Université d'Ottawa · University of Ottawa

The Professionalization of History in English Canada to the 1950s

by

Donald A. Wright

Thesis submitted to
the School of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Ph.D. degree in History

University of Ottawa

©1999

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre reference

Our file Notre reference

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-48121-2

Canada

Abstract

In opposition to the historiography which plots the rise of a historical profession in turn-of-the-century English Canada, this thesis argues that to think in terms of a rise from amateur history to professional history obscures more than it clarifies. Instead, it plots a different trajectory. Owing to the demands of an increasingly modern, urban and industrial society, intellectual life was transformed. In other words, one way of organizing intellectual life yielded to another way of organizing intellectual life.

Whereas the nineteenth-century historian was a generalist for whom the study of the past was a part-time activity, the twentieth-century historian was a specialist for whom the study of the past was a full-time career. However, at the same time as there were changes in the practice of history, there were also important continuities.

Against this backdrop, this thesis argues that while pre-professional historians could write hagiographic and patriotic books and articles, they also practised some of the techniques associated with professional history: archival research, historiography and the weighing of evidence. Moreover, women could be, and indeed were, historians when history was a part-time activity.

Beginning with George Wrong's 1892 appointment to the University of Toronto, history began its migration into universities across English Canada. In addition, the *Canadian Historical Review* was launched in 1920; the Canadian Historical Association was founded in 1922; and graduate programmes were instituted.

Historians also pursued a variety of professional strategies, including the drawing and policing of boundaries between who could and could not be a historical knower. Boundary-work was a gendered process. Whereas women

were historians when history was understood as a past-time, they were excluded from the historical project when it was understood as a career. In this sense, the professionalization of history also saw its masculinization.

Central to any professional project is the defence of independence. To study the defence of professional autonomy, this thesis examines the many relationships English-Canadian historians had with American philanthropy. In the absence of Canadian granting agencies, historians were forced to rely on American foundations for subventions to research and publication. Although the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation had their own research objectives, at the end of the day English-Canadian historians successfully pursued their own research agendas.

In the crisis of World War II and the Cold War, professional historians began to re-think the historical project. Abandoning history as a practical social science, they returned to an older notion of history as a humanity concerned with questions about human values.

Acknowledgements

This thesis could not have been completed without the support of my supervisor, Dr. Michael Behiels. It is to his patience, encouragement and insights that I owe my greatest debt of gratitude. I would like to thank Dr. Donald Davis as well. His interest in the project from the beginning went beyond the call of duty. Dr. Thomas Bender, a professor of history at New York University, deserves thanks for supervising the research on American philanthropy.

Throughout the research stage, I was assisted by several archivists. In alphabetical order, they are: Harold Averill, University of Toronto Archives; Cheryl Avery, University of Saskatchewan Archives; Tina Bradford, Dalhousie University Archives; Betty Brock, Stanstead Historical Society Archives; Gordon Burr, McGill University Archives; Judith Colwell, Canadian Baptist Archives, McMaster Divinity College; Cheryl Ennals, Mount Allison University Archives; Mary Flagg, University of New Brunswick Archives; George Henderson, Queen's University Archives; John Lutman, J.J. Talman Regional Collection, University of Western Ontario; Pamela Miller, McCord Museum Archives; Sue Young Park, Columbia University, Rare Book and Manuscript Library; Carl Spadoni, William Ready Division, Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University; Lewis Stubbs, University of Manitoba Archives; Patricia Townsend, Acadia University Archives; Richard Virr, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, McGill University; and Anke Voss Hubbard, Rockefeller Archives Center

Of course, the research for this thesis would not have been possible without financial assistance in the form of graduate scholarships and

research grants. These included: a Fulbright Scholarship (1998); a Rockefeller Archives Center Research Grant (1997); a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Doctoral Fellowship (1996-1997); a Sir John A. Macdonald Graduate Fellowship in Canadian History (1994-1996); a University of Ottawa Excellence Scholarship (1994-1998); and a Univserity of Ottawa Research Scholarship (1993-1994).

I must also thank the following individuals who generously allowed me to interview them: Margaret Banks, Jill Ker Conway, the late W.J. Eccles and the late Irene Spry.

Along the way, several individuals assisted me in the form of counsel, criticism and, at one point, a UNB library card despite my lack of a UNB affiliation. In alphabetical order, they are: Sheila Andrew; Rusty Bittermann; Ramsay Cook; Eric Damer; Ramsay Derry; David Frank; Chad Gaffield; Ralph Guentzel; Margaret McCallum; Duncan Meikle; Sergio Piccinin; Alison Prentice; Donald Smith; Gillian Thompson; Sylvia Van Kirk; and Peter Waite.

At the University of Ottawa, I was fortunate enough to be surrounded by a supportive cast of fellow graduate students. Thanks to David Calverly, David Hartman, Steve High, Lise Legault, Jo-Anne McCutcheon and David Moorman.

I also want to acknowledge the moral and financial support of my parents, Jack Wright and Donnie Wright. If they have not always understood my choices, they have always supported them.

Joanne Wright deserves many thanks not only for enduring endless ramblings about the historical profession, but for adding many insights along the way.

Of course, no one listed above is responsible for any errors of fact and/or interpretation in what follows.

Dedicated to

Harriet Grace Wright

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

I. History as Avocation 24

II. From Avocation to Vocation: the beginnings 62

III. Professionalization Continued: "the post-1918 generation" 106

IV. Boundary-Work and the Historical Profession 169

V. Protecting Scholarly Independence: a professional imperative 233

VI. The 1940s and Early 1950s: introspection and redefinition 307

Conclusion 347

Bibliography 354

Introduction

In those days administrative tasks usually fell to the English Secretary and Treasurer. So when the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences invited the Canadian Historical Association to make an August 1949 presentation, Council duly assigned "the donkey work" to David Farr at its June meeting in Halifax.[1] As English Secretary and Treasurer, it was Farr who received the various suggestions from Council members, prepared a first draft, circulated it for comments and hurried the process along in order to meet the fast-approaching deadline. On 21 July 1949, President A.L. Burt, Council members C.P. Stacey and Fred Soward, French-language Secretary Séraphin Marion and, of course, Farr gathered in Ottawa to discuss the CHA's presentation. Farr's preliminary draft served as a basis for discussion. Stacey, for example, wanted the brief to privilege history which, after all, was the special concern of the CHA. There was too much "circumlocution" around general questions of culture which would be better left to the end.[2] With comments, suggestions and corrections in hand, Farr returned to the drawing board and completed a final version. A week later, he submitted it to the Royal Commission. A couple of more weeks passed before the CHA made its formal presentation. The Past President, Abbé Maheux, drove from Quebec to join Burt and Farr at the Exchequer Court where the Commission held its Ottawa hearings.[3]

---

1 David Farr, interview with author, 28 June 1998

2 C.P. Stacey to David Farr, 15 July 1949, University of Toronto Archives (UTA), C.P. Stacey Papers, B91-0013, Box 3, file CHA 1946-1951

3 Details about the preparation of the CHA's brief to the Massey Commission come from the personal diary of David Farr. I would like to thank Dr. Farr for sharing his notes with me.

In its brief, the CHA identified itself at the outset as "the recognized professional society representing those interested in historical studies throughout Canada." From the perspective of professional historians, there were numerous impediments to serious scholarly work. The Public Archives, for example, was underfunded, understaffed and desperately short of storage facilities. In addition, the Government had not yet adopted a policy for the systematic transfer of public records, including the papers of individual Ministers, to the Public Archives. Next, the CHA raised a perennial complaint: research money. Pointing to "the great and growing need of financial support for historical studies and indeed for all studies in the social sciences," the CHA recommended government assistance grants for scholarly journals, academic monographs and travel to learned conferences. After all, such assistance had been made available to the natural and physical sciences since the 1920s. Finally, the CHA stressed the importance of a national fellowship and scholarship programme for post-graduate students in the humanities and social sciences.[4]

When the Canadian Historical Association submitted its brief to the Massey Commission in the summer of 1949, it unwittingly created a convenient starting point for this dissertation: in economical prose and a matter-of-fact tone, the brief clearly articulated the professional interests of historians. Over the course of the first half of this century, the study and practice of history had been transformed from a past-time for interested men and women into the careers of university-trained, university-based professional historians. In 1892 the University of Toronto appointed George Wrong to its Chair in History; McGill and Queen's followed

4 "Brief Prepared by the Canadian Historical Association for Submission to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences." National Archives (NA), RG 33, 28, vol. 13

Toronto's lead a few years later. In addition to being Toronto's first professor of history, Wrong also founded the awkwardly-named *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada* in 1896. An annual publication, it provided a forum for critical, scholarly reviews. Following the First World War, the pace of change quickened: the *Canadian Historical Review* first appeared in 1920; the Canadian Historical Association was founded two years later; and the Public Archives of Canada, located in Ottawa, became the site of annual summer pilgrimages for historians from across the country. With the assistance of American philanthropy, the 1930s witnessed the publication of two multi-volume series, the Frontiers of Settlement Series and the Canadian-American relations series. In addition to these tangible markers of history's professionalization—the creation of distinct departments of history, the founding of the CHA, the publication of the Canadian-American relations series—the first five decades of this century also saw historians struggle to cultivate expertise, authority and status, to mark boundaries between who could and who could not be a historical knower.

This dissertation studies that transformation: the professionalization of history in English Canada from the turn of the century to the early 1950s. Although the CHA and the *CHR* made nominal efforts at bilingualism, both remained almost entirely rooted in English Canada and dominated by English-speaking Canadians. Indeed, Quebec developed its own historical profession.[5] Moreover, the parameters of this thesis are by necessity

---

[5] See Serge Gagnon, *Quebec and its Historians: 1840-1920* (Montreal: Harvest House, 1982); Serge Gagnon, *Quebec and its Historians: The Twentieth Century* (Montreal: Harvest House, 1985); Jean Lamarre, *Le Devenir de la nation québécoise, selon Maurice Séguin, Guy Frégault et Michel Brunet* (Sillery: Les éditions du Septentrion, 1993); Ronald Rudin, *Making History in Twentieth-Century Quebec* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997). See also the articles dedicated to the

imprecise. Unlike biography or *histoire événementielle*, the study of an intellectual profession does not easily lend itself to precise beginnings and exact endings. Simply put, the process of history's professionalization neither began nor ended on this date in that year. Still, the mid-twentieth century represents a logical terminus as a new generation of historians emerged in the 1950s and, by the 1960s, dominated the profession. Maurice Careless once recalled that in 1951 he, Gerald Craig and Jim Conacher assumed the editorship of the *Canadian Historical Review*. We were the "three young upstarts," he said, and we called ourselves "the three C's." It was very much a case of "the juniors" taking over.[6]

I

The professionalization of history did not take place in a vacuum. Rather, it is best understood as a chapter in a larger story: the modernization of Canada. Although a slippery term and thus difficult to pin down, modernization's broad features are nevertheless clear: urbanization, industrialization, secularization, bureaucratization and the expansion of the state. As Canada modernized it also found itself confronting intensified and intractable problems including urban poverty, class conflict, unemployment and the economic cycles of boom and bust.[7] To deal with these problems, society demanded a different kind of knowledge and the rational application of that knowledge. Moral philosophy and religious knowledge were seen as increasingly irrelevant to the problems at hand. Knowledge must be based on scientific principles and rigorous research;

---

theme of "Les pratiques de l'histoire de l'Amérique française depuis 50 ans" in *Revue d'histoire de l'Amerique française* 51, 2 (Automne 1997).

6 Interview with J.M.S. Careless, 13 July 1983, UTA, B86-0038, Tape 6

7 For an overview of the modernization of Canada see Robert Craig Brown and Ramsay Cook, *Canada, 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974).

above all, it must be practical. In this process, universities assumed a leadership role. They would become less centres for the guardianship and transmission of traditional values and more centres for the production of scientific knowledge and of trained experts. Similarly, the specialist intellectual as expert in a specific body of knowledge replaced the generalist intellectual as guardian of society's values.[8] As Patricia Jasen argued, the "widely felt need for persons able to guide the development of a newly independent Canada—bogged down in political controversy over such issues as tariff protection, immigration, labour relations, and the imperial connection—created a position of authority for social scientists which they readily filled."[9] In short, intellectual life professionalized.

The proliferation of professions in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries constitutes an unmistakable fact of modern life. And yet, scholars disagree on the nature and defining features of a profession. Before the 1960s scholars itemized the defining traits of a profession and the stages of professionalization. In 1933 the British sociologists A.M. Carr-Saunders and P.A. Wilson attempted a systematic study of all the professions in England in an effort to isolate what they termed "a complex of characteristics." A profession, they argued, is a body of experts who, by virtue of extended and specialized training, "have acquired a technique which enables them to render a specialized service to the community."[10] Entry into the profession was controlled by examination while the profession itself was governed by its own code of ethics.

8 See Robin S. Harris, *A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663-1960* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976); and A.B. McKillop, *Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario, 1791-1951* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994).

9 Patricia Jasen, "The English Canadian Liberal Arts Curriculum: An Intellectual History, 1800-1950," (PhD, University of Manitoba, 1987): 96

10 A.M. Carr-Saunders and P.A. Wilson, *The Professions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933): 284

Professionalization, it followed, was the acquisition over time of these traits. In 1960 W.J. Goode listed what he believed to be the ten defining traits of a profession, two of which he termed the "core characteristics": a prolonged specialized training in a body of abstract knowledge and a science orientation.[11] The trait based approach dominated the study of the professions until the 1960s when a new political climate, and a new generation of scholars, redefined the study of professions and professionalization. While earlier efforts were by no means simple apologies for unequal distributions of social and economic power, new studies were much more attentive to power. According to Eliot Freidson, from the late 1960s writers emphasized "the unusually effective, protective institutional forms and high status of professions and treated knowledge, skill, and ethical orientations not as objective characteristics but as ideology, as claims by spokesmen for professions seeking to gain or to preserve status and privilege."[12]

How, then, does this thesis define profession and professionalization? While the trait-based approach was problematic because it excluded professions which satisfied some traits but not others, and because it accepted professionalization as a benign process, it was not altogether meaningless. In simple terms, professionals are full-time specialists with extended training in a particular body of knowledge. To be sure, there are professionals and then there are *professionals*. Through an elaborate credential system and legislative protection, medical doctors enjoy a

---

11 W.J. Goode, "Encroachment, Charlatanism and the Emerging Profession: Psychology, Sociology and Medicine," *American Sociological Review* 25 (1960): 902-914

12 Eliot Freidson, "Are Professions Necessary?" in Thomas Haskell, ed., *The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984): 5

monopoly in highly defined sectors of the medical labour market. Historians, meanwhile, may have a credential system in the form of graduate degrees but they do not have legislative protection; nor do they enjoy a monopoly over the field of history. In other words, while only a licensed medical doctor can practise medicine, anyone with an interest in the past can write history. Nevertheless, it is still possible to refer to the professionalization of history.

In his study of the emergence of professional social science in turn-of-the-century America, Thomas Haskell argued that the professionalization of social science is "a three part process by which a community of inquirers is established, distinguishes itself from other groups and from the society at large, and enhances communication among its members, organizing them and disciplining them, and heightening their credibility in the eyes of the public." Moreover, "Any act which contributes to these functions, which strengthens the intellectual solidarity of this very special kind of community, is a step toward professionalization." Solidarity does not mean "harmony or the absence of conflict." Indeed, mutual hatred and solidarity are perfectly compatible.[13] Rather, it means the recognition of what David Hollinger termed a community of discourse. Hollinger argued that an intellectual community shares a common intellectual discourse, an animating set of common assumptions, questions, methods and values.[14]

---

13 Thomas Haskell, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977): 19

14 David Hollinger, "Historians and the Discourse of Intellectuals," in John Higham and Paul Conkin, eds., *New Directions in American Intellectual History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979). M. Brook Taylor found community of discourse a useful concept when writing his study of nineteenth-century English-Canadian historiography. So too did Mark Smith in his treatise on objectivity and the American social scientists. See M. Brook Taylor, *Promoters, Patriots and Partisans: Historiography in nineteenth-century English Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto

Taking its cue from Haskell's observation that an intellectual community will seek to distinguish itself from other communities, this thesis regards boundary-work, that is, the establishment and defence of borders between insiders and outsiders, as an important strategy of professionalization. Moreover, boundary-work can be a gendered process. In her book, *Professions and Patriarchy*, Anne Witz insisted that we take seriously gender as a system of power when referring to strategies of professionalization and constructions of professionals. Gender, she argued, is not incidental but central to professionalization. In reference to British radiographers in the 1930s she wrote that, "through discursive strategies...male radiographers were intent upon distinguishing between technical and caring skills in radiography, establishing discursive equivalences between technical skills and masculinity, on the one hand, whilst simultaneously elevating the value of the technical and denying the legitimacy of the caring skills in radiography."[15] In defining the professional male historian, historians drew on gendered assumptions about who could and could not be a historical knower.

II

Although there is a body of literature on the professions in Canada,[16] there has been little work done on the historical profession. Certainly, the immediate historiographical starting point is Carl Berger's *The Writing of Canadian History: aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing since*

Press, 1989); and Mark C. Smith, *Social Science in the Crucible: The American Debate Over Objectivity and Purpose. 1918-1941* (Durham: Duke University Press. 1994).

15 Anne Witz, *Professions and Patriarchy* (London: Routledge, 1992): 181

16 For example, see R.D. Gidney and W.P.J. Millar, *Professional Gentleman: The Professions in Nineteenth-Century Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994) and Mary Kinnear, *In Subordination: Professional Women in Manitoba, 1870-1970* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1995).

1900. An outstanding book, it remains the standard reference. Although Berger largely concentrated on historiography, he plotted an ascending trajectory for the historical profession. In the beginning, history was the domain of gentleman amateurs. These men, Berger asserted, wrote history "to amuse themselves, to commemorate and memorialize the eminent, to strengthen patriotism, or to draw morals from the past." Then, around the turn of the century, history began its inevitable rise. It became a profession.[17] Similarly, in their respective dissertations both Alan Bowker and William Duncan Meikle sketched an ascending profession. Indeed, the very titles of their dissertations betray a certain enthusiasm: "Truly Useful Men: Maurice Hutton, George Wrong, James Mavor and the University of Toronto, 1880-1927"; and, "And Gladly Teach: G.M. Wrong and the Department of History at the University of Toronto."[18] And finally, Paul Phillips assumed the unproblematic rise of a historical profession in his treatise on the teaching and writing of British history in English Canada. For example, two preliminary chapters are entitled "Birth of a Discipline" and "The Rising Profession."[19] On the one hand, the historiography is correct: beginning around the turn of the century history began to resemble a modern profession. On the other hand, it is wrong: history did not experience a triumphal rise.[20] Rather, the study and practice of history simply changed. In its rejection of progress and the grand rise of

17 Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 1-8

18 See Alan Bowker, "Truly Useful Men: Maurice Hutton, George Wrong, James Mavor and the University of Toronto, 1880-1927" (PhD, University of Toronto, 1975); and William Duncan Meikle, "And Gladly Teach: G.M. Wrong and the Department of History at the University of Toronto," (PhD, Michigan State University, 1977).

19 See Paul T. Phillips, *Britain's Past in Canada: The Teaching and Writing of British History* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1989).

20 To be fair, the scholarship of Berger, Bowker, Meikle and Phillips has been helpful in the writing of this thesis. Where appropriate, I have acknowledged my debt to their work.

history in English Canada, this thesis joins a small, but growing, revisionist historiography.

In the past few years a handful of historians have chipped away at the narrative of professionalization which plots the rise of history from amateur past-time to professional career. Lyle Dick demonstrated that interpretations of the Seven Oaks incident—an early nineteenth-century armed conflict between Métis and Selkirk settlers—became less accurate and more ideological as history professionalized in the first half of the twentieth century.[21] In his dissertation, Chad Reimer detailed the key role Judge Frederic Howay played in the professionalization of history in British Columbia. Without benefit of specialized training in history and from outside the university, Howay did more to professionalize the discipline and practice of history than his UBC counterparts.[22] And although he studied the development of history in Quebec, Ronald Rudin explicitly rejected the whiggism implicit in *The Writing of Canadian History*. In his own words, "There was something celebratory in Berger's insistence that historians were capable of repressing their subjective instincts and improving their techniques so as to develop a 'better' understanding of the past." Rudin therefore plotted a different trajectory: "...I have arrived," he wrote, "at a view of Quebec historical writing which, if graphed, would resemble a horizontal line, rather than a constantly rising curve."[23]

Indeed, the American historian Thomas Bender cautioned historians against the "progressivist fallacy." Inspired by the work of Thomas Khun,

---

21 Lyle Dick, "The Seven Oaks Incident and the Construction of a Historical Tradition, 1816 to 1970," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 2 (1991): 91-113

22 Chad Reimer, "The Making of British Columbia History: Historical Writing and Institutions, 1784-1958" (PhD, York University, 1995), chap. 4

23 Rudin, *Making History in Twentieth-Century Quebec*, 4, 10

Bender argued that intellectual communities are best studied as distinct systems.

> One system, in this way of looking at things, would be replaced by another when the earlier could not work, whether not working was defined socially or intellectually. Instead of a study of a movement from nothing to something, the emergence of modern academic professions represented a reorganization of intellectual culture—from civic foundation to a professional and academic one.[24]

From this perspective, what preceded professional academic life was not weak or inferior but simply different. It must be considered, therefore, on its own terms and not by what replaced it. But, Bender's insistence that an intellectual community is best studied on its own terms, and not in relation to what succeeded it, must not be taken to mean the absence of continuities and similarities between preceding and succeeding ways of organizing intellectual life.

Even as this thesis rejects the idea of the rise of professional history, it also looks at the continuity between "amateur" and "professional" history. Thus Berger's description of nineteenth-century historians as amateurs who wrote history "to amuse themselves, to commemorate and memorialize the eminent, to strengthen patriotism, or to draw morals from the past" can be used to describe twentieth-century professional historians.[25] Indeed, George Wrong once remarked that history was also a pleasant exercise in satiating human curiosity; "We should wish to read about Napoleon and Caesar and Alexander, even if our knowledge should have no value in practical life."[26] For his part, A.L. Burt described the study of history "as

---

24 Thomas Bender, *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993): xiii-xiv

25 Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 1

26 George Wrong, *Historical Study in the University and the Place of Medieval History: An Inaugural Lecture* (Toronto: The Bryant Press, 1895), 18

an ever-growing joy."[27] Moreover, several leading historians served on the Historic Sites and Monuments Board: these were D.C. Harvey, Fred Landon, Morden Long, W.N. Sage, A.G. Bailey, Donald Creighton, Arthur Lower and J.J. Talman.[28] At its most basic, the HSMB commemorated and memorialized the eminent. As to strengthening patriotism, both Lower and Creighton in the latter part of their careers deliberately drafted history to the cause of Canadian patriotism. But it is in the moral imperative—what Berger loosely described as drawing morals from the past—that we can see the greatest continuity.

In point of fact, the question of the morality and values lies at the heart of the historiographical debate on the emergence of the social sciences in English Canada. In their respective scholarship, S.E.D. Shortt, A.B. McKillop, Ramsay Cook and Marlene Shore have argued that in opposition to the philosophical idealism and theology in nineteenth-century intellectual life, twentieth-century intellectual life—increasingly located in the university—emphasized the empiricism of the new social sciences. Although uneven, this transformation was largely completed by 1920.[29] According to Ramsay Cook, "The new social science, which gradually replaced the old religiously based moralism, overcame the nineteenth-

27 A.L. Burt, "On the Study of History," 1927; reprinted in Lewis Thomas, *The Renaissance of Canadian History: A Biography of A.L. Burt* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975): 162

28 C.J. Taylor, *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Canada's National Historical Parks and Sites* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1990): Appendix I

29 S.E.D. Shortt, *The Search for an Ideal: Six Canadian intellectuals and their convictions in an age of transition, 1890-1930* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976); A.B. McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1979); McKillop, "Science, Humanism and the Ontario University," in McKillop, *Contours of Canadian Thought* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987); Ramsay Cook, *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985); and Marlene Shore, *The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origins of Social Research in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987).

century crisis of authority that accompanied the questioning of religious certitude. And with the new social science came a new professional leadership, replacing the older religious leadership."[30] For his part, A.B. McKillop has observed that between the 1870s and the advent of the Great War, "the life of the mind shifted in major ways." As he explained, "Recognition of the complexity and interdependence of economic and social relations gave rise to questions about the nature and mechanisms of social causation for which traditional Christian teleology had, it seemed, no adequate answers."[31] It was in this period that the social sciences first emerged.

Disagreeing with the above account of the social sciences, Michael Gauvreau re-inserted a consideration of morality and values into the historiographical debate. Gauvreau did not deny the emergence of the social sciences; but, he did re-cast their history. He argued that social scientists *did not* operate in a value-free paradigm. Taking Harold Innis as a case study, Gauvreau demonstrated that Canada's leading social scientist between 1920 and 1950 maintained a consistent belief "that social science was a single, unspecialized, philosophical perspective in which history could elucidate the creative interplay between the physical factors of the environment and the realm of human values and culture."[32] Quite simply, there was no divorce between religion and the social sciences. To be clear, Gauvreau's work remains an important corrective to the idea that idealism and empiricism are mutually exclusive, that data collected by social scientific methods cannot be applied to moral aims. At the same time, his

30 Cook, *The Regenerators*, 5

31 A.B. McKillop, *Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario, 1791-1951* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994): 178-179

32 Michael Gauvreau, "Baptist Religion and the Social Science of Harold Innis," *Canadian Historical Review* 76, 2 (June 1995): 163

work remains an important reminder of the continuities in history. Historians too often look for—and thus find—breaks and ruptures.

Still, Gauvreau has misread the historiography,[33] in particular the work of McKillop. McKillop could not have been more straight forward when he wrote that "The writings of Harold Innis on the nature and implication of communications...bear the direct marks of their nineteenth-century cultural inheritance." That inheritance, according to McKillop, was the moral imperative "to reconcile inquiry with affirmation."[34] Indeed, in his most recent monograph McKillop applied the same observation to the historical profession as a whole to 1960.[35]

This thesis, therefore, owes an intellectual debt to the work of Gauvreau and McKillop. It studies the emergence of a historical profession committed to the research ideal embodied in the new social sciences and a historical profession equally committed to questions of human values. The profession was not somehow schizophrenic, nor was it a contradictory project. Rather historians always understood their discipline to be both a social science and a humanity. The Canadian Historical Association was one of the four sponsoring bodies of the Canadian Social Science Research Council in 1940.[36] Three years later, in 1943, historians supported the establishment

33 Ramsay Cook noted that in their work, *A Full Orbed Christianity*, Michael Gauvreau and Nancy Christie "come booted and spurred to smite those heathen hip and thigh who have attempted to diminish the role of social Christianity in the creation of if not the Kingdom of God on Earth or the Co-operative Commonwealth then at least the welfare state." Ramsay Cook, "Salvation, Sociology and Secularism," *Literary Review of Canada* 6, 1 (1998): 11.

34 McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence*, 230-231

35 McKillop, *Matters of Mind*, 474-475

36 See Donald Fisher, *The Social Sciences in Canada: 50 Years of National Activity by the Social Science Federation of Canada* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991); Barry Ferguson and Doug Owram, "Social Scientists and Public Policy from the 1920s through World War II," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 15, 4 (Winter 1981): 3-17.

of the Humanities Research Council of Canada.[37] Or as A.L. Burt said in 1949, "Personally, I am opposed to that distinction or that fixing of a gulf between the so-called social sciences and the humanities, and personally, I feel that rather strongly because my subject is always on both sides of the gulf, and in some places we have been cut in two as a result."[38] At times one ideal could be stronger than the other—to 1920 history was primarily conceived as a humanity, in the interwar years it was a social science and in the 1940s it was a humanity again—but both visions were always present.

III

Against this backdrop, the basic argument of this thesis is as follows. In the first half of this century history became a profession in English Canada. However, this was a process marked not by the rise of professional history but by the transformation of history from the part-time activity of men *and* women located outside the university into the full-time careers of men (and only occasionally women) located inside the university. In other words, one way of organizing intellectual life yielded to another way of organizing intellectual life. Moreover, it was a process marked by continuity as much as by change. Even as historians sought to make history into a social science they did not sever history's roots in the older humanistic ideal of the liberal arts.

To this end, chapter 1 studies the men and women who dedicated their time and energy to various historical projects—projects which ranged from

---

37 See Watson Kirkconnel and A.J.P. Woodhouse, *The Humanities in Canada*, 2 vols. (Humanities Research Council, 1946); n.a., *Humanities Research Council of Canada, Canadian Federation for the Humanities, 1943-1983: a short history* (Ottawa: Canadian Federation for the Humanities, 1983)

38 Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence, Canadian Historical Association, 19 August 1949, NA, RG 33, 28, vol. 13

the publication of books to the creation of museums—in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. These men and women were not professional historians. But nor were they amateurs. According to the nineteenth-century definition of the term, they were historians. Although they could write hagiography and although they could indulge in patriotic excess, they could also write well-researched, well-documented history. Finally, these men and women laid some of the foundations essential to professional history, including the Historic Landmarks Association, forerunner to the Canadian Historical Association. But as several scholars have noted, Canada's great transformation into a modern, urban, industrial society precipitated a transformation in the organization and orientation of intellectual life. From the turn of the century onwards intellectual life centred in the university and oriented itself towards research.

Chapter 2 examines the beginnings of professionalization and the impact of World War I. Between the late 1890s and 1920, history became more fully located in the university. George Wrong was a central figure in this process. Hired at the University of Toronto in 1892 he built the country's largest history department over the course of his thirty-five year career. Inspired by the Oxford model, Wrong stressed tutorial work and character formation through the all-male History Club. In the first two decades of this century universities across English Canada created distinct departments of history. In addition, between 1909 and 1917 the multi-volume series *Canada and Its Provinces* appeared. An important landmark in Canadian historiography, the series embodied a larger tension in the historical project itself: history as both social science and humanity. Early professional historians undertook original, archival research with an eye to contemporary problems at the same time as they maintained a

commitment to history as moral judgment. Not subscribing to Weberian notions of value-free research they understood historical truth to comprise both the factually true and the morally good. World War I changed this. It accelerated a movement already present in intellectual life towards more social scientific scholarship. Historians did not operate in a moral vacuum, but they did seek in the interwar decades to make their discipline more clearly a social science and more clearly useful.

Chapter 3 looks at the post-1918 generation of professional historians. In the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s professional history came of age. Undergraduate enrolments increased, departments expanded and graduate programmes were instituted. In 1920 the *Canadian Historical Review* was first published and, two years later, the Canadian Historical Association was founded. Both the *CHR* and the CHA were important institutions in the professionalization of history: the *CHR* provided a forum for the dissemination of scholarly research while the CHA provided historians with a national association for the protection and promotion of their professional self-interest. That self-interest, moreover, was also material. In promoting history, particularly in the schools, historians created a need for their expertise which they filled through the writing of school textbooks. There was still another dimension to the professionalization of history in these decades, the social dimension. Through the annual meeting of the CHA and through the medium of gossip historians created a fictive kinship network, or what Arthur Lower once referred to as a "wider brotherhood."[39] In this network historians felt less isolated and more attached to a wider community of scholars engaged in the same project.

39 Arthur Lower, *My First Seventy-Five Years* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967): 181

But professionalization involved more than the launching of a journal, the creation of a professional association and the institutionalization of graduate programmes. As chapter 4 argues, it also involved boundary-work: that is, the drawing and policing of boundaries between who could and who could not be a historian. Thus, historians went to some lengths to distinguish themselves from their predecessors—those men and women who wrote history in their leisure time and belonged to local and regional historical societies—by critiquing their work as unscientific, as romantic and as highly unreliable. In this way professional historians cast their own work as scientific, scholarly and reliable. In other words, the professionalization of history also witnessed its amateurization.

This process of boundary-work, of distinguishing professional historians from amateur historians, was also gendered. Whereas women could be, and indeed were, active in the nineteenth and early-twentieth century community of historians, they were conspicuous for their absence in the historical professoriate from 1920 to 1960. Time and time again, qualified women candidates did not get academic appointments. The near total exclusion of women from the professoriate can be explained by the need for the historical profession to protect its claim to science, reason and knowledge. The presence of women, who were culturally constructed to be subjective, irrational and emotional, would undermine this claim. Moreover, the presence of women threatened to turn the profession into a low-wage ghetto like teaching and nursing. In other words, just as the professionalization of history involved its amateurization, it also involved its masculinization.

A key strategy in any professional project is the cultivation and protection of independence. This is the subject of chapter 5. The most

obvious starting point for a study in professional independence is the question of academic freedom. Certainly, the attempts by the President of the University of Toronto to remove Frank Underhill were direct threats to academic freedom and professional independence. But the protection of professional independence was an ongoing process, not the result of spectacular campaigns in the defence of academic freedom.[40] This process, furthermore, was most visible in the relationship between historians and American philanthropic foundations. In the absence of Canadian granting agencies English-Canadian historians were forced to rely on the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation. For example, the twenty-five volume series on Canadian-American relations was funded by the Carnegie Endowment. Far from being disinterested patrons of research, American foundations had their own research agendas and research objectives. However, English-Canadian historians successfully pursued their own research agendas within these constraints. As well, the charge from radical historiography that philanthropy drew social scientists into an informal alliance with state and capital rings false in view of the fact that English-Canadian historians in the interwar years wanted to be useful. They wanted to lend their expertise to the state in the formation of public policy.

Finally, chapter 6 examines the impact of World War II on the historical profession. European fascism, the collapse of France and later the atomic bomb precipitated a period of introspection and self-criticism. What is history? What is the role of the historian? English-Canadian historians turned their collective back on the social science model of history as

40 On the development of academic freedom in Canada see Frank Abbott, "The Crowe Affair: The Academic Profession and Academic Freedom," *Queen's Quarterly* 98, 4 (Winter 1991): 818-839.

solution to contemporary problems. History's strength, they now argued, lay in its civilizing and humanizing capacity. The historical project must become more concerned with the articulation and defence of the abiding values of Western civilization. Arthur Lower, Harold Innis and Donald Creighton: each in their own way sought to make history more a humanity.

IV

As a final note, I want to situate this thesis in its historical context: the 1990s. Punctuated by debate, conflict and uncertainty, the past six years have been difficult, even painful, ones for the profession. In 1994 a group of historians created a new historical association dedicated to the study of what it called national history. A new English-language historical journal appeared. As its name suggested, *National History* would be dedicated to the study of national history rather than narrowly conceived studies in regional, gender or labour history. In response, graduate students at one university threatened to boycott *National History's* publisher because it had aided and abetted the enemies of social history. Graduate students at another university convened a special meeting to discuss the implications of a dividing profession and to devise a survival strategy. For these students the consensus was, "lay low and don't get caught in the crossfire." Among professors, tempers flared and words were exchanged. Epithets like "grumpy old white men" and "social-history nazis" were pinned on opposing lapels.[41] In 1995, the President of the Canadian Historical Association publicly called this new association a band of secessionists. Privately, and in no uncertain terms, he was told to mind his own business.

41 My favorite insult, because it was directed at me, remains a comment I received in reference to a session proposal I had submitted to the 1995 CHA Programme Committee: "Your session looks like five white guys sitting around talking about the national question."

Meanwhile, federal budget after federal budget brought new rounds of cuts to funding for the social sciences and humanities. Their own budgets either frozen or cut, universities could not replace retiring professors. All in all, it was a dark period.

In an attempt to grapple with and understand these problems, the CHA held two round table discussions. The 1995 Annual Meeting featured a session entitled "Clio's Un-Civil War: On the Politics of Doing History." The following year saw a panel discussion on the "State of the Historical Profession in Canada." Speaking to the interest in what it is we do as historians, both panels were well attended and marked by lively conversation and debate. The topics covered ranged from the over-production of PhDs to cutbacks in research dollars, and from the hyper-specialization of history to the inability of historians to speak to a general audience. Panel discussions such as these are self-evidently important. Still, they harbour an inherent irony. As historians we constantly insist on the importance of history to contemporary debates and issues and events; yet we know very little about our own profession. Indeed, three of the four participants on the 1995 panel cited Peter Novick's well-known book, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession.* Although a brilliant book, it is, as its subtitle indicates, a study of the American historical profession. In his capacity as moderator of the 1995 panel, John Herd Thompson called on Canadian historians to learn more about themselves and their profession. "The end result of our unwillingness to study our own past is an unhealthy lack of perspective."

My hope is that this thesis will provide a much needed perspective on the usually difficult, often nasty and sometimes puerile debates now taking

place within the historical profession.[42] Understanding ourselves offers a therapeutic tonic to the malaise and uncertainty infecting our profession.[43] To this point I can speak from experience. While researching and writing this dissertation, I had the privilege to serve as the CHA English-language Secretary. During Executive and Council meetings, I was repeatedly struck by a sense of *déja vu:* the issues and questions with which we were struggling were not unlike the ones historians confronted fifty, sixty and seventy years ago. There has never been a Golden Age. After all, the historical profession has always been about change, about optimism and self-doubt, consensus and conflict, expansion and contraction. That historians should not have remembered this is a supreme irony indeed.

Besides, I wonder if our collective hand-wringing about the state of the profession does not miss the point. The profession itself is as strong now as it ever was. Historians continue to write books, publish articles and organize learned conferences. There exists a palpable excitement among historians around the possibilities of making history accessible to larger audiences through the Internet and the World Wide Web. And yet, Canada's collective sense of its past, its collective knowledge of its history, is as weak now as it ever was. This is not a particularly profound or original

---

[42] See Christopher Moore, "Of Heroes and Housemaids," *Beaver* 75, 6 (December 1995-January 1996).

