pan-Britonism," is beginning to draw more attention.[78] In the process of exposing the multiplicity of Anglo-Celtic identities, cultural historians have also begun to excavate and classify the strata of Canadian Britishness. It has become more difficult to downplay or dismiss Britishness as an "imperial allegiance" and "imperial past" and portray Canadians as a colonized people who emerged from colonial status to independence. After all, Buckner wrote, "Try telling Canada's aboriginal peoples that Canada was merely the object of British colonialism." Adele Perry's study of race, class, and gender in colonial British Columbia is a pioneer in the Canadian branch of this literature, though it is to be hoped that scholars will devote more attention to the paradigm of Canada as a *colonizing* force.

Rather than a colony-turned-nation, Canada was more akin to a minor colonial power, and recognition of this fact properly returns the debate to the role of Britishness

[78] Buckner, "Was there a 'British' Empire?," 127; Buckner and Francis, eds., *Rediscovering the British World*, op. cit.; Buckner and Francis, eds., *Canada and the British World*, op. cit.

and 19th century Canadianism as a hegemonic ideology and not merely as an embryonic anti-colonialism. As such it is not clear that Britishness should be perceived as a foreign or alien quantity imposed on Canada from outside. Valuable studies might be made, for example, of the Britishness of Aboriginal people who retained as part of their identity loyalty to the Crown as opposed to putting their trust in the political process in Ottawa;[79] or in their role as some of the most celebrated troops in service of King and Empire, or as athletes in the British Empire Games.[80] These would be steps forward in our understanding of the interpenetration and intertwining of "non-ethnically British" Canadianness and Britishness.

Why did English Canada's self-identification as "British" fade in the postwar era? Buckner has depicted a "Long Goodbye" at the end of which, in the 1960s, Canadians "remarkably quickly" ceased to think of themselves as primarily British;[81] "suddenly," as Igartua puts it. But it is this latter period that has suffered the most neglect in the historiography. For many, the confrontation with Britishness in 1964-68 was a much-anticipated climax in a decades-long nationalist movement preoccupied with the country's lingering colonial status.[82] Nationalists gradually came to view the old badges of nationhood—the Red Ensign, the Crown, and "Dominion," as tokens of subordination, colonialism, and incomplete nationhood. The attachment to that type of Britishness was a form of subservience that inhibited true autonomy and arrested national maturity. In their place, Canadians could finally, after decades of gradual struggle towards autonomy, erect

---

[79] Keith Thor Carlson, "The Indians and the Crown: Aboriginal Memories of Royal Promises in Pacific Canada," in Colin Coates, ed., *Majesty in Canada: Essays on the Role of Royalty* (Toronto: Dundurn, 2006), 72.
[80] Frank Cosentino, "Afros, Aboriginals and Amateur Sport in Pre World War One Canada," Canada's Ethnic Group Series, No. 26 (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1998).
[81] Buckner, "Long Goodbye," 201.
[82] Carl Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*: *Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing since 1900* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986).

the signposts of true sovereignty, with distinctively Canadian symbols and without signs of dependency or attachment to a declining Empire. As early as the beginning of the 20th century and even in the 19th century, Canada-centric Canadianism found expression in the nationalisms of both French and English Canadians, "two chosen peoples," whose sense of national destiny, at certain times, appeared to be complementary.[83]

Survey histories over the years have devoted a page or as much as several pages to certain aspects of the process, such as the flag debate, the struggle over the term "Dominion," and armed forces unification.[84] Polemical tracts appeared in the 1970s and 1980s depicting a blatant exercise in top-down social engineering but emphasizing the Trudeau period rather than its Pearsonian forerunner, and attributing the changes to "French" influence rather than to Anglo-Canadian initiative.[85] A small subset of English (and some French) traditionalists explained the advantages of Monarchy.[86]

Most historians have linked the decline of Britain's political, military, and financial clout—the hard-headed, pragmatic bases of the British connection—to the fading of Britishness in Canada. Igartua's work is important for setting his "other quiet revolution" in the larger context from 1945 to 1970. For Igartua, the explanation for the collapse of the British Canadian imagined community lies in English Canadians' progressive loss of interest, from one generation to the next, in British traditions, as the prestige of the Empire went into decline. By 1960, he says, Canadians had lost interest in

[83] Sylvie Lacombe, *La rencontre de deux peuples élus: Comparaison des ambitions nationale et impériale au Canada entre 1896 et 1920* (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université de Laval, 2002).
[84] J.L. Granatstein, *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1986); Creighton, *Forked Road*, 105, 128-31, 226-9.
[85] Peter Brimelow, *The Patriot Game: National Dreams and Political Realities* (Toronto: Key Porter, 1986); J.V. Andrews, *Bilingual Today, French Tomorrow* (Richmond Hill, Ontario: BMG Publishing, 1977) 60-1; Sam Allison, *French Power: The Francization of Canada* (Richmond Hill: BMG Publishing, 1978).
[86] Cf. the journal *Monarchy Canada*, ed. John Aimers (1970-97), ed. Arthur Bousfield and Garry Toffoli (1997-), thereafter *Canadian Monarchist News*.

preserving the title Dominion or understanding the "meaning" of such holidays as Victoria Day because, in the broadest terms, "the attraction of British symbols had waned as the lustre of the Empire had dimmed."[87] Secondly, at the national level, the diversification of source countries for immigrants reduced the number of reinforcements for British perceptions and assumptions about Canada. Thirdly, the abandonment of school history texts that emphasized British and English history and their replacement by Canada-centred texts that downplayed the British connection meant that younger generations of students were formed with a decreasingly "British" idea of Canada. Even when they were taught such an interpretation, it did not coincide with their own perceptions. By the 1960s, textbooks no longer celebrated "the superiority of British institutions and the glory of the British Empire," Igartua writes, while they continued to reinforce stereotypes of French Canadians and ethnic groups in a manner that was "increasingly at odds with the day-to-day experiences of the schoolchildren of the 1960s."[88]

This "educational" explanation reinforced the findings of Paul T. Phillips, who traced the "dramatic shifts" in academic life in the decades after 1945 when scholars at all levels showed "increasing interest in the modern era, in Canadian as opposed to British and imperial history, and in social history," and as the teaching and study of Canadian history was "increasingly detached from remaining links with British history."[89] In place of the old national focus, historians turned to what J.M.S. Careless described as "limited identities" such as region, ethnicity, class, and gender—a trend that

[87] Igartua, *Other Quiet Revolution*, 109.
[88] Ibid., 163.
[89] Paul T. Phillips, *Britain's Past in Canada: The Teaching and Writing of British History* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1989), 137, 153.

perhaps reflected the transfer of Canadians' identification from the Empire to the regions and to other identities in a multicultural setting. Finally, Igartua cites transformational events such as the flag debate of 1964 and the acceptance by English-Canadian opinion-makers and daily newspapers of a two-nations concept after the B & B Commission almost "without reservation," an achievement that he attributes to "the courage of the Pearson government,"[90] in advancing a stronger sense of Canadian independence.

Few scholars have addressed the decline of Britishness in any detail. Kenneth McNaught and Raymond Breton wrote about the invention, or reconstruction, of a post-1960s identity, a new imagined community that was the result of English Canada's "own quiet revolution."[91] These have appeared in articles and reviews rather than substantive studies. Phillip Massolin wrote in 2001 that "the decline of 'British' Canada was, indeed, as important as the Quiet Revolution."[92] However, recent studies may be a sign of growing interest in the field. Igartua has attempted to chronicle what he calls "The Other Quiet Revolution,"[93] through newspaper editorials, school textbooks, and House of Commons debates. "We have ignored a revolution even more quiet than Quebec's," he writes, "a fundamental shift in English-Canadian representations of Canadian identity."[94] The dominant pre-1960s understanding of Canada as an "ethnic" British definition was

---

[90] Igartua, *Other Quiet Revolution*, 222.

[91] Kenneth McNaught, "Mordecai Richler Was Here," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 26, 4 (1991/92), 142; Raymond Breton, "Ethnicity and Race in Social Organization," in R. Helmes-Hayes, *The Vertical Mosaic Revisited* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 104; Andrea Benvenuti and Stuart Ward, "Britain, Europe and the "Other Quiet Revolution" in Canada," in Buckner, ed., *Canada and the End of Empire*, op. cit.

[92] Massolin, 266.

[93] José E. Igartua, op. cit.; "L'autre révolution tranquille: le Canada anglais," *Possibles*, 23, 2, Printemps 1999, 41-52; "L'autre révolution tranquille: l'évolution du nationalisme canadien-anglais, 1945-1971," in Gérard Bouchard and Yvan Lamonde, eds., *La nation dans tous ses États: le Québec en comparaison* (Montréal: l'Harmattan, 1997), 271-296; ""Ready, Aye, Ready" No More? Canada, Britain, and the Suez Crisis in the Canadian Press," in Buckner, ed., 47-65.

[94] Idem, "The Quieter Revolution: Evolving Representations of National Identity in English Canada 1941-1960," paper presented at a joint session of the Canadian Historical Association and the Association for Canadian Studies, St. John's, Nfld., June 8, 1997, 3.

imposed by ethnic Wasps on the "lesser" ethnic groups, based on "blatant" racism "often couched in coded language." This identity, based on ethnic Britishness and an appeal to a shared British heritage perpetuated by immigration and British-oriented school textbooks, was "abruptly discarded" in the 1960s, as the "de-ethnicization"[95] of English Canada's identity gave rise to a non-ethnic, civic Canadianism that, ironically, stemmed from a "British" emphasis on civil rights. Curiously, Igartua perceived advocates of both a British and a non-ethnic "civic" definition of Canada as "blind to the contradiction between the two."[96] Yet Igartua himself seems to overlook the possibility that the civic identity might in some respects be a fulfillment, rather than a rejection, of the British heritage. If he does not accept that interpretation, neither does he attempt to refute it.

Another recent book-length account, by Gary Miedema, situates the displacement of British identity in the context of the de-privileging of Christianity in Canadian public life in the 1960s, with a particular focus on the Centennial celebrations of 1967. While religious historians and sociologists have been preoccupied with secularization theory, which tends to assume that the ebbing of religion and its replacement by secularism are a natural and inevitable process, Miedema suggests that Canadians deliberately re-imagined the role of religion in their "national identities" in the manner in which they chose to celebrate the Centennial, transforming Canada's public space from a Christian to a multi-faith framework. For Miedema, a vision of Canada that was "British and Christian" was replaced by one that was "secular and inclusive,"[97] not because this was accidental or inevitable but because Canadians wanted it that way. Miedema has not been

---

[95] Idem, *Other Quiet Revolution*, 35, 1.
[96] Ibid., 5, 61-2.
[97] Gary Miedema, *For Canada's Sake: Public Religion, Centennial Celebrations, and the Re-making of Canada in the 1960s* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005).

the first to link the "decolonization" of Canada with the decline of Protestant religious influence and the decline of fraternal organizations like the Orange Order.[98]

Neither Miedema nor Igartua comes to grips adequately with the meaning and role of Britishness in the Canadian context. The précis each writer offers of the flag debate, for example, echoes standard nationalist accounts. "Canada was no longer British," writes Igartua. The flag debate "marked the last hurrah for English Canadian believers in a British Canada." It "marked the end of the British view of Canada."[99] Referring to symbols like the Crown and the flag, Miedema has said: "The state, the most significant manager and protector of the symbolic order … moved quickly to restructure and adapt that order to allow it to include previously alienated groups."[100] There are a number of problems with this account. First, the Britishness and Canadianness of Canada have overlapped each other to a greater extent than is usually acknowledged. There was much interpenetration and intertwining involved. Secondly, it is an oversimplification to suggest that one monolithic vision of Canada suddenly replaced another. As Buckner has written, "Most nations are constructed out of a jumble of pre-existing historical materials and mix together notions of territoriality and ethnicity."[101] Gayatri Spivak rejected the binary opposition of colonizer and colonized, a "subaltern studies" theme adapted by Kosmas Tsokhas to the Australian context, where Tsokhas says the relationship between Britishness and Australianness was "much more heterogeneous and hybrid."[102]

---

[98] Cecil J. Houston and William J. Smyth, *The Sash Canada Wore: A Historical Geography of the Orange Order in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), 170-71.
[99] Igartua, *Other Quiet Revolution*, 173, 192.
[100] Miedema, "For Canada's Sake," loc. cit.
[101] Buckner, "Long Goodbye," 183.
[102] Tsokhas, 20. Gayatri Spivak, "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography" in Ranjit Guha, ed., *Subaltern Studies IV: Writing on South Asian History and Society* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989).

In Canada, the complexity and multi-layered nature of Britishness has been oversimplified. Many historians have implied that inexorable forces of change were underway in these events, thus neglecting the contribution of agency in bringing about what were, fundamentally, political decisions that manifested the crisis of Britishness from 1964 to 1968 and the deliberate confrontation with the overtly British symbolism of the state. While it does appear that Canada inevitably became less "British" during the 1960s, many of the key changes that manifested this apparent "decline" of Britishness were in fact policy decisions opposed by large segments of the population, even though they also enjoyed a substantial measure of public support. But that does not make the introduction of such changes inevitable. It is in this sense that the confrontation with Britishness was engineered as much as it was part of a Whiggish progress to nationhood.

Still, the "new Canada" (Pearson's expression) that was imagined into being during the crisis of Britishness was not simply the work of an elite, but also had deeper roots in the public imagination. As Anthony D. Smith has pointed out, nations and national identity are not simply "invented" by intellectuals. Rather, elites including journalists and political elements have "revived" and "rediscovered" the nation rooted in a core ethnie. In Canada, the largely Anglo-Celtic elites performed this role, confronting older, overt "British" definitions of identity and reconstituting that identity based on "myths, memories, values and symbols" with a deep measure of public resonance. It is thus, according to Smith, that "the agendas of everyday people play a role" in reinventing the nation, "grounded in popular feeling."[103] Still, to a greater extent that has been acknowledged to date and as Chapter 7 below will suggest, the popular sentiment in favour of change in the symbolic order was by no means universal—and not all

[103] Dixson, 37, 55.

Canadians defined the nation's "myths, memories, values and symbols" in a post-British light. The profound attachment of a large segment of the population to traditional Canadian symbols became clear during the flag debate of 1964, even if it was described by Gregory A. Johnson as the "last gasp of empire."[104]

For a variety of reasons, this older conception of Canadianism did not prevail and a new symbolic order was ushered in. As Hobsbawm and Ranger have suggested, new symbols typically come into being when "old traditions and their institutional carriers and promulgators no longer prove sufficiently adaptable and flexible, or are otherwise eliminated: in short, when there are sufficiently large and rapid changes."[105] The crisis of Britishness of the mid-1960s in many ways fit this description. To their critics, mainly Conservatives, the tradition-inventors seemed to have ungratefully and ungraciously pitted themselves against the British inheritance. But the opponents of change were largely routed—"cleansed" and "purged," according to protagonists like John Matheson and Mitchell Sharp, a former public servant, cabinet minister and Pearson ally—to the extent that some historians have characterized their recalcitrance as an expression of anti-modernism.[106]

Yet nationalists did not simply "break with the past," rejecting or "destroying" tradition, as their critics maintained. They brought with them "their own relevant past." Historians sympathetic to change had provided an interpretation of Canadian history as a struggle for independence that, according to those who agreed with them, justified the government's policies. In so doing Pearson and his associates "establish[ed] continuity

[104] Gregory A. Johnson, "The Last Gasp of Empire: The 1964 Flag Debate Revisited," in Buckner, ed., *Canada and the End of Empire*, 233-50.
[105] Hobsbawm and Ranger, 5.
[106] Ian McKay, *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), 67-8.

with a suitable historic past," as Hobsbawm and Ranger put it,[107] and at the same time discredited their opponents' defence of the old order. For nationalists, the symbolic changes of the 1960s were the fulfillment of aspirations long cherished but stifled in the past by a lack of determination or by conservative elements, the equivalent of Australia's "reluctant nation" attachment to British ties.[108] As Matheson put it in reference to the flag debate of 1964, Pearson did not create the flag problem, "he inherited it"—as if it were a wound that had not healed. The country, according to this view, had long been "waiting" for a new flag. "Canada stands in much need of a new National Flag," wrote J.S. Ewart in *The Canadian Republic* monthly in 1930.[109] Parliament debated the flag question in the 1920s, in 1938, 1945, and again in the 1950s—and all of these debates ended with the traditional Canadian Red Ensign intact. Thus, it fell to a particular group of political leaders who found themselves in power in 1963, with support from intellectuals and elements of public opinion—the Eminent Pearsonians—to recognize and seize the opportunity to effect decisive symbolic change. As A.R.M. Lower wrote in 1953, Canadians "have to *build a new country*; a new community" (emphasis added), a project which, he said, "calls for all the effort, all the imagination, that any group of men can bring to it."[110] The legacies of the era of *Nova Britannia* were long overdue for replacement.

---

[107] Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1.

[108] David Day, *The Reluctant Nation*: *Australia and the Allied Defeat of Japan 1942-45* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1992).

[109] John S. Ewart, "Imperial Unity—How Much Remains? Flags and Citizens," *The Canadian Republic* (Montreal), April 1930, 29.

[110] Welf H. Heick, ed., *History and Myth: Arthur Lower and the Making of Canadian Nationalism: Selected Essays of A.R.M. Lower* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1975), 164.

Chapter 2

The Challenge of Anglo-Canadian Ethnicity

Despite attempts over the years to study Anglo-Celts in Canada as an ethnic group or groups—the English, Scots, Irish, and Scots-Irish—certain aspects of Anglo-Canadian ethnicity remain a conundrum. "Really good ethnic history," according to Donald Akenson, "is simultaneously a rigorous documentation of the behaviour of a specific group of individuals and equally a chronicle of their evolving consciousness."[1] Few scholars have attempted to explain the "decline of the Wasp" as a dominant Anglo-Canadian ethnic group, either in terms of its status as a core *ethnie* in Canada (at least, of English Canada), or still less in terms of its behaviour and evolving consciousness. Pre-1960s Canada continues to be portrayed as society in which Wasps defined the country as ethnically British, with the French Canadians and the non-Anglo Saxon ethnic groups subordinated.[2] According to some, a "British" imagined community collapsed relatively quickly in the 1960s, with the rise of a newly confident Canadian nationalism. One aspect of this process that is poorly understood, however, is the long-term development of a distinctive Anglo-Canadian sense of themselves, individually and collectively, as distinguished from the British "other." As in Australia, "despite the persistence of empire loyalty" and older expressions of Britishness, "increasingly, the British became outsiders … represented as the other," and even as "hostile aliens."[3] At least some of this process

---

[1] Donald H. Akenson, *The Irish in Ontario: A Study in Rural History* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984), iv.
[2] Igartua, *Other Quiet Revolution*, 23.
[3] Tsokhas, 294.

can be understood in terms of ethnicity. What might be called an "untold prelude" to the crisis of Britishness in the 1960s was the emergence, over a much longer period dating from the post-First World War era, of an imagined community both tied to and alienated from its own British antecedents, the latter being increasingly differentiated as "other." Indeed it could even be traced to the Annexation Manifesto of 1849.[4] A significant part of this neglect is the lack of attention paid by scholars to the nuances of English-Canadian ethnicities, and particularly to English ethnicity and to the many fissures and faultlines *within* the cluster of Anglo-Celtic ethnic groups often lumped together as "the British," "Wasps," "Anglo-Celts," or "English Canadians." For example, Jo-Anne Lee and Linda Cardinal have referred to the "hegemonic nationalism" of English Canadians with "a view of the nation imagined as naturally white, male, Christian, middle and upper class, English-speaking, British, and, more recently, Northern European in cultural heritage [that] is now more or less synonymous with the idea of 'Canadianness.'"[5] This, however, is to paint with too broad a brush. To describe pre-1960s Canada in blanket terms (or, as Lee and Cardinal do, Canada *in the 1990s*) as the projection of an undifferentiated "British" dominant *ethnie* is to miss important elements of the story.

The British, "Anglo-Saxons," or "Anglo-Celts" have not been understood by scholars as an ethnic group or groups until quite recently. Some defined the term "ethnic group" as "a self-perceived group of people who hold in common a set of traditions not shared by others with whom they are in contact," including "folk" traditions, "religious beliefs," language, "a sense of historical continuity, and common ancestry or place of

---

[4] See above, page 17.
[5] Lee and Cardinal, *Painting the Maple*, 218.

origin."[6] In part because Britishness, broadly understood, was believed to lack traditional folk elements, historians have generally not included it among the ethnicities of the Canadian mosaic. In fact, folk traditions were not lacking: pre-1960s Canadian school texts presented the semi-legendary tales of King Arthur, King Alfred the Great, Magna Carta, Robert the Bruce, the Spanish Armada, and William of Orange,[7] as part of the sweep of Canada's traditions. Curiously, the invocation of these identity-forming folk myths is overlooked in recent studies of the pro-British bias of English-Canadian school texts.[8] Instead, such studies emphasize the British North American episodes in this Anglo-Canadian folk tradition, such as Wolfe at the Heights of Abraham or Sir Isaac Brock, Tecumseh, and Laura Secord in the War of 1812. If these elements constitute what could be considered a folk tradition for English Canadians of past generations, they must form part of any attempt to understand Anglo-Canadian ethnicities.

André Siegfried as early as 1937 perceived the degrees and "subtle distinctions" among people of British origins in Canada: first, the English-born Englishman who was a recent migrant to Canada and who "has never ceased to be English;" secondly, the son of the English immigrant who grew up in Canada "in an atmosphere of loyalty to Britain, and who seems to be part of a British garrison." The ethnicity of these first two types is readily identifiable because they were born abroad or bear obvious signs of their status as first- or second-generation immigrants. More intriguing, however, are Siegfried's next two categories: first, "the Canadian of British origin, still mindful of this fact although he has become assimilated to [North] American surroundings;" and secondly, "Alongside

[6] George DeVos and Lola Romanucci-Ross, eds., *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change* (Palo Alto: Mayfield, 1975), 9.
[7] Hereward Senior, *Orangeism: The Canadian Phase* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1972), 91.
[8] Igartua, *Other Quiet Revolution*, Chapters 3 and 6.

him … the English-speaking Canadian, whose family arrived so long ago that he is out of touch with the Old Country." Finally, "In each of these types one must sort out the English from the Scots and the Irish," and from descendants of the Loyalists, "whose ancestors were American" for generations before they were Canadian. "To these we must add a medley of others of foreign origins who also speak English. The gradations of the political tints of these different groups are as delicate as the colours on an artist's palette."[9] Thus, 70 years ago, Siegfried mapped a potential field in Anglo-Canadian ethnicity that has yet to be fully explored.

Generations of new ethnicities have been added to Siegfried's "medley of others" since the 1960s and 1970s, as "the old colonial centre," as Neil Bissoondath has called it, "was … swept away by waves of 'non-traditional' immigrants."[10] But an ethnic core of Anglo-Canadians remained. Who were the Anglo-Canadians? Such a group could be defined as those Canadians descended from settlers and immigrants from the British Isles, including Protestant elements from Ireland, a considerable proportion of whom have at some stage married outside the Anglo-Celtic ethnic group but almost all of whom continue to belong to the English-speaking population—and who have comprised the unique predominantly Protestant "British amalgam" in Canada. They also incorporated the thoroughly "Anglo" or anglicized English Canadians who could be European in origin, or half-European and in some cases, half-British, such as Bert Hoffmeister, the Second World War general, or John Diefenbaker, prime minister from 1957-63.[11] Taking these developments into account, Siegfried's categories of inclusive, exogamous, and

---

[9] André Siegfried, *Canada* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1937), 231.
[10] Bissoondath, 201.
[11] Douglas E. Delaney, *The Soldiers' General: Bert Hoffmeister at War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2005).

hybrid British ethnicity remain useful, and the basic problem of Anglo-Canadian taxonomies has changed little. Ethnic historians in Canada have long scrutinized Scots, Irish, and even Anglo-Norman ethnicities, which have included more easily recognized "folk" elements such as bagpipes and Highland dancing.[12] As Siegfried perceived, within the overarching British identity there were always a myriad of sub-categories and the ethnographer continues to confront the difficulty of defining them satisfactorily. In other words, even if there was a common "British identity" of Canada from the Victorian period to the middle of the 20th century, there remains the problem of defining and explaining the ethnic categories and perceptions that underpinned and reinforced that identity.

Anglo-Canadians of an earlier era, if they thought about race, considered themselves to be British or broadly Anglo-Saxon—although, as Robertson Davies, whose forebears were Welsh, pointed out, "in the case of Canada, that should, perhaps, be altered to Anglo-Celtic."[13] Some historians have adopted the latter term, thought critics have suggested that "Anglo-Celts" creates confusion about the common British identity—the unique Canadian British amalgam—that subsumed most English-speakers throughout much of the history of English Canada, a shared sense of Britishness that

---

[12] Akenson, op. cit.; W. Stanford Reid, ed., *The Scottish Tradition in Canada* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976); J.M.Bumsted, "The Scots in Canada," *Canada's Ethnic Groups,* No. 1 (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1982); David A. Wilson, "The Irish in Canada," No. 12 (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1990); Yves Frenette, "The Anglo-Normans in Eastern Canada," No. 21 (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1996).

[13] Davies to a student, 31 January 1977, in Judith Skelton Grant, ed., *For Your Eye Alone: The Letters of Robertson Davies* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1999), 16.

survived at least into the 1950s. For others, the term Anglo-Celt is "governmentalese" and implies a narrowly "racial connotation as opposed to cultural identification."[14]

The historically dominant core of this group or groups were the "non-Celtic" Anglo-Canadians, sometimes described as Wasps—White Anglo-Saxon Protestants—defined by Linda Bell Deutschmann as native-born Canadians "of British ancestry and Protestant background" that "constitute the core of the 'dominant group.'"[15] She found that Wasps differ from those traditionally regarded as "ethnic" groups in that they expressed no greater willingness to vote for political candidates of their own background. Rather, Wasp consciousness of their own ethnicity was latent and unobtrusive. The majority of Wasp Canadians in her survey did not regard "any part of the British Isles" as a "homeland," nor were they "especially interested in what goes on in Britain." At the same time, Wasp Canadians felt that their "British background made some difference to the kind of 'Canadian' they were."[16] Why, then, the neglect of this group by observers? Deutschmann suggested that historians have tended to pass over "ordinary" Wasps in favour of either the very rich or very poor. On the one hand there were Patrick A. Dunae's "gentlemen emigrants," upper-class founders of ranches, clubs, churches, colleges, and schools, and one of the underestimated sources of the pre-1914 Britishness, of which living traces could still be found in the remnant of longstockings of the rural

---

[14] Linda Bell Deutschmann, "Decline of the Wasp? Dominant Group Identity in the Ethnic Plural Society," in M. L. Kovacs, ed., *Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education* (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1978), 415 n. 1, 418 n. 34.
[15] Ibid., 411-18.
[16] Ibid., 416 n. 10.

West in the 1950s.[17] On the other end of the social scale were the poor and orphans including the Home Children sent to Canada from institutions in England.[18]

Inordinate emphasis on these two extremes of the social scale in part explains the lack of a more broadly-based understanding of Wasps, the ethnic group that, curiously, did not behave like other ethnic groups. While Britishness was often identified with elites, it seems that Canadians of all classes, genders, and ethnicities could and did imagine Canada as a "British" society at different times. Apart from the rich and poor, there remained the broad swathe of lower-middle and middle class English immigrants and their descendants who have not usually been viewed as an "ethnic" group. The English formed the largest single category of new entrants to Canada from 1867 until the 1950s and were always a substantial proportion of the Canadian-born.[19] Whether or not the Scots and Protestant Irish were included, the core of this "majority" has been studied little, Deutschmann noted, except in order to examine "prejudice and discrimination" by the "dominant group" or the haughtiness of "reluctant hosts" toward minorities,[20] upon whom they are said to have imposed "Anglo-conformity,"[21] according to Howard Palmer, and whom they have excluded from access to "power," according to John Porter's 1965 study, *The Vertical Mosaic*. Other studies concurred that the more a member of a visible minority in the mid-1970s was able to assimilate to the majority Anglo-Canadian culture

---

[17] Patrick A. Dunae, *Gentlemen Emigrants*: *From the British Public Schools to the Canadian Frontier* (Toronto: Douglas McIntyre, 1981), 234.

[18] Joy Parr, *Labouring Children: British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924* (London: Croom Helm, 1980); Kenneth Bagnell, *The Little Immigrants: The Orphans Who Came to Canada* (Toronto: MacMillan, 1981).

[19] Buckner, "Introduction," *British Journal of Canadian Studies* 16.1 (2003), 1-6.

[20] Porter, *Vertical Mosaic*; Deutschmann calls for study of prejudice and discrimination *by* minority groups, op. cit., 416, n. 8.

[21] Palmer, "Reluctant Hosts; Kay J. Anderson, *Vancouver's Chinatown: Racial Discourse in Canada, 1875-1980* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991).

(i.e. managed to conform) , the further he or she advanced materially in Canadian society.[22]

Porter did not attempt to unravel Anglo-Canadian ethnicity per se, but posited a "self-perpetuating" relationship between class, power, and membership in the English-speaking "charter group" sustained by British immigration and educational aspirations, training, and networks that favour the English-speaking population. According to Porter, in their vocational attainments, work patterns, and market relationships, among the non-charter ethnic groups only the Jews followed the British pattern while other Europeans tended to be more like the French-speaking charter group, occupying less lucrative and powerful positions in society.[23] Whether in terms of class status and income, economic and political power, organized labour and the "labour elite," the federal bureaucracy, the clergy, or the media, Porter concluded that those of British origins were disproportionately represented in the higher echelons. A 1998 study entitled *The Vertical Mosaic Revisited* noted a significant diminution in Wasp dominance, a greater diversity among elites in which a wider array of (mostly European) ethnic origins could be found.[24] What continued to stand out, however, was Deutschmann's observation that most Wasps did not belong to elites or occupy elite positions in society at all.

More recently, Eric P. Kaufmann has proposed that there has been, or was at one time, a "Wasp ethnocracy" in Canada, a power structure centred around Canadians of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Celtic stock whose understanding of themselves was based on a

---

[22] Tomoko Makabe, "Ethnic identity and social mobility: the case of the second generation Japanese in metropolitan Toronto," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 10, 1 (1978), 106-23, cited in Robert J. Brym and Bonnie J. Fox, *From Culture to Power: The Sociology of English Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989), 113-14.
[23] Porter, 84-90.
[24] Helmes-Hayes and Curtis, eds., *Vertical Mosaic Revisited*, 18.

"Canadian ethnic Britannicism" that went into "decline" in the middle of the 20th century. Kaufmann cited the decline in the membership of Wasp-oriented or intensely pro-British associations like the Orange Order, whose membership in western Ontario declined from 40,000 members in the 1920s to a few thousand in the 1990s. On the other hand, Kaufmann does not take into consideration that such a decline in membership was observed across a wide spectrum of voluntary associations irrespective of ethnicity during the mid-20th century—the decline of "social capital" and civic engagement across the board in the United States as well as Canada.[25] More significantly, perhaps, Kaufmann cited the decline in the proportion of Canadians reporting "Wasp" (British or part-British) ethnic origins in the Census from nearly 80% in 1921 to little over 60% in 1971.[26]

Kaufmann also suggests geopolitical and ideological factors in the decline of Wasp "ethnocracy." First, he says that because the Wasp ethnic group "had invested greatly in the symbolism of the British Empire," by the mid-20th century, the "decline of the British Empire opened up space for criticism of the entire Wasp-Canada axis." This connection is stated rather than explained. How did the "end of empire" spell the end of Wasp dominance or influence in Canada itself? According to Kaufmann, the loss of the British connection, in the sense of the distancing of Canada from Britain, engendered a kind of "disarray" in the English Canadian identity, assisted by "currents of anti-British" forms of Canadian nationalism dating back to 1837. The fading of the Empire after 1945

[25] Robert D. Putnam, "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital," *Journal of Democracy* 6, 1 (January 1995), 65-78.
[26] Eric P. Kaufmann, "The decline of the WASP in the United States and Canada," in Eric P. Kaufmann, ed., *Rethinking Ethnicity: Majority groups and dominant minorities* (London: Routledge, 2004), 61-83.

left English Canadians with "no sense of cultural rootedness."[27] As one journalist put it, English Canadians experienced "confusion" when the "Imperial tradition was cut down."[28] Two additional factors in Wasp decline, according to Kaufmann's analysis, were that "dissenting Protestant sects like the Baptists were generally predisposed to this kind of [anti-British] sentiment"—although he does not cite evidence. (It may be the Kaufmann is conflating American-Baptist dynamics that may not apply in Canada, and neglecting British Baptist infuences.) Kaufmann's second factor is an intellectual and psychological diminution within the Wasp group in assumptions of Anglo-Saxon superiority, and a greater openness, particularly among cultural and intellectual elites, to a diversity of ethnic groups. Referring to both Canada and the United States, Kaufmann writes: "The notion of Anglo-Saxon and now 'white' decline tends to be viewed as a positive development by most within the (largely white) cultural elite and is perceived as an indicator of progress towards a new type of civilisation." Kaufmann speculated on intellectual trends among English-speaking Canadian elites that encouraged the trend in favour of more diverse immigration in the mid-20th century.

By the 1940s, F.H. Underhill, for example, dismissed the British as "just poor relations,"[29] adding a note of disdain to the sense of difference, otherness, even *schadenfreude* that some Canadians had nurtured in the interwar years and, symbolically, after Dunkirk in 1940, a fitting symbol of the downturn in British fortunes.[30] But this was also a two-way disillusionment. Looking at relations between Britain and Canada in the 1960s, John Holmes cited British *ennui* as a key part of the "Anglo-Canadian neurosis,"

---

[27] Idem, "Condemned to Rootlessness: The Loyalist Origins of Canada's Identity Crisis," published online, 27-29.
[28] Brimelow, 148.
[29] Underhill, 221.
[30] Levitt, *Vision Beyond Reach*, 187.

as Canadians became “increasingly aware … of the resentment against them in Britain which has replaced the old irritating but comfortable condescension and patent pride.” Post-Suez Canada “discriminates against British produce, acts mischievously in the Commonwealth, maltreats the Queen, postures like a high-minded nuisance on the world scene, and is a vulgar, *nouveau riche* second-cousin.”[31] These considerations suggested that emotional factors might be just as important as economics and migration in explaining Wasp sentiments.

Psychological analysis was applied by Charles Hanly to explain the lingering Canadian “anglophilia” of the 1960s. Hanly suggested that for a Canadian to be anglophile or pro-British indicated a higher loyalty to Britain than to Canada. “Diefenbaker, like so many Canadians of his generation,” Hanly wrote, “owes his deepest emotional allegiance to Britain and things British in Canada.” The former Conservative government’s opposition to British membership in the European Common Market, Hanly said, could be compared to “a pampered self-styled favourite child afraid of the loss of the mother when she shows signs of interest in men [sic] of her own generation.” Anglophilia, then, “represents a major psychological barrier” to forming “a unifying nationalist sentiment in Canada” out of preference for “retaining a dependent relation upon *their* country of origin—the British conqueror of Canada.”[32] But the largely speculative psychological approaches of Hanly, and to a some extent Kaufmann, are about as far as scholars today have gone in attempting to explain the causes and effects of the “decline of the Wasp” in Canada. Quite apart from the effects of “decline” (however

---

[31] Holmes, 103-4.

[32] Charles Hanly, “A psychoanalysis of national sentiment,” in Peter Russell, ed., *Nationalism in Canada* (Toronto, McGraw-Hill, 1966), 313. Presumably Hanly conceived of the British Empire as a single mother, or possibly as a widow; in any event willing to receive the attentions of “men” of her own age.

that term is defined) or of anglophilia, the question of what constituted Anglo-Canadian ethnicity is largely overlooked in these studies.

If examples of racism, intolerance, Anglo-conformity, and "reluctant" hospitality could be found among Anglo-Saxon Canadians, some believed that this was not necessarily the typical response. J.M.S. Careless offered a critique of the view that English Canadians were characterized chiefly by a desire to assimilate newcomers and to make them conform to Anglo-Saxon standards. "Has WASPishness in Canada really worked out in such a way? Has the British-Canadians' contribution to multiculturalism essentially been that negative: to deny it, oppose it, and strive against it?" In Careless's view, "the British-Canadian element has actually operated (if often unwittingly) to found and develop a multicultural environment. This did not emerge by accident, though some of it did by necessity. But … the British-Canadian community, being multicultural itself in many respects, served to foster a multi-cultural heritage. It was not as WASPish as it tried to be," including as it did, from the earliest times, a mélange of British ethnicities; a variety of Protestant sects; Roman Catholic minorities; and entailing the necessity, after 1760, of coping with a large French linguistic and cultural enclave. "Very much because Canada emerged but slowly out of British colonialism, without definite proclamation of some overriding new national model [as in the United States]—ethnic pluralism … was itself enabled slowly to develop with the increasing influx of non-British, non-French peoples." Careless concluded that "the British-Canadian experience … had within it strong propensities that made for the continued growth of multiculturalism within this country."[33] Careless' interpretation gains some support from studies of the legacy of the

[33] J.M.S. Careless, ""Waspishness" and Multiculture," in *Careless At Work: Selected Canadian Historical Studies* (Toronto: Dundurn, 1990), 295-307.

Loyalist migration of the 18th century, in which the Loyalists are seen not as guardians of some uniform Anglo-Protestant tradition, but rather as an ethnically diverse assortment of refugees whose very diversity set the stage for a multi-ethnic society and even anticipated the policy of multiculturalism.[34]

Explanations of the Loyalist legacy, and the Wasp or "British" ethnic groups' interaction with minorities, did not go far towards explaining English *ethnicity*, as opposed to its relationship to power structures and the "other," with which only a few scholars have grappled. Pauline Greenhill and Ross McCormack have focused on the ethnicity of immigrants from England. Greenhill attempted to "reify" English ethnicity in Ontario as distinguished from what she calls "mainstream" English Canadians, interviewing recent immigrants and studying carnival and folkloric activities such as Morris dancing and the contrived transformation of Stratford, Ontario, into the quintessentially "English" centre of a Shakespearean festival.[35] McCormack studied working-class English immigrants in Winnipeg who were distinguished, like other ethnic groups, by boundaries including their accent, "cloth caps," attitudes towards others, and the host society's reactions to English people. The problem is that both Greenhill and McCormack deal effectively only with recent English *immigrants*, the outward peculiarities of first-generation arrivals, only one aspect of English ethnicity in Canada—that of newcomers more or less "right off the boat," the least assimilated group with the

---

[34] Joan Magee, *The Loyalist Mosaic: A Multi-Ethnic Heritage* (Toronto: Dundurn, 1984); Norman Knowles, *Inventing the Loyalists*: *The Ontario Loyalist Tradition and the Creation of Usable Pasts* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997).

[35] Pauline Greenhill, *Ethnicity in the Mainstream: Three Studies of English Canadian Culture in Ontario* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994); Ross McCormack, "Cloth Caps and Jobs: The Ethnicity of English Immigrants in Canada, 1900-1914," in Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando, eds., *Ethnicity, Power and Politics in Canada* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1981), 38-55; A. Ross McCormack, "Networks among British Immigrants and Accommodation to Canadian Society: Winnipeg, 1900-1914," *Social History* 17, 34 (Nov. 1984), 357-74.

most distinctive characteristics—and thus only the first of Siegfried's categories. This approach to English or British immigrants is in the vein of Reynolds' 1936 classic *The British Immigrant* (which distinguished between the unassimilated "British" of Verdun, Quebec, and the more Canadianized "English" of nearby Notre-Dame-de-Grâce in Montreal) and other studies of British emigrants such as Edwin Guillet's *The Great Migration* (1937). French Canadian intellectuals thought they had the English marked when they objected to the country being swamped with English "drunkards, paupers, loafers, and jailbirds."[36] This hostility to British immigration had its "*No English Need Apply"* counterpart among English Canadians,[37] who thus defined themselves and their Anglo-Canadianism to some extent in contrast to the British and English "other." Defining one set of attributes and habits as foreign, what may be called Britishness-as-other, became an important mark of ethnic differentiation for Anglo-Canadians who were themselves of British stock.

Greenhill pointed out that among second-generation English Canadians (her "mainstream" category), there were additional distinctions created by exogamy—the offspring of marriages between English people and non-English such as Greenhill herself, whose father was born in England and whose mother was an anglicized Franco-Ontarian. Exogamy raises the question of the role of "choice" in the ethnicity of the second, third, and subsequent generations for whom "simple origin, determined patrilineally" or otherwise by invoking a mixture of non-English ancestry, "becomes highly problematic."

---

[36] Henri Bourassa, quoted in Porter, 61.

[37] Basil Stewart, "*No English Need Apply," Or, Canada as a Field for the Emigrant* (London, 1909).

However, the study of Morris dancing, an eccentric hobby practised by only an extremely limited segment of society, reveals little about these non-immigrant British categories.[38]

Another historiographical approach has been to view the English, and the British generally, as part of a "diaspora" extending into North America.[39] Frances Swyripa has described the "interaction among Britishness or a diasporic British World, Canadianism, and English ethnicity" among Edmontonians attached to the "interlocking roles and identities—religious and secular, local and (inter)national," associated with that city's Anglican cathedral.[40] On the other hand, some dispute the notion that Anglo-Saxons may legitimately be considered as a diaspora. "Ethnic diasporas are created either by voluntary migration … or as a result of expulsion from the homeland … and settlement in one or more host countries," Gabriel Sheffer has written, but that to qualify as diasporas they must "remain minority groups." He thus *excludes* "the Anglo-Saxon segment in Canada" on the dubious grounds that they do not represent a minority or minority groups.[41] In reality, those of British ancestry have been shrinking as a proportion of Canada's population since the 1950s, and did in fact constitute a minority in the postwar era. Donald Akenson has made the case that use of the diaspora concept would be a "liberating" one in Canadian ethnic history:

[38] Greenhill herself had to seek out and "join" a Morris troupe in order to conduct her study. Were it not for her scholarly interest, she would in all likelihood not have bothered with it—itself a sign of the questionable relevance of Morris to English ethnicity beyond the first and second generations.
[39] Bridge and Fedorowich, op. cit.
[40] Frances Swyripa, "The Monarchy, the Mounties, and Ye Olde English Fayre: Identity at All Saints' Anglican, Edmonton, 1875-1990s," in Buckner and Francis, eds., *Canada and the British World*, 323-4.
[41] Gabriel Sheffer, *Modern Diasporas in International Politics* (New York: St. Martin's, 1986).

> Potentially, "diaspora" allows us to escape the tyranny of the nation-state. Instead of depicting the history of English-speaking Canada within the context of the geopolitical construct called Canada (a useful perspective, but a very limiting one), the concept of diaspora allows an entirely new set of viewpoints. … To understand, one must emphasize an absolutely pivotal proposition: diaspora histories, if they are not merely to use the word "diaspora" as a flag of convenience, must be multipolar. They must deal with the homeland and with two or more countries of reception. Otherwise, one is not studying diaspora, but simple migration from one point to another, something quite different.[42]

Although it is beyond the scope of the present thesis to undertake a comparative international diaspora history in the sense that Akenson describes, it is noted here as a potential subject for others to pursue.

Insofar as historians have referred to British diaspora and immigration, the assumption is that such immigration has acted, or at some former time acted, to "reinforce" the country's British character. H.V. Nelles has written of the post-1945 period: "There remained a good deal of sentimental attachment to things British—especially royalty—among recent British immigrants and older English-speaking Canadians," and that these were key sources of "British influence" that began to fade in the 1960s.[43] On Nelles' account, recent immigrants and elderly monarchists were the chief remnants of Britishness. As immigration patterns changed in the late 20th century,

---

[42] Donald H. Akenson, "The Historiography of English-Speaking Canada and the Concept of Diaspora: A Sceptical Appreciation," *Canadian Historical Review* 76, 3 (1995), 377-409.
[43] Nelles, 210-11.

then, Canadians outgrew the British connection. This made it easier to account for lingering Britishness as a mark of *immaturity*, or at best the temporary result of the disproportionate influx of British immigrants, their impact sustained artificially by the family ties of first-generation arrivals.

A "British connection" rooted in birth and family ties posed few problems, for example, for nationalist historians of the Canadian Expeditionary Force of 1914-18. Enthusiasm for enlistment could be explained by the birth of so many of the volunteers in the United Kingdom, whether "gentlemen emigrants" or recruits from "factory, mill, and workshop."[44] The Britishness of Canadians born in Britain or with recent British family ties, as in Serge Durflinger's interpretation of "loyalism" in Verdun, Quebec, seemed unproblematic.[45] Like them, the poet Earle Birney's father enlisted in Banff in 1915 to uphold "the old Traditions of True Britishness" and Birney's grandfather, in turn, had been born in England and fought in the Crimean War.[46] Even many of the Canadian-born "bucks" in the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry regiment, Sandra Gwyn wrote, thought of themselves *not* as Canadians or even as Colonials, but as "Overseas Englishmen."[47] In this way, the Britishness of British-born recruits could be pigeon-holed as a *foreign* allegiance, while the Britishness of Canadian-born recruits was categorized as a quaint peculiarity of the time, or a holdover from the past. They were not really Canadians. "Their ethnic loyalties remained [sic] British," Mary Vipond wrote, and

---

[44] Jonathan Vance, *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning, and the First World War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997), 161.
[45] Serge Durflinger, "Owing allegiance: the British community in Verdun, Quebec during the Second World War," *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXXVI, 1 (2004), 9.
[46] Elspeth Cameron, *Earle Birney: A Life* (Toronto: Viking, 1994), 1, 12.
[47] Sandra Gwyn, *Tapestry of War* (Toronto: HarperCollins, 1992), 74.

"most of them still [sic] thought of Canada as British in its values and principles."[48] The implication of the terms "remained" and "still" was that these attitudes fell short of being genuinely Canadian and that there was a kind of normative linear progression from British to Canadian at work. "The ethnic identification, the race and blood of many English-speaking Canadians was in fact British," Vipond added.[49] Here again was the assumption that Britishness was something *pre*-Canadian rather than an overlapping spectrum of multiple identities.

The belief that British immigrants necessarily reinforced old-style Britishness was also open to doubt. Some British-born immigrants could be found in the forefront of Canadianization. These included such Englishmen of regional and relatively humble origins as General Charles Foulkes, Chairman of the Canadian Chiefs of Staff in the 1960s. Born in Stockton-on-Tees, North Yorkshire, and educated in London, Ontario, Foulkes was an early advocate of "Canadianizing" the armed forces by means, for example, of imposing "one uniform" on the army, navy, and air force so that, as he put it, they would no longer be "a miniature model of the old British forces."[50] Foulkes provides a fine example of the complexity of Britishness in Canada: a Yorkshire-born English immigrant and self-professed Canadian nationalist who chose to define Britishness as "other," and who constructed his idea of Canadianness by insisting that overtly British traditions be downplayed. Andrew Thompson, the official Liberal liaison with non-British ethnic groups in Ontario and leader of Ontario's Liberal Party in the mid-1960s, was a native of Belfast, educated at Monkton Combe School in England and Oakwood

[48] Mary Vipond, "National Consciousness in English-Speaking Canada in the 1920s: Seven Studies," (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1974), 2-3.
[49] Ibid., 19.
[50] Charles Foulkes, draft article for *Star Weekly* magazine, 14 October 1961, typescript in Hellyer papers, Foulkes file, Vol. 72.

Collegiate in Toronto before entering the University of Toronto, and served in the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve (RCNVR) from 1943 to 1946 (in contrast to the Canadian-born A.R.M. Lower, who served not in the Canadian naval reserve but in Britain's Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve). With this decidedly British background, Thompson played a significant role in the confrontation with Britishness in the mid-1960s, having dedicated his political talents to the courtship and integration of non-British, non-French ethnic groups in a "Canadianized" understanding of Canada since the 1950s (see Chapter 6).

Another immigrant from Britain, Ernest S. Watkins, a biographer of R.B. Bennett, illustrates how British immigrants participated in the "othering" of certain forms of Britishness in the crisis of the 1960s—in particular the rejection of the class system and of class differences. Born in Liverpool and educated at the Liverpool Institute and Liverpool University, Watkins served in the Royal Artillery during the Second World War (having joined the reserve Territorial Army in 1938), then as a lawyer and journalist in London before emigrating to Canada in the 1950s. He was called to the Alberta bar in 1955, elected to the Alberta Legislature as a Progressive Conservative in 1957, and named Queen's Counsel (QC) in 1964. Writing in 1963, the year Pearson became prime minister, Watkins said his "compelling motive" for emigrating from the U.K. was his "distaste for what one was leaving behind," an "abiding hostility towards those who make up what is now known as the Establishment in Britain," and an "escape from their arrogance."[51] Watkins, like Foulkes and Thompson, shows the complexity of Britishness in Canada, even in the first generation. On the one hand British immigrants are thought to

[51] Ernest Watkins, *R.B. Bennett: A Biography* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1963), 12, 140.

have *reinforced* old-school British influences, such as when the Timothy Eaton Co. hired English immigrants to work in customer service because they brought, or so it was believed, a "touch of class."[52] On the other hand, it would seem that some British immigrants also added to the development of a "Canadian" nationalism that sought to distance Canada from "British" characteristics—with some hostility toward the British or English "other" (in this instance, the upper-class element).

However, this Canadianism was not necessarily un-British or anti-British, but merely anti-*Establishment*—and as such was shared by many other Britishers throughout the Commonwealth. There was the possibility of being both English or British by birth and at the same time sceptical of, even hostile towards, England and of British society and British values. As George Orwell wrote of English intellectuals, "In left-wing circles it is always felt that there is something slightly disgraceful in being an Englishman and that it is a duty to snigger at every English institution, from horse racing to suet puddings. … All through the critical years [i.e., the 1920s and 1930s] many left-wingers were chipping away at English morale, trying to spread an outlook that was sometimes squashily pacifist, sometimes violently pro-Russian, but always anti-British."[53] It was during these decades that Canadians were most directly exposed to British intellectual influences while studying at Oxford. Thus, when Canadians adopted such attitudes, they were not necessarily assuming anti-British or un-British positions.

Other British-born immigrants influenced the Canadian labour movement. F.H. Underhill noted that all of the founders of the League for Social Reconstruction in

---

[52] William Stephenson, *The Store That Timothy Built* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1969), 63.
[53] George Orwell, *The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1941), 48.

Canada were either English-born, or Canadians who had studied at Oxford.[54] Gad Horowitz made a similar observation of the "primarily British" origin of both the "personnel and the ideology of the Canadian labour and socialist movements."[55] The L.S.R. was "a Canadian version of the British Fabian Society," wrote Margaret Prang,[56] and the *Canadian Forum* was its answer to the *New Statesman*. The Britishness of the Canadian Left encompassed such figures as the Scottish-born Communist Party activist James Bryson McLachlan, and such phenomena as the "British enclave" in Sydney Mines (and not only of the British-born "Sons of the British Isles" but of the local Britishness of the long-established, and "reconstructed," ethnicity of native Cape Bretoners[57]). There were also Robert Drummond, the Scottish-born president of the Provincial Workingman's Association in Nova Scotia; Daniel O'Donoghue, the "father of the Canadian labour movement," born at Tralee, Eire, in 1844; and Arthur J. Turner, a Norwich-born coppersmith and Vancouver MLA for the CCF from 1941-66. This is not to discount the presence of American unions and leaders, but institutional linkages to "Britishness" included the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, a British union with locals in Hamilton, Toronto, and Brantford during the 1850s; and the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, with branches in Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston, and St. Catharines. In more recent times, Jack Munro was born in Lethbridge to Scots immigrant parents; Bob White was born in Ulster (Northern Ireland).[58]

---

[54] Frank Underhill, *In Search of Canadian Liberalism* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1960), xii.

[55] Gad Horowitz, *Canadian Labour in Politics* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968), 24.

[56] Margaret Prang, "F.H.U. of the *Canadian Forum*," in Norman Penlington, ed., *On Canada: Essays in honour of Frank H. Underhill* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), 19.

[57] Cf. McKay, *Quest of the Folk*, op. cit.

[58] Turner's papers are in the UBC Archives; see also David Frank, *J.B. McLachlan: a biography* (Toronto: Lorimer, 1999), 48; Jack Williams, *The Story of Unions in Canada* (Toronto: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1975), 10; Charles Lipton, *The Trade Union Movement of Canada 1827-1959* (Toronto: NC Press, 1973), 40; Jack

Labour historians have skirted the complex issue of ethnicity in the Canadian labour movement. Craig Heron attributed the shaping of Canadian labour activism at least in part to British influences.[59] British-born workers accounted for only 20 percent of Vancouver's population in 1892, but as much as 50 percent of the membership of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council. However, Mark Leier has defined British ethnicity (for convenience, he explains) as *birth* in the United Kingdom or Ireland as opposed to birth in Canada, suggesting that membership in the "labour aristocracy" had less to do with ethnicity—defined in this case as "British-born" as opposed to "Canadian-born"—than with ideology.[60] This leaves to ethnic historians the task of determining what elements constituted "British" ethnicity among labourers and their representatives.

After all, were not the majority of *Canadian*-born members of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council also probably "British" in ethnicity, meaning that they were of British stock and exhibited British working-class characteristics (including cloth caps) and assumptions? Interestingly, Leier points out that of five English, two Scots, and one Irish council president between 1889 and 1909, not all "would appreciate being labelled 'British.'" This is only one of many complex ethnic questions raised by "place of birth, upbringing, work experience, or initial union activity" abroad. Nor has anyone attempted to assess what proportion of the Canadian-born council presidents, in contrast to the Irish, would actually have been *comfortable* with the label "British." Very likely all of them could be described as having working-class English, Scots, or Irish *ethnicity*.

Munro, *Union Jack: Labour Leader Jack Munro* (Toronto: HarperCollins, 1989), 19; Bob White, *Hard Bargains: My Life on the Line* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1987), 19.

[59] Craig Heron, "Labourism and the Canadian Working Class," *Labour/Travail* 13 (Spring 1984), 45-77.

[60] Mark Leier, "Ethnicity, Urbanism, and the Labour Aristocracy: Rethinking Vancouver Trade Unionism, 1889-1909," *Canadian Historical Review*, LXXIV, 4, 1993, 513-14. Cf. idem, *Red flags and Red Tape* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 48-50.

Interestingly, by concluding that ethnicity does not account for differences in ideology among Vancouver's labour aristocracy, Leier implies (without actually stating) that British and Canadian ethnicity, in the Vancouver of that time, were virtually one and the same thing.

The same difficulty applies to categorizing and breaking down the Britishness (or Englishness) of second- and third-generation Canadians of English (or other British) descent; the generations of Canadians born in Canada. Englishness is often defined as a combination of Anglo-Saxon ethnic origins and ancestry in England and, at the same time, "a set of universal political and legal values" such as responsible government, liberty, property, jury trial, etc. in the British-Atlantic world – the "rights and liberties of Englishmen" that have been claimed by Protestant Irish, Scots, colonial Americans, and other white settlers who have described themselves in an ethnic or non-ethnic sense as "English"[61] or at least English-*speaking*. In Canada, the very term "English Canadian" or "English-speaking" refers to use of the English language—a phenomenon that has transcended ethnic boundaries the world over. But in Canada it also carries connotations of the English political, legal, and to a lesser extent Protestant religious tradition in this country, which also appears to have transcended ethnic boundaries in the sense that adherents of such traditions could be born in Hong Kong, Singapore, Argentina, or any part of the world where English ideas have been transposed. Such assumptions, beliefs, and ideals were somehow bound up, then, with Anglo-Canadian ethnicity, in how English Canadians defined themselves vis-à-vis others who lacked, or were perceived as lacking, the true "British" traditions of liberty, democracy, and fair play.

[61] Colin Kidd, "Ethnicity in the British Atlantic World, 1688-1830," in Kathleen Wilson, ed., *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 260-77.

To what extent can "Britishness" be classified as a separate Canadian ethnicity or bundle of ethicities? This is somewhat difficult if one relies on definitions of ethnic identity as "both a matter of self-identification and of taxonomies developed by the host society," as Akenson has said. The problem with the latter is that in this case, the Anglo-Canadians (in the "Wasp" sense) have usually been understood as the core *ethnie* or at least a substantial part of the *host* society, not as a minority group. In reality they should probably be seen as *both* an influential bloc within the host society *and* a constitutive ethnic group at the same time. However, if we take Wsevolod W. Isajiw's definition of ethnicity as "an involuntary group of people who share the same culture or descendants of such people who identify themselves and/or are identified by others as belonging to the same involuntary group,"[62] then this could be applied more readily to the Anglo-Canadians. Although they might not always have seen it themselves, it was possible for others—French Canadians and recent immigrants—to identify the appearance, behaviour, and manners of "les Brits" even if they had been in Canada for generations. It might be said that flying Hurricane fighter planes in the Battle of Britain (as did Hartland Molson, a fifth-generation Canadian, in 1940, for example) is a "voluntary" and quite conscious identification with Britain by a Canadian of mostly British stock (though non-British Canadians also took part).[63] But Molson's Britishness was not limited to service overseas, but coloured his life and culture as an Anglo-Canadian. A glimpse of the "ethnicity" of such men can be seen in Charles Ritchie's description of Dean Acheson, the half-Canadian U.S. Secretary of State who spent part of his youth in Canada, as being "in

[62] Wsevolod W. Isajiw, "Definitions of Ethnicity," *Ethnicity*, I (1974), 111-124.
[63] Karen Molson, *Hartland de Montarville Molson: Man of Honour* (Richmond Hill. Ont.: Firefly Books, 2006).

style, in appearance, even in his London-looking clothes … the nearest of all Americans to an upper-class Englishman or Anglo-Canadian."[64]

Clothes raise an interesting point. If traditional costumes and rituals help to define Ukrainian Canadian ethnicity, should not the same be said of Wasp ethnicity? In 1964 Vincent Massey, at 77 the venerable manor lord of "Batterwood House, Nr. Port Hope," having retired as Governor General and vacated Rideau Hall five years earlier, made earnest arrangements to have his favourite bowler hat repaired. Some of the fur had been damaged, and Massey had been unable to find a Toronto hatter with the necessary skill. Resourcefully, Massey got his secretary to ship the hat by surface mail to Lock & Company of St. James Street, London. It was "very comfortable," he explained. Unfortunately, a few weeks later, Massey was told that repair was impossible. The forlorn coke hat was put back in its box and made a stately return journey to Canada by sea.[65] Massey's appeal to a London hatter typified his lifelong devotion to English style, a sartorial intersection of one prominent Canadian's affections and affectations, anglophilia, mannerisms, class consciousness, and (in a most literal way) continuing dependency on the mother country, that coloured his nationalism. Having been raised in the family seat on Jarvis Street in Toronto, attended St. Andrew's School, made the pilgrimage to Oxford University, donned a uniform in service of King and Empire, and served as High Commissioner in London, Massey cherished his associations with members of the British aristocracy,[66] and emulated its *noblesse oblige* in the Canadian setting. In 1964, he continued to place orders for "one dozen stiff white linen collars"

---

[64] Ritchie Diary, 22 February 1963, in *Storm Signals*, 40.
[65] Vincent Massey Papers, University of Toronto Archives, Massey-Lock & Co. correspondence, 11 March to 1 June 1964, Box 357, File 14, "Clothes."
[66] Cf. Massey correspondence with Lord and Lady Clark (i.e., the former Sir Kenneth Clark, the art critic), and his visits to Saltwood Castle, Kent, among other examples in ibid., Correspondence files.

from Everitt & Macklin, Ltd., shirtmakers and hosiers, of Hanover Square, London.[67] Lester Pearson, another Ontario-Canadian with a Methodist background who served in the Great War and studied at Oxford, once explained to reporters that he preferred bow ties to the more common long cravat style tie because the latter tended to "dangle around." Ironically, the photograph accompanying the report shows Pearson wearing a waistcoat—the traditional gentleman's sartorial solution to the dangling tie.[68] The preoccupation with what may be seen as the equivalent of "national costume"—perhaps an analogue for folk costumes of "other" ethnic groups—has been neglected as a mark of Anglo-Canadian ethnicity.

Clothes were merely one avenue of Anglo-Canadian association with Britishness, which included numerous interests, hobbies, affectations, and customs. A.R.M. Lower identified "a few well-defined fields" of English influence, including "our system of laws and government, the etiquette of the 'best circles,' the clothes of men who pay much attention to clothes, the amusements of the few, a select list of reading—indulged in by another 'few'—and the classics of English literature come from Great Britain."[69] Esmond Butler was born in Wawanesa, Manitoba, raised in an Anglican parsonage in Weston, Ontario, and educated at Weston Collegiate and the Universities of Toronto and Geneva. He served in the Royal Canadian Navy in the Second World War and worked as a journalist and an information officer with the Canadian government until 1957, when he was appointed to the staff of Buckingham Palace. He was the first Canadian and the first "colonial" to receive such an appointment. In news coverage of his departure for

[67] Massey "Clothes" file, loc. cit.
[68] *New York Post*, 24 November 1947.
[69] A.R.M. Lower, "National Policy…Revised Version," *Manitoba Arts Review* 3 (Spring 1943), rpt. in Wolf H. Heick, ed., *History and Myth: Arthur Lower and the Making of Canadian Nationalism* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1975), 168.

England, the “pipe-smoking,” “jaunty” anglophile remarked to English reporters: “I’m a bird man and a trout man. I’ll put both my shotgun and my rod in.”[70] This may be interpreted on many levels: as an expression of genuine love for the outdoors; or of a desire to impress elements of the society into which he was entering, perhaps including a need to associate his masculinity with the preferred pastimes of those with whom he would rub shoulders; the affected Englishness of a small-town Ontarian son of the manse and therefore something of a phoney put-on for the benefit of reporters; or even a boast designed to shore up his self-confidence at the outset of a position with daunting responsibilities and social expectations—or a combination of all of these possibilities. Less exhibitionist, perhaps, was Graham Spry’s consciousness that his ancestors, like his South African-born and London School of Economics and Cambridge-educated wife Irene’s, had served in various armed forces and governments in “India, Canada, Australia, South Africa, Italy, Egypt, Nigeria, Aden, West Africa, Hong Kong.” It was a *tour d’horizon* of the wider British world of which even the staunch Canadian nationalist couple was proud to be a part.[71] Few would question the Sprys’ commitment to Canada, and yet their personal identity or “ethnicity” stemmed from a wider Britishness and drew a kind of inspiration from it. Butler, on his return from England, served for 26 years as secretary to a succession of governors-general in Ottawa. Far from being associated with snobbery or elitism, however, Butler’s “unstuffy” Canadian style was said, by some, to be “ideally suited to help the office [of Governor General] adapt to the more democratic style that Canadians expected from it.”[72]

---

[70] London *News Chronicle*, 14 March 1958.
[71] Notation in ink, 20 January 1977, draft memoirs, Graham Spry Papers, LAC, Vol. 84.
[72] David Twiston Davies, *Canada From Afar: The* Daily Telegraph *Book of Canadian Obituaries* (Toronto: Dundurn, 1996), 245-6. Butler was replaced when the modernizing—but rigid—approach of Jeanne Sauvé,

Britishness, then, included surface characteristics and eccentricities as well as underlying loyalties, associations, and preoccupations. What Akenson has said of the Irish could equally be applied to the Anglo-Canadians of British descent. "For at least two or three generations," Akenson writes, ethnic background "was a significant determinant of the behaviour of most people of Irish descent. … even after that, it remained … as *a perduring stream, subterranean, but still partially determining personal behaviour*, and this long after the individuals in question have ceased to think of themselves as Irish" (emphasis added).[73] The same could be said of Canadians of British, and particularly of English, ethnic background, many of whom ceased at some point to identify themselves to census-takers as English or British but as ethnically "Canadian."[74] (This number rose from 0.5 percent in 1986 to 30 percent in 1996—in part because the Census now allowed for the self-identification of Canadian "ethnicity.") Their identity has been shaped, in ways that are difficult to classify, by the "perduring stream" of their ethnicity and by "subterranean" influences on their behaviour as Canadians within a larger "cultural and institutional web" of identities. Some have suggested that the adoption of "Canadian" ethnicity by those of British origin repesents a new assertion of Anglo-conformity over other ethnic groups.[75]

Governor General from 1984 to 1990, proved incompatible with his "unstuffy" traditionalism. Still, which of these irreconcilable approaches to the office—Butler's or Sauvé's—represented stuffiness, and whose was the more inflexible personality? It is arguable, on the evidence, that Butler's old-school Canadian Britishness was more easy-going than Sauvé's "Canadian," but more formal, style.

[73] Akenson, *Irish in Ontario*, xx-xxi

[74] Madeleine A. Kalbach and Warren E. Kalbach, "Becoming Canadian: Problems of an Emerging Identity," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* XXXI, 2, 1999, 1-16; Cf. M. Boyd, "'Canadian, Eh?" Ethnic Origins Shifts in the Canadian Census," Research Paper No. 10, Ethnic Studies and Population Research Lab. (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1998).

[75] Leo Dreidger, *Multi-Ethnic Canada: Identities and Realities* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1996), 31.

Certain multi-generational ethnic Anglo-Canadians, like Brooke Claxton or O.D. Skelton, developed a sense of partial alienation, ambivalence, and otherness with respect to some of their British (or English) counterparts. The "othering" of British or English people *by* Anglo-Canadians can be seen in Arthur Irwin's struggle against what he called "Englishism," an excessive preference among the Canadian-born for things that they regarded as authentically "English." Born in Ayr, Ontario, in 1898, the son of a Methodist minister, Irwin served in the Great War, became a journalist, editing *Maclean's* from 1945-50. After a stint running the National Film Board, Irwin served as Canadian High Commissioner to Australia, Brazil, Mexico, and Guatemala, and in 1964 became publisher of the *Victoria Daily Times*. Irwin wrote in 1949 of his frustration that many of his fellow Anglo-Canadians did not take sufficient pride in Canada, "a great country in the making," and in being Canadian "intuitively, intellectually, and every other way. I fought *Englishism* for 15 years," he wrote (emphasis added), and while working at a magazine, found more support for his nationalism from an English-born editor than from a subsequent Canadian editor who was more anglophile than his English-born predecessor.[76] Irwin represents a certain alienation from Englishness, a sense of "otherness" as a Canadian that, as we shall see in the chapters that follow, was a hallmark of the crisis of Britishness.

This point deserves to be emphasized because it was a characteristic of ethnically British Canadians, of small-town Ontario Protestants like Arthur Irwin. By contrast, one can find prominent ethnically half-French Canadians who reflected no such alienation. Georges P. Vanier, a French Canadian of seven generations (but whose mother had been

[76] David Clark MacKenzie, *Arthur Irwin: A Biography* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 216-17.

born in Cork, Ireland) modelled his persona in many respects on the British military officer ideal. Maurice Pope, the general, diplomat, and son of Sir John A. Macdonald's private secretary Sir Joseph Pope, had a French-Canadian mother. Both were Roman Catholics and might be expected to have felt some distance from Protestant-dominated Anglo-Canadianism and from the British elites among whom they made their career. In fact, they represented a unique form of Canadian hybridity: the half-French Canadian who suffered no inner conflicts about his own "British" identity or relationships with British people. These examples of Britishness as a multiple identity will be more closely considered in Chapter 3.

Anglo-Canadian ethnicity and identity-formation did not necessarily entail alienation or otherness. H.R. MacMillan was born in Newmarket, Ontario, in 1885, raised in the typical "British" atmosphere of the time, educated at Yale University, and at the age of 27 became chief forester of British Columbia. He was best-known later in life as director of the forestry giant, MacMillan-Bloedel, Ltd. By the time of the Great War, the Yale alumnus, who claimed Scottish and United Empire Loyalist ancestry, had supervised B.C.'s forests for three years and from 1915 served as Timber Trade Commissioner in the Department of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa.[77]

MacMillan's previously untapped diaries from his 1916 survey of India's timber trade for the Dominion government reads like a classic, unapologetic account of the culture and assumptions of the British Raj. For some of this experience MacMillan was prepared by his upbringing in Victorian and Edwardian Ontario. Yet MacMillan was so immersed in a British world or British "mind" that we find him remarking without irony on the native-free enclave of the Royal Bombay Yacht Club; hiring a "Babu" to type his

[77] *The Canadian Who's Who, 1967-1969*, 692.

report on East Africa; expelling a “native” from a first-class train carriage; meeting an “educated native gentleman in English sporting clothes” at Jogighopa on the Brahmaputra; discussing Shakespeare with “all the babus in [Goal] village;” reading at leisure *England*, *The English* (“a mighty good book”); shooting partridge, lynx, Brahmini ducks, and jungle fowl; revelling in sightings of Indian “bison” and tiger tracks, and happening upon a group of “bushmen, wild Garos [who] threw down [their] packs and bolted into the woods—thinking we were spirits [riding] on elephant[s].” For MacMillan, this unabashed Britishness seems to have sat comfortably with his identity as a U.S.-educated Anglo-Canadian, and his tour of Africa, India, and Australia provided “great inspiration” for his dream of a forestry school for his adopted province of British Columbia comparable to that of India.[78] His Canadianism was also hostile to petty “Colonial” arrogance, as he saw it, disparaging the boastfulness of Australian nationalists in 1916: “Interesting [to] see how Australian newspapers [are] full of [Australian prime minister] Hughes running [the] Empire and Anzacs cleaning up [the] war. It is nauseating, narrow-minded and will lead to even more over-conceit.”[79] When an English officer in India expressed “contempt for Americans” and assumed that MacMillan “was one,” the young Canadian took it in stride and bore no grudge—a resilience toward English snobbery that not every Anglo-Canadian could manifest.[80]

This was an old-school Canadianism comfortable with the larger British identity of which many Anglo-Canadians felt themselves to be a part, an amalgam of Britishness

[78] *Diary*, January 3 to 29, 1916, H.R. MacMillan Papers, University of British Columbia Archives, Box 113, File 22. In his undated application to have his name changed from “McMillan” to “*Mac*Millan,” he gives his birthplace as Whitchurch Township, York City, Ontario, but he is claimed virtually as a native son by the town of Chemainus, B.C.
[79] MacMillan Diary, 26 June 1916, loc. cit.
[80] Ibid.,17 February 1916.

and Americanism, at ease with membership in a larger imperial scheme and a larger world on both sides of the Atlantic in which Canadians were bound up. MacMillan, one interviewer reported, was as well-known in London society as in Vancouver.[81] Years later, his response to the Pearsonian confrontation with Britishness is interesting. He was one of the millions of Canadians in the 1960s who did not wish to do away with British symbolism, and who strongly opposed the creation of a national flag without the Union Jack included in the design. Not surprisingly, MacMillan "regretted" and "viewed with sadness and perhaps with dismay the liquidation of the British Empire," lamenting the replacement of British by American world influence.[82] In 1964, he advised Pearson against any move "to supersede the Canadian Ensign as the flag of Canada or to remove the Union Jack therefrom"[83] and, after Pearson ignored this advice, continued to fly the old flag from his yacht outside Canadian waters.[84]

Thus, while MacMillan's ethnicity on the level of *race* was Scottish and Anglo-American, other aspects of his identity and ethnicity as an Anglo-Canadian were really an accumulation of affections, assumptions, and characteristics steeped in the wider British tradition. Moreover, this pattern of Britishness—some of which was overt and some of it a function of unspoken assumptions and habits of thought and behaviour—he by no means defined as foreign or "other." It was a Britishness that was seen by those who shared it as something that was, at the same time, fully and distinctly Canadian. For

[81] Interview with Stevens, loc. cit.
[82] Conversation with G.R. Stevens, 15 September 1966. Notes for G.R. Stevens" draft biography (unpublished), MacMillan Papers, Box 112, File 3, typescript, 124-5, 192.
[83] MacMillan to Pearson, 6 April 1964, loc. cit. Box 33, File 23.
[84] Ken Drushka, *HR: A Biography of H.R. MacMillan* (Madeira Park, B.C.: Harbour Publishing, 1995), 364.

