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ABSTRACT

MANAGING THE CANADIAN MOSAIC:
DEALING WITH CULTURAL DIVERSITY DURING THE WWII YEARS

Ivana Caccia
University of Ottawa, 2006

Supervisor:
Prof. Chad Gaffield

The thesis examines the public discourse on race, foreignness, ethnic diversity, inclusion of “new Canadians” in the Canadian national community, and the meaning of “Canadianism” during the WWII years, from 1939 to 1945, and maps the dialectic course of its construction by the Canadian mainstream intellectual and political elite (mostly Anglo-Saxon and Protestant) and the Liberal government in place.

The pre-WWII years were marked by noteworthy official disinterest in “Canadianizing” newcomers and by a latent “racialization” of diversity mostly articulated on the basis of “foreignness” or cultural “strangeness” of so-called “racial” origins of non-British and non-French immigrants. With the outset of war, the “we vs. they” polarization, until then specifically implying on the political scene the British vs. French dualism, began to refer as well to a rather different tension in power relations, generated by the “Canadian born” vs. resident “foreign born” or “immigrant” dichotomy. The meaning of this duality briefly shifted to signify the potential distinction between “loyal citizen” and “enemy alien”. Fascist or communist ideological leanings and strong nationalist feelings for the fate of the embattled homelands in Europe further exasperated this tension.
In the heat of the WWII years, the Canadian government hired Tracy Philipps -- an Englishman with expertise in colonial, Middle-Eastern and East-European affairs -- to act as an adviser in its endeavours to secure loyalty and support for its war efforts among Canadians of continental European origin, to mitigate the adversarial relationship among various cultural groups, and to encourage faster assimilation of “new Canadians”. To this end, the government set up the Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship and established the Nationalities Branch within its Department of National War Services, with Philipps as its European Adviser.

The thesis explores the subsequent changes in the discursive practice created by the mediation of different ideological approaches brought forward by Philipps, various politicians and adult educators in their search to recognize and define what constituted being a “citizen”, a “foreigner” – and, most of all, a “Canadian”. The debates accelerated the process of common national self-identification and the emergence of a new institution of “Canadian citizenship”. The resulting new discourse affirmed the idea that Canada was a national unit with, nevertheless, an inherent diversity that can be contained and managed if that management were entrusted in the state authority as guarantor of the equality of all its citizens.
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Happy New Year 1942

In SEVENTY-THREE Tongues

Seventy-three languages—one more than the grand total of 72 used in the New Year greeting of 1941—are being used by the Free Press in wishing one and all a Happy New Year for 1942.

A greeting to Selena Auner (Anishinabe) received at the 11th hour from an American Indian subscriber, an old-time resident of Winnipeg, sent the focal unexpectedly over the top. Earlier in the year, a subscriber, who had read the 1941 greeting in a copy of the Free Press in San Francisco, criticized the current French-Canadian and sent his version, which is being used below by spec. (The Greeting Editor, to whom Armenian is as Sanastra or Zuul, is not in a position to do battle for either version.)

Although the Empire is now at war with Italy, Germany, and Japan, and technically so with certain other nations in the Axis group, the greetings in these languages are sent to the many loyal Canadians who, although descendents from these nations, are giving support to Canada and the Empire in the present struggle.

Equipped then with more languages than ever before, the Free Press—which, by the way, will enter its 71st year of service to its readers in November of the present year—wishes you all a HAPPY NEW YEAR in SEVENTY-THREE tongues:

Folksan Novjaar! (Esperanto)
Och s trown ki jik kWii! (Cree)
O she de winikj in kii! (Ojibway)
Kommunaar Jichtgejeh! (Blackfoot)
T'-bii-i, a tu’a la u-rill! (Eskimo)
A Happy New Year! (English)
Blaiddir Nua fe mbaisse duinit! (Irish Gaelic)
Blaiddir Nua a De! (Scottish Gaelic)
Robin Vie Neul! (Manx)
Bonne et Heureuse Année! (French)
Biliwydny Newyyyy Ddael! (Welsh)
Blythen Mad-Dal (Cornish)
Blawes Mad o-booch Digand Dou! (Breton)
Zalig Nieuw Jaar! (Flemish)
Buon Capo d'Anno! (Italian)
Bon Principi! (Friulian)
Të Aurgër Up Buon Anno! (Tuscanese)
Bujps Caprianoi (Sicilian)
Buni Noëddu Annel (Sardinian)
Bollog Ujevet Kivanunuki! (Magyar)
Anul Nou! Cui Ferikreale! (Romanian)
God Sejen Dei Nos Joor! (Transylvanian Saxon)
Daudz Laimes Jaune Gadai! (Latvian)
Laimingu Nauju Metu! (Lithuanian)
Gelukkig Nieuw Jaar! (Dutch)
Félix Ano Nuevo! (Spanish)
Félix Novo Ano! (Portuguese)
Bonn Noveli! Anseli! (Wallon)
Glücklicher Neues Jahr! (German-Swiss)
Bonne Année! (Swiss Romande)
Buon Anno! (Italian-Swiss)
Feli Gurb An! (Catalan)
Alegre Nuou An! (Provencal)
Allegrès Nouv An! (Romansch)

Gelikik Nij Jler! (Friulian)
Gluhek Nije Jare! (Plattdeutsch)
Gelukkig Niwe Jare! (Afrikaans)
Veselo Novo Leto! (Slovene)
Weselo Novo, Leto! (Wendish)
Onnellista Uutta Vuotta! (Finnish)
Stastny Novy,Rok! (Czech)
Stastlivy Novy,Rok! (Slovak)
Haad Uut Aastali! (Estonian)
Puoraks-Aatas Jakkel! (Lappish)
Alje Për-ioll! (Osland)
Zori Ozemko Yrte Beni! (Basque)
Igodänn Izin Motit! (North Albanian, or Gheg)
Mot i rët Lusitërel! (South-Albanian, or Tosk)
Shinharov Nër, Dëri! (Armenian)
Yeni Yiliniz Kutlu Olsun! (Turkish)
Sale Now Mobarak Bad! (Persian)
Zache Fara, Et Nebo Danely! (Spanish Gypsy)
Evičes to neon etol! (Modern Greek)
Gott Nytt Jaar! (Swedish)
A Glückliche Neujahr! (Yiddish)
Issena H Tialh! (Maltese)
Szczaśliwego Nowego Roku! (Polish)
Sretna Nova Godina! (Croatian)
Günlükçe Neşet SağLit! (German)
Gledeligit Nyt År! (Daneish)
Gledeligit Nyt Aar! (Danish)
Счастливый Новый Год! (Russian)
Česky H Noveho Roci! (Czech)
Сретене Нова година! (Bulgarian)
Сретене Нова Годиша! (Serbian)

(Old Armenian)
(Asyan)
(Old Armenian)
(Asyan)
(Corcan)
(Chinese)
(Japanese)
(Arabic)
Introduction

On December 10, 1946, Tracy Erasmus Philipps, former European Adviser, Nationalities Branch, Department of National War Services of Canada between 1942 and 1944, gave a presentation before the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland in London entitled The Continental-European Ethnic and Cultural Composition of the Canadian Nation. His credentials as an ethnographer and long-time member of the Institute, and his first hand observations of the Canadian people during the war years promised some worthwhile and scholarly insights into the subject.¹

According to Philipps, one could identify in Canada of the mid 1940s six modern ethnic “stocks”: French, English, Scottish, Irish, German and Ukrainian. There were also “Indigenous Canadians”, he conceded, but they were “in decline”. One fifth of the population, “not quite a quarter”, was “foreign-born”, he informed his audience. It did not mean that they were themselves necessarily born abroad but that one or both of their parents were born outside the British Empire. As children, and during the susceptible years of child formation, they were in consequence “under the influence of one or both parents of non-Canadian background.” These “new Canadians” were, however, “in rapid progress of new national integration.” It was their mother-tongue, more than ethnicity, that made them distinguishable, he informed the audience. Christianity and various church organizations were another unifying factor for those “non-English communities

from Europe,” which in his account included, and were “headed by those from France.” These communities consisted mostly of rural people, not necessarily open to embrace the spirit of nationalism such as the one that inspired great modern nations. Philipps viewed the prospects of integration of these communities into a modern state as follows:

Man’s three, relatively young, ideals of Morality, Civilization and Universalism, if they are to triumph, have to overcome a hard-case veteran giant. The giant is human nature ... tough, competitive, often aggressive, survival-value qualities of man ... [this giant] has to be remodelled if it is to serve these modern three ideals of humanity. 

Being, as he claimed, a long-standing observer of persisting ethnic conflicts in East-central and South-eastern Europe -- “where historic hatreds and vicious vendettas and artificially conflicting cultures assume religious intensity” -- he had been pleasantly surprised, therefore, how quickly, according to him, these antagonisms disappeared among the newcomers to the Americas. Once “in a comparative geographic isolation with a community of language,” he affirmed, “a fair tolerance and a liberal spirit can create a cloak of unison linking the ethnic and cultural diversities themselves.”

Philipps’ 1946 assessment of what had purportedly happened in terms of a successful integration of “new” Canadians relied on his conviction that his expert approach to the matters of cultural contacts, progress and the effectively assimilative influence of one cultural sphere on another applied during his brief stay in Canada must have yielded desired results. Philipps himself, however, admitted in 1952 that migrant manual workers and peasants landing on the shores of North America, mostly

---

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.
“untravelled” and spiritually and mentally deeply rooted in their native soils and original cultures, were not easy to adapt to cultural changes and be “absorbed and digested, converted and assimilated, in a brief time.” Their successful integration, hardly achieved by the first generation of immigrants, mostly depended, according to Philipps in 1952, on the skilful guidance by knowledgeable specialists and a sympathetic new environment allowing for the necessary inter-cultural harmonization.

Philipps spoke from experience and first-hand observation. After all, in the heat of the WWII years, as mentioned above, the government of Canada had hired him as an expert in Middle-Eastern and East-European affairs to act as an adviser in its attempts to secure loyalty and support for its war efforts from members of “non-Anglo-Saxon” and non-French communities. In fact, judging from the correspondence preserved in his archival collection at the Library and Archives of Canada, it was Philipps who designed that job himself by impressing on a few key ministers and bureaucrats that his expertise could help in doing some “positive” work among “new Canadians” to “Canadianize” them and make them abandon the feuds of the old country. His experience as soldier, as diplomat on special services in Russia during the catastrophic outbreak of famine in the early 1920s, as ethnologist and as a diplomatic correspondent covering “these peoples”, seemed to have prepared him, in his own words, to become “something of a Specialist in the racial mentality and the political affairs of the peoples who have the misfortune to

---

4 Tracy Philipps, Memorandum [regarding the establishment of an international social service]: “Culture – Clash or Composition? Assimilation or Re-Integration?” January 20, 1952, in file 30 “Correspondence 1950-52,” vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
exist between the Russian and the Prussian empires.”

During the Second World War years, the Canadian political elite (predominantly Anglo-Saxon and Protestant) and the Liberal government in place envisaged, debated and eventually undertook a series of measures conceived to deal with non-British, non-French segment of the population. Their purpose was to (a) counter possible disloyal or subversive activities on the domestic front; (b) involve all Canadian residents in creating a responsible and unified public support for its war efforts; and (c) prepare the nation for the post-war reconstruction. What kind of structures were put in place, as a result, to deal with the issues involved? What was Philipps’ actual role during the war? How did the elite legitimize its discourse on the subject of ethnic diversity and its impact on national unity and identity? These questions are pertinent because sixty years later, in the aftermath of September 11, 2001, the Western world, including Canada, is waging a new type of war on subversion and terrorism and sometimes questioning national loyalties of its multicultural citizenry.

**Discourse on Diversity**

There are different ways one could approach this subject. One could study the experiences of individual ethnic groups during the war years and focus on their community building and national consciousness in wartime.\(^6\) One could concentrate on

---

\(^5\) Letter by Tracy Philipps to Mr. Justice T. C. Davis, Associate Deputy Minister, Department of National War Services, February 25, 1941, file 17, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\(^6\) For instance, Thomas M. Prymak, *Maple Leaf and Trident: The Ukrainian Canadians During the Second World War* (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1988)
the exclusionary discursive processes of ethnic identification as "otherness". One could look at it in terms of the public reaction to the increased number of immigrant workers and farmers in the country, their place in the labour market and their right to be treated without discrimination as equal members of the society. Donald Avery took this approach with his *Reluctant Hosts*. So did Howard Palmer and John Herd Thompson in their historical overviews of nativism during WWII. Another approach would be the explorations of expressions of dual loyalties of some Canadian residents whose mother countries were at war with Canada, by comparing the extent of expressed loyalty to Canada, on the one hand, and, that of suspected loyalty and attachment to the old country, on the other hand -- the latter allegedly coerced and sustained by propaganda from abroad. The approach based on such dual loyalties allows for a particularly focused historical analysis of the treatment of so-called "enemy aliens" during the war years: how they were watched, arrested, and interned.

---


10 See, for example, Franca Iacovetta, Roberto Perin and Angelo Principe, eds., *Enemies Within: Italian and Other Internees in Canada and Abroad* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000) and relevant contributions in Norman Hillmer, Bohdan Kordan and Lubomyr Luciuk, eds., *On Guard for Thee: War, Ethnicity, and the Canadian State, 1939-1945* (Ottawa: Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, 1988)
The focus of this thesis is on the government institutional mechanisms set up to exercise a more subtle control of minority groups in wartime conditions. In choosing this approach I am distancing myself from the existing literature by opting to treat the subject from the specific viewpoint of how diverse ideological stances on the issue of ethnic diversity advanced by different members of the Canadian mainstream elite and government officials eventually influenced political action in the process of complex elaboration of institutional structures and policy positions.\textsuperscript{11} Canadian politicians realized in the late 1930s that the presence of people of non-British and non-French origin was neither a social issue merely confined to the Western provinces, nor an immigration issue \textit{per se} -- how many and whom to admit into the country -- but a highly political issue affecting the nation as a whole, and at its core, in wartime as much as in peacetime. It became evident in the late 1930s that there were not just two "nations", English and French, locked in Confederation. The polarization "we vs. they", implying until then exclusively the "English vs. French" dualism (with Aboriginal people deliberately kept out of the picture), became, on the political scene, a potential reference to another, and rather different tension in power relations: the dichotomy involving the opposition

between the “Canadian born” or “native-born”, on one side, and “new Canadian” or “foreign-born”, on the other. At the beginning of World War Two, the meaning of this duality temporarily shifted with remarkable ease to signify also the distinction between “loyal citizen” and “enemy alien”.

The question is to what extent this polarization between “native-born” and “foreign-born” – or “loyalty” and “enemy”, so frequent in the wartime political discourse of the predominantly English-speaking, British-oriented elite, really represented, in a more profound way, the discursive juxtaposition of the exclusively Anglo-Saxon “we” against, broadly taken, all of the domestic population of continental European origin, plus French-Canadians in many minds, embodying the category “they”. Behind this question lies the need to understand whether or how the circumstantial wartime discursive process eventually influenced perceptions, attitudes and decision-making concerning Canadian citizenship, nationhood and sovereignty beyond the wartime period.

*On Historiography*

The existing historiography on the institutional mechanisms created to deal with ethnic pluralism during the war years primarily concentrates on the events and historical factors preceding and surrounding the establishment of the Nationalities Branch and the role Tracy Philipps assumed in that context. This former colonial administrator, anthropologist, officer in the British imperial army and diplomatic correspondent for the *London Times* on issues related to equatorial Africa, the Orient, Turkey, southern Russia, central Europe and the whole Mediterranean basin, Philipps was proud of his expert knowledge of human diversity and was a keen defender of British values. But why, precisely, a middle-level civil servant should attract so much interest as an individual?
The majority of historians dwell on his successful mediation, encouraged by British and Canadian governments, to reach, in November of 1940, a truce among competing and ideologically very diverse Ukrainian associations and religious organizations (with the exception of left-wing, "communist" ones) leading to the creation of a Canadian Ukrainian Committee.\textsuperscript{12} Approached from a very different angle, is Philipps' portrait drawn by Mark Kristmanson in his \textit{Plateaus of Freedom}. Philipps is not observed here as a unifier of a Ukrainian national community but as a complex creation of a colonially-minded England, a quasi-genius, a spy and informer, and a minor wheel in the conspiratorial machinery manipulated by the British and American intelligence to squash left-wing, Soviet-inspired dissent in the Western, English-speaking cultural world, including Canada.\textsuperscript{13} The present thesis intends to approach the make-up of Philipps' persona from the perspective of his life experiences and examine, both, his worldview and some of the mystifications surrounding him.

The ongoing operations of the Branch as such or Philipps' scope of work during the four years of his stay in Ottawa have been discussed, to a lesser extent, in the existing literature. Two essays published in 1988 in N. Hillmer, B. Kordan and L. Luciuk's, \textit{On Guard for Thee} are particularly relevant: N.F. Dreisziger's "The Rise of a Bureaucracy for Multiculturalism: The Origins of the Nationalities Branch, 1939-41" and William

\textsuperscript{12} See, for instance, above mentioned texts by Dreisziger; see also: Lubomyr Luciuk, \textit{Searching for Place: Ukrainian Displaced Persons, Canada, and the Migration of Memory} (Kingston: Kashtan Press, 2001) and Bohdan S. Kordan, \textit{Canada and the Ukrainian Question, 1939-1945} (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001); as well as reminiscences of Paul Yuzuk, \textit{The Ukrainians in Manitoba: A Social History} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1953) and Bohdan Panchuk, \textit{Heroes of Their Day} (Toronto: Multicultural History Society, Ontario heritage Foundation, 1983)

Young's "Chauvinism and Canadianism: Canadian Ethnic Groups and the Failure of Wartime Information."\(^\text{14}\) As implied in the title of his essay, Dreisziger suggested that the beginnings of a federal bureaucracy for multiculturalism could be detected in the wartime operations of the Nationalities Branch. While he considered the Nationalities Branch "the progenitor of today's Multiculturalism Canada," he conceded that "it would be a mistake to equate" wartime policies with multiculturalism.\(^\text{15}\) "Nevertheless," he added, "the institutional tie and the similarities between many of the sentiments expressed then and now justify linking the wartime developments to the evolutionary chain" that had resulted in current policies.\(^\text{16}\) Dreisziger also suggested that the activities of this Branch were marked with tolerance and sensitivity for cultural and ethnic characteristics of "new Canadians".

William Young, on the other hand, explored in his contribution to the same volume the operations of the Bureau of Public Information (BPI) and its successor the Wartime Information Board (WIB) set up by the Liberal Government of W.L. Mackenzie King to promote national unity and create a favourable public opinion as regards government policies and war efforts.\(^\text{17}\) In his discussion of the relationship of the WIB

\(^\text{14}\) Hillmer, Kordan and Luciuk, eds., *On Guard for Thee*, pp.1-29 and 53-70, respectively.


with the Nationalities Branch, he explored the attempts by the Board’s general manager in the mid-1943 to absorb within WIB the activities of the Nationalities Branch and to promote, without distinction as to the cultural makeup of different groups, the same sense of unity and loyalty among ethnic communities as among English or French Canadians. In Young’s interpretation “the age of cultural mosaic and multiculturalism” was still far away in the future.¹⁸

“Some version of multiculturalism has been at the core of Canadian debates” before its official consecration, argues Leslie Pal in his study of the antecedents of the Department of Secretary of State (currently Heritage Canada). He adds, though, that the institutions in place during the war years “defined the conceptual terrain of ethnicity and citizenship differently than is customary today, but there are some common points even here -- for example, in debates about discrimination.”¹⁹ Thomas M. Prymak also agrees that the multicultural programme of the present-day Department of Secretary of State (Canadian Heritage) “traces its origin” to the Branch.²⁰

This interpretation was picked up by Richard Day in his 2000 study of the historical background of multiculturalism in Canadian society.²¹ Day constructs his narrative of a progressive emergence of multiculturalism policy as being the result of a series of adaptations and reproductions through centuries of Western civilization (from

---

¹⁸ Young, “Chauvinism and Canadianism,” p.46.


²⁰ T. M. Prymak, Maple Leaf and Trident: The Ukrainian Canadians During the Second World War (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1988)p. 61.

Plato and Herodotus to modern-day Canada), of what he calls a metasstructure: "the division of human individuals into groupable ‘types,’ the arrangement of these types into a hierarchy, the naming of some types as presenting a ‘problem,’ and the attempt to provide ‘solutions’ to the problem so constructed." To trace this evolution, Day relies for each discursive situation -- in our case the World War Two period -- on secondary and printed sources from which he picks up a selection of what seem to him key ("epitomal") texts. He then looks "at the nature of the categories and the hierarchical order established, the problems constructed, and the solutions proposed and implemented."\(^{22}\) Relying on Dreisziger’s description of the establishment, personnel and early operations of the Nationalities Branch, he argues that those "bureaucratic conditions" may have "depended heavily upon modern methods of discipline" but signified "first, tentative steps towards the adoption of a new, postmodern form" one that would eventually lead to the acceptance of pluralism and multiculturalism as a social organization.\(^{23}\)

Dreisziger has recently re-visited his account of the Nationalities Branch and its role during WWII by concentrating on the "negative" (repressive) and "positive" (educational) aspects of the interventionist policy approach of the wartime government. He also highlights some tolerant views and the conciliatory approach taken by some top civil servants such as Norman Robertson, under-Secretary of State for External Affairs and close adviser of Prime Minister Mackenzie King, or J.F. MacNeill, Deputy Minister of Justice, when defining that policy.\(^{24}\) Tracy Philipps and his Nationalities Branch


\(^{23}\) *Ibid*, pp.9, 159.

\(^{24}\) N.F. Dreisziger, "7 December 1941: A Turning Point in Canadian Wartime Policy toward Enemy Ethnic Groups?" *Journal of Canadian Studies* 32, No.1 (1997) pp.93-111; and *idem*, "Rallying Canada's Immigrants behind the War Effort," in *Forging a Nation: Perspectives on the Canadian Military Experience*, ed. Bernd Horn (St. Catherine's:
appear in these more recent writings as minor players in the policy-making and the claim of their being precursors of the later-day multicultural policy approach is relegated to a footnote. Dreisziger also now argues that “wartime decision-makers did not discern, let alone debate, the respective merits and dangers of acculturation and assimilation” and implicitly assumed that the state had to be involved in the integration of immigrants. The present thesis intends to examine and re-evaluate this argument.

On Methodology

My research was centered on the documentary corpus contained in Tracy Philipps Fonds at the Library and Archives of Canada covering the period of his life spent in Canada between 1940 and 1944 and carefully preserved by his friend and assistant at the Nationalities Branch, V.J. Kaye. As one of the persons behind the creation of the first government agency devoted exclusively to Canadians of non-British, non-French origin, and for two years practically exclusively in charge of its operations, Philipps was responsible for its ideological make-up -- however short-lived it was -- and acted as its principal interpreter and defender.

My investigation paid attention to the ideological positioning of various other policy makers and commentators who had influenced, mediated or re-produced existing discourses on cultural diversity and its advantages or inconveniences for unity and nation-building. A useful source were the official reports of the debates of the House of Commons where interventions of Members of Parliament reflected various public views


25 Dreisziger, “Rallying Canada’s Immigrants behind the War Effort,” p.190.
on issues that concern me here. I also looked at publications and papers of a few individuals whose writings illuminated some significant standpoints on the matter. They include: Watson Kirkconnell, a university professor and linguist who acquired national fame for his passionate interest in cultural, literary and political expressions of “new Canadians” and for the manner he interpreted them; the “Propaganda Maestro” John Grierson, a Scot, who, upon his arrival in Canada in the late 1930s as a highly praised creator of a new genre of documentary films, conceived and presided over a novel cultural institution, Canada’s world-renowned National Film Board and, then, in the mid-1940s was in charge of the Wartime Information Bureau with the task of rallying Canadians to support government war efforts; and Robert England, an adult educator, who for years worked for the Canadian National Railways in charge of their recruiting and educational programs for new immigrant workers. In the spring of 1944 the government called upon England to review the operations of the Nationalities Branch and reorganize it, which prompted Philipps to depart.

The thesis contains references to various politicians, civil servants, journalists and adult educators, whose public debates, writings, speeches and activities may help in the deconstruction of the 1939-1945 wartime discourse on the homogeneity (or heterogeneity) of the Canadian society and the quest for a national identity. Moreover, the research included the scanning of certain newspapers (notably, The Globe and Mail, Toronto Star, Winnipeg Free Press and Winnipeg Tribune) as well as journals (e.g. Queen’s Quarterly, Dalhousie Review, University of Toronto Quarterly, Canadian

---

26 The sampling was performed by examining Hansard records of daily question periods and major debates on “Speeches from the Throne”, war appropriations, departmental expenditures, national security and reports of the committee reviewing the Defence of Canada Regulations. The search was enhanced by the consultation of detailed indexes that accompanied the publication of the full text of debates for the period from summer of 1939 to summer of 1945.
Journal of Economics and Political Science), and periodicals such as Canadian Forum, Saturday Night, Macleans, Canadian Business, United Church Observer and Canadian Welfare.

Productions of ideologies and their re-production and legitimization through discourse are complex processes that unfold over time. The concept of ideology should be understood as a reference to any system of abstract beliefs — and a coherent system of social representations grounded on such beliefs — that are shared by members of a social group.27 Because the beliefs of a specific social group are rooted in the general beliefs (knowledge, values, opinions, commonsense) shared by the whole society or culture, interaction and influence among different social groups within a society or cultural sphere is possible. A specific ideological construction of the world around them allows members of a group to validate their identity and define, defend and explain their interests, values and goals. The constant interaction of social groups and social actors entails ideological conflicts but also mediations, hybridization and transformation (re-positioning), and can be mapped by describing both their structural context (institutions, groups, society at large), and strategic approaches taken by social actors as producers, legitimizers and persuaders of ideologies. In other words, ideologies are constructed and perpetuated through social and discursive practices in which social context, intertextuality and rhetoric play equally constructive roles. Discursive practice involves agency, context (of space and time), and content (representations of constructed and ideologically prescribed meanings as well as inherent indicators of relationships of power). It is a process consisting of a series of acts of communications and the related social action performed by individual and corporate actors on different platforms and in different formats (written

---

texts, broadcasts, documentary films, public speaking), as well as acts of state-generated violence, diplomacy and negotiation, teaching, and institution-building.

With that in mind, this thesis views the institutionalized structures created to deal with cultural diversity in wartime Canada as part of an order of discourse. Discursively constructed themselves, these structures served in turn as vehicles for the construction of representations and meanings of who was Canadian, who was at the centre where power and knowledge were situated, and who was recognized as peripheral and objectified through a process of identification, categorization, expulsion or integration by government agencies according to a perceived degree of distinctiveness -- "otherness" -- and assimilability.

The research project is informed by Stuart Hall’s theories of "new ethnicities" and the formation of cultural identities. 28 Hall argues that no ethnic group -- and certainly no national group -- is everlasting, pure and homogeneous, "one true self", or "one people", with stable, unchanging and continuous frames of reference and meaning, beneath the shifting divisions and vicissitudes of our actual history. 29 In his opinion, one should recognise that a cultural identity comprises many similarities within its formation but also "critical points of deep and significant difference", disguised in silence in the context of the culturally (discursively) constructed and accepted historical narrative of its becoming


29 Hall, “Cultural Identity and Diaspora,” p. 223.
and its being as a cultural community. These anomalies are equally formative and may re-emerge at given moments of history as salutary points of new identification. In short, "identity does not proceed in a straight, unbroken line, from some fixed origin." And he adds: "Cultural identities are the points of identification, the unstable points of identification or suture, which are made, within the discourses of history and culture. Not an essence but a positioning. Hence, there is always a politics of identity, a politics of position, which has no absolute guarantee in an unproblematic, transcendental 'law of origin'." 30

One should add to this statement the reference to the dynamics of power relations, notably the importance of the agency and the variable of who controls the channels of discourse. Also implied but not declared is the concept of hegemony which can explain the process of positioning as being geared and controlled by a pre-dominant culture. Hegemony is achieved by means of various integrative devices, the most evident of which are public education, mass media and the promotion of national symbols.

The voices of the ethnically marginalized Canadians were not an integral part of the mainstream political discourse of the time under discussion, certainly not in the early years of the war. They did not appear in the pages of Saturday Night, The Globe and Mail or the Winnipeg Free Press. 31 With a great number of recent immigrants hardly speaking or reading any English (or French), the so-called "foreign-languages" press served a highly valued function among them of providing community information but, most of all, communicating old country news and debating old-country ideological and nationalistic


31 When they did get published, their names had already been anglicized in most cases. That was the case, for instance, of Raymond Arthur Davies (aka Rudolf Shohan), an Ukrainian whose articles were published by Saturday Night.
issues. The presence of an ethnic voice in Parliament, was minimal, practically limited to
one person, Anthony Hlynka, an Ukrainian Social Credit MP for Vegerville (Alberta). The
language of recent European immigrants was identified as “foreign” and their
expressions and names deemed “unpronounceable”, impenetrable and exotic. As a result,
the voice of the members of Canadian ethnic communities is quasi absent from the pages
that follow. The French voice is also mostly absent in this study. The considerable
compactness of the French-Canadian community made the issues of marginalization of
those of European and Asian origin extraneous. It was Anglo-Saxon Canada that faced
the impact of the population change caused by immigration and found it imperative to
extend its hegemony by subduing the chorus of many voices into a single melody line
before the emerging polyphony could have attained strength and volume.

The Thesis Outline

Apart from its inherent and formative English-French duality, Canada is also a
national community characterized by the fluidity of its social and cultural fabric either
due to the constant flow of immigration of new members, or temporary presence and
departure of sojourners and refugees, or emigration (mostly to the United States). The
identification of meanings of what it is to be Canadian in terms of citizenship and/or
cultural identity is consequently continuously discursively negotiated and contested.

32 Joseph Thorson, Minister of National War Services from July 1941 to September 1942,
was of Icelandic origin, and so fully integrated through education and career (he was a
Rhodes Scholar, WWI veteran and a public figure in Winnipeg) that his origin was rarely
openly evoked. Hlynka’s memoirs and diary were recently published by his son Denis as
Anthony Hlynka, The Honourable Member for Vegreville: The Memoirs and Diary,
introduced and translated by Oleh W. Gerus and Denis Hlynka (Calgary: University of
Calgary Press, 2005). See also a contemporary portrait by Austin F. Cross, Anthony
Equally significant for the construction of a Canadian identity has been the process of transformation of Canada from a colony to a national sovereign formation and the gradual severing of discursive and practical ties with the colonial power. Tracing through different stages of Canadian history the process of “Canadianization” of both native-born Canadians and immigrants is crucial for understanding the meaning of Canadian identity in its constant making, perpetuation and transformation. To reach that understanding one has to explore the dynamics behind the production of that identity.

As will be discussed, the research into the existing documentation on the government operations during the WWII years and into the extensive writings of Tracy Philipps unveils discursive and social manifestations concerning this process of “Canadianization” as not entirely devoid of debate, as suggested by Dreisziger. Neither did they herald some future, postmodern ideological position, as suggested by Day. The evidence reveals attitudes rife with ambivalence: stereotyping, paternalism and assertions of unqualified Anglo-Saxon and Protestant superiority over the continental Europeans were confronted with the liberal universalistic approach of the principle that individual rights and freedoms prevail over group rights, and by pragmatic expressions of good will and genuine “sympathetic” understanding here and there expressed by some officials and experts. The evidence also suggests that existing interpretations of the precursory aspects of the Nationalities Branch were simplifications and that the makeshift arrangement behind the setting up of the Branch could have hardly meant the “rise of bureaucracy for multiculturalism.” The government concerns with the “problem” of ethnic minorities during the WWII years had little to do with a genuine attempt to institutionalize the long-deserved recognition of Canadian cultural diversity. Its concerns were principally driven by the desire to secure unconditional participation of ethnic minorities in Canada’s efforts to play a role in the international field, in the ranks of allied armed forces and as an
important member of the British Empire -- with the ensuing and remarkable advantages for Canadian economic growth. The government’s, and Philipps’ ultimate aim was neither to secure individual and group rights to preserve and celebrate one’s cultural identity nor to guarantee equality in diversity -- the core principles behind the construction of multiculturalism as a policy -- but rather the reduction of cultural differences and homogenization of the population according to an Anglo-Saxon model.\textsuperscript{33} Not everybody agreed on how to achieve the goal of “Canadianization” but their common ultimate goal was a modern -- preferably a British -- nation founded on the principle of “unity” rather than “diversity”.

The first chapter offers an overview of the discourse the Canadian political and intellectual elite shared about certain values and institutions informing their way of life at the outset of the WWII: Anglo-conformity, Christianity, democracy, free enterprise, representative government, the English-French constitutional compact, and inevitable modernization. Comparing their way of life with that of others -- those they were determined to fight against (fascist and communist regimes) or those they had to share national space with (French Canadians and immigrants) -- they felt assured of being on the right track to become a modern, sovereign and united nation.

Measures taken to defend Canada’s home front during the war years are the subject of the second chapter. More specifically, the chapter deals with the provisions of

\textsuperscript{33} The 1971 Policy Statement on Multiculturalism provides that “Canadian identity will not be undermined by multiculturalism. Indeed, we believe that cultural pluralism is the very essence of Canadian identity. Every ethnic group has the right to preserve and develop its own culture and values within the Canadian context. To say we have two official languages is not to say we have two official cultures, and no particular culture is more "official" than another. A policy of multiculturalism must be a policy for all Canadians.” See Federal Government’s response to Book IV of the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, in \textit{Debates of the House of Commons}, October 8, 1971, p.8580.
the Defence of Canada Regulations which gave the government power to exercise ultimate control over “enemy aliens”, namely residents legally considered aliens or naturalized Canadians but originating from countries against which Canada was at war. Using the debates of the House of Commons and newspaper coverage, the chapter traces the scope and content of the public reaction to rumours of the potential “enemy within one’s gates” and to the specific precautionary measures taken to counter the danger. For some Canadians, and most of all for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), communists counted among domestic enemies. Just as many Canadians worried instead that their arrests, trials and internment were either clear violations of civil liberties, or potentially damaging for the friendly relations with the USSR, a valued war ally against Nazi Germany.

The third chapter examines discursive representations in use in the 1930s and 1940s of such concepts as “race”, “racial origin”, “foreignness” “mosaic”, “hyphenation”, “Canadian race” and “nation”. In the light of the evident diffusion of the use of the term “race” in the Canadian context (referring to everything from national origin, cultural adherence to skin colour distinction), it is argued in this chapter that “foreignness” (or “strangeness”) rather than “race” signified “otherness” and, consequently, implied marginalization or outright exclusion. Without diminishing the importance of English-French duality as a constitutive factor of national identity, the shifting of boundaries that divided the concept of “being Canadian” from that of being “foreign-born”, “new Canadian” (or “hyphenated” Canadian) also played, therefore, an important role in the process of national self-identification. The discussion in this chapter uses the material produced by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the debates of the House of Commons and the contemporary academic literature to substantiate the argument.
The account of Tracy Philipps' life full of extraordinary experiences in Africa, the Middle East and Eastern Europe, and of his ideological make-up forms the content of the fourth chapter. The account is based on the archival documents and numerous articles that Philipps published throughout his very active life. It is meant to help understand Philipps' actions at the helm of the Nationalities Branch created by the Canadian government in January 1942.

Chapter Five deals with the modalities of setting up the Branch and its advisory Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship. Records show that the officials involved in deciding on the set-up had three policy options to choose from: (a) celebration of the Canadian cultural mosaic, under the assumption that a progressive and inevitable amalgamation -- through acculturation due to cohabitation, education, inter-marriage and group attrition -- would eventually, after several generations, produce a Canadian "racial type"; (b) state-directed, closely monitored and highly encouraged assimilation of European cultural groups to be achieved at different speeds according to the degree of assimilability of each group, with, as an ultimate goal, Anglo-conformity; (c) social (community-oriented) and political (civic) individual integration of all Canadians, new and old, making deliberate abstraction, on official level, of their cultural background and group adherence.

Chapters Six and Seven describe the various activities Philipps and his staff undertook on behalf of the Nationalities Branch and the advisory committee. Chapter Seven pays special attention to three aspects of these activities: the relationship with the so-called "foreign-language" press; Philipps' contacts with the Italian community; and the dealings with the communist agitation which eventually cost the Branch its credibility.
Late 1943 and early 1944 marked a clear change of course. The Nationalities Branch became the object of attacks by the very cultural communities it was supposed to serve, and by various government officials who ideologically and personally disapproved Philipps' methods of operation. Chapter Eight deals with these events. It highlights the role of adult educators in promoting citizenship education and that of the Wartime Information Board in constructing images of a unified national identity. Their influence accelerated Philipps' departure from Canada, the transformation of the Nationalities Branch into the Citizenship Branch, and the adoption of a new policy: promotion of a unique Canadian citizenship and a Canadian civic nationality.

The thesis as a whole is, thus, conceived as an examination of the dialectical process involving the construction of what it meant to be Canadian as it was problematized by the exigencies of the war and a specific series of concurrent inter-cultural encounters: between Canadians of British origin and Canadians of other ethnic origins; between native-born and foreign-born or newcomers; between Canadian nationals and British nationals; citizens and aliens; and those considered loyal to the ideals of Western democracies and those considered enemy aliens or radicals. It is also an attempt to evaluate the impact that one particular Englishman, Tracy Philipps, had on that newly emerging Canadian political discourse when he tried to apply his anthropological expertise acquired at the frontiers of the British Empire to hasten social and cultural integration of "new" Canadians of central and southern European origin into the Canadian social fabric. The thesis is, thus, an exploration into the rise of the concept of Canadian citizenship as a great Canadian equalizer in the context of an emerging cultural diversity.
Chapter 1
Going to War to Defend a “Way of Life”

... this war, in its essence, is not so much a war between nations, as the clash of two opposing forces in the world. These two forces are present, in greater or less degree, in every nation and in every people. They are competing for possession of the soul of man. They are nothing less than the forces of good and evil.

_W.L. Mackenzie King_ (1941)\(^1\)

For this war is not merely a war between England and Germany, or a war between democracy and totalitarianism (what about Russia?), or a world revolution against capitalism by the proletariat (what about a lot of things?), or a war between racial fanaticism and the rights of minorities, or a war for the defence of the Western Hemisphere. In its deepest sense, it is a war between Light and Darkness, between Right and Might. It is part of the eternal agony of man’s redemption wherein God is seeking to teach men the awful sin of those who refuse to accept their responsibilities for mankind.

_Claris Edwin Silcox_ (1941)\(^2\)

There is no doubt that democracy presupposes for its successful working, a very considerable measure of unanimity of purpose among the citizens as a whole. It presupposes that the majority will be willing to abstain from any attempt to do anything that would be unendurably distasteful to any important minority; and it presupposes that all important minorities must have some hope of becoming part of a majority, at some future date, by combining with other minorities or with elements of the existing majority. A permanent minority, whether of class, of race, or of economic interests, is always a permanent menace to the successful working of democracy.

_B.K. Sandwell_ (1940)\(^3\)

\(^1\) W.L. Mackenzie King, Servitude or Freedom. Speech at a dinner tendered in his honour by the Canadian Club of Ottawa, Chateau Laurier, Ottawa, September 17, 1941 (Ottawa: Edmund Cloutier, 1941) p.13.

\(^2\) Claris Edwin Silcox, _The War and Religion_ (Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada, 1941) p.29.

\(^3\) K. Sandwell, _You Take Out What You Put In_ (Toronto: Canadian Association for Adult Education and the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, November 1940) pp.6-7.
It has been a commonplace understanding among historians that wars provide ideal historical contexts for an accelerated process of nation-building. Today’s social theorists explain it in terms of an identity crisis in a typical situation of high oppositional adversity and uncertainty that can be only overcome through an assertive re-construction and re-affirmation of one’s collective identity founded on a distinct set of commonly imagined and shared ambitions and claims.\textsuperscript{4} In times of wars, the physical space, namely the territory of a national community, may not be necessarily turned into a battlefield with all the destruction and desolation that it involves. Such a community may nevertheless traverse a time of collective uncertainty, and manifest signs of insecurity as to its ability to face the challenge of a major upheaval that could result in external social disorder penetrating and crossing the imagined boundaries of its particularity and putting in questions its own way of life. Hence a heightened urge to find cohesiveness, to revisit the boundaries of its identity, and perhaps even to re-write the narrative of its specificity, of its origins (roots), its continuity (tradition) and the collective itineraries (routes) of its becoming a recognizable national identity.

At the eve of the Second World War Canada was apparently still “an unknown country” in search of itself, still on the way to transform itself from a “colony into a nation”.\textsuperscript{5} When Hutchison wrote in the early 1940s


\textsuperscript{5} Those are obvious references to the two well known reflections, of a very different
No one knows my country, neither the stranger nor its own sons. My country is hidden in the dark and teeming brain of youth upon the eve of its manhood. My country has not found itself nor felt its power nor learned its true place. It is all visions and doubts and hopes and dreams. It is strength and weakness, despair and joy, and the wild confusions and restless strivings of a boy who has passed his boyhood but is not yet a man,

his words struck a special chord among his compatriots, and his book turned into a bestseller. ⁶ "Our time is come and we are ready" said Hutchison. ⁷ No more "a backward nation", no more just "a colony", no more "a timid race" slow to change. ⁸

How can we assess what being "Canadian" corresponded to in the 1930s and 1940s? Was it "an unconventionalized and optimistic view of life, work and manners, sprung from untrammelled contact with a wide new effort-creating country" on the road to progress, as Robert England claimed? ⁹ Was the assessment by J.B. Brebner in his presidential address before the members of the Canadian Historical Association in 1940 that "only to a limited degree does Canada stand on her own feet" more appropriate? Brebner also suggested that Canada only occasionally attained "the degree of internal

kind, one journalistic, the other scholarly, by two equally well known Canadians of the time: Bruce Hutchison, The Unknown Country (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart,1943) and A.R.M. Lower, From Colony to Nation: A History of Canada (Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1946)

⁶ B. Hutchison, The Unknown Country: Canada and her People. Rev. ed. 1948 (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965) p.3. The book was first published in New York in 1942. It was published in Canada in October 1943 and went through three reprints during the war years.

⁷ Ibid, p.5.

⁸ Ibid, p.3.

unity upon which a self-confident sense of all-embracing nationality can be built."\textsuperscript{10} His address on "Canadianism" concluded by suggesting that Canadian identity consisted of "over three centuries of successful struggle with a recalcitrant environment, of over a century's original and successful political adaptation and inventiveness, and of a kind of conservatism which history has shown can be converted by adversity into stubborn, indomitable will."\textsuperscript{11}

Could one suggest that the declaration of war in early September 1939 by the Canadian government -- and the subsequent mobilization of all human and material resources to take active part in the war effort -- signified one such demonstration of "indomitable will", self-confidence and masculine strength of character of a pioneer nation? Maybe the answer lies in what one could read in the October 1940 issue of the \textit{Dalhousie Review}, namely, that, properly understood,

this national mobilization should be the symbol of our national coming-of-age. Politically we have attained to the status of a nation; economically and industrially we have not fulfilled the promise of our political development. The world-crisis has thrown upon us new and sudden responsibilities. What we have claimed as rights must now be fulfilled in terms of obligations. We are like a young man who, suddenly in the midst of years, by constraint of circumstance, has adult responsibilities thrust upon him. Such an experience is a testing time for character.\textsuperscript{12}

By the end of the war, it was this optimism, rather than the conservatism invoked by Brebner that emerged as the trait of Canadianism and an ideal of citizenship.

\textsuperscript{10} B. Brebner, "Canadianism - Presidential Address," \textit{Annual Report of the Canadian Historical Association} 1940, p.6.

\textsuperscript{11} Brebner, "Canadianism," p.15.

Optimism was reflected in the speech which M.H. Tory, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Canadian Council for Education in Citizenship (future Canadian Citizenship Council), gave before the Canadian Club in Montreal in March 1945:

The question may well be asked, is it possible to develop in a body of ordinary men and women like ourselves such an understanding of our position as to maintain it as a workable scheme, especially as we try to absorb into our national life many with a tradition foreign to our own? This depends on our ability and willingness to maintain certain ideals of Freedom, Justice, Law and Order, for ourselves at least, and for mankind if possible, at whatever material cost. If in the sharing of a common way of life we maintain our ideals and our practices high enough, the world may come to desire to share it with us.\[13\]

"When Britain is at War, Canada is at War"

From the very outset of the war in Europe, the Canadian government of the day decided that Canada should stand at Great Britain's side in the gigantic effort to stop German advances. With the great oratorical pathos of a Victorian romantic, appropriate for the solemn moment of declaring war, the Prime Minister of Canada explained:

The forces of evil have been loosened in the world in a struggle between the pagan conception of a social order which ignores the individual and is based upon the doctrine of Might, and a civilization based upon the Christian conception of the brotherhood of man, with its regard for the sanctity of

---

contractual relations, and the sacredness of human personality.\textsuperscript{14}

What ensued was not a mythical clash of evil and good forces but a modern war waged and won on the resolve and endurance, co-operation and alliances, technology and organization. This was a war involving huge numbers of people to be mobilised \textit{en masse}, moved around, driven into line of obedience or by sense of collective obligation, invigorated by means of massive propaganda and supported and equipped by powerful government machineries. In Canada, it meant inspiring people to enlist in the army and engage in concrete battles waged thousands of miles overseas and organizing a home front for a major war effort in the industrial and agricultural sectors of the economy. It meant overcoming resistance to conscription in Quebec and convincing Canadians that the war in Europe was really a Canadian issue and that Canadians should help Britain in its national predicament for the sake of the entire "free world".\textsuperscript{15} The Opposition leader R.J. Manion spoke, however, on behalf of many Canadians of British origin when he declared on September 8, 1939: "As part of the British empire, we are at war to-day. I do

\textsuperscript{14} As quoted in W.L. Mackenzie King, "Servitude or Freedom: Speech delivered at Chateau Laurier, Ottawa, September 17, 1941," \textit{Canada and the Fight for Freedom}. 1944 (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1972) p.18. The existence of the state of war with the German Reich was proclaimed on September 10, 1939 (\textit{Order-in-Council PC 2625}).

\textsuperscript{15} Ernest Lapointe, Mackenzie King’s Quebec lieutenant, assured for example the House of Commons that his French origin did not preclude his admiration of Britain: "Such a nation is a great nation... we will endeavour to be worthy of that splendid people and that great nation, and we will not fail her in her hour of trial." See Dominion of Canada. \textit{Official Report of Debates of the House of Commons}, [hereafter: Debates of the House of Commons], \textit{2\textsuperscript{nd} – 19\textsuperscript{th} Parliament (November 7, 1940-January 2, 1942), February 24, 1941}, p.965.
not think there is any doubt about it.... When Britain is at war, Canada is at war.”

Canadian citizens were British subjects, after all, insisted the editor of the Globe and Mail; they owed the existence of their nation entirely to the influence of British traditions. Half the population in the country may “lack the ties of British blood” but that should not distract the government and the nation as a whole to affirm that being part of the British Empire and being associated with that great nation in its battle for survival is more important than national unity, if it ever were to be put in question. The Editor was commenting on a bill brought before the House of Commons in Spring 1939 by the Member of Parliament for Selkirk (Manitoba), J.T. Thorson, an eminent lawyer of Icelandic origin. Thorson was proposing that Canada should be able to take full responsibility for her decisions to assume a belligerent status and not declare war as a matter of “any automatic commitments to be made for her by any Government outside of Canada.” The Editor was blunt:

Does Mr. J.T. Thorson, M.P., ever pause to consider that the opportunities enabling him to become an eminent lawyer and Rhodes scholar were founded by British initiative before his parents left Iceland? Doesn’t he and every one else in Canada, regardless of racial origin, know that this country owes everything to British protection, policies and traditions. Are we now going to spurn the hand that fed and nurtured us?”

---

16 Debates of the House of Commons, 5th (Special War) Session-18th Parliament (September 7-13, 1939), September 8, 1939, p.18.


18 See Mr. J.T. Thorson moving, on February 2, 1939, for leave to introduce Bill No. 16, respecting the status of Canada in time of war, in Debates of the House of Commons, 4th session-18th Parliament (January 12-June 3, 1939) p. 539, and the subsequent debate upon the 2nd reading of the Bill, on March 31, on pp.2483-2504, and April 3, on pp.2511-2513.
The editor of a distinctly conservative *Globe and Mail* reflected the opinion of many of his readers, if not on the subject of dubious loyalty of politicians of non-British origin such as Thorson, undoubtedly on the issue of “why go to war”. Did not William L. Mackenzie King, Canada’s Prime Minister, finally, after some hesitations, assume the task of leading Canada into war “with a sense of being true to the very blood that is in [his] vein”? And that “blood” was considered to be of British origin.

*Defending Democracy*

What, then, did Britain so firmly stand for that was worthwhile defending? It was a way of life based on principles of democracy and liberalism, Canadians were told. “If we, through our victory,” wrote the President of the University of Toronto, Sir Robert Falconer,

make certain that the fundamental moral conception of the worth of the individual becomes more deeply rooted in the hearts of our peoples, the way and the forms in which it will find social and political expression, I am content to leave to the

---

19 Prime Minister King ignored this attack on Thorson’s apparent disloyalty and appointed him the first minister responsible for National War Services on June 11, 1941. In his diary for June 11, 1941, King wrote: “I had much in mind Thorson’s appointment being something that would please those of foreign extraction in the country and, of course, had much in mind him having served himself overseas in the last war and his long term of service in the H. of C.” King also noted in his diary that John MacNicol, Liberal M.P. from Toronto, congratulated the government in the House of Commons “on the appointment and particularly as it revealed the freedom and chances there were under the British constitution for men who have come from other lands to have their place in the making of laws.” [Available at http://king.archives.ca/EN]. Thorson eventually resigned on October 7, 1942 to take the position on the bench of the Exchequer Court.

20 *Debates of the House of Commons*, Fifth (Special War) Session–18th Parliament, September 8, 1939, p.20.
good sense of moral persons and to the approved British method of advancement by public discussion.\textsuperscript{21}

The war to be waged was not, said the popular British playwright and broadcaster, J.B. Priestley, a “war in the old sense at all.” It was in fact, he argued, “a desperate battle, in which the whole future of the world is involved, between two ways of life.” One way, “our” British way was not perfect, but “we” could criticize it if “we” wanted to and could improve it if necessary, he argued. “But the other kind of life, which has spread like a foul stain over half Europe, is simply evil. It isn’t German... It is simply a gigantic insane gangsterism, a vast power machine built for nothing but brutal conquest.”\textsuperscript{22} And it had to be destroyed, or else, “we” would be destroyed. The “we” here became a broader concept identified with Western civilization, including what the Germans had achieved as a nation until the arrival of Nazism. In a way, the British and the free world were fighting against a new social, authoritarian order maintained with machine guns and violence.\textsuperscript{23} Priestley’s inspirational broadcasts and Churchill’s patriotic speeches were heard and appreciated in Canada, too. Their messages were re-conveyed in more elaborate words by various public commentators, including Watson Kirkconnell:

\textsuperscript{21} Sir Robert Falconer, “Introduction,” in Philip Child and John W. Holmes, Dynamic Democracy (Toronto: Canadian Association for Adult Education and Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1941) (Behind the Headlines Series, no. 9) p.2.


\textsuperscript{23} Noticeably absent on the international scale were open references to communist Russia as enemy, of the kind encountered during the cold war years of the late 1940s and 1950s. As of June 1941, moreover, Soviet Russia was an ally in war against Nazi Germany. In Canada, communism was a domestic enemy and the covert war against it was the domain of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.
A clear distinction has been drawn between the German nation and the Nazi incubus that bedevils it and chokes its liberties. Britain seeks to save not only the world but Germany itself from Hitler and Nazism.... Difficult as it may sometimes seem, we must, as our highest patriotic duty, keep it clear to ourselves and our neighbours that we are not fighting against the German nation, German music, German literature, and all of the German legacy to our joint civilization.... Their citizens, moreover, by their qualities of mind and heart, are, for an Anglo-Canadian, perhaps the most immediately congenial of all Europeans. The present tragic conflict is not directed against our Germanic kindred but against the aggressive menace of Nazidom.  

,"We are fighting for Christianity, in all its branches," stated the Conservative leader Hon. R.J. Manion in the Canadian House of Commons, "because Christianity, Protestant and Catholic alike, has been persecuted in Germany by Hitler." Expressing his indignation in the face of utmost immorality, he added: "We are fighting for religion, because Judaism and the Jews have been persecuted even more cruelly by Hitler." This was followed by a statement of "our" political credo: "We are fighting for democracy, for liberty of person, liberty of speech and assembly, liberties which we in Canada enjoy." The "we" stood here for the British people as well as for the Western, predominantly Anglo-Saxon world, including the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America. In this rhetoric, the Canadian way of life stood for liberal democracy and absence of intolerance against minorities and dissent.  

"Democracy" was used as a conceptual abstraction of universal value to signify a

---


diversity of political and social claims. For John Diefenbaker, the eloquent, newly elected conservative Member of Parliament from Saskatchewan, it seemed to stand for an "attitude of mind" allowing for policies to be "settled by free discussions" which meant, in other words, the right of opposition to keep an eye on the majority in power.27 "We have to have, I quite agree," said Stephen Leacock, the satirist and McGill Professor in Political Economy, "an ‘opposition’ at Ottawa, His Majesty’s Loyal Opposition. We pay for it and we are entitled to get it. In any case it has come down to us as part of our British genius of Government."28 Others stressed that democracy meant representative government, "245 men and women" elected at more or less regular intervals to "become responsible to the citizens of the country in the conduct of their public affairs."29 That is why, in order to exercise an informed judgment on whom to elect, people must "be kept as intelligent as possible by free discussion and free expression of opinion."30

Democracy also stood for sanctity of individual freedom. The protection and preservation of civil liberties – freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of


29 J.W. Holmes, How the Wheels Go Round (Toronto: Canadian Association for Adult Education and Canadian Institute of International Affairs, October 1940) p.1.

30 Holmes, How the Wheels Go Round, p.4.
conscience and religion – were considered basic democratic rights. More progressive commentators added to those rights claims for equality of opportunities in social and economic spheres. For a progressive Christian, said Gregory Vlastos (Associate Professor of Philosophy at Queen’s University and member of the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order), the guiding principle of a democratic new order ought to be (1) solidarity of all men as producers and consumers, which meant, among others, the right to work, and the right to work for the good of all not for the profit of an individual, the right to adequate livelihood, education and health care; (2) a solidarity of all citizens within the nation, which amounted to popular participation in democratic self-government, the right to information and adult education in citizenship; and (3) a solidarity of the citizens of all nations for the benefit of collective security. For the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire (IODE), the cornerstone of democracy was service to the community and the first principles of democracy -- "the familiar Christian principles" -- should be "discipline, tolerance, unselfishness, self-restraint, and above all,

31 The first issue of a new periodical of the Canadian Association for Adult Education, Food for Thought, consisted of a single article by R.S. Lambert, "This Freedom: A Guide to Good Citizenship in Time of War," Food for Thought 1 (January 1940)

32 See, for instance, H.G. Skilling, How Did We Get That Way ((Toronto: Canadian Association for Adult Education and Canadian Institute of International Affairs, October 1940) pp.3, 15. Skilling's pamphlet was the first in a series of five pamphlets entitled Democracy and Citizenship Series published jointly by the Canadian Association of Adult Education (CAAE) and the Canadian Institute of International Affairs (CIIA). The other titles include the above mentioned pamphlet by J.W. Holmes, as well as B.K. Sandwell's You Take Out What You Put In, T.W.L. MacDermot's Can We Make Good and Lambert's Do You Deserve Democracy: A Letter to a Young Canadian Citizen.

consideration for the rights of others.”

On the other hand, University of Manitoba History Professor H. N. Fieldhouse warned Canadian readers of Queen’s Quarterly, that the democracy was “simply a matter of numbers,” and its meaning should not be confounded with liberalism. Democracy “means government by the mass of the people as a whole, and its criterion is not spiritual but numerical.” Fascism and Nazism did not oppose democracy, he argued, they relied, in fact, on the rule of the masses emotionally charged by adequate propaganda – but they did oppose liberalism. This is because, he explained, liberalism is “the product of a cultivated, tolerant and urbane society,” it is “an attitude of mind,” “acquired by degrees as a man enters into the conscious possession of his own personality through a life of discipline and moral progress.” It cannot, he added, be practised by “men in temper” or “by men in a hurry.”

Democracy “connotes peaceful evolution (swift or slow as need demands) but never revolution,” argued Philip Child and James Holmes at the end of their pamphlet on Dynamic Democracy. They quoted Goldwin Smith who had said that one should “never glorify Revolution; statesmanship is the art of avoiding it” and they acquiesced that “there could be no finer justification of democracy than that belief.”

---

34 J.D. Detwiler, “Do We Deserve Democracy?” Echoes, no. 168 (Autumn 1942) p.44. See also her “Education for Citizenship in a Democracy,” Echoes, no. 170 (Spring 1943) p.10. Detwiler was National Educational Secretary and member of the National Empire Study Committee of the IODE.

35 H.N. Fieldhouse, “Dictatorship and Democracy,” Queen’s Quarterly 47, no.2 (Summer 1940) p.162.

At issue, in fact, was not how democratic a regime was in itself but how liberal and tolerant it was in respect to the rights of individuals and minorities, suggested B. K. Sandwell, editor-in-chief of *Saturday Night*. It all depended on how homogenous the population under the pressure and authority of a democratic government had been. That homogeneity is achieved either “because the hand of the government is at the throat of every man who does not cry Heil,” or because of a consent reached when minorities “learn to tolerate a lot more of that pressure, along lines dictated by the majority,” and the majority “learns to exercise the greatest possible tolerance in all matters wherein governmental interference is not absolutely necessary.” Vital to the achievement of this consensus and workable unanimity were, in Sandwell’s words, clear manifestations of tolerance and mutual understanding of objectives and *raison d’être* of both minorities and the majority.

*Going Modern*

At the same time as these various reflections on the tenets of democracy and the cultural debt Canadians owed to the “mother country” were expounded in the press and other public fora, a realization was growing that, with the progress of war, and owing to its economic potentials and strength, Canada had begun to acquire a respectable, if not dominant, status among Western allies. While engaged in war activities, Canadians

---


38 For the official history of Canada’s participation in WWII, see C.P. Stacey, *Arms, Men, and Governments: The War Policies of Canada, 1939-1945* (Ottawa: Queen’s
also chose, cautiously and pragmatically, to follow a well-trod road some other Western societies had already taken towards applying novel methods of planning and regulating social activities of their people in order to confront challenges of economic depression, social strife and other side effects of growing industrialization and urbanization.

The eminent Canadian historian Donald Creighton used the metaphor of the forked road to describe Canada in the late 1930s. Canada chose, he said, the fork that "led directly into a new world of planning and management, of economic controls and social equalization" instead of going "along the familiar way it had followed before the war." 39 Creighton would have preferred the latter option, the old, conservative way of life. In 1976, the year he wrote his book, he did not explicitly elaborate on his own views, guided, evidently, by the golden rule of historians to avoid overt political biases (something Creighton was not very successful at, one must add). But in the early 1940s, while still a young scholar, he already revealed his fears - albeit acknowledging the demands of the circumstances of war - that modernity brought with it "unusual controls, present and prospective" falsely based, in his opinion, on the notion "that democracy can best be preserved and improved at its own expense," with no return to old patterns of political life. 40 He did not even stipulate, for him an unimaginable option, that Canada might have also chosen to go along the road of fascism or communism something that

---


40 Donald Creighton, "The Course of Canadian Democracy," University of Toronto Quarterly 11, no.3 (April 1942) p.268.
was a great concern of those in charge of the national security.

Historian Doug Owram’s study of Canada’s road to modernity is quite different from the one written by Creighton in 1976. Owram views in a positive sense the increasing involvement of intellectuals in government business and the construction of such a modern state.\textsuperscript{41} “War”, he says, “offered some encouraging possibilities for those who advocated a more active ‘planned’ state.” It also provided “the concrete test case of the modern state in fully developed form.”\textsuperscript{42} Acting on behalf of the federal State, the government began to acquire a greater and ever greater ability to plan, manage and control an increasing number of areas of social and economic development. This entailed the emergence of a growing corpus of public servants to administer new programmes and government undertakings, and an increased recourse to expert knowledge of specialists and scientists to advice the bureaucrats and politicians. The columnist of “Backstage at Ottawa” in the Maclean’s Magazine, wondered whether “anybody at all is left back home to run business and industry.” Streets of Ottawa were full of strange faces: “‘dollar-a-year’ men and ten- and twenty-dollar-a-day men, controllers of this, that and the other thing.”\textsuperscript{43} Even some members of Parliament wondered at the necessity and justification of such recourse by government:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{41} Doug Owram, \textit{The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State 1900-1945} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986). According to Owram’s figures, there were 36,000 federal civil servants in 1939, 67,000 in 1941, 104,000 in 1943, and 115,000 in 1945.
\item \textsuperscript{42} Owram, The Government Generation, pp.255, 253.
\item \textsuperscript{43} “Backstage at Ottawa,” Maclean’s Magazine 53, no.20, October 15, 1940, p.12.
\end{itemize}
"...why there should be such a horde of them is puzzling."

_Macleans' Magazine_, October 15, 1940
Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not like the move of the government toward state bureaucracy. I realize that some of it is necessary in war time, but not in such large doses as are being fed to us today. That is not Liberal, at least not the Liberalism that I have always known in past years.\footnote{44 Intervention by J.A. Marshall (Camrose, Alberta) on March 4, 1943, in Debates of the House of Commons, 4\textsuperscript{th} session - 19\textsuperscript{th} Parliament (January 28, 1943-January 26, 1944) p.971.}

All these experts were brought to Ottawa to hasten the transformation of scientific knowledge into bureaucratic tools of governing and keeping social forces under control. They brought modernity into Ottawa's corridors of power. According to Zygmunt Bauman, who has enriched our understanding of modern and post-modern states of mind, the transformation of expertise into bureaucratic power is an indispensable modern phenomenon in the construction of a rationally viable social order by means of ever-more complex technologies of control and "seduction".\footnote{45 Z. Bauman, Intimations of Postmodernity (London: Routledge, 1992) p.15.} At one point, Bauman equates modern societies to "garden cultures." To look after them and reproduce them in the desired, man-made order -- in other words, to govern them -- requires constant expert supervision, design, cultivation, strengthening of fences and vigilant surveillance. Nothing can be left to hazard and nature, otherwise, "uninvited, unplanned, self-controlled plants" could cause disorder, allow "wilderness" to creep in and reveal "the fragility of the imposed order."\footnote{46 Z. Bauman, Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals (London: Polity Press, 1987) p.51.}

In a modern state, the society is viewed by those who wield or hope to wield power as an object of administration, to be controlled, mastered and improved, in short,
according to Bauman, "a legitimate target for 'social engineering'." In his explorations of how something so horribly calculated and violent as the Holocaust could take place in a modern society, Bauman extends his gardening metaphor by adding that this practice begins by dividing "vegetation into 'cultured plants' to be taken care of, and weeds to be exterminated," a social technology which can, under extreme conditions of social malaise, easily lead to the idea of bureaucratically categorizing and sorting out people in order to isolate or eliminate all those considered socially undesirable.  

It is noteworthy, therefore, to read some of the statements one of the newly arrived experts in Ottawa made about how he conceived the nature of his specialized work among the immigrant population. Using a highly metaphorlic language that belonged to what Bauman identified as the discourse of "garden cultures" of modernity, Tracy Philipps, European Adviser at the Department of National War Services, explained to his superiors in Ottawa:

If, in our garden, we wish to transplant successfully from abroad an adult shrub, we are careful in the process not to insist on tearing at once all the old earth from its roots. Indeed, on the contrary, the more we can temper the shock and the set-back of the upheaval by ourselves admitting some of its old and familiar soil to the new hole, the more sure we can be that the tree has something to use as a stabilizing basis to thrust down strong roots into the new land. ... the old soil of their virtues and arts which can best be blended as the basis of the transition to Canadianism. And the more durable the tree, the more gradual the growth. Only mere plants can be expected to adapt themselves and to flower in a day. The peasant peoples of eastern Europe are the most deeply rooted of all the human trees in the world. For them, the shock of transplantation is far more cruel than we know.  

---


48 Tracy Philipps, "Report on Tour in Western Canada, November-December 1940, Part
Philipps used the images of uprooting and transplanting when speaking of migrants and their adaptation in the new country years before these images had become popularized by Oscar Handlin and John Bodnar through their groundbreaking studies of American immigration.⁴⁹

Gardening is a method of tending to and caring for useful plants in a selected environment. It also involves transplanting, grafting and selective weeding of the weak and unwanted elements. In that sense, it is similar to medical treatment. In medicine, one has to diagnose, operate, apply treatment, nurse and hasten the rehabilitation of patients. A medical metaphor also implies that the object is unfit, sick, in decay, infested with bacteria and viruses, in need of repair, sanitization, or purification. Philipps used, consequently, this metaphor as well when explaining the principles involved in achieving “Canadianism”, the ultimate goal of his assignment:

In constructive diplomacy as in bone ailments, there are two main methods. The first method is the most spectacular, prompt and popular. It is the equivalent of a surgical intervention. It often requires other operations to follow. It is rapid, drastic and aggressive. One attacks the foreign element which has entered the body-politic. In the realm of diplomacy it takes the form of threat and direct action... It is the least satisfactory method ... the permanence of the cure depends on the period and quality of the subsequent nursing. ... The second technique ... seems the better one, for the future. One gives the subject access to the sun. It illuminates, it enlightens and it heals. One unearths their misapprehensions and their grievances. One treats these simultaneously and sympathetically. One lets in light and air. It

I (January 8, 1941),” p.7, vol. 1, file 16, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

produces a healthy, firm and lasting build-up.\textsuperscript{50}

On a different occasion, he suggested the following:

Our care has to be directed to their conversion to our faith. Our prescription is assimilation. Our machine has therefore to be set-up with multiple gears to engage and treat each main group of patients according to the very different origins and symptoms of their externally stimulated ailments which are complicated by mental under-nourishment.\textsuperscript{51}

Techniques, machines, build-ups, humans perceived as unanimated plants to be treated and manipulated, communities perceived as organic units to be expertly moulded according to the objectives of the state – those were the concepts of modernity that modern experts employed in policy making to gear social forces in the direction politicians wanted them to go.

Brooke Claxton, member of Parliament for Montreal and later the Prime Minister’s parliamentary assistant made a revealing prediction in a private letter, written in 1942 to the editor of the Financial Post, Ronald McEchearn.\textsuperscript{52} In it, Claxton shows his awareness of the potentials of social technology as a modern means to conduct politics. Government, Claxton anticipated, “will become more and more a job of engineering.” The rest of the letter makes it clear that what Claxton meant was nothing

\textsuperscript{50} Tracy Philipps, “Report on Tour in Western Canada, November-December 1940, Part I (January 8, 1941)” p.6, vol. 1, file 16, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\textsuperscript{51} Tracy Philipps, “Ref. Memorandum - plans of 13\textsuperscript{th} January, 20\textsuperscript{th} May (Washington) and 17\textsuperscript{th} June 1941 (Signed October 16, 1941),” vol. 1, file 25, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\textsuperscript{52} Letter by Brooke Claxton to R.A. McEachren, November 10, 1942, in File “Nominal Correspondence, M-Mac, 1923-1942,” vol. 19, Brooke Claxton Fonds, MG 32 B5, LAC. See also a reference to this letter in Owrarn, The Government Generation, p.260.
as radical as Bauman's implications but rather that political debates among different "isms" - conservatism, liberalism and socialism - could become more and more irrelevant as the differences in their social and political goals became "enormously reduced." For Claxton, and modern technocrats of his generation, Parliament seemed on its way, sometime after the war, of reverting to being merely a chamber of communications between government and "people in a locality" represented by an MP. It would cease to be a forum *par excellence* for a constructive exchange of ideas. The objectives of any government would be then centred on satisfying consumer needs: "has he a house, food, a job and a chance," and on the task to plan and secure means to reach such objectives. Private enterprise would be encouraged with the awareness that interests of management (and not necessarily ownership of production) and those of labour could be regarded as identical. Claxton was an able politician, and, to a certain extent, a prophet of things to come, fifty years later.

Significantly, Claxton asked McEachern not to publish the letter: this rational assessment of what modern government was about to become was exactly what some Canadians - such as Creighton, and so many other conservatives in the country -- were objecting to and were not prepared for.\(^53\) Canada was difficult to govern, declared Claxton in a speech on "Information and Morale in Wartime" delivered at the meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association in May 1941. There were "great concentrations of economic control, wide disparity of individual incomes, intense and

\(^{53}\) On the conservative intellectual climate in the country, see Philip Massolin, *Canadian Intellectuals, the Tory Tradition and the Challenge of Modernity, 1939-1970* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001)
sometimes highly intolerant adherence to different religious views."54 People were subjected to competing influences of Britain and Europe, on one hand, and the North American realities, on the other. Instead of being carried away by rugged individualism, Canadians should be brought together to overcome "ignorance, apathy and difference - racial, political or economic," those enemies of democracy and Hitler's potential allies.55 For that purpose, the government should use propaganda to raise the country's morale and keep the public aware that they are all part of a big national project -- a cultivated Canadian garden, to use Bauman's -- and Philipps' -- metaphor.

Successful use of propaganda was one of the major aspects of the successful "engineering job" that Claxton was talking about. Propaganda and public opinion polls were new, modern tools in governing that had their fervent supporters and equally fervent detractors.56 While propaganda was intended to modify, channel or crystallize opinion and collective attitudes, polls served to assess them. In both cases the object of these techniques was the public, a collective of individuals whose value systems could

54 Address by Brooke Claxton to the Canadian Political Science Association at Kingston on Friday, May 23, 1941, entitled "Information and Morale in Wartime," in vol. 179 "Speeches," Brooke Claxton Fonds, MG32 B5, LAC. The expression "adherence to different religious views" is a disguised way for a cautious politician from Montreal to refer to the very divisive relationship between Catholic and Protestant Canadians, in other words, French and Anglo-Saxon Canadians.

55 Ibid.

be tested and moulded by social scientists. In the words of Wilfrid Sanders, first Director of the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion, public opinion polls consisted of a sampling process, making scientifically sure that all types and groups of the population are represented – and here we have, again, a medical reference -- "much the same as that used by a doctor, in seeking to ascertain the condition of a person’s blood.”

The rather vague concept of “the public” stood as a comprehensive reference to the class of people employed in different social activities such as workers, farmers, soldiers, sailors, office workers, tradesmen - and women, too (usually mentioned as a separate social group). It was sometimes replaced by a far less neutral term of “the masses” because of its inherent connotation of unruliness, street manifestations and large numbers of labouring people demanding something or other or being manipulated by self designated leaders. In short, “the public” was for those in positions of political power everybody except the “elite”. The elite possessed the necessary tools to govern, legislate, educate and acquire knowledge in order to govern, legislate, educate and acquire even more knowledge more effectively.