[43] "Many departments express great uncertainty about the future." The key issues are declining enrolments, over-reliance on sessional and contract appointments, the over-production of PhDs and budget cutbacks. Minutes of Meeting of the Chairs of Departments, Canadian Historical Association, 5 June 1997. In possession of author.

Doug Owram recently argued that the malaise may also stem from the fact that "a quarter of a century of unprecedented support and activity has done much to advance individual studies but little to contribute to our understanding of Canada as a whole....The profession seems unable to bring all its efforts together and to say, at least tentatively, 'this is Canada'." Doug Owram, "Narrow Circles: The Historiography of Recent Canadian Historiography," *National History* 1, 1 (Winter 1997): 5

observation. Arthur Lower once noted that the past has "practically no appeal" to English Canadians. "They have no consciousness of their history, but at the same time there is a great professional interest. Rather hard to put those two things together, isn't it?" Lower offered his own answer: the professional historian, "who is merely raking up footnotes," has failed to speak to wider, more public audiences.[44] But the answer, it seems to me, lies not in the profession; rather, it lies at the heart of modernity's bias against time and memory and its affirmation of the future over the past. The problem of history is the problem of modernity.

---

44 Ramsay Cook, "An Interview with A.R.M. Lower," in Eleanor Cook, ed., *The Craft of History* (Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1973): 35, 37

Chapter I. History as Avocation

In the 1880s and 1890s history had a vital and vibrant existence outside the university and only a tentative one inside the university. Scores of men and women across English Canada dedicated their leisure time—and in some cases, their lives—to collecting, preserving, documenting and writing the history of their country. By 1900 over twenty historical societies and associations had been founded across the country. Within a decade close to ten more would be created.[1] Because these men and women did not have advanced research degrees and because they did not teach in university history departments, historians have labeled them amateurs. For example, in his book on the Loyalist tradition in Ontario, Norman Knowles described the men and women who wrote history, erected monuments and created museums at the turn of this century as "amateur historians" and "housewives."[2] But the term amateur is not only condescending, it is ahistorical. After all, according to the contemporary definition of the term they were historians. Scholarly publications, peer review and careerism barely existed. Whatever else it was—an avocation, a past-time, a hobby, often a passion, sometimes even an obsession—history was not yet a career.

This chapter studies history and historians outside the university in turn-of-the-century English Canada.[3] It does not pretend to be exhaustive.

---

1 It is difficult to determine the precise number of associations and societies. There are no central records and some societies had a tendency to decline only to be revived a few years later. See "Canadian Historical Societies," *Canadian Historical Review* 12, 4 (December 1931): 356-363.

2 Norman Knowles, *Inventing the Loyalists: The Ontario Loyalist Tradition and the Creation of Usable Pasts* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997): 111. See also Carl Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing since 1900*, second edition (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986): 1.

3 See also Chad Reimer, "The Making of British Columbia History: Historical Writing and Institutions, 1784-1958," (PhD, York University, 1995); M. Brook Taylor, *Promoters, Patriots and Partisans: Historiography in Nineteenth-Century English Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989); Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power:*

Instead, it focuses on William Douw Lighthall and David Ross McCord; it examines the active part played by such women as Janet Carnochen and Jenny Simpson; it looks at the creation of a national history association, the Historic Landmarks Association; and, finally, it studies the career of William Dawson LeSueur, a leading intellectual and historian in early-twentieth-century English Canada. These men and women—Knowles' so-called "amateurs" and "housewives"—helped to the lay the foundations for, and contributed to, history's eventual professionalization.

I

William Douw Lighthall loved history. Born in 1857, he graduated from McGill University in 1879 with an honours degree in literature and history; at his convocation he carried away two prizes, the Shakespeare Gold Medal and the Dufferin Prize for best Historical Essay. After a Grand Tour of Europe, he returned to McGill's law school. Bright, bilingual and indefatigable, Lighthall became an important Montreal barrister. In 1906, he was named King's Council. Still, his passions lay elsewhere, in poetry, novels, philosophy and, of course, history. These many pursuits, however, were directed at a higher plane: service. As a man of privilege, education and social standing, it was his duty to serve his country. And in the 1880s, his country confronted a questionable future. Many questioned the very survival of a separate British North America. The execution of Louis Riel, the election of Honoré Mercier, the Jesuit Estates Act and the Equal Rights Association threatened the already tenuous French-English, Catholic-Protestant relationship. The economy sputtered and talk of annexation filled the air. Goldwin Smith dared to ask the Canadian question: "Whether

---

Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970); and Knowles, *Inventing the Loyalists*.

the four blocks of territory constituting the Dominion can forever be kept by political agencies united among themselves and separate from their continent."[4] Fired by the desire to cultivate a Canadian identity, a generation of Canadian nationalists instinctively turned to history.[5] The ubiquitous Lighthall entered the fray. Out of the past he would fashion a Canadian nationalism, which for him meant imperialism and the imperial connection. Here he would find stories of heroic men, glorious battles and great explorations.[6]

Although Lighthall penned romantic, inspirational history, his work was not based on rhetoric alone. His 1889 pamphlet, *An Account of the Battle of Chateauguay*, offers an example. In it he rejected the argument that Britain was to blame for the War of 1812. Rather, the War stemmed from America's lasting hatred of England, its "envy of her commerce and prestige" and "especially the scheme for the conquest of Canada." Within this context, the Battle of Chateauguay was a battle of freedom against repression and a victory for righteousness over injustice. Leading the American charge, there was the repulsive Major General Wade Hampton: "self-important, fiery and over-indulgent in drink...he was one whose chief virtues were not patience and humility." Leading the Canadian defence was Lieut.-Colonel De Salaberry, "a perfect type of old French-

4 Goldwin Smith, *Canada and the Canada Question* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971: originally published in 1891): 5

5 See Berger, *Sense of Power*.

6 Not surprisingly, history also underpinned both his poetry and his novels. Lighthall published three volumes of poetry. See *Thoughts, Moods and Ideals, or Crimes of Leisure* (1887); *Land of Manitou* (1916); and *Old Measures* (1922). As well, he published three novels. See *The Young Seigneur* (1888); *The False Chevalier, or The Lifeguard of Marie Antoinette* (1898), and The *Master of Life: A Romance of the Five Nations and of Prehistoric Montreal* (1908). That Lighthall's interest in history found several different outlets is consistent with the activities of his contemporaries. See Diane Hallman, "Cultivating a Love of Canada through History: Agnes Maule Machar, 1837-1927," in Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory: English-Canadian Women and the Work of History* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997).

Canadian military gentry, a stock of man of whom very little remains." On occasion, Lighthall took excessive liberties. For example, he fictionalized De Salaberry's reaction to the news of the American advance. "'D— it!' he explained, jumping up from his seat, 'Hampton is at Four Corners and I must go and fight him!' and mounting his fine white charger, he dashed away from the door." Finally, the pamphlet presented a morality lesson. The Battle of Chateauguay tells us that "we shall always be able to preserve ourselves free in our course of development towards our own idea of a nation." Nonetheless, Lighthall based his account on printed primary documents, secondary sources and "local tradition," that is, the oral accounts that still existed in and around Chateauguay. He weighed evidence. And when he could not determine which fact was the correct fact, he acknowledged his inability "to obtain the necessary verifications from Ottawa or elsewhere." In other words, for all of his mythologizing, Lighthall also practised some of the skills associated with modern historical scholarship: research, skepticism and argumentation.[7] Trained as a lawyer, he gathered evidence, marshalled the facts and presented an argument.

Lighthall focused his research not only on Canada's European history, but on its Native history as well.[8] When four or five shallow graves were accidentally unearthed on the western slope of Mount Royal in 1898, Lighthall organized an archaeological expedition. Here he hoped to locate information on Hochelaga and its "mysterious people." In the end, he

7 See W.D. Lighthall, *An Account of the Battle of Chateauguay* (Montreal: W. Drysdale, 1889).

8 On Lighthall's interest in Native history see Donald Wright, "W.D. Lighthall and David Ross McCord: Antimodernism and English-Canadian Imperialism, 1880s-1918," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 32, 2 (Summer 1997): 134-153.

discovered two more skeletal remains, a young man and a young woman.[9] Over the course of the next thirty years, he would publish another five articles on Hochelaga, its people and its fate.[10] While interesting, the details of his various theories are not important.[11] Rather, the importance of this incident lies in what it can tell us about history in turn-of-the-century Canada. Distinct disciplines and concomitant specialization did not yet exist. To the eclectic Lighthall specialization was an anathema. Military history and native history, history and ethnohistory: as a historian, he did not make these distinctions. They would occur later. Meanwhile, Lighthall ensured the preservation of the skeletal remains; after all, "they will doubtless be regarded with interest by scholars."[12]

The question of preservation was an important one to turn-of-the-century historians. For David Ross McCord, it constituted an obsession. Born in 1844, McCord belonged to a prominent, wealthy Anglo-Quebec family.[13] Like his father, he also studied the law and was called to the bar in 1868. For the next fifteen years or so he practised law in Montreal; he also dabbled in municipal politics, serving as an alderman from 1874 to

9 W.D. Lighthall, "A New Hochelagan Burying-Ground discovered at Westmount on the Western Spur of Mont Royal, Montreal, July-September 1898," (Montreal: n.p., 1898)

10 See W.D. Lighthall, "Hochelagans and Mohawks: a link in Iroquois history," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 5 (1899): 199-211; "The Westmount stone-lined grave race," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 16 (1922): 73-75; "Hochelaga and the 'hill of Hochelaga'," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 18 (1924): 91-106; "The false plan of Hochelaga," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 26 (1932): 181-192; "New Hochelaga finds in 1933," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 28 (1934): 103-108.

11 For a consideration of Lighthall's contribution to the debate over Hochelaga see Bruce Trigger, "Hochelaga: History and Ethnohistory," in Bruce Trigger and J.F. Pendergast, *Cartier's Hochelaga and the Dawson Site* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1972).

12 Lighthall, "A New Hochelagan Burying-Ground," 4

13 For a history of the McCord family see Donald Fyson and Brian Young, "Origins, Wealth and Work," in Pamela Miller et al., *The McCord Family: A Passionate Vision* (Montreal, 1992).

1883. However, the 1880s signaled a dramatic change—McCord began to collect. From Temple Grove, the family's Mount Royal estate, he cast his collector's net far and wide in an obsessive attempt to build a national museum. Like Lighthall, he was an ardent imperialist and committed romantic. Wolfe, Montcalm, Brock and Tecumseh: all were heroic, galvanic and inspirational. However, McCord also displayed a commitment to research and accuracy. In her study of his ethnographic collection, Moira McCaffrey noted that "McCord sought to document, research and display his collection according to the most advanced scientific guidelines." To this end, he "initiated research projects as varied as the determination of geological sources of stone used to make hunting weapons and pipes; the identification of feathers in headdresses; the chemical analysis of glass beads; the meaning of wampum belts; and the interpretation of design elements."[14] In addition, McCord was a voracious and critical reader of history. He understood that the "Archives" were essential.[15]

As a result of his reading and his research, his collection showed a detailed knowledge of Canadian history. Although he did not write history, he did posit an interpretation of Canadian history through a deliberate museum arrangement. Arranged chronologically by room, the early museum outlined North America's Native origins, the French Regime, the Plains of Abraham and British North America. Themes of nobility, military accomplishment, French-English cooperation, pioneer endurance,

14 Moira T. McCaffrey, "*Rononshonni*—the Builder: McCord's Collection of Ethnographic Objects," in ibid, 111

15 Of William Kingsford, McCord believed that "He never could have done anything without the Archives. What I mean is, he was not one who went to the Archives, as we all must, after long years of previous reading & ripening. He went there for the reading and ripening as well as the special knowledge for which archives are created." McCord Museum of Canadian History, McCord Family Papers, file no. 2024, Canadian Note Book no. 3, 282-283

constitutional progress and national destiny dominated.[16] To be sure, McCord's "narrative" was not terrifically original. It fit the pattern of imperialism. But originality is not the point. Rather, the point is that as a historian, McCord was reflective and thoughtful and careful.

Lighthall and McCord were like other turn-of-the-century historians in that history was not something they did for a living. Lighthall's legal career was one thing, history quite another; McCord was a man of inherited means, history an end in and of itself. Trained as an engineer, William Kingsford did not begin writing history until he "secured absolute leisure" at age 65.[17] John G. Bourinot's career as the Clerk of House of Commons and his pioneering work in constitutional history were complementary.[18] By day, James Coyne worked as the Registrar of Deeds and Titles for Elgin County; by night, he studied the history of southwestern Ontario.[19] William Canniff was a medical doctor as well as the author of two books dealing with the early history of Ontario.[20] Brigadier-General E.A. Cruikshank served in the active militia at the same time as he dedicated every spare moment to studying the War of 1812 and the Niagara Peninsula.[21] Similarly, William Wood was commissioned in the 8th Royal

16 For an analysis of McCord's military collection see Donald Wright, "Remembering War in Imperial Canada: David Ross McCord and the McCord National Museum" *Fontanus: from the collections of McGill* 9 (1996).

17 *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada* 1 (1896): 11

18 See Carl Berger, "Race and Liberty: The Historical Ideas of Sir John George Bourinot," *Annual Report of the Canadian Historical Association* (1965): 87-104.

19 See Hugh Alexander Stevenson, "James H. Coyne: His Life and Contributions to Canadian History" (MA, University of Western Ontario, 1960).

20 See Heather MacDougall, "Canniff, William," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol. 13, 1901-1910* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994): 156-158.

21 See David McConnell, "E.A. Cruikshank: His Life and Work," (MA, University of Toronto, 1965). For a quick summary of Cruikshank's career see Ernest Green, "In Memoriam: Ernest Alexander Cruikshank," Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records*, 33 (1939): 5-9. Cruikshank's first wife wrote a book on their time in Niagara; in it she makes various references to her husband's distractions with "battles long ago." [Julia Cruikshank, *Whirlpool Heights: The Dream-House on the Niagara River* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1915), 40] The Dalhousie historian, D.C.

Rifles in 1887 and eventually promoted to Colonel. His military career, however, did not preclude a prodigious publishing record in Canada's military history in addition to the history of Quebec.

II

Women, too, were active in the turn-of-the-century historical community as writers, organizers, collectors and patriots. Agnes Maule Machar, Sarah Curzon, Mary FitzGibbon, Janet Carnochen and Matilda Edgar were as well known as their male counterparts.[22] Women formed their own historical societies (the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto, the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa, the Women's Wentworth Historical Society and the Women's Historical Society of Bowmanville), they participated in several other societies (the Ontario Historical Society, the Niagara Historical Society, the Manitoba Historical and Scientific Society, and the Huron Institute), and at least one woman (Jenny Simpson) took on a leadership position in the Historic Landmarks Association, forerunner to the Canadian Historical Association. Invited to address the Wentworth Historical Society in 1891, Sarah Curzon spoke directly to the issue of her sex and the writing of history. At first, she explained, "I felt compelled to decline your courteous invitation." After all, one of my sex "had never been recognized as in its right place when found upon a platform, even the very modest platform of the essayist." However, she accepted the invitation in the end. By opening its membership roll to women, and by extending her an invitation to speak, the Wentworth Historical Society had upheld, in

---

Harvey, once wondered if the "old general" "kept the book before his poor second wife as an example or a warning." DC Harvey to Fred Landon, 11 August 1945, University of Western Ontario, J.J. Talman Regional Collection, Fred Landon Papers, Box 4209, file 28

22 See Hallman, "Cultivating a Love of Canada."

her words, "the doctrine of the equal rights of woman as a human being." The historical project as it was then understood was one for both sexes. As Curzon argued, "Together, men and women built up this noble country by whose name we call ourselves; together they must preserve and develop it; and together they will stand or fall by it."[23]

A few years later, Curzon proved the driving force behind the creation in 1895 of the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto (WCHST). Article II of its Constitution clearly spelled out its objectives: "The encouragement of a study of Canadian history and Literature; the collection and preservation of Canadian historical records and relics; and the building up of Canadian loyalty and patriotism."[24] As their motto, the founding women selected "Deeds Speak." Toward making deeds speak, the Society published an *Annual Report* and the occasional *Transaction* (or occasional paper). In addition, it organized regular Saturday afternoon meetings where members read papers on a variety of topics—"Amherst Island and its Neighbourhood," by Mrs. Leigh; "The First Three Years of British Rule," by Mrs. Graham; and "Historic Sketch of Canadian Women in Art," by Mrs. Dignam[25]—at the same time as it participated in various efforts to promote history more generally. As Mary FitzGibbon explained in 1900, the WCHST wanted to foster a knowledge of Canadian history "among those belonging to other nationalities who make their homes on Canadian soil and thus become citizens of the British Empire."[26] In 1899

---

23 Sarah Curzon, "Historical Societies," *Journal and Transactions of the Wentworth Historical Society* 1(1892): 105, 106

24 Stella Cook, "The Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto, 1895-1970," Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto, Transaction no. 29 (Toronto, 1970): 4

25 See Miss FitzGibbon, Report of the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto, in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 6 (1900): Appendix C, xlvi

26 Ibid, xlviii

the WCHST proved instrumental in organizing a history exhibition at Victoria University[27] and, in 1905, it joined the fight to save Fort York from a projected streetcar line.

The early success of the WCHST encouraged Matilda Edgar to institute a similar society in Ottawa. Born Matilda Ridout in 1844, she married James D. Edgar in 1865. A prominent Barrister in Upper Canada and later a Member of Parliament, James Edgar was eventually elected Speaker of the House of Commons in 1896. In any event, Matilda Edgar called a general meeting for those interested in creating a Women's Canadian Historical Society on 3 June 1898. Accordingly, "Thirty-one ladies assembled in [her] drawing room." Here Edgar explained the origins and purpose of the WCHST: to create a space for women interested in the study of history and to actively promote patriotism. With support and enthusiasm the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa was duly created. A motto was chosen—"Love Thou Thy Land"—and an executive appointed.[28] At its first general meeting in November 1898, the WCHSO selected 29 March as the permanent date of its annual meeting, it having been on this day in 1867 that the BNA Act received Royal Assent.[29] As its next item of business, the WCHSO divided Canadian history into four periods: discovery and early settlement to 1800; 1800 to 1841; 1841 to 1867; and 1867 to the present. The goal was to study each period and invite members to present papers on such topics as "the Indians, the invasions of Canada, the historians, the social and domestic life

27 In its report, the Ontario Historical Society stated that the success of the Victoria University historical exhibition owed "to the labours of the Women's Canadian Historical Society." David Boyle, Report of the Ontario Historical Society, Ibid, iv

28 "Organization Plans for Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa," 3 June 1898, Bytown Museum Archives (BMA), Box 66, 1/3

29 As the date of its annual meeting, the WCHST selected 16 November, the birthday of James FitzGibbon, a British commander in the War of 1812 and the man to whom Laura Secord delivered her message about a planned surprise attack by the Americans.

of the early inhabitants; relics that remain from the early days and so on."[30] Within two years, however, the Society decided to focus its attention on the history of the Ottawa area.[31]

Over the next decade and a half the WCHSO heard papers on topics ranging from "Lumbermen of the Ottawa Valley" to "The History of the Ottawa General Hospital."[32] Although its focus was local history, it maintained an interest in general history. In 1910, 1912 and 1913, for example, the Society reported that over the course of the year it had selected a specfic theme for investigation: Canada's battlefields, its historical waterways and international treaties. It also became a custom at each meeting to read a patriotic poem. At the same time as it provided a forum for women to present papers, the WCHSO organized "several children's meetings especially adapted to foster youthful loyalty." According to an *Annual Report*, "love of our Country's flag, with all it stands for, [was] particularly emphasized at these meetings."[33] Like every other historical society at this time, the WCHSO took a keen interest in commemoration. In January 1911, the President, Mrs. Thomas Ahearn and Mrs. J.B. Simpson met with the Prime Minister, Sir Wiflrid Laurier, the Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Pugsley and the Minister of Labour, the Hon. Mackenzie King, to discuss a possible memorial to "that great historic event, the Confederation of the Provinces—the Victory of Peace."[34] Three years later, Jenny Simpson duly noted that not only had the Society

30 "Minutes of the first general meeting of the WCHS of Ottawa," Ibid

31 Mrs. George E. Foster, Report of the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa, in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 6 (1900): Appendix C, xiii

32 C.E. Billings, "Honorary Secretary's Report," Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa, *Annual Report* (1908-1909): 9-10

33 Ibid, 8

34 Jenny Simpson, Report of the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa, in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 5 (1911): Appendix E, lxxxix

managed to place a portrait of Col. By, the founder of Ottawa, in the Council Chamber of City Hall but that it would soon see a monument to Confederation erected at Connaught Place. Already she had received a kind congratulatory note from Sir Charles Tupper, "the last remaining Father of Confederation."[35] Never resting on its laurels, the WCHSO founded in 1917 the Bytown Museum in the Old Registry Office of Ottawa on Nicholas Street.[36]

The existence of separate women's historical societies suggests the existence of a need for women's historical societies. Indeed, both Sarah Anne Curzon who founded the WCHST and Matilda Edgar who founded the WCHSO were early feminists and active in the National Council of Women. They deliberately founded these societies to advance a particular agenda: through the study of women in history, they wanted to promote contemporary women's rights. Beverly Boutilier made precisely this argument: "Although her work on Laura Secord helped to disseminate the history of Loyalism, it was in order to further the cause of women's rights, and thus to redefine the parameters of female citizenship, that Sarah Curzon initially turned to the writing and preservation of Canadian history."[37] Norman Knowles echoed this argument when he stated that, "Through organizations like the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto, middle-class women set out to record the contributions of their

---

35 Jenny Simpson, Report of the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa, in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 8 (1914): Appendix F

36 In 1951 the Bytown Museum moved to its present location, the former Commissariat Building at the entrance to the Rideau canal. In 1956 the WHSO became the Historical Society of Ottawa. The latter's mandate was similar: "To carry on the work of the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa and the Bytown Historical Museum and Reference Library;...and to foster Canadian Loyalty and Patriotism." See Constitution and By-laws of the Historical Society of Ottawa," BMA, Box 67, 1/4

37 Beverly Boutilier, "Women's Rights and Duties: Sarah Anne Curzon and the Politics of Canadian History," in Boutilier and Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory*, 51-52

foremothers and to claim a place in the nation's history." Of course, a close relationship existed between their history and their politics. "In asserting their place in the nation's past, such women challenged the male domination of history and insisted on their right to greater status and recognition in the present." In addition to the efforts to commemorate Laura Secord, Knowles examined the efforts of Methodist women to use the example of Barbara Heck, the founder of American Methodism, "in their campaign for ecclesiastical suffrage."[38]

Yet Boutilier took her argument even further: not only did women create their own societies in order to advance the cause of women's rights, they did so because they were either altogether unwelcome or cast in "auxiliary" roles within Ontario's historical societies. To be sure, the Lundy's Lane Historical Society was exclusively male while the Elgin Historical and Scientific Institute and the Wentworth Historical Society (WHS) created women's auxiliaries.[39] Indeed, Boutilier suggested that the WHS was "perhaps typical."[40] By 1900 its ladies committee had become the Women's Wentworth Historical Society. Energetic, this society arranged for the purchase of the Gorge House and a surrounding four-and-a half acre plot of land: it was in this house that War of 1812 British Generals resided and it was on this land that the British defeated their American enemies in the Battle of Stony Creek. However, Boutilier did not mention the fact that women continued to serve on both the executive and the council of the WHS throughout the 1900s and 1910s.[41] In other words, the existence of a ladies

38 Knowles, *Inventing the Loyalists*, 125-126, 137

39 Boutilier, "Women's Rights and Duties," 66. The Literary and Historical Society of Quebec was exclusively male; the Antiquarian and Numismatic Society of Montreal had a ladies auxiliary, the Women's Antiquarian Society.

40 Boutilier, "Women's Rights and Duties," 66

41 See WHS Annual Reports printed in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada.*

auxiliary and then a separate women's society did not preclude the participation of women in the WHS.

The same pattern can be seen in the Elgin Historical and Scientific Institute (EHSI). Its founder, James S. Coyne, was a leading figure in the history movement in turn-of-the-century Ontario. Having served in a private militia against the Fenian Raids in 1866 and having been inspired by the Canada First Movement, Coyne intended to instill patriotism through history. In 1891 he gathered together several prominent St. Thomas citizens in an effort to organize the Elgin Historical and Scientific Institute. Its purpose was patriotic and practical: to serve the country by gathering facts, objects, "Indian relics" and local flora and fauna. As he explained in 1901, it was a matter of solemn duty "to preserve the records of the past and to honour the men and women whose lives and deeds made possible its present."[42] From the past will come inspiration in the present. In 1896, the EHSI expanded to include a ladies auxiliary or women's branch, as it was sometimes called. Within a few years this branch became the Women's Historical Society of the County of Elgin. However, women continued to sit on the executive and council of the EHSI and to give papers at its regular meetings. For example, in 1900 there was a woman vice-president, a woman secretary-treasurer and a woman councilor. This pattern continued throughout 1900s and 1910s: in some years, women made up nearly half of the council in addition to holding two and sometimes three executive positions.[43]

Moreover, men did not see the creation of the women's historical societies as threatening in the least. For his part, W.D. Lighthall was very

42 Quotation in Stevenson, "James H. Coyne," 167

43 See EHSI Annual Reports printed in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada.*

pleased to have been named an honorary member of the WCHST. In his own words, he was in "deep sympathy" with the society's objects. "The founding of Woman's Can. Hist. Society is a noble idea," he said. "I pressed [two Montreal women] to found one here the other day when they called upon me for the Cabot Exhibition."[44] James Coyne was similarly impressed. Although unable to accept its invitation, he hoped that the 1896 event at Fort York hosted by the WCHST would provide a "great impetus" to all historical societies.[45] And Charles Mair, one of Canada's leading poets who liked to use historical themes in his writing, welcomed the WCHST as a positive force for Canadian womanhood and Canadian nationhood. "The sacred domestic instincts of Canadian womanhood will not suffer in the least degree, but will rather be refreshed and strengthened by the most which I trust your society proposes to do not only in searching for fresh materials for our public history but, more important still, in rescuing from destruction the scattered and perishable records of Ontario's old, and, in many respects, romantic home life."[46] Again, women historians were welcome allies in the cause of Canadian history.

Thus, Boutilier's characterization of the historical movement in turn-of-the-century Ontario as "male dominated" was premature.[47] As Boutilier herself observed, the indefatigable Janet Carnochen founded the Niagara Historical Society (NHS) in 1895 and served as its president until 1922.[48] Born in 1839, Carnochen became a high school teacher, eventually retiring in 1900. However, her great passion was history. As president of the NHS,

---

44 William Douw Lighthall to Mary FitzGibbon, 21 May 1896, Archives of Ontario (AO), Women's Canadian Historical Society Records, Series A, MU 7837, Correspondence 1890-1896

45 James S. Coyne to Mary FitzGibbon, 1 September 1896, Ibid

46 Charles Mair to Mary FitzGibbon, 8 May 1896, Ibid

47 Boutilier, "Women's Rights and Duties," 69

48 See AO, Ontario Historical Society Records, Series D, MU 5440, Scrapbook, Janet Carnochen.

Carnochen wrote over two dozen essays and pamphlets on the history of the Niagara region, published one book, raised the $5 000 needed to restore Niagara Memorial Hall into a local museum and arranged for commemorative stone markers at various historical sites related to the War of 1812. To mark these sites was to mark "ground drenched with the blood of heroes of the past, who so nobly stood for King and country."[49] Then there were the endless administrative duties. In one year alone she counted 240 letters sent to people who had requested either a publication or some information on this or that topic.[50] Moreover, Carnochen was not the only woman active in the NHS; at any given time, there were two or three other women on the executive and council.

Not all women achieved the prominence of Carnochen, but women took an active part in other historical societies. For example, in its 1900 report to the Royal Society of Canada the Peterborough Historical Society listed a woman on the executive and on the council; in addition, the Society reported that another woman proved instrumental in raising the funds for a suitable monument to Peterborough poet, Isabella Valancey Crawford.[51] Meanwhile, a Mrs. W.N. Ponton served as president of the Belleville and Bay of Quinte Historical Society from 1899 and 1901.[52] Founded in 1904 to further the causes of history, zoology, geology, botany and civic improvement, the Huron Institute of Collingwood consistently had women members, executives and directors.[53] Indeed, the list goes on. The Thorold

---

49 Janet Carnochen, Report of the Niagara Historical Society in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 9 (1903): Appendix D, cxiv

50 Janet Carnochen, Report of the Niagara Historical Society, in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 7 (1913): Appendix G

51 T.A.S. Hay, Report of the Peterborough Historical Society, in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 6 (1900): Appendix C

52 See Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records*, 3 (1901): 4.

53 See Huron Institute Annual Reports printed in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*.

and Beaverdams Historical Society, the Halton Historical Society, the Victoria County Historical Society, the Perth Historical Society, the London and Middlesex Historical Society, the Lennox and Addington Historical Society, the Kingston Historical Society, the St. Catharines' Historical Society and the Amherstburg Historical Society: all witnessed the participation of women as members and officers.[54] Even the Lundy's Lane Historical Society, which Boutilier characterized as a men-only group, had opened its executive to women by 1910.

From its beginnings in 1898, the Ontario Historical Society opened its doors to women. In point of fact, it was a Miss Sarah Mickle who moved that the newly created society be called the Ontario Historical Society rather than the proposed Ontario Pioneer and Historical Association.[55] Now, it is also true that men clearly outnumbered women. But, as Terry Crowley commented, women played a "prominent role."[56] Indeed, they sat on the executive and the council; they presented papers at the annual meeting; they published essays and notes in the OHS journal;[57] and in one year a Marjorie Fraser received first prize in the OHS's History Essay Competition for her paper entitled "Feudalism in Upper Canada."[58] Another woman, Clementina Fessenden, used the OHS as "her base" from which to agitate "for a flag to spread the gospel of imperialistic patriotism. Eventually, the letters she wrote, the articles she composed, and the speeches that she gave

54 For a description of the Kingston Historical Society see Louis J. Flynn, "The Early Years of the Kingston Historical Society, 1893-1906," *Historic Kingston* 11 (March 1963): 35-46.

55 AO, Ontario Historical Society Records, Series B, MS 249, Minutes 30 March 1898

56 Terry Crowley, "*Ontario History* at 100," *Ontario Historical Society Bulletin*, no. 114 (May 1998): 7

57 Between 1899 and 1923 twenty different women published thirty-two papers in *Papers and Records*. See "Index of Authors and Subjects", Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records*, 20 (1922): 149-184.

58 See Marjorie J.F. Fraser, "Feudalism in Upper Canada," Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records*, 12 (1914): 142-152.

resulted at the end of the nineteenth century in the creation of Empire Day."[59] In addition to the eight papers she published in *Papers and Records*,[60] Janet Carnochen served as vice-president in 1915.

As historians, women writers echoed many of the themes of their male counterparts. True, as Boutilier and Knowles noted, some women deliberately broadened the scope of history to include the history of women in an effort to advance women's rights. And although their political intentions remain unclear, it is also true that other women researched and wrote about the history of women. Essays included "Jane Craig, A Revolutionary Heroine," "Madeleine de Verchères" and "A Woman's Place in the world."[61] On one occasion, a Miss Amelia Poldon published an essay entitled "Women in Pioneer Life" in which she referred to the "male-monopolized" world of the early-nineteenth century education and championed Dr. Emily Stowe as an important pioneer in opening the doors to women in higher learning.[62] However, the vast majority of history written by women centred on the Loyalists, the War of 1812, military heroes and colonial governors. Of the thirty-two papers written by women in the OHS *Papers and Records* between 1899 and 1922 only two were on the subject of women. For the most part, the WCHSO concentrated on the same historical topics as Lighthall, McCord, Cruikshank and Coyne. In the same

59 Crowley, "*Ontario History* at 100," 7. See also AO, Niagara Historical Society Records, Reel 15, H IV.1, Clementina Fessenden Papers.

60 Only E.A. Cruikshank who published eight essays and W.R. Riddell who published nine had as many papers printed. See papers by Janet Carnochen in Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records*, 3 (1901); 5 (1904); 7 (1906); 8 (1907); 13 (1915); 15 (1917); 17 (1919); 19 (1922).

61 See Report of the Women's Historical Society of Ottawa, *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 8 (1902): Appendix B; Report of the Elgin Historical and Scientific Institute, *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 9 (1903): Appendix D; Report of Women's Historical Society of the County of Elgin, Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 1 (1907): Appendix G.

62 Amelia Poldon, "Women in Pioneer Life," Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records* 17 (1919): 25-29

year that it heard a paper on the women workers of Ottawa, it initiated a series of talks on "Canadian men of note."[63] The founder of the WCHSO, Matilda Edgar, published three books, all on traditional subjects: the War of 1812, General Brock and Haratio Sharpe, a colonial governor of Maryland.[64] Clementina Fessenden may have been a busy historical activist, but she did not believe in the parliamentary franchise for women.[65] Boutilier made the same observation in her work when she reported that despite Sarah Curzon's personal commitment, the WCHST was never a women's rights organization; although, it was politicized to the degree that it insisted on women's civic role as nation builders.[66] Women historians imagined the Canadian nation along similar lines as the Lighthalls and McCords: imperialism. Canada's past was a British past; its destiny was a British destiny; and in its imperial connection lay its greatness.

By the turn of the century, then, scores of men and women busied themselves with writing, collecting and preserving the past; there were numerous local and even some provincial historical societies; and yet there was no national organization, there was no co-ordinating body capable of acting as an information centre. Never one to sit back and let things more or less take care of themselves, W.D. Lighthall set his sights on the creation of a national historical association in the early 1900s. Owing to a pervasive

63 See Report of the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa, *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 9 (1903): Appendix D.

64 See Matilda Edgar, *Ten Years of Upper Canada in Peace and War, 1805-1815* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1890; reprinted as *Ten Years of Upper Canada in Peace and War (The Thomas Ridout Captivity)*, New York: Graland Publishing, 1977); *General Brock* (Toronto: Morang and Co., 1904); and *A Colonial Governor in Maryland: Haratio Sharpe and his time, 1753-1773* (London: Longmans, Green, 1912).

65 See, "Fessenden, Mrs. Clementina," in H.J. Morgan, ed., *The Canadian Men and Women of the Time*, 2nd edition (Toronto: William Briggs, 1912): 392. See also Molly Puvar Ungar, "Trenholme, Clementina (Fessenden)," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol. 14, 1911-1920* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998): 1008-1009.

66 Boutilier, "Women's Rights and Duties," 69

neglect, he believed, Canadians had allowed their physical and architectural heritage to fall into disrepair. Dilapidated buildings that once housed an important person and falling-down forts that once saw a key confrontation did not speak well of Canadian patriotism. In August 1905, he learned that the Dominion Government intended to sell as so many lots "the old military common adjoining the Fort and barracks" in Chambly, Quebec. First, he wrote to the Mayor suggesting that the City Council issue a bond series in order to purchase and thus save the site from development.[67] Next, he contacted his old friend and comrade in things historical, Major William Wood of Quebec City and active member of the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec. The Chambly Common, he explained, "has many memories and should be left alone." Now, more than ever, the time is right "for us to begin the Historic Landmark Association." Objects must be defined, a circular printed and a petition to save the Common started. Presidents, vice-presidents, secretaries and a treasurer need to be named. As well, and because he "shows such hearty and sincere interest" we really must seek the Governor General as our "Patron" (although "I detest the word"). In any event, "the important thing is action."[68] A few weeks later, Lighthall received the go-ahead from Samuel Dawson, the Honorary Secretary of the Royal Society of Canada, to organize the Association under the auspices of the RSC.

That the Historic Landmarks Association emerged out of the Royal Society is not at all surprising. Founded in 1882, the RSC quickly established itself as the country's chief organizational vehicle for intellectual life by providing a home to individuals and scholars across the

67 W.D. Lighthall to Mayor Willett, 30 August 1905, McGill University Rare Books and Special Collections (MURBSC), Lighthall Papers, Box 17, file 16

68 W.D. Lighthall to Major William Wood, 1 September 1905, Ibid

country. Divided into four sections (I. Littérature Français, Histoire, Archéologie; II. English Literature, History, Archaeology; III. Mathematical, Physical and Chemical Sciences; IV. Geological and Biological Sciences) membership was by election only. Although its principal mandate was the organization of an annual meeting (always in the third week of May) and the publication of its *Proceedings and Transactions* (which ate up most of its $5 000 government grant), from time to time the RSC also lent its weight to historical causes. In 1891 the Royal Society assisted the Antiquarian and Numismatic Society of Montreal in "its successful efforts to preserve the Château de Ramezay, built in 1705 and later used as a residence for British governors, from the prevalent 'spirit of vandalism'."[69] The idea to save the building from its fated destruction belonged, in point of fact, to Lighthall. After a three-week visit to the local museums of Boston and Albany in 1890, he decided to start a similar institution in Montreal. He immediately selected the Château Ramezay and proposed a "plan of rescue."[70] In addition to assisting Lighthall and the Antiquarian and Numismatic Society of Montreal, the RSC "actively promoted commemoration of the 400th anniversary of the voyages in 1497 and 1498 of the Cabots."[71] Then in 1901 the Council of the RSC established a sub-committee of Sections I and II "for the Preservation of Scenic and Historic Places in Canada."[72] Inspired by the National Trust in Great Britain and intended as a national co-ordinating committee, the RSC sub-committee never got off the ground. The following year, Council found it

69 Carl Berger, *Honour and the Search for Influence: A History of the Royal Society of Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996): 30

70 W.D. Lighthall to Editor, *Montreal Star*, 8 March 1939, NA, Lighthall Papers, MG 29 D 93, vol. 2, file Correspondence 1939

71 Berger, *Honour and the Search for Influence*, 31

72 *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 7 (1901): xx

"expedient" to renew its call for an active, energetic sub-committee on historic preservation.[73] Again, there was little activity. In 1905, the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec, an affiliated society, urged the RSC to create a Canadian Landmark Association.[74]

For the next two years Lighthall and William Wood sought support for their proposed association from the RSC and various local history societies; as support mounted, they settled on the 1907 Annual Meeting of the Royal Society of Canada for the inaugural meeting.[75] With the assistance of Wilfred Campbell, Secretary of RSC Section II, Lighthall ensured a representative turnout for the meeting. It must be a national association and not simply an Ontario/Quebec association. Both the West and the East must be represented.[76] Finally, after four years of sporadic effort and two years of organized effort the Historic Landmarks Association was duly constituted on 15 May 1907. From its inception, the Association acted as "an intelligence department" and lobbying group. In other words, it would keep an ongoing list of the country's physical heritage and, where and when appropriate, it would "concentrate effective influence" for its preservation.[77]

---

73 *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 8 (1902): xii

74 *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 11 (1905): Appendix E, cxviii

75 See F.C. Wurtele to W.D. Lighthall, 16 September 1905; William Wood to W.D. Lighthall, 17 October 1906; and William Wood to W.D Lighthall, 5 April 1907, MURBSC, Lighthall Papers, Box 17, file 16.