MacMillan, as for many others, the Red Ensign was an expression not of some foreign allegience, but of their *Canadianism*.

Such was the multi-generational Anglo-Canadian of British origins—the Canadianism of mid-20th century figures like MacMillan who inhabited a transatlantic culture. Hartland Molson, by the mid-1960s a non-party-affiliated senator, a supporter of Lester B. Pearson, and a patriot, also in many ways embodied the Britishness of the multi-generational Canadian-born, English-speaking Canadian. Thoroughly Canadian in his thought and character, among many preoccupations including the family brewery, Molson was joint president of the City of Montreal Committee for the Royal Visit of 1951 and of the associated Banquet Committee.[85] His second wife Magda (née Posner) in the 1970s continued to correspond with Princess Alexandra and Princess Alice Mary, the wife of the former Governor General, the Duke of Connaught. In part this was made possible by class, wealth, and connections—but it was also a function of the multiple identities that made up the Molsons' multi-generational British-Canadian ethnic amalgam.

Such men were frequently the product of private schools dedicated to the formation of Anglo-Canadian gentlemen. In their structure, purpose, methods, and ethos they were among the most powerful manifestations of Britishness (or Englishness) in the Canadian context, modelled as they were on England's public schools.[86] As such this might be classed by cultural historians as colonial fantasy and "mimicry." On the other hand, they had developed their own traditions organically in a North American context. Did the Britishness of these Anglo-Canadians depend exclusively on *external* sources of

[85] Hartland Molson Papers, LAC, Vol. 554.
[86] Jean Barman, *Growing Up British in British Columbia* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1984).

British meaning? Overseas connections played a part, but they do not explain everything. Major-General A. Bruce Matthews, CBE, DSO, was born in Ottawa in 1909, the son of Albert E. Matthews, a stockbroker who served as lieutenant-governor of Ontario from 1939 to 1946. The young Matthews attended Upper Canada College and the University of Geneva, served in the Canadian Army during Second World War, and afterwards became a Toronto insurance executive and member of clubs including the Granite, York, and Mount Royal. He was described in a British newspaper obituary as "the *archetypal English Canadian*, with his ramrod-straight back and impeccable dress" (emphasis added), and "worked in a room containing signed photographs of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth, silver cigarette boxes and silk lampshades."[87] In 1967 some thought of him as a successor to Georges Vanier in the post of Governor General, but Matthews, who would have been the second army general in a row, was passed over due to his recent presidency of the National Liberal Federation of Canada, a post that had also been occupied from 1932-35 by a previous Governor General, Vincent Massey (1952-59).

To the extent that Britishness was a transatlantic phenomenon, the circuits of Anglo-Canadianism ran two ways, and there were also the Canadians who attended schools or universities in Britain. Those who travelled "from the periphery to the centre," as Cecilia Morgan has written of Canadian Aboriginals who toured England, had the opportunity to learn more about *differences* and otherness than those shaped only by British-derived institutions and assumptions in Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia, or Nova Scotia. At Charterhouse, the elite English private school, the young Hartland Molson "was ragged for his gravelly Canadian accent" (though it is not clear how "gravelly" his adolescent voice could have been), and for "being the son of a brewer" (a

[87] Davies, 148.

middle-class commercial occupation and therefore not truly upper class), according to one obituary.[88] Molson's contemporaries who went to Oxford—Pearson and his associates—discovered a similar sense of otherness in being Canadian that tinged their continuing Britishness, as we shall see in Chapter 5. The mid-Atlantic, multi-generational Canadianism of such men deserves closer study. They were thoroughly Canadian, conscious that British people were "other" and yet kindred at the same time: British like themselves but not the same.

A Massey, Molson, MacMillan, or Matthews was relatively comfortable with "elite" or upper-class Britishness. To a certain extent this was a function of class, wealth, and membership in the Anglo-Canadian elite which in turn gave them some advantage in coping with their British counterparts—as well as a matter of ethicity and identity. By contrast, other Canadians of British descent recoiled from contact with certain manifestations of Britishness. It is here that we find another set of nuances and characteristics among Anglo-Canadians of British stock discovering and emphasizing the *otherness* of British people. O.D. Skelton, for example, described meeting Burgon Bickersteth at Kingsmere in 1927 and finding the Englishman "sympathetic" despite what he called "some traces of Oxford superiority complex." Personal irritation got the better of Skelton, who decided that Bickersteth had better remain at Hart House rather than come to External Affairs to work in proximity with himself: "Perhaps [I am] somewhat prejudiced by his volubility and his Englishness," Skelton, a quieter man, admitted.[89] For his part, Bickersteth said of Skelton: "I always knew that Skelton had a

[88] Obituary, *Daily Telegraph,* 1 October 2002.
[89] Skelton Diary, June 13, 1927. O.D. Skelton Papers, LAC.

chip on his shoulder about England as indeed did his son [Alex]."[90] This was a type of Canadianism, perhaps a setting up of self-defined ethnic boundaries, in contrast to the Britisher or Englishman-as-other.

Arthur Eustace Morgan, an Englishman, served as Principal of McGill University from 1935-37 before returning to England to serve in the Ministry of Labour during the Second World War. At McGill, according to Eugene Forsey's memoirs, Morgan "succeeded in antagonizing everyone … Englishmen, Scots, Americans, Canadians." A colleague, Robert George, also an Englishman, explained the source of this universal antagonism: "All Englishmen know that we are superior to everyone else in the world. But some of us have enough sense to keep it under our hats. Morgan hadn't." Forsey added that Morgan's behaviour in England was completely different from his behaviour in Canada:

> The Englishman abroad … is the antithesis of the Englishman at home. This perhaps accounts for the fact that any Canadian of Scots or Irish ancestry can say proudly, "I'm Scotch", or "I'm Irish", and not an eyebrow is lifted. But woe betide the Canadian of English ancestry who says "I'm English". I did it once, proclaiming myself "solidily and stolidly English, alike by ancestry and cast of

[90] Bickersteth to Massey, 27 November 1963, Massey Papers, UTA, Box 401, file 14. The Skeltons might have been surprised to find Bickersteth, in the flag debate of 1964, on Pearson's side, denouncing the debate as a "bore" and Diefenbaker as a "boor" and "saboteur." (6 December 1964, loc. cit.) This was another instance when being an Englishman did not necessarily imply support for Canada's "British" tradition as represented by the Red Ensign. On the contrary, the idea of a distinctive Canadian flag appealed to Englishmen, as it did to many Canadians of British extraction like Pearson himself.

mind", and got away with it, but I think only because it was in the context of the "two nations", "French" and "English".[91]

Similar reservations about Englishness were expressed by Arthur Lower, whose Great War service in the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, where he felt a stranger,[92] made him "more Canadian." He recoiled at the class system as he witnessed it serving alongside Englishmen.[93] But what has not been explained is why, as late as 1969, Lower was still conscious of a lifelong "inability to make friends among the Eng. of the [upper] classes. Partly, perhaps largely, my own fault—too standoffish (*what I get from being English myself*)"—a remarkable self-diagnosis of a kind of "anglophobic anglophilia" (emphasis added).[94]

It seems that many Anglo-Canadians, even the very accomplished, became conscious of a Britishness in themselves that, at the same time, was distinctive from the Britishness found in the United Kingdom. They developed an aversion to certain characteristics among Englishmen in particular. And yet this was not anti-Britishness, just as Mackenzie King's aversion was not to England *per se* but to Tory imperialists. Such cases present us with an Anglo-Canadian experience of Britishness and otherness at the same time, defined in contrast to a certain type of Englishness and yet, in a complex manner, in many ways still characteristically and psychologically "English"—the Englishman-as-other as distinguished from the Anglo-Canadian self.

---

[91] Eugene Forsey, *A Life on the Fringe: The Memoirs of Eugene Forsey* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990), 28.
[92] Interview with A.R.M. Lower in Ramsay Cook, ed. *The Craft of History* (Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1973), 10.
[93] R.G. Moyles and Doug Owram, *Imperial Dreams and Colonial Realities: British Views of Canada, 1880-1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 240; Vipond, 139. Cf. A.R.M. Lower, *My First Seventy-five Years* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967), 94, 108, 120, 139.
[94] "Jottings 1969" (18/9/69), A.R.M. Lower Papers, Queen's University Archives, Box 57.

Part of this self-distancing stemmed from a definition of that which was "aristocratic" or upper class as "other." Lower's hostility to the class system was not limited to what he had seen in the United Kingdom. It can also be discerned in his dismissal of the Anglo-Montreal elite, and "the English of Quebec" generally, as "morally bankrupt," by which he meant that they were bereft of any "sense of national or any other purpose." In a breakdown that echoes André Siegfried's early attempts at an ethnic taxonomy of Anglo-Canadians, Lower wrote in 1966 that Anglo-Quebecers comprised various groups, including the "English … consisting in a residuum of Anglo-Saxons in the countryside and small towns," the English and non-English of various origins, Irish Catholics, Jews, and others: "All this conglomeration headed by a relatively small group of the 'tycoon' type." Many of these "English," he says, have "what might be called a 'Protestant hangover,' and a considerable number still holding to outmoded British Imperialist concepts. The 'Protestant hangover' provides no real faith or objective," Lower claimed. Essentially Anglo-Montreal had the character of a "magnified trading post" and its people were merely

> a broken remnant, opposed by a real *people* [the French Canadians], a people who know themselves to be a people, united by innumerable internal links with each other, and with a definite objective, to which dollar chasing is subordinate. The English consist of the dollar-chasers and their white collar employees, mainly. And w.c. employees are not good fighting men. Any group people who are willing just to

> evaporate in comfort, as it were, allowing stronger, humbler groups to take their place, are in my opinion, "morally bankrupt."[95]

Lower's association of members of an elite with a lack of vigour or higher purpose may simply be attributed to bias—perhaps a middle-class prejudice that speaks to his own origins in small-town Ontario and his alienating war experience among naval officers who, for Lower, represented the English elites. In fact, prominent and privileged Anglo-Montrealers did give their lives in war, such as Guy Melfort Drummond, killed at Ypres in 1915, and Percival Molson, killed at Avion Pas-de-Calais, in 1917.[96] Others contributed to nation-building not only by investing and "dollar-chasing," but through charitable activities and other forms of public service. Once again, Lower's attitude points to the complexity of Anglo-Canadian ethnicity and identity-consciousness. First, his own ethnic identity and sense of self were complicated by a somewhat skittish awareness of his own English roots. Secondly, his attempts to describe one segment of Anglo-Canadians (the Anglo-Quebecers) seems to have been influenced by class-motivated prejudice, as well as ethnicity, nationalist assumptions, and the complexity of his own Englishness.

Others made a point of distinguishing Britishness from Englishness. W.L. Morton wrote of his youth in Gladstone, Manitoba: "British we were, but English in the sense of southern English we never were ... Our Britishness … was not Englishness, but a local

[95] Ibid., Lower to A.M. Brockington of Huntington [sic], Quebec, 25 May 1966.
[96] N.M. Christie, ed., *Letters of Agar Adamson, 1914-1919* (Nepean: CEF Books, 1997), 294.

brew which we called Canadian."[97] Less conflicted was the unabashed Britishness (and determined *non*-Englishness) of Charles Ritchie's Nova Scotia forebears:

> They thought of themselves as belonging to the British Empire, than which they could imagine nothing more glorious. They did not think of themselves as English. Certainly everything British was Best, but they viewed the individual Englishman with a critical eye. If the English patronized the Colonials, the Colonials sat in judgement on the English. The Colonial was an ambivalent creature, half in one element, half in another; British, but not English, cantankerously loyal. These were Nova Scotia Colonials.[98]

Ritchie described his own identity as that of a perpetual "outsider-insider—one immersed from boyhood in English life but not an Englishman."[99] Elsewhere he reversed the phrase as "insider-outsider," one who "slipped in and out of the interstices of English life. Recognized in no social category … I was familiar without belonging."[100] (Still, he got along better than most, perhaps because he was "so bloody English," as he put it.) C.P. Stacey, also Oxford-trained, suggested that "many good Victorian colonials combined a deep theoretical regard for *England* with a strong distaste for many *Englishmen*."[101] Here again we see the definition of self both in contrast to and in comparison with the

[97] W.L. Morton, "An English Canadian Denounces Separatism," *The Globe* Magazine, 24 September 1964, 10.
[98] Charles Ritchie, *My Grandfather's House: Scenes of Childhood and Youth* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1987), 11.
[99] Idem, *The Siren Years: A Canadian Diplomat Abroad 1937-1945* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1974; Macmillan Paperbacks, 1987), Foreword, 7.
[100] Idem, "London 1967-1971," *Storm Signals: More Undiplomatic Diaries, 1962-1971* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1983; Macmillan Paperbacks, 1987), 87.
[101] C.P. Stacey, *Mackenzie King and the Atlantic Triangle* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1976), 19.

Englishman or native Britisher. This was not unique to Canada and could be found among American anglophiles, particularly the "East Coast upper crust" and among American Rhodes Scholars.[102]

Brooke Claxton was a second-generation Anglican whose Baptist father had entered the Church of England while studying in Lausanne (the latter had been sent to Geneva by Brooke's grandfather, T.J. Claxton, to avoid the fleshpots of Paris).[103] Brooke's father's loyalties were to St. John the Evangelist Church in Montreal and the Victoria Rifles militia regiment; he believed in the Church of England, its history "and everything that it stood for." Brooke himself was raised in the *haut-bourgeois* milieu of Westmount, Eton suits, Lower Canada College, McGill, and the Canadian Officer Training Corps. He served on the Western Front, and after the war belonged a circle of Oxford alumni (of which he was not one himself), was active in the Canadian Radio League (acting as its honorary counsel),[104] and later was honorary solicitor for Montreal's Elgar Choir[105]—all of which illustrate various aspects of Canadian Britishness. But the young Claxton seems to have felt deeply affronted when Sir John Simon, the English jurist and politician, arrived in Montreal to receive an honorary LL.D. from McGill without having prepared an acceptance speech. To Claxton's horror, Simon relied on a quick briefing from Claxton in the taxi on the way to the Convocation.[106] Perhaps this was a case of an aspiring Canadian anglophile discomfited by his own imperfect grasp of

---

[102] Priscilla Roberts, "Paul D. Cravath, the First World War, and the Anglophile Internationalist Tradition," *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 51, 2 (June 2005), 194-215.
[103] Claxton Memoirs (unpublished), Brooke Claxton Papers, LAC, typescript, 7-14.
[104] Graham Spry, "Public policy and private pressures: The Canadian Radio League 1930-36 and countervailing power," in Penlington, op. cit., 25.
[105] Claxton Memoirs, 72, 82, 277.
[106] Ibid., 233-4.

the aristocratic informality affected by Simon, whose roots were, like Claxton's, middle class.

Just as Morton isolated the categories "southern English" and "Englishness" from other types of Britishness, Claxton was discomfited by what might be called an English lack of attention to Canadian detail. This can be compared to the Australian Robert Menzies' self-distancing from "these English" that "implied a degree of separation from them, an ambiguity within his sense of his own Britishness."[107] Too many historians of Canadian identity and ethnicity have failed to distinguish among the constituent elements of the British ethnic core: English (including regional subcategories), Scottish, Irish, and so on. Consideration must also be given to how the Irish and Scots origins contributed to a distinct Canadian attitude toward a certain type of Britishness, understood as the English ascendancy in the British Isles. The most recent accounts of the "decline" of Britishness in Canada, including Deutschmann, Kauffman, and Igartua, omit mention of the fissures and differences within the British Canadian ethnic "core."

One of these fissures that divided Anglo-Celtic ethnic groups amongst themselves revolved around historic mutual enmities between Celtic and English, and thus from old ethnic feuds inherited from the Old World. However, Celtic-Canadian hostility toward Englishness and of some English Canadians' mimicry of Englishness, had deep roots in Canada that were not simply Scots or Irish in origin. Gentlemen emigrants, for example, from privileged English backgrounds tried to recreate the landed gentry ideal in the Canadian West, and many perished on the Western Front having rallied to the call of King and Empire. For their pains, these pioneers of a universal English elitism have gone

[107] Tsokhas, 145.

down in history as good-for-nothing remittance men.[108] The latter "is a type, inevitably the product of dozens of real-life anecdotes about the poor younger son of the rich 'governor' who struggles manfully in the colonies to uphold the honour of his name and the glory of Britannia's realm," writes Eric Thompson. "The young man is always naive and is the butt of practical jokes played on him by other settlers. But it is his insufferable attitude of superiority which earns him the scorn of his benighted inferiors."[109] Literature abounds in examples of Canadians' dislike of the "priggish young Englishman," as in W. H. P. Jarvis's *The Letters of a Remittance Man to His Mother:* "It's the long-suffering, patronizing smile that irritates one most in this country. It conveys such an air of fancied superiority on their part, and is particularly out of place when one considers the light in which we hold them; but the worst of it is, that our opinion of them does not seem to trouble them a bit."[110] The hero of English-born Bernard J. Farmer's *Go West, Young Man*, writes Thompson, "is also a fool."[111]

For later generations, the upper-class Englishman and the legacy of English maltreatment continued to animate debates in Canada. Some examples reflect a Celto-Hibernian element—and it may be that, in addition to Protestant influences, one of the most influential factors in the redefinition of Canadian Britishness was the rise to full participation in the "mainstream of Canadian life" of English-speaking Catholics.[112] Joseph O'Keefe, the M.P. for St. John's East, speaking as "a Roman Catholic of Irish descent" in support of Pearson's flag design in 1964 and against the inclusion of the

---

[108] Dunae, op. cit.

[109] Eric Thompson, "Prairie Mosaic: The Immigrant Novel in the Prairie West," *Studies in Canadian Literature*, 5.2 (1980), 236-59.

[110] W. H. P. Jarvis, *The Letters of a Remittance Man to His Mother* (Toronto: Musson, [1907]), 34.

[111] Bemard J. Farmer, *Go West, Young Man* (Toronto: Nelson, 1936), 187.

[112] Mark McGowan, "The Making of a Canadian Catholic Identity," in Terrence Murphy and A. Gerald Stortz , eds., *Creed and Culture: The Place of English-Speaking Catholics in Canadian Society, 1750-1930* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993), 211.

Union Jack in any Canadian flag, said: "Memories of old world strifes, of wrongs and of bitter oppression are not easily forgotten."[113] In 1967, Senator Harold Connolly, who had been Angus L. Macdonald's executive assistant from 1941 to 1945 when the latter was Minister of National Defence for Naval Services, cited his own experience in Halifax as sound reason to abolish the "Royal" Canadian Navy as a separate service: "I had my stomach full of *certain types* of naval officer (emphasis added)," he wrote in 1967—a swipe at some RCN officers' English mannerisms.[114] Hugh MacLennan's sense of self was shaped by his consciousness of English persecution of the Scots. Of French Canadians, he "believed, rightly or wrongly, that I understood how they felt. After all, I too come from a defeated minority race."[115] MacLennan's purportedly "convincing picture of life" in Saint-Marc-des-Erables in *Two Solitides* contains a "solitary Englishman … difficult to swallow, only dragged in apparently to be disgusting," and to give the book's "embittered young nationalist … justification for his hatred," wrote W.D. Woodhead, the English-born former Dean of Arts and Sciences at McGill University.[116]

Nor was the dislike of Englishness limited to ethnic Celts. Brooke Claxton, in his capacity as defence minister from 1948 to 1954, deplored "stuffy and pompous" pseudo-English accents and considered them "un-Canadian."[117] Michael Shalom Gelber, a psychotherapist and a Jew, who attended Upper Canada College in the 1930s, recalled "many Englishmen and pseudo-Englishmen," the latter "actually farm boys from the backwoods of Ontario" who had "appropriated all the techniques and the language of Englishmen." Stephen Clarkson, too, loathed the "Englishness" of the school, his

[113] *Hansard*, 2 July 1964.
[114] Connolly to Hellyer, 7 January 1967, Hellyer Papers, Vol. 81.
[115] Hugh MacLennan, "The Other Solitude," typescript (c. 1965) in Hugh MacLennan Papers c. 5 file 18.
[116] W.D. Woodhead, Review of *Two Solitudes* in *McGill News*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (Autumn 1945), 58.
[117] Milner, 184-5, 242.

"overwhelming memory" being that "There were certainly Canadian-born teachers, but you wouldn't necessarily have known it from the way they spoke." Conrad Black recalled one master, "a war veteran of that very English imitative type," while Borys Wrzesnewskyj puzzled over why the boys were made to study English history and not Canadian history, part of the "very WASPishness" of the place, what Wally Seccombe described as a cultivated "noblesse oblige … imperialistic, Lord Baden Powell, boy scout ideology."[118]

The ethnic, class, and religious background of Canadian nationalists was not a simple matter of membership in an undifferentiated Wasp group or dominant core *ethnie*. Skelton and Pearson's Protestant Irishness was overlain with English-Ontario liberalism and dissenting low-churchmanship (respectively, Ulster Presbyterianism and English Methodism). Arnold Heeney, an Oxford-trained official in Ottawa in Mackenzie King's time, was conscious of an ancestral Irishness accommodated within his father's Anglican rectory in Ontario and Quebec.[119] Hugh MacLennan, the McGill professor and novelist, as a boy drew pictures of the Highland games that he watched with his family in Nova Scotia, and believed that his own heritage as a member of a "persecuted" group (the Scots) gave him special insight into the French-Canadian mentality. Others of Scottish origins made a point of praising the English element. "Let us remember, those of us who are not English, … the splendid contribution that the people of that race have made to the development of Canada, … to government and law and order … the passion for justice, for honesty, for fair dealing … a passion that has always characterized the English race in

[118] James FitzGerald, *Old Boys: the Powerful Legacy of Upper Canada College* (Toronto: Macfarlane Walter & Ross, 1995), 39, 97, 127, 156, 286.
[119] Lester B. Pearson, *Mike: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson, Volume 1: 1897-1948* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), 3-4; Arnold Heeney, *The Things that are Caesar's: Memoirs of a Canadian Public Servant* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), 3.

whatever part of the world it might have been," said Angus Macdonald, the Nova Scotia premier, in a "toast to Canada" in 1934.[120]

If Irish Catholics are not to be included among British categories, then "Ulster" and "Scots" attitudes toward Englishness are no less intriguing. For a time in the 19th century the Protestant Northern Irish "hatred" for the English was as pronounced as that of the Roman Catholics of the South. Pearson himself took pride in his (Protestant) Irishness and disliked English "stuffed shirts."[121] On his External Affairs application in 1928, Pearson put "Irish," rather than "British," as his racial origin. One of Pearson's letters of recommendation for the Ottawa post came from another Irish Canadian, W.P.M. Kennedy of the University of Toronto, who wrote that "Professor Pearson had a distinguished war record, both in camp and on the field of battle."[122] Kennedy described Pearson as "an enthusiastic Liberal Canadian of fine traditions and stock."[123] And it was Pearson who exclaimed in a heated moment in England in 1940, "Never have I been as glad to be a Canadian as in these last days. … I hope Canada will become a republic and that would be the end of this business of our duty to the Empire."[124] For a Canadian in 1940, this attitude is arguably as much an "Irish" sentiment as a "Canadian" one; it was not shared by his companion on that day, fellow Oxford alumnus Charles Ritchie, a Conservative who continued to promote the British-Canadian association in the 1950s. Even for Lower, certain manifestations of Britishness (but not all) were an impediment to

[120] Angus L. Macdonald, *Speeches of Angus L. Macdonald* (Toronto: Longman, Green & Co., 1960), 20.
[121] Cf. Pearson to Grattan O'Leary: "in Winnipeg at the St. Andrew's Society dinner, at which I spoke like a true Irishman…" 10 December 1959. Grattan O'Leary Papers, LAC, Vol. 2.
[122] W.P.M. Kennedy to Civil Service Commission, 18 May 1928, Civil Service Commission Papers, Pearson Personnel File, LAC.
[123] Kennedy to Skelton, 30 January 1927, in ibid.
[124] Charles Ritchie Diary, 29 May and 17 June 1940, in *Siren Years: A Canadian Diplomat Abroad, 1937-1945* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1974; Macmillan Paperbacks, 1987), 54, 57.

pure nationalism, and yet were an inescapable part of his Canadianism. He himself later remarked that to be a good Canadian did "not" imply "separation from Britain."[125]

Anglo-Celtic Canadians like Pearson and his contemporaries remained anglophiles at some level all of their lives, deeply attached to the "English" tradition of liberty while less sympathetic to the retention of overt British symbols to represent the Canadian state. For George Grant, even "Socialist leadership in Canada has been largely a pleasant remnant of the British nineteenth century—the Protestant tabernacle turned liberal."[126] Contemporaries like New Democratic Party leader T.C. Douglas, born in Scotland, embraced the movement for new, "Canadian" symbols. The Britishness of such leaders was manifestly not reducible to ethnicity alone or to a supposedly "ethnic definition" of the nation. Nor was Britishness merely about "power" relationships between a "majority" (which was not really a majority) demanding "conformity," or a core *ethnie* easily distinguished from the British "other." Britishness was an intersection of ethnic background, attitudes, class, race, and other traits embedded in the Canadianism of individuals and groups of a variety of ethnic backgrounds. It was not limited by ethnic origins or by attachments outside the country but revolved around traditions and multiple identities that emerged within Canada and that were considered by their adherents to be fundamentally Canadian. There were numerous fissures within the too-often undifferentiated "dominant" Wasp group, and there remains much work to be done to unravel the complexity of Anglo-Canadian Britishness.

[125] Quoted in Cook, 10.
[126] Grant, *Lament for a Nation*, 75.

Chapter 3

Multiple Identities, Britishness, and Anglo-Canadianism

If Anglo-Canadian Britishness cannot be reduced or limited to ethnicity, whether as a core *ethnie* or group of ethnicities, we may explore the ways in which Britishness can be understood as a multiple identity, or perhaps a cluster of identities. By thinking of Canadian Britishness as something that overlapped with, but was not limited by, ethnicity, it becomes clear how members of ethnic origins other than those that constituted the ethnic core of Anglo-Canadians could adopt or support a hybrid British-style Anglo-Canadianism. This approach may also yield further insights into the "evolving consciousness" of Anglo-Canadians as they imagined and re-imagined the meaning of Canadianism. "True" Canadianism has often been portrayed as something that is post-British, or that emerged alongside the decline or displacement of the "British connection" in the 1960s. But we have seen in the previous chapter that Canadians, including some French Canadians, experienced the sense of being British (and not only those of English, Scottish, Irish, and Ulster-Irish ethnicity) as well as Canadian, and that this did not depend solely on an external British connection. There was something "British" at the heart of homegrown Canadianism to which Britishness was not always a foreign element. "One of the most interesting things in our country is the meeting of traditions"—those of the "old country" and those "springing out of our own North American soil," Vincent Massey observed, perhaps the best-known example, and

exponent, of this interpenetration in his lifetime.[1] However, this view could also draw harsh criticism from those who sought to accentuate the differences between Canadians and Britishness. For those who sympathized with the latter approach, what mattered were the *distinctive* qualities of Canadianism, the elements that could (or so it was thought) be distinguished from the British heritage. This chapter develops the theme of Anglo-Canadian identity formation by drawing on the background and youth of those who later engineered the crisis of Britishness in the 1960s, such as Pearson, Robertson, Matheson, Hellyer, and others, including their upbringing, religious heritage, and, in some cases, military service.

The Canadian "offspring," Massey said, "could emulate the manners and attitude of the parent without bringing into question its own sturdy independence."[2] Massey and his ilk are easily dismissed as "old-fashioned, irrelevant, anachronistic, Tory elitists,"[3] as David Cannadine has noted. George Ignatieff, who went to Oxford in the 1920s, found Massey sycophantic and naively pro-British,[4] while Douglas LePan, another Oxonian, described Massey as a "mannikin," an "actor," and a "cipher" with "presence" but not "substance."[5] Massey was easily made a butt; for all his aspirations to culture he may well have embodied, for some, Canon Lionel Groulx's attribution to Anglo-Saxons of "médiocrité de goût et des oeuvres d'arts, inélégance atavique, hypocrisie, mesquinerie, vanité, egoïsme, arrogance, pédanterie, vénalité."[6] The "mediocrity" of the rising Anglo-

---

[1] Vincent Massey, *What's Past is Prologue: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Vincent Massey, C.H.* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1963), 25.
[2] Ibid., 124.
[3] David Cannadine, "Imperial Canada: Old history, new problems," in Colin M. Coates, ed., *Imperial Canada 1867-1917* (Edinburgh: Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997), 13.
[4] George Ignatieff, *The Making of a Peacemonger* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), 63-4.
[5] Douglas LePan, *Bright Glass of Memory* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1979), 25, 51.
[6] Gérard Bouchard, *Les Deux Chanoines: Contradiction et ambivalence dans la pensée de Lionel Groulx* (Québec: Boréal, 2003), 142-4.

Ontarian middle class, as compared to the creativity, *joie-de-vivre*, and sophistication of intellectual life in Quebec, also preoccupied Scott Symons.[7] During the debates of the 1960s, a strong sense of British identity was often derided by English- and French-speaking Canadians as subservient "loyalism." A too-British identity could be an intolerable eccentricity, the attachment to traditional Canadian symbols cited as evidence of a foreign allegiance, or "colonial" dependency.

Still, the "first Canadian-born" viceroy—Massey's family, originally from Cheshire, had been in North America for nine generations—is an example of the interpenetration of Canadianism and Britishness. The distinction between what is British and what is "truly" Canadian is a conundrum with a long pedigree but few scholarly inquirers. Sir John A. Macdonald may have died "a British subject," but his successors did not doubt his "true and deep Canadianism."[8] J. Murray Beck subtitled the second volume of his life of Joseph Howe, "The Briton Becomes Canadian."[9] Yet later, Britishness and Canadianism were sometimes portrayed as polar opposites. As Blair Fraser wrote in 1967: "The issue lay between those who wanted Canada's symbols to be British and those who wanted them to be Canadian."[10] Historians, too, have assumed a kind of Manichean division between British and Canadian: either in favour of Canadian independence, or beholden to the British connection; on the one hand, anglophile traditionalism represented by Massey, and on the other, anglophobe nationalism associated with O.D. Skelton. As John Holmes perceived, "Anglophobia is an old

---

[7] Symons, *Combat Journal*, 47-8, 144, 188.
[8] Sir John Thompson, in Joseph Pope, ed., *Memoirs of the Rt. Hon. Sir John Alexander Macdonald, G.C.B.* (London: Edward Arnold, 1894; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1971), Vol. 2, 344.
[9] J. Murray Beck, *Joseph Howe*, Vol. I, *Conservative Reformer, 1804-1848*; Vol. II, *The Briton Becomes Canadian, 1848-1873* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1982).
[10] *Hansard*, 30 June 1964; Blair Fraser, *The Search for Identity: Canada 1945–1967* (Toronto: Doubleday, 1967), 235.

phenomenon in Canada—along, of course, with an equally irrational Anglophilia."[11] For Charles Hanly, Britishness was a serious psychological handicap to true Canadianism.[12]

One assumption that has sown much confusion and misinterpretation, then, is that there were two opposing camps among Canadians: those who were pro-British and those who were anti-British. According to Massey, himself no unquestioning imperialist,[13] Skelton was "anti-British."[14] Skelton, on the other hand, mistrusted Massey's devotion to England. Donald Creighton condemned Skelton, Mackenzie King, and their East Block kindergarten[15] as "anti-British" for having squandered the British counterweight to American influence,[16] while nationalist historians have lionized the same men as "true patriots" who constructed an autonomous nationalism that has proven more durable than the Empire they sensed Canada was outgrowing: men "with the vision and skills to make Canada the kind of country it could and should be," J.L. Granatstein wrote.[17]

Historians have encouraged the belief that Britishness was a *pre*-Canadian phenomenon, just as Australian nationalists dismissed Britishness as something that predated a true sense of Australian identity. Robert Bothwell, for example, has reduced Britishness to a vestige, the "imperial allegiance" or "imperial past," replaced in the 1960s with the new, ostensibly post-British nationalism of leading Pearsonians, a neat transition from "British" to "Canadian" represented by the new flag. Even if Canadians remained quite "British" in character in the post-1945 era—at least up to the time of the

---

[11] Holmes, *Better Part of Valour*, 103.
[12] Hanly, loc. cit.
[13] cf. Massey's pre-war Liberal views on tariffs, Ireland, and dreadnoughts. Claude Bissell, *The Young Vincent Massey* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), 94.
[14] Massey, 135.
[15] James G. Greenlee, "Canadian External Affairs 1867-1957," *Historical Journal*, 27, 2 (1984), 508.
[16] Donald Creighton, *The Forked Road: Canada 1939-1957* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976).
[17] J.L. Granatstein, *The Ottawa Men: The Civil Service Mandarins 1935-57* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982, 1998), 273. Doug Owram, *The Government Generation: Canadian intellectuals and the state, 1900-1945* (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1986).

Suez Crisis—for Bothwell it was merely a matter of "breaking the ties"—as if Britishness were a removable appendage.[18] According to H.V. Nelles, Britishness in the post-1945 era was a relic associated only with immigrants and the elderly.[19] In the Canadian historiography, to the extent that the significance of Britishness has been addressed in all of this, it tends to be treated as a form of colonialism, a quaint artefact, an immature "local variant of Britannic pan-nationalism,"[20] or a manifestation of anti-modernism.[21] Like Bothwell, Nelles saw Britishness as a relic that had somehow lost its potency.

According to this view, Britishness was a transitory stage on the road to independent Canadianism. Traditional symbols and institutions were seen, by some, as an impediment to mature nationhood. W.A. Deacon in 1933 called for the abolition of the monarchy: "The last political tie with Britain must be severed. Then she will respect us as she respects the United States; the world will respect us and—most important of all—we shall respect ourselves."[22] According to F.H. Underhill, who had developed his Canadianism while reading W.A. Dafoe in the Winnipeg *Free Press*,[23] a "belated colonialism" and "a literary theory of our constitution" benighted Canadians with the mistaken belief that a North American state could be run on "British" lines "and it is high time we shook ourselves free from it."[24] Fundamentally, both Underhill and A.R.M. Lower's yearning was to import from American history the "profound break" and "sense of separateness" from the mother country that history had failed to provide.[25] For the

---

[18] Robert Bothwell, "Breaking the Ties," *Literary Review of Canada*, April 2005, 23-4.
[19] Nelles, loc. cit.
[20] Douglas L. Cole, "Canada's "Nationalistic" Imperialists," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 5:3 (August 1970), 44-50.
[21] Massolin, 235; McKay, *Quest of the Folk*, 67-8.
[22] William Arthur Deacon, *My Vision of Canada* (Toronto: Ontario Publishing Company, 1933), 247.
[23] Penlington, op. cit., *On Canada*, xi.
[24] Quoted in Berger, *Writing of Canadian History*, 63.
[25] Ibid., 134.

Pearsonian generation of nationalists, Underhill was a seminal figure, the Lionel Groulx of English Canada, Graham Spry suggested. "Both [Groulx and Underhill] were suffused with their own concept of Canadian history," Spry wrote, "and both found in Canadian history justifications to support their own convictions about Canada. … but in the long run Underhill may come to be seen to have shared a greater vision of Canada." If Groulx had prophesied "survivance" for French Canada, Underhill was the historian and prophet of "the English-Canadian 'nation.'"[26] In the post-war years, Pearson shared the developing belief that Canada could not afford to "dwell upon its past."[27] When Underhill, by then a well-connected Liberal, turned 80, Pearson presided at the celebratory banquet for his fellow Oxford alumus—a symbolic occasion, if ever there was one, for the nationalist school of history.[28] An odd example of Underhill's determination that Canada somehow effect a "break with the past" was his notion that an appropriate national flag for Canada would consist of "a green maple leaf" surrounded by "multicoloured rainbows," on a "background of pure white to signify our Canadian innocence of colonialism, imperialism, … capitalism, socialism, and all the other 20th century sins."[29] Few historians today would share Underhill's belief that Canadians could blithely wash their hands of complicity in such "isms."[30]

Even so, as George Grant pointed out, the writings of Canadian continentalists, including Underhill, "carry more the note of Mill and Macaulay than of Jefferson and

[26] Spry, op. cit., in Penlington, *On Canada*, 29-30.
[27] Bothwell, Drummond, and English, 270.
[28] *Toronto Star*, 27 November 1969; *Ottawa Journal*, 5 December 1969.
[29] F.H. Underhill, speech at the University of New Brunswick in 1962, quoted in *Hansard*, 2 July 1964. A rainbow was the suggestion of Henri Joly de Lotbinière in 1865.
[30] Adele Perry, *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race, and the Making of British Columbia, 1849-1871* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001).

Jackson."[31] Those who sought a break with the past, or at least a "break with Britishness," at the same time resented the implication that they were "anti-British." Good Canadian patriots of British descent, according to Lower, "found it possible to entertain respect and admiration for Great Britain while devoting their careers and their hearts to their own country."[32] Lower's *Colony to Nation* interpretation of Canadian history, condemned by Creighton as the "Authorized Version," an arbitrary nationalist reading friendly to the Liberal Party in which Canadian history is told as a "coming of age," a maturing beyond the British connection, and a necessary self-distancing from Great Britain. One of Lower's original formulations of this theory is seldom quoted in full:

> For Great Britain [the English-speaking Canadian] has had all the affection of a child for its mother. This filial attitude evolved in much the same way as that of individuals. At first there was hardly any sense of a different identity, then the irresponsibilities of the small boy manifested themselves. Next came the uncertainties and sudden antagonisms of adolescence, followed by the growing confidence of early manhood, not without over-sensitiveness at any display of parental authority just ended. Lastly the separate establishment of married life entailed growing concern in one's own family affairs.[33]

For Lower it was natural that, in keeping with Canada's autonomous nationhood, Britain should be regarded as a foreign power. Lower lamented, at the end of the war, "that

---

[31] Grant, *Lament for a Nation*, 91.
[32] Lower, *Colony to Nation*, 473.
[33] Ibid., 441.

Canadian attitudes towards the *outside world* [i.e., Britain] should always have been so heavy with emotion as to hinder the growth of a native Canadian patriotism and as a rule, exclude rational discussion."[34] Significantly, Lower extended this retardant effect to symbolism: "Canada is perpetually divided between the forces of history and geography, tradition and environment. *All the public symbols, such as flag and king, represent tradition*," he wrote (emphasis added). There was a sense of "destiny," or teleology, in this approach, as if Canadian "geography" and "environment" militated, in some mystical but inexorable sense, against Canada's inherited symbols.

The assumption was that exponents of Canadian Britishness were motivated by nostalgia for British glory and took too little pride in Canada on its own merits. Exasperated patriots had long quoted Sir Charles G.D. Roberts' couplet, "How long the ignoble sloth, how long / The trust in greatness not thine own?"[35] And yet there was nothing un-British about being a Canadian patriot. Even Roberts' couplet has Shakespearean overtones that suggest its provenance from a British-influenced mind; indeed as something of an artefact of the "British World." As Mary Vipond has written, "the ethnic identification, the race and blood tie of many English-speaking Canadians … was in fact 'British.'" They were "simultaneously Britannic nationalists and Canadian patriots," and Frank Underhill, like many others, could refer to the Canadians and "the other British peoples."[36]

There was, after all, a certain "universality" of Britishness "with a small 'b,'" as Sir Fred Clarke's summed up the "Empire of ideas," attitudes, spirit, and way of life on

[34] Ibid. 442.
[35] Matheson used it as the prefatory quotation in John Ross Matheson, *Canada's Flag: A Search for a Country* (Belleville, Ontario: Mika Publishing, 1986).
[36] Vipond 19, 140.

both sides of the Atlantic.[37] Britishness with a capital "B" referred to institutions identified with the British Isles such as "the monarchy, … the peerage, the Church of England, the old school tie, the Oxford-B.B.C. accent, 'Britannia Rules the Waves,'" and "a certain condescension towards foreigners," as Underhill summarized the differences after reading Clarke.[38] Britishness with a small "b" referred to "the long tradition of the freedom and dignity of the individual … the spirit of toleration, the flair for compromise, … independence of the judiciary, a free press, free political parties, free churches, free trade unions," as Underhill put it. Clarke called this the *Res Britannica*, "the British entity" (on the analogy of *res publica*), not so much a political structure as "that whole philosophy of life and culture and social order which, with its roots and historical origins in these islands, has now re-rooted itself and grown to maturity in distant lands … the solid fact of which the historian of modern ages must take account." This did not detract from local and regional variations within the worldwide *Res Britannica*, not even the "marked difference in outlook as between the centre and points on the circumference." Nor did anti-imperial sentiment in the colonies invalidate the affinities between centre and periphery. Those "younger men" in the Dominions "who feel the differences more keenly"—a reference to anti-imperialist nationalism in South Africa and Canada—Clarke interpreted not as a threat to the survival of Britishness, but as evidence that "the inner logic of the British spirit, a logic of influence more than of power, has been working itself out." British Liberal values, in other words, contained an inner logic that would bring about a natural evolution within an empire of ideas, education, and reform—in short, "sovereignty of the rule of law, the free action of groups and communities in the life of

---

[37] F. Clarke, "'British with a small "b'," *Nineteenth Century*, CXIX, 710, April 1936, 428-439.
[38] Quoted in Francis, "Historical Perspectives on Britain," loc. cit.

the whole, individual responsibility for the common good, responsible government, these and suchlike things are universal values."

If Britishness merely meant nostalgia for lost Empire and subservience to its outmoded ideals—excessive anglophilia, mimicry, etc.—then it would be difficult to account for the Britishness of many staunch Canadian nationalists. If centre-left intellectuals such as Underhill, himself an Oxford Canadian, believed that Canada should remove vestiges of old-style Britishness in order to cleanse its soul, this was not necessarily an *un*-British sentiment. To be anti-imperialistic, or anglophobic, or to be opposed to a tradition-bound Britishness attached to inherited symbols, did not necessarily imply being anti-British. As Lower wrote in 1946, "The effort has invariably been made in Canada to convict anyone stressing national sentiments of being 'anti-British.'" In fact, these nationalists were usually not anti-British but anti-elitist, anti-Establishment, or anti-imperialist. Anti-monarchists like Phillips Thompson, E.E. Sheppard, Goldwin Smith, and John S. Ewart embraced republicanism—but they did so believing that it would *strengthen* the British connection by removing vestiges of subordination from the relationship.[39] W.A. Deacon, in his call for a Canadian republic, wrote that "the logical effect to expect from our retirement from the Empire, in name as well as in fact, is that present friendship between Canadians and English will ripen into cordiality."[40] Even without the monarchy, Canada's British ties (and, one might add, character) would remain. An autonomist like Skelton thought of Canada as essentially

[39] Wade A. Henry, "Severing the Imperial Tie? Republicanism and British Indentity in English Canada, 1864-1917," in Colin Coates, ed., *Imperial Canada* (Edinburgh: Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997), 177-86.
[40] Deacon, 248.

part of "the British galaxy," Vipond wrote.[41] Many early nationalists perceived autonomy for Canada as one of the "inalienable rights of British subjects" and their Canadian nationalism "demonstrated how deeply British they were."[42]

To be anti-Tory and anti-imperialist, like the anglophile Mackenzie King, was no less "British" than to be a jingo, as C.P. Stacey has written.[43] The prime minister's affectation of the life of the country squire at Kingsmere paralleled Massey's aspiration to be the facsimile of an English gentleman. King, Skelton, and Massey, each a Liberal with a Protestant background and ultimately humble immigrant roots, represent a spectrum of hybrid Britishness within their Canadianism. If Skelton felt "something like hate for the Empire," as Gerald Graham claimed, then the senior mandarin also admired the British "spirit of compromise" in its dealings with Indian nationalists in the 1930s.[44] Both Massey and Skelton were proud Anglo-Canadians with some experience of the British governing classes—and it is no surprise that after lunching with Massey in 1926, Skelton found "a good deal of sympathy and respect under the surface differences."[45] As Berger wrote of the imperialist and anti-imperialist traditions, "both Skelton and G.M. Grant were Canadian nationalists, but no historian can with assurance conclude that either one or the other represented a truer, more legitimate, and superior form of it."[46] Britishness cannot be so easily dismissed as a foreign influence or even as an external factor alone; it was deeply ingrained and was often thoroughly Canadianized.

[41] Vipond, 104. Still, Vipond thinks of Britishness as something that was ultimately external, an outside force, rather than as something inherent in Canadianism.
[42] Ibid. 102.
[43] Stacey, op. cit.
[44] Gerald Graham to Anthony Kirk-Greene, November 9, 1978, quoted in *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 15, 1 (1981), 35, n. 9; Crowley, 183.
[45] Skelton Diary, January 4, 1926. Skelton Papers, Library and Archives Canada (LAC).
[46] Berger, 9.

Nor have Anglo-Canadian characteristics been limited to one ethnic group or groups descended from antecedents in the British Isles. Both French Canadians and Canadians of non-British, non-French ethnic origins often shared with Canadians of British ethnicity elements of a common British-Canadianism. In the flag debate, the non-British ethnic loyalism of Canadians of Ukrainian and East-Central European background is an example of this. Chapter 6 addresses the relationship between Britishness and New Canadians. Such an attachment to British-Canadian identity, in fact, subsumed a range of *multiple* identities and ethnicities, from anglophilia to anglophobia, in association with Scottishness, Irishness and Englishness, influenced by class and religious factors.

Because this chapter deals with Britishness as a multiple identity or group of multiple identities, Phillip Buckner's definition is repeated here in full:

> Canadians, like other peoples, hold multiple identites simultaneously. … In the 19th century, most anglophone Canadians could comfortably combine a sense of being British with a sense of being English, Scottish, Welsh or even in may cases Irish, and of being also a Nova Scotian or an Upper Canadian, as well as a Haligonian or a Torontonian. After 1867 the sense of also being a Canadian was, with varying degrees of ease and speed, added to this list … If we have learned anything about the construction of identity in the past 20 years, it is surely that identities are self-determined and that people have the ability to maintain a considerable number of identities simultaneously, even ones which historians believe ought not to be compatible.[47]

[47] P.A. Buckner, "'Limited Identities' Revisited: Regionalism and Nationalism in Canadian History," *Acadiensis*, XXX, 1 (Autumn 2000), 12.

Some Canadian habits and customs, after all, struck observers as "more British" than those of the mother country. Harold Macmillan, the future British prime minister, when aide-de-camp to the Governor General of Canada, the Duke of Devonshire, from 1919 to 1924, called Mackenzie King's oratorical style "old-fashioned from our point of view," and found speeches in the House of Commons generally "much longer and more formal" than at Westminster. If so, which parliamentary style—Canada's or Britain's—was more British?

The Britishness of Canadian nationalists in the 1960s has also been underestimated. A collection of papers on Britishness published in 2005 includes a study of "three self-styled 'British' prime ministers at Empire's end": Robert Menzies of Australia, Roy Welensky of the Central African Federation, and John Diefenbaker.[48] Stuart Ward argues that these three men exemplified the residual attachment to "Britishness" in overseas settler societies in the 1960s as well as "fundamental differences about the meaning of being British." Diefenbaker is easily derided for his anachronistic wish to divert Canadian trade towards Britain. However, his arch-rival, Lester Pearson, was no less a "British" prime minister than the Chief. They simply expressed their Britishness in different ways. It could be argued that Diefenbaker's homogenizing brand of "unhyphenated Canadianism" was *less* British than Pearson's adoption of unity in diversity—though Pearson did use the "unhyphenated" phrase in his 1964 speech to the Royal Canadian Legion.[49] Pearson enjoyed smoother relations with British officialdom than had the supposedly pro-British Tories: as Charles Ritchie wrote

---

[48] Stuart Ward, "Worlds Apart: Three "British" prime ministers at Empire's end," in Buckner and Francis, eds., *Rediscovering the British World*, 399-419.
[49] Pearson, *Mike*, III (Toronto: Signet [paperback edition], 1976), 293.

in 1962, "Canadian Tories have, or used to have, a devotion to the 'British connection.' [But] when they went to London, as Diefenbaker did, they were more at odds with the British Establishment than Liberal politicians who have no devotion to 'Crown and Altar.'"[50] Pearson and his colleagues did share this respect for the monarchy to some extent, but expressed it in different ways. Perhaps Ritchie's distinction implies that Pearson was *more* British than Diefenbaker—in the sense that he "got on" more easily with certain British types with whom he had much more in common than did his rival, the populist lawyer from Prince Albert with no Oxford education, who idealized "England" at the age of 60 much as Pearson had done at the age of 20. According to Gladwyn Jebb, the Oxford-trained English Liberal mandarin, Pearson was "one of us."[51] Diefenbaker was not. Indeed, Vincent Massey recorded Diefenbaker's self-confessed tendency to "black out" in the presence of the Queen and Prince Philip; Massey presumably did not suffer from nerves in this way on formal occasions.[52] It seems then, that we are confronted not with a set of "true Canadians" and "British holdovers," but with a spectrum of Canadian Britishness in which the multiple identities were interpenetrated with influences like class, *savoir-faire*, and even elementary self-confidence.

This interpenetration can be traced to the background and youth of the generation of leaders who engineered the crisis of Britishness in the 1960s. Pearson and his contemporaries' upbringing was immersed in the Victorian and Edwardian Britishness of Ontario, the Maritimes, or the Western provinces. The Britishness of that earlier era pervaded the homegrown Canadian traditions associated with their schools and

[50] Charles Ritchie, Diary, 22 February 1963, in *Storm Signals*, 40.
[51] English, *Worldly Years*, 174, cf. 361, n. 5.
[52] Massey Diary, University of Toronto Archives, 14 October 1957.

universities, churches, government at various levels, clubs, associations and charities, the armed forces, police services, newspapers, and other institutions. Their upbringing, schooling, and social circle, family friends from Vancouver, McGill, or elsewhere, had given shape to a distinctly Canadian Britishness. Heeney's youth was typical: "Father's sentiments and loyalties," Heeney wrote, "meant that from the very first I was surrounded by British influences. The earliest stories which I read were of British heroes from Alfred the Great to Kitchener of Khartoum … by the time I arrived in Winnipeg I was ready for the spate of G.A. Henty to roll over me." His school was "frankly English," its headmaster "vibrantly Canadian in every sinew."[53] Hugh MacLennan's Halifax school was "violently patriotic (British) [sic]," and "reinforced the idealization of England already instilled by his father."[54] Escott Reid's clergyman father had been born in England, and Reid, too, grew up in the atmosphere of an Anglican rectory, attending five different schools between 1910 and 1917.[55] Pearson, the son and grandson of Methodist ministers, said of his own youth in an itinerant parsonage: "As a boy I used to read *Boy's Own Annual* and *Chums*, an English magazine which had stories of Oxford college life that were pretty romantic and attractive."[56] He also attended several schools during those itinerant years.[57] "Canadian nationalism hardly touched us in those days since our teaching was concentrated on Canada as part of an empire," Pearson wrote. Dean Acheson, the future U.S. Secretary of State who had grown up partly in Middletown, Ontario, wrote: "My mother's enthusiasm for the Empire and the Monarch was not diluted by any corrupting contact with Canadian nationalism." The "dominant influence"

[53] Heeney, 6-7, 9.
[54] Elspeth Cameron, *Hugh MacLennan: A Writer's Life* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), 7-8.
[55] Escott Reid, *Radical Mandarin* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), 17.
[56] John Robinson Beal, *The Pearson Phenomenon* (Toronto: Longmans, 1964), 36-7.
[57] Pearson, *Mike*, Vol. I, 15, 11-14.

in their house, his mother, "was a British subject with deep affection for Ireland."[58] Arthur Irwin recalled the "One flag, one fleet, one throne" atmosphere of his small-town Ontario youth, "soaked in Methodism," as the son of an itinerant minister.[59]

Canadian-born imperialists and Empire-builders displayed a Canadian Britishness not limited by ethnic, gender, and class boundaries. Sir Percy Girouard, born in Montreal, a graduate of the Royal Military College at Kingston, served in the Royal Engineers, built the railway that made possible Kitchener's ascent of the Nile, served in the Boer War, and became governor of the British East Africa Protectorate in 1909-12 and later Canadian High Commissioner to Nigeria and Director of War Office Munitions. Sir Frederick Guggisberg, born in Galt, Ontario, a Royal Engineer, served in the Great War, and became governor of the Gold Coast (later Ghana) from 1919-27. Guggisberg's political officer, Beckles Willson, born in Colbourne, Ontario, recalled the impression made on him as a youth by locally retired Hudson's Bay Company factors and a certain Mrs. Grover's "huge beaver coat" (what could be more Canadian?); Willson made his first trip to the U.K. at the age of 22.[60] Sympathy for English liberalism, "the free action of several independent British communities," influenced Henri Bourassa no less than his anglophone counterparts.[61] To be Canadian meant something different for earlier generations at ease with, or at least reconciled to, the Britishness that characterized the Canadianism of the time.

---

[58] Dean Acheson, *Morning and Noon* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), 8, 10.
[59] MacKenzie, 13, 7.
[60] Beckles Willson, *From Quebec to Piccadilly and Other Places: Some Anglo-Canadian Memories* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1929).
[61] Sylvie Lacombe, "Henri Bourassa: A Nationalist Leader Against British Imperialism," *Journal of Indo-Canadian Studies* 2, 2 (July 2002), 86.

Another species of homegrown imperialist was the Canadian who believed in Empire to such an extent that he wanted Canada to take it over. There were Methodist roots here, too, as Egerton Ryerson described Upper Canada in 1852 as "a country possessing all the elements of a mighty empire."[62] The particular Canadianism of Sir Sam Hughes attributed to men born in Canada and particularly in Ontario not merely equality with the British, but "superiority" over others in acumen, virtue, and vision.[63] This "Canadian ideology" can be seen in Hughes' insistence on equipping the CEF in 1914 with the Canadian-manufactured Ross rifle, a fine target rifle but almost useless for the mass fire of the trenches. Massey's diary indicates that Hughes test-fired it under the supervision of himself—"Maj. Vincent Massey"—chief musketry officer of Militia District No. 2, in July 1916.[64]

The notion of Canadian superiority was not limited to Tories like Hughes. Isabel Skelton wrote of what she believed to be the "paralyzing effect of the caste spirit in English life, and the waste of ability and happiness it entails."[65] A.R.M. Lower wrote that "the growth of national spirit in Canada since the war has changed the emphasis on the British connection and possibly on the monarchy too." Again, Lower drew a connection between the evolution of a distinct Canadian society and the replacement of outmoded symbols with truly Canadian emblems. The new "spirit of the age," Lower wrote, was "strongly equalitarian," and "[t]he major difficulty of Canadian Conservatism, and still more of the right, or tory, wing, is that the age has passed it by."[66]

---

[62] Goldwin French, "The Evangelical Creed in Canada," in W. L. Morton, ed., *The Shield of Achilles* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1968), 29.
[63] Ronald Haycock, *Sam Hughes: the public career of a controversial Canadian* (Waterloo and Ottawa: Wilfrid Laurier University Press and the Canadian War Museum, 1986), 322.
[64] Massey Diary, UTA, 11 July 1916, newspaper clippings pasted into the diary space.
[65] Isabella MacVane [Isabel Skelton], *Globe and Mail*, 18 September 1909, p. 4.
[66] Lower, *Colony to Nation: A History of Canada*, 4th edition (Toronto: Longmans, 1964), xv.

The circle of Imperialists depicted by Berger so loved the Empire that they believed Canada should be "the future centre and dominating portion" of it. (Or, as Leacock put it, "The old man's got old … can't kick him off the place" but "the boys have got to step right in and manage the farm.")[67] Like Lorne Murchison, Sara Jeanette Duncan's fictional small-town *Imperialist*, some believed that the Dominion was a sturdier barque for preserving British ideals than the effete English elites. Murchison remarks in his climactic speech:

> The imperial idea is far-sighted. England has outlived her own body. … In the scrolls of the future it is already written that the centre of the Empire must shift—and where, if not to Canada? … Is it not …easy to imagine that even now … the sails may be filling, in the far harbour of time, which will bear their descendants to a representative share of the duties and responsibilities of Empire in the capital of the Dominion of Canada?[68]

This feeling was not unique to small-town Ontario but was shared by, among others, Rudyard Kipling (born in India), whose associates included Canadians such as Sir Max Aitken and Sir Andrew Bonar Law.[69] A later variant of this sentiment is reflected in Hugh MacLennan, a Nova Scotia Presbyterian-Scot by origin, who wrote in *Barometer Rising*: "Maybe when the wars and revolutions were ended, Canada would begin to live; maybe instead of being pulled eastward by Britain she would herself pull Britain clear of

---

[67] Berger, *Sense of Power*, 260-1, quoting W.D. Lighthall, *Canada, A Modern Nation* (Montreal, 1904), 78.
[68] Sara Jeanette Duncan, *The Imperialist* (London: Copp Clark, 1904), New Canadian Library paperback edition (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1971), 229-30.
[69] Charles Carrington, *Rudyard Kipling: His Life and Work* (London: Penguin, 1986), 465, 476, 490, 517.

decay and give her a new birth."[70] Leacock, too, subscribed to a Tory "Canada First" imperialism, what he referred to in 1907 as "Greater Canada."[71] Eugene Forsey referred to Leacock as "an ardent Conservative and Imperialist (though also, like Sir Sam Hughes, a fierce Canadian nationalist.)"[72] For Leacock many years later, in 1940, the British connection survived "not by compacts of governments but by the affections and antecedents of uncounted millions,"[73] throughout the British world.

Not all historians accepted Carl Berger's characterization of this type of imperialism as an expression of Canadian nationalism. Douglas Cole suggested that it was really a case of "Britannic pan-nationalism" and not a form of Canadianism at all.[74] But even if it were not a genuine nationalism, Imperialism remained one of the most widely-held of all Canadian multiple identities, though it was not the only one. Arguably, Skelton, Ulster-Irish in origin, and his East Block protégés (Pearson: Irish; Robertson: Scots; Heeney: Irish, etc.) adapted from their own experience the Hughesian sense of a Canadian vocation to safeguard British (or English) liberal institutions. Massey, whose roots were English, also identified in Canadians a superior form of Britishness, more broadmindedly British and imperial than the "too provincial Anglo-Saxonism in Canada and in England."[75] Skelton praised Pearson in 1937 for his "distinctive Canadian point of

---

[70] Hugh MacLennan, *Barometer Rising* (Toronto: Collins, 1941), 200-1; Cameron, 143.
[71] Stephen Leacock, "Greater Canada: An Appeal," *University Magazine*, VI, 2, 1907, 132-41.
[72] Forsey, 21.
[73] Stephen Leacock, *Our British Empire: Its Structure, Its History, Its Strength* (London: J. Lane, 1940), 179.
[74] Douglas L. Cole, "Canada's "Nationalistic" Imperialists," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, V, 3, August 1970, 44-50.
[75] Massey, 38.

view."[76] The Canadianism of such Eminent Pearsonians was neither exclusively Anglo-Saxon nor exclusively Canadian, but an amalgam or Britishness and Canadianness.

One Ontario woman who combined Canadianness with Englishness was Charlotte Whitton, born in Renfrew in 1896. She graduated from Queen's University but never studied abroad. As director of the Canadian Council on Child Welfare she helped organize the immigration of British children to Canada during the Second World War. According to reports when she was first elected mayor of Ottawa in 1951—the first female mayor of a major city—she was known to lecture on Irish poetry and as something of an expert on English cathedrals.[77] As mayor again in 1964, Whitton told Brigadier Michael Wardell at the *Atlantic Advocate*, "We are going to have quite a colourful ceremony here on Victoria Day … when we shall confer the right 'to march at all times with bayonets fixed and pennants flying' on the Brigade of Guards. I am hoping to make quite a ceremony out of this. It is the first time that it has been done in Ottawa , and I think it is not a ceremony that has taken place, in many parts of the country, at any time."[78] She greeted with derision the proposed new national flag that did not include symbols of the founding races. Referring to Pearson's initial three-leaf proposal, Whitton dismissed it as a "white badge of surrender, waving three dying maple leaves" which might as well be "three white feathers on a red background"—a symbol of cowardice. "It is a poor observance of our first century as a nation if we run up a flag of surrender with three dying maple leaves on it," she said.[79] The following year, when invited by Martin

[76] Skelton to Massey, 18 February 1937, Pearson Personnel File, Civil Service Commission Fonds, LAC, Vol. 536.
[77] CBC Radio report, Oct. 1, 1951, archived at http://archives.cbc.ca. Barbara Hanley (1882-1959) was elected mayor of Webbwood, Ontario, in 1936, the first female mayor in Canada.
[78] Whitton to Wardell, 6 April 1964, Charlotte Whitton Papers, LAC, Vol. 6.
[79] *Ottawa Citizen*, 21 May 1964; *Globe and Mail*, 22 May 1964.

Symons, the president of the St. George's Society of Ottawa, to reply to the traditional toast to "St. George and England" at the Society's annual dinner, Whitton replied that she would speak about Sir Winston Churchill, who had recently died. The wartime British prime minister, Whitton explained, provided "such an expression of the free parliament which Englishmen have given to the world and the seven hundredth anniversary of which we are observing in 1965."[80]

What applies to English-speaking Canadians applied also to some French Canadians. Both manifested what Buckner calls "multiple identities" and could see themselves as Canadians whether French, Scots, Irish, or English, Catholic, Protestant, or otherwise—and yet still retain Britishness as one of a variety of simultaneous multiple identities.[81] Most often cited in the Canadian context are Taché and Cartier at the time of Confederation, and more recently such figures as the half-German Canadian general Hoffmeister and the half-Irish, bicultural governor general, Georges Vanier.[82] The young Lieutenant Vanier, on his father's side a seventh-generation French Canadian, described at East Sandling camp in England in 1915 a "gathering of Canadian officers from every part of the Dominion and belonging to every walk of life, united in the mother country and proclaiming the solidarity of the English peoples."[83] A Roman Catholic and a combination of the gentleman of the classical French school, the British army officer

---

[80] Whitton to Symons, 30 January 1965, ibid., Vol. 7.

[81] Phillip Buckner, "Limited identities revisited: Regionalism and nationalism in Canadian History," *Acadiensis*, 30, 1 (2001), 4-15; J.M.S. Careless, "Limited Identities" in Canada,"*Canadian Historical Review*, 50, March, 1969; P.A. Buckner and Carl Bridge, "Reinventing the British World," *The Round Table* No. 368 (2003), 77-88.

[82] Donal Lowry, "The Crown, Empire Loyalism and the Assimilation of Non-British White Subjects in the British World: An Argument against "Ethnic Determinism,"" in Bridge and Fedorowich, eds., 96-120; Réal Bélanger, "L'élite politique canadienne-française et l'Empire britannique: trois reflets représentatifs des perceptions canadiennes-françaises 1890-1917," in Coates, ed., 122-40.

[83] Vanier to his mother, 5 August 1915, in Deborah Cowley, ed., *Georges Vanier—Soldier: The Wartime, Letters and Diaries 1915-1919* (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2000), 48.

ideal, and, according to A.R.M. Lower, a "splendid example of biculturalism,"[84] Vanier was quite at ease in the transatlantic British-Canadian milieu. He received the Military Cross at Windsor personally from the King in 1916, and played tennis at Wimbledon while on leave from France in 1917. (Tennis was out of the question the next time he was wounded; he lost most of his right leg in 1918.)[85] Vanier respected established Canadian symbols: as a diplomat in 1940, on more than one occasion during his escape across France from the advancing *Wehrmacht*, he expressed relief at the sight of the Canadian Red Ensign, recognizing it without hesitation or irony as "the Canadian flag."[86] (He was attached to the old flag until it was lowered for the last time in his presence as governor general, when he remarked, "Oui je salue *ces deux* drapeaux"). Similarly, Major-General Maurice Pope, whose mother was a French Canadian, enjoyed a greater sense of ease than most Anglo-Canadians among French officers in France, and yet was also more than comfortable in his British-Canadian skin. He played cricket on the grounds of Rideau Hall, hunted on horseback with the East Kent Fox Hounds while stationed at Shorncliffe (a "living tradition," he called it), and dined at the Carlton Club on Armistice Day in 1918.[87] Bert Hoffmeister was born in Vancouver in 1907 to a second-generation German immigrant father who had moved from Ontario in the 1880s and married a Vancouver woman of British origins. His mother, née Flora Rodway, anglicized the pronunciation of her husband's surname to "Hoffmaster" and was never pleased about the German connection—an interesting insight into multiple identities that Hoffmeister's biographer

[84] A.R.M. Lower, *Queen's Quarterly*, Winter 1970, 637.
[85] Deborah Cowley, *Georges Vanier, Soldier: The wartime letters and diaries 1915-1919* (Toronto: Dundurn, 2000), 200, 161.
[86] Robert Speaight, *Vanier: Soldier, Diplomat & Governor General* (Toronto: Collins, 1970), 196, 210.
[87] Maurice Pope, *Soldiers and Politicians: Memoirs* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962), 8, 28, 43.

does not explore at length.[88] Hoffmeister grew up in the typical British-Canadian milieu of Vancouver: he joined the Seaforth Highlanders cadets at the age of 12, took up oars for the Vancouver Rowing Club, and played basketball at St. Mark's Anglican Church. Throughout his life he was attached to the uniforms, regimental life with the Seaforths, and parades on Granville Street to the tune of "Scotland the Brave."[89] Vanier, Pope, and Hoffmeister represent a hybrid Britishness that was, at the same time, proudly and self-consciously Canadian.

This amalgam of inherited and hybrid Britishness also contained the potential for a good deal of mimicry, the aping of British manners and styles that irritated a certain type of nationalist. Massey's approach as dean of residence at Victoria College in Toronto before the Great War "was that the essentials of life in an English college applied equally well to one in Canada. There were naturally many differences, but the basic principles were the same," said Massey. "A 'college' is essentially a community wherever it exists," even at Burwash Hall.[90] This could be the subject of conflict with the younger generation, however. According to Pearson, a student at Victoria College, Dean Massey

> had just returned from Balliol College, Oxford, and was concerned with introducing the manners and mores of that venerable institution into Burwash Hall. Our hall, however, was built in 1912, not 1412, and housed Canadian town and country boys who were not graduates of Eton or Harrow or from the stately

[88] Douglas E. Delaney, "The soldiers' general: Bert Hoffmeister as military commander," Royal Military College Ph.D. diss. (2004), 33. Cf. Delaney, op. cit.
[89] Ibid., 35, 42-3.
[90] Massey, 42.

> homes of England. The dons of the other houses in Burwash, chosen I suppose by Mr Massey, were also graduates of Oxford and very English indeed. But the residence, built by Mr Massey's family, remained rowdily Canadian, successfully resisting, in spite of disciplinary action, even the demand that we should wear gowns at meals in hall. Traditions have very real value and importance in a college, as in a nation, and there are no better traditions, as I was to learn later, than those at Oxford. But they took centuries to develop. Burwash was only a month or two old, and would have to create and foster its own traditions.[91]

According to Pearson, when Massey assumed the office of Governor-General in 1952, "the only change that I could detect … from the previous régimes … was that, under the first Canadian Governor-General, there was an atmosphere rather *more* regal and rather *more* formal than under, say, the Earl of Athlone, a member of the Royal Family (emphasis added)."[92] Who, then, was the more "British"—Massey or Athlone?

Many years later, Massey took delight in securing Robertson Davies, a fellow Oxford alumnus who was, if possible, even more anglicized than Massey himself, as the first Master of Massey College in 1963. The appointment ensured that a British collegiate tone would prevail at the newly-founded institution. Davies was a "heaven-sent Master," Massey told Burgon Bickersteth.[93] Around this time, Davies was pressing Alan Beddoe, who advised the Canadian government on heraldry matters, to do what he could through contacts in England to speed up the grant of a modified version of Davies' father's coat

[91] Pearson, *Mike*, Vol. I, 17.
[92] Ibid., Vol. III, 224.
[93] Massey to Bickersteth, 30 October 1961, Massey Papers, Box 401, file 14.

of arms so that the Master could have his silverware suitably crested and play host in proper style.[94]

Making one's Canadian way in the British class system was an aspiration and a skill shared by only a few Canadians. The class-based lifestyle had not been replicated or adapted in this country beyond the privileged circles of the largely urban elites of Montreal, Toronto, and a few other cities, despite persistent predictions that Canada would evolve its own squirearchy. At Garnons, the country house in Herefordshire let by the Masseys as a hospital for Canadian officers, the masseur assured Charles Ritchie in 1941 that, "What I foresee in Canada is an aristocracy beginning to grow up there. You will have aristocrats—the grandsons of the Eatons, Masseys, Flavelles and other millionaires." Ritchie commented: "Of course he is dead wrong. There is no aristocratic principle alive in Canada and you will not make it by a few rich men imitating English lords."[95] The lack of an established aristocracy in Canada, however, did not prevent its characteristics from being inherited, imitated, and experienced as a multiple identity by Canadians who could afford to mimic it or even, like some of the Molsons, marry or be appointed into it.[96] Hartland Molson's daughter, Zoë, married the Hon. Nicholas (later 5th Viscount) Hardinge in 1955; though they later divorced, Molson's grandson became the 6th Viscount Hardinge. Hugh Molson, a Conservative M.P. in Britain and cabinet minister in the Churchill, Eden, and Macmillan governments from 1953-59, was created Baron Molson in 1961.[97]

---

[94] Alan Beddoe Papers, LAC, Vol. 23.
[95] Ritchie Diary, 18 March 1941, in *Diplomatic Passport*, 96.
[96] Shirley E. Woods, *The Molson Saga 1763-1983* (Scarborough: Avon Books, 1983), 338.
[97] London *Daily Telegraph*, 1 October 2002.

English styles and acquisitions, such as those of a Massey or a Molson, would seem to lend credence to the view that Britishness was merely imported from abroad—quaint, like the 19th century quadrangle of Trinity College (or concrete-encrusted like that of mid-20th century Massey College), but borrowed glory all the same. Typical of this imitation was the exchange when, in 1938, Skelton asked Massey if he thought Canada should adopt British diplomatic uniforms "with some distinctive Canadian feature," or "seek some sartorial genius to devise a new one." Massey replied that a "distinctively Canadian" uniform could be a Canadianized version of the British model, "but this distinction can be provided quite easily by the use of maple leaf embroidery on the collar and cuff and by the use of a special Canadian button."[98] To nationalists, this kind of mimicry seemed effete, cringing, and imitative—not the sturdy Canadianism of a robustly independent people. To traditionalists, it only made sense to emulate the best examples they knew, and to perpetuate the British connection with local variations in style.