Among the elite were men and women who by birth, class or education were entitled to express publicly their ideas and act upon them if so willing. Potentials


seemed great in the late 1930s and early 1940s to influence Canada’s progress on its road to modernity. There was, as Owram describes, a “community of intellectuals who were not only active in observing and assessing the changing nature of the state in Canada but were also the proponents of, and participants in, that change.” Among them were those, like Claxton, who wished that the Canadian modern state remain a liberal democracy and its economy a capitalist one. Some of them also believed that Canada, as a modern state, should opt for a planned economic development, provide conditions for employment opportunities and social security of its citizens, including adequate standards of living, health care and greater access to education. There were among this elite those who promoted change and social reconstruction; those who formed a new party with Left-wing leanings; those who became involved in adult education through the network of Canadian Clubs, university extension programmes, broadcasting and film-making; but also those, who, after brilliant stints at the best universities in Great Britain (some endowed with a prestigious Rhodes scholarship), joined civil service ranks or the ruling Liberal Party and became politicians.  


Brooke Claxton was one of those eager reformers who chose politics as their field of action. Undoubtedly influenced by his vast contacts with academics, adult educators, and writers and artists, Claxton followed a pragmatic road in his political activities as a Liberal MP and a minister of the Crown and did not perceive contradictions, in those days of global and domestic crisis, to mix his liberalism with beliefs that the state had a mobilizing role in providing cohesion and adequate conditions of public solidarity in search of social and economic security and individual well-being.\footnote{In 1944, Brooke Claxton became the first federal minister of health and public welfare and laid foundations for the long list of measures in this field that still serve as symbols of Canadian national values. For a biography of Claxton, see D. Jay Bercuson, True Patriot: The Life of Brooke Claxton, 1898-1960 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993)}

“The total process of modernization has, in fact and in spite of all individualistic trends, collectivized life in a new and inescapable sense” wrote adult educator Watson Thompson in the Canadian Forum in 1942. “Insofar as Canada may tend to become a centrally controlled and socialized economy,” he added, “it is certain that she will plan and socialize opinion by some means that will be quite legitimately called

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Claxton was a great believer in the merits of using positive propaganda as a driving force to infuse in the mind of people pride in the country and the will to participate in the war efforts. One should tell the truth, because unnecessary repression and censorship created fear, he argued in a series of letters and memoranda he wrote to Prime Minister King between 1940 and 1942, promoting his ideas on the need for the government to improve its communications with the public. Every means should be used to reach the public: press, radio, films, posters, lectures, government agencies (including the Post Office and the Tourist Bureau), various commercial and professional organizations, schools, and other institutions. In this view, one must create a general feeling of confidence, make people identify themselves with national action and appreciate the way of life they are called to defend.

Two Ways of Life

The way of life that Canadians, according to the English-speaking intellectual elite, had chosen to maintain and celebrate was, thus, as we have seen, a life under democracy. It seemed an obvious choice because the other ways of life, the one proposed to subjugated Europeans by Hitler, or that by Stalin, were unacceptable. There was either tyranny or freedom. The polarized construction of “two ways of life”


63 See File “Education: Pamphlets, Memoranda, Speeches, Clippings,” vol. 147, Brooke Claxton Fonds, MG32 B5, LAC.

64 Memorandum by Brook Claxton to The Prime Minister, W.L. Mackenzie King, May
emerged in different contexts all along that period.

Two publications issued in 1940 with large circulation for broad public consumption carried the titles *Two Ways of Life*. The one produced in 1940 by the government, through its Bureau of Public Information, emphasized the polarization of “we” and “they” by highlighting it in its parallel French title (*Two Ways of Life* = *Eux et Nous*). It underlined the positive choice Canadians, in the sense of “we-nous” – whether born in the country or naturalized – had made by opting for democracy and civilization instead of tyranny and dictatorship espoused by “them-eux”. “Our way of life is the civilized way of life,” repeated the pamphlet in seven European languages on a same page: English, French, Ukrainian, Polish, German, Italian and Norwegian. “It is the civilized way because under it every citizen enjoys the right to worship as he pleases, to select his own rulers, to help make his own laws, to choose his own career and to live more freely than under any other form of government known to man.” The contrast between this, “our” way of life, on one hand, and the world of tyranny, political murder, slave labour, regimentation and coercion, on the other, was displayed in juxtaposition of collages of pictorial representations of how it looked “there” in comparison to “here,” with brief captions in all the above-mentioned languages, vilifying and praising the situations, respectively, as it fitted.

5, 1941, file 2-14-2, vol. 8, RG36-31, LAC.
Cover page: *The Two Ways of Life – Eux et nous* (Ottawa: Bureau of Public Information, 1941)
The slim pamphlet was distributed through provincial ministries of education and within six months, by March of 1941, some 1,250,000 copies were handed out.\(^{65}\) It was a pure example of straightforward propaganda with no subtlety or sophistication in its opposing good -- to be praised and defended, against evil -- to combat and destroy.\(^{66}\) Even less sophisticated was a pamphlet in French asking French Canadians Que préfères-tu? (What do you prefer?) The pamphlet was in fact merely a series of drawings opposing images of free action (working alone in a field, voting, speaking, praying), implying LA LIBERTÉ (Freedom) in contrast to scenes of drudgery, coercion or pillory, implying situations of SERVITUDE. It concluded with a straightforward message: “Cette liberté - - la tienne - - va la défendre outre-mer. ENRÔLE-TOI!” (This freedom -- yours -- go defend it overseas. ENLIST!) The pamphlet seemed to be destined for the “habitant” who supposedly hardly read and would be more likely receptive to uncomplicated calls for mobilisation with minimum text and maximum drama.

The other publication also entitled Two Ways of Life was written by W.J. Lindal, a respected Saskatchewan judge of Icelandic origin who felt compelled to write a lengthy pamphlet to stress the fact that Canada rightly chose a “balanced way of life”

\(^{65}\) See the report by the Minister responsible for the National War Services, including the Bureau of Public Information, Hon. J. G. Gardiner during the debate on the War Appropriation Bill, March 7, 1941 in Debates of the House of Commons, 2\(^{nd}\) -19\(^{th}\) Parliament (November 7, 1940-January 21, 1942) p.1334.

\(^{66}\) “A very clever pamphlet” was the comment by E.G. Hansell, Social Credit (New Democracy) MP from Alberta. “It is well got up, it is attractive mechanically, and it is printed in several languages, but it is very clever politically.” Simplicity of depicting the “other” as evil and brute had its admirers! Debates of the House of Commons, 2\(^{nd}\) -19\(^{th}\) Parliament (November 7, 1940-January 21, 1942) November 29, 1940, p.531.
instead of totalitarianism. In his view, Canadians were guided in their choice by Christianity and various democratic values upon which this highly preferred way of life was based. This meant maintaining a correct balance between freedom and authority, favouring peace and democracy for all, instead of tyranny of the few resulting in an oppressive dictatorship as a form of government for all. Italy, Germany, Spain and Japan had succumbed to the lure of dictatorship, and Russia to that of the Soviet power, Lindal argued, but Canada and its people had always known better.

Lindal pointed out an important distinction, in his opinion, between, on the one hand, "democracy" when it signified a form of government, and on the other, what he labelled a "democratic way of life" which was essentially, he suggested, timeless and without borders, in the same sense as Christianity. It had universal value, it made "no distinctions." And he added: "In a real democracy there are no 'lords' and 'serfs'; no division into 'We' and 'They'." This claim is remarkable considering that Lindal was frequently recognized in public as an Icelandic, whose successful judicial career was praised for having been achieved against all odds because of foreign origin, one of the "others"/"them", so to say!

A similar "we" and "they" dichotomy in Canada was highlighted under the same construction of "two ways of life" by historian Arthur Lower in his presidential address at the annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association in 1943 when he referred

---

67 W.J. Lindal, Two Ways of Life: Freedom or Tyranny (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1940). That Lindal was of Icelandic origin was often highlighted as an example of a successful integration. His wife, a friend of Prime Minister King, was a notable adult educator for citizenship, until her death in 1942.
to this dichotomy as the primary antithesis of Canadian history, juxtaposing "two philosophies, two contradictory views of the fundamental nature of man." Applying an essentialized approach to "human types", Lower confronted "peasant-spiritual, or rural-natural, the primitive outlook of life" of French-Canadians with Calvinist, materialistic, commercialized, individualist and urbanized attitude of English Canadians. "The two communities will never be one, there can be no question of a blood brotherhood," for the time being, he added. The fact that so-called English Canadians were not a culturally cohesive group seemed not important at that stage because its homogeneity would be hopefully achieved sooner rather than later through gradual assimilation and emigration to the US: Canadian racial diversity, in Lower's assessment, was constructed exclusively as an irreconcilable French-English duality, the primary feature of the Canadian society.

A very different juxtaposition of "we vs. they" on the home front figured in the most commented upon pamphlet on the subject of what Canada was confronting in the war. It was written by Watson Kirkconnell and entitled Canada, Europe, and Hitler. It

68 Lindal, Two Ways of Life, p.104.


70 Lower, "Two Ways of Life," p.17.

71 Ibid, p.18. It must be noted that Lower was speaking at the height of the controversy between English-speaking Canada and French-Canadians on the subject of conscription. On the issue of conscription, see, J.L. Granatstein and J.M. Hitsman, Broken Promises: A History of Conscription in Canada (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1977)

72 Watson Kirkconnell, Canada, Europe, and Hitler (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1939)
was praised for breaking new grounds,\textsuperscript{73} as a "work of absorbing topical interest,"\textsuperscript{74} for being "refreshing"\textsuperscript{75} and a "fluent and compact survey of Canadian war attitudes."\textsuperscript{76} The book consisted of two parts. The first part gave an account of the dramatic political situation in Europe with the emphasis on Hitler's military advances and his Aryan race theories, offering some personal insights on nationalistic aspirations of smaller European states or stateless populations caught between the territorial ambitions of Germany and Soviet Russia. The second part consisted of an account of how these ideological, territorial and nationalistic struggles in Europe were reflected on Canadian soil among "European Canadians," so defined as those who were neither Anglo-Saxon nor French. It was in this second part of the book where its generally recognized originality resided. That Canada was not homogenous culturally had been evident to many Canadians and books such as \textit{Canadian Mosaic} by John Murray Gibbon had highlighted existing differences by focussing on artistic expressions, handicraft, folklore and history.\textsuperscript{77} That

\textsuperscript{73} A.S.P. Woodhouse, "Reviews: The Plain Man and the War," \textit{University of Toronto Quarterly} 9, no.2 (January 1940) p.235.

\textsuperscript{74} [Prince], A.E.P., [Book Review:] "Canada, Europe and Hitler. By Watson Kirkconnell ....," \textit{Queen's Quarterly} 47, no.1 (Spring 1940) p.102.

\textsuperscript{75} Frank Underhill, "Canada, Europe and Hitler," \textit{Canadian Forum} 19, no.228 (January 1940) p.318. Underhill did not agree with Kirkconnell in most of his arguments on the reasons for going to war and what to expect upon the restoration of peace. What he appreciated was the method of presenting facts and avoiding "oratorical bombast about liberty and democracy." Kirkconnell would however soon begin to indulge in oratorical bombast in his prolific attacks not on Hitler and Nazism but rather the Soviet Union.

\textsuperscript{76} Wilfrid Eggleston, [Book Review:] "Canada, Europe and Hitler. By Watson Kirkconnell ...." \textit{Canadian Historical Review} 21 (March 1940) p.87.

\textsuperscript{77} John Murray Gibbon, \textit{Canadian Mosaic: The Making of a Northern Nation} (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1938). In his published recollections, a renowned journalist of
cultural diversity also meant diversity of political and nationalistic allegiances was somehow ignored by the general public – if not by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) or immigration branch of the federal Department of Mines and Resources. Kirkconnell disclosed in public the lively political activity taking place behind the linguistic barrier that kept news about the life in the communities of continental European origin out of reach of the mainstream media.

Kirkconnell was known for his knowledge of a vast number of European languages and for his interest in literature other than French or English. In *Canada, Europe and Hitler* he revealed his interest in reading the “foreign-language press,” some 70 newspapers published in Canada and distributed among “new Canadians” who might or might not be able to read English- or French-language mainstream press and thus were kept informed of the political and military developments in their respective countries of origin entirely in their own language. Owing to his remarkable linguistic erudition, Kirkconnell was able to expose to the general public the existence of a most

---

the times, Wilfrid Eggleston, quoted from his personal journal from around Christmas 1938: “Even a casual glance at such a volume as *Canadian Mosaic* reminds me of the fascinating human material which makes up Canada. It is an aspect which we who deal with symbols of financial and economic factors should never forget... It would be a task worthy of the dedication of a life – to do something that would contribute to the welfare of these people. First, to know how we may serve them, second, to bend one’s energies, imagination and capacities toward that target.” W. Eggleston, *While I Still Remember: A Personal Record* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1968) p.251.

78 See, for instance, his annual chronicles of “New Canadian Letters” published in the *University of Toronto Quarterly* since 1937.

heterogeneous array of opinions on the war in Europe, on why to fight, why not to fight, whom to support and what to expect in peacetime when the hostilities were over. Nevertheless, Kirkconnell believed that the war against tyranny, dictatorship and racial nationalism in Europe would engender a common national spirit provided that liberal and democratic precepts of tolerance and mutual understanding prevail among all Canadians, French, English and of continental European origin alike.

Conclusion

The above selection of some of the representations of the Canadian democratic framework of life and its challenges used in the public discourse of the late 1930 and early 1940s reveals a quest for a meaningful construction of the values that informed that way of life. The selection also highlighted some of the suggestions put forward on how these values could be best defended, promoted and if necessary adjusted to the specific Canadian social circumstances in the face of the first, and potentially major challenge to the sovereign existence of Canada as a unified nation in its own right.

Thus, as exemplified by Lindal’s pamphlet, one could recognize a notable tendency to make an abstraction of the Canadian singularity and perceive the “democratic way of life” as a universal and timeless concept of moral life guided by a Christian set of values and humanism: those who chose to live that kind of life were identified with the idealized concept of “mankind”, with a subsumed non-existence of any inherent divisions between “We” and “They”. In his rationalization of Canadian identity, Lower, instead, perceived an inherent dichotomy of French and English ways of
life -- one with its genesis under absolute monarchy, the other a product of liberal and
democratic conditions -- as the driving energy behind its continuous articulation. The
dynamics of this antithesis was not external but constitutive of Canadian culture. At the
same time he covered in silence as inconsequential and ephemeral the cultural diversity
of English-speaking Canadians.

Then there were those like Sandwell, instead, who did recognize the importance
of minority rights in democracy but understood them in terms of freedom of conscience
and respect of minority opinion, regardless of cultural or national identification.
Sandwell recognized mediation as an adequate means of achieving necessary semblance
of social cohesion. Kirkconnell's pamphlet demystified the presumed homogeneity that
characterized the self-representation of Canada in the public discourse of the times and
exposed its cultural and ideological heterogeneity and fragility when faced with the
challenges of a major national mobilization to defend democracy under the banner of the
British Empire. The following chapters will explore how in the face of the existing
domestic diversity, on one hand, and the war, on the other, various social actors
eventually intervened in the attempts to construct a unified and democratic community.
Chapter 2
Creating “Enemies Within the Gates”

We know our enemy. We know too, that this enemy is going to use every means, foul or fouler, to beat us. We know this. If we are going to defeat this enemy we have got to exert ourselves to the utmost, be ruthless with ourselves, our prejudices, our amiable weaknesses, easy-going laissez-faire, our mirages, our somnambulism. We must be firm, stern and resolute toward the enemy.... The enemy is not only at our door, but it is also in our midst.... Every German must be regarded as a menace, a potential spy, or a ‘fifth column’ agent. ... We cannot fight this enemy with a few whoops, dances and arrows. Our methods must be modern or we shall as surely disappear as the Hurons.

*Letter to the Editor of the Globe and Mail (May 1940)*

Canada will not let its internal enemies use free speech to deprive its people of it. Canada will not let them use the right of assembly to organize semi-military associations.
Canada will not allow freedom of the press to cover up traitorous propaganda. Canada will not let fifth columnists run down its form of government to help the enemy.

*L.B. Picard, MP for Bellechasse, Québec (May 1940)*

I again take opportunity to ask the people of Canada everywhere to remain calm, steady, not to get unduly perturbed by rumours of all kinds ... old incidents, second hand gossip, a German-sounding name, a Teutonic haircut, almost anything now assumes a sinister aspect and immediate and drastic action is demanded of the police.

*Hon. Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice (May 1940)*

We speak of national unity, we speak of the flag, we speak of our heritage, we resort to arms to defend our borders. Let us start to-day to defend the hearts and minds of our people. This communistic doctrine has no right to exist under the Canadian flag; it has no right to be protected by the institutions of our country.

*Wilfrid Gariépy, MP for Trois-Rivières, Québec (1939)*

---


From the very early days of World War Two, the Canadian government introduced a variety of measures to counter the possible spread of communist or fascist domestic opposition to its war efforts and those of its Western Allies against Hitler's, Mussolini's, and Japan's powers. It was commonly believed in government circles that the spread of communism and fascism would most likely take place among recent immigrants, refugees and foreign-born seasonal or short-term contract workers and sojourners from continental Europe. Those were known to be continuously preoccupied and, in some cases, directly involved in various ideological, ethno-cultural and religious battles taking place in their former countries of continental Europe. They were kept informed of the developments in Europe through their community "foreign-language" press and radio broadcasts transmitted from across the ocean and then relayed to Canada courtesy of the free airwaves in the USA. These immigrants from continental Europe were considered potential "enemies within the gates". As a result, the government of Canada took a number of steps with significant consequences in many parts of the country.

There is a considerable literature denouncing the committed injustice, and describing -- with variable passion and scholarly application -- unjustifiable and undeserved hardships and suffering in specifically targeted ethnic communities. Referring to this literature, the editors of the most recent scholarly endeavour on this subject entitled *Enemies Within: Italian and Other Internees in Canada and Abroad*, claimed that their own intention in putting together this collection of essays was to avoid approaching the subject in terms of abstract and universal principles (of justice, equality

---

and minority rights) or demands for apology, remedy and material compensation. They claimed that their approach was guided by the rule of objectivity that historians must observe when considering these principles in terms of their application to a specific historical context. They claimed that most of the existing literature had ignored objectivity and dealt instead with the subject as a series of examples of Canadian government’s treatment of certain minorities as if these examples were the proof of the Government waging a “war against ethnicity”.

This had been notably the case, they argued, of a collection of essays entitled *On Guard for Thee: War, Ethnicity, and the Canadian State, 1939-45*, the only other multifaceted survey of the public treatment of ethnic minorities during WWII.

At issue in this thesis is not the harshness of treatment of individual ethnic groups or exact statistics on the number of interned, released and registered, but rather how these acts against both citizens and foreign residents of certain ethnic origins were justified or judged by the Canadian political discourse of the time. The “enemy within the gates” -- imagined or real, communist or fascist, native-born or alien -- served a particular function in the process of developing a recognizable Canadian self-identity. Whether the difference between “the enemy” and “us” is in the realm of political discourse on how to distribute wealth and revolutionize labour-management relations or govern a body politic (capitalist vs. communist, or liberal vs. fascist ideological position) or is a matter of nationhood, ethnicity and cultural and racial difference and dominance (for example,  

---  


white British Columbian vs. Japanese Canadian, Anglo-Saxon vs. Italian, Gentile vs. Jewish), the fact is that the boundaries between the two opposites are fragile and permeable. As much as they separate, boundaries mark the points of contact, an indefinable zone of interrelationship where the two polarities share a common sphere of social interaction. Modern social organizations abhor boundaries which are too blurred, too easily transgressed, too mobile. They have to be constantly redefined and hardened by means of sets of social prescriptions of what/who should be included and what/who should be excluded. 7 Constructing national identity in wartime thus meant sifting “loyal citizen” as “us” and considered to be within, from “enemy alien” or “them”, to be kept outside the boundaries, or to use Zygmunt Bauman’s gardening metaphor, separating “useful plants” from “weeds”. 8

Defining who was an “enemy alien” helped define a “loyal Canadian.” The process of identification is two-sided: while one defined, regulated, isolated and excluded from one’s midst the “enemy”, one made sure to recognize, nourish, protect and gradually insulate from outside influence the “loyal” self with all the minor signs of

---

7 Barbara Lorenzkowski offers an interesting case study of such a construction of “enemy alien” and “disloyal citizen”, in her “‘Spies’, ‘Saboteurs’, and ‘Subversives’: German-Canadian Internees and the Wartime Discourse at the Canadian Homefront, 1939-1945,” in A Chorus of Different Voices: German-Canadian Identities, ed. Angelika E. Sauer and Matthias Zimmer (New York: Peter Lang, 1998) pp.167-185. She uses statistical information on German internees (their birthplace, age, occupation, citizenship, for example) to deconstruct the image of dangerous Nazi sympathizers created by the Canadian officials in order to justify their internment. She argues, convincingly, that the officials relied on stereotypes and demonstrated a genuine lack of knowledge of not only the German-Canadian population itself but Canadian ethnic realities in general.

8 The reference to Bauman is linked to his metaphor of modern societies being “garden cultures” from which wilderness and unwanted plants are weeded out in scientific and rational manner to keep the garden well organized and under control. See, Z. Bauman, Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals (London: Polity Press, 1987) p.51.
dissonance and difference that are contained in our multiple identities as individuals. In a national community so heterogeneous as was Canadian society, the sifting was not easy, the boundaries often displaced and unclear. The resulting dichotomization of “loyal” vs. “other” was usually circumstantial.

It was significant, for instance, that in 1939, while preparing for an imminent armed conflict with Germany and during the first nine months of hostilities, the animosity directed against Germans as a nation and as Canadian residents was mitigated and not shared by everybody, certainly not as deeply and so widespread as during WWI. After all, according to the 1931 census, there were in Canada some 600,000 people of German origin, some of them Canadians several generations back, many from parts of Europe outside the German boundaries proper and mostly, with the exception of Hutterites and some Mennonites, for instance, well integrated. As John Murray Gibbon said in his pamphlet *The New Canadian Loyalists* many of them “have been thoroughly digested and absorbed in the Canadian system.”

Robert H. Keyserlingk assessed the Government’s treatment of German Canadians during the war as being “a deep split between its benevolent political view of German Canadians and a hasty, ill-informed security practice.” In late 1938, an article in the weekly *Saturday Night* sympathized with Canadian citizens of German origin who were urged by Nazi propagandists to join in glorifying the new German Reich. Still, the writer argued that the acceptance of Nazi ideology made any expatriated German a dubious citizen in his host country and an actual


menace. There should be no surprise, therefore, continued the article, if Canada resorted to the "adoption of methods whereby those who accept it may be treated somewhat as Jews are treated in respect of citizenship rights in the Third Reich, that is to say, transferred from the category of ‘members of the state’ to that of ‘non-member subjects’,” not on the basis of racial origin but that of ideological incompatibility “with true Canadianism”. 11 The Prime Minister himself was able to say in September 1939 that he pitied “the German people in this country and in the old world. I know something of the German people. I was born in Berlin, Ontario.” In his view, “no better class of citizens is to be found in any country” compared to German settlers. 12 Nine months later he still called on Canadians to refrain “from persecution and panic action against harmless and law-abiding people who share our life and in most instances our common citizenship.” 13

Defence of Canada Regulations

This was not the first time Canadian authorities undertook drastic measures considered necessary in wartime to contain subversive activities of some supposedly suspicious ethnic groups on the civilian front. 14 It was a measure tolerated under the

11 “Germans in Canada,” Saturday Night, September 17, 1938, p. 3.

12 Speech by W.L. Mackenzie King during the special session of the House of Commons, Debates of the House of Commons, 5th (special war) session-18th Parliament, September 8, 1939, p.19.

13 See the intervention by the Prime Minster at the opening of the new session of Parliament, Debates of the House Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament, May 20, 1940, p. 47.

existing international law, be it only merely, for lack of proper codification. Modern laws governing nationality, citizenship and naturalization included provisions for obliging citizens or subjects to comply with orders of military mobilization. The effect was that aliens who happened to reside in a foreign country at war with their country of origin could be assumed by the authorities of the host country as a potential enemy military presence and a source of imminent danger for the safety of the nation. Different measures were conceived to control their movements: compulsory registration and regular reporting to the local police, or internment for the duration of the hostility until they might be deported permanently from the country. These measures were viewed as imperative for the national security. However, in the light of abuses committed during WWI against enemy nationals and those with double nationalities, the practice was admittedly considered problematic from a humanitarian point of view and discussed in international fora prior to the open hostilities of 1939-1945. A draft “convention on the condition and protection of civilians of enemy nationality who are on territory belonging to or occupied by a belligerent” was thus discussed at an International Red Cross convention in Tokyo in 1934.

The outbreak of war stalled the negotiation process until after WWII when the drafting of a new series of international treaties to form a new body of laws of war was resumed, resulting in the adoption of four Geneva Conventions of 1949, including one regarding the protection of civilian population in times of armed conflicts. During the WWII years, and in the absence of a specific international code on the treatment of

"enemy aliens", the International Committee of the Red Cross was able to arrange that civilian internees be treated as prisoners of war and be protected under the provisions of the 1929 Prisoners of War Convention. Canada was evidently not alone in taking these measures to control aliens whose countries of origin were at war with Canada, notably Germany, Italy and Japan. During the WWII years both the USA and UK, as well as Australia resorted to these measures as well.


In Canada, the measures were legally based on the legislation that was passed at the outbreak of WWI, in 1914, and remained on the statute books, handy to be evoked at any appropriate moment. The War Measures Act, as it was entitled, authorized the Governor-in-Council, in case of “real or apprehended war,” to act in ways deemed necessary for the security of Canada, notably by measures in matters of (a) censorship and the control and suppression of publications, writings, maps, plans, photographs, communications and means of communications; and (b) arrest, detention, exclusion and deportation.\(^{17}\)

During the WWII years, these measures were incorporated in the Defence of Canada Regulations (DOCR), sixty-five in all, first issued on September 3, 1939 by Order-in-Council PC 2483 and then amended on several occasions throughout the early years of hostilities, adding new categories of enemy aliens or subversive activities and specifying aspects of the procedures.\(^{18}\) They remained in force until August 16, 1945, the date they were finally revoked by Order-in-Council PC 5637. These Regulations -- with the exception of Regulations 24, 25 and 26, applicable exclusively to enemy aliens – applied formally to all persons residing in Canada, whether British subjects or not.\(^{19}\)

---

17 *War Measures Act 1914*, c.2, s.1 (R.S. 1927, chapter 206)

18 *Defence of Canada Regulations (Consolidations) 1941* and *Defence of Canada Regulations (Consolidations) 1942* (Ottawa, 1941 and 1942, respectively). See also the first Report on Defence of Canada Regulations presented before the House of Commons by Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, May 23, 1940, *Debates of the House of Commons*, 6\(^{th}\) session, 18\(^{th}\) Parliament (January 25, 1940) and 1\(^{st}\) session-19\(^{th}\) Parliament (May 16-November 5, 1940), vol. 1, 1940, pp.143-146.

19 There was a special category of subversive activities prosecuted under the DOCR that did not fit either enemy alien or communist label. It concerned Jehovah’s Witnesses because of their stand against Catholicism and whatever other established Church, as well as an obscure organization advancing a new social order, called Technology Inc. On the plight of Jehovah’s Witnesses during the war years see William Kaplan, *State and
Regulations 24, 25 and 26 applied also to Canadian nationals of German origin naturalized within ten years prior to the beginning of the hostilities and those of Italian origin naturalized since 1922, the year Fascists took power in Italy. The regulations covered a variety of activities requiring control: postal censorship, press censorship, possession of firearms, internment conditions, enemy alien property, naturalization. The most infamous of DOCR was Regulation 21 providing for detention of any person deemed acting in a "manner prejudicial to the public safety or the safety of the state." As a result of the application of this Regulation, 1227 internment cases were on record in January, 1941, including 636 cases of German internees (out of a total number of 763 interned since September 1939), 481 Italian internees (out of 586 originally interned) 82 communists (out of the original 87) and 28 members of the National Union Party.\footnote{See File 164 "Interdepartmental Committee - Internment Cases", vol. 14, Norman Robertson Fonds, MG30 E163, Library and Archives of Canada (hereafter LAC).} On June 1, 1945, \textit{The Globe and Mail} reported that on V-Day, May 8, there were 34,664 prisoners of war held in custody in Canada and still 310 civilian internees detained under the DOCR.\footnote{"Canada Holds 34,664 Prisoners of War," \textit{The Globe and Mail}, June 1, 1945. Those still detained were interned since the early days of the war. According to Justice Minister, L.S. St. Laurent (on January 27, 1944), no additional person had been detained under DOCR between July 1, 1943 and January 25, 1944. \textit{ Debates of the House of Commons, 5th session, 19th Parliament} (January 27, 1944-January 31, 1945) p. 5-6.}
Selected Defence of Canada Regulations

14 Postal censorship (of any mail and imported publications) (September 3, 1939)
15 Press censorship (special targets being Left-leaning and so-called 'foreign-language' press) (September 3, 1939)
21 Preventive detention of any person acting in any manner prejudicial to the public safety or the safety of the state (e.g. Communists, Arcand followers, National Socialists, Jehovah Witnesses) (September 3, 1939)
22 Appointment of a three-member advisory committee to hear appeals from internees under Regulation 21
23 Any provision relative to treatment of 'prisoners of war' should apply to any person detained or interned under the Regulations (as amended by PC 2322 of May 31, 1940)
24 Arrest, detention and internment of enemy aliens who (a) are members of enemy armed forces, (b) who attempt to leave Canada to join enemy, or (c) who engage in espionage or acts of sabotage (September 3, 1939)
25-26 Provisions related to compulsory registration of enemy aliens (September 3, 1939)
26A Regulations 24, 25, 26 apply to all persons born in territories which were under the sovereignty or control of the German Reich on September 9, 1939 (PC 3342 of October 26, 1939), those born in Italy (PC 2305 of June 10, 1940) and those "of the Japanese race" (PC 9591 of December 7, 1941)
26B Canadian residents of German and Italian origin naturalized since 1922 to be registered as enemy aliens (PC 6130 of November 2, 1940)
26C Special provisions for persons of Rumanian, Hungarian and Finnish nationality after the declaration of war against their countries of origin, providing for certificates of exemption from the operations of Regulations 24, 25 and 26 (PC 9343 of December 23, 1941)
39 Prohibition of spreading reports which might be prejudicial to the safety of the state or the efficient prosecution of war (as amended by PC 37 of January 4, 1940)
39A Prohibition of printing, publishing and distribution of any document containing statements or reports intended or likely to be prejudicial to the safety of the state (e.g. Communist-leaning newspapers and pamphlets) (as amended by PC 37 of January 4, 1940)
39C Declaring illegal certain organizations, among them, Deutscher Bund für Kanada, Communist Party of Canada, Canadian Labour Defence League, Ukrainian Labour Farmer Temple Association, Finnish Organization of Canada, Croatian Cultural Association; in addition, every person advocating or defending acts and policies of such illegal organizations was deemed guilty of offence against the Regulations "in the absence of proof to the contrary" (PC 2363 of June 4, 1940); all property of illegal organizations to be under the control and management of the Custodian of Enemy Property (PC 2667 of June 20, 1940)
62 Prohibitions under Regulations 39 and 39A apply to associations, organizations or societies, and may entail penalty of illegality

* Source: Defence of Canada Regulations (Consolidations) of 1941 and 1942
The objectives of the measures introduced by the government as Defence of Canada Regulations were, in their most lofty sense, to secure loyalty of the domestic population in support of the war effort, and at their worst, to exercise unrestricted economic and physical control over “aliens” categorized as “enemies” of democracy and deemed dangerous for the nation. 22 While the Regulations were in their general concept accepted by the public as necessary requisites of waging a modern “total war” without distinct boundaries between the home front and the battlefield, criticism was nevertheless frequent and varied: either that the measures were not thorough enough or that they were, in total contrast, not in line with basic principles of democratic values and civil rights. Thus, H.A. Bruce, Member of Parliament from Toronto, worried that Canadian lives may be lost “as a consequence of not using the power given under regulation 21” and warned the Minister of Justice that “a heavy responsibility will rest “on his shoulders if he refrained from taking firm action of interning all suspects (“thousands of potential quislings”) and even impose capital punishment in some cases. 23 The Leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), M.J.W. Coldwell, on the other hand, admitted that “when a nation is at war, actions against the safety of the state must be prevented or punished as the case may be, but,” he added, that it was essential “that every man shall have the right to plead guilty or not guilty before a competent authority in open court.” 24

22 The property of those interned or deported (as in case of Japanese residents of British Columbia) was consigned in trust with the Custodian of Enemy Alien Property, an official of the Department of Justice who had the authority to sell or lease the assets when deemed appropriate.

23 Hon. H.A. Bruce (MP for Parkdale, Toronto) on June 12, 1940, in Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament (May 16–November 5, 1940) pp. 725, 728.

24 M.J.W. Coldwell (MP for Rosetown-Biggar, Saskatchewan) on May 20, 1940, in
One set of criticisms involved the extent of executive power invested in the government to draft and implement these Regulations with no parliamentary input or control. That was definitely the case for the first nine months into the war. Whenever a question was asked in the House of Commons on the reasons for internment or release from detention of one or the other particular individual or group, the stock answer by the government was that such information could not be provided as it would jeopardize national security. A selected number of parliamentarians eventually got a glimpse into the mechanisms involved in implementing the DOCR once the government agreed to have a special committee of the House of Commons consider and review them and "ascertain whether such regulations reasonably [met] the requirements of the country in time of war." The Committee promptly met on June 19 1940 and began its deliberations in camera. In the course of its existence, well into 1944, it recommended several amendments to the DOCR -- not all accepted by the Government -- and studied ways and means to improve the procedure on the naturalization of aliens. It heard testimony from British officials on the way they handled "enemy aliens" in UK, and was authorized to

Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament (May 16–November 5, 1940) p. 50.

25 See the motion to appoint a committee to consider and review the Defence of Canada Regulations read by the Prime Minister before the House on June 11, 1940. Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament (May 16-November 5, 1940) p.658. The first MPs to be appointed as members of the committee were Liberals E. Bertrand (Laurier, Montréal); Brooke Claxton (St.Lawrence-St. George, Montréal), V. Dupuis (Chambly-Rouville, Québec), S. Factor (Spadina, Toronto), Hon. J.L. Ilsey (Digby-Annapolis-Kings, NS), R. Maybank (Winnipeg South Centre), H.B. McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River, Ontario), G.H. Ross (Calgary East), A.G. Slaght (Parry Sound, Ontario) and J.G. Turgeon (Cariboo, BC); Conservatives A.J. Brooks (Royal, NB), John Diefenbaker (Lake Centre, Saskatchewan) and H.C. Green (Vancouver South), CCF Leader M.J.W. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar, Saskatchewan) and New Democracy Party (former Social Credit) member J.A. Marshall (Camrose, Alberta). Ilsey was its first chair, replaced in 1941 by J.B. Michaud (Restigouche-Madawaska, NB), Minister of Fisheries. It was also at that time that Liberal Paul Martin (Essex East, Ontario) joined the Committee.
receive representations and hear witnesses on matters of treatment of the interned persons, on infringement of civil liberties or needs to strengthen the regulations.²⁶

The first public report of the government on the measures undertaken under the provisions of the DOCR was delivered orally in the House of Commons by the Minister of Justice, Ernest Lapointe, on May 23, 1940.²⁷ He informed the House that for the past several years the RCMP was “watching closely” subversive activities of various organizations in the country and that since March 1938 an interdepartmental committee of government was making necessary policy decisions on the matter. He pointed out that:

1. The law and the regulations as they stand cover all possible eventualities.
2. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police and their secret service are in complete control of the situation, both present and as it may develop.
3. Persons of present enemy origin suspected of nazi activities have been interned.
4. Persons of potential enemy origin are known and are being closely watched.
5. The overwhelming majority of foreign-born citizens are passionately anti-nazi.
6. Any cessation of labour or diversion of effort to deal with

²⁶ Among others, the Committee received briefs and presentations by wives of interned Labour leaders asking that their husbands be treated as political prisoners and not enemy aliens, and be allowed to receive family visits and mail. See file 5, vol. 2481 “Committee on Defence of Canada Regulations,” RG 14, LAC. Representations to the Committee were kept on file by category: list A-1: protests against DOCR in general; A-2: protests against specific regulations; A-3: pleading for individuals or organizations; B-1: favouring strengthening of DOCR in general; B-2: recommending changes of specific regulations, e.g. internment of all enemy aliens, or, as a minimum those above 12 years of age, ban of possessing firearms for enemy aliens. Recommendations under the two categories A-1 and A-2 were submitted in particular by various Civil Liberties Association, those under B-1 or B-2 were submitted by, among others, Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, several women’s clubs, army and navy veterans, the Canadian Legion and a number of chambers of commerce. See vol. 2482, file 84, “Representations re Defence of Canada Regulations, 1939-40,” RG 14, LAC.

²⁷ An amendment to the DOCR introduced by Order-in-Council PC 2322 of May 31, 1940, made such periodic reports to Parliament mandatory in future.
matters that are being and can only be handled by the police would be helping the enemy.

7. Any persecution of racial minorities in this country is unworthy of our people, and foreign to our traditions and our national spirit.28

This carefully worded and itemized summary was intended to respond to several common comments on the activities undertaken under the Regulations: are they tough and extensive enough?; should civil defence measures be introduced at local levels to help RCMP?; are there any dangerous enemies still at large; are all “new Canadians” loyal or disloyal?; should labour unrest be tolerated?; should “foreigners” be allowed to keep their jobs and be trusted while “our” boys are fighting abroad? Lapointe’s statement included statistics and description and objectives of different regulations and was obviously constructed with the intention of conveying to the Members of Parliament and the public the view that the Government was in control and not complacent, that the RCMP was efficient, that law and order -- the fundamental pillars of Canadian system of government -- were respected.

28 Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament, May 23, 1940, p.146. See also, the account of his statement in “Home Guard of Veterans to Be Set Up,” The Globe and Mail, May 24, 1940, p.2.
Timeline

Applications of Defence of Canada Regulations

March 14, 1938 Appointment of a interdepartmental committee on emergency legislation (chair: E.H. Coleman) to draft appropriate regulations under the War Measures Act

August 26, 1939 RCMP Commissioner Wood submits to the Minister of Justice, Ernest Lapointe a list of names of individuals recommended to be immediately arrested and interned and of organizations to be outlawed in the event of war

August 31, 1939 Appointment of a committee - N. Robertson (External Affairs) J.B. MacNeill (Justice) and E.W. Bavin (RCMP) - to review and propose the type of action

September 2, 1939 RCMP Commissioner appointed Registrar General of Enemy Aliens

September 2, 1939 Censorship Regulations authorized (Order-in-Council PC 2496)

September 3, 1939 Defence of Canada Regulations (DOCR) enter into force (PC 1483)

September 4, 1939 Arrests and detention of enemy aliens begin; by December 31, 1939, a total of 403 persons interned under Regulation 21 (59 of them released after appeal)

September 16, 1939 Regulation 24 (re: arrest and internment of enemy aliens) proclaimed (Canada Gazette of September 16, 1939)
Advisory committee set up to hear appeals against orders for detention under Regulation 21

October 11, 1939 Order-in-Council PC 3042 issued prohibiting the use or possession of firearms, ammunition, dynamite, gunpowder or other dangerous explosive by enemy aliens

October 26, 1939 Regulation 26A issued providing that Regulations 24, 25 and 26 shall apply also to all persons born in territories which were under the sovereignty or control of the German Reich on September 3, 1939 (PC 3342, published in Canada Gazette of November 11, 1939)

November 14, 1939 Regulation 26A amended providing that Registrar general may issue exempting certificates for persons of undoubted loyalty (PC 3623, published in Canada Gazette of November 25, 1939)

January 4, 1940 Regulations 39, 39A and 58 amended to provide that prosecution under these regulations must be authorized by the federal or provincial Attorney-Generals (PC 37, published in Canada Gazette of January 20, 1940)

May 15, 1940 Court decision by Supreme Court of Ontario declaring the Communist Party of Canada illegal

May 31, 1940 Regulation 21 amended to provide for periodic reports to Parliament on number of detained and released internees
Regulation 23 amended to ascertain that status of prisoner of war should apply to all enemy aliens interned under DOCR

(continued...)
(continues...)

June 4, 1940 of New Regulation 39C outlaws 15 organizations, including the Communist Party of Canada, Deutcher Bund of Kanada, the Ukrainian Labour Farmer Temple Association, the Finnish Organization of Canada, etc. It also provides as guilty of an offence against DOCR all persons involved in activities of the illegal organizations.

June 10, 1940 to Order-in-Council PC 2505 ordering all aliens of German or Italian racial origin to register Regulation 60A issued providing for photographing and fingerprinting of detainees under Regulation 21.

June 11, 1940 A committee of the House of Commons established to review DOCR.

June 12, 1940 Order-in-Council PC 2527 issued outlawing 8 Italian organizations.

June 20, 1940 New provision 39C(4) issued (PC 2667, Canada Gazette of June 29) providing that all property, rights and interests of illegal organizations shall be vested in and be subject to the control and management of the Custodian of Enemy Property.

August 5, 1940 Order-in-Council PC 3720 issued specifying that persons detained under Regulation 21 shall be detained in internment camps for prisoners of war under the same conditions as are prisoners of war.

September 12, 1940 First consolidation of DOCR.

September 26, 1940 Order-in-Council PC 5755 issued approving indefinite postponement of military training for Mennonites and Doukhobors.

October 29, 1940 New Regulation 65 (PC 6124, Canada Gazette of October 29, 1940) added declaring that no person interned or detained under DOCR shall be eligible as a candidate for any public office.

November 2, 1940 Regulation 26B mandatory registration of all enemy aliens of German or Italian origin amended (PC 6150) to provide that it applies to all Italians naturalized since 1922.

July 15, 1941 Second consolidation of DOCR.

December 7, 1941 Order-in-Council PC 9591 issued extending application of Regulations 24, 25 and 26 to persons of Japanese nationality.

December 16, 1941 Order-in-Council PC 9760 (Canada Gazette of December 17, 1941) ordering re-registration by RCMP of persons of Japanese race in British Columbia, and registration of Japanese-Canadians across the country.

December 23, 1941 Regulation 26C issued providing that notwithstanding the state of war with Romania, Hungary and Finland, nationals of these countries would be exempted from Regulations 24, 25 and 26 and issued a certificate as “loyal inhabitants of this country.”
(Continues...)  

July 9, 1942  
*Order-in-Council PC 5846*, re: compulsory military service for aliens and certain other groups hitherto exempt, to enter into force in October 1942

December 25, 1942  
Naturalized British subjects of Italian origin declared exempted from provisions of Regulation 26B

February 5, 1943  
*Order-in-Council PC 946*, re: evacuation of persons of the Japanese race from protected areas in British Columbia

February 15, 1943  
Regulation 39 amended providing that every person who acts (instead of: is) an officer or member of an illegal organization, etc. is guilty of an offence against DOCR (*PC 1266*)

October 14, 1943  
Certain organizations (e.g. ULFTA, Jehovah Witnesses, Finnish Organization of Canada) removed from the list of illegal organizations under DOCR (*Order-in-Council PC 8022*)

October 19, 1943  
Appointment of an advisory committee to make recommendations to the Custodian of Enemy Property as to the manner in which properties confiscated from the organizations mentioned in *PC 8022* above should be returned to them

June 7, 1945  
An interdepartmental committee is constituted to consider modification and amendments to DOCR consequent upon the termination of European hostilities (*PC 4136*)

August 2, 1945  
Regulation 21 revoked, provisions being made for continued control of persons of Japanese race by amending *PC 946* above

August 16, 1945  
DOCR revoked by *Order-in-Council PC 5637*.

Sources:  
The So-Called ‘Enemy Aliens’

An editorial in the *Globe and Mail* greeted the report by saying that the Minister of Justice had finally “abandoned his alarming attitude of complacency and is beginning to grapple with the fifth column menace in our midst.” 29 There was at the time a growing uneasiness in the general public about sabotage, subversive activities and national security, exasperated by Hitler’s military advances in Spring of 1940 and his attack on several European, supposedly neutral countries, that quickly fell under the brutal impact of Nazi occupation and control. Their fall was attributed to the underground presence of enemy collaborators, the so-called “fifth columnists.” The fear of “fifth column” spread like fire across Great Britain and North America and public morale sank in its wake. 30

Newspapers promptly informed Canadians that, in the light of the rapid advances of Nazi troops in the direction of the British Isles, Britain had begun interning enemy aliens and imposing drastic restrictions. 31 What about Canada? 32 Some members of the

---


30 See, for instance, Francis MacDonnell, *Insidious Foes: The Axis Fifth Column and the American Home Front* (Guilford, Ct: The Lyons Press, 2004). MacDonnell suggests that much of the fifth column paranoia in the USA was orchestrated by the British with the objective of making the Americans join the war effort.

31 As a sampling of that coverage, see “Britain Rounds Up 3,000 in Enemy Alien Sweep,” *The Globe and Mail* May 13, 1940, pp.1, 8; “Fate of Dutch Leads British to Take Steps,” *ibid*, May 16, 1940, pp.1,2; “3,000 More Enemy Aliens Are Arrested in Britain,” *ibid*, May 17, 1940, p.8; “Fifth Column Rat Holes Plugged by British Bill,” *ibid.*, May 23, 1940, p. 3; “Mosley, Archibald Ramsay Jailed As King Assents to Treachery Bill,” *ibid*, May 24, 1940, p.1. For a contemporary account of the policy behind the sweep of arrests of aliens in UK, see Norman Bentwich, “England and the Aliens,” *The Political Quarterly*, 12 (1941) 81-93.

32 *The Globe and Mail* of May 15, 1940 reported that Mounted Police officials felt confident that the system in place to keep in check any potential “fifth column” activity was working out satisfactorily and that a general roundup of the kind undertaken in
public wanted to know more: Why are so many aliens still going free? Why are “Reds” not contained?\(^{33}\) In Canada, agitation took various forms. The President of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce was reported saying that it was necessary to “have totalitarian use of resources to wage war against a totalitarian power.” He also warned that the war was “not merely a struggle in support of the Mother Country, but a fight for Canada’s markets, for the nation’s economic life.”\(^{34}\) Ontario Attorney-General, G.D. Conant, kept asking in his public speeches and statements to the press for stronger measures to round up “these slimy subversive elements” (referring, in particular, to communists). He was also complaining that proper control of subversive influence was impossible under the time-honoured, “cardinal principle of British justice”, namely, that one was innocent until proven guilty.\(^{35}\)

Rallies were held and pledges made to defend the country to the last stand. One such rally was organized by the League for Patriotic Action and attended by 8,000 Torontonians under heavy rain.\(^{36}\) Reminiscent of the ominous 1933 Crystal Night in Britain was not necessary. See, R.A. Farquharson, “Ottawa Sure Enemy Aliens Under Check. General Roundup Need Doubted; Say Dangerous Ones Are All Interned. 16,000 Registered,” *The Globe and Mail*, May 15, 1940, p. 15.


\(^{35}\) See editorials in *The Globe and Mail* of May 6 and May 15, 1940, p.6. On Conant’s complaints, see “Would Deny Home Foes Legal Rights,” *ibid*, May 8, 1940, p.1. Conant was supported in his agitation by City of Toronto councillors and the mayor (see, for instance, “Intensify Local Check of Fifth Columnists,” *ibid*, May 16, 1940). Toronto and Winnipeg were considered “red centres” because of the number of communist cells there, while Montreal was seen as the centre of Nazi activities (see, for instance, “Three Cities Make Protests to Ottawa Against Alien Isms,” *ibid*, January 7, 1940, p.1, or “Let Us Form Home Guard Toronto Requests Dominion,” *Toronto Star*, May 17, 1940, p.2.

\(^{36}\) See “9,000 Citizens Condemn ‘Apathy in High Places’. Meeting Braves Weather to
Germany, ex-Mayor of Toronto, president of the British Empire Association, suggested in advance of the May 24 celebration of Empire Day that it should be marked "by the seizure of all subversive literature and its burning in City Hall square."\textsuperscript{37} There were also riots. Riots in Regina were triggered by a group of 80-200 drunk soldiers. Reports vary on who were the rioters on rampage through the streets, damaging an Ukrainian community hall, a restaurant named \textit{Austrian Kitchen} and a Canadian German club.\textsuperscript{38}

The label "enemy alien" carried such a powerful meaning of menace and subversion that some, including Minister of Justice E. Lapointe, while debating in the House of Commons how to deal with the problem, often slipped into some convoluted lexical constructions to refer to their objects of concern, calling them, invariably, "so-called aliens", "persons of enemy nationality resident in Canada", "naturalized British subjects of enemy origin", "persons of potential enemy origin, known and closely watched", "persons of alien origin".\textsuperscript{39} There was also reference to "citizens of foreign

---


\textsuperscript{38} These riots were reported in the press (see"Demonstrating Regina Troops Raid Alien-Occupied Buildings," \textit{The Globe and Mail} of May 17, 1940, p.5 or "Soldiers, Civilians Raid Regina Hotel. Mobbing Trouble Started by Rumor of Nazi Celebration," \textit{Toronto Star}, May 18, 1940, p.5) and raised in the House of Commons on May 23, 1940 by M.J.W. Coldwell, leader of the CCF, as a question of the Minister of National Defence (see \textit{Debates of the House of Commons, 1\textsuperscript{st} session-19\textsuperscript{th} Parliament} (May 16-November 5, 1940) pp.142-143).

\textsuperscript{39} Examples are drawn from the \textit{Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament} (May 16-November 5, 1940) on May 27, 1940, p. 239 and May 23, 1940, pp. 143-146.
extraction”⁴⁰ “persons of enemy origin” and “enemy within our gates.”⁴¹

One Member of Parliament was so eager to distance himself from “these people” and make their “foreignness” fully emphasized that, in his question to the Minister of Justice he used the pleonasm “alien foreigners” when speaking of those who might have committed “a breach in wartime regulations.”⁴²

Officially, “enemy alien” meant “a person who, not being a British subject, possesses the nationality of a State at war with His Majesty.”⁴³ That definition was added to the DOCR once the regulations were consolidated in 1941. This appellation applied in September 1939 to German and Austrian nationals and Canadians of German and Austrian origin naturalized since September 1, 1929. They had to register and in principle would not be disturbed in their “ordinary avocations” unless, according to Regulation 24, there was reasonable ground to believe that they are engaged in espionage, “in acts of hostile nature”, or they “otherwise contravene any law.” In such a case, they were passable of arrest and detention. By mid-1940, some 16,643 of them were duly registered.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ The Prime Minster speaking during the opening debate of the new Parliament, on May 20, 1940, Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament (May 16-November 5, 1940) p.47.

⁴¹ P.H. Casgrain, Secretary of State on July 15, 1940 and H.A. Bruce (Toronto) on June 12, 1940, Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session - 19th Parliament (May 16-November 5, 1940) pp.1643 and 725, respectively.

⁴² Question raised by C.E. Desmond (M.P. for Kent, Ontario, Conservative) on June 12, 1940, Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament (May 16-November 5, 1940) p.725.

⁴³ Defence of Canada Regulations (Consolidations) 1941, section 2.

On September 4, 1939, the first series of arrests were made based on a preliminary list of names of persons considered dangerous as reported to the Minister of Justice by RCMP commissioner Wood. That list had been, prior to the arrests, reviewed by the Interdepartmental Committee chaired by Norman Robertson of the Department of External Affairs, and it eventually included 265 German nationals and 60 naturalized Canadians of German origin. By November 13, 1939, 303 of these individuals were apparently arrested and interned according to the report by the Department of Justice to the Prime Minister's Office in December 1939.\(^\text{45}\)

On October 26, 1939 an amendment to the DOCR specified that the registration of enemy aliens should extend to all persons born in territories occupied by the forces of the Third Reich on September 3, 1939 and not naturalized British subjects. That meant that individuals originating from Czechoslovakia, for instance, fell under this provision,

---


\(^{45}\) See Memorandum enclosed to the letter by B.J. McNeill, Deputy Minister of Justice to J.W. Pickersgill, Office of the Prime Minister, December 4, 1939, Reel C-3746, C-231099-231103, vol. 273, J.W. Mackenzie King Fonds, MG 36 J4, LAC. The actual figures of how many people were arrested and detained from 1939 to 1945 vary from tally to tally and historians offer different counts. The reasons may be due to secrecy or tendency by officials to lower or increase the numbers, according to ideological inclinations (embarrassment or eagerness) or simply due to administrative difficulty to keep track of new arrests and releases. For examples of those different figures and tallies, see Robert H.Keyserlingk, “Which Fatherland in War?” and G. Kealey and R. Whitaker, *R.C.M.P. Security Bulletins: The War Years* (St. John's: Canadian Committee on Labour History, 1993)
Newspapers stopped reporting these stories, as well as stories about arrests, as specific new censorship directives put a ban on their publication.\textsuperscript{50} From A.G. Slagt, MP for Perry Sound (Ontario) one could learn in the House of Commons that continuous street disorder was accompanied by “lightening raids”, and “a much larger number of dangerous men of Italian racial origin were apprehended,” as compared to Germans nine months earlier.\textsuperscript{51} It is estimated that in total between 500 and 600 Italians were eventually interned.\textsuperscript{52}

A year later, however, in December 1941, when the state of war extended to three Axis’ collaborators, Finland, Romania and Hungary, the Canadian government decided to give the nationals of these three countries the benefit of the doubt as to their loyalty to Canada and obliged them to register but only in order to receive individual exemption certificates from being declared enemy aliens.\textsuperscript{53} Historian N.F. Dreisziger considers this a watershed decision which marked a definite change in government policy towards ethnic minorities in the country. From 1939 to the end of 1941 the government viewed most ethnic groups as \textit{a priori} disloyal, Dreisziger claims, but thanks to the enlightened

\addcontentsline{toc}{section}{Notes}


\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Press Censorship Directive No. 46}, dated June 10, 1940, in File “Press Censorship Directives, 1939-40”, vol. 5942, RG2-14, LAC.

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Debates of the House of Commons}, 1\textsuperscript{st} session-19th Parliament, July 25, 1940, p.1922.

\textsuperscript{52} For a discussion on the contested number of internees, see, Luigi Bruti Liberati, “The Internment of Italian Canadians,” in \textit{Enemies Within}, pp. 76-98.

attitude of people such as Norman Robertson, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, this policy was finally abandoned.\footnote{N.F. Dreisziger, “7 December 1941: A Turning Point in Canadian Wartime Policy Toward Enemy Ethnic Groups?” \textit{Journal of Canadian Studies} 32, no.1 (Spring 1997) pp.93-111.}

Dreisziger’s assessment reflects eurocentricism. Whatever the reasons for the way Hungarians, Finns and Romanians were dealt with – and they were certainly not strictly a matter of ethnic empathy but most likely, and to a great extent, because of the increased demand for manpower in the war industry – the exemptions they were thus accorded were approved during the same month of December 1941, when the provisions of Regulations 24, 25 and 26 were extended to the most notorious group of all so-called enemy aliens in Canada, namely the Japanese Canadians. This group was notorious not because of their dangerousness, but because of the extent and harshness of the way they were treated.\footnote{On the treatment of Japanese Canadians, see, among many texts, W.P. Ward, “British Columbia and the Japanese Evacuation,” \textit{Canadian Historical Review} 67, no.3 (1976) pp.296-301; A.G. Sunahara, \textit{The Politics of Racism: The Uprooting of Japanese Canadians During the Second World War} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981); Werner Cohn, “The Persecution of Japanese Canadians and the Political Left in British Columbia, December 1941-March 1942,” \textit{BC Studies} 68 (1985-86) pp.3-22; J.L. Granatstein and Gregory A. Johnson, “The Evacuation of the Japanese Canadians, 1942: A Realist Critique of the Received Version,” \textit{On Guard for Thee}, pp.101-130; Patricia Roy et al., \textit{Mutual Hostages: Canadians and Japanese During the Second World War} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990); and Ken Adachi, \textit{The Enemy That Never Was} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991).} Their presence, as well as that of people of Chinese origin, was considered from the early years of their arrival on this continent as problematic for the white

coastal province of British Columbia. From this perspective, the war with Japan provided an excellent opportunity to deal expeditiously with the troublesome "Oriental Problem".

On the level of Dominion politics, residents of Chinese or Japanese origin, whether Canadian nationals or sojourners, were each dealt with in radically different ways during the war years. While the Chinese were in principle considered allies in the war against the Axis, the Japanese were enemy aliens and their total community was treated with embarrassing violence that Ottawa politicians left to the RCMP to administer. Thus, significantly, a certain unusual lenience could be noticed in the regulation authorizing, "legal and permanent residents of Canada of Chinese origin" to delay their return to Canada for more than the two years as had been stipulated by the highly restrictive and discriminatory Chinese Immigration Act of 1923. This new provision secured that the possessions and "acquired interests" during the years of residence in Canada would not be lost and "sacrificed if their return cannot be effected" due to war circumstances.57

When the wife of Generalissimo Chiang-Kai-Shek, Chinese republican leader, paid a visit to Ottawa to solicit Canadian support for Chinese resistance to the Japanese


57 Order-in-Council PC 7722 of December 31, 1940. That there was probably hope on behalf of British Columbians that the Chinese trapped by war in their mother country would eventually never return to Canada is probably true as well.
invaders, Prime Minister Mackenzie King was more than lavish in his praise of the Chinese people: "patient and heroic" people of "ancient race... immemorial culture" he was heard saying. He also asked Mme Chiang-Kai-Shek to tell "the men and women of China how unbounded is our admiration of their unswerving fortitude." When it came to comply to her demands for more lenient immigration rules as regards the Chinese who wished to come to Canada, the Prime Minister was more convoluted and suggested that the "government is carefully going into these different problems", of mostly economic nature, with the hope "to work out a solution which would remove any cause on their part to feel that they were being discriminated against as a race." Eventually nothing was done of any significance.

On the other hand, a series of regulations concerning Japanese Canadians adopted a different, openly racist tone, particularly after the declaration of war with Japan in December 1941. These regulations imposed compulsory registration of all persons "of the Japanese race", including every person "not wholly of the Japanese race if his father or mother is of the Japanese race and if the Registrar General of Enemy Aliens by notice in writing, requires him to register as an enemy alien." They prohibited "operation of any


60 Order-in-Council PC 9591 of December 7, 1941.
vessel in waters adjacent to West Coast by persons of Japanese race." A re-registration of Japanese Canadians, by the RCMP this time, was ordered in compliance with the concerns expressed in a report of December 2, 1940 by the members of the Special Committee on Orientals in British Columbia, alleging that the presence of persons of Japanese and Chinese origin would cause problems of national security. Stricter control was unabashedly argued as necessary "both for purposes of civil security and in order to deprive persons hostile to the Japanese, of a constant and effective ground for complaint." Once in the hands of the RCMP and strictly a security issue, Ottawa politicians could consider the problem settled. As A.F. Cross wrote in Canadian Business:

Canada's Yellow Peril has vanished. More than a year ago, thousands in this country were anxious about the Japanese problem. Today it is as dead as last year's bogeyman... Canada has solved the Japanese problem by spreading them ever so thin... The story of this wholesale transfer of 21,228 men, women and children, without precedent anywhere, and carried on without bloodshed or casualties, is something of which Canada should be proud.

---

61 Order-in-Council PC 9761 of December 16, 1941.

62 Order-in-Council PC 9760 of December 16, 1941.

63 Austin F. Cross, "What's Become of the Japanese?" Canadian Business 16 (July 1943) p.48.
Hysteria Creeps In

As mentioned earlier, the public openly worried about the way war was unfolding in Europe by mid 1940, and was looking for scapegoats to vent the anxiety. The editorial page of the Winnipeg Free Press offered its readers the following assessment:

Canada is feeling its way in the confusions of war and the rising threat of revolutionary change abroad in the world.... These harsh restrictions, these invasions of liberty, this strange new discipline imposed upon a free people, these huge new costs borne gladly... these are the omens of cosmic change in the world in which Canada must survive. The recent deaths of nations point the dangers, teach the lessons that must be learned. ... Since May 16, the temper of Canada has changed. It has hardened and we have shed our tolerance. 64

The RCMP was “swamped with a flood of complaints”. People began reporting suspicious occurrences and spotting “foreigners” in places considered high security matters. The Toronto police received a letter from a citizen informing them that his neighbour behaved suspiciously: he “has a coop full of pigeons and there is a typewriter working long into the night.” 65 Excesses of patriotism prompted people to cancel concerts that featured modern German or Italian music, and employers to dismiss skilled German or Italian workers under pressure of their co-workers. 66 A fire in a lumber yard was

65 “Trojan Horse Coos, Taps a Typewriter, Anyway Citizens Call and Police Look Into It,” Toronto Star, May 21, 1940, p.3.
66 The decision not to play music by contemporary German and Italian composers was reported in The Globe and Mail of June 15 and June 16, 1940 on page 6. On Italian workers being dismissed, see for instance “Local Workers Get Camp Job; Toronto Men Replace 14 Italians at Borden,” The Globe and Mail, May 17, 1940, p 4; and on German workers in the Windsor Chrysler Corporation plant, see “3 German Workers Let Out of Factory; Can’t Return Until They Become Naturalized,” Toronto Star, May 24, 1940, p.1.
attributed to a possible act of sabotage;\textsuperscript{67} accidents on factory floors and mines were suspected to be acts of communist agitators;\textsuperscript{68} a German veteran of WWI was found strolling with his family near lock No. 23 of the Trent Valley Canal and immediately reported by witnesses and interrogated by the police;\textsuperscript{69} a person released from the internment camp after appeal was caught possessing a firearm and fined but not re-interned: “It is this sort of thing that is worrying the Canadian people,” commented H.C. Green, MP for Vancouver South in the House of Commons.\textsuperscript{70}

In a letter to the Editor of the Globe and Mail, a reader was pointing out to the “Treachery From Within” and argued: “We fight, they stay at home and keep their jobs, go to night school and learn the language.”\textsuperscript{71} Calling himself “Ex-Imperial,” a reader of the Toronto Star said he would intern all aliens. It was time, he said, for Britishers and native-born Canadians to get together and “put an end to the favoritism shown to foreigners by the employers of labor in Canada.”\textsuperscript{72} Members of a war veterans’ association from Hamilton adopted a resolution urging that all those “dismissed from industrial employment under suspicion of subversive or Fifth Column Activities be

\textsuperscript{67} See The Globe and Mail, May 8, 1940, p.3.

\textsuperscript{68} See The Globe and Mail, May 2, 1940, p.4. Commenting on the reports of such attempts of sabotage, the Toronto fire chief admitted that Canada was “singularly fortunate in the success of its counter-espionage” but suggested that the peak was still to come.

\textsuperscript{69} See the intervention by Hon. H. A. Bruce, MP for Parkdale (Toronto) on May 28, 1940 in Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament (May 16-November 5, 1940) p. 302.

\textsuperscript{70} See the intervention by H.C. Green, M.P. for Vancouver South on June 11, 1940, in Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament (May 16-November 5, 1940) p. 676.

\textsuperscript{71} “Treachery From Within,” The Globe and Mail, May 14, 1940, p. 6.

interned for the duration of the war," the argument being that it would be most undesirable that, unemployed as they were, they would be left loose in the community with nothing to do.\footnote{3}

Questions were raised why so many Germans had been admitted to Canada as immigrants in recent years, conveniently forgetting that these immigrants were in fact political refugees from Germany because of their anti-Nazi stand or because of being Jewish and persecuted for that very reason. The new Leader of the official Opposition, Conservative R.B. Hanson of New Brunswick, wondered whether Canadians were aware of the danger caused by the presence of so many enemy aliens of German or Italian origin in the country. "Fortunately or unfortunately," he said, "we in eastern Canada have not many people of German origin living in our communities." Those who did live there were peaceful and law-abiding, he quickly conceded. But, recently "more German have been admitted as immigrants to Canada than Scottish, Irish and Welsh settlers put together." How many of them formed "part of Hitler's campaign of peaceful penetration... may be a matter of conjecture", he added.\footnote{4} To counter such worries, the Canadian government had decided a few months earlier to suspend issuing naturalization certificates to applicants whose documents disclosed that they had been German nationals. \textit{Order-in-Council PC 3041}, of October 21, 1939 stipulated as reason behind this measure the Government's desire "to avoid discrimination and conflicting decisions" across the country. The regulation was avowedly -- and hypocritically -- intended to

\footnote{3}{See letter by Colin Gibson (MP for Hamilton West, Ontario) dated June 19, 1940 transmitting to the members of the parliamentary committee reviewing the DOCR, the resolution adopted by the Stelco War Veterans' Association in Hamilton, on May 27, 1940, in file 53, vol. 2482, RG14, LAC.}

\footnote{4}{See \textit{Debates of the House of Commons}, 1\textsuperscript{st} session-19\textsuperscript{th} Parliament, June 11, 1940, p. 663. See on the same theme, Editorial "Why So Many Germans?" \textit{The Globe and Mail}, June 4, 1940, p. 6.}
protect "these people [who], while technically enemy aliens, are, in effect, refugees, and have expressed an eager desire to assist the cause of Canada."

A real wave of "hysteria" was evidently motivated, probably, as much by genuine fear of the enemy reaching out and penetrating North America, as by economic concerns for jobs and security stemming from the painful experience of the recent depression. The anxiety would not fade away for several months, well into 1942. Tommy Douglas, a prominent CCF Member of Parliament, gave his colleagues in the House of Commons this explanation of what was happening:

There is always in war time the danger of hysteria; people lose much of the sanity which they have at other times. Newspapers within the last day or two have carried reports of people in Libraries burning German books. I do not know why we should blame Immanuel Kant for Hitler, or Beethoven or Mozart for Goering and Goebbels, or Johann Strauss for Rosenberg. But people do that ...[they become anxious] to do something, to give vent to their passions by engaging in witchcraft hunting."\(^75\)

As Sandwell explained, "It is the feeling of uncertainty as to who one's neighbour really is and where he came from that is at the bottom of most of the 'jitters' from which a section of Canadian public is suffering from."\(^76\) In his study of the German fifth column in Europe, Louis De Jong gives a plausible explanation of the process of the construction of an omni-present, mostly imaginary saboteur or fifth columnist as might have been experienced also by Canadians in the early days of the war: it is the combination of fear, a sense of aggressiveness engendered by that fear that needs a target to unload the pressure, and a feeling of helplessness and uncertainty in not knowing where in the close

\(^75\) Debates of the House of Commons 1st session-19th Parliament, June 13, 1940, p. 752.

\(^76\) B.K. Sandwell, "For a National Registration," The Globe and Mail, June 14, 1940, p. 6. In his view, a national registration of all citizens, a measure that did take place a few month later, would dissipate such fears.

*Civil Liberties in Jeopardy*

Communists and Soviet sympathizers -- regardless of their ethnicity -- were also among those suspicious individuals (and neighbours) to be watched. Communism was considered as a highly dangerous ideology by being against the preservation of liberal principles of the sanctity of private property and free enterprise, and, therefore, capable of destroying the basic foundations of Canadian society. A 1942 confidential memorandum of the Department of Justice compared the Party to Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in its way of declaring loyalty to Canada and the war efforts and at the same time plotting the overthrow of "the social order of the very Country it pretends to support."\footnote{"The Communists," in file 36, vol. 2482 "Committee of Defence of Canada Regulations," RG 14, LAC. The report was part of a presentation to the special House of Commons committee reviewing the operations of the DOCR, and was delivered by P.M. Anderson on July 7, 1942.}

covetness as far as government policy was concerned -- but not in its intensity within the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) -- after Soviet Russia joined the Allies in the fight against Hitler in June 1941, and then intensified again at the end of the armed conflict and the beginning of the cold war. Reg Whitaker painstakingly retraces these activities in his various publications, the most relevant here being his article “Official Repression of Communism During World War II.” He calls the war period of official repression of communism an “ugly chapter” in an ongoing story, “an episode in a continuity of state coercion against the Communist left, heightened by the extraordinary powers placed in the hands of government and a wartime atmosphere of public intolerance of dissent.” The evidence Whitaker uncovered in the early 1980s by means of the Access to Information legislation shows a dogged determinism of the police to

---


81 Whitaker, “Official Repression of Communism,” pp.166 and 136, respectively.
discourage any spread of even slightly left-wing opinion in the country.

As the RCMP chief commissioner, S.T. Wood said in his often quoted article on “Tools for Treachery,” it was not Nazis or Fascists that were the problem – the enemy aliens were easy to recognize. The problem was the communist activist: “your ‘Red’ has the protection of citizenship, his foreign master is not officially an enemy and, unless he blunders into the open and provides proof of his guilt, he is much more difficult to suppress.”82

By referring to his Canadian readers as “you”, and the “Red” communists as “yours,” Wood implied that complacent Canadians (he would include among them influential government officials, CCF members and a whole range of liberally-minded intellectuals) were all responsible for the persisting presence in the country of radicals by covering up for them, and, were it not for the good services of people like Wood and his police force, all these treacherous individuals would still be at large. The use of the term “Reds” was a common feature in the press of the day. It was short and colourful.83 In September 1941, Canadian Forum noticed with a chuckle that The Globe and Mail had made a public announcement of deciding “to discontinue the practice.” The Globe explained its reasons: the term implied the “infection with a dangerous revolutionary spirit,” it had been used in a derogatory sense and “should no longer be applied to people who have been officially accepted by Mr. Churchill as our allies.”84


83 Equally short and punchy was the term “Huns” applied to Nazi troops. One could thus read the following headline on the front page of The Globe and Mail of June 30, 1941: “Huns Drive Through Reds Into Trap.”

Watch the Right, Too, Copper!

UNITY
AGAINST HITLERISM
IN DEFENCE OF THE HARDWON LIBERTIES WE HAVE

In dealing with our Fifth Column it is as well to remember that the Quislings do not come usually from the Left Wing.
Wood's implication that the police force must pay greater attention to the activities of the Left than those of Nazis and fascists provoked ire from an outraged leader of the CCF: "To say that communist activities are more dangerous to democratic institutions than those of fascist and nazi sympathizers is surely to fly in the face of recent history," he argued. "It was this attitude of mind that allowed the war to steal upon us." 85 Other members on both sides of the House were less sympathetic about the Communist plight in the country. 86 And daily newspapers kept reporting with satisfaction, whenever allowed by the censor, about which Left-wing publications were censored, which organizations banned and which individuals were arrested. 87

The Communist Party newspaper, The Clarion, was banned on November 21, 1939 under the provisions of Regulation 15 relative to censorship. The Party was banned on June 4, 1940 (Order-in-Council PC 2363) following a court decision by the Supreme

85 Debates of the House of Commons, 2nd session-19th Parliament (November 7, 1940-January 21, 1942), February 27, 1941, p.1069. Coldwell was particularly upset about Wood's article because the commissioner had accused unnamed parliamentarians of subversive statements in public and Coldwell felt Wood's remarks inappropriate in that respect as well. An exchange with the Minister of Justice on that matter took place in the House over several days.