76 W.W. Campbell to W.D. Lighthall, 18 April 1907 and 20 April 1907, Ibid. Although there were affiliated societies from western Canada and the Maritime, the Executive remained thoroughly central Canadian throughout the life of the Association. In his 1920 Presidential Address, Lawrence Burpee urged a more representative executive. Lawrence Burpee, "Presidential Address," The Historic Landmarks Association of Canada, *Annual Report* (1921): 14

77 The Historic Landmarks Association, Circular, 1908, NA, The Historic Landmarks Association Collection, MG 28 I 52, vol. 1

In his article on the disciplinarization of history in Quebec, Patrice Régimbald examined the role played by the RSC; its most important initiative, he asserted, was the creation of the HLA in 1907. His mangled history of the HLA notwithstanding, to call the HLA the most important initiative was surely an overstatement.[78] After all, throughout its fifteen-year existence it remained thoroughly outside the university and the changes taking place within the study and practice of history. Although the University of Toronto historians George Wrong and W.S. Wallace joined the Association there is no indication that they even indirectly, let alone directly, participated. Indeed, the Executive consisted of men for whom history was a past-time, albeit a passionate one, rather than a career. The HLA did not define history in "scientific" terms. Rather, it employed a romantic discourse. Its first mission statement is rich in romance and full of energetic optimism. Although the author is not identified, it was most likely Lighthall. The opening paragraph used the word "exultant" three times to describe Canada's heritage, its natural riches and its pioneers. Of the self-governing dominions, Canada's history and its "moving incidents" remain "the most romantic of them all." Soldiers, poets, priests, explorers, Norsemen and Indians: "each has left landmarks to tell their story to all who listen understandingly." Using a broad definition of landmark, the HLA cast a wide net. "It may be a monument set up by pious hands; a building, a ruin, or a site; a battlefield or fort; a rostrum or a poet's walk; any natural object; any handiwork of man; or even the mere local habitation of a legend or a name. But, whatever the form, its spirit makes

78 Régimbald reported that in 1919 the HLA became the Historic Sites and Monuments Board and that in 1922 the HSMB became the Canadian Historical Association. He was wrong. The HSMB was a government body created in 1919. It still exists. In 1922 the HLA became the CHA. See Patrice Régimbald, "La Disciplinarisation de l'histoire au Canada français," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 51, 2 (Automne 1997): 163-200.

every true landmark a talismanic heirloom, only to be lost to our peril and shame." These monuments and sites and landmarks would neither be the "constricting grip" of a dead hand nor a bar "to real progress." Rather they would carry a living message, a reminder of our greatness and an inspiration; "lest, seeking the whole mere world of riches, [Canada] loses her own soul."[79]

For fifteen years the HLA organized an annual meeting in conjunction with the Royal Society, published an *Annual Report* and acted as a national registry of historic sites and important landmarks. It also provided a forum for women historians and women interested in history. Although the RSC remained in effect a male institution—Section II did not elect a woman until 1951—the HLA proved open to both women's membership and participation. Admittedly, women never constituted anything more than a minority; still, their participation is clearly evident in the minutes: "A most interesting discussion followed re. the work of our Association in which Mrs. John Thorburn, Mrs. F.A. Paget, Lt. Col. Cockshutt & Dr. Campbell took part";[80] "An interesting discussion followed regarding 'natural monuments,' the geographic keys that open the gate of history, mountains & rivers named after explorers, missionaries & many added since the outbreak of the great war. Mr. Whitcher, Mr. Drysdale, Mrs. Somerville & Miss Carnochen taking part";[81] "Mrs. Lynch-Staunton drew attention to the efforts of their Society for government aid in laying out as a park of the beautiful grounds of Stoney Creek farm"; "Miss Merritt heartily endorsed after viewing Madame E. Roy's interesting historic relics...a motion of appreciation to the

79 The Historic Landmarks Association, Pamphlet, 1908, NA, The Historic Landmarks Association Collection, MG 28 I 52, vol. 1

80 The Historic Landmarks Association, Minutes of Annual Meeting, 21 May 1917, Ibid

81 The Historic Landmarks Association, Minutes of Annual Meeting, 21 May 1918, Ibid

Press."[82] In other words, women were hardly silent members. Moreover, the survival of the Association owed largely to Jenny Simpson.

In 1914, the treasurer George Durnford presented a bleak report: "annual receipts are dwindling." Indeed, in 1908 the HLA could count fifty-two individual members and six affiliated societies; by 1914 its membership rolls had declined to twenty-eight individual members and three affiliated societies. Among the Association's most faithful friends, Durnford listed the Toronto Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire, the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa and the Antiquarian and Numismatic Society of Montreal.[83] That year the HLA secured the services of Jenny Simpson as General Secretary. Carrying a small stipend of $50.00 in 1914, it was the only paid position in the Association. It was also the only position that required a lot of day-to-day work. In his 1915 President's Address, Pemberton Smith singled out Jenny Simpson: "...she has devoted all her time to the work of the Association, to which her services have been so valuable as to merit our sincerest thanks, and the strongest terms of praise."[84] Simpson's stipend was raised to $125.00 in 1916. By 1918, the membership had increased to 131 individual members and eleven affiliated societies. In 1920 Simpson's stipend was raised again, this time to $200. That year Lighthall moved that "Mrs. Simpson's valued services & untiring devotion to the work" of the HLA be recognized; she was summarily presented with a set of the *Chronicles of Canada*.[85] When Simpson resigned

---

82 The Historic Landmarks Association, Minutes of Annual Meeting, 20 May 1919, Ibid

83 G. Durnford, Treasurer's Report, 27 May 1914, NA, W.D. Lighthall Papers, MG 29 D 93, vol. 1, file 26

84 Pemberton Smith, "President's Address," Historic Landmarks Association, *Annual Report* (1915): 8

85 The Historic Landmarks Association, Minutes of the Annual Meeting, 19 May 1920, NA, The Historic Landmarks Association Collection, MG 28 I 52, vol. 1

her position in 1921, then President Lawrence Burpee spoke of her "enthusiasm and untiring energy" to which "the Association owes so much of its success." More specifically, "through the efforts of Mrs. Simpson, we are able to announce a substantial addition to the membership of the Association."[86] By 1921, there were 136 individual members and twenty-two affiliated societies.

Lighthall, McCord, Carnochen and Simpson, the Bytown Museum, the McCord National Museum and the Historic Landmarks Association: the countless men and women who wrote history, founded associations, created museums and erected monuments embodied a different ideal of the historian, an ideal captured by the term "amateur." Recall Norman Knowles' reference to the "amateur historians" and "housewives" who wrote history. As a term, amateur is used to denote someone who is not professional; however, it is also used to connote do-gooders, dabblers and local history buffs. Although many of the men and women who wrote history tended towards romance and hero worship, some exhibited those traits associated with modern scholarship: primary research, skepticism and criticism. Lady Edgar gathered, annotated and published a collection of letters because she recognized their importance to future historians.[87] John Bourinot sounded not unlike a modern historian when he accepted the difficulty in writing contemporary history and thus avoided those topics "too near to us to admit of a cool and purely historical treatment."[88] Janet Carnochen referred to the "great care" and "close scrutiny" historians must exercise in their research.[89] Brig.-General E.A.

86 Burpee, "Presidential Address," 12

87 Edgar, *Ten Years of Upper Canada*, "Introduction"

88 John G. Bourinot, *Canada Under British Rule, 1760-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900): viii

89 Janet Carnochen, "Some Mistakes in History," *Ontario Historical Society: Papers and Records* 13 (1915): 28

Cruikshank defined the historian's "scientific conscience" as "the habit of accuracy, open-mindedness, impartiality of judgment and the love of the truth."[90] Simply put, the term "amateur" is ahistorical when applied to the men and women who practised history at the turn of the century. They understood themselves to be historians. Moreover, these men and women, the so-called amateurs and housewives, assisted in laying the foundation for history's eventual professionalization. They preserved, documented and recorded the past; they published valuable primary document collections; in the HLA they created a national historical association; and in addition to the hagiography and patriotic excess, some wrote thoroughly-researched and well-documented history. William Dawson LeSueur's career is vivid testimony to the latter approach.

III

Born in 1840 and educated at the Ontario Law School and the University of Toronto, LeSueur worked as a civil servant with the Post Office in Ottawa. Although he would eventually be made chief of the money order system, his primary interests lay outside the civil service. Working for the Post Office provided the income necessary to his intellectual pursuits. In evenings and on weekends, LeSueur read widely and voraciously, trying to keep abreast current debates in science, philosophy and religion. At the same time, he wrote essays and articles in which he worked out a reconciliation between science and faith. Science and the scientific spirit, he argued, must be cultivated and advanced: "if a spirit of rational enquiry can be awakened, if the work of science can be nobly conceived by us," he

90 E.A. Cruikshank, "The Study of History and the Interpretation of Documents," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 15 (1921): Section II, 13

wrote in 1879, "then we shall be sure in due time to do our part faithfully and well in building up that structure of scientific knowledge which, in the years to come, shall be, as it were, the common home and shelter of humanity."[91] In this sense, LeSueur was a modern. According to A.B. McKillop, "The place of W.D. LeSueur within the history of the Anglo-Canadian moral imagination, and Canadian history in general, is an important one, for it was he who first introduced the spirit of modern criticism into Canadian life."[92] However, McKillop's reference to the moral imagination is important. At the same time as LeSueur argued the necessity of critical inquiry, he argued its compatibility with morality. Embracing dualism, he believed in the existence of a moral order subject to metaphysical investigation and in physical order subject to scientific investigation. "Brain is brain, and mind is mind; and though each may react on the other, it is the merest folly to say that one, in any sense, is the other."[93]

Following his retirement from the civil service in 1902, LeSueur dedicated himself to the study of history. As McKillop noted, the shift from philosophy to history was neither sudden nor enormous; after all, his writings "had always shown a historical perspective," particularly his essays on politics and morality written in the 1890s.[94] Moreover, he brought to the study of history the same critical spirit he had demonstrated as a philosopher. As events unfolded over the course of the next fifteen years, LeSueur's criticism landed him in very hot water, cost him time and

91 W.D. LeSueur, "The Scientific Spirit," 1879; reprinted in A.B. McKillop, ed., *A Critical Spirit: The Thought of William Dawson LeSueur* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977): 111.

92 Ibid, xx

93 W.D. LeSueur, "Science and Materialism," 1877; reprinted in Ibid, 101

94 Ibid, 248

money to fight five court cases and caused him no end of grief. At issue was his biography of William Lyon MacKenzie, the leader of the 1837 Rebellion in Upper Canada. Although the story has been well told by McKillop,[95] neither LeSueur's ideas about history nor his legal troubles have been placed in the context of the professionalization of history.

In the early 1900s the publisher George Morang initiated a twenty-volume series on great Canadians. Called the *Makers of Canada*, it included biographies of Lord Sydenham, Joseph Howe, Etienne Cartier and Sir John A. Macdonald. As its title suggests, the series adopted a decidedly whiggish, sometimes hagiographic point of view. For his part, LeSueur contributed a volume on Frontenac.[96] In addition, he agreed to serve as an editor. It was in this capacity that he read Thomas Hughes' manuscript on the life of William Lyon Mackenzie. According to LeSueur, the manuscript did not meet the standards of historical criticism. "Declamation much more than historical analysis or careful research is [Hughes'] forte," he told Morang.[97] Based on LeSueur's recommendation, Morang rejected the manuscript. Perhaps you would like to write a Mackenzie biography, Morang inquired. At first, LeSueur balked. After all, it would hardly look good when it was his criticism that led to the manuscript's rejection in the first place. Morang next approached George Wrong. He initially agreed but then quickly declined. Morang finally returned to LeSueur; this time he consented. According to LeSueur, Wrong "had been dissuaded by friends from entering on a subject which he could hardly hope to treat quite independently without exciting partisan feeling and criticism, which

95 See Ibid, 247-267. See also Daniel Francis, *National Dreams: Myth, Memory, and Canadian History* (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1997): 114-119.

96 See W.D. LeSueur, *Count Frontenac* (Toronto: Morang and Co., 1906).

97 Quotation in McKillop, ed., *A Critical Spirit*, 249.

might be hurtful to his influence as a teacher."[98] As a retired civil servant, LeSueur had more intellectual freedom than did Wrong as a university professor. However, as events unfolded, LeSueur's freedom proved more illusory than real.

With access to Mackenzie papers in the possession of Charles Lindsey, the Rebellion leader's son-in-law, LeSueur completed a manuscript in April 1908. Hardly an ending, it marked the beginning of his troubles. Just one month later Morang rejected the manuscript on the grounds that it would only invite controversy and be therefore injurious to the series.[99] Not only had LeSueur criticized Mackenzie, he had dared to question the achievement of Responsible Government. As McKillop pointed out, LeSueur did not object to responsible government in principle; rather, he objected to what it meant in practice: party politics, corruption and the abdication of moral responsibility for political expediency.[100] LeSueur protested both Morang's reading of his manuscript and his disregard for intellectual independence: "The demand is more and more being made that works pretending to be historical shall be based on independent research, and what on earth is the use of independent research if you are predestined to arrive at the conclusions of the multitude every time?"[101] Although not a professional historian, LeSueur articulated a defining feature of the professional historian: independence. For the next five years he found himself in and out of court. First, he fought for the return of the one and

98 W.D. LeSueur, *William Lyon Mackenzie: A Reinterpretation*, edited and with an introduction by A.B. McKillop (Toronto: Macmillan, 1979): xxxiii

99 George Morang to W.D. LeSueur, 6 May 1908; reprinted in McKillop, ed., *A Critical Spirit*, 273-275

100 A.B. McKillop, "Editor's Introduction," in LeSueur, *William Lyon Mackenzie*, xxi-xxii

101 W.D. LeSueur to George Morang, 11 May 1908; reprinted in McKillop, ed., *A Critical Spirit*, 276

only manuscript copy of his biography so that he might seek an alternative publisher. This round he won. Next, he fought against the efforts of Mackenzie's heirs to secure an injunction prohibiting his use of any material gathered from the Mackenzie papers in their possession. This round he lost. The whole ordeal cost LeSueur both physically and financially. As he confided to his sister in January 1913, the doctor has prescribed a week of "absolute rest."[102] Although he re-wrote his manuscript in accordance with the legal decision, it remained unpublished at the time of his death in 1917.

It was during his legal battles that LeSueur delivered a thoughtful, erudite and, most importantly, modern treatise on the nature of history. His 1912 presidential address to the Royal Society of Canada remains a remarkable statement on history as an idea and as a practice. In it he betrayed his keen intelligence and understanding of trends taking place in modern historical scholarship. He acknowledged the importance of the archives; after all, history must be based on original sources. However, he cautioned against the uncritical acceptance of facts. Not all facts are facts. For example, did not Frontenac in a despatch to France deliberately exaggerate the number killed at Lachine in a self-conscious effort to secure more "men, money and material" for the fledgling colony?[103] To rely on Frontenac's official despatch, to accept it as fact, is to distort the past. Therefore, documents must not be accepted at face-value but rather must be subjected to criticism. However, LeSueur did not attempt to lay down a science of history. As human beings we are bound by human

102 W.D. LeSueur to Isabella Hay Stitt, 27 January 1913, NA, W.D. LeSueur Papers, MG 30 D 51, vol. 2, file Correspondence Isabella Hay Stitt

103 W.D. LeSueur, "History: Its Nature and Methods," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 7 (1913): Appendix A, lxii

limitations and subject to human biases, he explained. History can never claim finality.

> Let two men work independently on the same period of history; give them access to the same documents and other sources of information, let them agree as to general methods, and let them be as free from prejudice as is possible for poor humanity, yet they will not tell you exactly the same tale.[104]

Moreover, not only will two historians give different versions of the same event, there is considerable risk involved for the historian who offers a new and different interpretation. Here he spoke from painful experience. Myth and legend are powerful forces; to debunk myths and question legends is to court trouble. "An original historian is an object of universal distrust, scorn and disgust."[105] In the end, the Victorian LeSueur left his audience with a modern approach to history: thorough research, judicious selection, honest citation and a commitment not to grind any axes. Although imperfect because human beings are imperfect, history must strive to tell the truth as "honestly and humanly" as possible.[106]

What is LeSueur's significance? McKillop ranked him as his generation's most wide-ranging intellectual and credited him with introducing "a critical spirit" into Canadian intellectual life. More specifically, LeSueur is important for what he can tell us about the professionalization of history in English Canada. He did not have a university career and yet he wrote history according to critical standards that were taking root in the university. He was by no means a professional historian but he articulated some of the defining features of the professional historian. In other words, history's professionalization came from those outside the university at the same time as it came from those

104 Ibid, lxv-lxvi
105 Ibid. lxii
106 Ibid. lxxxiii

inside the university; it came from those men and women Carl Berger described as amateurs as much as it did from those he identified as the founders of professional history.

Yet even at the peak of their activity, the Lighthalls and McCords, the Carnochens and the Simpsons, were being surpassed. Overlapping history's vibrant existence outside the university was its gradual emergence inside the university.

IV

Although the observation is hackneyed, it is also apt: turn-of-the-century Canada experienced a great transformation. The trans-continental railway had been completed and it now carried tens of thousands of immigrants each year to western Canada. The industrial economy of central Canada expanded quickly, drawing more and more people to the cities. At long last, it seemed, the promise of John A. Macdonald's National Policy had been realized. The twentieth century, Wilfrid Laurier pronounced, would be Canada's century. And yet Canada's long-awaited economic boom generated as much unease and uncertainty as it did optimism. Immigration, industrialization and urbanization produced new social problems. Newspapers featured stories about loose women, abandoned children, filthy living conditions and organized crime. Canadians anxiously wondered how the country could possibly assimilate so many foreigners. Materialism, greed and self-interest, many believed, had replaced the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. As Doug Owram demonstrated, Canada's social transformation precipitated a transformation in the intellectual community. "Canadian society was changing so rapidly by the early twentieth century that the tenents of idealism seemed less and

less plausible as an answer to the problems confronting man."[107] The intellectual community, centred in the university, increasingly turned away from moral philospohy and metaphysical speculation at the same time as it turned toward empiricism and the social sciences. The university, like the rest of the country, was itself transformed.

The origins of higher education in Canada lay in organized religion. Beginning in the late eighteenth century and continuing throughout the nineteenth century each denomination founded its own university. Laval and St. Francis Xavier were Catholic, Acadia and McMaster Baptist; Mount Allison was Methodist and Queen's Presbyterian. True, the University of Toronto had been established as a non-denominational university in 1850 but it was constituted by denominational colleges: Trinity College was Anglican, Victoria College Methodist and St. Michael's Catholic. The university's mandate was broadly conceived in terms of moral instruction, religious knowledge and education in the classics. Yet by the late nineteenth century this mandate seemed anachronistic at best as a rapidly changing society demanded relevance from its universities.[108]

James Loudon, President of the University of Toronto, captured this sentiment in his 1902 presidential address to the Royal Society of Canada. The "provision of adequate facilities for research," he began, "is one of the prime necessities of university education in Canada." Loudon did not limit his definition of research to the physical and natural sciences; indeed, he deliberately defined research to include all branches of knowledge. This was the function of the German university where research had been made

---

107 Doug Owram, *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986): 14

108 For the American context see Alexandra Oleson and John Voss, eds., *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979).

the "fundamental principle." Twenty-five years ago, he claimed, American universities began to follow the German lead by creating graduate programs leading to the PhD. However, Canadian universities have fallen behind. Emulating the British example which is marked by utter "indifference towards organized research," Canadian universities have limited their function to imparting "a general and liberal education." Not only is it out of date, it is irresponsible. "To hold up before the student, either by theory or practice, solely the ideal of acquiring what has already been learned is medievalism pure and simple." Still, there are encouraging signs. Canadian scholars, influenced by the German and American example, are taking note of the importance of research to national success. In the final analysis, Loudon concluded, "the research university must be regarded as the only university."[109]

In 1905 the Ontario Government appointed a Royal Commission to investigate the future of the University of Toronto. The Commission tabled its report within a year.[110] Taking its cue from state universities in the United States, the Commission recommended that new professional faculties be established; that an annual provincial grant be made to stabilize university financing; that academic and financial matters be separated by the creation of a senate and a board of governors; and that, while the denominational colleges could continue to teach, only the University of Toronto could confer degrees. The ideas contained in the Report served as a model for new universities, particularly in western Canada. There, the University of Manitoba told a cautionary tale: one university in name, but

---

109 James Loudon, "The Universities in Relation to Research," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 8 (1902): Appendix A

110 See A.B. McKillop, "The Research Ideal and the University of Toronto," in A.B. McKillop, *Contours of Canadian Thought* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987).

three denominational colleges duking it out in fact.[111] Wanting to avoid such debilitating and time-consuming sectarianism, Henry Marshall Tory, the first President of the University of Alberta, charted a different course. In a long letter marked "Private and Confidential" to the Premier of Alberta, Marshall outlined his vision. Blunt and to the point, he stated that "one of the greatest dangers to good educational work is the denominational spirit." Witness the examples of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba. The new provinces should not, in this instance, follow the lead of the older provinces. Alberta must create a state university, one capable of transcending particular loyalties in the interest of the general community.[112] This was also Walter Murray's hope for the University of Saskatchewan.[113] Like his counterpart in Alberta, he intended to build a state university that owed nothing to a particular group but everything to the larger community. Only a state university could provide the research facilities, professional schools and expert knowledge now required by society. Meanwhile, those universities with "grand ambitions" responded in similar fashion to the "utilitarian demands of an industrial age." McGill, Queen's and Dalhousie "widened their student constituencies by broadening their programs to include extensive professional training."[114]

Against this backdrop, history's transition from part-time activity to full-time career was perceptible—but far from complete—by 1900. In his

---

111 See W.L. Morton, *One University: A History of the University of Manitoba, 1877-1952* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1957).

112 H.M. Tory to A.C. Rutherford, 6 March 1906, NA, Henry Marshall Tory Papers, MG 30 D 115, vol. 2, file 21. See Mario Creet, "H.M. Tory and the Secularization of Canadian Universities," *Queen's Quarterly* 88, 4 (Winter 1981): 718-736; and E.A. Corbett, *Henry Marshall Tory: A Biography* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1954; reprinted with an introduction by Doug Owram, Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1992).

113 See Michael Hayden, *Seeking a Balance: The University of Saskatchewan, 1907-1982* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1983).

114 Paul Axelrod, *Making a Middle Class: Student Life in English Canada during the Thirties* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1990): 10

book on nineteenth-century English-Canadian historiography, Brook Taylor concluded that, "By the turn of the century Canada's amateur historians—for such they now were—had lost their sense of purpose. No longer able to look forward, they had no reason to look back."[115] As an example, Taylor pointed to the very negative reviews William Kingsford received in 1896, 1897 and 1898 in the *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada*, the foreunner to the *Canadian Historical Review*. But in his parting assessment Taylor left a false impression. There was never a malaise infecting the turn-of-the-century historical community. Besides, it was another "amateur," E.A. Cruikshank, who wrote the largely negative reviews of Kingsford's multi-volume history of Canada. Moreover, the "amateur" historians did not just disappear. Local and provincial historical societies continued to flourish. In addition, the new professional historians continued to consult "amateurs" well into the century. George Wrong looked to Lighthall for information on Quebec history; in the early 1930s a young Alfred Bailey likewise looked to Lighthall for his extensive knowledge of Hochelaga.[116] Wrong also relied on non-professional historians to edit volumes for the Champlain Society.[117] Adam Shortt turned to Janet Carnochen for her newspaper collections.[118] Leon Harvey, who taught English and Modern History at UNB in the 1920s, asked Col. Wood

115 Taylor, *Promoters, Patriots and Partisans*, 265

116 George Wrong to W.D. Lighthall, 9 July 1907, MURBSC, Lighthall Papers, Box 1, file 19; Alfred Bailey to W.D. Lighthall, June 1933; W.D. Lighthall to Alfred Bailey, 19 June 1933, University of New Brunswick Archives (UNBA), RG 80, Alfred Goldworthy Bailey, Series 12, Case 60, file 3. Lighthall advised Bailey to investigate "the Hochelagan pottery collections in the McCord Museum & the Chateau de Ramezay Museum in Montreal—the only ones in the world." In the preface to his book, Bailey thanked Lighthall, John Clarence Webster and W.F. Ganong for their assistance. See Alfred Bailey, *The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures, 1504-1700* (Saint John, 1937).

117 Founded in 1905, the Champlain Society published primary documents relating to the history of Canada.

118 Adam Shortt to Janet Carnochen, 27 September 1924, Queen's University Archives (QUA), Adam Shortt Papers, Box 6, file Correspondence 1924

for advice in using a "Movie Machine" to teach Canadian history.[119] The two University of Western Ontario historians, Fred Landon and J.J. Talman, regularly consulted James Coyne.[120] At the University of Saskatchewan in the 1920s, Arthur Morton and Frank Underhill initiated a document collection project which relied on the efforts of non-professionals to gather, preserve and make available for research primary documents relating to the history of Saskatchewan.[121] Meanwhile, the editors of the *Canadian Historical Review* from the 1920s through to the 1940s regularly invited Col. Wood, Brigadier General Cruikshank and Judge Howay to review books.[122] In the 1930s, Canadian historians working on the Carnegie Endowment's Canadian-American relations series insisted that Judge Howay participate in the volume on British Columbia.[123] In other words, the professionalization of history was not a single event or an overnight phenomenon; rather, it was an evolutionary process—and a slow and uneven one at that.

However, by 1900 the tide was beginning to turn: the historian would become someone who had specialized training, taught at a university and earned his (and only rarely her) livelihood from the study of the past.

---

119 Leon Harvey to William Wood, 30 October 1924, NA, William C.H. Wood Papers, MG 30 C 60, vol.1, file 1923-1933

120 Stevenson, "James H. Coyne," 197

121 University of Saskatchewan Archives (USA), RG 1, Presidential Papers, S1, B38: Annual Reports, 36: History, 1926-1927. See also Donald Wright, "History at the University of Saskatchewan from E.H. Oliver to Hilda Neatby" Occasional Paper Series. University of Saskatchewan, (forthcoming).

122 These three men contributed dozens of reviews to the *Canadian Historical Review.* For a complete list see *Canadian Historical Review, Index, volumes I-X, 1920-1929* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1930); *Canadian Historical Review, Index, volumes XI-XX, 1930-1939* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1944); *Canadian Historical Review, Index, volumes XXI-XXX, 1939-1949* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959).

123 James Shotwell to H.F. Angus, 5 January 1934, Columbia University, Rare Book and Manuscript Library (CUL), James Shotwell Papers, Box 284, file Can-American Relations, H.F. Angus

Chapter II. From Avocation to Vocation: the beginnings

In 1905 Oxford announced a new professorship, the Beit Professorship of Colonial History. David Ross McCord duly applied. After all, he considered himself a historian, a man of "special knowledge" of Canadian and colonial history.[1] However, his greatest qualification, he believed, remained the McCord family name. It was this qualification—the prominence of the McCord family in Quebec history—that his letters of support stressed. Attached to his application, McCord included twenty-two testimonials from prominent English-speaking and French-speaking Quebecers. To be sure, everyone wrote in approving terms. However, each letter emphasized the McCord family and David Ross' connection to it. "No one is your equal in such a sphere, acquired not only by study, but by the opportunities you have inherited and worthily taken advantage of—opportunities which carry you back to the Colonial days prior to the American Revolution," the Hon. Mr. Justice Loranger observed. "Your family has taken part in the making of Colonial history."[2] The Montreal journalist and writer George Murray followed suit. Indeed, McCord carefully underlined a portion of Murray's letter in a deliberate attempt to draw its contents to the committee's attention: "Mr. McCord's great grand-father was the father of the Parliament of Canada. The family [has] furnished the leading judicial record, six judges who sat, and a seventh, a member of the bar, who declined the honour. Mr. McCord has followed in the footsteps of his distinguished relatives."[3] Although the twenty-two letters were solid, they

1 David Ross McCord to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 8 August 1905, McCord Museum of Canadian History, McCord Family Papers, file 1803, Application for Beit Professorship

2 Justice Loranger to David Ross McCord, 31 July 1905, Ibid

3 George Murray to David Ross McCord, 3 August 1905, Ibid

also struck a pathetic note. No one referred to McCord's scholarly activities, his publications or his teaching experience precisely because no one could. To have come from an eminent family may have qualified McCord for the position of gentleman, but it did not qualify him for the position of Professor of Colonial History. However, another Canadian with more hope of success also set his sights on Oxford: his name was George McKinnon Wrong, the first professor of history at the University of Toronto.

This chapter examines the beginnings of history's transition from a part-time pursuit into a full-time career from the 1890s to the conclusion of the Great War. It opens with an examination of George Wrong and the Oxford-inspired department he built at Toronto. However, it also looks at the origins of history departments across English Canada. In addition to the creation of history professorships and separate university departments, there were other signs of history's gradual—but incomplete—professionalization. These included the development of the Public Archives in Ottawa and the publication of the multi-volume series, *Canada and its Provinces.* Although the professionalization of history is equated with "science" and "objectivity," the first generation of professional historians did not attempt to make history an exact science. Instead, at the same time as these men responded to society's demand for expert knowledge they deliberately maintained a commitment to history as a moral and patriotic project.

I

George Wrong's biography has been well documented.[4] Born in 1860 in southwestern Ontario, Wrong grew up in what Duncan Meikle described as

4 See Robert Bothwell, *Laying the Foundation: A Century of History at University of Toronto* (Toronto, 1991); Alan Bowker, "Truly Useful Men: Maurice Hutton, George

"genteel poverty."[5] His father was both a failed farmer and a failed inventor. "He was always on the eve of making some invention that might lead to fortune," Wrong recalled. It never did. As a result, "I sing no praises of poverty, whose pangs I know."[6] Nevertheless, the Wrong family valued education. After working for a short stint as a clerk in a Toronto mercantile house, the Methodist Wrong converted to Anglicanism and enroled in Wycliffe College as a theology student. The next year he enroled in University College. In 1883 he graduated from UC with a degree in mental and moral philosophy. Although ordained, he never assumed a parish. Instead, he remained at Wycliffe for the next nine years as a lecturer in ecclesiastical history and apologetics. In the summer of 1890 he went to Berlin to study history; two years later, in the summer of 1892, he studied at Oxford. While at Oxford, Wrong learned of the death of Sir Daniel Wilson. Although the President of the University, Wilson had been its professor of history as well. After praying to God for guidance, Wrong applied for the position.[7] Due to financial difficulties the University offered him a lectureship, not a professorship. Taking a cut in pay, Wrong accepted and thus began his thirty-five-year tenure at the University. He was not the first professor of history in English Canada. But, as he later recalled, even though "Dalhousie at Halifax and Queen's at Kingston had professors of history, they were old men and quite ineffective."[8]

Wrong, James Mavor and the University of Toronto, 1880-1927," (PhD, University of Toronto, 1975); William Duncan Meikle, "And Gladly Teach: G.M. Wrong and the Department of History at the University of Toronto," (PhD, Michigan State University, 1977); W.S. Wallace, "The Life and Work of George M. Wrong," *Canadian Historical Review* 29, 3 (June 1948): 229-239.

5 Meikle, "And Gladly Teach," 37

6 Quotation in Wallace, "The Life and Work of George M. Wrong," 229

7 Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 194

8 George Wrong, Notes prepared at the suggestion of George Smith, 1944, University of Toronto Archives (UTA), University of Toronto Press, CHR Files, A86-0044, Box 5, file CHR, 25th Anniversary Letters, no. 1

In 1894, Wrong applied for the position of Professor of History and Ethnology. In his letter of application he referred to his qualifications: eleven years of "collegiate work" at Wycliffe, Toronto, Berlin and Oxford; a commitment to "learning the art of teaching"; a book in Medieval history "based upon the original authorities"; and a book in progress on the history of Canada under French Rule. Although he could not boast a higher degree, he was well qualified for the position. And he was determined. "In these days of historical interest," he explained, "I want to enlarge the course of the study of history." His fourteen letters of support all attested to his capacity as a teacher and a scholar. Rev. Nathaniel Burwash referred to his "patient industry which is required for historical work." W.J. Ashley, then Professor of History at Harvard but formerly Professor of Political Economy and Constitutional History at Toronto, commented on Wrong's capacity for original, independent research in addition to his ability to "handle large masses of evidence." "I have seldom known a man who so quickly acquired the art of profitably dealing with original authorities."[9] In the end, Wrong received the appointment. Although it aroused charges of nepotism—Wrong was the son-in-law of Edward Blake, Chancellor of the University—precipitated a students' strike and led to a provincial investigation, no wrong-doing or undue influence was ever uncovered.

Following his appointment, Wrong delivered an inaugural address in which he outlined his conception of history. Entitled "Historical Study in the University and the Place of Medieval History," his address took direct aim at the study and practice of history. In paying customary tribute to his predecessor, Sir Daniel Wilson, Wrong noted that as Professor of History, English Literature and Ethnology Wilson had carried a "huge burden."

---

9 George Wrong, *Application and Testimonials of George M. Wrong, BA, for the post of Professor of History in the University of Toronto* (Toronto, 1894)

After all, each subject requires "copious and varied reading." No single professor can keep abreast developments in so many fields; as a result, it has proven necessary to create separate chairs. "This division of labor has come none too soon," Wrong observed. Still, there are those that consider history to be a rather simple, matter-of-fact undertaking. Unlike chemistry or biology which have "a technical language intelligible only to a special student," "any untrained reader can enjoy his Macaulay or his Froude, lounging on a sofa, or toasting his knees before the fire." Indeed, there are few people "so ignorant that they do not know something about History." As a result, Wrong cautioned, "men who have not given an hour's serious study to historical questions will assume the tone of experts and critics with a lightheartedness that is amazing." The meaning of the past, after all, is "only to be grasped when the insight and discrimination of a trained student are brought to the task." However, and this is important, Wrong carefully steered away from the opposite extreme: clothing learning in "superstition" and "hidden methods" thus placing it beyond the reach of a layman. Between these two extremes—that anyone can do it on the one hand and that only experts can do it on the other—Wrong sought a middle ground. Of course, history must be based on primary documents: "I have little doubt that the increasing rigor of historical study will make it necessary for any great historian in the future to use manuscript as well as printed material." But, at the same time, history must also be accessible; it must not be cloaked in mystery but be made readable and even entertaining. Wrong also used his inaugural address as an opportunity to outline his philosophy of teaching. "Students of History," he explained, "ought to become something more than passive receivers of other men's opinions, and earn the right to do their own thinking upon historical

questions. The first axiom of sound historical study is that it involves some, if necessarily a very limited, dealing with original authorities." In other words, teach students how to handle the very stuff of history. Here they will learn important skills of criticism; they will learn that even primary documents contain "mistakes" and that primary documents must be checked against other primary documents.[10]

Wrong's inaugural address reflected important changes that were taking place in the practice of history, not just in Canada but in Germany, England and the United States. The nineteenth-century German historian Leopold von Ranke is credited as the father of modern history. From his historical seminars at the University of Berlin, Ranke taught students the techniques of internal and external criticism of documents and he instilled in them a commitment to studying the past on its own terms. His famous formulation, to study the past as it actually was *(wie es eigentlich gewesen)*, constituted history's declaration of academic independence. The Rankean model soon migrated to England and the United States.[11] Herbert Baxter Adams founded the first history seminar at Johns Hopkins in 1876 and the American Historical Association named Ranke its first honourary member at its founding meeting in 1884. Although there were important distinctions between history in Germany, England and the United States, there existed a shared commitment to the use of primary documents, university training in how to properly handle those documents, the

10 George Wrong, *Historical Study in the University: An Inaugural Lecture* (Toronto: The Bryant Press, 1895)

11 See Doris Goldstein, "History at Oxford and Cambridge: Professionalization and the Influence of Ranke," in Georg Iggers and James Powell, eds., *Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of the Historical Discipline* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990); Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988): 21-46.

emergence of learned journals and national historical associations and an emphasis on causation.