On an institutional level, the inspiration for Massey College was not far removed from the CBC's debt to the British Broadcasting Corporation model of state-supported radio and television, or the Stratford Festival's recruitment of English theatrical talent (literally, in the persons of Tyrone Guthrie and Alec Guinness) to establish a "genuinely Canadian" cultural institution on Southern Ontario's Avon River.[99] Hilda Neatby, the scholar and member of the Massey Commission, commented on the underlying Englishness of Canadian institutions and habits of government, reflecting, in 1953, that the English had "provided the machine" of Canadian government and had, as a racial

[98] Massey to Skelton, August 15, 1938, quoted in ibid., 139.
[99] Greenhill, op. cit., 128-9.

group, “been obliged for the most part to surrender the wheel in English-speaking Canada to the Scots.” Yet Canadian Englishness remained a strong, sometimes unacknowledged current even among the usurping Scots minority: “It is surely not without significance that Canada’s late and justly celebrated prime minister [Mackenzie King] whose life was consciously a tribute to his impulsive, dogmatic, intellectually argumentative Scottish grandfather, unconsciously displayed to an almost excessive degree those English qualities of tenacity, caution, compromise, a capacity for delay amounting to genius.” Neatby added: “A consideration of this typical Canadian suggests that in Canada the English spirit is mighty yet.”[100] It is difficult to see how the Englishness and Scottishness of the “incredible Canadian” were reducible to “foreign” influences. Rather, they exemplify deeply-ingrained “English” habits of thought and behaviour that run through the history and style of Canadian governance to the present day.

Neatby both observed and exemplified the complexity of Anglo-Canadian ethnicity. She was born in England and “profoundly influenced by things English,” writes Michael Hayden.[101] Her father read to the family from a 3,000-volume library brought from England. She did not make the pilgrimage to Oxford, but studied in Paris on a scholarship in 1924-25. As a member of the Massey Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences from 1949-51, she took part in one of the first post-1945 efforts to dissect and promote Canadian culture. While the Scots may have come to predominate politically and in other fields, “in a curious fashion the Englishman has come into his own in Canadian public life,” she wrote, in that it was always an

[100] Hilda Neatby, “The English in Canada” (1953?), in Saskatchewan Archives Board A139, no. 198(6), rpt. in Michael Hayden, *So Much To Do, So Little Time: The Writings of Hilda Neatby* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1983), 110.
[101] Hayden, 4.

English spirit, often unacknowledged, that quietly underlay the workings of government at the Dominion level and the provincial level including Quebec, whose assembly debates were conducted according to British parliamentary procedures. As a Presbyterian and an anglophile, Neatby was typical of her generation of Anglo-Canadian Protestant thought and culture. As a woman, however, she was not typical, her career curtailed by the gender barriers of the day.[102] It was a circle of sports-playing (and male) "sons of the manse" that took up the leading role in the crisis of Britishness in the mid-1960s.

It was said of Pearson in the 1940s that he was not a typical civil servant but that he was "typical of the young men in External Affairs," the "unique East Block brains trust," as *Maclean's* described them in 1944.[103] To the extent that Pearson and his contemporaries functioned as the equivalent of a guiding elite in the 1950s and 1960s, it is worth considering whether they constituted a "neo-*aristocratic base*," as Anthony D. Smith has written of post-colonial nationalist movements in Asia and Africa. Such a neo-aristocratic elite, Smith suggests, typically emerges from a "lateral *ethnie*"—namely, a leadership stratum in society that has the ability to "form close links with the upper echelons of neighbouring lateral ethnies," such as the British foreign service and other elite circles. If Eminent Pearsonians formed an elite, they owed their prominence to a combination of family and regional background and connections, educational experience and the cachet of Oxford University, and, in their case, selective recruitment into the civil service, together with whatever talents they possessed or cultivated. Such an elite is "often permeated," Smith has argued, "with religious and priestly influences." This religious or "priestly" background, in the case of Pearson and his associates, was

---

[102] Donald Wright, "Gender and the Professionalization of History in English Canada before 1960," *Canadian Historical Review* LXXXI, 1 (March 2000), 58.
[103] *Maclean's*, 15 January 1944, 7, 33-5.

provided by their largely post-Christian,[104] secularized or "emancipated" Methodism and dissenting Protestantism (See Chapter 4)—the high priestliness of the social gospel and benevolent internationalism. At the same time, Pearson and his associates represent the triumph of the rising middle classes which increasingly set a tone for the country's developing nationalism in the 1960s and gave shape to the Britishness of Anglo-Canadian identity. According to Smith, it is typical for such neo-aristocracies to strive for "the inclusion of significant ethnic minorities," particularly, in the Canadian context, the large French enclave centred on Quebec.

When Pearson and his associates left office, Canadians seemed to have broadly accepted an officially post-British sense of identity, with a new symbolic order centred around the Maple Leaf. They had "divest[ed] themselves of their imperial heritage … whilst simultaneously preserving and adapting their ethnic cultural heritage" (to borrow again from Smith's paradigms), retaining at some level their Anglo-Canadian Britishness, and avoiding "too sharp a repudiation of that heritage."[105] This developing identity contained a good deal of ambivalence: on the one hand, Brooke Claxton was one the foremost advocates of Canadianization and a scathing critic of the anglophile mimicry in certain elements of the navy, and believed that excessive attachment to British tradition was a barrier to "full nationhood." On the other hand, Claxton could nevertheless celebrate, in a passage written in 1954, the "settlers who came from England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales … who brought with them the very breath of freedom, on which they

[104] "Post-Christian" in the sense of having abandoned belief in the Christian Gospel while retaining to varying degrees for pragmatic reasons its behavioural forms and precepts. Cf. Ramsay Cook, *Regenerators*, op. cit.; Miedema, *For Canada's Sake*, passim.
[105] Smith, *National Identity*, 53, 101-2.

had been nurtured in the land of freedom, which was England itself."[106] There remained, in other words, a certain continuity and consciousness of a British inheritance.

The experience of service in "British" wars and of study at the foremost British university gave a select group of Anglo-Canadians unusual exposure to the wider Britishness for which their Canadian upbringing in a Victorian and Edwardian milieu had prepared them, and which they believed they understood well. Like Claxton, many Eminent Pearsonians combined a lifelong belief in the benevolence of the British Empire and in the wisdom of English liberalism, with a disdain for "arrogant" forms of Britishness, the English upper classes and their imitators, and a too-fawning attachment to "British" traditions. Like Australian anglophiles, their psyche incorporated pro- and anti-British elements, enthusiasm for the best in the English liberal inheritance alongside their scepticism toward elements of the British legacy that they deemed to be "backward." In turn it is remarkable how many of these hybrid, conflicted, and ambivalent Anglo-Canadians occupied positions of importance and influence during the crisis of Britishness in the mid-1960s. The next two chapters will examine more closely their Anglo-Canadian identity formation, religious and military background, and experience of study at Oxford University.

[106] Claxton Memoirs, 283.

Chapter 4

Religion and War in Anglo-Canadian Identity Formation

Among the purveyors and sustainers of Britishness with a small "b" throughout the English-speaking world in the 19th century were the Protestant churches steeped in English or Scottish religious traditions tied by birth, ethnicity, liturgical practice, and piety to British origins.[1] The Protestant churches in Canada, chiefly the Methodists, Anglicans, Baptists, and Presbyterians, were in many ways "British" institutions "imported and developed to meet Canadian needs," as the *Presbyterian Witness* put it in 1923.[2] In turn, as Michael Bliss has shown, English Canadians' enthusiasm and participation in the First World War were "largely a function of their militant idealism … encouraged and sustained by the nation's Christian churches." Just as in New Zealand, where "identification with the interests and actions of Great Britain was echoed" in "ecclesiastical pronouncements,"[3] for Canadian Methodists, too, the war, and the struggle to introduce conscription, were part of "a divine cause."[4] In the postwar years, the movement for Church Union—the ecumenical fruit of Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational collaboration—was aimed at developing a "distinctly Canadian Church"

[1] Colin Brown, "Church, Culture, and Identity: the New Zealand Experience," in David Novitz and Bill Willmott, eds., *Culture and Identity in New Zealand* (Wellington: GP Books, 1989), 238-259.
[2] Vipond, 175.
[3] Brown, 247.
[4] J.M. Bliss, "The Methodist Church and World War I," *Canadian Historical Review* XLIX, 3 (September 1968), 213, 216.

that would "serve as the soul of the Canadian nation."[5] In short, religion and war were catalysts in the development of "national consciousness," among certain individuals and groups preoccupied with such matters, as nationalists and social reformers, including many of Lester Pearson's contemporaries, combined "militant nationalism with a determination to reconstruct Canadian society."[6] It was not only Methodist and other Protestant spiritualities that interacted with ethnicity in the worldview of many Anglo-Canadians but the secularized post-Christian *élan* of the social gospel. George Grant claimed that 20th century "Protestantism's moral teachings," as they became adapted and shaped in a secularizing context, "readily served the deeper springs of modernity," and functioned as a "legitimizer of the age of progress and its liberalism."[7] The character of Canadian progressivism was, he said, the "Protestant tabernacle turned liberal."[8] Because this background was shared in common by the Pearsonian generation who experienced, engineered and presided over the crisis of Britishness in the 1960s, these factors will be explored in the pages that follow.

The link between Methodism, secularized dissenting Protestantism, and Pearsonian nationalism has not been fully explored. For A.R.M. Lower, himself a Methodist who lost his Christian belief, the secularized crusading spirit of Methodism served as a model for the historian's vocation "to inspire a new national 'faith'" in Canada as a nation in the making.[9] Nationalism, the sense of building a new Canada, provided a post-Christian,[10] quasi-spiritual motivation. For Pearson, "much of his value

---

[5] Vipond, 216-17.
[6] Bliss, 233.
[7] George Grant, "From Roosevelt to LBJ," in Al Purdy, ed., *The New Romans: Candid Opinions of the U.S.* (Edmonton: M.G. Hurtig, 1968), 40.
[8] Grant, *Lament for a Nation*, 75.
[9] Berger, *Writing of Canadian History*, 114.
[10] See Chapter 3, note 104.

system stemmed from the church," wrote A.W. Johnson, who, like Pearson, was the son of a Methodist manse. "His Methodism," Johnson said, "like that of many of his contemporaries[,] had given way to a secular commitment to public service."[11] Pearson wrote of his youth that, "Religion, if not very relevant to the Pearson boys in an evangelical sense, was ours by instinct, part of our being."[12] Together with Arnold Heeney, Escott Reid, Roland Michener, and Hugh Keenleyside, Pearson came from "that group of clergymen's sons, whether sons of the parsonage, the manse or the rectory, who form one of the real aristocracies of ability in Canada today," as one admiring journalist wrote in 1948.[13] In Canada, "all of those who come to the top are sons of the Manse," Charles Ritchie told Sir John Colville at the Travellers Club in 1940, quintessentially English gossip about the class origins of others, in this case Mackenzie King and John Buchan, the latter also a minister's son.[14] Pearson's father was "the ideal Christian minister," he wrote.[15] Hellyer was a former United Church Sunday school and Bible Class teacher, "the churchman who could be our next prime minister," according to the United Church *Observer*, and his father a Baptist deacon.[16] Lower and his junior colleague at Wesley College, J.W. Pickersgill, shared Pearson's small-town, middle-class Ontario Protestant origins. Skelton had a Presbyterian background. Brooke Claxton was the son of an Anglican convert from the Baptist church. (Claxton died in 1960, but his nationalism and aversion to the pseudo-Britishness of Canadian military culture in the 1940s and 1950s anticipated the reforms of the 1960s.) It is in the religious background

[11] A.W. Johnson, "Consistency," in Hillmer, ed., *Unlikely Gladiator*, 172, 176.
[12] Pearson, *Mike*, Vol. I, 10.
[13] John Bird, *Ottawa Citizen*, 30 July 1948, p. 2.
[14] John Colville, *The Fringes of Power: 10 Downing Street Diaries 1939-1955* (London: W.W. Norton, 1985), 95.
[15] Mike, I, 7.
[16] Kenneth Bagnell, "The Churchman Who Could be Our Next Prime Minister," *The Observer*, 15 March 1966, 12-15, 40.

of such men that we may perhaps find evidence for Kaufmann's assertion that "dissenting Protestant sects … were generally predisposed" to a Canadianism that sought to distance Canada from the Empire while retaining assimilated British elements. There was a marked religious dimension to the Anglo-Canadian identity-formation of such men—though for many this religious influence was in a sense post-Christian.

Another Canadian of Celtic-Presbyterian stock, the Very Rev. Arthur Bruce Barbour Moore (1906-2004), described himself as as a "country boy" from New Brunswick, the fifth son of a Scots-Irish family that had been five generations in Canada, but felt "at home" when studying in England, having grown up reading the works of Henty. He studied at Oxford University in 1930-31 on a travelling fellowship. He lost two brothers in the First World War. A lifelong anglophile as well as a Pearsonian nationalist, Moore served as President and Vice-Chancellor of Victoria University in the University of Toronto (1950-70), where he helped found Margaret Addison Hall, the E.J. Pratt Library, and Northrop Frye Hall—all redolent of Ontario Methodism—and as moderator of the United Church of Canada (1971-72). Moore presided at the wedding of Pearson's daughter, Patricia Lillian, and later at the respective funerals and burials of Pearson, Norman Robertson, and Hume Wrong in Chelsea, Quebec.[17] In A.B.B. Moore, D.D., a lifelong friend and admirer of Pearson who belonged to the Canadian Institute of International Affairs and received the Order of Canada in 1976 for "services to the religious and educational life of our country,"[18] the Eminent Pearsonians of the 1960s

[17] A.B.B. Moore, *Here Where We Live* (Toronto: United Church Publishing House, 1988), 2, 7, 17, 70-1, 224.
[18] Ibid., 64, 84, 224, 238. Cf. Moore's Order of Canada citation at http://www.gg.ca/honours/search-recherche/honours-desc.asp?lang=e&TypeID=orc&id=1193

could be said to have found a kind of unofficial chaplain-general: Canadian, yet British, in his character and outlook.

The religious background was intermingled, for some, with class aspirations. Massey's reception into the Church of England personally by the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the age of 39, helped to complete his escape from underlying middle-class rural Ontario Methodist origins by the well-travelled aspirant bourgeois route of High Church Anglicanism.[19] Disillusioned with the "mediocrity" of Methodism, Massey felt the need to complete this identity-conversion despite the fact that he represented the third generation with money in the family. The religious background gave colour to Canadianism in other ways. Arthur Lower interpreted his nationalism "in the language of *religion*," Carl Berger wrote. "Just as Methodism had instilled into people impulses to action, so nationalism could be a source of individual certainty as well as of collective behaviour." Nationalism was part of English Canadians' "quest for assurance," a "confusion between religion and nationalism."[20] Mary Vipond cited the ties between nationalist thought and the intellectual heritage of the United Church, itself a legacy of "imported" British churches whose founders envisioned the UCC as a key force for Canadianization.[21] According to Hilda Neatby, "It is hard … to do more than guess at the immense influence of English non-conformity [i.e., the Methodist tradition] as distinguished from the sharply institutionalized Anglicanism" of High Church Toryism that is more easily identified and more typically associated with Britishness, in the development of national consciousness among such Canadians.[22]

---

[19] Claude Bissell, *The Young Vincent Massey* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), 116.
[20] Berger, *Writing of Canadian History*, 136.
[21] Vipond, 170, 175.
[22] Hayden, 109.

The 18th and 19th century Methodists were associated with Loyalism and with bringing American, as well as "English" influences, into British North America. Still, historians have tended to associate Methodism with nascent Canadian national consciousness. "Of all the Canadian denominations," wrote Goldwin French, the Methodists "were the most nationalist, the most anxious to settle Canadian problems in Canadian terms and the most willing to envisage the parallel expansion of Canada and the Methodist Church."[23] Underhill, himself of a Presbyterian background, wrote that, more than any other group, the Methodists "set the imprint of their character upon Ontario,"[24] and in turn it was Ontario that "defined the nation" for English Canadians, as Vipond put it.[25] Writing about J.S. Woodsworth, Underhill said:

> The double inheritance of pioneer loyalism and pioneer Methodism needs to be emphasized. For there is nothing that is more distinctively and essentially Canadian than that combination. … the Anglican past of loyalism has left us mainly a tradition of stuffiness and snobbery. It was the Methodists (with some considerable help from the Scotch Presbyterians) who formed the creative element in early Upper Canada, and who did most to make us what we are today in Ontario.[26]

Goldwin French gave as examples "*low church*" Anglicans (his emphasis, referring to that segment of the Anglican tradition that preferred less ceremonial worship, greater

---

[23] Goldwin French, "The People Called Methodists in Canada," in John Webster Grant, ed., *The Churches and the Canadian Experience* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1963), 76.
[24] Underhill, 149.
[25] Vipond, 16.
[26] Underhill, 149.

emphasis on Bible reading, and a more restrictive private morality than did those of a high church persuasion) and Presbyterian dissenters—each flowing into the secularizing spirit of Queen's University that shaped both Adam Shortt and Skelton.[27] That the Methodist church was "Canada's national church" was one of their proudest boasts.[28] As the Methodist *New Outlook* put it in 1925, "Canada is our parish."[29] The movement for what advocates called a "distinctly Canadian Church [that] would serve as the soul of the Canadian nation,"[30] in some sense presaged the movement for "distinctively Canadian" symbols in the 1950s and 1960s. Methodism and its United Church offspring were thus key institutional expressions of a certain type of ethnic Anglo-Canadian nationalism which, at the same time, did not cut itself adrift from its old moorings. In the mid-20th century, the United Church and other "dissenting" (non-Anglican) Protestant sects retained a sense of the British connection and of residual Britishness—including Englishness, Scottishness, and Protestant Irishness—in their character, though perhaps to a lesser extent than the more self-consciously "English" Anglican Church of Canada. Its variant of the Church of England's Prayer Book, *Common Prayer Canada*, last issued in 1962, was displaced by new liturgies in the 1970s and by a new official text, the *Book of Alternative Services* in 1985. The transformation of Canadian Anglicanism almost exactly mirrored the evolution of Church of England liturgical practises (e.g., the *Alternative Service Book* of 1980), and the controversy between modernizers and

[27] A.B. McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001), 218.
[28] Neil Semple, *The Lord's Dominion: The History of Canadian Methodism* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), 397.
[29] *New Outlook*, June 10, 1925, quoted in Vipond, 154.
[30] Vipond, 216-17.

traditionalists, in the United Kingdom.[31] "Anglican dilemmas of identity" and morale were aggravated throughout by Anglicans' inability to replicate in Canada the powerful church-state relationship that gave the Church of England its essential character in Britain,[32] another factor that, in the Canadian context, seemed to weaken Anglicanism's ability to influence society, and to give rival Protestant sects the upper hand.

The historiography has acknowledged Pearsonian diplomacy's debt to Methodist roots and to secularized Protestant culture,[33] but has paid little attention to these as points of interpenetration for Britishness and Anglo-Canadianism. For Pearson, Lower, Keenleyside, Herbert Norman, and the Pickersgills, the predominantly small-town Ontario Methodist background has been mentioned by biographers only in passing.[34] Attempting to delve deeper, Karen Finlay has written that Vincent Massey's Canadianism was rooted in "his Methodist heritage—a hotbed of nationalist sentiment."[35] Though Massey himself later denounced Methodism as mediocre, bitterly condemning the middlebrow Chautauqua theatre movement,[36] Methodism left a powerful legacy. Reviewing Pearson's memoirs, Lower wrote:

> If I were to elect one element in [Pearson's and my] common background as more prominent than the others, … I would rank the Methodism in which we were both brought up. The former Methodist Church has disappeared … but if you wish to

---

[31] Michael Ingham, *Rites for a New Age: Understanding the Book of Alternative Services* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1986).
[32] William H. Katerberg, *Modernity and the dilemma of North American Anglican identities, 1880-1950* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001), 216.
[33] Denis Stairs, "Liberalism, Methodism, and statecraft: the secular life of a Canadian practitioner," *International Journal* XLIX (Summer 1994), 673-80.
[34] Roger Bowen, ed., *Innocence is Not Enough: The Life and Death of Herbert Norman* (Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre, 1986), 17; Granatstein, *Ottawa Men*, 76.
[35] Finlay, 116.
[36] Bissell, 43.

see its monuments, look around. Pearson was one of them. There is hardly a line in this book [*Mike*, Pearson's memoirs] that does not proclaim it.[37]

In a similar vein, John Matheson wrote, "Like Pearson, I was of British background and the son and grandson of a Protestant manse."[38] Matheson's father was principal of Emmanuel Theological College at the University of Toronto's Victoria College. Paul Hellyer, though of a younger generation, practised the "broad middle-of-the-road liberalism" of the United Church, and remained "one of the very few men … who seriously tries to play a Christian role in politics."[39] These influences are significant both in themselves and because Eminent Pearsonians attributed importance to them in explaining the formation of their Canadianism.

One channel of Methodist influence was the mutual assistance network among co-religionists, a little acknowledged example of English- (or Scottish-) style self-help in Canada. The Canadian "aristocracy" of parsons' sons was not the same as the British original, which combined merit and patronage with hereditary and educational privilege, and involved a more complicated set of habits, accents, speech inflections, and mannerisms. In reality, the Canadian version was also based in part on wealth, connections, and cultural lineage. Among the Methodists who had migrated from small towns and farms to occupy positions of influence in Toronto, the most successful families, like the Masseys, had risen quickly from relative poverty and unsophistication

[37] Lower, Review of Pearson Memoirs, *Queen's Quarterly*, Spring 1973, 130.
[38] Matheson, 3-4.
[39] Bagnell, 12-15, 40. The second quote ('Christian role') is attributed to Douglas Fisher.

to wealth, prominence, and the earnest pursuit of culture.[40] Toronto's Methodist elite was captured by Underhill as follows:

> I remember a few years ago sitting one evening in the chapel of Victoria College when Ned Pratt was giving a recital … The audience consisted of the cream of the graduates of that great Methodist college. Everywhere one could see faces of men who were prominent in the professional and business life of Toronto. The chairman was the titled head of one of the most famous Methodist families of Ontario. … As I listened, … I could not help reflecting that, after all, it was neither then Jesuits nor the Iroquois who eventually won Ontario, and who set the imprint of their character upon the life of this province; it was the Methodists.[41]

Some lamented that the Methodist church had "surrendered its soul to the monied middle classes—the Rowells, Masseys, Flavelles, Fudgers, and Eatons," as it embraced theological modernism.[42]

It is important to emphasize that Methodist pious practices continued among these families, but it was a piety increasingly battered by the winds of the social gospel. Young men raised in the Victorian and Edwardian era felt themselves emancipated by advances in science and psychology. Gradually, societal salvation replaced individual salvation, and former Methodist and other Protestant believers placed their hope and aspirations in the promise of state legislation to alleviate social ills. As Karen Finlay illustrates, as

[40] English, 2; Finlay, 7.
[41] Underhill, 149.
[42] Ramsay Cook, *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), 23.

members of the Victorian-Edwardian new rich in pursuit of culture and sophistication—and endowed in some cases with fantastic wealth—leading Ontario Methodists like Flavelle and the Masseys began to affect the kind of *noblesse oblige* traditionally exercised by the Anglican establishments of Montreal and Toronto, and by their upper-class model in Britain. In other words, they added to their British ethnicity and religious background a new layer of pseudo-aristocratic Britishness. Flavelle had exercised the impulse to improve society through the growing Methodist network.[43] He endowed chairs at the University of Toronto and played host, like other well-to-do Methodists with capacious panelled parlours, to Victoria College students,[44] to whom sherry was probably *not* served. With fellow governors A.E. Kemp, A.E. Ames, and George Cox, Flavelle underwrote many of Victoria's scholarships.[45] It was a Flavelle scholarship that funded Massey's studies at Oxford. So apparent was the linkage of Pearson, Massey, and Methodism that some newspapers mistakenly reported that Flavelle's largesse had also funded Lester Pearson's Oxford studies in the 1920s; in fact, Massey himself had arranged this—an example of the Methodist "aristocracy" of self-help across three generations.[46] When Pearson appealed to Skelton for work in Ottawa, the eminent Methodist Liberal-Unionist statesman Newton Rowell wrote one of his letters of recommendation. Another was written by University of Toronto's Professor W.P.M. Kennedy, suggesting a fusion of Pearson's Protestant Irish ethnicity with his "English"

---

[43] Michael Bliss, *A Canadian Millionaire: The Life and Business Times of Sir Joseph Flavelle, Bart. 1858-1939* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1978), 94.
[44] English, 23.
[45] Semple, 394.
[46] The *Ottawa Citizen* made the error, 30 July 1948, 2; *Maclean's* got it right, 15 January 1944, 7.

and anglophile upbringing in a unique Toronto network of self-help. Denis Stairs suggested that Pearson, the Methodist, had "the right friends."[47]

The escape from mediocrity can also be seen in Massey's crusade for higher educational standards. "The Methodist Church at present is an apotheosis of mediocrity," Massey wrote.[48] Still, the imprint of "Methodism's blend of moralism and liberalism made him a zealous reformer," Finlay writes, and, "saturated with Methodist nationalism, he strongly identified education with Canadian citizenship."[49] The Masseys' academic endowments, from Hart House to Massey College, were fruits of this earnest, socially responsible Methodist *noblesse*.[50] His own earnest efforts to study art ("Am reading Ruskin assiduously. He is very good on Venice…") and his solicitude to improve Methodist educational standards are examples. Massey's conversion to Anglicanism was attributed by Claude Bissell to "religious skittishness and a drift towards establishment conservatism."[51] But it is more likely, to be precise, that it was related to Massey's flight from mediocrity by adopting the Church of England religious milieu of the English upper classes and the Anglican paternalist tradition of Upper Canada. Massey appears to have spent hours poring over his entry in the British edition of *Who's Who*, carefully deleting from an earlier entry the reference to his Second-Class Honours degree from Oxford.[52] In the photo of Massey in a 1930s edition of the *Who's Who in Canada*, edited by Sir Charles G.D. Roberts, the way in which the collar of his jacket rides up his neck suggests that he may have been wearing an off-the-rack suit.[53] Massey recorded in his diary that

---

[47] Pearson Personnel File, Civil Service Commission papers, LAC; Stairs, 674.
[48] Massey Diary, 4 March 1910, quoted in Bissell, 43, and Finlay, 29.
[49] Finlay, 27.
[50] Massey, 24.
[51] Bissell, 111.
[52] See Box 050, file 3.
[53] The date is not clear (1930-2), page 611.

his father had “passed away,” which was not an expression used by the English upper classes, who would have said “died.”[54] These seemingly trivial lapses in authenticity are significant in part because Massey himself attached importance to mimicking the intricacies of English personal style.

The legacy of Methodism has provoked strong reactions among Tories. Loring Christie, himself of Nova Scotia Baptist background and a graduate of Acadia University, said of Newton Rowell that he “has great ability, but he is not first class. … He is an Ontario Methodist—a vicious breed—much worse than any Jesuit.” J.L. Granatstein has quoted this passage from Christie but offered no explanation.[55] Scott Symons, the self-exiled, dissipated voice of Tory High-Anglican Loyalist Legitimism, condemned the bureaucratic ruling class of the 1960s as that of the “mute mediocre Methodist mannikin.” The “Emancipated Canadian Methodist,” according to Symons, had imposed Ontario Methodist ideas and assumptions upon Canada as a whole, ignoring or eliminating the traditional “meaning” of Canada as a combination of British and French traditions.[56] Grant blamed mainstream Protestantism more generally for abandoning the deeper theological and philosophical roots of the Loyalist tradition as a bastion against modernity.[57] Yet why should the “Honest Ontario Yeoman” and “Methodist Grit Farmer Squatter” inspire such loathing from Tory-inclined voices such as Christie and Symons?

The available evidence is inconclusive, but it is clear that several leading nationalists of the 1960s—those who implemented the confrontation with Britishness—did indeed come from a middle-class background and from small towns or other rural

[54] Massey Diary, 1 June 1920, Massey Papers. Cf. Douglas Sutherland, *The English Gentleman* (London: Debrett’s Peerage, 1978).
[55] Christie to Felix Frankfurter, quoted in Granatstein, *The Ottawa Men*, 65.
[56] Scott Symons, “The Meaning of English Canada,” 34; *Combat Journal*, 79, 80, 83, 144.
[57] Grant, *Lament for a Nation*, 63, citing Richard Hooker, the theologian of High Church traditionalism.

areas in Ontario. Sir Sam Hughes was born in Bowmanville. Pearson was from Newtonbrook, and spent his youth moving from one small town to another.[58] J.W. Pickersgill was born in Wyecombe, Norfolk County and grew up – as a colonist from Ontario – on a farm near Ashern, Manitoba, where the only church was Presbyterian. Mitchell Sharp was born to a middle-class family in Winnipeg.[59] Arnold Heeney was born in Belleville, Ontario, and grew up in Winnipeg. Arthur Irwin came from Ayr, Ontario, the son of a Methodist minister in a small village in Waterloo County.[60] Hugh Keenleyside, born in Toronto, the son of an alderman whose father had been a "local [Methodist] preacher," grew up in Vancouver, whose population was a mere 29,000 when Norman Robertson was born there in 1904.[61] Frank Underhill chided Lower for his "discovery … that the whole of Canada is just the little town of Barrie writ large."[62] Kenneth McNaught remarked upon Lower's "secularized Protestant rectitude (which turned out to be Liberal) derived from his home turf, the rolling WASP farmlands around Barrie." Underhill was himself conscious at Oxford University that he could never break free of his small-town lower-middle-class roots in Stouffville, Ontario.

Perhaps because of their humble origins, the influence of a milieu of newly-acquired wealth and connections, and their belated discovery of class-consciousness after exposure to life in England, some Anglo-Canadians also adopted the status-obsessed English habit of scrutinizing and classifying one's peers. Escott Reid ranked several of his External Affairs colleagues as either first or "second rate" minds. He counted

[58] Pearson, *Mike*, Vol. 1, 8.
[59] Mitchell Sharp, *Which Reminds Me: A Memoir* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994).
[60] MacKenzie, 7.
[61] 1901 Census. Historical Statistics of Canada.
[62] Underhill, 269.

Pearson, Heeney, and Keenleyside among the latter.[63] Arthur Lower confessed to perceiving a good deal of mediocrity even in his friend Pearson:

> He is, again, like countless Canadians of his stamp, an excellent secretary, dependable, industrious, self-effacing. Though not on the higher slopes of the intellectual world, he has some scholarly attainment and a good brain. It is not a dazzling intelligence that looks out from these pages ("Mike," I believe, was outshot by some of the heavy guns in G.M. Wrong's Battery of Historians), but a good, working intelligence of clarity and common sense.[64]

In 1962, Lower had criticized Pearson's leadership, writing to Underhill that the newly minted national Liberal leader possessed "no qualities of what we need at the moment," he was "just … 'Mike.'"[65] Like Massey's Anglican conversion, government service offered some young Anglo-Canadian scholars an opportunity to escape from mediocrity and into a life of influence and relative comfort that they had glimpsed at university. When Skelton began recruiting his Kindergarten (to borrow the term applied to Lord Milner's circle[66]), Pearson and his contemporaries may well have thought, as Kim Philby wrote in another context: "One does not look twice at an offer of enrolment in an elite force."[67] The escape from humble origins to institutions of power by means of a privileged education was not unique to the public service. However, because it follows an

[63] J.L. Granatstein, "Becoming Difficult," in Greg Donaghy and Stéphane Roussel, eds., *Escott Reid: Diplomat and Scholar* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004), 19-20. The "first rate" were Skelton, Robertson, Christie and Wrong.
[64] Lower, *Queen's Quarterly*, loc. cit., 130-1.
[65] Lower to Underhill, 20 March 1962, F.H. Underhill Papers, LAC, Vol. 12.
[66] James G. Greenlee, "Canadian External Affairs 1867-1957," *The Historical Journal* 27, 2 (1984), 503-511, uses the expression "Skeltonian kindergarten," 508.
[67] Kim Philby, *My Silent War* (New York: Grove Press, 1968), xxi.

English (or Scottish) pattern of self-help through a network of like-minded men linked by schools, wealth, and influence (so important to Philby's career), it stands out as a defining characteristic of the Britishness of their Anglo-Canadian identity-formation. It is this network of self-help that infuriated Scott Symons, explaining in 1967 why "I instinctively hate the Canadian Awakening—because it is a state-subsidized release of the creative energies of that Methodistical Lower Middle Class at our expense … we still 'tow [sic] the line' while we are eliminated! The Canada Council, like Massey College, like Parliament, like the CBC … is simply a Finishing School system for Wesleyans."[68] According to Symons, almost all Canadian institutions had been created or re-fashioned by a rising Ontario Methodist element in Canadian society according to their own interpretations of what Canadianism should be.

Pearson and his contemporaries may also be said to have inherited something of Methodism's crusading mentality, an aversion to excessive or laborious tradition, and a preference for simplicity. Their antecedents and examples growing up, writes Michael Bliss, "were all moralists—all obsessed with doing the right thing, doing good, serving man and society" in the manner they knew to be right.[69] In Sir Joseph Flavelle, "the perfectionist drive was intensely personal, directed to personal habits, to the perfecting of his business organizations, and then to personal social service."[70] The sense of service pervaded the typical Ontario Methodist upbringing: "It was part of living," recalled Arthur Irwin, "you had your responsibilities."[71] Vincent Massey embodied the secularized, sociological Golden Rule of the emancipated Methodist as influenced by

[68] Symons, *Combat Journal*, 144.
[69] Bliss, 506.
[70] Ibid., 505.
[71] MacKenzie, 13.

S.D. Chown.[72] For adherents of the social gospel, societal standards could be increasingly improved by enlisting the state for social betterment. Crusading had been part of Methodist tradition since Egerton Ryerson's battle with the pro-Establishment Anglicans in Upper Canada.[73] Massey's discovery of the world of art in his late twenties occurred under the influence of Lawren Harris and his contemporaries, who promoted Canadian art in crusading terms.[74] It was "an important battleground in the fight for national independence," and Massey's "platform for Canadian sovereignty."[75] Pearson and his associates were "liberal idealists … moralizing … anti-imperialists," pro-British but "suspicious of the worst excesses" of both British and American foreign policy.[76] Secularized Methodism, understood as a religious background overlain with progressive social activism—a "priestly" influence in the anthropological sense—should be part of a better understanding of the contradictions and complementarity of Britishness and Canadianness. It was not the only influence, but it is offered in the present thesis as a neglected piece of evidence in understanding the forces that gave shape to the Eminent Pearsonians and their nationalism.

It should be stressed that secularism, meaning the loss of religious belief and its replacement by secular assumptions, was important in the formation of the "emancipated Methodist" sense of self. Lower said of his contemporaries who had abandoned religion:

---

[72] McKillop, *Contours of Canadian Thought*, 110.
[73] Finlay, 19.
[74] A.Y. Jackson, *A Painter's Country: The Autobiography of A.Y. Jackson* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co., 1963), 24.
[75] Finlay, 163.
[76] Quoted in Cohen, op. cit., 123.

> By good minds the more saccharine aspects of [Methodist] theology could be set aside. There remained a deep sense of duty, an acute feeling that life could be perfected and that one had to do what he could to setting a world more or less out of joint to right. Man's duty was to steer towards Utopia as he conceived Utopia. … It was no accident that so many socially radical people were children of the old Methodist Church.[77]

Others had no religion to lose, having grown up without a sense of belief. Hugh Keenleyside, raised in a Methodist home hostile to drinking, smoking, dancing, card playing, theatre-going ("inventions of the Devil"), and suspicious of Catholics and High Church Anglicans, was among those of his generation who "never had believed" in his parents' religion, and felt indifferent rather than hostile.[78] Norman Robertson had little religious sense. His father, head of the Classics department at the University of British Columbia, had been a sceptic. Robertson, his biographer says, "never felt any need for the crutch and comforts of religion," adopted a "tough-minded rationalist" approach, and admired H.G. Wells—an intellectual posture superimposed on the conventional anti-Catholicism of his family's Presbyterianism.[79]

Secularization and loss of faith were not unique to Canadians but were common to both sides of the Atlantic.[80] To that extent these attitudes among Pearson and his contemporaries cannot be construed as part of a "break with Britishness." On the

---

[77] Lower, *Queen's Quarterly*, loc. cit.
[78] Keenleyside, *Hammer the Golden Day*, 30-8, 68.
[79] Robertson's mother was a "good Presbyterian," but it is not clear what the author means by that. J.L. Granatstein, *A Man of Influence: Norman A. Robertson and Canadian Statecraft, 1929-68* (Ottawa: Deneau, 1981), 3, 27.
[80] Owen Chadwick, *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

contrary, they may be seen as evidence of continuity and compatibility with the changing nature of the British connection. Anglophile nationalists lost their religion, but so had contemporary British intellectuals who replaced it with a desire for social reform. Even the most exotic observers took note. "You English are such liberal do-gooders," said Ernst Henri, alias Semyon Nickolayevich Rostovsky, the Comintern agent "most interested in undergraduates" at English universities, and himself an anglophile with a predilection for "well made English suits" and English detective stories.[81] In a sense, Pearson had adopted the secularism of English-born Oxford colleagues like Gladwyn Jebb and Malcolm MacDonald.[82]

This underlined the common brand of liberal Britishness shared by Canadian and British thinkers and statesmen of the time. The secularized religious background of Pearson and his contemporaries can be taken, then, as evocative of *continuity* with what was happening in Britain, rather than as a break with Britishness. Canadian proponents of the welfare state were participating in what Daniel Patrick Moynihan called the worldwide "British Revolution," the growth of a British welfare model and state-based meliorist culture in many of the Empire's successor states that was, in varying degrees throughout the world, "suffused with socialist ideas and attitudes" adapted to local needs and conditions.[83]

Did Canadian Methodism have direct implications for the confrontation with Britishness in the 1960s? The supposed Methodist aversion to excessive tradition and reference to "the past," shared with some other Protestant denominations, was traced by

---

[81] Cited by Christopher Andrew in Richard Langhorne, ed., *Diplomacy and Intelligence in the Second World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 25, 29.
[82] Hubert Miles Gladwyn Jebb, *The memoirs of Lord Gladwyn* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972), 15.
[83] D.P. Moynihan and Suzanne Weaver, *A Dangerous Place* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1978), 34.

Goldwin French to Victorian dissenters' impatience with the "mere chronological bond" upheld by High Churchmen and Roman Catholics preoccupied with preserving customs and practices handed down through history, even when these customs had outlived their practical utility.[84] The Methodist preference for "plain and unadorned church buildings" and understated ritual and liturgy was noted by one of the biographers of the poet E.J. Pratt.[85] Norman Robertson wrote of Canadian anglophiles at Oxford: "I find the abject acceptance of everything that is English and antique quite as annoying as the cheap comfort that some misfits find in a spurious Canadian nationalism."[86] In successive generations a present-mindedness and refusal to bow reflexively toward English tradition contributed to a kind of instinctive suspicion of arguments resting on the authority of past generations. In the House of Commons debates of the mid- to late-1960s this attitude can be seen in relation to symbols such as the Crown and the Red Ensign flag. "We cannot be saved or sanctified merely by the valour and devotion of our ancestors," Pearson told the Commons.[87] Brooke Claxton became incensed at certain Canadian naval officers' "stuffy and pompous" pseudo-English accents in the early post-war navy.[88] An interesting parallel can be seen in Egerton Ryerson 100 years earlier, expressing "my love for the British Connexion and Government" but also his hostility to the colonial sycophancy of a certain overt anglophile, the "*upstart pretensions*" and "bastard imitation" of the contemporary Minister of Militia (emphasis in original), presumably a reference to the

---

[84] Goldwin French in Morton, ed., 28.

[85] Angela T. McAuliffe, *Between the Temple and the Cave: The Religious Dimensions of the Poetry of E.J. Pratt* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000), 5.

[86] Letter home from Oxford University, 28 October 1923. Norman Robertson Papers, LAC. The typescript says "spacious" but the original handwriting reads "spurious."

[87] *Hansard*, 15 June 1964.

[88] Cited in William Glover, "Colonial or Canadian?" in Hadley H. Crickard, ed., *A Nation's Navy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), 72-3.

anglophile Sir George-Etienne Cartier.[89] There is some evidence, then, that a dissenting Protestant aversion to conservative arguments resting on the flimsy basis of ancestral traditions helped to create sympathy for the idea of replacing British-looking symbols with simpler "Canadian" ones.

In the end, there are many ambiguities in the Methodist legacy among Pearson and his contemporaries. Some of the more eccentric among the Canadian pilgrims to Oxford University, such as Newfoundland-born Eugene Forsey (who, unlike most Canadian scholars at Oxford, earned a first-class degree from Balliol), never sought to obtain a position in government. In addition, Forsey may have taken a leading role in the League for Social Reconstruction, but he remained an ardent "Tory" where British-Canadian traditions were concerned. If Methodism can be linked to a brand of nationalism that sought to downplay overt forms of Britishness in Canadian life, then why did Forsey, a lifelong Methodist, oppose these steps? The answer remains open to speculation, but a clue may lie in the fact that Pearson and his allies were products of a largely secularized, post-Christian formation, while Forsey continued to profess a belief in Christian teachings, and the flame lit by Forsey's upbringing was not extinguished by the winds of the social gospel.[90] The same was true of Watson Kirkconnell, a devout Baptist and fourth-generation Canadian of Scots origins who studied at Oxford as a postgraduate on an Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire scholarship in 1921-22,[91] who never lost his Christian belief or his esteem for the British connection. It is not at all clear, then, that a direct line can be drawn between the influence of the rising

[89] June 19, 1870, in C.B. Sissons, ed., *My Dearest Sophie* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1955), 190.
[90] Milligan, 34-5.
[91] J.M.R. Beveridge, "Watson Kirkconnell: A Biographical Sketch," in J.R.C. Perkin, ed., *The Undoing of Babel: Watson Kirkconnell, The Man and His Work* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1975), 11-15.

“Methodistical” or low-church Protestant middle class, so witheringly depicted by Scott Symons, and the confrontation with overt symbolic Britishness in the mid-1960s. The ranks of Methodist and post-Methodist (that is, men of Methodist background whose attitude towards religious “belief” was post-Christian) Canadians included both defenders and critics of the Red Ensign and of other Canadian traditions, and conclusions can only be tentative in this regard.

If Methodism and dissenting Protestantism lent colour to the background and upbringing of Pearson’s generation, another key factor in Anglo-Canadian identity formation was undoubtedly the impact of the Great War. There is evidence of developing nationalism among front-line troops on the Western Front—such as photographs of soldiers in France holding up a nine-province Red Ensign, perhaps as an expression of their distinctive Canadianism. But this was not necessarily anti-British. Much of the historiography has obscured the continuing Britishness of Canadians in the inter-war years by depicting the Great War as a uniquely nationalizing experience, a transition to Canadianism or “coming of age” from colony to “nation forged in fire.” It was true that Canadians discovered or gained a new sense of their Canadianness in the most exotic places, as Pearson noted on his arrival in Egypt in 1917 en route to Saloniki. Although their uniforms were identical to those of British Tommies, Pearson observed, “We caused quite a stir during the march [into Alexandria] as soon as it was found that we were Canadians. For we were the first of our race they had ever seen save the plutocratic

winter tourist of a happier day … as the song of the maple leaf was heard in the land of the Nile."[92]

Canadians' experience in British arms could be embittering for some, as in Underhill's post-war revulsion at any society "run by the British governing classes." However, historians tend to apply the nationalizing effect of the Western Front broadly to English Canadians as a whole. To R.G. Moyles and Doug Owram, the war signified to Canadians that, "Death and futility, not glory and civilization, were the hallmarks of imperialism … disillusionment contributed to the end of Empire."[93] Carl Berger asserted that many forces undermined imperial sentiment in Canada, but the First World War "killed" it.[94] The "lost generation" of volunteers of 1914-15, both British- and Canadian-born, according to George Grant, cleared the way for the "elimination of Great Britain as an independent source of civilization" for English-speaking Canadians, a factor that "increased the pull of the United States."[95] John English said, "So many of the underpinnings of the [former] Anglo-Canadian sense of nationhood had eroded during the war and its aftermath."[96] Pearson's former trust that the "British Empire and the Methodist religion … would keep Canada and its world safe from any danger" was "shattered" by the war, "changing Pearson forever and setting him adrift," wrote Granatstein and Norman Hillmer.[97] David Bercuson wrote that the First World War "turned [Brooke] Claxton into a Canadian nationalist. … He had fought alongside

[92] Pearson Diary, 1919, L.B. Pearson Papers, LAC, typescript, 48.
[93] Moyles and Owram, 240.
[94] Berger, *Sense of Power*, 264.
[95] Grant, loc. cit.
[96] English, *Shadow of Heaven*, 127.
[97] J.L. Granatstein and Norman Hillmer, *Prime Ministers: Rating Canada's Leaders* (Toronto: HarperCollins, 1999), 138.

Englishmen, and he keenly felt the differences."[98] Claxton himself wrote in 1954: "We came back to Canada with a new-won pride in being Canadian."[99] Sir Ernest MacMillan's biographer wrote that "England's handling of the western front and its all-too-frequent cavalier use of Canadian troops as cannon-fodder [sic] so disenchanted English Canadians that their ties to the mother country were forever loosened."[100] In explaining the sense that Britishness was something foreign, historians most often cite the First World War as a nationalizing experience. According to Moyles and Owram, the experience of A.R.M. Lower, who served in the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve (R.N.V.R.), was typical:

> Some Canadians who went to Britain … undoubtedly had their earlier [idealistic] impressions confirmed. … Many, however, reacted differently. They were dismayed to find British society more different from Canadian than they had imagined. … Thus, for example, a young Canadian naval officer named Arthur Lower was struck … by the difference in class structure between the two countries …'[101]

Lower had felt a stranger,[102] sensing that Englishmen were "indifferent" to Canada, and that the experience made him "more Canadian." He later wrote of his own revulsion at Britain's class system.[103] According to Arthur Irwin's biographer, Irwin, who served in

[98] Bercuson, 40.
[99] Claxton Memoirs, 199.
[100] Ezra Schabas, *Sir Ernest MacMillan: The Importance of Being Canadian* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 51.
[101] Moyles and Owram, 239-40.
[102] Cook, ed. *Craft of History*, 10.
[103] A.R.M. Lower, *My First Seventy-five Years* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967), 94, 108, 120, 139.

the 10th Siege Battery in France, returned to Canada "indignant" about the "class system," and "being treated like a 'colonial,'" though he had "felt very much 'at home'" when sightseeing in London, which was "everything [he] had imagined."[104]

And yet historians are now beginning to emphasize that if the war was a nationalizing experience, it also reinforced Canadians's sense of Britishness and ties to the Empire. As C.P. Stacey wrote earlier, "So far as Canadians were concerned," the First World War "left the British connection … still the dominant fact in Canadian external relations."[105] But this was also true within Canada, where Anglo-Canadians' sense of themselves remained firmly rooted in Britishness. A new generation of historians is rediscovering that the war made Canadians *more* British as well as more Canadian. Canada "entered the war a colony and emerged a nation," wrote Brooke Claxton in the 1950s. "Looking back, this seems evident enough today, but it was not so clear in 1919."[106] In fact, Jonathan Vance has shown that the pacifist view of the war as a "futile slaughter" was delayed by the "myth" of noble sacrifice, and took decades to set in.[107] But this was true of many Englishmen as it was of other Britishers. Underhill himself does not seem to have acquired an anti-war posture in 1919, when the battlefield was a fresh memory: he owed his first job after the Armistice to Lionel Curtis and his pre-war Round Table network, and felt nostalgic (perhaps with some irony), in 1919, for the "leisurely life of a British officer with afternoon tea, servants and drinks."[108]

---

[104] MacKenzie, 22-23.
[105] C.P. Stacey, *Canada in the Age of Conflict*: *A History of Canadian External Policies*, Vol. 1 (Toronto : Macmillan, 1977), 235.
[106] Claxton Memoirs, 284.
[107] Vance, op. cit., 4, 7.
[108] R. Douglas Francis, *Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 41-47.

Even Pearson did not adopt a "disillusioned" stance immediately. English quoted Pearson's 1919 diary in which he declared that London was the "true heart of a world Empire … and will be forever such."[109] Some of Pearson's ruminations, however, were perhaps too strong for inclusion in *Shadow of Heaven*. Of his first visit to Canterbury Cathedral on leave from Shorncliffe, Pearson wrote: "Here Beckett was stabbed [sic], here Henry did pennance [sic] at his tomb, here the graves of the impersonation of mediaeval romance, the Black Prince, and his father. It all appealed to me very much."[110] On a visit to the British Museum, Pearson meditated on the last words of Captain R.F. "Scott of Antarctica" in the British Museum: "The secret of Britain's greatness lies in that self-written obituary of a great and noble soul," he said of Scott's famous last diary entry, which he saw while on leave during the war ("the hardihood, endurance and courage of my companions … would have stirred the heart of every Englishman," Scott wrote). This, Pearson enthused, "was the spirit of Trafalgar, of the Light Brigade, the spirit that was to be shown a million times in a million ways in the dark days ahead." Strikingly, Pearson endorsed—without a trace of irony—the playing fields of Eton, the sportsmanship, "geniality" and "pep" of British *officers* and men alike, describing as "marvellous to behold the ease with which our 'brass hats' shed their dignity and sometimes their age" to relax with the men.[111] Far from "distrust of the 'brass hats'" (English's unsubstantiated phrase),[112] if Pearson was eventually to adopt the posture of disillusionment of later decades, there was little foretaste of it in 1919. English implied as much when he described Pearson in the 1920s as "a self-styled 'British-Canadian Conservative'

[109] English, *Shadow of Heaven*, 1-2, 21, 60.
[110] Pearson Diary, 14-15, LAC, typed from his own notes, February 1919, and titled "Looking Back."
[111] Ibid., 24.
[112] English, 53-4.

[sic]."[113] For Pearson, as for many, the partial disillusionment may have to be sought sometime later, perhaps after the appearance of anti-war tracts such as *Goodbye to All That* in 1929. ("Mischievous young Corporal Mike Pearson" made an appearance only when Robert Graves wrote an epilogue in 1957, by which time Pearson had unexpectedly become "Canada's most famous citizen."[114]) Arnold Heeney wrote that during the war years, "Canadians, inspired by the achievements of the Canadian Corps," had "developed a new spirit of nationalism."[115] But as Patrick Brennan has shown, if the war strengthened the Canadianism of many officers, it also strengthened their allegiance to the British Empire. "They seem to have emerged from the experience more confidently Canadian and yet with an unshaken faith in the British Empire and a certainty that Canada would—and should—continue to make common cause with the British World. Britishness, in other words, remained central to their sense of Canadian national identity," Brennan wrote.[116] It would not be surprising to find that the war deepened the shared sense of Britishness, as well as the Canadianism, of many Canadians beyond the officer corps. If Private Peat is to be believed, it did exactly that: "There has come about a complete change in the Canadian mind in its attitude to the English," he wrote. "If, before this war, there was ever a possibility of our breaking away from the empire, that possibility is now dead—dead and buried beyond recall."[117] In some cases, like Pearson's, a continuing attachment to Empire evolved into a sense that it represented progress and the spread of

[113] Ibid., 130.
[114] Robert Graves, *Goodbye to All That* (London: Cassell, 1957), 306.
[115] Heeney, 12.
[116] Patrick H. Brennan, "The Other Battle: Imperialist versus nationalist sympathies within the Officer Corps of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, 1914-1919," in Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, eds., *Rediscovering the British World* (Calgary: Calgary University Press, 2005), 261.
[117] Peat, 214.

liberal ideas, but not did not become, until much later, an outright disillusionment with Empire.

Another widely held belief about Great War nationalism is that there is some connection between having been wounded or suffered loss in the war and becoming disillusioned with the Empire and with British elite values. It is not that nationalists became anti-British but that they were alienated from certain forms of Britishness and that this complicated their sense of themselves. It is often taken for granted, for example, that good Canadians shared Borden's fury at British incompetence. According to Moyles and Owram, "It was difficult to glory in the history and traditions of imperialism while recovering from a gas attack or while facing a return to the slaughter of the trenches," and this left Canadians disillusioned.[118] Ironically, one could argue that it was the Canadians who emerged from the war *physically unscathed* who later became nationalists sceptical of the British officer ideal, while men who were wounded or maimed tended to retain a certain respect for this British model. Both Georges P. Vanier and Percy E. Corbett were actually wounded in battle, and remained comfortable all their lives with overt and traditional expressions of Britishness. By contrast, Lower and Pearson, unharmed by hostile fire, went on to hang their nationalist hats upon the devastation of war and their supposed "disgust" (acquired some time later) with the officer class. Underhill partially fit Moyles and Owram's description—except for the gas, for he too emerged from the war unscathed. Brooke Claxton, who later attributed his nationalism to the scars of war, spent the Hundred Days "digging rather than firing," according to his commanding

[118] Moyles and Owram, 240.

officer, who described him as “excellent at outdoor work.”[119] These examples by themselves are not conclusive proof that Canadians who were actually wounded in combat tended to remain pro-British. More research would be needed, but these cases do suggest that British conduct of the war may have stimulated nationalist impulses chiefly for a predisposed minority whom the war left physically, if not emotionally, unscathed. In short, the war experiences of nationalists added layers of complexity to their continuing sense of Britishness.

Some Canadians were far from disillusioned by service alongside Englishmen. Lower’s wartime friend, Lieutenant Perce Serjeant, the sole Canadian officer serving with a battalion of the Devonshire Regiment in the Indian Expeditionary Force in Mesopotamia in 1917, wrote to Lower, then serving aboard the supply ship HMS *Arrogant* in Dover: “I don’t blame you for getting fed up with the Englishman at home. In England, they stick their noses up at bally Colonials, rawthaw! But over here, Art, they are different. They are more like colonials having been in India for some time. I’m the only Canadian in our mess. Nearly all Devonshire men,” he wrote. English soldiers “go anywhere and live under any conditions and always have lots of guts (to use a good Canadian term),” he added. “It’s the Tommy in the ranks and the Jack on the sea winning this war for us, eh?’[120] These sentiments lend credence to the claims of *Private Peat*, who wrote, also in 1917:

> When I enlisted, and before I went over to England, I had no use for the Englishman myself; that was, the Englishman as we knew him in Western

[119] Letter from O.C., Canadian Siege Battery, to Claxton’s father, 7 October 1917, quoted in Claxton Memoir, 173-4.
[120] Serjeant to Lower, 9 January 1917, Lower Papers, Box 1.

> Canada. We had had specimens of “Algy boys,” of “de Veres” and “Montmorency lads.” These, we soon found out, were not the English true to type. They were ne’er-do-wells, remittance men, sent out of the way to the farthest point of the map. … I have no English blood in my veins, but I believe in fairness, I believe firmly that all the other nations of the empire put together have not done so much as have the English Tommies by themselves.[121]

Percy Corbett of Prince Edward Island, the son of a Presbyterian minister, a McGill graduate and Quebec Rhodes Scholar twice wounded in the Battle of the Somme, suffered no wrenching loss of faith in the British connection either in the trenches or subsequently at Oxford. In fact, with his First Class degree in jurisprudence, Corbett found himself ushered into the *sanctum sanctorum* of All Souls, a rare distinction because only two were elected per year from the entire University of Oxford. As a Yale professor in the late 1940s, he continued to promote the Crown and the Commonwealth connection.[122] In short, if the First World War had a disillusioning effect on a segment of Canadians attracted to government service under King and Skelton, and for other Anglo-Canadians associated with Pearson in the public service and academe, it did not necessarily do so for all, or even most, Canadians.

The religious and military background illustrate how Britishness and Canadianness were interpenetrated in the conflicted pro- and anti-British feelings of

[121] Harold R. Peat, *Private Peat* (Toronto, George J. McLeod, 1917), 213-14.
[122] D.C. Corbett, “Draft Biography,” Percy E. Corbett Papers, McGill University Archives (MUA).

certain Eminent Pearsonians. A nexus of ethnicity, religion, and the service of King and Empire contributed to the identity-formation and sense of self of many Anglo-Canadians. Anglo-Celtic origins, dissenting Methodism or some other freethinking Protestant background, new and relative wealth, the escape from mediocrity, self-help networks, attraction to elite education and public service, and intolerance of excessive anglophile tendencies—these lay in the background of their Canadianism. Still, Pearson and his contemporaries were not so much anti-British as examples of the changing nature of Britishness in a younger generation of nationalist dedicated to the autonomy of their own country while still attached to British traditions in modified form. All their lives they bore the marks of anglophilia in their dress, affections, and manners. To paraphrase Frances Swyripa, the male, Anglo-Celtic identity of the Eminent Pearsonians, a product of the unique British amalgam and hybrid identities in Canada, was exhibited in "group-imposed behaviour models" that represented the British connection at the same time as the emergence of the local nationalism of the Anglo-Canadian "nation."[123]

In conclusion, Pearson and his contemporaries constituted something like a neo-*aristocratic base* in a "lateral" *ethnie*, as Anthony D. Smith wrote of postcolonial elites. Such an elite was "often permeated with religious and priestly influences," in this case the largely post-Christian, "emancipated" Methodism or secularized Protestantism of their religious background. The piety and practice of their youth was secularized by influences like the social gospel and the promise of state legislation. The transformation of a personal Methodist faith into belief in collective progress gives colour and relief to Pearson's liberal nationalist internationalism, derived ultimately from liberal imperialism. This accompanied the migration of small-town Methodist families to larger urban centres,

[123] Cf. Swyripa, 257.

the acquisition of wealth, education, and culture—and this the social climbing of the Methodist middle class represented by the Flavelles, Masseys, and others. A case can be made, then, that Pearson and his associates in the expanded mid-20th century public service represented the triumph of Ontario's post-Methodist middle and lower-middle classes which, in some sense, usurped some of the role of Ontario and Quebec's tiny quasi-aristocracy in giving shape to the Britishness of Anglo-Canadian identity. Smith's theory of postcolonial elites suggests that such neo-aristocracies are marked by a preoccupation to ensure "the inclusion of significant ethnic minorities." In Canada, this would apply well to the large French enclave centred in Quebec, and to the "New Canadians" who represented a third element in Canada. F.H. Underhill embodied and observed this phenomenon in his musings about Methodist middle class influences. If Underhill's great socially progressive vision, as Spry said, was to fight for "his people's enfranchisement," he would do this, Spry said, by bringing to bear "Oxford's profound scepticism" on behalf of the "English-Canadian "nation"'[124] and by insisting that Anglo-Canadians must accommodate themselves to other ethnic groups. It is to the Oxford experience that we now turn.

[124] Spry in Penlington, ed.

Chapter 5

The celebrated *rite-de-passage* at Oxford University

Oxford University was "the greatest of all schools of English Canadian nationalism," according to J.W. Pickersgill.[1] On the other hand, Irving Layton's poem stereotyped the "Anglo-Canadian," whose family had been in Canada for at least three generations and yet, having attended Oxford for three years, "his accent / makes even Englishmen / wince, and feel / unspeakably colonial."[2] The reality was more complex than Layton's mildly disdainful poem suggested, and historians have never drawn out the nature of Oxford's influence. According to the standard interpretation, the Oxonian-Canadians of the 1920s—Norman Robertson, Graham Spry, King Gordon, Escott Reid, Hugh MacLennan, Frank Scott, Gordon Robertson, and Lester B. Pearson (to name but a few)—represented "a new generation" of nationalist, "more assured and less hag-ridden by fear of the British," wrote John Holmes, who had studied at the University of London: "They had all learned at Oxford to regard the British as equals."[3] The experience was "more important for what it taught them about themselves as Canadians," David Bercuson says, than for any degree it conferred. George F.G. Stanley was "a Rhodes Scholar … with a doctorate from Oxford … who nevertheless was first and foremost a

---

[1] J.W. Pickersgill, *International Perspectives* (March-April 1973), 56.
[2] Irving Layton, *Collected Poems* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1965), 158.
[3] John W. Holmes, *The Shaping of Peace* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), I, 15.

Canadian," wrote John Matheson.[4] The connection between Oxford and Canadian nationalism, and its impact on Canadian Britishness, deserves a closer look. Many Oxonian alumni became academics and public figures in Canada,[5] including a number who presided over so great a symbol of Canada's independent nationhood as Pearson's Maple Leaf flag of 1965, based on a design submitted by Stanley. Thus, while historians, biographers, and memoir writers have superficially attributed a nationalist character to the impact of Oxford, there has been little exploration of this question—or of the ways in which Oxford also reinforced their Britishness and contributed to changing, but also consolidating and extending, the underlying Britishness of Canada.

Oxford appears in memoirs and biographies as something of an epiphany, a rite of passage from which the Canadians returned proud and confident of their equality and distinctiveness, determined to be Colonial no longer. They emerged from a period of "identity formation" influenced by class, gender, ethnicity, and their encounter with "other"—in this case, university-class Englishmen, "Oxbridge Men"—in the pattern of generations of travellers, male and female, from the "margins" of Empire to the "centre."[6] Kosmas Tsokhas has shown how fantasy and journeys to Britain in the 1930s shaped the young R.G. Menzies (the future Australian prime minister), reinforcing in his character both admiration and "differentiation"—though Menzies himself did not study at a British university.[7] The Canadians, too, remained anglophiles at some level for the rest of their lives. In 1949 Pearson dined with the Fellows at his old college, St. John's, and was

---

[4] Bercuson, 50; Matheson, 23.
[5] David E. Torrance, "Instructor to Empire: Canada and the Rhodes Scholarships, 1902-39" in Buckner and Francis, *Canada and the British World*, 250-69.
[6] Paul R. Deslandes, *Oxbridge Men: British Masculinity and the Undergraduate Experience, 1850-1920* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005); Angela Wollacott, *To Try Her Fortune in London: Australian Women, Colonialism, and Modernity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).
[7] Tsokhas, 140-50.

"relieved to find that nothing had changed… or indeed was ever likely to change."[8] If Pearson and his contemporaries gained a new consciousness of themselves as Canadians, their Britishness remained very much intact. He, like the others, was both "an anglophile" and "a nascent Canadian nationalist," reflecting in 1940: "I have more than once been struck by the fact that some of our more ardent nationalists are Oxford graduates who find it quite easy to reconcile their Canadian nationalism with a devotion to Oxford."[9] It tends to be overlooked that Oxford, like the Western Front, reinforced their Britishness as well as their Canadianism.

Oxford and Cambridge worked their romantic Empire-building magic on generations of Colonials who gravitated to the academic wellspring. South Africans, Australians, New Zealanders, and others associated in Cecil Rhodes' mind with Anglo-Saxondom were selected under the Rhodes scheme, intended to mark them "for life" and instill in them "the advantages to the Colonies as well as to the United Kingdom of the retention and unity of the Empire."[10] The unintended effects on scholars, Rhodes or otherwise, were more complicated and ambivalent. If Indian nationalists like Krishna Menon suffered at Oxford "from a complex, resulting from the unnatural relationship between the ruler and the ruled,"[11] nevertheless, "For years, nearly a century, the books that Indians have read have been the books of our English radicals, our English liberals," wrote Paul Scott.[12] Liberal imperialists relished seeing anglicized nationalists depart from Oxford to assume leadership of independence movements while retaining a strong

[8] Lester B. Pearson, *Mike: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson, Vol. 2, 1948-1957* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), 100.
[9] Granatstein, *Ottawa Men*, 79 n.
[10] Deslandes, 224.
[11] Richard Symonds, "Oxford and India," in F. Madden and D.K. Fieldhouse, eds., *Oxford and the Idea of Commonwealth* (London: Croom Helm, 2982), 48-72.
[12] Paul Scott, *The Jewel in the Crown*, (New York: William Morrow, 1966), 62-3.

attachment to British ideals. This was the emerging *Res Britannica*, the British entity, Sir Fred Clarke wrote in 1936, not a political unity but a universal "Empire of ideas … that whole philosophy of life and culture and social order which, with its roots and historical origins in these [British] islands, has now re-rooted itself and grown to maturity in distant lands."[13] Young interwar nationalists represented "the inner logic of the British spirit, a logic of influence more than of power, has been working itself out," Clarke said. This was a liberal imperialism. If Canadian governments began to build up a *Res Canadiana* (to coin the *mot juste*) with distinctive symbols like the Canadian Red Ensign and later the Maple Leaf flag, their nationalism was no less a product of a British world.

Canadian memories of Oxford are tinted with the nostalgia of "autumnal mists," "mannered idiosyncracies" and *Brideshead Revisited*.[14] It was "a timeless world apart, where golden young men perfected their elegance," wrote David Corbett, son of the 1915 Rhodes Scholar from McGill, Percy Corbett, later a professor of international law at Yale and Princeton.[15] As Pearson recalled, Oxford "turned out to be all that I had hoped and dreamed," sending forth men "well equipped to govern the Empire—aye, the World." His two years there were "the happiest in his life," Pearson told John Robinson Beal, an admirer and fellow Wesleyan Methodist. "It was wonderful. I played on all the teams in my college and I loved the subject I was studying, modern history. My tutor, W.C.

[13] Clarke, ""British with a small "b"," 428-439.
[14] Idem, *Shadow of Heaven*, 71; English also cites *Chariots of Fire*, but that was set in Cambridge, not Oxford.
[15] D.C. Corbett, "Draft Biography," P.E. Corbett Papers, McGill University Archives (MUA).

Costin, became my friend."[16] "Mike's athletic skills, easy ways, growing sense of frivolity, and popularity with both sexes won him respect and friendship," John English says; "Mike, clearly, was one of the élite of St. John's." There he gained "polish," "experience," and "self-confidence" that "made him less colonial," Robert Bothwell says. Escott Reid, too, was "a major figure at Oxford."[17] The impression is that Pearson and his contemporaries were popular and successful Oxonians; their British credentials underscored that such men were the "best and brightest," uniquely gifted for public stewardship.

Pearson "fitted right into the Oxford of the early 1920s," J.L. Granatstein tells us. But did he really? Among the Canadians, Oxford left more than what Mrinalini Sinha calls the "veneer" of an Oxbridge training.[18] But the nature and trajectory of this impact have been little explored by biographers. It troubled Graham Spry, for example, that despite Pearson's performance at sports the Canadians were unpopular with English students and staff. The degree to which they were accepted (or not), the unexpected foreignness of the "Oxford Englishman" in the flesh, and unforeseen limitations discovered during their sojourn, left their mark. Rejection, disillusionment, and disappointment, as well as self-discovery, shaped their sense of themselves. This was a pan-British experience, a certain alienation, "ambivalence … difference and otherness" shared by Australian anglophiles, a "mixture of discovery, reconciliation and

[16] Pearson, *Mike*, Vol. 1, 44; English, *Shadow of Heaven*, 87; Beal, 36-7.
[17] Norman Hillmer, "Pearson and the Sense of Paradox," in Norman Hillmer, ed., *Pearson: The Unlikely Gladiator* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999), 6; Granatstein in ibid., 52; Bothwell in ibid., 21; Granatstein, "Becoming Difficult," 11, 13.
[18] Mrinalini Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity: the manly Englishman and the effeminate Bengali* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 131.

separation."[19] To recoil did not mean to withdraw from a British world but to carry home one's Britishness, with adjustments, to coexist with other multiple identities, as had American pilgrims J. William Fulbright (Pembroke, 1925) and Dean Rusk (St. John's, 1931). Pearson wrote that the Canadians' devotion to Oxford was "as deep, and probably deeper, than that of most British undergraduates."[20]

Still, few returned with their enthusiasm for Imperial unity intact. "Your year in Oxford didn't help you much in that regard," says the hero's mother in Ralph Connor's *The Gay Crusader* (1936). "Perhaps," replied the son, "but think of my two years in Harvard and Wall Street."[21] There were many influences besides Oxford, and a study might be made of Ivy League Canadians.[22] The continentalism of F.H. Underhill, described by Graham Spry as the "Lionel Groulx" of English Canada, infused a generation of nationalists with a sense that Canada had "too much memory" and needed an American-style break with "the past."[23] It was study circles in Montreal in the late 1920s, we are told, that changed F.R. Scott "from a young Anglophile…to a staunchly Canadian socialist and nationalist."[24] Before Oxford, one's upbringing, schooling, and social circle, "family friends from McGill or Vancouver,"[25] had given shape to a distinctly Canadian Britishness. A character in Connor's *The Major* (1917) "rejoiced in the greatness of the British Empire" but "believed that Canada's first duty was to herself, to the developing here of a strong and sturdy national spirit. Canada for Canadians" of

[19] Kosmas Tsokhas, "Tradition, fantasy and Britishness: Four Australian prime ministers," *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 31, 1 (2001), 3-30; Tsokhas, *Making a Nation State*, 300.
[20] Pearson Diary, 21 April 1940, L.B. Pearson Papers, LAC.
[21] Ralph Connor [the Rev. C.W. Gordon], *The Gay Crusader* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1936), 20.
[22] Cf. Peter Newman, *The Canadian Establishment* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975), 338, 435-6.
[23] Bothwell, Drummond, English, 270.
[24] Sandra Djwa, "F.R. Scott," *Canadian Poetry*, 4 (Spring/Summer 1979).
[25] Granatstein, *Man of Influence*, 3.

diverse immigrant backgrounds, "Canada first."[26] Charles Ritchie's Nova Scotia family thought of themselves as "British, but not English, cantankerously loyal." The conflation of Britishness with Englishness, by some,[27] is inadequate in the Canadian setting.

At Oxford, said Roland Michener, "We were all a little puzzled by the Englishmen … their reserve and sort of indifference to such important people as Rhodes Scholars."[28] Percy Corbett "found the Master of my college … quite unimpressed. He was like one saying, "This is not Arcadia, my lad, and we are not coming out with pipe and dance to usher you in!""[29] According to Escott Reid, "Most Rhodes Scholars would … gladly come home at the end of their first term. One knows no one. There seems no possibility of knowing anyone. Many … give up the struggle and say the Englishman is not worth knowing and from then on consort only with their own nationals or with other Rhodes Scholars." Reid transcribed much of his Oxford diary directly into his memoirs, but omitted the passage: "I never felt quite at home in England."[30] Stephen Leacock's irreverent "discovery of England" in 1921, like John Diefenbaker's reverent one in 1957, both occurred in middle life,[31] but the Oxonian Canadians were jolted by Oxford's peculiar reality at a tender age; Norman Robertson was 18 when he first walked through Balliol's gates, drenched because he couldn't afford a taxi.

Much depended on how their background and awareness of class prepared them for life in England. As we have seen, Pearson, Heeney, Corbett, Reid, Michener, Keenleyside, and others were later recognized as a unique Canadian neo-aristocracy of

---

[26] Ralph Connor, *The Major* (Toronto: McClelland, Goodchild & Stewart, 1917), 152.
[27] Deslandes, 41.
[28] Peter Stursberg, *Roland Michener: The Last Viceroy* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1989), 3.
[29] Percy Corbett, "Impressions–Mostly Oxonian," typescript, Corbett Papers.
[30] Reid, 49; Reid Diary, 12 June 1930, Escott Reid Papers, LAC.
[31] Stephen Leacock, *My Discovery of England* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1961), 72-96; H. Basil Robinson, *Diefenbaker's World* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), 60-64.

clergymen's sons. The Oxonian Canadians were, in the main, products of an ordinary middle-class Victorian-Edwardian Protestant background hostile to drinking, dancing, card-playing, Catholics, and hierarchies, but with the pro-imperial imprint of "this blessed spot, this earth, this realm, this Ontario," to quote Robertson Davies, whose Francis Cornish character makes the Upper Canadian pilgrimage to Oxford.[32] Heeney's youth had been "surrounded by British influences."[33] And Pearson told Beal:

> As a boy I used to read *Boy's Own Annual* and *Chums* … which had stories of Oxford college life that were pretty romantic and attractive. It became a kind of dream; if I could only get over to Oxford, and experience that kind of life, living at a college, taking part in the games, and having a tutor and sitting around the fireplace! I never thought I would be able to do it, because it cost a lot of money. But after that spring at Wadham College, I thought, if I ever get out of this war alive, somehow I'm going to come back here as an undergraduate.