86 Commenting on Regulation 21 and some suggestions in the public to repeal it as contrary to justice, the Leader of the Opposition, R.B. Hanson, MP for York-Sunbury (New Brunswick) suggested, for instance, on June 11, 1940, that "a certain type of intelligentsia – we call them 'pinks', on the street," should reconsider their attitudes, "mix with the common people, and perhaps the pink colouring will shade into a more orthodox white." Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament (May 16-November 5, 1940), p.666.

87 Defence of Canada Regulation 15 set in motion the application of a series of censorship directives regarding information on arrests, detention and internment of individuals under DOCR, in particular as pertained to enemy aliens. Thus directive No. 57 of July 16, 1940 stated that "occasionally it will happen that the names of interned persons are disclosed in parliament, in court, or by an official statement. In these cases, the press may safely carry the report, but should not originate such material."
Court of Ontario, Judge Edgar Chevrier presiding, on May 15, 1940. The trial involved three men distributing anti-war pamphlets on behalf of the Communist Party, a chargeable offence under the provisions of Regulation 62. Several other organizations were also banned under the new Regulation 39C, introduced for that purpose, and among them: the Young Communist League of Canada, the Canadian Labour Defence League, the League for Peace and Democracy and several so-called “foreign-language” organizations, such as the Ukrainian Labour Farmer Temple Association (ULFTA), the Canadian Ukrainian Youth Federation, the Finnish Organization of Canada, the Russian Workers and Farmers Committee, the Croatian Cultural Association, the Hungarian Workers Clubs, the Polish People’s Association, as well as the Deutsche Arbeitsfront, the Deutscher Bund für Kanada, the National Unity Party and the Canadian Union of Fascists. In addition, a section of this new Regulation 39C provided that every person—“officer or member of an illegal organization, or who professes to be such, or who advocates or defends the acts, principles or policies of such illegal organization shall be guilty of an offence against this regulation.” The burden of proof to the contrary rested with the accused.

Even before these organizations were banned, the RCMP was interning individuals suspected of being Communists, and did so from the very first day the DOCR entered into force on September 3, 1939. By August 1941, the total number of

---

Communists interned was 102, sixteen of whom had been, by then, released.⁸⁹ A confidential memorandum submitted to the House of Commons Committee on July 7, 1942 stated that by that date there had been altogether 112 individuals interned on the ground of their Communist activities. Among them 48 were of British origin, 30 Ukrainians, 5 Poles, 3 Rumanians, 1 Russian, 2 Swedes, 2 Finns, 1 Latvian, 17 Jews, 2 Hungarians and one German.⁹⁰

There were, however, even outside Communist circles and so-called sympathizers, many who questioned whether measures taken under the Defence of Canada Regulations were not in fact more harmful than beneficial to Canada. “You cannot fight for freedom,” one could read in Canadian Forum, “with one hand and strangle it with the other without making yourself ridiculous and, incidentally, the loser in the end.”⁹¹ On June 9, 1941, Brooke Claxton argued in the House of Commons that “we have to make our democracy fight for us and we have to fight with it as we go along.” This was important, at least for two main reasons. One, he insisted “by reason of our alien population” -- in which he included some 800,000 people of German descent and 130,000 of Italian descent. He was convinced “that we should show these people, the vast majority of whom are completely loyal, that they were right in leaving the old land and coming to this country ... that this is the place where they can be free to work out their

⁸⁹ See File 164 “Interdepartmental Committee - Internment Cases,” vol. 14, Norman Robertson Fonds, MG30 E163, LAC. Norman Robertson was chair of the interdepartmental committee on security.

⁹⁰ File 36, “The Communists,” vol. 2482 “Committee of Defence of Canada Regulations,” RG 14, LAC. The report was part of a presentation before the special House of Commons committee on the Regulations delivered by P.M. Anderson on July 7, 1942. According to Whitaker, the total number of interned Communists amounted to 133 by the end of the war. See Whitaker, “Official Repression of Communism,” p.146.

⁹¹ “Civil Liberties - 1942,” Canadian Forum 22, No.257 (June 1942) p.70.
lives in cooperation with us and have the protection of our laws.” And then he added the other reason:

There is the effect of our freedom on the enemy itself. Every time we bring about any curtailment of individual liberty Hitler uses that fact in his propaganda machine. Ultimately the breakdown of the enemy will be brought about by the recognition by his people that in ours they can find a very much better way of life than in any nazi system.92

The moderation in treatment was thus, in Claxton’s opinion, warranted by foreign policy and strategic considerations just as much as by those of civil liberties and freedom of political opinion. Writing in 1940 to the Prime Minister, Brooke Claxton already warned: “We should be more cautious about red-baiting because we will probably find that Russia will be with the democracies slightly, in the long run.”93 He was right about the USSR: when, a year later, Hitler’s army attacked the Soviet Union on June 21, 1941, the Soviets did become Western allies, even if that alliance was not particularly welcome on either side.

Before the war, it must be pointed out, Claxton had been one of the members of a fairly active Civil Liberties Association in Montreal. He joined many critics of the regulations, notably Regulation 21, aimed at restraining, if not decisively uprooting, all subversive or leftist radical activities. They viewed the matter exclusively in terms of civil liberties, and specifically freedom of expression and political opinion (two essential ingredients of democratic principles) as well as legal guarantees of habeas corpus and fair


93 Letter by Brooke Claxton to M. King, October 12, 1940, , File “Education: pamphlets, memoranda, speeches, clippings,” vol. 147, Brooke Claxton Fonds, MG32 B5, LAC.
An editorial in *Saturday Night* questioned the justifiableness of combating the dangerous influence of communist propaganda by suppressing their literature and internment of their writers: "Suppression and internment appear to some people to be an easier way, but the easier way is not always the better."  

Critics pointed out the notorious case of J.A.P. Sullivan, president of the Seamen's Union arrested and interned for allegedly being a Communist. His lawyer, J.L. Cohen, appealed for writ of habeas corpus. The reasoning given by a judge for the internment was quoted in the press and in the House of Commons as an example of travesty of justice and absurdity: "Your detention," said the judge, "has been deemed necessary in the interest of the state because representations have been made that you are a member of the communist party of Canada, a subversive organization which is opposed to the interests of Canada. In view of this, it would appear that you are disloyal to Canada." The decision was made not on proof but allegations and Sullivan's disloyalty deducted by his association not his acts. Sullivan's case was not unique.

---

94 For a revealing glimpse into the precarious state of civil liberties in the early days of the war, see the monthly chronicle "Civil Liberties" prepared by the Toronto Civil Liberties Association and published in *Canadian Forum* from June 1941 to June 1942. On the general issue of civil liberties in wartime, see also Ramsay Cook, "Canadian Freedom in Wartime," MA Thesis, Queen's University, 1955; and its shorter version under the same title in W.H. Heick and Roger Graham, eds., *His Own Man: Essays in Honour of Arthur Reginald Marsden Lower* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1974) pp.37-54. See also Whitaker, "Official Repression of Communism," pp.160-164.


97 For examples of individual internment cases, see William and Kathleen M. Repka, *Dangerous Patriots: Canada's Unknown Prisoners of War* (Vancouver: New Star Books, 1982) see also, Ben Swankey, "Reflections of a Communist: Canadian Internment
On May 7, 1940, the Winnipeg Free Press published a "Memorandum prepared by a group of Winnipeg men and women, circulated privately and largely signed by citizens of Western Canada" as it had been forwarded to the federal government in Ottawa. "In Defence of Canada Regulations," said the Memorandum, "we regret to find incorporated ... certain extensions of governmental power which are not necessary and which we cannot approve. We are the more confirmed in our judgment in that we observe that the magnitude of the extension of power taken in Canada surpasses that deemed necessary even in Great Britain." Among the signatories were such public figures as H.J. Tarr, a prominent lawyer, Victor Sifton of the Winnipeg Free Press, writer Laura Goodman Salverson, historian W.L. Morton, several school principals, university professors and ecclesiastics.98 Historian Arthur Lower was one of the founders and President of the Winnipeg-based Civil Liberties Association which produced the memorandum. Lower continued to campaign in defence of civil liberties by lecturing and writing briefs and open letters to politicians even after the Regulations were reviewed by Parliament, amended and eventually repealed.99 On behalf of the Winnipeg Branch of the Civil Liberties Association, Lower appeared before the House of Commons special committee on the Defence of Canada Regulations, on July 11, 1940. In his submission he argued that "citizens should not be deprived of the right to freely criticize their government" even in wartime. "Our liberty is not theoretical, something to be worshipped in the abstract and ignored in the concrete," he added. "It is on the contrary highly

---


specific, so that in law it may be properly referred to rather as ‘liberties’ than as liberty.” Lower concluded his submission on behalf of his Association by making it “quite plain that [they] are not pleading the cause of enemy aliens, but of Canadian citizens, who as citizens presumably have rights as well as duties.” By no means, he argued, did they condone acts and statements which would endanger the State nor did they plead for “the freedom of association with organizations subject to foreign control or internationalist affiliations.”

Lower’s argument contains several angles of meanings. The obvious, intended meaning was to pre-empt all possible hints of self-incrimination. There also transpires the understanding that fundamental freedoms of speech, opinion and conscience together with even more basic legal guarantees of fair trial (habeas corpus, presumption of innocence, right to appeal, etc.) were not as yet considered universal human rights of all individuals regardless of national boundaries, race, culture, religion or gender. They were attached to the status of citizen and by derivation left aliens outside the system of legal protective mechanisms and dependent on the basic protection of Christian compassion and humanitarianism. This might have been different after the war and the successful drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the international Organization of United Nations with the help of two North American civil libertarians: Eleanor Roosevelt, widow of U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and John Humphrey, Law Professor at McGill University in Montreal.

One could read even more into the text of the memorandum. Lower and his friends were pleading for the respect of rights and liberties at the foundation of the

---

100 Submission by the Civil Liberties Association, Winnipeg, June 1940, a sequence to “Freedom in Wartime”, File 13, “Civil Liberties Association, Winnipeg and Toronto (1940),” vol. 2481 “Committee of Defence of Canada Regulations,” RG14, LAC.
Canadian way of life. Immigrants who kept coming to Canada as sojourners or potential citizens appeared from this Anglo-Saxon native-born perspective to be preoccupied by a different, imported set of values long enough and strong enough to make this preoccupation a social — and political — problem, particularly in the wartime. It was, therefore, the moral duty of native-born Canadians to protect, preserve and fight for the liberal values of the British tradition. It was their civic responsibility. Their task was vital in the process of nation-building, considering that almost one half of the Canadian population did not originate from the British Isles and was obliged to learn to identify with these values or be considered a potential “enemy alien” in terms of national security.

Lower was at the time member of the Native Sons of Canada, whose one objective was “to create and foster distinctively Canadian national spirit and develop Canadian institutions, literature, art and music”, in other words, “to make the people of Canada realize the position of their country as a sovereign state and to develop in them a spirit of patriotism toward it and a spirit of loyalty to the King in his capacity of King of Canada.”

Membership to this organization was limited, “with certain small exceptions, to those who were born in Canada.” As Lower wrote twenty years later, in his Canadians in the Making

Like the earlier waves, the foreign immigration of the twentieth century upset a society just nicely getting on its feet and introduced a range of social problems whose settlement would take many decades. It was as if one were to have his family made over by adopting orphan strangers of unfamiliar habits and various tongues, strange conceptions of family life, peculiar diets and sketchy notions of civic responsibilities. It was very well to expect the strangers to adapt themselves to you, but how about you having to adapt yourself to them?

101 “The Native Sons of Canada,” Canada Calls 1, no.7 (October 1942) p.5.

Lower and many of his like-minded compatriots regretted that homogenization and cultural assimilation wouldn’t occur more rapidly and that Canada did not follow the American example of forming a melting-pot. It was said that the strong presence of the French factor made a united construction of a national identity evasive. “The result was,” argued Lower, “a greater sense of exclusiveness on the part of ‘old’ Canadians as compared with Americans and a much sharper sense of race: this has delayed the process of society building through intermarriage.”103 This peculiar Anglo-Saxon “sense of race” informed most if not the entire public discourse on social integration of these waves of “strangers” at Canada’s gates, as did, indeed, their treatment as “enemy aliens”. The next chapter will explore how the Canadian public discourse evolved in the course of the late 1930s and the 1940s in terms of what Lower identifies as the “sense of race” and the need imposed on the society to adapt to the growing presence in its midst of “orphan strangers of unfamiliar habits and various tongues”.

---

103 Lower, *Canadians in the Making*, p.373.
Chapter 3
The Meaning of “Race” and “Foreignness”

If we are to understand the Canadian people, we must know more than just geography and scenery of Canada, and the customs and habits of the Canadians. We must also study their racial origins.
J.M. Gibbon (1938)¹

Like all strong nations, Canada is a blending of race stocks. She is fortunate in having behind her the two great traditions of European culture – the British and the French. Her economic assets are as varied as her racial.
John Buchan (Lord Tweedsmuir, Governor-General of Canada) (1939)²

The Canadian people are only emerging and crystallizing now as a distinct type out of many races, as their character is forming out of many common experiences, successes, failures and dangers. It is a type worth noting.
John Dafoe et al. (1941)³

Three months after the Canadian declaration of war, Deputy Minister of Justice, J.F. MacNeill, forwarded two documents to the Office of the Prime Minister. On December 4, 1939 he sent a detailed report on the measures undertaken so far to contain

³ John Dafoe, ed. Canada Fights: An American Democracy at War (New York & Toronto: Farrar & Rinehart, 1941) p.29. The text of this book was a collaborative work of several prominent journalists, notably Grant Dexter, Bruce Hutchison, George V. Ferguson, B.T. Richardson, Percy W. Corbett and John W. Dafoe.
possible sabotage and "fifth column" activities by "enemy aliens". The next day, he sent a letter to the Prime Minister offering personal reflections on the impact of these measures on "people of foreign extraction" settled in Canada.\footnote{Letter by J.F. MacNeill to J.W. Pickersgill, December 4, 1939, Reel C-3746, 231103-231103, vol. 273, Mackenzie King Fonds, MG 36 J4, Library and Archives of Canada (hereafter LAC).} The letter expressed concerns about the extent of the marginalization of Canadians of origins other than British or French which could eventually constitute a potential danger for national unity, security and stability. This could happen if the social and political integration of such marginalized groups were left to their own assimilative instincts and to their capacity to resist potential subversive influences from abroad. Prime Minister King found MacNeill's letter "excellent" and asked his staff in a handwritten note at the margin of the letter to follow it up.

Referring to "various races we have in this country," MacNeill claimed that too many Canadians of continental European origin lacked knowledge of the "languages most commonly used in this country" and therefore relied on newspapers and radio programmes in their mother tongues which frequently "extol the merits of some one of the current 'isms'." MacNeill refrained from specifying which "isms" he had in mind among communism, Nazism, fascism, or sectarianism of the Doukhobors or Hutterites. His concern was that "these people" knew very little about Canada's values, institutions and war efforts. They were "subjected to subversive propaganda," he argued, and only

\footnote{Letter by J.F. MacNeill to W.J. Turnbull, December 5, 1939, Reel C-3746, 231075-231103, vol. 273, Mackenzie King Fonds, MG 36 J4, LAC.}
realized it when confronted by a police officer and charged “under some one of the many restrictive regulations” in force at the time as “enemy aliens”. In order to make his point about how little attention government was paying to the need of integrating non-English and non-French speaking Canadians into the body politic, he exclaimed:

We spend many thousands each year to ensure the sale of pigs, potatoes, poultry and kindred products. We spend more thousands promoting the health and well being of domestic animals. We even spend a good deal on the wild animals in our parks and forests. What good purpose will all this serve if we do not at the same time spend a little time and money on making good citizens out of the various races we have in this country who know nothing about our real history or the principles on which our nation is built or should be built. We shall need an enlightened body of citizens when this war is over.

This curious juxtaposition of government policy on pigs, poultry and wild animals with the official inattention to Canadians speaking so-called “foreign languages” was not only a criticism of a major political oversight in government management of national resources, human in this particular case, but also reflected and underlined the social construction of naturalized Canadians of European or Asian origin as outside the general public; as “them” in relationship to “us”, as different, as peripheral, as “people of foreign extraction,” and not British or French in origin.

MacNeill’s two documents serve here as an illustration of the emerging concerns in the late 1930s about Canada’s growing “racial” heterogeneity. Of particular importance was its effect on national security in a war situation. It was also seen as important to deal with it considering that Canada was at the time a country in the process of nation-building and modern state formation, facing serious challenges: extensive war
efforts on the home and overseas fronts; labour force requirements connected with notable economic growth; plans for a post-war reconstruction; and attacks from both the left and rightwing ideological spectrum against its cultural and social structures built on liberal values. MacNeill and his contemporaries in Ottawa, including the Prime Minister, judging from his handwritten comments on the letter's margin, viewed the inherent heterogeneity, if not kept under control, as a potential threat to the unity of action on all these political fronts. Whatever the situation, in order to control it, one has to possess knowledge about its components and understand the dynamics of forces that inform it. What follows is an exploration of the set of meanings upon which such knowledge was constructed and represented in the public discourse of the time.

A considerable body of historical literature deals with issues tangential to these policy-making concerns about the impact of the increasing diversity in the population on nation-building and national unity. One could single out studies of immigration and refugee policy, histories of certain ethnic groups and their relationship with the authorities in wartime, treatment of enemy aliens, and biographies of some of the people, whether politicians or educators, active during that period.6 The specific subject of the
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6 Here are some examples: Irving Abella and Harold Troper, None Is Too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe. 2nd ed. (Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1986); Donald H. Avery, Reluctant Hosts: Canada's Response to Immigrant Workers, 1896-1994 (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1995); Kristi Corlett, A Dream of Homogeneity: Arthur Lower's National Vision and Its Relationship to Immigrants and Immigration in Canada.” M.A. Thesis, Queen’s University, 1995; Norman B. Hillmer, B. Kordan and L. Luciuk, eds. On Guard for Thee: War, Ethnicity, and the Canadian State, 1939-1945 (Ottawa: Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, 1989); Franca Iacovetta, R. Perin and A. Principe, Enemies Within: Italian and Other Internees in Canada and Abroad (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000); Valerie Knowles, Strangers at Our Gates:
treatment of diversity as a national identity and policy issue in the late 1930s and 1940s has been discussed far less by scholars. Will Kymlicka describes the period of mid-20th century as one generally marked across the Western liberal world (including Canada) by “benign neglect” of ethnic minorities.\(^7\) Richard Day, instead, views it as a distinct stage on the road to multiculturalism in Canada, marked, according to Day, by public encouragements of a gradual integration of various cultures into a collective national “Self”, identified as a national mosaic, to be achieved through deliberate, long-term and non-coercive methods of government seduction.\(^8\) Day’s analysis is built on a string of historical indicators that suggest that multiculturalism is merely a recent, postmodern and ineffective reproduction of a series of imaginative and similarly ineffective solutions in dealing with diversity while attempting to construct a homogenous national community.

There is, however, more to explore in the Canadian political discourse of the time in connection with the expanding cultural and racial diversity and its potential effects on

---


a cohesive modern management of public affairs. How were, for instance, the constitutive elements of the heterogeneous body politic identified and dealt with in the area of policy-making? To what extent the concerns with internal pluralism affected public opinion and contributed to the gradual re-construction of such concepts as “race” or “racial origin”, “people of foreign extraction”, and most of all, “being Canadian”? How were the meanings of these concepts normalized and naturalized? Who was identified as a person of “foreign extraction”? What was the axis of juxtaposition on which the process of identification of differences evolved?

As David Theo Goldberg, a scholar of racial theory and multiculturalism, explains in *The Racial State*, modern liberal state formation implies production and reproduction of institutions, practices and social technologies that have for their purpose the reification and consolidation of a community characterized by a “racially” conceived and “racially” configured homogeneity called the “nation”. By “racial” Goldberg understands culturally constructed (imagined) indicators of assigned or assumed physical or biological markers, including presumed physical markers recognizable on human beings as the result of their cultural behaviour. No matter how persistently pursued by the state apparatus, internal homogeneity is mostly assumed, however, and remains an illusive project, argues Goldberg. Homogeneity is meant to be achieved by delimiting the boundaries of the community through a system of social exclusions, and by codifying and normalizing the terms of inclusion for those who fit the imagined national profile. Goldberg suggests that

---

in the construction of a nation, any heterogeneity should ideally remain in the realm of the foreign world, one beyond the confines of individual national states. This is rarely achievable. No boundaries are impermeable, and, consequently, the state, as guardian of the national project, must constantly intervene by defining and re-defining the parameters of national distinctiveness in order to proceed with the process of unification.

As suggested by another scholar of racism and nationalism, Etienne Balibar, this national unification, particularly in times of crisis, presupposes an ideological form, including a normalized representation of “self-identity” as a natural community with its history and values. This ideological form “must become an \textit{a priori} condition of communication between individuals (the ‘citizens’) and between social groups – not by suppressing all differences, but by relativizing them and subordinating them to itself.”\textsuperscript{10} Through this process, the imagined boundary of the nation is designed to delimit a symbolic difference between “ourselves” and “foreigners”, by, so to say, internalizing “external” frontiers and thus protecting the collective identity of the in-group. In other words, national unification meant identifying all those left outside the national realm of communications as belonging to a “foreign” world. One could extend Balibar’s argument by adding that regardless of the temporal length of their presence within the spatial domain of a national community, members of “racial” (or ethnic) groups left outside the ideologically constructed boundaries of a national identity retain their external or foreign character at least until they are willing or forced to join the realm of communications by

assimilating linguistically (by learning and using the national language as the vehicle of communication) and ideologically (by adopting values and beliefs shared by the dominant “selves”).

What Balibar calls “ideological form”, proponents of cultural studies call “culture” or “cultural context”, a socially constructed system of meanings, values and behaviours represented in the form of signs and symbols communicated and shared by means of a discursive practice commonly negotiated and constructed through time and space.\(^\text{11}\) Borrowing from structuralists, the practitioners of cultural studies, Stuart Hall among them, explain the self-identification process as the marking of difference through a binary juxtaposition of opposite meanings: stranger/native, outsider/insider, male/female, black/white, Muslim/infidel, self/other. Difference implies the existence of a boundary, a fragile contact zone, not defined by space or time, which symbolically determines the positioning of the point of identification in relationship to, let us say, one’s own cultural sphere, on one hand, and “otherness”, on the other. Boundaries are threshold points between two possibilities of identification. They are products of a continuous process of dichotomization. A dialectic process of communications of meanings and representations may entail a gradual displacement (deferral) of meanings of difference and the eventual blurring and transgression of boundaries. It may also

reaffirm the positions of similarity and difference and harden the boundaries. Nevertheless, as suggested by Stuart Hall, the concept of identity, whether individual, ethnic or national, does not imply a "stable core of the self, unfolding from beginning to end through all the vicissitudes of history without change." Cultural identity, whether ascribed or assumed, is not an immutable essence, he says, but a constant process of positioning of a point of identification "which has no absolute guarantee in an unproblematic, transcendental 'law of origin'".

With such theoretical background in mind, we can explore whether those patterns of racialization of a national project advanced by Goldberg correspond to the evidence of Canadian efforts in the 1930s and the early 1940s to achieve unity as a nation facing a war crisis. If so, what kind of racial thinking lay behind Canadian nationalism? Was it the binary "white" vs. "black" racial opposition that profoundly informs Goldberg's reflections on racial state or was it founded on a different set of polarities with the same constitutive effect? Equally, taking up the propositions of Balibar, or Stuart Hall and scholars of cultural studies, is there any evidence on whether -- and if so -- how was "foreignness" or "otherness" identified and used in that historical period in Canada as criteria to establish boundaries between inclusion and exclusion? Who was considered enough "Canadian" to be included in the subjective "we", and who was marginalized,
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objectified, and potentially excluded because of being of “foreign extraction” or of specific “racial origin”? Public debates in the press and Parliament should help us identify certain ideological trends on these issues.

“Various Races in This Country”

A long-lived historical narrative of the making of the Canadian nation consecrated the understanding that two dominant “races” – British and French -- participated in the setting up of Canadian confederation and this duality informed the fundamental characteristic of the nation for decades to come.14 Nonetheless, even at the time of Confederation, it was argued that the Canadian society was quite heterogeneous since Scots, English, Irish and Welsh were all “races” in their own right. Their “racial” identity was, for the purposes of political convenience and distribution of powers, submerged under the umbrella of a common denominator: having their origin in the British Isles and being imbued in British traditions. Notably, however, when George-Etienne Cartier

---

proposed the idea of a “political nationality” during the constitutional debates of the 1860s, he referred to the existence of a “diversity of races” (namely English, French, Irish and Scotch) in Canada and argued that the preservation of such diversity would be an advantage for the confederacy.\(^\text{15}\) “Racial” differences were, in practice, for lack of clear physical distinctions, identified by their cultural manifestations (social institutions, folklore, dress, food, traditional behaviour). In the case of British-French duality, the enumerated distinctions would particularly emphasize religion (Protestantism vs. Catholicism) and language (English vs. French).

Politically and economically being most numerically prominent, Canadians of British origin -- and notably those priding themselves on being Anglo-Saxons -- dominated the social scene and orchestrated the process of nation-building in their image, and the modern state formation according to their cultural tradition. Still, the countrywide homogenization of social factors (institutions, social conditions) was continuously hindered by the constitutionally entrenched English-French duality of nationhood and the historically created regional (and hence cultural) idiosyncrasies (of Québec and Atlantic Canada, for example). The possibility of “racial” amalgamation or any significant cultural assimilation of the French population into the British fold was elusive. As sociologist Charles Dawson put it in 1943, “English and French form two sides of one shield we call Canada”. Understanding this duality, he argued, might help create not

national uniformity but unity.\textsuperscript{16}

The unifying process certainly became more complicated at the turn of the twentieth century with the arrival of a significant flow of new immigrants from all over Europe, triggered by the deliberate state policy of importing cheap labour to give a strong boost to potential economic growth and territorial expansion towards the prairies.\textsuperscript{17} Any hope for some kind of racial homogeneity, and even the peculiar "racial" duality, was seriously jeopardized from then on. What was, under such circumstances, the subsequent role of "race" in the national project of Canada? What kind of culturally assigned or assumed markers served as indicators for inclusion under -- or exclusion from -- a common designation labelled "Canadian" in the 1930s and 1940s?

"Race" as a concept was generally used in a much broader sense in Canada than in the United States. In the United States "race" was primarily constructed as an identification founded on so-called biological criteria to be applied in the essentialist, "black" vs. "white" differentiation. As such, "race" acquired a high level of pervasiveness as the key factor in national public discourse and the construction of all basic social categories.\textsuperscript{18} In his 1938 book \textit{Canadian Mosaic}, John Murray Gibbon


\textsuperscript{17} For a history of Canadian immigration policy from early days of Confederation to the present, see Freda Hawkins, \textit{Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Kingston & Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988), or Valerie Knowles, \textit{Strangers at Our Gates: Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1340-1997}. 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1997).

\textsuperscript{18} On the meaning of "race" in that latter context, see, for instance David Theo Goldberg,
pointed out that the Canadian use of the term “race” corresponded to the broad definition of the term legitimized by the authoritative *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th ed., 1911): “a tribe, breed, a group of individuals descended from a common ancestor [... ] an ethnical or national stock; comes from Fr. *rase*, adopted from Ital. *razza*, line mark, cognate with Engl. “write”, i.e. the line marking descent.”19 What was missing from this definition, he argued, but widely understood in everyday usage, was the fact that a group of individuals stemming from a common set of ancestors should also share, some “common tools”, such as “language, customs, costumes, art and music”, should live long enough together, “say five hundred years”, intermarry and otherwise closely interact. Only than would they be “recognizable as a Race.”20 Throughout a series of portraits of various ethnic groups in Canada, Gibbon insisted, in his description of these groups, on the communality of language, on examples of “folk songs and dance, folklore and folk arts (such as spinning, weaving and embroidery)”, in short, on cultural aspects of their “racial” characteristics.21

---


20 Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.3.

21 Gibbon’s book was an outcome of a project he had devised for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation consisting of a series of radio programmes, each offering a sampling of folk songs and instrumental music of a different cultural group of European origin settled in Canada. Gibbon wrote the commentaries. Folk songs were not sung in the original language: Gibbon provided English adaptations “on Canadian themes” for
Cultural indicators of differences, rather than some supposed innate and biologically constituted ones, became the focus of all those who wanted to find an alternative and acceptable method of describing human groupings, particularly when dealing with “European races”. To the scientist, wrote Watson Kirkconnell in his *Canadians All*, “race is simply and solely a matter of physical characteristics such as skull-shape, colour of eyes, hair and skin, texture of hair, stature, and blood group” and, consequently, in their view, “neither language nor political grouping proves anything as to the race of any human being.” He conceded that there might exist three main European subspecies of the human race (Nordic, Mediterranean and Alpine) but “no such thing as a French race, an Italian race, an Anglo-Saxon race, or a German race - or for that matter, a Polish race, a Ukrainian race, or a Russian race. We are all mixtures; and to the historian mixtures are a good thing, for they encourage new developments in civilization.”22 The differences were manifested in cultural expressions: in the language spoken, in the folklore and artistic endeavours, in religious practices, in the dress and costume, in history and progress.

Discussing in 1943 the status of Canadian population in the early 1940s after the benefit of a heterogeneous Canadian audience. He admitted it was “a bold innovation”. See, *ibid*, pp.x-xi.

22 Watson Kirkconnell, *Canadians All* (Ottawa: Bureau of Public Information, 1941) p.11. Commenting on this emphasis on racial mixture, also raised by scientists such as Huxley and Haddon, the author of a 1935 review of Huxley’s and Haddon’s book on *We Europeans* had this to say: “What we glibly call pride of race is but pride of tradition for apparently were any of us to look hard enough we could be sure of finding a nigger in the woodpile.” E.G. “[Book Review:] We Europeans: Julian Huxley and A.C. Haddon; Jonathan Cape; pp. 288. S2.75,” *Canadian Forum* 15, no. 179 (December 1935) p.406.
decades of European and Asian immigration to Canada and the emigration of Canadian residents to the United States, the President of the Canadian Political Science Association, Charles Dawson suggested that:

Racial diversity, in the strict biological meaning, is not great in Canada. Anglo-Saxons, Slavs, and Latin peoples comprise the great bulk of our population. These groups are mixtures and are closer together racially than they are culturally. In terms of feature and colour, which are the most important barriers to assimilation, these groups are near enough alike to make assimilation well-nigh inevitable in due course.23

There were, however, groups “destined by physical characteristics to be permanently marginal,” he added. “No racial inadequacy or inferiority” could be scientifically detected concerning “the orientals” or “negroes”, he admitted. Nevertheless, due to their “racial visibility in terms of colour and feature” -- taken as “symbols of social identification” -- these groups created with their presence “a perennial racial problem”. This was, certainly, the case in the United States, and, to a lesser extent, in Canada, he added.24 As regards Canadians of Japanese or Chinese origin, Dawson explained:

Japanese and Chinese of the second, and especially of the third generation are in sentiment and loyalty as Canadian as we permit them to be. They bear a physiological badge that destines them to be in some sense perpetually strange and alien to the rest of

24 Dawson, "Canada in Perspective," p.295. The similar arguments were advanced at the time by H.F. Angus in his discussion of “Underprivileged Canadians,” Queen's Quarterly 38 (1931) pp.445-461, and by Ruth MacKenzie, although she claimed that there was “no Canadian negro problem,” mostly because of their small number. See, MacKenzie, “Race Prejudice and the Negro” Dalhousie Review 20, no.2 (1940) p.200.
us. This badge arouses the normal and natural reactions of racial antipathy on the part of Japanese and white Canadians. These antipathies are as natural as the physiological process of breathing and can be brought only partially under rational social control.\textsuperscript{25}

In recent decades, scholars have focussed on the process of racialization, its origins and consequences in the form of prejudice, discrimination and, in its extreme, racism.\textsuperscript{26} Their work shows that racial prejudice and high level of discrimination, in particular in regard to Aboriginal or black populations, or to those of Asian origin (Chinese, Japanese and Hindu), was by no means absent or insignificant in Canada.\textsuperscript{27} The presence of Japanese and Chinese immigrants in Canada, constituted a problematic situation of its own kind, particularly in the province of British Columbia, and was always dealt with in very specific terms, profoundly marked by extreme prejudice.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{25} Dawson, “Canada in Perspective,” p.296. In reading this quote, one should be aware of the fact that Dawson spoke about “sentiment and loyalty” of Japanese Canadians at the time when some 23,000 of them, the totality of British Columbian Japanese population were declared enemy aliens, deported from the coastal areas of the province, settled in concentration camps, and their properties expropriated under the provisions of the War Measures Act and the Defence of Canada Regulations.


\textsuperscript{27} See, for instance, Constance Backhouse, \textit{Colour-coded: A Legal History of Racism in Canada, 1900-1950} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999)

\textsuperscript{28} For a contemporary critical view of this prejudice, written prior to the over-zealous public construction of all Japanese-Canadians as enemy aliens at the aftermath of the Pearl Harbour attack in December 1941, see, for instance, H.F. Angus, “Underprivileged Canadians,” \textit{Queen’s Quarterly} 38(1931) pp.445-461; \textit{idem}, “The Effect of the War on
Jean Brunet says, Canadians took otherwise a long time to admit and reflect on the fact that racism, and its particular form, antisemitism, existed in Canada and that it had existed even before these terms were invented in the early 1930s in the wake of Hitler’s Aryan crusade. Racist manifestations may have occasionally appeared to be “polite and subtle” in the public political arena, to use Brunet’s words – in fact, they were wrapped in convenient silence, understatement, rationalization or hypocritical denial -- but they did not lack in oppressiveness.

Thus, in the debates in the House of Commons, some politicians were clumsy in their attempts to appear tolerant or sympathetic; some were blunt in their racist overtones. One could witness, in the 1940s, a Member of Parliament from British Columbia being quite comfortable in expressing himself in the following blunt manner in the House of Commons:


29 Jean Brunet, “Introduction,” in Migrations and the Transformation of Cultures, ed. J. Brunet et al. (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1992) p.xiii. Before WWII the meaning of the term “racism” was evolving so that as late as May 11, 1943 it was used in The Globe and Mail to refer to the German policy of self-promotion of its own superior race and not as an ideologically driven pattern of persecution and oppression of others.
We in British Columbia are firmly convinced that 'once a Jap always a Jap'. The words 'being naturalized' are just like a snowflake on a river. It is a mere gesture...They are all alike; you cannot tell one from the other... If you adopt an attitude of complaisance or anything which is suggestive of subservience to the brown man, he thinks you are afraid of him. The countries of the world have not been won for the white race by adopting an attitude like that. I still think that we should have taken a firm hand with the Japanese and all the native races, and as a consequence, they respect you.\textsuperscript{30}

His views were largely shared by the majority of his colleagues from British Columbia during the debates on the so-called "Japanese problem". The MP for New Westminster, T. Reid, stated, on a different occasion, what seemed to him obvious, namely that the "colour bar" made amalgamation of "races" practically impossible:

\begin{quote}
[my colleagues] have failed to recognize the great difference there is in the two races ... there is a difference between people of German or Italian extraction and those of Japanese. We have hundreds of thousands of people in this country who are of German and Italian descent, but who in the second or third generation have become good Canadians. But who is going to marry into the oriental group? If they do, what will their progeny be? They will be oriental because that is what has happened whenever mixed marriages have taken place.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

Another Member of Parliament, this time from Nova Scotia, was, on the other hand, probing the question of why black volunteers for enlistment in the army were not accepted. G.B. Isnor, MP for Halifax urged the Minister and his associates "not to think

\textsuperscript{30} A.W. Neill, MP for Comox-Alberni (British Columbia), February 25, 1941, Debates of the House of Commons, 2\textsuperscript{nd} session-19\textsuperscript{th} Parliament (November 7, 1940-January 21, 1942) pp.1017-1019.

\textsuperscript{31} T. Reid, MP for New Westminster (British Columbia), June 30, 1943, Debates of the House of Commons, 4\textsuperscript{th} session-19\textsuperscript{th} Parliament (January 28, 1943-January 26, 1944) p.4222.
of the members of this race as being illiterate, flat-footed and barbarian people who
cannot be disciplined” and to refrain from visualizing “a camp ground occupied by these
people as one filled with chicken feathers and empty beer bottles.” He specified that:

I refer to a race of people who perhaps are not blessed as we are,
or as we think we are, namely those people who have not white
skins ... they have volunteered their services and have been
turned down.

... to which, evidently uncomfortable, the Minister of Defence, Chubby Power,
mumbled in response, in all appearance not even getting up from his seat: “There is no
bar to the enlistment ... no legal bar, I believe.”

On a similar subject, the only Ukrainian Canadian Member of Parliament,
Anthony Hlynka, devoted his maiden speech in the House to extend the debate on hand
regarding Canadian unity to “other important phases of this subject”, notably to condemn
those “who seek to create disunity among our people by playing upon racial differences
or racial superiority in our midst.” He questioned why according to the announcement for
recruiting RCMP constables published in an Edmonton newspaper in autumn of 1940
qualified candidates had to be of “British racial origin”. In a manner that seemed careful
not to accuse anybody in particular, Hlynka elaborated on his inquiry, arguing that the
meaning was vague:

When interpreted broadly, it would appear to mean that any
person born in any British dominion is eligible for enrolment, be
he of Anglo-Saxon or any other racial extraction. But interpreted

---

in a narrower sense, it would simply rule out the eligibility of all those not of Anglo-Saxon origin. Unfortunately, this narrower interpretation is being used by minor officials for the purpose of racial discrimination.  

He suggested, as a conclusion, that in future the government should use “a more specific choice of words” when drafting its circulars. Three years later he rose in the House again to denounce yet another such recruiting announcement, this time for naval officers. “What is it that makes these men of non-British origin unfit for officer material?” he asked. The answer he got was as indirect and evasive as the one by Chubby Power mentioned earlier: the announcement must have been unauthorized, no such regulation existed. However, the fact that such announcements were printed with such wordings suggested that such racially-motivated unofficial “slips of the tongue” were not uncommon.

In March 1943, Norman Jaques, a Social-Credit (New Democracy Party) MP from Alberta, wondered out loud why, on the list of the world’s most powerful financiers, the names were all Jewish: “How many French names are in that list? How many British? How many Christians?” Jaques was interrupted by Paul Martin, a French-Canadian Liberal from Windsor: “Let us have no Jew-baiting.” Another Alberta Social Credit Member interjected: “Then do not do it. You are mentioning it; the hon. member is just


giving the names.” To which Martin responded: “The implication is quite clear.” And Jaques retorted: “If the cap fits I cannot help it.” He then pursued his theme by adding that these financiers with Jewish names gave funds to the London School of Economics, whose objective is to train “bureaucrats for the future world socialist state” and whose graduates included well-known socialists and communists such as Leonard Marsh, William Beveridge and Harold Laski. He was not the first or last one to make such attacks on communism in antisemitic terms.

The Jewish plight in Europe and the Canadian response to help Jewish refugees and offer them sanctuary is also a story in itself. While antisemitism informed government immigration policy in the 1930s and 1940s, public attitudes also contributed to the conspicuous inaction on behalf of the Canadian authorities to save people from genocide. On January 30, 1939, the Liberal MP for Quebec-Montmorency tabled in the

35 N. Jaques, MP for Wetaskiwin (Alberta), March 24, 1943, Debates of the House of Commons, 4th session-19th Parliament (January 28, 1943-January 26, 1944) p.1531. Marsh and Beveridge were authors of two major policy proposals suggesting the introduction of broad social reform measures in Canada and England, respectively. Laski was a celebrated political science professor at the London School of Economics and a Labour Party member, known for his left-leaning political views.

House of Commons a petition of the Société St. Jean Baptiste with 127,364 signatures “vigorously protesting against all immigration whatsoever and especially Jewish immigration.”\(^{37}\) The outright antisemitism of this petition was visible on other occasions in the debates in the House of Commons as to whether or not to admit Jewish refugees from Europe. As a good Roman Catholic, another MP from Quebec knew that Jews should be treated as any other people, but so many considerations were given to their case as refugees in need of special treatment, that he wondered whether the country was “engaged in this war for the sole purpose of saving or helping out the Jews all over the world”.\(^{38}\)

Elsewhere, the resistance to admitting refugees was most often expressed in economic terms, but, as suggested by *Canadian Forum*, racial prejudice, “though less vocal”, was probably a more likely motive.\(^{39}\) At the national annual meeting of the

---


\(^{39}\) “The Refugee Problem,” *Canadian Forum*, 18, no.218 (March 1939) p.361. The short article had also this to say: “Racial exclusiveness is no less stupid in Canada than it is in Germany and Italy.”
Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire in 1939, members debated whether refugees should be welcome to Canada “where spaces are wide, where we need population and where we are a free people.” What emerged from the debate was the conclusion that the membership should discuss the issue further as “the matter was one that should be considered without sentiment, but with sane consideration, as in some Provinces the foreign question was a very vexed one.”

In other words, the conclusion was to procrastinate and do nothing. The editor of Saturday Night, B.K. Sandwell, suggested that, as a nation, Canadians did not persecute and murder people but could easily be said to be “passers-by on the other side.” Sandwell proceeded by quoting the Winnipeg Free Press as saying that “antisemitism, shameful though it must be to admit, has far too large a footing among Canadians.” On another occasion he asked:

Is it better for Canada that, let us say, a hundred thousand Jews should enter the country, or that those same hundred thousand Jews should die because we kept them out? The answer perhaps depends to some extent on whether we believe that God judges the nations of the earth – Canada included.

The inaction on behalf of Canadians on the subject of Jewish refugees and other

---


41 Toronto Star (May 15, 1940, p.19) reported Miss Constance Hayward, Secretary of the Canadian National Committee of Refugees, saying that Canada seemed slow in aiding refugees: “To obtain permission for refugees to enter Canada is a ‘very slow process’, because of public opinion, she claimed. ‘This is not a disinterested opinion, but people have failed to realize its importance,’ she said.”

42 B.K. Sandwell, “Passing By on the Other Side,” Saturday Night, April 17, 1943, p.27.

persecuted groups from Europe, (left-wing intellectuals and resistance fighters), was also lamented by some religious leaders, notably Reverend Claris Edwin Silcox of the Christian Social Council of Canada. Already in the spring of 1939, Silcox wrote his “Canadian Post-Mortem on Refugees,” a text rife with pessimism that any tangible change in national behaviour on that subject could be expected.\(^{44}\)

This lack of any clear leadership and moral commitment was obvious, among other things, by the fact that some concerned experts and bureaucrats raised at a certain point the question whether, for the administrative and policy purposes within government, Jews (Hebrews) should be considered “Canadians of recent European origin”. A ministerial decision was required to provide an answer which was, eventually, given in the affirmative.\(^{45}\) The fact that their original immigration papers reported most likely Poland, Czechoslovakia, Germany or Austria as their places of birth was not considered on face value as a sufficient proof of their European roots. It was their “race” that counted here, not “origin”.

As noted by Ruth MacKenzie in 1940 in *The Dalhousie Review*, racial thinking had not always been triggered by an aggressive sense of biological or cultural


\(^{45}\) Note by G.W. Simpson to Tracy Philipps, January 9, 1942, file 33, vol. 1, Tracy Philipps Fonds, MG30 E350, LAC.
superiority.\textsuperscript{46} It could have also been triggered as a defensive move, from the growing fear of being overwhelmed by someone’s increasingly cumbersome and frightening presence, or fear of losing ground, social status or control that one might have had so far.\textsuperscript{47} Such fear or resentment could, eventually, turn into “race prejudice, with all its justifying myths and ideologies.”\textsuperscript{48} The superiority of a human group, she concluded, was then rationalized by the apparent evidence of its high civilization, better education or an illustrious history.

“Racial differences are not of kind but of degree,” one could read in the \textit{United Church Observer}:

\begin{quote}
God hath made of one blood every nation to dwell on the face of the earth. We are of common origin. We belong to the same family tree, the variety of fruit has arisen through climatic and cultural conditions. Racial differences are not of kind but of degree... In the better day that is coming, the weaker nations, the more backward peoples, will be treated as the younger children in the human family, and in the Father’s house... [however] we protect and feed, clothe and educate, the younger members of our families, while we have violated and robbed and stripped the child races of the human family.\textsuperscript{49}
\end{quote}

This statement echoed the one made by Robert England a few years earlier on the social status of Central European immigrants in Canada when he suggested that

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{46} Ruth I. MacKenzie, “Race Prejudice and the Negro,” \textit{Dalhousie Review} 20, no.2 (July 1940)
  \item \textsuperscript{47} Sociologist Dawson seemed to consider this “a natural and inevitable defence reaction in certain social situations.” See, Dawson, “Canada in Perspective,” p.296.
  \item \textsuperscript{48} MacKenzie, “Race Prejudice and the Negro,” p.197.
  \item \textsuperscript{49} W. E. Brewing, “Racial Relationships after the War,” \textit{The United Church Observer}, April 15, 1941, p.15.
\end{itemize}
"customs, habits, social and economic background of [this] people belong not only to another land but to another century."\textsuperscript{50} He considered the difference between Canadians and Central Europeans as "largely one of time."\textsuperscript{51} England, however, did not claim that Anglo-Saxon civilization and progress were necessary better. The newcomers, he said "possess as their heritage an old-fashioned family life where parents rule, a church to which they are loyal, traditions, customs, superstitions, a love of the land, together with some prohibitions, perhaps not modern, but some of which are no worse than those we have set up." Still, assimilation of these peoples was possible and necessary for the national harmony, he believed, provided that the process of "moulding the minds" be undertaken with care and tact. The onus was on the newcomers, nevertheless, to "correct their institutions, their habits of life, and if necessary, their language to make co-operation possible between us."\textsuperscript{52}

The preference for cultural indicators of difference did not mean abandoning racialized thinking. This shift of emphasis from the scientifically-defined biological differences to those of social and cultural progress, national temperament and cultural characteristics was significant but not less discriminatory and prejudicial. However, in the light of alarming extremes of political abuse of scientific racism and racialization, notably in Germany with the Nazis in power in the 1930s and 1940s, this shift in

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Ibid}, p.162.
emphasis to culture and progress helped reduce, at least for the time being, the potential spread of racially founded nationalistic ideologies and acts under the banner of “blood and belonging”. Julian Huxley, a renowned British biologist who took a very public stand in the fight against racism, denounced “‘racial’ absurdities and the ‘racial’ horrors perpetuated in the name of science”.

Other scientists and sociologists began also to speak of “racial myth” and argued that the existence of purely biological differences among races could not be scientifically proven. “The racial myth is an easy and comfortable doctrine, of the same general character as the statements that lightning causes thunder, or that rain comes from cloudbursts,” argued Canadian sociologist C.W.M. Hart. He attributed the “tenacity of popular racial prejudice” to inadequacy of the educational system. Students who came out of schools were “steeped” in “such racial nonsense as the ‘natural genius of the Anglo-Saxons for democracy,’ ‘the inherent manliness of the Nordic races,’ the laziness (innate) of the Negro, the inborn genius of the French for formal painting (or surrealism), and the rest of the catchwords.”

---

The questioning of the use of signifier “race” as an adequate means of classifying people and its replacement with other terms (ethnicity, nationality, minority) was accompanied by new assertions of racial equality before the law in the spirit of liberal – and Christian – tenets of universalism.\(^{57}\) These were all international phenomena. In his book *The Silent War*, Frank Füredi suggests a series of factors which might have contributed to this shift, among them: the weakening of the Western grip on the colonies and the awakening of race consciousness among the colonized populations; Japan’s rise as a world power threatening the European hold on lucrative Asian trade centres by a series of military victories humiliating for the European sense of superiority; the rise of German nationalism and antisemitism; the war in Europe conducted in the name of democracy and freedom; the Holocaust; Soviet and Communist propaganda of a colour-blind ideology; demographic dangers of declining fertility among Western populations and increased mobility from peripheral areas of the globe to the industrial countries of the West.\(^{58}\)

Changing demography and international migrations had a significant impact on racial thinking in Canada. According to official statistics some six million new immigrants from all over Europe arrived in Canada between 1900 and 1941 in search of work, land or simply a better life. This phenomenon introduced into the population a


variety of new cultural groups or so-called “racial” formations, also referred to as “stocks,” “types,” “strains of blood,” “elements” or “nationalities”/”national groups.” Their diverse group identities were invariably recognized by such specifications as birthplace or nativity, language, nation-state of origin and even religion (for example, Polish, Ukrainian, Belgian, Yugoslav, Hutterite, Hebrew), all classified under the common denominator “racial origin”.

The Elusive Meaning of Racial Origin

According to the national decennial census held in 1941, there were, along with Canadians of British origin, who formed half of the population, and French Canadians who were the second largest “racial” group (at 30.27 percent), some 17.76 percent of Canadian residents who declared themselves of European, but neither of British or

---

59 For instance, “Is it a sound immigration policy that brings more Germans and other Europeans to Canada than settlers of British stock?” (Editorial in The Globe and Mail, June 4, 1940, p.6)

60 For instance, “No one type has had a monopoly of genius in creating civilization...” in Watson Kirkconnell, Canadians All, p.8.

61 For instance, “There are many drops of Dutch blood in the Canadian system” in Gibbon, Canadian Mosaic, p.17.

62 For instance, Ukrainians being described as “one of the most important, and in our opinion most valuable, of the racial elements of which the future Canada is destined to be composed.” (Front page editorials, Saturday Night, May 8, 1943, p.1)

63 For instance, there were in Canada “nearly two and a half millions whose ancestors were of European nationalities other than British and French” (Kirkconnell, Canadians All, p. 6)
French origin. The results of the 1941 enumeration could be summarized as follows.⁶⁴

**Ethnic origins of the Canadian population, 1901-1941**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1941</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>57.03</td>
<td>55.49</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>51.86</td>
<td>49.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>28.96</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>25.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>11.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>30.71</td>
<td>28.61</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>28.22</td>
<td>30.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>17.76†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiatic</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.64††</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.7258</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Including German (4.04), Ukrainian (2.66), Jewish (1.48), Dutch (1.85), Polish (1.46), Norwegian (0.88), Swedish (0.74) and Russian (0.73) ethnic groups, among others

†† Including Chinese (0.30), Hindu (0.01), Japanese (0.20) and Syrian (0.10) ethnic groups

The above statistics were derived from information recorded by census enumerators when asking people at their doorsteps: “What is your racial origin?” As *The Canada Year Book 1940* explained, the data on the racial origin of each person had been collected through decennial censuses since Confederation with the exception of the 1891 census. The object was “to ascertain from what basic ethnic stocks the Canadian

⁶⁴ The summary is excerpted from Table I in W. Burton Hurd, *Ethnic Origin and Nativity of the Canadian People 1941* (Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961?) p.32.
population, more particularly the recently immigrated population is derived.” The answer “Canadian” was not accepted under the heading. The Year Book pointed out, however, that the purpose of the question was to obtain, eventually, in so far as possible, an acceptable definition of “Canadian” in terms of a racial derivation.65

The Year Book acknowledged that this approach had its critics. Critics argued, notably, that there were some Canadians whose families resided in Canada for several generations and had difficulties, with the exception of French Canadians de souche, to know their ultimate racial origin. It was also argued that this practice perpetuated racial distinctions and thus hindered desirable assimilation of newcomers and the ensuing homogenization of the nation.66 Dominion statisticians counter-argued that knowing racial origin of the population was important to ethnologists, criminologists, and social and “biometric” scientists for their study of such “a new country like Canada”.67 Most of all, although not mentioned by The Year Book, was the fact that such data had significant value for the purposes of defining and defending whatever immigration policy was to be adopted, pursued or modified by government. The data revealed the degree of

65 Dominion Bureau of Statistics, The Canada Year Book 1940 (Ottawa: King’s Printer, 1940) p.85.


67 The Canada Year Book 1940, p.86.
adaptability of various ethnic groups as new Canadians and allowed to trace their assimilation.\textsuperscript{68}

The instructions prepared by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for the benefit of enumerators for the 1941 census specified that, for the purposes of the census, “the word ‘race’ signifies - ‘descendants of a common ancestor’” and that “racial origin” and “nationality” were very often quite different. The instructions used the example: “The Canadian nationality comprises many different racial origins, e.g. English, French, Irish, Scottish, Welsh, Italian, German, etc.”\textsuperscript{69} The instructions also specified that the origin should be traced through the father’s line, except in cases where there was an ancestor on either the father’s or mother’s side belonging to “the black, yellow, or brown races”. In such cases, the origin was determined by the race of the non-white parent. The offspring of Indian and white marriages were to be listed as “half-breeds”. Instructions also defined how to register people of “coloured stocks”: “For persons belonging to stock involving difference in colour (i.e. the black, yellow and brown races) the entry shall be Negro, Japanese, Chinese, Hindu, Malayan, etc., respectively, thus indicating the branch within the distinct ethnic stock, to which such persons belong.”\textsuperscript{70}

In the introduction to his analysis of the 1941 census results commissioned by the

\textsuperscript{68} On the importance of racial origin data for the evaluation of the success or failure of immigration for nation-building and economic growth of the country, see Hurd, \textit{Ethnic Origin and Nativity} 31; \textit{idem}, “Is There a Canadian Race?” \textit{Queen’s Quarterly} 35 (Fall 1928) pp.615-627; and \textit{idem}, “The Case for a Quota,” \textit{ibid}, 36 (Winter 1929) pp.145-159.

\textsuperscript{69} Dominion Bureau of Statistics. \textit{Eighth Census of Canada 1941. Instructions to Commissioners and Enumerators} (Ottawa, 1941), Section 100 (column 25)

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Eighth Census of Canada 1941. Instructions}, Section 100, para 2(b)
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Professor W. Burton Hurd stated that "since, in the census, the principal purpose of the origin classification was to distinguish groups in the population having distinct cultural characteristics," he chose to use in his study the term "ethnic origin" instead of the term "racial origin" used in the official census data.\(^{71}\) The term "ethnic", however, seemed to be used in the pre-WWII years to connote the concept of sectarian, collectivist behaviour of a group rather than its origin. In his study of group settlements in Western Canada, published in 1936, Professor Dawson defined "ethnic groups" as "groups in which language, sectarianism, nationalism and collectivism in various combinations distinguish them from their neighbours."\(^{72}\) Throughout his study he referred to these communities as "separatist or bloc settlements", "cultural islands" or "colonies". This terminology permeated the language used in non-academic literature as well when referring to the isolated life of Hutterites, Mennonites and Doukhobors who refused to mingle with their neighbours and who proclaimed their pacifism and conscientious objection high and loud.\(^{73}\) It should be emphasized, therefore, that Hurd's 1941 study remained an internal document and was only published after the war when identifying people by their racial origin would have been largely unacceptable in the light

\(^{71}\) Hurd, *Ethnic Origin and Nativity*, p.29.

\(^{72}\) C.A. Dawson, *Group Settlements: Ethnic Communities in Western Canada* (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1936) p.xiii. In the forward written by W.A. Mackintosh, it was stated that this was "a study of groups rather than of 'foreigners'. It is a study of a type of settlement which contrasts sharply with a normal type of individualist settlement."

\(^{73}\) See, as an example, a series of fourteen articles by R.J. Needham, entitled "Strangers in Our Midst", published in the *Calgary Herald* from June 29 to July 8, 1942 devoted to the closed-in colonies of Mennonites, Hutterites and Doukhobors in Alberta.
of racist violence that had been rampant in Europe in the 1930s and 40s.

In his study, Hurd explained that the answers provided by those enumerated as to their “racial origin” implied references to some distinctive characteristics which “in the minds of those answering the question” distinguished them from other groups. The distinctiveness included “biological factors” (colour of the skin, shape of the eyes) but most often had a cultural significance (mother tongue, religion), or a geographical reference (“common ancestral homeland”). It might have also reflected, Hurd remarked, the “consciousness” or “delusion of being derived from a common biological strain.” It is noteworthy that Hurd had made such observation decades before the theories of “imagined communities” and subjectivity in ethnic and national identification became commonplace. One should also note Hurd’s similar, earlier discussion in connection with the 1931 census: “One merely follows popular usage in employing the terms, ‘English stock’, ‘French stock’, ‘Italian stock’, etc, ... such usage is familiar to the public in general, and only when our ‘origin’ classifications follow such lines can they be collected by a census, be understood by the people or have any significance from the practical standpoint of the development of a Canadian nation.” Further on, Hurd summarized: “Except in the case of the Hebrews, the term ‘origin’ always connotes the original geographical habitat of a population group, usually implies a distinct culture, and

---

74 For Hurd’s discussion on the interpretation of “race” and “racial” in the context of census taking, see his *Ethnic Origin and Nativity*, pp.29-31.

75 The term “imagined communities” was introduced in 1983 by Benedict Anderson. See his *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1991)
often a definite biological strain. In any case, it refers to a specific group of immigrants and their progeny."

The Hebrews were a category apart, he explained: they were homeless, with no territorial base and therefore hardly fit to be categorized by origin. Their distinction was religious. In his studies in connection with both 1931 and 1941 census, Hurd made it clear that the classification was hardly "scientific"; that categories were established lacking all uniformity; and that perception and subjectivity in representations played the strongest role in the choice of the dominant signifier.

Is There a Canadian Race?

Hurd's study as a whole reflected the on-going debate within the Bureau on the appropriate way of registering cultural diversity of Canadians. As there was awareness that the scientific value of identifying Canadian population by racial origin might be doubtful, why pursue it? Why couldn't one be, simply, either Canadian or a foreign

---


77 In his 1941 census study, Hurd avoids, as if afraid to touch a delicate subject, any specific reference to the Jewish (Hebrew) segment of the population and the group's ethnic and cultural closeness or isolation.

78 See Adam Green and Christine Pothier, "'They All Want To Be Called Canadians': The Complexity of Racial Origin According to DBS Archival Sources." Paper presented at the Crabtree Conference, organized by the Canadian Century Research Infrastructure Project, Ottawa, April 29-30, 2004.

79 For a historical overview of the use of "racial origin" category in Canadian censuses and the arguments justifying it, see Enid Charles, *The Changing Size of the Family in Canada. Eighth Census of Canada 1941: Census Monograph No. 1* (Ottawa: Dominion
national? For some, the answer might have been disguised in the following discussion in April 1927 when a Member of Parliament asked the minister responsible for the Dominion Bureau of Statistics:

The census enumerators as a rule will not accept the answer that a person is a Canadian; they say he must be described as Scotch, Irish, English, German, Ruthenian, and so on. Is it necessary that a Canadian should trace back his ancestry until he finds from what particular country his forebears came?

The minister responded by conceding that the issue had its difficult aspects, but the Bureau had to compile “information on racial lines.” And, in order to show what he considered as difficulties involved, he pointed out: “Is a Chinaman born in Vancouver a Canadian?” The member who had raised the question in the first place was equally doubtful himself and the matter was dropped for this time.80

The MP’s question seemed obvious: if, as an answer to the “what is your racial origin?,” one could be ascribed the label Russian, “Yugoslavic”, or Chinese, as possible racial categories - and thus making in fact reference to actually very heterogeneous national formations – why couldn’t one be “Canadian” in response to the same question?81 Why could not one suggest that there was a “Canadian race”?


81 Among those listed as of Russian origin, there could have very well been those of
At the beginning, the idea seemed ridiculous to the officials of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. No competent scientific ethnologists would consent that there was such a thing as a “Canadian race”, it was argued. Creating by law a Canadian nationality in terms of “race” in its own right would be as great a mistake as “for the legislature of the State of Tennessee to pass an Act declaring that the world was made in six days.”

Not even Americans dared to go that far.

Hurd explained why. The Canadian population was still undergoing profound changes in its “racial” composition, whether because of the influx of new immigrants or due to fertility rates among some “racial” groups (much higher among newcomers and French Canadians than among those of British origin). The processes of amalgamation and assimilation were ongoing but, unfortunately, slow, in Hurd’s opinion, as revealed by the census data on people’s “racial origin”. To extrapolate one Canadian type as representative of the nation would have been impossible, he argued:

> Our racial melting-pot is boiling; the ingredients therein are increasing at different rates and foreign elements are being added continuously. Anyone who is so rash as to explore the cauldron for the Canadian par excellence will find him most elusive, and

Ukrainian, Cossack, Jewish or German origin; Yugoslavia was in 1919 specifically created as a Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and acquired the name Yugoslavia as a Serbian nationalist state power takeover in 1929; and people from China identified themselves, traditionally, according to the province they came from and would be, consequently, ethnically Manchurians, Mongolians, Cantonese, and so forth.

82 Memorandum for Mr. Coats [Chief Statistician] by Chief, General Statistics Branch, May 12, 1926, re Mr. Dafoe’s letter - suggested addition, in File “Racial Origin,” vol. 1417, Statistics Canada Fonds, RG31, LAC.

probably succeed only in getting burnt. 84

Ten years later, the cauldron seemed still to be boiling. As Gibbon said in his Canadian Mosaic, “Canadian people have not lived long enough together to be set in their ways... have not yet been blended into one type.” Five hundred years might be needed, was Gibbon’s forecast. What to do in the meantime? How to construct a nation on such “racially” and “communally” heterogeneous grounds? Is it a nation, is it an “amalgam”, a “rainbow”, a “system”, or, perhaps, a “mosaic”?

Kirkconnell liked the concept of “amalgam”. “We are all minorities,” he would say, “but all Canadians, entering, each with his own capacities, into the richness of the national amalgam.”85 In his “European Sources of Non-Anglo-Saxons in Canada”, Rev. Denzil G. Ridout, admitted that “just as the individual colours of the spectrum are in themselves beautiful,” it is rather “the harmony of all colours in the glory of the rainbow that stirs the fullest admiration.”86 Gibbon may have once suggested the term “Canadian system” when saying that those of “German racial origin” were fully “digested and

---

84 W.B. Hurd, “Is There a Canadian Race?” Queen’s Quarterly 25 (Fall 1928) p.625. The “culinary” image was taken further by Kirkconnell when he wrote: “Such are the varied human ingredients that history has poured into the huge mixing-bowl of Canada’s national life. Surely no mincemeat in the world could have more spice and flavour than the Canadian people.” See, Kirkconnell, Canadians All, p.7.

85 W. Kirkconnell, Canadians All, p.7. See also his contribution to an American wartime magazine devoted to Americanization of many ethnic minorities in the U.S: idem, “The Canadian Amalgam,” Common Ground 2, no.1 (Autumn 1941) pp.37-40.

absorbed into the Canadian system”\(^{87}\), but it was his concept of “Canadian mosaic” that, many years later, was eventually popularized to describe most adequately, it seemed, the Canadian nation. Gibbon admittedly did not invent the term.\(^{88}\) The poetic description of the mosaic he put together was, nevertheless, aptly crafted and memorable:

> The Canadian people today presents itself as a decorated surface, bright with inlays of separate coloured pieces, not painted in colours blended with brush on palette. The original background in which the inlays are set is still visible, but these inlays cover more space than that background, and so the ensemble may truly be called a mosaic.\(^{89}\)

This mosaic was heralded, however, at a time when the full assimilation or a “national amalgam” was considered a more attractive and certainly more efficient formula for Canada in dealing with the heterogeneous mass of immigrants while striving to become a full-fledged nation in its own right. Pointing out the existence in one’s midst of a diversity of “racial” origins and cultures, as Gibbon did, seemed counterproductive to those concerned with building a unified, harmonious and modern nation, with a system of government that functioned well, and a war economy that had to rely on every

---


\(^{88}\) It was apparently used for the first time by an American traveller, Victoria Hayward, in her book on *Romantic Canada* (Macmillan & Company, 1922). It appeared as a title theme to a 1926 survey of immigration issues commissioned by the Young Women’s Christian Associations of Canada. See: Kate A. Foster, *Our Canadian Mosaic* (Toronto: Y.W.C.A., 1926). Gibbon recognized those two, but did not make note of an article by Clara L.K. Holmes, “The Great West Festival at Calgary” (*Canadian Geographical Journal* 1, No.3 (July 1930) pp.269-275) where it was suggested that “the fact of Canada’s entity as a national mosaic of great beauty and of intrinsic cultural worth is just beginning to dawn upon her own citizens.”

\(^{89}\) Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic*, p.viii.
available manpower to be found regardless of origin, class or culture. What was needed was rallying people under a common call – as “Canadians All”. The question is, who were those recognized as “Canadians” under that rallying call.

“People of Foreign Extraction”

Since Canada was a nation characterized by the politically-motivated absence of a predominant racial identity labelled “Canadian”, cultural duality was seen as its hallmark. It was a society in which an array of “racial origins” served to categorize and systemize people, most of whom (the exception being those colour-coded -- “black”, “yellow” or “brown” -- and, by definition, inassimilable) were, in principle, eligible to be eventually absorbed in the melting pot called Canada. Canada was a national project meant to evolve steadily into “a British nation not so much by blood as by political institutions, tradition, by its way of life, its attitudes, and by a British instinct for democracy, which has given the French absolute equality and has spread through the newly immigrated peoples.”

The core of its population consisted of Canadian nationals, born in Canada or naturalized, who were, by the same token, British subjects.

With its growing economy, Canada wanted more people and since the turn of the 19th century they were arriving, from abroad, by the thousands. After several decades of setting up a new home, labouring, forming families and having children, immigrants began identifying with their new surroundings, keeping some of their old traditions and

---

adopting new ones. Their inclusion into Canadian society took place gradually: the way they dressed, ate and entertained themselves began to change; they learned one of the official languages of the new country and began to participate in the activities of the neighbourhood community as responsible and active citizens. If and when they started calling themselves German-Canadians, Hungarian-Canadians, Japanese-Canadians, and the like, they may have been on the verge of being blended into the society of their adoption — they were "digested and absorbed" as Gibbon once said, referring on that occasion to numerous German-Canadians, assimilated among their Anglo-Saxon neighbours.\footnote{J.M. Gibbon, \textit{The New Canadian Loyalists}, p.13.} What distinguished them, still, was that inescapable "hyphen", the mark that revealed their original "foreign extraction" no matter how long they had called Canada their home.

The hyphen was the indication of the hybrid condition, straddled over the delimitation line between inclusion and marginalization, if not full exclusion. That exclusion beyond the boundary of the "national core" depended on the degree of the perceived persistence of their initial "strangeness" or "foreignness" represented in phenotypical terms (for example, the colour of the skin of Asians and Africans), in spatial or geographical terms (a country of origin or ethnic and cultural entity other than Scandinavian or western European) or temporal terms (the perceived level of progress in civilization measured in comparison with the achievements of the Anglo-Saxon culture in education, science and technology, lifestyle, etc). By the fact of being foreign born, those
of the first generation were most likely to remain marginalized and eyed with prejudice, if not fear. The most famous "foreigner" in Canadian cultural history is probably Kalman, the fictional hero of Ralph Connor's novel *The Foreigner*. Born in Russia, he came to Canada as a young boy, and with all the education he received in the Prairie schools and the managerial skills he demonstrated in his job, after two decades of life in Canada, he was being referred by his Scottish born wife-to-be, at the end of the novel, as "my foreigner, my Canadian foreigner." 92

Things were not very much different at the eve of WWII. In his study of the 1941 census, Professor Hurd used the term "foreign population" when making reference to Canadian residents of non-British, non-French origin, i.e. those of continental European and "Asiatic" origin -- respectively 17.76 and 0.64 percent of the total population in 1941 according to the census enumerators. 93 Terms such as "foreign population", "foreign origin" or "foreign stock" were meant to be distinct from the term "foreign-born", which implied not being "Canadian-born," or born in Great Britain or another dominion or colony of the Empire. The computation of the number of "foreign-born" (2,017,902 according to the 1941 census) was based on the census question regarding birthplace or nativity. This data of vital statistics informing the dichotomy "Canadian born" vs. "foreign-born" was applied in everyday language, as well, to label people. The label of "foreignness" served the purpose of identifying social marginality.

The term "foreign" deserves attention for a number of reasons. To be "foreign"

---

93 See an example in Hurd, *Ethnic Origin and Nativity*, p.117.
can theoretically infer a two-pronged meaning. On the one hand, it implies an external origin and birthplace, as contrary to native-born, and indicates the association with some outside group or country. When that association includes allegiance to a foreign sovereign (as a legitimately recognized citizen or subject of that foreign entity), the legal term “alien” is applied. On the other hand, “foreignness” implies inherent “strangeness” or “oddity”, and invokes “outside intrusion”. The “foreigner” as “stranger” brings forward the cultural aspect of his or her out-sidedness, articulated around such signifiers as “foreign” language, unpronounceable names, quaint clothing, lifestyle and folklore. In biblical context, a stranger is a wanderer, as Moses and his people were in Egypt, in hope of an eventual return home: “And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself” (Leviticus, 19:33-34). Moreover, it is one’s duty to help and entreat the “stranger that is within thy gates” to hear and learn God’s words and observe the law (Deuteronomy, 31:12-13). As a wanderer, the stranger comes and may leave again. This is the most fundamental metaphorical characteristic of the stranger as pointed out by sociologist Simmel in 1908. He or she is then also referred to as

---


95 On this dimension of the meaning of “stranger”, see Mary Douglas, “The Stranger in the Bible,” Archives de sociologie européenne 35(1994) pp.283-298. The biblical reference is reflected in J. Woodsworth’s study of his congregation at the All People’s Mission in Winnipeg, entitled Strangers Within Our Gates, 1909 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972) and echoed afterwards in various references to the immigrant population.