Between 1895 and 1905, Wrong attempted to realize the intentions he outlined in his inaugural address. In 1896 he founded the awkwardly named *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada.* As he recounted some forty years later, he had been influenced by developments in historical scholarship in Germany, England and the United States: the German seminar, the American Historical Association, the *English Historical Review* and the *American Historical Review.* Within this context, he sensed "the need for some organ in Canada that should bring adequate criticism to publications related to its history." The *Review of Historical Publications* did not publish original articles; rather, it was a place for "searching and technical criticism of books on history." Moreover, the authors of reviews were granted anonymity. Wrong believed that in a small country like Canada anonymous criticism was necessary to honest criticism.[12]

Not surprisingly, women historians endured the most "honest criticism." As chapter 1 argued, women were active participants in the turn-of-the-century historical community. Agnes Maule Machar, Sarah Curzon, Mary FitzGibbon, Janet Carnochen, Matilda Edgar, Jenny Simpson and Clementina Fessenden created historical associations, preserved and published primary documents and wrote articles, pamphlets and, in some cases, books. But as history professionalized, women's participation grew more circumscribed. When the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto (WCHST) was founded in 1895 and incorporated in 1896, George Wrong's *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada* extended an

12 George Wrong, "The Beginnings of Historical Criticism in Canada: A Retrospect, 1896-1936," *Canadian Historical Review* 17, 1 (March 1936): 2-8

ambivalent welcome, one that reflected the tension within the historical project itself. On the one hand, its welcome was warm. "The Woman's [sic] Canadian Historical Society of Toronto is now definitely under way, and has a wide field before it. There will be, perhaps, a stimulating rivalry between the sexes in historical work." In other words, the appearance of a women's historical society in no way constituted a threat to history understood as patriotism. Indeed, this was the response of men like W.D. Lighthall, James Coyne and Charles Mair to the WCHST. On the other hand, the *Review's* welcome was cold. Marking a boundary between amateur and professional history, the *Review* disciplined one woman in particular and cautioned the group as a whole. According to the *Review*, Mary FitzGibbon's paper on the discovery of a banner from the War of 1812 in a Toronto school attic, was "too emotional" in its narrative style. Similarly, the *Review* warned, "Some similar societies in the United States have, in their patriotic fervour, become more hysterical than historical."[13] But the boundary between amateur and professional was clearly gendered as hysteria and the inability to transcend the emotional were understood to be specifically female characteristics. In other words, the appearance of a women's historical society constituted at least a potential threat to history understood as a profession.

The Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa (WCHSO) offers a case in point. Founded in 1898, the WCHSO dedicated itself to "the encouragement of a study of Canadian loyalty and patriotism."[14] However, the WCHSO was neither oblivious nor indifferent to the shift taking place

---

13 *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada* 1 (1896): 167. Review authors are not identified in the *RHPRC*.

14 "Organization Plans for Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa," 3 June 1898, Bytown Museum Archives, Box 66, HSOT 1/3

within history. For example, in 1909 and 1911 it sent a delegate to the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, the professional association of American historians. In her delegate's report to the WCHSO, Jenny Simpson recounted Albert Bushnell Hart's presidential address and his insistence that "scientific principles" be introduced to the study of history.[15] In her delegate's report, Elizabeth Bayly similarly emphasized William Sloane's presidential address and his plea for strict attention to primary documents in the writing of history.[16] The 1914-1915 Annual Report recorded that, together with the Ontario Historical Society, the WCHSO had invited the American Historical Association to hold its 1916 meeting in Ottawa.[17] Although the AHA declined the invitation, the invitation revealed that these women were aware of and participating in, albeit to a limited degree, the professionalization of history.

And yet, over a period of about two decades, George Wrong's *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada* looked more and more unfavourably upon the WCHSO. In a 1902 comment on *Transactions of the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa, vol. 1*, the *Review* noted that, while the Society was to be commended for its efforts, it was nevertheless the case that "most of the papers are compiled from books which are more or less within reach." What is needed, the *Review* continued, is more attention to the preservation of local history, not the "frequently rehearsed' story of Canadian 'valour' and 'endurance'."[18] Some nine years

---

15 "Report of our Delegate, Mrs. J.B. Simpson to the American Historical Convention," WCHSO, *Annual Report*, 1909-1910, 17. See Albert Bushnell Hart, "Imagination in History," *American Historical Review* 15, 2 (January 1910): 227-251.

16 "Report of our Delegate, Mrs. G.M. Bayley to the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the American Historical Society," WCHSO, *Annual Report*, 1911-1912, 19. See William Sloane, "The Substance and Vision of History," *American Historical Review* 17, 2 (January 1912): 235-251.

17 WCHSO, *Annual Report*, 1914-1915

18 *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada* 6 (1902): 78

later, the *Review* asserted that most of the papers in the WCHSO's *Transactions* "are of a somewhat light description."[19] In 1914 the WCHSO received another tepid review: "Some of the papers...show signs of independent research in the Archives; but it cannot be said that the Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa is making full use of its opportunities in connection with the material at its hand in the Archives Department."[20] Two years later the *Review* was more blunt in its assessment: "These papers, which are interesting and well written, are in most cases, however, not the work of experts; and they do not add much to the sum of human knowledge."[21] And finally, in 1919, the *Review* tendered its most damning commentary. "The *Transactions* of the Woman's Canadian Historical Society...contains nothing of which attention needs to be called. Most of the papers appear to be compilations from well known and often unreliable secondary sources."[22]

The WCHST earned a similar, and arguably a more revealing, treatment. In their 1914-1915 *Annual Report and Transaction*, the WCHST reprinted a primary document, an 1816 letter from a Mrs R. Hazen of Saint John. The *Review* argued that the letter was "full of information on the fashions in dress and furniture of the period, but not especially significant to the student of Canadian history."[23] This statement was neither harmless nor neutral. Because the professionalization of history involved the marking of serious from frivolous, or significant from insignificant, areas of research, the *Review* effectively argued that the domestic sphere was an insignificant topic for investigation. Since the domestic sphere was also

19 Ibid, 15 (1911): 63
20 Ibid, 18 (1914): 121-122
21 Ibid, 20 (1916): 63
22 Ibid, 22 (1919): 106
23 Ibid, 20 (1915): 109

the women's sphere, it followed that women's experiences were not "especially significant to the student of Canadian history." Simply put, experiential knowledge was not historical knowledge. Because the boundary separating experience and knowledge was gendered, the interests of the WCHST were relegated to the frivolous (and feminine), outside the boundaries of legitimate (and masculine) historical inquiry.[24]

True, the *Review* criticized the WCHSO and the WCHST as amateurs—their work was not scholarly according to emerging professional standards—but it also criticized them as women. No other local historical society endured such harsh criticism. Taking the Ontario Historical Society (OHS) as a comparative example, we see that *Review* was altogether praising and complimentary. In 1900 it announced that the *Papers and Records* of the OHS was "excellent work" while the President, James Coyne, delivered a "scholarly address."[25] In 1901, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1910 the *Review* heaped praise on the OHS. For example, "The Ninth volume of the Papers and Records of the Ontario Historical Society is, like its predecessors, a credit to the Society."[26] Although the *Review* tempered its enthusiasm in 1913 and 1914 it resumed its high appreciation for the OHS's "excellent"[27] work in 1915, 1916 and 1917/1918. While the work of the OHS was not qualitatively different from the work of the WCHSO—as noted in chapter 1, both men and women historians studied the same themes of Loyalism, heroism and imperialism—the *Review of Historical Publications*, as the nucleus of an

---

24 For a discussion of the socially constructed and gendered boundary between experience and knowledge see, Jean Barman "'I walk my own track in life & no mere male can bump me off it': Constance Lindsay Skinner and the Work of History," in Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1998).

25 *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada* 5 (1900): 122

26 Ibid, 15 (1910): 105

27 Ibid, 20 (1915): 103

embryonic but growing historical profession, singled out women's historical societies for "honest criticism." Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice were absolutely correct when they observed a close alliance between the professionalization and masculinization of history.[28]

Meanwhile, when Wrong learned of Oxford's newly endowed Beit Professorship of Colonial History he considered the idea of submitting his name. Indeed, the prominent Canadian imperialist and Secretary of the Rhodes Scholarship Trust, George Parkin, encouraged his application. "To me the post appears an important one, with large possibilities." Except for McGill's first Professor of History, Charles Colby, there is really no one else in Canada, Parkin observed.[29] Wrong equivocated. "The thought of Oxford is, of course, a delight. I love the place and when I heard that [a good friend] was going to Oxford I thought him a lucky dog and came as near as envying him as the law permits." After all, "The distinction of a Professorship at Oxford is not to be regarded lightly and it is a great sphere." Wrong certainly considered himself qualified. In addition to having founded the *Review of Historical Publications*, Wrong had undertaken a vigorous campaign of research and writing. Since his appointment, he had translated and annotated an eighteenth-century manuscript letter about Louisbourg; he had published a school textbook; and he had completed a biography of the Earl of Elgin.[30] David Ross

---

28 Ibid, Boutilier and Prentice, "Introduction," 5

29 George Parkin to George Wrong, 15 January 1905, NA, Parkin Papers, MG 30 D 77 vol. 7, file "G. Parkin-Prof. George Wrong, 1904-1915". Charles Colby did consider submitting his name. However, his father's poor health prevented him from leaving Canada. See George Wrong to Charles Colby, 16 July 1905; and George Wrong to Charles Colby, 12 August 1905, Stanstead Historical Society Archives, Fonds Colby, C.W. Colby, Series 2, Subseries A, Box 2, file 4.

30 See George Wrong, "Louisberg in 1745: The Anonymous Letter d'un Habitant de Louisberg (Toronto, 1897); George Wrong, *The English Nation* (Toronto, 1903); George Wrong, *The Earl of Elgin* (London: Methuen, 1905).

McCord could not point to these scholarly accomplishments. But there were other factors to consider. The cost of education in England was prohibitive for a man of his means, especially when he had five children to put through school. Moreover, his appointment at Toronto was permanent whereas the Beit Professorship was not. Finally, he added, "I am not sure that I should not...have a more effective influence here where we have a great nation in the making."[31]

If Wrong could not go to Oxford, he could always bring Oxford to Toronto.

II

Wrong deliberately designed Toronto's Department of History on the Oxford model. "Oxford was much in my mind," he later recalled, "and my plans for a graduating department were largely shaped by the Oxford tradition."[32] Between 1904 and 1918 he made fifteen appointments. Although some appointments were temporary, and not all those appointed to permanent positions remained, twelve out of the fifteen had done at least one degree at Oxford.[33] No one had a doctorate and only two had an MA at the time of

31 George Wrong to George Parkin, 18 January 1905, NA, George Parkin Papers, MG 30 D 77 vol. 7, file "G. Parkin-Prof. George Wrong, 1904-1915". Hugh Egerton received the Beit Professorship. He was assisted by a Canadian, W.L. Grant. For letters pertaining to the Beit Professorship see William Ashley to George Wrong, 5 July 1905, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto (TFRBR-UT), George Wrong Papers, MS Coll. 36, Box 1, file 4; Hugh Egerton to George Wrong, 29 April 1906, Ibid., Box 1, file 69; George Parkin to Sir William Osler, 16 August 1905, Ibid., Box 2, file 84

32 George Wrong, Notes prepared at the suggestion of George Smith, 1944, UTA, University of Toronto Press, CHR Files, A86-0044, Box 5, file CHR, 25th Anniversary Letters, no. 1

33 The following list indicates the name, degrees and length of tenure of Wrong's early appointments: E.J. Kylie, BA (Toronto), BA (Oxon.), 1904-1916; A.G. Brown, BA (Toronto), BA (Oxon.), 1905-1914; K.G. Feiling, BA (Oxon.), 1907-1909; K.N. Bell, BA (Oxon.), 1909-1911; W.S. Wallace, BA (Toronto), BA (Oxon.), 1910-1924, 1927-1929; J.J. Bell, BA (Oxon.), 1911-1912; W. Harvey, BA (Toronto), MA (Toronto), 1911-1912; R. Hodder-Williams, BA (Oxon.) 1912-1923; G.M. Smith, BA (Toronto), BA (Oxon.), 1912-1929; H. McMurchie, BA (Toronto), MA (Toronto), 1912-1919; Vincent Massey, BA (Toronto), BA (Oxon.), 1913-1919; W.P.M. Kennedy, BA (Dublin), MA (Dublin),

their appointment. The primary qualification for a position in Wrong's department was an Oxford BA. As he admitted in 1921, Wrong hired his staff on the basis of "character, good manners, forcefulness as well as learning."[34] In addition to seeking out Oxford graduates, Wrong introduced the Oxford tutorial method to Toronto. Because Toronto lacked the resources, tutorials did not replace the lecture; still, they brought students and instructors into closer contact.[35] Taking another page from the Oxford playbook, Wrong founded the Historical Club in 1904. Highly selective, the Historical Club held fortnightly meetings in the homes of wealthy Toronto citizens and organized debates on topics of timely interest.[36] Wrong, however, excluded women. At a very early date in history's professionalization, the deliberate exclusion of women was apparent. One of Wrong's early Oxford appointments, Keith Feiling, urged him to hold fast on "the great Woman question." By all means, give them a degree, give them the vote even, "but keep, oh keep them, out of our seminars of learning."[37] This pattern—the exclusion of women from history—would become more pronounced in the decades after the Great War.

Wrong emulated the Oxford model because, he believed, Oxford prepared young men for their future roles as national leaders. It did not emphasize research; rather, it emphasized the man. By the title of her article Reba Soffer captured the essence of history at Oxford in the nineteenth and

---

1914-1916; Margaret Wrong, BA (Oxon.), MA (Toronto), 1915-1921; S.H. Hooke, BA (Oxon.), 1916-1923; Marjorie Reid, BA (Toronto), BA (Oxon.), 1918-1920, 1922-1926.

34 Quotation in Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 307. For a description of Wrong's Anglophilia, elitism and Oxford obsession see Arthur Lower, "ONCE THEY WERE ALIVE, Our Betters—My Instructors, George Wrong," Queen's University Archives (QUA), Arthur Lower Papers, Box 42, B 977

35 Bothwell, *Laying the Foundation*, 41-42. For a strong endorsement of the tutorial method see R. Hodder Williams, "The Tutorial Experiment," *University of Toronto Monthly* 15, 4 (February 1915): 195-203.

36 Ibid, 51-56

37 Keith Feiling to George Wrong, 27 November 1909, TFRBR-UT, Wrong Papers, MS Coll. 36, Box 1, file 76

early-twentieth centuries: "Nation, Duty, Character and Confidence."[38] History was a morality play; in it one could be read important lessons of duty and obligation and service. To this end, Wrong sent his young protegés to Oxford for refinement including Edward Kylie, Vincent Massey, A.G. Brown, G.M. Smith, Carelton Stanley, A.L. Burt, Frank Underhill and Charles Cochrane. When appointing Kylie in 1904, Wrong conceded that he had not engaged in specialized research but that he "is especially valuable to us for Oxford leads the English speaking world in History just now."[39] And when Underhill complained about Oxford (he found it cut off from "real life" and a place where truth did not count nearly as much as a "flippant tone" and "the ability to make epigrammatic remarks"[40]) Wrong offered a gentle rebuke. Revealing his commitment to the Oxford ideal, he responded:

> Luxury shocks me as I see it shocks you. Yet it may be that a year or two of luxury will do a Canadian youth no harm. I doubt whether the soul is after all much injured by the luxury of good pictures, carved furniture, comfortable easy chairs and beautiful rooms. Some of these things are more dependent upon taste than upon money and a large number of people in Canada could have them if they only had the good taste to desire them. Even Oxford luxury if it does not lead to indolence and arrogance may serve a useful educative purpose in leading to a desire for ease and beauty.[41]

Again, it was the man that mattered, not the research.

---

38 See Reba Soffer, "Nation, Duty, Character and Confidence: History at Oxford, 1850-1914," *The Historical Journal* 30, 1 (1987): 77-104

39 Quotation in Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 302. See also Ramsay Cook, "Kylie, Edward Joseph," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol. 14, 1911-1920* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998): 565-566.

40 Frank Underhill to George Wrong, 2 February 1912, TFRBR-UT, Wrong Papers, MS Coll. 36, Box 3 file 59. According to J.M.S. Careless, Underhill grew to be sentimental about his Oxford days. "Even Frank Underhill who was very down on things imperial used to get starry eyed about Balliol and about Oxford," he recalled. Interview with J.M.S. Careless, 13 July 1983, UTA, B86-0038, Tape 4

41 George Wrong to Frank Underhill, 14 March 1912, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 2, file G.M. Wrong 1907-1927

Of course, Toronto was not the only university in English Canada to develop a history department. At Acadia University John Freeman Tufts introduced modern history to the curriculum in 1875. Having done his BA and MA at Harvard, Tufts had been influenced by new trends in historical scholarship. From Henry Adams, who was then at Harvard, he learned that history was not something to be memorized; rather, it was something to be interpreted.[42] Indeed, the President of Acadia deliberately sought out Tufts in an effort to modernize the curriculum. "In making the appointment, [the President] made it clear that the former Classical system of education was no longer adequate, and that attention must now be given to such subjects as the Sciences, Modern Languages, Education, and History."[43] In point of fact, the distinction of being English Canada's first Professor of History belongs to Tufts. However, at a time when universities were very small—in the 1870s Acadia had a faculty of eight—Tufts quickly found himself the Professor of History, Logic and Political Economy.[44] In 1890 logic was dropped from his job description and Tufts became the Dean and Mark Curry Professor of History and Political Economy. Tufts used his Honours Course as, in part, a Seminar wherein students were introduced to different approaches to the study of the past and to different philosophies of history.[45]

Dalhousie University followed a path similar to Acadia's. It first offered instruction in history in 1865 when James De Mille was named Professor of Rhetoric and History. When he died suddenly in 1880, the University could not afford to replace him. Indeed, rumours circulated that Dalhousie might

42 Ronald Longley, "History at Acadia," Acadia University Archives (AUA), Ronald Longley Papers, Box 10, file "Centennial"
43 Ibid
44 AUA, Acadia University Calendar, 1879
45 Longley, "History at Acadia"

shut down altogether. It was at this point that George Munro, a wealthy businessman, offered to endow two chairs, one in physics and the other in history. The Chair in History came with the stipulation that his brother-in-law and member of the Dalhousie Board of Governors receive the appointment. On the ides of March 1881, John Forrest became Dalhousie's first Professor of History. In 1885 Forrest also became President.[46] And, owing to financial limitations, the George Munro Professor of History became the George Munro Professor of History and Political Economy. Forrest was one of the men Wrong referred to as "old" and "ineffective." Twenty-eight years later, James Eadie Todd replaced Forrest as Professor of Economics and History. Although there had been some talk of dividing the Chair, it proved impossible "on account of poverty," explained President A. Stanley Mackenzie.[47] Having studied at Oxford, James Todd had the right background. Mackenzie liked the Oxbridge type. "It may have its limitations and drawbacks but it is a very characteristic product." To "modernize" or "bring up to date" these two institutions would be a great mistake.[48] When Todd left Dalhousie in 1916 to serve in the War, the President anxiously searched for another Oxford trained historian: "I tried particularly to get track of those who had been Rhodes Scholars as more likely to appreciate somewhat the Oxford tradition and methods and the British standpoint."[49] In the end, he did indeed secure a Rhodes Scholar, albeit an American. In addition to an Oxford BA, Carroll Wooddy also had a Princeton PhD. When he enlisted with the American military in 1918,

46 See Peter Waite, *The Lives of Dalhousie University, vol. 1, 1818-1925* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1994).

47 A. Stanely Mackenzie to D.C. Harvey, 7 January 1913, Public Archives of Nova Scotia (PANS), D.C. Harvey Papers, MG 1, vol. 1200, file 1

48 Ibid

49 A. Stanley Mackenzie to James Todd, 1 August 1916, Dalhousie University Archives (DUA), President's Office, MS-1-3 A-538, History Department 1913-1960

Dalhousie did not offer history and political economy for the 1918-1919 academic year.

McGill University created a distinct Professor of History in 1895. Prior to this history had been taught as part of English literature. Moreover, there is no evidence to suggest that C. E. Moyse, McGill's Professor of English Literature and History from 1878 to 1895, gave serious attention to history. As his University of London mentor said of him, Moyse intends "to give his life to the study of English."[50] However, in 1894 Charles Colby joined the faculty as a lecturer in English and History; the following year, he was appointed Professor of History. An alumnus of McGill, Colby proceeded to Harvard where he completed his PhD in 1890. On the one hand, it was Colby who laid the foundations for history as an autonomous subject of study at McGill. In addition, he published three books between 1899 and 1915. On the other hand, Colby proved a frustration to the University. Throughout the 1910s he spent extended periods of time in New York as President of the Noiseless Typewriter Company. Moreover, his books were not scholarly. Indeed, he openly conceded that his book on New France contained "no new material" and used "with freedom the works of others."[51] Responsibility for the Department fell to C.E. Fryer who had been appointed in 1906 after completing his PhD at Harvard.

Appointed in 1869, Queen's University's first professor of history was Rev. G.N. Ferguson; like his counterparts at other universities his was, to borrow Hilda Neatby's phrase, a rather "ample" chair.[52] For a princely salary of $1 400, he taught History, English language and literature and

50 Quotation in Michael Perceval-Maxwell, "The History of History at McGill," (Unpublished Paper, McGill University Archives)

51 Charles Colby, *Canadian Types of the Old Régime, 1608-1698* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1908): iii

52 Hilda Neatby, *Queen's University, vol. 1: 1841-1917* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978): 135

Modern languages. Ferguson remained at Queen's for well over thirty years. According to W.B. Munro, a senior Harvard historian, it was Ferguson who first taught him "the habit of going to the fundamental sources of historical information."[53] Nonetheless, Wrong considered him "old" and "ineffective." Following his retirement in 1907, Ferguson was replaced by a young Englishman, J.L. Morison. Whereas Ferguson had been responsible for lecturing in English literature and Modern Languages, Morison was responsible only for history. Two years later, W.L. Grant joined Morison when he accepted an appointment to the newly endowed Douglas Chair of Colonial and Canadian History. Like their counterparts in Toronto, Morison and Grant could trace their academic training to Oxford.

At the University of Manitoba, history was initially taught with philosophy in the denominational colleges which constituted the university; moreover, it was taught not by trained historians but by priests and ministers. Although the University Act of 1877 had been amended in 1892 to allow the University of Manitoba to assume teaching responsibilities—as opposed to simply examining students and conferring degrees—it was not until 1904 that the University appointed professors in the natural sciences, fields which the denominational colleges could not cover. Of course, if the University could teach the natural sciences, should it not also assume responsibility for the humanities and the social sciences thus leaving theology to the colleges? An acrimonious debate ensued pitting the traditionalists (those who favoured denominational instruction) against the secularists (those who wanted to modernize the University and create a secular, state supported institution). When all was said and done,

53 Quotation in Katherine Ferguson, "George Dalrymple Ferguson: First Professor of History at Queen's University," *Historic Kingston* 14 (January 1966): 51

the University of Manitoba appointed three new chairs in English, Political Economy and History.[54] In 1909 Chester Martin became Manitoba's first Professor of History. A graduate of UNB and a Rhodes Scholar from Oxford, he remained at Manitoba until 1929. Ralph Flenley—an Englishman and also an Oxford graduate—joined Martin in 1913.

Appointed in 1909, the University of Saskatchewan's first professor of history was E.H. Oliver.[55] While doing his doctoral studies at Columbia University Oliver had studied with James Harvey Robinson, one of America's most prominent historians. Building a veritable dynasty at Columbia, Robinson was a key figure in the professionalization of history in the United States. He himself had studied in Germany and returned with a Rankean obsession that history must be based on original source material. Another Canadian who had studied at Columbia was James Shotwell. As he recalled, "There was no one in the academic world who had a stricter sense of the obligations of scholarship than James Harvey Robinson. While we had to read secondary works to get the general bearing of the details we worked on, they never were to be cited in class—only the original sources."[56] Upon taking up the position at Saskatchewan Oliver wrote his former professor requesting advice. Robinson responded that what one teaches is really a personal matter, a matter of one's own "tastes" and "enthusiasms." Nonetheless, he continued,

---

54 See W.L. Morton, *One University: A History of the University of Manitoba, 1877-1952* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1957).

55 For a detailed history of the Saskatchewan history department see Donald Wright, "History at the University of Saskatchewan from E.H. Oliver to Hilda Neatby," *Essays: University of Saskatchewan*, 1, 1 (1999): 1-47.

56 James T. Shotwell, *The Autobiography of James T. Shotwell* (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1961): 42. See also Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988): 104

> ...let us deal with things worth while and not with the past in which we really have no natural interest. I feel now that little is worth while studying in the past—or better, presenting to students, which does not have some assignable relation to their own present or future. So I am partial to the explanations of our own plight, especially our intellectual prejudices. Beard and I have struggled to give a basis for a more rational dealing with our own time. How far we have succeeded it is for you and others to determine.[57]

Oliver proceeded to make the history of western Canada the focus of his research and he did include it in the curriculum. Although the calendar did not list western Canadian history as such, Oliver nevertheless taught it as part of History 4, the British Empire. As he reported in 1914, "The Christmas term is given over to a study of the History of Western Canada."[58] Indeed, Oliver dedicated more time to western Canada than he did to Canada. When Canadian History was made a separate course the following year, the calendar description noted that the course would treat the history of the West with "special attention."[59] In other words, he presented his students with a usable past, one that had some "assignable relation" to their experience as western Canadians. After a meeting with his former student, George Wrong recorded that, "like so many, he would not willingly live in the East again."[60]

Founded in 1908, the University of Alberta's first President and a physicist by training, Dr. Henry Marshall Tory, assumed responsibility for lecturing in history. Indeed, he would remain head of the department until 1921. When Saskatchewan's E.H. Oliver learned that Tory was to teach history in addition to his duties as president, he could not contain his

---

57 J.H. Robinson to E.H. Oliver, 14 August 1909, USA, E.H. Oliver Papers, MG 6, S 1, A. Correspondence, II. Miscellaneous Correspondence

58 USA, RG 1, Presidential Papers, S1, B38: Annual Reports, 36: History, 1913-1914

59 USA, University of Saskatchewan Calendar, 1915-1916

60 George Wrong, Diary, 5 June 1912, TFRBR-UT, Wrong Papers, MS Coll. 36, Box 6, file 45

skepticism. "I insisted that Tory's cause was ridiculous, that he was a man in Mathematics and had never done any work in history."[61] For his part, Oliver bristled at the prospect of teaching outside his own field. While he was expected to teach economics as well as history, and while he resolved to do the best he could, he let Walter Murray know that he was first and foremost "a History man."[62] Indeed, a self-conscious identity as a historian found expression in his diary. Frustrated with the paltry library budget, Oliver decided that "Murray underestimates the importance of books for history."[63] In any event, Tory appointed Alfred Leroy Burt and Stanley Gordon Fife as lecturers in 1913. Both had been Rhodes Scholars at Oxford. For his part, Burt created a Historical Club at Alberta along lines similar to the one he had belonged to at Toronto, including the provision that women could not be members. On a tour of western Canadian universities, Wrong noted that Burt had been one of his students: "altogether Toronto has helped to shape this place."[64] On the other side of the Rockies was the University of British Columbia. Although it had been created by the University Act of 1908, it was not until 1915 that it opened its doors . That year, S. Mack Eastman, with a PhD from Columbia, was appointed UBC's first Professor of History.

Professorships in history, separate departments, a new journal, a shared commitment to archival research: history in English Canada was slowly migrating to the university and taking on the trappings of a profession. In 1909 the time seemed right for a multi-volume history of Canada.

---

61 Diary of Edmund H. Oliver, 22 September 1909, USA, Jean Murray Papers, MG 61, E. IV. Name and Subject Files, N. Oliver, E.H., 2. Diary

62 Ibid. Oliver taught economics until a separate appointment was made in 1913.

63 Ibid

64 George Wrong, Diary, 27 June 1916, TFRBR-UT, Wrong Papers, MS Coll. 36, Box 6, file 58

III

First conceived in 1909 by an American publisher who wanted to create something similar to the *Encyclopedia Americana*, the multi-volume history of Canada would prove a huge undertaking. After some preliminary investigations in Toronto, the publisher's representatives learned that if they could draft Adam Shortt and Arthur Doughty the venture would be a success.[65] Indeed, these two men were a logical choice. Very knowledgeable, well connected and highly regarded, Shortt and Doughty could give the project not only their knowledge but their network of contacts and the authority of their names. Shortt began his university career at Queen's in 1886 where, initially, he taught philosophy, chemistry and botany. However, in 1891 he was named the John A. Macdonald Professor of Political Science. As has been well noted, Shortt took a decidedly historical approach to the discipline of political economy. In point of fact, he quickly emerged as one of Canada's most prominent historians, publishing some thirty articles on Canada's banking history and, in 1908, a biography of Lord Sydenham. It was in 1908 that Shortt left the university to take up a new career in Ottawa as one of two civil service commissioners. Actually, his career change did not represent a sudden shift. For the past five years he had busied himself with government service, including the Chairmanship of the Ontario Commission to Invest Railway Taxation and as a labour arbitrator for the Department of Labour.[66] Meanwhile, Arthur Doughty was the Dominion Archivist. Appointed in 1904, the former drama critic and librarian launched a vigorous archival programme. According to Danielle Lacasse and Antonio

65 QUA, Adam Shortt Papers, The Adam Shortt Diaries, 11 May 1909
66 See Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 21-22.

Lechasseur, Doughty had observed historical methodology in Europe and the United States and was eager to replicate it in Canada.[67] In just a few years, Doughty oversaw the move to the Archives' first permanent home on Sussex Drive; he secured a substantial increase in the Archives' annual appropriation; he instituted three new specialized divisions in the Archives, the Manuscript Division, the Library and Map Division and the Print Division; and, in 1907, he convinced the Government to create the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Charged with the responsibility to advise the Government on archival policy and to undertake a programme of document publication, the Commission consisted of Doughty and five historians: George Wrong, Charles Colby, A.H. Gosselin, Joseph Roy and, of course, Adam Shortt.[68]

In any event, when the publishers approached Shortt and Doughty the two men expressed reluctance. True, they had edited a collection of documents relating to the constitutional history of Canada in 1907; but the proposed multi-volume history of Canada represented a much more daunting task. After the initial meeting in May 1909 Shortt recorded in his diary that he did not think the "scheme very feasible"; nevertheless, the publisher "stuck to it" and arranged for a future meeting.[69] In June the three men met again. This time Shortt and Doughty agreed.[70] As they knew it would be, the project proved an enormous undertaking. Shortt's diary contains reference after reference to the long hours, the many meetings and the numerous headaches he endured over the course of co-

67 Danielle Lacasse and Antonio Lechasseur, *The National Archives of Canada, 1872-1997* (Canadian Historical Association Historical Booklet, 1998): 6

68 For a detailed summary of their respective careers see Ian Wilson, "Shortt and Doughty: The Cultural Role of the Public Archives, 1904-1935." (MA, Queen's University, 1973).

69 QUA, Adam Shortt Papers, The Adam Shortt Diaries, 11 May 1909

70 Ibid, 24 June 1909

ordinating ninety authors writing 153 distinct essays.[71] *Canada and its Provinces* occupied the better part of seven years from its inception in 1909 to its conclusion in 1917 when the twenty-third and final volume appeared at long last. W.A. Mackintosh thought that it marked "a definite point in the development of Canadian historical writing."[72] Arthur Lower stated that it "set a new standard in Canadian historiography."[73] And in what is surely an exaggeration, Lacasse and Lechasseur asserted that the series "still stands as a fundamental work for understanding pre-1918 Canada."[74]

There is no question that *Canada and its Provinces* constituted an important landmark in English-Canadian historiography. After all, both *The Makers of Canada* and the *Chronicles of Canada* were more popular than academic in orientation.[75] As Shortt and Doughty explained in their introduction, in adopting the co-operative method they had followed "the practice of modern historians in other and older countries." In this way a single topic will be covered from more than one angle. For example, a specific matter of public finance will be dealt with from a financial,

71 Ibid, 14 July 1909; 24 July 1909; 30 July 1909; 5 September 1909; 9 September 1909; 10 September 1909; 11 September 1909; 14 September 1909; 26 September 1909; 3 October 1909; 7 October 1909;7 December 1909; 14 December 1909; 24 February 1910; 13 March 1910; 17 March 1910; 22 March 1910; 23 April 1910; 16 June 1910; 5 August 1910; 4 September 1910; 8 December 1910; 10 January 1911; 16 January 1911; 18 January 1911; 25 January 1911; 26 January 1911; 7 February 1911; 16 February 1911; 26 February 1911; 2 March 1911; 6 March 1911; 5 April 1911;7 April 1911; 8 April 1911; 14 April 1911; 19 April 1911;18 May 1911; 24 May 1911; 28 May 1911; 31 May 1911; 6 June 1911; 16 June 1911; 19 June 1911; 21 June 1911; 23 June 1911; 2 January 1912; 14 January 1912; 13 February 1912; 18 March 1912; 18 November 1912. Shortt's diaries for this period end at this point.

72 W.A. Mackintosh, "Adam Shortt, 1859-1931," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 4, 2 (May 1938): 173

73 Arthur Lower, "Adam Shortt, Founder," *Historic Kingston* 17 (January 1969): 6

74 Lacasse and Lechasseur, *The National Archives*, 8

75 See D.C. Scott, Pelham Edgar and W.D. LeSueur, eds., *The Makers of Canada*, 20 vols. (Toronto: Morang and Co., 1906-1908); and G.M. Wrong and H.H. Langton, eds., *Chronicles of Canada*, 32 vols. (Toronto: Glasgow, Brook and Co., 1914-1916).

political and historical perspective. "From each of the three standpoints new light is given, and a comprehensive view of the whole matter is thus afforded." Besides, "The range of facts is so wide and the topics so various and complex that no one author could possibly compass them."[76] According to Carl Berger, the series testified "to the need for specialization."[77]

For example, Shortt and Doughty enlisted E.H. Oliver from the University of Saskatchewan to work on the history of the West. Within a week of arriving at Saskatchewan, Oliver began a project to collect, preserve and publish a collection of primary documents relating to the history of western Canada. In a 1911 letter to Wrong, he outlined his historical research.

> Shortt and Doughty have induced me to contribute to the History of the N.W.T. for their History of Canada, and most of my time is being spent in Journals, Sessional Papers, etc. I am attempting in a humble way to collect documents, papers, etc. as Archives of the Province. When I was in Lloydminster in January lecturing I secured a couple of diaries of the Barr Colonists. I think I shall devote my spare time to such work for Saskatchewan.[78]

Of course, Walter Murray encouraged Oliver's research. It conformed perfectly to his vision of a state university as servant to that state. Excited by the inherent possibilities in what was known as the Wisconsin idea, Murray reported in 1910 that the University of Wisconsin had enjoyed "excellent results" from the "prominence given to History, Economics, Political Science and allied subjects." He believed it to be "a duty of the State University to provide special facilities for the study of social

---

76 Adam Shortt and Arthur Doughty, eds., *Canada and its Provinces*, vol. I (Toronto: The Publishers' Association of Canada, 1913): ix

77 Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 28. On the need for specialists in the series see Robert Glasgow to Adam Shortt, 5 December 1911, QUA, Adam Shortt Papers, Box 3, file Correspondence Sept.-Dec. 1911

78 E.H. Oliver to George Wrong, 27 February 1911, TFRBR-UT, MS Coll. 36, Wrong Papers, Box 2 file 83

conditions and the problems of government." Because "important questions in transportation, trade, education and government" have already arisen, the "growth of all these departments must be rapid." Finally, in a statement remarkable for its clarity, Murray concluded,

> Public opinion requires the guidance of the expert. It is the duty of the University to provide it.[79]

The generalist, the man-of-letters and the moral philosopher were fading beneath the rise of the university-trained, university-based expert who sought to apply new research and new methods to social problems.[80] That Oliver should embrace the primary document project so enthusiastically is not a surprise. After all, he considered himself a professional historian. By 1914 Oliver had managed to complete a two-volume collection of primary documents in addition to a general history of Saskatchewan and Alberta for *Canada and its Provinces*.[81]

Still, *Canada and its Provinces* did not represent a profound rupture with the preceding historiography. Of the ninety authors, only a small minority were professional historians. The vast majority were civil servants, journalists, priests or "amateurs." For his part, W.D. Lighthall contributed two articles. Although he went to the Public Archives for the specific purpose of undertaking original research on his assigned topic,[82] his article on the history of English settlement in Quebec is framed by a

---

79 Walter Murray, The President's Report, 1909-1910, 12-13

80 See Thomas Haskell, ed., *The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984); and Doug Owram, *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986).

81 See E.H. Oliver, *The Canadian Northwest, Its Early Development and Legislative Records, 1870-1912* (Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau, 1914); and E.H. Oliver, "Saskatchewan and Alberta: General History, 1870-1912," Shortt and Doughty, eds., *Canada and its Provinces*, vol. 19.

82 W.D. Lighthall to Arthur Doughty, 25 September 1910, NA, W.D. Lighthall Papers, MG 29 D 93 vol. 1, file 23

romantic narrative: "The seeds of [English Canada's] progress were deliberately sown by strong and intelligent men, who brought with them those principles and customs, acquired through centuries by their island forefathers, that their descendants still cherish as their most precious heritage."[83] Importantly, the editors did not object.

At the same time as they wanted to present Canadians with an up-to-date and factual account of Canada's past, Shortt and Doughty intended the series to mould national character, to counter, in their words, the "destructive tendency" of sectionalism "by the positive and constructive idea of the Nation."