It was Vincent Massey who arranged Pearson's funding (a "Massey Fellowship") to go to Oxford in 1921, just as Sir Joseph Flavelle had given Massey a scholarship – a case of Methodist self-help across three generations.

Hugh MacLennan's letters home from Oxford have not been tapped before, and provide a rich impression of the rude awakening for Canadians who in later life rose to great prominence. His school experience in Halifax had been highly British in tone, and his father, an amateur classicist, had spent many evening hours studying Greek and Latin

[32] Robertson Davies, *The Diary of Samuel Marchbanks* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1947), 60; idem, *What's Bred in the Bone* (New York: Viking, 1985).
[33] Heeney, 6-7

with his son to prepare him for top honours at Oxford. But upon arrival the Nova Scotia lad's earnest Presbyterian formation induced a state of near-shock: the academic metropole was "so overwhelming that when I first encountered it, I was lonely and unhappy for months," MacLennan wrote, "shaken as a man is when he encounters something that is almost too much for him."[34] Contrary to his expectations, he could form no friendships with Englishmen, whose brand of Britishness was foreign to his own. Unable to bridge the gulf despite bicycling and taking tea with "English freshers," he turned to a Welsh divinity student, who explained, "one can't help feeling a gap between [Englishmen and others]." This, MacLennan wrote, "is not at all a gap of nationality or anything like that. There is absolutely nothing of the "Colonial" sort of talk one used to hear so much about." But in the midst of unravelling this enigma—the breach between his own (middle-class Protestant-Scots-Maritimes) Britishness and that of Oxford—even the future novelist's powers of description failed him and he changed the subject to his Christmas plans in St. Moritz. Holidays with one's compatriots in Switzerland, like hockey, lacrosse, and the distinctively Canadian Red Ensign displayed in C.P. Stacey's rooms at Corpus Christi, were identifying marks of the Oxonian ghetto.[35]

Paradoxically, Oxford's cold weather could be unnerving and, perhaps, struck at the Canadians' sense of masculinity. The winter of 1928, MacLennan wrote, saw the first man to bicycle on the Thames River since 1888. "Of course, I am supposed to feel at home in this sort of thing, being a Canadian," he told his family. "Personally, I think the English are much more hardy than we are." The following winter he wrote, "I really think

[34] Elspeth Cameron, *Hugh MacLennan: A Writer's Life* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), 7-8; Hugh MacLennan, "Oxford Revisited," *Scotchman's Return* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1960), 193.
[35] Hugh MacLennan Papers, 14 November 1929; C.P. Stacey, *A Date with History* (Ottawa: Deneau, 1983), 30.

the English are a hardier lot than we, for they none of them wore coats in the cold snap—only sweaters, scarves, and so on."[36] It is ironic that Englishmen should have challenged even the Canadians' sense of their unique ability to tolerate the cold—perhaps a blow to their confidence and, contemporary scholars might infer, to their masculinity, causing a kind of "humiliation and emasculation."[37] MacLennan shared a fruitcake sent by his mother with a "Scotchman," a Yorkshireman, a Gloucestershireman, a Frenchman, and two Americans—a symbolic gathering of outsiders.[38] Just as Oxford students typically divided themselves into various "sets" such as athletes, aesthetes, hard-drinking "hearties," and studious "reading men," the Canadians tended to form their own set.

Interestingly, Canadians of non-British origins felt less ghettoized. Marius Barbeau, the Laval graduate, found Oxford "charming and happy … We can eat like Vitellius and drink like Canadian codfish."[39] He joined the Oxford Union, the renowned debating society, and the Club français d'Oxford, and felt no ostracism on account of his Roman Catholicism, "my conscience being my recognized and inviolable guide. They uphold the same things, in short, as you uphold at Laval; which makes me say that they consider us men." David Lewis, whose Central European Jewishness was far removed from MacLennan's Presbyterianism or Pearson's Methodism, disapproved of what he called "class-consciousness in reverse" at Oxford (naïvely, he believed that "Percy" was his scout's *first* name). Lewis' adjustment to "unaccustomed comfort and luxury" was "not difficult," and his "forthright earnestness" helped to make him the first Canadian president of the Oxford Union. For George Ignatieff, of Russian noble-functionary stock

---

[36] MacLennan to his mother, 16 February 1928; to "Dadden," 21 February 1929.
[37] Tsokhas, *Making a Nation State*, 155.
[38] MacLennan to his mother, 21 January 1929.
[39] Nowry, 73.

and schooled in Russia and England, Oxford "encouraged individuality and elevated eccentricity to a virtue," setting "high standards of intellectual originality." But these men were, in some ways, untypical of the Oxford Canadians.[40] Barbeau's francophone background and Lewis and Ignatieff's foreign origins seem to have innoculated them in some way from ghettoization in Oxford. By contrast, the local British amalgam of Anglo-Canadianism, interpenetrated with youthful idealism and regional parochialism, acted as a barrier to understanding and acceptance.

However, many Canadians suffered little disillusioning effect during their time at Oxford. How were they different? Percy Corbett had postponed his scholarship to join the Black Watch in 1915, was wounded on the Somme, awarded the Military Cross, and again severely wounded in 1918. Corbett experienced no wrenching loss of faith in the British connection either in the trenches, during several months in hospital recovering the use of his arm, or subsequently at Oxford. In fact, he adapted so well to English university life that in 1921 he was one of only two scholars elected annually to All Souls. In the 1930s Corbett, unlike Pearson, saw the impossibility of Canadian "neutrality in British wars."[41] It is important not to exaggerate the "nationalizing" effect of study in England beyond a relatively narrow circle of nationalists.

Canadians tended to dislike the "effortless superiority" of the upper classes and their imitators: a middle-class loathing that, because class-conscious, was also very British. It was not necessary to go to Oxford to acquire it. During his teens in North Toronto, Kenneth McNaught's parents played host to a rogue's gallery of the Oxford-

[40] David Lewis, *The Good Fight: Political Memoirs, 1909-1958* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1981), 50, 56-7; George Ignatieff, *The Making of a Peacemonger* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), 50.
[41] *The McGill News*, II, 1, December 1920, 25; P.E. Corbett, "Isolation for Canada?" *University of Toronto Quarterly*, VI, 1936-7, 121.

Canadian left: Underhill, Scott, Spry, Reid, Lewis, Douglas LePan, Eugene Forsey. In 1937, the Upper Canada College graduate chose University College over Trinity out of "inverted snobbery which I mistook for egalitarianism," McNaught wrote, just as he joined the army in 1942 as a private, rather than as an officer, out of a sense of "democracy." He later shared an office at the Methodist college in Winnipeg with Arthur Lower, adopting the latter's dislike of "second-rate Englishmen," some of them not from England.[42] The Canadian nationalist's devotion to "democracy" and "equality," like Forsey's, was as much British in origin as it was Canadian.[43]

Brooke Claxton's experiences also contributed to a sense of otherness. As in Pearson's humiliating contretemps with a London bus, in which the Royal Flying Corps officer cadet was knocked down and injured while on leave one evening during blackout[44]—Claxton was hit by a truck during blackout while riding a bicycle back to Deepcut from Windsor Castle. Claxton's biographer implies that his decision not to attend Oxford was voluntary. But his own unpublished memoirs make it quite clear that, as a demobilizing officer in 1918, Claxton did seek a place at New College. He was rejected, and then declined the offer of a place at the University of Edinburgh.[45] Having overlooked this episode, Bercuson naturally discerns no embittering effect. Perhaps there was none. But Claxton's developing class consciousness, including an aversion to upper-class mannerisms, has been underestimated as a mark of Canadian nationalism. It has been attributed to a higher "North American" sense of democracy. In fact, it was also very British to *Look Back in Anger* and to participate in the othering and demonization of

[42] Kenneth McNaught, *Conscience and History: A Memoir* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 17, 22, 33-4, 67.
[43] Milligan, 65.
[44] Pearson, *Mike*, Vol. 1, 35.
[45] Claxton Memoirs, 185.

the British elite.[46] A glimpse of this can be discerned in Hugh MacLennan's remark after visting Blenheim Palace near Oxford on a bicycle. MacLennan watched as "the Duke of Marlborough" rode past "very slowly on his horse." With little knowledge of Charles Spencer-Churchill—the 9th Duke and creator of the gardens and library that MacLennan had just been admiring inside—other than what he may have gleaned socially or from newspapers, MacLennan remarked: "He is a thorough swine and looked it."[47] Whatever he meant by this remark, it cannot be based on personal acquaintance, and can in some measure be attributed to class prejudice.

For those, unlike Claxton, who did make the pilgrimage, Oxford on the one hand reinforced the sense of belonging to a larger British world. "*I am in Oxford*," Heeney wrote, "and sitting at the feet of the greatest minds in the Anglo-Saxon world. … One can but begin to realize the breadth and spirit of the Rhodes conception when he actually comes here and sees and meets so many types, and kinds of Britons." Graham Spry called Oxford "the most educating place in the English-speaking world." The University was "like a dreamland and I wonder sometimes just where I am, or how I got here and how it will all end," wrote J.S. Woodsworth, who entered Mansfield College, not actually part of the University but a hall originally for non-Anglican students, in 1899.[48]

On the other hand, Oxford took them aback, and there is truth in Hillmer's conclusion that "seeing England's imperfections at close range intensified their Canadian nationalism." Heeney claimed that the "thoroughgoing Canadian nationalism" of his

---

[46] Christopher Booker, *The Neophiliacs: the revolution in English life in the Fifties and Sixties* (London: Collins, 1969), 108-9, 119-20, 166.
[47] MacLennan letter home, 14 November 1929.
[48] A.D.P. Heeney Papers, 14 October, 11 November 1923, LAC; Rose Potvin, ed., *Passion and Conviction: The Letters of Graham Spry* (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1992), 41; Grace MacInnes, *J.S. Woodsworth: A Man to Remember* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1953), 30.

generation, compatible with "affection and respect for things British" was already in place before he left for Oxford.[49] Once at Oxford he wrote in a letter home: "The Canadians in Oxford as a whole are distinctly a strong group, lacking perhaps the strong grounding on the hard and fast lines of the English Public Schools, but with a background of experience, a breadth of outlook and a practical idealism which few Englishmen can equal. I can truly say that I am proud to be a Canadian here, and that the ideals of Canada are my ideals."[50] These "ideals" were those of Heeney's Edwardian upbringing in an Anglican rectory—the small-town Anglo-Ontario culture of Hughes, Pearson, Pickersgill, of Graham Spry (born in St. Thomas), and Escott Reid (Campbellford). Here again clothes, as a mark of class and clubbability, could be a preoccupation. Underhill, the Stouffville boy, felt compelled to "upgrade his wardrobe" at Balliol in 1911.[51]

Cecilia Morgan has explored Aboriginal encounters with privilege, and "what happened when the margins return to the centre," Colonials to the imperial metropolis,[52] just as Kosmas Tsokhas wrote about the Australian anglophile Robert Menzies' trips to England.[53] The experience of white Anglo-Canadian males, who, for all their whiteness and "knowingness," remained at some level "exotic colonials," is less well-understood. How did a middle-class Ontario Methodist fit into what Leacock called the "sneeriority" of Oxford, its intense microcosm of the class system? "You have come to Oxford," says a proctor in the fictional *Sinister Street*, which Graham Spry was reading at his college in 1922, "some of you to hunt foxes, some of you to wear very large and very unusual

[49] Heeney, 14.
[50] Heeney Papers, 4 November 1923.
[51] Underhill, 269; McNaught, 67; Francis, 22, 26.
[52] Cecilia Morgan, "A Wigwam to Westminster': Performing Mohawk Identity in Imperial Britain, 1890s-1990s," *Gender & History* 15, 2 (August 2003), 319-41.
[53] Tsokhas, *Making a Nation State*, 140 ff.

overcoats, some of you to row for your college and a few of you to work. But all of you have come to Oxford to remain English gentlemen."[54] What was the hapless Colonial to make of this? Max Mueller, the Sanskrit scholar, denounced the idea that the purpose of Oxford was to turn Indian students into "the model of English public school gentlemen" with "inappropriate and anglicized values." Rather, its purpose should be to train proud and self-respecting Indians, "fostering an Indian renaissance" and genuinely Indian institutions.[55] Many Indians (and Canadians) admired the gentlemanly ideal, but the barriers were formidable. Hence the double impact: Oxford repelled but also attracted, strengthening colonial nationalism while reinforcing Britishness.

English university life presented a dilemma: to anglicize or not to anglicize. Integration, adaptation, and acceptance as well as fantasy, imitation, and social ambition were factors in "clubbability."[56] "Newcomers from more modest social backgrounds reacted sometimes admiringly, sometimes critically," Victor Kiernan said of Cambridge.[57] Ironically, the assumptions of the Canadians' "British" upbringing seem to have hindered their integration. "At Oxford the man from the dominions lives in the midst of what is almost a distinct type of civilisation," wrote Corbett. Norman Robertson, we are assured, was one of the few who stood aloof from anglicization, unfazed by upper-class Englishness: "Over here I'm quite a rabid imperialist & anglophile compared with most other Canadians," Robertson wrote. But he would never be "a successful anglo-Canadian … with English externals—in voice and clothes and opinions with the

[54] Compton Mackenzie, *Sinister Street* (London: Macdonald, 1913, rpt. 1968), 421. Cf. letter from Spry to a friend, 30 June 1922, Graham Spry Papers, LAC.
[55] Symonds, 51.
[56] Mrinalini Sinha, "Britishness, Clubbability, and the Colonial Public Sphere: The Genealogy of an Imperial Institution," *Journal of British Studies* 40, 4, October 2001, 489-521.
[57] Victor Kiernan, "Herbert Norman's Cambridge" in Bowen, ed., 27.

usual disastrous effects."[58] Newly class-conscious anglophiles underestimated Oxford's imprint on their identity. Robertson described himself as "the only Rhodes person in college who is still unappalled [sic] by the general level of reading culture etc. of [the] English University man." "The dons are of course unequal but not so unequal as staff at home," he wrote to his mother and father, dismissing one of his tutors as "cocky and assured, quarrelsome and conceited. … I can't abide him … In actual fact he is a stupid man." Robertson then took offence when told that his mark would be "a good Beta … a thoroughly sound second-classer" and not a First—a hard blow for a youngster who had always been at the top of his class, ready to enter the U.B.C. at the age of 15—virtually groomed to view himself as "brilliant." The Rhodes Scholarship, we are told, was really only the "cap" to his previous successes.[59] He dismissed the celebrated Oxford ideal—"a mixture of work and play"—as "uncommonly obtuse," bewildered by the dons' underestimation of his abilities.[60]

Robertson's contempt for the "innocuous desuetude" of Balliol stemmed, in part, from a sense of superiority toward English life that pre-dated his arrival. Perhaps this variant of Canadianism, part-Scottish, can be compared with the Ulster-Ontarian bluster of Sir Sam Hughes, which found a fitting symbol in the Ross Rifle, useless for mass-firing but Canadian-made and therefore made obligatory for the CEF. Clever and conceited, Robertson had won the Rhodes Scholarship by accident, and was the third recipient from B.C., he wrote, who did not "smoke or drink." His self-described "secularian disabilities" were adumbrated by a post-Presbyterian censoriousness toward

---

[58] Granatstein, *Man of Influence*, 17.
[59] Ibid., 4-5, 8-9.
[60] Robertson Papers, 28 October 1923: the typescript says "unaffected" but the original handwriting reads "unappalled'; Ibid., 25 February 1923, 22 October 1923, 15 March 1924.

liquor and folk piety. “It does seem that Oxford has been wasted on us. … I'm Balliol's only example of that horrid creature, the confirmed teetotaller,” a sense of puritanism apparent in his disgust at a folk festival that he witnessed in Florence involving firecrackers. Despite rowing and attending 16 lectures per week (when he was obliged to attend only three or four), Robertson found Oxford so boring that he spent his vacations at the London School of Economics or at sessions on “International Labour Problems” in the League of Nations Union.[61]

Others had greater disadvantages to overcome than Robertson, the professor's son. A.L. Rowse, the son of a china clay worker from Cornwall (England), “against all the odds, coming from a semi-literate working class background,” won a scholarship to Christ Church and became a Fellow of All Souls, “the youngest ever and the first from his social class.” Rowse described his undergraduate workload as “a great strain … so much reading, interminably: there is no end to it. … much of it laboured and dull and ill-written—a fearful burden.”[62] Still, Rowse accepted his tutors' guidance and achieved a First, while Robertson's letters home reveal a young man preoccupied with his standing in a competitive setting and unwilling to reconcile himself to its peculiar demands.

Corbett, however, believed that a measure of adaptability could ease the pain of adjustment:

> Making new friends is a matter that requires more time in England than with us. … After I had been a year at Oxford and become very much attached to a number of people, a Canadian who was approaching the end of his first month there, asked me

---

[61] Ibid., 4 February, 27 December, 19 April, 25 January (1924).
[62] Obituary, *Contemporary Review*, December 2001; A.L. Rowse, *A Cornishman at Oxford* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1965), 191, 51-3.

> what it all meant. His case was a poignant one. … Were they all snobs? … Call it reserve, rudeness, what you will; it is part of their character, and in their country you must take it at that. … How then do they look upon us? We are likely at first to take what is a national mannerism as a discrimination against ourselves…

Graham Spry, too, was disconcerted by Englishmen's "terrifying self-possession which I admired, and fear so much." The first year was "terrifying," Spry wrote, with its "deflation, self-effacement, and terrible realization of colossal ignorance and hopeless inferiority." Some Canadians instinctively sought Englishmen's approval, and found their reactions puzzling: "I am told that the college officers do not like Canadians," Spry wrote to Heeney, "but I cannot believe that to be correct, especially as the most active man in St. John's playing for football, rugby, track, hockey and other teams is Pearson of Toronto."[63] (Indeed, Oxford officials sometimes felt that the Canadian Rhodes Scholars, especially those from the University of Toronto, had "over-inflated views of their own intellectual abilities."[64]) Having admired England and felt kinship with its achievements, they could not understand why Englishmen did not receive them more warmly. As C.P. Stacey put it, "I suspect I came to it with romantic notions that had little foundation in fact. I expected a warm family welcome and got what I now recognize as a normal cool English reception. … I don't think I ever felt I was a real insider."[65] Woodsworth wrote: "Sometimes there is just a kind of loneliness—wistfulness—as you have to shut yourself up within yourself, be regarded as an outsider. And sometimes in the evening as you pass the windows of many homes [you] feel that in the whole cityful you have none."

---

[63] Potvin, 40-1; Spry to Heeney, 31 [sic] Feb 1923, Heeney Papers.
[64] Comment from Prof. Jonathan Vance on an earlier version of this text, 16 March 2007.
[65] Stacey, 38.

Some fit in better than others. Massey shared rooms with Murray Wrong but his memoirs give the impression that most of his friends were Old Etonians.[66] Corbett was relatively clubbable. His exposure to the trenches helped: “While he was at Oxford it was not with his Canadian contemporaries … that Percy made friends,” wrote his son and biographer, “but with Englishmen and Scots. He had served with British soldiers as well as with Canadians, and his circle of Oxford friends were mostly British ex-servicemen.” For some reason Pearson’s non-combatant experience did not provide the same clubbability. Charles Ritchie, with his upper middle-class background, seems to have “fit in” better. He was unique in adopting the life of the “aesthete,” one of the more rarefied “sets” in Oxford society. Soon after his arrival at Pembroke in 1926, after a night of exotic company, champagne, roulette, Egyptian cigarettes, and tales of weekends spent at a resort town with actresses, Ritchie was hooked: “This is the life for me.” He eschewed the Oxford of cocoa-sipping scholars reciting limericks to each other in their rooms, of sports in the open air, and of evangelical prayer meetings. Significantly, he also avoided his own countrymen. “I had tea with a group of Canadian undergraduates. It would be very easy to fall into the habit of going about with my fellow Canadians. There are a lot of them around … Of course it’s nice to swap experiences of Oxford and to talk about things at home, but I did not come to Oxford for this.”[67]

Most Canadians, however, took solace in each other’s company. Like many things, the “cult of aesthetes” annoyed Robertson, who shared rooms with Heeney and befriended Spry and John Hicks. Visitors from Cambridge “like it but find it a bit lonely.

---

[66] Massey, 28-9.

[67] Diary, 24 October 1926, in Charles Ritchie, *An Appetite for Life: The Education of a Young Diarist, 1924-1927* (Toronto: Macmillan Paperbacks, 1977), 114; 20 October 1926, 112.

It is strange how Canadians stick together."[68] "The Canadians and South Africans stick a lot together here and don't mix much with the English fellows—which I think is a mistake," wrote King Gordon,[69] son of the Rev. C.W. Gordon, the Presbyterian minister whose *nom de plume* was Ralph Connor, the best-selling Canadian novelist of his time. Pearson played hockey and baseball with Michener and John Farthing. For Heeney, there was no place like Winnipeg: "I am very lucky to have so many friends from home here, for although I have already met some very fine chaps, there are none like the ones from home." Switzerland was a mecca because "hosts of Winnipeggers and Canadians … will be at Murren for Christmas … In fact be assured that nowhere else could I feel more at home." Reid's diary describes breakfast one morning with "Plaunt, Forsey, Graves[?], [Alex] Skelton" and struggling one Sunday to relight his fire and boil the kettle for "Vaughan, Hume, Plaunt and Frost."[70] It had always been so: Woodsworth appeared on the Isis in a canoe "paddling Canadian-fashion, vigorously, from a kneeling position."

The garrison mentality entailed a penalty for those who acculturated too well, such as anglophiles who acquired the intolerable eccentricity of an English accent. Robertson found George Glazebrook to be "quite anglicized but amiable."[71] But "neither Robertson nor his close Canadian friends would *choose that course* [anglicization]," Granatstein says (emphasis added). "I find the abject acceptance of everything that is English and antique quite as annoying as the cheap comfort that some misfits find in a spurious Canadian nationalism," Robertson said. "As for Mike," wrote an admiring journalist in 1942, "his accents never change, and neither do his mannerisms nor his

[68] Robertson Papers, 25 February 1924 and typescript, 105; 19 November 1923.
[69] King Gordon Papers, 15 October [1920] to "Charley old bean," LAC.
[70] Heeney Papers, 14 October 1923; 5 December 1923; Reid Diary, November 20, 1927.
[71] Granatstein, *Man of Influence*, 12; Robertson Papers, 12 October 1923 and typescript, 35.

habits. They are racy of old Ontario."[72] Escott Reid had so many English friends that "other Canadians despised me slightly because they thought I had become anglicized." After a visit to Stacey, Reid reflected: "Am I becoming anglicized?'[73] Corbett also anglicized: "Percy was, for the time being, moving away from his Canadian past," wrote his son. "Even his accent began to reflect his Anglophile preferences."

Undue emphasis on Robertson's Canadianness overlooks the bureaucrat's lifelong anglophilia and tweedy, gnomic elitism. The studiedly eccentric and anglicized bearing, manner, and clothes of Robertson, Glazebrook, and Pickersgill were captured by Elizabeth Harrison in her painting, "Cafeteria, Chateau Laurier, 1944," a satirical portrait which belies the "residual anglophilia and colonial dependency that formed the other half of [these] officials."[74] Pickersgill illustrated his memoirs with photographs of himself wearing his New College tie not only with a tweed suit in an Oxford punt, but decades later posing with ministers in Ottawa and even with fishermen in his Newfoundland constituency. As Robertson admitted in a passage not quoted by Granatstein, "I'll probably suffer a bit more [from anglicization] than I'll ever realize myself perhaps but by the grace of god [sic] I'll outgrow it."[75] Some measure of the anglophobic anglophiles' dislike of Canadians with a fake accent, it seems, stemmed from an uneasy awareness of their own imagined and constructed Englishness and the memory of disillusionment and incapacity to "fit in." But this did not prevent them from exploiting the cachet of "Oxford" in obtaining a job in Canada.

---

[72] *Globe and Mail*, 27 June 1942.
[73] *Radical Mandarin*, 59; Escott Reid Papers, Diary, 12 October 1927, LAC.
[74] Mark Kristmanson, *Plateaus of Freedom: Nationality, Culture, and State Security in Canada, 1920-1960* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003), 140.
[75] Robertson Papers, 15 December 1924 and typescript, 213.

Acquired manners were one thing. Graham Spry developed the theory that to associate too closely with Englishmen implied that one might cease to think like or even to *be* a Canadian. To remain a Canadian in good standing, Spry wrote in 1923, necessitated holding different *political* opinions from Englishmen:

> All good Oxon men will tell you to mingle with the Anglais, which is good advice, but I am coming more and more to think that perhaps Canadians emphasize that side too much. … It leads … in some cases, to making the Canadian attitude English, and the exchange of views an exchange of being a Canadian for being an Englishman. Particularly, does that apply to the academically successful, or the socially successful in Oxford. The Canadian who takes a first has many opportunities open before him in England, and often he stays. The temptation is great … and the result is that Canada loses what is hers.[76]

Here again the peculiar secular puritanism justified a refusal or failure to integrate: to drink too deeply of Oxford life was rendered as unpatriotic. Spry's maxim became "not to be a typical and good Oxonian, but a typical and better Canadian," a fine example of defining oneself in contrast to the constructed "other." The loyal citizen must be vigilant not to agree too closely in policy matters with the "Anglais," an expression that emphasized the foreignness of Englishmen, or to participate in a social life that might lead one astray from what has been called "the Importance of Being Canadian."[77] All the same, before leaving England, Spry hoped to "gain some experience either on an English newspaper, or in some English government office." If sharing the opinions of Englishmen

[76] Potvin, 37.
[77] Schabas, op. cit.

entailed the danger of becoming un-Canadian, of being immersed in the other, extending one's immersion in English life and culture remained highly desirable.

Spry's "litmus test" made Canadian self-differentiation negatively from Englishmen's opinions a *sine qua non* of Canadianism. Who passed, who failed? Corbett, Ritchie, and Forsey all transgressed Spry's strictures by becoming academically or socially "successful" at Oxford. Perhaps a regional factor played a role in their success: all three were from Atlantic Canada. Corbett retained a strong lifelong attachment to pan-Britishness, dissenting from interwar Liberal foreign policy and advocating a "continued special association of the British peoples" after the Second World War. Corbett "was opposed to any Canadian government's inclination to puff itself up and to show off its sovereignty at the expense of the good that could be done. … Dominion autonomy should be handled with care and maturity, not with the upstart jingoism which animated some brash Dominion nationalists," a reference to Skelton's Quixotic policy of tilting at Imperialist windmills, some of them imaginary. At Yale in 1946, Corbett extolled the "certain peculiar and almost paradoxical quality in the nationalism of British countries … the belief that liberty and democracy owe most to pertinacious British experimentation."[78] Most of the Oxford Canadians, including Pearson, would have agreed with the latter at some level, though they did not necessarily accept Corbett's explicit linkage of these ideas to British symbols.

Ritchie, in turn, also stood out from his contemporaries in the Suez Crisis of 1956. While the East Block Oxonians engineered a sharp divergence from Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, aligning Ottawa with Washington and expressing "regret" for Britain's actions, Ritchie, a Conservative, presented an alternative way of thinking about the crisis:

---

[78] P.E. Corbett, *Britain: Partner for Peace* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1946), 57-60.

"The British will be there long after Eden is gone and will remain the best bet in a bad world." Historians have been at pains to emphasize that the British were "grateful" for Pearson's interventions, but, as Ritchie observed, "In their hearts, they feel that their true friends were those like the Australians, who backed them up to the hilt." Michener, then a Conservative M.P., viewed Colonel Nasser's rebuff of the Queen's Own Rifles, a thoroughly Canadian regiment, as a "humiliation" to the government, which had chosen the wrong side in his view.[79]

Forsey, armed with a first-class degree from Balliol, became a pedantic defender of tradition, denouncing his Liberal contemporaries' suppression of the Royal Cipher, the Royal Mail, Red Ensign, and Dominion Day, all arbitrarily deemed insufficiently "Canadian." Thus Corbett, Ritchie, and Forsey, three "successful" Atlantic Canadians at Oxford, showed a more pronounced attachment to the British connection later in life. Spry's maxim rendered such views less than "truly Canadian." This was a school of thought that persisted in the 1980s when a correspondent told Forsey, born in Newfoundland, to "go back to good old England where he belongs."[80] Canadian traditions were thus redefined and inverted as something foreign and other.

Forsey's first-class degree raises the question whether it was significant that the Canadians took a first-, second-, or even third-class degree. First-class men combined study and sports to obtain the highest standing without appearing to have done much work. Few succeeded, as had F.E. Smith, in living the life of an aesthete for three years, and then cramming for three weeks to pull off a First. "You want either a first or a

[79] Diary, 25 November 1956, in Charles Ritchie, *Diplomatic Passport: More Undiplomatic Diaries, 1944-1962* (Toronto: Macmillan Paperbacks, 1986), 122; 5 March and 15 June, 1958, in ibid., 140; Michener to Diefenbaker, 10 July 1957. Roland Michener Papers, LAC, Vol. 104.
[80] Hodgetts, *Sound of One Voice*, 225.

fourth," declared cousin Jasper in Evelyn Waugh's Oxford novel. "Time spent on a good second is time thrown away."[81] Interestingly, John English omits this passage from his numerous *Brideshead* quotations.

According to nationalist lore, it is axiomatic that the Oxonian Canadians were first class. Massey was regarded by Arthur Glazebrook as "first-rate." But Oxford did not think so. Massey said both Robertson and Pearson had a "first class" mind.[82] But again, Oxford disagreed. Heeney said that if Robertson had only stuck to the prescribed books, "there is little doubt that *he would have taken a first* ... As it was he followed his own tastes and was *content with a second* [emphasis added]." Heeney got a "sound second," as did Spry, "about what I deserved." Gordon Robertson got "a good solid second. No disgrace but no distinction." MacLennan took third class, and his letters home convey with pathos his realization that all those hours studying with his father would not bear fruit: "not much likelihood of a "First," I'm afraid."[83] As a friend wrote to King Gordon: "Just plain folk like you and me, folks. Plain folk who took plain "seconds" … and I just took a plain honest-to-goodness folisome [sic] 2nd like the other folks did. … I'm glad no accident did you out of a second at least." It was, he said, "delicate work to congratulate a 2nd. I mean it sort of confesses that you expected a first from the congratulated."[84]

---

[81] Selina Hastings, *Evelyn Waugh: A Biography* (London: Minerva, 1995), 111; Evelyn Waugh, *Brideshead Revisited* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1945), 26.
[82] Bissell, 95, 27, 296.
[83] MacLennan to his mother, 22 October 1929. One clue as to his lack of success is that he believed that the inscription on the Monument to the Royal Stuarts in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome was in Italian ('I couldn't very well understand the Italian inscription," he wrote to his father, 11 April 1929. He believed it was "the tomb of Bonnie Prince Charlie who has [I think] been canonized by the Church'). In fact the words are in Latin, one of the languages in which he took his degree. In fact, three Stuarts, James Francis Edward Stuart, his elder son Charles Edward Stuart ('Bonnie Prince Charlie'), and his younger son, Henry Benedict Stuart, are buried in the crypt below the church.
[84] Heeney, 21; Potvin, 42; Gordon Robertson, *Memoirs of a Very Civil Servant* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 30; Gordon Papers [1925?], quoted in Gordon to Julian Bell, 7 February 1987.

Biographers have downplayed the significance of second-class degrees. English felt it necessary to point out that "virtually all Canadian students in those days at Oxford" were denied a first-class degree. "Most Canadians … seemed to get seconds," wrote C.P. Stacey. But they were not indifferent to the fact. That Robertson was "content with a second" (as Heeney claimed) is not the picture that emerges from Granatstein's account: Robertson's Second "annoyed him and continued to annoy him." F.R. Scott was traumatized by his Third: "For what does it all mean? Ever since I was a small boy people have told me I was clever; I took prizes at school and prizes at college, and a first in history at Bishop's and now, now, after two years' quite steady reading I only get a third! A third—the easy course at Oxford! … That pretty well tears to pieces your old ideas about yourself, doesn't it, Frank? God, what an awful thing—to doubt one's ability, to have one's confidence in oneself shaken! Not to have faith!'[85] The "Schools," Oxford's undergraduate examinations, should perhaps be considered as one of the more bruising rites of passage in the Canadian coming of age.

There were Canadian "Firsts": Forsey was one; Reid another: "I believe that Hume Wrong [and] Douglas LePan … were the only contemporaries of mine to have been awarded a first class," Reid noted. Corbett got a first, as did John Macalister, a Rhodes scholar from Guelph who topped his Oxford law class of 142 students, joined Britain's Special Operations Executive, and died alongside Frank Pickersgill at Buchenwald with "Vive le Canada" on their lips. (Pickersgill had visited Oxford only as

[85] Sandra Djwa, *The Politics of the Imagination: A Life of F.R. Scott* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1988), 55.

a tourist but responded warmly to its Englishness.)[86] It is tempting to conclude that those who got a First at Oxford, or did not have a visceral reaction to Englishness, were less likely to be disillusioned with the Britishness of Canadian traditions, while those with a Second or Third went on to emphasize its foreignness. However, there were exceptions. John Farthing, the son of Montreal's Anglican bishop, propounded Canada's inherent Britishness, but had taken a Second,[87] as had Donald Creighton, the son of a Methodist manse who was regarded at Oxford as "quite bright."[88] It is unclear whether Ritchie's "Brideshead" experience earned him "a first or a fourth."

The proof that failure to attain a First-class degree contributed to a sharpened sense of alienation is not conclusive. And yet rationalizations and excuses for it appear in many of their letters, memoirs, and biographies. Corbett believed that the Canadians arrived in Oxford less articulate, less skilled in conversation, less well-read, and, in spite of being older than English freshmen, faced the "undeniable advantage of English youth from the point of view of liberal attainments." They had left their small towns and school honour rolls with high expectations, their heads full of an idealized "England," and returned chastened by their relative lack of academic success.

It might have helped if, before setting sail for the Old Country, they had consulted Sir George Parkin's guide to *The Rhodes Scholarships* (1912). "There is no doubt," Parkin wrote, that the Rhodes man "for his part has learned there [at Oxford] his own limitations. … he finds as a rule that intellectually he has been less thoroughly grounded than the best of the men with whom he comes in competition. … [No scholar] even after

[86] George H. Ford, ed., *The Making of a Secret Agent* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978), 33, 217; Roy MacLaren, *Canadians Behind Enemy Lines, 1939-45* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1981), 59, 70-3.
[87] Robertson Papers, 14 July 1924.
[88] Stacey, 38.

his preliminary years at a home university has found the path to Oxford distinctions, which are equally open to all, an easy one." According to F.J. Wylie of the Rhodes Trust: "the Englishman's customs, traditions, manners, temperament even, will be unfamiliar to him; and he may not always find the adjustment easy. There may be—indeed there are bound to be—things that irritate, wound, or discourage him: insularities (as they will certainly appear) of outlook, of manner, or etiquette. … I have known Rhodes Scholars who, from native reserve, or from indolence, or possibly from some unsuspected insularity of their own, have proved unequal to the effort. Abandoning the attempt to overcome the unfamiliar, they have fallen back on their books and their own compatriots…'[89] This would seem prophetically close to the Canadian experience a decade later. It does not imply inferiority but difference in the midst of familiarity. Some have suggested that the war and Oxford were "deprovincializing" experiences, making Canadians less "subservient." But in a sense they also had a "re-provincializing" effect, causing them to take solace in parochial securities, not "less colonial" but arguably moreso, pushed back into Leacock's "little Canadianism." In an echo of Hughesian small-town Ontario superiority, a species of *schadenfreude* can be discerned in Underhill's dismissal of the British in 1953 as no more than "poor relations."[90]

The Oxford experience was more complicated and nuanced than biographers have credited. The sense of otherness invaded, but did not drive out, their continuing Britishness. If some failed Spry's litmus test for what it meant to be a "typical and better Canadian," none of the Canadians completely shed the British imprints of their youth, military service, and study abroad. It seems that the Rhodes legacy was not to strengthen

[89] Sir George R. Parkin, *The Rhodes Scholarships* (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1912), 226-9; F.J. Wylie, "The Social Side of Oxford Life," in ibid., 186-7.
[90] Underhill, 221.

the bonds of Empire or to foster Anglo-Saxon solidarity. Yet Pearson (whose fees were paid by Massey not the Rhodes Trust) believed that Oxford "saved the Commonwealth," according to MacLennan, by linking "Indians, Pakistani, Ceylonese [sic]" to England.[91] Part of the legacy was to make a generation of small-town anglophiles' sense of themselves more complex, and to interweave a degree of ambivalence into their Britishness. On the other hand, the Canadians were, or became, perfect embodiments of the Rhodes ideal: well-rounded, academically quite good, athletic "men of activity, responsibility, and common sense."[92] Like others who dreamed of "better Britains,"[93] their classless, neo-paternalist meliorism and internationalism found expression in welfare legislation, peacekeeping, the B & B Commission, multiculturalism, and an ostensibly post-British flag.

Fewer than one in one thousand English youth reached Oxford or Cambridge.[94] The Canadian fraction may be somewhat higher, but not much, creating a tiny elite siphoned from a narrow segment of society into a public service that was sociologically unrepresentative of the population,[95] attained senior positions in the public service. More interestingly, the mandarins may not have been *philosophically* representative, either. The population at large may have thought little about these issues in the abstract, but English-speaking Canadians were conscious of the British connection as somehow part of their identity, rather than as a colonial yoke. Certainly, most had not had the privilege of studying at Oxford. Many may have disagreed with the Skeltonian, separatist, colony-to-nation view of Canada, and their identity remained "loyalist" long after the elites had

---

[91] MacLennan, "Oxford Revisited," loc. cit., 194.
[92] Deslandes, 16, 47.
[93] P.A. Buckner and Carl Bridge, "Reinventing the British World," *The Round Table* 368 (2003), 79.
[94] A.J.P. Taylor, *English History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 308.
[95] Cohen, loc. cit.

been disaffected.[96] Corbett, his biographer suggests, "may well have been in tune with a majority of Canadians potentially sympathetic with some middle way" that would not displace the British connection.[97] Pearson, though "an enthusiastic Liberal Canadian of fine traditions and stock" with a "distinctive Canadian point of view,"[98] did not agree with Skelton on all matters, but he and his peers did share a developing nationalism impatient with overt forms of Britishness that, it could be argued, came to fruition in the orders-in-council and symbolic iconoclasm of the 1950s and 1960s. The proclamation of the Maple Leaf flag in 1965 is an expression of this British-Canadian nationalism that can be traced to Oxford where Pearson and Stanley studied and won their "Blue" in hockey.

Canadianness and Britishness were not opposites, but deeply interpenetrated. George Grant arrived at Balliol in 1939 as "a rather vague North American isolationist," and in 1950 deplored Oxford's "continual sense … that they are the centre of the world and the way they think is the right way … never have I felt so alien or foreign in England." But this did not diminish his sense of Canada's essential Britishness, which was not dependent on English acceptance or recognition but had developed its own roots in North America. Forsey said Oxford "reinforced my pride in England, "her glory and her message" (to use Churchill's words), in which I had been brought up. … It confirmed my 'loyal passion for our temperate kings,'" a desire to perpetuate Canada's inheritance of liberty secured under the Crown. Like Forsey, left-wing Indian nationalists combined their devotion to independence with pride in Britishness. J.D. Shukla said of Oxford in the 1930s: "It speaks a lot for the British tradition of freedom, and their confidence in the

---

[96] E.g., Igartua, ""Ready, Aye, Ready" No More?" loc. cit.
[97] D.C. Corbett, loc. cit.
[98] W.P.M. Kennedy to Skelton, 30 January 1927, with a suggestion of "Irish" networking; Skelton to Massey, 18 February 1937; Pearson Personnel File, LAC.

openness of their society that they exposed us, the civil servants of an empire, to the free and academic atmosphere of a great university rather than a government institution."[99]

The "British connection" was no external link severed sometime after 1945 by "breaking the ties." What W.L. Morton called the "local variant" of Britishness was in-built; not imposed or retained from outside but an animating element from within, and it did not perish with the proclamation of a new flag designed in part by Oxford alumni. This is obscured by historians influenced by what Anthony Smith has called "retrospective nationalism,"[100] a colony-to-nation mentality that has defined what is truly "Canadian" as *post*-British. Historians have been writing as if only those Canadians who distanced themselves from the British heritage were "Canadians in full," and as if Spry's Oxford litmus test for "typical and better" Canadianism were valid. The Oxford experience was not a clear-cut epiphany. The effects of study at Oxford were ambivalent and complex, modifying but also reinforcing, in some ways, the Britishness of their Canadianism and leaving the British imprint intact. In both intended and unintended ways, Canadianism was an excrescence of Britishness, in the positive sense of that term, and their nationalism was the product of a British world.

---

[99] William Christian, ed., *George Grant: Selected Letters* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 61, 162; Forsey, 48; Symonds, 68.
[100] Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001), 58.

Chapter 6

The Courtship and Apprenticeship of Non-Wasp Ethnic Groups

One of the major factors to which the “decline” of British influence in Canada is typically attributed is the arrival of increasing numbers of non-British immigrants in the years after the Second World War. According to David Cannadine, “The decline of the British connection was as much evidenced by the arrival of garlic in Canadian restaurants as by the flying of the maple-leaf flag.”[1] Immigration from East-Central and Southern Europe in particular contributed to transforming the face of English-Canadian cities, and it is usually assumed that this trend helped in some way to bring about the crisis of Britishness in the mid-1960s. As Franca Iacovetta showed in the case of the Italians in Toronto, this was a time of awakening and self-awareness for Canadians of non-British, non-French origins—in particular Ukrainian, Italian, German, and Polish groups—that prepared the way for multiculturalism.

As the major political parties fielded competing visions of nationalism in the build-up to the 1967 centennial, ethnic voters did not lack political suitors among the major political parties, a process that went beyond mere vote-getting. Does the record bear out José Igartua’s claim that ethnic Anglo-Canadians defined Canada prior to the 1960s as “essentially a British country,” thus relegating non-British ethnic groups to the sidelines? As we will see, ethnic groups were by no means marginalized. Political

[1] David Cannadine, “Introduction,” Coates, ed., 13.

courtship helped to integrate “New Canadians”[2] into civic life, into Canada’s British Parliamentary system with its appeals to voting blocs and interest groups, lobbying, patronage, and patron-client relationships. There was little that was anti-British or un-British about this process. In fact, that a successor state to a multiracial Empire should embrace a policy of multiculturalism could be seen as a fulfillment rather than a contradiction. In recent times Britain too has defined itself as “a nation of immigrants.”[3]

In Canada, political courtship and integration into the Parliamentary system was a contributing factor not just in the construction of a new Canadianism but in the redefinition of Britishness. Andrew Thompson, a Liberal Party organizer in Toronto, wrote in 1958: “Previously the ethnic groups generally had considered the Conservative party to be narrowly British,” with an quasi-assimilative tendency to accept old-style Britishness as the true Canadian identity. Almost a decade later, Winnipeg alderman Peter Taraska wrote, “Some of our people who would emulate [the English] have, without mature thought, succumbed to the idea that to be a good Canadian, one must be British in thought, language, and action.”[4] The pressure to “conform,” and therefore the sense of exclusion and subordination, has long been part of the historiography of this process.[5] However, if there was a Britishness characterized by conformity or a perceived need to conform, there was also another species of Britishness characterized by hybridity and variety and diversity, in which ethnicity was not a limiting factor but an aspect of multiple identities.

---

[2] Peter Regenstreif, *The Diefenbaker Interlude: parties and voting in Canada, an interpretation* (Toronto: Longmans, 1965), 89-90.
[3] Eric Richards, *Britannia’s Children: Migration from England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales since 1600* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 274.
[4] Taraska to Hellyer, 29 April 1966, Paul T. Hellyer Papers, LAC.
[5] Palmer, “Reluctant Hosts.”

Without turning their backs on their own heritage, some "European" Canadians had embraced the Britishness of Canada. This became clear in the 1964 flag debate, when Senator Paul Yuzyk, the "father of Multiculturalism,"[6] paid tribute to the Union Jack, a symbol of the Parliamentary system that was the "imperishable gift of the British to the Canadian way of life."[7] Others were less anglophile. One way to explain these different approaches is that there are various ways of understanding Britishness—both in the traditional, Union Jack-waving sense associated with the old Empire and the First and Second World Wars, and the quieter, hybrid Britishness that underlay post-1960s Canadianism. Members of ethnic groups in Canada, too, had to negotiate and renegotiate their place in the midst of shifting dominant group identities. Some did so by embracing the new Canadianism of the 1960s, others by continuing to value Canada's Britishness in the varied ways that different ethnic leaders defined it.

Historians have made little analysis of the interplay of ethnicity, Britishness, and various forms of Canadianism in the flag debate. The political parties put forward competing brands of Canadianism, with the Liberals seizing the advantage among those who rejected the overt Britishness of the old symbolic order. If Diefenbaker had captured significant ethnic support in the late 1950s with his rhetoric of "One Canada" and "un-hyphenated Canadianism," by the mid-1960s his stubborn defence of the Red Ensign is thought to have alienated much of this new support. The nationalism of the build-up to Expo 67, and the government's future-oriented efforts to accommodate French Canadians such as the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission, had the effect of provoking a tide of "third element" assertiveness. This self-discovery among New Canadians, together

[6] "Yuzyk remembered as father of multiculturalism," *Ukrainian Weekly*, 20 July 1986.
[7] Senate *Hansard*, 17 December 1964, 1251.

with the moral earnestness that drove Ottawa's external affairs and federalist initiatives in the 1960s, helped to sweep aside the old public vestiges of Britishness, and to foster a multi-ethnic Canadianism associated with multiculturalism and internationalism.

The historiography has neglected the foundational contribution of ethnic political courtship to this story. In the 19th century, the first ethnic groups, "Highland Scots, Catholic Irish, and Lunenburg and loyalist Germans, all … had small experience of parliamentary government," but were "as quick as the French to learn all the tricks of the game," wrote W.L. Morton.[8] Political parties produced many of the earliest foreign language newspapers.[9] Tories conducted a successful appeal to ethnic communities in the 1950s,[10] only to be outdone by the Liberals in later years.[11] Sceptics have argued that in supporting Diefenbaker in 1958, voters of southern and eastern European origins "were not displaying dispositions that were at variance" with others carried by the Diefenbaker tide.[12] However, documents from political operatives at the time may contradict this view.

In the summer of 1961, Thompson, a 37-year-old Liberal organizer and the MPP for Dovercourt, Ontario, packed his suitcase and moved in for a month with a family of Toronto immigrants to discover "How the Italians live." It was a "strange interlude" for Thompson—an episode interpreted by Franca Iacovetta as typical of Anglo-Saxon

---

[8] Morton, *Canadian Identity*, 103.
[9] Watson Kirkconnell, *A Slice of Canada: Memoirs* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), 260.
[10] John D. Harbron, "The Conservative Party and National Unity," *Queen's Quarterly*, LXIX, Autumn 1962, 354.
[11] Jean R. Burnet with Howard Palmer, "*Coming Canadians': An Introduction to a History of Canada's Peoples* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart/ Ministry of Supply and Services, 1988), 172-5; Howard Palmer, "Ethnicity and Politics in Canada Since Confederation," Canada's Ethnic Groups Series, No. 17 (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1991), 20.
[12] Regenstreif, 91.

condescension toward “hardworking exotics.”[13] No doubt there was something paternalistic and patronizing, a touch of British Toronto, about Thompson’s whimsical experiment. But the term “strange” had some justification, for Thompson was himself an immigrant, an Ulster Protestant from Belfast, with a ruddy complexion and a “flowing Irish accent.”[14] He also had an affinity for what, at the time, seemed quaint and beguiling: urban immigrant groups.[15] More prosaically, the resourceful activist was keen to win over the votes that such liaisons might accrue for the provincial and national Liberal parties.

A series of memos written by Thompson a half-century ago reveal in remarkable detail how the major political parties came to grips with ethnic voters in the 1950s and 1960s. Ten years prior to his Italian “interlude,” the ambitious Ulster-Ontarian had parlayed a Master’s degree in Social Work from the University of British Columbia, and his proclivity for the unfamiliar, into a highly successful political career as the friend of Toronto’s ethnic communities and a key mobilizer of his party’s electoral base. Three weeks before the 1953 election that gave Louis St. Laurent a second majority government, Thompson raised the alarm that “the Ethnic vote” was shifting to the Progressive Conservatives under George Drew. The Tories, Thompson warned, had seized control of the ethnic press. He urged senior Liberals to stop patronizing the New Canadian Press ethnic news agency, which he said was “serving the Conservatives” and whose manager, Leon Schedlin, had encouraged pro-Tory coverage. Thompson

---

[13] Franca Iacovetta, *Such Hardworking People: Italian Immigrants in Postwar Toronto* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1992), 121; Pierre Berton, “How the Italians Live: 1. Andy Thompson’s Strange Interlude,” Toronto *Star*, 26 June 1961, 17. Iacovetta’s endnote gives the article date incorrectly as July 12.

[14] *The Canadian Who’s Who*, Vol. XI, 1967-1969 (Toronto: Who’s Who Canada Publications, 1969), 1082. On his accent, Jonathan Manthorpe, *The Power of the Tories: Ontario Politics 1943-Present* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1974), 67.

[15] Some believe that there is “little evidence for the hypothesis that the minority groups from the British Isles – the Irish, Scots, and Welsh – had any more sympathy than people of English origin for the aspirations of the “other ethnic groups,”“ cf. Palmer, “Reluctant Hosts,” 327, n. 10.

recommended that "through the *Star* we set up our own publicity to ethnic groups," with volunteer interpreters and "some appropriate Liberal in charge."[16] When, on election day, August 10, the Liberals kept their majority but lost 22 seats, Thompson believed that ethnic voting had influenced the outcome. On the Tory side, the result confirmed Ontario Conservative MPPs Allan Grossman and John Yaremko's conviction that ethnic voters were "a new force."[17] In political terms, the integration of New Canadians reached another watershed by the end of the decade: the active seeking of patronage appointments and rewards for representatives of ethnic groups in the political system.

To date, J.W. Pickersgill's memoirs are virtually alone in testifying to Andrew Thompson's "extraordinary rapport with the ethnic community [sic] in Toronto and, indeed, almost everywhere in Canada."[18] Pickersgill took pride in his own courtship of Italian and Hungarian immigrants in the 1950s, citing his Citizenship and Immigration Department's "small branch to assist in the social and cultural integration of immigrants into Canadian life and to encourage them to take their place as citizens of their new country." It was through the embryonic Citizenship Branch that the partisan Thompson "worked closely" with ethnic organizations. These efforts were rewarded with his appointment to the Senate in 1967 by a grateful prime minister. By 1971, when the Trudeau government officially endorsed the "multicultural society in a bilingual framework," Thompson presided over ethnic political meetings no longer from a rented hole-in-the-wall in Toronto, but from a fully-appointed Senate office in Ottawa.[19] For

[16] A.E. Thompson, "Monthly Report on Ethnic Groups," 18 July 1953, Jack Pickersgill Papers, LAC.
[17] Peter Oliver, *Unlikely Tory: The Life and Politics of Allan Grossman* (Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1985), 147.
[18] J.W. Pickersgill, *My Years with Louis St. Laurent* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), 247; *Seeing Canada Whole* (Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1994), 438.
[19] Present in Thompson's office on 6 April 1971, for example, were Thompson, Charles Caccia, Stanley Haidasz, and Bill McAfee of the National Liberal Federation. Copy of minutes in Hellyer Papers.

historians of ethnicity, Thompson's career as "Ethnic Groups Liaison Officer for the National Liberal Party" has a larger import than merely his own rise to prominence.[20] It also represents more than an exercise in Toronto-British-Canadian *noblesse oblige*. His interest in immigrants, and efforts to establish networks of support for the Liberal Party, struck a chord with newcomers familiar with the exchange of favours between patron and client. And because this courtship integrated willing, compliant, clubbable, and ambitious members of ethnically non-British populations into the British-Canadian liberal system of political relationships and influence, the work of Thompson, himself an immigrant, is of interest to students of Britishness in the English-speaking diaspora.[21]

The term "ethnic" is defined in this chapter as the political strategists of the day defined it: a convenient label for non-British and non-French communities of minority voters. Thompson had little time to reflect on the definition of "ethnic voting," but Raymond Wolfinger defined it as "situations in which ethnic group membership is an important independent variable in voting behaviour."[22] Also to be borne in mind is Isajiw's definition of ethnicity, presented above in Chapter 2, as "an involuntary group of people who share the same culture or to descendants of such people who identify themselves and/or are identified by others as belonging to the same involuntary group."[23] To strategists, however, ethnicity was a form of political currency that could be denominated in terms of ballots and seats. On the whole, ethnic voting is poorly represented in the literature and is often tangled with religious voting patterns. Grace

---

[20] In 1998 Thompson was obliged to resign from the Senate on grounds of poor attendance (12 appearances in seven years), two years prior to mandatory retirement. Reform Party MPs donned sombreros, hired a Mariachi band, and served burritos in the Senate lobby to draw attention to the Senator's Mexican domicile, which he attributed to poor health, apparently to make the case for an elected Senate.
[21] Sinha, op. cit.; Lowry, op. cit.
[22] Raymond E. Wolfinger, "The development and persistence of ethnic voting," *American Political Science Review* 59 (December 1965), 896-908.
[23] Isajiw, loc. cit.

Anderson found that, even when broken down into "British background, Italian, French-Canadian, Eastern and South-Eastern European, Irish, and 'other' … in *every* ethnic group the majority of Catholics expressed a preference for the Liberal party." But her study was based only on one district of Hamilton in the transitional 1962 election.[24] Alain Pelletier traced the growth of ethnic representation in the House of Commons from 1965 to 1988, comparing the number of minority MPs elected with the "number of members required for equitable representation."[25] But he did not explain how these changes were achieved. Jerome H. Black, surveying ethnic participation in the 1980s, found that to the extent that ethnicity was a factor, "the immigrant condition, rather than ethnicity *per se*, accounts for lower levels of political activity." Black found that "Canadian-born minorities" in the Toronto area "tend to match the majority British group's involvement in virtually every domain of political activity."[26] But this was not the case 20 years earlier, the period with which this chapter is concerned. Black, and others such as Raymond Breton, have drawn attention to "networks," "institutionally complete" minorities, and ethnic media as a force for integration, rather than isolation.[27] The role of the Canadian Citizenship Branch (CCB), which grew out of the wartime Nationalities Branch, in courting ethnic citizens and influencing ethnic media has also received some

---

[24] Grace M. Anderson, "Voting Behaviour and the Ethnic-Religious Variable: A Study of A Federal Election in Hamilton, Ontario," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* XXXII, 1, February 1966, 27-37. "Transitional" in the sense that Diefenbaker's government was reduced to a minority prior to its defeat in 1963 by a minority Liberal government.

[25] Alain Pelletier, "Politics and Ethnicity: Representation of Ethnic Groups and Visible-Minority Groups in the Hosue of Commons," in Kathy Megyery, ed., *Ethno-Cultural Groups and Minorities in Canadian Politics: The Question of Access* (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1989), 129.

[26] Jerome Black, "Ethnic Minorities and Mass Politics in Canada: Some Observations in the Toronto Setting," *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 3, (Spring 1991), 148.

[27] Idem, "Immigrant Political Adaptation in Canada: Some Tentative Findings," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* XV, 1 (March 1982), 25-6; Idem and Christian Leithner, "Immigrants and Political Involvement in Canada: The Role of the Ethnic Media," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* XX, 1 (1988), 1-19

attention. Some cast the CCB as a positive force for integration,[28] while others take a dim view of treating ethnic groups as pawns of the cold war and the domestic political game.[29] According to Joseph W. Kirschbaum, a leading figure in ethnic press associations and the author of *Slovaks in Canada*, “The ethnic press retains a warm spot in its heart” for Thompson’s work as one of the Branch’s Toronto liaison officers.[30] But Kirschbaum did not allude to Thompson’s partisan alter ego. In short, the courting of ethnic voters by party operatives, and its role in the redefinition of Canadian Britishness, deserves more attention.

The 1960s saw nationalist leaders openly confronting the old overt Britishness of Canada and the perceived need to downgrade elements of the dominant Anglo-Canadian heritage in the name of achieving full autonomy, preserving national unity, and integrating newcomers. Such had been the motives for a series of Canadianizing initiatives from the Citizenship Act of 1946,[31] to the unification of the Anglo-dominated armed forces in 1966-68. A brief from the Canadian Ethnic Press Federation to the Dominion government, signed by German, Italian, Polish, and other ethnic press representatives, cited 1951 Census figures showing that 18.2% of Canadians were of origins other than British or French, and that after six years of diverse immigration one in

---

[28] Fred N. Dreisziger, “Rise of a Bureaucracy for Multiculturalism: the Origins of the Nationalities Branch,” in N. Hillmer, et al., eds., *On Guard for Thee: War, Ethnicity, and the Canadian State, 1939-1945* (Ottawa: Department of Supply and Services, 1989), 20 ff.; Leslie A. Pal, *Interests of State*: *The Politics of Language, Multiculturalism, and Feminism in Canada* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1993), 86 ff.

[29] Franca Iacovetta, “Making Model Citizens: Gender, Corrupted Democracy, and Immigrant and Refugee Reception Work in Cold War Canada,” in G. Kinsman, et al., eds., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (Toronto: Between the Lines Press, 2000), 159-61.

[30] J.M. Kirschbaum, *Twenty Years of the Ethnic Press Association of Ontario* (Toronto: Ethnic Press Association of Ontario, 1971), 170-1.

[31] Palmer, 313; Igartua, *The Other Quiet Revolution*, loc. cit.

five now belonged to neither founding race.[32] Within a decade, nationalists had brought in a new flag that was "inclusive of all cultures and ethnic backgrounds," presided over the all-Canadian Centennial celebrations of 1967, and substituted "O Canada" for "God Save the Queen"—all of which, Gary Miedema says, were attempts to "restructure and adapt that [symbolic] order in order to allow it to include previously alienated groups."[33] The assumption is that British-looking Canadian symbols failed to "include" minorities—something that tended to be taken for granted by the supporters of change.

Historians of ethnicity have used the term "Anglo-Conformity" to describe the dominant group's presumption to assimilate others. However, a neglected aspect of the movement to Canadianize national symbols is the assumption that non-British immigrants and their descendants could not, by definition, feel affinity for Britishness or its Canadian manifestations. This, however, is another form of Anglo-Conformity that has been called "ethnic determinism."[34] Without being aware of it, those who adopted this attitude took for granted that to be "ethnic" predisposed one against Britishness. Presumably, then, a person of "ethnic" background who supported the inclusion of the Union Jack in a Canadian flag represented a species of Uncle Tom? But surely this is a particularly condescending form of ethnic determinism. F.H. Underhill saw the removal of Britishness as a prerequisite for assimilating newcomers: "We can never make the Ruthenian an Englishman," he wrote, but "we could make him a Canadian."[35] Brooke Claxton wrote that New Canadians had "no attachment to Britain and could feel none."[36]

[32] Canadian Ethnic Press Club, Submission to the prime minister and cabinet on the "Integration of New Canadians" February 1957, Copy in Hellyer Papers.
[33] Miedema, "For Canada's Sake," 140.
[34] Lowry, 96.
[35] F.H. Underhill, "Canada, the Empire, the League," undated *Grain Growers Guide* pamphlet, 3, F.H. Underhill Papers, Vol. 47, file marked "Books – Canada & Empire."
[36] Claxton Memoirs, 281-2.

Similarly, A.R.M. Lower claimed: "To many a Slav on the Western Prairie, King George V must be as obscure a figure as the Shah of Persia'[37]—a naïve assumption, given that the king was, in fact, a first cousin (by marriage) of the Tsar, with whom many immigrants were familiar. Mennonites, for example, viewed monarchy as the protector of minorities, and "non-leftist" Slovak newspapers showed "loyalty to their new country" by celebrating Dominion Day and royal tours.[38] Still, Lower insisted on the impossibility of ethnic groups' ability to embrace Britishness.[39] In contructing this stereotype of "ethnics," Lower and others from small-town Ontario backgrounds, like Pearson himself, were perhaps unaware of the extent of the admiration for British traditions felt by non-British peoples who had lived under considerably less liberal institutions than those they enjoyed as British subjects in Canada.[40] In fact, during the flag debate, according to Léo Cadieux, a Liberal MP, "The people who, in my estimation, were more attached to the Union Jack were the *new Canadians* because in the case of at least one [on the flag committee] who came from Central Europe after the first war, it represented liberty. So this is a very honourable sentiment" (emphasis added).[41]

Ironically, conservative Anglo-Canadians were early proponents of the compatibility of diversity with the old-style Britishness represented by the Union flag. Stephen Leacock is remembered as a critic of unassimilable foreigners. But in 1937 he

---

[37] Berger, *Writing of Canadian History*, 134.

[38] W.L. Morton, "The Meaning of Monarchy in Confederation," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, I, iv, June 1963, ii., 271-82; Joseph W. Kirschbaum, *Slovaks in Canada* (Toronto: Ukrainian Echo Publishing, 1967), 313.

[39] Cf. "Canadians and the Crown," *Contemporary Review*, May 1970.

[40] On non-British anglophilia, Ian Buruma, Voltaire's Coconuts (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1999); cf. the tradition of exiles in London such as Engels and Marx; the Canadian monarchism of Garry Toffoli (b. 1953), organizer of Victoria Day parades in Toronto (cf. *Toronto Sun*, 21 May 2002); Elie Halévy, among others, associated England with "genuine" liberty, cf. Myrna Chase, *Elie Halévy: An Intellectual Biography* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980).

[41] Peter Stursberg, Lester Pearson and the Dream of Unity (Toronto: Doubleday, 1978), 168

wrote of his Western tour: "Leave them alone, and pretty soon the Ukrainians will think they won the Battle of Trafalgar."[42] Immigrants might hold on to tokens such as "their foreign papers" and "beer gardens" but ultimately "they want to be like us." More subtly, Governor General Lord Tweedsmuir (John Buchan) told a Ukrainian audience in Manitoba in 1936: "You will all be better Canadians for being also good Ukrainians," prompting Peter Henshaw to trace multiculturalism to its British imperial roots in Canada.[43] Far from demanding conformity, it was the Conservative thinker, Watson Kirkconnell, who pioneered Anglo-Canadian appreciation of East-Central European immigrant culture and literature.[44] In the 1950s the bulletin of the Ethnic Press Club, *Canadian Scene*, was produced by volunteers from the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire.[45]

The foregoing makes it less surprising that in the process of wooing ethnic voters, some of the first courtiers were Tories. Ontario Conservative leader George Drew told an immigrant audience in the 1940s: "It is a good thing for Canada that those who trace their ancestry from many nations should keep alive old memories of the achievements of their people and of the special cultural attainments which are their own."[46] Allan Grossman (a Jew), a former Toronto alderman and the MPP for St. Andrew-St. Patrick, Ontario, and John Yaremko (Ukrainian), the MPP for Bellwoods, entertained New Canadians in their

[42] Stephen Leacock, *My Discovery of the West* (Toronto: Thomas Allen, 1937), 159.
[43] Peter Henshaw, "John Buchan and the British Imperial Origins of Canadian Multiculturalism," in Adam Chapnick and Norman Hillmer, eds., *Twentieth-Century Canadian Nationalisms* (McGill-Queen's University Press, forthcoming), citing a speech in Fraserwood, Manitoba, 21 September 1936, rpt. in J.M. Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic: The Making of a Northern Nation* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1938), 307.
[44] Dreisziger in Kovacs, ed., 87-96.
[45] Oliver, 155-6.
[46] Ibid., 144.

homes to meet cabinet ministers and build networks.[47] They created detailed files on ethnic communities—street by street—and assembled an extensive organization through personal contacts, lunch meetings, and other events. Grossman made a point of accepting "ethnic" wedding invitations; one Toronto Chinese reported that Grossman "never said no."

At the national level, the Diefenbaker slogans "One Canada" and "unhyphenated Canadianism," the Conservative rhetoric of equality and anti-discrimination, and the promise to enact the country's first Bill of Rights appealed to New Canadians. Arthur Maloney, a Toronto lawyer, Roman Catholic, Conservative M.P. for Toronto-Parkdale since 1957, and key ethnic organizer for the party, wrote in the German-language *Der Courier* that Liberals were "indifferent" to immigrant welfare; Conservatives had reduced the residence requirement for elderly immigrant pensions—and "informed all ethnic groups of this action," Andy Thompson remarked.[48] The effect was tangible among those in close contact with ethnic leaders. The Tories passed the Bill of Rights in 1960, despite partisan Liberal opposition and scepticism from constitutional scholars. The Diefenbaker government was the first to bring forward an early form of the "points" system, moving beyond a race-based immigration system in 1962. Conservatives also turned the tables by portraying the *Liberals* as the "Anglo-Saxon" party, an elitist organization that discriminated against ethnic groups and preferred to recruit candidates of British descent.[49]

---

[47] Ibid., 147.
[48] Liberal Party summary of the ethnic press, 24-30 March 1963, Hellyer papers, LAC.
[49] Thompson to Pearson, 31 August 1962, Pickersgill Papers, Andrew Thompson file.

Perhaps influenced by journalistic treatments of the period,[50] the historiography has lost sight of the extent to which Diefenbaker's populism generated fear and envy among Liberal strategists. His appeal to social concerns and allure among ethnic groups, let alone the shock of defeat after holding office since 1935, aggravated Liberals' anxiety about an incipient "tory-democracy movement." All that Diefenbaker would need to create such a movement was "an adviser who knows any English history," Underhill wrote to Tom Kent.[51] A sustained populist Toryism, he implied, could, with the aid of sound strategy, leadership, and understanding of francophone Québec, keep the partisan left out of office for a generation. Such a Tory electoral juggernaut never materialized, and Diefenbaker's ascendancy was of short duration—but Underhill's concern represents an intriguing counter-factual of the 1960s.

At the time, the Conservative landslide of March 31, 1958 seemed to validate Thompson's warnings about ethnic voting, and provoked his diagnosis of "possible reasons why the Liberal party lost the ethnic vote."[52] No longer could Liberals simply repeat Pickersgill's perennial campaign bromide that "All through the 20th Century the Liberal Party has been the party of immigration and the Conservative Party has been the party of emigration" and invoke the legacy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Clifford Sifton to win ethnic support at the ballot box. Paul Martin, Sr. had courted the Serb and Italian voters of Windsor.[53] But Diefenbaker's inroads meant that it was no longer an adequate

[50] Peter C. Newman, *Renegade in Power: The Diefenbaker Years* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1963).
[51] All Diefenbaker would need to create such a movement is (to listen to) "an adviser who knows any English history." F.H. Underhill to Tom Kent, 25 November 1957, Underhill Papers, LAC, MG 30 D204, Vol. 12.
[52] "Suggested programme with ethnic groups," 1 May 1958, Hellyer Papers, LAC, Vol. 229.
[53] Howard Palmer, "Ethnicity and Politics in Canada Since Confederation," Canada's Ethnic Groups Series, No. 17 (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1991), 20.

strategy to portray him as the head of a "coalition of 19th century imperialists" and Duplessis nationalists, as the Liberal brains trust had agreed to do in 1957.[54]

When Diefenbaker, speaking in Winnipeg in 1959, invoked Conservative strategist Norman M. Dunn, his personal liaison to ethnic communities, on "Selling a Political Party to the Ethnic Groups," the Liberal M.P. for Toronto-Trinity, Paul Hellyer, took note. Hellyer urged Thompson to obtain a copy and "use this material to excellent advantage here," in Toronto.[55] At first, only a small number of activists understood what was happening. At times, complained party president Keith Davey—who, like Thompson, was later rewarded with a Senate appointment—it seemed that Thompson and Hellyer were the only "stalwarts" cultivating ethnic communities.[56] Thompson wrote to Pickersgill of his difficulties in finding Liberal contacts for some groups: "Still no success re: suitable Chinese staff. If satisfactory employees located during weekend [Liberal M.P.P Ian] Wahn will phone you."[57]

Anti-Communism was one source of affinity between ethnic groups and the Conservative Party in the 1950s. Tories were more convincing cold warriors than Liberals, particulary as the growing number of new arrivals from behind the Iron Curtain displaced the ethnic left.[58] To Poles, Czechs and Slovaks, and Hungarians, with fresh memories of Communist purges, prisons, and official atheism in their homeland, the "Liberal" name carried connotations of the ambiguous, fellow-travelling elements of European social democracy—an association which Conservatives did nothing to

---

[54] H.E. Kidd, composite sketch of Liberal conversations in Ottawa, 5 November 1957, A.R.M. Lower Papers, Queen's University Archives, Box 8, file A139.
[55] Hellyer to Thompson, 23 April 1959, Hellyer Papers.
[56] Keith Davey to Andy Thompson, 10 October 1962, in ibid.
[57] Thompson to Pickersgill, 29 June 1962, Pickersgill Papers.
[58] Burnet and Palmer, 172.

discourage. Diefenbaker's United Nations speech in 1960 drew attention to the "subjugated peoples"—and Liberals were obliged to redouble their efforts. Thompson had long been urging party officials to do a better job of explaining the difference between Canadian Liberalism and its less reliably anti-communist European cousin.[59]

A decade later, as Diefenbaker's government fell apart, Liberals were able to reclaim anti-communism as a potent tool. Pearson returned from his meeting with President Kennedy in May 1963 to reverse the Liberals' opposition to nuclear warheads and to portray the Conservatives as equivocal alliance partners and "soft" cold warriors. Hellyer stepped up the jingoistic rhetoric, vowing to "protect free nations from Soviet Imperialist encroachment."[60] When Diefenbaker received "a favourable reaction by the political refugee groups" at a meeting of the Canadian Ethnic Press Federation in Winnipeg in 1962, Thompson urged Liberal candidates to "make use of the pamphlet "Lester B. Pearson—A force against communism" [among] groups from behind the Iron Curtain." This would be easier to do, however, once candidates had systematically "broken down your voting list into ethnic groups."[61] The headline "Liberals accept nuclear arms" was prominent in ethnic newspapers in the run-up to the 1963 election.[62]

Thompson first submitted his "Monthly Report on Ethnic Groups" in 1953 with "suggestions for useful ethnic contacts" that became the basis of a network surrounding Pickersgill and Hellyer, a Toronto Polish doctor named Stanley Haidasz (later an M.P. and Senator), Ontario provincial Liberal candidate Sam Kelner, and eventually John Wintermeyer, a Toronto lawyer and leader of the Ontario Liberal Party from 1957 to

---

[59] Thompson, "Monthly Report on Ethnic Groups," 18 July 1953, loc. cit. cf. Reg Whitaker, *Double Standard The Secret History of Canadian Immigration* (Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1987), 24.
[60] "Defence Policy for ethnic papers," 25 February 1963, Hellyer Papers, Vol. 15.
[61] Thompson to Liberal candidates, 23 April 1962, Hellyer Papers, Vol. 46.
[62] Liberal Party summary of ethnic newspapers, 10-23 March 1963.

1963. “I arranged that Kelner should be invited to a large Polish picnic,” Thompson wrote. “I also arranged a meeting of approximately twenty negro representatives at his home.” Thompson lamented that the Conservatives had “a summer cottage to which a group go every week-end” along with “steady home entertainment” for ethnic leaders. The good news, Thompson reported, was that Toronto Auxiliary Bishop Francis Marrocco (referred to in the memo as “Bishop Morocco”) assured him that ethnic leaders would rally to the Liberals given “some recognition and personal friendship.”