96 Georg Simmel, “The Stranger” (1908), in Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic
Zygmunt Bauman, has recently reflected further on the "stranger" as a metaphor representing a certain type of social hybridity, manifesting both spatial and temporal uncertainties and anomalies in relationship to the host society. Bauman’s reflections are attractive and can be summarized as follows: the arrival of the stranger from somewhere outside is an event in time and historically determined. The stranger’s link with the community is not a fact of nature (that is to say, based on blood or kinship). His or her origin being “naturally” elsewhere, it cannot be entirely obliterated even by a deliberate and legal act of “naturalization” which the host society offers to the stranger in order to secure an orderly existence of the in-group itself. The ritual of naturalization is meant to relativize the stranger’s ambiguous position of being both physically “near” and culturally “remote”, “involved” and “objective”, “loyal” and “treacherous”. There are other means to reduce the impact of the stranger’s ambiguous nature on the community: by forced or self-imposed physical isolation in group settlements or colonies (for example, in the case of Mennonites, Hutterites or Doukhobors); by ghettoization (for


example, Chinese quarters in Vancouver or ethnic neighbourhoods in Toronto and Montreal); by deportation (for example, of politically active foreign workers, crime perpetrators or those declared mentally or physically unfit); by legal imposition of various restrictions (for example, admission quotas for schools or certain professions) or, simply, by the construction of stigma based on stereotypes, namely “by representing the outward, visible and easy to spot traits as signs of less evident, yet truly dangerous qualities”, among them double allegiance or apparent disrespect for national cultural cohesion (for example, not speaking the national language, wearing old-world clothes, observing different religious rituals). 98 This would, in the Canadian context, entail the continuous reference to continental European immigrants as “foreigners”, or at least as “foreign born”, and the emphasis of the inherent nearness/remoteness dichotomy, by referring to people of other than British or French origin as “hyphenated” Canadians (for example, Ukrainian-Canadians, Italian-Canadians, German-Canadians).

It was the double allegiance or loyalty of those labelled “foreign-born” or simply “foreigners”, of their possibly “sitting on the fence”, that appeared as the greatest threat to Canadian national integrity, especially in wartime. Thus, when, on December 5, 1939, Deputy Minister of Justice, J.F. MacNeill wrote to the Prime Minister regarding “people of foreign extraction”, he particularly emphasized the concern about their limited inclusion in the Canadian political orbit. 99 As an editorial in the Globe and Mail suggested, “In every country of immigration like Canada, these new people will have a

---

99 See note 5, above.
pull between the ties of their homelands and their loyalty to their new country."¹⁰⁰ And as Sandwell pointed out, the feeling of uncertainty as to who one’s neighbours really were and where they had come from made Canadians uncomfortable and jittery.¹⁰¹ Warnings were launched in the House of Commons on various occasions. "We have always been too careless about naturalization. We never seem to stress the need in Canada for a change of allegiance in mind," argued one MP.¹⁰² "A naturalization certificate is an admission that the state recognizes that the person who has been accepted for membership in that proud heritage of British citizenship is a citizen whose loyalty is unquestionable," was Diefenbaker’s assessment of what naturalization implied. But even Diefenbaker warned that it should not be taken as a badge of immunity and a cautious approach as to the loyalty of foreign-born was not out of place.¹⁰³

But "foreignness" was not only an issue of loyalty. The only woman MP in the House of Commons at the time, Doris Nielsen, believed that "many of these so-called foreign speaking peoples are more aware than Canadian-born people" of the insidious consequences of the war at hand. By her elliptic, semantically awkward reference to immigrants as "foreign speaking people" she conveyed the inherent message that their

¹⁰⁰ "Dominions Declare War On Three Axis Nations: Canada Follows Lead of Britain Within 4 Hours," The Globe and Mail, December 8, 1941, p.5.
¹⁰³ John Diefenbaker, M.P. for Lake Centre (Saskatchewan), June 13, 1940, Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament (May 16-November 5, 1940) p.749.
system of thinking and understanding of meanings had a distinct dimension not shared by
the dominant community.\textsuperscript{104} The "foreignness" in this case underlined the impermeability
of culturally different systems of communications. A brief portrait of Anthony Hlynka,
Ukrainian MP from Alberta, published in the \textit{Canadian Business} magazine, praised the
democratic system in which "a so-called foreign-born lad could, at the age of 33, reach
the Canadian Parliament."\textsuperscript{105} Here, the example of a foreign-born’s success provided a
laudable demonstration of liberal tolerance and readiness to offer equal opportunity to all
those who can compete with the best of the in-group, regardless of race or origin. C.
Gillis, a CCF MP from Cape Breton, instead, reported the case of 127 miners of Italian
origin suddenly released from work in the summer of 1940: "It was a question not of
alienism," he tried to explain, "but of unemployment, the last stand of desperate men to
secure employment." As a result, the laid-off miners and their 227 dependents had to live
on an inadequate relief payment, and their children were unable to go to school. Union
officials tried to re-instate them but the native born miners kept refusing to give in. The
problem lasted three months. Genuinely concerned with the welfare of Cape Breton
miners he was representing in the House of Commons, Gillis concentrated on the
economic aspect of the incident and failed to recognize that fear of unemployment and
lack of economic security breeds nativist behaviour and scapegoating.

\textsuperscript{104} Doris Nielsen, MP for North Battlefold (Saskatchewan) November 18, 1940, \textit{Debates
of the House of Commons, 2\textsuperscript{nd} session-19\textsuperscript{th} Parliament (November 7, 1940-January 21,
1942) p.189.}

\textsuperscript{105} Austin F. Cross, "Anthony Hlynka, Social Credit, Vegreville, Alberta," \textit{Canadian
Business} 16, No.3 (March 1943) p.8.
As to the hyphenated signifiers of ethnicity, the author of a letter to the editor of the Globe and Mail wondered, for example, about the appropriateness of the conjunction contained in the term “German-Canadians”: “They are either good Canadian citizens or they are Germans. There can be no half-way mark when we are at war ... They are for us or they are against us ... A spade is a spade and a German is an enemy.” No tolerance here. A foreigner is a foreigner, and stays that way.

Not all agreed. The Saturday Night editor exclaimed in wonder one day in 1943:

A member of the B.C. Legislature the other day referred to a fellow-member as a “foreigner” because he was not born on Canadian soil, although he fought for Canada in the last war. If there is anything more idiotic than making nationality dependent purely upon race, like the Germans, it is making it dependent purely on the accident of the place of birth.

To avoid the label of “foreignness”, other labels were invented: “new Canadians” or “today’s Canadians”, or simply “immigrants”, no matter how long the concerned persons lived in the country and had been naturalized as Canadian nationals. The representation inherent in these labels still conveniently pointed to the hybrid, marginal condition of the status of the person in question, in the same manner as did the hyphenation.

There was also a persistent appreciation of the fact that, for a country in the process of consolidating its ranks and performance as a nation-state, the sooner these

107 Saturday Night, April 24, 1943, p.3.
anomalies were effectively dealt with the stronger the nation would become. "We have too many hyphenated people in Canada," argued a Conservative MP from New Brunswick. "I am sure that all hon. members would rather have our people called Canadians than called German-Canadians, Italian-Canadians or some other form of hyphenated Canadians." He believed too little attention had been paid to teach "our foreign-born residents" Canadian ideals and values.\(^{109}\) In 1940, John Diefenbaker wanted to see emerge as soon as possible "an unhyphenated Canadianism that is dominant, proud and strong." He believed that the manner in which the census data was collected, namely, by insisting on registering the nationality of people's paternal ancestors, stood in the way of "the creation of an unhyphenated Canadian nation." He wanted Canadians to register as Canadians and be Canadians.\(^{110}\)

With the war demanding that Canadian residents contribute to the best of their abilities to the common effort to fight the enemy -- abroad and at home -- "hyphenated" Canadians, and particularly those who still held tight to their emotional ties with the old country, were, thus, in the eyes of those in charge of the state apparatus, mostly either highly unreliable or disturbingly unpredictable elements to dealt with. Hence, MacNeill's letter to the Prime Minister's Office. Hence, a similar message by Brooke Claxton, the well-known lawyer from Montreal and a rookie Member of Parliament, who joined the chorus of political advisers in drawing the attention of the Prime Minister and his

---


\(^{110}\) John Diefenbaker, MP for Lake Centre (Saskatchewan) June 13, 1940, *Debates of the House of Commons*, 1\(^{st}\) session-19\(^{th}\) Parliament (May 16-November 5, 1940) p. 749.
immediate entourage to the fact that Canadians of all races must be reminded of their need to be loyal to Canada. Claxton was worried about the outbursts of nativist manifestations by ordinary people at workplaces and public spaces, and about the extent of the official treatment of so-called “enemy aliens” – German-, Italian- or Japanese-Canadians. He advised that “friendly aliens and naturalized Canadians should be used to help us rather than forced by our treatment to regard themselves as enemies.”

In conclusion, and without minimizing the importance of the continuously tense historical relationship between the two original participants in Confederation, Canadians of British origin and French-Canadians, the evidence suggests that much of the dynamics of Canadian nation-building in the late 1930s and the 1940s also resided in the context of integrating the resident “foreigner” into the unified national project. In a country perceived more and more as an agglomerate or a mosaic of “races” and cultures, the proliferation and mixture of assumed or assigned “racial” identities made “racial” identification almost meaningless as the indicator of belonging or as the sign of legitimacy to claim one’s Canadian identity. The mobilizing tension behind nation formation may centre on the racialized dichotomy between two metaphors, “white” and “black”, as argued by Goldberg, but the two opposite sides of the dichotomy may, however, be given different sets of signifiers to designate the needed dialectical tension:

111 Memorandum by Brooke Claxton to W.L. Mackenzie King “Suggestions for a Department of Information”, May 4, 1941, file 2-14-2, vol. 8, “Wartime Information Board,” series 31, RG36, LAC.

112 Goldberg, Racial State, passim.
French/English, aboriginal/colonizer, native/foreign.\textsuperscript{113} In the same way, just as the two colour-coded terms, "white" and "black", may change shades and intensity through time and in different environments, so can those other juxtaposed labels also undergo a process of mutation.\textsuperscript{114} Their juxtaposition in a process of national self-recognition remains, nevertheless, crucial when constructing the boundary between "we" and "they".

Thus, in the Canadian context of the 1930s and 1940s, as threats to the nation seemed to be coming from "outside" of the national realm -- in the ideological forms of fascism or communism, and most of all in the form of war itself and inter-cultural conflicts it exacerbated, those threats began to emerge as equally internal in nature and integral part of the domestic political atmosphere as was the British/French tenuous duality. This was certainly the case in the context of western Canada where the cohabitation of native and foreign born people was so much more prevalent than in the eastern regions of the country (with the exception of large urban centres of Toronto and Montreal). Therefore, the axis on which the positioning of the self-identification concentrated and the semblance of homogeneity constructed, gradually shifted from "race" -- whether biologically or culturally defined -- to "origin", with the place (or

\textsuperscript{113} For a different perspective on this subject, see Vic Satzewich, "Whiteness Limited: Racialization and the Social Construction of 'Peripheral Europeans'," \textit{Histoire sociale/Social History} 33, no.66 (November 2000) pp.271-290. Satzewich retains the white/black binary set to discuss the process of Ukrainian national self-identification in the context of what he calls the Canadian racialization of immigrant communities as being "black" as opposed to "white" Canadians of British or French origin.

\textsuperscript{114} On the various shades of "whiteness" as a condition for inclusion, see Matthew Frye Jacobson, \textit{Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchem of Race} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998)
country) of birth becoming the indicator. Those considered being "native-born", whether
British or French, became the in-group. The positioning on the margin, and even outright
exclusion, befell to those declared "foreign-born" (namely immigrants of first, but also of
second and multiple past generations in case of some ethnic origins). They were
recognizable by their use of "foreign-language" in their communications, by their
unpronounceable names, and by an assigned badge of distinction - a hyphen, purposefully
conceived to indicate their potentially indelible double identity.

At this point in time, two options appeared available as to how to deal with the
problem given the precarious context of the war. One would be to cover in silence the
potential "foreign origin" of Canadian citizens and communicate with everybody as
Canadian nationals divided by class, age, gender, and French or English language spoken,
but not by cultural difference or country of origin. The other option -- one the Canadian
government eventually decided to adopt when pressured to act -- was to put into motion
an operation that would deal with cultural minorities by addressing them directly and
individually, possibly in their own language, in order to convey the pressing need of
collaborating and supporting Canada’s war efforts. For that purpose, a government office
named the Nationalities Branch was set up. It was operative from January 1942 to May
1944. The person in charge of its day-to-day operations was Tracy Philipps.
Chapter 4
The Making of a Specialist

If one wishes to speed up, and to outstrip, the normal processes of Nature, the handling of the human spirit, especially from the outer edge of European civilization, where Rome with Democracy has never lived, it is at least as ticklish and technical a job for experts as the manipulation of electric current is for experts in electricity.

*Tracy Philipps (1941)*

If ones [sic] knowledge and languages could not be directly used among the peoples of the NEAR EAST (African, Asian or European), the next most useful thing was to be useful among these same peoples wherever else they were thickest on the ground (as in the Americas) or wherever else they were in key-positions (as the Labour of war-industries of N. America) positions in which they could influence, to win or to lose, the war.

*Tracy Philipps (1942)*

After two years of preoccupations with "fifth columnists" and other "enemy aliens", federal government officials reached an agreement in October of 1941 to appoint an advisory committee and set up an office designed to improve government’s relations with Canadians of continental European origin. The make-up of the office, the Nationalities Branch, was largely the brainchild of Captain John Erasmus Tracy Philipps, an Englishman who arrived in Canada in 1940, full of ambition and energy, and left it in May 1944, a very disappointed man. Who was

---

1 Tracy Philipps, “Report on Tour of Western Canada, November-December 1940,” Part I (January 8, 1941), file 16, vol. 1, Tracy Philipps Fonds (hereafter TPF), MG30 E350, Library and Archives of Canada (hereafter LAC)

2 Letter by Tracy Philipps to Sir Edward Grigg, Financial Secretary, The War Office
Philipps, and on what grounds was he entrusted with the day-to-day implementation of this government initiative, considered by some historians as a precursor of present-day multiculturalism program within the Department of Canadian Heritage? It is useful after all to know something about the views and ideology of a person who proposed to set up and operate, on behalf of the Canadian government, a wartime office in charge of dealing with Canadian residents of European (non British or French) origin, at the time when government officials felt that something should be done but no one among them had a commonly acceptable vision of how and to which end. Reading his writings scattered in a most disparate number of publications and knowing more about the kind of experience he had accumulated in the course of the 1920s and 1930s during his migrations through the British Empire and beyond, contributes to the understanding of the intellectual baggage he brought to the job and facilitate the assessment whether his ideas were innovative and fitting to the Canadian environment or were they merely a transplantation of precepts of how to govern colonized populations who happened to fall under the Anglo-Saxon trusteeship.

(London, UK), August 13, 1942, file 8, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1890</td>
<td>Tracy Philipps is born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1913</td>
<td>educational period: Marlborough College; Oxford &amp; Durham Universities (BLitt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913-Aug. 14</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner, British Expeditionary Army, French-German frontier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 5, 1914</td>
<td>Eastern Front with Indian Expeditionary Force (B), attached to King's African Rifle (KARs); wounded; awarded with Military Cross for valour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1914-1915</td>
<td>in London, attached to the War Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Political officer to Bukoba Expeditionary Force in equatorial Africa (Tanganyika)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Chief (Military) Political Officer (G.S.O.3), in ex-German East Africa; wounded; awarded the rank of Captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Austrian-Italian front and British Legation in Rome; Abyssinia (on the slave-trade route)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Eastern Mediterranean secret intelligence (b) corps, Athens (Greece)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>in Cairo and Jerusalem, attached to the Arab Bureau, run by the famous Lawrence of Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-1920</td>
<td>in charge of administration of the northern (Kayonsa) region of the Kigezi District of Uganda at the border of the Belgian East Africa, during the rebellion of the Nya-Bingi Secret Society; walked on foot along the Equator from east to west Africa; discovered a clawless otter, named after him <em>Lutra (paraonyx) philippsii</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1923</td>
<td>stationed in Turkey, as British Relief Commissioner for Southern Russia (Caucasus and Ukraine), in charge of supply services for the famine relief in Russia organized by the British Red Cross under the auspices of the League of Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>London <em>Times</em> correspondent on Greco-Turkish war; appointed liaison officer with the French and Hellenic troops in Thrace (Greece); awarded the medal of the Holy Redeemer of Greece, in recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-25</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Intelligence, Khartoum (British Sudan) and Cairo, during the mutiny of Egyptian-born officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Commissioner of the Military Province of the Bahr el-Gazal, on the frontier with the French colonial territory, at the Congo-Nile divide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-1927</td>
<td>back in the Kigezi District, as District Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1935</td>
<td>Deputy Provincial Commissioner, East Africa; dismissed from colonial service with the rank of Deputy Governor of a Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932-1933</td>
<td>travels through southern Soviet Union, Greece, the Balkans, Turkey and Italian colonies (Libya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-1939</td>
<td>Diplomatic Correspondent for London <em>Times</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Doctor in Civil Law <em>honoris causa</em>, Durham University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>mission to Latin America re: possible settling of Jewish refugees there to avoid the heightening of local Arab nationalism in Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-May 1944</td>
<td>European Adviser to RCMP and Government of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Chief, Planning Section, Displaced Persons Division, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), Washington, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-1958</td>
<td>Secretary-General, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), Brussels, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 21, 1959</td>
<td>Tracy Philipps dies in an Oxford hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philipps came to North America to enlighten American and Canadian audiences with his lectures on how the British people were discharging with great dignity and courage, but insufficient moral and material help from North America, the crucial role to stop Hitler’s advances. This was the time when British authorities encouraged British intellectuals and celebrities of all kinds to make fervent appeals to Americans by ways of lecture tours and highly publicized public appearances in order to urge them to get involved in the war effort. Philipps’ speaking tour was more specific. The public was informed that his lectures were offered under the auspices of the National Council of Education and mostly organized by the Association of Canadian Clubs “to help indicate the deep currents beneath International Relations in the NEAR EAST, and to interpret the background of the disjointed daily news of the

---

war," or to put it more plainly, to explain what was at issue behind the less known Eastern war front.\(^4\) Through summer and autumn 1940, Philipps was thus speaking to select business clubs, local Canadian Clubs and the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, presenting himself as "an up-to-date Specialist" capable of delivering relevant information "on a purely scientific basis."\(^5\)

While on that tour, Philipps was also invited, by local organizers, to address audiences of mostly immigrant origin, and interpret to them current events in the Mediterranean and Eastern Europe. This was most convenient, because, behind the official cover of public lecturing, Philipps was on a mission for the benefit of the British Foreign Office to collect intelligence on the nationalist undercurrents among the European immigrant population in both USA and Canada, and gauge the extent of their support for British European policy and war strategy.

Of particular concern were the activities of several Ukrainian organizations with different and sometimes entirely opposed views as to what should be the national status of their homeland Ukraine in relationship to the powers at war, and how it should be defined in any future peace agreement concerning national boundaries between Poland, the Soviet Union and the rest of Eastern Europe. In his *Canada and the Ukrainian Question*, Bohdan Kordan offers a detailed and highly

---

\(^4\) Brief Presentation Note by the Association of Canadian Clubs, under Department of N.W.S. of Canada, January 1, 1941, file 16, vol. 1, TPF, MG30, E350, LAC.

\(^5\) Tracy Philipps, "Report on Tour in Western Canada, November –December 1940, Part II: Annex-Notes and Suggestions (January 8, 1941)," p.20, file 16, vol. 1, TPF, MG 30 E350, LAC.
documented discussion of this aspect of Philipps' activities in Canada and of Canada's foreign - and domestic - policy in respect to Ukrainian Canadians and their lobbying of government officials in Canada and abroad. Kordan joins a series of historians and writers of personal memoirs who, in the post-WWII years, kept pointing out, with different emphasis, how it was due to Philipps' negotiating skills that those various Ukrainian organizations reached an agreement to collaborate, at least nominally, under the umbrella of a newly established Ukrainian Canadian Committee. The formation of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee in this wartime era has been considered a crucial event in the ethnic history of Ukrainian Canadians. Kordan, however, views these activities more specifically from the point of view of Canadian -- and British -- foreign policy in respect to Ukrainian national aspirations for independence, and he creates a much more complex portrait of Philipps in comparison to other writers. From reading his exposé, one gets the impression that Philipps was very well informed about most of the intricate aspects of the "Ukrainian question" from the international and domestic perspective, while at the same time

---


completely out of sync with what Western Allied Powers, including his mother
country, Great Britain, were prepared to offer and eventually deliver to Ukrainians
through future peace agreements, in return for their unconditional support of the
Allied war effort.

In his recent book *Plateaus of Freedom*, Mark Kristmanson, stresses that
Philipps' activities throughout his stay in Canada were carried on in collaboration
with the RCMP and British undercover agents, and were basically intelligence
gathering operations in disguise.\(^8\) Existing documentation does indicate that Philipps
was hired by the RCMP on contracts during 1940 and 1941 and did collect
information while travelling across the country.\(^9\) Creating almost a caricature of a
restless, megalomaniac British colonial adventurer at the sunset of his career, and
with not much concern with the chronology of real events in Philipps' career,
Kristmanson uses the storyline of a 1927 pulp fiction concoction, *The Man Who
Knew*, to create a composite "characterization" of Philipps as a British intelligence
agent who outwits a group of murderous and wicked "oriental" Bolsheviks trying to
incite coloured people of Asia and Africa to rise in a destructive revolt against the

---


\(^8\) Mark Kristmanson, *Plateaus of Freedom: Nationality, Culture, and State Security
in Canada, 1940-1960* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2003), notably chapter 1:

\(^9\) See, for instance, letters by S.T. Wood, RCMP Commissioner to Tracy Philipps, on
May 2 and May 8, 1941, offering a three-month contract with RCMP, on a trial basis,
file 6, vol. 1, TPF, MG30, E350, LAC. Once attached to the Nationalities Branch, he
continued informing the RCMP on various individuals he would come across through
his contacts. See his two letters to the Assistant Commissioner of RCMP, F.J. Mead,
dated February 26 and March 12, 1943, file 9, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
British rulers. The novel in question was written by F.A.M. Webster, and Philipps himself made several references to its existence, hinting that the author had not consulted him when he made him, "under a thinly veiled disguise", the main character of his novel, Philip Tracy.\footnote{F.A.M. Webster, *The Man Who Knew* (London: Selwyn & Blount, 1927). For Philipps' references to the novel, see the Flyer issued by the National Council of Education of Canada, May 15, 1940, announcing his lecture tour, file 5, vol. 1, TPF, MG 30 E350, LAC; as well as an undated biographical note written by Philipps himself, in file "Tracy Philipps-Personal Dossier," vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.}

Some kind of intelligence work, one way or another, had been part of Philipps' activities ever since he left university at the age of 23 to join the Regular Army Reserve of Officers in 1913 and subsequently assumed different tasks in the army and the colonial administration in the course of the 1920s and 1930s.

But, colourful, or sinister, as this side of Philipps' persona might be, this is not why one should pay a specific attention to Tracy Philipps as an individual in the context of the present study. As mentioned before, it is the review of his full life itinerary and ideological background that make his behaviour and actions as a Canadian civil servant during the WWII years understandable.

*A Many-Faceted Career*

Everything about John Erasmus Tracy Philipps indicated that he was an English gentleman of excellent education, determined to pursue a very complex but distinguished career as a soldier, colonial administrator, naturalist, anthropologist,

Family and Education

Tracy Philipps was born into a family associated with the descendants, so he claimed, of Richard Philipps, governor of Nova Scotia from 1717 to 1749, although, more likely, of the governor’s nephew, James Erasmus Philipps, a distinguished resident of Annapolis Royal and member of the Nova Scotia Council from 1730 to 1759. Philipps’ mother was a viscountess, and he moved with ease among the London upper class. During his years of travelling, he used as his mailing addresses in London famous gentlemen’s clubs, such as Army and Navy or The Travellers’, and

---

11 Information used to draw the following sketch of the public life of Tracy Philipps is found in various files in the Tracy Philipps Fonds (MG30 E350) in the Library and Archives of Canada, notably in the flyer announcing his lecture tour, issued by the National Council of Education of Canada, May 15, 1940, file 5, vol. I, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC; the undated biographical note in the file “Tracy Philipps-Personal Dossier”, vol. I, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC; and “Brief Presentation Note by the Association of Canadian Clubs, under Department of N.W.S. of Canada, January 1, 1941, file 16, vol. I, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. Also helpful were Who’s Who, 1939 and Who’s Who, 1959 (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1939 and 1959 respectively) and Philipps’ published texts in various periodicals.

12 The Times (London), July 24, 1959.

13 See Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol. III (1641-1770) (www.biographi.ca/EN) for the entries under “Philipps, James Erasmus” and “Philipps, Richard”. Philipps mentioned this family link in a draft bibliographic note dated February 4 [1944?] as a claim of his legitimacy to work as a public servant in Canada. See file 21, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. It was under Governor Richard Philipps’ tenure that Nova Scotia Acadians were forced to pledge their oath of allegiance or be expelled from the colony. Governor Philipps had no known children,
he eventually established his residence on the distinguished Pall Mall itself. His education was also first class: Marlborough College, then Oxford, then Durham University, which, in 1937, conferred him the doctorate in civil law, *honoris causa*, "for public work, both at home and abroad, in Colonial Science and in International relations towards the betterment of British-and-Foreign understanding."\(^{14}\) He was "steeped in classics" -- evident in his literary references scattered in his correspondence and various writings. He spoke French, German, Italian, and, later on, Ukrainian, and boasted of even knowing thirteen African languages.\(^{15}\)

For a couple of years, Philipps was married. There was a boy, named Igor, but Philipps never mentioned him in his correspondence and Igor may not have been his child. The marriage collapsed soon after the couple and the boy arrived in Canada. Bitter and astounded, he blamed his wife, Lubka Kolessa, for both personal and political betrayal, when she suddenly left him to seek refuge with friends in Toronto, and also appeared -- so he was told -- as being in contact with ultra-nationalist Ukrainian organizations in North America and serving as their emissary between

---

14 See the Flyer announcing his lecture tour, issued by the National Council of Education of Canada, May 15, 1940, file 5, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC

15 That he "talks Ukrainian" was communicated to O.D. Skelton, under-secretary of foreign affairs, by W.A. Tucker, MP for Rosthern (Saskatchewan) in a letter of November 25, 1940. See File 165 - Part II, vol. 18, RG26, LAC. For his knowledge of African languages, see *Who's Who, 1939* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1939); also, the flyer announcing his lecture tour, issued by the National Council of Education of Canada, May 15, 1940, in file 5, vol. 1, TPF, MG30, E350, LAC. As to being "steeped in classics", see the obituary in London *Times*, August 13, 1959.
Canada and USA. Kolessa was a concert pianist of some renown in Europe. Of Ukrainian origin, she was brought up in Prague, Czechoslovakia, where her father was university professor in Ukrainian studies. As a public performer, she was praised for her beauty and talent. She settled in Canada after the divorce, and, until her death in 1997, had a successful career as a piano teacher at the conservatories of Toronto and Montreal.

In the Military Service

It was Philipps’ linguistic aptitude and excellent education that made him prime material for recruitment in the military intelligence contingent established in 1913. According to the assessment of a historian of that wing of the British Army, a good intelligence officer was supposed to be inquisitive, showing a tendency not to conform but, rather, incessantly probe the meaning of things and therefore be quick-witted and an independent thinker; dedicated to his task; resourceful and adaptable to new conditions of work; capable of moving and navigating in a new environment; and be a good communicator. The available evidence of Philipps’ life experiences

---

16 See, for instance, his letter to Leland, a friend, c/o Senator A. Knatchbull-Hugessen, also a family friend, dated August 15, 1942, file 8, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

17 See the flyer announcing his lecture tour, in file 5, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.


19 For a description of the intelligence corps of the British Army, their recruitment and operations in the Middle East and Africa, see Jock Haswell, British Military Intelligence (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973)
reveals all these qualities. From the day of his enlistment, Philipps was on the go, as if trying to understand, interpret and predict political and social developments that may have an effect on the makeup of this world as a whole and the British Empire in particular. Throughout his career, Philipps kept moving from one assignment to another, sometimes staying on a particular job for only a few months at a time and then moving to another assignment. He sometimes left on his own initiative in a seemingly restless urge to be where a novel type of action was taking place. He also, on occasions, resigned, in desperation, or was dismissed for being too free-spirited and critical, at odds with procedures or policies in place.

Philipps' early days of soldiering took him first to the French-German border and then to the Eastern front on the borderline between Greece and Turkey. He was wounded three times and eventually discharged from active combat service with the rank of captain. During the remaining years of the war he performed different military and field reconnaissance functions on the Austrian-Italian front, in the Middle East, Abyssinia and, eventually, central and eastern Africa, more specifically in and around the recently conquered areas of former German colonies at the border with the Belgian Congo.

In Abyssinia, Philipps was briefly involved in uncovering the black slave trade route, from the frontiers of Abyssinia bordering French, Italian and Uganda-Sudan territories to the Arabian Peninsula slave markets. In a letter to the Editor of London Times, some years later, Philipps assessed the roots of that major humanitarian problem without beating around the bush. The Kingdom of Ethiopia, he said, was the "Land of Habesh", meaning "the land of confusion". He knew the
country “from personal observations”, he claimed. And he added: “Men of the ruling race constitute a military caste. They know no other occupation. They are generally a mess of untrained, undisciplined, soldier-parasites, into whose hand the subject peoples are delivered in lieu of pay and maintenance.” It was this military caste that was involved in the trade. The remedy was therefore not the repression of the trade by force, but an economic reform. The international community of the League of Nations, in Philipps’ opinion, should have been pressing the Ethiopian rulers to improve the financial management of the country.\textsuperscript{20}

In the Middle East

For a short while, in 1918, he was attached to the famous Arab Bureau in Cairo from which Lawrence of Arabia exercised his influence on British activities in the Arab region.\textsuperscript{21} Philipps would later proudly mention that he knew and worked with Lawrence, and he probably wished he could have emulated him. This early exposure to the Middle East and to the collapse of the Ottoman Empire provided a useful basis on which to build his reputation as an expert on the subject of British policy in the area when, in the late 1930s, he returned there acting as diplomatic correspondent for the \textit{London Times} and other newspapers. This reputation allowed him to set out on the lecture tour in North America to explain what was Britain doing

\textsuperscript{20} See, Tracy Philipps, “Abyssinian Slave Raids,” \textit{The Times} (London), April 12, 1923.

\textsuperscript{21} On the Bureau, see Bruce Westrate, \textit{The Arab Bureau: British Policy in the Middle
in the Near East and why was the Near East important to the safety of Western civilization.

He was aware of the growing resentment among the Arab population of Palestine for their lack of independence and for being obliged to share their space with new arrivals from Europe, thousands of fugitive German and Polish Jews. Pretending to be relaying to the British readers of the London Times the views of a knowledgeable local observer, Philipps wrote in a Letter to the Times Editor: "At present you are trying in Palestine to ménager le chou et le chèvre [sic]. Do you know now which is your cabbage and which is your goat? Besides, isn't the cabbage showing suspicious signs of turning into a cactus?" And he added: "Your hesitations or facing-both-ways, however conscientious, will only earn you the dislike or distrust of both parties and their numerous co-religionists or backers all over the world."  

According to R. Meinertzhagen, a long-time colleague in the intelligence ranks since they first met in equatorial Africa (Tanganyika) in the late 1910s and then again in Cairo and Jerusalem, Philipps, "went so far as to question the practicality of a Jewish Home in Palestine, could not see its purpose and suggested that we should scuttle out of Palestine and leave the Jews to go to the Devil in their own way." Philipps favoured re-locating Jewish refugees to places such as Latin America, rather than

---


Palestine, and went on a special mission to Argentina in 1938 to prepare a report for a highly publicized international conference on refugees held that same year in Evian (France). Neither his report nor the conference as a whole had any positive humanitarian effect on the critical situation of European Jews.\textsuperscript{24}

Philipps would have firmly denied any antisemitism on his part. He considered Anti-Jewish propaganda as "morally base and as scientifically false". Therefore, he wondered "whether it has not become a public duty of citizens of our free countries, each time we hear Jews as a whole indiscriminately reviled, not to let the occasion pass without question."\textsuperscript{25} To begin with, he insisted, the Semitic-speaking group of people included Arabs as well as Ethiopians and Jews, all of them God's chosen people, with Arabs and Jews hoping with equal passion to regain in Palestine their promised homeland and their holy city of Jerusalem. Believing that Palestine belonged geopolitically and historically to the Arab people, Philipps insisted that Zionism was wrong and that "the honour, the power and the glory of the Jewry lies in the diaspora. The hope and the strength of the Jews lies in their mysticism and their virtues, in their tenacity and their solidarity, in their dispersal [his emphasis] throughout the world."\textsuperscript{26}


\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Ibid}. 

Tracy Philipps (PA 205981, Library and Archives of Canada)
By 1922 he was on the Greco-Turkish border where a new, local war was waging. He was there first in the capacity of a liaison officer with the Greek army and then as a war correspondent for the London Times. He enjoyed his stay in Turkey and kept returning there “for holidays to ride with Turkish friends on horseback.” He even owned a house in Istanbul, and joined the local club of orientalists, Le Cercle d’Orient. He sometimes referred to Istanbul as Constantinople, its name of the times before 1453, when this glorious Byzantine capital and the seat of the Eastern Orthodox Church had fallen into the hands of the Ottomans. He seemed to wish to underline by this gesture the inherent link which that particular part of the Near East had with the European and Christian world.

While stationed in Turkey, he gladly assumed in 1922 the assignment of supply commissioner for the famine relief operation in Ukraine and southern Russia organized by the British Red Cross under the auspices of the League of Nations and the Nansen Committee for Refugees. This task allowed him to travel through the


Ukrainian and Russian countryside and familiarize himself with the people and traditions of the area. In the 1930s, as a diplomatic correspondent, but, insistently, also in a private capacity as an anthropologist (although that could be argued, knowing his predilection for intelligence gathering), Philipps went back to that region on several occasions, in particular to Soviet Russia. He thus kept himself up-to-date about the political and economic developments in this notorious communist country, and was quite outspoken in his critical judgment of the Soviet regime. This became evident while operating in Canada as European Adviser and was definitely a hindrance to his career in the ranks of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) which he joined in the capacity of Chief of Planning in the Division on Displaced Persons once he left Canada in May 1944.\footnote{On UNRRA, see the official history compiled by George Woodbridge, \textit{UNRRA: The History of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration} (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950). UNRRA was established in 1943 by the Allies to prepare themselves for the reconstruction of Europe after the war, both in terms of dealing with millions of displaced persons and concentration camp survivors as well as restoring damaged and annihilated infrastructures. It was replaced in 1949 by International Refugee Organization and various other United Nations agencies.} Philipps found entirely unacceptable and inhuman the Allied policy of allowing the Soviet occupying forces to repatriate displaced persons to their original homelands (Ukraine, Poland or the Baltic countries, for instance) without the consent of the people involved. He believed that displaced persons were entitled to choose, for political or economic reasons, not to return to the country of origin and to be duly informed of the parallel relief operation in Russia was organized by the American Relief Administration, lead by the future U.S. President Herbert Hoover. See, Bertrand Patenaude, \textit{The Big Show in Bololand: The American Relief Expedition to Soviet Russia in the Famine of 1921} (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002)
consequences of their choice. And so he resigned but not abandoned the urge to expose the issue at stake. Later on, invoking his own experience with both the League of Nations and UNRRA, he found the opportunity to point out certain aspects of the Organization of the United Nations that would eventually and inevitably cause the paralysis of its actions and effectiveness: the recruitment of the staff according to a nationality quota, multiple language operation, and the veto power of some states, including the USSR.

In the Colonial Service

Beside the call to arms and the enlistment in the British army corps, the next most exciting assignment available to those keen for adventure and stimulating action happened to be in the outskirts of the British Empire as part of the colonial service. In Philipps’ case, this meant Africa. He came to Africa as early as 1914 on a military

31 See his letter to the Editor of the Manchester Guardian dated July 12, 1946, pointing out that the British Government and UNRRA had a policy of distributing only a carefully selected number of newspapers in refugee camps for displaced persons, and among them no British, American or, for that matter, Canadian newspapers, as if deliberately depriving them of information coming from the Western sources. In file 37, vol. 2, TPF MG30 E350, LAC.

32 See his letter to the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Allied Control Commission for Germany, dated June 10, 1946, and the script of his BBC Broadcast of June 1946 on the subject of displaced persons. See as well his commentary regarding the extensive editing of that script by the producer before it was aired, in file 27, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

assignment and kept returning there, in particular to the equatorial region: Uganda, Rwanda and the areas along the frontier with the Belgian Congo. With his “boy” by his side, he crisscrossed the region, mostly on foot, and held different jobs in the course of the 1920s and early 1930s, both as a military intelligence officer and a colonial administrator.

Along with a good education (by far preferable if obtained at one of the two major universities, Oxford or Cambridge), it was believed that an effective colonial official should also have leadership qualities, linguistic skills and adaptability to new environments, as well as some knowledge of law, forestry, agriculture, administration and some training in anthropology. Judging from the several articles he published in the 1920s and early 1930s, Philipps seemed to have acquired such training and certainly demonstrated a definite interest. He recorded in writing some of the most striking of his observations on, for instance, cannibalism, animist spiritualism and the mysteries of the tropical forest. His articles on the Azande people written in 1926 still figure in anthropological bibliographies on the social organizations of populations that have traditionally inhabited equatorial Africa. A few of his African writings bordered with sensationalism and appeared in popular periodicals of the type


that reminds us of today’s Readers’ Digest.\textsuperscript{36} In most of these texts Philipps, the anthropologist, appeared as the active observer and hero of the story. Philipps used widely this technique of providing evidence in favour of an argument by mentioning, whenever possible, how he had observed a particular phenomenon himself in his travels and had known the facts first hand. His Letters to the Editor of the London Times or scholarly journals as well as his correspondence are full of such references to his personal experience and expertise. He could have been the model for Mary Louise Pratt’s imperial explorer, the “seeing man”, whose travel and exploration writings “produced ‘the rest of the world’” for European readership and whose “imperial eyes passively look out and possess.”\textsuperscript{37}

In one such text, he describes how a group of faithful Rwandan porters carried him in a hammock, himself being feverish and weak, through a hostile territory where signs of recent cannibalism spoke of constant danger as they marched “westward toward the great river-arteries whence civilization radiates”. As they advanced further west, “the more savage, the more truculent, and the less well-disposed” the local people turned to be. At a certain point, a village chief told him in confidence that, during a famine, he had eaten sixteen people in his youth “when such meat was easier

\textsuperscript{36} T. Philipps, “A March through Cannibal Land,” The Living Age 325 (June 6, 1925) pp.517-522.

\textsuperscript{37} Mary Louise Pratt, Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturalism (London: Routledge, 1992) pp. 5 and 7. According to Pratt (pp. 204-205), imperial explorers used to convey their “discovery” of a new space applying three conventional rhetorical strategies: estheticizing, textual density (numerous adjectives and references) and mastery (painting the sight as seen from a static vintage point, seizing it in image or words, evaluating its meaning and “translating” it for European
to come by than now.” Nonplussed, Philipps felt compelled to offer his readers a brief comment: “It is however, probable that since the war [i.e. WWI] there have been more cases of cannibalism in Eastern Europe than in Central Africa.” He was, of course, referring to the case of devastating famine in Ukraine and southern Russia in the early 1920s which he had witnessed himself as a foreign relief commissioner. In another account, he paid a solemn visit to the sultan of Rwanda and was treated with the high pomp due to the British representative that he was.

It was the accounts of his observations of gorillas in the forests of Belgian Congo and northern Uganda that really demonstrated the extent of Philipps’ desire to convey to his readers that central Africa was still an uncharted, uncivilized and mysterious world of danger and adventure, and that he was alert, at ease and in control of the situation in these wild surroundings. In “Monkey and Man: How the Great Apes Attack Human Beings”, Philipps described how mutilated were the bodies of victims of various attacks by gorillas and baboons. Those accounts were apparently not in order to condemn the gorillas as such but in order to highlight the violent atmosphere of the jungle where survival was the constant order of the day. Intermingled with the gruesome stories of “homicidal” animal attacks which he had admittedly witnessed himself in 1913, 1916, 1920 and 1925, Philipps introduced the

audiences). Philipps’ texts reveal all three of these strategies.

38 Philipps, “A March through Cannibal Land,” p.520.

39 T. Philipps, “A Visit to Juhi Musinga, Sultan of Ruanda, the Native Ruler of a Division of East Central Africa Now Administered Under a Belgian Mandate,” World Work 42 (Summer 1923) pp.343-358.
story of the Nya Bingi cult which was thriving in the area of former German East Africa and Belgian Congo. He hinted how he was involved in eradicating this “anti-European” revival movement while combing the forest area and visiting one village after the other, in order to collect helpful information. The article concluded with two remarks. One was that the leader of the dreaded cult had been captured and killed and his skull donated to the British Museum where he continued “to grin in forlorn peace,” and that the whole story had been used by F.A.M. Webster to construct his novel *The Man Who Knew* mentioned earlier. The other was that gorillas of the region should have been protected from humans who had begun to invade the forest by clearcutting it in search of new sites for settlements and food gathering. This human invasion was endangering the gorilla habitat and therefore engendering the animal’s aggressive behaviour.

Philipps never ceased to promote this idea of animal protection and conservation of nature and pleaded for years for the creation of large national parks in equatorial Africa.\(^{40}\) With this in mind, he was a long-standing member of the Belgian Research Institute on African National Parks, and spent the last two years of his life as Secretary General of one of the earliest and highly respected international environmental organizations, the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), with headquarters in Brussels.\(^{41}\) His obituaries written for


\(^{41}\) On IUCN, see, Martin Holdgate, *The Green Web: A Union for World Conservation* (London: IUCN & Earthscan, 1999)
the London Times underlined this particular aspect of his preoccupations, more than anything else. In one such obituary written by a former Director General of UNESCO, Luther Evans, he was praised, together with Julian Huxley, another former head of UNESCO, as being instrumental in saving the unique fauna of the Galapagos Islands.\footnote{The Times (London), August 13, 1959.}

Julian Huxley, the famous biologist and, later on, international public servant, shared with Philipps the same lively interest in Africa. While traveling through central Africa in 1930, Huxley met Philipps in the forests of Western Uganda and afterwards acknowledged in the introduction to his travelogue entitled Africa View Philipps’ “unrivalled knowledge” of the area.\footnote{Julian Huxley, Africa View (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1931) p.9.} Huxley found District Commissioner Philipps at the Kikori Station, in company of three highly distinguished entomologists on a special scientific mission, 250 miles from any railway and in the midst of the huge and hardly inhabited area where the tsetse fly was ravaging the countryside while spreading the dreaded sleeping sickness.\footnote{Huxley, Africa View, pp.76-77.} Philipps was not merely a provider of protection, shelter and service to visiting scientists. Throughout his stay in Africa, Philipps was doing his own animal observations during his perambulations in the tropical forest, and then reported about them.\footnote{For instance, T. Philipps, “Four-Tusked Elephants: Report from Belgian Congo. A Hunter’s Experience,” The Times (London) January 13, 1926, p.13; idem, “Crocodiles in Africa: The Mystery of Lake Edward,” The Times (London) April 10, 1930, p.12.}
clawless sub-species of otters which one day he discovered by chance and duly recorded for the benefit of science as *Lutra (paraonyx) philippsi*.

Philipps remained in the colonial service until 1935. His last assignment was as District Commissioner of the Lango District in Uganda. He was removed from that duty in 1934 by the governor of the province because of his persistent criticism of the ways colonial administration was handled. The following year, he resigned from the colonial service. In his opinion, the application of the principle of indirect rule – namely, devolution of local administration to native chiefs -- brought about rampant corruption among the chiefs in power at the expense of ordinary native population.\(^4\) He spoke and wrote on various occasions about this flip-side of the reforms promoted by the British colonial service in Africa. His argument was that the African social tribal structures and their spiritual foundations had been hastily replaced by European-style education and administrative organization without providing beforehand for an adequate and salutary Christian moral framework to sustain it the way it had for centuries been sustaining the European social structures.\(^5\)

Philipps was a keen observer, and a sharp one, too. By 1922, relying on the observations during his experience of almost nine years in the tropics, he was calling for the awareness of his British readers that “the coloured peoples are awakening or


\(^5\) See, for instance, his two-part article on “New Africa” in *The Nineteenth Century and After* 122 (1937) pp.568-595, and 123 (1938) pp.351-364; also his comments in the debate on Lord Hailey’s “Some Problems Dealt with in the ‘African Survey’,” *International Affairs* (Royal Institute of International Affairs) 18, no.2 (March-April
re-awakening from an age-long sleep.\textsuperscript{48} Awakening in what sense? In his view, it was the awakening of race consciousness among 150,000,000 black Africans instigated by the propaganda by Soviet Russia and American black intellectuals which was being spread over the continent "against white (chiefly Anglo-Saxon) supremacy".\textsuperscript{49} To avoid intensified race-hatred confrontations, he argued, European powers with territorial possessions on the continent should embark in coordinating their activities of guiding, "with wisdom and sympathy", their black subjects. What was needed, Philipps warned, was "a harmonized system of trusteeship", better communication and transportation systems among politically divided colonies, adequate education and sanitation, better preparation of the native population for the badly needed labour force where the extraction of valuable raw material is taking place: "Europe is increasingly dependent on the tropics for raw material. Nowhere is it so abundant or so easily obtainable as in Africa."\textsuperscript{50} Oh, yes, Philipps was convinced: "Europe needs Africa and Africa needs Europe. The clock cannot be put back."\textsuperscript{51}


\textsuperscript{49} Philipps, "The Tide of Colour: I," p.130.


His outspokenness went further. He considered the Italian conquest and occupation in 1936 of until then the independent kingdom of Abyssinia as being a good development for a country that he perceived as a land of confusion and violence. The people of Abyssinia preferred the law and order Italians brought in, Philipps believed, to the oppressive regime of their own ruling caste. Attending an international conference in Rome, in 1939, Philipps evoked the glorious colonial tradition of the Romans occupying Palestine or the British Isles. He then praised the Italian government of the day for the “enterprise and energy” employed to colonize Libya by reclaiming agricultural land from the desert and settling whole families of hardworking Italian farmers, while pacifying at the same time the local population with compensation. He also expressed, on another occasion, his belief that European conflict and any imminence of a war could be avoided if colonial Powers would agree “to act as trustees for Africans and to develop Africa as a field of equal opportunity, equal guarantee, and equal rights for all the nations of the European family.” In other words, he was in favour of re-admitting Germany as a partner at the table where tropical riches were to be re-distributed and, in doing so, “re-solidarising us as

---


Europeans in Europe itself.\textsuperscript{54} Such political candour and outspokenness on colonial issues at home and at the international stage put any future re-employment with the colonial service in question. When, in 1944, attempts were made by the Canadian government to release Philipps from his service at the Department of National War Services and find a suitable position for him back in his home country, it appeared that the Colonial Office could not "conscientiously recommend" him for whatsoever employment in the British government service.\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{Philipps the Lecturer}

By the time Philipps left the colonial service and began his free-lance meandering from one interesting spot in Europe to another, he had already been armed with a set of ideas on a variety of issues that would guide him eventually also in his work in Canada. Once in Canada, this set of ideas informed whatever he said or acted upon, both as a lecturer and in employment with the federal government.

From his military days, for instance, Philipps kept his poise, sense of duty, a whole hearted interest in his work, and relentlessness in pursuing a goal "for the common cause of the English-speaking people."\textsuperscript{56} Proud recipient of the Military


\textsuperscript{55} See the telegram by Norman Robertson, High Commissioner for Canada in Great Britain to H. Wrong, acting under-secretary of foreign affairs, May 4, 1944, File "Department of National War Services: Nationalities Division – Correspondence, 1944-47," vol. 3, Robert England Fonds, MG30 C181, LAC.

\textsuperscript{56} Letter by Tracy Philipps to S.T. Wood, RCMP Commissioner, September 26,
Cross for his valor in WWI, but with injuries that would not allow him to rejoin the ranks at the outbreak of WWII, he was eager to do something useful for his country, be it across the ocean. He called the ocean “that wide English-speaking lake, which is the North Atlantic which unites us all who lawfully and jointly rule its waves” and share the same great tradition “of which Magna Charta and Westminster Abbey are but monumental milestones.” In a letter he wrote in June 1940 to Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax (an acquaintance from the early days of service in the Middle East, under whose auspices Philipps undertook the lecture tour of North America), Philipps claimed being “ashamed to seem to be doing so very little.” He promptly added that he had, by the end of May 1940, “shot my bolt and given everything I could in the form of Plans relating to the countries in which I have served or travelled. It remains to give every ounce I can to this work which seems at least to be showing some satisfactory results.” By March of 1941, he was able to report to the Director-General of the British Information Service in New York, that 255 of his lectures had been well received by the public and reported in the press. Such publicity was

1941, file 7, vol. 1, TPF, MG 30, E350, LAC.


58 Letter by Tracy Philipps to Lord Halifax, June 25, 1940, in file 5, vol. 1, TPF, MG 30 E350, LAC.

59 For some of that press coverage, see “Ukrainians of Canada Are United,” The Leader Post (Regina), November 12, 1940; “Distinguished Soldier Is Sure Britain Will Remain Supreme in Mediterranean,” Edmonton Journal, November 20, 1940, p.1; “Philipps Speaks on Red Sea War,” Calgary Herald, November 26, 1940, p.1; “Russia Bluffs Help Nazis, Says Philipps: Ukrainians Hear Talk,” ibid, November 29,
valuable. But, he insisted, there were many more other meetings, not covered by the press, at which he was speaking to small groups of workers of European origin on the subject of conditions in their old countries. He felt appreciated for his efforts, the proof being in the great number of invitations “from both the top and the bottom” (meaning big business and “foreign-born” labour). And he was convinced that he owed the success to his special technique of lecturing which, “like that of any other intricate and specialist work, can be learned by each differing individual by careful observation and by hard experience.”

Convinced of his expertise as a lecturer and communicator, he preferred to be presented to the press and the public, as an independent journalist with “academic and scientific and journalistic qualifications”.

The main theme of his lectures, as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, was the review of the military and political developments in the so-called Near East, which was in 1940 still vulnerable to both German and Russian penetration and to the opening of a front that would endanger Britain’s supply lines from its colonies. Among topics raised or potentially used in future figured

---


60 Letter by Tracy Philipps to Sir Gerald Campbell, March 14, 1941, in file 18, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

61 Letter by Tracy Philipps to Ian MacLennan, British High Commissioner in Ottawa, February 17, 1941, file 17, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

62 Ibid.
Philipps once provided what he called a “clear-cut definition” of what should be considered the Near East. Although communicated to the readers of the *London Times* only in 1945, that definition had admittedly dated from the times of the Arab Bureau in Cairo where he had briefly worked in 1918:

1. All south-eastern Europe below the oblique Balkan watershed;
2. All the north-eastern corner of Africa fit for settled habitation;
3. All Asia that lies on the hither side of a truly distinctive boundary – i.e. the Media or Indian isthmus, or waist of Asia, between the Caspian and Indian Seas.\(^6\)

But during the WWII, while in Canada, Philipps opted for a broader term, that of the East, which allowed him to extend boundaries of his primary concern northward and include in the scope of that term most Slav nations, and specifically Ukraine and Soviet Russia, while still avoiding the Far East (China and Japan) and the subcontinent of India. Thus, his lecture delivered in Regina in November 1940 carried the title “The Situation in the European Near East with Special Reference to the Ukrainian Areas”. His audience was pleased and the convener expressed their feelings: “We feel him doubly one of ourselves not only as a fellow-British subject

\(^6\) Memorandum by Tracy Philipps to Secretary of the Association of Canadian Clubs, January 16, 1941, in file 16, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\(^6\) Tracy Philipps, “[Letter to the Editor:] The Near East,” *The Times* (London), June
but also by his fellow-feeling for our, nearly 50 million, brethrens in our old home country."

The promotional flyer for the lecture series as a whole carried his picture and a caption stating that Philipps was “shown seated at the edge of EUROPE, on the battlements of Istanbul looking towards England. In the near background can be seen ASIA.” There is evident and powerful symbolism in this photograph of the tall, imposing and confident Englishman in a tweed suit and a pair of impeccable walking shoes sitting on the dividing line between his European world and the world of his life-long field of action and intellectual involvement. Philipps’ commanding figure is rendering the Asian backdrop behind his back even smaller and more distant.

Turkey was obviously at the heart of his ‘East’, his ‘Orient’. And he often talked about it. The address delivered before the Empire Club of Canada was devoted to the Turkish predicament as being cajoled and threatened at the same time by advancing Germans on one side and Russia on the other. And like some other countries which had with minimum resistance eventually succumbed to Germans rather than the Soviets, the Turkish people were pressed in turn, argued Philipps, to make their own critical choice between “bloody Oriental Bolsheviks” and “orderly Germans”. It should be noted that he delivered this lecture a few months before the

30, 1945, p.5.

65 The lecture was reported in “Ukrainians of Canada Are United,” The Leader Post, November 12, 1940.

66 File 5, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

67 T. Philipps, “The Empire at War,” 316. To British dismay, Turkey, eventually,
Russians were attacked by the Germans in June 1941 and before Soviet Russia joined Britain in the struggle against Hitler. Most revealing is, however, Philipps' use of the label "Oriental" to underline the menacing and alien character of communism and its advances in the direction of Europe.

*Philipps the Human Technician*

Through his education and various activities, Philipps had mastered tools to scrutinize, classify, specify, evaluate and illustrate for his audience a world as he had understood it and interpreted it on the foundations of an ideologically complex construction of Western collective imagination. The world of his understanding was conceptually divided into what Stuart Hall described as the "West" and the "Rest". According to Hall, the "West" in this dichotomy usually represents a cultural context and a type of society "that is developed, industrialized, urbanized, capitalist, secular, and modern" and could be used as a shorthand for "modern". The "Rest" is practically everything that is not the above. The discursive formation of "The West and the Rest" is the creation of a historical process through which Europeans "discovered" the other worlds surrounding them and undertook to dominate them by the power of their military machinery, economic incentives and knowledge. In that

opted for neutrality rather than joining the Allies.


discursively constructed “Western” culture Philipps was both a mediator and a product of that process.

Most of his life Philipps travelled through the Middle East and Africa with the apparent ease of a rational intellectual, a respectable Anglo-Saxon, European of Christian upbringing and determined to acquire his “know-how” first-hand. The world of this “East” and “Africa” that he believed he eventually “knew” was in his conceptualization a world of “otherness”, the “Rest” of the world, the very “Orient” so skilfully deconstructed for us by Edward Said.  

The description Said gave of an Orientalist mindset in his now famous exposé on Orientalism, fits Philipps’ way of thinking. So does Said’s description of an Orientalist’s interpretation of the reality fit well the way Philipps approached his observable world: as a promotion of “the difference between the familiar (Europe, the West, “us”) and the strange (the Orient, the East, “them”)”, the former being in no particular order “rational, peaceful, liberal, logical, capable of holding real values, without natural suspicion; the latter are none of these things.” As a way of Western European thinking, “Orientalism” consists of a series of rhetorical strategies which, when deconstructed, reveal apparent contradictions embedded in the adopted set of representations of the non-Western world (the Orient). They are displays of parallel fascination and criticism; passionate interest and rationalization; romanticism and scientific analysis; banal prejudice and

---


71 Said, Orientalism, pp. 43 and 49.
imperialist sense of superiority and power; paternalistic protectionism and desire to mould, transform, control and create a world to one’s own image.

As a member of the Orientalists’ Club in Istanbul, Philipps may have objected to seeing the epithet of “Orientalist” being interpreted in such a critical manner. He would certainly admit some level of fascination and sentiment on his part, and no doubt agree to possessing the capacity to rationalize and apply scientific analysis and the desire to mould and transform that outside world to his understanding of what the western European model was about. He also believed that it was the duty of Europeans – western Europeans to be more precise -- to provide guidance and protection to those lacking in the progress and civilization that the people he belonged to, the British people in the first place, were endowed with.

From his experience as the colonial administrator he retained the strong belief that people differed biologically and culturally and that different people had to be dealt with differently. For an administrator coming to Africa as an outsider and foreigner, “any profound and balanced comprehension of the deep currents of the spirit of the peoples,” he argued, can be achieved only by learning the language they spoke so as to reach deep into their “typical mind-matter and thought-processes”. That was essential, because, he added, “For as men speak, so they think. As they think, so they are. As they are, so they act.”72 This should apply to dealing with or managing other populations that differed from each other and from “ourselves”:

To ensure successful results, it is not very practical to give the same food, the same size of collar and the same function and the same

training to a bulldog, a greyhound and a poodle, -- although all are
of the canine race, even when all live in the same establishment.
This applies with much more force to men.73

Philipps' training as an anthropologist gave him the tools to describe human
behaviour in what he considered as objectified terms. His intelligence work in the
Middle East and Africa also helped him acquire techniques of "amassing general
information and absorbing knowledge, of local conditions and of persons, in such a
way, (necessarily non-committal), as to be able to put them into action in a plan at
once."74 In all his writings, he described himself as an objective observer and a
specialist with the pretence of not expressing any judgement or feeling, only facts,
and plenty of them.

Philipps believed in the principle of the "dual mandate" which the advanced,
European, Christian powers were supposed to exercise while governing the various
colonies and territories allegedly allotted to them in trust on behalf of civilization.75

73 Off the Records Notes by Tracy Philipps to C. Payne, Deputy Minister, September
15, 1943, file 21, vol. 1, TPF, MG 30, E350, LAC.

74 Ibid.

75 On "dual mandate" theory and the debate taking place in Britain during the period
between the two world wars on how to pursue and monitor the inevitable social
change in Africa, see Penelope Hetherington, British Paternalism and Africa, 1920-
1940 (London: Frank Cass, 1978). On the discussion of the merits and demerits of
trusteeship approach and its "travelling companion", humanitarianism, see also Susan
Pedersen, "Modernity and Trusteeship: Tensions of Empire in Britain Between the
Wars," in Meaning of Modernity: Britain from the Late-Victorian Era to World War
a general overview of British colonial policy between the two world wars, see
Kenneth Robinson, The Dilemmas of Trusteeship: Aspects of British Colonial Policy
Between the Wars. The Reid Lectures Delivered at Acadia University in February
1963 (London: Oxford University Press, 1965)
This concept was embedded in the covenant of the League of Nations and vigorously promoted by Sir F.D. Lugard, the theoretician of colonial ideology of the times. Lugard argued that nations in control of the tropics were trustees

on one hand for the development of the resources of these lands, on behalf of the congested populations whose lives and industries depend on a share of the bounties with which nature has so abundantly endowed the tropics. On the other hand they exercise a ‘sacred trust’ on behalf of the peoples who inhabit the tropics and who are so pathetically dependent on their guidance.76

According to Lugard – endorsed by Philipps – the European powers, not without self-interest in mind, accepted the grave responsibility, to uplift “the backward races who are, in the words of the Covenant of the League of Nations ‘unable to stand alone in the strenuous conditions of the modern world’.”77

The backwardness, warned Philipps, was not due to inferior mental capacities of the Africans. “It is not necessary or wise to handicap ourselves collectively with too great a condescension or superiority-complex”, he suggested. There was a large fraction of the “most industrially and mechanically advanced” white population, that was “sub-normal” or “feeble-minded” he argued, and a patronising perspective in


77 Lugard, “The White Man’s Task,” p.66. In an article on “human relations in the tropical girdle of the globe” written in 1958, Philipps quotes the following statement from Africa Today, saying that history would certainly confirm it: “the processes now called colonialism have been beyond question, the most beneficent, disinterested, and effective force which has ever been brought to bear on Africa in all its history. That it might have been better, and that it has had its blemishes and faults, does not alter the plain statement of fact.” See, T. Philipps, “Co-existence,” Quarterly Review 296 (1958) pp.64-65.
regards to subject peoples as such was unwarranted.\textsuperscript{78} Nevertheless, what was needed was guidance in moral issues, proper Christian education, in fact, mass education of all classes, labourers and chiefs alike. "The African is turning a full corner in history," wrote Philipps. "He is suddenly exposed to the blasts of simultaneous religious and economic, industrial and mechanical revolutions," and this "cold wind from the north" threatens to throw him off the proper road, blow out "his guiding lamp of life" that was his traditional social environment and leave him naked as a "shorn lamb" with no fitting cloths for the new circumstances in life.\textsuperscript{79} Sudden, precipitated application of modern European-style administration and democratic principles of government might be too much of a cultural shock. "Only moral education and \textit{European} instruction can hope to help the still undiscriminating peoples to attain such stature as to reach up, pick and distinguish the poisonous from the life-giving fruits of the tree of knowledge-of-good-and-evil of European ways."\textsuperscript{80} Such needed help should be provided by knowledgeable technicians, or skilled "gardeners". The quality and spirit of Western European values cannot be just grafted suddenly upon "people with roots in quite other soil," Philipps argued:

\begin{quote}
The banana tree does not flourish in English air, nor the mountain pine on the banks of the Congo or the Nile. Both can doubtless be imported and kept alive under glass, so long as English gardeners control all the doors and windows and the temperature. And no conscientious trustee can as yet afford to permit himself the immoral luxury (however cheap, convenient and apparently liberal)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{78} Philipps, "The New Africa – II," p.358. Noticeable here is Philipps' sense of class.

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Ibid.}, pp.357-358.

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Ibid.}, p.353. The italics are in the original.
of decreasing, and still less of withdrawing his ‘gardeners,’ whose number and efficacy are already inadequate.  

What Philipps was saying in this particular text and other similar writings of this period has all the ingredients of benevolent trusteeship and can be summed up as follows: cultural differences are deeply rooted in peoples’ traditional soils; the transplantation is difficult and the adjustment slow but possible if specialized support were provided; when the differences are a matter of the level of progress, the integration must be taking place with the help of proper guidance to avoid irreparable anomalies or the development of inferiority complexes; the proper guidance of the process of integration will be beneficial for both recipients and givers of the guidance; the properly trained technicians are to be therefore called upon to apply judiciously their know-how to the task.

*On the Mission to “Canadianize”*

Philipps’ reflections on how best to administer “exotic and still-subject peoples” whose antecedents and stage of material backwardness were so problematic explain his activities in Canada. Philipps transposed his views of European, and specifically Anglo-Saxon moral trusteeship of less evolved peoples living under the colonial rule to the assignment of “Canadianizing” people of southeastern and central Europe. He perceived these people as belonging to the class of peasants and labourers, still guided and inspired by very traditional moral values of their

---

homelands at the "outside edge of European democracy", and still a long way from reaching the stage of "mechanistic civilization".\textsuperscript{82} The "Canadianization" of such "foreign" elements of the population meant fulfilling a "dual mandate": strengthening Canadian identity and unity from coast to coast while at the same time helping "foreign-born" new Canadians adjust morally and culturally to their new environment and become good and loyal citizens, particularly in the wartime.

Once the first round of Philipps' lectures was completed in December 1940, Canadian authorities (notably the Deputy Minister of the Department of National War Services, the RCMP Commissioner, and the head of the Association of Canadian Clubs, the organizer of the tour) asked him to write a report on his impressions of western Canada and its culturally mixed population. They also asked him to put forward suggestions of possible intervention in order to improve, if necessary, the relationships of the various cultural groups with the government. Philipps obliged with a 35 page-long exposé of his observations and advice, all this with one consideration looming over the whole report: the haunting threat of German propaganda -- and an even greater threat of communism -- invading the mind and spirit of not fully assimilated new and old immigrants and disrupting, if not making simply impossible, any successful "Canadianization" among them.

In this report, Philipps insisted that the work among Canadian ethnic minorities was important and urgent if the ultimate aim of making all Canadian residents wholeheartedly involved in winning the war were to be achieved. What was

\textsuperscript{82} T. Philipps, "Report on Tour in Western Canada, November-December 1940," Part
needed was the creation of a sense of national unity. However, "the exigencies of wartime and the need of nation-wide unity are not an excuse but a reason for giving these people the unifying and conscious Canadianism which they need." How to achieve this unification? Philipps, the specialist, put forward two methods of what he called "constructive diplomacy". The first method, he said,

Is the most spectacular, prompt and popular. It is the equivalent of a surgical intervention. It often requires other operations to follow. It is rapid, drastic and aggressive. One attacks the foreign element which has entered the body-politic. In the realm of diplomacy it takes the form of threat and direct action. It is a regrettable wartime technique extended to the realm of the civilian. ... It is the least satisfactory method. In these cases the permanence of the cure depends on the period and quality of the subsequent nursing.  

Philipps added that he had used this drastic method himself in November 1940 when he had been given the confidential task of putting an end to the discord among Ukrainian groups representing different nationalistic, religious and ideological stands on the place of Ukraine, their homeland, in the post-war Europe. Their unification in Canada under a single umbrella organization was very much a war requirement in the eyes of both British and Canadian foreign affairs officials and geopolitical strategists.  

The second method was "convenient to Nature." Philipps considered this technique a better one:

---

I (January 8, 1941), file 16, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.


84 See, for instance, Kordan, The Ukrainian Question, passim.
One gives the subject access to the sun. It illuminates, it enlightens and it heals. One unearths their misapprehensions and their grievances. One treats these simultaneously and sympathetically. One lets in light and air. This second process calls for far more patience. It is slower but surer. It produces a healthy, firm and lasting build-up.\(^{85}\)

This method, Philipps believed, aimed at creating a modest self-confidence and making a potential inferiority complex disappear. Its aim was to make the treated subjects become more independent from their clannish, traditional, old country attachments: “they are caught up into Canadianism of which at last they can be helped to fell themselves the co-creators.” One should not want to proceed hurriedly, because, “If one wishes to speed up, and to outstrip, the normal process of Nature, the handling of the human spirit, especially from the outer edge of European civilization, where Rome with Democracy has never lived, it is at least as ticklish and technical a job for experts as the manipulation of electric current is for experts in electricity.”\(^{86}\)

Philipps firmly advised against trying to bring the diverse European nationalities too soon together under a same roof and treat them as if they were ingredients of a melting pot which would fuse when mixed. Philipps considered such a method to be Utopian and of the surgical type mentioned earlier. Each national group should be approached individually and treated according to its peculiarities and degree of assimilability. “The un-Candianized humanity which needs treatment is not


\(^{86}\) Ibid, p.7.
of the professional classes, who might meet amicably,” Philipps argues. By imposing the melting pot strategy

Penitent Prussians would be expected to prance with Poles. Newly naturalized Germans would jest with Jews. Hungarians would be expected to play ball with Romanians, Ukrainians with Russians, and Italians with Austrians. Rabbits and ferrets, lions and lambs, cats and dogs, would all mix and dance together, till they became good Canadians … or till the police arrive with the ambulances on the way to the morgue. A great many of the un-Canadianized would indeed be liquidated in the process.87

To avoid such a disaster, a careful plan of action had to be set up. This would mean, in Philipps’ view, undertaking specialized “work among ‘Europeans’ with whom European experience, personality and continuity count far more than among old-established French and Anglosaxon Canadians.”88 Eastern European peasants – and the work to be undertaken would precisely be among these people – were in Philipps assessment, “the most deeply rooted of all the human trees in the world.” Their transplanting is a cruel operation. One must be careful not to remove too much too soon of the old earth attached to the roots as they are put into the new soil and one must “temper the shock and the set-back of the upheaval”.89

Any successful intervention among this “foreign-born” human material, Philipps argued, required first-hand knowledge of ancestral homelands and of the languages spoken there. This was necessary in order to comprehend the way of

87 Philipps, “Report of the Tour in Western Canada, Part II: Notes and Suggestions,” p.3.

88 Tracy Philipps to Commissioner S.T. Wood, May 2, 1941, in file 6, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
thinking and behaving of a particular group. It also required “sorting out and drawing together the strings of so many mutually conflicting nationalities represented in the human material which has to be separately consolidated into a new nation” that the planning alone could easily take six months.\(^90\)

Philipp was however ready and willing. He was confident that he had better knowledge of eastern Europe than any one else in Canada of British origin at that time. He spoke Ukrainian and probably was able to understand some other Slav languages. He was familiar with the Italian language and customs which made establishing contact with people from that part of Europe easier.\(^91\) As an intelligence officer he had learned how to extract useful information from people normally reluctant to give their confidence to any person of authority. He believed that his experience of meandering through the jungles of Africa, or Russian and Ukrainian steppes and countryside, had taught him how to make humble villagers, peasants, labourers and people of what he called lower status, class or education at ease in his presence.\(^92\) As he wrote to the RCMP Commissioner, S.T. Wood, once the

---


\(^91\) Confidential Memorandum to Mr. Commissioner S.T. Wood by Tracy Philipp, November 14, 1941, in file 7, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\(^92\) Half of Philipp’s family was apparently Catholics and he had relatives living in Rome where he stayed with them occasionally. See, the letter by Tracy Philipp to Judge Davis, Deputy Minister, October 24, 1941, in file “Ukrainians in Canada,” vol. 36, RG44, LAC.

\(^92\) Talking to farmers and manual masses, Philipp once explained, had to be done using simple language, in their own style and with proverbs and imagery they were familiar with: “It had, moreover, to be illustrated by everyday stories of personal experience in their own villages.” See Tracy Philipp to James Mess, President of the
government decided that it felt confident enough to entrust him with the work with so-called communities of European origin, and provided him with a wish-list of what the policy should be, he would be able to "make a good job of it for Canada, that is for the common cause of the English-speaking peoples."\footnote{Tracy Philipps to Commissioner S.T. Wood, September 26, 1941, in file 7, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.} In October 1941, he was given the green light to put this task in motion.

His ideas of a gradual unification of diverse cultural groups under a British Canadian national banner were based on his understanding of benevolent trusteeship from his colonial experience as much as on his genuine interest in the European eastern borderlands. He may have denied any justification for feeling particularly superior as an Anglo-Saxon, but he did believe that the privileged status his compatriots and himself enjoyed by being civilized, educated, rational and utterly modern people left them with the Christian duty to help those other people -- less developed and less fortunate ones -- go through the process of being uplifted, enlightened and civilized. This attitude, in all its appearances, had all the ingredients of a genuinely paternalistic discourse that would imbue his future dealings with Canadians of eastern European origin during the WWII years.

\footnote{Association of Canadian Clubs, November 20, 1940, in file 165 – Part II, vol. 18, RG26, LAC.}
Chapter 5
Setting Up a Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship

[The task ahead: ...]
5. to do everything possible to weave these people into the fabric of Canadian life and to make them Canadians, to feel themselves as such and to think in terms of Canada, and to get the greatest possible support out of them to all major efforts of the Canadian people and the Canadian Government.

Judge T.C. Davis (1942)1

Such communities are still foreign matter and therefore a foreign affair. Therefore the most effective approach is to understand and to utilize their foreign-ness as a base from which to work away, towards Canadianism.”

Tracy Philipps (1941)2

All the values of civilization are not summed up in the Anglo-Saxon. To weave into the Canadian fabric the multicoloured threads of all of Europe’s cultural legacies ought, if it were possible, to produce in the end a civilization of unusual richness.... For the individual, moreover, a process whereby he is cut off entirely from his cultural and linguistic past and made an orphan in an alien land is not likely to produce the happiest results. A man is likely to become a better Canadian, and to make a more confident and valuable contribution to Canadian Life, if he is led to feel pride in his own national past and to realize that his fellow-Canadians, because they admire and respect his national tradition, expect great things from him.