> To the end that a broad national spirit should prevail in all parts of the Dominion, it is desirable that a sound knowledge of Canada as a whole, of its history, traditions and standards of life, should be diffused among its citizens, and especially among the immigrants who are peopling the new lands....Good citizenship grows out of a patriotic interest in the institutions of one's country and a sympathy with the people who dwell there.

To ensure that the series presented a unified interpretation of Canada, the two editors carefully selected their Quebec contributors. In his diary Shortt speculated that "There will be difficulty in getting suitable contributions from Que. as the liberal and conservative elements are so radically opposed in their interpretation of historic events."[84] A few months later he recorded their hope "to secure Mr. Chapais to supervise and largely contribute to the volume on Quebec."[85] To promote unity over sectionalism, Chapais was the logical choice. He interpreted the Conquest "as a providential event that saved French Canadians from the Revolution of 1789." Likewise, he "stressed the liberality and the conciliatory character

---

83 W.D. Lighthall, "English Settlement in Quebec," in Shortt and Doughty, eds., *Canada and its Provinces*, vol. 15, 121

84 QUA, Adam Shortt Papers, The Adam Shortt Diaries, 5 September 1909

85 Ibid, 14 December 1909

of British policy."[86] Although it took nearly sixteen months, Chapais eventually agreed. In the end it was Chapais along with "Father Drummond and Abbé Gosselin, head of Laval, and Abbé Scott" who wrote the history of Quebec for the series.[87]

The use of history to promote national unity did not disappear with history's transition from avocation to vocation. In other words, to plot a rise in the transition from "amateurs" and "housewives" to professional historians is to obscure this underlying continuity. W.D. Lighthall and Janet Carnochen would have agreed that "Good citizenship grows out of a patriotic interest in the institutions of one's country and a sympathy with the people who dwell there." *Canada and its Provinces*, therefore, embodied a conception of history which included both a commitment to critical inquiry and a commitment to affirmation. Canada's first generation of professional historians subcribed to archival research but they did not embrace the notion of value-free research.

IV

George Wrong did not believe that history could be a science. In two public talks, both delivered late in his career, he considered the nature of history and the duty of the historian. For his 1927 presidential address to the Canadian Historical Association, Wrong tackled what he termed "the historian's absorbing problem." Given man's fickle nature, his immaturity and his irrationality, given that there "is no uniformity in his actions,...no single motive [and] no law of reason to which he is always obedient," and given that "he is so often false to himself and so false to others that perhaps

86 Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 181
87 QUA, Adam Shortt Papers, The Adam Shortt Diaries, 24 May 1911

more than half of his written testimony about them is untrue," how is the historian to find the truth? Wrong argued that there will never be a science of history, that history will "never be finally written." Nevertheless, the historian had definite obligations. "The first is making sure of the facts." Facts are the necessary foundation of all history, he added. But facts alone do not make history. Indeed, the historian must pass to the second stage—interpretation. At this stage, the historian must exercise his imagination, he must be willing to discriminate and he must be prepared to pass judgment.[88] It was the latter duty that Wrong took most seriously. As he explained in a 1932 address to the American Historical Association, the historian has a fundamental duty to pass moral judgment. "The historian is the guardian of truth, truth not merely as to specific fact, but truth as expressing constructive standards of conduct."[89]

Carl Berger argued that Wrong was an "ambiguous figure." After all, he founded "the *[Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada]* and other agencies associated with the new 'scientific' history, but he never accepted the nostrums of historical science."[90] However, there was nothing ambiguous about Wrong. In point of fact, he remained clear in his conception of history and consistent in his commitment to it. Wrong believed in the unity of historical truth. Historical truth, as he conceived it, comprised both the factual record and the moral good. History must be scientific in that it must be based on archival research. But archival research did not preclude the historian from making moral pronouncements. Wrong saw no contradiction between his commitment to

88 George Wrong, "The Historian's Problem," *Annual Report of the Canadian Historical Association* (1927): 5-7

89 George Wrong, "The Historian's Duty to Society," American Historical Association Annual Meeting, 1932. Printed as "The Historian and Society," *Canadian Historical Review* 14, 1 (March 1933): 4-8.

90 Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 31

research on the one hand and his commitment to moral judgment on the other. The two were perfectly compatible because the truth, as he understood it, encompassed fact and morality. Recall the precision in his statement, "The historian is the guardian of truth, truth not merely as to specific fact, but truth as expressing constructive standards of conduct."

Furthermore, Berger deliberately contrasted Wrong with Shortt. Describing them as "radically different," he wrote that in Lord Acton Wrong found "the justification of history as a moral teacher" whereas Shortt found "the rationale for the scientific and specialized quest for facts." At the outset of his career Shortt committed himself to empiricism. History must be based on rigorous research and reference to the original authorities. Because of his obsession with the facts, Queen's Principal G.M. Grant dubbed him Mr. Gradgrind in reference to a Charles Dickens character in *Hard Times* who wanted the facts, the facts alone and nothing but the facts. But Shortt did not simply chase down obscure facts. Instead, he attempted to define a new role for the social scientist as expert, one capable of mediating society's competing interests.[91] Expert advice, he once stated, "must be introduced as through the surgeon's injecting needle, into the proper tissues of the body politic." Furthermore, he warned, "The wrong serum administered by enthusiastic but misguided amateurs may have disastrous effects."[92] A few years later, Shortt used his 1919 address to the Royal Society of Canada to outline his commitment to history based on archival evidence. Because he worried about the possibility of radical solutions to contemporary problems, Shortt insisted on an appeal to history.

---

91 Barry Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism: The Intellectual Legacy of Adam Shortt, O.D. Skelton, W.C. Clark and W.A. Mackintosh, 1890-1925* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1993): 60-61

92 Adam Shortt, "The Aims of the Canadian Political Science Association," *Proceedings, Canadian Political Science Association* (1913): 10

> It is to history in its most disinterested form—a broad and impartial presentation of conditions as they have actually developed—that we may yet have to appeal to save us from many wild phases of economic and social doctrine.

If "our Canadian history is to be known in authentic form," he continued, the documents upon which history must be based should be made readily accessible.[93]

Yet, Berger painted too sharp a dichotomy between the two men. First, Wrong took archival research seriously; there was nothing in Shortt's 1919 address that he would have found disagreeable. His own scholarship was based on primary documents. In 1905 he was a key participant in the organization of the Champlain Society. Modeled upon the Surtees and Hakluyt Societies in Great Britain and the Prince Society in the United States, the Champlain Society edited and published—and continues to edit and publish—original and rare documents relating to the history of Canada.[94] In 1915 Wrong and Shortt intended to create a Good Government League which would offer expert advice and impartial reviews of public policy.[95] Although their intention never materialized due to a lack of funding, it nevertheless demonstrates that the two men had much in common. Second, Shortt did not embody an absolute and inviolable empiricism. His commitment to empiricism did not mean a rejection of idealism. Although Berger portrayed him as a disciple of the new historical science, Shortt clearly accepted the limitations of the social sciences. In an

---

93 Adam Shortt, "The Significance for Canadian History of the Work of the Board of Historical Publications," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* Third Series, 13 (1919): Section II, 103, 106. Shortt had just been appointed to the Historical Publications Board. Created by the Borden Government in 1917, the Historical Publications Board replaced the Historical Manuscripts Commission. As its name indicates, its mandate was the publication of original documents relating to the history of Canada. See Wilson, "Shortt and Doughty," 176-209.

94 See W. Stewart Wallace, *A Sketch of the History of the Champlain Society* (Toronto, 1937)

95 S.E.D. Shortt, *The Search for an Ideal: Six Canadian intellectuals and their convictions in an age of transition* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976): 112

April 1895 review of Benjamin Kidd's book, *Social Evolution*, Shortt rejected the possibility "that society may be explained by one or two rigid and universal principles, that all its disorders may be traced to one or two universal causes, and may be cured by one or two universal remedies." After all, society is simply too complex. It is "a realm where nature reaches her fullest and richest spiritual expression, an expression which even in its stablest forms is the joint product of a multitude of plastic, subtle and evanescent influences." Shortt conceded that "the basis of society is a number of animal organisms, and the basis of wealth is a number of physical objects." But, he immediately countered, "the animal organisms are the instruments of spiritual purposes, and the physical objects as wealth are the means to social ends."[96] The social sciences, therefore, cannot grasp all aspects of society because not all aspects of society are measurable. In another piece, Shortt revealed his attachment to inspirational history, to biographies of great men in particular. Sounding not unlike Wrong, he wrote that, "The lives and deeds of its great men come in time to be the living past of the nation. They are its standards, its self-respect, its conscience."[97]

That history should be based on archival research and that it should not lose its capacity to judge and to inspire formed the dominant approach to the study of the past among the first generation of professional historians. When Albert Henry Newman arrived at the Toronto Baptist College in 1881 as Professor of Biblical Introduction, Old Testament Exegesis and Church History, he sensed his was a divine calling. As he explained in a letter, "It really seemed to me that I had been set apart as it were by Divine

96 Adam Shortt, "Social Evolution, According to Mr. Kidd," *Queen's Quarterly* 2, 4 (April 1895): 329

97 Adam Shortt, "Current Events," *Queen's Quarterly* 6, 1 (July 1898): 84. See also S.E.D. Shortt, *The Search for an Ideal*, 105.

Providence for the work of writing an exhaustive history of the Baptists."[98] Nine years later, the Toronto Baptist College became McMaster University and Newman became its first Professor of History and Civil Polity.[99] Trained as a theologian, Newman nevertheless exhibited those traits associated with professional history (a commitment to the sources, a critical disposition, etc.) at the same time as he articulated a clear definition of history. History, Newman believed, involved "the setting forth in literary or oral form of the development in time of the divine plan of the universe, in so far as this development has become an object of human knowledge."[100] Church history, meanwhile, "is the narration of all that is known of the founding and the development of the kingdom of Christ on earth."[101] Although a self-conscious church historian, Newman echoed his counterparts in modern history by his adherence to original research and impartiality. The church historian, he explained, must "represent the exact facts in their relations to each other and to the times and circumstances concerned in each case." Moreover, "he should deal as impartially with his materials as does the chemist with his specimens." In his final three annual reports (1899-1901) Newman stated his intentions to

98 Albert Henry Newman to John Castle, 6 June 1881. Quotation in Jerry Breazeate, "Albert Henry Newman: Historian and Theologian," (Doctor of Theology, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1960): 21. See Albert Henry Newman, *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States* (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1894).

99 In his history of McMaster, Charles Johnston wrote: "Baptist educators pressed ahead with new fields of instruction at McMaster. Steps were taken before the first convocation to add to the store of 'modern' subjects by introducing political history, as distinct from the purely ecclesiastical history that had long been the staple of institutions developed under denominational auspices....By 1895 both constitutional history and ancient history were being offered, along with considerable work in the old course in church history, by Professor Newman, the first occupant of the history chair at the university." Charles Johnston, *McMaster University, vol. 1: The Toronto Years* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976): 62

100 Albert Henry Newman, *A Manual of Church History*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: American Baptist Society, 1900): 3

101 Ibid, 4

introduce the Seminar method to teaching. "I have often called your attention to the desirability of having a single class-room for all the work of my department to be used for other purposes as little as possible," he reminded the Chancellor.

> This would enable me to have maps, pictures, and books for use in the work of the department always accessible....History to be taught effectively requires apparatus just as really as does Science or Physics.[102]

At first glance, Newman's references to chemistry and physics appear to be a straight forward effort to create a science out of history. In a sense it was. But Newman never attempted to separate the true and the good. He did not subscribe to value-free research. Although the researcher must subject documents to internal and external criticism, and although the researcher must exhibit impartiality,

> it is neither practicable nor desirable that the church historian should be indifferent to the subject-matter of his science or that he should be so destitute of convictions as to form no moral judgments on the opinions and acts of parties and individuals whose history he studies and seeks to expound.[103]

The true and the good, he believed, constitute an essential unity.

Although less explicit, McGill's first professor of history shared this conception of history. In a 1905 address to the Canadian Club of Toronto Charles Colby spoke to the intimate relationship between history and

---

102 Albert Henry Newman, Annual Report, 24 April 1901, Canadian Baptist Archives, McMaster University (CBA), Box McMaster University, Chancellor's Reports and Reports to Him, 1901-1909, file McMaster University Annual Reports—Departmental, 1900-1907. See also Albert Henry Newman, Annual Report, 5 April 1900, CBA, Box McMaster University, Chancellor's Reports and Reports to Him, 1901-1909, file McMaster University Annual Reports—Woodstock College, Departmental 1899-1900; and Albert Henry Newman, Annual Report, 5 April 1899, CBA, Box McMaster University Chancellor's Reports 1891-1892, 1895-1900, file McMaster University, Annual Reports—Chancellor's Report to Senate, Moulton College, Woodstock College, Departmental, 1898-1899

103 Newman, *A Manual of Church History*, 5. For a similar conception of Church history see John Dall, "The Study of History," *Queen's Quarterly* 19, 3 (January 1912): 253-268

patriotism. He acknowledged that "the historian should have, so far as is humanly possible, the disinterestedness of the dead; that he should not set forth the results of his researches with a view to justifying any special cause, or even to vindicate the record of his own ancestors." However, he also referred to the existence of lower and higher forms of patriotism. There was "beating the big drum and waving the bloody flag" and then there was "doing something for one's country." The historian, he continued, should direct his efforts to the higher form. Of course, he must undertake specialized research. But specialized monographs based on original research "are the solid pedestal upon which the work of art—the great national history—must stand." As a script of citizenship, a national history will explain at the same time as it will instruct and inspire.[104] Or, as he wrote in an unpublished address, "The scientific impulse has done much for historical scholarship, but man shall not live by bread alone."[105]

Colby attempted his own great history in his 1908 book, *Canadian Types of the Old Régime.* We now "live in a generation which demands reasons, craves to know the cause of things, and which will not be put off with rhetoric, however glib, or rhapsody however eloquent," he stated. Therefore, historians must practise the "comparative method" of historical research. In this case, the experience of New France must be compared with that of France and with that of the English in America in order to better understand the experience of New France. "When written without some sense of perspective, [history] becomes a mere catalogue of events in which great and little are jumbled together, heedless of weight or

104 Charles Colby, "History and Patriotism," *Proceedings of the Canadian Club, 1904-1905* (Toronto, 1905): 108, 110, 115

105 Charles Colby, "The Modern Historian," n.d., Stanstead Historical Society Archives, Fonds Colby, C.W. Colby, Series 2, Subseries C, Box 5, file 59

quality."[106] But if history offers "the cause of things," it must also offer instruction. Through his study of representative types in New France, he wanted to instruct English Canadians. "It seems to me," he commented, "a thousand pities that of English Canadians not one in ten understands the sentiments and aspirations of French Canada." English Canada ought to understand "why the habitant thinks, feels, and acts as he does." Likewise, French Canada ought to appreciate the benefits of British political institutions and English criminal law, for example.[107] In other words, history instructs as much as it explains. History, he once explained, introduces us "to the supreme art, the art of living."

> The teacher [of history] who, having himself been stimulated by man's best achievement, can fill the souls of his pupils with the splendour of the same spectacle is helping them in no slight degree to raise themselves above the level of the corrupting and commonplace.[108]

Queen's historian J.L. Morison agreed. In a revealing review article, Morison presented an unambiguous statement on the nature of history and the obligation of the historian. He opened his article with a snide description of the new scientific history with its emphasis on the minute study of ever-multiplying documents and its "conscientious elaboration of even unimportant detail." The arrogant proponents of the new history, with their penchant for bibliography and their refusal to make moral judgments, threatened a revolution. Literary style had become the victim of "increased attention to Archives and Record offices." To be sure, Morison did not object to research:

> No one doubts the place of scientific method in research, or the need for the strictest attention to minute detail; treatises, let us say, on

106 Colby, *Canadian Types of the Old Régime*, 3-4
107 Ibid, 313-321
108 Charles Colby, "The Teaching of History" n.d., Stanstead Historical Society Archives, Fonds Colby, C.W. Colby, Series 2, Subseries C, Box 5, file 73

> medieval constitutional history call for a scientific apparatus at least as elaborate as that required in any of the exacter sciences.

But science did not mean value-free scholarship; it meant scholarship tested by original authorities. The difference was enormous. Morison wanted to retain the capacity to judge. That historians should refrain from moral judgment was little more than an "intellectual fad." "As if history, in its more inspired moments, has not always been a recognized court of moral appeal, where men usurp, for a little, the office of the final judge."[109]

Morison's colleague, W.L. Grant, expressed his disdain for the mere fact chaser and chronicler. As he explained, the fact chaser "will proceed to his work of 'Chronological Classification,' being careful first to provide himself with a cabinet full of small drawers in which to systematize his notes." The problem, he argued, is that facts are infinite in number: "Can we investigate them all? On what string are we to arrange our scattered pearls? The Chronological? How, then are we to get perspective?" Grant concluded that historians ought to articulate some ideal and place it before their fellow citizens. In schools and in universities students ought to be presented with a lofty ideal to which they can aspire.[110] What might that ideal look like? Grant answered this question when, a few years later, he likened the study of colonial history in general and Canadian history in particular to a moral force in its capacity "to advance the great spiritual drawing together of the Anglo-Celtic race which, were it to come, would be strong enough to guard the peace of the world."[111]

---

109 J.L. Morison, "Some Recent Historical Literature: European and British," *Queen's Quarterly* 19, 3 (January 1912): 269-273

110 W.L. Grant, "The Study of History in Ontario," *Canadian Magazine* 22, 5 (March 1904): 431-436

111 W.L. Grant, "The Teaching of Colonial History," *Queen's Quarterly* 18, 3 (January 1911): 186

Saskatchewan's first Professor of History did not see a contradiction between fact and value, or the true and the good: at the same time as Edmund Oliver was a professional historian he was studying for the Ministry. He completed his Bachelor of Divinity at Toronto's Knox College in 1910 and, three years later, was ordained a Presbyterian minister. Although he deliberately incorporated the history of western Canada into the curriculum, it occupied only a small part during his tenure. In point of fact, the curriculum maintained an emphasis on Western civilization in its listings of Ancient History, Modern European History, Medieval History and the British Empire. Although the Ancient Greeks and Romans were far removed from contemporary life in Saskatchewan, Oliver saw in history an essential civilizing mission. In his diary he wondered if he could be both practical and "an influence for good" like W.S. Milner, his classics professor at Toronto.[112] He also believed that Latin should be "a compulsory subject" for matriculation; but, as he added, "I incline to be conservative."[113] In other words, Oliver did not look upon history as something that was simply practical. For all of the perspective and context history offered to contemporary social problems, it also taught moral lessons of duty and obligation. In a 1909 letter, Walter Murray approved Oliver's preliminary "plan for the History work." But he went further. He rather liked the course on the British Empire because, as he explained, "It

---

112 Diary of Edmund H. Oliver, 18 September 1909, USA, Jean Murray Collection, MG 61, E. IV. Name and Subject Files, N. Oliver, E.H., 2. Diary. Oliver had been moved and inspired by Milner. In a 1904 letter to George Wrong, Oliver said that he intended to dedicate his Columbia thesis to Milner. "Further, in carrying out this [thesis] I have come more and more to appreciate the learning and ability, and to admire the personality of Mr. Milner. I have come to respect and love him, as I do few men." E.H. Oliver to Wrong, 18 December 1904, TFRBL-UT, MS Coll. 36, Wrong Papers, Box 2, file 83

113 Diary of Edmund H. Oliver, 24 October 1909, USA, Jean Murray Collection, MG 61, E. IV. Name and Subject Files, N. Oliver, E.H., 2. Diary

will foster growth of the Empire spirit & also the national spirit which Canadians are just beginning to feel."

> Formerly one was moved to poke fun at the pretentious courses in U.S. History in the Univs. & the Schools of the Republic. They have served their purpose.[114]

Neither Murray nor Oliver intended to create deranged nationalists. Rather, they intended to foster "feeling," or a sense of duty and obligation to the greater good. Through a study of history, students in western Canada would learn that they were part of a greater project, the seamless advance of Western civilization. In his 1910-1911 President's Report, Murray explained the goal of the Faculty of Arts and Science of which History was a part. "In the first place this Faculty gives the best preparation for the general duties of citizenship. Its aim is to acquaint its students with the best that has been thought and done in past civilizations, and to study the problems of today."[115] Here we find Murray seeking a balance between the practical needs of the community and the best traditions of the university. So it was that Oliver could write in 1911 that he had criss-crossed the province giving public lectures on everything from the history of the North West Territories to Ancient Greece, from the French Revolution to the meaning of citizenship.[116]

Oliver's commitment to history as something both practical and moral, as both true and good was not contradictory. He thought the university, even the officially non-denominational University of Saskatchewan, should be Christian in orientation. He wanted voluntary Chapel for the university community (although some fellow faculty felt it contravened

---

114 Walter Murray to E.H. Oliver, 16 July 1909, USA, E.H. Oliver Collection, MG 6, Addendum

115 Walter Murray, USA, The President's Report, 1910-11, 8

116 E.H. Oliver to George Wrong, 27 February 1911, TFRBL-UT, MS Coll. 36, Wrong Papers, Box 2 file 83

the University Act) and he encouraged students to form organizations for Christian fellowship. To this end, he requested information from the Head Office of the YMCA in New York.[117] In an address before the Presbyterian Synodical banquet Oliver stated that the University and the Church "are both attempting to do the same work in working for a Kingdom of Enlightenment."[118] For Oliver, history must be factual but it need not be value-free; it must be based on the concrete findings of painstaking research but it need not be empty of moral purpose. In short, history did not preclude morality. It was the professor's job to inspire students to "effort and noble endeavour."[119] Oliver deliberately linked Christian morality and history, the good and the true. Together they formed an inseparable unity.

Oliver left the University of Saskatchewan in 1914 to serve as Principal of Saskatoon's newly created Presbyterian Theological College.[120] He believed that he could best execute his duty to the people of Saskatchewan as a Minister, not as a Professor of History. Clues to his departure from the department which he founded can be located in his diary. On his first night in Saskatoon Oliver prayed as he did every night. "My evening prayer is that I may be here in Saskatchewan a workman that needeth not be ashamed."[121] This is a direct reference to Paul's second epistle to Timothy. In it Paul exhorts Timothy to present himself to God as "a

---

117 Diary of Edmund H. Oliver, 23 September 1909, USA, Jean Murray Collection, MG 61, E. IV. Name and Subject Files, N. Oliver, E.H., 2. Diary

118 Diary of Edmund H. Oliver, 7 November 1909, USA, Jean Murray Collection, MG 61, E. IV. Name and Subject Files, N. Oliver, E.H., 2. Diary

119 Diary of Edmund H. Oliver, 15 January 1912, USA, Jean Murray Collection, MG 61, E. IV. Name and Subject Files, N. Oliver, E.H., 2. Diary

120 Oliver enjoyed a long career with the Theological College, renamed St. Andrew's College in 1924. In the 1920s he was a leader in the movement for Church unification; in 1930 he was selected moderator of the United Church. He died in 1935.

121 Diary of Edmund H. Oliver, 18 September 1909, USA, Jean Murray Collection, MG 61, E. IV. Name and Subject Files, N. Oliver, E.H., 2. Diary

workman that needeth not be ashamed" so that he might carry the word of God and the salvation that is in Jesus Christ (2 Timothy 2:15). Three years later, in 1912, Oliver noted that he seemed to be doing a lot more preaching and bible study than he had done in the past.[122] Eventually, the call of God proved greater than the call of Clio and Oliver exchanged the gown for the cloth.

Wrong, Shortt, Newman, Colby, Morison, Grant and Oliver: unwittingly, these historians embodied a larger transition animating English Canada's academic community. On the one hand, they were committed to facts generated by research. Since the turn of the century, English-Canadian academics had embraced research, what James Loudon, President of the University of Toronto, identified as "the fundamental principle."[123] On the other hand, they remained committed to the good. Truth comprised both fact and value.

World War I, however, had an enormous impact. As several scholars have noted, the war accelerated that movement already present in academic life towards the research ideal embodied in the new social sciences. Disillusioned by the moral calamity of the Western Front and terrified by the prospects of Bolshevism, the academic community shifted Canada's reform movement away from its social gospel roots and towards what they believed to be a more sound foundation in the social sciences. Social scientists, armed with a scientific understanding of society, could

---

122 Diary of Edmund H. Oliver, 15 January 1912, USA, Jean Murray Collection, MG 61, E. IV. Name and Subject Files, N. Oliver, E.H., 2. Diary

123 James Loudon, "The Universities in Relation to Research," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, second series, 8 (1902): Appendix A. See also Norman Nicholson, "The Evolution of Graduate Studies in the Universities of Ontario, 1841-1971," (PhD, University of Toronto, 1975): 65-71.

best provide expert direction on state policy.[124] Indeed, there was a general belief that a scientific understanding of society, its past and its present, would assist the immediate task of post-war reconstruction, provide the stability necessary to liberal democracy and prevent a repetition of the war. A.B. McKillop argued that science filled the vacuum created by the general crisis of authority precipitated by the war.

> Until the Great War...the proponents of the Ontario university's role as agent of a social and intellectual transformation firmly rooted in the industrial order had been on the defensive, for the authority of the past, rooted in the biblical record, remained the fundamental basis of moral force in higher education. At the Armistice of 11 November 1918, much of that authority was gone, and professional apostles of the new academic order were readying themselves for the brave new post-war world.[125]

Walter Murray, President of the University of Saskatchewan, captured this sentiment in his 1916-1917 President's Report when he emphasized history as a social science. From the premise that "racial animosities, deep seated in history," had set "the world on fire," Murray called for a deeper understanding of the historical origins of "racial ambitions" and for a re-thinking of "those fundamental principles and laws which should regulate the conduct of nations no less than of individuals." In this we will avoid another war. He then predicted a place in the sun for the social sciences: "History, Law, Economics—the sciences of human society—will be appealed to as never before."[126] In her study of the undergraduate arts curriculum

---

124 See Marlene Shore, *The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origins of Social Research in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987); Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism;* and Owram, *The Government Generation.*

125 A.B. McKillop, *Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario, 1791-1951* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994): 292. See also McKillop, "Science, Authority, the American Empire," in McKillop, *Contours of Canadian Thought* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987).

126 Walter Murray, USA, The President's Report, 1916-1917, 4-5

in English Canada, Patricia Jasen argued that the interwar era was "the most utilitarian of all eras in the history of the arts curriculum."[127]

None of this is to suggest that historians functioned in some kind of moral vacuum or that they embraced the ideal of value-free research. Indeed, both McKillop and Michael Gauvreau have argued otherwise.[128] Still, there was an attempt to make history a social science, to make it more immediately useful. The question of values, if not abandonned, was at least submerged. Against this backdrop, the interwar decades were key decades in the professionalization of history. As Queen's historian Reginald Trotter remarked in 1943, "It was a period when history was rapidly coming into its own as a profession in Canada."[129] The *Canadian Historical Review* replaced the *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada;* the Canadian Historical Association emerged out of the Historic Landmarks Association; and a new generation of historians—A.L. Burt, Frank Underhill, Chester New, Arthur Lower, Harold Innis, Donald Creighton, George Brown, Reginald Trotter, Duncan McArthur, Mack Eastman, W.N. Sage, Arthur Morton and D.C. Harvey—exhibited a heightened self-consciousness as professional historians.

---

127 Patricia Jasen, "The English Canadian Liberal Arts Curriculum: An Intellectual History, 1800-1950," (PhD, University of Manitoba, 1987): 189

128 See McKillop, *Matters of Mind*, 474-475; and Michael Gauvreau, "Baptist Religion and the Social Science of Harold Innis," *Canadian Historical Review* 76, 2 (1995): 161-204.

129 QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 26, file Correspondence Queen's, D. McArthur

Chapter III. Professionalization Continued: "the post-1918 generation"

Alfred Leroy Burt made the Public Archives his summer home in the 1920s. When classes ended in the spring, he boarded the train for the long trip from Edmonton to Ottawa. A historian of Canada with a special interest in the French-English relationship, Burt had quickly discovered that the secondary literature was wholly inadequate. As he would recall some years later, it was this inadequacy that "drove me to the Public Archives of Canada."[1] Moreover, he was never alone. Beginning in the early 1920s, the Public Archives became the meeting place for historians from across the country. In numerous letters to his wife, Burt offered a running commentary on who was at the Archives and what they were doing. Harold Innis, Duncan McArthur, Frank Underhill, Chester New, Reginald Trotter, Arthur Morton, Bartlet Brebner, George Brown, W.N. Sage: everyone, it seemed, made repeated summer trips to the Archives.[2] "It is quite interesting to see the actual renaissance of Canadian history in course of preparation," he wrote in 1926. "Certainly all the professional historians

1 A.L. Burt, Preface, *The Old Province of Quebec* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1933). See also A.L. Burt, "The Need for a Wider Study of Canadian History," Department of Extension of the University of Alberta, The *Press Bulletin* 9, 5 (23 November 1923): 2

2 Burt was not the only historian to observe the activity at the Public Archives. Frank Underhill also commented on the Archives as a summer meeting place: "we have a very agreeable crowd in Ottawa for the summer—Burt of Alberta, Harvey of Manitoba, three or four men from Toronto, Morton and myself from Sask." Frank Underhill to Monica McQueen, 27 June 1926, National Archives (NA), Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 1. file Monica McQueen 1907-1927. In a letter to a colleague in New York, Reginald Trotter remarked: "I am delighted to learn that you will be at Ottawa this summer, joining the growing circle of history men who gather there seasonally." Reginald Trotter to Prof. Bonham, 27 February 1929, Queen's University Archives (QUA), Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 26, file Summer School of Historical Research, 1922-1933. See also Interview with Charles Perry Stacey (1977), NA, R9079.

in Canada are turning their eyes on the Archives during the summer & a revolution is bound to come about as the result."[3]

Indeed, the 1920s witnessed a rapid expansion in historical research. Although there were notable exceptions—McGill's E.R. Adair, Manitoba's Noel Fieldhouse and McMaster's Chester New, for example—most historians focused their attention on the writing of Canadian history.[4] Arthur Morton began his study of western exploration and early settlement; Harold Innis studied the Canadian Pacific Railway before turning his attention to the history of the fur trade; Arthur Lower examined the history of Canada's lumber economy; Chester Martin studied imperial relations and western settlement; Frank Underhill focused his energy on Canadian political history, Confederation in particular; Fred Landon began his research on the history of southwestern Ontario; W.N. Sage studied the history of British Columbia in both his University of Toronto dissertation and UBC career; George Brown conducted an investigation of British North America's trade with Great Britain and the United States; having to abandon his interest in the French Revolution, Donald Creighton turned to the history of Canadian commerce; and, of course, Burt studied the French-English relationship in the immediate aftermath of the Conquest.

Burt's many letters to his wife captured the energy and excitement in the historical profession as a new generation of historians, what he would later refer to as "the post-1918 generation," came to maturity in the interwar years.[5] Although the foundations of a historical profession had

3 A.L. Burt to Dorrie Burt, 13 July 1926, NA, A.L. Burt Papers, MG 30 D 103, vol. 1, file 1

4 E.R. Adair presented a scathing indictment of Canadian insularity in 1943. Indeed, he even considered Chester New to be a Canadianist. See E.R. Adair, "The Canadian Contribution to Historical Science," *Culture* 4, 1 (mars 1943): 63-83.

5 A.L. Burt to Donald Creighton, 26 May 1948, NA, Donald Creighton Papers, MG 31 D 77, vol. 2, file General Correspondence 1948

been laid by the likes of W.D. Lighthall, Jenny Simpson, Janet Carnochen, George Wrong and Adam Shortt, the profession emerged more fully and completely after the Great War. The revitalization of history departments, the emphasis on research and scholarly publication, the institutionalization of graduate studies, the development of undergraduate courses in methodology and historiography, the creation of the *Canadian Historical Review* and the founding of the Canadian Historical Association were but different aspects of the same project: to professionalize the study of history in English Canada.

I

At the conclusion of the War and into the 1920s, history departments across the country were revitalized as veterans returned and new members joined. At Dalhousie, not only had the War claimed the services of its Professor of History and Political Economy, James Todd, it had claimed the services of his war-time replacement, Carroll Woody. As a result, the University did not offer any instruction in history and political economy in the 1918-1919 academic year. In 1919 President MacKenzie hired George Earle Wilson to lecture in history and political economy. A graduate of Queen's, Wilson was at this point a doctoral student at Harvard. Completed in 1926, his dissertation studied the life of Robert Baldwin, the Upper Canadian Reformer. In 1920 the President re-iterated his long-standing desire to divide history and political economy and to create two separate departments. As always, money was tight.[6] But after a successful capital campaign, Dalhousie created a distinct department of history in 1921. Originally hired as a temporary lecturer, Wilson received a

6 A.S. MacKenzie to J.L. Morison, 26 June 1920, Dalhousie University Archives (DUA), MS-1-3, President's Office Staff Files, no. 543

permanent appointment and remained at Dalhousie for the next forty-three years. In 1923 he was joined by A. Stanley Walker, who had a B.Litt from Oxford and an MA from Leeds.

Acadia University experienced a similar change in the aftermath of the War. After forty-five years of teaching, John Freeman Tufts retired in 1920 and for the next ten years, Acadia saw historians come and go. With an MA from Columbia University, the peripatetic and difficult Menzies Whitelaw replaced Tufts. He remained for only two years: indeed, throughout the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s he would teach at universities across Canada and the United States. Things never seemed to work out for him. In 1922 the University separated history and political economy and named Norman McLeod Rogers the Mark Cury Professor of History. An alumnus of Acadia and a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, Rogers stayed in Wolfville until 1926 when he went to Ottawa to work in the Prime Minister's Office. Temporary appointments—including a woman named Florence Sharman—carried out the work in the department until 1929 when Thomas Dadson and Ronald Longley were appointed to full-time positions. Dadson already had his PhD from Chicago; Longley would receive his from Harvard in 1934. Together these two men constituted the department and remained at Acadia for the remainder of their long careers.

When Charles Colby, McGill's Professor of History *in absentia*, finally offered his resignation in 1920, a search for his replacement began. Although he had hoped to appoint a Canadian,[7] Principal Arthur Currie hired Basil Williams from England when he could find no suitable

7 Sir Arthur Currie to [name deleted for reasons of privacy], 1 March 1921, McGill University Archives (MUA), RG 2, Box 61, file History Applications, 1920-1925

candidates closer to home. Williams, who had an MA from Oxford, was well-published and, at fifty, he represented a senior figure to a department in need of leadership. After all, the dilatory and absent Colby had provided little. Principal Arthur Currie made it clear to Williams that he expected him to continue his research and writing. "I am indeed anxious that you shall keep up your writing and research work. For although you have been engaged primarily to teach, I realise that the more you write the better it will be for the University and for yourself. I am anxious to encourage you in that in every way I can, and I quite realise that I must give you every opportunity for production."[8] In 1922, Currie hired a third historian, W.T. Waugh. Like Williams, Waugh did not have a PhD. His highest degree was an MA from Manchester. Williams requested a fourth member in 1924. The current staff is spread too thin, he explained in a letter to Principal Currie. "If the History work is to be good, the professor must be constantly keeping ahead of research and recasting his lectures....The proverbial professor of old times who made a set of lectures & went on delivering them from father to son is gone for ever."[9] A year later, Williams again asked that a fourth "man" be secured.[10] Both times Currie rejected his request on financial grounds.[11] When Williams left in 1925 to take a position at Edinburgh, he was replaced in 1926 by the the brilliant, irascible E.R. Adair. He too had an MA from a British university: Cambridge.

Like McGill, Queen's witnessed a changing of the guard in its history department in the aftermath of the War. Both J.L. Morison and W.L. Grant

---

8 Sir Arthur Currie to Basil Williams, 11 August 1921, MUA, RG 2, Box 61, file History: Prof. Basil Williams, 1921-1925

9 Basil Williams to Sir Arthur Currie, 10 March 1924, Ibid

10 Basil Williams to Sir Arthur Currie, 7 February 1925, Ibid

11 Sir Arthur Currie to Basil Williams, 14 April 1925, Ibid

took leaves of absence to serve overseas. On top of his responsibilities as Sir John A. Macdonald Professor of Political Economy, Oscar Skelton served as Acting Professor of History with help from two young lecturers, W.N. Sage and A.G. Dorland. Both men had an MA, Sage's from Oxford and Dorland's from Yale. When the War ended, Grant left Queen's to become Headmaster of Upper Canada College. Morison returned in 1919 but stayed only three years before going back to England because of his wife's poor health. Duncan McArthur replaced him as the Douglas Professor of Canadian and Colonial History. McArthur had an MA from Queen's and he had worked at the Public Archives. In addition, he had the recommendation of Adam Shortt: McArthur lacks "the peculiar personal flavour of Morison which renders him so attractive as a popular lecturer and representative of the University abroad, but he has wide sympathies, a good manner, a clear mind, and is able to marshall his facts effectively....I should say without hesitation, get McArthur if at all possible."[12] McArthur was joined a year later by A.E. Prince, a Medievalist with an MA from Manchester and three years later by Reginald Trotter, a PhD from Harvard.

At western Canadian universities a similar pattern unfolded. At the University of Manitoba, Chester Martin had to rely on the help of a part-time lecturer when his colleague, Ralph Flenley, joined the war effort. When he returned in 1919, the Oxford-educated Flenley stayed only one year before taking a position at the University of Toronto. In 1920, D.C. Harvey—whose BA came from Dalhousie and whose MA came from Oxford—was finally able to leave Wesley College. He had been there for five years and never felt at home in the Methodist college. As he explained, "...I do not wish to be tagged a Methodist & lecture only to Methodists when I am not a

12 Adam Shortt to Principal Taylor, 2 June 1922, QUA, Adam Shortt Papers, Box 6, file Correspondence Jan-June 1922

Methodist."[13] For the better part of the decade, Martin and Harvey, with the assistance of two part-time lecturers, constituted the department.