It was a long and painstaking courtship. Lists were compiled of ethnic contacts, organizations, churches, editors, newspapers, and radio stations that should be cultivated. Thompson wrote briefings on “annual ethnic ceremonies” and events that Liberals should mention in speeches and, if possible, attend in person. Thompson lunched almost daily with an “ethnic” representative, and submitted reports on his potential loyalty. He wrote that Julius Baier, owner of the German *Zeitung*, was a Conservative, “but Hans Kames opposed him for the Harmony Club presidency. Kames, however, may still be too German nationalistic” to be a useful Liberal. Dr. Yip, a Chinese lawyer, set Thompson aback with the claim that perhaps 60% of Toronto Chinese were Conservative, and offered suggestions for immigration policies that might attract more Chinese votes.

Thompson found that the Tories had developed an effective network based on mutual exchanges of information and hospitality. Conservative organizers consulted experts whose advice made Tory speakers appear well-informed: Thompson reported that a recent speech by Maloney on “General Siworski [sic] … apparently was historically factual. It is being printed in the Polish paper.” Thompson’s July 1958 progress report listed new contacts and each group’s politically exploitable “problems.” *Corriere*

Canadese editor Arturo Scotti, he said, “appears to have swung towards the Conservative ranks. Conservative Italians have financial control.” *Der Courier*, Thompson said, seemed Liberal-leaning; *Polish Voice* was Liberal, but one of its staff, Zwiakowski, was “not Liberal” and Poles should be cultivated through a more reliable contact, Frank Glogowski: “I talked with him. He is a staunch Liberal and editor of the paper.” The Czech *Novy Domov* “seems to have gone CCF”; *Vilne Slovo* was Tory, “controlled by Mr. Boyko.” Conservative Party headquarters had been providing ethnic newspapers with a “steady flow of *Hansard* excerpts,” House of Commons speeches pre-translated for each group. “The editor showed me the material which the Conservatives have been sending. Every speech by Diefenbaker or Maloney is translated into the language of the paper and sent personally to the editor. This situation was confirmed by other papers with which I talked.” Thompson attended the studio opening of a CBC television program on ethnic music, and actually took the phone numbers of musicians who could provide “entertainment at Liberal functions.”[63] Clearly, he was working every angle to make new friends.

But it was not enough—at least not yet. After the Liberal defeat in 1958, Thompson’s fascinating “Suggested programme with ethnic groups” enumerated “possible reasons why the Liberal party lost the ethnic vote.”[64] “Previously the ethnic groups generally had considered the Conservative party to be narrowly British,” Thompson wrote, “and that it was against the Liberal government’s immigration policy towards Europeans and Asiatics.” However, by 1957-58 a dramatic change had occurred, unseen by complacent Liberal planners. For a decade, the Drew-Diefenbaker Tory party

[63] Pickersgill Papers, Thompson file, 18 July 1958.
[64] Thompson, “Suggested programmed with ethnic groups,” loc. cit.

had been building support even in urban areas where the CCF was popular, outmanoeuvring parties to their left. No statistics were provided; Thompson based this conclusion on reports from candidates, staff, and volunteers. Simply put, "The Conservatives won the ethnic vote."

Diefenbaker had stressed his own half-German background, the extraordinary "ancestral" memory his father carried of Diefenbaker's German great-grandfather from the Napoleonic Wars, when he "was knocked down by a French soldier, his pig stolen, and his leg broken," the type of ancestral experience that explained a generational ethnic European devotion to the Union Jack, the symbol of Bonaparte's defeat.[65] Diefenbaker's government made important gestures towards ethnic representation in high office, in Parliament, and among Tory candidates, appointing the Ukrainian-Canadian Michael Starr as Minister of Labour, the first "ethnic" cabinet minister, in 1957.[66] For a time, they received better coverage in the ethnic press. The first Chinese in Parliament was a Tory, Victoria-born Douglas Jung, elected in 1957 to represent Vancouver Centre. Denouncing any citizenship of "hyphenated consideration," Diefenbaker told the Commons in 1958: "I'm very happy to be able to say that in the House of Commons today in my party we have members of Italian, Dutch, German, Scandinavian, Chinese and Ukrainian origin, and they are all Canadians,"[67] to the Liberals' chagrin. The first Ukrainian-Canadian senator, William (Wasyl) Wall, had been appointed by St. Laurent in 1955, but Diefenbaker added John Hnatyshyn in 1959 and Professor Paul Yuzyk in 1963. Thus, the Tories introduced a more visible presence of New Canadians into public life and in political appointments, adding to the prime minister's ethnic political capital. Judy

[65] Diefenbaker, Vol. I, 17.
[66] *Ukrainian Weekly*, 2 April 2000.
[67] *Hansard*, 29 March 1958.

LaMarsh, the Liberal M.P. for Niagara Falls, expressed partisan outrage that the "sole purpose" of several Tory operatives was "to get ethnic votes … to hammer at ethnic groups. … It's a pretty cynical approach to buying votes," she said, even as Thompson was then pursuing a similar strategy.[68]

What was good for the Tory goose was good also for the Liberal gander. In response came Thompson's impressively detailed plan of action for the early 1960s, his "Suggested method to regain the ethnic vote," whose essentials have become standard practice. Drawing once again upon the Tory model, Thompson called for an official Liberal "representative" to ethnic communities (a position for which he himself, not coincidentally, was uniquely qualified) to "establish a personal contact with groups," initiate regular lunch meetings, compile research, meet religious leaders from "the Cardinal down," get invited to "ethnic affairs," and drop the tantalizing offer of a face-to-face meeting with Pearson, the Nobel Prize-winning opposition leader and future prime minister. Organizers must ensure the attendance of ethnic "representatives at every possible Liberal occasion." Toronto and Yorks Liberal Association president Richard J. Stanbury wrote in a "Dear Liberal friend" circular that the "Tories have been doing an excellent job of impressing the Ethnic group [sic] with their interest in them. We have not been keeping pace, but we now have an opportunity to catch up lost ground." Thompson recalled with embarrassment hearing a Liberal M.P. congratulate a Hungarian audience for having "expelled" the Russians when, on the contrary, Warsaw Pact forces had crushed the 1956 uprising. "The Conservatives," he added caustically, "when attending ethnic functions, expressed some knowledge of the background of the particular function." In future, Liberals must have "background material on ethnic groups." It was

[68] *Calgary Herald* (1962?), clipping in Hellyer Papers, Vol. 3,

crucial to ensure that the party and candidates had accurate data on ethnic membership in ridings. (Thompson wrote in disbelief: “There were Liberals who still considered Spadina to be a predominantly Jewish riding,” which was not the case.)

Thompson suggested that a film about the Liberal Party should be distributed in various languages to ethnic community halls across Canada. But it was important not to be seen to be making a crass pitch. “The representative [himself] should not attempt to force them [ethnic citizens] into partisan politics. In the long run it creates ill-will,” he wrote. The more effective technique was to befriend and cultivate *one* Liberal-leaning member of an organization’s executive, and to encourage Liberal “ethnics” to get involved in the group and seek office within it. Liberals should not “bulldoze” groups into political activity, but influence them under the guise of offering “help,” such as: “If they should have need of assistance in writing their constitution, finding a meeting place, etc.” On the whole, it was more prudent to attract “ethnic people” *to* Liberal associations than the other way round.

Liberal officials also adopted the tactic of sending form letters to ethnic organizations to “congratulate them on every appropriate occasion.” Thus Hellyer’s February 20, 1959 compliments to Mrs. A. Kopmanis on her election as President of the Baltic Women’s Council in Toronto.[69] Other recipients included the Latvian National Committee, the German-Canadian Business and Professional Association of Toronto, and the Chinese Community Centre. Politicians sent their photograph to community groups such as the Negro Citizenship Association, and Thompson arranged for Christmas cards to be sent to “our Italians friends.”[70] A “personal” letter from Pearson, on Leader of the

[69] Hellyer Papers, Vol. 229 file 1.
[70] Pickersgill Papers, Vol. 109.

Opposition letterhead, could convey the party's sympathy, concern, or appreciation as desired: Pearson congratulated the Polish Combatants Association on the work of their "gallant comrades … in the defence of liberty."[71] It was an effective technique, and while some ethnic recipients may have sensed insincerity in these missives, others took them at face value; still others recognized their usefulness in generating gratitude and support that would be of mutual benefit.

Like the Conservatives before them, the Liberals became active providers of ethnic hospitality. Paul Hellyer's files contain a vivid illustration: an "ethnic dinner" in his home. It began with a memo from Thompson suggesting that he host an informal Q & A at his own home, for perhaps 28 people, and that Hellyer, as a prominent and ambitious Liberal MP, attend as the featured guest.[72] Several months later an ethnic dinner was hosted by the Hellyers at their home. A letter from a Toronto caterer illustrates the process of choosing a politically sensitive menu. Of several options available, the company suggested that for a buffet supper to be held on a Friday (September 8, 1961), "The Catholics could eat the curried shrimp, the Jewish people (if any) the turkey (John says they do not eat shell fish), and the Protestants could have the ham—only they won't, they will probably eat the shrimp. You could have little signs printed 'Catholics only,' etc."[73] As ever, the faithful Thompson took charge of details, explaining how to compose a guest list for maximum effect: "Use a key ethnic contact with Liberal leanings both to suggest and to contact the proposed persons from his group," Thompson wrote. "This will build up the Liberal, and also put the onus of criticism on him rather than you for anyone who may feel ignored. The Liberal should understand that you want the most

---

[71] Pearson to Polish Combatants Association in Canada, 16 April 1959, copy in Hellyer Papers.
[72] Thompson to Hellyer, 24 January 1961.
[73] "Mary" of Curran Hall Ltd. (caterers) to Hellyer, 29 August 1961, Hellyer Papers.

influential people." Glogowski, a "reliable" Polish contact mentioned earlier, he said, should invite five prominent editors, including Julius Baier and Dan Iannuzzi, editor of Toronto's *Corriere Canadese*. A list of desirable guests followed, broken down according to ethnic categories. For the Ukrainians, Hellyer should arrange for Marshall Romanick to send out the invitations, as "he feels we often make a mistake in inviting Conservative Ukrainian free loaders to our parties." "Dr. Haidasz" should invite the Poles. Other groups were listed under the heading "ethnic people invited to reception and buffet supper at Paul Hellyer's home," in order as follows: Baltic, German, Italian, Hungarian, Slovak, Croatian, Chinese, and Japanese. "I have excluded Serbs, Slovenians, Greeks, Macedonians, because I feel that they are either small or not well organized," Thompson wrote.[74] There could be few better documented examples of political operatives attempting to make insightful use of ethnic pecking-orders and networks of influence, based on a kind of divide-and-rule approach, to enhance the electoral prestige of a party.

In 1963, during the election campaign that returned the Liberals to power, Thompson laid out a strategy called "Ethnic Groups programme of advertising, leaflets and press information." Admonishing urban candidates who had not caught up with the times, he wrote: "While some ridings are predominantly Ethnic, there is hardly one riding in Toronto which does not have people of Ethnic origin."[75] He proposed taking out large ethnic-language advertisements alongside regular national Liberal Party ads in 30 ethnic newspapers, providing names and addresses, advertising rates, distribution, and languages. Thompson explained that the contact for placing the ads was "Stan Mokrzycki

---

[74] Thompson to Hellyer, 16 August 1961.
[75] Thompson to Liberal candidates, March 13, 1963, Hellyer Papers, Box 46.

(pronounced Mok-shee-sky) [sic].” The ads would highlight the Liberal record in government and the negative effect of having “two splinter parties” (i.e., the CCF-NDP and Social Credit). It was helpful that under the Diefenbaker Conservatives, “immigration has declined.” (Liberals noted with satisfaction an editorial in the *Corriere Canadese* remarking that Italian immigration had fallen to “second place” after British immigration in 1962, and that immigration overall had declined from 300,000 in 1957, the last year of the St. Laurent government, to 74,000 in 1962—both facts that the Liberals were able to exploit for electoral benefit.)[76] Thompson assured his readers that advertising in immigrant languages “does help to get their vote,” “is a proof that the Party is concerned about them and wants them to know our program,” and “has helped to win seats.”[77] Though a detailed analysis of voting patterns in 1963 has yet to be made, the Liberal seat count in Parliament grew to 128, giving Pearson the first of two minority governments.

By the late 1960s, ethnic politics had grown into another new phase: outright appointment-seeking along ethnic lines. Canada’s appointed upper house, like Britain’s life peerages, had long provided an opportunity to reward the governing party’s loyal servants and integrate outsiders. Memos in the previously untapped Stanley Haidasz Papers reveal Ethnic Press Federation stalwart Joseph Kirschbaum urging Pearson to appoint a cabinet minister of “other than French and Anglo-Saxon origin.” He suggested Haidasz, the Toronto Polish Liberal activist and M.P. for Toronto Trinity since 1957, who, Kirschbaum said, “enjoys trust and great respect among many ethnic groups.”[78] Here again the Liberals were playing catch-up: Kirschbaum was either unaware, or chose

[76] “Summary of ethnic newspapers,” 3-9 February 1963.
[77] Thompson, “Election campaign to the ethnic groups,” Hellyer Papers.
[78] Kirschbaum to Pearson, 29 February 1968. Stanley Haidasz Papers, R 1273, LAC.

to ignore, that Diefenbaker had named Michael Starr to cabinet in 1957. Haidasz was himself an advocate of ethnic appointments, urging George Dobrzanski, the secretary of the Polish Alliance, to find an eminent "Canadian of Polish origin" to recommend for a Senate seat. Ted Glista, the group's president, recommended Winnipeg's Peter Taraska.[79] As the new ethnic politics took shape in the late 1960s, ethnic leaders lined up to be integrated—literally—into political positions through the patronage system. In 1972 Haidasz did become the first cabinet minister of Polish origin, as Minister of State, and, six years later, the first Polish senator. In 1981 Charles Caccia became the first Italian-Canadian cabinet minister—following in Starr's footsteps in the Labour portfolio—and other appointments from the growing ethnic political talent pool followed in due course. Ethnic membership in the Canadian honours system, too, would make an interesting study, including Dan Iannuzzi's membership in the Order of Canada in 1990 for his contribution to Italian-language media.[80]

When Pearson, campaigning as opposition leader in 1963, repeated his wish to replace the Canadian Red Ensign with what he called a "distinctive Canadian flag," he made the announcement in Winnipeg to a group of ethnic newspaper editors, at an event that went unnoticed by local newspapers.[81] The choice of venue provoked the Canadian Corps Association to demand whether Pearson, now the head of a minority government, judged the "desires of New Canadians" to be "more important" than the "unanimous

[79] Haidasz to Dobrzanski and Glista reply, 26 January 1966, Haidasz Papers, loc. cit.
[80] The link between ethnicity, integration, and honours has received little attention. McCreery, *Order of Canada*, does not explore questions of ethnicity.
[81] "Pearson Rejects Ensign, Promises Flag in 2 Years," *Globe and Mail*, 9 March 1963, 1. Neither the *Tribune* nor the *Free Press* covered the event; for some reason, the Toronto-based *Globe* was aware of it.

opinion" of veterans,[82] as though New Canadians could not also be veterans while holding different views on the flag issue. The Association did not question ethnic support for Pearson's initiative but, interestingly, assumed that "ethnics" would approve. In fact, many Polish and Ukrainian veterans supported the retention of the Red Ensign. In any case, Pearson's reply was that, no, "the opinion of ethnic groups in Canada has not now become more important to our government than that of servicemen and women."[83] For both sides of the debate, awareness of the importance of "ethnic politics" was growing.

In the early 1960s many ethnic opinion leaders shared in the mounting disillusionment with the Tory party. Regenstreif argued that ethnic voters were reacting no differently from other urban groups to the economic downturn, and quoted an "Italian marble cutter" and "another Italian, a tile-layer," who said, "'I think I change. … People say Liberals better for working man.'"[84] The government was accused of deliberately reducing the intake of non-British newcomers. A chorus of ethnic editors, including that of the German *Der Nordwesten* of Winnipeg, condemned the Conservatives as "indecisive" and unable to lead the country.[85] Dan Iannuzzi had been a Conservative constituency officer in the early 1950s,[86] but by the mid-1960s his allegiance had shifted, and the leading Italian newspaper was running large photos of Andy Thompson and following with approval his ascent to the provincial Liberal leadership in 1965. The *Corriere* also ran group photos of the newspaper's editor with Liberal MPs René Tremblay and Joe Macaluso, a member of Pearson's House of Commons committee to

[82] Canadian Corps Association Press Release, 8 May 1963, Gordon Churchill Papers, LAC, Vol. 90. The CCA added that the Red Ensign "always has been and always should be the national flag," but did not question the Liberal assumption that there was "ethnic demand" for a new flag.
[83] Pearson to Stanley Harpham, president of the Canadian Corps Association, quoted in the *Ottawa Citizen*, 4 July 1963.
[84] Regenstreif, 91.
[85] Liberal Party notes on ethnic newspapers, 10-23 March 1963.
[86] Oliver, 155.

choose a new national flag; and front-page photos of the editor with Pearson and Macaluso together.[87] The fix was in: there was no longer any comparable coverage of Conservative politicians. Whether because Liberal strategists had cultivated ethnic leaders and opinion leaders, or because the more recent immigrant groups and the younger generation were already tending in what might be called a post-British direction, the Liberal message found a ready audience. Ironically, of course, there was nothing un-British about their integration as Canadians of diverse origins.

Liberal strategists had been forced by Conservative inroads among ethnic communities to back away during the 1950s from associating the Tories with an exclusively "British" or imperialistic vision of Canada. But in the flag debate of 1964, Liberals took the opportunity to level the same charge as never before. The Canadian Red Ensign, with a Union Jack in the upper-left canton, was easily portrayed as a "British" flag, allegedly a symbol of colonial subordination. In its coverage of the flag debate, *Corriere Canadese* (24 June 1964) ran a front-page montage of Pearson and Diefenbaker: superimposed beneath the Liberal prime minister's face was what he had billed as the "truly Canadian" three-maple-leaf motif, unveiled on May 13, 1964. Beneath the Tory leader's photo was not the Red Ensign or the Canadian Coat of Arms, but simply a *Union Jack*—a clear association of Diefenbaker with British imperialism and backwardness as opposed to genuine forward-looking Canadian patriotism.[88] Ironically, the same newspaper later ran a photo of an Italian-Canadian community group in Toronto, in which the Red Ensign and the Piedmontese tricolour, the Italian national flag, flew

[87] *Corriere Canadese*, 23 September 1964, 1, 6; 9 December 1964, 1.
[88] Ibid., 24 June 1964, 1.

together at an open-air event.[89] However, the *Corriere*'s position in the flag debate was clear: "The Canadian flag should be 100 per cent Canadian, an exclusive flag without an I or you"—meaning a "purely Canadian" banner without the divisive symbols of any ethnic group.[90]

This "pure Canada" approach was exactly what Pearson himself had called for in the House of Commons two weeks earlier: the country needed a new flag that could not be mistaken for that of any other country and that did not contain "exclusive" symbols. The Canadian Red Ensign, Pearson said, did not truly represent Canadians. "We should consider German, Ukrainian, Dutch, and Scandinavian elements," wrote Eugene L. Collins, an Irish-Canadian journalist writing in a newsheet called *Canadian Commentator*, edited by another Irishman, Marcus Long. In an interesting refusal to recognize the British fact—the foundational role of the unique British amalgam in Canada that included the Irish—Collins argued that the Italian or Netherlands flag had just as much place in a future Canadian flag as any British symbol.[91]

Some ethnic leaders proposed a break with old habits of integration that did not accord with new approaches to Canadianism. As Peter Taraska, a Winnipeg alderman, wrote to Hellyer: "In some quarters there still persists the notion that the British and their kindred peoples are the true Canadians, and such as Poles, Germans, Ukrainians, Italians, and all others are strangers even though they have lived here for many generations." This superstition had obliged immigrants "to outdo themselves in pretending to be as much

[89] Ibid., 12 August 1964, 3.

[90] Ibid., 29 May 1964. I thank John Zucchi for these translations.

[91] Eugene L. Collins, *Canadian Commentator*, June 1958, 2. Collins is evidence of both Irish-Canadian anti-Britishness and affinity for ethnic groups, (see n. 2 above); he most certainly illustrates an Anglo-Celtic nationalist determination to remove overtly British symbols from public life; the *Commentator*'s editor was the Irish-born Marcus Long, cf. "A Tourist's View of Ireland," *Empire Club of Canada Speeches,* 1955-1956 (Toronto: Empire Club Foundation, 1956), 282-292.

like the British as possible'[92] Borys Wrzesnewskyj, of Ukrainian background, observed the same tendency in the intense microcosm of Upper Canada College, "a feeling among a number of kids who were of non-English background that they felt a need to be WASP," an "anglicizing process … done with white gloves."[93] Taraska advocated an alternative approach for Polish Canadians: the "British are a great people," he said, but a Pole is a "better citizen and a better Canadian if he is proud of his Polish identity." This was the wave of the future,[94] a growing consensus among ethnic leaders in light of the B & B Commission Report and, it should be added, the flag debate. There are many forms of Britishness, but for its critics in Canada in the mid-1960s, it meant the outmoded "chauvinism" of "Britain-firsters," an "intense British loyalty," even among Anglo-Canadians born in Canada, that ran counter to the country's "overall cohesion." Anglo-Saxons and "Canadian anglophiles" had been "pampered" and "catered to" for too long, wrote Eugene Collins, and the decision on a new flag was "no longer theirs to make."[95] Prominent intellectuals shared this view. "There is no doubt that the red ensign was an emblem which symbolized particularly the traditions of that part of the population whose ancestors came from the British Isles," wrote F.H. Underhill. "But we are no longer a predominantly Anglo-Saxon people. We have become a heterogeneous, pluralistic community with a growing majority of our population consisting of Canadians who are

[92] Taraska to Hellyer, 29 April 1966, loc. cit.
[93] Fitzgerald, *Old Boys*, 286.
[94] Richard J.F. Day, *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity* (Toronto: U. of T. Press, 2000); Will Kymlicka, *Finding Our Way: rethinking ethnocultural relations in Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1998); Paul Yuzyk, *For a Better Canada* (Toronto: Ukrainian National Association, 1973).
[95] Collins, *Canadian Commentator*, loc. cit.

not British in the narrow ethnic sense."[96] This was not the voice of Anglo-conformity—at least, not in its former guise.

The new Anglo-conformity stemmed from the Liberal nationalist interpretation of "Red Ensign" Britishness as other, something foreign to Canada. It was rooted in a *certaine idée* of Canadian history, namely the coming of age narrative popularized by Lower and absorbed by Pearson and his contemporaries. According to this narrative, Canada, as a country made up of many races, had outgrown the old symbols. This, however, was compatible with the liberal Britishness of Canadians who were themselves British in origin but who had come to regard the overt acknowledgement of old-style Britishness as a badge of inferiority, a triumphalist provocation to French Canadians, and an alien imposition on New Canadians. Their conviction bore the hallmarks of an ideology—but one which was nonetheless informed by British liberal assumptions. In the years leading up to the Centennial, Pearson and his associates became convinced that a sudden public break with the past would enable a more diverse society to flourish, but one nonetheless informed by new multicultural expressions of Britishness.

A variety of explanations may be adduced for the readiness of some ethnic groups to embrace the new Canadianism. Among these, we have noted the political cultivation of ethnic leaders, and the development of a post-British sense of Canadianism among some immigrants. But another explanation should be considered: that Canadian Britishness, under Pearson's influence, was entering a new phase, that of a more diverse, inclusive, hybrid, underlying Britishness that no longer required or expected overt symbolic representations. A new flag, emptied of obvious British referents, would embody this

[96] F.H. Underhill, "Preview Commentary" addressed to J.W. Pickersgill, 15 February 1965, Hellyer Papers, Vol. 94.

liberal Britishness in its new guise. The removal of overt symbols was one thing; it did not necessarily mean the denunciation of Britishness altogether, but the embrace of a more diverse Canadianism that was in accord with the broad liberal conception of Britishness absorbed by Pearson and his associates. To that extent, perhaps what happened in Canada in the 1960s was the further articulation and construction of Canada as a "better Britain," more diverse and welcoming than earlier narrow expressions of Britishness, just as earlier waves of British immigrants had sought to build "'better Britains' than the ones they or their forebears had left behind."[97] It did not matter if most or many Canadians were aware of this underlying Britishness. What mattered was that the "new nationalism" seemed to offer something new, free of exclusive symbols, impositions and subordinations—in other words, what Farthing called "pure Canada."

Some ethnic opinion leaders found themselves in accord with the new Canadianism, and did not perceive any need to retain vestiges. *Corriere Canadese* wrote that the Queen, visiting Canada in 1964, "represents the symbol of an old subordination [that] is by now extraneous, at least nominally, to the Canadian order." The "British [sic]" Monarch was "the symbol of a past that no longer exists," though she should be welcomed as "the head of a foreign country," and "the representative of a friendly people."[98] In a 1959 editorial addressed personally to the Sovereign, the *Corriere* wrote that "many newly arrived people who become Canadian citizens and who swear loyalty to you do so intending that the oath be made to the Queen of Great Britain of which Canada is a Dominion," rather than to the Queen of Canada. Few immigrants understood the latter concept, it seemed, due to "the limited historical cultural background of your

[97] Buckner and Bridge, "Reinventing the British World," 79.
[98] Liberal ethnic press summary, 16 September, 7 October 1964.

new subjects and above all the neglectful ways in which the Canadian authorities deal with so important a problem."[99] If new citizens did not understand the monarchy or the concept of a Canadian Crown, then a role may have been played by citizenship officers from the 1940s to the 1960s, together with schools, news media, and other sources of public information and education—raising the interesting possibility that the monarchy in Canada was damned by faint praise. The *Corriere* suggested as early as 1959 that the head of state, flag, and national anthem should be debated and the current "British" versions simply replaced.

German-language media also shared nationalist assumptions. There is no reason to believe that Liberal Party courtship was a decisive influence in this tendency, which was shared by many Canadians regardless of political stripe. "Canada is still not independent," wrote the *Deutsche Courier* in a German-language editorial carried across Canada. "First, these symbols of dependence on Great Britain must be removed," the *Courier* said, soon after Pearson announced his proposal, adding, "before a true national flag and anthem can be genuine symbols of an independent nation free of the control of foreigners [sic]."[100] Later that month the *Courier* endorsed Pearson's three-maple-leaf design to replace the Red Ensign, which "had little meaning" for "French Canadians and New Canadians," and praised the prime minister for placing "above tradition and history" the need to accommodate "all the linguistic groups in our country."[101] An unusual German-Canadian voice was that of Eckehart J. Priebe, who believed that, "In view of the growing diversity of the Canadian population, the Union Jack had outlasted its

---

[99] Ibid., 23 June 1959.
[100] *Der Courier* (printed in German in Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Vancouver editions), 21 May 1964, 3. The translations are my own.
[101] Ibid., 28 May 1964, 3.

usefulness as a rallying symbol." The former Messerschmidt pilot with No. 2 Squadron, Fighter Group 77 of the *Luftwaffe*, said the Maple Leaf "must be considered one of the most outstanding contributions to Canadian unity … It is a very powerful symbol of a young country of the free … a source of pride to any Canadian wherever he might come from."[102]

There is little negative comment in the main flag file that has survived in the Pearson Papers, and researchers must look elsewhere for evidence of divergent opinion.[103] The Toronto *Ukrainske Zhyttia* (Ukrainian Life) said that it "approves the new design … and says that Ukrainian Canadians should wholeheartedly support it."[104] A memo to the prime minister also cited the support of *Vestnik* (the Herald), a Toronto Russian paper. One extant fragment of ethnic dissent in the file is Pearson's December 27, 1963 reply to James C. Boeckh, president and general manager of the Boeckh Co. Ltd. of Toronto, explaining why the PM wanted a new flag while still respecting the old Ensign. But Boeckh's original letter, which might have been source material for "ethnic" opposition, is no longer on file. This "absent presence" of critical correspondence suggests the files may have been culled to leave a certain impression of public opinion. If Boeckh's letter is missing, what else has gone missing?

Ethnic opinion in the flag debate in some ways echoed the backlash against the founding-race presumptions of the B & B Commission, an outpouring of ethnic dissent that is better represented in the historiography.[105] As Paul Yuzyk said, the "third element"

---

[102] Eckehart J. Priebe, *Thank You, Canada: From Messerschmidt Pilot to Canadian Citizen* (West Vancouver: Condor Publications, 1990), 348-9.
[103] It is a slim file in MG 26 N7, Vol. 3, which contains only a fraction of the positive and negative material the PM received.
[104] 27 May 1964, Briefing on the ethnic press, Pearson flag file, LAC.
[105] The *Bulletin of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association*, later *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, and their lengthy bibliographies of ethnic scholarship, were some of the fruits of this awakening.

deserved recognition as a force for national unity. *Corriere Canadese* suggested that they could be an "integrating" glue for the nation: "New Canadians cannot stand idle while the separatists are asking for secession," and all groups must work together in order "to make Canada a multicoloured [sic] country."[106] Ethnic opinion on change in the symbolic order, however, was not a one-dimensional affair. Being a non-British immigrant or descendant of immigrants did not automatically entail a rejection of old-style Britishness or an endorsement of a newer, apparently post-British expression of it. The Canadian Ensign's staunchest defenders included Diefenbaker, himself part-"ethnic." His father, the son of German immigrants, "was deeply devoted to the Monarchy … and defended it strongly against all comers."[107] (His Scots mother was *less* enamoured of Britishness, which in her mind was really Englishness, and "did not share Father's devotion to the Crown.") Another half-German Canadian, Major-General Bert Hoffmeister, lamented in the mid-1960s that "he had gone to war under one flag [the Red Ensign] only to see it replaced by another."[108]

More likely to be forgotten today is that the Ukrainian-Canadian Senator, John Hnatyshyn (the father of Ramon Hnatyshyn, Governor General from 1990-95), opposed not only the three-leaf Pearson design, but also the one-leaf red-and-white flag manoeuvred through the flag committee by the Liberals and NDP in October 1964. Hnatyshyn would have preferred a distinctively Canadian design that included the Fleur-de-lys and Union Jack. The latter, he said, represented "freedom" for his and other New

[106] Liberal summary of ethnic newspapers., 20 January 1963.
[107] Diefenbaker, Vol. 1, 17.
[108] Hoffmeister soon became accustomed to the new flag and flew it from his summer cottage, as recounted by his son, Rod Hoffmeister, reached by telephone in Vancouver, June 2005.

Canadians' ancestors.[109] The lack of founding-race heritage in the proposed flag suggested that Canada was a newly-independent post-colonial state in Asia or Africa, a misrepresentation: "We are not forming a new nation," Hnatyshyn said, "Canada has existed for 97 years" and any new flag should reflect that.

Senator Yuzyk also opposed Pearson's flag project. In fact, he endorsed the open letter from Donald Creighton, W.L. Morton, T.H.B. Symons, and others urging the prime minister to scrap his "simplistic" three-leaf flag and develop a design that represented the two founding races. He thought a maple leaf should be included, but "by itself," he said, "I cannot associate it with civilization and culture." The "third element" and "unity in diversity" were important, but the national flag should contain deeper symbols than a mere floral token. The Fleur-de-lys symbolized the French gift of cultural preservation and religious devotion; French Canadians had much to teach English Canada about the "meaning of life," he said: without them "there would be no Canada." But the Union Jack, at a minimum, belonged in any Canadian flag design because the Parliamentary system was Britain's "imperishable gift" to all Canadians.

Another "third element" senator, the Icelandic-Manitoban Gunnar Thorvaldson, said millions of Canadians felt "mortally wounded at the tearing away of the Union Jack" from the Canadian flag.[110] Nick Mandziuk, the Tory M.P. for Marquette, Manitoba, since 1957, contradicted the assertion of Margaret Konantz, Liberal M.P. for Winnipeg South, that the Ensign was a symbol of colonial subordination to Britain.[111] On the contrary, said Mandziuk, born in the Ukraine in 1902, East and Central European immigrants came to Canada "under a flag of liberty, the Union Jack under which French Canadians had also

[109] Senate *Hansard*, 16 December 1964.
[110] Ibid., 16 December 1964.
[111] House of Commons *Hansard*, 14 December 1964.

preserved their liberties.[112] Mandziuk was scathing of the claim that "ethnic" status implied support for Pearson: "I know the prime minister tries to hide behind the alibi that it is the ethnic groups who have asked for a distintive Canadian flag," and that "these people … are just dying to get a new flag," he said. However, a pro-Ensign petition from Legion members in his Manitoba riding received as many Ukrainian and Polish signatures as Anglo-Saxon. The Ukrainian Legion branches in Winnipeg, claiming 1,000 members, voted unanimously for the Red Ensign. Mandziuk said European immigrants had entered Canada "under a flag of liberty, the Union Jack."

Government ministers who supported the flag project were aware that "ethnic" opinion was divided. Mitchell Sharp received a letter from John A. Goebbels of Rockcliffe Park, Ontario, pointing out that, "As a child in England, I was taught that the Red Ensign is the Flag of Canada, and I still believe this is so." It "might not be entirely acceptable to everyone in Canada, but I am equally certain that it is acceptable to the majority of us and that we are proud to call it our flag." Goebbels believed that, "The wishes of the small minority who may have some reservations" about the old flag could be satisfied by replacing the shield with Fleurs-de-lys and maple leaves. "As for the other Ethnic groups, they came to Canada accepting the protection either of the Union Jack or the Red Ensign, and would be equally happy with either. Surely we are not going to be railroaded into acceptance of an ill conceived new flag solely for the purposes of political agrandisment [sic]." He even described Pearson's proposal as "the kind of flag one would expect a minor Dictator, having recently conducted a successful revolution in a small mid-European or South American State, to produce to a conquered nation with a view to

[112] Ibid.

wiping out any past heritage they may have enjoyed."[113] How typical such views were among first-generation immigrants would require another paper. But obviously there was not universal acceptance. Lawrence Kindt, the Tory M.P. for Macleod, Alberta, told the House of Commons that his nephew, Cecil Kindt, a Lancaster bomber pilot killed in the Second World War, "fought for the protection of this flag [the Red Ensign] and gave his young life for it," according to a letter from the young pilot's mother.[114]

In the Hungarian *Kanadai Magyar Ujság*, Marcus Van Steen, an Irish immigrant syndicated through *Canadian Scene*, deplored the omission of the Union Jack, which for immigrants represented democracy, liberty, and acceptance when he came to Canada.[115]

> In this whole flag controversy, the most heated argument I have heared for the retention of the Union Jack came, not from a British Canadian, but from a Hungarian gentleman, less than five years in the country. He is a brilliant man, a Doctor of Philosophy from Budapest, now working in Hamilton. He said he came to Canada because the Union Jack in the Canadian flag meant for him personal liberty, equality before the law, free speech and an opportunity to express his own individuality.[116]

The *Kanadai Magyar Ujság* newspaper followed the debate closely, retaining the Red Ensign on its masthead alongside the Hungarian tricolour for nine months after the new flag was introduced (the November 12, 1965 issue was the first to carry a Maple Leaf flag on the masthead) and pointing out to its Hungarian-language readers that Manitoba

[113] Sharp Papers, LAC, letter stamped "received" 1 June 1964.
[114] *Hansard*, 14 December 1964.
[115] *Kanadai Magyar Ujság*, 29 September 1964.
[116] Marcus Van Steen, "The Flag and Unity," *Canadian Scene* bulletin, Issue 656, 18 September 1964.

adopted a Red Ensign as its provincial flag as a countercultural statement when the Maple Leaf was imposed.[117] Clearly, even some first-generation Canadians of non-British ethnic origin did not necessarily endorse the Maple Leaf nationalism of 1964. Opposition was not limited to rural Tories. Manchurian-born Japanese-Canadian academic Mitsuru Shimpo, a research sociologist at the University of Saskatchewan, wrote to his fiancée in Japan that the flag debate had paralysed Parliament. But the result did not impress him: "The enclosure is the new Canadian flag chosen by the Parliament. I do not admire it very much," Shimpo wrote, enclosing a newspaper clipping of the new flag in colour. "Many people are opposed to it … Because of this national flag dispute, it was the longest session in the history of the Canadian Diet."[118]

These voices did not accord with government members' assessment of ethnic opinion in the House of Commons. Stanley Haidasz, the Liberal M.P. for Trinity, said the Canadian Polish Congress "strongly" supported Pearson,[119] forgetting that few of the 400,000 Canadian of Polish origin whom the Congress claimed to represent were actually asked their opinion. Pauline Jewett, the government M.P. for Northumberland, said, "If we read the ethnic press carefully we can ascertain that they would prefer a new flag."[120] Pearson, too, said his flag design was derived "from our diversity, the achievement of peoples with pasts in other countries."[121] There were many ethnic voices in favour of change, but little attention has been given to the other side, or how members of ethnic

[117] *Kanadai Magyar Ujság*, 21 May 1965, 1. I thank Tom Dobozy for assistance with translation.
[118] Mitsuru Shimpo to Kayoko Sugawara, 24 December 1964, Mitsuru Shimpo Papers, University of British Columbia Archives, Box 3, file 51-1, letter 32. For the translation I thank Ms. Hidemi Shiga, doctoral student in the Department of Asian Studies at the University of British Columbia, who, be it noted, did not endorse Shimpo's views.
[119] *Hansard*, 3 July 1964.
[120] *Hansard*, 2 July 1964.
[121] *Hansard*, 15 June 1964.

groups might well identify with the Britishness of the old symbolism as well as preferring to establish something new and "distinctively Canadian."

This is merely a preliminary, and by no means definitive, glimpse of ethnic opinion in the flag debate and raises interesting questions. The variety of ethnic views expressed toward competing visions of Canadianism has been neglected by historians. But it is too easy to assume that the symbolic changes of the 1960s were necessarily required to "accommodate" the third element, as is now taken for granted. A complete breakdown of ethnic opinion would be difficult, but it is clear that there was at least some ethnic opposition to the overthrow of symbols associated with Britishness. Earlier generations of non-British immigrants, such as the Ukrainians, Germans, and Poles, and perhaps even pre-war Italians, had been integrated to a traditional model of Canada and saw no contradiction between Britishness and Canadianism. It may be that immigrants already disposed to support the Conservative Party were more likely to oppose the Liberal nationalist model implemented in 1960s. Perhaps—and this too is supposition—later groups of immigrants such as the post-war Italians, Greeks, and Portuguese were more likely to endorse a Liberal version of Canadianism. But this would not account for expresssions of Hungarian, Dutch, or Japanese support for inclusion of the Union Jack in the Canadian flag as a symbol of liberty for refugees. At any rate, the assertion that the new symbols were "more inclusive" has been overdrawn. Sociologists have advanced this claim without much evidence. If any group could be described as "alienated" by Britishness it was *not* the newcomers of non-British origin, but the Canadian nationalists of Irish, Scottish, regional English, and small-town Ontario origins who composed,

supported, and advised Pearson's minority government, and who designed and implemented the Maple Leaf flag.

The unique cache of Andrew Thompson's memoranda reveals the relationships forged by political parties competing for the loyalties of New Canadians in the context of Canada's British parliamentary system with its favour-exchanging, lobbying, patronage, and appointment-seeking. What began as a game of Liberal Party catch-up with the Conservatives' networks evolved during the 1960s into competition over differing interpretations of Canadian nationalism. Both parties sought to win over New Canadians in a process that contributed to their integration into civic life. Conservatives cited the 1960 Bill of Rights and the Diefenbaker slogans "One Canada" and "unhyphenated Canadianism." Liberals cited national unity and ethnic exclusion in their public confrontation with Britishness that culminated in the new flag and other Canadianizing landmarks. But political courtship had its limits. While Liberal stalwarts like Thompson, Hellyer, Davey, and Pickersgill strove to make alliances with ethnic Canadians, their courtship ran into the stumbling block of ethnic resistance to the "bilingual" nationalism of the 1960s. By the mid-1960s, the Conservatives had been surpassed in urban ethnic courtship not only by the Liberals but also by the NDP, at least among southern, if not eastern European voters—a turn of events that deserves further study.[122] It remains for another study to explore how, after 1971, ethnic citizens courted so actively by political parties representing competing brands of Canadianism, negotiated these labels, perceptions, and loyalties worked themselves out in the tide of official multiculturalism. What can be concluded here is that while the confrontation with Britishness of 1964-68 was partially carried out in the name of "ethnic groups," in fact some non-British ethnic

[122] Regenstreif, 91.

groups did not necessarily oppose or resent the overtly British character of the old symbolic order. In spite of this, in the post-war process of being integrated into the Canadian political system and in the development of multiculturalism, what New Canadians contributed to was not exactly the elimination of Britishness—a redefinition and perpetuation of Britishness in a post-1960s framework. Canadians of non-British, non-French ethnic background participated in both the othering of Britishness and in the perpetuation of Britishness as a multiple identity and this did not make them less authentically "Canadian." Contrary to the existing historiography, New Canadians could be found on both sides of this debate.

Chapter 7

Canadianism and Britishness in the Flag Debate, 1964-65

The flag debate, which occurred between May and December 1964, is remembered, if at all, as a bitter partisan struggle over national symbols. But it also provides a complex case study in the crisis and confrontation with Britishness. The flag is the central symbol of "the other quiet revolution," the transformation of post-1945 identity from "British" to "English Canadian."[1] The achievement of a "distinctively Canadian" flag was hailed as the "transfer of power from one generation to the next."[2] It has been portrayed as a rebirth of popular patriotism and as a prime example of the invention of tradition. Others have downplayed the significance of flags: Guy Lamarche wrote that, "le drapeau ne fait pas le pays." And yet in the forty years since the red and white design was first leaked to the public in October 1964, the Maple Leaf logo has transformed Canada's symbolic imagination, consigning almost to oblivion its predecessor, the Canadian Red Ensign. "It's safe to say that perhaps the largest percentage of Canadians don't even remember any other flag, much less think about the old one fondly," one journalist wrote in 2002.[3]

Still, if the overt Britishness of the Red Ensign was downgraded, the new flag was a less dramatic break with the past than is commonly assumed. In its design, content, and implementation, the new flag remained the product of a British world. The rebranding of

---

[1] José E. Igartua, "L'autre révolution tranquille: l'évolution du nationalisme canadien-anglais, 1945-1971," in Gérard Bouchard and Yvan Lamonde, eds., *La nation dans tous ses états* (Montréal: l'Harmattan, 1997), 271-96.
[2] Montreal *Star*, 15 December 1964.
[3] Lincoln Cho, "Standing on Guard," *January Magazine*, November 2002.

British scarlet, the red of the Red Ensign, as "gules on a Canadian pale argent" represents a continuing, if more subtle, Britishness. The provenance and implementation of the Maple Leaf, when examined more closely, were firmly rooted in the British past, and suggest the continuation of an underlying Britishness of Canada under the appearance of dramatic change. The flag debate, then, does not provide a clean "break with Britishness" but, instead, as Patrick Reid put it, a "murky" story, "replete with imperial echoes and local tribalism."[4]

The historiography has been generated largely by protagonists. A kind of filiopietism holds that the flag marked the birth of "our new nationalism," as Pearson put it in 1964,[5] that was universally accepted, according to Arthur Lower.[6] George Stanley, who sketched the design, in red ink, that was manouevred through the flag committee by "clever manipulation" (John English's phrase), penned the first monograph.[7] The English-born Tom Kent, who believed the timing of the initiative to be inopportune, cited "the strength of Mr. Pearson's personal feeling."[8] Pearson, in his memoirs, emphasized his own determination to "see it through."[9] John Ross Matheson, the Liberal M.P. for Leeds, who played a supporting role as Pearson's parliamentary secretary, wrote a book-length panegyric as much to promote his own role as to lay down an orthodox version of the events that remains the sole semi-scholarly book-length account.[10] Matheson's 1980 encomium, originally a master's thesis at Mount Allison University in 1975 supervised

---

[4] Patrick Reid, *Wild Colonial Boy: A Memoir* (Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1995),168.
[5] *Hansard*, 15 June 1964.
[6] Arthur Lower, "Centennial Ends: Centennial Begins," *Queen's Quarterly* LXXIV, 2, Summer 1967, 237.
[7] George F. Stanley, *The Story of Canada's Flag: A Historical Sketch* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1965); English, *Worldly Years*, 291.
[8] Tom Kent, *A Very Public Purpose: An Experience of Liberal Opposition and Canadian Government* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988), 323.
[9] Lester B. Pearson, *Mike: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson, PC, CC, OM, OBE, MA, LLD*, Vol. 3, *1957-1968* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), 310.
[10] Matheson, v.

by Stanley, has been described (by English) as "definitive," although Matheson was a self-confessed partisan.[11] Rick Archbold's "popular" illustrated volume, the only other book-length contribution to the literature, relies heavily on Matheson's account. In 2002, *Maclean's* praised Archbold's "superb job of summing up the whole story," and not a single reviewer was aware that there had ever been any other interpretation of the events. The result is a largely uncontested consensus that the "powerful" new flag "symbolized Canadian unity," as Norman Hillmer has said, and that it was, in J.L. Granatstein's words, "a step into independence" with "a happy ending."[12] A.R.M. Lower, a keen supporter of Lester Pearson's initiative, wrote of the "universality" of the new flag's acceptance. It was the "crowning step" in Canada's independence from Britain.[13]

There have always been cracks in this façade. As H.V. Nelles writes, "almost everyone now forgets" how the new flag came into being. According to Roger Riendeau, the "single red Maple leaf" with red borders "triggered a lengthy and emotionally charged debate."[14] But the single red leaf did not trigger the debate; that was another "distinctively Canadian" design—Pearson's trifoliate updating of the Imperial "red, white and blue," as he said privately. Pearson believed that his tricolour or its two-tone replacement would produce "greater national unity." However, as Desmond Morton wrote in revising the fifth (2001) edition of his *A Short History of Canada*, "national unity was not an obvious by-product."[15] Some of Pearson's opponents conceded that the

---

[11] English was an unsuccessful Liberal candidate in the federal election of 1988 and served as the M.P. for Kitchener from 1993-97.
[12] Rick Archbold, *I Stand for Canada: The Story of the Maple leaf Flag* (Toronto: MacFarlane, Walter & Ross, 2002); *Maclean's*, 17 February 2003; Hillmer, "Pearson and the Sense of Paradox," 3; J.L. Granatstein, *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1986), 205.
[13] A.R.M. Lower, Queen's Quarterly, (Summer 1967), 237.
[14] Nelles, 218; Roger Riendeau, *A Brief History of Canada* (Markham: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 2000), 254.
[15] Desmond Morton, *A Short History of Canada* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2001), 284.

flag "in years to come will no doubt be acceptable to most Canadians," but in Quebec, even in the Centennial year for which, in part, the flag had been hurried through, it was the Fleur-de-lisé that "sprouted in thousands."[16] Even so, Gregory A. Johnson has been the first to suggest that the Maple Leaf, as the elixir of unity, "must be judged a failure,"[17] in a groundbreaking essay that is ignored in a review by prominent keepers of the nationalist consensus.[18]

For most, however, the flag is a key symbol of the "break" with Britishness. Johnson describes the flag debate as "the last gasp of empire."[19] By 1964, wrote José Igartua, Britishness was "no longer deemed essential" to English Canadian "representations of themselves as a nation." But not everyone agreed. According to Johnson, the Maple Leaf would "support and foster the Canadian nation-state" with a new "hegemonic nationalism" capable of replacing the British connection as the basis of a pan-Canadian identity. As Johnson puts it, for Pearson, "the old-style British connection was gone and with it British-Canadian nationalism."[20]

If "old-style" meant that the Canadian Red Ensign was an out-of-date symbol of the Imperial past, then this assessment is probably correct. But in other ways, this view of Pearson is based on a simplistic understanding of his Britishness. In reality, Pearson was as much a "British" prime minister as Diefenbaker, but in a different way.[21] In Vincent Massey's case, ex-Methodist Anglican *noblesse oblige* and "affection for England" influenced the liberal-minded Canadian's instinct for individualism "within the bounds of

---

[16] Thomas Van Dusen, *The Chief* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1968), 65, 67.
[17] Johnson, "Last Gasp of Empire," Buckner, ed., 233-50.
[18] Robert Bothwell, "Breaking the Ties," *Literary Review of Canada*, April 2005, 23-4.
[19] Johnson, 247.
[20] Ibid., 243.
[21] C.P. Champion, "Eminent Pearsonians: Britishness, Anti-Britishness, and Canadianism," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, Vol. 16 (2005), 319-40.

a strong sense of laws expressed in living symbols."[22] For Pearson, the Crown might be left intact but the flag must be changed in order to express this British liberty more effectively in the Canadian context. The story of Pearson's Canadianism is not a simple coming of age from imperialism to internationalism.

Similarly, the notion that the Red Ensign was "British" and the Maple Leaf "Canadian"—the assertion both of the government of the day and of most historians since—is merely the vexillological equivalent of the "colony to nation" thesis.[23] In reality, Canadianism and Britishness were interpenetrated in both flags. Canadians' feelings reflected an innate sense of British-Canadianism: fifty-three per cent of the Parliamentary press corps endorsed Pearson's trefoil, with only eleven per cent for the Red Ensign and nine per cent for other designs. But among the public, majorities in nine out of ten provinces supported the retention of British symbols in a new national flag; and at least forty-one per cent nationally favoured retaining British symbols, with the Union Jack preferred as the *national* flag by as many as twenty-five per cent.[24] The full story remains to be told from a post-nationalist standpoint. The government spent the entire summer and fall defending the three-leaf design. Although Pearson's May 17, 1964 speech to a Royal Canadian Legion branch in Winnipeg is remembered by supporters purely as a brave appearance before a hostile audience, in fact Pearson seems to have been quite unnerved by the experience. He urgently pencilled a note to an aide that well-drawn designs of his three-leaf proposal must be made to appear "unofficially—in the

[22] Hilda Neatby, *Queen's Quarterly* 71 (1964), 271.
[23] Alistair B. Fraser, "A Canadian Flag for Canada," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 25, 4 (April 1991) 64-80; idem, *The Flags of Canada* (published online, 1998, with a foreword by Matheson); another Alistair Fraser, not related, served as a Liberal staff member during the 1960s was named clerk of the House of Commons.
[24] *La Presse*, 16 mai 1964; Mildred Schwartz, *Public opinion and Canadian identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 106-7.

most useful media," because "this is becoming a major public relations problem. Our flag policy could be destroyed by leaving the field to the Red Ensign supporters who are now well-organized. Or even worse, by exposure of badly drawn unattractive designs of replacement flags."[25] Finally the government cut a deal with the NDP, the Créditistes, and the dissidents Tories from Quebec to enact the one-leaf flag with red bars.[26] Among the elected representatives in Parliament, at least, the flag represented the coming-together of nationalist elements from all parties, if only a fragment of the Progressive Conservative caucus.

For nationalists who viewed British symbols as "other," the creation of a truly Canadian flag was long overdue. But many wondered "why Mr. Pearson had to move in such a hurry."[27] Pearson's senior advisor, Tom Kent, thought the flag could wait. In political terms, the minority Liberals could not afford another defeat after the "largely self-generated" Pension Plan "crisis of national unity."[28] Journalists accused the government of lacking a substantial agenda.[29] Pearson gambled on the flag, knowing that "he could, with the support of the NDP, roll our faces in the dirt," claimed Alvin Hamilton, the Tory M.P. for Qu'Appelle.[30] Whatever the combination of motives, Pearson vowed that the government would stand or fall on an "exclusively Canadian" flag—one that, he said, "will bring us closer together; give us a greater feeling of national

---

[25] Undated note "handed me Sunday May 17 [1964] Winnipeg, by PM" and marked "very important." L.B. Pearson Papers, Vol. 3.
[26] "The tactics of the voting operation and the political strategy were left to Grant Deachman," wrote Matheson, 128, 132-3, washing his hands of the deception and leaks.
[27] Quebec *Chronicle*, quoted in *Hansard*, 16 June 1964.
[28] Bothwell, 146.
[29] Gérard Pelletier, "Symbole, oui, mais de quoi?" *La Presse*, 21 mai 1964; Peter Newman, "The grey, quiet failure of the Liberal adminisration," *Maclean's* 4 July 1964; for Fraser, *Maclean's,* 5 Septemer 1964.
[30] Stursberg, 157-165.

identity and unity," and "ensure the survival of the Confederation."[31] The appeal to Quebec was elevated by historians into a "race against national division," as John English put it. For Granatstein, "the survival of Canada seemed at stake."

From the beginning the government pointed to Québec as the main justification for urgent action, while at the same time accusing the Conservatives of bigotry for attributing the flag initiative to appeasement. Milton Klein, the Liberal M.P. for Cartier, said, "French Canada wants a distinctive Canadian flag in order to be able to rally around some common denominator with the rest of Canada."[32] Some English Canadian citizens placed a similar faith in the unifying promise of a new flag. One correspondent, Peter Nicolas, wrote in an open letter to Members of Parliament in April 1963 that, "The British flag forever reminds the French Canadians as a conquered people [sic], and that is why there is a separatist movement in the province of Quebec." A truly national flag would produce a "more harmonious attitude between English, the French and ethnics groups."[33] John Matheson said that a new flag would divert the country from "the road to a political convulsion. As a native Quebecker, I did not require convincing as to the importance and urgency of this issue," he wrote in 1980. Born in Arundel, Quebec, in 1917, Matheson saw Pearson as "the great agent of reconciling mercy at a moment of Canada's anguish and despair," when Diefenbaker and the others did not even recognize that a crisis existed. "We felt sure … that our Liberal caucus was in possession of a more thorough intelligence concerning the true state of affairs in French Canada."

Anglo-Canadian paternalism, the assumption that Liberals understood Québec better than the other parties, and *noblesse oblige* toward the francophone "other" were

---

[31] *Hansard*, 15 June 1964.
[32] *Hansard*, 3 July 1964.
[33] Nicolas seems to have lived in Winnipeg. Wally Nesbitt Papers, LAC, Vol. 2.

hallmarks of Matheson's Britishness—and can be contrasted with the resentment and mistrust that characterized francophobe Orange manifestations of Britishness.[34] Proud of his Scots-Loyalist ancestry, Matheson believed a new flag would be a justifiable "concession to the French," whom he compared to his children:

> The French are a part of us … part of our family. In my household we have a lot of little people. In a family, every member is loved whether they are big or small, or young or old, and the interest and the anxieties of each member are important. The distress of one, as I see it—and I am trying to speak in the British sense—is the distress of all. … It is only by caring for one another and being joined together and being firmly rooted in this rich Canadian soil that our Maple leaf family can survive.[35]

There was an important segment of opinion sharing this belief. "Many persons of Anglo-Saxon descent," said the *Toronto Daily Star*, "in fact, recognize that in the interests of unity a distinctive flag is needed."[36] Paul Hellyer, the Minister of National Defence, wrote: "Those of us of English stock, whether we like it or not, are in the minority in this country … about one-third of the population."[37] (In fact, it was more like one-quarter). Lower expressed his brand of Ontario-Methodist paternalism and self-abnegation: "Personally I could accept the traditional flags of my *race* without question," he wrote. But "it is not fair for me, as a member of the majority group, to force my historic symbols

[34] Lowry, 98.
[35] *Hansard*, 17 June 1964.
[36] *Toronto Daily Star*, May 19, 1964
[37] Granatstein, 203.

upon the members of the minority. … Canada is in urgent need of a unifying symbol, one that will mean something to both races. … In other words, if we are to remain a nation, what we must have is a compromise, something in the way of the Canadian flag acceptable to both peoples."[38] Lower told the House of Commons flag committee in 1964: "My whole identity is English. From my childhood I have been soaked in English and English institutions, and there is nothing that would require me to seek a change in them except this simple fact, that if we are going to make the country united we have to get together and we have to find things on which we can agree and, in the interests of this greater goal I am ready to abandon my past."[39] He wrote to T.H.B. Symons, "I believe a national flag to be so necessary that I am prepared to accept almost any design."[40]

Anglo-Canadian paternalism and the sense of self-sacrifice could be found in all parties. Robert Stanfield, the Conservative Premier of Nova Scotia, told the Canadian Club in Montreal a month before Pearson unveiled his flag proposal: "Surely the Canadian thing for us to do is to find symbols which are mutually acceptable. … Surely we can have a national anthem and a flag that unites Canada." This was as good an expression of *noblesse oblige* as any: Stanfield's origins were English—Yorkshire to be exact, Church of England, "highly respectable," and grounded in independent means.[41] George Stanley put forward his red and white design as a "unifying symbol."[42] As

[38] Lower (open letter) to S.J. Sugden, 7 May 1964, Pearson flag file.
[39] Transcript of flag committee remarks, A.R.M. Lower Papers, Queen's University Archives, typescript, 72.
[40] Lower to Symons, no date (Symons had written to Lower on 21 May 1964), Lower Papers.
[41] E.D. Haliburton, *My Years with Stanfield* (Windsor, N.S.: Lancelot Press, 1972), 10; Geoffrey Stevens, *Stanfield* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973), 13, 26.
[42] Stanley to Matheson, 23 March 1964, Alan Beddoe Papers, LAC, Vol. 9.

Pearson told groups of MPs and journalists at 24 Sussex Drive, "I'm going to push through a flag. Got to do this to make Quebec happy."[43]

It was also argued in 1964 that the non-British, non-French "Ethnic" groups, who, by definition, felt no connection to established symbols, demanded a new flag. "Canadians who had no ties with Britain could not have the sentiments nor share the loyalty of those of British stock," Brooke Claxton wrote.[44] "I can see no reason why it should not be possible to suggest that the three leaves appropriately symbolize the fact that the Canadian nation derives from three main sources," Gordon Robertson, the clerk of the privy council, advised: "the people of British ancestry, the people of French ancestry and those from other countries—with all symbolically joined together."[45] Pearson spoke of "the other five million who have come to Canada from other faraway lands with a heritage neither British nor French," and his belief that a maple leaf emblem "will bring them closer to those of us who are of British stock and make us all better, more united Canadians."[46]

The historiography has tended to accept these assumptions. "Most of the one-third of Canadians" neither English nor French "wanted a flag that said Canada and nothing else," Archbold says. Diefenbaker's pro-British rhetoric "left the massive wave of post-war immigrants cold," writes the biographer of André Laurendeau.[47] The Liberals offered "a characteristic Canadian maple-leaf image with which all Canadians might identify," Nelles writes. The new flag, Gary Miedema says, was "inclusive of all ethnic groups,"

---

[43] Stursberg, 155.
[44] Claxton Memoirs, 281.
[45] Robertson to Pearson, 27 April 1964.
[46] Matheson, 74
[47] Donald J. Horton, *André Laurendeau: French Canadian Nationalist, 1912-1968* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1992), 205.

part of the "restructuring of Canada's public symbols and norms … designed to stabilize and unify the nation," as "the state, the most significant manager and protector of the symbolic order and the one with the most to lose in the case of its failure, moved quickly to restructure and adapt that order to allow it to include previously alienated groups." Raymond Breton concluded that a "whole array of circumstances and forces, including Canada's increasingly pluralistic composition, meant that increasing numbers of Canadians felt excluded from its institutions and public symbols. Groups and individuals more often chose to challenge, rather than appropriate or disengage. The result was 'a profound crisis of legitimacy … for society's institutions, especially for state institutions.'"[48] Some argued that the British element held no greater claim on Canadian symbolism than any other ethnic category. The journalist Eugene Collins argued that for Canadians of "Anglo-Saxon" background to expect the Canadian flag to include a Union Jack was the same as Italian or Dutch Canadians expecting to have the flag of Italy or the Netherlands included.[49] Many took for granted, as we have seen, that non-British groups could not understand or embrace the Red Ensign. However, we also saw in Chapter 4 that these claims were overstated. In fact, there was some measure of "ethnic" support for overt symbols of Britishness and for a "British" understanding of Canada, and New Canadians did not necessarily share the government's protestations of urgency about symbolic change.

Finally, it was argued in the 1960s that a new flag was needed to engage the patriotic affections of youth and to bring the country's symbols up to date. "Rising above

[48] Gary Miedema, "For Canada's Sake: The Centennial Celebrations of 1967, State Legitimation and the Restructuring of Canadian Public Life," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 34, 1 (Spring 1999), 140; Breton, "Production and Allocation of Symbolic Resources," 129.
[49] *Canadian Commentator*, June 1958, 1-2, in Hellyer's 1958-65 flag file.

the landmarks and milestones of the past," Pearson said, the new flag "will say proudly to the world and to the future, 'I stand for Canada.'" It would "symbolize and be a true reflection of the new Canada."[50] The idea of an "all-new flag caught something of the spirit of the times," wrote Rick Archbold, as "younger-generation Canadians … believed that a new country was in the process of being born."[51] This sentiment seemed to tap into the 1960s cult of youth and the alleged aspirations of the young, the culture of "neophilia"—a preoccupation with what was "new" and a disdain in some circles for what was established, familiar, or traditional.[52] To borrow from Michael Gauvreau's account of the driving force of the Roman Catholic left in Quebec's quiet revolution, the prejudice in favour of "youth" was "emphatically deployed … as a separate and privileged … category which was used to flay and excoriate what was brusquely dismissed as old-style, routine, and conformist."[53] In the church this came in the form of attacks by progressive clergy on lay popular piety and the Latin liturgy.[54] In the secular sphere of Canadian national symbols, the preoccupation with youth and "the future" contributed to the assault on overt symbols of British identity, with which the young allegedly could no longer identify and, presumably, could not be taught to respect or be expected to tolerate. If so, one contributing factor seems to have been the considerable change in the content of history curricula in high school textbooks. New textbooks in the 1970s placed little or far less emphasis on the British component of Canada's past, and

[50] *Hansard*, 15 June 1964.
[51] Archbold, 17.
[52] Booker, op. cit.
[53] Michael Gauvreau, *The Catholic Origins of Quebec's Quiet Revolution 1931-1970* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005), 160.
[54] Ibid.; Yves Normandin, *Un curé dans la rue*, (Editions Héritage, 1976), tr. as *Pastor Out in the Cold* (Sherbrooke: Saint Raphael's Publications, 1978), q.v. 34-40, 55-7, 101-7.

curricula tended to omit the English (and French) history that was once commonly included in Canadian school texts.[55]

The flag debate of 1964-65 raised key questions about the interpenetration of Britishness and Canadianism. The government was determined to prove that the Red Ensign was not truly Canadian. According to Matheson, only "the 1/42nd or the 1/48th part" was "Canadian," the three maple leaves on the shield, "the only part of the ensign alluding to Canada." Pearson said: "I think it accounts for about one forty-secondth of the flag." The Red Ensign was merely a British merchant marine flag that had never been authorized for use on land. It was "first authorized in 1892 for use on Canadian ships by the British admiralty," Pearson said. Matheson added that, "really," the Ensign "should not have been defaced like that," referring to the coat of arms. This was disingenuous, because, as a heraldry aficionado, Matheson knew that "defacing" is a technical term for adding distinctive markings. In keeping with their sympathy for Pearson's initiative, news reporters relayed the government's bowdlerized history to the public: Peter Newman and Peter Stursberg both wrote the Red Ensign "had first been authorized for use on Canadian ships by the British Admiralty in 1892," with Ottawa's approval only in 1924.[56] Mitchell Sharp went furthest: "After all the Red Ensign was not adopted until 1945," he told a CBC interviewer. Veterans were deluding themselves in believing that the Red Ensign had been used "in any way, shape or form for the Canadian forces" during the First World War, Pearson claimed. That set the record "straight," Matheson

[55] One text used in B.C., Saskatchewan, and Ontario, *Canada in the World Today* (Toronto: Henry Holt, 1945; Clarke, Irwin, 1950, rpt. 1952-63), in print until the early 1960s, included sections on English and French history (1-48; 49-86) before launching into the history of the Dominion (87-224), followed by a section on US History (225-93) and a section on Canadian civics (295-363).
[56] Newman, 256; Stursberg, 153.

wrote.[57] However, this was not correct. Pearson's "bald statement" was "quite untrue," said Gordon Churchill, the Tory House Leader who had been a machine-gunner on the Western Front. Indeed, he and George Nowlan, an ex-artilleryman, could prove it with photographs. When Pearson, who had served in Greece and England but not in the trenches, repeated that "None of us saw a Canadian Red Ensign in those years," Churchill interjected, "You didn't serve in France, either." To this, Pearson could only admit: "No."

Liberal speakers continued to say in the Commons and in public statements that the Red Ensign was purely a British maritime banner of recent origin, with little basis as a Canadian flag. Archbold suggested that the 1965 electoral map revealed a country divided into two camps: on the one hand, blue, Tory, backward-looking "British" districts; on the other, large progressive urban areas (plus Quebec) that were "painted more or less entirely Liberal, new-flag red."[58] The debate was thus framed in black-and-white, British vs. Canadian terms, "a distinctive Canadian flag versus a flag of British design and origin," according to Grant Deachman, a key Liberal strategist. As Blair Fraser wrote in 1967, "The issue lay between those who wanted Canada's symbols to be British and those who wanted them to be Canadian."[59]

Forty years on, these interpretations have hardened into received wisdom. According to Nelles, the Maple Leaf was truly "Canadian" and "replaced a British symbol, the Ensign." The new banner was Canada's first "distinctive" flag, writes Gary Miedema, its predecessor merely the "old British ensign." Archbold's reviewers called the Red Ensign "a makeshift banner adapted from the Union Jack" or "a modified Union

---

[57] Matheson, 73.
[58] Archbold, 130.
[59] *Hansard*, 30 June 1964; Blair Fraser, *The Search for Identity: Canada 1945–1967* (Toronto: Doubleday, 1967), 235.

Jack."[60] The "distinctively Canadian" Maple Leaf, wrote Granatstein and Hillmer, replaced what was merely "a variation of the British flag."[61] In 2005, the official website of Canada's Air Command (the air force) referred to the Red Ensign in the caption of a 1958 photo as "the Canadian Commonwealth flag,"[62] a title with no historical basis. According to the limited French-language historiography, the Red Ensign "n'était rien d'autre, en effet, que le pavillon de la marine marchande."[63] Archbold even attributed a degree of masculinity to the Maple Leaf that was lacking in its predecessor, which, he says, "limply hung" from the flagpole on February 15, 1964 awaiting its more virile replacement. (Matheson credited Pearson with a certain "unafraid" manliness: "Canada needed a man with that special brand of courage,"[64] an avenue that may prove fruitful to some future scholar of masculinity.)

Why did Pearson and his followers devote so much energy to discrediting the traditional flag of the Dominion? After all, the Red Ensign was not a foreign flag at all, but a *fons et origo* product of Canadian nationalism. Contrary to the government's public utterances, Sir John A. Macdonald "constantly made use of it," George Stanley wrote in 1965, promoting "by precept and example" a Canadianized Red Ensign as "the recognized flag of the Dominion both afloat and ashore" since the 1860s.[65] A Red Ensign can be seen over the East Block in O.R. Jacobi's 1866 watercolour of the "old Parliament buildings." The prime minister's own flag files contain briefings on flag history that are

[60] *Ottawa Citizen*, February 15, 2002; December 15, 2002.
[61] Granatstein and Hillmer, 146.
[62] http://www.airforce.forces.gc.ca/equip/historical/arrowlst_e.asp, accessed 5 October 2005.
[63] Marcel Gingras, *Diefenbaker et le Canada français* (Vanier, Ontario: Éditions L'Interligne, 1997), 73.
[64] Matheson, 65, xii.
[65] Stanley, *Story of Canada's Flag*, 26-7. Cf. note prepared by A.D.P. Heeney for the PMO, 6 September 1945, citing an 1891 memo from the Governor General, Lord Stanley, which stated: "the Dominion Government has encouraged by precept and example the use on all public buildings throughout the provinces of the Red Ensign with the Canadian badge on the "Fly." " Despatch No. 311, 12 December 1891, GG's Office, file 290A, Vol. 1, 1865-1937.

at variance with what he said in public. If it began as England's maritime flag, Prince Rupert had, in 1682, granted permission to fly a Red Ensign on land, at Hudson's Bay Company posts; Queen Anne authorized its use on land in 1707, as documents in Pearson's flag files make clear.[66] Scholars have created the impression that it was only diehard, British Empire-obsessed groups like the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire and the Sons of England that thought of the Red Ensign as the flag of Canada.

Ironically, nationalists had flown the Canadian Red Ensign since 1870 precisely because it was not the Union Jack, and because "they have no other" flag.[67] Australian nationalists, too, had substituted the Australian Blue Ensign for the Union Jack.[68] If it lacked "official sanction" from London, as critics repeatedly pointed out, the Canadian Red Ensign did manifest popular patriotism. It flew over Parliament until 1904, when Laurier replaced it with the Union Jack; Henri Bourassa demanded that "the old flag that has been used in Canada ever since Confederation" be put back.[69] John S. Ewart argued in 1908 that the Red Ensign was "the Canadian Flag—the only flag authorized for distinctively Canadian use."[70] O.D. Skelton wrote in 1915: "Dominion ships were to fly … the *distinctive flag of the Dominion* at the jack-staff (emphasis added)."[71] It was carried by the Canadian Expeditionary Force (although the Union Jack was more

[66] Pearson's flag file "1911-1953."
[67] *Hansard*, 14 February 1938.
[68] Tsokhas, *Making a Nation State*, 148.
[69] *Hansard*, 17 March 1904.
[70] John S. Ewart, "The Canadian Flag," in *The Kingdom of Canada: Imperial Federation, the Colonial Conferences, the Alaska Boundary, and Other Essays* (Toronto: Morang & Co., 1908), 70.
[71] O.D. Skelton, *The Day of Sir Wilfrid Laurier: A Chronicle of Our Own Times,* 1915 (rpt. 1964), 309.

common) in 1914-18, and reaffirmed by order-in-council in 1924. During the Second World War, Mackenzie King chose to fly the Union Jack from the Peace Tower, but he told General H.D.G. Crerar in 1945 that the Canadian Army, by showering itself in so many battle honours under the Red Ensign, had "solved for Canada the matter of our national flag."[72] Maurice Pope wrote in his diary in August 1945: "The Canadian flag is flying from the Peace Tower. The precedent first set at Quebec two years ago is now growing into an established fact,"[73] a reference to the first Quebec Conference, where King had arranged to fly the Red Ensign between the American flag and the Union Jack. In 1964, John Diefenbaker did not defend the Red Ensign only because it symbolized an overseas connection to Britain. As George Grant pointed out, when the British rejected Diefenbaker's trade overtures and drew closer to the European Economic Community, this did not affect the former prime minister's belief in the traditional flag. "After what the English did to him in 1962 and 1963," Grant wrote, "Diefenbaker still fought for the Red Ensign in 1964." That was because, to Diefenbaker, it was a *Canadian* flag, not a symbol of Great Britain.[74]

Despite *coups d'essai* over the years to bring in another flag, King and his successor, Louis St. Laurent, found the question too "divisive." In the mid-1950s, the St. Laurent government continued to express public opposition to the notion that a new flag would contribute positively to national unity. On the contrary, flag debates were seen as divisive. When Gordon Keyes of Toronto wrote to Paul Hellyer in 1954, "Do you favour abolition of the Union Jack or would you support a move for a new flag with the Union Jack as a part thereof?," Hellyer's reply was that, "The present policy of the Government

[72] Speaight, 196, 210; *Hansard*, 17 June 1964, citing Crerar from *The Legionary*, March 1963.
[73] 15 August 1945, Maurice Pope Papers, LAC, Vol. 2.
[74] Grant, *Lament for a Nation*, 35.

is that a National Flag should be a unifying force between all the various groups who make up our Nation. It is strongly felt that a new flag at this time might tend to divide rather than unify our peoples."[75]

A segment of English Canadian opinion continued to believe that it was appropriate that a national flag of Canada should, quite naturally, contain a Union Jack—and even that the Union Jack should *be* the national flag. Jon McIntosh of Toronto wrote to Hellyer, "As one of your supporters in your riding I wish to urge you to see to it that *no* flag is made official for Canada but the *Union Jack*, plain and unspoiled by any addition. It is our flag with our tradition of a thousand years of braving the battle and the breeze. … We will never forgive you if you ever let the old flag fall. Uphold our traditional and true Canadian sentiment of 'One flag, one fleet, one empire.'" To this, Hellyer replied that "the 'Red Ensign' has been the official flag in Canada since September 5, 1945; I don't think it is likely that there will be any change in the immediate future."[76] The government, therefore, was prepared to acquiesce, at least for the time being, in the older conception of Canadianism in which overt expressions of Britishness were widely supported. Thus, St. Laurent himself told the press that the flag issue should be resolved only when Canadians "were united in a demand for a distinctive Canadian flag … but not before. … It is better to institute those things which will be received wholeheartedly by the whole nation rather than cause dissensions by forcing things which a portion of the population does not want to accept."[77] In 1962, J.W. Pickersgill, as an opposition M.P., told the Quebec *Chronicle-Telegraph* that the Union

---

[75] Keyes to Hellyer, 2 April 1954, Hellyer Papers, Vol. 251.
[76] McIntosh to Hellyer, 19 February 1954; Hellyer to McIntosh, 26 February 1954, in ibid.
[77] The clipping, in the Pearson flag file 1911-53, is marked in pen "Windsor Star, 21 July 1953." However, the *Windsor Star* did not publish in 1953. The clipping is from a newspaper, but it has not been possible to ascertain which one.