Watson Kirkconnell (1939)3

1 Memorandum by T.C. Davis, Deputy Minister to the Hon. L.R. LaFlèche, Minister of National War Services, November 13, 1942, File “Bureau of Public Information,” vol. 35, RG 44, Library and Archives of Canada (hereafter LAC)

2 Tracy Philipps, “War Services and Canadianization – Ref. Memo – Plans of 13th January, 20th May (Washington) and 17th June 1941, [signed October 16, 1941],” file 25, vol. 1, Tracy Philipps Fonds (hereafter TPF), MG30 E350, LAC. The emphasis is in the original.

The establishment, in January 1942, of a specific wartime government structure to deal with communities of various ethnic origins other than British and French was the result of a perception that a more conducive political atmosphere was necessary to make recent immigrants feel welcome and useful in Canada. The outbreak of war exacerbated perennial prejudices against recent immigrants amongst the mainstream population of Anglo-Saxon and French origin and had a strong demoralizing effect on all communities of continental European origin whether foes or friends of the Allies in the common front against the Axis.⁴ There were reports from different parts of Canada that people “of foreign name or birth” had been dismissed from their jobs or denied new employment under the pretext of preventing sabotage.⁵ While the necessity was clear and the pressure from both civil servants and politicians existed since the outset of the war, it took the Department of National War Services two years to formally set up an office and appoint an advisory body to deal with the issue. Behind that formal initiative were three federal politicians from the Prairie provinces: James G. Gardiner, former Liberal Premier of Saskatchewan, assigned by Prime Minister Mackenzie King to the parallel responsibilities of two federal departments: Agriculture and National War Services; Gardiner’s successor as Minister of National War Services, J.T. Thorson, a Westerner

---


⁵ See, for instance the exchange of letters between James G. Gardiner, Minister of National War Services and Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice during August and September 1940 regarding measures that the Dominion government might wish to undertake to alleviate the problem of unemployment among “enemy aliens and naturalized Canadians of enemy racial origin,” File “German and Italian
himself, of Icelandic origin; and Justice T.C. Davis, former Attorney General of Saskatchewan and a friend of Gardiner. It was Gardiner who specifically brought Davis to Ottawa to be his Associate Deputy Minister of National War Services. Davis was the most instrumental of them all in putting the project into action and was deeply and personally involved in its first few months of operation. 

The outline of the political underpinnings in these efforts to launch a new government office has been provided by N.F. Dreisziger and Leslie Pal in several studies but they have not explored the various and sometimes conflicting ideological considerations that lay behind the setting up of the programme. Key questions deserve

Unemployment,” vol. 36, RG44, LAC.


consideration. Was cultural pluralism understood and dealt with as a positive and healthy feature of the Canadian national identity, or as a "problem" to be solved? How were the original political intentions actually interpreted by a disparate group of people concerned with their implementation? What was the guiding line of the actual approach taken? Most of all, did it reflect a growing tolerance towards ethnic diversity, as claimed by Dreitziger?8 Was it the desire to construct, at the time of an ongoing major national strife, a new national identity founded on unity and common citizenship? Or was it, an expedient way of dealing with a wartime issue of security and of getting rid of various "isms" that threatened the liberal democratic order in place?

Canadians All

Keen to communicate to all Canadians across the country the extent of government war efforts and to enlist their cooperation and full involvement, the government created in December 1939 an office of public information and then incorporated it in the Department of National War Services when the latter was created in July 1940.9 In November 1940, Associate Deputy Minister of National War Services,

Judge Davis, suggested to his minister, J.G. Gardiner, that, thus reorganized, the Bureau of Public Information make some very specific and targeted efforts “to create good feeling among the people who have come to Canada from foreign lands”. The ways to do it would include: channelling information through the “foreign press of Canada” (meaning Canadian newspapers published in a language other than English and French); launching and sponsoring newspapers in “foreign-languages”; using broadcasting, lecturing, producing films and pamphlet literature; and – as the most controversial of all suggestions put forward by Davis -- re-opening community halls confiscated at the beginning of the war for being owned by organizations considered of communist inclination. These halls were in the custody of the federal Custodian of Alien Enemy Property and, according to Davis, should be given new life and purpose.

With that objective, a radio programme and a small booklet were commissioned in the course of 1941 by the Bureau of Public Information to highlight the valued presence of various ethnic groups in the country. The radio programme and the follow-up publication, both entitled Canadians All, followed an already established formula in describing the growing Canadian cultural pluralism: a catalogue of group profiles of various ethnic groups. It had begun with J. S. Woodsworth’s Strangers at Our Gates in 1909, and was picked up by J. Murray Gibbon in his The Canadian Mosaic in 1938 and in his The New Canadian Loyalists in 1941. The title, Canadians All, was inspired by a

---

10 Memorandum by T.C. Davis, Associate Deputy Minister for Hon. J.G. Gardiner, Minister of National War Services, November 13, 1940, file “Bureau of Public Information”, vol. 35, RG44, LAC.

11 On these community halls, see Peter Krawchuk, Our History: The Ukrainian Labour-Farmer Movement in Canada, 1907-1991 (Toronto: Lugus Publications, 1996).

12 J.S. Woodworth, Strangers at Our Gates, or Coming Canadians. 1909 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972); John Murray Gibbon, The Canadian Mosaic: The Making of a Northern Nation (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1938) and idem, The
similar undertaking in the United States called *Americans All – Immigrants All*, an educational 22 weeks’ radio programme launched during the 1939-1940 programming season and then extended for another year, after receiving positive reviews.\(^{13}\)

The Canadian radio programme consisted of eleven weekly broadcasts from February 27 to May 7, 1941, each dedicated to one ethnic group: British, French, Dutch, Hungarian, Swedish, Finn, Czechoslovak, Polish, Belgian, Italian and German. Each broadcast began with a short introduction by a distinguished Canadian telling the audience about how praiseworthy the highlighted group was, followed by a series of musical pieces chosen either because the composer was of a given nationality or because the performers were of that nationality. The programme concluded with some inspirational words by a representative specimen of the group (for example a soldier or a famous musician) and some more music.\(^{14}\) It was all conceived to give English-speaking Canadians a sense that “people of foreign extraction” were hardworking, loyal people who love life and music and that, after all, some great composers and artists, such as Beethoven, Grieg, Verdi or Toscanini were German, Norwegian or Italian and should be admired and recognized for their achievement.

A month later, in June 1941, a manuscript, also entitled *Canadians All*, was ready for print. Its author was Professor Watson Kirkconnell of McMaster University. Once again it was a pamphlet on the “nature and extent of the ultimate contribution of each group to our national life,” a “primer of Canadian national unity.”\(^{15}\) In it, Kirkconnell

---

*New Canadian Loyalists* (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1941)

\(^{13}\) On the success of this programme, see “Americans All – Immigrants All,” *Common Ground* 1, no.2 (Winter 1941), p.80.

\(^{14}\) For transcripts of nine of these programmes, see File 10-4-47, vol. 19, series 31, RG36, LAC.

\(^{15}\) W. Kirkconnell, *Canadians All: A Primer of Canadian National Unity* (Ottawa:
denied that distinct nationalities, including the Canadian one, signified “downright differences of race,” or that there were inferior and superior races. “Neither language nor political grouping proves anything as to the race of any human being,” argued the author.16 There is a human race and there are subspecies, he suggested. There was no Anglo-Saxon race: “we are all mixtures,” he argued.17 The danger lay in maintaining that “people who speak the same language or live under the same government belong to the same race.” Kirkconnell’s appraisal of hybridity and diversity of “racial origins” was combined with the appeal to national unity, which should not “necessarily mean uniformity,” he argued, as “we”, meaning the nation, would otherwise “be in sorry danger of developing sleeping sickness.”18 Half of the pamphlet consisted of a series of group profiles of various ethnic minorities. After vigorous arguments that “nationality” did not mean “race” as stated in the introduction, it is striking to find that the profiles were listed alphabetically according to “racial origins”. The descriptions of each group had something positive to say about them. The booklet made reference to allegedly everybody significant, from Anglo-Canadians, Asiatic Canadians to the Swiss and Ukrainians.19

Director of Public Information, 1941) p.21.

16 Ibid, p.8.
17 Ibid, p.11.
18 Ibid, p.11.
19 T.L. Church, Conservative MP for Broadview (Toronto), speaking in the House of Commons on May 18, 1942 described Canadians All as “political propaganda, and the glorification of the foreign-born in this country at the expense of the British-born, for disunity.” He also blamed it for setting “class against class, those of one racial origin against others, something which no decent citizen would do in this country.” See, Dominion of Canada, Official Report of Debates of the House of Commons (hereafter Debates of the House of Commons), 3rd session-19th Parliament (January 28, 1942-January 27, 1943) p. 2537.
The pamphlet was hardly off the press when it had to be withdrawn due to the fact that the Soviet Union became a Western ally after the German attack on June 21, 1941. Hastily, a new edition was prepared as all negative references to Communist conspiracy were removed and the profile of Russian Canadians revised. Taking advantage of the reprint, a profile of “Indian” and “Eskimo” Canadians was added: in the first version, these Canadians had been omitted. The English version was printed in 232,000 copies and an abbreviated French version in 64,000. Its dissemination ceased by the end of 1942. 

*A Specialist’s View of the “Problem”*

By July 1941, the Department was still considering options of how to reorganize the Bureau of Public Information and make possible a creation of a section “to be known as the European Section, or the Foreign Language Section, or the Foreign Press Section, or some other appropriate name.” The Department was by then also considering hiring an outsider, the British expert Tracy Philipps, to run the Section.

Circulating through Canada as lecturer and “merely a free agent”, Philipps was in fact working at that time on contract with the RCMP, with a confidential mission to establish useful contacts among various ethnic communities across the country and spread feelers around to detect the political mood in their ranks. Not everything was

---


21 Letter by T.C. Davis to RCMP Commissioner S.T. Wood, July 16, 1941, file “Bureau of Public Information,” vol. 35, RG44, LAC.

22 Memorandum by T.C. Davis for Hon. J.T. Thorson [Minister of National War Services], re: Foreign Activity Correlation, June 27, 1941, vol. 35, RG44, LAC.
always going smoothly, though, due largely to his inclination to be highly critical of the Soviet Union, thus attracting the attention of both supporters and critics of communism. One of his talks in Quebec City was even reported in the *New York Times* and created some commotion in British foreign policy circles.\(^{23}\) To start with, he was identified in the article as a member of the British War Office and this revelation shattered the credibility of his being a free agent. Philipps was then reported saying that Stalin, being in a weak position and militarily unprepared, was bluffing in the way he was playing his apparently menacing cards against German advances in the Dardanelles strait between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean area. Philipps was also reported saying that Hitler was on the other hand beating "the drums of bloody Oriental bolshevism to scare his intended victims into the Nazi net." Philipps was convinced that too much misinformation about the intention of both Hitler and the Soviets circulated in the public and he was quite outspoken in trying to dispel it. He liked to remark that it was the duty of a technician with good knowledge of Europe, such as himself, to clear up any misunderstanding of the European situation. The way to do it was to discredit and uncover the "subterranean technique" both Nazi and Soviet propaganda agents were spreading about their true political objectives with the view to luring Canadian and American immigrants of European origin to help them succeed in their opposing expansionist schemes.\(^{24}\)

Philipps' travels around the country on behalf of the British War Office or the RCMP, were in themselves, however, good preparation for the job he was planning to create for himself within either the RCMP, the Department of External Affairs or, in collaboration with Associate Deputy Minister Davis, in the Department of National War

\(^{24}\) Letter by Tracy Philipps to [Ian MacLennan, at the High Commission of the United Kingdom?], February 19, 1941, file 17, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
Services. This was already clear in January 1941 when he wrote the report on his observations of the situation among ethnic communities in Western Canada and offered suggestions on how to deal with the potential problem of disloyalty among Canadians of European origin.²⁵

Throughout his report Philipps insisted on the fact that ethnic communities differ among themselves very much in terms of temperament and level of civilization. He quickly established that "Teutonic-speaking peoples from continental Europe" should be a priori dealt with in a different manner from those coming from "eastcentral" Europe. By "eastcentral Europe" he understood the area between the southern Alps and the southern Urals and divided the people coming from that area into three linguistic groups: the Slavs (Ukrainians, Czechs, Poles, Slovaks, Serbs, Slovenes, Croats, Bulgars); the Latin peoples (Italians and Romanians); and the Finns, Hungarians and Turks, forming among themselves a separate language group. Doukhobors and Mennonites were in his view also a separate group, falling under a "semi-religious rather than a racial category". In their case, the issue of assimilation was "more a moral than a political problem."²⁶

The language factor in categorizing people was important, he argued:

Language indeed is a factor of every day value in deciding the various practical ways of approach which can lead to assimilation. Language is far more than just a form of self-expression. A language group marks an attitude of temperament. It demarcates an angle of approach to the problems of life. Changes of environment produce local variations.²⁷

²⁵ T. Philipps, "Report on the Tour in Western Canada," January 8, 1941, file 16, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. The "American" in this context referred to the continent and not the US.
²⁶ Ibid, p.2.
²⁷ Ibid, p.2.
The issue of whether the country of origin was at the time free, threatened by or held under occupation by either the German Nazis, the Italian Fascists or the Russian Soviets was another criteria of importance in Philipps’ view. The mental state and anxiety with which people observed developments in the war varied in function of whether their relatives and friends were among the victims of occupation or not.

The class factor was equally important. The majority of immigrants from eastern Europe were peasants and labourers and their immigration to Canada was a matter of basic survival. As Philipps said, “only the most cruel conditions of Nature and of Police-government can wrench them out of the ancestral soil so laboriously fructified by their fathers.” 28 In terms of progress, they were not, Philipps was convinced, contemporaries of native Canadians. In his assessment, they persisted in viewing professional classes as capitalist exploiters who should not be trusted. “There is, moreover, ingrained in these people of this class the ancestral habit of looking for a lead,” in contrast to “us”, meaning native Canadians and Anglo-Saxons like him. Anglo-Saxons, he claimed had “learned to like to be let alone. We resent any putative paternalism. In time of peace-and-plenty, we only ask a liberal live-and-let-live. But this is quite inadequate for east Europeans who come from the outside edge of European democracy.” By contrast, even after being “overwatched and overherded” in their old countries, he argued, these eastern European immigrants -- once landed on the American continent -- still “feel deep need of being

sustained by a friendly social, and positive political, philosophy.”29 They were bringing along with them the desire to anchor themselves once again deep into the soil, even if it were a new, unbroken soil. Any unguided, speedy “Americanization” of these peasant immigrants would “just lift the anchor off the land” and the impoverished peasant would eventually drift into town. Such a development would bring along disillusionment and loss of hope, and make the unprepared peasant prey of “delusive organizations”, communist or fascist, alike. Without benevolent government support, they could “slip downwards like a plan [sic]” and be “apt to fall into a mental and political void”.30 Philipps preferred, therefore, to apply a prudent approach to integration of new immigrants which would for a while valorize the old country values and carefully build up behind them a new set of values and new national support systems. Such a gradual approach to “Canadianization” would allow the consolidation of the immigrant mass into a “well-welded nation”.31

Each, “un-Canadianized” ethnic community should be approached and “treated” separately, he advised. The animosity between certain nationalities – Philipps referred to the manifestations of these animosities as “violent historical vendettas” – were too strong, and any effort to deal with them all at once without distinction under the melting-pot formula of integration would be counter-productive.32

When Judith Robinson, a high-profile journalist of the time, suggested in a letter

29 Ibid, p.3. The emphasis is in the original.
30 Ibid, p.3.
31 Ibid, p.5.
she wrote him on February 4, 1943 that they shared the same view “that public efforts to
unite racial and political prejudices in a sort of mixed broth, are not the best way to go
about solving the problem of Canada’s split personality,” her assumption was not entirely
correct.\footnote{Ibid, p.3.} To start with, Philippps only rarely referred to differences and prejudices among
Europeans in terms of “race” and “racial origin”. He probably deemed such concepts as
“race”, racism and prejudice, and all their irrational manifestations, too complex and
controversial to tackle openly without embroiling himself in contradictions of his own.
Besides, he referred to the horrors of war in Europe in terms of “fratricide follies” and
not of racial strife.\footnote{Judith Robinson, Editor of News to Tracy Philippps, February 4, 1943, file 14, vol. 2,
TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.} As to political prejudices, he attributed the emergence of a “rising
flood” of old nationalisms among Europeans, to Hitler’s progress in occupying and
“melting away” one European nation after another, creating a “river” that, once in full
flow, “can not be confined or dammed without danger.” That river must be “canalized”
and with special care “harmonized and harnessed with our own. It can then help generate
the Nation’s power.”\footnote{Tracy Philippps, “Nationalities Branch – Canadian Communities of recent European
Origin – Survey and construction period, 1941/2,” file 1, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.}

In other words, what lay behind his pluralist approach was a belief that the
assimilation of eastern Europeans into a Canadian unified nation was achievable given
time and patience: “If we desire that these peoples shall cease to look back over their

\footnote{Tracy Philippps, “Memorandum – Hemisphere Defence. Foreign-born European
Populations in the Americas, [revised May 9, 1941]” p. 8.}
shoulders to Europe (as, for example, Norwegian-Canadians, Czech-Canadians and even other Canadians are now doing),” he said, “it is up to us to offer a new embrace to replace the patriotic and maternal mysticism of the Old Motherland.” 36 Or, as he put it in one of his numerous memoranda,

Our care has to be directed to their conversion to our faith. Our prescription is assimilation. Our machine has therefore to be set-up with multiple gears to engage and treat each main group of patients according to the very different origins and symptoms of their externally stimulated ailments which are complicated by mental under-nourishment.

To the above he added that “our ‘nursing’ machine” should be designed to do the work which would be at the same time “(a) European in its present origins; (b) Inter-national in its nature and affiliations (European, Canadian, and pan-American), (c) National in its ultimate objective.” 37

Philipps envisaged undertaking the process of “Canadianization” from inside the group by means of engaging the “willing and already assimilated elements within each national group and of the same vocational class” to act as catalysts. “Through them we can close up to other and older-Canadian contacts,” said Philipps, “until the new Canadians are insensibly merged into the main life-current of the Nation.” One would have to start “from scratch”, he suggested, on the basis of their distinct peculiarities, knowing that it was “only through Canada and on a common Canadianism that these elements can be got together.” 38 This could be achieved, he explained in a letter to a

38 Ibid, pp.3-4.
British compatriot, by constructing “a positive plan for comm-unity more than unity, and for unity more than uniformity.”³⁹ On another occasion, later on, he explained: “…in Canada, it is the all-Canadian idea which alone can furnish common ground and a common ideal towards unity of Canadians into a composite united nation.”⁴⁰

While government officials seemed slow in making any concrete decision, Philipps was submitting to the RCMP Commissioner and to Judge Davis of the National War Services suggestions after suggestions on how to deal “with special wartime problems arising out of foreign born communities”. He implied that it was his duty to offer to the Canadian government his services being “something of a Specialist in the racial mentality and the political affairs of the peoples who have the misfortune to exist between the Russian and the Prussian empires.”⁴¹

The “problem” was complex, he argued, but, all things considered, a specialist of his makeup would know how to deal with them. The “problem” involved the fact that “half this war has got to be won in the factories of North America” and nearly half of the workers employed in the war industry were of Italian or eastern and central European origin, “the weakest links in our human armour.”⁴² The “problem”, however, had foreign implications and was far more than a domestic issue: “For the British nations at war it is important that the masses of the eastcentral European peoples who occupy the vital area between the Russian and the Prussian empires … should be kept in sympathy with us, in

³⁹ Letter by Tracy Philipps to Arthur O’Bray, H.B.M. Consul in Detroit, March 5, 1942, file 2, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.


⁴¹ Letter by Tracy Philipps to Judge Davis, February 25, 1941, file 17, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

⁴² Philipps to Davis, February 25, 1941.
harmony with each other and undivided within their own racial groups ... until they can be enabled to rise together behind our common enemies." For that reason, a British-born specialist who knew what was at stake at home and abroad, who knew how to create "a strong but quiet counter-current against Communism," and who knew how to talk to mostly uneducated people in the manner that reflected "the still familiar terms of their old mentality or background" would be an ideal person to take over the job and he saw himself well in this position.⁴³

By the summer of 1941, Philipps began to employ the term "foreign-born" when referring to who should be the object of the "treatment" and to underline the "foreign-ness" as the essence of what was at stake. Reporting from Sydney (NS) to his employer, RCMP Commissioner Wood, Philipps wrote:

In this area, foreign-born labour, whether or not born in Canada, remains very foreign and very susceptible to their old languages and to the call of their old ways-of-thought.
It is as such that they need our attention towards a more conscious Canadianism. In this sense, they are getting here no attention at all. It is largely because they are treated as, and called, foreigners that they themselves still feel foreign.

He was, therefore, proposing to the RCMP Commissioner to set up within the RCMP a unit composed of "two men for each foreign born group" with one, alternately, operating in the field and the other in the office in Ottawa. Their work would be defined in function of the size, the "foreign-ness" and the attitude to the war of each community. Philipps suggested to start this type of work by addressing the Ukrainian community "before proceeding to deal with the rest" in the effort to dispel the influence of the

⁴³ Ibid.
⁴⁴ Letter by Tracy Philipps to Commissioner Wood, August 13, 1941, file 7, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
“Communazi” combined appeal on the national pride of these various communities.  

In another memo, dated June 11, 1941, Philipps pointed out that three government departments were directly affected by the “problems arising from the foreign-born”: justice, national war services, and external affairs. Questions of security, enemy aliens and countering Communism fell under the Justice Department. Questions concerning “foreign-language” press and broadcasting, issues of national unity, and problems involving discrimination against foreign-born workers fell under the Department of National War Services. The Department of External Affairs had a particular role to play, considering that issues concerning foreign-born citizens were of diplomatic, strategic and international nature. Moreover, the work with foreign-born could hardly be successful without the collaboration across the border with the American counterparts in a joint effort of building up a necessary “hemisphere defence”.

**American Counterpart**

Concurrent with this planning of a Canadian programme, American authorities were also envisaging setting up an outfit of their own. The task of such a unit was meant to be establishing contacts with the so-called “foreign nationalities” and serving as an intermediary in acquiring intelligence on activities and sentiments in the highly diversified American population. The American Foreign Nationalities Branch was

---

45 Tracy Philipps, “Memorandum for the Commissioner, May 28, 1941,” file 6, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.


47 Tracy Philipps, “Memorandum – Hemisphere Defence. Foreign-born European Populations in the Americas, Atlanta University, May 1, 1941, [revised May 9, 1941],” file 20, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
established in January 1942 within the Office of the Coordinator of Information (OCI) and was given a double task: (1) to maintain contacts with prominent figures of foreign origin suspected of “influencing American opinion and government policy in the field of foreign affairs”, and (2) to collect information “pertaining to foreign affairs on the sentiments, activities and cross-currents within foreign nationality groups in this country and on the characters of their leaders, press and radio”. Subversive activities on the domestic front were specifically excluded.48

By June 1942, the Foreign Nationalities Branch employed a full-time staff of 35 and secured the participation of 50 volunteers with the assigned task of reading “foreign-language” press in search of potentially relevant information. The Director, DeWitt Clinton Poole, supervised the operations and maintained personal contacts with key informants, exiled political refugees and leaders of so-called “free movements” (loose organizations whose objectives were to provide support to resistance movements in their respective mother countries and to recruit soldiers for combat as part of the Allied armed forces). Poole’s task was of a diplomatic nature and was discharged in close cooperation with the State Department. Some 30 nationality groups were the object of close studies and reports were produced by the Branch for the benefit of the Department of State, the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), among others. The OCI was reorganized six months after the US had entered the war, and renamed the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). The Branch was consequently given an even stronger mandate of intelligence-gathering with the focus on developments abroad. Its objective was thereon to maintain “contact with foreign nationality groups in the United States to

aid in the collection of essential information for the execution of psychological warfare operations in consultation with the State Department.⁴⁹

In the general scheme of shared responsibilities, subversive activities and fifth column infiltrations at home were left in the care of the FBI. The monitoring of “foreign language” media and the dissemination of information in “foreign languages” for domestic consumption was the task of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of Facts and Figures (OFF), renamed the Office of War Information (OWI) after June 1942.⁵⁰ Harold Hoskins, reputed for his knowledge of intricate European affairs, was appointed special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State with the task of liaising in an unofficial manner with foreign groups and leaders of “free movements” and thus help avoid any possible embarrassment for the State Department on the official, diplomatic level while dealing with foreign powers and various governments-in-exile.⁵¹ As to the domestic issues of discrimination, assimilation and “Americanization”, those were the domain of private organizations, such as the Common Council for American Unity (formen Foreign Language Information Service or FLIS), National Conference of Christians and Jews, Council for Democracy and local International Institutes.⁵² It was assumed at the time that one-third of the total American population was either foreign-

born, first generation (with one or both parents born abroad) or alien. Based on the 1930 census, that meant 13 million, 25 million and 5 million, respectively. The war had galvanized public opinion and politicized the way this mass of people was perceived either as a liability, a menace and an imposition, or else, as a valuable asset in pursuing the war effort by being loyal Americans and sharing with native-born Americans the same pursuit of an American dream. Philipps was carefully watching the developments in Washington and wished he could implement some of their formulas in Canada.

The Government Plan

The Canadian plan for a government operation of a similar kind but on a far smaller scale and only oriented to the domestic front began to take shape on October 30, 1941 when an interdepartmental committee put final touches to the list of conditions for the creation of an advisory body to deal with matters arising from the presence in the country of “approximately two million people of largely European descent”. In preparation for that meeting, Associate Deputy Minister Davis explained to his minister, J.T. Thorson, what was at stake in regard to these people:

They are discriminated against in the matter of employment and there is a general tendency to make them feel that they are not Canadians. We want to get the most out of these who are employed in industry, and get the wholehearted support of all these groups behind the national war effort, including the

---

the greatest possible number of enlistments in the armed forces. We want to make them feel that they are Canadians and that they are welcome as such by the other elements in our population and we want these other elements to make them feel that they are Canadians and welcome in Canada as such.54

Along these problems, the Minister was informed, there was a series of “other kindred problems”, presumably problems arising from what Davis obliquely referred to in another memorandum as “foreign activity correlation”, namely various types of activities by groups and individuals aimed at influencing strategies and international policy decisions affecting their home countries and motivated by specific national aspirations.55 Most importantly, Davis argued elsewhere, (using the common we/they formula and a certain tone of self-congratulation), there was “a large percentage of this type of person” living in the Prairies, “and we accept them as Canadian citizens.... They are an accepted party of our lives.” In the East, the situation was different, according to Davis: “No attempt is made to distinguish between the Ukrainians, the Poles, the Swedes, the Norwegians, the Danes or anything else.” As long as the name of a person sounded foreign and not Anglo-Saxon, this person would be identified (Davis used the expression “branded”) as German and denied employment. In his opinion, the government programme to be put in place would have for its purpose to “aid these people to become Canadians, and to bear their share of the war effort”.56

All these considerations made the decision on the make-up of the new section within the Bureau of Public Information highly complex, having in mind the obvious

54 Memorandum by Judge T.C. Davis to Hon. J.T. Thorson, Minister of National War Services, October 29, 1941, Vol. 35, RG44, LAC.
55 Memorandum by T.C. Davis for Hon. J.T. Thorson, June 27, 1941, Vol. 35, RG44, LAC.
56 Letter by T.C. Davis, Associate Deputy Minister to H.R. MacMillan, Wartime Merchant Shipping Ltd., February 28, 1942, vol. 35, RG44, LAC.
need for a close cooperation with the Department of External Affairs and probably other
government departments as well. Davis informed the Minister that Professor George
Simpson, an expert in Slavic Studies and History at the University of Saskatchewan was
being proposed to be the head of the Section while Tracy Philipps would act as an
adviser.

From the slate of bureaucrats attending the meeting of the interdepartmental
committee on that October 30, 1941, one could quickly deduce the perceived extent of
the implications involved: from national security and foreign affairs to communications
and press censorship. The committee – whose mandate was to act foremost in an advisory
capacity to the Department of National War Services -- was convened by Deputy
Minister Davis following upon an idea apparently originally put forward by Norman
Robertson, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs.57

Among the bureaucrats present were Norman Robertson, Under-Secretary of State
for External Affairs, Wilfrid Eggleston, Chief Press Censor, J.S. Roe, Examiner of
Publications, Department of National Revenue, John Grierson, head of the National Film
Board, Walter Herbert, representing the Bureau of Public Information (BPI), as well as
representatives of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), the RCMP, the
Custodian of Enemy Alien Property and the Department of the Secretary of State. Also
present were Professor George Simpson, Tracy Philipps and Robert England, who was
known as an expert in matters of immigrant education and integration and was the author
of the acclaimed study *The Central European Immigrant in Canada*. Judge Davis was in

57 In a letter he wrote to N. Robertson, on November 9, 1940 Davis referred to
Robertson’s idea as “an excellent one”. He told Robertson that he was convinced that
constructive work could be achieved through such a committee, see file “Department of
National War Services”, vol. 36, RG44, LAC.
the chair.  

What a few days earlier had been referred to as a section of the BPI, was by the time of the meeting identified as a different type of advisory committee to be composed of people outside the government ranks. This change in format was founded on the belief and hope that the concept of an advisory committee, rather than a government branch, section or division, would create the impression among those with whom the outfit would be dealing with, that they were communicating with a “representative group of Canadian citizens in whom they have confidence and faith” and not the government itself. The representativeness of this group, however, did not imply that members should be “identified solely with the activities or interests of any one particular foreign-language group.” The reason behind this decision was the emphasis that the planned body should not “have as its object the preservation of group differences, but should seek to encourage individuals from these foreign-language communities to identify themselves as closely as possible with the rest of the Canadian community.”

There was a considerable debate on what name to give to the new outfit and by what term to address the object and scope of its concerns. During earlier consultations among the members of the interdepartmental committee, an agreement was reached to avoid in future communications the use of the term “new Canadians” as it was considered

---

58 S.F. Rae (Department of External Affairs), “Interdepartmental Meeting on Organization of Proposed Committee on Cultural-Group Co-operation under Ministry of National War Services [October 30, 1941]” November 1, 1941, vol. 36, RG 44, LAC.

59 Memorandum by T.C. Davis, Associate Deputy Minister, Department of National War Services to Hon. Jos. Thorson, Minister of National War Services, November 4, 1941, file “Committee for Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship,” vol. 36 RG 44, LAC.

60 Rae, “Interdepartmental Meeting on Organization of Proposed Committee”

61 Ibid.
offensive: "they are either Canadians or they are not." Terms such as "Foreign section", "Foreign-language section" or "European section" were also rejected to avoid any implication that the Committee's business was strictly a matter of external affairs.

George Simpson suggested the concept of "cultural group co-operation." The choice of these words was explained in a memorandum prepared for the meeting:

The term 'Cultural-Group' includes those language groups whose mother tongue is not English or French. The term 'cultural' is used in a strictly scientific sense in order to exclude the idea of racial or political particularism. The word 'cooperation' is employed to suggest that their [sic] exists a greater field than has as yet been possible to cultivate for mutual helpfulness between the Government and the groups, and between the groups themselves with the help of the Government.

That there was an obvious uneasiness about commonly used labels such as "ethnic", "racial" or "foreign" came through clearly in this text. What was the "scientific sense" of the terms used was not explained but must have implied anthropological considerations. "Cultural" was in the anthropological context a label for an observable "otherness" and in the above text emphasized the outsider status of "foreign-language" groups in relationship to their government. Hence the use of the term "cooperation" to indicate the type of relationship the committee would encourage. In that sense, the government was meant to cooperate with the groups, "for mutual helpfulness", as if it did not inherently represent them by the mere mechanism of the democratic order of things. To make things more obvious in terms of distinct insider/outsider relationship and co-

---

62 Memorandum by Judge T.C. Davis to Hon. J.T. Thorson, Minister of National War Services, October 29, 1941.

63 "Memorandum on the Establishment of a Committee on Cultural-Group Cooperation to advise the Minister of National War Services, [October 30, 1941]," file "Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship," vol. 36, RG44, LAC.
operation, Philipps pointed out in his own explanatory note that many well-known organizations founded to improve international and intra-national relationships between different "cultural groups of nationalities" opted for the use of either "cultural" or "cooperation", or both, in their names.\footnote{Tracy Philipps, ""Committee on Cultural-Group Co-operation'? Choice of Title," file "Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship," vol. 36, RG44, LAC.} Then he added this statement:

In a more positive and more specially Canadian sense, the two main categories of Public ((a) Franco-British and (b) others) with whom we are concerned will be reassured, by the Cultural title, that the set-up is (a) national, federal and non-controversial, and not seeking to permit perpetuation of 'foreign-ness'; (b) that, for the others, it is in a practical sense academic. The "academic" is to the unacademicized such an object of ambition, of respect and of cult, that a speaker being presented to a Slavic or Italian farmen or workmen audience is, in order to gain the most respectful and eager hearing, often to his own astonishment presented to them in the vernacular as "Professor".\footnote{Ibid.}

Philipps was giving here a clear indication that the "others" were a distinct segment of the public – the amorphous mass of people the government had to be concerned with. He was stating that they were "foreigners" whose "foreign-ness" should not be permitted to persist, that they were an uneducated class of labourers with a common awareness of their own lower status and ignorance and in awe of people of learning like himself.

Simpson’s (and Philipps’) suggestion was, however, rejected as "it stressed groups which was not desirable whether they were cultural or national groups."\footnote{Memorandum by T.C. Davis, to Hon. Jos. Thorson, Minister of National War Services, November 4, 1941.} Norman Robertson, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs suggested the concept of "co-operation in citizenship". Such a description of the work of the committee, explained
Robertson, should be acceptable to "old" and "new" Canadians, naturalized and non-naturalized, because it would place "the emphasis on the common rights and duties implied in Canadian citizenship." The name "Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship" was finally agreed upon, notwithstanding the fact that another organization specializing in adult education under a very similar name -- the Canadian Council for Education in Citizenship -- already existed! The chair designate, Prof. Simpson viewed at the start the proposed solution as "less specific and may be even a little mystifying" but agreed that it expressed well the ultimate objective of the committee's work.

The Director of Public Information, G.H. Lash, had his misgivings about the conclusions of the meeting and in a memorandum to his Deputy Minister cautioned against any precipitated decision-making that might have had serious future repercussions. He found the adopted name cumbersome, not to mention the obvious confusion it would engender. He also insisted that one should not lose sight of the principal function of the new outfit, namely to "provide a vehicle through which Public Information may work more closely with the 'foreign language groups' in the winning of the war." He was worried that under the influence of various pressure groups the newly

---

67 Under-Secretary for External Affairs to Mr. Justice Davis, November 3, 1941, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.

68 The Canadian Council for Education in Citizenship was formed in 1941 as a forum for co-operation between provincial education ministries and various adult education associations and community oriented organizations in order to enhance public participation and community involvement of citizens. After the WWII, it changed its name to Canadian Citizenship Council and continued operating until 1968. For a brief history of this adult education movement and its main parent organization, the Canadian Association for Adult Education, see Gordon Selman, *Citizenship and the Adult Education Movement in Canada* (Vancouver: Centre for Continuing Education, University of British Columbia, 1991)

69 G.W. Simpson to Mr. N.A. Robertson, December 2, 1941, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.
established committee would direct its activities "into all sorts of by-paths, thus weakening the strength of the effort in the direction of the immediate and main objective."\textsuperscript{70}

Lash was right to worry about possible deviations mainly because the person chosen to be in charge of the day-to-day operations of the new committee, namely Philipps, was, for exactly opposite reasons, also not entirely in agreement with the adopted recommendations and would subsequently attempt to define his own course of action. As a matter of fact, Norman Robertson, was also not convinced that Philipps should assume the administrative and organizational work in support of the newly established advisory committee, and suggested that he be given instead "a roving commission to carry on the useful work" he had already began as lecturer and contact man.\textsuperscript{71}

Philipps was supposed to work under the administrative umbrella of the Director of Public Information, in this case, Lash himself. Philipps complained about this arrangement, arguing that his work with people of foreign origin who still harboured "inherited instinct and distrust of anything which comes to them, directly or indirectly, from a Department of Information" would be hampered by the connection.\textsuperscript{72} Public Information was propaganda by another name, he argued, and would be quickly regarded by the "foreign-born" citizenry "as a machine of whatever 'Party' is in power, designed

\textsuperscript{70} Memorandum by G.H. Lash to Mr. Justice T.C. Davis, Associate Deputy Minister, Department of National War Services, November 10, 1941,, vol. 36, RG 44, LAC.

\textsuperscript{71} Note for Mr. Robertson re visit of Mr. T.C. Davis, September 15, 1941, prepared by SFR[ae], file 3426-40, vol. 2977, MG25, LAC. Robertson would have preferred Graham Spry for the job.

\textsuperscript{72} Tracy Philipps, "Proposed EUROPEAN SECTION for war services, and Canadianization of immigrant Europeans," October 22, 1941, vol. 35, RG 44, LAC.
to whitewash war-events, to make bad cases seem good and to deceive the masses.”

Using imagery of Slav folk tales, Philipps explained: “To the foreign-born, Departments of Information sound familiar as rather clever cousins of wolfish Political Police, even if disguised in slightly sheepish clothing. Our work from such a base, which no camouflage will conceal, will be simply suspect as poisoned bait.”

Moreover, whatever “propaganda” had to be disseminated, it would be, said Philipps, “a relatively minor part of the foreign-born work.” Admitting, he said, that the foreign-born had to be kept informed like every other part of the population, this mere fact did not make them primary subjects for a government information agency, “any more than chestnut horses should be fed primarily on horse chestnuts.”

His pleas for a different administrative arrangement were obviously not heeded and he had to accept the situation. Not for long, however, because in November 1942, BPI was closed down and a new agency, Wartime Information Bureau, operating under the direct authority of the Prime Minister Office was created. The CCCC, meanwhile, remained under the umbrella of the Department of National War Services. Ironically, while Philipps was objecting to having his work associated with something resembling a ministry of information and propaganda, his very work seemed to have all the ingredients of genuine propaganda or indoctrination, whether he preferred to call it “Canadianization”, “Americanization”, “assimilation” or the method of “leading them to turn more and more to us for guidance

---

73 Letter by Tracy Philipps to Ht. Mr. Justice T. C. Davis, October 6, 1941, file 25, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

74 Ibid.

75 Ibid.

76 See the official history of the Advisory Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (Nationalities Branch), Department of National War Services, pp.8-9. Vol. 36-7, RG35, LAC.
and leading them gradually to merge their old nationalisms in Canadianism and in Canada.\textsuperscript{77}

He was also not pleased with the argument that the principal sphere of the new committee’s concern should be domestic cooperation and cohesion and not political developments abroad. Philipps perceived his work as essentially a “foreign affairs” matter. It was, after all, the only aspect of the issues involved that he thought he understood better than anyone else in his entourage. He drew parallels with what had been done so far in that area in Britain and USA, where “foreign” interferences and alien infiltration were prime scope of the operations, and he argued:

\begin{quote}
It will be borne in mind that no action can be taken touching any still-foreign-feeling community in Canada without it having a direct repercussion on the far more numerous adjoining and kindred communities elsewhere in the Americas and without it reaching the ears of the European mother-nation whose silenced voice our immigrant communities often effect to represent. These are essentially and inescapably External Affairs.\textsuperscript{78}
\end{quote}

Once again, the interdepartmental committee concluded otherwise. While the new committee and its administrative unit would be able to provide useful information on the political mood among various groups, it was said, policy-making with its foreign repercussions would remain strictly the domain of the Department of External Affairs.

Then there was the issue of the advisory committee itself. Philipps did not like committees. On an earlier occasion he argued: “In principle, I regard Committees as bodies which reopen or invite discussions (and therefore delays) on many matters of

\textsuperscript{77} Tracy Philipps, “Nationalities Branch – Canadian Communities of recent European Origin – Survey and construction period, 1941/2,”, file 1, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\textsuperscript{78} Letter by Tracy Philipps to Ht. Mr. Justice T. C. Davis, October 6, 1941, file 25, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
which the issue is already clear and often serve to shield from responsibility men who are paid by the nation to have the courage to assume it."\textsuperscript{79} Here, too, he had to comply with the decision of his future superiors. He eventually accepted the offer to be appointed European Adviser and become an employee of the Department of National War Services.\textsuperscript{80}

\textit{The Advisory Committee Is Set-Up}

The Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (CCCC) was formally established on January 27, 1942 by a ministerial order signed by Minister J.T. Thorson under the authority of the \textit{Department of National War Services Act 1940} (4 Geo.VI, ch. 22).\textsuperscript{81} The duties of the CCCC were enumerated as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(a)] to maintain contact with Canadian citizens of non-British and non-French origin and to seek to interpret their points of view to the Government and to the Canadian public generally.
\item[(b)] to co-operate with the Director of the Bureau of Public Information in distributing news to the foreign language press in Canada, and in explaining public policy as it develops.
\item[(c)] to maintain close relationships with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the National Film Board, and other similar services; and the Canadian Council for Education in
\end{itemize}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{79} Letter by Tracy Philipps to Judge Davis, February 25, 1941, file 17, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
\textsuperscript{80} Philipps was appointed an Adviser to the Director of Public Information by Order-in-Council P.C. 104/9400 of December 3, 1941, See, Memorandum by W.E. Halliday to Mr. Heeney, Secretary to the Cabinet, May 14, 1943, file 8-9-1, vol. 13, series 31, RG36, LAC.
\textsuperscript{81} A draft Order-in-Council (P.C. 718) creating the Committee was, for unknown reasons, not approved by the Privy Council when duly submitted in January 1942. See, Memorandum by W.E. Halliday to Mr. Heeney, Secretary to the Cabinet, May 14, 1943, file 8-9-1, vol. 13, series 31, RG36, LAC.
\end{flushright}
Citizenship.
(d) to encourage cultural activities which may promote mutual understandings and esteem between Canadian citizens of different origins.
(e) to interest itself in situations which appear to be producing misunderstanding, dissatisfaction or discord among groups of Canadians of European origin, non-French and non-British, or between these groups and other Canadian citizens, and, if it is thought advisable, to make representations with respect to such situations to the appropriate bodies or authorities. 82

The thrust of the mandate appeared to be of a social and cultural nature, with a highly restrained reference to possible conflictual situations in inter-group relations without any direct reference to war or potential foreign origins of such conflicts and their implications. Nowhere in sight were the objectives Philipps kept raising:

**IMMEDIATE AIM** – To win the war. A bold and positive policy to consolidate Canadians of continental European origin. To inspire and to activate them for war services in such a way that enthusiasm comes from them.

**ULTIMATE AIM.** The unification of the nation. To conceive and to implement more positive and constructive measures of Canadianization. 83

Philipps’ objectives were highly interventionist, something the government was obviously not prepared to admit as its goal, from fear of criticism by, on one hand, the opposition – as being too political and self-serving – and, on the other, by targeted groups themselves -- as being demeaning and paternalistic.

The choice of members of the Committee was also meant to demonstrate a highly conciliatory approach to cultural diversity. The members were all considered prominent experts in matters of inter-cultural relations and community development. Noteworthy

82 Ministerial Order signed by the Minister of National War Services, January 27, 1942, file “Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship,” vol. 36, RG44, LAC.
was the absence of any representative of an ethnic minority community. That absence was explained as being deliberate in order to avoid inter-group suspicions and jealousy as to who was chosen and why.⁸⁴ Responding in early 1944 to criticism from a group of Slavic communities on this matter, Tracy Philipps elaborated on this argument of need to avoid jealousy and competition among groups by adding that in his opinion it was “not very logical or practical” to expect that “not fully Canadianized persons” should advise the government on questions of “Canadianization”.⁸⁵

The chair of the Committee was assigned to George Wilfred Simpson, a professor of history at the University of Saskatchewan, specializing in Ukrainian history. He was well known in Ukrainian circles as a friend and a reliable source of support. In 1941 he published a small volume of maps situating Ukraine in the geopolitical context of eastern Europe and providing an overview of the history of the Ukrainian people and their fight for recognition as a nation.⁸⁶ His radio broadcasts and public lectures had for objective to raise public awareness in Canada of the Ukrainian predicament as a divided nation, under the rule of Russians, Polish, Hungarians or Czechs, and as being, at the outbreak of war, at the crossroad between life under the Soviets and occupation by the Germans. The latter option was perceived by some Ukrainians as a way to achieve independence from Soviet Russia by collaborating with the occupying Nazis authorities.

Together with Philipps, Simpson was instrumental in achieving, in November

---

⁸⁴ “Advisory Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (Nationalities Branch), Department of National War Services”, Part II (Confidential),” [1945-46?] 4, vol. 16, series 7, RG35, LAC.

⁸⁵ See his memorandum dated February 5, 1944 in file 25, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E 350, LAC.

1940, a very precarious agreement among various Ukrainian organizations to form a Canadian Ukrainian Committee and make them co-operate among themselves, even if temporarily, for the purposes of helping the British and their allies wage war without at the same time publicly competing for recognition of their nationalist, independentist or pro-Soviet opposing causes. In November 1941, Simpson accepted the government offer to come to Ottawa and act as a full time and paid chairman of the new Committee. Six months later he returned to Regina, allegedly for health reasons. He thereon retained the title of Chairman of the Committee but kept in touch with the Department only in a consultative capacity. His chairmanship was regarded by Ukrainian leaders of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee as a positive experience. In a submission to the Prime Minister on November 13, 1943, they affirmed that during the period Simpson was in full charge of the Committee its work seemed to evolve around closer co-operation and understanding among ethnic groups “without arousing any suspicion that they are being directed to adopt any particular attitude.” That was not necessarily the opinion of Ukrainian communists who blamed Simpson for favouring right-wing groups. An article published in the left-wing Ukrayinske Zhitya of June 25, 1942, suggested that judging “from the staff added to the committee (Simpson, Kay [sic], Kirkconnell and Philipps) all ‘specialists’ in the Ukrainian question – the activities of the whole committee would be directed towards the Ukrainians” and not towards co-operation among groups, as originally claimed.

87 On this episode in the history of Ukrainian Canadians, see Bohdan Kordan, Canada and the Ukrainian Question, 1939-1945 (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2001)

88 Rev. Dr. W. Kushnir, President, J.W. Arsenych (Secretary), Ukrainian Canadian Committee to the Hon. W.L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister, November 13, 1943, file 165-Part IV, vol. 18, RG26, LAC.

89 “Translation of an article in “Ukрайинське Життя” (Toronto) June 25, 1942, No. 26
There were altogether 14 members of the committee, among them six university
crossors (H.F. Angus, J.S.A. Bois, Jean Bruchéci, S.D. Clark, Watson Kirkconnell and
George Simpson), four historians (Jean Bruchéci, Margaret Stovel McWilliams, George
Simpson and Isabel Skelton), three lawyers (Jean Bruchéci, Emily Lynch and Edgar J.
Tarr), two former railway officials (Robert England and J. Murray Gibbon) and two
educators (Charles H. Blakeny and Donald Cameron). There were only two French
Canadians, one of them, Jean Bruchéci, appointed as an afterthought. Bois' presence on
the committee was contested in late 1943 in a letter to the Minister of National War
Services, Major LaFlèche, a French-Canadian himself. The argument was that Bois was
not worthy of representing the ideas and traditions of the Quebec people since Bois had
been an ordained priest but had abandoned his pastoral service in 1930 and married in
June 1941. LaFlèche acknowledged the receipt of the letter without comment.

Three women were appointed to the Committee, with only McWilliams being on
it from beginning to end. While their personal qualifications would substantiate their
appointment, it is noteworthy that the two married women members, Mrs. R.F.
McWilliams and Mrs. O. Skelton, were referred to in formal records of the Committee in
terms of their married status to prominent men: Manitoba Lieutenant-Governor Ronald
Fairbairn McWilliams and federal government Under-Secretary for External Affairs,
Oscar Skelton.

(weekly)" signed L. Biberovich, in file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.

The sitting number was twelve. When two of the members (Robert England and Isabel
Skelton) resigned in 1943, two others were appointed for the remaining duration of the
Committee's existence. For the full list of the members, with biographical notices, see
Appendix I.

Roland Germain, secrétaire du Comité des œuvres catholiques de Montréal to
LaFlèche, Minister of National War Services, December 3, 1943, file 30, vol. 1, TPF,
MG30 E350, LAC.
The Two Apologists of Cultural Diversity

Watson Kirkconnell was considered to be by far the best qualified member of the committee. He was, in fact, approached as early as December 1940 to provide some advice and was, eventually, also offered to chair the advisory committee once it had been decided to form it. He declined it in order to keep his independence vis-à-vis the government and to be able to speak his mind without restraint.

Kirkconnell was a university professor of literature, a prolific translator of poetry, a devout Baptist and a very passionate man when it came to defending his beliefs. There was something romantic and Herderian in Kirkconnell's understanding of the importance

---

92 See the letter by Norman Robertson of the Department of External Affairs to Watson Kirkconnell, December 10, 1940, file 165, part III, vol. 18, RG26, LAC. Robertson wrote: “We are sure that we can count on advice of men like yourself who have given a good deal of special study to the problem of the new Canadians and to the job of making the rest of us appreciate their points of view.”

93 “I do not, however, delude myself into thinking that I am the only one qualified to head it up,” was Kirkconnell’s response. Letter by Watson Kirkconnell to Lt. Col. James E. Mess, February 8, 1941, file 17, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. See also, Watson Kirkconnell, A Slice of Canada: Memoirs (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967) p.276.

of cultural roots and, what he called, “rich diversity of racial gifts.” He was the author of several anthologies of poetry he had translated himself from various European languages (e.g. Ukrainian, Icelandic, Hungarian German), including a collection of “Canadian poetry” originally written in Swedish, Norwegian, Ukrainian, etc., entitled Canadian Overtones.\textsuperscript{95} In the introduction, Kirkconnell advanced the idea, uncommon in his time, that the poetry of new Canadians may help English-speaking Canadians (the “we” in his text) abandon their patronizing interest in folk costumes and folk dances of immigrants (“them” in his text) and develop a “much truer attitude towards them, as ‘beings breathing thoughtful breath’, men and women as capable as any amongst us of appreciating the beauties and the philosophies of this world.”\textsuperscript{96} He was further convinced that reading and preserving this poetry may help “develop in succeeding generations a Canadianism nourished by pride in the individual’s racial past.” Awareness of one’s “racial roots”, argued Kirkconnell, was important for a successful realization of personality of each individual. That speedy integration of new Canadians was of “supreme national importance” Kirkconnell had no doubt. “But it would be tragic,” he said, “if there should at the same time be a clumsy stripping-away of all those spiritual associations with the past which help to give depth and beauty to life.”

His understanding of cultural pluralism appeared on the surface at odds with modern rationalism and liberal concepts of universal human values (significantly, constructed exclusively on the foundations of northwestern European and Christian moral

\textsuperscript{95} Watson Kirkconnell, Canadian Overtones (Winnipeg: The Columbia Press, 1935) From 1938 onwards, for more than a decade, Kirkconnell was offering on the pages of the University of Toronto Quarterly an annual review of literature produced by “New Canadians”. See the first such review of “New-Canadian Letters [:1937],” University of Toronto Quarterly 7, No. 4 (July 1938) pp.567-571.

\textsuperscript{96} Kirkconnell, Canadian Overtones, p.4.
ideals) embraced by his contemporaries. His ideas were nevertheless appreciated because Kirkconnell did not reject ultimate assimilation of all these diverse gifted racial elements into a new Canadian nationality -- an amalgam, a mixture, a hybrid, a sum of it all -- the way the American nation had been formed a century earlier. Kirkconnell’s passion and interests in Ukrainian, Hungarian and other east and central European cultural contributions was, however, eventually diverted into equally passionate, almost violent political crusade against communism and Soviet Russia at the time when the Soviet Union was a Western ally and untouchable.97

John Murray Gibbon was another passionate promoter of minority cultures, particularly folklore. As a person in charge of corporate policies and programmes for the successful integration of immigrant workers in the work camps along the railway lines of the Canadian Pacific Company, Gibbon devoted most of his public activities since his arrival to Canada, at the end of WWI, to the question of “foreign-born” and “new Canadians”. He used to be praised for his role in organizing folk festivals and radio programmes.98 Those were described as having for their objective the “encouragement if the special aptitudes and cultural traditions of the many racial groups that have come to Canada, not as bases of divisions among our people but as contributions to the life of the

97 Thus, Kirkconnell, for instance, gave a luncheon speech before the Canadian Club in Toronto, on February 1, 1943 engaging in the debate on who is loyal and who is not among Canadians of foreign origin. These lectures were usually radio broadcast but on this particular occasion, CBC refused to air it. See a report on the lecture in The Globe and Mail of February 1, 1943: “Kirkconnell Charges Communistic Papers Stir Up Racial Trouble.”

nation."99 The most famous of his writings has remained, undoubtedly, *The Canadian Mosaic*.100

In preparation for the first meeting of the Advisory Committee, Gibbon submitted to his new colleagues a three-year plan to publish, in English translation, a series of affordable reprints of some 40 literary masterpieces representative of the great European cultural heritage as yet unknown to ordinary Canadians. This "Legacy of Literature Library" would, in Gibbon's view supported by Kirkconnell's, enhance mutual appreciation among Canadians of different origins and would leave a fundamental and permanent mark on Canadian life.101 The plan never took off the ground, mostly because of the immensity of the project, lack of bureaucratic support and, probably, just as much, because such an undertaking was not particularly appealing to a politically-minded, action-oriented, overworked and over-tense person such as Philipps, in charge of implementing most of the assignments decided upon by the committee.


Conclusion

The full committee met only three times in the course of the three years of its existence: January 10, March 11 and November 26, 1943. ¹⁰² Between the meetings, the members of the committee were advised to be active in “making contacts, expressing the Committee’s point of view regarding the unity of Canadian citizens, and furnishing to the office information which might be useful in the carrying on of its work.” ¹⁰³ The day-to-day work was handled by its administrative section, in the hands of Tracy Philipps. Although his title was of an adviser, he actually ran the office. Philipps ceased to be “a dollar-per-year” expert on November 27, 1941 when he officially joined Canadian civil service with his appointment as European Adviser to the Director of Public Information, receiving an annual salary corresponding to a colonel’s pay amounting to $4,392 plus allowances. ¹⁰⁴ He was, nevertheless, formally operating under the authority of the superior bureaucrats in the department, whether the Director of the Public Information, G.H. Lash, as was the case at the beginning, or, ultimately, the Deputy Minister of the Department himself. He suffered from these bureaucratic and political constraints which seemed to be increasing as time went by and a new minister, Major-General LaFlèche, and a new deputy minister, Chester Payne, replaced Jo Thorson and Judge Davis, respectively, drawing the whole project into an embarrassing standstill by late 1943.

¹⁰² A meeting was scheduled for September 1942 but did not take place.

¹⁰³ Summary of the discussion of the second meeting of the CCCC, March 11, 1942, p.4. file “Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship,”, vol. 36, RG44, LAC.

The reasons for this development were not exclusively bureaucratic. The gradual disengagement of the government was the result of the fact that three fairly distinct outlooks on the “problem” of how to proceed with the desired integration of Canadians of continental European origin had been on the table at the time of the launching of the programme, and the dilemma as to the acceptable policy choice had not been fully resolved. The three propositions all stemmed from the classical liberal precepts of individual freedom, human perfectibility and progress, tolerance, and the role of the modern state to protect and build a sovereign and democratic nation.

For Kirkconnell and Gibbon, it was through the celebration and sympathetic appreciation of the cultural contributions of diverse groups that a common sense of belonging to a new national amalgam could be developed in due course. It might require several generations of shared life in this country under the sign of tolerance, respect and freedom before a true and united Canadian nation could be achieved as a result of the healthy dynamics of inter-cultural contacts and intermarriage.

For Philipps, the integration of newcomers could be accelerated by the judicious intervention of experts who could orchestrate appropriate leadership and provide careful guidance through the process. This paternalistic approach was particularly compelling, in his view, under the circumstances of war and political strife the country was experiencing at the time. It required taking into account the mindset of a mostly uneducated, peasant or working class population disturbed and politically agitated by the developments in their old countries but whose loyalty to Canada and participation in the war efforts of the Allies had to be secured with considerable urgency.
For some influential government officials, the federal state had a particular role to play in nation-building, by minimizing cultural group diversity and emphasizing the homogenizing effect of public belief in the existence of a common civic nationality. This general policy meant, on the one hand, attempting to strengthen national identity against the persisting menace of the provincial constitutionally entrenched particularism, and, on the other, asserting liberal assumptions that cultural identity was the manifestation of the individual right to freedom of association, and that one of the basic premises of a modern liberal state was the universal equality of all individual citizens in their relationship with the state and its institutions.\textsuperscript{105} Hence, the insistence on co-operation and citizenship education. Hence the categorical denial in the House of Commons by the Minister of National War Services, Jo Thorson, that the newly established advisory committee was mandated to deal with cultural relations.\textsuperscript{106}

By assigning Tracy Philipps to the job of government adviser, the officials in charge at the time decided, at least temporarily, to recognize the immediate significance of dealing with diverse ethnic and linguistic groups within the context of the war situation in their countries of origin, as well as their ideological stands and political activities in Canada. This decision would be put in question a year later, triggered by the introduction of a new policy of government communications with the general public and a major overhaul of the Wartime Information Board (WIB).

\textsuperscript{105} See Will Kymlicka, \textit{Multicultural Citizenship} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995)

\textsuperscript{106} Mr. Thorson, May 27, 1942, \textit{Debates of the House of Commons}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} session-19\textsuperscript{th} Parliament (January 28, 1942-January 27, 1943) p.2806.
Chapter 6
The Nationalities Branch in Action

In the present, we have to face the fact that, in (this) the first generation and a half, it is through this European-type jungle that passes the only path out beyond to any deep and abiding Canadianization. Any attempt to shirk the issue and to take superficial short-cuts around the jungle by taking the line of publicity or of least resistance will only result in leaving this exotic jungle unCanadianized behind our front or in our midst. If we only decorate (and hide) the outer edge of the jungle with excellent flags and oaths and “O Canadas”, we shall in our haste not succeed in Canadianizing the jungle’s heart.

Tracy Philipps (1942)¹

THE WORKING FORMULA:
(1) At least half of this War has to be won in the mines, shipyards and factories of North America.
(2) More than half the heavy Labour operating the heavy industries is ‘foreign born’, with one or both parents born abroad.
(3) Their confusion of mind arises from the fact that, within the economic frame of Canada (pay and housing etc.), they are still in spirit and in politics living and thinking (and often speaking) ‘European’.

THE AIM:
(1) Immediate: to ‘win’ the war. Everything else is now subsidiary to this.
(2) Ultimate: in this process, to build these foreign-born elements willingly and actively into the nation.

Tracy Philipps (1942)²

¹ Memorandum to the Deputy Minister re functions and place of the Nationalities Branch, signed by Tracy Philipps, dated November 6, 1942, in file 11, vol. 2, Tracy Philipps Fonds (hereafter TPF), MG30 E350, Library and Archives of Canada (hereafter LAC)

² “Brief report, as asked, for the personal information of General LaFleche, Minister for National War Services, on the (a) origin, (b) aim and (c) functions of the Nationalities Branch”, signed by Tracy Philipps, dated December 26, 1942, in file 30, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
The Nationalities Branch of the Department of National War Services was operational for just over two years (between January 1942 and June 1944) as one of the first government units devoted exclusively to government relations with the country's diverse "ethnic" communities. It was originally conceived as an administrative support to the 12-member Advisory Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (CCCC) which was formally established by ministerial order of January 27, 1942 to act as an outreach and information programme of government, addressing issues concerning "foreign-born" Canadians (namely not only Canadians born themselves abroad but also those born in Canada with one or both parents born abroad). The chair of the committee, Professor George Simpson, was retained in Ottawa as a paid advisor to the Director of the Public Information under whose auspices the Committee operated until November 1942. By August 1, 1942, Simpson left Ottawa and his paid job, giving health problems as the reason.³ No time elapsed before the Nationalities Branch, left in the care of its European Adviser, Tracy Philipps, began to act on various initiatives mostly without consulting members of the Committee. Neither much time elapsed before Philipps and his small unit became the object of both occasional praise and, more frequently, criticism for interference in political and international matters. By the autumn of 1942 even the most eager supporter of the Branch, Deputy Minister of National War Services, Justice Thomas C. Davis, expressed his doubts as to its efficacy and future. What had happened?

Those were years rife with tensions of all kinds. There was, of course, the war in which Canada was fully engaged. Those years marked the beginning of a period in Canadian history when potential ideological interferences from the left and the right in the political spectrum, coupled with foreign policy implications resulting from government actions in the domestic field made everybody wary and circumspect. The war in Europe and Asia affected the spirit of various ethno-cultural communities and contributed to exasperating nationalistic aspirations and animosities between groups and within their own ranks, already fermenting in their homelands and then simply transplanted to Canada. The combination of heightened emotions of fear, hope, pride, prejudice and resentment occasionally led to heated exchanges of insults and outright denunciations of disloyalty to Canada or to the distant homeland, or accusations of nationalism, communist leanings or dangerous fascist connections.

Negotiating and encouraging, in the midst of these high tensions, the abatement of such nationalistic or ideological conflicts and the gradual break-off of emotional ties with the homeland required several skills and assets. One needed: (a) specific social skills (of a negotiator, communicator or educator); (b) real, or at least strong semblance of authoritative leadership; (c) a policy framework; and (d) the support of one’s superiors. Philipps possessed the first three and lacked the fourth, the crucial one in his opinion. Philipps was a skilful negotiator and communicator. The manner in which he convinced Canadian civil servants to give him the job is a proof of his negotiating skills; his lecture tours across Canada were a success. His way of making it known that he had powerful connections, notably the British foreign minister Lord Halifax, when talking to the Ottawa elite, or his hinting that he worked
for the government of Canada when on his "field trips" to Sudbury, Hamilton or Montreal, helped enhance his authoritative stature. Those skills and Philipps' plans for action have been discussed earlier. A review of the actual activities of the Branch, and of Tracy Philipps in particular, and his relationship with government officials and his superiors may help bring out a more complex picture of the reasons why the Branch failed to satisfy the expectations of its early promoters.

*What Is in the Name?*

For several months the unit set up to provide administrative support to the CCCC within the Bureau of Public Information, had no name of its own. Philipps was uncomfortable with the "long-winded and unwieldy label" of the Committee with which they had been stuck from the beginning. He sometimes attached to the title the proviso: "Canadian communities of recent European origin" in order to indicate more clearly the real scope of the enterprise. In a letter to his superior, Deputy Minister Davis, he suggested in October 1942 that a brief and concise title be found. "Ethnic Branch" seemed accurate but potentially too academic, he mused. "Minorities Branch" was short and descriptive but might bring to the forefront the "unpleasant past" marked by the failure of the League of Nations to deal with the rights of ethnic minorities in Europe. He preferred to follow the American example when they gave the name "Foreign Nationalities Branch" to a similar unit within the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). Once stripped of the word "foreign" -- "an implication which we, as you know, are anxious to avoid", he wrote -- the label "Nationalities
Branch” appeared to him “a very simple and suitable phrase”. It is worth noting here, that notwithstanding the inserted remark which was most likely made to humour Davis and whatever other government official who might read the letter, Philipps was convinced that his work consisted of encouraging those he insistently referred to as “foreign-born” to participate in the Canadian war efforts and gradually integrate into the Canadian society. Communities of recent European origin were, in fact, in his view “still foreign matter and therefore a foreign affair.” Moreover, in the case of the American branch, its mandate was properly related to foreign affairs and various nationalities abroad as it was directed to maintain informal contacts with ethnic minorities in the US in order to collect strategically pertinent information and support for the successful pursuit of war operations in occupied Europe. Unaware, or not worried about the implications, Justice Davis approved the naming of the Branch.

4 Memorandum by Trace Philipps, European Adviser, to Deputy Minister, Hon. Mr. Justice T.C. Davis, October 2, 1942, file “Foreign section – Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship,” vol. 36, RG44, LAC.

5 Memorandum by Tracy Philipps “Plans of 13th January, 20th May (Washington) and 17th June 1941,” dated October 16, 1941, in file 25, vol.1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

6 At the time it was established in autumn of 1941, the role of the American Foreign Nationalities Branch was to serve the information needs of the Department of State on the political conditions abroad as reflected domestically by members of various ethnic minorities. With the USA joining the war and with the establishment of the Office of Strategic Services in June 1942, the assignment of the Foreign Nationalities Branch was re-phrased as maintaining “contact with foreign nationality groups in the United States to aid in the collection of essential information for the execution of psychological warfare operations in consultation with the State Department.” See, US War Department, Office of the Assistant Secretary of War, Strategic Services Unit, History Project, War Report of the OSS (Office of Strategic Services), with a new introduction by Kermit Roosevelt (New York: Walker and Company, 1976) p. 199.

7 Memorandum to Tracy Philipps, signed T.C. Davis, Deputy Minister, November 2, 1942, file 16, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 17, 1940</td>
<td>Department of National War Services established, with James Gardiner (a former Premier of Saskatchewan) as Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23, 1940</td>
<td>Mr. Justice T.C. Davis (a former Minister in Gardiner's government in Saskatchewan) appointed Associate Deputy Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 1941</td>
<td>J.T. Thorson, another Minister from the Prairies, becomes Minister responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1941</td>
<td>Reorganization of the Department, creation of a special section within the Bureau of Public Information to deal with communities of non-British or non-French Origin, with Tracy Philipps as senior European Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 1942</td>
<td>First meeting of the advisory Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship (CCCC), chaired by Prof. Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 1942</td>
<td>Signing of the ministerial order officially establishing the CCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11, 1942</td>
<td>CCCC’s second regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1942</td>
<td>First wave of attacks on Philipps for having fascist connections, reported in <em>The New Republic and the Globe and Mail</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 1942</td>
<td>J.T. Thorson appointed President of the Exchequer Court and replaced by Major-General L.R. LaFlèche as Minister of National War Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5, 1942</td>
<td>Justice Davis leaves office to become High Commissioner to Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 1943</td>
<td>C.H. Payne appointed Deputy Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer-Autumn 1943</td>
<td>Second wave of attacks on Philipps launched by several ethnic organizations and ‘foreign-language’ newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 25-26, 1943</td>
<td>Third and last full meeting of the CCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6-7, 1944</td>
<td>Joint meeting of WIB and the Nationalities Branch on the division of labour as regards the reviewing of Canadian “foreign-language press”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 1944</td>
<td>Robert England assumes temporary directorship of the Branch with the view to reorganizing it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 1944</td>
<td>Tracy Philipps leaves office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1944</td>
<td>Minister LaFlèche gives a series of speeches on the valuable contribution of ethnic minorities to the war effort and the merits of government involvement in encouraging understanding among people of different cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 1944</td>
<td>Robert England reports on the reorganization of the Branch and the creation of a Citizenship Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 12, 1945</td>
<td>CCCC is disbanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26, 1945</td>
<td>Citizenship Branch is transferred to the Department of Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Boards, Offices, Commissions Records, vol. 13, RG36, LAC; Department of National War Services Records, vol. 35-36, RG44, LAC; Tracy Philipps Fonds, MG30 E350, LAC.
The Team

Even before the Branch was established, Philipps had already set out a list of possible avenues of action: public speaking, private personal contacts, radio broadcasting, collaboration with newspapers published in languages other than English and French (so-called “foreign-language press”). Those were all activities he had already pursued under contract with the RCMP in 1941 when preparing the groundwork for the job he would land by the end of that year within the departmental framework of the National War Services and its Bureau of Public Information. The members of his advisory committee, the Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship, had no objections. As to the objectives, Philipps was particularly concerned with defusing the foreign influence of war propaganda from Berlin and Rome among Canadian ethnic communities and denouncing the equally demoralizing effects of communist activism. The Committee members were instead more interested in policy-making concerning matters of employment discrimination against citizens with foreign-sounding names, in improving procedures of naturalization, and in increasing cultural exchanges among majority and minority groups within the population.8

Philipps promptly set to work. He remained responsible for public speaking and personal contacts with communities. The task of scanning “foreign-language” press -- some 75 newspapers and periodicals -- and communicating with their editors

---

8 See summaries of discussion of the first and second meeting of the CCCC, January 10, and March 11, 1942, file 1, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC, or file “Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship,”, vol. 36, RG44, LAC.
and publishers befell on Dr. Vladimir Julian Kysilewsky, an Ukrainian Canadian friend and protegé of Philipps from pre-war days in England who conveniently changed his name to a more familiar-sounding V.J. Kaye, thus disguising his Slav origin. ⁹ There was also an editorial assistant, Miss Grant, experienced in radio-broadcasting and editing. The three of them, with some secretarial staff, formed the Branch. Tracy Philipps’ secretary was a young woman. For a man like Philipps with a long service in military intelligence and colonial government, high politics and war were undoubtedly a man’s business, and he once expressed his opinion that a good secretary was supposed to approve wholehearted the “personality and methods” of the person he or she worked for. A secretary, he said, “is an intimate thing in a man’s work ...the personal touch cannot, and should not, be eliminated from it ... I always had men [his emphasis] as Private Secretaries, which I prefer.” ¹⁰

Moreover, Philipps had a very strong opinion on the particular qualifications people needed to have in order to perform well in this type of work, in addition to the general requirements of having the right kind of character and some proof of adaptability, sensibility and a sense of mission. He wanted applicants vetted by the RCMP to detect potential communist connections. ¹¹ He believed that very distinct life

---

⁹ In the existing documentation and literature the spelling of “Kysilewsky” varies: Kysilevsky, Kisilewsky, Kysilewskyj, etc.

¹⁰ Tracy Philipps to G. Simpson, Chairman of the CCCC, August 5, 1942, .file 33, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

¹¹ See the exchange of correspondence between Philipps and J. Leopold of RCMP in May 1943, regarding a candidate for a secretarial job with the Branch, who, according to RCMP, appeared to have been subscribing to Canadian Tribune, a “communist” newspaper. Philipps considered it “exceedingly lucky” that he had inquired with
experiences were necessary for the job, none of them really related to Canada and the problems of social integration by ethnic communities. Thus, knowing European languages was not enough; having lived in a country of eastern or southern Europe neither. Unless, he argued, the person had travelled extensively in the area and knew several different countries and nationalities – preferably by living and working there with peasants and workers rather than the educated elite – the potential candidate for the job might inevitably, and without being conscious of it, exercise a certain positive bias towards the ethnic population he or she knew best from personal experience, and thus be unable to view with objectivity the persisting prejudices and feuds among different groups. In other words, specialization in any one nation, in his view, bred inevitable and unconscious partiality, and therefore constituted “a grave handicap”.  