Frank Underhill returned to the University of Saskatchewan in 1919 to find that Arthur Silver Morton had permanently replaced him as Chair. It only added to his frustration and his longing to leave the West. In 1922 the department added a third member, George Wilfred Simpson. Simpson had completed his BA in History and English at the University of Saskatchewan before going to Toronto for his MA in History. From there, he went to the University of London as the first IODE Overseas Fellow from Saskatchewan. He completed his PhD in 1920. Clearly, Simpson had been picked as a star, as someone to be sent off for further studies on the assumption that he would return. Morton thought of him as "a very promising man" who "will do well in our Province because of his ability to lead as well as his education."[14] In a letter of recommendation, his supervisor at the University of London, Arthur Percival Newton, poured praise on Simpson's technical skills as a researcher.

> In the stringent training in historical method both in my seminar and our various technical classes through which Mr. Simpson has passed, he has completely held his own. He has greatly increased his historical equipment by attendance at the courses of lectures of some of our best historical teachers in European and Constitutional History and in Political Science.

Indeed, Newton added, his research on colonial land policy in British North America was "definitive."[15] Simpson would remain in the history department for the next thirty-six years before finally retiring in 1958.

---

13 D.C. Harvey to A.S. MacKenzie, January 1920, DUA, MS-1-3, President's Office Staff Files, no. 549

14 Arthur Morton to Adam Shortt, 9 June 1920, QUA, Adam Shortt Collection, Box 5, file Correspondence 1920

15 Arthur Percival Newton, 30 June 1922, University of Saskatchewan Archives (USA), Presidential Papers, Series I, B.8, Applications and Appointments Sh-Sl

The University of Alberta's department of history was left seriously understaffed when Gordon Stanely Fife enlisted in 1915 and was killed a year later, when the President of the University and the Head of History, H.M. Tory, went to England in 1917 to organize the Khaki University for demobilized personnel, and when A.L. Burt enlisted in the First Tanks Battalion in 1918. Writing to Tory, the Dean of Arts and Acting President explained that "Burt's going left our Department of History completely cleaned out." However, there is someone in Edmonton who could assume responsibility for the department: Morden Long. A Rhodes Scholar from Oxford, he is currently teaching in the high school. He "is a pleasant fellow to meet, unassuming in manner, but an enthusiast, I think, in his subject. He is engaged on a book, I believe, at present, which is to be out pretty soon."[16] Although it involved a cut in pay of $500,[17] Long accepted a permanent appointment in 1918. Throughout the 1920s, Burt and Long—with the assistance of one and sometimes two sessional instructors each year—were Alberta's department of history. In 1930 Burt went to the University of Minnesota while Toronto's George Smith replaced him as Chair.

When UBC's Mack Eastman enlisted in 1917, he was the department of history. However, when the War ended the department expanded. Walter Sage—who had a BA from Toronto and an MA from Oxford—was appointed an Assistant Professor in 1919. In 1925 received a PhD in History from the University of Toronto. In 1922 Eastman and Sage were joined by Fred Soward, who had a BA from Toronto and an MA from Oxford. Although Eastman left in 1925 to work for the International Labor Office in Geneva,

16 W.A. Kerr to H.M. Tory, 4 May 1918, NA, H.M. Tory Papers, MG 30 D 115, vol. 2, file 5

17 W.A. Kerr to H.M. Tory, 29 April 1919, Ibid, vol. 2, file 6

he was replaced at first by a temporary appointment and then, in 1928, by Manitoba's D.C. Harvey. Throughout the 1920s UBC had a department of three permanent members.

Of course, the University of Toronto boasted the country's largest department of history. In 1919 Toronto had a staff of six. By 1924 it had a staff of nine making it three times larger than UBC and nearly five times larger than Dalhousie. George Wrong still favoured the Oxford connection. With only one or two exceptions, all of his appointments had at least one degree from Oxford and most had a degree from Toronto as well. Indeed, Lester Pearson had a Toronto BA and an Oxford BA when he joined the faculty in 1923. As he recalled in his memoirs, "It was never even suggested to me that I must get a PhD quickly or depart."[18] Indeed, Wrong only appointed one PhD to his department: that was George Brown in 1925. Of course, Brown had done undergraduate degrees at Toronto and Oxford and this was very much to his advantage. "You know this place and I need not enter into any further explanations," Wrong told him.[19] In 1927 Frank Underhill finally had a chance to leave Saskatchewan when Wrong offered him a position. He quickly accepted. After all, he never felt at home in the West: it "is not a very comfortable place to live in, or at any rate I don't find the great open spaces particularly alluring to an academic person like myself," he confided to an old friend in 1926.[20] Also joining the department in 1927 was a young Donald Creighton, another Toronto-educated, Oxford-polished historian.

---

18 Lester B. Pearson, *Mike: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson, vol. I: 1897-1948* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972): 52

19 George Wrong to George Brown, 10 March 1925, University of Toronto Archives (UTA), Department of History, A-70-025, Box 7, file 4

20 Frank Underhill to Kenneth Bell, 29 January 1926, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 1, file K.N. Bell, 1907-1927

Except for the University of Toronto, history departments in the interwar years were numerically small with two or three members. Moreover, the University of New Brunswick and Mount Allison University did not have separate history departments until the late 1930s. At any given time, there were only thirty-five to forty historians teaching at English-Canadian universities. Nevertheless, there was a critical mass of men—the first woman appointed to a permanent position was Jean Murray at the University of Saskatchewan in 1937—who identified themselves as professionals. And as professionals they embraced research and scholarly production as their mandate. True, the threat to publish or perish had yet to be uttered in the interwar years, but there was a palpable pressure to produce.[21] Basil Williams at McGill complained that his over-worked staff did not have the time "to keep up with the constantly increasing literature of their subjects"; nor did they have the time "to do any original work."

> Some people hold that it is not the business of a professor to publish original work: but in the first place a university is more likely to attract good teachers if they feel they have the time to pursue their own work, & secondly there is little doubt that students are attracted to a university of which the teachers have a public reputation.[22]

Arthur Lower believed that his early articles in the *CHR*, published before he began his Harvard doctorate, contributed to his "professional reputation."[23] Toronto's Ralph Flenley advised Charles Stacey—who in 1929 had set his sights on an academic career—to "get something in print" if he

---

21 In an autobiographical essay written late in his life, Dalhousie's George Wilson remarked that, "Outside the classroom, I was completely free. There was no demand for publication. If I wished to write that was my own affair. If I did not wish to write the University was quite unconcerned. 'Publish or perish' was a threat that had never reached this part of the world." Although Wilson may not have felt pressure to publish at Dalhousie, that pressure existed at other universities. See George Earle Wilson, *All for Nothing?* (n.p., 1972): 43. A copy of this self-published memoir is located in DUA, MS-1-Ref.

22 Basil Williams, Report on History Department of McGill University, 31 December 1921, MUA, RG 2, Box 61, file Department of History, 1920-1925

23 Arthur Lower, *My First Seventy-five Years* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967): 130

wanted to work at one of the better universities.[24] Even George Wrong began to stress research and publication.

Whereas in the 1900s and 1910s he did not pressure his staff to undertake research projects, Wrong placed a new emphasis on scholarship at Toronto in the 1920s. For his part, Lester Pearson would later claim that the "age of research and scholarly production as the first requirement for prestige and promotion had not descended on us." If a junior member of Wrong's department happened to publish, then fine. "But we were not plagued by this necessity."[25] However, as his biographer made clear, Pearson's account of his brief tenure as a history professor was "misleading."[26] Wrong expected Pearson to undertake a large research project on the United Empire Loyalists. In a 1923 letter to Frank Underhill, Wrong emphasized the importance of research and the pressure he was now putting on his staff:

> As you know I have long had my eye on you in respect to University work and I have urged you to get a book with your name on the title-page. I quite understand the difficulties for a man in active academic life to get himself free for writing. I do hope, however, that you will manage this in the course of the next year or two....*At the moment I am putting pressure on members of my own staff to do this*, and there are a dozen topics relating to Canada alone on which books are urgently needed.[27]

Making his way to the Public Archives in the summer of 1926, Pearson began a research project on Loyalist settlement. According to A.L. Burt, he rather enjoyed the research. Pearson, he reported, "is quite intoxicated by his study of the Loyalist settlement in Upper Canada" and that he "is as

---

24 Ralph Flenely to Charles Stacey, 26 January 1929, UTA, Charles Stacey Papers, B90-0020, Box 8, file Princeton, Correspondence, loan from mother

25 Pearson, *Mike, vol. I*, 51-52

26 John English, *Shadow of Heaven: The Life of Lester Pearson, vol. I: 1897-1948* (Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1989): 127

27 George Wrong to Frank Underhill, 21 March 1923, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 1, file G.M. Wrong 1907-1927. Emphasis mine.

happy as a lark digging up materials."[28] But Pearson's enthusiasm for the project proved short-lived. In his memoirs Charles Stacey remembered Pearson as an amiable fellow, not as "a massive scholar."[29] Indeed, John English argued, Pearson's sympathies lay with an older conception of history as moral instruction. "In the 1920s, however, this view of the role of history and the historian lost strength among younger academics who began to talk about the professionalization of the discipline and the need for specialization and archival research in scholarship."[30]

This "need for specialization and archival research" found concrete expression in more systematic graduate and undergraduate training.

II

"Prolonged specialized training in a body of abstract knowledge," according to W.J. Goode, constitutes a core characteristic of a profession.[31] Although every school offered an MA programme, only Toronto, McGill and Queen's offered a PhD programme.[32] At the University of Toronto George Wrong had supervised MA theses since 1893. Throughout the first two decades of this century, however, the MA programme "was little more than a BA plus an essay."[33] Indeed, that "essay" could be as short as twelve pages.[34] References, when provided, were not formalized. And

28 A.L. Burt to Dorrie Burt, 9 July 1926 and 25 July 1926, NA, A.L. Burt Papers, MG 30 D 103, vol. 1 file 1

29 C.P. Stacey, *A Date With History* (Ottawa: Deneau, 1982): 15

30 English, *Shadow of Heaven, vol. I*, 133

31 W.J. Goode, "Encroachment, Charlatanism and the Emerging Profession: Psychology, Sociology and Medicine," *American Sociological Review* 25 (1960): 903

32 See Norman Nicholson, "The Evolution of Graduate Studies in the Universities of Ontario, 1841-1971," (PhD, University of Toronto, 1975), chapter iv, "Prelude to the PhD" and chapter v, "Developing the Graduate Curriculum, 1895-1945."

33 William Duncan Meikle, "And Gladly Teach: G.M. Wrong and the Department of History at the University of Toronto," (PhD, Michigan State University, 1977): 184

34 Robert Bothwell, *Laying the Foundations: A Century of History at University of Toronto* (Toronto, 1991): 67

bibliographies were irregular. In other words, the *apparatus criticus* of modern scholarship was either absent or inconsistent. Although the University had established "the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy...for the purpose of encouraging research" in 1897,[35] the history department itself did not offer a PhD until 1915 and did not have any doctoral students until the early 1920s. The department was too small and too focused on undergraduate instruction.[36] But in the early 1920s the University as a whole began to take its graduate programme more seriously. In his 1922 Report to the President, the Chairman of the Board of Graduate Studies, J. Playfair McMurrich, noted that "the organization of graduate studies under the direction of the Board of Graduate Studies did not sufficiently emphasize the importance of these studies in the work of the University." As a result, "Graduate work seemed to be an addendum to the undergraduate work, rather than a logical sequence...."[37] In order to organize graduate studies more efficiently and in order to raise its status in the university, McMurrich recommended a School of Graduate Studies. Toronto indeed created a School of Graduate Studies in 1922.

It was in this context that the Department of History attempted to raise the status of its graduate program. In 1922 Wrong indicated that he wanted to increase the research component of the MA programme. For more convenient access to sources students ought to be pointed in the direction of local history. There "are good many subjects which could be treated here." Of course, any gaps could be filled in by a visit to Ottawa.[38] Still, it

35 UTA, University of Toronto Calendar, 1897

36 P.N. Ross, "The Origins and Development of the PhD at the University of Toronto, 1871-1932" (PhD, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972): 278

37 J. Playfair McMurrich, Report of the Chairman of the Board of Graduate Studies, UTA, University of Toronto President's Report, 1921-1922

38 George Wrong to Adam Shortt, 29 November 1922, QUA, Adam Shortt Papers, Box 6, file Correspondence July-Dec. 1922

was possible for a student never to step foot on the campus and still receive an MA. Working under Adam Shortt's supervision at the Public Archives, Arthur Lower did not physically attend the University. He simply deposited a thesis in 1923.[39] But in 1924 Toronto instituted a series of changes. First, there would be a mandatory course for MA students in Historical Method, Bibliography and the Development of English Historical Writing. Second, a distinction was made between MA by course and MA by thesis with requirements—including residency requirements—for each option clearly listed in the calendar. And third, students who undertook a Canadian topic were "expected to avail themselves of the facilities for research in the Dominion Archives at Ottawa."[40] Also in 1924, Wrong organized mandatory group work for all graduate students in the first two months of their programme. Under this scheme graduate students met with the various members of the department for about four hours of group discussion per week on subjects not necessarily related to their theses. "We find that they are apt to feel rather at loose ends here until they settle down into this environment, and henceforth we shall keep them pretty busy doing work for us...until they have settled into our conditions." In a second letter he re-iterated his plan and added that "We must also do more for them by way of social entertainment until they feel at home."[41] To what extent Wrong realized his intentions is not known; nonetheless, his letters indicate a growing awareness of, and interest in, Toronto's graduate programme in the early 1920s. By 1928 all MA students required a language skill—either

39 Lower, *My First Seventy-five Years*, 130

40 UTA, University of Toronto Calendar, 1924-1925

41 George Wrong to Frank Underhill, 17 March 1924; George Wrong to Frank Underhill, 23 April 1924, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 1, file G.M. Wrong, 1907-1927

French or German—while those MA students presenting a thesis had to take both a written and an oral exam.

Toronto's PhD programme experienced similar changes. Since its creation in 1915 PhD candidates had been required to take one major subject and two minor subjects in addition to demonstrating "an adequate knowledge of French and German." The thesis, moreover, had to be "of such a character as to constitute an addition to the literature."[42] Yet there were very few doctoral students: in 1919 there was one; in 1920 there were none; in 1921 there were two. President Falconer could "not understand how it has arisen that it has not been the custom of the department of History in the University of Toronto to grant a degree of Doctor of Philosphy."[43] For his part, Wrong was skeptical of the degree. Speaking of Innis' history of the CPR, he observed: "It is a sound piece of research but it is almost formless in respect to literary quality and the text is so overburdened by footnotes to an absurd extent. And this excess of method is what the American School of History glories in."[44] Despite his misgivings, Wrong attempted to make the PhD programme more systematic in 1924 by making the course in historical methods mandatory for doctoral candidates. In 1925 two candidates completed their PhDs: W.N. Sage and W.B.

---

42 UTA, University of Toronto Calendar, 1915-1916

43 President Falconer to A.B. Corey, 6 February 1924, UTA, University Historian Collection, A83-0036, Box 6, file Department of History

44 George Wrong to President Falconer, 19 May 1923, Ibid. In his 1927 Presidential Address to the Canadian Historical Association, Wrong complained about the "dull chronicle" and the "mere record of a succession of facts" in historical writing. See George M. Wrong, "The Historian's Problem," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1927): 6.

Similarly, in his review of Innis monumental work on the fur trade, George Wilson noted that "it would not injure the fur trade in any way if the facts of its history were presented with somewhat more ease and grace." Indeed, Wilson continued, "The present work savours too much of a PhD thesis." Although he too had a PhD, Wilson continuously worried that history had become too technical at the expense of its essentially philosophical nature. See George Wilson, *Dalhousie Review* 10 (1930-1931): 575; and "Why Teach History?" *Queen's Quarterly* 40, 3 (August 1933): 406-413.

Kerr. A few years later, in 1928, the calendar outlined the department's increased expectations for the thesis: "The thesis must be a work of original research. It must be worthy of publication." The calendar stated that doctoral students "must be in attendance save when engaged in research in the Archives at Ottawa or elsewhere for the purpose of the thesis."[45]

McGill too offered a graduate programme. Although the University had conferred many MAs and the occasional PhD since the turn of the century, its graduate work was clearly subordinate to its undergraduate work. But as active research became more and more important to a university's mandate in the early decades of this century McGill created a Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in 1922.[46] True, the Department of History had admitted MA candidates since 1910 but the standards were low and the results uneven. When Basil Williams arrived in 1921 he intended to improve McGill's graduate programme. After surveying the lay of the land at McGill, Queen's, Toronto and the Public Archives Williams submitted a detailed report. Among other things, he drew the Principal's attention to the quite inadequate provision for graduate students. As it is, the staff is already spread too thin by its responsibilities to undergraduate students. Ideally, the department would offer a distinct graduate programme.[47] When W.T. Waugh joined the department in 1922 as its third member, Williams implemented a distinct MA programme. In addition to graduate-level courses in British and European history, it included a mandatory

45 UTA, University of Toronto Calendar, 1928-1929. J.J. Talman, who completed his PhD in 1930, recounted his experiences in Toronto's graduate programme in a lengthy letter to Robin S. Harris. See J.J. Talman to Robin S. Harris, J.J. Talman Regional Collection, University of Western Ontario (JJTRC-UWO), J.J. Talman Papers, Box 11, file 19

46 See Stanley Brice Frost, *McGill University: for the advancement of learning, vol. II: 1895-1971* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1984): 80-82, 177-181.

47 Basil Williams, Report on History Department of McGill University, 31 December 1921, MUA, RG 2, Box 61, file Department of History, 1920-1925

course in Historical Method and Criticism. Two years later the calendar listed a graduate course in Canadian history, 1840-1867. Williams stressed the direct relationship between the department's graduate programme and its reputation. "On [graduate students] and on the work they produce will largely depend the reputation of McGill for original work in History, & they must, if they are to do their best, be allowed almost individual choice of subjects."[48] To this end, Williams and Waugh failed an MA thesis in 1923 because it did not meet the standards set by the "best of the American universities." According to Waugh, the thesis failed "to show a grasp of the elementary principles of historical criticism." Asked to review the thesis, Charles Colby agreed: it "would not be accepted at Harvard, Yale or Princeton."[49] In 1934 McGill started a PhD programme. It was a three-year programme, although in practice it took four years to complete.[50] The first year involved course work, including the methodology course. Doctoral candidates, moreover, had to demonstrate proficiency in two foreign languages. The remainder of the programme, of course, involved thesis research and preparation. According to the calendar, the thesis "must represent a genuine contribution to historical scholarship."[51]

Technically speaking, Queen's University first initiated its doctoral programme in 1889 when "the Senate established in the humanities and sciences formal courses leading to the PhD in humanities and the DSc in

48 Basil Williams to Principal Arthur Currie, 10 March 1924, Ibid, file History: Prof. Basil Williams

49 Frank D. Adams to Charles Colby, 21 May 1923; W.T. Waugh to Dean of the Faculty of the Graduate School, n.d.; Charles Colby, "Memorandum Re: Thesis on the Imperial Federation Movement with Special Reference to Canada," 24 May 1923, Stanstead Historical Society Archives, Fonds Colby, C.W. Colby, Series 2, Subseries A, Box 3, file 4.

50 See E.R. Adair, "The Study of History at McGill University," *Culture* 2, 1 (mars 1941).

51 MUA, McGill University Calendar, 1934-1935

the sciences."[52] In practice, however, a Queen's doctorate was extremely rare. Meanwhile, its MA degree was not a research degree. According to Frederick Gibson, it would not be until 1917 that the University transformed its MA "into a true graduate degree instead of a recognition of high standing in an honours course." Indeed, "a greater emphasis on graduate studies was an essential element in the concept of a research-oriented university advanced by [political economist] O.D. Skelton and [physicist] Arthur Clark at the end of World War I." Still, the PhD remained rare. Throughout the interwar years, "Queen's honours graduates seeking to prepare for the doctorate were encouraged to go elsewhere."[53] In the interwar years, very few outside doctoral students were admitted. Exceptions were made for students who wanted to work with a particular professor. Indeed, the department of history had only two doctoral candidates in the interwar years; one failed to complete her thesis following her marriage, the other graduated in 1931.[54] In addition to its graduate programme, Queen's also introduced a special course in historical research. Initiated by J.L. Morison in 1922, and held at the Public Archives in Ottawa, the Summer School of Historical Research in Canadian History became an annual event. Open to students from any university who either intended to pursue post-graduate studies or who were already engaged in post-graduate studies, the five-week course emphasized instruction in the use of manuscript sources. Read one advertising brochure, the course "will be conducted in daily seminars, attention being given to the problem of

52 Hilda Neatby, *Queen's University, vol. I: 1841-1971* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1978): 185

53 Frederick W. Gibson, *Queen's University, vol. II: 1917-1961* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1983): 318

54 Reginald Trotter to Edith Ware, 26 April 1933, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 1, file 6

historical method and to the bibliography of Canadian history for the period studied." Students will also be expected to present reports "on special topics based upon intensive use of the first-hand materials in the Canadian Archives."[55]

Although most historians teaching in the university did not have a PhD, it became more and more common throughout the 1920s and 1930s. W.N. Sage took a purely pragmatic approach to the degree. Already teaching at UBC, he decided that since he would be "working at B.C. history anyway" he "might as well get some academic credit" for it. "This is rather a utilitarian way of looking at it," he told W.L. Grant, "but the Canadian West is not exempt from the American worship of the PhD." Besides, he continued, the UBC department is in an "unsettled condition" right now; it is very important, therefore, to secure "this PhD degree in as short a time as possible."[56] In the mid-1920s Arthur Lower decided that he wanted to be a professor of history. Knowing that a Toronto MA would not qualify him, he looked south: "...I thought if I could get leave [from the Archives] for a term, I might go to some great American university and begin my training for a PhD."[57] It was at Harvard that he finally became a historian. Although he called it a "knowledge factory," Lower admitted that it trained him in the discipline of history. "Knowledge factory or not, Harvard turned me decisively away from amateurism. If one were to stay in its graduate school, one had to become a professional."[58] For his part, Gerald

55 "Queen's University Summer School of Historical Research," 1929, Ibid, Box 26, file Summer School of Historical Research, 1922-1933. The Summer School continued to 1939 when it was terminated owing to the War.

56 Sage did not think much of a Toronto PhD, however. As he explained to Grant, "my dream is to get an English doctorate, preferably from London, but in the meantime I should be glad to obtain a Toronto PhD." W.N. Sage to W.L. Grant, 16 October 1921, NA, W.L. Grant Papers, MG 30 D 59, vol. 9, file Sa-Si.

57 Lower, *My First Seventy-five years*, 131

58 Ibid, 158. Arthur Lower, "ONCE THEY WERE ALIVE, Our Betters—My Instructors, George Wrong," QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 42, B 977

Graham went from Queen's to Harvard in 1926. There he was overwhelmed by "the American system of post-graduate education—which means grinding hard work, as part of the constant policy— 'Thorough'."[59] At one point he referred to America's festishization of the PhD. Nevertheless, he correctly read the writing on the wall: fetishized or not, the PhD was fast becoming the minimum requirement for historians.[60] Because of his interest in British history, and with a Parkin Travelling Fellowship, Graham left Harvard for Cambridge in 1927. But he did enrol in a doctoral programme. As W.L. Grant stated, "I quite agree that you are right in bowing the knee to Baal, and in doing research work for your PhD rather than BA work."[61] When in 1929 C.P. Stacey decided that he wanted to be a historian, he decided at the same time to do a doctorate at Princeton: "...it occurred to me that if, in addition to my Toronto and Oxford experience, I acquired a Doctor of Philosophy degree in history from a good American graduate school my qualifications would be so impressive that job offers could not fail to flow in upon me."[62]

In a 1926 article Toronto's W.S. Wallace accepted the reality of post-graduate studies but, at the same time, urged students to remember history's roots in literature. Entitled "Some Vices of Clio," he reported that while the PhD was not the *sine qua non* for academic appointments, "there appears to be almost everywhere a tendency to regard this degree as a *desideratum*, and in many [North American] universities to regard it frankly as an

59 Gerald Graham to W.L. Grant, 12 October 1926, NA, W.L. Grant Papers, MG 30 D 59, vol. 11, file Correspondence Parkin Travelling Scholarship, 1924-1929

60 Gerald Graham, Report of Progress at Harvard, n.d., c. April 1927, copy in Ibid

61 W.L. Grant to Gerald Graham, 5 May 1927, Ibid. See also Paul T. Phillips, *Britain's Past in Canada: The Teaching and Writing of British History* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1989), chapter 6, "An Interview with Gerald S. Graham."

62 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 39-40. Toronto's Ralph Flenley advised him to pick a large topic. "So many of the PhD subjects are too microscopic," he said. Ralph Flenley to C.P. Stacey, 26 January 1929, UTA, Charles Stacey Papers, B90-0020, Box 8, file Princeton, Correspondence, loan from mother

essential...." This is not necessarily bad. After all, the PhD does represent two or three years of solid primary research. "That this is a gain, no one who is conversant with the work of historians of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and even nineteenth centuries can deny." Still, something has been lost. There is not one PhD thesis that even approximates "a 'great book'," Wallace observed. Furthermore, the topics themselves are tragic in their narrowness. Looking at the list of dissertations published by the Carnegie Institute, "one is filled with a sense of futility, the unreality, the misdirection of much in higher education in America today."

> That a student should spend two or three years in the heyday of life exploring the history of 'Higher Education for Women in Missouri' or even 'The Status of the American College Professor in the Nineteenth Century'...can only be described as a tragedy.

Recognizing the importance of post-graduate studies, Wallace also reminded students of their obligation to the art of history. If the PhD had become a reality, it should not mean the end of readable, literary history.[63]

In this brief article, Wallace articulated the abiding contradiction of professional historians: the need for specialization vs. the need for generalization. Although clearly uncomfortable with the direction history was moving in the 1920s, Wallace was powerless to stop it. In 1928 he urged President Falconer against appointing someone "simply because he knows how to read medieval charters."

---

63 W.S. Wallace, "Some Vices of Clio," *Canadian Historical Review* 7, 2 (June 1926): 197-203. Chester Martin agreed. Although he welcomed graduate work, he also wanted history to be alive. "The task of Canadian history...can never be completed by the technique of 'graduate schools'. Professional research may discover the truth, and inspire the teacher, and illumine the textbook. But it requires a coal off the altar to make Canadian history live for the Canadian people. Trevelyan in a moment of exasperation at the mechanics of research once claimed that Sir Walter Scott had done more for British history than all the professional historians." Chester Martin, "Fifty Years of Canadian History," in *Royal Society of Canada: Fifty Years Retrospect* (Ottawa, 1932): 69. See also Charles W. Colby, "The Craftsmanship of the Historian," in Jean Jules Jusserand et al., *The Writing of History* (New York: Charles Scribner's, 1926).

> I see, from the standpoint of the library, so much of what appears to me undue specialization whithin the departments of the University, that I should be sorry to see the history department, which has always stood out against undue specialization, afflicted with the same disease.

But, by his own admission, he tended to be old fashioned: "I, like Professor Wrong, belong to an era in which a professor of history 'professed' all periods, and perhaps my views are antiquated."[64]

In any event, graduate school also served another function. Not only did it train students in historiography and research methods (Wallace's complaint notwithstanding), it also served as a part of the socialization process. W.J. Goode observed that, "The student professional goes through a more far-reaching adult socialization experience than the learner in other occupations."[65] In other words, graduate school—then and now—instills in students proper professional behaviour. Burton Bledstein went even further: graduate school "indoctrinated the select participants" in the culture of professionalism.[66] Unfortunately, it is difficult to recount the graduate school experience. Although mentoring relationships between professors and students certainly existed, they are difficult to locate. The supervisor-student relationship, after all, was—and still is—an informal one. However, surviving in the personal papers of Reginald Trotter is a continuous correspondence with his doctoral student, John P. Pritchett.[67]

When teaching at Stanford University in the early 1920s, Trotter first met Pritchett who was then an undergraduate. There Trotter turned Pritchett's attention northwards to Canadian history and to the possibility

---

64 W.S. Wallace to President Falconer, 15 August 1928, UTA, University Historian Collection, A83-0036, Box 6, file Department of History

65 Goode, "Encroachment, Charlatanism and the Emerging Profession," 903

66 Burton Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1976): 94

67 See QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 23, file Correspondence, Pritchett, J.P. (i); file Correspondence, Pritchett, J.P. (ii); and file Correspondence, Pritchett, J.P. (iii).

of a career in history. When Trotter went to Queen's University, Pritchett followed a few years later in 1926 and began work on a PhD. Here Trotter took him under his wing: he got him funding; he arranged part-time teaching contracts; he put him in touch with experts in his field; he gave him teaching and research tips; and, of course, he wrote endless letters of recommendation. When Pritchett graduated in 1931, their relationship did not end. Indeed, Trotter continued to play an avuncular role. When Pritchett solicited his counsel, he gladly provided it. When Pritchett needed employment, Trotter always managed to secure him a summer-session course. When James Shotwell was planning the Canada-America relations series in 1934, Trotter submitted Pritchett's name. In 1935 Trotter ensured that Pritchett would have a spot on the programme of the 1936 annual meeting of the CHA. After securing a Social Science Research Council grant in the spring of 1937 Pritchett sent Trotter one of his many thank-you notes. But in this one he added a more personal comment. "Please do not think me maudlin, when I say I admire you above all my friends. You are so unselfish and so fine. You are my ideal of a gentleman. If at any time I can do anything for you I want you [to] know that I am 'at your service'."[68] Trotter responded in kind. "It has always been a great interest to me to watch your academic progress and a joy to see you stepping on from one goal to another," he said, "and I am proud to have been a companion along part of the way."[69] Indeed, Trotter's careful nurturing of Pritchett continued into the 1940s. When Pritchett wrote what George Brown considered an ill-considered and misguided review of a book by George Wrong, he informed Trotter that he might want to have a

68 John Pritchett to Reginald Trotter, 2 April 1937, Ibid, file Correspondence, Pritchett, J.P. (iii)

69 Reginald Trotter to John Pritchett, 5 April 1937, Ibid

word with his protégé.[70] Trotter agreed. Pritchett, he said, "is too good a man to be allowed to weaken his own position by taking on such superior airs about the work of better men."[71] A few weeks later, over the course of dinner in New York City where Pritchett was teaching at Queen's College, Trotter disciplined his former student, offering him some "pretty frank" advice. In the long run, he told Brown, I hope that it will not be "without effect."[72]

Meanwhile, the emphasis on technique in graduate school found its way into the undergraduate curriculum. In 1922, for example, Mack Eastman noted that UBC had already graduated several students in Honour History without having been able to offer an honours seminar in historical method. It is essential, he said, to add a seminar "that would teach Honour students how to do intensive and accurate work in one or more fields...[that would] involve a study of Bibliography, Research methods, etc."[73] However, it would not be until 1927 that Historical Method and The Writing of History were listed as two out of five possibilities for the seminar that year.[74] In 1931, a third year methods course was made a permanent listing. As D.C. Harvey explained,

> The third year seminar for honours students is an examinations [sic] of historical standards and methods and training in the technique of historical writing.

---

70 George Brown to Reginald Trotter, 5 April 1941, Ibid, Box 24, file CHR 1934-1950. In the offending review Pritchett had stated that Wrong lacked objectivity for relying on the persistent premise of superior "races, classes, political devices, religious creeds [and] economic tendencies." See John Pritchett, *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 27, 4 (March 1941): 663-664.

71 Reginald Trotter to George Brown, 10 April 1941, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 24, file CHR 1934-1950

72 Reginald Trotter to George Brown, 30 April 1941, Ibid

73 Samuel Mack Eastman to President Klinck, 7 October 1922, University of British Columbia Archives (UBCA), President's Office Collection, Microfilm Roll 323

74 UBCA, University of British Columbia Calendar, 1927-1928

> The fourth year seminar affords practice in applying these methods on some subject in which source material is amply available.[75]

Beginning in 1931 the Manitoba calendar advised students taking Canadian Constitutional History that they "will be expected to be familiar with the documentary base of this period;" i.e., the original sources.[76] In 1933, the calendar stated that both Topics in Canadian History and The French Revolution would also serve "as an introduction to methods of research."[77] In his annual report, Noel Fieldhouse explained. "The Department believes that only by the use of some such method (whereby the student is given some training in using reliable sources of information for himself, in weighing contradictory evidence and opinions, and in discriminating between relevant and irrelevant material) can the teaching of History have any educative value."[78] In the mid-1930s, Queen's University listed a reading course in History and Historiography which included readings in nineteenth-century historiography, historical methods and sources.[79]

Even if a particular department did not offer a course in historical methods, the method of history was nevertheless stressed. In his 1895 inaugural lecture George Wrong encouraged the use of primary documents

---

75 D.C. Harvey, "The Department of History. University of British Columbia," 22 July 1931, UBCA, W.N. Sage Collection, Box 4-21

76 University of Manitoba Archives (UMA), University of Manitoba Calendar, 1931-1932. When he was at the University of Manitoba, Chester Martin pleaded for an expanded departmental library for teaching purposes. "It cannot be too strongly emphasized," he argued, "...that the subject of history is pursuing precisely the methods employed by scientific departments in their lectures and laboratory work—with books for our apparatus and reagents, with written instead of visual evidence for the basis of reasoning, and with the existence of observation and judgment as the chief requisite for sound work. On a subject like history—unlike a subject in which theory or purely literary taste predominates—a reliance upon lectures alone would be to put a premium upon credulity and to stultify sound historical methods at the very outset." See Chester Martin, "Memorandum on Departmental Libraries," n.d., c. 1920s, copy in Public Archives of Nova Scotia (PANS), D.C. Harvey Papers, MG 1, vol. 441, folder 101

77 UMA, University of Manitoba Calendar, 1933-1934

78 UMA, Annual Reports, Department of History, 1933-1934

79 QUA, Queen's University Calendar, 1935-1936

in the teaching of history.[80] The calendar told students in the Honour Course of Modern History that, if they hoped "to secure first class honours," their major essay "must be based on the study of original materials."[81] For his part, Underhill thought this insufficient. When at the University of Saskatchewan, he too had stressed the use of primary documents. "In my own classes the Documents are made the basis of all the work," he told the President. "In any University history class nowadays stress is always put on the reading of original documents just as Science class stresses laboratory work."[82] In his critique of the Toronto curriculum, Underhill charged that secondary books are used from beginning to end, that "there was only occasional use of original materials, and knowledge was acquired throughout in predigested doses. 'A polite veneer of ideas' was the inevitable result."[83] By 1938 the calendar stated that, in the fourth year, history will be studied "in part from the original sources" and that, in addition to understanding "the forces which lie behind the world today," students will have "some knowledge of the materials on which historical study is based."[84] J.M.S. Carless remembered Chester Martin from the late 1930s as "a deeply imbued scholar" who could get his seminar students very excited by what could be done "with the raw materials of history," with the primary documents.[85]

---

80 See George Wrong, *Historical Study in the University: An Inaugural Lecture* (Toronto: The Bryant Press, 1895).

81 UTA, University of Toronto Calendar, 1919-1920

82 Frank Underhill to Walter Murray, 4 January 1926, NA, Frank Underhill Collection, MG 30 D 204, vol. 1, file W.C. Murray 1907-1927

83 n.t., 2 November 1929, NA, Donald Creighton Papers, MG 30 D 77, vol. 24, file History Dept. 1928-1938

84 "The Course in Modern History," UTA, A70-0025, Box 9, file 85. The document is dated 5 December 1938.

85 Interview with J.M.S. Careless, 13 July 1983, UTA, B86-0038, Tape I

Other departments emphasized the use of primary documents as well. McGill's honour courses were taught as seminars wherein students were expected "to submit a really substantial piece of work based wholly on original material." While E.R. Adair conceded that this "may not always be profound historical research," he quickly added that, "it introduces the students to the technique and the trials of the historical writer by giving them a chance to use their critical and literary capacity in performing, though on a minor scale, the same sort of labour as that which [the historian] is faced."[86] The University of Alberta's Morden Long began teaching a Canadian history seminar in 1932: according to the calendar, it was to be "a course based on original sources."[87] Chester New told the McMaster Chancellor that beginning in 1938, he intended "to do something in historical method and criticism in a very informal way" for those students intending to go on to graduate school.[88] Although he never got the chance to introduce his plans to Mount Allison's history curriculum, George Stanley likewise stressed training in the use of primary documents. He wanted to establish a fellowship which would allow a senior undergraduate to do some original research at the Public Archives of Nova Scotia or the New Brunswick Museum "in the history of the seaboard provinces." "I think you will agree with me," he told John Clarence Webster, "when I say that the real interest in the study of history comes in handling documents or contemporary source materials....And that is why I want to encourage suitable students to delve into at least the topsoil of

86 Adair, "The Study of History at McGill," 56-57

87 University of Alberta Archives (UAA), University of Alberta Calendar, 1932-1933

88 Canadian Baptist Archives, McMaster University (CBA-MU), Box: McMaster University Annual Reports, 1934-1938, file Reports to Chancellor, 1937-1938

historical research."[89] Hired at UNB in 1938, Alfred Bailey instituted a half-year methodology course: History of historical writing, historical method and the philosophy of history.[90] A few years later, in 1941, he offered two half-year courses: Historiography and Philosophy of History. The latter course was dedicated entirely to Arnold Toynbee's *Study of History*. According to Bailey, his course on Toynbee was the first such course in the world.[91] In 1945, Bailey combined the two half-year courses into a single full-year course in the Philosophy of History and expanded the reading list to include Vico, Hegel, Comte and Spengler as well as Toynbee, but not Marx.