Jack must be included in any future Canadian flag, and that there could be a "second flag that is entirely Canadian." Not to have the Jack on any future national flag, Pickersgill implied, would "cause a deep rift among Canadians."[78] No doubt Pickersgill had in mind the premier of his own province of Newfoundland, Joey Smallwood, who was deeply attached to the Union Jack.

There was no consensus in 1964 that the Red Ensign should be replaced. "The Red Ensign under which Canada has lived in peace and war for three score and ten years is as distinctly Canadian as a flag could be," said the Winnipeg *Tribune*: "It has become Canada's flag and a glowing part of Canada's heritage." "The Canadian Ensign is Canadian by adoption, by assimilation and by tradition," said Tory Robert Coates, the M.P. for Cumberland, N.S. "Flying over the Peace Tower at this time is a distinctive Canadian flag. It is distinctive because it represents our past, our history and tradition, the sacrifices our people have made in war and peace, the founding cultures of our nation—a flag that is representative of everything that is great in this country." "The Red Ensign, which after all is a distinctive flag, to me at any rate, has been my choice since the first Great War," said Oscar W. Weichel, the M.P. for Waterloo North and a Mennonite, "It is a well-known fact that people from other countries of the world recognize our Canadian Red Ensign as Canada's national flag." Nick Mandziuk, the Ukrainian-born M.P. for Marquette, quoted the open letter from Donald Creighton and other academics: "No other country flies the Red Ensign and it has become known all over the world for half a century as Canada's distinctive flag."[79] As Coates put it, if the Union Jack were an

[78] Quebec *Chronicle-Telegraph*, 2 February 1962.
[79] "Leave Our Flag Alone," *Winnipeg Tribune*, 9 December 1963, quoted by Nick Mandziuk in *Hansard*, 30 *Hansard,* June 1964, 17 June, 16 June, 30 June 1964.

exclusively British and monarchial symbol, it would not appear on the flag of Hawaii, a U.S. state.[80]

Pearson's opponents continue to be judged harshly as "virulently francophobe," "full-throated" bigots, and no more than a "hardline crew of Red Ensign supporters." By contrast, the prime minister is cast as "entirely reasonable" and "correct."[81] Pearson, the victor, was on the right side of history; Diefenbaker, who only six years earlier had won the greatest-ever landslide, was "an anachronism."[82] "The Conservative boss held tight to the past, while Pearson transcended his limitations," wrote Norman Hillmer, echoing Peter Newman's 1968 verdict that "the Tory chief remained a prisoner of his heritage … inflamed by issues that no longer animated the majority of Canadians."[83]

Was there a clear majority? No one had the right to be so sure, on either side. But one intriguing clue as to the Liberals' tactics is that, as of July 29, 1964, Mitchell Sharp's office received 432 phone calls, telegrams, and letters in favour of the Red Ensign, and 56 in favour of a "distinctive maple leaf" design. The numbers were compiled in response to an urgent memo to Liberal MPs from the chief whip, James E. Walker, who was "anxious to have an assessment of any re-action from your constituents in connection with the Leader of the Opposition's recent Television appeal, regarding support for the Red Ensign." Walker wanted the information "*at once*." In spite of the numbers, Sharp then wrote a speech (the notes are in the same file) declaring that Diefenbaker's appeal "Predictably … produced very little result."[84] Sharp may have been correct that

---

[80] *Hansard*, 17 June 1964.
[81] Granatstein, 199, 202-3, 205.
[82] Bothwell, Drummond and English, 342.
[83] Hillmer, 11; Peter C. Newman, *The Distemper of Our Times: Canadian Politics in Transition 1963-1968* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1968), 254-5.
[84] Notes dated 29-30 July 1964, Mitchell Sharp Papers, LAC, MG32 B41, Vol. 4.

Diefenbaker's supporters represented only a disgruntled minority—but then the urgency of Walker's message would still require explanation.

In fact, there was a spectrum of resistance to Pearson's approach, including provincial premiers, ethnic leaders, and French-Canadian nationalists. For many, the Union Jack was not a foreign symbol, but an accepted expression of Canada's inherent Britishness in every province, as the centenary celebrations of New Glasgow, Quebec, with pipes and drums, in the summer of 1964, were a timely reminder.[85] Smallwood vowed that Newfoundland would always fly the Union Jack; W.A.C. Bennett had included one in British Columbia's flag in 1960. During the flag debate, in the process of updating the Manitoba Schools Act, the province officially replaced the Union Jacks outside all of its public schools with a Canadian Red Ensign.[86] At the Red River Exhibition in June 1964, the New Democratic Party found that of 15,000 ballots cast in it flag survey, 74% favoured a national referendum (as advocated by the national Progressive Conservative Party), though 64% did not want an election over the flag question. As to designs, 41% favoured the Red Ensign; 33% the three-leaf Pearson design; 15% a one-leaf flag; and 12% some other design.[87] As a direct rebuff to Ottawa, John Robarts and Duff Roblin, the Conservative premiers of Ontario and Manitoba, created provincial Red Ensigns—one of many unforseen outcomes of Pearson's initiative.[88]

Resentment toward Quebec did influence some of Pearson's opponents. One constituent wrote to Hellyer: "The French wouldn't be satisfied with the [flag] Pearson is

---

[85] "Bel exemple d'unité raciale," *L'Echo du Nord*, 26 août 1964.
[86] *Canadian Forum*, July 1964, 84.
[87] *Winnipeg Tribune*, 29 June 1964. 66% did "not approve" of the Liberals" handling of the issue.
[88] Fraser, 246-7; A.K. McDougall, *John P. Robarts: His Life and Government* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 164-5; *La Presse*, 28 mai 1964.

proposing. … Had the Red Ensign been chosen, your Government would tell Quebec this is your flag. Quebec will not be separated from the Crown unless by civil war."[89] But others were more sensitive to "French" sensibilities. Robarts, for one, accepted that a new national flag was needed.[90] Many Tories readily embraced the inclusion of historic French symbols: what they objected to was the "removal of every symbol of historical or antecedent significance" whether British or French.[91] According to traditionalists Scott and Tom Symons, a "completely new flag" that suppressed both the British and French heritage would symbolise "un Canada neuf et unilingue anglais" and would fail to achieve rapprochement. Scott Symons was quoted in Quebec as the "authentic" voice of English Canada—"Car, affirme-t-il, si les Anglo-Canadiens perdent leurs traditions, comment pourront-ils respecter les vôtres?"[92] By contrast, Pearson's design, which Tom Symons described to André Laurendeau as "le légume," failed to embody full-blooded Canadianism, either English or French. "Bloodless" was how Scott Symons later described it for having "dissolved" and "castrated" traditional Canadianism: "Every time I look at that frigging Maple Leaf I dissolve. I simply cease to exist. … It's a non-flag."[93]

Symons and others implied that a more enlightened and creative Conservative leadership (which Diefenbaker and his successors failed to provide) might have presided over a strongly-rooted Anglo-Canadian Loyalist nationalism in the 1960s that was complementary to resurgent French-Canadian culture since the late 1940s. A truly Canadian flag would embody both founding traditions and most newcomers and ethnic groups would probably accept it. Ellen Fairclough recalled that as early as 1957, Tory

---

[89] Telegram to Hellyer 17 May 1964, Hellyer Papers.
[90] *l'Action*, 23 mai 1964.
[91] Van Dusen, 64.
[92] Jean-Guy Labarre, *Non à drapeau canadien* (Montréal : les Editions Actualité, 1962), 143.
[93] Symons, *Combat Journal*, 5, 79, 83, 92; Idem, "Meaning of English Canada."

ministers were aware that some action regarding "a new flag" would be necessary "before too long."[94] But they did not proceed. Thus, then one of recent Canadian history's most intriguing counter-factuals would be how Establishment Toryism might have negotiated the symbolic adjustments of the 1960s while retaining traditional elements. This consideration is little to be found in the historiography of the flag or in the literature on post-1945 Tory intellectuals.[95]

In fact, although Pearson's opponents are known to collective memory as reactionaries and bigots, the record suggests that there were at least some voices of compromise in the Tory camp. David Pugh believed that the Conservatives on the flag committee—who at the time believed Pearson's agreeing to name a committee was a sign of weakness—already "had compromised to the extent that we were no longer sticking entirely for the Red Ensign." As J. Waldo Monteith, the Conservative M.P. for Perth and former mayor of Stratford, repeatedly told the committee, "a large percentage of Canadians who preferred the Red Ensign … could conceivably accept a revised flag" provided traditional symbols were retained. For example, one New Brunswick man wrote to Gordon Fairweather, the Conservative M.P. for Royal, "I feel that the Red Ensign is our Flag. If it must be changed, then let us have one with some links to our heritage with the British and French."[96] Monteith's conclusion, having received many such comments, was that "the Conservatives really were about the only ones who gave any indication of some real effort of compromise!"[97] Indeed, the documents bear marks of Tory doodling of compromise designs—something they would not have troubled themselves with had

[94] Ellen Louks Fairclough, *Saturday's Child: Memoirs of Canada's First Female Cabinet Minister* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 107.
[95] Smith, *Rogue Tory*, 524; Massolin, op cit., omits mention of the Symons.
[96] L.H. Nickerson of Queenstown, N.B. to Fairweather, 4 December 1964, G. Fairweather Papers, Vol. 11.
[97] Monteith flag committee diary, 29 and 16 October 1964

all of the Conservatives fit the hardline caricature. Wally Nesbitt, for example, the Tory M.P. for Oxford, Ontario, drew a White Ensign with a cluster in the fly consisting of a single maple leaf and three fleurs-de-lys.[98]

It is thus a mistake to think of the Liberals alone as the party of compromise. In any case, having run circles around Tory opposition members, Pearson's supporters then welcomed the support of the other parties to force the flag through the House of Commons by invoking closure, a manoeuvre that was opposed by the NDP,[99] who then voted for the flag itself, ensuring that it passed by 163 to 78, on December 14.[100] In the ensuing months and years, the new Maple Leaf nationalists and partisans of "distinctive" Canadianism revealed that they could be as uncompromising as some Conservatives had been on the subject of flags. Some citizens who embraced the new flag were keen to stamp out vestiges of the past, such as the carrying of pre-1965 flags in cadet parades, the use of the old naval ensign in recruiting ads, and even the display of the Union Jack by Legion members on Remembrance Day (see Chapter 8). Rosaire Gauthier, the government member for Chicoutimi, said Pearson's opponents were not "true Canadians." "No true Canadian" could oppose the introduction of a new flag, wrote one *Toronto Star* reader.[101] The conclusion that it was the government's critics alone who were aggressive, devious, and intransigent, rather than *both* sides of this highly political struggle, can be sustained only by a partisan reading of the record.

The actual state of francophone opinion in Québec is difficult to gauge. Pierre Trudeau said French Canadians "do not give a tinker's damn about the flag. It's a matter

---

[98] Wally Nesbitt Papers, LAC, Vol. 2.
[99] "We were opposed strongly to closure being used on the issue," said Stanley Knowles; Stursberg, 170.
[100] Matheson, 156.
[101] Letters, *Toronto Star*, 19 May 1964.

of complete indifference." Gérard Pelletier agreed: "Au Québec, la question du drapeau ne soulève plus grand intérêt et l'adoption du « fleurdérablisé » ne causera à personne une grande joie."[102] Hugh MacLennan, the novelist and McGill professor, believed the flag "a very minor matter in the eyes of French Canada now."[103] Gilles-E. Parent, a columnist for *l'Echo du Nord*, said the flag issue "est largement dépassé par les événements." French Canadians, according to Parent, already had a flag of their own in the Fleur-de-lisé, as did Anglo-Canadians in the Red Ensign. It would be a fiction to declare Canada reunited "en plein processus d'éclatement." Amidst the talk of "un drapeau dit national," some argued, the government was forgetting an important question: "Derrière un drapeau, il faut des têtes de patriotes. Où les trouver? Comment les former?'[104]

There had been considerable interest in Quebec in a new Canadian flag prior to 1948, and still at least some interest in the 1960s. Anatole Vanier, the Université de Montréal professor and president of the Ligue d'action nationale, believed that Canadian embassies should fly "un embléme tout à fait nouveau, sans Union Jack." If traditional symbols must be used, he suggested a flag with both the Union Jack and the blue Fleur-de-lys.[105] The "Ligue pour un drapeau national" promoted a "diagonal" red and white flag with a green maple leaf that was endorsed by Luc-André Biron, heraldry expert and archivist at the U. de M. Eugène Achard proposed a unique red, white and blue cross with a green maple leaf in 1944.[106] Twenty years later, some in French Québec, as in English

---

[102] English, *Worldly Years*, 291; *La Presse*, 21 mai 1964.
[103] Hugh MacLennan, "The Crisis of Canadian Nationhood," typescript in MacLennan Papers, file 7.
[104] *L'Echo du Nord*, 27 mai 1964, 1 juillet 1964.
[105] Anatole Vanier to Mackenzie King, 17 mai 1927; Archives de Centre de Recherche Lionel-Groulx (ALG), P29/E,46.
[106] Eugène Achard, *L'Histoire du drapeau canadien* (Montréal: Librairie générale canadienne, 1944), 43 ff.

Canada, dismissed Pearson's design as "idiote et insensée, dépourvue de tout contexte historique et artistique."[107] Others wanted a cross and at least three colours.[108]

Many, however, believed that French Canadians already possessed a national flag, the Fleur-de-lisé, and that it was of little moment what the Anglo-Canadian majority chose to impose from Ottawa. This had been the nationalist position since Québec's flag debate of 1948. The U. de M. flew the Fleur-de-lisé on those occasions "quand nous célébrions une fête canadienne-française" such as "fête de Dollard, fête du saint-Jean Baptiste," while on holidays associated with Canada as a whole, "ou qui n'avait pas un caractère spéficiquement canadien-français," it was "le drapeau de la Confédération," the Red Ensign. Anatole Vanier said it would be better to place the Red Ensign and the Fleur-de-lisé side by side, as was the practice of Montreal's new Champlain cinema on federal holidays—"sur un pied d'égalité."[109] This mildly competitive coexistence in certain locales would presumably pose no threat to the Dominion while giving important recognition to duality where people wished to do so voluntarily.

In the 1960s, French Canadian nationalists continued to promote the viability of two flags. Jean-Guy Labarre, in his book *Non à drapeau Canadien* (1962), denounced the movement for a "drapeau distinctif" as presumptuous and superfluous. The Red Ensign was the legitimate, distinctive, and correct emblem of the Anglo-Canadians, just as the Fleur-de-lisé was the historic emblem of the *Canadiens français*. "Le Red Ensign et le Fleurdelisé sont respectivement les drapeaux de la nation anglo-canadienne toute-puissante à Ottawa et de la nation canadienne-française toute-puissante à Québec,"

[107] *La Presse*, 29 mai 1964.
[108] *Le Devoir*, 24 mai 1964.
[109] Olivier Maurault à Anatole Vanier, 14 mai 1948, ALG, P29/K,556 ; Anatole Vanier à Msgr. Maurault, 25 mai 1948.

Labarre wrote. He could not believe that English Canadians would abandon their flag. Despite the utopianism of "les pancanadiens et les fédéralistes," no single flag would ever truly embody both French and English Canadians, and such a flag could only be imposed by the dominant group. What perplexed Labarre was that there were actually federalist "propagandistes" in favour of a flag "truly distinctive" of Canada, yet "without any allusion" to the two principal ethnic groups.[110] The Abbé Groulx was cautious when Labarre sent him a copy of *Non à drapeau Canadien*. He did not endorse the book, but reiterated in a "Lettre-préface" that, for his part, French Canadians already possessed a national emblem.[111]

Whether they endorsed a two-nations concept or not, 70% of francophone Quebecers were in sympathy with the idea of a new Canadian flag.[112] As *Le Soleil* pointed out, it was obvious that Canadians should have their own flag and anthem without "foreign" symbols.[113] Many regarded the British connection as merely a colonial tie, unable to grasp that, for Anglo-Canadians, Britishness was in some way central to identity. Théogène Ricard told the flag committee that many people in his mostly-francophone riding of Saint-Hyacinthe- Bagot were in favour of the Red Ensign.[114] This was not typical, but among Quebecers, there were layers of complexity of which politicians in Ottawa seem to have been unaware and which historians have ignored. Many were "indifferent," wrote the pro-Union Nationale *Montréal-Matin*, and "la feuille d'érable n'a jamais eu sur les Francophones de vertu particulièrement magique." Pearson

---

[110] Labarre, 116, 125-6, 128.
[111] "Pour ce qui est de quelques autres controverses, vous comprendrez les raisons qui m'imposent de non m'y point immiscer," Groulx to Labarre, Groulx Papers, 11 juin 1962.
[112] Frankel, 123.
[113] *Soleil*, 1964
[114] Monteith Diary, 8 October 1964.

had earned only 40% of the popular vote and a minority government, the paper noted; he had not been forthright about his intentions in the 1962 and 1963 campaigns, and ought to put the flag to a separate referendum ballot at the next election. For one thing, if the new flag made "les loyalistes anglo-canadiennes" unhappy, the *Montréal Matin* concluded that "nous ne serons plus avancés." The status quo, some believed, would be less divisive.[115]

At least some segments of francophone opinion, in fact, did not mind the retention of the Union Jack as a symbol of the Commonwealth and the Crown in Canada.[116] Though Matheson and other Liberals believed that they "understood" francophone Quebec better than the Conservatives, perhaps the province in its inner complexities remained for them, as it had been so many small-town Ontarians like the young John Robbins (born in Hampton), "terra incognita."[117] Jules Léger believed that for Pearson and his colleagues, Quebec had been a "blind spot."[118] Of the flag, Pearson said that his Québec ministers would ensure that French Canadian opinion was represented.[119] And yet the French Canadian members of the flag committee actually believed that the fleur-de-lys had *no following* in Québec because it was a symbol of Royalist France.[120] Yet the Fleur-de-lys flag had been affirmed in 1950 by a *unanimous* vote in the provincial Assembly. Stanley, Matheson, and Alan Beddoe, as students of heraldry, must have been aware that the fleur-de-lys was a Catholic and counter-revolutionary emblem. Its immiediate inspiration was the "Carillon Sacré-Coeur," the banner of the Saint-Jean-

---

[115] *Montreal Matin*, 21 mai, 3 juin, 13 juin 1964.
[116] Lauréat Alain, "En faveur du drapeau," *l'Actio*n, 12 juin 1964, 4.
[117] John A.B. McLeish, *A Canadian for All Seasons: The John E. Robbins Story* (Toronto: Lester and Orpen, 1978), 81.
[118] English, 84.
[119] *Hansard*, 16 June 1964.
[120] Monteith diary, 22 September, 5 October 1964.

Baptiste Society with fleurs-de-lys, a wreath of maple leaves, and a Sacred Heart of Jesus in the centre of the white cross, which had been used unofficially on "state" occasions in Québec since the turn of the century.[121] When historian Marcel Trudel of the Université de Laval advised the flag committee that "any flag, if it is to be truly significant, must contain symbols of the nation or nations which contributed to establishing the country," his argument baffled the more obtuse members, and was either omitted by historians or dismissed as "puzzling."[122] Matheson, Stanley, Pearson, English, and Granatstein simply ignored it in their accounts of the debate. As Scott Symons predicted, when English Canadians discarded their traditional banner, it became increasingly difficult for them to understand Quebec's aspirations.

Labarre's readers need not have embraced his call for a sovereign Québec to see sense in the two-flag approach. As Labarre predicted, to replace the Red Ensign with a hegemonic "pavillon rouge" would merely be to "put on a different face" on Anglo-Canadian dominance. "Redisons-le, le drapeau du Canada, quelque couleur qu'on lui donne ou quelque symbole qu'il puisse renfermer," Labarre said, "sera toujours le drapeau de la nation maîtresse, le Canada anglais." Théogène Ricard, the only French-speaking member of the flag committee, warned that he "did not think that one flag would necessarily produce unity."[123] Lieutenant-Colonel Fraser Grant, who served in the First World War and taught engineering at the Royal Military College and Queen's University, predicted that Quebec would continue to fly its own flag, the other provinces

---

[121] Cf. the cover image on Ronald Rudin, *Founding Fathers*: *The Celebration of Champlain and Laval in the Streets of Quebec, 1878-1908* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003).
[122] Archbold, 81.
[123] Monteith diary, 20 October 1964.

would acquire their own, and the effect would be a kind of "Balkanization."[124] Most Tories agreed with Gordon Fairweather, who was "unconvinced that the proposed new flag, which completely ignores the history and heritage of our country, will help promote national unity."[125]

From this perspective, Pearson's timing may well have been misjudged. Jean Charpentier, the parliamentary correspondent for *l'Action*, recommended the status quo—a flag for Quebec and a flag for the Dominion.[126] There was not enough national unity in the mid-1960s to make a success of a truly national flag. Jean-Charles Bonenfant, former secretary to Maurice Duplessis, wrote that the flag was not a pressing issue in 1964.[127] A true national flag could not be made by law, but must emerge from history and consensus.[128] According to the weekly St. Hyacinthe *Courier*, Pearson was "un homme qui attache les boeufs derrière la charrue, proposant le symbole de l'unité nationale au moment ou celle-ci parait plus problématique que jamais." Editor-in-chief Harry Bernard wondered: "Veut-on que l'illusion de la feuille d'érable consacre l'illusion de l'unité nationale."[129] As Charpentier put it in *l'Action*, French Canadians did not have the right to ask the Anglo-Canadians to renounce the Union Jack in exchange for renouncing the Fleur-de-lys. There is some evidence, therefore, to suggest that a major pillar of the government's case for a new flag—the pacification of Québec—was founded upon an imperfect understanding of that province.

---

[124] Grant to Lower, 27 May 1964, Lower Papers. Nova Scotia had created a provincial flag in the 1920s based on its 17th century Coat of Arms.
[125] Undated 1964 remark, G. Fairweather Papers, Vol. 11.
[126] *L'Action*, 13 mai 1964.
[127] Ibid., 14 mai 1964.
[128] Ibid., 20 mai 1964.
[129] *Le Courier de Saint-Hyacinthe*, 28 mai 1964.

Others believed that a new “Canadian” flag would be a step in the right direction. Biron, the archivist, had promoted the diagonal maple leaf design with no Union Jack in his book *Le Drapeau Canadien*, which won accolades from Québec francophone media: “Ce dessin répond entièrement à mes éxigences. Il est net, éloquent, simple et unique,” said Paul Gladu of *Le Petit-Journal*—words that could be applied to the flag that was proclaimed in 1965. “Très simple, ce drapeau m’a plu par son symbolisme,” said Jean-Louis Gagnon of Poste CKLM. *Le Devoir* took up the battle on Pearson’s side, sustaining positive daily front-page coverage for weeks after the prime minister’s announcement.[130] Claude Ryan hailed the arrival of “ce nouveau Canada anglais,” a new majority unafraid to detach itself from its British roots. Louis-Philippe Roy said Canada “pourra arborer *son* drapeau.” Pierre Sévigny, the ex-Conservative M.P. for Longueuil, founded a local “mouvement de l’unité canadienne” and proposed a “unifolié” design similar to the one chosen in December. Sévigny had denounced the Tories’ “stubborn refusal” to link “true” Canadian independence with new “symbols of sovereignty,” referring to Diefenbaker’s missed opportunity.[131] “Ni le Red Ensign, ni l’Union Jack, ni la Fleur-de-lys ne peuvent être acceptés comme emblèmes nationaux par plus d’une minorité de Canadiens,” wrote the *Echo du Nord*. The St. Jerome branch of the Royal Canadian Legion endorsed Pearson’s flag, cabling: “Tous nos membres sont d’accord. Stop. Plusieurs sections de la Légion Canadienne de l’Est du Canada préférent un drapeau distinctif au red Ensign. Stop.”[132] Jean Lesage, the Liberal premier who had been an associate of Lester Pearson in Ottawa during the St. Laurent years and worked closely with Gordon Robertson as

[130] *Echo du Nord*, 19 août 1964, p. 39 ; 15, 16 et 19 mai 1964.
[131] *Le Devoir*, 25 mai 1964 , 21 May 1964; Sévigny, 3.
[132] *L’Echo du Nord*, 27 mai 1964, 3 juin 1964.

minister and deputy minister,[133] pronounced himself "satisfait" with the three-leaf motif.[134] It was with these voices in Quebec that Pearson and his colleagues threw in their lot. So did Québec Tories, led by Léon Balcer of Trois-Rivières, voting for the new flag. Balcer later dismissed the old flag as "ce vestige colonial," an example of that segment of French Canadian opinion that regarded Britishness as no more than a colonial tie, and a badge of Anglo-Canadian immaturity.[135]

If there was francophobia among some Red Ensign partisans, the same applied on the Maple Leaf side, where anti-Britishness played a significant and long-forgotten role. Even a man of elevated sensibilities like Laurendeau, for example, recoiled at the decor of the Empress Hotel in Victoria, so redolent of "les British," "un monde britannique, sensible des l'entrée, qui s'accentue d'un corridor a l'autre, et jusqu'a notre suite: lourdes boiseries, style victorien, images au mur rappelant les gloires de l'empire …" When he learned that Pearson's flag proposal had tried to take heraldry into account, he referred sarcastically to "les objections medievales et heraldistes (on doit passer par je ne sais quel conseil britannique …)." Veterans had merely "imagined" that they had fought under the Red Ensign, he added, when "c'était alors l'Union Jack"—evidence of the way Pearson's erroneous claims were adopted by others. Laurendeau was delighted when his taxi driver in Vancouver, "descendant d'Italiens, qui parle un anglais impeccable," endorsed Pearson's design and shared Laurendeau's dislike for "les British," whom the driver found "ennuyants et prétentieux."[136] Did such opinions represent a well-founded and substantial underlying resentment toward "les Brits?" Linda Bell Deutschmann has

---

[133] Johnson in Hillmer, *Unlikely Gladiator*, 176, 179.
[134] *L'Action*, 21 mai 1964.
[135] Balcer, 132.
[136] Laurendeau Diary, 20 mai 1964, ALG, P2/C, 798, typescript, 254, 211; 3 juin 1964, 252-3.

remarked on the need for more “studies of *minority* group prejudice and discrimination towards others (emphasis in original).”[137] Either way, if anti-British feelings predisposed some Canadians of non-English extraction in favour of replacing the Red Ensign, such attitudes have escaped the notice of historians who portray only Pearson’s opponents as prejudiced.

Broadly typical of opinion in francophone Québec, perhaps, was Daniel Johnson’s satisfaction in 1965 that, at least, the Union Jack no longer constituted a quarter of the Canadian flag. As Arthur Blakely had recognized in 1962, “By and large, French Canada wants a distinctive national flag containing no trace of the Union Jack. By and large, Canadians in other provinces want the Union Jack to be retained in the flag somewhere, somehow.”[138] Some in Québec, however, questioned the assumption that French Canadians should expect Anglo-Canadians to give up their cherished symbol, the Red Ensign, in return for a French Canadian embrace of a new symbol instead of the Fleurdelisé.[139] As strange as Britishness might seem to French Canadians, said the *Montréal-Matin*, the French “were not the only builders of Canada,” and the “loyalist” heritage should be respected.[140]

It is surprising how much faith Anglo-Canadian nationalists placed in the new flag. MacLennan was aware of the French-Canadian resistance to homogenizing influences, writing, “Not long ago I heard an Ontarian say ~~with perfect good will~~ [sic, crossed out], of a French Canadian: ‘He’s a wonderful fellow. He thinks just the way we do.’ This idea of unity is intolerable to Quebec,” MacLennan pointed out, “for if carried

[137] Deutschmann, 416 n. 8.
[138] *Montreal Gazette*, 9 February 1962.
[139] *L’Action*, 20 mai 1964.
[140] *Montréal-Matin*, 13 juin 1964.

far enough it means assimilation,"[141] the uniform Canadianism that some Orangemen had proposed in the 19th century.[142] And yet MacLennan told the McGill Society of Toronto in 1965 that the new flag was the *beginning of the end* of the "two solitudes," one of "many signs that at least the two solitudes of Canada are approaching one another, and … may at least [sic] join hands to build a new kind of nationhood."[143] "Already the strains of biculturalism seem to be easing off," wrote Blair Fraser.[144] Matheson admitted to Peter Stursberg: "My impression of the French Canadian input" in the creation of the flag, "—and I studied it very, very carefully—was I would say neutrality and standing aside. It's a most interesting thing that *there was actually no participation on the part of French Canadian Members in the creation of what is our flag* (emphasis added). They were there," Matheson said, "trusting."[145] This is an extraordinary admission from someone who was acting out of a paternalistic concern for the "little people."

Paternalism is most often associated with the Upper Canadianism of "God's peculiar people," Tories like Grant and the Symons, the Liberal "elitist" Vincent Massey,[146] or with the CCF "Tory" Eugene Forsey. However, Matheson's condescension toward the "little people" of Québec, and the "gallant little Lutheran from the Crimea" (as he described Reynold Rapp, M.P.), as a manifestation of a certain liberal Anglo-

[141] Hugh MacLennan, "The Other Solitude."
[142] Senior, *Orangeism: The Canadian Phase*, 70.
[143] "Hugh MacLennan: Sees Two Solitudes Ending," *McGill Daily*, Vol. 46, No. 3, June-July 1965, 9-10.
[144] Fraser, *Search for Identity*, 315.
[145] Stursberg, 166.
[146] Finlay, *Force of Culture*, 245.

Canadian Britishness, is essential for understanding the flag debate. "The fight for the flag," Matheson wrote, "became a crusade for national unity, for justice to all Canadians, for Canada's dignity. The enemy was racial arrogance, the small and the mean heart."[147] But not only were the paternalists who created the new flag exclusively of ethnically British extraction (and generally naïve about Québec), but virtually all of their formative influences and affections—youthful sentiment, educational choices, religious background, military experience, anglophilia, even the penchant for heraldry oriented towards the Royal College of Arms and the Court of the Lord Lyon—derive their meaning from a British milieu. In a sense, the Maple Leaf was as much a product of British Canada as the Red Ensign. As Matheson himself said, "The leadership in this task [of establishing a Canadian flag] would have to come from British Canada."[148]

Matheson deeply resented the opposition's accusations of "disloyalty to our British tradition." He took pride in his Scots-Loyalist origins and regimental affiliation, and in having been wounded in Italy as a forward observation officer. Rick Archbold says Matheson represented "the best sort of "old stock" Anglo-Canadian. The row of medals he wore to Remembrance Day ceremonies … attest to how deeply he honours the past." Like Pearson, Matheson "wore the conventionally respectable, if hardly exotic, medals of service to my country during war," he wrote: "I had been conspicuously disabled by enemy gunfire in World War II" and remained an "active member of the Royal Canadian Legion." By contrast to the self-doubting Mackenzie King, he added, Pearson, too, was "secure in himself and in his past."

---

[147] Matheson, 69.
[148] Ibid., 5.

The new flag did constitute a "break with the past," Pearson admitted. But it also represented the country's evolution within the wider Empire, and, Pearson said, "marks another stage in the growth of Canada." According to Lower, the flag "signifies, to a great degree, our turning out back on our colonial past though not, I hope, on our best traditions."[149] These "best" traditions were liberalism and liberal imperialism. Pearson was a Canadian, to be sure, but he was also an anglophile with Oxford connections, his views harmonious with those of British liberals. Admirers even traced Pearson's inspiration to 13th century England: "The forces which were shaped on the fields of Runnymede five and a half centuries ago … found full expression" in the prime minister's flag speeches; and Pearson himself invoked Magna Carta in his opening flag speech.[150]

It is at least worth considering, then, that the Maple Leaf flag project was a manifestation of liberal imperialism. According to *The Times*, a Canadian flag was "a matter of pride." This was a broad, variegated Britishness that can perhaps be summed up by quoting Mackintosh Bell, the mining engineer (born 1877 in St. Andrews, Quebec), who told Sir Frederick Banting in 1928: "The greatest way we can help the Empire is by developing a true Canadian spirit." To "be nationalists" was "the best way of being Imperialists."[151] Lord Rosebery had written that the strength of interwar Britishness was its tolerance for a wide scope of local nationalisms, as opposed to demanding a

[149] Jottings, 22 October 1969, Lower Papers.
[150] W. Burton Ayre, *Mr. Pearson and Canada's Revolution by Diplomacy* (Montreal: Wallace Press, 1966), 275.
[151] Michael Bliss, *Banting: A Biography* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1984), 178. Bliss incorrectly identifies Bell, born in St. Andrews, Quebec, as "Mackenzie," perhaps because he went by "Mack." Cf. Alan Mason, "Bell, James Abbott Mackintosh 1877-1934," *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, Vol. 3, 1901-1920, (Wellington: Auckland University Press, 1996).

questionable "uniformity."[152] By the 1960s, Pearson's liberal imperialism had evolved into liberal internationalism (as had that of British Liberals and Pearson's English-born advisor, Tom Kent, formerly of *The Economist* and the *Winnipeg Free Press*). It had been British-born journalists, such as the Scottish-born J.A. Stevenson, who had given the quintessentially nationalistic *Canadian Forum* its "Canadian" voice in its early years.[153] It was arguably this innate Britishness within Pearson's Canadianism that found expression in his initiative for a "distinctively Canadian" flag.

The influence of ethnically non-English regional British background recurs throughout the debates over identity, the flag, and the Canadianization of the armed forces—but has eluded explanation by historians. The ethnicity of the flag's creators was British, but this needs to be refined. The core group of those who worked on the flag—Matheson, Beddoe, "Scotty" Duguid, Stanley, and Pearson—were all of Scottish and Irish origins. Beddoe's father had been born in England (his mother in the United States), and he considered himself half-Scots in origin. He had drawn maple leaves at the Ottawa Model School before the Great War, answered the call to defend King and Empire in 1914, and was taken prisoner in the Second Battle of Ypres.[154] Eugene Collins, that fervent voice of anti-British nationalism, accused narrowly Anglo-Saxon supporters of the Red Ensign, whom he called "Britain-firsters," of "chauvinism." Their "intense British loyalty," he said, ran counter to the country's "overall cohesion." "Canadian anglophiles" had been "pampered" and "catered to" for too long, and the decision on a new flag was "no longer theirs to make." There is a link between Collins' anglophobic

[152] A.P.P. Rosebery (Earl of), "The Patriotism of a Scot," in *Miscellanies, Literary and Historical*, Vol. 2 (London: Hodder & Stoughton 1921), 109-10.
[153] Prang in Penlington, ed., 3.
[154] Beddoe Papers, Vol.1.

writings and the Irish-Canadian Senator Harold Connolly's distaste for "a certain type of naval officer" in wartime Halifax, and even to Pearson's mockery of English "stuffed shirts" that pleased admiring reporters following his diplomatic travels.[155] Glimpses of this underlying Celtic self-consciousness can be found elsewhere. When, during the Royal Tour of 1964, Quebec cabinet minister Eric Kierans was introduced to the Queen and Prince Philip by the premier, Jean Lesage, the premier announced, "This is the English member of our cabinet." But Prince Philip corrected the premier: "On no," he said, "I understand he's an Irishman." This remark left Kierans "fumbling" and speechless, by his own account: "A smile and a bow, and I was gone."[156] The minister later tried to dismiss his own embarrassment as a casualty of the royals' "slick professionalism." But disdain for the royal *modus operandi* only amplifies the offense Kierans seems to have taken at being identified—and in so disarmingly upper-class *English* a manner—as "an Irishman," with all the implications of that term in the mind of the victim, and coming from the mouth of a member of the English elite. After all, Kierans insisted, "I *was* the English member of cabinet" (emphasis added). In the background, collective memory of the history of Anglo-Irish relations must be taken into account. When Lower declared that "opposition to a national flag is for many a cover for racial antagonism," he received an endorsement from Fr. William McCarthy, a Roman Catholic priest in Halifax of Irish descent. Lower replied that "despite my own English descent … it is somewhat easier for the Irish (of the Catholic religion) to be nationalistic

[155] Pearson was adept at "deflat[ing] certain "stuffed shirts" in London … a source of many chuckles in Ottawa," according to the *Globe and Mail*, 27 June 1942, an early example of journalists' helpfulness in constructing the Pearson persona.

[156] Eric Kierans with Walter Stewart, *Remembering* (Toronto: Stoddart, 2001), 90. He might have forgiven the Duke had he born in mind that the Queen's husband came from the Greek Royal Family, and was, like the Queen herself, descended from Germans, Danes, and Scots.

in Canada" than for those aligned "with the British tradition."[157] Joseph O'Keefe, the M.P. for St. John's East, speaking as "a Roman Catholic of Irish descent," in support of the Pearson flag, said, "Memories of old world strifes, of wrongs and of bitter oppression are not easily forgotten."[158] It would appear, then, that a degree of Celtic resentment of the English legacy did contribute, obliquely but tangibly, to the movement to replace the Canadian Red Ensign with a flag that did not appear to affirm the English ascendancy. If so, then an important strand interwoven into the origins of the Maple Leaf may be traced to Anglo-Celtic enmities whose ultimate source is in the British Isles. This only serves to underline the British origins of the new flag.

In 1965, Graham MacInnes, the Canadian High Commissioner to Jamaica and a graduate of Scotch College, Melbourne, Australia, had "Auld Lang Syne" played as the Red Ensign was lowered for the last time in the presence of the Canadian residents.[159] Whatever their feelings about Englishmen may have been, the flag's designers and supporters were themselves, on other levels, British to the core. Like other Eminent Pearsonians, Arnold Heeney's "British influences," a childhood nurtured on "British heroes from Alfred the Great to Kitchener of Khartoum," and G.A. Henty, were universal for his generation. Like Pearson reminiscing about his dream of attending Oxford (seen in an earlier chapter), Matheson also told the House of Commons that in his youth, "our literary fare was *Chums*, *Boy's Own Annual* and the Waverley novels" and that to be "British" meant "being generous, being valorous, and being kind." It was this small Anglo-Canadian cadre that implemented the flag project, including Stanley, who,

---

[157] *Montreal Star*, 11 July 1964; McCarthy to Lower, 17 July 1964; Lower to McCarthy, 28 July 1964, Lower Papers.
[158] *Hansard*, 2 July 1964.
[159] Fraser, *Search for Identity*, 246.

Matheson said, may have been British-educated but who was "first and foremost a Canadian."[160] Asked by CBC interviewers if the flag was a concession to Quebec, Mitchell Sharp, also of Scots descent, replied: "Well I don't think it is. I'm not a French Canadian. I haven't got any French Canadian blood in me. But I most strongly want a Canadian flag. … I look upon this as something that goes along with national maturity. … If I may say so, this initiative did not come from French Canada, this particular one. It came from *a group of English speaking Ministers* (emphasis added)."[161] One journalist wrote, in the *Winnipeg Tribune*: "Those who regard the new flag as something of an anti-British, pro-French plot may be surprised to learn the backgrounds of these men. All are of Anglo-Saxon stock. All are military men with distinguished [sic] records of service."[162]

Heraldry may also be counted as influences under the rubric of anglophilia. Beddoe, the government's most experienced heraldry expert, told Pearson that a Canadian flag should be "as simple as the Cross of St. George," combining three leaves "*and the crown* to tell the world this is the 'Kingdom of Canada'" (his emphases).[163] Most of the heraldic precedents cited were, perforce, of a military and Imperial nature. A maple leaf badge had distinguished Canadian troops serving in Imperial forces in South Africa, where there were few other distinctive Canadian identifiers.[164] In time, a single red-maple-leaf aircraft roundel differentiated the Royal Canadian Air Force from other Commonwealth forces. If red and white were "granted" as national colours by King George V in 1921, their use in Canada dated at least from the N.-W.M.P.'s lance pennons

---

[160] Matheson, 123.
[161] CBC radio interview, 1964, Pearson flag file.
[162] Winnipeg *Tribune*, "Weekend Magazine," No. 4, 1965.
[163] Beddoe Papers, LAC, June 13, 1964 and September 23, 1963.
[164] Carman Miller, *Canada's Little War* (Toronto: James Lorimer, 2003), 27.

in 1873-74 (standard colours for British cavalry lancers since the Napoleonic Wars), and from the General Service Medal issued in 1899 by the British government with Queen Victoria "Regina et Imperatrix" on the obverse and the Red Ensign and "Canada" on the reverse, under a red-white-red ribbon, the colour pattern duplicated in the flag of the Royal Military College in Kingston,[165] that gave Stanley the idea for his design. As Wilfrid Lacroix, the Liberal M.P. for Québec-Montmorency, told the 1945 flag committee, red was the "typically English" colour, redolent of the Cross of St. George, of "loftiness, royalty, assurance, ardour, and military virtues," though he also said that white is typically French.[166] Réal Caouette, the Créditiste leader, held his nose in December 1964 to vote for the Maple Leaf, a flag "of British and regal inspiration." Red and white were "not Canadian" colours, he said: they had been chosen by the king of England and Scotland, the Emperor of India—"old souvenirs taken out of the drawers of Buckingham Palace or of the Colonial Office."[167] In fact, maple leaves had been used in the 1830s by the Patriotes, in popular celebrations of the Feast of St. John the Baptist (cf. the "Maskinongé" flag in the Chateau Ramezay in Montreal), and later in the banners of the Societé Saint-Jean-Baptiste. It was also adopted by English Canadians in the mid-19th century as the floral symbol of the loyalty of the Canadian-born to the Empire, maple leaves enjoying in Canada the same significance as the rose in England, the thistle in Scotland, or the shamrock in Ireland.[168]

---

[165] Matheson, 17.

[166] Minutes of the Joint Committee of the House of Commons and Senate, 8 May 1946, 31.

[167] *Hansard*, 16 June 1964.

[168] Janet Carnochan, "The Origin of the Maple Leaf as the Emblem of Canada," Ontario Historical Society *Papers & Records* 7 (1906), 139-46. One occasion of its adoption occurred in St. Lawrence Hall in Montreal in anticipation of the visit to Canada of the Prince of Wales in 1860, cf. "The Formal Adoption of the Maple Leaf as the National Emblem of Canada," Ontario Historical Society *Papers & Records* 5 (1904), 22-6.

The three leaves in Pearson's design, wrote George McIlraith (another Scot), were "sanctioned by history and by Royal favor."[169] Matheson "felt it becoming to assume some personal responsibility to ensure that whatever flag was chosen it would conform 'to the Queen's taste.'" He briefed Pearson: "Three is a mystic number, a sacred number, recurring again and again in heraldic form. But for us, it may denote 'Unity in Diversity,'" a motto of the Loyalists. Heraldic precedent, he added, "does think in terms of that mystic number three, that holy number three, three Plantagenet lions for England, three fleurs-de-lis for France, even three stocks of wheat for Saskatchewan. And, after all, this is what has been given us, and I don't like to see us tampering with what we have been given in this honourable way."[170] Matheson soon abandoned this position, however, in favour of one maple leaf. Gary Miedema has placed the new flag in the context of the larger de-privileging of Christianity in Canada's public space in the 1960s. Many who opposed the abandonment of the Red Ensign did so because it meant removing from the national flag the Christian crosses of the Union Jack.[171] Matheson—once it was clear that the Liberals would have to compromise with supportive opposition parties and accept a one-leaf design—actually began assuring his caucus colleagues that three leaves (evoking the Holy Trinity) might after all be unrepresentative of non-Christians and that one leaf would be preferable because it would convey no connotations of Christian dominance.[172]

The decision that the red of the new flag "will be the shade that has been used in the Canadian Red Ensign and the Union Jack," using the same British Admiralty codes, underlines the intended continuity between the two flags. The MPs on the flag committee

[169] George J. McIlraith to correspondents, 4 June 1964.
[170] John Matheson, "Notes re: flag," 26 May 1964, Pearson Papers, Vol. 47; Matheson to Geoff Scott on CBC's "The Nation's Business," 27 May 1964.
[171] Miedema, *For Canada's Sake*, 44.
[172] Matheson papers, LAC.

had voted for this, Herman Batten told reporters on December 14,[173] and Pearson confirmed it at the end of December.[174] The shade of red dye was changed over the years as reports came in that the original flags were fading too quickly: the armed services, in particular, found that "first issue flags were an orange shaded scarlet," which "fades rapidly." A year later, the cabinet was still working to "find a manufacturing process which will be more acceptable and give more durable colour."[175] Stanley's heavy use of red, Matheson wrote, "seemed a happy emphasis for a country long accustomed to the red ensign."[176] The result did not please Scott Symons, who wrote in 1967, "the colour averts me—the 'kemglo' of it—inorganic dye. Bloodless." It was a "non-flag," representing the triumph of a new elite, "the New Canadian Establishment," the "Emancipated Canadian Methodist" and "mute mediocre Methodist mannikin" public service, a branch of the "Finishing School system for Wesleyans" through which Pearson and others had climbed.[177] In the eyes of legitimist loyalism, the Maple Leaf embodied the small-town anglophone middle class, "the Honest Ontario Yeoman; the Methodist Grit Farmer Squatter—circa 1850!"[178]

Despite such caricature, this remained a British heritage. Symons wrote to W.L. Morton that the flag debate and its outcome "have completely destroyed my faith in my country, my religion, my home, my career, my past, my future. … The new flag has simply destroyed me as a meaningful citizen. I feel as though I were murdered by Order-in-Council, by remote control. … I have been annulled. I am a belated, second-class

---

[173] *Montreal Star*, 15 December 1964, 1.
[174] PMO Press Release, 31 December 1964.
[175] Memos from CF bases to Hellyer, 5 November 1965; Gordon Robertson to Pearson, "The Colour of the Flag," 14 September 1965. Hellyer Papers, Vol. 230-31.
[176] Matheson, 124.
[177] Symons, *Combat Journal*, 83, 144.
[178] Ibid., 79.

American."[179] In contrast, Morton's reply displays a kind of phlegmatic "British" response to the change, belittling it in hindsight as one of many "superficial triviae that distress us." Morton shared Symons' disappointment in the elimination of the Red Ensign, regretting "that the country I knew and valued has come to an end." Despair was not the answer, however. "Life and Canada go on," Morton wrote, "and one must face up to both as best one can." It was better to take heart from the "tremendous vitality," a younger generation perhaps "growing big enough" to be worthy of "this … absurd country." In reconciling himself to the new flag, Morton, rather than Symons, manifested the British-Canadian "stiff upper lip."[180]

When, late in October 1964, Pearson needed help with refining the central motif, "very quietly from people he can trust within the civil service," he chose the Ulster-born Patrick Reid of the Canadian Government Exhibition Commission.[181] Reid's career had taken him from the Methodist College rugby team in Northern Ireland, to Sandhurst, the 14th/20th King's Hussars, the Indian Army, and British Malaya, where, in 1947, he sketched a drawing of his turbaned Pathan driver, Jaffar Khan. Reid turned to Jacques Saint-Cyr, an artist at the Commission who had been wounded in Normandy in 1944. Traditionalists like Symons may not have seen it, but the Britishness of the Maple Leaf and its designers did underline that the new flag, however simple, was an expression of continuities as well as departures from the past. "Unlike Dahomey, Gabon, Mali, and the Malagasy Republic," complained Robert Coates, "Canada was not born yesterday." According to an *Ottawa Journal* reader, "There is…no more spineless and craven

[179] Symons to Morton, 6 October 1965, William Morton Fonds, Box 21, file "Symons, S., 1963-66," in McMaster University, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections. I thank Donald Wright for passing this on.
[180] Morton to Symons, 22 June 1966, loc. cit.
[181] Reid, *Wild Colonial Boy,* 168 ff.

personality in all Canada than the English-speaking Canadian of British origin who is ashamed of his background."[182] That was one interpretation of the flag.

Traditionalists may not have recognized it at first, but another way of looking at it was that Canada remained an organically British society, responding to the changing times, without altering its underlying essence. As in colonial Upper Canada, the choice lay between replicating British models, or adapting the British *spirit* in the local context.[183] Such an approach would suggest that overtly British symbols were not necessary to sustain the British essence of Canadian democracy. As Matheson later claimed, overstating his own role, the "Royal Military College, its colours, and its traditions" were "uppermost in my mind."[184] It is in this sense that the Eminent Pearsonians resembled a nation-building postcolonial elite, divesting themselves of the imperial heritage and yet "preserving and adapting" the country's core identity while avoiding "too sharp a repudiation" of the past.[185]

The difference was that Canada was *not* a postcolonial state, but was in fact a minor colonial power—a legatee and executor of Empire and settlement, with its own Crown and "dominion" in its own sphere. By the 1960s, as Linda Colley wrote of Great Britain in the 18th century, Canada was transforming itself into "an invented nation that was not founded on the suppression of older loyalties so much as superimposed on them."[186] Some of the support for change came from nationalist elements tapping into a long-term trend in Canadian thought. But support came also from anti-British (or anti-

---

[182] *Hansard*, 16 June, 3 July 1964.
[183] Jane Errington, *The Lion, The Eagle, and Upper Canada* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 1987), 6.
[184] Matheson, 123.
[185] Smith, *National Identity*, 102.
[186] Colley, 327.

English) segments of opinion that bridled at the Red Ensign's redolence of Empire, Britishness, and the English ascendancy. In the spectrum of Anglo-Canadianism, this hostility represented only one interpretation of the significance of British-looking symbols in Canada.

The new flag was "distinctively Canadian" with no obvious reference to the Colonial past. It struck a decisive blow, and became the quintessential icon, for a Pearsonian conception of Canadianism: for plainness and simplicity;[187] for moral earnestness in the public sphere oriented towards "the future" and "peace;" and for what an admiring W. Burton Ayre called "Mr. Pearson's revolution by diplomacy," his *dei ex machina* of bilingualism-biculturalism at home and peacekeeping-internationalism abroad. However this type of Canadianism remained a liberal variant of the larger Britishness that coloured all the successor states of Empire.

That the new flag was British did not make it less Canadian, any more than the British provenance of the Stanley, Grey, and Minto Cups voided their status as a national sports trophies. Matheson himself said the idea of a "new" flag "appalled" him;[188] he preferred to think that the Maple Leaf had emerged over a "couple of hundred years,"[189] as the maple leaf was employed by various groups from at least early as the 1830s, and precedents for the use of floral emblems could be traced back even further. The result was what the *Winchester Press* had called for: "a flag that would be pronouncedly Canadian as well as British."[190] The government invoked "British" precedent in 1964 for confining the decision to Parliament. The Tories' demand for a "divisive" national

[187] Matheson, 233, 255 n. 30
[188] Matheson, 2.
[189] Archbold, 104.
[190] *Hansard*, 14 February 1938.

plebiscite "would be flying in the face of British parliamentary democracy," said government MPs. "Our British tradition," said Herb Gray, the M.P. for Essex West, obliged Parliament to act on its own: this was "the British political tradition."[191] To invoke closure was also to follow the "British" model.[192]

As loyal subjects of the Crown and good Canadians would be expected to do, many of Pearson's opponents transferred their allegiance to the new flag once it was proclaimed by the Queen. (This was true of many but not all: a survey of ethnic Wasps in 1976 found that 63% were still "opposed" or "resigned" to the new flag.[193]) Still, the example of loyalty to the new flag was set, as might be expected of the viceroy, by Georges Vanier when, as governor general, he saluted "ces *deux* drapeaux," the old and the new, at the flag-raising ceremony of February 15, 1965. Time has obliterated memory of the bitterness that divided the country, and the ubiquitous Maple Leaf has become, for most, a proud symbol. But in the 1965 election, voters in Leeds, Ontario, punished Matheson by reducing his electoral margin to two hundred votes—at least, that was the significance attributed to the result by Blair Fraser who cited "the fiercely loyalist voters of his riding."[194] Contrary to Archbold's conclusions, the Conservatives' stance in the flag debate did not damage their standing in Quebec: the Tories retained the same number of seats (eight) in the 1965 election as in 1963, and *increased* their share of the popular vote (from 19.5% to 21.3%) while the Liberal popular vote remained the same (45.6%).

"Whether it divided or unified the country," reflected Bruce Hutchison, the newspaperman and Pearson confidant, "I don't know whether anybody knows that. I'm

---

[191] Ibid., 3 July 1964.
[192] Liberal Bulletin, 15 December 1964, Hellyer Papers, Vol. 94.
[193] Deutschmann, 416, n. 17.
[194] Fraser, *Search for Identity*, 24. In 1968 Matheson was defeated, and named a Judge of the County Court of Carleton.

not sure."[195] With the government's minority status, and the nationwide opposition and weight of tradition that they overcame with their compelling brand of Canadianism, what Pearson and his associates achieved was nothing less than a revolution in the country's foremost symbolic expression. For Pearson, the new flag represented a fulfillment, not a rejection, of the past. Like Britain itself, we may observe in hindsight, Canada emerged from the crisis of Britishness of the 1960s by assuming its place as "an invented nation" with new symbols and representations "superimposed" on older loyalties without rejecting them.[196] In short, the continuities and the Britishness of Canada's hybrid multiple identities remained behind the apparent neutrality and straightforward "Canadianness" of the Maple Leaf, a flag that continues to hide and disclose its layers of meaning in a most beguiling manner.

[195] Ibid., 160.
[196] Colley, "Britishness and Otherness," 327.

Chapter 8

Confronting Britishness in the Canadian Armed Forces: 1964-68

The crisis of Britishness during the 1960s also gave rise to the policy of Canadianization that accompanied unification of the Canadian armed forces after 1964. The Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Air Force, and the Canadian Army had long been viewed by critics as reactionary bastions of Britishness. At one level, military traditions were too redolent of the British past. In 1966, Pearson told Brooke Claxton, the former Minister of National Defence, that he wished the names of Canadian Army regiments "resounded a little less of the Raj."[1] On another level, the government was concerned that the officer ranks were dominated by Anglo-Canadians of British ethnic origin and English-speaking Canadians of ethnic origins other than British or French—with very few francophone officers. Addressing this inequity was one of the major policies of the Pearson years. In the process of reforming uniforms, rank designations, and emblems from 1964 to 1968, many of the characteristic themes from previous chapters came into play: in particular, the defining of overt forms of Britishness as "other" in order to promote a purely Canadian identity. The sweeping reinvention of three separate tradition-bound armed services as the unified "Canadian Armed Forces" (first abbreviated as "CAF," later as "CF') was intended to create "one national mobile task

[1] Quoted by Terence Robertson in *The Canadian*, 15 October 1966.

force."[2] "For national identity and sovereignty reasons," wrote General F.R. Sharp, "we need uniquely Canadian armed forces."[3] The single, all-green uniform for all three services was perhaps the most telling symbol of this new direction. As J.L. Granatstein put it in 1968, "The very act of giving the force a single uniform will mark a break with the past. The psychological impetus will make training for the new tasks of the 1970s easier." In short, "Unification will produce a force that is unique … a healthy fillip to Canadian nationalism."[4]

Thus began the invention of a "uniquely Canadian" military tradition that was foreseen by some as something quite different from the British inheritance. "During the 1960s," wrote one observer, "the Canadian Armed Forces began to take on a 'new look.' Many of the traditions they inherited from the British were abandoned and Canadian ideas were introduced."[5] "Here at last was something in which Canada was leading the world," wrote Vernon Kronenberg.[6] From 1964 to 1968, customs and symbols deemed "detrimental" by nationalists were eliminated or suppressed, a process that turned out to be more complicated than simply replacing "British" traditions. It was not easy, in practice, to redefine as "other" customs and traditions that were seen within the military as *Canadian*. Thus Canadianization provoked a kind of cultural "schizophrenia" in the

---

[2] J.V. Allard, address to the Canadian Club of Montreal, 14 November 1966, Paul T. Hellyer Papers, Library and Archives Canada (LAC), Vol. 79.
[3] F.R. Sharp, cited in R.B. Byers, "The nature of military professionalism," in R.B. Byers and Colin S. Gray, eds., *Canadian Military Professionalism: the search for identity*, Canadian Institute of International Affairs Wellesley Paper 2, February 1973, 15.
[4] Jack Granatstein, "All Things to All Men: Triservice Unification," in Stephen Clarkson, ed., *An Independent Foreign Policy for Canada?* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968), 144-5.
[5] Strome Galloway, ed., *Beddoe's Canadian Heraldry* (Belleville: Mika, 1981), 151.
[6] Vernon J. Kronenberg, *All Together Now: The organization of the Department of National Defence in Canada, 1964-1972* (Toronto: Canadian Institute for International Affairs, 1973), 101. Originally a Master's Thesis, Carleton University, 1971.

forces,[7] exposing at the same time the inescapable Britishness of Canadian institutions. Once the dust had settled, the military did emerge with a new and distinct character. But by the 1990s, distinct army, navy, and air force identities had been permitted to return and much of the Britishness of the old services was preserved, revived, and updated. Ironically, the forces in the 1990s were about as integrated as the *opponents* of unification in the mid-1960s had believed they should be.[8] At the same time, some of the underlying Britishness had reasserted itself and continued to be key part of the military's Canadianism.

The push for unification did not stem primarily from a preoccupation with tradition or ceremony. The expansion of the three armed services from 1950 to 1962, from 47,000 personnel to a peak of 126,500, had brought into sharper focus the need for organizational efficiency. Streamlining to reduce tri-service conflict and administrative triplication was already underway when the Liberals returned to power with a minority government in 1963.[9] The Tory national defence ministries under George Pearkes (1957-60) and his successor Douglas Harkness (1960-63) had integrated the forces' medical, dental, legal, and chaplaincy services. The Glassco Commission, reporting in 1962-63, recommended further sweeping change to eliminate inter-service rivalry and redundant pay, recruiting, intelligence, and public relations by three competing services.

Integration of the command structure in 1964 had satisfied some military reformers. But integration and unification were not the same thing. The Tri-Services Identities Organization (TRIO), a lobby group formed by retired senior officers in an

[7] The expression used by Major Michael Boire in conversation with me at RMC Kingston, March 2005.
[8] Marc Milner, *Canada's Navy*: *The First Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 308, citing Admirals Landymore, Stirling, Brock, Dyer, and Hennessy.
[9] Desmond Morton, *A Military History of Canada* (Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 1985), 249-50.

effort to preserve three separate services, were supportive of integration and streamlining. But they also expressed doubts about unification into one force. "What are the specific advantages," they asked, "in a single military service that are not attainable under an integrated three service system?'[10] Opposition MPs such as Douglas Harkness, the former defence minister, deplored the "confusion" that the government had created by failing to explain the distinction between *integration*, some of which he had implemented as minister a few years earlier, and *unification* into a "single unified force."[11] "We have had no definition of what the minister means when he uses the terms "integration" and "unification," said H.W. Herridge, the English-born NDP Member for Kootenay West.[12] Gordon Churchill, the Tory house leader, repeatedly reminded speakers on the government side that there was a difference between integration and unification that many of them seemed to ignore. "I am not interested in semantics," snapped John Matheson at one point in the debate, "I am interested in the development of an idea."[13] "Unification or integration—call it what you will," said J.R. Reid, the Liberal member for Kenora-Rainy River, the policy was "reasonable" and "logical … if one accepts the assumptions on which it is based."[14]

Unification was about more than semantics. "Mr. Hellyer has produced the first meaningful defence force in Canada's peacetime history … capable of carrying out coherent, realizable roles," wrote Jack Granatstein.[15] For some proponents, the policy was a kind of elixir to transform the Canadian military into a force equipped for the needs

[10] Cited by J.Chester MacRae, a New Brunswick Tory MP, in *Hansard*, 31 January 1967.
[11] *Hansard*, 30 January 1967.
[12] *Hansard*, 2 February 1967.
[13] Ibid.
[14] *Hansard*, 2 February 1967.
[15] Granatstein, "All Things to All Men," 145.

of the modern world—more effective for both peacekeeping and traditional alliance roles. It would give rise to "a living tradition for Canada. Something we have shaped for ourselves" and which would be emulated by other countries.[16] Some supporters demonstrated a kind of faith or futuristic zeal in the advantages of unification. The newspaper columnist Ron Collister, born in England, seemed to express the optimism of the time when he wrote: "Unification is on its way because it makes sense to the new generation, in or out of uniform, on the grounds of economy and efficiency in 1966 and the age of science."[17] John Matheson, the government M.P. for Leeds, believed that Hellyer was implementing "the recommendations of some of the most prophetic and knowledgable people in the military field known to our times."[18] Nothing should be permitted to stand in the way of the future, or of the progress in which Canada had placed itself at the leading edge. "Canada is ushering in a new era in defence policy, venturing upon a policy which is fresh, creative, and designed to lead, ultimately, to world peace," Matheson said.

A few government figures and senior officers may have seen in the three powerful service chiefs a barrier to their nationalist and internationalist goals. There was also the factor, normally present in political decision-making, of personal ambition. Hellyer had served in the air force and army in Canada from 1944 to 1946, was the founder of Mari-Jane Fashions and a realtor, and was first elected to Parliament in 1949 at the age of 26. It has been suggested that he launched the unification battle to establish a reputation for boldness that would stand him in good stead for the party leadership when Pearson

[16] K.R. Patrick, Address on Canada's Emerging Defence Policy," Business Papers Editors Association, 25 January 1967, 16-17.
[17] Cited by Matheson in *Hansard*, 30 January 1967.
[18] *Hansard*, 30 January 1967.

stepped down.[19] This was the charge made by political opponents at the time, such as Terence Nugent, the Tory M.P. for Edmonton-Strathcona, who claimed that the minister's only goal was "to sell his own image and to gain the political benefits … from building himself up. … His prime purpose is to ensure his own greatness."[20] But Hellyer was probably not motiviated solely by personal ambition. The minister and his supporters shared nationalist perceptions of the need to reduce overt Britishness in the Canadian military—a theme with deep roots dating back to the "tin pot" navy debate.[21]

Post-war trends in Canadian military culture have been attributed, inter alia, to Americanization.[22] The close post-war relationship with the United States in the North American Air Defence Command (NORAD), and the collaboration between the United States Air Force (USAF) and the RCAF, made for "an intense cross-border tie."[23] It is often overlooked that unification (as distinct from the integrated command structure that preceded it) was, in part, "an attack upon tradition and the Britishness" of the three services.[24] Unification "struck at what remained of the [army's] Britishness," Granatstein has written, obliging the forces to become "Canadian in look and feel and attitudes."[25] Marc Milner and others have written of the postwar struggle for a "Made in Canada"

---

[19] Peter Haydon, Review of Hellyer, *Damn the Torpedoes*, *American Review of Canadian Studies* 22: 3 (1992), 427-31.
[20] *Hansard*, 31 January 1967.
[21] William Glover, "Colonial or Canadian?" in Michael L. Hadley, Rob Huebert and Fred W. Crickard, eds., *A Nation's Navy: In Quest of Canadian Naval Identity* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992).
[22] Allan D. English, *Understanding Military Culture: a Canadian Perspective* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004); J.L. Granatstein, "The American Influence on the Canadian Military," in B.D. Hunt and R.G. Haycock, eds., *Canada's Defence* (Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1993), 129-39.
[23] Joseph T. Jockel, *No Boundaries Upstairs: Canada, the United States, and the Origins of North American Air Defence, 1945-1958* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987), 56.
[24] David P. Burke, "Hellyer and Landymore: The Unification of the Canadian Armed Forces and an Admiral's Revolt," *American Review of Canadian Studies* 8: 2 (1978), 3-27.
[25] J.L. Granatstein, *Canada's Army: Waging War and Keeping the Peace* (Toronto: U. of T. Press, 2002), 357.

navy that finally dislodged "hidebound" RCN officers who were "not sufficiently Canadian."[26] Major John Hasek, a 30-year infantry officer of Czech origin, ascribed confusion and low morale to the traumatic and misguided "attempt to cleanse the forces of their Britishness."[27] The assumption was that Britishness—at least a certain type of Britishness that characterized elements of the armed services—was not "Canadian." The quest for "uniquely Canadian customs and methods" continued into the 1970s.[28]

Britishness in the old armed forces was deeply ingrained and could take many forms, from the purchase of British-made equipment to the use of slightly modified British training manuals. The uniform of the Governor General's Foot Guards replicated that of the Coldstream Guards—with a "Canada" badge on the other ranks shoulder strap. Highland Regiments were popular among Canadians, generally unfazed by Scottishness. Clipped moustaches were fashionable among army and air force officers; in photographs, RCAF officers appear to be classical English airmen—to all appearances, incarnations of the fictional Group Captain Lionel Mandrake from the 1962 film, "Dr. Strangelove." Charles Ritchie described the traditional Canadian army, navy, and air force officer "type" circa 1968, as "the descendants of the old Canadian Permanent Force, the class and kind of people I was accustomed to in Halifax in my youth—Canadians modelled on a British tradition."[29] There was little military culture in Canada that did not stem from the British taproot. In effect the military, or at least large elements of it, embodied a quasi-British style, bearing, and manner adapted to North American conditions—the unique British amalgam.

---

[26] Milner, op. cit., Rear Adm. E.R. Mainguy, R.C.N., L.C. Audette, Esq., Leonard W. Brockington, Esq., Report on certain "Incidents', etc. [Mainguy Report] (Ottawa, 1949), 17, 33.
[27] John Hasek, *The Disarming of Canada* (Toronto: Key Porter, 1987), 146.
[28] Byers, loc. cit.
[29] Charles Ritchie, Diary, 21 January 1968, in *Storm Signals*, 98.

There had been a French military heritage in Canada, but this had largely evaporated with the departing regiments of the 18th century, even if regimental and seigneurial vestiges have survived in the heraldry of Quebec towns such as Berthierville and Lanoraie (originally La Noraye), named after regimental officers. French-Canadian military traditions found some echo under subsequent British command but were largely submerged, as francophone anglophiles embraced the British colours. The recruitment of papal Zouaves by Bishop Ignace Bourget of Montreal in the 1870s was intended to foster an ultramontanist intellectual veteran class rather than to perpetuate or resurrect an indigenous "French" martial tradition.

Subsequently, well-intentioned politicians betrayed a profound misunderstanding of Canadian military traditions. In 1971, Edgar Benson, Minister of National Defence in the first Pierre Trudeau government, proposed that the ceremonial Changing of the Guard on Parliament Hill be conducted on alternating days in 18th century French military uniforms, to "put the [ceremony] into a truer historical English-French framework for Canada," he said. But Benson quickly withdrew the idea when it was explained to him that the red tunics and bear-skin hats that entertained summer tourists were not merely actors' costumes adopted arbitrarily by some anglophile impresario, but the official uniform of the Governor General's Foot Guards, a full-fledged militia regiment of Canada's army.[30]

However, there were other frictions apart from the French-English divide that preoccupied governments of the 1960s and 1970s. These frictions were to be found *within* Anglo-Canadian elements of the population, the government, and the armed

[30] *Globe and Mail*, 16 August 1971.

forces, between traditionalists and Canadianizers. The Britishness of RCN tradition, a certain irritation and confusion over RCAF rank titles like "group captain" and "squadron leader," and the pervasive sense of dependency on, or derivativeness from, a tradition based not in Canada but overseas, became, in certain circles, increasingly problematic.