That was the reason why, in his view, many of the translators employed by the government in other departments (customs or press censorship, for instance) were mostly unreliable. This was especially the case if they were political exiles or refugees and inevitably lacked the “historical objectivity and political self-control” necessary for the job. “The temptation to get back on political opponents, personal enemies or other ethnic groups, may sometimes prove irresistible,” he used to argue.

---

RCMP prior to hiring her. In file 9, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
12 Memorandum by Tracy Philipps dated November 6, 1943, in file 23, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
13 Letter by Tracy Philipps to Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs [Norman Robertson], April 8, 1942, file 4, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. In a Memorandum to G.H. Lash, BPI Director, Philipps also commented on the lack of “political ability” of the Examination staff of the Directorship of Censorship hired to read “foreign-language” publications and make objective interpretative comments. He argued that
Dr. Kaye by contrast had his full confidence. Philipps considered him a highly able person, “one of the most transparently and scrupulously honest men” he had ever met, with no ambitions of a public nature, and almost as devoted to England as to Canada.\textsuperscript{14} Kaye was born in western Ukraine, which was at the time part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. With a PhD degree from the University of Vienna he emigrated to Canada in 1924 and became a Canadian citizen in 1930.\textsuperscript{15} By then Kaye had already become actively involved in the life of the Ukrainian community, and, having acquired some journalistic experience with the Ukrainian press in North America, he soon landed the position of head of the Ukrainian Press Bureau in London, England where he met Philipps, married “a very straightforward English girl,”\textsuperscript{16} and obtained another doctorate in Slavonic and East European Studies at the University of London under the supervision of Prof. Seton-Watson, a renowned expert in minority rights. In 1940, Kaye returned to Canada and was soon lured by Philipps to join the civil service and help him maintain contacts with Ukrainian and other Slav communities as well as keep track of the abundant ‘foreign-language’ press. While some Ukrainians invested a lot of trust in him as a “medium of contact”

\textsuperscript{14} Letter by Tracy Philipps to the British High Commissioner, dated February 19, 1941, in file 17, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\textsuperscript{15} Library and Archives of Canada, Manuscript Division. \textit{Finding Aid No.1409: “Kaye (Kysilewsky) Vladimir Julian, MG 31, D 69”} (Ottawa, 1999)

\textsuperscript{16} This is how Philipps described Mrs. Kaye in the letter to the British High Commissioner, February 19, 1941, in file 17, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
between the Government and the Ukrainian community, others saw in him a servile civil servant, "more monarchistic than the British themselves" who did not merit, by acumen or deed, the respect he had been given by his Canadian compatriots.\footnote{17} According to the Chairman of the CCCC, George Simpson, Kaye seemed to have "no stomach for political squabbles and controversy."\footnote{18} He excelled, instead, "in assembling information and statistics" and was a hard and conscientious worker to the point of developing stomach ulcers, falling seriously ill and being obliged to take prolonged sick leaves on several occasions during the 1942-44 period.\footnote{19}

Replacing Kaye during his absences was not easy, and not only because of Philipps' high-staked requirements. The fact was that until Spring 1944 the budget allocated for the maintenance of the Branch was minimal and hiring of additional help seemed out of the question. The estimates for the 1942-43 fiscal year were set at $25,567 and for the year 1943-44 at 18,347. The actual expenditures approved were

\footnote{17} Regarding the question of "trust", see, letter by W. Swystun of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee to Tracy Philipps, dated April 5, 1941 in file 19, vol. 1, MG30 E350, LAC; for the critical assessment of Kaye, see B. Panchuk, \textit{Heroes of Their Day} (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1983) p. 52; and S. Frolick, \textit{Between Two Worlds} (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1990) p. 118.

\footnote{18} Letter by G.W. Simpson to Justice T.C. Davis, November 17, 1942, in file 8-9-1, "Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship," vol. 13, series 31, RG36, LAC.

\footnote{19} Kaye's recollections of these days with the Nationalities Branch were recorded in Michael Ewanchuk, \textit{Reflections and Reminiscences: Ukrainians in Canada, 1892-1992} (Winnipeg: The Author, 1994) pp. 91-106. Kaye remained in the civil service until 1962, working for the Citizenship Branch of the Department of Secretary of State as researcher on the settlement in Canada of eastern European communities, in particular the Ukrainian. From 1950 to 1960 he also taught at the University of Ottawa.
much lower: $11,608.68 and 9,032.66, respectively. Exasperated, Philipps pointed out on one occasion that the cost of running the Branch and performing a public service with a long-lasting effect on the cohesion and unity of the country was “only slightly over half of the cost [his emphasis] of one 25-pounder gun of which the work, although necessary, is only temporary and wholly destructive.”

Nevertheless, in the late summer of 1942, the Branch hired on contract three field operators, Bela Eisner, Dr. Alfred Fossati and Peter Taraska, with the assignment to travel through western Canada and make contacts with scattered settlements of Hungarians, Italians and Poles, respectively. The idea was that they would test the political inclinations of various organizations and individuals and appeal to their loyalty and willingness to contribute to the war efforts of the Allies. They were also advised to try or help organize a group of liberal-minded community leaders to co-operate with the government in these efforts. The experiment turned out to be unsuccessful: their activities raised suspicions among the groups and even triggered an investigation by the RCMP. The idea of sending out a similar type of emissaries to visit other ethnic settlements was subsequently abandoned.

---

20 See, for the estimates, the official history report on the Advisory Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship (Nationalities Branch), Department of National War Services, p. 17, and for the expenditures, Appendix 9 to the same report, both in vol. 16, RG35, series 7, LAC.


22 About the project of short-term employment of field workers and liaison officers attached to the Branch, see the Memorandum by T.C. Davis, Associate Deputy Minister to T.B. Wallace, Chief Treasury Officer, dated August 31, 1942, file
Collecting Information

There was more behind the difficulties in hiring new people than just lack of perfectly suited qualifications. Philipps and Kaye shared a one-room office space in the newly constructed Supreme Court Building appropriated by the government for its expanded war activities. Any newly hired person would be confined to the same office space and would be inevitably privy to confidential conversations carried on by phone or with visitors who in turn might find this situation objectionable and thus stop communicating to Philipps privileged, off-the-record information they might possess and which he badly wanted to obtain.\textsuperscript{23} He was after all, and most of all, an intelligence officer by formation and predilection. The essential part of his foremost mandate, as he believed it to be, was collecting secret and strategic information about

\textsuperscript{23} On October 18, 1942 Philipps wrote to his Deputy Minister explaining his objection to hiring a temporary staff member during Kaye's extended sick leave and to having to share the office room with him: "But it is quite impossible to expect foreign-born people to come to speak confidentially to me in front of any third person, and more particularly of a stranger from another foreign-born community." See, file 22, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
foreign influences and manoeuvres among nationalist, pro-fascist or pro-communist groups of European origin and pass it over to the appropriate authorities (the RCMP, Department of External Affairs, as well as US or British intelligence services). There was also the need to appease "foreign-born" communities, expose the Nazi and communist propaganda as being enemy infiltration, convince some prominent community leaders to co-operate with the government -- all this with the purpose of helping Allies of the English-speaking nations win the war. The information sometimes concerned individuals or groups of people with suspect political motivations and their activities among members of their community. It sometimes consisted of rumours that might destabilize public opinion. Whatever the case, it was passed to the RCMP for their records.²⁴

Collecting information on various and scattered communities of European origin was done in two ways. Kaye was mainly responsible for getting hold of statistical material and amassing as much as possible any existing and reliable information on the history of their settlements; on their social and community life; religious affiliations; mutual benefit societies and other community organizations and institutions; leading personalities; as well as on the press in their respective languages

²⁴ "For what it is worth" thus wrote Philipps to the RCMP Assistant Commissioner, F.J. Mead on February 23, 1943, passing to him information he received from "usually well-informed folk" about some seemingly suspect activities of a person of Hungarian origin who had recently arrived from the States. See file 9, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. For a similar communication on another Hungarian considered suspect for being a nationalist provocateur, see Philipps' letter to Mead dated March 12, 1943, ibid, as well as Memorandum to the Minister signed by Tracy Philipps on March 13, 1943, in file 15, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
and readership.\textsuperscript{25} It was the sort of information that would not be stored in the RCMP files or compiled in the form of formal, but quickly outdated census figures. At his end, Philipps was acquiring up-to-date information through personal contacts with various community leaders, church authorities and employers, but also from people he met during his lecture tours and impromptu visits.

Philipps was very proud of his ability to make people welcome and talk to him. He insisted however on never approaching a group or a community without being invited. He attributed the large number of invitations he received from various groups in the course of 1941 and 1942 to his way of speaking about their homelands based on his first-hand knowledge acquired during the pre-war travels through Eastern Europe. In the language and style adjusted to the level of education of the audience before him he would explain the political and strategic consequences of the progress of war operations in Europe and tell what the Canadian government itself was doing to win the war.\textsuperscript{26}

In exchange to such imparting of his intimate knowledge of their homeland he would receive information of particular value if connected with the war waged in

\textsuperscript{25} An extensive part of the material thus collected by Kaye can be found stored in V.J. Kaye Fonds, MG31 D69, LAC.

\textsuperscript{26} See his letter to James Mess, President of the Association of Canadian Clubs, dated November 20, 1940 in which he divided his audiences in two categories: (a) "professional men" (clergy, school teachers) and (b) farmers and "manual masses". He would address professionals first and explain to them complicated concepts of Canadian way of life, such as democracy, patriotism, rights and responsibilities, freedom etc. He would speak to less educated audiences with the help of maps, folk stories and proverbs in their mother tongue and leave to the professionals to serve as interpreters, transmitters or influencers when it came to explain the more abstract terms. In file 165, Part II, vol. 18, RG26, LAC.
Europe and if it gave him an insight into the social dynamics of a particular community. This was helpful as several of the communities of European origin seemed fully engaged in making everything possible to influence the political outcome of the war inasmuch their homelands were concerned. Within communities of Ukrainian, Polish, Croat, Slovak or Finnish immigrants, for example, there were individuals and sometimes well organized groups which vigorously lobbied American, Canadian and British governments for a national independence for their old country or people. There were those who thought that a fascist puppet state would be a better fate than a communist regime. There were communist sympathizers and activists who fought for exactly the opposite to happen. And then there were those who were sufficiently integrated as Canadians and as British subjects to believe that their homelands were best served with a strong victory of the Western Allies.

“Situations Which Appear to Be Producing Misunderstanding, Dissatisfaction or Discord...”

Not all information involved incidences of nazi, fascist or communist infiltrations and propaganda war. During his trips from one industrial centre to another Philipps was able to pick up a variety of pieces of information providing indications of “difficulties, rumours, job-discriminations, grievances and attitudes in the groups concerned.”27 As he told a British friend in early 1941, “there are so many

27 “Note on Field Work” attached to the briefing material prepared by Tracy Philipps on January 13, 1943 describing the work of the Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship, in file 13, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
Canadas to understand, and they understand each other so little, that it takes time and
much travel and very varied [his emphasis] contacts before one can get a proper
perspective of the underlying picture."28 This was definitely within the mandate of his
Branch and the CCCC as a whole, as stated in the ministerial order of January 27,
1942 which created it:

> to interest itself in situations which appear to be producing
> misunderstanding, dissatisfaction or discord among groups
> of Canadians of European origin, non-French and non-
> British, or between those groups and other Canadian
citizens, and if it is thought advisable, to make
> representations with respect to such situations to the
> appropriate bodies or authorities.

Philipps paid attention to several such "situations" with varied success.

Following are some examples.

**Discrimination in Employment**

There was abundant information, for instance, on discrimination in employment. People were losing their employment or were unable to find one because of their continental European origin easily detectable by their "foreign-
sounding" names. One of the original arguments for creating the Branch in 1941 was
exactly this labour problem. Prejudice and discrimination did not affect only those
labelled "enemy aliens". Indiscriminate public concerns were expressed across the
country that people of foreign, European origin, kept working or looking for jobs
while fine home-grown young men of British origin enlisted in the army and went

---

28 Letter by Tracy Philipps to Sir Gerald Campbell, [Head of the British Information
Office in New York], March 14, 1941, file 18, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
overseas to fight for freedom. Being in war, however, the country could not afford to dispense with any loyal Canadian able to work or join the armed forces. At the same time, politicians, government information agencies and the police were spreading cautionary messages about potential sabotage and enemy infiltration. The brisk rounding up and internment of enemy aliens heightened the atmosphere of suspicion and prejudice against "foreigners". Particularly targeted were residents of German and Italian origin, but xenophobic prejudice extended the discrimination in employment to many others with non-Anglo-Saxon- or French names. The Globe and Mail reported the case of a Toronto man who forged his National Registration Card by giving himself an Anglo-Saxon name in order to get a job. The paper argued that without proper guidance from the government the employers were compelled to assume themselves the task of sorting out loyal from dangerous individuals as best as they could and should not have been burdened with such a responsibility. At the same time local relief agencies were unwilling to direct public money towards the provision of assistance to those who remained unemployed for reasons of being suspect as enemy aliens and thus unable to feed their families. In the midst of almost hysterical scaremongering about potential sabotage and fifth column activities in

29 "His Name Against Him," The Globe and Mail, December 26, 1941. The Montreal Star of December 30, 1941 identified the man as Myrm Chuknoski.

30 In an article entitled "Enemy Aliens Prove Problem," The Montreal Star reported that the Toronto Board of Control in charge of delivering welfare relief to people in need, applied to the Federal Government for instruction on what to do with enemy aliens who were not interned and who were unable to secure employment. The Board's application was triggered by a letter addressed to the Board by an Italian with ten children fit for work but unemployable by reason of his origin. The Montreal Star, October 30, 1941.
Canada, the public opinion was not ready for any official gesture of good will or social assistance for those considered “foreigners” in dire need of basic subsistence.\(^\text{31}\)

Representations of concerns expressed by National War Services Minister Gardener and his Deputy Minister Davis to the ministers of Justice and Labour eventually resulted in a circular letter to employers and trade union leadership signed by N.A. McLarty, Minister of Labour on March 14, 1941. The circular praised employers for their vigilance in preventing sabotage and for scrutinizing with so much care the credentials of their employees in order to avoid any serious trouble. Nevertheless, the letter considered “proper, however, to ask that some care be exercised that citizens of Canada and resident aliens of undoubted loyalty and of known good character should not be subjected to unjust treatment merely because of foreign name or birth.” How could one build “a truly national spirit”, the letter argued, without the support of those who pledged to Canada “the allegiance they formerly owed to the country of their birth”?\(^\text{32}\)

Once at the helm of the Nationalities Branch, Philipps re-launched the subject of employment discrimination. The effort resulted in a policy statement approved by Deputy Minister Davis and made public in May 1942. There is a difference in approach between McLarty’s and Philipps’ advisory to employers at large, no doubt reflecting changing economic realities of the war efforts and the new and encouraging

\(^{31}\) See Chapter 2, above, for more details on this matter.

\(^{32}\) Circular letter to Employers of Labour and Secretaries of Trade Unions “Re – Employment of Citizens and Aliens”, signed by N.A. McLarty, Minister of Labour, March 14, 1941, file “German and Italian Unemployment,” vol. 36, RG44, LAC.
developments in favour of the Allies in the world conflict. Instead of dwelling on the need to safeguard national security and to respect precepts of Christian morality and justice, Philipps, the rational technician, emphasized, on one hand, the practicality of the problem (the need for skilled manpower) and on the other, the "technicality" that exasperates it: the labels "foreigner" or "enemy alien" used in policy statements and official transactions to categorize people according to their place of origin while making the abstraction of the fact that many individuals thus labelled and ostracized were perfectly loyal to Canada and willing to support its war effort. "The employment of these persons, whether in Government work or in private industry," argued Philipps' circular letter, "should be fully encouraged, after clearance has been obtained from the prescribed official authorities." The underlining argument of the letter was that the war Canadians were engaged in was about "decenty and a square deal for all" and those who had chosen Canada to live and enjoy full equality of opportunity for themselves and their children "will cherish and defend the land where in practice [his emphasis] this square deal is found."  

33 "Consideration regarding the employment of Canadians who have foreign-sounding names and of those who are not yet citizens", dated May 25, 1942. See file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC. Some of the expressions in Philipps' circular could be found in a similar statement by US President Roosevelt issued earlier that year (for example: "we are fighting for decency" appears in both texts, and Roosevelt's reference to the Nazi-professed technique of "Pit race against race, religion against religion, prejudice against prejudice. Divide and conquer!" becomes in Philipps' text: "Put race against race; creed against creed; prejudice against prejudice. Divide and conquer"). See the press clipping from New York Herald Tribune of January 3, 1942 entitled "Roosevelt Asks Job Protection for Alien-Born – Expresses Deep Concern at Discharges, Says Sons of 'Foreigners' Defend U.S.," in file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC. On the US government concerns with ethnic discrimination in
Philipps did not pursue the campaign as such any further. The workers' rights issues were a private matter to be resolved between employers and themselves. Philipps' subsequent and preferred method was private persuasion rather than government policy statements. In addition, as he often stated, the Branch operated under the working formula that "(1) at least half of this War has to be won in the mines, shipyards and factories of North America" and (2) "more than half the heavy Labour operating the heavy industries is 'foreign born'." This kept Philipps focus on the "foreignness" of the workers rather than on their status and rights as workers.\(^34\) He wanted to elaborate ways how to replace their supposed tendency to think and function in terms of their old country with the imperative concerns of helping Canada and its Allies win the war.

**Recruitment in the Armed Forces**

Of particular interest to Philipps and the CCCC members was also how to avoid discrimination in the armed forces and to encourage able young people of immigrant descent to enlist. At issue was equality of opportunity and treatment at the

\(^34\) The statement that "more than half of the heavy skilled labour" was foreign-born was later contested in a confidential annex to the official history of the Nationalities Branch as not having been properly established. It was argued that half of the labour in Canadian industry was of British origin, one quarter to one third were French Canadians and only 24 percent of continental European origin, with half of them born in Canada. See part II of the history of the Advisory Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (Nationalities Branch), Department of National War Services, in vol. 16, series 7, RG 35, LAC.
level of recruitment, assignments, services available and selection of officer material regardless of ethnic or religious distinction. While evidence existed that many so-called “foreign-born” young men and women joined the forces, still no numbers could be provided to corroborate the extent of the phenomenon in the early years of the war. Attempts in the House of Commons to extract some information mostly failed, with the government claiming that such data were either not easy to extract from the files or were protected information. Eventually, on June 1, 1943, the Minister of Defence, J.L. Ralston, informed the House that the origin of 25,000 Canadian soldiers was other than British and that 2,500 of them originated from an enemy country. Of the latter, 65 to 70 per cent had been naturalized prior to enlistment, specified the Minister.35 A year later, in a speech promoting a new policy approach to citizenship and integration, the Minister of National War Services, Major-General LaFlèche, claimed that the number of enlisted in the armed forces “who speak not only English or French but have a second language, speaking a European tongue fluently” was enough to form three divisions, one full division speaking a Slav language, with twelve thousand of these speaking Ukrainian. Moreover, announced LaFleche proudly: “I think you know something of the hesitancy with which we have accepted Hungarians and Italians in our forces and yet we have a thousand speaking Hungarian and over two thousand two hundred speaking Italian.” And he added: “... no one race in Canada has a monopoly of

gallantry just as no one race has a monopoly of patriotism.” Ten percent of those killed in action, according to data provided by LaFlèche, were non-Anglo-Saxon and non-French.36

Such type of recognition was not evident in the early days of the war. Efforts had to be deployed to secure some basic accommodations and services for the recruits of diverse origins and religions. Letters had to be written arguing the necessity of appointing army chaplains to administer to the spiritual needs of Greek Catholic or Orthodox soldiers serving abroad.37 At a conference of district recruiting officers in October 1942, attended by one of the founding members of the CCCC, Robert England, and by Philipps, England argued in favour of enhancing the process of recruiting young men and women of “European extraction” in the army. They could be invaluable, was one of England’s arguments, because of their linguistic skills. The conference concluded with the recommendation to assign a non-Anglo-Saxon clerk to various recruiting stations to alleviate “the recruiting problem among foreign-born.” It was also recommended to give extra consideration “to potential officer material of

36 “Extract from an Address by Major General The Honourable L.R. Laflèche to the Dominion Convention of the Canadian Legion of the B.E.S.L., at Vancouver, B.C. June 1944,” in “Appendices – Citizenship Division, Department of National War Services” being part of the official history of the Advisory Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (Nationalities Branch), in vol. 16, series 7, RG35, LAC.

37 Thus, for instance, a letter by Rev. Stephen Semczuk, President of Clergy Association of St. Paul, Winnipeg to G.W. Simpson, dated March 4, 1942, pointed out that an Ukrainian Orthodox Church Chaplain had been appointed but not, as yet, an Ukrainian Catholic Chaplain, although promised. The matter was resolved positively a few days later. See file 6, vol. 11, V.J. Kaye Fonds, MG31 D69, Reel H-3005, LAC.
non-Anglo-Saxon origin.” Earlier that month, the Department of External Affairs issued a press release announcing the compulsory military service for registered aliens whether from Allied countries or British subjects from other Commonwealth countries. Enemy aliens who declared their intent to apply for naturalization were also liable for compulsory service. Philipps expressed his concerns: what would happen to a foreign-born “with European looks and accent, not yet naturalized” if captured by the enemy and recognized as citizen of his old country? He pointed out that such a person could be, in full legality, declared traitor of his country of origin by his captors.

Reflecting further on the subject, Philipps felt compelled to elaborate on the issue of potential conflict arising from the latent or revived loyalty to the old country haunting the enlisted “men of recent European origin” and specifically those from Germany:

As I see it, we are fighting Germans and Germanism which has not changed its foul fundamentals ever since Germans came into the ken of recorded history. There is moreover in this generation such a call-of-the-blood among Germans,

38 “Minutes of Conference of District Recruiting Officers, Defence Council Chambers, Ottawa, Ontario, 5-6-7 October 1942. Meeting of 7 October 1942: Recruiting of Aliens and Nationals,” in file 26-1-A, vol. 2, RG26, LAC. In June 1943, MP for Vegerville (Alberta), Anthony Hlynka, also raised the issue of preference given to people of British origin as “officer material, whereas the others were left behind.” See, Debates of the House of Commons, 4th session-19th Parliament (January 28, 1943-January 26, 1944), p. 3435.


40 Ibid.
such a magnetic mysticism at work for “Deutchum”, and such an “enthusiasm for its pseudo-greatness”, that is scarcely reasonable, apart from an internal civil war, to expect (when it comes to the real point) Germans to kill Germans in order to defeat Germany especially when these young men would be fighting for Germany’s enemies under our (to them) foreign flag.  

Antisemitism

Undoubtedly, Philipps did not trust the whole German nation. He was convinced that “Even German Jews, who hate Hitler, are at heart Jewish German” and should be kept under observation until the war was over. The Jewish plight in Europe was altogether a difficult issue for Philipps and the CCCC. Questioned what had been done so far to stop the spread of the “most deplorable” of prejudices, Philipps legitimized the evident inaction -- his own as well as that of others -- by evoking the existence of a shared responsibility in that matter between perpetrators and the very objects of what he called “anti-Judaism” or negative attitudes towards “real or imaginative character and conduct of Jews:”

It is doubtful whether the Government of Canada would feel able to undertake work among Jews to beg them to abandon the characteristics with which they are rightly or wrongly credited in relations to non-Jews or, on the other hand, to beg French and Anglo-Canadians to desist from disliking Jews wherever and if they do. Such characteristics or prejudice are probably largely matters of economic balance, and of

---

41 Memo to Deputy Adjutant-General (C), “Enlistment of Men of Recent European Origin from Germany,” signed by Tracy Philipps, dated October 27, 1942, in file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.

42 Ibid. This rationale reflected what was happening in Great Britain where thousands of Jewish and anti-Nazi refugees from Germany and Austria were interned in May 1940 and a great number of them shipped to Canada’s internment camps.
eventual enlightening education which lies within the provincial sphere.\textsuperscript{43}

In late 1943, a certain Mr. Sigmund Samuel from Toronto approached the government with the request to be allowed to join the CCCC as a full member as he felt that his services would be of value to the Committee.\textsuperscript{44} The Deputy Minister of the Department of National War Services, C.H. Payne suggested to his minister to give a negative answer, and he explained why: “If, as it would appear, Mr. Samuel’s main interest is in immigration of people of Jewish persuasion, it is difficult to see what contribution he could make to the work of the Committee.” Payne then reminded the minister that the purpose of the Committee was the promotion of mutual understanding between citizens of French and British origin with citizens of European origin.\textsuperscript{45} The clear implication of Payne’s remark -- whether bureaucratically, politically or antisemitically inspired -- was that promoting the understanding of the humanitarian drama of European refugees who happened to be Jewish, and then give moral support to Jewish communities in Canada to help alleviate that drama as best as they could, did not fall under the provisions of the CCCC’s mandate.

\textsuperscript{43} Note [by Tracy Philipps] dated July 13, 1943; “Question: What is being done by the non-Ukrainian advisers of the Ukrainians to combat anti-semitism?” file 32, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. The emphasis is in the original.

\textsuperscript{44} Letter by Norman A. Robertson, Under-secretary of State for External Affairs to General LaFleche, Minister of National War Services, December 4, 1943, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.

\textsuperscript{45} Deputy Minister Chester Payne to Minister LaFleche, December 14, 1943, file 29, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
Doukhobors

When the Minister of National War Services responsible for the National Resources Mobilization programme, Joseph Thorson, faced the impasse in trying to break the resistance of certain more isolated Doukhobor communities to participate in the war efforts, Philipps, in his capacity as European Adviser, offered a possible solution. Referring to his experiences in the Near East and eastern and central Europe, and the supposed suspicious nature of some of the tightly closed-in communities, Philipps suggested hiring under a short-term service contract a private person with no visible links with the authorities to undertake a reconnaissance mission. The person would be of Slavic origin, know the language and have “basic qualifications for penetrating behind the tortuous scene of their minds.” The person would then “go to their area in apparent pursuance of his own agricultural avocation” which would not raise any suspicion and be welcome by the communities. He would then employ himself in searching for root causes of their refusal to cooperate and in finding practical suggestions to resolve the situation, having the advantage of looking at it from a fresh slant that so far had escaped government officials. Philipps had already identified such a man, a forester and member of the Pulp and Paper Association who had also already expressed his willingness to take the assignment. The mission never materialized. ⁴⁶

The Plebiscite of 1942

The Nationalities Branch was instructed to take no action as regards to the plebiscite on conscription organized on April 27, 1942. The argument was that the

⁴⁶ Memorandum on Doukhobors, signed by Tracy Philipps, dated June 15, 1942, in file “Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship,” vol. 36, RG44, LAC.
plebiscite was a political matter, organized by a party in power. While the negative vote in the province of Quebec was expected, it turned out that a considerable number of “no” votes were found in western Canada in electoral districts with a high percentage of voters of French-Canadian, German and Ukrainian origin.\(^{47}\) Philipps implied in his report to the new Minister of National War Services, Major-General LaFlèche, that the disturbing results could have been averted if the Branch and the Committee members had been given the time and the possibility of “organizing and enlightening” the foreign-born “jungle”. The apparent slowness and inability of that “jungle” to grasp the political thinking behind the vote, was due, he argued, to the mental confusion created by having been told so many times in previous campaigns by Canadian authorities that conscription was unnecessary.\(^{48}\) He also blamed the anti-war propaganda by the Canadian Left carried in the early days of the war (before Germany attacked the Soviet Union in June 1941) for leaving some deep impressions in the minds of the “foreign-born” with the idea that conscription and total war were undesirable. While concentrating so much on domestic communist influence, Philipps omitted mentioning that some of the negative vote might have just as well reflected the persistent and profound disagreements among supporters of different Ukrainian organizations as to what should be the future prospects of the Ukrainian nation,

---

\(^{47}\) For a summary of the results in the districts with a majority of “no” votes as reported in Canada Gazette, see, Thomas M. Prymak, Maple Leaf and Trident: The Ukrainian Canadians during the Second World War (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1988) p.163. See also, “Where the “No” Vote Lay Here,” Winnipeg Free Press, April 29, 1942. The article published in the immediate wake of the plebiscite raised the spectrum of ethnic disloyalty and the criticism compelled the Free Press to retract in print the apparent insinuations.

\(^{48}\) “Brief report, as asked, for the personal information of General LaFlèche, Minister for National War Services, on the (a) origin, (b) aim and (c) functions of the Nationalities Branch,” (p. 4), dated December 26, 1942, in file 30, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
although, on the eve of the plebiscite, their leaders had pledged full support for the federal government’s initiative on their behalf. Among “no” voters were undoubtedly those who favoured Ukrainian independence from the Soviets and therefore disliked the idea of Canada’s strategic alliance with Russia in the war effort. In defence of their failure to secure a more unanimous expression of loyalty, some Ukrainian leaders also pointed out that the majority of “no” votes were registered in rural districts settled by Ukrainian peasants viscerally rejecting anything to do with conscription, the soldiering and going to war, things that had plagued their ancestors’ lives for centuries.49

_Maintaining Contact with Canadian Citizens of Non-British and Non-French Origin_

Philipps referred to his Ottawa’s office work in his capacity as government adviser as being “inward work”. Although he was known for long memoranda and elaborate style of writing, Philipps claimed that he disliked paperwork and preferred the “outward work”: going places, making contacts, meeting people, hearing news and rumours. One of the mandates of the CCCC, and his own, as provided in the ministerial order of January 27, 1942, was precisely,

_to maintain contact with Canadian citizens of non-British and non-French origin and to seek to interpret their points of view to the Government and to the Canadian public generally._

---

49 For an analysis of the plebiscite crisis from an Ukrainian Canadian point of view, see Prymak, _Maple Leaf and Trident_, pp. 69-81.
Philipps considered holding private talks in people’s homes and giving public lectures in clubs and meeting halls as most effective in the process of guiding disparate “foreign-born” communities and helping them gradually loose the characteristic aspects of their “foreignness”. That “foreignness” included: a particular thinking process, being the product of cultures very different from that informing the Anglo-Saxon societies; a strong attachment to their traditions, language and homeland and a historically ingrained mistrust of other nationalities; a fear of governments and authorities and an inferiority complex, in large part due to the treatment they received by the Anglo-Saxon majority since their arrival to the North-American continent. Mostly neglected by existing social and governmental institutions, and left to their own devices to survive and integrate the best they could, the various immigrant communities maintained their communal cohesions through their own churches and community centres and relied on support from any organization, political or nationalistic, which would approach them with information in their language and awake their love for the old country.

“Consolidation as a nation,” Philipps argued, “can only be attained by the natural process, agreeable to all the groups, of abating their feeling of neglect by attracting, as a whole, each ‘foreign-born’ community from the outside edge of the nation towards the centre which is a nation’s heart which is a nation’s Government.”
What they needed, he insisted, is a “dynamic and cohesive national mysticism for Canadiansim [sic] and for Canada.”

Each community, Philipps maintained, had to be approached on its own terms. The strategy Philipps devised consisted of identifying liberally-oriented individuals and cultivating in them the trust in government’s preparedness to recognize their loyalty and sense of citizenship. What was necessary, he argued, was to dispel their fears of neglect, discrimination and condescension on the part of the majority, as well as reduce their need to rely on their mutual benefit societies, self-protection committees and cultural associations, and lead them towards a quiet merging into the mainstream of the nation. What was also necessary, was to thwart enemy influence on the communities, whether that destructive influence came from the Fascist Right or the “Fascists of the Left”, as he used to refer to domestic communists. It was very important, in his view, “to anticipate and nullify all enemy action upon this essential human element whose misunderstanding, defection or slackening would probably

---

50 “Memorandum for the Deputy Minister and for the Committee,” signed by Tracy Philipps, dated September 25, 1942, appearing as an attachment to the “Brief report, as asked, for the personal information of General LaFlèche, Minister for National War Services, on the (a) origin, (b) aim and (c) functions of the Nationalities Branch,” dated December 26, 1942, in file 30, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. Emphasis is in the original.

51 For an example of how Philipps approached a particular community, see Chapter 7, sub-section 7.1: Case Study No.1: Italian Community.

52 Explanatory note dated January 9, 1943, attached to the briefing material prepared by Tracy Philipps on January 13, 1943 describing the work of the Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship, in file 13, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
lose us the war." He suggested in one of his numerous memorandums that the spirit that animated his (and CCCC's) work was political in the sense that it wishes to promote the adjustment of relationship between that part of the nation which is long settled in Canada and those more recently arrived, through governmental institutions, and it is Christian in that the work is inspired by the sense of elementary duty toward one's neighbour.  

On other occasions he compared his work to that of an engineer who tried to harness deep currents of water rushing in different directions in order to make them flow together and generate new power for the nation. He always argued that his work is as much inter-national as national and closer in nature and consequences to that of the Department of External Affairs than that of the Bureau of Public Information to which his Branch remained attached until the fall of 1942. Nevertheless, he did perceive his job as a matter of education, persuasion, moulding of mind and of changing a deeply ingrained type of "thought-process". As he

---

53 Letter by Tracy Philipps to Colonel O.M. Biggar, Director of censorship, dated June 27, 1942, in file 31, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

54 Briefing material prepared by Tracy Philipps on January 13, 1943 describing the work of the Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (p.1), in file 13, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. The emphasis is in the original.

55 In moments of despair, not sensing sufficient support by his superiors, Philipps used a different simile: "In a time of war and total 'state-of-emergency', a trained navigating-Officer is sent out with his ship to embark foreign-born WHITE CARGO. The only things which are withheld [sic] from him are Orders, his Course, a Compass, a crew or a port of destination. It therefore only remains for him to be court-martialed for saving dagoes." Behind that statement lurked remnants of some dark colonial references to Africa and the slave trade, as well as racial stereotypes linked with prejudices against Italian immigrant working-class. See personal letter by Tracy Philipps to the RCMP Commissioner [Wood], September 20, 1941, file 24, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
suggested: "Their confusion of mind arises from the fact that, within the economic frame of Canada (pay and housing etc.), they are still in spirit and in politics living and thinking (and often speaking) 'European'.” 56 It was his contention that the groups which needed most guidance and reinforcement were those whose second, namely European loyalty "if they still felt one, might be a matter of doubt." 57 In his opinion, this particularly applied to Italian, Ukrainian, Romanian, Finnish and Hungarian communities.

*Encouraging Cultural Activities Which May Promote Mutual Understanding*

The CCCC members showed particular interest for the aspect of their mandate that dealt with promoting cultural activities designed to enhance understanding and esteem among Canadians of different ethnic origins. A major project brought forward by John Murray Gibbon and Watson Kirkconnell at the first meeting of the Committee consisted of publishing in English translation some forty classics of continental European literature as a powerful testimony of the richness of the cultural tradition 'new Canadians' were representing. 58 The Committee members conceded,

56 "Brief report, as asked, for the personal information of General LaFlèche, Minister for National War Services, on the (a) origin, (b) aim and (c) functions of the Nationalities Branch," dated December 26, 1942, in file 30, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

57 Ibid.

58 For the proposal ("Three Year Plan") to publish a *Legacy of Literature Library*, see Memorandum for the Minister signed by G.W. Simpson, March 13, 1942 (with attachments) in file "Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship," vol. 36, RG44, LAC; and "Summary of discussion of the first Meeting of the Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship held in Room 268, House of Commons, on January 10th, 1942," file 1, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
however, that the project was far too ambitious and costly to be undertaken at the
time.\textsuperscript{59}

There were other ideas: a pamphlet showing the meaning of foreign-sounding
names and comparing them with their equivalents in English;\textsuperscript{60} visits of “British
yeomen’s farms, country houses and ancient institutions” by Canadian soldiers of
“non-British-Isles origins” stationed in England so that “they may appreciate the \textit{roots}
and \textit{fruits} of the spirit and the institutions on which all the sister English-speaking
nations are based today;”\textsuperscript{61} handicraft festivals and screening of National Film Board
documentaries. Once asked by a keen citizen from Kitchener-Waterloo on how to
promote inter-group relations, Philipps recommended to organize “a fine educational
show” of films produced by the National Film Board depicting Greek Orthodox or
Eastern Catholic wedding ceremony in an Ukrainian village or handicraft by some of
the many ethnic groups. “It would be wise to avoid seeming curiosities or freaks,” he
advised. “It would therefore be best to show such films, which are in colour and
wonderfully well executed, together [his emphasis] with films of communities of
(say) French, English or Irish origin.”\textsuperscript{10} One must not forget that these were still the
times when a Ukrainian wedding with folk costumes and colourful ceremonies taking

\textsuperscript{59} “Summary of discussion of the second Meeting of the Committee on Co-operation
in Canadian Citizenship held in Room 268, House of Commons, on March 11th,
1942”, file 1, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\textsuperscript{60} “Summary of discussion of the first Meeting of the Committee on Co-operation
in Canadian Citizenship held in Room 268, House of Commons, on January 10\textsuperscript{th}, 1942,”
(p. 2), file 1, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\textsuperscript{61} Letter by Tracy Philipps to Mr. M.R.K. Burge dated September 29, 1943, file 21,
vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. the emphasis is in the original.

\textsuperscript{10} Tracy Philipps to Mrs. W.P. Clement, Nationalities Friendship Council, Kitchener-
Waterloo Area, March 11, 1944, vol.2-24-5, RG26, LAC.
place in the middle of Canada could appear to Anglo-Saxon viewers as a curiosity of disturbing proportions for the future of an Anglo-Saxon Canada.

"Foreign-language" Broadcasting

Early in the war, radio broadcasting was recognized as a powerful long-distance vehicle of communications and propagandists of all sides took advantage of its accessibility in the most remote and isolated communities in order to distribute news, political messages and public announcements. The ministerial order of January 27, 1942 suggested that CCCC members collaborate with the two most important public information agencies, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) and the National Film Board (NFB) to reach out to the communities otherwise cut off from mainstream media because of the language barrier or geographic isolation. Philipps pursued this aspect of the mandate with persistence but without the results to his liking. Philipps lamented that, contrary to what happened in Great Britain and the US at the outbreak of the war, the Canadian government specifically declined to use foreign language in its public broadcasting and thus conceded "virtual monopoly" to the non-Canadian outsiders to communicate information in languages others than English and French.62 Philipps believed that supervised broadcasts of Canadian information in various European languages on domestic airwaves, preferably courtesy of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, would substantially help in dissipating the

62 "Memorandum on local broadcasting, to Canadian Communities of recent European origin, in the mothertongues in which the majority still think," dated June 14, 1942, signed Tracy Philipps, file 6, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
influence of radio broadcasts produced by Nazi and fascist enemies and transmitted by private stations located in the US.

As Philipps explained on several occasions, a carefully scripted radio programme for Canadian consumption should not take the form of a negative, counter-propaganda, namely an exercise in refuting the distorted information coming from abroad, but rather offer “positive” propaganda that would educate the “foreign-born” in realities of Canadian way of life and encourage them to identify themselves as Canadians. He even devised a plan for a 30-minute programme to be aired once a week in four different languages (Hungarian on Monday, Italian on Tuesday, Ukrainian on Wednesday and Finnish on Thursday) over regional CBC stations of Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Edmonton and Vancouver. The programme would be divided in three segments of 10 minutes: Canadian news and Canadian interpretation of news from their homeland; feature items (description of Canadian institutions, rights and duties of citizens, practical advice on starting a business, sketches from the history of both the homeland and Canada); music and cultural information. The programme would be adjusted regionally according to the concentration of a specific type of audience: industrial workers in eastern Canada, peasants and farmers in the Prairies.  

Philipps’ arguments in favour of a Canadian-made broadcast in non-English and non-French languages received an approving nod from the RCMP.  

---


64 See, letter by RCMP Commissioner S.T. Wood to Tracy Philipps, dated June 23,
instead, although sympathetic, rejected Philipps' proposal, having first consulted the Department of External Affairs on the matter.\textsuperscript{65} This was in line with the policy advocated by some prominent civil servants, notably Norman Robertson of the Department of External Affairs, of making deliberate attempts to ignore group particularism and approach individuals of different ethnic origin in terms of their being Canadian nationals and not as members of a particular group. With CBC out of the picture, Polish, Czech and Ukrainian groups, among others, resorted to services of private radio stations, some of them located in the US, to initiate limited programming addressed to the Canadian audience.\textsuperscript{66} Philipps felt uneasy about allowing these private stations broadcast messages, many of them on behalf of various domestic movements created in support of the armed resistance against Nazi occupation in their homelands, no matter how pro-Allied and officially sanctioned they might be. In his opinion, allowing these so-called free movements, whether Romanian, Polish, Austrian or Italian, discuss European post-war politics could only lead to blowing up embers of nationalistic discontent, "scattered everywhere in our Canadian population," and thus embitter inter-group relations.\textsuperscript{67} Norman Robertson

\textsuperscript{65} Letter by Augustin Frigon, CBC Acting General Manager to Tracy Philipps, dated September 28, 1943, file 21, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\textsuperscript{66} Letter by Tracy Philipps to James S. Thomson, CBC General Manager, September 18, 1943, file 21, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. According to the information provided by Alan Cranston, Chief of the Foreign Language Division, US Office of War Information, there were in the US about 145 radio stations broadcasting foreign language programmes in 30 different languages. See his letter to Tracy Philipps, dated March 16, 1943, in file 15, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\textsuperscript{67} Letter by Tracy Philipps to Norman Robertson, Department of External Affairs,
of the Department of External Affairs was of a different view, particularly if these national associations for the liberation of their homelands were conducting anti-Nazi propaganda at the same time. Discussing a particular case of the Free Romanian Movement launching a radio campaign on private radio stations to collect funds for the purchase of ambulance units to be used by the Red Cross in Europe, he argued that, on balance, those public announcements performed a useful job "in keeping before Canadians the fact that many Romanians are sincerely anti-Nazi." He also believed that the government should encourage a competition of such anti-Nazi, pro-Allied propaganda by various branches of these free movements and thus avoid the appearance of Canadian public commitment to any particular resistance group.⁶⁸

"Distributing News to the Foreign Language Press"

Philipps did not have much more luck in persuading the government officials in the Censorship Directorate, External Affairs, Wartime Information Board or the RCMP to give their consent to sending out to different editors and publishers of "foreign-language" press across the country detailed guidelines on what and how to publish news in their publications so that they would be Canadian oriented, supportive of the Allied war effort, and devoid, as much as possible, of references to

---

⁶⁸ Letter by Norman Robertson to G.W. Simpson, Chair of CCCC, January 15, 1942, in file 5, vol. 11, V.J. Kaye Fonds, MG31 D69, Reel H-3005, LAC.
or echoes of old country nationalist quarrels and European geopolitics. Financially restricted editors of the “foreign-language” press, relying on their own devices, made ample use of pre-edited material and information in their mother tongue available from the US, the homeland or even Moscow, Berlin or Rome. Philipps persistently highlighted to his superiors the role such press had in “perpetuating foreignness, by non-Canadian guidance and on non-Canadian issues, and thus retarding Canadianization.” His own guidelines were drafted following the American model produced by the Foreign Language Division of the Office of War Information (OWI). They were designed, as Philipps put it, “to supply, for editors sailing in a sea of controversy, the kind of guidance which a master-mariner can, if he wishes, get from a chart’s ‘aids to navigation’.” Any direct instruction on what was appropriate material for publication went counter, in the eyes of Canadian officials, to the British traditional respect of freedom of the press and received no sanction by any of the government departments Philipps approached for approval.

---


70 Ibid.


72 For more on the Branch’s relationship with the “foreign-language” press, see, below, Chapter 7, sub-section 7.1: “Case Study No.2: “Foreign-Language Press”.
"Summarized Diary" of Tracy Philipps:
Movements among "Foreign-born" Labour in Southern Ontario,
September 28 – October 10, 1941*

**SEPT. '41.**

28 Sun.  
To see Ukrs. & Finns on farms beyond SCHREIBER  
P.m. Jarvis St. Baptist Church to hear T.T. Shields public attack on Catholic  
Canada & on Dom. Govt.'s Postal Censorship.  
Wild words from a factory of bad blood bet. Ont. & Quebec.  
A breeder of nat. disruption. Charges quite unsubstantiated.  
Properly describable as "subversive".

29 Mon.  
Arrears of mail and correspondence. P.m.with Austrians and Croats.  
RCMP, ré f-b in Labour & strikes.

30 Tue.  
With Hungarian personality visiting from Wash'tn.  
Lunch, only time to get together mrn on foreign-language b'casts from & in N.Am.  
2 men from CBC, I Wash'tn, I N.York.  
Influence of air-borne (patriotic) music for f-bs agnst.Germs.  
CBC expert to tea. Pooling of suggestions.  
Arranging for Windsor-Detroit contacts: F-Bs, Pub. Relations.  
Counsellors, salesmen in touch with F-Bs in Defence-Industries.

**OCT.**

1st Wed.  
A.m. Iv. Toronto for Windsor ar. p.m.  
In response to invtns., discussion with Pub. Relations. Counsellors.  
Michigan Manufacturers, ré measures assimilation F-Bs round DETR.  
Discussion with Polish Labour people ré relations with Czechs and to employers  
In disputes; rôle of CIO & foreign politics. Courtesy-call British Consul.  
And with German Americans, & CIO. After dinner, meeting with Ukrs. In Windsor.

2 Thur.  
Discussions with salesmen who grant loans to F-Bs round DETR. FORD Plant Defence  
Labour, F-Bs attitude & links with Canada F-Bs. P.m.late, back to Windsor.

3 Fri.  
Discussion with Editors of papers selling & catering for F-Bs. Discussion with Ukrs.  
Workmen in Automotive Defence Industry. Their attitude & links with their  
Ex-compatriots in Canada. Meeting with "Russians" in Defence Industry, their links  
with CANDA. P.m. later, return to Windsor, meeting with Italians.

4 Sat.  
A.m. Iv. Windsor for Toronto, ar. p.m.  
Meeting with Stevens, fresh from Russia and Near East, r é E.C.Eurpn. peoples,  
returned N.Yrk Sunday. Meeting with a new German American, r é Milwaukee.

5 Sun.  
Meeting with persons knowing Negro community, linked with U.S.

6 Mon.  
Accepted invt, discuss Cosmopolitan Page for F-Bs in papers.  
Met again new German-American on his way back to Chicago. P.m.

7 Tue.  
Long discussions of whole Germanic situation, and key-positions of adherents  
in the Americas & Switzerland, with Excellency ROTT, titular head of FREE  
AUSTRIA in North America. P.m. addressed annual meeting of united Church  
organizations for their annual Red Cross day drive.

8 Wed.  
Meetings with CBC officials r é School of the Americas, foreign language b'casts.  
Suggested means of furthering the English-speaking peoples' Cause by Catholic  
Latin Canada speaking to Catholic Latin America, French Canadians & Italian  
Canadians "speak South".  
Meeting with Social Service organizations dealing with F-Bs.

9 Thur.  
A.m. Iv. Toronto ar. p.m. Ottawa.  
Dealing with accumulation of urgent mail & telegrams.

* Source: "SUMMARIZED DIARY. CONFIDENTIAL. "FOREIGN-BORN" LABOUR IN S.W. ONT. 
Movements 28 SEPT. to 9 OCT.'41." File 25, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
Re-assessment Is in the Air

By the end of 1942, the up-beat, positive atmosphere in the Branch began to fade away. Philipps became discouraged by too much work, by lack of competent staff, and by the fact that too many of his recommendations had not been followed up. Admittedly, the recommendations had not been rejected but rather remained without either a ‘yes’ or a ‘no’ answer.\textsuperscript{73} One of the reasons for the inaction was embedded in the departmental organization. The Branch was part of the Public Information Division and fell under the direct supervision of Walter Herbert, the person in charge of “information and publicity”. Philipps “detested” publicity and argued that his work pertained to the domain of “diplomacy” and that the cross-purposes of the two activities were doomed to engender misunderstanding.\textsuperscript{74} No wonder that the relationship within the Division were purely structural and financial. The only government official with a real commitment to the broad objectives of the Branch was the Deputy Minister Justice Davis but his other tasks at the helm of the Department of National War Services were overwhelming enough.

Hardly a year after its creation, it became evident that the Public Information Division failed in its role of communicator of government information, partly due to the reluctance of the privately-owned media to use its service considered to be a

\textsuperscript{73} See his “Brief Report, as asked, for the personal information of General LaFlèche, Minister for National War Services,” p. 1.

\textsuperscript{74} Letter by Tracy Philipps to G.W. Simpson, August 5, 1942, in file 33, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
vehicle of political partisanship and a waste of taxpayers’ money.\textsuperscript{75} The failure was partly due also to what its own director described as “the meshes of the red tape of an archaic system of government”.\textsuperscript{76} To remedy the situation, a new agency was created, the Wartime Information Board (WIB), under the direct authority of the Prime Minister’s office. The operations of the Public Information Division were automatically transferred to the WIB by \textit{Order-in-Council PC 8099} of September 9, 1942 - with the exclusion of the Nationalities Branch. The Branch remained an integral part of the National War Services.\textsuperscript{77}

This was not the only turmoil affecting the Branch in the second half of 1942. Minister Thorson, who presided over the creation of the Branch, was appointed President of the Exchequer Court and resigned from Cabinet and Parliament on October 7, 1942. Thorson was replaced by Major General Léo Richer LaFlèche.\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{75} See “Government’s Propaganda Machine Is Now in High Gear,” \textit{Toronto Telegram}, July 26, 1940; “A Shocking Waste of Money,” \textit{The Globe and Mail}, February 3, 1941, p.6. Taxpayers’ money, it was argued, was going down the drain.

\textsuperscript{76} As quoted by \textit{The Globe and Mail} editorial “Mr. Lash Speaks Out,” of November 4, 1941, p.6; as well as by J.T. Thorson, minister responsible for the Bureau of Public Information, speaking in the House of Commons on November 5, 1941. \textit{See Debates of the House of Commons}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} session-19\textsuperscript{th} Parliament (November 7, 1940-January 21, 1942) p.4105.

\textsuperscript{77} On the Public Information Division of the Department of National War Services, see the official history of the Department in vol. 5, series 7, RG35, LAC. For more on the WIB and its relationship with the Nationalities Branch, see Chapter 8, below.

\textsuperscript{78} Major-General Léo Richer LaFlèche was a WWI war hero, served as Deputy Minister of National Defence from 1932 to 1940 and, following a scandal, was transferred to the Canadian Legation in Paris as Military Attaché. LaFlèche was recalled home by Prime Minister to join the War Cabinet. He was first elected to Parliament in a by-election on November 30, 1942 and kept his position as Minister of National War Services until April 17, 1945 when he took up the post of ambassador to Greece.
The new minister concentrated his attention on other aspects of his National War Services Department and preferred to wait and see how to deal with the Nationalities Branch itself.  

More significantly, not only the chairman of the Advisory Committee, George W. Simpson left Ottawa, but so did, in November of that year, Deputy Minister Davis. Davis, was appointed new Canadian High Commissioner in Australia. While Simpson kept in touch and remained chairman of the CCCC, Davis’ replacement, Chester Payne, did not take up his office until March 1943. With the Minister unprepared to deal with the Branch’s activities, and with no new Deputy Minister for several months, who, once arrived and willing, was still unfamiliar with the files for another few months, the Branch seemed grounded in a state of bureaucratic limbo for most of 1943. As Davis had already assessed the situation before his departure, the Branch had “been more or less an orphan with no one taking any particular interest” in the government ranks for far too long a time already.  

To make things worse, Philipps and Kaye became targets of attacks in pro-communist foreign-language press for having fascist leanings, no love lost for communists and a dubious past. When the allegations (or the “vilification” as Philipps called them), spread into the English-language press in the US and reached the

---

79 Four months into the job, General LaFlèche wrote to Norman Robertson in a letter dated February 27, 1943 that he was still studying the subject of what to do about the CCCC and the Branch. File 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.

80 Letter by Justice Davis to Tracy Philipps, dated November 10, 1942, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.
venerable *Globe and Mail*, Philipps set on a bitter defence and even offered his resignation which was eventually not carried through.\(^{81}\)

The Branch thus entered 1943 handicapped on different fronts. Philipps lost the confidence of his superiors and was publicly humiliated. Norman Robertson admitted to Major General LaFlèche that he considered Philipps' usefulness highly questionable and that he based that conclusion "reluctantly reached in the light of rather more than a year's experience of cooperation with the Committee."\(^{82}\) Philipps' passionate verbosity, his righteousness about his knowledge of the facts and methodology of action, and his constant tendency to see all ethnic group relationships as conflicts of interest of international consequences for the future of British-American post-war new order sounded burdensome to the pragmatic bureaucrats around him. Donald Cameron, a member of the CCCC, summed the situation well in his letter to Justice Davis who was by then on route to his new assignment:

> I think it is most unfortunate that men of the outlook of Philipps and Dr. Kaye should have had central positions in the work of such a committee. I was never happy about Philipps' appointment, and I think it very important for the future success of any work the Committee may do, to have people employed under it who are Canadians and who have the full confidence of all ranks of Canadian citizenship.

Cameron did feel, nevertheless, that "a great deal can be done in interpreting one part of Canada to another and in uniting the various racial and cultural groups

---

\(^{81}\) For a more detailed examination of this affair, see Chapter 7, sub-section 7.3: Case Study No.3: "Vilification".

\(^{82}\) N.A. Robertson to Major General L.R. LaFlèche, Minister NWS, November 20, 1942, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.
into sound Canadian citizens." He offered to think it over and put forward some suggestions on how to save the CCCC from disrepute. He was not the only one who mused about the future of the CCCC and the Branch which appeared in some eyes as having engendered more controversy than positive results. The year 1943 was therefore marked by a prolonged re-assessment of the utility and purposefulness of Philipps' methods to unite Canadians under a common national mission.

By mid-1943, Philipps' interfering in the formations and make-up of organizations, his taking sides and negotiating compromises among various factions, his insisting on "foreignness" rather than democratic nature of their internal political debates awakened the awareness among various groups that they should be able to speak for themselves and need no government-sent intermediary to guide them, however ably and delicately, towards "Canadianism".

Before dealing with this new phase in Philipps' relationship with the ethnic communities and some specifically concerned government departments, the three case studies examined in the next chapter provide for a close look at the various reasons behind these emerging misgivings and concerns that would eventually bring about the collapse of the whole project of the Nationalities Branch as originally conceived by Philipps. The case studies deal with Philipps' relationship with the Canadian Italian community, the attempts to control "foreign-language" press, and the growing mistrust between Canadian communists and Philipps becoming a public matter and costing the latter his reputation.

83 Cameron to Davis, November 27, 1942, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.
Chapter 7
The Nationalities Branch in Action II:
Three Case Studies

The previous chapter provided a broad overview of the organization and activities of the Nationalities Branch during its two years of existence under the leadership of Tracy Philipps. This chapter is devoted to three specific dimensions of these activities: Philipps’ efforts to appease the Italian community, the Branch’s relations with the “foreign-language” press, and the impact of communist agitation in the country on the effectiveness and the changing perception of the Branch in and out of government circles.

7.1 Case Study No. 1: Italian Community

On June 10, 1940, following the declaration of war with Italy, Canadian residents of Italian origin who were not naturalized British subjects – or who received their naturalization within the previous ten years, since September 1, 1929 -- were declared “enemy aliens” under the provisions of Defence of Canada Regulation 26B, and some 500 of them were also promptly arrested and interned without trial.¹ Two days later, by Order-in-Council PC 2527 of June 12, 1940, seven organizations of Italians in Canada

¹ For the discussion on how many were actually interned, see Luigi Bruti Liberati, “L’internamento degli Italocanadesi durante la seconda guerra mondiale,” in Il Canada e la guerra dei trent’anni, ed. Luigi Bruti Liberati (Milano: Guerini, 1989) pp.216-219; idem, “The Internment of Italian Canadians,” in Enemies Within: Italian and Other Internees in Canada and Abroad, ed. Franca Iacovetta, Robert Perin and Angelo Principe (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000) pp.89-90.
were declared illegal.\(^2\) Under public pressure in the frenzy of a wave of fears about the fifth column infiltration in Canada, the government amended Regulation 26B on November 2, 1940 by providing that British subjects of Italian origin who were naturalized since 1922 were also considered “enemy aliens” and required to register as such.\(^3\) On December 22, 1942, Regulation 26B was once again amended, this time in positive terms, by exempting British subjects of Italian and Austrian origin from its provisions.\(^4\) In the meantime, people lost their jobs or businesses and found themselves ostracized and discriminated. For many the sense of pride and the exhilaration of patriotism encouraged and manipulated by the Italian government among thousands and thousands of “italiani all’estero” (Italians abroad) turned into the feeling of betrayal and disorientation.\(^5\) Out of 112,000 Italians enumerated in 1941, only a small number (some

\(^2\) The organizations in question were: Fasci italiani all’Estero (Italian Fascio Abroad), O.V.R.A. - Organizzazione Vigilanza Repressione Antifascismo (National Security Organization for the Repression of Anti-Fascism), Società Dopolavoro (‘Leisure after Work’ Organization), Associazione combattenti italiani (Italian War Veterans’ Association), O.G.I.E. - Organizzazioni giovanile degli italiani all’estero (Youth Organization of Italians Abroad), Fronte unico morale di Montréal (Italian United Moral Front).

\(^3\) Order in Council PC 6150, November 2, 1940.


\(^5\) See, for instance, the editorials in the two Italian newspapers encouraging Italian-Canadians to regroup and stay strong: “I ‘nostri’ e il loro contegno (Our People and How They Comport Themselves),” Il Cittadino canadese, August 21, 1943, p.2 (“The war will end. The people will stay on, the expectations will be less imposing once Canada gets rid of its burden of the alien problem,” says the editorial by Antonino Spada); “Per l’unità degli’italo-canadesi (For the unity of all Italian-Canadians),” signed Anselmo Bortolotti, Ibid, September 18, 1943, p.7; “Problemi attuali degli’italiani in Canada (Current Problems of Italians in Canada),” La Vittoria, May 9, 1942, p.1; “Uscire all’aperto (Need
3,500 according to figures collected and computed by Bruti Liberati) had been formally involved in fascist organizations which were, with the tacit blessing of the Canadian government, known to be controlled by Italy’s consular staff in Canada at the eve of the war. No matter how many were active supporters of the Fascist government in Italy, how many were only attracted by the pageantry surrounding events and festivities organized by Fascists, or how many were in Canada because they fled fascism at home and were antifascist activities or only wanted to work and raise in peace their families, the community as a whole eventually felt the impact of the measures imposed indiscriminately on “enemy aliens”. Many felt compelled to justify themselves afterwards by claiming to have been victims of an “ubriacattura” (intoxication) or as just having had a “a nice dream”. Camillo Vettore, a former fascist, explained in 1942 that “our fascism was essentially nothing else but national euphoria,” carried away by the sounds of drums and trumpets and turning into a joyous carnival. Others, from the very early days, made to Come Out),” Ibid, p.3; “Il polso della collettività (The Pulse of the Community),” Ibid, July 11, 1942, p.1; “Gli italiani sono dei ‘Wops’? (Are Italians ‘Wops’?)” Ibid, May 8, 1943, p.1.


7 As quoted in Principe, The Darkest Side of the Fascist Years, p. 193.

public efforts to prove to the society at large their antifascism, their loyalty to Canada and their commitment to winning the war against Nazism and fascism alike. 9

These dramatic events that gravely affected the Italian Canadian community were retold on different occasions and from different angles in Canadian historiography and political literature. The published material includes personal accounts of internment; debates on statistical data; arguments about injustice committed and about a whole ethnic community put on trial; as well as arguments in favour of long overdue apology and reparation or counter-arguments that the community exaggerated the extent of suffering.10 Less known are, however, the activities of the Nationalities Branch in respect to the Italian community in this crucial period. While extending the awareness of the wartime experiences of the community, the following account of these activities, also serves as an example of how the Branch operated -- especially Tracy Philipps, its European Adviser -- when targeting a particular cultural group.

---

9 In Trail, BC, a collective of Italian workers employed by Consolidated Smelter agreed to pledge their loyalty to Canada and to allow the management to withdraw monthly one dollar off their salaries for Red Cross purposes. In exchange, their employer promised not to lay them off. See the intervention by MP for Vancouver South, H.C. Green, on June 11, 1940, in Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-19th Parliament (May 16-November 5, 1940) pp.677-678. For another example, see John R. Sturdy, “Anti-Fascist Here Back War on Italy. Representatives of 900 Italo-Canadians Meet to Reaffirm Loyalty,” Montreal Gazette, June 11, 1940, p. 11. See also reports in the Canadian English-language press on the money collection campaign in Montreal and Ottawa organized by the Independent Order of Italian Canadians to buy an ambulance vehicle for the Canadian Red Cross: “Italians in Canada Buy an Ambulance. Also Pledge Loyalty to Britain, Hatred of Fascist Regime. Called Mussolini Doomed, Opposition Always Strong, Local Colony Declares – ‘Free Italy’ Planned on de Gaulle Model,” Montreal Gazette, November 12, 1940; “Says Fascists Have Fifth Column Active in Canada,” Ottawa Journal, December 16, 1940, as preserved in Antonino Spada Fonds, R-2934-0-6-E, Library and Archives Canada (hereafter LAC).

10 For the discussion on this subject, see Iacovetta, Perin and Principe, Enemies Within.
"[T]he Italian community is by far the most difficult and complex case with which I have had to do," wrote Philipps in a letter to his friend George Simpson. What happened to the community was, in his opinion, the result of "incorrect diagnosis of their case," and "wrongheadedness which is steadily making things daily worse." Perfectly well-meaning people afraid of taking chances with the security of the nation, Philipps added, made "the most grotesque, and therefore, the most unfortunate error" of assessing the whole community as potentially disloyal to Canada and thus, otherwise good medicine, was "administered for the wrong disease with lamentable results."¹¹

Philipps had a special interest and affinity for the Italian community and proudly claimed that he could speak Italian, that he had relatives living in Italy and that in his early days in the military, by the end of WWI, he was attached to the British Embassy in Rome and spent some time at the Austrian-Italian front. Moreover, he travelled to Italy on several occasions in the late 1930s and publicly praised the efficient and orderly management of Italian colonies of Abyssinia and Libya by the Italian Fascist government.¹² These trips to Fascist Italy would haunt him back as part of the accusations for harbouring Fascist sympathies, launched against him personally, and the Nationalities Branch as a whole, by the communist "foreign-language" press, intent to demolish his claim of impartiality.¹³

¹¹ Tracy Philipps to G.W. Simpson, March 20, 1942, file 33, vol. 1, Tracy Philipps Fonds, MG30 E350, LAC.
¹² See Chapter 4, note 53 above.
¹³ See, below, "Case Study No. 3: "Vilification"
The knowledge of the language was important, he consistently argued, because it allowed to penetrate the thought-process (so foreign to the English mind) of the transplanted people, socially and politically still functioning in terms of their old country. While language maintained the community coherent, it isolated it from the society around it. To make things worse, as far as the Italian community was concerned in early 1940s, the three pre-war newspapers in Italian language demonstrated outright Fascist support, and were therefore banned in June 1940 with the consequence that for two years no newspaper in Italian was in circulation.\(^4\)

Philipps found in Antonino Spada, a well-known member of the Montreal Italian community the most appropriate person available at the time to launch a new newspaper. Spada was a long-time antifascist, a non-Catholic from a community predominantly Catholic and secretary of the Independent Order of Italo-Canadians, a break-away organization from the traditional Order of the Sons of Italy when the latter began to manifest its public support for fascism in Italy.\(^5\)

\(^4\) On the Italian pre-WWII press, see Angelo Principe, *The Darkest Side of the Fascist Years*.

\(^5\) For a self-portrait of Spada in the form of an interview, see Filippo Salvatore, *Fascism and the Italians of Montreal: An Oral History, 1922-1945* (Montreal: Guernica, 1998) pp.203-219; see also his *Italians in Canada* (Ottawa & Montreal: Riviera Printers and Publishers, 1969). See also the biographic note on Spada in a letter by F.C. Blair, Head of the Immigration Branch, Department of Mines and Resources to O.D. Skelton, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, dated July 15, 1940, in file 153, vol. 13, Norman Robertson Fonds, MG30 E163, LAC. On his being a non-Catholic and how it was perceived by his Italian compatriots and the Catholic Church in Quebec at large, see the letter by J. MacNeill, Deputy Minister of Justice to Superintendent E.W. Bavin, RCMP, dated October 29, 1940, in file 153, vol. 13, Norman Robertson Fonds, MG30 E163, LAC. See also the letter to the editor “Un communiste démasqué,” signed by Père S. M. Cheli, himself of Italian origin, and published in *Le Droit* of January 20, 1941, in which Spada was described as “a sinister individual”, a real communist, more dangerous to
Spada transformed the newsletter he used to publish on behalf of the Order into a small newspaper, named *Il Cittadino italo-canadese* (Italo-Canadian Citizen). The first issue in this new incarnation appeared in the summer of 1943.\(^{16}\) For the duration of his stay with the Nationalities Branch, Philipps kept corresponding with Spada who kept asking for guidance and for help in getting government printing contracts. He also asked Philipps to help him get a position with the Canadian army as an interpreter or administrator in the liberated areas of southern Italy from where he originated.\(^{17}\) At the same time V.J. Kaye, head of the Editorial Section of the Branch kept sending Spada various press releases issued by the Branch for general distribution, as well as specifically targeted service of a series of articles produced in London UK with Italian translations on issues related to the situation in Italy which was at the time on its way to be liberated by the Allies. Philipps described this material as “solid educative rather than hot news,” prepared in an explanatory form and as a counter-argument to issues raised in German-controlled radio programmes transmitted from Rome in a deliberate effort to confuse and demoralize immigrant communities in North America.\(^{18}\)

---


\(^{17}\) For this correspondence, see file 33-1-1 “Il Cittadino canadese”, vol. 4, RG26, LAC.

\(^{18}\) Letter by Tracy Philipps to F.J. Mead, Deputy Commissioner, RCMP, August 17, 1943, in file 33-1-1 “Il Cittadino canadese,” vol. 4, RG26, LAC.
As early as 1941, Spada made an unsuccessful attempt to mobilize Italian Canadians and form an army unit for overseas assignment to free Italy from fascism and the German occupation. Usually under the auspices of the representatives of various European governments in exiles, similar military mobilizations within other European immigrant communities were organized in the form of "free movements" with the objective to fight along the Allies and participate in the liberation of their respective countries. Under Spada’s project the Italian recruits would have formed a unit within the Canadian forces. While Spada was encouraged by the Minister of the Department of National Defence to help in recruiting Italian youth, the project as such was declined. Requests for creating separate units on a ‘racial’ basis were advanced by other groups as well, according to the Minister, but the Minister insisted that there was “no point seeking to be segregated and making administration more difficult and weakening considerably the utility and effectiveness of the Army by breaking it up into a large number of racial units.”

Spada was -- along with Augusto Bersani (a former Catholic priest turned Protestant), Camillo Vettere (a former, publicly repentant Fascist) and Ennio Gnudi, alias Verdi (a former socialist Mayor of Bologna in Italy) -- one of the few personalities in the Italian community whose names reappeared here and there in the government files as, invariably, informers, double-crossing spies working for the Italian government, presumed fascists or presumed communists -- or all of the above. Occasionally they also

---

19 Letters by Minister of National Defence to President of the Free Italy Committee, dated May 21 and June 11, 1941, in Spada Fonds, R 2943-0-6-E, LAC.
pointed fingers at each other with such insinuations.20 Ennio Gnudi was not only a former socialist mayor of Bologna but also a member of the Italian parliament, prior to Mussolini’s full takeover in 1929. In exile since 1930, he circulated in North America between Mexico, New York and Canada (he washed dishes at Château Laurier Hotel for a while) and maintained contacts with the Italian communist organization, Garibaldi International, stationed in Mexico. He was considered a suspect individual both by the Canadian and Italian governments. Philipps, himself, liked to be kept informed by RCMP of Gnudi’s latest political indiscretions. Bersani, Vettere and Gnudi were linked with the appearance and the eventual demise of an Italian language newspaper from Toronto, La Vittoria, whose quick slide under the editorial directorship of Gnudi from being merely an anti-fascist paper into a pro-Soviet and pro-communist one was Philipps’ continuous pre-occupation.21 Using a well-worn stereotype, Philipps argued in one of his communications with the RCMP Deputy Commissioner, F. J. Mead, that the confusion and potential misjudgement by the officials of some of these personalities may have stemmed from the fact that, by misfortune, “these folk from the land of the vendetta are

20 See the correspondence between the departments of justice, external affairs and RCMP regarding the reliability of Spada, in file 153, vol. 13, Norman Robertson Fonds, MG30 E163, LAC.

21 On the launching of La Vittoria by A. Bersani and the course it began to follow under the direction of E. Gnudi (alias Verdi) see Luigi Bruti Liberati, Il Canada, l’Italia e il fascismo, 1919-1945 (Roma: Bonacci Editore, 1984) pp.200-214. A notable change, for instance, was the appearance of photos of Soviet soldiers printed on the pages of the paper instead of those of Canadian ones sent to the editor by the Editorial Division of the Nationalities Branch.
ready, by jealousy or vindictiveness, to turn and tear anyone who has the courage to come out and do a job of public work."^{22}

In order to find an answer to this lack of reliable leadership, Philipps put some effort in encouraging the creation of a new organization by enlisting a different set of people for the project, among them a music teacher and conductor from Toronto, Carlo Lombardi, and a university professor, Alfredo Fossati.^{23} He was hoping to see formed a "nation-wide non-political organization" with the objective to serve as "an agency of adaptation from Italianita [sic] towards Canadianism."^{24} The result was the revival of a Canadian branch of the already well-known anti-fascist Mazzini Society operating among Italians in the UK and US. Founded in the late 1939 by a group of political exiles, the Society had two objectives. One objective was to mobilize Italian immigrants in the spirit of antifascism and participation in the democratic life of their host countries so as to offset the negative image created under the impact of pre-war fascist influence and the subsequent "enemy alien" status. The other was to engage the immigrant community in the preparation of a new political order for Italy by creating a coalition of different anti-fascist formations, including the communists, as a political force strong enough to govern

^{22} Letter by Tracy Philipps to F.J. Mead, Deputy Commissioner, RCMP, August 17, 1943, in file 33-1-1 "Il Cittadino canadese," vol. 4, RG26, LAC.

^{23} In the autumn of 1942 Philipps engaged Fossati in a mission to investigate the political mood of Italians in the Prairies and British Columbia. See Chapter 6, note 22.