Graduate programmes at Toronto, McGill and Queen's, the Summer School for Historical Research and undergraduate instruction in historical methodology and historiography indicate a heightened self-consciousness among historians, a sense that their discipline was unique, that it had its own rules and methodologies and that it was neither political science nor English literature. It was also in the interwar years that two other important institutions first emerged, the *Canadian Historical Review* and the Canadian Historical Association.

III

When he returned from the War, W.S. Wallace "proposed to Professor Wrong the transformation of the *Review of Historical Publications* into a quarterly."

---

89 George Stanley to John Clarence Webster, 23 January 1944, New Brunswick Museum Archives (NBMA), John Clarence Webster Collection, F302

90 University of New Brunswick Archives (UNBA), University of New Brunswick Calendar, 1939-1940

91 A.G. Bailey, "Origins of the Study of History in UNB," (1972), UNBA, Alfred G. Bailey Collection, MS4.7.1.10

> My reasons for this were twofold: in the first place the number of publications relating to Canada had increased to such an extent that it was difficult to review them adequately in an annual volume; and in the second place I was convinced that the time had come when students of Canadian history would be glad to have a vehicle for the publication of their researches.[92]

With financial support from the University, the *CHR* first appeared in March 1920. Twenty-five years ago, the editors stated in the inaugural issue, historical research in Canada was in its "infancy." Since then research has become more "vigorous." There "is now a large body of historical students, not only in Canada, but also in England and in the United States, engaged in sifting the vast masses of new material relating to Canadian history which recent years have brought to light." And yet, "there is almost no medium in Canada through which the occasional work of these historical students may be given to the public." To this end, the *Canadian Historical Review* will serve "as a medium for the publication of original articles on Canadian history and allied subjects, of important documents and of correspondence relating to questions of interest to students of Canadian history."[93]

In terms of the disciplinization of history, the *CHR* performed an incalculable function. By its appearance it, in turn, confirmed the existence of a body of knowledge, in this case Canadian history. As a national journal published out of the country's leading university, it conferred prestige on its contributors. Within the historical profession itself, the *Review* shrunk distances and eased isolation. A historian at Dalhousie could read the work of a historian at UBC and discuss it with a

---

92 W.S. Wallace, "The Establishment of the *Canadian Historical Review*," *Canadian Historical Review* 26, 1 (March 1945): 101

93 Notes and Comments, *Canadian Historical Review* 1, 1 (March 1920): 1-2. For a history of the *CHR* see Marlene Shore, "Remember the Future: The *Canadian Historical Review* and the Discipline of History, 1920-95," *Canadian Historical Review*, 76, 3 (September 1995): 410-463

colleague at Toronto. In this sense it not only communicated scholarly information, it acted as a medium through which historians communicated with other historians.[94] Reading the *Review* allowed historians to imagine themselves united with other historians in a great project—the writing of their country's history. As Arthur Lower remarked, the *CHR* provided "a focus for Canadian historical studies and Canadian historians, giving them a sense of unity and an *esprit de corps* long before other disciplines."[95]

Like the *Canadian Historical Review*, the Canadian Historical Association performed an integrative function. Its forerunner, the Historic Landmarks Association, had exhausted its purpose. From its creation in 1907, it gathered information about Canadian landmarks and provided an arena for men and women to share their interest in Canada's built and natural heritage. However, the creation of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board and the Quebec Historic Monuments Commission rendered the activities of the HLA suddenly redundant. When Lawrence Burpee assumed the presidency of the HLA in 1920, he made his goal the transformation of the association. Its mandate, he said, ought to be broadened, its constitution amended and its name changed. Taking his cue from the American Historical Association, Burpee intended to create a national historical association for students of all history.[96] In 1922 he presented the Historic Landmarks Association with a draft constitution for a new association to be called the Canadian Historical Association.

---

94 Thomas Haskell, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977): 19

95 Lower, *My First Seventy-five Years*, 49

96 As he explained, the CHA "will continue the activities of the Landmarks Association, and also attempt to cover for Canada somewhat the same field as the American Historical Association does in the United States." Lawrence Burpee to Col. Dennis, 27 July 1922, McGill University, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections (MURBSC), Lighthall Papers, Box 5, file 2. See also Lawrence Burpee, "Presidential Address," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1923): 9

Deliberately concise,[97] the constitution spelled out the objectives of the CHA: "to encourage research and public interest in history; to promote the preservation of historic sites and buildings, documents, relics and other significant heirlooms of the past; [and] to publish historical studies and documents as circumstances may permit."[98] Whereas the HLA had focused its efforts solely on landmarks, the CHA would focus on research and dissemination in addition to preservation. After the HLA provisionally adopted the new constitution, W.D. Lighthall moved that Lawrence Burpee be elected the President of the Canadian Historical Association.[99] As Chester Martin once remarked, it was largely through Burpee's "persistent efforts" that the CHA was founded at all.[100]

A career civil servant, Burpee did not have advanced training in history nor did he teach in a university. Born in Halifax in 1873, he joined the federal civil service in 1890; he worked as private secretary to several cabinet ministers; he served as the Head Librarian of the Ottawa Public Library from 1905 to 1911; and, from 1912, he was the Canadian Secretary of the International Joint Commission. In this sense, he seems an unlikely founder of the CHA. But Burpee also had an abiding interest in history and a modern conception of history. In 1908 he had published an article in *The University Magazine* outlining the modern approach to history. It is no longer possible, he said, "for the historian to build his structure with secondary material." Instead, "he must build his work upon the sure

97 In a circular letter to members of the HLA, Marius Barbeau, the CHA's first Secretary-Treasurer, enclosed a copy of the draft constitution. "It has been made as short as possible, the principal consideration being to express clearly and concisely the objects of the Association." Marius Barbeau, December 1922, copy in MURBSC, Lighthall Papers, Box 5, file 2

98 "Constitution," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1922): 20-21

99 "Minutes of the Annual Meeting," Ibid, 18

100 Martin, "Fifty Years of Canadian History," 67

foundation of original sources; and he must leave his foundation exposed so that all who go by may test the character of his material and the faithful use he made of it." He therefore called for greater co-operation from individuals, societies, colleges and institutions in the preservation of manuscript material.[101] When Lighthall nominated him for the presidency he had already published three books and a handful of articles.[102] Besides, he did not see the CHA as a narrow professional association. Its membership was open to anyone interested in history; the first Executive and Council constituted a mix of academics, archivists and non-academics;[103] and its first standing committee dedicated itself to landmark preservation. Indeed, Burpee envisioned the CHA as in part a patriotic association. As he explained in his first presidential address, "Not the least important object of the Association would be to associate itself with other patriotic agencies in bringing into more perfect harmony the two great races that constitute the Canadian people."[104] At least one professional historian complained. Writing to his wife in July 1923,

---

101 Lawrence J. Burpee, "Co-operation in Historical Research," *The University Magazine* 7, 3 (October 1908): 360. Further testimony to Burpee's modern conception of history is a remark he made in the *CHR*. Disagreeing with another author's interpretation, he stated that two men, "studying the same documents from somewhat different angles, can arrive at surprisingly different conclusions." Lawrence J. Burpee, "Professor Morton and La Vérendrye," *Canadian Historical Review* 10, 1 (March 1929): 55.

102 See Lawrence J. Burpee, *Pathfinders of the Great Plains: A Chronicle of La Vérendrye and his Sons* (Toronto: Glasgow, Brook and Co., 1915); *Sandford Fleming: Empire Builder* (London: Oxford University Press, 1915); *The Search for the Western Sea: The Story of the Exploration of North-Western America*, 2 vols. (Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1935; originally published 1907).

103 The following is a list of the first Executive: Lawrence Burpee, President; W.D. Lighthall, Vice-President; C. Marius Barbeau, Secretary-Treasurer; J.F. Kenney, Editor of Annual Report. The first Council, 1922-1925, consisted of: Arthur Doughty, Pierre-Georges Roy, George Wrong, Chester Martin, Archibald MacMechan and F.W. Howay. Burpee, Lighthall and Howay were non-academics. Wrong, Martin and MacMechan were academics. Kenney, Doughty and Roy were archivists. Barbeau worked at the Victoria Museum in Ottawa.

104 Lawrence Burpee, "Presidential Address," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1922): 8

Alberta's A.L. Burt lamented the absence of an association for scholarly exchange in Canadian history. "There are a number of local societies organized for local antiquarian research, but nothing can be hoped for from them." The CHA, be believed, promised little more. "It will never be a real Canadian Historical Association, for it has been started on the wrong lines and the best students of Canadian history are not taking it seriously. Indeed, it threatens to prevent the formation of a real Canadian Historical Association, which would be a clearing house for ideas on the study of Canadian history."[105]

Burt's concern proved premature. Throughout the 1920s the CHA became the principal home for professional historians in English Canada. Each year, the CHA sent a delegate to the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association. In 1922 Arthur Doughty represented the CHA at the International Congress on the History of America in Rio de Janeiro. In 1923 Burpee reported that the CHA had been represented at the Congress of Historical Sciences in Brussels; five years later, the CHA joined the International Committee of Historical Sciences.[106] In 1924 the Executive was expanded to include a French Editor of the Annual Report. First suggested in 1923 by Burpee but revived in 1925 by George Wrong, the CHA negotiated a subscription to the *Canadian Historical Review* and the *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques* for its members.[107] In 1925 the CHA

105 Alfred Burt to Dorrie Burt, 15 July 1923, NA, A.L. Burt Papers, MG 30 D 103, vol. 1, file 1

106 See D. Mack Eastman, "Report of the Assembly of the International Committee of Historical Sciences," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1929): 17-19; Reginald Trotter, "Report of the Assembly of the International Committee of Historical Sciences," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1930): 13-15

107 Burpee took the idea from the relationship between the American Historical Association and the *American Historical Review*. Lawrence Burpee, "Presidential Address," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1923): 12; "Minutes of the Annual Meeting at Montreal, May 21-23, 1925," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1925): 16

voted to make the President an annual appointment. However, the "burden of organization" would belong largely to the newly created Chairman of the Management Committee, in this case, Burpee.[108] In 1926 Council was expanded from six to nine members in an effort to guarantee better regional representation. Moreover, the makeup of the Council changed in the 1920s. Seven out of nine were either academics or archivists in 1926. Council now included Duncan McArthur from Queen's University, Chester Martin from the University of Manitoba, Frank Underhill from the University of Saskatchewan, Leon Harvey from the University of New Brunswick and A.L. Burt.

Although Council included more academics than non-academics by the mid-twenties, the CHA continued to appoint non-academics to the Presidency into the early thirties.[109] Unfortunately, very few CHA records have survived from this period; nonetheless, it is not unreasonable to assume that the CHA looked to prominent citizens as an opportunity to enhance its status. Sir Robert Borden, for example, served as Vice-President in 1929 and as President in 1930. Prime Minister of Canada from 1911 to 1920, Borden enjoyed a reputation as Canada's "senior statesman" following his retirement from politics.[110] A self-titled "man of affairs," Borden busied himself with business and academic interests until his death in 1937. In 1921 he delivered the Marfleet Foundation Lectures at the

108 "Minutes of the Annual Meeting at Montreal, May 21-23, 1925," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1925): 17

109 The Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux (1929-1930) was a law professor at Laval, federal cabinet minister and senator. Sir Robert Borden (1930-1931) was Prime Minister of Canada from 1911 to 1920. Judge F.W. Howay (1931-1932) was a British Columbia judge and leading historian of British Columbia history. J.C. Webster (1932-1933) was a medical doctor and historical activist in New Brunswick; he founded, for example, the New Brunswick Museum. From 1933 onwards, the President of the CHA was either an academic or an archivist.

110 Robert Craig Brown, *Robert Laird Borden: a biography*, vol. II (Toronto: Macmillan, 1980): 186

University of Toronto on matters constitutional and in 1927 he gave the Rhodes memorial Lectures at Oxford also on matters constitutional. Having "earned something of a reputation as a scholar," he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1928.[111] Indeed, it was not uncommon for Borden to act as the president of voluntary associations; he was the first President of the League of Nations Society and he was Chairman of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. However, Borden was very much a hands-off leader. He disliked the administrative duties. As historian Craig Brown noted, Borden "advised the organizers of the CIIA not to look to him, as chairman, for active promotion of the group."[112] Likewise, when asked in 1932 to sit on the general committee for the Carnegie Endowment's Canada-America relations series. Borden agreed on the condition that his duties would be kept to an absolute minimum. Because documents pertaining to the Canadian Historical Association do not appear in his personal papers it would seem that Borden did precious little as either vice-president or president. For example, in his diary entry following the first day of the 1931 annual meeting Borden referred to the CHA as the Canadian Historical Society. Moreover, his presidential address on patronage and the civil service was not an academic presentation. By his own admission, it was not a presidential address but "rather a summary enlivened by anecdotes & c."[113] However, he was useful to the CHA as a figurehead, a prominent Canadian whose presence conferred authority and legitimacy.

---

111 Ibid, 203

112 Ibid, 202

113 Robert Laird Borden, Personal Diary, 26 May 1931, NA, Robert Laird Borden Papers, Personal Diary, microfilm no. c-1866

Similarly, the early CHA did not abandon its interest in heritage, landmarks and commemoration.[114] But there was an important difference between the CHA's interest in commemoration and the HLA's interest. For the CHA commemoration represented an exercise in self-promotion at the same time as it represented an exercise in patriotism. After all, there was no guarantee that the CHA would survive. In a 1923 letter to Lighthall, Burpee emphasized the importance of the up-coming annual meeting. "By the way I hope you will do what you can to bring as many Montreal members of the Canadian Historical Association to this year's meeting as possible. Our future success may depend to quite a large extent on the success or otherwise of our meeting this year. We are hoping you have an interesting programme."[115] A year later, Burpee visited every province except Prince Edward Island in order "to discover ways and means of increasing the usefulness of the Association, as well as to build up its membership."[116] Again, CHA records from this period are incomplete; but the documentation surviving from one project—the erection of a monument to the explorer David Thompson—shows the Association using the monument as an opportunity to promote itself.

---

114 The CHA continued to print reports from the Historic Sites and Monuments Board in its *Annual Report* well into the 1950s.

115 Lawrence Burpee to W.D. Lighthall, 23 April 1923, MURBSC, Lighthall Papers, Box 5, file 3. Burpee likewise pleaded with Charles Colby to attend. "Do you think you could put together a short paper for the Canadian Historical Association this year. As this is really the first meeting of the new organization, it is rather important that we should have a good programme, and I should very much appreciate it if you could help us out. It dies not matter what the subject is, as long as it falls within the wide boundaries of history, and it is equally unimportant whether you have a formal paper or give us an informal talk." Lawrence Burpee to Charles Colby, 17 April 1923, Stanstead Historical Society Archives, Fonds Colby, C.W. Colby, Series 2, Subseries A, Box 3, file 2

116 Lawrence Burpee to A.S. Morton, 11 June 1924, University of Saskatchewan Archives (USA), Morton Papers, MG 2 1.1 General Corr., 1918-1944. See also C. Marius Barbeau, "Report of the Secretary-Treasurer," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1925): 11.

The CHA's involvement in the campaign to commemorate Thompson began with a 26 July 1922 letter from Col. J.S. Dennis, Chief Commissioner of Colonization and Development for the Canadian Pacific Railway, to Burpee in his capacity as President of the Canadian Historical Association. Dennis noted that the CPR was in the process of building a reproduction of a "typical" fur-trading fort at Invermere, on Lake Windermere in the Columbia Valley, as a monument to the great explorer. He wondered whether or not the CHA "would be agreeable to having the land vested to them in trust, and undertake to maintain the memorial."[117] While Burpee thought it "very appropriate" for the CHA to undertake maintenance of the site, he quickly added that the Association lacked the requisite resources. If the Hudson's Bay Company and the CPR provided the money then perhaps the CHA could consider the matter.[118] Dennis responded that he would contact the National Parks Branch—perhaps it would be willing to take responsibility for site maintenance. In the meantime, Dennis continued, there was a meeting planned for 30 August 1922 at David Thompson's unmarked grave in Montreal's Mount Royal Cemetery. The agenda was simple: to raise the necessary money, to commission an artist and to erect an appropriate grave marker.[119] In time, the CHA assumed the leadership of an effort to mark the grave site of David Thompson.

True, the David Thompson memorial conformed to Burpee's vision of the CHA as in part a patriotic association. In his 1923 presidential address Burpee reported that plans for the Thompson memorial were proceeding apace and "that before long we shall be able to remove the reproach

117 J.S. Dennis to Lawrence Burpee, 26 July 1922, MURBSC, Lighthall Papers, Box 5, file 2

118 Lawrence Burpee to J.S. Dennis, 27 July 1922, Ibid

119 J.S. Dennis to Lawrence Burpee, 14 August 1922, Ibid

against the people of Canada that they have allowed one of their greatest explorers to lie in an unmarked and practically unknown grave."[120] Similarly, Burpee's letters of request for financial support relied heavily on patriotic rhetoric: "The Canadian Historical Association is raising a small fund for the purpose of placing a small monument over the grave of the great Western-Canadian explorer, David Thompson, in Mount Royal Cemetery, Montreal. As you know, Thompson, who gave a lifetime to the cause of western discovery, and who has been described by Tyrrell as the greatest land geographer the world has known, lies in an unmarked grave, which is not creditable to Canada or Canadians."[121]

But to read the CHA's involvement with the Thompson memorial as a straight forward exercise in patriotism is to misread its complexity: it was also an exercise in promotion, an opportunity to promote a young, and fledgling, Canadian Historical Association. Although Burpee was not a professional historian—that is, he did not have a graduate degree and he did not teach at a university—he was nevertheless an important figure in the process of professionalization. Consistent with a pattern documented in chapter 1, the professionalization of history came from outside the university as much as it did from within. Indeed, Burpee appreciated the necessity of primary sources to the writing of history,[122] he published widely, and he was instrumental in broadening the objectives of the Canadian Historical Association to include research in addition to its original mandate of landmark preservation.

---

120 Lawrence Burpee, "Presidential Address," *The Canadian Historical Association, Annual Report 1923*, 10-11.

121 Lawrence Burpee to T.C. Elliott, 7 May 1926, NA, Canadian Historical Association, MG 28 I 4, vol. 9, file 31.

122 He once lamented the failure of essay competitions to encourage original research. See Lawrence Burpee, Review of *Valiant La Vérendrye*, in *Canadian Historical Review*, 10, 1 (March 1929): 63.

Although Burpee stressed the memorial's patriotic dimension in public, he displayed a different side in private. For example, note the healthy cynicism and the high degree of self-awareness in his 13 April 1926 letter to C.N. Cochrane, Professor of Ancient History at the University of Toronto, Secretary-Treasurer of the CHA and member of the David Thompson Committee.[123] "I sent out a letter a few days ago to a selected list of victims in the Association asking for a contribution of $10 toward the David Thompson Fund....I imagine that we will have no difficulty in getting the balance of what we need for the fund."[124] Once the money had been raised and the sculptor commissioned, the Committee turned its attention to the unveiling ceremony. Again, Burpee displayed a high degree of self-consciousness. Writing to Cochrane, he suggested the following:

> Sir Frederick Williams-Talyor might do. He is general manager of the Bank of Montreal, one of the larger subscribers to the fund. Or it might be worth while to ask the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec. *It would probably bring a large crowd, and that is what we need.* (Emphasis mine.)[125]

Burpee later suggested Sir Arthur Currie, national war hero and Principal of McGill.[126] The David Thompson memorial was, of course, an end in and of itself; but it was also a means. Indeed, the memorial receded as the Committee members sought to use the occasion to advance the Canadian Historical Association: the Lieutenant Governor "would probably bring a large crowd, and that is what we need." In the end, the Committee secured Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor, General Manager of the Bank of Montreal and prominent citizen.

---

123 C.N. Cochrane published a school text on David Thompson in W. Stewart Wallace's Canadian Men of Action series. See Charles Norris Cochrane, *David Thompson, The Explorer* (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada, 1924, 1928).

124 Lawrence Burpee to C.N. Cochrane, 13 April 1926, NA, Canadian Historical Association, MG 28 I 4, vol. 9, file 31

125 Lawrence Burpee to C.N. Cochrane, 29 March 1927, Ibid

109 Lawrence Burpee to C.N. Cochrane, 21 April 1927, Ibid

In addition, Burpee instinctively understood the importance of newspapers. As he told Cochrane, "We will get all the publicity possible for the occasion, including possibly a motion picture by the Pathé service."[127] Consumer culture was, by the 1920s, an established reality. In a 1927 editorial, *The Globe* correctly observed that "almost any article under the sun may be bought or sold. Everything, from steam-engines to darning needles, comes within the purview of the advertising man, and more or less depends today on the medium of publicity for its very life and existence."[128] If steam-engines and darning needles depended on advertising for their "very life and existence," so too did the CHA. Cochrane shared Burpee's desire to advertise and sell the CHA. In a letter to Williams-Taylor he explained his position in no uncertain terms. "I am anxious that the occasion should receive due publicity and I should, therefore, be glad to do anything possible to further that end." He then added that "[George] Wrong and I have prepared an account of the ceremony, including your speech and the speech of Mr. Tyrrell, and we are having these sent to the editors of all the daily papers in Canada and the more important of the weekly papers."[129] To McGill's W.T. Waugh, Cochrane elaborated: "This is an occasion," he explained, "on which we may properly look to secure additional members and if the invitations are well distributed they may serve the purpose of interesting a certain number of new people in our work." He also noted that he had sent the invitations to Williams-Taylor because he could no doubt "command secretarial assistance" in getting

---

127 Lawrence Burpee to C.N. Cochrane, 23 March 1927, Ibid

128 *Toronto Globe*, 21 May 1927, 4

129 C.N. Cochrane to Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor, May 1927, NA, Canadian Historical Association, MG 28 I 4, vol. 9, file 31

them distributed.[130] Not only did Williams-Taylor have convenient access to a secretarial pool, but as an individual of affluence and connection he had access to the newspapers as well. As he informed Cochrane, "so far as Montreal is concerned, you need have no fear for I will have no difficulty in interesting my press friends."[131] Nonetheless, Cochrane did not intend to leave anything to chance. In his press packages to the Toronto and Montreal papers, which included advance copies of the addresses to be given by Williams-Taylor and celebrated geologist J.B. Tyrrell, he suggested that they "run feature articles on the subject of Thompson in their week-end editions on May 21."[132] Again, the David Thompson memorial was a vehicle on to which Burpee, Cochrane and Waugh intended to hook the CHA. It promised publicity. The *CHR* commented in June 1927 on the many difficulties involved in maintaining an Association in a country with so few people "who have a professional interest in history." The newspapers, it continued, are necessary to "arousing public interest."[133]

The unveiling itself was a success. At noon on 23 May 1927 an audience of historians, dignitaries and prominent Montrealers gathered in Mount Royal Cemetery to view the memorial. Designed by the French-Canadian sculptor Henri Hébert, it was "a simple but dignified fluted pillar, surmounted by a sextant, and with its base is about nine feet in height."[134] Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor gave a patriotic address on the importance of remembering national heroes: "One of the truest heroes in the history of our country, a history rich in heroism, is the man we honour to-day."[135]

---

130 C.N. Cochrane to W.T. Waugh, 10 May 1927, Ibid

131 Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor to C.N. Cochrane, 11 May 1927, Ibid

132 C.N. Cochrane to Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor, 13 May 1927, Ibid

133 Notes and Comments, *Canadian Historical Review* 8, 2 (June 1927): 94

134 "David Thompson Monument," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1927): 9

135 Ibid

Meanwhile, J.B. Tyrrell offered an analysis on Thompson's contributions to Canadian exploration. Unfortunately there is no record of the number of people who attended the event. Although Waugh had sent 1 000 personal invitations it is doubtful that anywhere near this number actually attended.[136] Nevertheless, the *Montreal Gazette* did comment on who attended: Hon. Senator Raoul Dandurand, Sir Montagu Allen, Hon. C.C. Ballantyne, Lady Drummond and Mrs. W.M. Molson.[137]

In terms of the publicity it generated, the unveiling ceremony was a success. The *Montreal Gazette* printed an article announcing the ceremony on the Saturday before. "EXPLORER'S GRAVE TO HAVE MONUMENT, Canadian Historical Association Arranges Memorial for David Thompson," ran the headline.[138] Because Canadian Press carried the event, the Canadian Historical Association received national press coverage. The *Globe* ran a story under the headline, "PRINCE OF EXPLORERS HONOURED IN CANADA LONG AFTER DEATH." It also noted the efforts of Lawrence Burpee and the Canadian Historical Association.[139] The *Winnipeg Free Press* carried not only a story but printed a drawing of the memorial as well.[140] The *Calgary Daily Herald* even wrote an editorial. Titled "A Story with a Moral," it thanked the Canadian Historical Association for its efforts and cautioned Canadians to not let fade the memory of "one of the greatest of their great men!" After all, "No state is so poor that it is privileged to forget in their

136 Waugh informed Cochrane that "a thousand people will receive a personal invitation, and there will of course be announcements in the newspapers. But as I told Burpee, place, day, and hour are all against a big audience. Still, it will probably be a keen and appreciative one." W.T. Waugh to C.N. Cochrane, 17 May 1927, NA, Canadian Historical Association, MG 28 I 4, vol. 9, file 31

137 *Montreal Gazette*, 24 May 1927, 5

138 *Montreal Gazette*, 21 May 1927, 4

139 *The Globe*, 24 May 1927, 2

140 *Winnipeg Free Press*, 24 May 1927, 8

hour of need its national heroes."[141] French newspapers also reported the event; both *La Presse* and *Le Devoir* referred to the CHA. "C'est grâce à la Canadian Historical Association q'une souscription permet aujourd'hui de rendre hommage au premier homme qui explora l'Ouest canadienne et fit une carte."[142]

Deliberately staged, the memorial was an opportunity for the CHA to generate publicity, increase its "credibility in the eyes of the public"[143] and, ideally, increase its membership. However, establishing a presence for the CHA, and by extension for professional history, was a process and not the result of a single memorial. Historians, therefore, adopted other strategies to broaden their profile and usefulness, including the promotion of history in the schools and on the radio through public education.

IV

Professional historians took seriously the teaching of history in Canadian schools. In 1898 George Wrong delivered a report to the American Historical Association on the state of history in Canada's secondary schools. He painted a bleak picture. Teacher training, he said, is wholly inadequate; the curriculum is "defective"; not enough class time is devoted to instruction in history; and the textbooks are "inferior in quality."[144] Wrong's 1898 complaint became a professional lament. After a 1912 meeting of the Protestant Teachers' Association in Montreal, the *Gazette*

141 *Calgary Daily Herald*, 25 May 1927, 12

142 *La Presse*, 23 mai 1927, 11. See also *Le Devoir*, 23 mai 1927, 3.

143 Haskell, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science*, 19

144 George Wrong, "History in Canadian Secondary Schools," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* (1898): 551-555. In his 1895 inaugural lecture at the University of Toronto, Wrong reported that, "on high authority," there is no other subject so "ill-taught in our schools" as history. See Wrong, *Historical Study in the University*, 8.

reported that Queen's historian J.L. Morison "could not find words strong enough to apply to the current textbooks which he referred to as one of the chief products of the devil." Morison also pronounced that history "was singularly and almost universally badly taught," and that "the students who came to him were absolutely hindered by what they had learned in that branch."[145] In 1921 Wrong reiterated his disregard for the teaching of history in the schools when he complained about the "abysmal" ignorance of history on the part incoming students. "The very name of History repels students coming to the University and this is due to bad work in the schools."[146] Discussing the question of history in the schools at the 1923 Annual Meeting of the CHA, McMaster historian Chester New urged the CHA to take a proactive interest. It is "the experience of probably every teacher of history in Canadian universities that fully seventy-five percent of every freshman class [has] acquired a profound distaste for history in general and a special hatred for Canadian history in particular." Chester Martin from the University of Manitoba concurred: "Enthusiasm for the study of history as it exists in the universities is lacking in the lower schools."[147] A year later, Duncan McArthur commented on the dreadful condition of Canadian history in the public schools. Its defects, according to McArthur, included an over-emphasis on constitutional history, a tendency to stress memorization, poor school libraries and a lack of practical, sound teaching guides. The country, he said, is cheating itself. "The security of our Canadian democracy is entirely dependent upon an educated and a correct public opinion, which in turn can be obtained only through a knowledge

145 Quotation in W.D. LeSueur, "The Teaching of History," 1912; reprinted in A.B. McKillop, ed., *A Critical Spirit: The Thought of William Dawson LeSueur* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977): 283.

146 George Wrong to Frank Underhill, 15 September 1921, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 1, file G.M. Wrong 1907-1927

147 See Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1923): 20

of our nation's history."[148] Not one to mince his words, Frank Underhill commented on the utter ignorance of first-year students. "On our first-year university history examination recently...we put on the question, 'What is responsible government, and when was it achieved?' We were surprised to find that not one in ten had the foggiest idea of what responsible government is: it was rather a startling commentary on the manner in which Canadian history is taught in our high schools."[149] Arthur Lower complained that few Canadians actually read history. Of course, he could not blame them. "The main association Canadians themselves have had with their own history has consisted in the terrifically boring stuff shoved at them in their school days."[150]

It was in this context that historians attempted to assist teachers in the teaching of history. Not every attempt, however, fully materialized. In 1923, for example, the CHA passed a resolution instructing the Executive to investigate the publication of a historical atlas to be used in Canadian schools and to co-operate with the Dominion Archives' scheme to develop a series of lectures and lantern slides to be used by high school history teachers.[151] Over the next few years the initiative to create a series of outline lectures died a quiet death. Only three were ever completed. Everyone is "overburdened with other duties," Burpee explained in 1926.[152]

148 Duncan McArthur, "The Teaching of Canadian History," Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records* 21 (1924): 206

149 "Rather Startling Commentary as to History Teaching," *Ottawa Citizen*, 15 June 1929, 5

150 Arthur Lower, *Colony to Nation: A History of Canada* (Don Mills: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946): x. In 1960 C.P. Stacey commented on how poorly the schools taught history; the end result was that history had failed to have the desired effect on national life. C.P. Stacey, "The Historian's Craft," Speech before the Library and History Sections of the OEA [Ontario Education Association], 20 April 1960, UTA, Charles Stacey Papers, B90-0020, Box 45, file 1960-040-20.

151 Ibid, 21

152 Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1926): 15

Meanwhile, the CHA could not hope to undertake the publication of an atlas. It simply lacked the resources.[153] On his own initiative, however, Burpee managed to create an atlas for publication in 1927. As he informed the 1926 Annual Meeting, he did the work independently and secured Thomas Nelson & Sons as a publisher.[154] Specifically designed for high school teachers, the *Canadian Historical Review* instituted in 1937 a new section entitled "Book Notes." As George Brown explained, "The Review might...do something in this way to keep teachers in touch with recent books in the field of historical scholarship, which are not too detailed or highly specialized to be of value to them."[155] The first Book Notes appeared in June 1937. For its part, the Canadian Historical Association made it a point to invite local high school teachers to its annual meeting and, in 1951, the CHA decided to undertake a booklet series for high school teachers. To be written by professional historians, these booklets would introduce high school history teachers to the most up-to-date research on a particular question in Canadian history.[156]

Professional historians promoted the better teaching of history in the schools because they believed it to be self-evidently important. After all, no one would argue that history should be poorly taught in the schools. To stop here, however, is to stop short. Historians had a professional self-interest in the teaching of school history. Their interest was not altruistic, although it may have been projected as such. Seeking legitimation, all

153 Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1924): 11

154 Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1926): 15. See Lawrence Burpee, *An Historical Atlas of Canada* (Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1927).

155 George Brown, 25 March 1937, UTA, University of Toronto Press, CHR Files, A86-0044, Box 5, file Durham Report June CHR

156 For the genesis of the CHA Booklets, which are still being produced, see Minutes, Annual General Meeting, 8 June 1951, NA, CHA Papers, MG 28 I 4, vol. 2, Minutes 1944-1953. See also letters in UTA, C.P. Stacey Collection, B91-0013, Box 3, file CHA, President 1952.

professions attempt to articulate the ideal of public service, the ideal that their particular skills are in the service of the public good. But there was even more at stake. As Bledstein observed, "The culture of professionalism tended to cultivate an atmosphere of constant crisis—emergency—in which practitioners both created work for themselves and reinforced their authority by intimidating clients."[157] In pointing out the terrible state of history in Canadian schools, professional historians placed themselves in a position to offer a solution: better text books written by professionally trained historians.

Indeed, professional historians wrote several school textbooks from the turn-of-the-century onwards.[158] George Wrong published several texts which, in turn, had several printings: *The British Nation* (1904);[159] *An English History, adapted for use in Canadian Elementary Schools* (1905); *Ontario High School History of England* (1911); *Ontario Public School History of England* (1921); *Ontario Public School History of Canada* (1921). With Chester Martin and W.N. Sage, Wrong published *The Story of Canada* (1929). Duncan McArthur published a text book entitled, *History of Canada for High Schools* (1927). A.L. Burt wrote three text books: *High School Civics* (1928); *The Romance of the Prairie Provinces* (1930); and *The Romance of Canada* (1937). Chester New co-authored two high school text books: *Ancient and Medieval History* with Charles Phillips (1941) and *Modern History* with Reginald Trotter (1946). Arthur Dorland wrote one,

157 Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism*, 100

158 Meikle, "And Gladly Teach," Appendix E.

159 Forty years later, Wrong recalled the writing of this particular book. "Messrs. Appleton of New York asked me to write a textbook on the history of England. During four years I spent what time I could on 'The British Nation,' which came out in 1903 [sic]. I took great care with the illustrations and in my judgment it is a very good piece of work. It was used for some years in both the United States and Canada. A textbook, however, rarely lasts for more than about ten years." See George Wrong, unpublished document, c. 1940s, UTA, University of Toronto Press, CHR Files, A86-0044, Box 5, file CHR, 25th Anniversary Letters, no. 2

Our Canada (1949). In 1942 George Brown authored the widely used textbook, *Building the Canadian Nation;* indeed, by 1971 some 600 0000 copies were sold to schools across Canada.[160] By 1961 Brown had written three more text books: *The Story of Canada* (1949); *Canada in North America to 1800* (1960); and *Canada in North America, 1800-1901* (1961). With J.M.S. Careless, Gerald Craig and Eldon Ray, Brown published three texts in 1953 alone: *Canada and the Americas; Canada and the World;* and *Canada and the Commonwealth.* Arthur Lower also wrote a book for the high school market. Based on the success of *Colony to Nation,* Longmans Publishers asked him to write a textbook. With J.W. Chafe, a Winnipeg teacher, Lower published *Canada—a nation and how it came to be* in 1948. According to his memoirs, it was still in use in 1967.[161]

Cracking the text-book market could prove lucrative. A.L. Burt boasted to his father that his first royalty cheque from *The Romance of Canada* would be a little over $1 000.[162] To someone who earned less than $5 000 per year, such a royalty cheque was no small matter. However, the best evidence of royalty payments comes from the papers of W.S. Wallace. The U of T librarian and history professor had four text books in use in Canadian public schools: *A New History of Great Britain and Canada* (1925); *A First Book of Canadian History* (1928); *A History of the Canadian People* (1930); and *A Reader in Canadian Civics* (1935). Unfortunately, the records are incomplete. Nevertheless, the records do reveal a healthy income from royalties. Published by Macmillan in 1928 and used in Ontario's schools to

160 Anxious to see his book approved for use in New Brunswick, Brown arranged for his publisher to send a copy to the prominent New Brunswicker, John Clarence Webster, in the hopes that he might have some influence. See George Brown to John Clarence Webster, 20 May 1945, NBMA, John Clarence Webster Collection, F296

161 Lower, *My First Seventy-Five Years,* 358

162 A.L. Burt to C.K. Burt, 11 April 1937, N.A., A.L. Burt Papers, MG 30 D 103, vol. 4, file 9

1949, *A First Book of Canadian History* sold roughly 520 000 copies.[163] Receiving three cents per book,[164] he earned over the course approximately $15 600 in royalties from this book alone. Between 1925 and 1935 he received a yearly average of $2 382.09 in royalties from Macmillan.[165] Again, for someone who earned less than $5 000.00 a year, an additional $2 400 was a sizable amount.[166] Professionalization, according to Magali Sarfatti Larson, is "an attempt to translate one order of scarce resources—special knowledge and skills—into another—social and economic rewards."[167] In this case, then, it was a matter of professional historians translating their special knowledge of history into economic reward in the form of royalties.

Similar to the desire to promote the profession of history through a promotion of teaching history in the schools was the CHA's experiment in radio broadcasts on history. Toronto's George Brown and George de T. Glazebrook saw in radio a marvelous opportunity for history and historical

---

163 This figure comes from Meikle, "And Gladly Teach," Appendix E

164 See financial statements in Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto (TFRBR-UT), W.S. Wallace Papers, MS Coll. 31, Box 24, file Accounts with Publishers

165 Ibid, Box 24, file Publishers

166 Not surprsingly, Wallace did not want to jeopardize his lucrative relationship with the Ontario Department of Education. Fearing that his essay debunking the myth of Laura Secord might further arouse her many passionate defenders, and not wanting to bite the hand that fed him (at this point he had two books authorized for use in Ontario's schools), Wallace cautiously sent a manuscript copy to G.F. Rogers, Chief Director of Ontario's Department of Education.