Some Canadian military habits and traditions betokened a kind of Britishness—upper-class Englishness—that became a preoccupation for other Britishers, including some Canadians who disliked or resented certain eccentricities of manner or style. There had always been friction as well as cooperation in Canadian and British military circles, and the movement against the trappings of Englishness had been building in Canada for decades. Around 1910, Lord Grey suggested that a "green maple leaf" be added to the naval White Ensign on Canadian ships, only to have this vetoed by the Admiralty.[31] Similar nationalist ideas continued to percolate in the ensuing years. It is no coincidence that when the Pearsonian generation of Oxford-trained Liberal nationalists came to power, outward manifestations of Britishness, no matter how long established, became a target for nationalizers once again, and were subject to rapid review. In the Second World War, according to some, Canadian troops had lacked adequate distinguishing marks, and it seemed as if "the United Kingdom considered our Canadian troops merely as mercenaries of the proud Albion," as Rosaire Gauthier, the M.P. for Chicoutimi, told the House of Commons in 1964.[32] Others simply could not see the point of military traditions. "Flags, kilts, pipers, and that sort of things [sic]," said Joseph-Alfred Mongrain, the Independent M.P. for Trois-Rivières, were merely "artificial things" on which no genuine national pride could be based in building a secure "future" for the

---

[31] Milner, 22.
[32] *Hansard*, 3 July 1964.

country. National pride, he said, should be based on a simple formula: "a concern for efficiency at the lowest possible cost."[33]

General Jean-Victor Allard, C.B.E., D.S.O., was brought in as the Chief of the Defence Staff in 1966 to oversee unification. Born in Ste.-Monique-de-Nicolet, Allard had joined the Three Rivers Regiment in 1933 and served in the Second World War and Korea as well as in diplomatic posts, serving as vice-chief of the general staff in Ottawa in 1958. In 1961 he became the first Canadian to command British troops since wartime, the 4th British Army of the Rhine, with NATO forces in Germany. This experience, which might have been expected to entail a culture clash, did not leave any apparent legacy of bitterness. Allard said that on visits to London, encountering many British officers and officials, he was "treated as one of them" and "didn't feel at all like a foreigner." It helped that, as a result of his Canadian military background, he was "very well acquainted with the regimental spirit." He said the loyalty of his British charges was never in doubt.[34] Allard, thus uniquely hybrid in his experience, was one of several senior generals who might have been chosen to oversee the unification process. What made him stand out from other distinguished officers was that, with the retirement of Major-General Jean-Paul Bernatchez in 1967, Allard was the sole French Canadian in the upper echelons of the military. He was particularly sensitive to the obstacles facing francophone troops in the Canadian Army,[35] and given the agenda in the mid-1960s, the B&B Commission, and the government's interest in promoting the francophone presence, Allard was the obvious

[33] *Hansard*, 2 February 1967.
[34] Jean V. Allard and Serge Bernier, *The Memoirs of General Jean V. Allard* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1988), 209.
[35] Ibid., 216.

choice from a political point of view, with the advantage that his record as a decorated soldier and commander was unassailable.[36]

Importantly, Allard was, or became, a *believer* in confronting Britishness. He wrote in his memoirs twenty years later that the upheaval of unification would "permit the constitution of genuinely Canadian forces."[37] To achieve a "truly Canadian structure," he said, it was necessary to "abolish a good portion of the British tradition upheld by the Air Force and Navy."[38] For the army and militia, unification "struck with a vengeance" with "the loss of all Regimental insignia except for the cap badge," wrote the historian of the Governor General's Horse Guards, a Toronto militia unit. "For a time even black berets," used by armoured corps since the 1920s, "were banned, all ranks having to wear a nondescript green officer-style forage cap in garrison."[39] All of this engendered a good deal of bitterness: "esprit de corps was out of date and must be destroyed," wrote another militia historian.[40] Regimental bands, which played many British marches and made no obvious contribution to the new peacekeeping mandate, became a popular target for cutbacks.[41]

These changes in priority with regard to military culture did not occur in isolation, but in the context of a general disposition in Western societies after the 1950s to question

[36] One curious solecism was Allard's belief that diplomat George Ignatieff, the son of a Russian count/bureaucrat, was of "Ukrainian origin" (204); for some reason this was not corrected by his editor, Serge Bernier.
[37] Allard, 281.
[38] Ibid., 261, 268.
[39] John Marteinson and Scott Duncan, *The Governor-General's Horse Guards: Second to None* (Toronto: Robin Brass Studio, 2002), 275.
[40] Stewart H. Bull, *The Queen's York Rangers: An Historic Regiment* (Erin, Ontario: Boston Mills Press, 1984), 189.
[41] Brereton Greenhous, *Dragoon: The Centennial History of the Royal Canadian Dragoons, 1883-1983* (Ottawa: Guild of the Royal Canadian Dragoons, 1983), 459-60.

long-standing traditions.[42] In the belief that the armed forces were in some undefined way a cause or a source of militarism and war, some clergymen removed or relocated First and Second World War era regimental colours from church aisles to less prominent positions in their churches because they were believed to be "militaristic." Officer cadet training programs at universities and schools, once a vital link between the military and civilian society, were phased out.[43]

What motivated these changes? Granatstein has suggested that "As a French Canadian," Allard was less enamoured of "British-style traditions and … 'royal' nomenclature."[44] However, to be a French Canadian was in itself no indication of anti-Britishness; the assumption is an example of "ethnic determinism."[45] True, Allard sweepingly dismissed defenders of a distinct Royal Canadian Navy, such as Rear Admiral William Landymore, as "the servants of the British Royal Navy."[46] However, Allard also believed that "the structure of the ranks had to take our British tradition into account." For example, he had no intention of eliminating the traditional badge of his own regiment, the Royal 22nd (Vandoos). "Certain traditional things which aid esprit de corps must remain," he said.[47] Thus, ironically, "the years 1955 to 1970 saw the *consolidation* of the regimental institutions and traditions of the Royal 22e" (emphasis added).[48] As Allard wrote, "the British influence was still there" in the scarlet tunics and

---

[42] Booker, *Neophiliacs*, op. cit.
[43] R.H. Roy, *Ready for the Fray: The Canadian Scottish Regiment (Princess Mary's) 1920-2002* (Calgary: Bunker to Bunker, 2002), 510; Bull, 189. On the cadet program at UCC, cf. Fitzgerald, *Old Boys*, 88.
[44] J.L. Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military? What Canada Must Do to Defend Itself in the 21st Century* (Toronto: HarperCollins, 2004), 77.
[45] Lowry, op. cit.
[46] Allard, 254.
[47] Lt. Cdr. P.A. Gardner to Lt. Barbeau, 3 November 1966, R.L. Raymont Papers, file 3143, Directorate of History and Heritage (DHH).
[48] Serge Bernier, *The Royal 22e Regiment, 1914-1999*. Tr. by Charles Phillips (Montreal: Art Global, 2000).

bearskin hats, fiercely defended by the regiment's French-Canadian members as they marched to "Vive la Canadienne" played in the style of a British regimental march.[49]

In fact, many traditions were untouched by unification. The militia proved to be particularly resilient in resisting change, "probably more because of bold defiance than official sanction."[50] They retained their traditional blue "patrol" dress, mess dress (often the traditional British scarlet), and, in some units, full dress. Unit collar badges, despite discouragement from above, quickly returned to usage; regimental buttons, rank shoulder pips and crowns, and black berets also survived. In the army, one of the ironies of unification is that it provoked an unexpected *resurgence* of tradition by calling into existence a vibrant network of retired officers and privately-funded regimental associations. It soon became clear that many army distinctions would survive or be revived in the 1970s.[51]

As early as 1966, Hellyer accepted that "members of the three services may continue to wear their present mess dress."[52] This meant that regimental dinners and officers' balls would continue to be highly British-looking, scarlet-jacketed, brass-buttoned affairs. In his memoirs, published twenty-two years later, Hellyer professed to be shocked by Lieutenant-General Robert Moncel's "revolutionary" idea of tampering with "one of the most sacred of Canadian traditions," the regimental system.[53] Highland regiments were permitted to retain their traditional accoutrements at private expense;[54] there are now more "Scottish" regiments in the Canadian Army than in the British

---

[49] Allard, 258.
[50] Marteinson, 276.
[51] N.A. Kellett, "Regimental Customs and Tradition," Unpublished DSEA Staff Note 12/86, 16; idem, "Regimental Dress Distinctions," Unpublished DSEA Staff Note 1/86, 22, Department of National Defence.
[52] *Hansard*, 7 December 1966.
[53] Hellyer, 160.
[54] Roy, 483, 488.

Army.[55] In fact, it may be significant that the Scots regiments were among the first to be granted a clear exemption by Hellyer, announced in late June 1966. Perhaps because they embodied the Scottish strand in Canadian Britishness, they were absolved of the offence caused by the elite English "other" that was particularly under attack from 1964-68.

When it came to the navy, a less tolerant tone prevailed. Hellyer described the visiting Lord Mountbatten as "not objective" for the latter's belief—shared by many senior Canadian naval officers—that sailors should wear blue uniforms with brass buttons,[56] as they did the world over. Admiral Landymore made the case that traditional navy blue was as important to sailors as the Highland dress was to Scottish regiments. "I know of no custom or tradition carried on in the Navy today which stands in the way of progress. Our dress, our rank designations, our traditions and customs, our ship designators, give us esprit-de-corps essential to a fighting service."[57] It was a matter of naval identity, and of naval officers and men being able to wear a walking-out uniform in foreign ports that was recognizably that of naval personnel.

For Hellyer, unity and common purpose came first, even if it meant that sailors should wear green and shout "Aye, Aye, Colonel!" on deck; to do otherwise would undermine the integrity of the unified force. Hellyer was provided by his departmental officials with a standard answer sheet which stated that a common uniform for all three branches was "essential" because without it, "old loyalties could not help but be continued to the detriment of the philosophy of unification." The common uniform "will be a visible symbol of the fact of unification and over a period of time loyalty will be

[55] This was determined by counting the Scottish regiments listed on the websites of the Canadian Army (eleven) and British Army (nine) respectively. The latter is mainly the result of regimental amalgamation in the U.K.
[56] Hellyer, 128.
[57] W.M. Landymore, Address for the House of Commons Committee on Defence, 1966, typescript, 23.

developed."[58] Some exceptions were made: at the eleventh hour, Hellyer relented and navy ranks and HMCS ship designations were permitted.[59] Still, from 1968 to 1985, the navy's walking out uniform was green; gone were its "Royal" identification, trade badges, white ensign flag, HMCS cap tally, and rank symbols "to such an extent that all distinctive naval identifiers were replaced." As one military heritage compendium states, "Every status symbol was changed or eliminated practically overnight."[60] It is clear that the navy was a particular target for Canadianizers and endured a less liberal unification régime than the army.

What Hellyer achieved was in some sense a military coup in reverse, in which the politicians swiftly subdued the senior brass. Civilian control of the military was one of the hallowed principles of British parliamentary government. Senator Harold Connolly stressed the necessity of preserving civilian control, and believed that unification would play a role in ensuring that recalcitrant senior officers fell into line. And yet, it seemed far-fetched to the policy's critics that opposition to unification in the "Admirals' revolt" could ever pose a danger to civilian control in the Canadian military. Senator Grattan O'Leary described the supposed threat to the principle of civilian control as a "vast irrelevance." "The question of civil control over the military was established in this country more than 60 years ago when Sir Wilfrid Laurier dealt with Lord Dundonald," O'Leary said. "To raise it now is simply to try to provide a smoke screen which will confuse the people … about the real purposes of this bill."[61] To Hellyer's opponents,

---

[58] Q&A prepared for the Minister, Allard Papers, 73/1223/V/2567, 28 October 1966.
[59] James Eayrs, "Canada Pioneers the Single Service," *Round Table* 234 (April 1969), 155.
[60] April O'Connor and M. Vincent Bezeau, "Identity and Uniforms in the Unified Force," A-JS-007-002/JD-001 (draft), corrected and revised by Directorate Ceremonial (now DHH), 4-4-1, in preparation. I thank Paul Lansey and Ken Reynolds of DHH for this reference.
[61] Senate *Hansard*, 28 April 1967.

then, the supposed threat to civilian control was a red herring and none questioned it. On the other hand, the spectacle of the country's most senior naval officers openly defying their political superiors, and speaking against unification to the servicemen in their command, continued to raise eyebrows.

When the Pearson government took office in April 1963 and Hellyer emerged as defence minister, he and his assistant, Group Captain William Lee, an American-trained public relations expert from the RCAF, believed they had been given "a blank cheque to make any reforms we wanted to." Public confusion was actually seen, and openly discussed, as *desirable* in wresting control from what Lee called the previous "military mastery."[62] They deployed unusual and somewhat unorthodox tactics. According to a reporter's account from the gallery of the House of Commons, during the unification debate, "The minister sat for the most part silent and inattentive, giving the impression that he was not even listening … But up in an official's gallery of the House," reporters observed, William Lee "and a small army of other defence department supernumeraries met every attack with a rain of pamphlets, copies of speeches, information sheets and whispered points directed at members of the press gallery." This "contempt" for explaining matters directly to Parliament, said Donald MacInnis, the Tory M.P. for Cape Breton South, proved that Hellyer was more interested in winning the public relations battle through "propaganda."[63]

The exodus of personnel reached 26,300 in the first eighteen months, including 13,142 early retirements, at least some proportion as a direct result of the

[62] Hellyer interview, 22 November 1968, and Lee interview, 21 November 1968, quoted by Tom Axworthy, "Public Opinion and Canadian Defence Policy: A Case Study of Unification," December 1968, 8 n. 10, 12. Copy in Hellyer Papers, Vol. 67.
[63] *Globe and Mail*, 1 February 1967; *Hansard*, 1 February 1967.

amalgamation.[64] Among them were dozens of "capable, senior officers," wrote Air Marshal W.A. Curtis, "not deadwood, but officers who two or three years ago had the ministers [sic] complete confidence."[65] So sudden, sweeping, and uncompromising was Hellyer's approach—a kind of political *blitzkrieg*—that many officers were stunned into despair. In effect, Hellyer handed recalcitrant officers the rope with which to hang themselves. Some, like Admirals Landymore, Stirling, Brock, Dyer, and Hennessy, and others attempted to fight back. But the only way they could do so was by trying to raise the stakes, draw the prime minister into the conflict, or oblige Hellyer to resign. Though Brock later claimed that the prime minister had been sympathetic to their claims,[66] this direct entry of military officers into political questions entailed a contradiction. On the one hand they were staunch believers in British tradition; on the other, a key part of that tradition was the subordination of the military to the civilian government. After his resignation, Admiral Brock entered active politics and ran in the 1968 election as a Progressive Conservative candidate in the Nanaimo-Cowican riding, finishing third in the race, after the NDP and Liberal candidates.

Apart from the question of civilian control, which to many was a red herring, what would be the impact of unification on Canadian military tradition? What would it mean to "Canadianize" three tradition-bound services imbued with varying degrees of Britishness? Which British traditions, exactly, were *foreign* to Canada? Although the desire to make the three services "more Canadian" was of long standing, the record reveals few stated criteria as to which traditions would be kept and which would be

[64] Desmond Morton, *Canada and War: A Military and Political History* (Toronto: Butterworths, 1981), 186.
[65] W.A. Curtis to Winters, 4 January 1967, copy in Hellyer Papers, Vol. 81.
[66] Jeffry V. Brock, *The Thunder and the Sunshine* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1983), 311-12.

replaced. This did not make the process any less ruthless. Perhaps there was an unwritten understanding, among Canadianizers, of what needed to be done. They had sharpened their teeth in the struggle to make the navy "more Canadian and less Royal," "embracing the nation" (rather than RN and RCN tradition) "as the wellspring of naval support and legitimacy."[67] All of this depended on how one conceived of "the nation." Some Canadians saw no conflict between Canadianness and home-grown Britishness, while others set them up in opposition to each other. A.R.M. Lower's memories of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve caused him to recoil at resurgent Britishness in 1943:

> The war introduces among us once more the panoply of English aristocratic life, its military traditions and usages. It is as difficult for us to make headway against these as against popular American influences. Thus it is only in a narrow and nominal sense that we have a Canadian navy, army, and air force. In these areas our native way of life is submerged in the British.[68]

Once again, we find the class-based perceived connection between "English aristocratic life" and unpopular aspects of Canadian military culture. Perhaps Lower was hypersensitive. After all, it was from within the military that the movement for a distinct system of Canadian honours and decorations emerged in the 1940s—the movement that led to the founding of the Order of Canada in 1967.[69]

If the navy was a particular target for Canadianizers, there was a history behind this. Hauteur or "Brit" arrogance in the armed forces was an old colonial bugbear. The

---

[67] Milner, 175-6.
[68] A.R.M. Lower, "National Policy…Revised Version," 168.
[69] McCreery, *Order of Canada*, 71.

RCN's critics, from the 1949 Mainguy Report to Milner's latest work, conflate the "Nelson tradition" with class snobbery and abuse, as if martinets and Captain Blighs were by definition "British," while enlightened, democratic, non-abusive officers were, in their very nature, "more Canadian." Yet Milner himself blamed "a simple failure of leadership" for the belowdecks tensions of the 1940s.[70] Peter Archambault has challenged the nationalist account, citing the "true" Nelsonian tradition of *noblesse oblige*, a paternal and protective concern for the men.[71] For Archambault, the quasi-mutinies of 1947 and 1949 could be blamed on "not enough" Britishness rather than "too much." Perhaps the scholarly spyglass should now be trained upon the "distinctively Canadian" martinet, a species not yet classified by the nationalist school, including those "patriotic" officers who cooperated with, and benefited from, unification and its attendant reshuffling. "There were rewards for those who [cooperated]," one officer recalled, "Double promotions were not unknown," and the exodus "made way for Hellyer's followers."[72] In every purge there are beneficiaries waiting in the wings. As resignations mounted, writes Desmond Morton, "ambitious subordinates quickly filled the vacancies."[73]

By the 1960s, an ensconced cadre of anglophile officers had long been a target for Canadianizers. Lieutenant W.H. Pugsley wrote that some officers "mistook their commissions for a sort of feudal overlordship," an obvious reference to abuse of authority and perhaps the class system.[74] Senator Connolly, who had been Angus L. Macdonald's executive assistant from 1941 to 1945 when the latter was Minister of National Defence

[70] Milner, 194-5.
[71] Peter Archambault, "Too Much "Britishness" or Not Enough? The Canadian Naval Mutinies of 1949," presented to the International Commission on Maritime History, Calgary, 28 June 1998.
[72] Galloway, 11.
[73] Morton, *Military History of Canada*, 252.
[74] W.H. Pugsley, *Saint, Devils and Ordinary Seamen: Life on the RCN's Lower Deck* (Toronto: Collins, 1945), 230.

for Naval Services, cited his own experience in Halifax as sound reason to proceed with unification in 1967: "I had my stomach full of certain types of naval officer," he told Hellyer—also probably a swipe at Englishness.[75] Memories of the incompetence and failure of the RCN during the opening phase of the Battle of the Atlantic became associated, in their minds, with *faux* Britishness. Connolly's remarks in 1967 echoed Brooke Claxton, defence minister from 1948 to 1954, who deplored some naval officers' "stuffy and pompous" pseudo-English accents. These were typical, Claxton said, of "un-Canadian" elements opposed to the wearing of "Canada" shoulder flashes and to the painting of maple leaves on ship funnels (both wartime practices that had been suppressed by postwar naval anglophiles).[76] Was it merely anglophilia? Officers who were opposed to Canadianization maintained that distinctive Canadian badges detracted from the idea of a worldwide "king's navy" with one flag and one uniform—obviously a traditional and sentimental link rather than a formal one. To Claxton, however, it was no more than "slavish conformity to the traditions of the Royal Navy." It was all "way out of line" in "our new navy."[77] In the end, Milner says, it took the "final crushing blow of unification," eight years after Claxton's death, to exorcise the ghost of Nelson. Only after 1968 did the navy became "unquestionably Canadian."[78]

With various kinds of Britishness at the centre of Canadian military culture, it was small wonder that even distinctly Canadian endeavours were tinged with transatlantic, or mid-Atlantic, influence. The mistake lay in seeing Britishness as a kind of foreign imposition, when it was in reality an organic growth with roots in every province,

---

[75] Connolly to Hellyer, 7 January 1967, Hellyer Papers, Vol. 81.
[76] Milner, 184-5, 242. Latham Jenson, *Tin Hats, Oilskins, and Seaboots* (Toronto: Robin Brass, 2000), 274.
[77] Glover, in Crickard, 72-3.
[78] Milner, 183, 243.

including Quebec. In that province, Britishness also took many forms. It could be one of the multiple identities of a Sir E.-P. Taché or a Georges P. Vanier. It could represent the nostalgia of anglophone militia regiments, or the Scots heritage of a Quebec town. Jean Paul l'Allier, the former mayor of Quebec City, told a *Maclean's* interviewer: "We'd want to know and celebrate our British cultural heritage even if we were separated, because that is our heritage."[79] Thus, while not particularly prominent in the narrow francophone-Québécois "nationalist" version of history, the British fact remains.

Among Anglo-Canadians this was more likely to receive overt recognition—particularly in military circles. When the Royal Air Force produced a list of battle honours in 1952, there was little alternative for the RCAF but to copy it, adding a few home defence honours. Still, it was the "*Canadian* list … separately approved by the Queen,"[80] even if the air force was considered to be the most "American" of the three services, working closely with the USAF in North American defence. The pre-unification navy may have been especially "British" in character, but it could also be a creative Canadianizer. In 1959, the Naval Board opted to christen HMC submarines with "Eskimo names which are readily pronouncable." The suggestion came from Lieutenant-Commander Edward Gigg on the basis that "opportunities for expressing original Canadian thinking are extremely rare" in his view.[81] In fact, the RCN in the Second World War had deployed vessels named after Canadian rivers, towns, and Indian tribes such as HMCS *Assiniboine*, *Haida*, *Louisburg*, *Restigouche*, *Saguenay*, and *Wetaskiwin*.

[79] Benoit Aubin, "An anglophile separatist," *Maclean's*, 7 July 2005.
[80] M.V. Bezeau, "Beyond Buttons and Bows" (1980), 13, copy in Raymont Papers, DHH 82/991
[81] Lt. Cdr. Edward Gigg, "Naming of HMC Ships," n.d., attached to NSC 8000-5 vol. 3, 13 January 1960, in DHH 161.009 (D55).

The longstanding preoccupation with Britishness culminated in the reckoning of the 1960s. At least one journalist claimed in 1966 that the armed forces had fallen victim to a cadre of officials obsessed with "Canadianizing Canada." Terence Robertson brushed aside the government's façade of economy and internationalism and asserted that the true motive of unification was "replacing symbols of the past with new and distinctive Canadian ones" in an effort "to Canadianize the armed forces by ridding them of the trappings of 'foreign' (i.e., British) origins."[82] Hanson Baldwin of the *New York Times* said "the changes reflect Canada's continuing search for a national identity and her attempt to adjust old loyalties and traditions to a modern frame."[83] Open hostility towards tradition was supposed to be avoided. One 1966 memo stated: "There is absolutely no intention that a few 'brass hats' in Ottawa will ride rough-shod over tradition."[84] The minister added, "Traditions for the single service would be developed upon traditions of the past…'[85] There was no intention of eliminating all traditions, only some. But which ones?

First, and most noticeable to the public, the new walking-out uniform for sailors, soldiers, and airmen "will be distinctively Canadian."[86] General Charles Foulkes, born in Yorkshire and educated in London, Ontario, and later at Camberley, was an early advocate of "one uniform" so that the services would no longer be "a miniature model of the old British forces."[87] It is interesting to note that a prominent advocate of

[82] Terence Robertson, *The Canadian*, 15 October 1966, 8.
[83] *New York Times*, 20 February 1967, cited in Kronenberg, 101.
[84] Air Commodore R.C. Weston, "for CP's use in Standing Committee," 2 November 1966, DHH, Raymont Papers, file 3143.
[85] Hellyer, *Hansard*, 7 December 1966, cited in D.J. Beattie, "Perceptions of Unification 1966-1967," in DHH 80/225 folder 115, 16.
[86] R.C. Weston, loc. cit.
[87] Charles Foulkes, draft article for *Star Weekly* magazine, 14 October 1961, Hellyer papers, Foulkes file, Vol. 72.

Canadianization was a Yorkshireman by birth, whose views and assumptions about class and elitism seem to have accorded to a large extent with those of Canadians in sympathy with the project, such as Lower. This suggests that being English as opposed to Canadian in origin may not be the determining factor. Equally important, perhaps, was an interpretation of Britishness grounded in class and youthful formation.

A tendency to seek the lowest common denominator was also evident. General Allard speculated before a group of naval NCOs on "what happened if you mix the colours of the [three] uniforms together. The result he described as a kind of grey."[88] They did not get grey but green. This would "give some semblance of unification" despite environmental differences as the services continued to operate on land, at sea, or in the air.[89] One internal Q & A said, "Over a period of time loyalty [to a single identity] will be developed."[90] Hellyer later claimed that German, Dutch, and Belgian officers in Brussels praised the new uniforms, saying, "Now you can look like yourselves and not like the British."[91]

Another major motive for change was a kind of 1960s futurism, as we have seen in the remarks of John Matheson and commentary by supportive journalists. "A single, distinctively Canadian uniform," Allard said, was "designed to meet the problems of a modern world—a scientific world which is growing away beyond the barriers of the past at a speed that cannot stand the slow pace of yesterday."[92] Hellyer told the Toronto Canadian Club:

---

[88] Gardner to Barbeau, loc. cit.
[89] R. Barry Tackaberry to Foulkes, n.d., Raymont Papers, file 3078.
[90] Q & A prepared for the Minister of National Defence, 28 October 1966, Raymont Papers, file 2567.
[91] Hellyer, 247-8.
[92] Statement of Allard to the Standing Committee on National Defence, 28 February 1967, pre-delivery version in Raymont Papers, file 2567.

> Strong loyalty to and identification with a single environment is no longer good enough. It has been overtaken by the technological revolution which is all around us. …We are becoming leaders in defence organization thinking, not just followers. It is something an independent Canada can do which other countries with more powerful vested interests and more powerful lobbies could not do.[93]

This passage illustrates the contemporary feeling that the atmosphere of change and innovation that prevailed at that moment, as opposed to traditional practices, should take precedence in policy decisions affecting *esprit de corps*—a certain moral earnestness that the "speed" of the "revolution" must render tradition and "the barriers of the past" redundant. This may be contrasted with the view of Hellyer's critics that stability and permanency of military tradition might be a useful and practical anchor during a time of rapid technological change and modernization. Organic change, the gradual evolution of traditions cherished by the military, was believed to be too slow and too reactionary in a forward-looking era of optimistic internationalism.

Reinforcing this futurism was a *certaine idée* of "the nation," the coming of age narrative that influenced Pearson and his contemporaries, who viewed the overt acknowledgement of Britishness as a badge of triumphalism, a mark of colonial inferiority, and a barrier to the recovery of national unity. Instead, the Liberal nationalist association of unity and "maturity" with the removal of established Anglo-Canadian traditions gained the upper hand. Thus, following the line of thought expressed by General Foulkes, a National Defence memo argued that "a truly Canadian uniform, not a

[93] Address to the Canadian Club of Toronto, 3 October 1966, 17, 20.

copy of our partners in the Commonwealth," would foster "a resurgence of a new Canadian military nationalism. … If a man cannot fight for that which is truly Canadian and not a throw back to the Empire it seems then that he is not ready for the independence from the crown that has been so long in coming." Pre-1966 uniforms, it was argued, came into being "prior to the Statute of Westminster during what may be called the 'British Empire' period of our history," the memo said in Lowerite terms, "patterned on those in use by the British services."[94] Allard told a navy audience, "We must think of the future," pointing to "his own uniform coat which he described as a Boer War battle dress [sic]."[95]

In fact, distinctions in uniform—some of them subtle—did date from the South African War, including the maple leaf helmet badge.[96] Six decades later, the criteria had understandably changed. And yet, why were exceptions made to preserve the most British characteristics of all: formal mess kit, regimental insignia, pipes and drums? "The identity of regiments and components of the Armed Forces was highly important," Allard told a navy audience in Montreal, "and everything would be done to maintain this identity."[97] Traditions linked to "operating environments," he said, would continue "at the unit level."[98] But why tolerate tradition in the army while suppressing it in the navy and air force?

The most obvious explanation seems to be that the army was better at providing opportunities for francophones than the navy and air force.[99] This made it easier for the

[94] "Uniforms, Flags and Insignia," DND briefing note, undated, Hellyer Papers, Vol. 79.
[95] Gardner to Barbeau, loc. cit.
[96] Miller, 27.
[97] Notes by Lt. Barbeau, attached to loc. cit.
[98] Allard to Worthington, 26 September 1966, Raymont Papers, file 3268.
[99] Kronenberg, *All Together Now*, 82-3.

army's defenders to justify regimental tradition. General Allard told reporters that if it were not for the existence of the French-speaking Royal 22nd Regiment, "it would not have been possible for eight French Canadians to rise to general."[100] Hellyer "appeared to view the unification exercise almost as part of a process of national catharsis,"[101] intended to increase the participation of French Canadians in national institutions, including those from which they had been most deplorably excluded. In 1966, 73.2 per cent of officers were of British origin and only 12.5 per cent of French origin, compared to 14.3 per cent who were of "Other" ethnic origin, chiefly German, Italian, Polish, and Ukrainian.[102] (The corresponding numbers for the population as a whole, based on the 1961 Census, were 43.8 per cent British, 30.4 per cent French, and 25.8 per cent "Other.") It would be normal in a country that was 70% English-speaking that the military would be predominantly anglophone. However, it particularly annoyed francophone editorialists that the non-British, non-French "ethnic" element, *les nouveaux-Canadiens*, would occupy a more privileged position numerically than francophones—particularly since new Canadians were, by definition, naïve about the cultural identities of their adopted country.[103]

The bilingualist panacea had been a major theme for the Pearson government as it formed the Bilingualism & Biculturalism Commission in 1963.[104] One of the commission's first research projects was the linguistic imbalance in the armed forces, widely seen as a "bastion of anglophonie," as General (now Senator) Romeo Dallaire

---

[100] *Calgary Herald*, 18 April 1967, 2.
[101] Kronenberg, 101.
[102] Pierre Coulombe, "Social and Cultural Composition of the Canadian Armed Forces," in Hector J. Massey, ed., *The Canadian Military: A Profile* (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1972), 145.
[103] This is a common form of condescension among francophone editorialists in the mid-1960s, cf. *Le Courrier de Saint-Hyacinthe*, 30 juillet 1964.
[104] J. Pariseau and S. Bernier, *French Canadians and Bilingualism in the Canadian Armed Forces*, Vols. 1 and 2 (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1987 and 1991).

later put it. The son of a French-Canadian father and a Netherlands-born mother, Dallaire was embittered by what he called "past redneck policies."[105] This was the kind of feeling that the B&B Commissioners tapped into with enthusiasm. André Laurendeau regarded the forces "en tant qu'agent assimilateur pour le bénéfice de la langue et de la culture anglaises."[106] F.R. Scott's diary reveals the Commissioners' preoccupation: a report in February 1965 "showed how late it was before we began to develop a truly Canadian army, and how much later before we began to develop our own naval and air forces." The terms "late" and "later" implied a kind of due date after which national maturity might somehow become overripe or past its prime—one of the reasons that a coming-of-age metaphor is ultimately artificial. Unfortunately, Scott added, "As [the] forces have become more professional they have become more British … Dependence on United Kingdom broken after World War II though tradition survives."[107] He added, "Training in Air Force and Navy is exclusively English, mostly so in Army. … In the Air Force, above the rank of Group Captain [i.e., Colonel] there are exactly no French Canadians in any position whatever."[108] Scott concluded from an interview with five French-Canadian airmen that the RCAF was "basically an English language service." The aviators said that they

> all agreed that the language of command would have to be English, as it is the official language used for all mixed operations in both NATO and NORAD. Communication

---

[105] Romeo Dallaire, *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda* (Toronto: Random House, 2003), 17, 19. On the interpenetration of Canadianness and Britishness, cf. Dallaire's Dutch mother preferred the company of English-speaking Montrealers and enrolled her son in a cub scout troop that met in an *Anglican* church. His father, a member of the Vandoos, had trained de Gaulle's paratroopers in Scotland during the war, and landed in Normandy on D-Day.
[106] Laurendeau Journal, Centre de Recherche Lionel Groulx, typescript, 92.
[107] F.R. Scott Papers, LAC, Journal of the B&B Commission, June 21, 1965, typescript, 225.
[108] Ibid., 164.

> in the air is also in English. Their complaint was rather at the absence of consideration for themselves and their families in the daily work of the airforce. … [that they were obliged to] conduct all their official work in the English language, and they find themselves at a grave disadavantage when it comes to promotions. The turnover in French speaking personnel is consequently very high. … They told us that they could sense a very strong resistance to the attempts recently introduced by the Federal Government to provide voluntary French instruction for the English speaking officers. Somehow or other every officer who might wish to receive this instruction was found to be indispensable from his present duties. When I asked them whether they found a more sympathetic attitude among the younger members of the Airforce they said "Yes." It was the Establishment at the top which was so hard to move.

Hence the need for a confrontational "coup" to remove recalcitrant elements. It would be tempting to conclude that unification was designed *tout court* to reduce injustice toward francophones, and the discrimination they had reportedly long suffered from anglophone officers. Strome Galloway, the self-described "general who never was," attributed the disbanding of the Canadian Guards regiment, founded in 1953 but abolished in 1970, to a "political decision" involving powerful "francophone" elements. "Our crime," he wrote afterwards, "was that we were 'too British' in uniform and character to pass muster with the Francophone hierarchy which dominated the Defence Department at the time. The Unification program was the official excuse, but the program itself was partly a gimmick

to ‘Americanize’ the Canadian forces and eliminate, as far as possible, the British traditions of the past.”[109]

However, undue emphasis on the bilingualism factor would cloud another powerful motive for the confrontation with Britishness: the influence of a particular brand of English Canadianism that viewed overt Britishness as a foreign retardant to Canadianization. “We did *not* have a Canadian uniform, just as we did not have a Canadian flag,” exclaimed K.R. Patrick, of Canadian Marigot Ltd. of Montreal, to a 1967 meeting of business editors. This is perhaps why it was “talked about in some official quarters as though it was an exercise in national identity.”[110] Had not Colonel Nasser rejected Canada’s Queen’s Own Rifles as participants in the United Nations Emergency Force in 1956 because their uniforms were “British,” much to Pearson’s “humiliation” as external affairs minister?[111]

The new national interest, according to Patrick and others, was to be found at the United Nations, and went hand in hand with “the founding of a tradition which is Canadian, truly Canadian and not taken over second hand.”[112] It is here that 1960s futurism connects with popular internationalism. In the new nationalist and internationalist ideologies, a “worldwide peace enforcement force,” as General Foulkes called it, would supersede Canada’s membership in the Commonwealth.[113] The latter might be a useful forum for maintaining sentimental ties among English-speaking countries, but when it came to the realities of peace, diplomacy, finance, and trade, other

---

[109] Strome Galloway, The General Who Never Was (Belleville, Ontario: Mika, 1981), 277.
[110] Kronenberg, 101.
[111] “Humiliation” was the term used by Roland Michener [then a Tory MP] to Diefenbaker, 10 July 1957. Roland Michener Papers, LAC, Vol. 104.
[112] K.R. Patrick, op. cit., 12, 16, 17.
[113] Foulkes” notes on “Some of the Problems of Unification,” 1966, Raymont Papers, file 3078.

organizations increasingly and rapidly overshadowed the Commonwealth in the postwar era, for Canadians no less than for others. For example, Andrew Brewin, born in England in 1907, the former president of the Ontario C.C.F., and elected in 1962 as the N.D.P. M.P. for Toronto Greenwood, told the House of Commons during the debate on Hellyer's bill that unification would enable Canada to do its part to "create stability in an unstable world." Brewin continued:

> In this field Canada can for the first time, if we have the imagination to do so, escape from a role in defence which is purely subsidiary either to the imperial strategy of Britain—though at a certain stage in history this was quite naturally what we depended upon—or to the great power strategy of the United States of America. In this proposal of a unified Canadian force lies the possibility of making for the first time a distinctively Canadian contribution.[114]

It is a fact generally overlooked in the historiography that some nationalists, in addition to voicing their pride in Canada and their hopes for world peace, displayed a certain degree of disdain for traditionalism. Letters to the government from zealous supporters of Hellyer's initiatives give us an insight into the ideology of Canadianization and into how some ordinary Canadians interpreted Britishness. It should be noted that such letters do not necessarily reflect a majority, but only an element of nationalist opinion—those self-selected citizens inclined to write letters to cabinet ministers. One, from Willowdale, Ontario, complained that the Royal 22nd Regiment in the closing ceremony of Expo 67 had failed to carry the Maple Leaf flag. Instead they carried what

[114] *Hansard*, 1 February 1967.

appeared to be “the British flag.” This, wrote W. Conroy, was “offensive to me,” and could give people “the impression we were either a colony or defended by an other [sic] nation’s soldiers.”[115] Accordingly, the staff at the Ministry of National Defence were called upon to explain the offending banner. “When carrying their [Queen’s] Colour with battle honours,” replied Brigadier H.E.T. Doucet, the Minister’s executive assistant, “they do not carry the national flag.” Such colours, throughout the Commonwealth, “have their historical origin in the tradition and customs of the British Army which we adopted in Canada many years ago.”[116] Reassuringly, Commodore F.B. Caldwell, Secretary to the Defence Staff, wrote: “Traditions are continually under review within the Armed Forces and when they are considered to be unnecessary or obsolete, action is taken to accommodate them to a changing Canadian scene at the appropriate time.”[117]

In a similar incident, General Bernatchez, successor to Georges Vanier as Honorary Colonel of the Royal 22nd since 1964, complained that the use of the Union Jack in the landing ceremony for President Charles De Gaulle at Quebec City in 1967 was “bound to have been misunderstood or even to have displeased numerous people,” and “provided the occasion for booing by a handful of separatists.” The root of the problem, said Bernatchez, a graduate of the Royal Military College attached to the Vandoos in 1934, and a veteran of the Italian campaign, was the presence of what he called “the British flag,” which left some “with the impression that our national flag is still the Union Jack or that the British flag takes precedence over our own.”[118]

---

[115] W. Conroy to Hellyer, 1 November 1967, Hellyer Papers, Vol. 231.
[116] Doucet reply, 8 November 1967. The next several citations are from Hellyer’s flag files in ibid.
[117] Caldwell memo, stamped 7 November 1967, loc. cit.
[118] Major-General Jean-Paul E. Bernatchez to Hellyer, 27 July 1967, Hellyer Papers, loc. cit. One wonders what De Gaulle made of the francophone Vandoos” red tunics and bearskin hats.

Bernatchez' remarks exemplify the assumption of some nationalists that the Union Jack was a British flag with no legitimate place in Canada's symbolic order. It is possible that Bernatchez was unaware—despite having served in the military since the 1930s—that the Union Jack was not the "national flag" of Great Britain, but the personal flag of the Monarch used by convention as the flag of the United Kingdom and the Dominions. But it was also a banner transposed all over the world by countries, regiments, provinces, and even the State of Hawaii, where the Union Jack was a purely historical symbol. Only in 1908 did a government member state in the Westminster Parliament that "the Union Jack should be regarded as the National flag." By the 20th century, regiments in Canada had carried the Union flag for generations. Nationalists had little patience with such arguments.

"Perhaps some of the ceremonial traditions of our services need re-examining," Bernatchez wrote. "Traditions, like everything else, should be altered or discontinued when they are generally detrimental." He did not cite evidence of detrimental effects, only his own inference the flag was a symbol of subordination. Leo Cadieux, a former journalist and Canadian Army public relations officer (1940-44) who became Minister of National Defence in September 1967, replied: "I share your concern … to avoid misunderstandings and anomalies."[119] General Allard had suggested to Cadieux three days earlier that it was "anomalous" for Canadian units to "carry the identification of Great Britain" as "the Queen's Personal Canadian Flag" and, he believed, the Maple Leaf "should have replaced the Union Jack on military flags automatically."

In fact, three years earlier, Hellyer's own office had informed the three services that "following proclamation the new national flag will be the flag flown by the Canadian

[119] Cadieux to Bernatchez, 19 October 1967, Hellyer Papers.

Armed Forces." However, the officials added that "Regimental and Queen's Colours will not be affected."[120] The RCN ensign (a replica of the Royal Navy's) and RCAF Blue Ensign (a replica of the RAF's with a maple leaf roundel) were to be immediately retired from use, the 1,300 pristine RCAF ensigns burned and 1,236 white ensigns sold to New Zealand at cost. Allowances were made for a few flags to be sent to museums and churches, and the files contain numerous requests from veterans for a surplus Red Ensign. But the "standard policy" was burning.[121] Gordon Robertson, the Clerk of the Privy Council and Secretary to the Cabinet, had long argued that promotion of the new flag design was urgent in the run-up to the Centennial, "so the controversy can die down well before 1967."[122]

The evidence for General Allard's argument for revising regimental Queen's Colours was that the Union flag had itself been modified in King's Colours in 1807 with the addition of the Cross of St. Patrick. New colours based on the Maple Leaf flag, he added, "should be presented in the normal way by Her Majesty personally … to each unit so entitled."[123] In 1968, the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry duly received its new Queen's Colour "in keeping," it was claimed, "with the tradition established by George II [sic]" that the basis of the colours should be the national flag as in Britain.[124] It is curious to note, however, that Parliament had voted in 1964 to *retain* the "Royal Union Flag" as "a symbol of membership in the Commonwealth and allegiance to the

[120] Memo from H.E.T. Doucet, executive assistant to Hellyer, 8 December 1964.
[121] R.G. [Gordon] Robertson to Hellyer, PCO directive, 5 October 1966, Hellyer Papers.
[122] Robertson to Pearson, 27 April 1964, flag file, L.B. Pearson Papers, LAC.
[123] Allard to Cadieux, 16 October 1967, Hellyer Papers, loc. cit. This entailed fifty-seven new colours for eleven regular units and forty-six militia units at a cost of $700 apiece, Allard reported.
[124] *Canadian Forces Bulletin*, vol. 3, no. 5, 28 June 1968, 1.

Crown,"[125] which might have been reason to retain it as the basis for regimental colours in recognition of their Commander-in-Chief, the Queen's representative in Canada.

It was thus an *arbitrary* decision to insist that regimental colours should bear the Maple Leaf rather than the Union Jack, since the latter was *also* a Canadian flag by Proclamation in 1965, representing the Crown in Canada. Perhaps it was another case of confusing Britishness with the United Kingdom and overturning tradition on the basis of the interpretation of a few highly placed individuals. Perhaps it was only natural that the Queen's Colours should be based on the Maple Leaf, a flag derived from Canada's British military traditions. "The reason was obvious," wrote Strome Galloway, "the Grand Union [flag] was no longer a symbol of Canadian identity."[126] The Queen had proclaimed the Maple Leaf as the national flag of Canada.

Several letters in Mr. Hellyer's files show little tolerance for older symbols. At the risk of revisiting the flag issue once more, it is important to register the extent to which this symbol resonated with nationalists in the armed forces debate, and the role this had in the "othering" of previous symbols. Seventy-eight-year-old Theodore Horrobin Sr., who signed his letter "Pioneer of Vancouver," sent the Prime Minister a newspaper photo of some air cadets parading the RCAF blue ensign. He scribbled on the clipping: "We have our own new flag, please advise them to use it. This is Canada, a nation, in it's [sic] own right. … There are a lot of people who are not truly Canadians at heart and were not born in Canada but they holler 'Canadians' very strong if it is to their advantage."[127] In this case, the Prime Minister personally forwarded the letter and

[125] "Flag Etiquette in Canada" (Ottawa: Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, 2000), 25-6.
[126] Galloway, ed., 153.
[127] Theodore Horrobin Sr., letter to the prime minister, 16 May 1965, copy in Hellyer Papers. His letter said he had been born in Vancouver in 1887.

clipping to Hellyer with a note signed "L.B.P." implying at least partial agreement. Upon investigation, however, it turned out that the picture had simply been reprinted in the *Vancouver Sun* from the retirement ceremony for the Red Ensign and other flags the preceding February.[128] The cadets were not, after all, making improper use of an unauthorized flag.

Another letter of complaint cited a recruiting advertisement in a newspaper with a drawing of the naval White Ensign in the background. An Edmonton reader signing himself "A. Capham" scribbled in capital letters "NOT CANADIAN," underscored the words three times, and pointed out that the "R" in Royal Canadian Navy should be replaced with an "L" to make it Loyal. "We as Canadians by birth by choice [sic] resent this ad," he wrote, demanding that the Minister rectify the situation.[129] Again the staff were set to work. The Minister's military secretary made inquiries and explained that an "old" advertisement was "inadvertently" reprinted due to an "urgent requirement for naval recruits."[130] Brigadier R.L. Purves, Secretary to the Defence Staff, added that Canadian Forces Headquarters "has taken positive action to prevent … similar errors."[131]

Then there was the complaint that the Campbelltown Armoury, home to local New Brunswick militia, had no national flag flying over it. The Member of Parliament for Madawaska-Restigouche, Jean-Eudes Dubé, wrote to Cadieux demanding an explanation.[132] The Associate Minister of National Defence, in turn, requested "a report concerning this allegation" that the armoury "does not fly the Canadian flag," thanking

[128] The clipping was dated 26 April 1965 but the photo had been taken in February.
[129] A. Capham, letter to the minister, 23 March 1965. The clipping was from the *Edmonton Journal*, 22 March 1965. Correspondence cited in this section can be found in Hellyer Papers, Vol. 231.
[130] Reply from J.-M. Favreau, Military Secretary, 2 April 1965.
[131] Brigadier R.L. Purves, Secretary to the Defence Staff, 31 March 1965.
[132] Dubé to Cadieux, 20 June 1967.

Dubé in a separate letter for his concern that the armoury "does not fly the Canadian flag'[133]—leaving the impression that perhaps it was flying some unauthorized flag. A second inquiry was drafted by Cadieux's office three weeks later but cancelled because the Armoury replied the same day. It turned out that the reason that there was no flag over the Armoury, wrote Commodore F.B. Caldwell to the Minister's military secretary, was that there was *no flagpole*. Adjacent buildings did not leave sufficient clearance of power lines, raising the danger of the "flag contacting high voltage wires when raised or lowered." The Minister could rest assured that the old buildings had now been demolished, and a flagpole duly installed on July 1, 1967. The Associate Minister of National Defence replied to the Member of Parliament for Madawaska-Restigouche accordingly.[134] Nationalists uncomfortable with the lingering presence of British-looking traditional symbolism could be satisfied that the government was dealing effectively with these matters.

Another writer complained that he could find no Canadian flag in a newspaper photo he had seen of Canadian war graves at Hong Kong. A reply from M. Dupuis, special assistant to Minister of Veterans Affairs Roget Teillet, explained that alongside the 283 Canadian dead in the military cemetery lay 1,010 from the United Kingdom, 243 Indians, and 71 Dutch in addition to those from New Zealand, Australia, Burma, and the United States. In view of this fact, Dupuis said, the policy was to fly no national flag.[135]

Finally, there was a complaint from Vancouver that a Royal Canadian Legion branch was still using the Union Jack in its remembrance activities, and demanding of the

---

[133] Cadieux to Campbelltown Armoury, 22 June 1967; Cadieux to Dubé, 22 June 1967.
[134] Cadieux to Dubé, 11 July 1967.
[135] Dupuis" reply of 23 July 1965.

Minister that the Legion "be made to conform to Canadian laws and customs."[136] Such letters were obviously taken seriously. Although unexpectedly rigid in tone, such expressions have been ignored by historians and can be found nowhere in existing accounts of Canadian nationalism. Hellyer, for example, makes no allusion to the existence of this sentiment in his memoirs. It may be suggested that these letters are in effect the voluntary intelligence communiqués of an informal "patriotic network" ensuring that certain vestiges of public Britishness were contained and eliminated. If so, it is a self-appointed one—and may not be representative of majority opinion. However, the letters do provide an unusual insight into attitudes about Canadianization, and raise interesting questions as to the degree of hostility toward long-established symbols. Are they indicative of a certain brand of pacifism or anti-militarism, an animus against martial banners that could be conveniently labelled as foreign?

The evidence suggests that more than a healthy patriotism lay behind these strong expressions of feeling that contributed to the othering of Britishness. When Rosaire Gauthier, the M.P. for Chicoutimi, told the House of Commons that Canada must move beyond "mythological colonialism" and become "an adult country," he reflected generations of national feeling among French Canadians. But he also attacked "the motives of a group of Anglo-Saxons and a few new Canadians who do not understand yet the meaning of "Canadian bi-ethnical" [sic]," implying that this new, narrow definition of Canada and its legitimate symbols would, in future, be the only acceptable one.[137]

A strain of consoriousness seems to have accompanied the new Maple Leaf nationalism. By contrast, at least some of tradition's defenders appear to have been

---

[136] Copy in Hellyer flag file, 8 December 1965.
[137] *Hansard*, 3 July 1964.

surprisingly mild-mannered. It was a standard tactic in the mid-1960s for the proponents of unification in Parliament to portray the Red Ensign's defenders as bigoted and intolerant—and historians such as Granatstein have reinforced that impression. But that is not, at least officially, the tone of the Naval Officers Association, which requested that the RCN flag be retained. W.A. Manfield of the Ottawa branch referred to the RCN and RCAF flags as the equivalent of "regimental colour[s]" for Canada's sailors and airmen "both with their own well known glorious heritage and traditions—earned by Canadians" in war and peace. If the Minister must abolish them would he consider simply replacing the Union Jack in the upper left canton with the new Maple Leaf flag? This concession to the new nationalism was hardly evidence of intransigence.[138] But it was ignored.

Appeals to Hellyer's democratic instincts also fell on deaf ears. The Chief and Petty Officers' Association, representing "stokers, ordinary seamen, signalmen, artificers," and others from the ranks who had risen to NCO status, also pleaded that the navy "should have a distinctive Ensign." The white ensign, they urged, "identifies our Navy as part of the noble and historical Royal and Commonwealth Navies. … [It] is ours and we think we deserve it, and we do not feel it should be taken from us," they wrote, concluding with a Burkean flourish on behalf of "our brave sailors, living and dead"—also to no effect.[139] If the Minister wanted more democratic armed forces, said a statement by three naval associations, why not determine the new naval uniform by means of a "contest" among serving men and women? As a joint statement by the Navy League of Canada, the Naval Officers' Associations of Canada, and the Royal Canadian Naval Association, put it:

[138] W.A. Manfield to Hellyer, 5 January 1965.
[139] Chief and Petty Officers Association to Hellyer, 5 February 1965.

> There has been criticism that some of the Navy's traditions are British. Is this bad? While the British Navy has had its vicissitudes, it had a fairly successful history as a fighting force, if victory in battle is any criterion. Why shouldn't Canadian sailors strive for the same spirit that conquered at Trafalgar? However, if anyone thinks that Canadian seamen are not proud of their country and Canadian service let him remember the maple leaf which was proudly worn on the little ships in the North Atlantic in World War II. … After all if the Canadian House of Commons cherishes the principles, precepts and traditions of Westminster—why is it a matter of criticism that Canada's Navy should take inspiration and example from the Royal Navy?[140]

Hellyer promised to give these "interesting" suggestions careful consideration, informed Cabinet that he had received "very little correspondence" in defence of the White Ensign, and said he could foresee little difficulty from naval quarters in abolishing it.[141]

The confrontation over unification of the armed forces lies at the heart of the effort to reshape Canada's symbolic order in the 1960s. One retired army officer, embittered by the experience, wrote that "Canada was at a crossroads. Having ceased to be British, it was in immediate danger of becoming American. In desperation it decided to try its best to become Canadian. Only in the armed forces, always guilty to some degree of anachronism, did the British myth continue and the old commandments stand. But they could not stand for long." They were overwhelmed by the perceived "need for a

---

[140] Statement by the Navy League of Canada, Naval Officers Associations of Canada, and the RCN Naval Association, February 1967, copy in Hellyer Papers, vol. 82.

[141] Hellyer reply, 26 September 1964. Hellyer to Cabinet, 20 January 1965, cited in *Damn the Torpedoes*, 124.

Canadian military machine which must be unmistakably *Canadian*."[142] Historians under the influence of national sentiment have downplayed the extent to which the unification and Canadianization movements were anglophobic and, like their opponents, ideological in nature. The determination to maintain the hard-won distinctiveness of the "single service" uniform persisted even in the mid-1980s. When, in 1984, the Mulroney government moved to restore naval and air force blue uniforms, R.L. "Bob" Raymont, the retired former executive assistant to General Foulkes in the 1960s and to successive Chiefs of the Defence Staff, adamantly opposed the reversion from "distinctively Canadian" uniforms to "the traditional copies of the British." Canadians were forgetting the lesson taught by Nasser during the Suez Crisis! To Mulroney, Raymont wrote: "The previous traditional uniforms often seemed to suborn the Canadian forces to those of the U.K."[143] Raymont, like others deeply involved in the changes of the 1960s, remained a passionate believer in the necessity of distinctive non-British uniforms, even if Canada's example had not, in fact, been emulated by other countries, most of whose navy and air personnel wore varying shades of blue or black.[144]

Canadianization, as an ideology shared by protagonists of change in the 1960s as well as historians who have written about it, was grounded in the assumption that certain symbols and customs that appeared to be "British" were necessarily *foreign* to Canada, no matter how long established in Canadian life. And yet all of this nationalist differentiation and othering took place within the context of a changing British world. At

---

[142] Galloway, 12-13.
[143] Raymont to Mulroney, 21 September 1984; draft letter to the *Globe*, November 1984. Raymont cited the "Report of the Task Force on Unification of the Canadian Forces," 31 August 1980, which called for an increase in environmental and unit identity but retention of "distinctively Canadian" uniforms. Cf. "Review Staff Group Paper on Identity," Annex T; Raymont Papers, file 3270.
[144] Today, Canada's navy sports Tilley hats or black baseball caps bearing their "HMCS" ship designation. Their uniforms are blue. Cf. photographs in *Esprit de Corps* magazine, Vol. 12, No. 10 (October 2005), 8-11.

the same time, historians have overlooked that these changes stemmed ultimately from a liberal Britishness that promoted distinctive national symbols for independent countries associated with a wider British culture. This, in part, may explain why many traditions did in fact survive. The process was characterized by continuity as well as change. In 1985, the air force resurrected its British "air force blue" ensign with a Maple Leaf flag in the upper left canton in place of the Union Jack. This was what some servicemen had asked for in the 1960s as an alternative to the abolition of distinctive symbols. Some RCAF rank titles also returned from oblivion: air bases known as "Canadian Forces Base" were renamed "Wing" in 1993, as in 4 Wing Cold Lake; their senior officer was called Wing commander, and squadrons found themselves under the command of someone called a squadron leader.[145] The success of Canadianization lies in the fact that today, the Canadian Forces probably do enjoy a reconstituted "military nationalism" of sorts, as the idealists hoped—but in a form that is more tolerant of tradition in the face of continuing Americanization.[146]

One further sign of interpenetration of Britishness and Canadianism remains to be drawn out in the present thesis. Some advocates of Canadianization in the debate actually cited *British* authorities for their policies. Matheson cited Lord Mountbatten, the Duke of Edinburgh, Sir Arthur Harris, Lord Tedder, Lord Wavell, and Lord Montgomery (as well as a few retired American generals) as advocates of a single service. A CBC program

---

[145] For this insight I thank Major Philippe Légère of IM Branch, NDHQ, Ottawa. Originally, a Wing Commander led two squadrons; today the title applies to the commanding officer of a CF air base or Wing.
[146] Allan D. English, op. cit., 95 ff.

broadcast an interview with Mountbatten in which the legendary admiral seemed to endorse unification into one service.[147]

In other ways, the government and its supporters were conscious of preserving continuities as well as departures from the past. When John McIntosh, a Saskatchewan Tory MP, asked whether dropping the "Royal" prefix meant that Canada's military personnel would no longer swear an oath to the Queen, Hellyer brushed aside this accusation by noting that many serving officers had taken their oaths in the navy and air service "*before* they were 'Royal'" (emphasis added).[148] Senator Connolly, introducing the unification bill in the upper house, also emphasized continuity. "Traditional groupings," he said, would remain within the three branches of the armed forces. "The sea companies, for example, will still include ships, squadrons of ships, fleets," while the army would continue to consist of "companies, battalions, regiments, brigades," and the "air components will still include squadrons, wings, and groups."[149] "I can understand people who love tradition being upset," Matheson said, but he did "not believe there is any person involved in the implementation of this operation [sic, meaning unification] who does not care about tradition."[150] Unification, according to Hellyer's assurances to the House of Commons, was intended not to destroy tradition, but to build on it—"not to destroy and erase at one stroke the traditions of the past but to build, on the solid

[147] In fact, Mountbatten was invited by Commodore Harold Groos of Victoria to clarify whether or not he had intended to endorse Hellyer and Matheson's position. Mountbatten wrote that, on the contrary, the British defence reorganization did not abolish service distinctions but took care "to preserve esprit de corps and morale and those traditions which help to maintain this … It has been accepted that to achieve this the three services must retain their uniforms and ranks with an identifiable professional head of their service. The idea of a single uniform and rank structure was also rejected as undesirable and unnecessary." If the government cited British authorities in support of their decisions, they did not necessarily cite them accurately. Cf. *Hansard*, 28 April 1967.

[148] *Hansard*, 7 December 1966.

[149] Senate *Hansard*, 26 April 1967.

[150] *Hansard*, 30 January 1967.

foundations we have forged, a strong and viable force to meet Canada's needs of tomorrow."

One of the ironies of the unification debate, then, is that *both sides* invoked tradition and Britishness to support their case. The "break with Britishness" was not, and perhaps could not be, as decisive as some Canadianists had hoped, and the new unified Canadian Forces would continue to preserve, revive, and update earlier martial traditions. In the end, deeper, underlying realities reasserted themselves. As Vincent Massey wrote in 1967 after attending a public ceremony in Ottawa, "The ceremonial was perfect. Guard of Honour by the Canadian Guards (not in green!) [sic]."[151]

In a continuing irony, the dark green uniform still worn by the army today—the quintessence of the 1960s crusade for distinctiveness—has been described by one retired subaltern as "rifle green," which he called "a fine *British* colour, if you will."[152] Even in the midst of pure Canadianism, Britishness remained inescapable. On state occasions the British (and Canadian) scarlet was as much in evidence as before, as in the annual Canada Day inspection of the Guard of Honour on Parliament Hill. The Army Officers' Ball was organized for the first time in many years in Ottawa in 2004-05, with much scarlet in evidence, and traditional pips and crowns signifying rank among the militia officers in attendance.[153] It seemed that if the Canadian military had need of

[151] Massey Diary, 29 June 1967.
[152] DHH Research Officer Steve Gannon, a former captain in the Canadian Guards (whose last regular battalion was disbanded in 1970), suggested to me in February 2005.
[153] The author attended this event, on 7 May 2005, in which the Stevens & Kennedy Band complemented the Loyal Edmonton Regiment Drumline, Calgary Highlanders Drumline, Governor General's Foot Guards Band, and the Pipes and Drums of the Stormont, Dundas & Glengarry Highlanders. A second ball, sponsored by the Commander of the Army, Lieutenant-General Marc Caron, was held in 2006, cf. http://ca.geocities.com/ottawaarmyball/, and may represent the (re)invention of an annual tradition. The militia's pips and crowns remain the envy of many Regular Force army officers, who continue to be obliged to wear navy-style stripes on their epaulettes and sleeves—a break with army tradition that has yet to be reversed. (Conversation with an active Regular Force officer, May 2005.)

“meaningful” traditions and ceremony, then, short of inventing new traditions, there was little alternative but to appropriate and adapt those of the foundational British amalgam from which Canadianism had emerged.

Conclusions

Diversity and continuity: the “perduring stream” of Canadian Britishness

On his journey to Peterborough to visit T.H.B. Symons, the president of Trent University, in May 1964, at the urging of Scott Symons, André Laurendeau took with him a copy of A.R.M. Lower’s *Canadians in the Making*. The book is a social history counterpart to *Colony to Nation*, and Laurendeau’s reading of it during his co-chairmanship of the B & B Commission illustrates how one historian’s version of the “usable past” provided a backdrop to the crisis of Britishness from 1964 to 1968. The pilgrimage to Symons’ house was intended to give Laurendeau a greater appreciation for the authentic Anglo-Canadian heritage that was missing from the Commission’s brief. It is not clear that Laurendeau, despite this momentary immersion in the antique Canadiana with which Symons furnished his old Ontario home, got the message.[1]

The two Pearson minority governments of the mid-1960s brought into the public square a dramatic confrontation with traditional assumptions about Canadian identity. They implemented what were described as the symbols of a distinctive Canadianism, displacing overtly British ones such as the Canadian Red Ensign. In effect Pearson and his associates engineered a “crisis of Britishness” in which their traditionalist opponents were defeated and largely discredited—a classic dialectical struggle when, according to Hobsbawm and Ranger, “old traditions and their institutional carriers and promulgators no longer prove sufficiently adaptable and flexible, or are otherwise eliminated: in short, when there are sufficiently large and rapid changes.”[2] This thesis does not claim to pronounce the final word on this subject, but it has provided a kind of chronicle

[1] Laurendeau Diary, 21 mai 1964, Archives de Centre de Recherche Lionel-Groulx, typescipt, 216.
[2] Hobsbawm and Ranger, 5.

or compendium of the changing Anglo-Canadian consciousness (ethnic and otherwise) and the evolving *mentalités* of individuals and groups in a variety of contexts: in their upbringing and education, at Oxford, at war, in their encounter with New Canadians, and in the political debates over Britishness in the Canadian flag debate and in Canadian military culture in the 1960s.

In some ways, Canada's tradition-inventors in the 1960s achieved something approximating a *coup d'état*, in the older sense of a decisive stroke of state policy. Replacing the traditional flag with the Maple Leaf was a *coup* also in the modern sense of the swift overthrow of an old order, one whose legitimacy had been questioned.[3] The use of the term "coup," however, is not intended to imply any long-term lack of legitimacy, something that was acquired by the Maple Leaf relatively quickly and with the passing of older generations. It was also a deliberate policy choice that had been avoided by previous prime ministers because of its potential to divide Canadians. In one dramatic blow the overt British symbolism of the Canadian Ensign was dislodged and many assumptions about the Britishness of the country's identity were shaken. The flag of 1965 remains probably one of the world's most successful and popular invented traditions, suggesting layers of meaning, historical legitimation, and memory that defy easy description. But that should not mask the dramatic nature of the change, nor the upheaval that it entailed for those attached to traditional symbols, the "defeated" party in the struggle for identity who had seen the old flag as a distinctively Canadian one—to borrow Sydney Wise's term: the "losers" of history.

Even so, the Canadianism of Pearson and his contemporaries ultimately remained an excrescence of Britishness. The Canadian branch of Sir Fred Clarke's *Res Britannica* remained in some way inseparable from its British origins. The Quebec nationalist Jean-Guy Labarre

[3] C.P. Champion, "A Very British Coup: Canadianism, Quebec, and Ethnicity in the Flag Debate, 1964-65," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 40, 3 (Autumn 2006), 68-99.

predicted in 1962 that any new Canadian flag would retain the character of another "pavillon rouge," the flag of the dominant Anglo-Canadian nation. It is possible to conceive of the Maple Leaf as a flag of uniformity and conformity imposed by politicians mainly from Ontario. Not only was the *feuille d'érable rouge* a largely English Canadian exercise in reimagining the nation—what Matheson called an initiative "from British Canada." It was literally the project of a small cadre of Anglo-Canadians within the government and a few academic associates, some of whom had made the colonial pilgrimage to Oxford University, with French Canadians and non-British ethnic groups largely sidelined. In a sense the Maple Leaf did emerge from a small-town-dominated subset of the Anglo-Ontarian core *ethnie* within Canada's larger British amalgam—that particular species of Anglo-Canadian described by Scott Symons as the "Honest Ontario Grit farmer-squatter-made-good," men cut from the cloth of a Massey or a Pearson.

Whether or not such Canadianized symbols were truly the product of a long-term evolution in national consciousness (as some of Pearson's supporters asserted) is open to dispute. This Whiggish explanation, by itself, is unlikely to command much credibility in the context of recent scholarship on the nature of nationalist movements. But whether it did or not, the Maple Leaf nevertheless emerged from a predominantly British milieu. The flag's designers were products of a "British-Canadian" formation. In Hobsbawm and Ranger's terms, "new traditions could be readily grafted on old ones,"[4] and in certain ways the new flag is a case in point, particularly when it is flown amongst 13 provincial and territorial flags the majority of which contain overt British heraldic devices. And yet, because of its lack of obvious historical symbols and references to "founding" ethnic groups, and due to its simple, bold logo-like design, the Maple Leaf is more easily accepted as the flag "of all" or at least *many* Canadians, and is one of the world's most easily and widely recognized flags.

[4] Hobsbawm and Ranger, 6.

Blair Fraser's assertion that the flag debate of 1964 pitted "those who wanted Canada's symbols to be British [sic]" against "those who wanted them to be Canadian"[5] was a false dichotomy and one that implied conformity to a pure and uniform Canadian ideology defined by Ottawa. Scholars, however patriotically Canadian they may be, are not supposed to acquiesce in the received wisdom, or in a commonly-held understanding of the popular imagination. Although some have interpreted Britishness as an attempt to impose a single ethnic identity upon Canada, there is another way of looking at the subject. Sir Halford Mackinder's argument that "The real freedom of men requires scope for a full life in their own locality"[6] may be applied to the development of distinctive Canadianism that fulfilled, rather than rejected, this British ideal. There is evidence to suggest, as Chapter 7 tried to show, that the new flag manifested the local nationalism of one part of the British world, and did not entail as sharp a break with the past as is commonly assumed.

The Canadianism of the mid-20th century evolved not as a monolithic and undifferentiated Canadianism, but as a mosaic of many elements. The British foundations of Canadianism—far from being eliminated—instead took on a quieter, perhaps "underground" role represented by the red and white of the flag. To paraphrase Donald Akenson, Britishness in Canada "remained … as a perduring stream, subterranean, but still partially determining personal behaviour, and this long after the individuals in question have ceased to think of themselves as [British]."[7] This was a Britishness that apparently transcended ethnicity, since it survived the decline of the formerly dominant Wasp *ethnie* and took on new forms in Canadian life that went beyond Anglo-Celtic ethnic origins and attached itself to a variety of hybrid identities. It is therefore inadequate to reduce Britishness to an expression of ethnic particularism.

[5] Fraser, *Search for Identity*, 235.
[6] Mackinder, loc. cit.
[7] Akenson, *Irish in Ontario*, xx-xxi

Canadian Britishness has too long been depicted as a foreign influence, the "British connection" that had to be cut in order for true Canadianism to come into its own. The role of Britishness has often been reduced to that of a *retardant* on Canadian progress towards independence. Terry Crowley implied that *bona fide* Canadian nationalists like the Skeltons were careful not to "[fall] back on the Britishness in which Mackenzie King sometimes wallowed [sic]."[8] This is one way to interpret the British inheritance. While historians have emphasized the distinctiveness of Canadians and the emergence of Canada from its colonial past, this separation has been overdrawn. As Hobsbawm and Ranger observed, "all historians, whatever else their objectives, consciously or not, contribute to the creation, dismantling and restructuring of images of the past."[9] In the Canadian context, even some of the most recent books, published in 2005 and 2006, have reinforced a nationalist interpretation and have thus neglected a complex spectrum of values, ethnicities, and multiple identities.

The "othering" of certain forms of Britishness can be compared to historic othering based on class, gender, ethnicity, and a version of Canadian history that portrayed Britishness as other. Historians have played a significant role in the isolation and denigration of the British other, in the sense that "orientalist" Western scholars are said to have defined categories in the Middle East for their own purposes.[10] The Oxford sojourn seems to have played a key role in the development of this sense of ambivalance, difference and otherness, which was not unique to Canadians but was shared by Australians, South Africans, New Zealanders, and even British-born Britishers.

---

[8] Crowley, 8.
[9] Hobsbawm and Ranger, 13.
[10] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979); John MacKenzie, *Orientalism: History, Theory, and the Arts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995).

The Pearson governments and their supporters, though at pains to present a distinctive Canadianism, were themselves conscious of continuities as well as departures from the past. The flag necessarily drew upon a military and imperial heritage steeped in the British legacy. Just as distinctive army, navy, and air force service identities survived in a Canadianized guise, much Canadian Britishness in the country's institutions was reimagined but nonetheless preserved.

The Skeltonian image of a colony struggling for freedom—the "usable past" that was preferred by many 1960s nationalists—was in many ways a fabrication. Canada was not a post-colonial state but a kind of *minor colonial power*, the legatee and executor, as cultural historians remind us, of settlers and colonizers.[11] Just as Canada began as a colonial enterprise—first French, then British—it remained, in many ways, an organically British society, the multicultural child of a multiracial Empire. During the 1960s, Canada transformed itself into "an invented nation that was not founded on the suppression of older loyalties so much as superimposed on them," as Linda Colley wrote of Great Britain in the 18th century.[12] Whatever was described subsequently as "the Canadian identity" or "identities," in other words, may in some sense amount to layers of *encrustations* over the underlying historical and cultural legacies. What remain, as Will Kymlicka has said, are two pillars, "the rejection of assimilationist policies and the acceptance of a duty to accommodate"[13]—both of which can be understood as legacies of liberal imperialism.

Buried underneath these layers, in a sense, there remains the question of Anglo-Canadian, Wasp, or Anglo-Celtic ethnicities. It is a highly complex set of interlocking ethnicities and

---

[11] Bonita Lawrence, "Rewriting Histories of the Land: Colonization and Indigenous Resistance in Eastern Canada," in Sherene H. Razack, ed., *Race, space, and the law: unmapping a white settler society* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2002), 26.
[12] Colley, "Britishness and Otherness," 327.
[13] Will Kymlicka, "Canadian Multiculturalism in Historical and Comparative Perspective," in M. Zachariah et al., eds., *Canadian Multiculturalism: Dreams, Realities, Expectations* (Edmonton: Canadian Multicultural Education Foundation, 2004), 172.

identities—a mosaic within the mosaic—in which English, Scottish, Irish, and Scots-Irish have differentiated themselves and participated in mutual "othering" that belies oversimplified classifications of monolithic Britishness. Gender was a component in this mosaic-within-the-mosaic. Symbolic order Britishness was largely constructed and gendered by males, along masculine lines, defined and determined in the public sphere by the decisions and choices of men. If the Parliaments of the 1960s included several female members and the electorate consisted of a large percentage of female eligible voters, nonetheless the Ottawa Men were, as would be expected of the early and mid-20th century Canadian public service elite, male, white, and privileged. It has been argued that maleness and enthusiasm for Empire were "entwined" in the late 19th century.[14] It might be expected to follow, then, that masculinity would be associated with the Britishness of quasi-Imperial symbols like the Red Ensign, carried into battle by Canadians in 20th century wars. Yet the few invocations of masculinity or manliness in the flag debate tended to occur among the supporters of a maple leaf design, as when Matheson praised the "gallantry" of his opponents. By the 1960s, it was the old British connection that could be portrayed as lacking in vigour, while the Maple Leaf and its sponsors emerged as more "masculine." The Red Ensign's apparent loss of masculinity, the weakened symbolism of a once-virile battle flag, and in turn the presumed vitality of the Maple Leaf, might perhaps provide an interesting role reversal: but this promising tangent must be pursued in another study. The point is that if, as Phillip Buckner maintains, there was once a common English Canadian identity broadly defined as "British," then it must also be admitted that there was not a linear progression from British to Canadian. There were also underlying complexities variegated according to class, gender, ethnicity, and the interaction of multiple identities.

[14] Paul Ward, *Britishness Since 1870* (London: Routledge, 2004), 38.

Pearson and his associates in some ways resembled the nation-building postcolonial elites of Asia or Africa, some of them also Oxford-trained, who sought to "divest themselves of their imperial heritage … while simultaneously preserving and adapting their ethnic cultural heritage," as Anthony D. Smith has written, and while also avoiding "too sharp a repudiation of that heritage."[15] If they superimposed Canadian symbols, they did not repudiate Britishness or the British connection. As Smith's theory of an aristocratic lateral *ethnie* predicts, Pearson and his associates achieved something that was less one of invention than of "reconstructing" the country's ethnic core and "integrating its culture with the requirements of a modern state and with the aspirations of minority communities."[16] Anglo-Canadian Britishness was not destroyed, nor was a completely new nation "imagined" into being.

Traditionalist opponents of what the present thesis calls the "confrontation with Britishness" may not have recognized it at first, but the changes from 1964-68 did not only dislodge overt British symbols. The process also reinforced the underlying Britishness behind the new symbolic order, as in 1967 when the Victoria Cross was left intact as the highest honour that could be awarded to Canadians, despite the founding of the Order of Canada. Another way of looking at it was that Canada remained an organically British society, responding to the changing times, without altering its essence. As in colonial Upper Canada, the choice lay between replicating British models, or adapting the British *spirit* in the local context. It is here that there is a continuity between a liberal, non-flag-waving imperialism and the quieter Canadianism of Pearson's peers.[17]

---

[15] Smith, *National Identity*, 102.
[16] Ibid., 111.
[17] That "Canadians have become a flag-flying people once again" (cf. Fraser, preface, *The Flags of Canada*) since the 1970s was not necessarily Pearson's intention. As Matheson observed, Pearson the liberal internationalist would have preferred a world without national flags. The revival of Canadian flag-waving in recent times is thus suggestive of continuity with the imperial flag-waving of an earlier era.

It is usually assumed that the successors of Carl Berger's imperial nationalists were the "lamenting" Tory intellectuals of the 1950s and 1960s. Berger, for example, described *Lament for a Nation* as "a depressing footnote" to the imperial-nationalist vision.[18] However, this may be a mistake. Instead, it might make more sense to think of Pearson and his Liberal associates as the true heirs of the G.T. Denison circle. At first glance they appear to have taken opposite positions: the imperialists pro-British and the Pearsonians anti-British. But it would seem that the two were in fact both pro-British *and* patriotically Canadian.