^{24} Explanatory note by Tracy Philipps added to a typewritten copy of the letter by Carlo Lombardi, president of the Toronto Branch of the Mazzini Society of Canada to Tracy Philipps, dated September 17, 1943, in file 21, vol. 2, Tracy Philippps Fonds, MG30 E350, LAC.
Italy after the liberation. A former Italian Foreign Minister, Count Carlo Sforza, provided, with his political contacts and renown, a certain legitimacy to the Society but the Society did not succeed in securing the necessary support of a significant portion of the Italian immigrant community and gradually lost its leadership energy that inspired its early days of existence. The same happened to the small group of Mazzini members in Canada, disappointed that the government officials, apart from Philipps, paid very little attention to them as individuals and even less as a group, and so offered no support. "As a matter of fact," the president of the Toronto Branch of the Mazzini Society of Canada, Carlo Lombardi, exclaimed in a letter to Philipps, "the present Government in Ottawa is just as helpful as a corpse."

Philipps sympathized with this statement as he tried in vain to exercise his influence on several other issues concerning the Italian community: notably, discrimination at work; improved communications with "kith and kin" in the homeland following the fall of Mussolini and the allies' landing in southern Italy; and official permission to broadcast radio programmes in Italian.

25 See the resolution adopted at the congress of the Mazzini Society held in New York, June 1942, reproduced in La Vittoria, June 27, 1942, p. 3.


27 Letter by Carlo Lombardi to Tracy Philipps, September 17, 1943, in file 21, vol. 2, Tracy Philipps Fonds, MG30 E350, LAC.
In a letter to the editor of *The Globe and Mail*, Philipps attempted to convince the Canadian public that Italians as a people were on the Allies' side, were suffering from fascism and detested Germans.\(^\text{28}\) He pleaded equality of treatment for the loyal and hardworking Italian Canadians and the restoration of their rights: "The law being what it is, it does not help toward a better understanding to reproach them with not being full citizens." He was referring here to the Defence of Canada Regulation 26B proclaimed in 1940 declaring the Canadian citizens of Italian origin naturalized since 1922 as enemy aliens.

Improvements did happen -- not necessarily as a direct result of his pressure -- when those drastic sanctions against Italian-Canadians as "enemy aliens" were repealed.\(^\text{29}\) Philipps had tried, however, through the intermediary of his Deputy Minister, Justice Davis, to convince the government to exempt British subjects of Italian origin from the provisions of Regulation 26B.\(^\text{30}\) His elaborate arguments should have been compelling for anyone with a liberal outlook at the time:

\(^{28}\) Tracy Philipps, "[Letter to the Editor:] Italians at Home and in Canada Detest Germans, Says Informed Writer," *The Globe and Mail*, May 5, 1942, p.6. The entire letter to the Editor was reprinted in *La Vittoria*, May 9, 1942, p.4.

\(^{29}\) *Order-in-Council PC 11561*, December 22, 1942.

\(^{30}\) See the letter by Justice Davis to Hon. Louis St. Laurent, Minister of Justice, dated September 1, 1942, in file "Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship," vol. 36, RG44, LAC; and Philipps' Memorandum addressed to the Deputy Minister, Justice T.C. Davis on "Canadians of Italian Origin: Invalidation of the value of citizenship acquired since September 1922," dated October 1, 1942, in file "Italian Element in the Americas," vol. 36, RG44, LAC. Similar arguments against the prolonged injustice were raised by Grant Dexter in his two articles "Italian Canadians: The Result of Panic," and "Italian Canadians: The Need for Justice," *Winnipeg Free Press*, October 26 and 27, 1942.
In spite of the generous policy of the Canadian Government, a substantial and sensitive body of our fellow-citizens and vital workers are still treated by the greater part of the public as 'wops' and 'dagoes'... We can hardly hope for co-operation in return for contempt. Apart from the democracy and equality-of-treatment for which we and our fellow-citizens are fighting, we can now ill afford the luxury of racial prejudice or condescension which permits these fellow-citizens to be pilloried in the press or to allow the public mind to be poisoned against them as objects of suspicion, which only makes them feel like enemies. It is in this light that we have to examine the popular assumption that it was unavoidable that Canadians of Italian origin should be so treated in wartime, irrespective of the risk of their becoming a terrorized (partly self-terrorized) or almost pariah community instead of an eager integral part of the Canadian nation.31

7.2 Case Study No. 2: “Foreign-Language” Press

The relevance of the so-called “foreign-language” press in forming the public opinion of some 2 million Canadian residents of European origin was brought to light in the late 1939 with the publication of the Watson Kirkconnell’s 200-page long pamphlet on Canada’s role in the war against Hitler.32 Kirkconnell pointed out that there was a considerable number of newspapers and periodicals in Canada written in languages others than English and French which contained enlightening information on the crucial and contentious issues behind the armed conflict flaring in Europe and the political dynamics related to these issues being played out within the ranks of various


32 Watson Kirkconnell, Canada, Europe and Hitler (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1939) pp.116-188.
communities of European origin scattered across Canada. Not everybody was thrilled to learn about the existence of such press. In a letter to the Editor, a "Fifth Generation Canadian" expressed his disappointment that such press existed and that "foreign-language" immigrants had not demonstrated enough good taste to learn the language and the customs of their adopted country. He therefore believed in the need to enforce by law that "assuming of our language exclusively be mandatory for people wanting to live here."\textsuperscript{33} The Ontario Attorney-General suggested in a press statement that, for the safety of the country, all material published in "foreign-language" newspapers should be accompanied by a parallel English translation. Commenting on this statement, the author of another letter to the editor of the Globe and Mail, an editor himself of a Jewish semi-weekly, found the idea highly objectionable for economic reasons and disrespectful towards foreign-born populations, pointing out that such measure would "cast a cloud on the patriotism" of the naturalized Canadians and expose them to constant suspicion.\textsuperscript{34}

The mere existence and the number of "foreign-language" newspapers may have been a revelation for the general public but this press had already been of great concern and value as a source of information to RCMP investigators engaged in scrutinizing and gleaning newspapers which seemed positioned at the left-wing extreme of the political spectrum -- advocating communism, as well as those at the right extreme -- advocating Nazi ideology or Fascism. The "foreign-language" press appeared also as a useful source of information to other government bodies throughout the war years, notably the


\textsuperscript{34} [Letter to the Editor:] "Foreign Language Press," The Globe and Mail, September 30, 1939, p.6.
Nationalities Branch and the Department of External Affairs. Whether published as a commercial enterprise or politically-motivated, the content of these newspapers allowed officials to assess public support for the war efforts, identify attitudes towards various domestic and international issues and conflicts, and detect the existence of subversive ideas and activities in certain segments of the population that were living and communicating with each other outside the realm of the routine and mainstream channels of communications. Kirkconnell's pamphlet publicized and brought forward the important question of whether or how much should the government exercise actual control over that press.

A systematic researcher and an able translator, Kirkconnell subsequently presented his findings to a gathering of members of the Canadian Historical Association at their meeting in 1940 as a study of "the rate and extent of our Canadian assimilation of these European groups." In 1905, he reported, 18 newspapers were published in four "foreign" languages (German, Swedish, Danish and Icelandic); the number of newspapers went up to 33 in 1911, 48 in 1931 and by 1939 he identified 51 newspapers published in 15 different European languages (German, Swedish, Danish, Icelandic, Norwegian, Finnish, Russian, Ukrainian, Slovak, Polish, Croat, Hungarian, Italian, Greek and Yiddish). Kirkconnell emphasized that the fact that so many languages were actively maintained on Canadian soil through press and community activities should not be understood as the "Balkanization" of Canadian national life. Canadians who continued


to speak foreign tongues, he argued, were in their greatest majority as loyal to the Canadian cause as Anglo-Saxons or French-Canadians. There was, however, he added, a minor portion of the press that was “distinctly disquieting, viz., the extent to which it has served as a vehicle for foreign propaganda.”

It was exactly this segment of the “foreign-language” press that interested Kirkconnell the most, as it did later on the staff of the Nationalities Branch, Tracy Philipps and Vladimir Kaye. The three of them used the consistent and sometimes personal relationship they had managed to nurture with some of the editors and publishers of “foreign-language” newspapers in order to influence their editorial policy towards assuming a greater role in encouraging public participation in the war efforts, in enhancing the “Canadianization” of their community of readership, and in opposing radical thought.

Philipps defined the concept of “Canadianization”, as a “process of building-in of a richly diversified human material into a very distinctive British-American edifice, identical with neither but drawing the best from both”. This would imply: abandoning old “thought-processes” based on native languages and homeland culture, and switching to English language; espousing Britishness, including liberal democratic values, constitutional monarchy and capitalist economic system; and adopting a sense of a particular Canadian unified community on the American continent composed of British subjects and forming a constitutive part of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the

---


English-speaking peoples as a whole. The parallel concept of "Americanization" was, defined in the literature of the time as "the process of social assimilation by which immigrants in the United States come to participate in the common life of the nation and to identify themselves with it in thought and feeling." By "social assimilation", on the other hand, contemporary sociologists such as renowned Robert Park, understood the adaptation to the new conditions of life, ability to speak the language, follow social rituals and participate in the social activities in the new environment without encountering prejudice and discrimination due to the "visibility" which characterized an immigrant "as a member of an alien group." Park defined "assimilation" as "a process or processes by which peoples of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages, occupying a common territory, achieve a cultural solidarity sufficient at least to sustain a

39 Philipps used to compare the process of social integration to the act of transplantation of a foreign shrub or tree with the soil in which it has originally grown still attached to its roots as it is carefully put in the new soil. "To assimilate." Philipps suggested in 1952, long after his departure from Canada, "signifies to change or convert any introduced element (such, for instance, as food) to the own substance of the being who nourishes himself on it. In this case, it's the nation which is replenishing and nourishing itself on an introduced foreign-body who cannot be absorbed and digested, converted and assimilated, in the brief time of a first incoming generation born elsewhere." See his Memorandum on International Social Services: "Culture - Clash or Composition? Assimilation or Re-integration?" January 20, 1952, in file 30, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.


41 The "visibility" manifested itself in the inability to speak the national language of the new country (French or English, in Canada), in maintaining traditional dress and rituals, in "foreign-sounding" and unpronounceable names, in the segregated community life (self-imposed or forced ghettoization), and most of all, physical features attributed to one's "racial" origin.
national existence." But he also emphasized its political aspect in the sense that it was "the process by which the generally accepted social customs and political ideas and loyalties of a community or country are transmitted to an adopted citizen." In that context, "assimilation" became, in Park's interpretation, "merely a generic and abstract concept corresponding to Americanization."

Park was also the author of a major, ground-breaking study of the so-called "foreign-language" or "immigrant" press in North America which he undertook in 1922 as part of a series of reports on different aspects of the Americanization process of immigrants in the US. Most of the "foreign-language" newspapers and periodicals in circulation at the time were of a commercial nature, subject to the combined impact of the market forces and the fluctuating profile of the community they tried to serve (in function, for instance, of the diminishing interest of the 2nd and 3rd generation of a potential readership base, the volume of the influx of new immigrants, or the extent of ghettoization of the community). The study also recognized the existence of sectoral publishing, notably religious periodicals serving particular congregations, as well as a

---


small number of newsletters and newspapers whose main objective was nationalist or ideological propaganda (the latter in the name of an on-going class war), generally financed by special interest groups, sometimes under direct influence and input from abroad.\footnote{Commenting in 1958 on the existence of this type of immigrant press, social anthropologist Zubrzycki referred to them as “abuses” of the freedom of press: less harmful when intended to perpetuate in the immigrant community aspects of political quarrels of the homeland, but serious when used to ferment hostile propaganda of Fascism or communism against the social order of the adopted country. See, Zubrzycki, “Foreign-language Press in Migrant Integration,” pp.80-81.}

In the concluding chapter, Park examined the means the American government agencies and various private social organizations (American Red Cross, for instance) had at their disposal to use the “immigrant” press for purposes of a successful “Americanization”. Park advanced an important assessment of the “foreign-language” press when he highlighted the double, and in itself contradictory but inherent function of the immigrant press: assisting the readership in assimilating into the social life of the new country, while at the same time preserving the heritage language and links with the traditions, cultural rituals and political life of the old country. Park assessed these two objectives from the point of view of “Americanization” of immigrants, and found them embodying both the problem and its solution. Assimilation had to be progressive and cannot be imposed, he argued. In order to succeed, gradual integration into the social structure of American life must be free of constraints and impositions: immigrants should be allowed to maintain their identity and express it through their language and the attachment to their heritage as long as they feel the need for it and until they have shed the fear of being dislocated. “Foreign-language” editors should be therefore encouraged,
he suggested, to promote both assimilation and group consciousness, and they should be supported and guided in performing that role. Park called this approach “control through alliance”. It included channelling through “foreign-language” press different forms of publicity for American goods and services, thus exposing “foreign-language” readers to samples of American way of life. It also included distributing to the “foreign-language” editors informative and useful material, prepared in objective and attractive manner, and in their heritage language, on subjects related to the new country, its political system, its institutions, and the merits of its economic and social order. This approach was implemented in the US by, among others, the Foreign Languages Information Service (FLIS), a WWI government agency privatized in 1919 in the wake of the war and then once again re-organized and significantly renamed as the Common Council for American Unity at the eve of WWII.46

Inspired by the American experience, Tracy Philipps chose this type of “control through alliance” as the working strategy for the Nationalities Branch in its dealings with the “foreign-language” press in Canada. He assigned Vladimir Kaye to be in charge of keeping record of the developments in the ranks of the “foreign-language” press

(regarding changes of editors or editorial policy, or changes in the size or profile of readership). Kaye was also responsible for the preparation, on a regular basis, of a carefully selected material to be distributed to various editors and publishers, containing news packaged in "a Canadian frame, from a Canadian and Canadianizing source." Kaye also kept statistical information on the content of each newspaper according to the percentage of space devoted to Canadian affairs, homeland, war operations or the Soviet Union. Assisted by Kaye, Philipps undertook the politically delicate task of establishing "alliances" with various editors deemed sufficiently integrated, liberally-minded and presenting leadership material to be nurtured and manoeuvred into acting as counter-balance to the apparent infiltration of radicalism in their communities. Faced with the lack of support from his superiors and other government officials, and with limited interest for such nurturing among the potential candidates, Philipps' endeavours had a modest success in making a significant impact.

In a society proud of its respect for freedom of the press, any attempt to interfere with the editorial freedom was by principle met with criticism. In wartime, however, the control of the press by government authorities appeared inevitable in the name of national security and military imperatives. As soon as the war was declared between Great Britain and Germany, even before Canada officially joined with its own declaration of war, censorship regulations and adjoining specific directives were announced on September 2,

47 Memorandum [by Tracy Philipps] on "Functions and administrative place of the virtual Nationalities Branch of the Department of National War Services," dated October 24, 1942, file 10, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. For a list of press releases prepared in 1942-43 by the Editorial Section of the Branch, see Appendix 2, below.

48 See files 24 to 30, vol. 13, Vladimir A. Kaye Fonds, MG31 D69, Reel H3008, LAC.
1939, a day before the Defence of Canada Regulations (DOCR), specifically designed to govern wartime security measures, were made public. Under the new DOCR, it became a chargeable offence to publish material "intended or likely to be prejudicial to the safety of the state or the efficient prosecution of the war," regardless in what language it was written and when or where it was divulged. The Censorship Directorate, the Office of the Examiner of Publications of the Customs Branch at the Department of National Revenue, postal censors, and particularly the RCMP were all given the task to watch out for possible infringements of the DOCR and alert the authorities empowered to exercise control of the press under the War Measures Act. The Office of the Examiner of Publications undertook the responsibility for the examination of most of the "foreign-language" publications, whether published in Canada or arrived from abroad. The examiners' reports, and, sometimes also full translations of relevant material, were prepared for the attention of the Department of External Affairs, intelligence services of the National Defence, RCMP, and the Nationalities Branch.

The RCMP assumed the specific responsibility of examining only the most radical press in circulation.49 The censorship branch of government relied on voluntary, self-imposed censorship by the Canadian press organizations and tried to identify the fine line defining the distinction whether a particular material containing criticism of the government and politicians was objectionable and prejudicial or not. "It is one of the

49 See the memorandum prepared by the Office of Examiner of Publications, Department of National Revenue, dated October 2, 1942 in preparation of a meeting of government officials interested in coordinating and rationalizing the examination and analysis of the newspapers published in Canada; in file 15 “Canadian foreign language press,” vol. 26, series 31, RG36, LAC.
proud boasts of truly democratic countries," wrote the English-language Press Censor, that no matter how trenchant a criticism of a government domestic policy or a politician may be, it could “be freely voiced even when the state is fighting for its life.”

Several newspapers were, nevertheless, effectively banned under the provisions of the DOCR, most notorious of them the organ of the Communist Party of Canada, The Clarion, but also several “foreign-language” papers, notably, fascist-leaning Deutsche Zeitung für Kanada (German Gazette for Canada), L’Italia nuova (New Italy), Il Bollettino (The Bulletin), L’Eco italo-canadese (Italo-Canadian Echo) and extreme left-wing papers in the Ukrainian language, Narodna Gazeta (People’s Gazette) and Kanadiyskiy Farmer (Canadian Farmer), in Russian, Kanadsky Gudok (Canadian Fiddle), and in Croatian, Slobodna Misao (Free Thought).

By mid-1943, government agencies, including the Nationalities Branch, kept a record and regularly examined the content of between 60 to 75 newspapers representing up to 20 different languages available in Canada. The ideological makeup of these papers varied and spanned from monarchist, nationalist, conservative, liberal, to social-


51 Compare these figures with American record: 1,092 newspapers and periodicals in 39 languages including Esperanto, Carpatho-Russian, Ladino, Welsh, Flemish and Armenian. See, Yarosav Chyz, “Number, Distribution and Circulation of the Foreign Language Press in the United States,” Interpreter Releases (Common Council for American Unity) 20, No.37, Series C: Foreign Born in USA, No. 11, October 13, 1943, in file 23, vol. 13, Vladimir A. Kaye Fonds, MG31 D69, Reel H3008, LAC. Among languages used in print in Canada were most European languages, from Bulgarian to Ukrainian, including Croat, Danish, Finnish, German, Hungarian, Icelandic, Italian, Lithuanian, Norwegian, Polish, Russian, Serbian, Slovak, Slovenian, and Swedish, and, in addition, Yiddish, Chinese and Japanese.
democrat and communist. A considerable number of them were of religious character.\textsuperscript{52} The readership also varied and spanned from 1,000 to 10,000. The majority of these papers were published in Winnipeg and Toronto but one could also find them across Canada.\textsuperscript{53}

The publication ban under the DOCR did not stop the left-wing press from re-emerging in the public domain.\textsuperscript{54} A bitter war of inflammatory words and mutual accusations among promoters of different causes and allegiances within the same ethnic communities occupied most of the printed space. Communist-leaning press was praising Soviet war successes and asking the Allies to open the second, western front in Europe and thus release the pressure on the Soviet army; Ukrainian nationalist papers were attacking Soviets and Canadian communists for not respecting the independence wishes of their co-nationals; Slovaks were blaming the Czechs; Croats were blaming the Serbs

\textsuperscript{52} Among the 61 newspapers listed in a 1943 survey of the "foreign-language" press undertaken by the Wartime Information Board, 20 papers were identified as of religious character, 15 as communist, 5 as having social-democrat sympathies and 6 as harbouring strong nationalistic feelings in favour of an independent state of their co-nationals in Europe. See, Wartime Information Board, \textit{Canadian Foreign Language Press Survey – Basic Report, September 9, 1943} (Ottawa, 1943)

\textsuperscript{53} According to the survey undertaken by the Wartime Information Board in the summer of 1943, 21 newspapers were published in Winnipeg alone, 20 in Toronto, 4 in Montreal 2 each in Edmonton, Regina, Vancouver, Sudbury, and eight newspapers were published in various smaller places in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Ontario. See, Wartime Information Board, \textit{Canadian Foreign Language Press Survey – Basic Report, September 9, 1943} (Ottawa, 1943)

\textsuperscript{54} Some of them re-emerged under a different name. Thus, \textit{Ukrainske zhitya} (Ukrainian Life), a communist-leaning paper in the Ukrainian language appeared in Toronto in the fall of 1941 and quickly picked up some 9,000 subscribers of the recently banned \textit{Narodna Gazeta} of Winnipeg. Similarly, Croatian language \textit{Novosti} (The News) launched in 1941 was considered the replacement for \textit{Slobodna Misao} (Free Thought) banned in June 1940. Equally, \textit{The Canadian Tribune} emerged in early 1940 to replace the banned communist organ, the \textit{Clarion}. 
for wanting to perpetuate political dominance in their respective homelands; communists were labelling socio-democrats as “fascists” while in the eyes of right-wing and religious commentators everybody left of centre of the political spectrum became “communistic”.

In his various assessments, Philipps frequently pointed out that news and editorial information kept alive old national ideological controversies and perpetuated “foreignness, by non-Canadian guidance and on non-Canadian issues.” As a result, the confused and distracting situation prevailing in the realm of “foreign-language” press could only lead to the slackening of war effort and retarding “Canadianization”. “The foreign-language press, lacking a lead withheld by us for reasons of ‘freedom of the press’,” Philipps argued, “tends to keep alive or even embitter the fratricidal follies of continental Europe.”55 He proposed to his superiors to authorize sending out a set of guidelines, largely copied from a similar undertaking by the American government agency in charge of “immigrant” press (the Foreign-language Division of the Office of War Information), suggesting a list of do’s and don’ts. In a draft letter he planned to send out along with the guidelines to all editors of the “foreign-language” press, Philipps wrote: “As Canadians, you will wish to see to it that Canada, our country, figures first in your space and sympathy.”56 Among the “don’ts” Philipps suggested avoiding “unfound

55 Memorandum “Nationalities Branch – Canadian Communities of Recent European Origin – Survey and Construction Period 1941/2,” file 1, vol. 2, Tracy Philipps Fonds, MG30 E350, LAC.

56 Draft letter to the editors, dated December 5, 1942, as attached to the Memorandum from T. Philipps to A.D. Dunton, Wartime Information Board, March 4, 1943, in file 8-9-1, vol. 13, series 31, RG36, LAC. Philipps couldn’t help but to accompany the above quote with the following testimony of his own cultural bias and patriotism: “The friendly French-and-English-speaking peoples, of which we Canadian people are one, should
and unconstructive criticism of Allies” (example: that Canada was threatened by English colonialism or by Yankee industrial imperialism); giving too much space to local political rivalries or “un-Canadian systems of governance”, (meaning communism); preferring publishing material received from outside sources to Canadian news services; prematurely claiming the right to national territories still under occupation in Europe (“this is not a fight about real estate”); stopping evasive comments about the war and pretending to be neutral when in fact supporting Quisling-type States in Europe created by the Axis (Croat Independent State, for instance): “who is not for us is against us.”

The letter and the accompanied document were never officially sent out for lack of approval on behalf of any agency he had approached with the request to sponsor the project. External Affairs, Censorship Directorate, RCMP, Wartime Information Board, his own superiors, they all refused to go along. The idea was dropped.

While Philipps was struggling with the guidelines, V.J. Kaye, his devoted friend and collaborator, occupied himself with monitoring and maintaining contacts with some 75 newspapers published in 17 European languages. This was one of the mandates specifically cited in the ministerial order of January 27, 1942 which constituted CCCC and its administrative support, the Nationalities Branch. Kaye and Miss Grant, the editorial assistant, formed the Editorial Section of the Branch. One of their tasks was to send out regular press releases consisting of a feature article and a series of war news receive sympathetic support and news-space in proper patriotic proportion, along with our other Allies.”

items. There was also a series of historical sketches and biographies of prominent past and current Canadians.58 Occasionally, Kaye would draw the attention of individual editors to some particular visual or textual material with Canadian content of potential interest to their readers.59

Even without the official approval, Philipps was on occasions sending out his draft guidelines to interested editors.60 Many of the editors of “foreign-language” press, however, were professionals with no intention of asking government officials how to do their editorial job. They were also sufficiently “Canadianized” to appreciate their freedom of expression.61 The government help was more then welcome, instead, when provided in

---

58 Among the biographies distributed by the Nationalities Branch figured Lord Selkirk and the Red River Settlement, Father Albert Lacombe (Catholic missionary in the Prairies), Count Paul Strzelecki (Polish-born explorer of New South Wales, Australia), Donald A. Smith, Lord Strathcona and Mount-Royal (governor of the Hudson’s Bay Company, and railway magnate), Andrew Bonar Law (Canadian-born British Prime Minister 1922-1923), Arthur Philemon Coleman (geologist), Sir Charles Saunders (discoverer of frost-resistant Marquis wheat), Wilfrid Laurier, John A. Macdonald, John Stanley Plaskett (astronomer), Sir Frederic Stupart (19th century meteorologist), Vilhjalmur Stefansson (Arctic explorer), Sir Frederick Banting (discoverer of insulin), and Sir Casimir Gzowski (19th century engineer). See letter by V.J. Kaye to Mrs. O.D. Skelton, June 13, 1944, in file 8, vol. 11, MG31 D69, Reel H-3005, LAC. The biographies were drafted by Watson Kirkconnell. Kaye informed Mrs. Skelton that the responses to these biographies were “exceptionally favourable” and that they were translated into many languages.

59 As an example, on October 9, 1943, Kaye sent a letter to Martin Dudak, editor of Nova Vlast, a Czech-language newspaper, attaching a photograph of a Czechoslovak Airman, Flt./Lt. Karel Kuttelwascher: “We thought that your readers would be interested in his photo.” File 33-N-2 “Nova Vlast,” vol.4, RG26,LAC.

60 On August 18, 1943, Philipps sent the draft of his policy statement to Antonino Spada, editor of the Cittadino canadese in Montreal who praised it “for clearness of your view and the elegance of exposition [sic],” and founded it “invaluable”. File 33-I-1, ‘Il Cittadino canadese,” vol. 4, RG26, LAC.

61 For example, “Canadian Foreign-language Press Survey,” a bi-monthly services by the Wartime Information Board, reported in its issue of October 16-31, 1943 (No.6, p.17)
the form of buying print space to place government advertisements or offering printing contracts.\textsuperscript{62} The representatives of the left-wing press, on the other hand, resented the attempts by the Nationalities Branch to interfere in the political life of their communities and launched personal attacks on Tracy Philipps, Vladimir Kaye, and Watson Kirkconnell.\textsuperscript{63}

A group of prominent “foreign-language” editors in Winnipeg formed in May 1942 the Canada Press Club composed of members of the press in all languages, including English and French. The first president and founder of the Club was Judge W.J. Lindal, an Icelandic-Canadian widely known for his efforts to promote Canadian citizenship and unity. The immediate objective of the club was to provide a united voice in support of the war effort. Awakening the awareness that Canadian unity could be achieved “within variety” was the club’s objective in the long run.\textsuperscript{64}

that the liberally-oriented Ukrainian newspaper \textit{Kanadiysky Farmer} (Canadian Farmer) denied “that the foreign-language groups in Canada are in need of any special political guidance.” This function, said the paper, reportedly, “is ably carried out by the foreign-language press.”

\textsuperscript{62} See for instance, the correspondence between various government officials and Frank Dojacek or J.T. Mitchell, both of National Publishers Limited in Winnipeg and owners of three ethnic newspapers, \textit{Der Nordwesten} (The Northwest) in German, \textit{Kanadiysky Farmer} (Canadian Farmer) in Ukrainian, and \textit{Hrvatski Glas} (Croatian Voice) in Croatian: file 24, vol. 1, Frank Dojacek Fonds, MG31 H188, LAC.

\textsuperscript{63} “Canadian Foreign-language Press Survey,” of the Wartime Information Board, reported in its issue No. 6 (October 16-31, 1943), p.17 that two “communist” papers, \textit{Ukrainske Slovo} (Ukrainian Word) and \textit{Ukrainske Zhitya} (Ukrainian Life) accused the Nationalities Branch and various people connected with its work of “spreading ‘dissatisfaction and discord.” For more on these attacks, see also, below, “Case Study No. 3: ‘Vilification’.”

\textsuperscript{64} The Club survived the war years. A second club of the same kind was formed in Toronto in 1947, and in the 1950s the two formed the Canadian Ethnic Press Federation.
As one of the members of the Club, John Brid, the editor of the English-language conservative paper the *Winnipeg Tribune*, offered to the other members of the Club space on the editorial page of the weekend edition of his paper to express their understanding of that very concept of “unity within variety”. Announcing the series, Brid urged: “Let’s not emphasize the dividing factor of ‘international’ character among various groups or within groups themselves split by political factions.” From September 13, 1943 to February 19, 1944, editor after editor expressed his and hers views on such varied subjects as unity, prejudice and discrimination, the proud history of a particular ethnic community in Canada, and citizenship education after the war. Certain themes were raised repeatedly throughout the series: the cornerstone of Canadian unity is tolerance, and understanding; unity will only come as the result of full equality – including the right to be different; there is no “minority” but rather a “majority” problem; expressions such as “foreigners”, “new Canadians”, “white men”, “bohunk” should have no place in Canada. Lindal offered the following picture of the patriotism of his colleagues of the press: “The whole Canadian set-up is of such fabric that it tends to create a hyphenated type of nationalism, what Mr. Brid calls ‘unity within variety’”. Elements of a common Canadianism had taken root and gained ground, added Lindal, but the process was by nature slow and appeared never to be complete: “There may always be a hyphen.”

---

For the history of the club see, Canada Press Club, *Multilingual Press in Manitoba* (Winnipeg, 1974)


A different kind of private initiative, also independent of the Nationalities Branch, was launched in Toronto by J.S.W. Grocholski, a Polish publisher of an annual bi-lingual, English-Polish, publication called *Poles in Canada* in circulation since 1938. He began publishing his annual periodical to instil in the Polish-Canadian youth the pride of being descendants of a great democratic nation endowed with remarkable cultural heritage. Many a Canadian youth, not just of Polish origin, he argued, was facing a problem and suffering of a sense of backwardness, a mild inferiority complex, occasioned by social "bullies", instilling into their minds, thoughts of being 'foreigners'. As evidence of this, we see youngsters changing their names to an English translation, when leaving school and seeking employment. There are two reasons for this. One is for convenience in business; the other is a deep bitterness when one's foreign sounding name keeps locked the door of opportunity.

In 1943, he decided to change the name of his publication to *Canadians All* and enlarge the scope of the publication and "present in future issues the contribution – past – present and future – of all the ethnic groups in Canada." In search for financial support for this ambitious project, Grocholski knocked at many doors, from the Rockefeller

---

67 J.S.W. Grocholski, "Editorial," *Poles in Canada* (Toronto: Acme Advertising Agency, 1940) p.6. Grocholski accounts his experiences as a young man in search of work, and the realization he had then reached that the "ski" in his name made him in the eyes of an employer "an able bodied but probably a weak minded Pole."

Foundation in New York to the Prime Minister of Canada, claiming that his request for subsidies towards launching a new magazine and an information agency to provide it with institutional support was submitted

on behalf of 2,500,000 citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who as yet are not accorded the freedom of calling themselves "CANADIANS", but are referred to as belonging to the particular European country from which their parents or earlier descendents emigrated. They are popularly referred to as "foreigners" and more reluctantly as "New Canadians". 69

The Prime Minister was advised that the project would have little chance of success however worthy it were. In his enthusiasm and good will, Grocholski ignored, it was argued, the realities of highly contentious political factors that opposed not only one community against another (Poles vs. Ukrainians) but also politically right wing elements of whatever ethnic community against the left-wing sympathizers, again, regardless of ethnic origin. To succeed, a project of such a politically-loaded nature, it was argued, should be undertaken by an agency free of any suggestion of partisanship. The Prime Minister was advised that his Wartime Information Board would be ideal to assume such a function. 70

The author of the above advice to the Prime Minister was John Grierson, recently appointed General Manager of the Wartime Information Board (WIB) whose intention

---


70 John Grierson, General Manager of the Wartime Information Board to Mr. H.R.L. Henry, Private Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister, March 5, 1943, in file 8-9-2 "Ethnic Groups in Canada," vol. 13, series 31, RG36, LAC.
was to rationalize and centralize government communications with all social actors in Canada. In his plan, the WIB would, among others, assume most of the functions of the Nationalities Branch and its Editorial Section, including maintaining contacts with “foreign-language” editors, reviewing their press and supplying them with high-quality information material on Canada’s war and its post-war reconstruction. The Department of External Affairs would be left with handling matters of foreign influences and issues affecting the morale and security of Canadians of different origins. All this would make the positions held by Tracy Philipps and Vladimir Kaye redundant. The Nationalities Branch would lose its raison d’être.

7.3: Case Study No. 3: “Vilification”

The earliest attacks on the Nationalities Branch and Tracy Philipps emanated as early as December 1940 from within the Ukrainian communities, and persisted well into late 1943, both in Canada and USA, in Ukrainian newspapers of clearly communist inclinations.71 Philipps was described as “a dapper gentleman” whose alleged past associations and friendship with British appeasement proponents (including Lord Halifax), Sir Oswald Mosley and his fascist circle, as well as with Italian fascists and Ukrainians with pro-Nazi sympathies, made him hardly an appropriate person to advise governments of Canada and US on how to organize the foreign-born support for Allies’ war efforts. These “vilifications”, as Philipps called them, also included incriminating

---

71 For a “tabulated summary” of these attacks, see “An Intervention in Canadian Affairs? A carefully staged and timed attack on a loyal Canadian Committee created by and for War Services,” dated May 14, 1943, in file 17, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
references to Vladimir Kaye, his faithful friend and collaborator, and began soon after the umbrella organization of several Ukrainian groups, the Ukrainian Canadian Committee (UCC), had been formed in November 1940 through a difficult negotiations skilfully manoeuvred by Philipps, Prof. G.W. Simpson and Kaye.\textsuperscript{72}

The "vilification" incident in its entirety was significant for a variety of its aspects. It provided a fatal blow to the future development of the Nationalities Branch as originally conceived by Philipps.\textsuperscript{73} It was a demonstration of energetic and rather vocal attempts by left-wing organizations to influence the political scene of the day.\textsuperscript{74} It also revealed the attitude some high-level civil servants and members of the liberal political elite preferred to favour when dealing with dissent, namely being extremely watchful while at the same time acting tolerant. This attitude was evident regardless of the RCMP urging to the contrary.

The intention behind the attacks was to hurt the credibility of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee and to denounce the government's support of that organization.\textsuperscript{75}


\textsuperscript{73} These consequences are the subject of the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{74} For an example, see Raymond Arthur Davies, \textit{This Is Our Land: Ukrainian Canadians Against Hitler} (Toronto: Progress Books, 1943)

\textsuperscript{75} See Kordan, \textit{Canada and the Ukrainian Question}, pp. ; also Lukiuk, \textit{Searching for Place}, p. 333-335;
The groups of Ukrainian Canadians which joined the UCC were either liberally-oriented or right of centre, and some of them defined as nationalistic, monarchist or religious, whether belonging to the Ukrainian Catholic or Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Absent were left wing groups recognized for their support of Soviet Russia’s claim on a Soviet Ukraine. This polarization left-wing/right-wing, accompanied by a high level of suspicion and a continuous series of mutual accusations of betrayal of this or other national interest, permeated all relationships within the community as well as between the community and the government.⁷⁶  

It was well known in Ukrainian circles that the UCC’s leaders considered Philipps their great friend hopefully able to convince the Canadian and British governments that the question of Ukrainian territories, previously under Polish, Czechoslovak or Russian control should be given due consideration by the Allies, resulting in their agreeing that the Ukrainian independence should be the imperative outcome of the armed conflict. Any commitment to this Ukrainian claim, however, was something the British government refused to contemplate at the time when Soviet Russia, the main opponent to such proposal, was a key ally in the strategic operations against Hitler.

In the early stages of the war Philipps favoured publicly the independence of the Ukraine. He was enough of a realist and far too good and loyal soldier to admit eventually that the British could not compromise the progress of war operations and the

⁷⁶ That same tension between left and right leaning Ukrainian-Canadians dominates and at the same time colours historical literature on this period. See, for instance, Thomas M. Prymak, Maple Leaf and Trident: The Ukrainian Canadians during the Second World War (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1988); Luciuk, Searching for Place, John Kolasky, The Shattered Illusion: The History of Ukrainian Pro-Communist Organizations in Canada (Toronto: Peter Martin, 1979)
ultimate victory by antagonizing their valuable allies, Poland and USSR, both of which made their competing claims on Ukrainian territories well known to the other Allies including the Canadian government.\textsuperscript{77}

As to the communist propaganda which various organizations were spreading in Canada under Moscow directives, Philipps believed that the propaganda spreading communist ideas in the Western capitalist world was merely a tool to destabilize the West and that communism had been for a long time already abandoned as a form of government and economic system in Soviet Russia itself.\textsuperscript{78} The USSR was no more, he argued, a revolutionary state. Communists in Canada and elsewhere, instead, he argued, still advocated a revolutionary approach to political change and promoted the destruction of social values inherent to the social order and the principle of good government adopted by the British Commonwealth.

His anti-communism derived, he used to explain, from his first-hand experience of dealing with Communist officials during his travels in southern Russia, Ukraine and Soviet Moslem Republics. He had no kind words for communists as individuals. This was easily detectable in his constant warnings to his superiors and other government departments against giving communists any sign of potential approval that might embolden them to accelerate their penetration of the Canadian working-class.

\textsuperscript{77} For the extensive discussion of this "Ukrainian problem" during the war years and the stand the Canadian government and Philipps took independently of each other on the subject, see Kordan, Canada and the Ukrainian Question.

community.\textsuperscript{79} He conceded that lifting the ban on the Communist Party of Canada as an organization could help remove the emotional cloak of communist martyrdom at the altar of democratic freedom of political opinion. He nevertheless believed that individual communists were “politically quick-change-artists” who, regardless of the label they adopted -- labour progressive or antifascist -- were essentially radical elements whose objective was to subvert by violence the capitalist system in place in Canada.\textsuperscript{80} He often referred to them as simply “fascists of the left”\textsuperscript{81}

His assessment of Soviet Russia was different:

\textbf{In Russia} they have had, and have recovered from, the Communist epidemic. Before 1937 it had already burned itself out. They have even acquired an immunity to the disease. Since Communism now represents to Russia a counter-revolution, the Russians are unlikely to wish to spread it in Europe except as an article of wartime export and as one of their defence weapons to put pressure on Germany by disintegrating from within.

\textbf{In the Russian bottle, the old Communist nostrum has been gradually replaced by a new national State-capitalist mixture. This mixture includes all those ingredients of capitalism formerly denounced such as capital (respect for private savings), interest-bearing securities, wage differentials, inheritance of property, etc.}

\textbf{On the Russian bottle it is only the old label, still called “Communism” which remains and deceives.}\textsuperscript{82}

\textsuperscript{79} See his memorandum addressed to the Deputy Minister of National War Services, Justice T.C. Davis, dated June 1, 1942, in file “Bureau of Public Information,”, vol. 35, RG44, LAC.


\textsuperscript{81} Address [by Tracy Philipps] to Deputy Minister of National War Services, January 1941, re: Sequestrated Halls, vol. 1, file 16, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\textsuperscript{82} Tracy Philipps to the Assistant Commissioner, RCMP, October 7, 1942, file 8-9-1-A “Tracy Philipps”, vol. 13, series 3, RG36, LAC.
In Philipps' assessment, Soviet Russia was a state power like any other, oppressing its own people and deceiving the world. Still, Soviet Russia was an important geopolitical factor not only in the strictly European context but also globally. Philipps was fully aware of the implications: for the duration of WWII, the Soviets being valuable British allies, he very carefully abstained from making any critical public commentaries of the kind quoted above and written for the eyes only of the RCMP top officials.

To add to the troubles caused by the public attacks on his person, Philipps' private life was also in crisis and his separation from his Ukrainian-born wife was accompanied by innuendos of her being involved in Nazi espionage and treachery. Recurring in the midst of all these upheavals in Philipps' private and public life was always the same name of an Ukrainian translator employed by the Customs Censorship Division, whose wife had befriended Philipps' wife, Lubka Kolessa. Philipps quickly identified the translator as the Ukrainian source of information on which the series of attacks published in Canadian and American pro-communist newspapers was based. An investigation by the RCMP was soon launched upon his request. At the same time Deputy Minister Davis inquired with the Censorship Division whether particular measures could be undertaken against the alleged instigator of the attacks on a public servant.83 Watson Kirkconnell, a passionate opponent of everything slightly communistic and a great defender of Philipps' Nationalities Branch, also intervened, vigorously pointing out that the attacks on Philipps

---

83 Letter by T.C. Davis to Col. C.M. Biggar, Director of Censorship, November 11, 1942, file D.C. 120 “Tracy Philipps”, vol. 5993, RG2, LAC.
in various newspapers were slanderous and poisonous. The censors concluded that they
could not intervene. In their view, the attacks on civil servants as individuals were not
subject to censorship as they could not be considered "a matter which can be regarded as
affecting the prosecution of the war" and therefore did not fall under the provisions of the
Defence of Canada Regulations. The person Philipps blamed for his miseries remained
a government employee (for reasons probably far more complex than it might have
appeared on surface from the preserved documentation) even if other inquiries, this time
by the Under-Secretary of External Affairs, Norman Robertson, suggested that albeit he
appeared to be a very competent translator, one should be "careful in relying on him" in
matters of ethical and political nature. Philipps' position as a public servant, on the
other hand, was severely damaged.

The problem amplified in September 1942 when a New York English-language
news bulletin of left-wing tendencies, The Hour, reproduced the story of Philipps' links
with various pro-Nazi and pro-fascist individuals and of his admiration for Benito
Mussolini. The story was summarized in the widely read New York weekly, The New
Republic, on October 26, 1942 and, to make it worse, picked up by the columnist J.V.

---

84 Letter by Watson Kirkconnell to Colonel Biggar, December 16, 1942, file D.C. 120,
vol. 5993, RG2, LAC.

85 Letter by Director of Censorship [O.M. Biggar] to Watson Kirkconnell, December 30,
1942, file D.C. 120, vol. 5993, RG2, LAC.

86 Memo for the file by Norman Robertson dated March 3, 1943, relating his conversation
with Robert England who had known the person in question since they both worked for
the Canadian National Railways. See file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.

87 A typewritten copy of the article "Mr. Philipps Goes to Washington", published in The
Hour of September 26, 1942, is preserved in file 8-9-1-A "Tracy Philipps", vol. 13, series
31, RG36, LAC.
MacAree in the *Globe and Mail* of October 31.\(^88\) Newspapers in other than Ukrainian language also picked up the story and questioned the effectiveness of the Nationalities Branch and its incriminated personnel.\(^89\)

The effects of these “vilifications” were “disastrous”, Philipps informed Deputy Minister Davis: his contacts began, he claimed, “shying-off” for fear of associative implications for having maintained communications “with someone classified as a ‘fascist’ and an ‘enemy’.” He could not blame them, he said, and hinted that he should resign, together with Dr. Kaye.\(^90\) Davis, who was about to move to a new assignment, was “inclined to agree”. He told Philipps that he might render much better service to the King and their two respective countries if he returned to South or East Europe, for example.\(^91\) Norman Robertson of External Affairs also doubted any further usefulness of keeping Philipps in Ottawa and began to look around for alternatives.\(^92\)

---


\(^{89}\) Thus, the Hungarian-language newspaper *Kanadai Magyar Munkas* published in its issue of November 11, 1942, an article by Istvan Szoke entitled “Who Is Tracy Philipps?” stating from the start, in the subtitle, that the government’s chief official for the nationalities had been accused of fascist sympathies. An English translation of the article is preserved in file D.C.120, vol. 5993, RG2, LAC.

\(^{90}\) Letter by Tracy Philipps to Judge Davis (strictly private and confidential), dated November 9, 1942, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.

\(^{91}\) Letter by Justice Davis to Tracy Philipps, November 10, 1942, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.

\(^{92}\) Norman Robertson to Major-General L.R. LaFleche, November 20, 1942, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.
But Philipps did not formally resign and his possible departure remained unresolved with two of his supporters, Minister Joseph Thorson and Deputy Minister Davis gone from the helm of the Department of National War Services and the new Minister, Major General LaFlèche expressing his inclination to study the subject in depth before making any major decision on the matter. LaFlèche simply ordered Philipps not to travel out of Ottawa and to submit all policy-oriented decisions for preliminary executive approval.

In the meantime, Philipps asked both The New Republic and the Globe and Mail for a public apology and wrote an elaborate list of point-by-point refutations of the incriminating allegations. In a letter to the Editor of the Globe and Mail, Philipps wrote:

You will certainly not have wittingly wished to lend support to any attack from outside Canada upon a fellow-British subject whom you are good enough to describe as having a distinguished record of public service. Nor will you have wished to render far more difficult his already delicate specialized wartime work for Canada and the allied nations.

He left it to his friend Watson Kirkconnell to defend him and the Nationalities Branch on such public occasions as the lecture at the Canadian Club of Toronto or the plenary meeting of the first congress of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee held in

93 Letter by Major-General L.R. LaFlèche to Norman Robertson, dated February 27, 1943, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.

94 In his column published in The Globe and Mail of November 7, 1942, J.V. McAree acknowledged the error in judgment when he had reported the allegations published in the American press. For Philipps’ list of refutations, see “Memorandum to Major General the Hon. L.R. LaFleche, Minister of National War Services” by T.C. Davis, Deputy Minister, dated November 7, 1942, in file 8-9-1, vol. 13, series 31, RG36, LAC.

Winnipeg in June 1943. Kirkconnell’s defence was accompanied by a strong attack on communist agitations among Ukrainians and did not help much in reducing left-wing resentment of Philipps’ and, by association, the government’s support of a nationalist, anti-Soviet position among Ukrainian Canadians.

The climax of attacks was reached in May 1943 when Moscow newspapers began to carry the story, triggering an exchange of diplomatic notes and ambassadorial visits to the Department of External Affairs. At issue was how committed the Canadian government was in fighting fascism, containing the activities of Ukrainian nationalist organizations under its control, and supporting and honouring Soviet efforts on the eastern front. Canadian diplomats gave the assurance that Canada was fully committed to winning the war, with no hidden agenda regarding the Ukraine.

The overall political discourse of the Liberal government during these war years (1941-1944) showed clear signs of pragmatism in the matter of communism and Soviet Russia. Thus, with the blessing of the two Ministers of Justice, Ernest Lapointe and Louis

96 On the luncheon speech by Kirkconnell at the Canadian Club of Toronto, on February 1, 1943, see “Kirkconnell Charges Communistic Papers Stir Up Racial Trouble,” The Globe and Mail, February 2, 1943. Speeches before the Club were usually radio broadcast but on this particular occasion, CBC refused to air this particular one. For Kirkconnell’s speech of June 22, 1943 at the First All-Canadian Congress organized by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, see W. Kirkconnell, Our Ukrainian Loyalists (Winnipeg: Ukrainian Canadian Committee, 1943). The speech was not reported in the official publications of the congress proceedings.

St-Laurent – both Quebeckers and both known for their anti-radicalism and anti-communism -- the RCMP kept a very close watch on the communist putatively subversive activities in the country. With that same blessing of the ministers, the ban of the Communist Party of Canada remained in force and some of the communist activists continued to be interned even after the USSR joined the Allies in the war against the Nazis and the Canadian communists and communist sympathizers abandoned their opposition to the "imperialists’ war" following instructions from Moscow. In the House of Commons the Minister of Justice, L. S. St.Laurent, explained that the Communist Party remained illegal not because of its attitudes towards the war (pertaining to the provisions of the DOCR) but rather because of its basic doctrine of inciting the use of force without the authority of law to bring about a governmental change in the country which contravened the section 133 of the Criminal Code. St. Laurent insisted that it was not the intellectual adherence to the communist doctrines that constituted the offence but the advocacy and the defence of acts, principles or policies of the seditious nature inherent to the communist ideology. Meanwhile, Doris Nielsen, a radical-left candidate from rural Saskatchewan, and Fred Rose, a former Communist Party executive from Montreal, succeeded in being elected to Parliament, the Government started sending greetings of encouragement to public rallies in support of Soviet Russia (acclaimed by the Ukrainian communist organizers as the valiant Fatherland), and a new Labour-

---

98 These RCMP activities under the provisions of Defence of Canada Regulations are examined in Chapter 2, above.

Progressive Party was formed in late 1943 with Tim Buck, former head of the banned Communist Party as its first leader.\textsuperscript{100}

It is significant that government officials outside RCMP ranks played down Philipps' warnings about the dangerous influence of outside communist propagandists on the morale and loyalty of "foreign-language" communities. They argued that the government should not interfere with the activities of foreign-language organizations as long as they abided by the law.\textsuperscript{101} In that vein, and in response to Philipps' alarming letters about an emerging new movement of pan-Slavism that appeared to be organized in North America under Moscow directives, Hume Wrong of the Department of External Affairs informed Philipps that the Pan-Slavic Movement was a private organization that might be held "undesirable because of its implications but it is most improbable that it could be headed off" and that it would not be "desirable to do so." Wrong even suggested that its outcome might turn out to be beneficial in strengthening co-operation or "reduce the frictions between different sections of our foreign born population of Slavic origin." Most of all, he added, it was not an appropriate time to create issues that could weaken Canada's war alliance with the USSR.\textsuperscript{102}

Kirkconnell and Philipps, instead, argued in favour of the government's stronger involvement in the control of and guidance in matters related to the political activities of

\textsuperscript{100} Norman Penner, \textit{Canadian Communism} (Toronto: Methuen, 1988) p. 182-215.

\textsuperscript{101} See, for instance, Memorandum by Norman Robertson to Dana Wilgress, Canadian Representative in Moscow, dated May 28, 1943, reproduced in \textit{A Delicate and Difficult Question}, p. 99.

\textsuperscript{102} Letter by H. Hume Wrong to Philipps, September 12, 1942, file 8-9-1-A, vol. 13, series 31, RG36, LAC.
ethnic communities in the national affairs of their homelands. They particularly insisted, although with apparently little avail, on the foreign origin and the destructive impact of communism on the Canadian way of life, both in terms of intense attacks on “Anglo-Saxon” capitalism as practiced in Canada and of its effect in slowing down the process of ushering the foreign-born into the ideological sphere of “Canadianism”. Moreover, Philipps was of the opinion that tolerance of one extreme political movement of alien origin -- for instance communism -- would strengthen, as counter-action, the appeal of nativist-motivated fascism (also mostly nourished with propaganda from outside), and vice versa.103

To counter such a development, Philipps offered a solution which no one was willing to pick up: in order to stop the spread of a communist epidemic in the country, Philipps suggested creating or using an existing all-Slavic Canadian newspaper with the objective of guiding Slavic communists and socialists into following a British-Canadian type of socialism: “It would appear preferable to have the Canadian Socialist or hesitant Communists as good Canadian citizens, rather than to have Slavic Socialists or hesitant Communists who take their political orders from outside Canada” by reading “unCanadian Communistic newspapers” and be fed with misleading information.104

103 Letter by Tracy Philipps to H.H. Wrong, October 13, 1942, file 8-9-1-A, vol. 13, series 31, RG36, LAC.

Disappointed at the government reaction to their warnings, Kirckonnell on his part felt compelled to write a letter to the Minister of National War Services, LaFlèche, alerting him to the fact that the attacks on Philipps by the communist press “have somehow succeeded in poisoning the mind” of External Affairs officials and turned them against the Nationalities Branch and its Advisory Committee for Co-operation in Citizenship (CCCC) “on the ground (1) that it is anti-Russian, and (2) that it has encouraged dangerous nationalism.”

Kirkconnell was no longer attacking Hitler’s fascism as he did in 1939-1940 and concentrated instead on a verbal fight against what he considered a far greater danger for Canadian liberal democracy and way of life: communism at home and abroad. During the war years, however, it was difficult to make public statements against Soviet Russia while it acted as an ally and its membership in the coalition of United Nations was vital for the successful campaign against Hitler’s armed forces on the Eastern front. Consequently, the speech Kirkconnell gave to the Canadian Club of Toronto in early 1943 provoked strong reactions. Not only was he vilified by the left-wing press for his bashing of communists, but Judith Robinson, a well-known liberal journalist and editor of the News, characterized his “hysterical eruptions” as more subtle than those of Dr. Goebbels but still “frigidly hostile to the Soviet Union and tenderly deferential to the old regimes of blood and reaction that once kept the people of Eastern Europe in slavery.” In her view, the speech was “a gloomy dirge of defeatist fascism.”

105 Letter by W. Kirkconnell to Major-Gen. L.R. LaFleche, Minister DNWS, dated February 8, 1943, in file 33, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs preferred not to comment publicly but wrote Kirkconnell a letter expressing his worries. While he would be ready to agree with much of the speech, Robertson told Kirkconnell, the speech might "lend itself, with very little distortion, to the enemy's divisive propaganda between and against foreign-language groups here." 107 The enemy in question could be either a Nazi sympathizer or Canadian communists themselves, profiting from the bizarre play of alliances on the international front to gain grounds and followers on the domestic political front.

Unabashed by official warnings to restrain himself, Kirkconnell pursued his polemical utterances about the potential communist impact on the Canadian way of life by means of its steady infiltration of various ethnic communities, notably Slav and Jewish. "I refused to yield," he said later, "to the tide of pro-Soviet propaganda that began to rise in June 1941. I had built my lighthouse on granite foundations of fact, and could wait in faith for the waters of falsehood and folly to ebb again." 108

In 1944 he published Seven Pillars of Freedom, a compilation of documented denunciations meant, as he put it in a letter to Vladimir J. Kaye, to "illuminate the Canadian public as to the whole race of Red reptiles." 109 In the book he documented in

108 W. Kirkconnell, "A Tale of Seven Cities. An Address given by Professor Watson Kirkconnell of McMaster University, president elect of Acadia University, at a public dinner held in his honour by Women's Civic Club, Hamilton, Ontario, on April 9th, 1948," p. 13.
109 W. Kirkconnell, Seven Pillars of Freedom (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1944). See the letter by Watson Kirkconnell to V.J. Kaye, dated August 22, 1943, in file 9, vol. 11, V.J. Kaye Fonds, MG31 D69, Reel H-3005, LAC. The choice of language was equally colourful in the case of Kirkconnell's opponents, judging from this quote from the Canadian Tribune, the organ of the Labour-Progressive Party of Canada which
detail how communists in Canada and Soviet Russia acted in violation of seven
fundamental principles of Canadian values: religious faith, co-operation, education,
justice, discipline, fraternity and loyalty. His attacks on Canadian communists led him
to assert that most of their leaders were of Jewish origin. The combination of public and
unrepentant "red-baiting" with such antisemitic statements appeared as an embarrassing
and strange reversal of opinion for someone who had been until not so long ago
denouncing acts of persecution of Jews in Germany and seemed condemning all types of
racial or cultural discrimination. His allegations about developments in Soviet Russia
were also judged at the time as too extravagant to be reliable and were met with public

Kirkconnell inserted in his "Tale of Seven Cities" (p. 20): "His books and his babble are
without truth, because they form an adulterous alliance with the vomits of the brown
python of Germany, the spews of the black snake of Italy, and the slime of the sun-shark
of Japan."

A book review of Seven Pillars suggests that Kirkconnell used "a slashing
broadsword" in his provocative treatise but, "even if a partial discount be required, his is
a weighty indictment." See, A.E.P[rincent], [Book Review:] "Seven Pillars of Freedom. By
Watson Kirkconnell...," Queen's Quarterly 52, no.1 (Spring 1945) p. 104.

See, Jack Lipinsky, ""The Agony of Israel": Watson Kirkconnell and Canadian
Jewry," Canadian Jewish Historical Society Journal 6, no. 2 (Fall 1982) pp.57-72. It is
worth noting that Kirkconnell, joined by a group of prominent Canadians (Sir Robert
Falconer, former Principal of the University of Toronto, historian George Wrong, John
Dafoe and Grant Dexter of Winnipeg Free Press, H.M. Tory, President of the Royal
Society of Canada, Mgr. Camille Roy, Rector of Laval University, etc.) signed a protest
note issued in early 1940 expressing utmost dismay at the "unprecedented barbarism"
inflicted in Poland by German authorities. The note referred to the expulsion of over a
million people from their "authentically Polish" districts who were as a consequence
condemned, without shelter and food, to an almost certain death. The protest note made
no reference whatsoever to the specifically targeted and horrendous plight of the Polish
Jews taking place at the same time. See "German Barbarism in Poland. A Canadian
criticism, most emphatically from the left-leaning, pro-Soviet circles. Only a few years later they were publicly confirmed as tragically true. At the time of the book’s publication they caused once again considerable uneasiness in the government ranks for fear of international repercussions in the crucially important Soviet-British relations. Under pressure, Kirkconnell, eventually, resigned from the Advisory Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship on December 4, 1944 and temporarily severed all his official links with the government.

Incontestably, there were numerous members of “foreign-language” communities among Canadian communists in the 1930-40s. In 1935, only 37 per cent of party membership nationwide was of either Anglo-Celtic or French Canadian origin, as noted by John Manley in his study of the Communist Party of Canada during the pre-WWII years. The “overwhelming majority” of members in Ontario and Manitoba were foreign-born. According to Ivan Avakumovic, the Party’s policy directives in the late 1930s included pressures to “anglicize” the ranks, or at least recruit the Canadian-born into the Party. In that spirit, some members of eastern European or Jewish origins went as far as anglicizing their “foreign-sounding” names. Nevertheless, according to Avakumovic,

---


113 See the file on “Watson Kirkconnell” in vol. 13, series 7, RG35, LAC.

114 See, John Manley, “‘Communists Love Canada!’: The Communist Party of Canada, the ‘People’ and the Popular Front, 1933-1939,” Journal of Canadian Studies 36, No.4 (Winter 2002-2002) p.74. The total number of Party members at the time was around 9,000, according to Ivan Avakumovic, The Communist Party in Canada: A History (Toronto: McCCelland and Stewart, 1975) p.115.
only a quarter of members of the Party’s top executive body, the central committee, were of Eastern European origin.\textsuperscript{115} The majority of those of European origin were Ukrainians and Finns. But there were also Russians, Poles, Hungarians, and Yugoslavs, a majority of them of Croat origin, representing by themselves alone one-tenth of the total Party membership.\textsuperscript{116} Usually hired as cheap labour and first fired in times of economic crises, they were all receptive to the urging communist call addressing the proletariat to unite and fight for its rights.

Some of the card-carrying communists in Canada had been already members of their national communist parties back in their homelands. Some joined the Party through their involvement in the labour movement. In the depression years, some became itinerant labour activists, spreading communist teaching among embittered and unemployed workers of their language group, and always, faithfully and without questioning, followed firm orders transmitted to them from Moscow.\textsuperscript{117}

Some, however, as argued by Philipps, became “communistic”, because they had found cultural activities organized by community halls managed mostly by left-wing sympathizers more attractive than those offered by local churches.\textsuperscript{118} He was particularly referring to the dozens of halls owned by the Ukrainian Labour Farmer Temple

\textsuperscript{115} Avakumovic, \textit{The Communist Party in Canada}, p.119-120.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., p. 121.

\textsuperscript{117} That was the case, in the early 1930s, of Tom Cačić, a Croat, who faced trial in company of Tim Buck and six other Communists in 1931 and was consequently deported. See Anthony W. Rasporich, “Tomo Cačić: Rebel without a Country,” \textit{Canadian Ethnic Studies} 10, No.2 (1978) pp.86-94.

Association (ULFTA) which were all indiscriminately confiscated in June 1940 at the
time the Communist Party was banned. Originally, these halls were built and managed
with money collected from the community. They were gradually taken over by
communist or left-wing-oriented members of the community who realized the potential
these facilities offered for ideological education through cultural entertainment and
community participation. In the early days of the communist movement in Canada,
separate “foreign-language” sections and clubs were formed by the Party to provide for
concentrated fora of discussion and mobilization towards activities in Canada and the
homeland alike.119 These sections within the Party were abolished by order from Moscow
in the mid-1920s. Some of the sections remained in place transformed into associate
organizations. That was the case of the Finnish Organization of Canada, ULFTA, the
Croatian Cultural Association, Hungarian Workers Clubs, Polish People’s Association or
Russian Workers and Farmers Clubs. Their function was to serve as the link between the
Party and the public. These associated organizations were usually in charge of publishing
a newspaper and providing useful services of educational, mutual aid or cultural nature to
a particular foreign-language community.120.

119 On the formation of these “foreign-language” organizations within the Canadian
communist movement, see Penner, *Canadian Communism*, pp.268-284.
120 On the history of ULFTA, seen from inside the ranks, see Peter Krawchuk, *Our
History: The Ukrainian Labour-Farmer Movement in Canada, 1907-1991* (Toronto:
Lugus Publications, 1996). On the Finnish organization, also seen from inside, see
William Eklund, *Builders of Canada: History of the Finnish Organization of Canada,
various organizations, see mimeographed memo entitled “Communists” distributed
among the members of the parliamentary committee reviewing the operations under the
Defence of Canada Regulations, in vol. 2482: “Committee on Defence of Canada
Regulations,” RG14, LAC. Several of these so-called “foreign-language,” “pro-
Not everybody felt seriously threatened by that situation. In an editorial published on May 17, 1940, a few days before the ban was imposed on communists, the *Winnipeg Free Press*, the pre-eminent Liberal newspaper, did not find Canadian Communists potentially dangerous for Canadian democracy:

Much of the rank and file of the so-called Communists of this country are simple-minded, hare-brained crackpots who have some dim vision of an elysium to which they may some day repair. Some of them have some inkling of orthodox Communist economic doctrine which is not necessarily dangerous. These persons should be left to pursue their erratic courses as they will and another and still larger class of loose thinkers and talkers might also be left to themselves.

In the view of the *Winnipeg Free Press*, danger lay instead in a “general, hysterical persecution of every unorthodox opinion.”¹²¹ In the course of the next few years, though, the editors of the *Winnipeg Free Press* began to find communist agitation in favour of Soviet Union too troublesome and too aggressive. Still some politicians and civil servants, as pointed out earlier, continued to see political and strategic advantage in professing a certain level of cautious tolerance in the wartime circumstances and in view of the strategically crucial international allegiances.¹²² This attitude was also highlighted by Norman Penner in his *Canadian Communism* as well as by John Stanton in his


"Government Internment Policy, 1939-1945". Repression could engender resentment, it was argued, so easily manipulated by domestic communist propagandists for their political gains. The Canadian economy could not afford labour disruptions in the time of war, others would argue. Besides, once Soviet Russia became an ally, communists became highly vocal anti-fascists and fervent advocates of total war effort and therefore useful allies. Years later, Lester Pearson recalled sitting on a special interdepartmental committee which dealt with security problems and realizing how silly it had felt to continue considering communists a security threat while at the same time depending so much on the gallant war effort of the Soviets and communist resistance movements in eastern Europe. “I recall,” he wrote, “arguing strongly in favour of new security policies which recognized communism as a source of support, however, temporary.”

Temporary it was, for sure. Only a couple of years later, Ottawa had the surprise of being chosen as the venue of the first major incident of a nascent cold war, the Gouzenko Affair. As its outcome, the liberally-inspired political tolerance of radical


124 Lester B. Pearson, Mike: The Memoirs of the Rt. Hon. Lester B. Pearson, vol. 1: 1897-1948 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972) p.198. In a memorandum he wrote as Assistant Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs to his superior, the Under-Secretary of State, Norman Robertson, on October 12, 1941, Pearson found “somewhat nauseating” how Canadian Communists had suddenly changed their view of the war: from imperialistic to “holy”. He had to admit that “whatever the reasons may be, the Russians are fighting on our side” and the Canadian communists had been on board. The text of this memorandum is reproduced in A Delicate and Difficult Question: Documents in the History of Ukrainians in Canada, 1899-1962, ed. Bohdan S. Kordan & Lubomyr Y. Luciuk (Kingston: The Limestone Press, 1986) pp.78.

125 On the Cold War period in Ottawa, see Reg Whitaker and Gary Marcuse, Cold War Canada: The Making of a National Insecurity State, 1945-1957 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994)
dissidence became a matter of the past. In 1943, however, Norman Robertson could still maintain his sentiment that Philipps must have been the victim of his own mystifications.\footnote{Tracy Philipps "is a very vain man and has a weakness for mystification which has made difficulties for himself," was the way Norman Robertson assessed Philipps as early as May 1941. See, his letter to Commissioner S.T. Wood, RCMP, May 10, 1941, in file 165, Part III, vol. 1896, RG25, LAC.} At the height of the crisis surrounding Philipps' wrangling with the "vilifications" of having Nazi connections, Norman Robertson enlisted John Grierson, founder of the National Film Board and, from 1943 to 1944, an energetic and powerful head of the federal Wartime Information Board, to help him in his efforts to remove Philipps and have the Nationalities Branch scrapped or absorbed by the Board. Ironically, a mere couple of years later, in 1946, Grierson will be himself victim of accusations as part of the Gouzenko Affair: he was accused of having communist connections.

While the real motives behind the attacks on Philipps had an international dimension and concerned the Ukrainian homeland and its future, the consequences were domestic and affected the way the government pursued its policy of ethnic assimilation and national unification from then on. Philipps' short-lived working formula for the Nationalities Branch turned out to be a failure. Instead of reducing the penetration of European political and nationalist battles, the Branch's activities practically exasperated them by getting involved -- however subtle or covert it may have been -- in the debates over various contentious issues of national sovereignty among European peoples affected by the war. Those included the Ukrainian, Croat and Slovak claims for independence, pan-Slavism and the competition among different anti-fascist and liberation movements being organized among European exiles in North America as to which of them could best
represent the political aspirations of their compatriots in the homeland. Philipps was right: those were foreign affairs and they did distract immigrant communities from concentrating on their becoming good Canadian citizens. But he did not, with his action, abate them. Quite the contrary.
Chapter 8
Changing the Course

Getting together is important. Getting our ideas together is important. Enlivening our sentiments in common is important. Getting our action going in unison is important. Once good feelings and good ideas move like wildfire across the democratic sky, we are half way toward building a community worth living in.

*John Grierson* (1939)

I doubt whether there is any advantage in underlying the fact of lines of distinction between various parts of the Canadian population.

*G. de T. Glazebrook* (1942)

Since it is probable that we have before us two or three more years of war to be succeeded by years of political adjustment in Europe which will disturb many of our peoples of European origin, it is a measure of national wisdom to attach them closely to Canadian ideals and aspirations in the interests of their own peace of mind, and of the future welfare of their children.

*Robert England* (1944)

From the early days of the war, the government felt an evident need to improve its means of communications with the public. But setting up an acceptable structure for the production and dissemination of public information was gradual and cautious. This was mostly due to the fear of criticism by the commercial, so-called independent press – and

---

1 John Grierson, “Searchlight on Democracy,” *Food for Thought* IV, no.7 (April 1944) p.4. This was the text of an address before the annual conference of the Canadian Association for Adult Education held in summer of 1939.

2 Memorandum by G. de T. Glazebrook to N.A. Robertson, dated September 2, 1942, file “Foreign Language Press in Great Britain and Canada,” vol. 3230, RG25, LAC.

the public -- to the effect that any information provided by the government was nothing but propaganda, self-promotion of the governing Liberal Party, and a breach of the freedom of press. The construction of the necessary infrastructures began with a cabinet committee. Based on its recommendations, the office of Director of Public Information was created. Some six months later the office was integrated into the Department of National War Services (DNWS) as one of its special divisions. As of January 1942, the Bureau of Public Information (BPI) also comprised the Nationalities Branch, mostly for the purposes of appropriations and a necessary organizational framework. With its specific function of administrative support to the Advisory Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (CCCC) and because of its exclusive dealing with issues related to immigrants of continental European origin, the Branch had a very distinct role and operated on its own devices under the direction of Tracy Philipps.

By the fall of 1942, it was generally agreed that the structure put in place to disseminate "public information" was, as feared, unsatisfactory and attracted more

---

4 Order-in-Council PC 3333 of July 19, 1940. About the activities of the Bureau of Public Information, see file "History of the Department of National War Services: Organization and Administration," vol. 5, series 7, RG35, LAC; also, G.H. Lash, [Report of the Director of Public Information], February 12, 1941, file 2-1-4, vol. 6, series 31, RG36, LAC; See also information provided by the minister responsible in the House of Commons: response by the Hon. J.G. Gardiner, Minister of National War Services to a question by E.G. Hansell (MP for Macleod, Alberta) on February 17, 1941, Dominion of Canada. Official Report of the Debates of the House of Commons (hereafter Debates of the House of Commons), 2nd session-19th Parliament (November 7, 1940-January 21, 1942) pp. 799-800; response by Mr. Gardiner to a question by A.H. Bence (MP for Saskatoon City) dated February 26, 1941, ibid, pp.1033-1034; intervention by Hon. J.G. Gardiner in the debate on War Appropriation Bill, dated March 7, 1941, ibid, pp.1333-1337; intervention by the Hon. J. Thorson, Minister of National War Services since June 1941, in the debate on the expenditures of his department, and notably its division of
criticism than praise. Its own director, Herbert Lash, complained about the red tape in which his operations were enmeshed, while outside critics called the information produced as "unimaginative, uninspiring and dated" or "verging on political propaganda," depending on the critic's political affiliation. Instead of re-organizing it once again, a new agency was created in September 1942, called the Wartime Information Board (WIB), to be under the direct authority of the Prime Minister.

---

5 "Judged by the quantity of printed material which reaches this newspaper from these government publicity offices," wrote the Toronto Telegram in its editorial of July 26, 1941, "the cost of stationary alone must be considerable." The Globe and Mail called it "a frightful waste of the taxpayers' money," particularly knowing the fact "that most of the propaganda prepared by these men goes straight into the waste-baskets of newspaper offices from coast to coast." See Editorial "A Shocking Waste of Money," The Globe and Mail, February 3, 1941. The Bureau was also compared to a distributing agent "for the monstrous flood of pamphlets." See, Watson Thompson, "Education and Propaganda," Canadian Forum 21, No.252 (February 1942) p.330.


7 Letter by Brooke Claxton (MP for St.Lawrence-St.George, Montréal) to Prime Minister Mackenzie King, dated May 5, 1941, in file 2-14-2, vol. 8, series 31, RG36, LAC.

8 See the intervention by D.K. Hazen (MP for St. John-Albert, New Brunswick) on November 28, 1940, Debates of the House of Commons, 2nd session-19th Parliament (November 7, 1940-January 21, 1942), p.508. In the House of Commons, other MPs also raised the issue of the material sent out by the Bureau as being political propaganda trying to create the impression that the party in power was doing a good job in governing. See the intervention by G.K. Fraser (MP for Peterborough, Ontario) on November 25, 1940, ibid, p. 390; or the one by the Leader of the Opposition, R.B. Hanson (York, Sunbury, New Brunswick) on February 19, 1941, ibid, p.833.

TIMELINE

Office of Public Information - Wartime Information Board

September 12, 1939  Three-member Committee of Public Information of the Privy Council appointed (Norman A. McLarty, Minister of Labour as chair) *(Order-in-Council PC 4017)*

December 8, 1939  Office of the Director of Public Information created *(PC 4073)*

July 19, 1940  Powers relative to Public Information vested in the Minister of National War Services *(PC 3333)*

September 13, 1940  Office of Public Information transferred to the Department of National War Services (DNWS) *(Order-in Council PC 4749)*

February-March 1941  Eleven weekly programmes entitled *Canadians All* aired on CBC Radio

Summer 1941  *Canadians All* by Watson Kirkconnell published

September 9, 1942  Public Information Division of DNWS transferred to Wartime Information Board (WIB) *(PC 8099)* and Charles Vining appointed chairman, responding directly to the Prime Minister *(PC 8100)*

February 12, 1943  Vining resigned, replaced by A.M. Norman Mackenzie (president of the University of New Brunswick), as chairman of the Board, and John Grierson, (Film Commissioner of the National Film Board) as general manager *(PC 1206)*

April 3, 1943  Grierson responds publicly to criticisms of high spending with a statement *It Is Not Done With Mirrors*

July 1943  A critical debate in the House of Commons

January 7, 1944  Agreement signed between the Nationalities Branch and WIB on responsibilities for surveying foreign-language press and communicating with ethnic organizations

January 10, 1944  Grierson resigns as general manger of WIB (continues to be Film Commissioner), is replaced at WIB by A. Davidson Dunton, his deputy

September 28, 1945  WIB dissolved and replaced by the Canadian Information Service, created to provide information on Canada abroad *(PC 6300)*

Sources: *Order-in-Council PC 8099* of September 9, 1942; and files in vols. 49-50, and 120, series B-2, RG2, LAC; and vols. 35 & 36, RG44, LAC.
What happened to the Nationalities Branch in the process? The question of where to transfer it and even whether to maintain it in operation was extensively deliberated among various officials, concerned with the pro-active and politicized approach the Branch had favoured in its work among ethnic communities, a fact that had been increasingly judged controversial.\textsuperscript{10} The way government officials eventually resolved the question reflected a concerted effort in re-enforcing a policy approach which would focus on the construction of a strong rallying point for national unity and minimize the potential effects of cultural diversification in the population. The chosen rallying point was “citizenship” to serve as the principle determinant of belonging to the Canadian community and the prime signifier of inclusion, without reference to racial, religious, cultural or linguistic markers.

In the concrete circumstances of the transfer of the BPI’s tasks to the WIB, the immediate question was the appropriateness of integrating the Branch into the working structure of the WIB and in so doing reduce its functions to a liaison office with the “foreign-language” press.\textsuperscript{11} There were also suggestions that it remain a war service and

\textsuperscript{10} The very person who was an active proponent of its creation, Justice Davis, Deputy Minister of DNWS, was himself by September 1942 convinced that the Branch should be abolished. See the memorandum by T.C. Davis to Minister LaFlèche, dated November 13, 1942, in file 29, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\textsuperscript{11} See the Memorandum of a conference held on September 22, 1942 between Campbell Smart, representing the WIB, on one hand, and Justice Davis, Deputy Minister of National War Services, George Simpson, chair of the CCCC and Tracy Philipps, on the other, to discuss the possible inclusion of the Branch in the newly created WIB, in file “Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship,” vol. 36, RG44, LAC; also the Memo prepared by Smart for the Chair of the Wartime Information Board, Charles Vining, concerning the same meeting, in file 8-9-1, vol. 13, series 31, RG36, LAC.
be allowed to pursue what Philipps considered its primary task, namely counter-balancing the foreign ideological and nationalistic influences among the ethnic communities and enlisting “foreign-born” human resources in the Canadian war efforts. Assuming that this task were truly its primary role, the question then arose: shouldn’t the Branch be integrated in the Department of External Affairs, instead, or, otherwise, join the Immigration Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources? It happened that neither of these two departments felt inclined to take the Branch and Tracy Philipps under their authority at that point in time and so it remained for another year part of the Department of National War Services as a separate unit.12

As it turned out, 1943 was a difficult year for the Nationalities Branch, plagued by several setbacks. The two main staff members were victims of serious health problems: Philipps had two nasty falls in the streets of Ottawa and both times injured his spine, while Vladimir Kaye suffered from serious stress problems and was on sick leave for months. Then, after the departure of a particularly sympathetic Deputy Minister, Justice Davis, in November 1942, for six months no Deputy Minister was appointed and no one provided broad departmental policy directions. The new Minister, Major-General LaFlèche, in place since September 1942, did not commit himself to any decision concerning the Branch for a whole full year into his mandate, except for denying permissions to Philipps and Kaye to give public statements and make field trips.13 He was

12 See, for instance, the memorandum by G. de T. Glazebrook addressed to Norman Robertson, Under-Secretary of External Affairs, dated September 2, 1942, in file “Foreign Language Press in Great Britain and Canada,” vol. 3230, RG25, LAC.

13 Writing to George Simpson, the chair of the Advisory Committee, about his going on a
also not willing to call a meeting of the Advisory Committee until pressed to do so in late November 1943, or else be accused of serious neglect of an important public relations issue. Both the Deputy Minister and the Minister had difficulties in understanding the refinements of Philipps' work. In fact, at a certain point, the Deputy Minister confessed to his Minister his "inability to understand what Mr. Philipps is doing and, what is more discouraging, to get him to express himself in a way which is comprehensible."¹⁴ Philipps once suggested that his minister seemed suspicious of everything, like "a peasant-come-to-town," and probably disliked the "foreign-born" "only one degree more than the Anglosaxons as intruders, thanks to the Anglosaxon control of immigration."¹⁵ As to Deputy Minister Chester Payne's complains that Philipps' memos were too long and difficult to understand, Philipps responded using his favourite metaphor of comparing his work with that of an electric engineer, and pointing out how inconvenient it would have been for the engineer, if each time he needed funds and staff to do the job, he had to explain in writing "the nature and principles of applied hydraulics and electricity, (which

---

¹⁴ See Memo by Chester Payne, Deputy Minister to the Minister, August 11, 1943, in file 29, vol.1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

¹⁵ Letter by Tracy Philipps to George W. Simpson, dated October 17, 1943, in file 33, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
has taken him a lifetime to learn), to a non-technical Chief.” His correspondence could not be brief, he argued, it also had to be read!\textsuperscript{16} To make things worse for the Branch and Tracy Philipps with it, attacks in the “foreign-language” communist press were on the rise, spreading also into other, less radical papers, and reaching the ears of Moscow, raising questions about the Branch’s efficiency on the domestic front and its liability in the domain of foreign affairs. With that in mind and in the light of the Minister’s obvious reluctance to define the Branch’s future role within his department, several senior bureaucrats pushed for a new direction in the government’s dealings with ethnic communities and saw in the WIB the best solution.

\textit{Grierson’s Wartime Information Board}

The functions of the Office of Public Information (BPI) consisted in collecting and disseminating to the public government-produced information on various phases and aspects of the war effort, co-ordinate information services of various government departments, and originate or engage other means “for the obtaining of the utmost aid from the people of Canada in the national emergency which has arisen.”\textsuperscript{17} Its successor, the Wartime Information Board had the additional task of providing Canadian war news and information abroad, in particular in the United States, and of maintaining an

\textsuperscript{16} Note 4: “Brevity”, attached to a strictly personal and confidential memo for the Deputy Minister’s eyes only, dated September 13, 1943, in file 21, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

\textsuperscript{17} Order-in-Council PC 8488 of October 31, 1941, concerning the re-organization of the Department of National War Services.
information programme for Canadian troops overseas. Both agencies operated in English but maintained a separate French language section and some, but not all of their publications were adapted into French or published only in French. Both agencies, the BPI and the WIB, paid considerable attention to the issues of public morale: how to counter the spreading of demoralizing rumours; how to improve industrial morale; how to engage consumers and producers in reducing waste by saving and recycling; and last but not least, how to reduce tension in English/French relations for the sake of national unity.

---


19 See reports of activities in File 1-3-1, vol. 2, series 31, RG36, LAC. The French name of the Board was a literary translation from English: *Commission d'information pendant la guerre*. The best known French-only publication were *Les Nouvelles catholiques*, a bimonthly periodical summarizing news material raised in the Catholic press around the world on topics related to the war. In his response to a question by T.L. Church (MP for Broadview, Toronto), Hon. J.G. Gardiner, Minister responsible for the Bureau of Public Information, informed the House of Commons on June 9, 1941 that the decision on whether a publication be produced in both or one of the official languages befall the Director of Public Information. Up to that date, 60 publications were issued in English, 35 in French and among those 95 publications, 41 were produced in only one language. *Debates of the House of Commons*, 2nd session-19th Parliament (November 7, 1940-January 21, 1942) p. 3679.

20 Herbert Lash, Director of the BPI, surrounded himself with psychologists and created an informal Committee on Morale to advise the BPI staff on how to deal with social dynamics under stress. See file 8-2-1, part 2, vol. 12, series 31, RG36, LAC.
The first chairman of the Board, Charles Vining, head of the Newsprint Association of Canada, was quickly acclaimed as the right man for the job of enlisting the goodwill of commercial press to disseminate information produced by government agencies.\textsuperscript{21} He kept the position for only a few months. By February 1943 he was forced to resign for health reasons. It was only under the leadership of John Grierson, appointed General Manager of the WIB upon Vining’s departure, that the early expectations of a new and successful turn in government relations with the public were actually fulfilled and the WIB transformed into a highly pro-active agency in full gear. A staff of some 130 people (41 of them French-Canadians) was organized into different sections with specific assignments: the External Branch, with offices in London (UK), New York, Washington and Canberra; the French News Branch; and the Domestic Information Branch, this last one with the task to “coordinate the departmental flow of information on specific subjects and channel it through the most appropriate media to specific and selected audiences.” There was also a Reports Branch whose Press and Research Section was assigned the task to observe and report on public morale and assess the public needs for information. Under the leadership of Prof. J.D. Ketchum, this section produced weekly press surveys (distributed to 158 addressees in various government departments and 19 Canadian legations abroad) and, since summer of 1943, a bi-monthly “foreign-language” press

\textsuperscript{21} Commenting on the creation of the new agency with Charles Vining at its head, Bruce Hutchison suggested that Vining had the required qualities to “build a new psychology in this nation and safeguard its reputation in the world.” See Bruce Hutchison, “Words Are Weapons,” \textit{Maclean’s Magazine}, November 15, 1942, p.18.
survey, circulated to 83 addressees in Canada and three abroad.\footnote{22}

John Grierson, the General Manager responsible for all these operations, was of Scottish origin, with university education from Glasgow and the renowned Chicago School of Sociology. He had been already a well-known producer of many noteworthy documentary films in Britain and the US, when he was invited to Canada in 1938 to help the government officials draft the appropriate legislation and launch a publicly-owned film industry known as the National Film Board. He did more than that: he remained in Canada as its first Film Commissioner. His appointment as the WIB’s General Manager in early 1943 was considered a temporary wartime expedience and for a year, until January 1944, Grierson was double tasking.\footnote{23}

There were no doubts about what Grierson was planning to do once he took over the WIB. He was considered an astute “Propaganda Maestro,” and an authoritative and hardworking manager.\footnote{24} “John Grierson doesn’t go for feeding the people gobs of information,” one could read in The Globe and Mail upon the announcement of his appointment. He was going to “give them simple patterns, dramatized patterns,” said the

\footnote{22} See WIB’s Annual Report 1943-1944, in file 1-3-1, vol. 2, series 31, RG36, LAC. A special task of the Reports Branch was the fortnightly production of Canadian Affairs prepared in Ottawa but printed in London, UK by the Canadian Military Headquarters for distribution among officers and soldiers enlisted in the army, navy and air force. See Memorandum to John Grierson by Squadron Leader Gregory Vlastos, dated July 12, 1943 file 3-5, part 2, vol. 8, series 31, RG36 LAC.

\footnote{23} On the Wartime Information Board during John Grierson’s management, see also relevant chapters in G. Evans, John Grierson and the National Film Board (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984)

article, adding that Grierson’s clear intention was “to fix their thinking along definite lines. If you can fix their thoughts, so much the better. That is good propaganda.”

Grierson was an idealist and enthusiast who saw in the modern technology of communications (new means of transportation, film, radio broadcasting) the potentials to involve and inspire people in common projects of enlightenment and public participation. He shared these views with a rather vibrant movement of adult educators who inspired many lasting projects in the Canadian cultural world: public broadcasting epitomized in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; the National Film Board; the educational radio and TV programming; continuous education through university extension programmes, and community-based educational services. The movement was also behind the spread of teaching of civics through the provincial school systems, and adult citizenship education in community settings addressing both native-born and newcomers. The latter initiatives involved lecture and film circuits in rural communities in the Prairies, and industrial plants in the East. They also involved “farmers’ forums” and “citizens’ forums”, both thematic radio broadcasts, followed by discussion circles organized in local community centres. There were also travelling teachers and libraries along railway lines and at isolated labour camps.

As stated by Ted Corbett, director of the Canadian Association

---


26 See Gordon Selman, Citizenship and the Adult Education Movement in Canada (Vancouver: Centre for Continuing Education, University of British Columbia, 1991). See also, Ron Faris, The Passionate Educators: Voluntary Associations and the Struggle for Control of Adult Educational Broadcasting in Canada 1919-52 (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Ltd, 1975); J.A.B. McLeish, A Canadian for All Seasons (Toronto: Lester and Orpen, 1978); Edward A. (Ted) Corbett, We Have With Us Tonight (Toronto:
for Adult Education at the time, the objectives of adult education were, among others to instil in people the awareness

(1) that the individual, his rights, his moral and spiritual significance, his dignity, is of supreme importance in a democracy;

(2) that social progress can only come about through improvement in the quality of human beings, and that improvement can only come through education;

...  

(5) that the ultimate objective of all education, particularly adult education, is the development of the individual’s capacity to live a fuller and more abundant life;

(6) that, ....education, like religion, can only be truly vital in the measure of its freedom from external authority...  

In 1941, a group of adult education enthusiasts created the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship (CCEC). It was composed of representatives of provincial ministries of education and various adult education organizations, with the aim “to strengthen and revivify throughout Canada and in all its citizens of every age, an understanding of their democratic heritage and determination to exercise and develop it by every means” in close co-operation with government agencies. The Nationalities Branch was not one of these agencies but two at least of the members of its Advisory Committee were, independently of the Branch, deeply involved in the founding of the


CCEC and continued to be its active members: Charles Blakeney, New Brunswick Minister of Education and Donald Cameron, director of the Extension Programme of the University of Alberta. Grierson’s Film Board and the WIB, on the other hand, did co-operate with the CCEC and also provided funds for its educational activities.\(^{29}\)

From the point of view of adult education, public information in democracy should not consist of “highly spectacular campaigns and ballyhoo from the top.”\(^{30}\) In one of the “Information Briefs”, produced by the WIB, government information officers and WIB’s employees were warned of the growing irritation in the public “at the use of ballihood, publicity stunts and high pressure methods in connection with war.” The author of the brief was J.D. Ketchum, psychology professor at the University of Toronto, temporarily co-opted into wartime government service because of his expertise. He offered a concise lesson in public relations by arguing that people were willing to participate in the war effort, but found it “a deeply felt affront” when “coaxed, cajoled, threatened or tricked into making sacrifices,” instead of being given the sense of inclusion and unity in fighting for a common cause. It was no good talking “at” people, he urged: “Don’t say ‘This is YOUR war!’ say ‘This is OUR war!’”\(^{31}\)

---

\(^{29}\) See for instance, Minutes of the CCEC’s Executive Committee of June 19, 1943, and Grierson’s statement on the need for co-operation, in vol. 45 “Minute Book 1940-1944,” Canadian Citizenship Council Fonds, MG28 I85, LAC.

\(^{30}\) J. Grierson, “It Is Not Done with Mirrors: J. Grierson Answers Criticism of Board,” Ottawa Citizen, April 3, 1943, p.27.

approach of inclusion and unity in action was very much what his General Manager was also, with equal frustration, trying to obtain from government officials around him. Discussing the low labour morale with Brooke Claxton, the Prime Minister’s parliamentary secretary responsible for the WIB, Grierson pointed out the demoralizing effect of a supposedly unwitting tendency by government officials to regard and treat working class people as “outsiders”.

What Ketchum and Grierson urged others to do was to concentrate on developing a sense of need for active citizenship and total involvement in community life, free of sectoral thinking and away from rugged individualism.

It was Grierson’s view that information should be “derivative of the people” and based on knowledge of common wants rather than “directive”, that is to say a service provided by “some grand folk up in Ottawa, out of their own heads and inspirations, to some other species of the human race which is called the people.”

Grierson argued that in a dictatorship a cohesive public opinion is achieved by giving orders through an efficient, technologically advanced communications system and by setting up centrally run organizations to control it. In a democracy it is achieved by ways of constructive initiatives and actions that

---

32 Letter by John Grierson to Brooke Claxton, parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister, responsible for WIB, dated June 17, 1943, in file 8-2-1, vol. 12, series 31, RG36, LAC.

33 For an overview of Grierson’s exposés on education, propaganda and documentary film production, see Forsyth Hardy, ed., Grierson on Documentary (London: Collins, 1946).

34 Grierson, “It Is Not Done with Mirrors.”
bubble up all over the place. Initiative must be not only central but local. By mere acceptance of democracy we have taken upon ourselves the privilege and the duty of individual creative citizenship and we must organize all communications which will serve to maintain it.\textsuperscript{35}

By taking over the WIB, Grierson planned to provide a public service of information that would give “a man the right to inquire where exactly his own particular local citizenship relates to the whole.” Grierson promised that in its endeavours to provide the best such service, the WIB would not be “crushed by the happy pluralism of a political experience so fantastic as the Canadian nation. After all, there is nothing quite like it.”\textsuperscript{36}

The above statement was mostly a reference to the English/French conflicting duality and the so-called “French-Canadian problem” created, in Grierson’s opinion, because of Anglo-Saxon sense of “messianic self-certainty”.\textsuperscript{37} Grierson otherwise did not dwell on cultural differences. Shortly after arriving in Canada in 1938, Grierson wrote a short piece for \textit{Saturday Night} entitled “Canada is People” in which he included, Scotsman as he was, this simple statement: “Men of the land are men of the land everywhere. Those cow-men at Calgary, who rode so easily and quietly on their horses, in and about the milling crowds, were just Scottish cattlemen who happened to be on horses.”\textsuperscript{38} If there were differences among people those were of social nature, as between workers and farmers on one hand, and the highly educated elite and the army of

\textsuperscript{35} Grierson, “Searchlight on Democracy,” p.4.

\textsuperscript{36} Grierson, “It Is Not Done with Mirrors.”


specialists, on the other. In the final analysis, they were all human beings, defined by their social functions rather than their cultural origin. They were all Canadians but knew little about each other. In that same early article in the Saturday Night Grierson offered the following observation as his concluding remark:

> When I hear about sectorialism in Canada, I have a notion that a lot of it is because Canadians don't know each other very well. One section doesn't know how the other section lives. They don't get together, because they don't in imagination live together. I don't want to pull an easy generalization, but I might almost say that Canada is a myth, it doesn't exist. And it never will till it is brought alive to itself – and that is all that being a nation ever means. 39

Adult educators of the time viewed education and propaganda as highly complementary tools for the construction of a new democratic order that would combine the best effects of state planning with local community development and individual initiatives. The role of both education and propaganda, Grierson suggested, was to inspire the democratic impulse, crystallize sentiments and create a common will in people to get involved and participate. This should be obtained without searchlight "but in the quiet light of ordinary humanism." 40 The metaphor of "searchlight" carried different meanings in this context. To start with, it implied that education and propaganda should bring to broad light what is good and positive in democracy. It also implied that traditional education was limiting access to enlightenment and opportunities for a meaningful social engagement to a chosen few and leaving the masses, the essence of democracy,

39 Grierson, “Canada Is People.”

enwrapped in the darkness of ignorance and irrelevance. It was certainly intended to bring the images of Nazi spectacles of mass meetings at Nuremberg and grand scale methods of haranguing the people with spotlight and sound into a “religious brotherhood of blood.”\textsuperscript{41} The metaphor would later conjure images of internment camps of Auschwitz or Buchenwald with their control towers and merciless searchlights, and the sinister spectre of modern social control and Foucault’s panopticum. Grierson believed that modern technology could be used differently, not as a means of mass manipulation and control, but as a means of inspiration and enlightenment for the universal benefit and progress for all:

Speaking intimately and quietly about real things and real people will be more spectacular in the end than spectacle itself. And, in the process of creating our democratic system of communications, in bridging the gaps between citizen and community, citizen and specialist, specialist and specialist, we shall find that we have in the ordinary course of honest endeavour made the picture of democracy we are seeking. And we shall have made it not only national, but international, too.\textsuperscript{42}

Among politicians, Grierson was sometimes considered a dangerous man since he was exuberant, unpredictable and too independent. J.W. Dafoe, the heart and soul of the \textit{Winnipeg Free Press}, was reported telling: “Whenever I see John Grierson, he is galloping past the liberal position in one direction or another.”\textsuperscript{43} His unpredictability led contemporaries and subsequently historians to assess him in contradictory manners,

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ibid}, p.7.

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Ibid}, p.9.

going from one extreme, as being too much at the left-side of the political spectrum, and even a Communist sympathizer — in 1945 he was among the suspects in the Gouzenko Affair, costing him his job at the National Film Board — to the other, as being at the service and payroll of callous transnational corporations such as Standard Oil and, hence, a capitalists’ puppet. 44 Most recently, Robert Fulford characterized Grierson as a “a dour but brilliant Scotsman” and “a propagandist with the awareness of an artist and the instincts of a politician.” 45 “If John Grierson is a dangerous character,” said once Brooke Claxton, the politician specifically responsible for the WIB on behalf of the Prime Minister, “it is high time we had more of them ... people who do things just as well as they can without thought of the political consequences.”


John Grierson (standing) and a collaborator at work, Wartime Information Bureau
(PA 179108, Library and Archives of Canada)
But even Claxton had to warn Grierson not to cross the line between being a bureaucrat and a visionary politician. It was most unwise, Claxton told Grierson, to make the WIB appear to promote the Liberal Party policy and to suggest that “the job of an information service included persuading people to accept government policy… Persuasion should only be used when government policy coincides with the general will of the nation” expressed, for instance, by politicians in the House of Commons.\(^{47}\) Grierson’s forays into politics were even more unorthodox than that. He envisaged a new social and political order emerging from the war crisis in which the state, endowed with modern technological power, would be the initiator and disseminator of new knowledge and have the capacity and democratically confirmed mandate to take into its own hands the determination of the type of education needed to secure active participation of common people in communal and national projects.\(^{48}\) Hardly a liberal or conservative outlook!

**Challenging the Nationalities Branch**

John Grierson was undoubtedly a dangerous man also in the eyes of Tracy Philipps, once the discussion of the fate of the Nationalities Branch re-opened in the spring of 1943. Concerned with reaching with his information the largest possible range

---

\(^{47}\) Letter by Brooke Claxton to John Grierson, June 2, 1943, file 2-14-2, vol. 8, series 31, RG36, LAC.

\(^{48}\) See his various speeches on education and propaganda in *Grierson on Documentary*, ed. Forsyth Hardy (London: Collins, 1946)
of people in the country, Grierson inevitably stumbled over the issue which agency would be the most appropriate to serve as the channel of government communications with "new Canadians" by approaching them not as the "foreign-born" and different, but as a constituent part of the larger Canadian community in the making.\textsuperscript{49} As a first step in that direction, he obtained the agreement from the Press Censorship Division and the Department of External Affairs that a bi-monthly survey of "foreign-language" press be launched by the WIB staff. The survey would consist of brief summaries in English of articles and commentaries that might be of interest to policy-makers.\textsuperscript{50} His staff also undertook broad inquiries among various civil servants, including the Prime Minister's office, with the view of establishing the acceptable reasoning for the WIB's take-over of most, if not all, the activities the Nationalities Branch had been involved in so far.\textsuperscript{51}

Little else could be undertaken as long as Philipps remained in control of the Nationalities Branch. By the second half of 1943, serious efforts were also undertaken to remove Philipps from office. This was done as delicately as possible so as not to alert public opinion to the existence of a controversy or potentially create an issue with the

\textsuperscript{49} See the internal memorandum by G. de T. Glazebrook dated June 5, 1943, informing Norman Robertson, his superior, about Grierson's opinion that the WIB and not the Nationalities Branch should handle propaganda directed to the "foreign-language" groups. In file "Foreign Language Press in Great Britain and Canada," vol. 3230, RG25, LAC.

\textsuperscript{50} See "Notes on Meeting of Desired Content [sic] of Canadian Foreign Language Press Survey held in Mr. Glazebrook's Office, August 30, 1943," file 15, vol. 26, series 31, RG36, LAC.

\textsuperscript{51} See file 8-9-1 "Committee for Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship," vol. 13, series 31, RG36, LAC.
British Foreign Office under whose auspices Philipps had come to Canada in the first place.

The rationales for Philipps’ removal were various. Clearly the main consideration was his meddling around the turf of the Department of External Affairs. It was argued that no adequate communications between the Nationalities Branch and the Department existed, and that the Department should take over the liaison with “foreign groups”. It was also considered of no “advantage in underlying the fact or lines of distinction between various parts of the Canadian population,” something Philipps strongly insisted upon as the only way to achieve successful “Canadianization”, group by group.\(^\text{52}\) There was no doubt that some supervision of individuals and groups “suspected of hostile action” was needed but not to the extent Philipps had wished to do. That there was a distinction between British subjects and foreign nationals was obvious but so was the fact that most “foreigners” seemed to support allies’ efforts and only a few could be considered enemy aliens. The matter was different when it came to the issues affecting Canada’s relationship with Russia. There it seemed advisable “to keep a close watch on the foreign groups in this respect, particularly those with extreme views.” To keep public opinion in Canada “on an even keel” was already quite difficult, and therefore any additional troublesome behaviour on behalf of certain groups or civil servants was to be avoided.\(^\text{53}\) So what to do? No “monkeying” around, for sure, of the kind Philipps was

\(^{52}\) Memorandum [by G. deT.Glazebrook] to N. Robertson, September 2, 1942, in File “Foreign-language Press in Great Britain and Canada,” vol. 3230, RG25, LAC.

indulging in his interactions with ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{54} Maybe, unofficially, some groups should be given “pats on the back, or equally unofficial warnings,” without specifying reasons for the unwritten ruling that any propaganda with damaging effects for the allies was not permitted and was subject to sanctions.\textsuperscript{55}

There was also Philipps’ emphasis on cultural diversity which worked counter the efforts by other agencies, notably the WIB, in promoting national unity.\textsuperscript{56} Government communications with the people, it was argued, should emphasize co-operation and inter-acquaintance among various ethnic communities and not aspects of their differences. The WIB’s General Manager, John Grierson, obtained from his superiors, and notably the Prime Minister, the freedom to devise a system of communicating government information which would be “bridging divisions which are sometimes geographical, racial and religious, but often political.”\textsuperscript{57}

Moreover, and that was significant, Grierson deemed it his duty to convey to Major-General LaFlèche, Minister responsible for the Nationalities Branch, some very specific complaints he had been privy to while visiting Winnipeg. There he met with representatives of an organization calling itself Canadian Unity Council formed in 1941

\textsuperscript{54} Norman Robertson, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs used this term in his letter to John Grierson, General Manager, WIB, dated May 17, 1943, pp. 301316, vol. 349, W.L. Mackenzie King Fonds, MG 26, J1, Reel 7043, LAC.

\textsuperscript{55} Memorandum by G. de T. Glazebrook to Under-Secretary [for External Affairs], July 2, 1942, in file 1939-165, Part III, vol. 1896, RG25, LAC.

\textsuperscript{56} Letter by John Grierson, General Manager, WIB, to Major General L.R. LaFleche, Minister of National War Services, dated October 28, 1943, File “Foreign-language Press in Great Britain and Canada,” vol. 3230, RG25, LAC.

\textsuperscript{57} J. Grierson, “It Is Not Done with Mirrors,” p.27.
by a number of ethnic organizations with the objective to promote a greater unity and mutual understanding among "old" and "new" Canadians. It also aimed at possibly replacing the Nationalities Branch by presenting itself as a more appropriate, less politically partisan and more representative agency to provide liaison between "new Canadians" and the government in wartime and beyond.\(^58\) Grierson's interlocutors expressed their resentment at insinuations propagated by the Nationalities Branch and repeated in the Liberal newspaper the *Winnipeg Free Press* that "new Canadians' adhere to the principle of double loyalties and were an easy prey to enemy influences."\(^59\) They stressed the already publicly expressed arguments from ethnic milieus that "new Canadians" needed no guidance and leadership from Anglo-Saxons to be loyal Canadians.\(^60\) They also raised a personal remark: why should Canadian-born members of ethnic communities be told how to be Canadians by a foreign-born government adviser who had only recently arrived in Canada? What they told Grierson was in essence the following:

---

\(^{58}\) The *Winnipeg Free Press* gave a thorough report of the founding meeting of the Council held in the buildings of the Manitoba Legislature with representatives of 18 groups present. "Tell Objectives of Canadian Unity Council," *Winnipeg Free Press*, December 29, 1941. See also the letter the president of the Council, R. Fletcher addressed to John Grierson as a follow-up to their meeting in Winnipeg in early November 1943, in file 8-9-2 "Ethnic Groups in Canada," vol. 13, RG36, LAC.

\(^{59}\) Letter by Fletcher (Canadian Unity Council) to Grierson, November 14, 1943, file 8-9-2, vol. 13, RG36, LAC. The article in the *Winnipeg Free Press* was entitled "Amazing Indifference" and was published on October 9, 1943.

Instead of getting the whole thing together on a healthy basis, Mr. Philipps produced a ‘guardianship’ over New Canadians who he regarded as ‘helpless and divided’. Mr. Philipps is associated with ‘sanitizing’ the country. In becoming a political storm centre he has unfortunately put the work of his committee on a political level, and this it should never have been allowed to become.  

Grierson urged LaFlèche to consent to examine the possibility “of relating the information service to New Canadians with the general information service of the Government represented by the Wartime Information Board.” After all, the WIB’s interests were not only the provision of information but also “the whole matter of unity, particularly as between the various ethnic groups in the country.” A healthy co-operation, however, would not be possible with the continued presence of Tracy Philipps, whose “divisive rather than unifying influence would remain a negative force within the set-up.”

62 Norman Robertson, Under-Secretary for External Affairs concurred with Grierson’s assessment and informed the Prime Minister that he had been worrying for some time “about possible mischief which might arise from the activities of the Nationalities Branch under the direction of Mr. Tracy Philipps.”

---


62 Ibid.

63 Memorandum by Norman Robertson to W. Mackenzie King, November 1, 1943, inclusing Grierson’s letter to LaFlèche, p. C260746, file 3944, vol. 376, W. Mackenzie
No More "Mischief"

The Minister of National War Services was unwilling to let the Nationalities Branch disappear in the folds of the WIB. In his own words, he instructed his Deputy Minister, "to pick this work up or to straighten out anything that requires rectification and even to build it up by the addition of thoroughly reliable men competent in the field." 64 Faced with mounting public adversity, the Minister finally agreed to convene the Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (CCCC) for a crucial meeting on November 26, 1943 in order to address some serious questions, notably various attacks on Philipps’ integrity, the Committee’s relevance and its relationship with the Wartime Information Board. 65

Even some members of the Committee had expressed their misgivings about the highly politicized direction the Branch was taking. Robert England simply resigned from the CCCC, uncomfortable with this politicization, while Donald Cameron, Director of the Extension Division of the University of Alberta, offered some constructive suggestions.

At an early stage, Cameron pointed out as potentially relevant the plans his friend John Grierson had in mind to create a mega “Office of Civic Information under which would come Radio, Film Board, Information Board and the Citizenship Programme for

King Fonds, MG26 J4, Reel H-1543, LAC.

64 Letter by L.R. LaFleche to Mr. H.W. Winkler (MP for Lisgar, Manitoba), dated November 12, 1943, in file 29, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.

65 Kenneth C. Cragg, “Advisory Body Not Moribund, Says LaFleche,” The Globe and Mail, October 13, 1943. LaFlèche was in a way responding to such criticism as published in the Winnipeg Free Press on October 7, 1943 under the title “Amazing Indifference.”
New Canadians.” A few months later Cameron elaborated his thoughts further by emphasizing the need for a re-vitalized advisory committee on Canadian citizenship. The committee’s purpose would be to devise ways and means by which Canadian citizens of foreign birth or origin would “be given the fullest opportunity of becoming good Canadian citizens.” In doing so, the new committee would endeavour to make foreign-born Canadians become aware: of the cultural contribution they could offer Canada; of their rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship; and of the fact that they could retain their mother tongue while at the same time be encouraged to adopt Canadian ways, values and customs as early as possible. Cameron also suggested that foreign born Canadian citizens should be encouraged by the committee to “think of their nationalism in the same manner as a Scot does his, as a bulwark of native pride and strength of character without imposing it on others.” At the same time, the committee would ensure that all Canadians become “familiar with the racial origins and the historical and cultural backgrounds of their new Canadian neighbors” and develop “greater racial tolerance through knowledge and understanding.” The suggestions remained on file but several of his ideas figured also in the proposal for the reorganization of the Branch put forward by his colleague Robert England a year later.

At the November 26, 1943 meeting of the CCCC, however, the attending members stood behind Philipps and expressed their confidence. The Committee also

---

66 Letter by D. Cameron to Norman A. Robertson, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, dated March 9, 1943, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.

67 Donald Cameron, “Memorandum re Committee on Canadian Citizenship,” attached to his letter to Norman Robertson, June 4, 1943, file 3426-40, vol. 2977, RG25, LAC.
expressed its wish not to be dissolved as an advisory body. It even decided to increase the membership, suggesting the desirability to have one or more members “who were incidentally not of French or British extraction.” Notwithstanding, the Committee’s choice of the potential new members included candidates with only indirect connection with ethnic communities, and thus ignored the misgivings of the very same people, the so-called “new Canadians”, whose moral and social integration they were supposed to deal with. The Committee also redefined its purpose and functions:

The purpose and aim of the Canadian Nationality Advisory Committee, known as the Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship, is to help to create among Canadians of French and British origin a better understanding of Canadians of recent European origin and to foster among the latter a wider knowledge and appreciation of the best traditions of Canadian life. 68

The apparent determination to maintain the Branch’s activities, by giving it moral support and recognizing the need for more staff, and more material and financial resources, met with new challenges. The new year, with its promise of a forthcoming end of the long war, brought major changes. Some were due to exasperations of not getting the support one wanted to achieve one’s goals of reforming the systems in place. That was the case of John Grierson who resigned, abruptly, his position as General Manager of

68 “Report to the Minister of National War Services of the meeting of the Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship held... November 25th and 26th 1943,” Appendix 3 to the [Official history of the] Advisory Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship, Appendices, in vol. 16, series 7, RG35, LAC.
the WIB. Some were due to the realization that with the imminence of a post-war reconstruction period, wartime agencies such as the Nationalities Branch needed structural reinforcement to make an effective transition to a peacetime operation. The backroom talks raised the issue of finding a way to have Philipps rejoin the British foreign service. The answer from London was negative: his usefulness in the British service had been also compromised. Until a solution could be found, it was decided to create a new position of director of the Branch and the appointee for the job be someone from the outside the Branch and of Canadian origin. What a blow for Philipps: not to be considered for the position was bad enough, but to be himself identified as a "foreigner", after having spent three years nurturing and guiding towards "Canadianism" all those "foreign-born" Canadians with thought-processes considered incompatible with English-speaking mindsets! Philipps defended his record and regretted the lack of success the Branch realized in implementing its foundational principle of abating the sense of neglect and inferiority complex among so many foreign-born labouring people. This was not due to the lack of trying, Philipps argued. Contrary to the impression created by publicized examples of discrimination, Philipps argued that Anglo-Saxons like himself were by

---

69 His resignation as the General Manager of the WIB became effective on February 1, 1944 but he remained head of the NFB and Prime Minister’s Special Advisor on Information. See “Extract form Minutes of Wartime Information Board, No. 21, January 10, 1944” signed by A.D. Heeney, in file 2-2-12-2, vol. 7, series 31, RG36, LAC. See also, “Grierson Is Special Adviser on Information: Leaves WIB,” The Globe and Mail, January 13, 1944.

70 See the exchange of telegrams between Norman Robertson, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs and the High Commissioner for Canada in London, April-May 1944, in file “Department of National War Services: Nationalities Division-Correspondence 1944-47,” vol. 3, Robert England Fonds, MG30 C181, LAC.
tradition guided by the "thoughtful and sincere" principle of equality-of-opportunity recognized and practiced on a man's merits alone "irrespective of the accident of birthplace." Now was the moment, he claimed, that the same precious and vital principle of comradeship he had applied during the years at the head of the Nationalities Branch in his dealings with the voiceless working class representatives of various Canadian minorities, be also applied to his case and the search for a Canadian-born director be abandoned.\textsuperscript{71}

To Philipps' great dismay an interim director took charge of the Branch in early April 1944. On his own initiative, Philipps quickly secured a position with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) as Chief of Planning in the Division on Displaced Persons and left Ottawa in mid May 1944.\textsuperscript{72} One of the last letters signed as the government European Adviser was addressed to Antonino Spada, publisher of \textit{Il Cittadino canadese} who had invited him to come to Montreal to discuss "a common plan of work to reeducate the italo-canadians." Philipps expressed his regrets for being unable to "look into the matter as [he] should have liked."\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{71} From "Extract from the letter replying to an enquiry from Professor Simpson: The enlightenment and reassurance of 'foreign-born' citizens in wartime production and war industry. A war service for Nationalities," dated April 4, 1944, in file 26, vol. 2, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC. He blamed the growing Catholic majority of the Canadian population for having raised and publicized a false and completely unwarranted spectre of Anglo-Saxon disdain, exploitative tendency, and "herren-volk" mentality as regards ethnic groups.

\textsuperscript{72} See the Memorandum by Robert England to the Deputy Minister, May 15, 1944, file "Department of National War Services: Nationalities Division-Correspondence 1944-47," vol. 3, Robert England Fonds, MG30 C181, LAC.

\textsuperscript{73} Exchange of letters between A. Spada and T. Philipps, of May 9 and May 13, 1944, in
Robert England, the person appointed interim Director, was not a “dangerous” man in the way John Grierson seemed to have been perceived. There was nothing radical and unpredictable about him. A WWI veteran, England was a renowned expert in inter-group relations and adult educator with a PhD in social sciences from the University of Sorbonne in Paris. He had an extensive work experience among immigrants in the Prairies as rural school teacher and western manager of the Department of Colonization and Agriculture of the Canadian National Railways (CNR), and was a former CCCC member. England was well at ease in the bureaucratic surroundings of Ottawa and was described by a friend as a man of great physical energy and a “sound mind”. 74 At the outbreak of war he was appointed Director of the Canadian Legion Educational Services and set in motion an important educational programme for enlisted men and women. He also acted as executive secretary of a government-appointed advisory committee on rehabilitation and demobilization and became particularly involved in veterans’ affairs and the post-war rehabilitation of the forces. England had been considered an authority in the matters related to immigration and assimilation of Central Europeans settled in the

Prairies ever since the publication, in 1929, of his study of *The Central European Immigrant in Canada.*

*The New Working Formula*

Describing to Robert England the modalities of his short-term contract as interim Director of the Branch, Deputy Minister Payne spoke frankly of the need to put the Branch "on its feet" and explained: "it means building from the ground up, because there was only a small organization to begin with and we are now on rock bottom." England "took stock" of the Nationalities Branch, and after two months of interviews and reading, submitted a report to the Minister of National War Services with suggestions on how to reorganize its operations. The report was a blunt, straight-forward account of the situation, with no embellishments and no time wasted on ideological considerations:

> The foreign-language press situation, the lack of a programme in respect of naturalization, the ignorance of the general public as to the contribution of other races to the war effort, the gap that still exists between large ethnic group communities and Canadian life, the inability to exploit other media of reaching the public and determining attitudes in this regard through broadcasting, films, speakers, literature, art, music, drama, all indicate that a more vigorous and determined policy to win the utmost in collaboration from all groups should be inaugurated.

---


The proposed new policy to improve the situation consisted in transforming the Nationalities Branch into a "Division of Citizenship" run by Canadian personnel with "intimate knowledge of Canada and of the particular groups it is designed to assist." The new personnel should be capable of putting in motion a series of Canadian activities to meet the purpose of promoting "among Canadians of French and British origin a better understanding of Canadians of recent European origin and to foster among the latter a wider knowledge and appreciation of the best traditions of Canadian life."  

Recommended activities included improvements in public relations with ethnic groups in comparison to what had been done until then: better exchange of information; better press service geared to the particular language and information needs of the "foreign-language" press; better involvement of public communication agencies (CBC, NFB) in servicing "foreign-language" communities; better support for cultural group activities (music, dance and craft festivals); better research regarding issues related to inter-cultural relations and history of settlements; and, most of all, improved citizenship education.

Several of these recommendations had already figured in Donald Cameron's proposal delivered six months earlier. Many were a mere reinforcement of the existing policies. The underlining philosophy behind this report could be found in England's 1929 study, however. "We cannot force the immigrant to be a Canadian," wrote England in 1929, but it "is our business to understand him, to reach out for points of contact, to offer him something better and to stimulate his desire" to adopt "our" way of life and to

13A, RG26, LAC.
assimilate. The "we" here were "old" Canadians, those who had already embraced a set of values and acquired standards of living that defined "Canadianism" of the time:

Canadianism at its best may be thought of as an unconventionalized and optimistic view of life, work and manners, sprung from untramelled contact with a wide new effort-creating country, a tolerance born both of pioneer conditions and the necessity of racial co-operation, and a consciousness of our Norman and English heritage of order and freedom sufficiently deep to make life's adventures conform to the higher discipline of achievement.  

Those who formed "old Canada" -- including England himself -- were quite willing, said England, to offer this set of standards accompanied by a series of institutions and attractive amenities of a higher level of progress than that previously known and enjoyed by the "new Canada". In exchange, they expected from the latter "to correct their institutions, their habits of life, and if necessary, their language to make cooperation possible between us." The setting of the co-operation between "new" and "old" Canada was the neighbourhood and the local community, argued England, where true Canadian citizenship could be crystallized and learned. It was at this level that various cultures would meet and interact and in the process enrich the social and cultural environment of the community. Out of a prolonged contact, England believed, "will come inevitably similarities of custom and habit, a certain standardization of logical

---


processes in thought, and even, perhaps, a similar response to emotional appeal."\footnote{Ibid, p.185.} For England, the process of immigrants' assimilation consisted of receiving from the "old" community and learning to give something in return. The newcomers' decision to settle in a newly adopted community and become its citizens, suggested England, should be accompanied by willingness to learn its language and communicate with "old" Canadians, share in communal success and hardships and show their understanding and appreciation of a person's duty to be of service to the community when needed.\footnote{Ibid, p.181. Writing in 1929, with the Great War behind him, England added: "Instead of universal military service, there should be universal public service, for citizenship is a life and public-spiritedness is its expression." His 1944 report went the other way, praising the high level of participation of Canadians of European origin in the armed forces and noting the importance of paying tribute to the fallen and their bereaved families of various ethnic origins for the service rendered to the nation.} “Citizenship is a service, not a subject in a curriculum,” argued England in 1929.\footnote{Ibid, p.182.}

There is a significant divergence between the 1929 study and the 1944 report. The early study dwelled in considerable length on the cultural difference between the "old" and "new" Canada, both in terms of the stage reached in the respective civilizing progresses and the form and pervasiveness of traditional cultural manifestations. In the 1944 report the significance of difference was overshadowed by the emphasis on the need for more tolerance and appreciation on the part of the "older stocks" as regards the contribution and sacrifice made by groups of recent European origin through their participation in the national war efforts. It was not the difference that was problematized
but the “public apathy and lack of interest in the question, and some unwillingness to
develop active attitudes of goodwill towards these newer groups,” to encourage
integration. In the 1944 report, the community has been enlarged and was now
composed of the nation. Noteworthy is also the absence in the report of any specific
reference to the groups’ “foreignness”, so significant and omni-present in Philipps’
 writings. By contrast, it was the importance of “citizenship” that was mostly highlighted.

On Citizenship and Naturalization

Until January 1, 1947, a Canadian was officially (a) a citizen of his “community”,
(b) a Canadian national for passport-bearing purposes and in relationship to citizens of
other nations, and (c) British subject with allegiance to the Sovereign Crown in authority
over the British Empire and Commonwealth. The otherwise often interchangeable
concepts of “citizenship” and “nationality” were not one and the same in that context, and
were definitely subordinate to the status of being the subject of the British Crown.
“Citizenship” implied having a domicile within a community for at least five consecutive
years, enjoying certain civic rights and simultaneously having equally important civic
responsibilities. “Nationality” did not in itself entail these requirements and benefits,
resulting in foreign wives of Canadian nationals and children of a Canadian national born
abroad being entitled to a Canadian passport without possessing Canadian citizenship or
having a Canadian residence at the same time. There was another difference: the status of
“Canadian national” was consecrated by law in the form of The Canadian Nationals Act,

while Canadian citizenship was legally defined only for the purposes of regulating the immigration to Canada.  

All three concepts of identification -- Citizen, National or British Subject -- implied traditionally the “natural” claim to the right of being recognized as such. This was secured by being native-born (or natural-born) on the Canadian territory, and through kinship or other established and traditional forms of communal structures having developed an emotional bond of belonging. Modern requirements of control and legalization of social interactions introduced the concept of “naturalization”, a legal procedure that allowed for an “outsider” or “foreign-born” to be included in a community -- to be “naturalized” by law -- and thus, by giving an oath of allegiance to the Sovereign Crown, be able to acquire citizenship and Canadian nationality, provided that a designated legal personality, on behalf of the community, was satisfied that a certain number of requirements had been met. Those included knowledge of the language spoken by the community, some basic knowledge of the national institutions and history, domicile requirements, good social behaviour, and assurance that the person would not be politically disruptive or a potential social or economic burden to the community.

The label "citizen" and "citizenship" being of particular concern here, the use of the term "community" instead of "nation" or "Canada" is deliberate, because the symbolic meaning of "Canadian citizenship" in reference to the nation as a unifying identifier for millions of Canadians truly emerged only at the end of WWII. A good pre-war citizen was a good member of his or her local community: responsible participant in community activities, co-operative, ready to serve when the community called to promote, protect or preserve common good, and respectful of the democratically determined social order and institutions. Local democracy and good citizenship were complimentary. Educational material produced by various private agencies all pointed out this aspect of citizenship.\(^7\)

Discussing the Canadian citizenship regime before 1947, political scientist Jane Jenson characterizes it as "place-sensitive". In her view, citizenship was defined by geographically (regionally) specified identities -- she calls them "island communities" -- with internal splits along the lines of common language, religion, political party, gender or class. "The ‘nation’ was under construction, but it was a nation of ‘island communities’," argues Jenson.\(^8\) This interpretation of pre-WWII Canada brings to mind Careless’ “limited identities”, and the repeated attempts by conservative politicians to

---

\(^7\) See, as an anecdotal evidence, the educational efforts by the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire (IODE) to stimulate discussions on citizenship and democracy among its members, in *Echoes*, nos. 162, 163, 168, 170 (1941-1943)

define Canadian federalism in terms of “a community of communities”.  

Jenson’s interpretation is insightful but does not address the specific issue of cultural groups scattered across the country and forming “island communities” of their own. And she only briefly touched what lay behind the process of the construction of the nation in the 1940s, namely (a) the need to put in motion a concentrated and collective effort towards recovery from the economic depression of the 1930s and prevent anything like it happening again, and (b) Canada’s entrance on the international scene, first through the doors of the League of Nations, then by way of its participation in the United Nations’ common front against the Axis with a vigorous military presence of its own. These new challenges led to a gradual construction of a nation-wide network of institutions and programmes initiated by the federal state and intended to alleviate social strife, on one hand, and improve Canada’s performance in the international context, on the other. These developments inevitably brought about the extension of the concept of community to the “national” level and imposed some measures of standardization and re-adaptation of the concept of common good and citizenship across the boundaries of “island communities” (without necessarily succeeding in erasing them entirely). Not of minor importance in these developments was the ideological imprint of Liberals in charge of the government operations for an extended period of time, in particular during the war years.

In wartime, the call for a unified effort in times of a major national crisis

---

contained elements of urgency in the face of a potential "enemy" that might threaten the nation coming from most imaginative angles: enemy alien within the gates, a heavily armed enemy landing on the shores of the Pacific or the Atlantic, a communist, a fascist, a saboteur, a malicious rumour-monger, an agitator, as well as apathy, low morale, penury, French/English tense relations, etc. In the face of these threats, politicians, bureaucrats and educators of all political stripes were creating a discourse of nationhood and citizenship inspired by the British liberal model and meant to unite Canadians, regardless of their cultural makeup, in living and believing in such powerful and motivating ideas as democracy, civic-mindedness, unity, tolerance, freedom, Christian values and universal rights of individuals.

At the same time, the almost irrational pursuit of enemy aliens at the outset of the war and the related debates about the defence of Canada on the domestic front brought the focus of concerns to the process of naturalization and its effectiveness in securing loyalty of the "new" Canadians. Concerns were expressed that the highly administrative and lacklustre procedure failed in conveying to the applicants for citizenship the importance and the challenges of that formal acceptance of a new allegiance. It was not enough to sign a document, it was argued. A proper ceremony should be envisaged with the applicants receiving the certificate of citizenship as a public event. There should be more preparation involved in the anticipation of that act: applicants should undergo citizenship training and be given encouragement to learn English or French. The Association of Canadian Clubs and the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship should be given the crucial role of spearheading these educational efforts. The new
Canadians should be encouraged to experience pride and anticipation of being formally inducted with full rights and responsibilities as "naturalized" members of the Canadian community.  

In discussing these issues, it became evident that the same pride should inspire all Canadians, "old" and "new", in their identification with the nation. The symbolic value of "Canadian citizenship", when exempt of any particularism of geography, language, origin, creed, colour or class, could have a powerful impact on the sense of unity, within the borders, and of a single national identity, on the international scene. The stage was thus set for the next step: the legal creation of the Canadian identity by the promulgation of the 1947 Canadian Citizenship Act.

Conclusion

The re-naming of the Nationalities Branch as the Division on Citizenship was one small step in that direction. Henceforth the emphasis would be put on the means of integration and cooperation among ethnic communities and to the need to abandon the theme of cultural adversities, "foreignness" and divided loyalties. The Division's paramount function was to maintain a cooperative relationship with various ethnic groups and "act as liaison between what might be termed `established Canadians' on the one

---

90 This were some of the arguments raised during various debates in the House of Commons: see Debates of the House of Commons 2nd session-19th Parliament (November 7, 1940-January 21, 1942) pp.1182-1186, 1213-1214; idem, 4th session-19th Parliament (January 28, 1943-January 26, 1944) pp.5343-5345. See also, minutes of proceedings of the special committee of the House of Commons on the Defence of Canada Regulations, vol. 2484, RG14, LAC. See also, Editorial, "Education for Citizenship," The Globe and
hand and, on the other, ‘new arrivals’ or ‘first-generation Canadians’.\footnote{Mail, January 28, 1942, p.6.} The new working formula would centre on the slogan of good citizenship. Citizenship education would be chosen as the preferred working method of enhancing and precipitating a successful inclusion process.\footnote{Official history of the Advisory Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (Nationalities Branch), Department of National War Services [1945?] p.17, in vol. 16, series 7, RG35, LAC. The quote is an example of a noticeable attempt to use new language terms for old concepts, for example, by replacing “foreign-born” by “first-generation”, and “old” Canadians” by “established” ones.}

To start with, the budget of the Division almost tripled in 1944, from $18, 347 to $46,367 a year.\footnote{See the debate on the appropriation bill and the specific item concerning the Committee on cooperation in Canadian citizenship, held on April 27, 1944, Debates of the House of Commons, 5th session-19th Parliament (January 27, 1944-January 31, 1945) p. 2395-2396.} A new permanent director was appointed on August 1, 1944 in the person of Frank Foulds, formerly of the Department of Agriculture but allegedly familiar with many “organizations of Canadians of recent European origin.”\footnote{Official history of the Advisory Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (Nationalities Branch), Department of National War Services [1945?] p.16, in vol. 16, series 7, RG35, LAC.} Vladimir Kaye retained his position and in 1945 completed a survey of Canadians of recent European Origin, considered a most valuable document for the future work of the Division. The Editorial Section of the former Nationalities Branch was re-enforced with new staff and
its press releases, on the request of recipients, translated into as many as required languages before being sent out to various "foreign-language" newspapers.

The Advisory Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship survived the administrative reorganization by only a few months. In January 1945, by common accord, the Committee agreed to dissolve itself. The Citizenship Division was, by Order-in-Council PC 6689 of October 26, 1945, transferred from the Department of National War Services to that of the Secretary of State, effective November 1, 1945.

That same month of October 1945, the Hon. Paul Martin, Secretary of State, solemnly introduced in the House of Commons a bill providing for clear definitions of Canadian citizenship, nationality, naturalization and status of aliens. The Secretary of State concluded his statement in an exclamatory mode:

Our "new Canadians" bring to this country much that is rich and good, and in Canada they find a new way of life and new hope for the future. They should all be made to feel that they, like the rest of us, are Canadians, citizens of a great country, guardians of proud traditions and trustees of all that is best in life for generations of Canadians yet to be. For the national unity of Canada and for the future and greatness of this country it is felt to be of the utmost importance that all of us, new Canadians or old, have a consciousness of a common purpose and common interests as Canadians; that all of us be able to say with pride and say with meaning: "I am a Canadian citizen."

95 Ibid, Appendix 10.


97 Hon. Paul Martin, October 22, 1945, Debates of the House of Commons, 1st session-20th Parliament, p.1337. The bill died on the order paper and was re-introduced in 1946. It was adopted on June 27, 1946, and entered into force on January 1, 1947 as Canadian Citizenship Act.

His face didn't look like much when they found him. But his identification disc told who he was.

He's not an unknown soldier. And does it matter whether he was Protestant, Catholic or Jew?

He fought Canadian. He died Canadian. He was Canadian.

He makes you feel proud that you are a Canadian.

But what of his brothers—by the thousand—here at home... of every blood, of every color, of every creed?

Are they different because they're alive?

Is the only true democracy in uniformed death?

Let's put an end to the foul prejudice fanned by our enemies...

By our obvious enemy, the goose-stepping Hun... and our more insidious one, the unCanadian-Canadian.

When you find anyone—you yourself included—thinking, speaking, acting, with racial or religious prejudice—STOP IT!

If Smith, Kelly, Cohen or Svoboda is good enough to die for us, he's good enough to live with us...

As an equal.

Pledge for Canadians

I BELIEVE IN THESE FOUR FREEDOMS:

The first is freedom of speech and expression.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way... everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want... to every race, a healthy, peaceful... life for its inhabitants.

The fourth is freedom from fear.

BE CANADIAN—
Act British!

Buy War Savings Stamps Regularly
Conclusion

The ultimate aim is a long-term proposition. Its 'results' lie deep in the intangibles and in the imponderables of the human spirit. They cannot be immediately weighted and measured by any material meter or on any physical chart. It is the morale of men's minds in their relation to the State.
Tracy Philipps (1942)¹

The historical period known as the World War Two years was marked by a visibly accelerated process of self-identification in "Canadianism". This was a moment in history when the imagined boundaries of national identity underwent significant displacement. At the beginning, this process was hesitant and in search of an acceptable direction. By the end of the war, the affirmation of a Canadian nation was firm and optimistic, no longer "an unknown country". The political discourse that emerged during the war years underlined, first of all, the fact that the country had outgrown its colonial status and was, politically and economically, sovereign. It reinvented the concept of political unity by recognizing that, along with the constitutionally entrenched duality, the country had an additional dimension in its ethnic diversity. The war effort helped uncover from under a shroud of silence the contribution of non-British and non-French segments of its population to the construction of the nation as a whole. Most of all, the new political discourse

¹ Tracy Philipps, “Nationalities Branch - Canadian Communities of Recent European Origin – Survey and construction period 1941/2,” in file 1, vol. 2, Tracy Philipps Fonds, MG30 E350, Library and Archives of Canada.
introduced a new signifier of the national identity, “Canadian citizenship”, and a new slogan, “unity in diversity”.

Several questions were put forward at the outset of this study: What kind of measures did the Canadian mainstream elite (predominantly Anglo-Saxon and Protestant) and the Liberal government in place take during the WWII years to deal with non-British and non-French segment of the population in its attempts to unify the public support for the war effort? How did the ruling elite mediate and legitimize its discourse on the subjects of diversity, unity, race, foreignness, “Canadianism”, “Canadianization” or loyalty? Who was entitled to be identified as “Canadian”? Who was the “outsider”? What was the meaning of the institution of “Canadian citizenship” in the construction of national unity? There was also the question of the wartime discursive use of the concept of “enemy alien” as a national threat and the effect it might have had on the public perceptions of immigrant communities and “new Canadians” in general.

The main thrust of the study was the examination of the ideological background of the institutions created to deal with interaction between the exigencies of the war and the concurrent specific inter-cultural conflicts: between Canadians of British and French origin, on one hand, and Canadians of different ethnic origins, on the other; between native-born and foreign-born or newcomers; between those loyal to the cause of Western democracies and those identified as enemy aliens, and so on. The question was also raised concerning the impact that Tracy Philipps, the government wartime European Adviser, may have had on that newly emerging Canadian political discourse when he tried to apply his anthropological expertise
acquired at the frontiers of the British Empire to hasten social and cultural integration of "new Canadians" of central and southern European origin into the Canadian social fabric and in the process shed their "foreignness".

Canadians as a nation participated in the WWII operations with a claimed conviction, that it was their moral duty to protect from totalitarian assault a way of life founded on the British model of parliamentary democracy and respect of minorities, and to help defend the mother country, Great Britain. The war revealed to Canadians a new dynamics in inter-group relations and a new type of polarising tensions: ambiguous, divisive, divided and potentially threatening loyalties of a segment of the Canadian population of non-British and non-French origin with emotional and political ties to their homeland. Whether considered as separate communities, each with its own characteristics and interests, or collectively, as a third force, their public presence as voters, as readers of the press, as labourers, as consumers, as soldiers, and most of all, under the war conditions, as good and loyal citizens -- or, indeed, as enemy aliens, communists or fascists endangering national security -- had to be taken into account. That revelation, however, was not accompanied by adequate and decisive measures and the direction of this aspect of public policy was for a while left in the hands of an expert who failed to understand the inherent heterogeneous nature of this country of immigrants. Tracy Philipps, the recently arrived Englishman, ran the so-called Nationalities Branch -- the first government agency exclusively devoted to government relations with cultural communities of European origins -- as a low-budget, two-person mediation and information office for various ethnic organizations and the "foreign-language" press.
At the same time he was using his office to collect information and influence political outcomes in foreign policy matters related to the complex European political and nationalist issues concerning such countries as the Ukraine, Poland, Soviet Russia and Czechoslovakia. This intelligence work was in his view of particular usefulness for the strategic war purposes of the Allies and his country of origin, Great Britain.

This was the time when Canadian politicians and bureaucrats began to realize the possibilities of running the national business with some forward planning to prepare the country for the post-war challenges: national and international reconstruction and social integration of masses of people on the move, among them displaced persons and economic immigrants from the war-torn Europe and Canada's own returning soldiers. The nation-building as they understood it had to involve everybody: the dominant British majority hardly reached 50 per cent of the population. War efforts and the reconstruction after the war had to be achieved with the collaboration of the population as a whole. The question was how to encourage such collaboration and how to create an effective discourse of unity of purpose in face of an obvious presence of heterogeneity of cultures, political aspirations, and achieved levels of integration, not to forget various degrees of emotional and political ties with the homeland. Different advisers and bureaucrats put forward different methods and approaches on how to deal with the issue, largely neglected until 1939 but exasperated by the wartime conditions.

Watson Kirkconnell, for instance, with his positive enthusiasm for ancestral cultural roots of Canadians laid his trust in the beneficial and enriching effects of cultural amalgamation and "racial" mixing. He believed that an intense effort in
cultural exchanges among various communities, including the dominant majority, would precipitate the development of a new Canadian "type". His personal involvement in the promotion of cultural contributions of various nationalities was eventually stifled under the exigency of his highly passionate crusade against Communism.

At the forefront of government wartime policy-making in relation to various domestic cultural groups or nationalities, Tracy Philipps insisted on the paramount necessity to engage wholeheartedly all working class people in the war effort and he placed the objective of winning the war as the immediate and primary task of his Nationalities Branch. He believed that most of the workers in crucial war industries were "foreign-born" (conceptualized as those born abroad or those whose one or both parents were born abroad), and that their "foreignness" impeded their commitment to Canada at war. His proposed method to "Canadianize" them and bring them on board along with other loyal British subjects, implied approaching them from the angle of their cultural diversity and their foreign thinking processes in order to nurture their friendship, enlighten their spirits, educate them in democratic values and guide them towards "Canadianism" and Anglo-conformity. Philipps' divisive treatment of nationalities according to their level of assimilability and educability to "Canadianism", or potentially problematic loyalties, and his propensity for covert manoeuvres of persuasion was a short lived operation, however. In the eyes of politicians in abhorrence of political tensions not of their making, Philipps' methods exasperated polarisations instead of diffusing them.
By contrast, John Grierson's propaganda methods -- inspired by the premises of adult education much in vogue among contemporary progressive educators -- were introduced to the public as a new type of adult education for citizenship. With their emphasis on the social roles of individuals rather than cultural backgrounds, those methods were, in effect, not very subtle means of enforcing assimilation -- something decision-makers in various positions of power inside and outside government circles believed should and would happen in the long run, anyway. While at the head of the Wartime Information Board, Grierson planned to centralize the sources of public information and to transform their output into a form of inspirational education for citizenship being offered by the state and universally available across the country by the most modern means of communications. Grierson's career as a civil servant was short lived, victim of anti-communist and anti-radical zeal, but government's involvement in public information and education for citizenship has persisted to this day.

It was exactly this all-inclusive citizenship education of the masses without particular reference to people's ethnic ("racial") origin (with the exception of French Canadians) and the emphasis on the unique civic nationality shared by all Canadians that was chosen by the end of the war as the most suitable method available to the government to manage the Canadian mosaic. The first manifestations of this emerging idea were incorporated in the report that Robert England, another adult educator, wrote in June 1944, regarding the long-awaited reorganization of the Nationalities Branch. The transformed agency was henceforth called Citizenship Division. The change of the name was significant in itself as an indicator of that new
mode in the discursive practice: the emphasis was now on what united Canadians, not what divided them.

Based on systematic study of diverse evidence, the thesis has mapped the dialectic course of the construction of that new discourse as it evolved through the war years. The pre-war years were marked by noteworthy official disinterest in “Canadianizing” of newcomers and by a latent racialization of diversity mostly articulated on the basis of “foreignness” or cultural “strangeness” of so-called “racial” origins of non-British and non-French origin immigrants. The outset of war brought along fear-triggered and collective ostracism of “enemy aliens”, further exasperated by fascist and mostly communist ideological interferences and strongly felt expressions of nationalist feelings for embattled homelands in Europe. This was followed by an attempt, in the form of a government agency and an advisory committee of academics, to mitigate the adversarial relationship among various cultural groups and the dominant majority, all of them highly concerned by the war in Europe affecting their respective homelands. Eventually, an emerging new discourse began to affirm the idea that Canada was a national unit with, nevertheless, an inherent diversity that can be contained and managed if that management were entrusted in the state authority as guarantor of equality of all its citizens.

To that end, a discursive construction of symbolic markers of that peculiar “unity in diversity” became imperative: “being Canadian” was important, “citizenship” was also, as was “democracy” and “duality”. “Racial origin”, previously considered as an important marker of distinction, was abandoned and officially replaced by the reference to the “cultural” or “national” background of Canadians. In
addition, with the increased post-war immigration expected on the horizon and viewed as a welcome economic boost, the marker “new Canadian” or “immigrant” acquired a new symbolic value, conclusively replacing the “foreigner” in the official discourse on social inclusion of newcomers. The imagined boundaries of the nation were thus displaced as the leadership of the national community opted for a much more expanded and generous inclusion of its “internal foreigners”.

With so many “foreign born” dying on the European battlefields wearing Canadian uniforms and so many more needed to contribute to the Canadian post-war economic growth, the “foreignness” or “strangeness” of cultural attributes lost its publicly encouraged indicative and demeaning value as signifier of internal “otherness”, a priori destined for social exclusion. So did the hyphenation. The attribution of a hyphen (Ukrainian-Canadian, Icelandic-Canadian, French-Canadian) lost the a priori meaning of permanent marginality due to the implied hybridity, and turned more and more into a mere indicator of a cultural characteristic and even used with eagerness and pride by some Canadians as a gratifying and important means of self-identification. This latter development was perceived as objectionable and disturbing in the eyes of Canadian nationalists who continued to urge for even greater national unification and homogenization under the umbrella of Anglo-conformity. But, as Lindal said in 1943, every Canadian was linked by a hyphen to some specific other loyalty or identity, including that of being Polish, Jewish, Croat, French de souche, English, Scot, Irish - or simply British.

The slide in significance of meanings did not, however, at the same time erase in the everyday life of people, as by some magic, the systemic prejudice and
discrimination directed against some cultural and visible minorities in public places, employment, housing or education. To eradicate such practices, the state promised an extensive programme of education for citizenship and community living, and began promoting the awareness of rights, duties and responsibilities of all citizens regardless of class, gender, age, religion or ethnicity. The “Canadian mosaic” nevertheless continued to be a “vertical mosaic” as before, and the vision of the “unity within diversity” a seemingly illusive goal. Most significantly, however, the idea of categorizing, dividing, manipulating and “nurturing” diverse cultural groups as an official method of coaxing them into adopting the Canadian way of life was abandoned. It was the turn of the symbolic “Canadian Citizenship”, with its equalizing effect, to take centre stage.
Appendix 1:
Advisory Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship
1942-1945

As of January 1942:

ANGUS, Henry Forbes
Professor at the University of British Columbia, expert on Pacific affairs; seconded to the Department of External Affairs during the war; former member of the Rowell-Sirois Royal Commission on Dominion and provincial relations; known for his work on legal rights of Chinese and Japanese residents of B.C.

BLAKENY, The Hon. Charles Hanford
Minister of Education of New Brunswick from January 1940 to November 1948; one of the founders of the Canadian Council for Education in Citizenship, a cooperative effort of provincial ministries of education and non-profit organizations involved in adult education and community development

BOIS, Major Joseph Samuel Anselme
Professor of Philosophy; founder of the Institute of Psychology at the University of Montreal; attached to the Special Services Department of the Army Personnel and Recruiting

CAMERON, Donald
Director of the University of Alberta Extension Programme (an adult continuing education program) since 1938; head of the Banff School of Fine Arts since 1936; active member of the Canadian Association for Adult Education

CLARK, Dr. Samuel Delbert
Professor of sociology, University of Toronto; author of several studies of social development of Canada

ENGLAND, Robert
Director of the Canadian Legion Educational Services in London, UK; a veteran of WWI; former western manager, Department of Agriculture and Colonization of the Canadian National Railways; and former director of Extension, University of British Columbia, author of Central European Immigrant in Canada (1929) (resigned from the Committee in 1943)

GIBBON, John Murray
Publicity Agent for Canadian Pacific Railways; author of The Canadian Mosaic (1938), Canadian Folk Songs Old and New, and The New Canadian Loyalists (1941)

KIRKCONNELL, Watson
Professor at McMaster University; formerly of Wesley College in Winnipeg; translator of poetry from various European languages (such as Hungarian, Polish and Icelandic); reviewer of Canadian literature in languages other than English or French in University of Toronto Quarterly; author of Canada, Europe, and Hitler (1939), Ukrainian Canadians and the War (1940), Canadians All (1941) and Seven Pillars of Freedom (1944)
McWILLIAMS, Margaret
Winnipeg alderman for four consecutive terms (1933-1940); social worker; author of history books on pioneer life of women in Manitoba; founder and first president of the Canadian Federation of University Women (1920-1924) and first vice-president of the International Federation of University Women; member of the federal government committee on post-war reconstruction since 1943; Wife of Roland Fairbairn McWilliams, lieutenant-governor of Manitoba (1940-1952)

SIMPSON, George W.
Chairman of the Committee; professor of history and head of the History Department of the University of Saskatchewan; special interest in Slavic studies and, in particular, Ukrainian history

As of spring 1942:

BRUCHÉSI, Jean
Professor of History and Political Science at the University of Montreal; publisher, journalist and lawyer; under-secretary for the Province of Québec since 1937; member of the Royal Society of Canada since 1940

SKELTON, Isabel
Author of several socio-cultural histories of life in New France and Upper and Lower Canada; published in 1925 the Life of Thomas D'Arcy McGee; widow of O.D. Skelton, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mrs. Skelton resigned in October 1943)

As of 1944:

LYNCH, Emily
Barrister from Windsor, Ontario

TARR, Dr. Edgar J.
Lawyer from Winnipeg; former president of the Institute of International Affairs (1937-1938); former president of the Association of Canadian Clubs; president of Monarch Life Assurance Company
Appendix 2:
A list of press releases prepared by the Editorial Section of the Nationalities Branch for the use by “foreign-language” press, 1942-1943*

August 13, 1942  Ottawa New and Old
August 20, 1942  It’s Women’s War Too
August 29, 1942  For Your Own Good (about the new income tax provision of taxation at the source)
September 5, 1942  A Wider World for Women
September 11, 1942  History Points the Way
September 19, 1942  They Give Their Blood (blood donors clinics)
September 25, 1942  Borden through History’s Eyes (training camp Borden near Barrie)
October 1, 1942  Important Changes in Naturalization Procedure
October 9, 1942  The Early Explorers Were Pioneer Miners (Cartier, Champlain, Juan de Fuca, Frobisher, etc.)
October 23, 1942  Up Where the North Begins (life of Irish American and Ukrainian Canadian soldiers in Alaska)
November 7, 1942  Provisions for the Returned Soldier
December 5, 1942  Changes in Canada’s Population Picture (1941 census)
December 19, 1942  All Thoughts Turn to Home (a 5 day-Christmas leave)
January 2, 1943  Firm as the Rock (Canadians at work on the world’s safest Air-raid shelter – Gibraltar)
January 23, 1943  Canada Takes Good Care of Men in Service and Their Dependents
January 30, 1943  Canada’s Women in Uniform
February 13, 1943  Training for War and Peace (17 to 18 years’ old to be trained in trades useful in the mechanical age and not sent overseas until 19)
February 20, 1943  Canada Salutes Her Boy Scouts

* Source: File 29, vol. 1, TPF, MG30 E350, LAC.
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