Berger's circle and Pearson's associates both, in their different ways, viewed Canada as a "better Britain." Intellectuals and "men of action," most of them born and raised in Ontario, they were both dedicated to a vision of the country that would transcend its limitations, and were both accused of the same "overestimation of Canadian capacities."[19] The great difference between them was that unlike Berger's imperialists, the Liberal group that may be called Eminent Pearsonians found themselves in a position to *implement* many of their ideas in government in order to save the nation. F.H. Underhill wrote that "politically," Mackenzie King "did not die until 1957,"[20] when the Liberal dynasty that had held power since 1935 fell to Diefenbaker's Conservatives. However, the British Canadianness of King's generation continued to influence the Pearson governments of 1963-68, the imperialists' liberal inheritors, in changing forms that were always adjusting to new realities.

Some are persuaded that the Trudeau era put a decisive end to the Britishness of Canada. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms of 1982 seemed, in significant ways, to displace the English common law tradition. A new civic identity seemed to have replaced the old, ostensibly ethnic identity. Yet according to others, the sense of Canadianness provided by the Charter, which also

---

[18] Berger, 265.
[19] Berger, 261; on the overestimation of Pearson, cf. Chapnick, op. cit.
[20] Underhill, *In Search of Canadian Liberalism*, xiv.

reinforced official multiculturalism, provided too inchoate a concept to constitute a new "distinct and firm and recognizably Canadian" identity. According to Neil Bissoondath, "a void remains, a lack of a new and definable centre."[21] For public intellectuals like Bissoondath and Ignatieff, there remained little that was concrete at the centre of Canadian identity that could fill the place of the old Britishness.

Still, even from the 1970s until more recent times, there have remained strong undercurrents of Britishness in Canadian life that suggested that it was alive and well. When Walter Stewart was asked by an interviewer in 1979 how Canada was doing, Stewart replied that the country was "still ticking over and muddling through in the old British tradition."[22] The Nova Scotia-born journalist Robert MacNeil, best known for his career in public broadcasting in the United States, in 1991 praised the "Britishness at the heart of everything" in Canada.[23] Parliament, the legislatures and the courts, police, armed forces, elements of the public and foreign service, university administrations, banks, and businesses carried out their daily activities and intercourse in a quietly, often unconsciously, British manner that is commonly accepted as "Canadian." Like the blood royal of uncrowned offspring of long-dethroned monarchs, Britishness continued to flow almost imperceptibly in Canadian veins. Perhaps this suggestion strays too far in the direction of constructing Britishness as a catch-all for everything that happens in Canada. But perhaps, after all, British ways did remain, though unacknowledged, somehow at the core of English Canadian identities.

Canadians over time developed a society that can be contrasted with that of their counterparts from the Victorian era to the Second World War. But contemporary Britons

---

[21] Bissoondath, 77.

[22] Walter Stewart to a National Film Board interviewer in "What the hell's going on up there?" NFB production, 1979.

[23] Robert MacNeil, "Looking for My Country," *American Review of Canadian Studies*, XXI (1991), 410, quoted in Cannadine, loc. cit., 14. MacNeil called it "the *wonderful little* Britishness," but that is the voice of an enthusiast.

underwent a comparable process, with the Labour government declaring in the 1990s that the United Kingdom is “a land of immigrants,” an epoch-making role reversal for the source of Britannia’s diaspora.[24] “Diversity is the product of life and growth,” wrote C.P. Lucas in *The Story of the Empire* in 1923, and “the more a living thing, plant, or animal, grows the more it differs from its first beginning.” What Lucas said of the interwar Commonwealth applies equally to Canada: “There has been no imposing of uniformity in the parts any more than in the whole … the absence of fusion coupled with the strain of continuity.”[25] Within Lucas’ description, of course, lies the liberal assumption that liberalism does not impose its own uniformity, the “liberal order framework.” Taking the many perspectives into account, the construct or imagined community that emerged at the end of the 1960s as a result of the confrontation with Britishness was that of a multicultural country within a bilingual and liberal framework that was, in many ways, the natural hybrid successor state to a multiracial Empire, a fulfillment, and not a rejection, of liberal imperialism. With all of its fusions, diversities, and continuities, the *Res Canadiana*, envisioned as distinctively Canadian, remains the product of a British world.

[24] Cf. Champion, Review of Richards, op. cit., in *Canadian Ethnic Studies* XXXVII, 2 (2005), 124-5.
[25] C.P. Lucas, *The Story of the Empire* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1923), 269, 276.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archives and Personal Papers Consulted

Archives du Centre de Recherche Lionel-Groulx, Montreal

Lionel Groulx Papers
André Laurendeau Papers
Anatole Vanier Papers

University of Toronto Archives, Toronto

Vincent Massey Papers

Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa

Alan Beddoe Papers
Gordon Churchill Papers
Davie Fulton Papers
King Gordon Papers
Stanley Haidasz Papers
A.D.P. Heeney Papers
Paul T. Hellyer Papers
John Matheson Papers
Roland Michener Papers
H. de M. Molson Papers
J. Waldo Monteith Papers
Wally Nesbitt Papers
Terry Nugent Papers
L.B. Pearson Papers
J.W. Pickersgill Papers
Gordon Robertson Papers
N.A. Robertson Papers
Graham Spry Papers
F.H. Underhill Papers
Georges P. Vanier Papers
Charlotte Whitton Papers

Directorate of History and Heritage / Department of National Defence, Ottawa

J.V. Allard Papers
R.L. Raymont Papers
N.A. Kellett Fonds

University of British Columbia Archives and Special Collections, Vancouver

H.R. MacMillan Papers
Mitsuru Shimpo Papers

McGill University Rare Books, Montreal

Hugh MacLennan Papers

Queen's University Archives, Kingston

A.R.M. Lower Papers

Periodicals

Calgary Herald
Canadian Commentator
Canadian Forum
Canadian Independence Magazine
Canadian Republic
Chronicle-Telegraph (Quebec)
Corriere Canadese
Courier de Saint-Hyacinthe
Der Nordwesten
Deutsche Courier
Deutsche Zeitung
Echo du Nord
Esprit de Corps
Globe and Mail
Głos Polski
January Magazine
Kanadai Magyar Ujság
L'Action
La Presse
Le Devoir
Le Soleil
Literary Review of Canada
Maclean's
McGill News
Montreal Gazette
Montreal Star
Montréal-Matin
Nederlandse Courier
News Chronicle (London, Ont.)
Ottawa Citizen
Ottawa Journal
Polish Voice
Saturday Night
Toronto Star
Toronto Sun
Ukrainian Weekly
Ukrainske Zhyttia
United Church Observer
Vancouver Sun
Vilne Slovo
Winnipeg Free Press
Winnipeg Tribune

Published Sources

Achard, Eugène. *L'Histoire du drapeau canadien.* Montréal: Librairie générale canadienne, 1944.

Acheson, Dean. *Morning and Noon*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Adams, D.K. ed., *Britain and Canada in the 1990s: proceedings of a UK/Canada Colloquium.* Ottawa: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1992.

Akenson, Donald Harman. *The Irish in Ontario: A Study in Rural History*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984.

Allard, Jean V. and Serge Bernier, *The Memoirs of General Jean V. Allard*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1988.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.

Anderson, Grace M. "Voting Behaviour and the Ethnic-Religious Variable: A Study of A Federal Election in Hamilton, Ontario," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* XXXII, 1 (February 1966), 27-37.

Archambault, Peter. "Too Much 'Britishness' or Not Enough? The Canadian Naval Mutinies of 1949." Unpublished paper presented to the International Commission on Maritime History, Calgary, 28 June 1998.

Archbold, Rick. *I Stand for Canada: The Story of the Maple leaf Flag*. Toronto: MacFarlane, Walter & Ross, 2002.

Armstrong, Pat. "Missing Women: A Feminist Perspective on The Vertical Mosaic," in Rick Helmes-Hayes and James Curtis, eds., *The Vertical Mosaic Revisited.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Axworthy, Tom. “Public Opinion and Canadian Defence Policy: A Case Study of Unification,” December 1968, 8 n. 10, 12. Unpublished typescript in Paul T. Hellyer Papers, Vol. 67.

Ayre, W. Burton. *Mr. Pearson and Canada’s Revolution by Diplomacy.* Montreal: Wallace Press, 1966.

Bagnell, Kenneth. “The Churchman who could be our next Prime Minister,” *United Church Observer*, 15 March 1966, 12-15, 40.

Balcer, Leon.. *Leon Balcer Raconte*. Sillery: Septentrion, 1988.

Barman, Jean. *Growing Up British in British Columbia*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1984.

Beal, John Robinson. *The Pearson Phenomenon*. Toronto: Longmans, 1964.

Beck, J. Murray. *Joseph Howe,* Vol. I, *Conservative Reformer, 1804-1848;* Vol. II, *The Briton Becomes Canadian, 1848-1873*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1982.

-----. “The Pearson Government after six months,” *Queen’s Quarterly*, LXX (Winter 1964), 465-74.

Bélanger, Réal. “L’élite politique canadienne-française et l’Empire britannique: trois reflets représentatifs des perceptions canadiennes-françaises 1890-1917,” in Colin Coates, ed., *Imperial Canada, 1867-1917*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1997.

Belich, James. “Neo-Britains,” unpublished paper presented to the first “British World” conference, London, 9 August 1998, cited in Phillip Buckner, “Was there a

'British' Empire?" *The Oxford History of the British Empire* from a Canadian perspective," *Acadiensis*, 32 (Autumn 2002), 111-28.

-----. *Making Peoples: A History of New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century*. Auckland: Allen Lane, 1996.

-----. *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001.

Benvenuti, Andrea and Stuart Ward. "Britain, Europe and the 'Other Quiet Revolution' in Canada," in Phillip Buckner, ed. *Canada and the End of Empire.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004.

Bercuson, David J. *True Patriot: The Life of Brooke Claxton, 1899-1960.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Berger, Carl. *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970,

-----. *The Writing of Canadian History.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Bernier, Serge. *The Royal 22e Regiment, 1914-1999.* Tr. by Charles Phillips. Montreal: Art Global, 2000.

Bhabha, Homi K., ed. *Nation and Narration*. London: New York: Routledge, 1990.

Biron, Luc-André. *Le drapeau canadien*. Montréal: Les Éditions de l'Homme, 1962.

Bissell, Claude. *The Young Vincent Massey.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Black, Jerome and Christian Leithner. "Immigrants and Political Involvement in Canada: The Role of the Ethnic Media." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* XX, 1 (1988), 1-19.

-----. "Ethnic Minorities and Mass Politics in Canada: Some Observations in the Toronto Setting." *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 3, Spring 1991.

-----. "Immigrant Political Adaptation in Canada: Some Tentative Findings," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* XV, 1 March 1982.

Bliss, J.M. "The Methodist Church and World War I," *Canadian Historical Review* XLIX, 3 September 1968.

-----. *A Canadian Millionaire: The Life and Business Times of Sir Joseph Flavelle, Bart. 1858-1939* Toronto: Macmillan, 1978.

-----. *Banting: A Biography.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1984.

Bongiorno, Frank. "The Price of Nostalgia: Menzies, the 'Liberal' Tradition and Australian Foreign Policy." *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 51, 3 (2005) 400-17.

Booker, Christopher. *The Neophiliacs*: *a study of the revolution in English life in the Fifties and Sixties*. London: Collins, 1969.

Bothwell, Robert. "Breaking the Ties," *Literary Review of Canada*, April 2005.

-----. *Pearson: His Life and World.* Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1978.

-----, Ian Drummond, John English. *Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics, and Provincialism.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Bouchard, Gérard. *Les Deux Chanoines: Contradiction et ambivalence dans la pensée de Lionel Groulx.* Québec: Boréal, 2003.

Bowen, Roger, ed. *Innocence is Not Enough: The Life and Death of Herbert Norman.* Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre, 1986.

Boyd, M. "'Canadian, Eh?' Ethnic Origins Shifts in the Canadian Census," Research Paper No. 10. Ethnic Studies and Population Research Lab. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1998.

Brennan, Patrick H. "The Other Battle: Imperialist versus nationalist sympathies within the Officer Corps of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, 1914-1919." In Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, eds. *Rediscovering the British World.* Calgary: Calgary University Press, 2005.

Breton, Raymond. "The Production and Allocation of Symbolic Resources: An Analysis of the Linguistic and Ethnocultural Fields in Canada. "*Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* XXI, 2 1984, 123-44.

Bridge, Carl and Kent Fedorowich, eds. *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity*. London: Frank Cass, 2003.

Brimelow, Peter. *The Patriot Game: National Dreams and Political Realities*. Toronto: Key Porter, 1986.

Brock, Jeffry V. *The Thunder and the Sunshine.* Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1983.

Brown, Colin. "Church, Culture, and Identity: the New Zealand Experience." In David Novitz and Bill Willmott, eds., *Culture and Identity in New Zealand.* Wellington: GP Books, 1989.

Buckner P.A. and Carl Bridge. "Reinventing the British World." *The Round Table* 368 (2003), 77-88.

-----. "Introduction." *British Journal of Canadian Studies* 16.1 (2003), 1-6.

-----. "'Limited Identities' Revisited: Regionalism and Nationalism in Canadian History." *Acadiensis*, 301 (2001), 4-15.

-----. "Was there a 'British Empire'? *The Oxford History of the British Empire* from a Canadian perspective." *Acadiensis* 32 (Autumn 2002), 111-28.

-----. “Presidential Address: Whatever happened to the British Empire?” *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 4 (1993), 3-32.

----- and Carl Bridge, “Reinventing the British World,” *Round Table* 368 2003, 79.

----- and R. Douglas Francis, eds. *Canada and the British World*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006.

----- and R. Douglas Francis, eds. *Rediscovering the British World*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2005.

Bull, Stewart H., *The Queen’s York Rangers: An Historic Regiment.* Erin, Ont.: Boston Mills Press, 1984.

Bumsted, J.M. “The birthday party,” *The Beaver*, 76, 2, April 1996.

-----. “The Scots in Canada.” No. 1 of *Canada’s Ethnic Groups*. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1982.

Burke, David P. “Hellyer and Landymore: The Unification of the Canadian Armed Forces and an Admiral’s Revolt,” *American Review of Canadian Studies* 8, 2 (1978), 3-27.

Burnet Jean R. and Howard Palmer. “*Coming Canadians”: An Introduction to a History of Canada’s Peoples.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart / Ministry of Supply and Services, 1988.

Byers, R.B. “The nature of military professionalism.” In R.B. Byers and Colin S. Gray, eds., *Canadian Military Professionalism: the search for identity*. Canadian Institute of International Affairs Wellesley Paper No. 2, February 1973.

Cameron, Elspeth. *Earle Birney: A Life.* Toronto: Viking, 1994.

-----. *Hugh MacLennan: A Writer”s Life.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Careless, J.M.S. "'Limited Identities' in Canada," *Canadian Historical Review* 50 (March 1969).

-----. *Careless At Work: Selected Canadian Historical Studies.* Toronto: Dundurn, 1990.

Carrington, Charles. *Rudyard Kipling: His Life and Work.* London: Penguin, 1986.

Champion, C.P. "A Very British Coup: Canadianism, Quebec, and Ethnicity in the Flag Debate, 1964-65," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 40, 3 (Autumn 2006), 68-99.

-----. "Confronting Britishness in the Canadian Armed Forces 1964-68," *British Journal of Canadian Studies* 19.1 (2006), forthcoming.

-----. "Mike Pearson at Oxford: War, Varsity and Canadianism," *Canadian Historical Review* 88, 2 (June 2007), forthcoming.

-----. "Eminent Pearsonians: Britishness, Anti-Britishness, and Canadianism." Journal of the Canadian Historical Association XVI (2005), forthcoming.

-----. "Courting 'Our Ethnic Friends': Canadianism, Britishness, and New Canadians." Canadian Ethnic Studies XXXVIII, 1 (2006), 23-46.

Chapnick, Adam. *The Middle Power Project: Canada and the Founding of the United Nations.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2005.

Christian, William, ed. *George Grant: Selected Letters.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Christie, N.M. ed. *Letters of Agar Adamson, 1914-1919.* Nepean: CEF Books, 1997.

Clarke, F. "British with a small 'b.'" *Nineteenth Century* CXIX, 710 (April 1936), 428-39.

Coates, Colin M., ed. *Imperial Canada 1867-1917.* Edinburgh: Centre of Canadian Studies, 1997.

-----. *Majesty in Canada: Essays on the Role of Royalty*. Toronto: Dundurn, 2006.

Cohen, Andrew. *While Canada Slept: How We Lost Our Place in the World*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2003.

Cole, Douglas L. "Canada's 'Nationalistic' Imperialists." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 5:3 August 1970, 44-50.

Colley, Linda. "Britishness and otherness: an argument." *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992), 309-329.

-----. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837.* London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Collins, Eugene L. "The Case for a Maple Leaf Flag." *Canadian Commentator* II, 6 (June 1958).

Colville, John. *The Fringes of Power: 10 Downing Street Diaries 1939-1955.* London: W.W. Norton, 1985.

Connor, Ralph [the Rev. C.W. Gordon]. *The Gay Crusader.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1936.

-----. *The Major.* Toronto: McClelland, Goodchild & Stewart, 1917.

Cook, Jack. *The Eleven Point Maple leaf*. Ottawa: Canada"s Four Corners, 2004.

Cook, Ramsay, ed. *The Craft of History.* Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1973.

-----. *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

Corbett, D.C. *Percy Ellwood Corbett: Draft Biography*. Typescript, P.E. Corbett Papers, McGill University Rare Books Division.

Corbett, P.E. “Isolation for Canada?” University of Toronto Quarterly VI (1936-7) [PAGES].

-----. *Britain: Partner for Peace.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1946.

-----. “Impressions–Mostly Oxonian.” Typescript, P.E. Corbett Papers, McGill University Rare Books Division.

Cosentino, Frank. “Afros, Aboriginals and Amateur Sport in Pre World War One Canada.” *Canada’s Ethnic Group* No. 26. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1998.

Cowley, Deborah ed., *Georges Vanier—Soldier: The Wartime, Letters and Diaries 1915-1919.* Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2000.

Creighton, D.G. “Macdonald and the Anglo-Canadian Alliance.” In *Towards the Discovery of Canada: Selected Essays.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1972.

-----. Presidential Address. *Report of the annual meeting.* Canadian Historical Association *Historical Papers* (1957), 1-12.

-----. *Canada’s First Century*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1967.

-----. *The Forked Road: Canada 1939-1957.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.

-----. *The Passionate Observer: Selected Writings.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1980.

Crowley, Terry. *Marriage of Minds: Isabel and Oscar Skelton Reinventing Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.

Dallaire, Romeo. *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda.* Toronto: Random House, 2003.

Davies, David Twiston. *Canada From Afar: The Daily Telegraph Book of Canadian Obituaries.* Toronto: Dundurn, 1996.

Davies, Robertson. *Tempest Tost.* Toronto: Viking, 1980.

-----. *The Diary of Samuel Marchbanks.* Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1947.

-----. *What's Bred in the Bone.* New York: Viking, 1985.

Day, David. *The Reluctant Nation: Australia and the Allied Defeat of Japan, 1942-45.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Day, Richard J.F. *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Deacon, William Arthur. *My Vision of Canada* Toronto: Ontario Publishing Company, 1933.

Delaney, Douglas E. "The soldiers' general: Bert Hoffmeister as military commander," Royal Military College Ph.D. diss. 2004.

-----. *The soldiers' general: Bert Hoffmeister at war*. (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2005.

Deslandes, Paul R. *Oxbridge Men: British Masculinity and the Undergraduate Experience, 1850-1920*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Deutschmann, Linda Bell. "Decline of the Wasp? Dominant Group Identity in the Ethnic Plural Society." In M. L. Kovacs, ed. *Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education.* Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1978.

DeVos, George, and Lola Romanucci-Ross, eds. *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change.* Palo Alto: Mayfield, 1975.

Diefenbaker, John G. *One Canada: Memoirs of the Rt. Hon. John G. Diefenbaker,* Vol. III: *The Tumultuous Years.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1977.

Dixson, M. *The imaginary Australian: Anglo-Celts and identity, 1788 to the present.* Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1999.

Djwa, Sandra. *The Politics of the Imagination: A Life of F.R. Scott.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1988.

Donaghy, Greg and Stéphane Roussel. *Escott Reid.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004.

Donald H. Akenson, "The Historiography of English-Speaking Canada and the Concept of Diaspora: A Sceptical Appreciation." *Canadian Historical Review* 76, 3 (1995), 377-409.

Dreisziger, Fred N. "Rise of a Bureaucracy for Multiculturalism: the Origins of the Nationalities Branch." In N. Hillmer, et al., eds., *On Guard for Thee: War, Ethnicity, and the Canadian State, 1939-1945.* Ottawa: Department of Supply and Services, 1989.

-----. "Watson Kirkconnell and the cultural credibility gap between immigrants and the native-born in Canada." In M.L. Kovacs, ed. *Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education.* Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1978.

Drushka, Ken. *HR: A Biography of H.R. MacMillan.* Madeira Park, BC: Harbour Publishing, 1995.

Dunae, Patrick A. *Gentlemen Emigrants: From the British Public Schools to the Canadian Frontier.* Toronto: Douglas McIntyre, 1981.

Duncan, Sara Jeanette. *The Imperialist.* New Canadian Library. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1971.

Durflinger, Serge. "Owing allegiance: the British community in Verdun, Quebec during the Second World War." *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXXVI, 1, March 2004.

Eayrs, James. "Canada Pioneers the Single Service," *The Round Table* 234 (April 1969).

Eldridge, C.C. *Kith and Kin: Canada, Britain and the United States from the Revolution to the Cold War.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1997.

Elson, Christopher, ed. *Dear Reader: Selected Scott Symons.* Toronto: Gutter Press, 1998.

English, Allan D. *Understanding Military Culture: a Canadian Perspective.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004.

English, John. *Shadow of Heaven: The Life of Lester Pearson 1897-1948.* Toronto: Lester and Orpen Dennys, 1989.

-----. *The Worldly Years: The Life of Lester Pearson 1949-1972.* Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.

Errington, Jane. *The Lion, The Eagle, and Upper Canada.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 1987.

Ewart, John S. "Imperial Unity—How Much Remains? Flags and Citizens." *The Canadian Republic.* April 1930.

Ewart, John S. "The Canadian Flag," in The Kingdom of Canada: Imperial Federation, the Colonial Conferences, the Alaska Boundary, and Other Essays. Toronto: Morang & Co., 1908.

Fairclough, Ellen Louks. *Saturday's Child: Memoirs of Canada's First Female Cabinet Minister.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.

Farmer, Bernard J. *Go West, Young Man.* Toronto: Nelson, 1936.

Farthing, John. *Freedom Wears a Crown* Toronto: Kingswood House, 1957.

Finlay, Karen. *The Force of Culture: Vincent Massey and Canadian Sovereignty* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

FitzGerald, James. *Old Boys: the. Powerful Legacy of Upper Canada College* Toronto: Macfarlane Walter & Ross, 1995.

Ford, George H. ed. *The Making of a Secret Agent.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.

Forsey, Eugene. *A Life on the Fringe: The Memoirs of Eugene Forsey.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Francis, R. Douglas. *Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Fraser, Alistair B. "A Canadian Flag for Canada," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 25, 4 April 1991 64-80;

-----. *The Flags of Canada.* Published online at http://fraser.cc/FlagsCan/, 1998.

Fraser, Blair. *The Search for Identity: Canada 1945–1967.* Toronto: Doubleday, 1967.

French, Goldwin. "The Evangelical Creed in Canada." In W.L. Morton, ed. *The Shield of Achilles.* Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1968.

-----. "The People Called Methodists in Canada." In John Webster Grant, ed. *The Churches and the Canadian Experience.* Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1963.

Frenette, Yves. “The Anglo-Normans in Eastern Canada.” No. 21 of “Canada’s Ethnic Groups. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1996.

Galloway, Strome, ed. *Beddoe’s Canadian Heraldry*. Belleville: Mika Publishing, 1981.

-----. *The General Who Never Was.* Belleville: Mika, 1981.

Gare, Deborah. “Britishness in Recent Australian Historiography.” *Historical Journal* 43, 4 (December 2000), 1145-55.

Gauvreau, Michael. *The Catholic Origins of Quebec”s Quiet Revolution 1931-1970.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2005.

Gibbon, J.M. *Canadian Mosaic: The Making of a Northern Nation.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1938.

Gingras, Marcel. *Diefenbaker et le Canada français* Vanier, Ont.: Éditions L”Interligne, 1997

Glover, William. “Colonial or Canadian?” in Hadley et al., eds., *A Nation’s Navy.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1996.

Granatstein, J.L. “All Things to All Men: Triservice Unification.” In Stephen Clarkson, ed. *An Independent Foreign Policy for Canada?* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968.

-----. “The American Influence on the Canadian Military.” In B.D. Hunt and R.G. Haycock, eds. *Canada’s Defence.* Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1993.

-----. *A Man of Influence: Norman A. Robertson and Canadian Statecraft, 1929-68.* Ottawa: Deneau, 1981.

-----. *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation.* Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1986.

-----. *Canada"s Army: Waging War and Keeping the Peace.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

-----. *How Britain"s weakness forced Canada into the arms of the United States* University of Toronto Press, 1989.

-----. *The Ottawa Men: The Civil Service Mandarins 1935-57.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982, rpt. 1998.

-----. *Who Killed the Canadian Military? What Canada Must Do to Defend Itself in the 21st Century.* Toronto: HarperCollins, 2004.

----- and Norman Hillmer. *Prime Ministers: Rating Canada's Leaders.* Toronto: HarperCollins, 1999.

Grant, George. "The Empire: Yes or No?" Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1945, rpt. in William Christian and Sheila Grant, eds., *The George Grant Reader.* University of Toronto Press, 1998.

-----. *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism.* Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005.

Grant, Judith Skelton, ed., *For Your Eye Alone: The Letters of Robertson Davies.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1999.

Graves, Robert. *Goodbye to All That.* London: Cassell, 1957.

Greenhill, Pauline. *Ethnicity in the Mainstream: Three Studies of English Canadian Culture in Ontario.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.

Greenhous, Brereton. Dr*agoon: The Centennial History of the Royal Canadian Dragoons, 1883-1983.* Ottawa: Guild of the Royal Canadian Dragoons, 1983.

Greenlee, James G. "Canadian External Affairs 1867-1957," *Historical Journal* 27, 2 (1984).

Gwyn, Sandra. *Tapestry of War.* Toronto: HarperCollins, 1992.

Hadley, Michael L., Rob Huebert, Fred W. Crickard. *A Nation's Navy. In Quest of Canadian Naval identity*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.

Haliburton, E.D. *My Years with Stanfield.* Windsor, N.S.: Lancelot Press, 1972.

Hanly, Charles. "A psychoanalysis of national sentiment." In Peter Russell, ed. *Nationalism in Canada.* Toronto, McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Harbron, John D. "The Conservative Party and National Unity," *Queen's Quarterly*, LXIX, Autumn 1962.

Hasek, John. *The Disarming of Canada.* Toronto: Key Porter, 1987.

Hastings, Selina. *Evelyn Waugh: A Biography.* London: Minerva, 1995.

Haycock, Ronald. *Sam Hughes: the public career of a controversial Canadian.* Waterloo and Ottawa: Wilfrid Laurier University Press and the Canadian War Museum, 1986.

Hayden, Michael. *So Much To Do, So Little Time: The Writings of Hilda Neatby.* Vancouver: UBC Press, 1983.

Heeney, Arnold. *The Things that are Caesar's: Memoirs of a Canadian Public Servant.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

Heick, Wolf H. ed. *History and Myth: Arthur Lower and the Making of Canadian Nationalism.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1975.

Hellyer, Paul. *Damn the Torpedoes: My Fight to Unify Canada's Armed Forces.* Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990.

Helmes-Hayes, Rick, and James Curtis, eds., *The Vertical Mosaic Revisited.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Henshaw, Peter. "John Buchan and the British Imperial Origins of Canadian Multiculturalism." In Adam Chapnick and Norman Hillmer, eds. *Twentieth-Century Canadian Nationalisms* McGill-Queen's University Press, forthcoming.

Hillmer, Norman, ed. *Pearson*: *The Unlikely Gladiator.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.

-----. "The Anglo-Canadian Neurosis: The Case of O.D. Skelton," in Peter Lyon, ed., *Britain and Canada.* London: Frank Cass, 1976, 61-84.

Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Canto, 1983.

Hodgetts, J.E. ed. *The Sound of One Voice: Eugene Forsey and his letters to the press.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Holmes, John W. "The Anglo-Canadian Neurosis: A Mood of Exasperation." *The Round Table* 223, July 1966.

-----. *The Better Part of Valour: Essays on Canadian Diplomacy.* Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1970.

-----. *The Shaping of Peace.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

-----. *Life with Uncle: The Canadian-American Relationship.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Hopkins, A.G. “Back to the Future: From National History to Imperial History.” *Past and Present* 164, 1999.

Horowitz, Gad. *Canadian Labour in Politics.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

Horton, Donald J. *André Laurendeau: French Canadian Nationalist, 1912-1968.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Houston, Cecil J. and William J. Smyth. *The Sash Canada Wore: A Historical Geography of the Orange Order in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

Iacovetta, Franca. “Making Model Citizens: Gender, Corrupted Democracy, and Immigrant and Refugee Reception Work in Cold War Canada.” In G. Kinsman, et al., eds. *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies.* Toronto: Between the Lines Press, 2000.

-----. *Such Hardworking People: Italian Immigrants in Postwar Toronto*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1992.

Igartua, José E. “‘Ready, Aye, Ready’ No More? Canada, Britain, and the Suez Crisis in the Canadian Press,” in Phillip Buckner, ed., *Canada and the End of Empire*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004, 47-65.

-----. “L’autre révolution tranquille: l’évolution du nationalisme canadien-anglais, 1945-1971.” In Gérard Bouchard and Yvan Lamonde, eds., *La nation dans tous ses États: le Québec en comparaison*. Montréal: l’Harmattan, 1997, 271-296.

-----. *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-71.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006.

-----. “L”autre révolution tranquille: le Canada anglais,” *Possibles* 23, 2 (Printemps 1999), 41-52.

Ignatieff, George. *The Making of a Peacemonger*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

Isajiw, Wsevolod W. “Definitions of Ethnicity,” *Ethnicity* I (1974), 111-124.

Jackson, A.Y. *A Painter’s Country: The Autobiography of A.Y. Jackson.* Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1963.

Jarvis, W. H. P. *The Letters of a Remittance Man to His Mother.* Toronto: Musson, 1907.

Jebb, Hubert Miles Gladwyn. *The memoirs of Lord Gladwyn*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972.

Jockel, Joseph T. *No Boundaries Upstairs: Canada, the United States, and the Origins of North American Air Defence, 1945-1958.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987.

Johnson, Gregory A. “The Last Gasp of Empire: The 1964 Flag Debate Revisited,” in Phillip Buckner, ed., *Canada and the End of Empire.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004.

Kalbach, Madeleine A.and Warren E. Kalbach, “Becoming Canadian: Problems of an Emerging Identity,” *Canadian Ethnic Studies* XXXI, 2, 1999, 1- 16.

Kaufmann, Eric P. “Condemned to Rootlessness: The Loyalist Origins of Canada’s Identity Crisis.” Published online.

-----. ed., *Rethinking Ethnicity: Majority groups and dominant minorities*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Keenleyside, Hugh L. *Memoirs of Hugh L. Keenleyside, Vol. 1: Hammer the Golden Day.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart 1981.

Kent, Tom. *A Very Public Purpose: An Experience of Liberal Opposition and Canadian Government*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988.

Kidd, Colin. "Ethnicity in the British Atlantic World, 1688-1830." In Kathleen Wilson, ed. *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, 260-77.

Kierans, Eric, with Walter Stewart, *Remembering.* Toronto: Stoddart, 2001.

Kirkconnell, Watson. *A Slice of Canada: Memoirs*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Kirschbaum, Joseph. *Slovaks in Canada.* Toronto: Ukrainian Echo Publishing, 1967.

-----. *Twenty Years of the Ethnic Press Association of Ontario.* Toronto: Ethnic Press Association of Ontario, 1971.

Knowles, N. *Inventing the Loyalists*: *The Ontario Loyalist Tradition and the Creation of Usable Pasts.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Kristmanson, Mark. *Plateaus of Freedom: Nationality, Culture, and State Security in Canada, 1920-1960.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.

Kronenberg, Vernon J. *All Together Now: The organization of the Department of National Defence in Canada, 1964-1972.* Toronto: Canadian Institute for International Affairs, 1973.

Kymlicka, Will. *Finding Our Way: rethinking ethnocultural relations in Canada.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Labarre, Jean-Guy. *Non à drapeau canadien.* Montréal: les Editions Actualité, 1962.

Lacombe, Sylvie. “Henri Bourassa: A Nationalist Leader Against British Imperialism.” *Journal of Indo-Canadian Studies* 2, 2 (July 2002).

-----. *La rencontre de deux peuples élus: Comparaison des ambitions nationale et impériale au Canada entre 1896 et 1920.* Québec: Les Presses de l’Université de Laval, 2002.

Langhorne, Richard, ed., *Diplomacy and Intelligence in the Second World War.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Leacock, Stephen. “Greater Canada: An Appeal,” University Magazine VI, 2 (1907), 132-41.

-----. *My Discovery of England.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1961.

-----. *My Discovery of the West*. Toronto: Thomas Allen, 1937.

-----. *Our British Empire: Its Structure, Its History, Its Strength.* London: J. Lane, 1940.

Leier, Mark. “Ethnicity, Urbanism, and the Labour Aristocracy: Rethinking Vancouver Trade Unionism, 1889-1909.” *Canadian Historical Review* LXXIV, 4 (1993), 513-14.

LePan, Douglas. *Bright Glass of Memory.* Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1979.

Levitt, Joseph. *A Vision Beyond Reach: A Century of Images of Canadian Destiny.* Ottawa: Deneau, 1982.

Lewis, David. *The Good Fight: Political Memoirs, 1909-1958.* Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1981.

Litt, Paul. *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1992.

Lower, A.R.M. "Centennial Ends: Centennial Begins." *Queen's Quarterly* LXXIV, 2, Summer 1967.

-----. *Colony to Nation.* Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946.

-----. *My First Seventy-five Years.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1967.

Lowry, Donal. "The Crown, Empire Loyalism and the Assimilation of Non-British White Subjects in the British World: An Argument against 'Ethnic Determinism.'" In Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich, eds. *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity*. London: Frank Cass, 2003, 96-120.

Lyon, Peter, ed. *Britain and Canada: Survey of a Changing Relationship*. London: Frank Cass, 1976.

Macdonald, A.L. *Speeches of Angus L. Macdonald.* Toronto: Longman, Green & Co., 1960.

MacInnes, Grace. *J.S. Woodsworth: A Man to Remember*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1953.

McKay, Ian. *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.

-----. "The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History." *Canadian Historical Review* 81, 4 (2000), 617-45.

Mackenzie, Compton. *Sinister Street*. London: Macdonald, 1913.

MacKenzie, David Clark. *Arthur Irwin: A Biography*. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Mackenzie, David. "Canada, the North Atlantic Triangle, and the Empire," in Judith M. Brown and Wm. Roger Louis, eds. *The Oxford History of the British Empire IV: The Twentieth Century.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

MacLaren, Roy. *Canadians Behind Enemy Lines, 1939-45*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1981.

MacLennan, Hugh. *Scotchman's Return*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1960.

Magee, Joan. *The Loyalist Mosaic: A Multi-Ethnic Heritage*. Toronto: Dundurn, 1984.

Manthorpe, Jonathan. *The Power of the Tories: Ontario Politics 1943-Present.* Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1974.

Marteinson, John and Scott Duncan, *The Governor-General's Horse Guards: Second to None.* Toronto: Robin Brass Studio, 2002.

Massey, Hector J. ed. *The Canadian Military: A Profile.* Toronto: Copp Clark, 1972.

Massey, Vincent. *What's Past is Prologue*: *The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Vincent Massey.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1963.

Massolin, Philip A. *Canadian intellectuals, the Tory tradition, and the challenge of modernity, 1939-1970*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Matheson, John Ross. *Canada's Flag: A Search for a Country*. Belleville, Ont.: Mika Publishing, 1986.

McAuliffe, Angela T. Bet*ween the Temple and the Cave: The Religious Dimensions of the Poetry of E.J. Pratt.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.

Mackinder, Halford J. *Democratic Ideals and Reality*. London: Constable, 1942.

McClean, Rosalind. "'How we prepare them in India': British Diasporic Imaginings and Migration to New Zealand." *New Zealand Journal of History*, 37, 2, October 2003.

McCormack, A. Ross. "Networks among British Immigrants and Accommodation to Canadian Society: Winnipeg, 1900-1914." *Social History* 17, 34 (November 1984), 357-74.

-----. "Cloth Caps and Jobs: The Ethnicity of English Immigrants in Canada, 1900-1914." In Jorgen Dahlie and Tissa Fernando, eds. *Ethnicity, Power and Politics in Canada*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1981.

McCreery, Christopher. *The Canadian Honours System.* Toronto: Dundurn, 2005.

-----. *The Order of Canada: Its Origins, History, and Development.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

McDougall, A.K. *John P. Robarts: His Life and Government*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

McKenzie, Francine. *Redefining the bonds of Commonwealth, 1939-48.* London: Palgrave, 2002.

Mackenzie, John. *Orientalism: History, Theory, and the Arts*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1995.

McKercher. B.J. and Lawrence Aronsen, *The North Atlantic Triangle in a Changing World: Anglo-American-Canadian Relations, 1902-1956*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

McKillop, A.B. "Who Killed Canadian History? The View from the Trenches." *Canadian Historical Review*, 80, 2, June 1999.

-----. *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.

McLeish, John A.B. *A Canadian for All Seasons: The John E. Robbins Story*. Toronto: Lester and Orpen, 1978.

McNaught, Kenneth. "Mordecai Richler Was Here." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 26:4 Winter 1991/92.

-----. *Conscience and History*: *A Memoir.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

McRoberts, Kenneth. *Misconceiving Canada: The Struggle for National Unity*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Meaney, Neville. "Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections," in Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich, eds. *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity*. London: Frank Cass, 2003.

-----. "The Problem of Nationalism in Australian History and Historiography," in Symposium on "Britishness and Australian Identity," *Australian Historical Studies* 116 2001.

Miedema, Gary "For Canada's Sake: The Centennial Celebrations of 1967, State Legitimation and the Restructuring of Canadian Public Life," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 34, 1 Spring 1999.

-----. *For Canada's Sake: Public Religion, Centennial Celebrations, and the Re-making of Canada in the 1960s.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005.

Miller, Carman. *Canada's Little War*. Toronto: James Lorimer, 2003.

Milligan, Frank. *Eugene A. Forsey: an intellectual biography*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2004.

Milner, Marc, *Canada's Navy: The First Century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Molson, Karen. *Hartland de Montarville Molson: Man of Honour*. Richmond Hill. Ont.: Firefly Books, 2006.

Monet, Jacques. *The Canadian Crown*. Vancouver: Clarke, Irwin, 1979.

-----. *The Last Cannon Shot: A Study in French Canadian Nationalism*, 1837-1850. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Moore, A.B.B. *Here Where We Live*. Toronto: United Church Publishing House, 1988.

Morgan, Cecilia. "'A Wigwam to Westminster': Performing Mohawk Identity in Imperial Britain, 1890s-1990s," *Gender & History* 15, 2 August 2003, 319-41.

Morton, Desmond. *A Military History of Canada*. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 1985.

-----. *A Short History of Canada*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2001.

-----. *Canada and War: A Military and Political History.* Toronto: Butterworths, 1981.

Morton, W.L. "An English Canadian Denounces Separatism." *The Globe Magazine*, 24 September 1964.

-----. "The Meaning of Monarchy in Confederation." Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, 1, IV (June 1963), ii, 271-82.

-----. *The Canadian Identity*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.

Moyles, R.G. and D.O. Owram. *Imperial Dreams and Colonial Realities: British Views of Canada, 1880-1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Mrinalini, Sinha. "Britishness, Clubbability, and the Colonial Public Sphere: The Genealogy of an Imperial Institution," *Journal of British Studies* 40, 4 (October 2001), 489-521.

Nelles, H.V. *A Little History of Canada*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Newman, Peter C. *Renegade in Power: The Diefenbaker Years.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1963.

-----. *The Distemper of Our Times: Canadian Politics in Transition 1963-1968.* Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1968.

Nowry, Lawrence. *Man of Mana: Marius Barbeau.* Toronto: NC Press, 1995.

O'Connor, April, and M. Vincent Bezeau, "Identity and Uniforms in the Unified Force," A-JS-007-002/JD-001 Draft, corrected and revised by Directorate Ceremonial, 4-4-1, in preparation. Ottawa: Directorate of History and Heritage, Department of National Defence.

Oliver, Peter. *Unlikely Tory: The Life and Politics of Allan Grossman*. Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1985.

Owram, D.R. "Canada and the Empire," Robin W. Winks, ed., *Oxford History of the British Empire V: Historiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, 146-162.

-----. *The Government Generation: Canadian intellectuals and the state, 1900-1945.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Pal, Leslie A. *Interests of State: The Politics of Language, Multiculturalism, and Feminism in Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

Palmer, Howard. "Ethnicity and Politics in Canada Since Confederation," Canada's Ethnic Groups Series, No. 17. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1991.

-----. "Reluctant Hosts: Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century." in *Multiculturalism as State Policy.* Ottawa: Department of the Secretary of State, 1976.

Pannekoek, Frits. "Who Matters? Public History and the Invention of the Canadian Past." *Acadiensis* XXIX, 2 (Spring 2000), 205-217.

Pariseau J. and S. Bernier. *French Canadians and Bilingualism in the Canadian Armed Forces*, Vols. 1 and 2. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1987 and 1991.

Parkin, Sir George R. *The Rhodes Scholarships.* Toronto: Copp Clark, 1912.

Pearson, Lester B. *Mike: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson, PC, CC, OM, OBE, MA, LLD, Volume 1: 1897-1948.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

-----. *Mike: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson, PC, CC, OM, OBE, MA, LLD, Vol. 3, 1957-1968.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

-----. *Mike: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson, PC, CC, OM, OBE, MA, LLD, Vol. 2, 1948-1957*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.

Pelletier, Alain. "Politics and Ethnicity: Representation of Ethnic Groups and Visible-Minority Groups in the Hosue of Commons." In Kathy Megyery, ed. *Ethno-Cultural Groups and Minorities in Canadian Politics: The Question of Access.* Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1989.

Penlington, Norman, ed. *On Canada: Essays in Honour of Frank H. Underhill.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Perry, Adele. *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race, and the Making of British Columbia, 1849-1871*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Pickersgill, J.W. *My Years with Louis St. Laurent.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

-----. *Seeing Canada Whole: Memoirs*. Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1994.

Pocock, J.G.A. *The Discovery of Islands: Essays in British History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Pope, Joseph ed., *Memoirs of the Rt. Hon. Sir John Alexander Macdonald, G.C.B.* 2 Vols. London: Edward Arnold, 1894; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1971.

Pope, Maurice. *Soldiers and Politicians: Memoirs.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

Porter, Bernard. *The Absent-Minded Imperialists: Empire, Society, and Culture in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Porter, John. *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Potvin, Rose, ed. *Passion and Conviction: The Letters of Graham Spry*. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1992.

Priebe, Eckehart J. *Thank You, Canada: From Messerschmidt Pilot to Canadian Citizen*. West Vancouver: Condor Publications, 1990.

Pugsley, W.H. *Saints*, *Devils and Ordinary Seamen: Life on the RCN's Lower Deck.* Toronto: Collins, 1945.

Razack, Sherene H., ed. *Race, Space, and the Law: Colonization and Indigenous Resistance in Eastern Canada*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2002.

Regenstreif, Peter. *The Diefenbaker Interlude: parties and voting in Canada, an interpretation*. Toronto: Longmans, 1965.

Reid, Escott. *Radical Mandarin.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Reid, Patrick. *Wild Colonial Boy: A Memoir.* Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1995.

Reid, W. Stanford, ed., *The Scottish Tradition in Canada.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.

Rickard, John. "Response: Imagining the Unimaginable?" In Symposium on "Britishness and Australian Identity," *Australian Historical Studies* 116 (2001).

Riendeau, Roger. *A Brief History of Canada.* Markham: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 2000.

Ritchie, Charles. *An Appetite for Life: The Education of a Young Diarist, 1924-1927.* Toronto: Macmillan Paperbacks, 1977.

-----. *Diplomatic Passport: More Undiplomatic Diaries, 1944-1962*. Toronto: Macmillan Paperbacks, 1987.

-----. *My Grandfather's House: Scenes of Childhood and* Youth. Toronto: Macmillan, 1987.

-----. *The Siren Years: A Canadian Diplomat Abroad 1937-1945*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1974.

Roberts Priscilla, "Paul D. Cravath, the First World War, and the Anglophile Internationalist Tradition." *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 51, 2 (June 2005), 194-215.

Robertson, Gordon. *Memoirs of a Very Civil Servant*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Robinson, H. Basil. *Diefenbaker's World.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Rowse, A.L. *A Cornishman at Oxford.* London: Jonathan Cape, 1965.

Roy, R.H. *Ready for the Fray: The Canadian Scottish Regiment (Princess Mary's) 1920-2002.* Calgary: Bunker to Bunker, 2002.

Rudin, Ronald. *Founding Fathers: The Celebration of Champlain and Laval in the Streets of Quebec, 1878-1908.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.

Russell, Peter, ed. *Nationalism in Canada*. Toronto, McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.

Schabas, Ezra. *Sir Ernest MacMillan: The Importance of Being Canadian.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

Schwartz, Mildred. *Public opinion and Canadian identity.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Scott, Paul. *The Jewel in the Crown*. New York: William Morrow, 1966.

Semple, Neil. *The Lord's Dominion: The History of Canadian Methodism*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.

Sharp, Mitchell. *Which Reminds Me: A Memoir.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

Sheffer, Gabriel. *Modern Diasporas in International Politics*. New York: St. Martin's, 1986.

Siegfried, André. Canada London: Jonathan Cape, 1937.

Sinha, Mrinalini. *Colonial Masculinity: the Manly Englishman and the Effeminate Bengali*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995

Sissons, C.B. ed. *My Dearest Sophie.* Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1955.

Skelton, O.D. *The Day of Sir Wilfrid Laurier: A Chronicle of Our Own Times* [1915]. *Chronicles of Canada*, vol. 30. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.

Smith, Anthony D. *National Identity: Theory, Ideology, History*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.

-----. *Nationalism and Modernism*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Smith, Denis. *Rogue Tory: The Life and Legend of John G. Diefenbaker.*. Toronto: Macfarlane, Walter & Ross, 1995.

Speaight, Robert. *Vanier: Soldier, Diplomat & Governor General*. Toronto: Collins, 1970.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography" in Ranjit Guha, ed., *Subaltern Studies IV: Writing on South Asian History and Society*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Stacey, C.P. *A Date with History*. Ottawa: Deneau, 1983.

-----. *Canada and the age of conflict: a History of Canadian External Policies.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1977.

-----. *Mackenzie King and the Atlantic Triangle*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1976.

Stairs, Denis. "Liberalism, Methodism, and statecraft: the secular life of a Canadian practitioner," *International Journal* XLIX Summer 1994, 673-[…]

Stanley, George F. *The Story of Canada's Flag: A Historical Sketch*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1965.

Stevens, Geoffrey. *Stanfield.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973.

Stewart, Basil. *"No English Need Apply." Or, Canada as a Field for the Emigrant*. London: Routledge, 1909.

Stratton, J. "Not just another multicultural story." *Journal of Australian Studies* 66 2000, 23-47.

Strong-Boag, Veronica, Sherrill Grace, Avigail Eisenberg, and Joan Anderson, eds. *Painting the Maple: Essays on Race, Gender, and the Construction of Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1998.

Stursberg, Peter. *Roland Michener: The Last Viceroy*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1989.

Swyripa, Frances. *Wedded to the Cause: Ukrainian-Canadian Women and Ethnic Identity 1891-1991.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Symonds, Richard. "Oxford and India," in F. Madden and D.K. Fieldhouse, eds., *Oxford and the Idea of Commonwealth*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Symons, Scott. *Heritage: A Romantic Look at Early Canadian Furniture*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1971.

-----. "The Contemporary Meaning in Canadiana: Jean Palardy's *The Early Furniture of French Canada*." *Queen's Quarterly* LXXI (Summer 1964), 257-70.

-----. "The Meaning of English Canada" [1963], in Christopher Elson, ed. *Dear Reader: Selected Scott Symons.* Toronto: Gutter Press, 1998.

-----. *Combat Journal for Place d'Armes: A Personal Narrative*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1967.

Taylor, A.J.P. *English History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Taylor, Charles. *Radical Tories*: the Conservative Tradition in Canada. Toronto: Anansi, 1982.

The Canadian Who's Who, Vol. XI, 1967-1969 Toronto: Who's Who Canada Publications, 1969.

Torrance, David E. "Instructor to Empire: Canada and the Rhodes Scholarships, 1902-39." In Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, eds. *Canada and the British World*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006, 250-69.

Tsokhas, Kosmas. "Tradition, fantasy and Britishness: Four Australian prime ministers. *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 31, 1 (2001), 3-30.

-----. *Making a Nation State: Cultural Identity, Economic Nationalism and Sexuality in Australian History.* Carlton South: Melbourne University Press, 2001.

Underhill, Frank. *In Search of Canadian Liberalism.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1960.

Van Dusen, Thomas. *The Chief*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Van Steen, Marcus. "The Flag and Unity," *Canadian Scene* Bulletin, Issue 656, 18 September 1964.

Vance, Jonathan F. *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning, and the First World War.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997.

Vipond, Mary. "National Consciousness in English-Speaking Canada in the 1920s: Seven Studies." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1974.

Wade, Mason. *The French Canadians, 1760-1945.* New York: Macmillan, 1955.

Ward, Peter. *Britishness Since 1870*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Ward, Stuart. "Worlds Apart: Three 'British' prime ministers at Empire's end." In Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, eds. *Rediscovering the British World.* Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2005, 399-419.

Watkins, Ernest. *R.B. Bennett: A Biography*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1963.

Waugh, Evelyn. *Brideshead Revisited.* Boston: Little, Brown, 1945.

Wigley, Philip G. *Canada and the Transition to Commonwealth: British-Canadian Relations 1917-1926*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Willson, Beckles. *From Quebec to Piccadilly and Other Places: Some Anglo-Canadian Memories.* London: Jonathan Cape, 1929.

Wilson, David A. *The Irish in Canada*. No. 12 in *Canada's Ethnic Groups*. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1990.

Wise, S.F. *God's Pecular People*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1993.

Wolfinger, Raymond E. "The development and persistence of ethnic voting." *American Political Science Review* 59 (December 1965), 896-908.

Wollacott, Angela. *To Try Her Fortune in London: Australian Women, Colonialism, and Modernity.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Woods, Shirley E. *The Molson Saga 1763-1983.* Scarborough: Avon Books, 1983.

Yuzyk, Paul. *For a Better Canada*. Toronto: Ukrainian National Association, 1973.

Zachariah, M. et al., eds. *Canadian Multiculturalism: Dreams, Realities, Expectations*. Edmonton: Canadian Multicultural Education Foundation, 2004.

Index

Acheson, Dean, US Secretary of State 85-86, 123-124
Alfred the Great, King 64, 123
Allard, Jean-Victor 300 ff., 313, 323
Americanization 41, 42, 296, 318
Anderson, Benedict 10, 209
Anglican
 Church of Canada 145
Anglo-Canadians, defined 65
Anglo-Conformity 12, 68, 73
Anglophilia 23, 29, 39, 72
Anglosphere 35
Annexation Manifesto (1849) 17, 63
Anthem, National (“O Canada”) 9, 211
Anthem, Vice-Regal (“God Save the Queen”) 30
Anti-Britishness 279
Anti-modernism 39, 41, 42, 60, 113
Armada, Spanish 64
Army Officers Ball 333
Arthur, King 64
Athlone, Earl of (Governor General) 132
Balcer, Leon 274
Balliol College, Oxford 131-2, 149, 177
Banting, Sir Frederick 278
Baptists 71, 102, 139, 151, 159
Barbeau, Marius 43, 180
Beaverbrook, Lord (Sir Max Aitken) 126
Beckett, St. Thomas 164
Beddoe, Alan 32, 271, 279, 282-282
Bennett, R.B., prime minister 80
Benson, Edgar 298
Berger, Carl 23, 25, 344
Bernatchez, Major-General Jean-Paul E. 321-2
Berthierville, Que. 298
Bhabha, Homi 16, 17, 20, 331
Bickersteth, Burgon 96, 132
Bilderberg Group 48
Bilingualism and Biculturalism (See under Royal Commission)
Bissoondath, Neil 65, 343
Bonar Law, Andrew 126
Bonaparte, Napoleon 18-19, 220, 283
Bourassa, Henri 124, 258
Bourget, Ignace, Bishop of Montreal 298
Boy's Own Paper, 123, 178, 282
Break with Britishness (Australia) 12
Breton, Raymond 10
Brewin, Andrew 319
Brideshead Revisited (novel) 174, 194-5, 197
British Amalgam (Australia) 14
British Amalgam (Canada) 14, 18, 65, 66, 169, 297 339
British Connection 11, 338
British Immigrants 11, 14, 37, 64, 68, 74-5, 77, 78, 80, 81, 113
British Museum 164
British North America (BNA) Act 37
British race patriotism 12
British World 16, 50, 51, 76, 116, 127, 174, 183, 201, 243, 330, 337, 345
Britishness, ignored by historians 21; French Canadian forms 43-44;
Britishness-as-other 37, 45, 75
Brock, Admiral Jeffry V. 307
Brock, Sir Isaac 64
Buchan, John (Lord Tweedsmuir) 141, 213
Buchenwald (concentration camp) 197
Buckner, Phillip 9
Butler, Esmond 87-88
Cadieux, Leo 322, 325
Canada Day 333
Canadian Armed Forces 10, 291-333
Canadian Army 10, 291
Canadian Corps 165
Canadian Expeditionary Force 78
Canadian Forum 82, 279
Canadian Guards 318, 333
Canadian Independence Magazine 20
Canadian Institute of International Affairs 142
Canadian Officer Training Corps 102
Canadian Polish Congress 239
Canadian Radio League 102
Canadian Red Ensign 21, 53, 61, 93, 247, 255-259, 260, 334
Canadian Republic (magazine) 20
Canadianism, “pure” 13, 333
Canadianization 8, 79, 137, 279, 291, 310, 320, 327, 330, 331
Canadians in the Making (See Lower, A.R.M.)
Cannadine, David 202
Careless, J.M.S. 55
Carillon Sacré-Cœur (unofficial flag of Quebec before 1948) 271
Carlton Club 130
Cartier, Sir George-Etienne 43, 158-159
Centennial (1967) 8, 25

Château Ramezay (Montreal) 283
Chautauqua 146
Christie, Loring 151
Chums, 123, 178, 282
Churchill, Gordon 294
Churchill, Sir Winston 35, 129
Clark, Lord (Sir Kenneth) 86n.
Clarke, Sir Fred 116, 174
Class 14, 29, 48, 63, 68-9, 74, 80-1, 83, 86, 94, 96, 98-100, 106, 111, 120, 122, 138, 143, 149, 151-2, 154, 166, 169, 172, 177-8, 180-5, 280, 286, 299, 310, 339
Claxton, Brooke 102, 158, 161, 166, 182-183
clothes, as ethnic costume 86-87, 95, 184
clubbability 208
Colley, Linda 18, 49
Collins, Eugene L. 253
Collister, Ron 295
Colony to Nation 39, 40, 115, 334
Commonwealth 48, 199
confrontation with Britishness 10, as result of deliberate actions, 59
Connolly, Senator Harold 105, 309-10
Connor, Ralph (*nom-de-plume* of Rev. C.W. Gordon) 176, 190
Conquest (1760) 19, 73
Corbett, Percy E. 166, 168, 187-188
Corriere Canadese (Toronto) 224, 225, 228, 232
coup d'état 335
Crerar, H.D.G. 258
Crimean War 78
Crisis of Britishness 11, 290; as result of deliberate actions, 59
Crowley 338
Curtis, Air Marshal W.A. 307
Curtis, Lionel 163
Dafoe, W.A. 113
Davies, Robertson 66, 132
De Gaulle, Charles 321
Denison, Sir George T. 342
Deutsche Courier 233
deux nations 44
Devonshire, Duke of (Governor General) 121
Diaspora, Anglo-Celtic 51, 76-77, 344
Diefenbaker, John G. 7, 121, 204, 220, 259
Dominion (as name and style) 7, 10, 46, 55; as "trivial fuss" (Pickersgill), 46
Dr. Strangelove (Hollywood film) 297
Drummond, Guy Melfort 100
Dubé, Jean-Eudes 325
Duncan, Sarah Jeanette 126
Dunkirk (Retreat from, 1940) 71
Durham, Lord 17
Eaton, Timothy 81, 133, 148
Elgar, Sir Edward 102
Elizabeth II, Queen 122
Eminent Pearsonians 17 ff., 27, 61, 128, 155, 287, 343
Ethnicity 12, 16, 27, 28, 29, 39, 58, 62 ff., 82 ff., 139, 149, 168, 172, 203, 208-9, 279, 338-9, 341
Ethnicity, Anglo-Celtic 12, 49, 62-108 passim
Ethnicity, British 14
Ethnicity, English 74
ethnie, Anglo-Celtic, as dominant core group, 59
Eton College 102, 131, 189
European Economic Community 259
Ewart, John S. 258-259
Fabian Society 82
Fairclough, Ellen 265
Farthing, John 42, 45
First Nations 52, 53, 311
First World War 160-170
Flag Debate (1964) 8, 58, 243-290; (1938) 61, 258
Flavelle, Sir Joseph 149, 154
Fleur-de-lys, as symbol of Royalist France 270-271
Forsey, Eugene 194
Foulkes, Charles 79, 312 ff.
Fraser, Blair 33, 256, 290, 337
French Canadians, as "defeated minority race" (McLennan) 105
French, Goldwin 158
Galloway, Colonel Strome 318
Garos, Indian tribesmen 92
Gauthier, Rosaire, M.P. 299, 327
Gauvreau, Michael 254
Gender 27-8, 340-1
Geneva, University of 87, 95, 102
George V, King 7, 130
Girouard, Sir Percy 43, 124
Go West, Young Man (novel) 104
Goodbye to All That (See Graves, Robert)
Gordon, King 195
Gordon, Rev. C.W. (see Connor, Ralph)
Governor General 47, 88-89
Governor General's Horse Guards 301
Governor-General's Foot Guards 297, 298
Graham, G.S. 119
Grant, George Munro 119
Grant, George Parkin 17, 42, 108, 114, 161, 200, 342
Graves, Robert 164-165
Greenhill, Pauline 74, 75
Grey Cup 289
Grey, Lord (Governor General) 299
Groulx, Lionel 110, 114
Group of Seven 155
Guinness, Sir Alec (actor) 134
Haidasz, Stanley 239
Harkness, Douglas 294
Harris, Sir Arthur 331
Harrow (school), 131
Hart House 96
Hawker Hurricane (fighter plane) 85

Heeney, Arnold 152
Hellyer 110, 141, 147, 216, 222, 224, 250, on flag 260, 264; armed forces unification 294, 296, 303 ff.
Hellyer, Paul 8, 141, 250
Henty, G.A. 123, 143
Herridge, H.W. 294
Highland dancing 66
Highland games 106
Hispanidad (Spanishness) 18
Hnatyshyn, John 235
Hobsbawm, Eric 7, 60, 334
Hoffmeister, Bert 65, 130, 235
Holmes, John 23, 39-40
Hong Kong, Canadian war graves 326
honours and decorations 9
Hudson's Bay Company 124
Hutchison, Bruce 290
hybridity 16, 18, 26, 28, 43, 58, 65, 91, 109, 119, 131, 138, 169, 203, 204, 231, 290, 300, 338, 345
Iannuzzi, Dan 224, 226
Ignatieff, George 110, 180-181
Ignatieff, Michael 17, 343
Imperial Federation 26
Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire 159, 213
Imperialism (See also "liberal imperialism"), 11
Indian Army 287
Invention of tradition 7, 8, 20, 243, 337, 345
Irwin, Arthur 124, 162
Isajiw, Wsevolod W. 85, 208
Jacobi, O.R. 257
Jebb, Gladwyn 157, 174
Jewel in the Crown, The (novel) 173
Judicial Committee of the Privy Council 47
Kanadai Magyar Ujság (Hungarian-language newspaper) 238
Kaufmann, Eric P. 69-71
Keenleyside, Hugh 8
Kennedy, W.P.M. 107, 149
Kierans, Eric 280
Kiernan, Victor 185
King, W.L. Mackenzie 38, 98, 106, 112, 119, 121, 135, 141, 338, 343
Kipling, Rudyard 126
Kirkconnell, Watson 43, 157, 213
Kitchener, Horatio, Lord 123, 282
Korean War 40
Kymlicka, Will 340
Labarre, Jean-Guy 268-269, 271
Labour aristocracy, and ethnicity 84
Lament for a Nation (See Grant, George)
Lanctot, Gustave 43
Landymore, Rear Admiral W.A. 302
Lanoraie, Que. 298
Laurendeau, André 264, 274, 334
Layton, Irving 171
Leacock, Stephen 126, 127, 177, 212-213
League for Social Reconstruction (LSR) 81-2, 159
League of Nations Union 187
Lee, Group Captain William 306
Léger, Jules 270
LePan, Douglas 110
Lessard, Francois-Louis 43
Letters of a Remittance Man to His Mother (novel) 104
Lewis, David 180
liberal imperialism 26, 39, 337, 343
Liberal order framework 27
Liberal Party of Canada 115
Light Brigade, Charge of the 164
Lower Canada 14, 17
Lower Canada College 102
Lower, A.R.M. 15, 80, 98, 99-100, 115, 125, 162, 167, 212, 308, 334
Loyalists, United Empire 42, 284
Lucas, Charles P. 344
Luftwaffe (German Air Force) 234
Macalister, John 196-7
Macdonald, Angus L. 105, 107
MacDonald, Malcolm 157
Macdonald, Sir John A. 111, 257
MacInnes, Graham 281
Mackenzie, Hector 24
Mackinder, Sir Halford 26, 337
MacLennan, Hugh 40, 105, 123, 126, 178 ff., 267, 275-6
MacMillan, H.R. 91 ff.
Macmillan, Harold 121
MacMillan, Margaret 50
MacNeil, Robert (PBS newsreader) 344
Magna Carta 64, 278
Mainguy Report (Royal Canadian Navy mutinies) 309
Maloney, Arthur 214
Mandziuk, Nick 236-237
Maple Leaf flag (three-leaf design) 7, 128; (one-leaf design), 243-90
maple leaf, on ships' funnels in wartime 310; green, on White Ensign (proposed) 299
masculinity 88, 257, 341
Maskinongé banner (Patriotes) 283
Massey College, University of Toronto 132, 134
Massey Commission 135
Massey, Vincent 15, 86, 109-110, 125, 131, 333
Matheson, John 22, 147, 244 ff., 276, as traditionalist 277-8, 295
Matthews, Bruce 95
Mau Mau (Kenya) 9
McGill University 102, 105, 106, 122
McKenzie, Francine 34, 36, 38
McNaught, Kenneth 181-182
Menon, Krishna 173
Messerschmidt (fighter plane) 234

Methodism, Methodists 123-4, 139-160 passim
Michener, Roland 141, 177
Military, civilian control of 305
Milner, Alfred, Lord 153
Minto Cup 289
Molson, Senator Hartland de Montarville 24, 85, 94, 133
Molson, Percival 100
Moncel, Lieutenant General Robert 303
Mongrain, Joseph-Alfred 299
Monteith, J. Waldo 265
Montgomery of Alamein, Lord 331
Montreal-Matin 270
Moore, A.B.B. 142
Morgan, Cecilia 95, 184
Morton, Desmond 245
Morton, W.L. 100
Mountbatten of Burma, Lord 331
Moynihan, Daniel Patrick 157
Multiple Identities 120, 203, 341
National Assembly (Quebec) 26
Nationalism, as construct, 22; as product of popular feeling, 59.
Neatby, Hilda 42, 134-136, 143
Nelles, H.V. 37, 77, 113, 245, 252, 256,
Nelson, Admiral Lord Horatio 309
Neo-Britains 51
New Democratic Party (NDP) 263, 266
North American Air Defence Command (NORAD) 296
North-West Mounted Police 283
Nostalgia 118
Nova Britannia 14, 51, 61
O'Keefe, Joseph (M.P.) 104
Ogdensburg Agreement 40
Ontario, origins in small-town 152
Orange Order 58, 70
Order of Canada 19, 142
Orientalism (Edward W. Said) 339
Orwell, George 81
Other Quiet Revolution 9
Oxford History of the British Empire 51
Oxford University 30, 81, 82, 114, 117, 122, 131, 135, 136, 138, 171-201
Oxford University 24, 171-201
Papineau, Talbot Mercer 43
Parkin, Sir George 197
Patriotes (of 1837) 70, 283
Perry, Adele 52
Philby, Kim 153-4
Pickersgill, Frank 196-7
Pickersgill, J.W. 46, 141, 152, 171, 191, 207, 215, 241, 261
Plantagenet, three lions 284
Plumb, J.H. 22
Pocock, J.G.A. 49, 51
Pope, Maurice 130, 259
Porter, Bernard 26
Porter, John 27, 68-9
Pratt, E.J. 142, 148, 158
Prince Philip (Duke of Edinburgh, HRH), 48, 122, 280, 331
Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry (PPCLI) 78, 323
Progressive Conservative Party 25, 263, 290
Puissance du Canada (French equivalent of "Dominion of Canada") 10
Quebec Conference (1943) 259
Queen's Colours 321-2, 323-4
Queen's Own Rifles 319
Ranger, Terence 7, 60, 334, 336
Raymont, R.L. 330
Red Ensign (see Canadian Red Ensign)
Regiments, Canadian Army (See name of regiment)
Reid, J.R. 294
Remembrance Day 277
Res Britannica 174
Res Canadiana 174, 345
Rhodes Scholarships Scheme 43, 177
Rhodes Trust 199
Rideau Hall 130
Ritchie, Charles 85-86, 101, 121-122, 133, 193-194, 297
Robarts, John 263
Roberts, Sir Charles G.D. 116, 150
Robertson, Norman 185 ff.
Roblin, Duff 263
Roman Catholics 73, 104
Rostovsky, Semyon Nickolayevich (alias Ernst Henri, KGB agent) 157
Round Table 163
Rowell, Newton 148, 149, 151
Rowse, A.L. 187
Royal, as armed services prefix 332
Royal 22nd Regiment 302-3, 321
Royal Bombay Yacht Club 91
Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF) 10, 282, 291; Air Force Blue Ensign, traditional 324, 327, with Maple Leaf 331
Royal Canadian Legion 121, 247, 278, 326
Royal Canadian Mounted Police 47
Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve (RCNVR) 80, 98
Royal Canadian Navy (RCN) 10, 87, 291, 325 White Ensign 323, 327, 327-9
Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism 10, 56, 316-17, 334
Royal Mail 46
Royal Military College (Kingston) 124, 287
Royal Style and Titles Act 47
Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve (RNVR) 80, 162

Royal Navy 302, 310, 329
Ryerson, Egerton 155, 158
Sacred Heart of Jesus, as emblem of Catholic Quebec 271
Said, Edward W. (See Orientalism)
St. George's Society of Ottawa 129
Saint-Laurent, Louis-Etienne (Louis-Stephen) 44, 47 206, 220, 225, 259-60, 274
Sandhurst (Royal Military College) 287
Scots, as "defeated minority race" (McLennan) 105
Scott, Captain R.F. (of Antarctica) 164
Scott, F.R. 176, 317-18
Seaforth Highlanders 131
Second World War 41, 259, 344
Secord, Laura 64
Shakespeare, William 74, 92, 116
Sharp, General F.R. 292
Sharp, Mitchell 255, 262
Shimpo, Mitsuru 239
Shorncliffe 130
Siegfried, André 64-5
Simon, Sir John 102
Sinister Street (novel) 184-185
Skelton, Alex 97
Skelton, Isabel 125
Skelton, Oscar Douglas 17, 23, 24, 26, 27, 90, 96, 106, 111, 112, 118-9, 127, 134, 141, 149, 153, 168, 193, 199, 259, 339
Smith, Anthony D. 59, 136-137, 169-170, 201, 341
Smith, Goldwin 118
Societé Saint-Jean-Baptiste 271, 283
South African War 124, 315
Special Operations Executive (SOE) 196
Spivak, Gayatri 58
Spry, Graham 88, 114, 188, 192
Spry, Irene 88
Stacey, C.P. 38, 101, 163, 188
Stanfield, Robert 251
Stanley Cup 289
Stanley, George F.G. 171, 200, 251, 257, 270, 282; flag design 244, 283
Starr, Michael 226
Strachey, Lytton 23
Stratford Festival, 134
Suez Crisis 35, 72, 113, 319, 332
Symbols, ethnic 7; Canadian 21,
Symons, Scott 42, 44, 151, 154, 264, 285-286, 339
Symons, T.H.B. 42, 236, 264, 334
Taché, Sir Etienne-Paschal 43, 311
Tedder, Lord 331
Thompson, Andrew 79, 203 ff.
Thorvaldson, Gunnar 236
Trafalgar, Battle of 164, 213, 328
Trinity College, University of Toronto 134
Tri-Services Identities Organization (TRIO) 293-4
Trudeau, Pierre 54, 267, 298
Two Solitudes (novel) 105
Under the Ribs of Death (novel) 15
Trudel, Marcel 271
Underhill, F.H. 15, 71, 81-82, 114, 144, 148, 198, 211-212
unhyphenated Canadianism 121, 214, 241
Union Jack 7, 260-261, 321-3
Union Nationale 270
United Church of Canada 95, 106, 139, 141-3
United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) 319
United States Air Force 296
Upper Canada 342; Rebellion (1837) 70
Upper Canada College 17, 105-106
Utopia, utopianism 156
Vance, Jonathan 163
Vancouver Rowing Club 131
Vancouver Trades and Labour Council 83
Vancouver Sun 324
Vanier, Anatole 267
Vanier, Georges-Philias 43, 90-91, 129-130, 166, 289, 321
Vertical Mosaic (Porter) 27, 68-9
Victoria College 147
Victoria Cross 342
Victoria Day 55, 128
Victoria, Queen 283
Victoria Rifles 102
Vipond, Mary 78-79, 116
"Vive la Canadienne!" (song) 303
Wasps (white Anglo-Saxon Protestants) 73, 62-108 passim
Watkins, Ernest S. 80
Wavell, Lord 331
Waverley (Sir Walter Scott) 281
Wehrmacht (German Army) 130
Wells, H.G. 156
Western Front 16
Westminster Parliament 121
Westmount, Que. 102
William of Orange 64
Wimbledon 130
Windsor Castle 130
Whitton, Charlotte 24, 128
Wolfe, General James 64
Woodsworth, J.S. 183, 188
Working class, and ethnicity 83
Wrong, George M. 153
Ypres, Second Battle of 279
Yuzyk, Paul 204, 234-235, 236
Zouaves, Papal (volunteers from Quebec in the defence of Rome, 1868-70) 298