> I am sending you herewith a copy of the analysis I have made of the evidence in the case of Wallace v. Secord, et al. I have been strongly urged by many people who have seen it to publish it in the March number of the Canadian Historical Review; but before promising to do so, I thought it would be well for me to let you see it, in order that you might advise me whether the Department had any objection to my printing it?

Presumably Rogers had no objections as the manuscript appeared as a booklet in March 1932. W.S. Wallace to G.F. Rogers, 14 January 1932, Ibid, Box 37, file Correspondence 1932, P-Z

167 Magali Sarfatti Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977): xvii

education. They struck an informal committee and, in February 1937, they approached the CBC. Their idea was a series of broadcasts—to be prepared by professional historians—on Ontario's historic roads. They believed that people's interest in the past might be "piqued in the happenings of yesterday which actually occurred on or in the vicinity of roads they frequently travel."[168] The CBC liked the proposal and, over the course of the next few months, eight shows were prepared and eventually broadcast in May in a series entitled Historic Roads of Ontario.[169] This cooperative effort between the CBC and historians convinced the CBC that it might do more broadcasting of this nature. Before the series actually aired, the CBC approached Brown: could not the CBC and the CHA work together in some future project?[170] Brown agreed.

To be sure, the participation of Brown, Glazebrook and the CHA in this early experiment in historical broadcasting was an exercise in public service. After all, Glazebrook received no remuneration for his work as Chair of the Radio Committee and those historians who actually prepared and presented a broadcast received a small honorarium of $20.00. A strategic move, service to the public and the greater good simultaneously legitimates a profession and enhances its authority in the pubic domain. Like the David Thompson memorial, then, historical broadcasting constituted a strategy of professionalization. Indeed, the correspondence of the key participants betrays their self-awareness. The first item on the agenda for Brown and Glazebrook was to get a discussion of historical

168 Edgar Stone, Radio Hall, Affiliated with the Toronto Conservatory of Music, Memorandum to Gladstone Murray, CBC, 26 February 1937, UTA, Canadian Historical Association, Committee on Historical Broadcasting, B86-0003, Bc. 1, file 4

169 The eight episodes in the series were: Yonge Street (2 broadcasts); Niagara Portage Road; Huron Road; Talbot Road; Kingston Road (2 broadcasts); and Coaches and Inns. See George Brown, circular letter advertising Historic Roads of Ontario, 7 May 1937, Ibid, file 6

170 D.W. Buchanan to George Brown, 22 April 1937, Ibid, file 1

broadcasting on the programme for the annual meeting to be held at McMaster. In his letter to Trotter, the programme organizer, Glazebrook referred to the enormous potential in some kind of association with the CBC. Unless the CHA seizes the opportunity now, it will be lost. Besides, the CHA "is the proper body for handling this whole question" of historical broadcasting; really, "it is the only machine for the purpose." In a handwritten afterthought he added, "The opportunity is now presented to the historical people to play ball with the CBC."[171] Trotter gladly placed a round table discussion on historical broadcasting on the programme. A month later, at the annual meeting, the CHA endorsed the proposal for a joint CHA/CBC project and Council duly struck a Radio Committee with George Glazebrook as Chair.[172]

Over the course of the next twelve months Glazebrook received recommendations, paired topics with historians and arranged the schedule for a series of broadcasts on forgotten Canadians. When all was said and done, the CBC aired twenty-seven broadcasts between 30 September 1937 and 1 April 1938.[173] Although Glazebrook endured many headaches, principally centred on the prickly—and ultimately impossible—question of broadcasts in French,[174] the organizational details of the series are not important. Rather, the importance of the series lies in Glazebrook's—and by

171 George de T. Glazebrook to Reginald Trotter, 23 April 1937, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 24, file Canadian Historical Association, 1936-1937

172 The Radio Committee included: George de T. Glazebrook (Chair), D.C. Harvey, Fred Soward, W. Kaye Lamb, George Smith, Arthus Morton, Blake Duff, Séraphin Marion, E.R. Adair and John Clarence Webster. Minutes of the Council Meeting, 25 May 1937, NA, Canadian Historical Association, MG 28 I 4, vol. 1, Minutes 1924-1943

173 For a complete list of the participants and their topics see "Canadian Portraits," UTA, Canadian Historical Association, Committee on Historical Broadcasting, B86-0003, Box 1, file 5. Several of the talks were reprinted in R.G. Riddell, ed., *Canadian Portraits: CBC Broadcasts* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1940).

174 See the correspondence between George de T. Glazebrook and Séraphin Marion in UTA, Canadian Historical Association, Committee on Historical Broadcasting, B86-0003, Box 1, file 3

extension, the CHA's—transformation of the series into a vehicle for the promotion of professional history. In a letter to Trotter immediately following the May meeting, Glazebrook stated in no uncertain terms that the CHA had been handed an opportunity for "adding to the usefulness and interest of the society."[175] Then, in a circular letter to the Radio Committee, Glazebrook stressed the wonderful opportunity now before the CHA. We must take every advantage of it, he stated. "The CBC is impressed by the desirability of having broadcasts on historical subjects, and the Association, as the sole agency with which it deals in this connection, has an opportunity of guiding the work of building up interest in history. I presume that if we fail to grasp this opportunity the direction of policy must necessarily fall into other hands."[176] In other words, to create an interest in history is to create a need for history; to create a need for history is to create a need for professional historians. "If our committee works as I hope it will," Glazebrook explained to W. Kaye Lamb, "we may be able to do a job of considerable importance in forming a bridge between the professional historians and the public."[177] At one point, mid-way through the series, Glazebrook complained that the CHA had not received its due recognition. Alan Plaunt of the CBC agreed "that the co-operation of the Canadian Historical Association [should be] acknowledged."[178] Of course, it is impossible to measure the impact of the series on the fortunes of professional history and the Canadian Historical Association. But that is not the point. Rather, the point is that the CHA, through the radio, tried to increase history's profile and its own profile.

---

175 George de T. Glazebrook to Reginald Trotter, 27 May 1937, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 25, file Canadian Historical Association, 1936-1937

176 George de T. Glazebrook, 23 June 1937, UTA, Canadian Historical Association, Committee on Historical Broadcasting, B86-0003, Box 1, file 2

177 George de T. Glazebrook to W. Kaye Lamb, 26 July 1937, Ibid, file 3

178 Alan Plaunt to George de T. Glazebrook, 16 February 1938, Ibid, file 4

Creating a presence and useful role for the CHA also necessitated that the CHA defend its territory against encroachment. From its beginnings, the Canadian Historical Association enjoyed a special relationship with the Public Archives.[179] This relationship was formalized in 1934 when the Archives made a room available to the CHA free of charge which the CHA intended to use as a library and board room.[180] When it became clear in 1935 that the Catholic Historical Association wanted a similar arrangement, an anxious Norman Fee penned a quick note to Reginald Trotter.

> There is also, as you can easily see, a very concerted move by certain interests to link up the Catholic Historical with the Archives. I dare not write more on this point. We must guard against anything that will leave the way open to even a questioning of the right of the Canadian Historical to recognition as the National Body.[181]

In the end, nothing came from the Catholic Historical Association's "concerted move." What part—if any—Fee and the CHA played is not known. However, Fee's letter is significant: as a member of the Executive, he wanted to defend the CHA's self-declared status as the national historical association.

In late 1939 the Royal Society of Canada approached the Canadian Historical Association and the Canadian Political Science Association with a proposal to create a new section which would take in the two associations. According to Columbia's Bartlet Brebner, the suggestion "provoked a positive explosion." Council considered the question but "the general thesis was that it was no fault of the CHA that the RSC had become moribund and that there seemed no good reason for two vigorous associations to risk their

---

179 From 1926 to 1932 the Public Archives paid for the printing costs of the CHA *Annual Report.*

180 Minutes of the Council Meeting, 27 October 1934, NA, Canadian Historical Association, MG 28 I 4, vol. 1, Minutes 1924-1943

181 Fee had requested that Trotter "destroy" this letter. Norman Fee to Reginald Trotter, 5 June 1935, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 24, file Canadian Historical Association, 1934-35

health in going to its rescue."[182] Thoroughly suspicious of the RSC's motives, the CHA nevertheless agreed to strike an *ad hoc* committee. However, Council also stressed "that the high standing which the Association occupies in the field of history should be safe-guarded."[183] Donald Creighton and Reginald Trotter met with representatives from the RSC and CPSA on 25 November 1939. They listened politely but, at the same time, they made it absolutely clear "that the members of the Association would be...unwilling to enter into co-operation on any basis that would destroy the autonomy of the CHA or even bind it to any set relationship between its own sessions and the sessions of the RSC." Quite naturally, they agreed that co-operation between the CHA and the RSC had potential benefits. The problem, therefore, "is to preserve the independence of the professional associations but to do it in a spirit of readiness to cooperate so far as cooperation may have positive values."[184] In their formal report to Council, Creighton and Trotter recommended that no further action be taken in this matter. To subordinate the CHA in any shape, way or form to the RSC would be wrong-headed.[185]

To quickly summarize, the Thompson memorial, the CHR's Book Notes, the writing of school textbooks, the historical broadcasts, the CHA's desire to defend its territory against encorachment and the historical booklets series were tangible and real aspects of history's professionalization. But

182 Bartlet Brebner to James Shotwell, 10 November 1939, Columbia University, Rare Book and Manuscript Library (CUL), James Shotwell Papers, Box 284, file Can-American Relations, J.B. Brebner

183 Minutes of the Council Meeting, 4 November 1939, NA, Canadian Historical Association, MG 28 I 4, vol. 1, Minutes 1924-1943

184 Reginald Trotter to Bartlet Brebner, 30 November 1939, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 24, file Canadian Historical Association, 1939-1940

185 Report of Committee appointed by the President under instructions from the Council to report on proposals adavnced by the Royal Society of Canada for the closer affiliation between that Society and the Canadian Historical Association, 22 May 1940, NA, Canadian Historical Association, MG 28 I 4, vol. 1, Minutes 1924-1943

there was an intangible dimension to the professionalization of history—the social dimension. Although it is many things, a profession is also a fictive kinship network.

V

The Canadian Historical Association became in the interwar years the principal home for historians in English Canada and, in turn, its principal activity became the annual meeting. Although it did not have a formal relationship with the Royal Society of Canada, at Lighthall's recommendation it initially held its annual meeting either just before or just after the RSC meeting in Ottawa.[186] However, in 1925 "it began to assert its independent existence by meeting separately about every second year."[187] It met in Montreal in 1925, in Toronto in 1927, in Winnipeg in 1928 and again in Montreal in 1930. Holding the meeting outside of Ottawa, the Secretary-Treasurer explained in 1928, generated greater awareness of "the work and purposes of the Association."[188] Throughout the 1920s the programme gradually became academic in its focus. Although as many non-academics as academics attended the annual meeting in the 1920s, the presenters tended to be academics after 1925. Papers presented were then published in the *Annual Report*. For his part, Frank Underhill wanted to see the CHA emulate the success of the AHA. As he explained to Cochrane, the CHA ought to provide more opportunity for its members to socialize, although "judging from this year's experience I don't know that meeting one another would be a particularly thrilling event." Nevertheless, it

186 See Lawrence Burpee to W.D. Lighthall, 6 February 1923; and W.D. Lighthall to Lawrence Burpee, 7 February 1923, MURBSC, Lighthall Papers, Box 5, file 3

187 Mary Vipond, "National Consciousness in English-Speaking Canada in the 1920s: seven studies," (Unpublished PhD, University of Toronto, 1974): 72

188 Norman Fee, Circular letter, 1928, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 24, file Canadian Historical Association, 1923-1933

should follow the lead of the AHA by arranging a lunch and a dinner.[189] Cochrane agreed. Also at Underhill's suggestion, he chose to organize the annual meeting around a specific theme, the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation.[190] To this end, Cochrane and Burpee invited specific historians to give papers on some aspect of Confederation. Underhill would later recall his contribution to the 1927 annual meeting as his "first professional historical paper."[191] Although Innis complained that the presentations had been average in quality ("some of the papers very good and others beating old straw"), he nevertheless enjoyed the Friday-night banquet ("excellent from the standpoint of food").[192] Following the 1928 Annual Meeting in Winnipeg, an excited George Brown from the University of Toronto penned a quick note to his colleague D.C. Harvey at the University of Manitoba. "I feel that the Association is really beginning to find itself," he said.[193]

Before the 1929 CHA annual meeting, Frank Underhill asked Western's Fred Landon if any of the "London people" would be attending. Toronto would be sending at least four or five.[194] The meeting had become a social event as much as it had become an academic event. In addition to providing a forum for historians to present their work, receive feedback and exchange information, the annual meeting provided historians with

189 Frank Underhill to Charles Cochrane, 29 May 1926, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 1, file C.N. Cochrane, 1907-1927

190 See Charles Cochrane to Frank Underhill, 22 November 1926, Ibid

191 Frank Underhill, "What, then, is the Manitoban? or This Almost Chosen People," *Historical Papers* (1970): 38

192 Excerpt from diary of Harold Innis in NA, Donald Creighton Papers, MG 31 D 77, vol. 15, file Harold Adams Innis, 1924-1954

193 George Brown to D.C. Harvey, May 1928, PANS, D.C. Harvey Papers, MG 1, vol. 1200, no. 53. See also George Brown, "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Historical Association," *Canadian Historical Review* 9, 2 (June 1928): 101

194 Frank Underhill to Fred Landon, 8 May 1929, JJTRC-UWO, J.J. Talman Papers, Box 11, file 19

an opportunity to meet their colleagues in a social setting.[195] Emile Durkheim argued that professional associations do not exist solely to promote and protect their members' interests. Professional associations also exist to allow like-minded people, i.e. their members, "just to associate, for the sole pleasure of mixing with their fellows and no longer feeling lost in the midst of adversaries, as well as for the pleasure of communing together, that is, in short, of being able to lead their lives with the same moral aim."[196] In his memoirs, Arthur Lower commented on the importance of the CHA annual meeting and the summer weeks spent at the Public Archives in Ottawa: "...one felt genuinely a member of a band that had no local moorings (except Ottawa) and was as broad as the Dominion. It was this sense of wider brotherhood that shored me up during many a dark day in Winnipeg."[197]

Keeping this "wider brotherhood" together was a shared commitment to a common project, to what Durkheim called "the same moral aim"; but gossip acted as a glue as well. In her 1985 presidential address to the CHA, Susan Mann Trofimenkoff discussed gossip in history. After all, she explained, "What historians gathered at the CHA actually do is GOSSIP. Who's doing what? How is he doing it? Why is he doing it? Is it appropriate historical behaviour?"[198] Gossip is not simply empty banter; nor is it necessarily malicious innuendo. Rather, it serves an important social function. Gossip binds a group together by keeping members informed about other members. Physical separation is overcome by

195 For an amusing account of contemporary annual meetings of the American Historical Association see Theodore S. Hamerow, *Reflections of History and Historians* (Madison: University of Wisoconsin Press, 1987): 72-75.

196 Emile Durkheim, *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals* (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958): 25

197 Lower, *My First Seventy-Five Years*, 181

198 Susan Mann Trofimenkoff, "Gossip in History," *Historical Papers* (1985): 3

pyschic connection. But it does more than this. Because it contains—either explicitly or implicitly—group norms and values, gossip functions as a form of social control. Through gossip, members of a group—be it a village, a department or a profession—feel a membership and learn the correct forms of conduct.[199]

Although a worthy subject of scholarly investigation, gossip, because it tends to be a form of oral communication, presents a notoriously difficult terrain for historians. For example, Harold Innis apparently loved nothing more than "an hour's gossipy conversation." According to Donald Creighton, "His study became a kind of clearing-house for the academic gossip of a large part of the English-speaking world. He had a great fund of stories, for men told their best anecdotes in his presence, and his own humour was rich, and generous, yet delightfully astringent."[200] Most of these stories and anecdotes have been lost forever. Nevertheless, the personal correspondence of English Canada's historians contains references to other historians. In other words, it contains gossip.

For the most part, the gossip was innocent and involved keeping up to date with each others comings and goings. Charles Cochrane informed Underhill that Daniel Harvey had received a temporary appointment at McGill and that A.L. Burt had been hired by the University of Alberta: "He has already departed to carry the gospel of the aesthetic to the Plains."[201] "McArthur tells me that you are migrating again to Ottawa this year,"

199 See Jörg R. Bergman, *Discreet Indiscretions: The Social Organization of Gossip* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1993).

200 Donald Creighton, CBC Radio, Obituary of Harold Innis, 28 November 1952, NA, Donald Creighton Papers, MG 31 D 77, vol. 15, file Harold Adams Innis, 1924-1954. In a 1978 appraisal of Innis' career, Creighton recalled an Innis visit to his Muskoka cottage and the "endless academic gossip." Donald Creighton, "Harold Adams Innis: A Special and Unique Brilliance," in Donald Creighton, *The Passionate Observer: Selected Writings* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1980): 147.

201 Charles Cochrane to Frank Underhill, 11 September 1913, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 1, file C.N. Cochrane, 1907-1927

Manitoba's Chester Martin told Saskatchewan's A.S. Morton.[202] When Innis heard that Burt was unhappy at the University of Minnesota and that he might return to Alberta, he told Arthur Lower.[203] Columbia's Bartlet Brebner told Charles Stacey that his name had been frequently mentioned at the Annual Meeting. Everyone, he said, was delighted to hear of your appointment as an army historian.[204] When it proved impossible for George Glazebrook to meet Donald Creighton in Washington over the Christmas holidays—at this point Creighton was on a Guggenheim fellowship in the United States—he began his letter, "Alas! Our gossip must be postponed." Nevertheless, he continued, the Modern History Club hosted a great Christmas party. "They did rags on the staff, all good fun; & four of the staff sang (sic!) equally topically. Dick Saunders appeared as Santa Claus—a great sight."[205] Gossip was not always professional; it could also be personal. On hearing from a Toronto historian that Brebner's wedding plans had been canceled, Burt promptly told his wife. "Glazebrook, my informant, explained it by saying that she is a Southern girl and like all other Southern girls is very unreliable."[206] As word circulated about Innis' deteriorating health in 1950, Fred Landon wrote to Frank Underhill: "I heard that Innis was ill. Is this correct? I wish that you would give me some particulars."[207]

---

202 Chester Martin to A.S. Morton, 2 May 1926, USA, A.S. Morton Papers, MG 2 S 1, I. Subject Files, 9. Other Universities, 1921-1943

203 Harold Innis to Arthur Lower, 13 May 1931, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 7, A 127

204 Bartlet Brebner to C.P. Stacey, 27 May 1941, UTA, Charles Stacey Papers, B90-0020, Box 42, file Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1934-46; 1971

205 George Glazebrook to Donald Creighton, 19 December 1940, NA, Donald Creighton Papers, MG 31 D 77, vol. 1, file General Correspondence 1941

206 A.L. Burt to Dorrie Burt, 21 June 1927, NA, A.L. Burt Papers, MG 30 D 103, vol. 1 file 1

207 Fred Landon to Frank Underhill, 25 September 1950, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 5, file Fred Landon, 1928-1956

Of course, gossip could be more pointed. Duncan McArthur delighted A.L. Burt with a "scandalous tale" about W.P.M. Kennedy, the Toronto constitutional historian. Fearing a negative review of his book, Kennedy selected his friend Chester Martin to review it in the *CHR*. But Martin, with assistance from Adam Shortt, wrote a critical review. As Managing Editor of the *Review*, W.S. Wallace showed the manuscript to Kennedy. "Kennedy went through it with Wallace, saying every now and then 'Now Wallace, you can't let that go in, for I know Martin is wrong there, and to let it pass, would hurt his reputation.'" When all was said and done, the book review was "a salad of Shortt, Martin, Kennedy and Wallace."[208] Another example of critical gossip comes from the correspondence between Innis and Lower. According to Innis, George Brown had been offered the position of Archivist at the newly created Public Archives of Nova Scotia; however, he feared that Brown would use the offer as a bargaining tool.[209] When Brown did precisely that, Innis grew cynical: "Rather disgusting business but there it is."[210] And finally, as Arthur Doughty neared his retirement, rumours about his successor circulated. Burt wanted the position. So too did D.C Harvey. When Burt received, in his words, "a disturbing note" to the effect that the Prime Minister was set to appoint W.S. Wallace he wrote Arthur Morton. Morton shared Burt's concern. Unfortunately, he said, Wallace has "good political pull" and his strong publication record "may lead those who do not know how little he has paid attention to archival

208 A.L. Burt to Dorrie Burt, 2 July 1923, NA, A.L. Burt Papers, MG 30 D 103, vol. 1, file 1

209 Harold Innis to Arthur Lower, 20 March 1931, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 7, A 127. For the correspondence between John Clarence Webster, George Brown

210 Harold Innis to Arthur Lower, 13 May 1931, Ibid. For the correspondence between John Clarence Webster, George Brown and the President of Dalhousie dated November 1930 to April 1931 see NBMA, John Clarence Webster Collection, F263

research to rate him higher than is just."[211] In these three examples, the gossip carried an implicit message: do not manipulate the review process; do not bargain one employer off of another; and archival research ought to be the mark of a historian's reputation.

Knowing how damaging gossip could be, Arthur Lower attempted to track down the source of "some old story floating about" in connection with his employment at the Public Archives in the 1920s. Apparently, R.O. MacFarlane at Manitoba had told Noel Fieldhouse, also at Manitoba, that Lower had withheld documents from Adam Shortt when he was in his employ and then used them in a volume of primary documents he edited with Innis. To make matters even worse, gossip had it that Lower then proceeded to review Shortt's volume and criticized it for not containing the documents that he himself had withheld. An obviously upset Lower wrote MacFarlane asking him to explain himself: "I cannot afford to have such things circulating."[212] MacFarlane responded that Lower was right to "nail down" this story at once; however, he also said that he knew nothing about it.[213] Lower let the matter drop with MacFarlane—Fieldhouse, he said, "must have got things twisted up in some way"[214]—but he pursued it with others, including Innis and W.A. Mackintosh. Innis told him that "you can't do anything with pure maliciousness."[215] Besides, "the whole thing is too preposterous for words."[216] For his part, Mackintosh advised him to

211 A.L. Burt to A.S. Morton, 22 February 1935; A.S. Morton to A.L. Burt, 1 March 1935, USA, Morton Papers, MG 2, I. 11. Personal-General, 1908-1946

212 Arthur Lower to R.O. MacFarlane, 6 June 1938, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 1, file A 10

213 R.O. MacFarlane to Arthur Lower, 7 June 1938, Ibid

214 See Arthur Lower to R.O. MacFarlane, 11 June 1938, Ibid

215 Quotation in Arthur Lower to W.A. Mackintosh, 28 June 1938, Ibid

216 Harold Innis to Arthur Lower, n.d., Ibid, Box 1, file A 11

ignore it. The Public Archives is a "hive of gossip."[217] In the end, Lower never discovered the guilty party. That he went to such an effort, however, indicates the importance of professional reputation and standing. At one point Lower conceded that he had probably been wrong to pay attention to the rumour: "But unless one does, I suppose they can go on festering for a long time."[218]

When the editors of the *Canadian Historical Review* invited selected readers to comment on past and future editorial policy, a couple of respondents requested that the *CHR* include more information about historians. Ronald Longley at Acadia requested "more regular news" about "the activities of the Canadian historical fraternity." As he explained, "I am interested in the activities of my colleagues, promotions, appointments, etc."[219] UBC's Fred Soward was of a similar opinion. The *CHR* should add more details about fellow historians, "their promotions, transfers, etc."[220] Sherwood Fox, Fred Landon, J.J. Talman and M.A. Garland from Western were even more direct. From time to time, the *CHR* contains obituaries, they observed. This is entirely appropriate, of course; but it would be nice get "more information on the personal activities of individuals while they are alive." In other words, the *Review* "might loosen up a little and admit

217 W.A. Mackintosh to Arthur Lower, 2 July 1938, Ibid. John Pritchett, a doctoral candidate at Queen's, complained about the gossiping among historians at the Public Archives. "The petty jealousies that exist between a number of the Canadian history professors are surprising and disgusting to me. Nasty and dirty insinuations about this man and that man are not at all uncommon among some men here. Inferiority and superiority complexes appear to be basic causes." John Pritchett to Reginald Trotter, 11 July 1928, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 23, file Correspondence, Pritchett, J.P. (i)

218 Arthur Lower to H.N. Fieldhouse, 28 June 1938, Ibid

219 Ronald Longley, n.d., UTA, University of Toronto Press, CHR Files, A86-0044, Box 5, file CHR, 25th Anniversary Letters, no. 1

220 Fred Soward, 19 October 1944, Ibid

that students of history are human beings."[221] Neither Longley, Soward, nor the historians at Western were mean-spirited gossip mongers. Rather, they were members of a profession. And as such, they wanted to keep abreast the careers of their colleagues. To know who was promoted, who won a prestigious fellowship and who received an administrative appointment was to be in "the know."

In the aftermath of the Great War a new cohort of historians emerged, defined themselves as researchers, initiated graduate programmes, attempted to instill in their undergraduates an appreciation for sources and their use, created a national journal and founded a professional association. In short, history professionalized. This process, however, also witnessed the deliberate—and gendered—attempt to mark and police boundaries between who could and who could not be a historian.

---

221 Sherwood Fox, Fred Landon, J.J. Talman and M.A. Garland, 6 November 1944, Ibid. Fred Landon had requested in 1922 that the *CHR* contain a "News" section which would keep historians abreast the comings and goings of other historians. The editor, W.S. Wallace, agreed that such a section would be desirable but that the *CHR* lacked the necessary "machinery" for gathering information. See W.S. Wallace to Fred Landon, 13 January 1922, JJTRT-UWO, Fred Landon Papers, Box 4208, file 4. For the editors summary and analysis of the survey results see George Brown and Donald Creighton, "Canadian History in Retrospect and Prospect," *Canadian Historical Review* 25, 4 (December 1944): 357-375.

IV. Boundary-Work and the Historical Profession

The professionalization of history in English Canada involved much more than the creation of separate university departments, the launching of a journal, the founding of a professional association and the development of graduate progammes. True, these are important institutions. But an institutional focus obscures professionalization as both a positive and negative process of self-definition. Throughout the first half of this century, historians defined themselves in terms of what they *were*—university-trained, university-based experts in history—and in terms of what they *were not*.

Although referring to the history of science, Thomas Gieryn's conception of boundary-work applies to the history of history. He argued that any effort to identify, categorize and organize the differences between science and non-science is bound to fail. The differences between science and non-science are not absolute but rather ideological. According to Gieryn, his work "restates the problem of demarcation: characteristics of science are examined not as inherent or possibly unique, but as part of ideological efforts *by scientists* to distinguish their work and its products from non-scientific intellectual activities." From this vantage point, he developed boundary-work as an analytic category for studying the history of science. "Boundary-work describes an ideological style found in scientists' attempts to create a public image for science by contrasting it favourably to non-scientific intellectual or technical activities."[1] Returning to the professionalization of history in English Canada,

1 Italics in original. Thomas Gieryn, "Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists," *American Sociological Review* 48 (December 1983): 781-782

historians engaged in boundary-work of their own. Indeed, professional historians made a distinction between what they did as historians and what amateur historians did as historians. By favourably contrasting their work to the work of amateur historians, professional historians raised their status and authority. Because professional historians needed amateur historians as a foil, the professionalization of history included the amateurization of history. This did not mean that professional historians discouraged amateurs from writing history; nor did it mean that they refused to consult their work. Indeed, professional historians believed that amateur and local historians had an important role to play in the gathering of facts, the preservation of documents and the promotion of history in general. However, it did mean that professional historians wanted to establish a clear hierarchy. But boundary-work involved much more than the demarcation of professional from non-professional history. This chapter, therefore, expands Gieryn's original concept to include the drawing and policing of boundaries between who could and who could not be a historian. This process, moreover, was deeply gendered as male historians, eager to enhance and defend their status, authority and privileged access to the academic labour market, excluded women. In other words, professional historians were neither amateurs nor women.

I

In his 1895 inaugural address, George Wrong drew a boundary between the trained and the untrained student of history. Recall his remark that "any untrained reader can enjoy his Macaulay or his Froude, lounging on a sofa, or toasting his knees before the fire." As a result, "men who have not given an hour's serious study to historical questions will assume the tone of

experts and critics with a lightheartedness that is amazing." Although Wrong did not want to discourage the educated public from reading history, neither did he want to encourage them to believe that anyone could write history. The meaning of the past, he said, is "only to be grasped when the insight and discrimination of a trained student are brought to the task."[2] Wrong made his remarks at a time when history was more commonly done outside the university by men and women who did not have advanced university training in historical methods. Indeed, Wrong liked to tell the story about how a well-read friend, upon learning of Wrong's appointment, offered his congratulations but also asked what exactly it was that a historian did.[3] Forty-three years later, however, there was a clear distinction between the professional and the amateur historian. In a 1938 speech Lady Tweedsmuir deliberately identified herself as belonging to "that humble and faithful type of writer," the amateur historian. She also noted that those "historians who have shed their amateur status and joined the closed ranks of the professional historians are apt to look down upon the efforts of those who have not got their equipment or their scientific knowledge."[4] Unwittingly, then, Lady Tweedsmuir had pointed to a strategy—first articulated by Wrong and then practised by the *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada*—in the professionalization of history: its simultaneous amateurization.

---

2 George Wrong, *Historical Study in the University: An Inaugural Lecture* (Toronto: The Bryant Press, 1895): 6. Defending his profession, Charles Colby similarly noted that "No, history is not the easy subject which many, with insufficient knowledge, deem it to be. No branch of the curriculum requires more sympathy, more imagination, more tact." Charles Colby, "The Teaching of History" n.d., Stanstead Historical Society Archives, Fonds Colby, C.W. Colby, Series 2, Subseries C, Box 5, file 73

3 George Wrong, "The Beginnings of Historical Criticism in Canada: A Retrospect, 1896-1936," *Canadian Historical Review* 17, 1 (March 1936): 3

4 Lady Tweedsmuir, "The Amateur Historian," *Canadian Historical Review* 20, 1 (March 1939): 1

UBC's Mack Eastman, for example, did not suffer fools gladly. When the Province removed W.L. Grant's *A History of Canada* from the list of approved textbooks in January 1920 in response to charges from BC Orangemen that it was anti-British, anti-Protestant, pro-French Canadian and pro-Catholic, he was livid. In a letter to Grant, Eastman condemned the book's detractors. "I believe that the general public, as well as the teaching profession, is friendly to your book. Only the wild Orangemen, the Fenian Raid Veterans and some other antiques who will soon die off, refuse to disarm."[5] Although Eastman, together with his UBC colleague, W.N. Sage, publicly and privately protested the decision, the book was never again approved for use in British Columbia's schools.[6] Two years after the banning of Grant's book, Eastman delivered an address to a teachers' convention in Vancouver. Although he did not refer directly to the Grant incident, he did argue that it is the professional historian, and not the amateur, that is best equipped to offer balance and perspective to school children. As he explained, "the perspective of the trained professional will be better than that of the man about town." And yet, it would seem that since the War "every man is his own historian."

> Any old man in the street can will [sic] tell us more of the 'true meaning of history' in ten minutes than you and I shall ever know in all our lives. History is open season and historians are fair game all the year round and no license is required....Today, more than ever before, amateurs and charlatans rush hourly in where professionals fear to tread.

Eastman hit the proverbial nail on the head: unlike doctors and lawyers, for example, professional historians cannot prevent people from doing history. Indeed, "Any old man in the street" can pronounce "the true

---

5 Mack Eastman to W.L. Grant, 29 May 1921, NA, W.L. Grant Papers, MG 30 D 59, vol. 3, file E. See also letters from W.N. Sage to W.L. Grant, Ibid, vol. 9, file Sa-Si

6 See Charles W. Humphries, "The Banning of a Book in British Columbia," *BC Studies* 1, 1 (Winter 1968-69): 1-12.

meaning of history." Continuing his critique, Eastman added that "Every monomaniac wants a textbook written or suppressed to appease his own special fetish." But the professional historian must not retreat. After all, "The children's only salvation...is in the calm and objective effort of the maturest and most gifted historians to place the recent past tentatively in its setting. If they fail, all fail."[7]

Reginald Trotter shared Eastman's concern. In a 1928 talk before the Saturday Club at Queen's University, he wanted to dispel the popular impression of history as "non-technical," as something upon which anybody can "speak with oracular authority." That just anybody can do history is preposterous, Trotter argued. He mocked the man who would claim, "I know nothing, and care less, about so-called scholarly criticism in historical research or about the art of lively but accurate historical narrative and exposition, but I know what history I like when I like it." In the final analysis, not everyone "is equally competent to pass judgment in historical matters." The writing of history is necessarily complex. For example, using primary material requires "the most critically discriminating examination before it can become the basis of reliable history." Indeed, the historian's material—his sources—"are not a whit less vital than are the laboratory apparatus and material to the investigations of the scientist." Trotter was careful, however, not to claim any kind of finality. "Absolute objectivity in historical narrative, whether or not it be desirable, is an unrealizable dream." Nonetheless, the historian is

7 Mack Eastman, "Teachers and Textbooks," address delivered at Teachers' Convention, King Edward High School, Easter, 1922, University of British Columbia Archives (UBCA), Box 1, file 17

infinitely "more competent than the inexpert layman to speak authoritatively" about the past.[8]

Alfred Bailey echoed the remarks of Eastman and Trotter. In a 1937 address to the Saint John Vocational School the young historian drew a sharp line between what he did and what the amateur did. History, he argued, must have a practical end. It must help us, in the here and now, formulate intelligent public policy. Too often, however, "the study of history is regarded as a mere hobby, like collecting stamps." This is hardly surprising given that "the so-called historical work in this country has been dominated by the ideas of the genealogist and the antiquarian." Antiquarians delight in obscure, unconnected facts. "For instance, he may piece together the story of a fire that burned somebody's barn in Oromocto in 1852." But really, who cares? The historian, meanwhile, would take this same incident, the 1852 burning of a barn in Oromocto, and transform it into usable, practical knowledge. First, he would gather statistics on all such fires in the preceding and succeeding years in an effort to determine their frequency. Linking these statistics to changes in the construction of buildings and in the knowledge of fire prevention, the historian would ask if "the financial burden sustained by the people of this province through economic loss by fire [was] due to ignorance of the proper construction of buildings and of efficient methods of prevention." If the answer is yes, then the historian must make policy recommendations about what can be done to prevent the loss of money and property by fire. As Bailey stated, the historian's aim "should be not merely to supply reading material to titillate the jaded curiosity of an effete leisured class, but to direct his

8 Reginald Trotter, "The Character of Clio," address delivered at the Saturday Club, 13 October 1928, Queen's University Archives (QUA), Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 27, file The Character of Clio, Saturday Club, 1928

studies of the past towards the solution of our present economic and social problems." Really, the historian must "combine the knowledge of the scientist with the fiery zeal of the missionary, and go out over the province with a new story told in new terms."[9]

If favourably contrasting their methods and results to the methods and results of amateur historians was one means of establishing their authority, professional historians also pursued another tactic: debunking.

II

In 1920 the *Canadian Historical Review* conceded that "Historical Revisions are seldom popular."

> Few people like to be told that Wolfe did not recite the lines from Gray's *Elegy* as he floated down to the Foulon on the night before the battle of the Plains of Abraham, or that Brock did not say, as he fell at Queenston Heights, 'Push on, brave York Volunteers.'

But popular or not, revision is absolutely essential.

> ...if Sir Robert Walpole's reproach 'Anything but history, for history must be false,' is to be removed, the accepted version of history must be constantly revised, and kept up to date, in the light of recent researches, without regard for cherished preconceptions or for the picturesqueness of the discarded details.[10]

The *CHR* might have added that in addition to arriving at more accurate version of history, the debunking of time-honored heroes distinguished professional historians from their predecessors.

Saskatchewan's Arthur Silver Morton, for example, argued that the French-Canadian explorer, Pierre Gaultier de La Vérendrye, was not the intrepid explorer found in popular accounts. "We have writers, colourists

---

9 A.G. Bailey, "Dramatic Incidents in New Brunswick's History and the Historical Solution of our Problems," unrevised notes for address to Saint John Vocational School, 1937, UNBA, A.G. Bailey Fonds, Series 3, Case 89, file 1

10 Notes and Comments, *Canadian Historical Review* 1, 2 (June 1920): 134-135. The author is not identified; however, it was more likely than not W.S. Wallace, the managing editor.

by nature, who are only satisfied with flaming tints," Morton began. As such, they paint a heroic picture of "a man whose soul burned to 'blaze' the trail to the Western Sea." However, material in the Public Archives "makes it possible to put our conventional idea of La Vérendrye to the test, and reach out towards a fresh interpretation of his career." According to Morton, "the light of the contemporary sources" reveals first a commandant of western posts and only second an explorer.[11] In a response to Morton's article, Lawrence Burpee strongly criticized his conclusion. "It is curious, after a man has assumed a certain hypothesis, how neatly all the available facts can be made to fit into it."[12] However, the veracity of Morton's interpretation is not the point. Rather, the point is his rhetorical style. He opened his article by mocking the heroic accounts of La Vérendrye. Against this backdrop, he presented himself as the dispassionate expert. Uninterested in hero-worship and unmoved by "the prevailing adoration of La Vérendrye,"[13] my interpretation, he proclaimed, will rely on the archival record. By his style and the tone of his argument he intended to at once distinguish himself from those writers "who are only satisfied with flaming tints" and establish himself as a professional historian interested only in the truth as found in the contemporary sources.[14]

---

11 Arthur S. Morton, "La Vérendrye: Commandant, Fur-Trader, and Explorer," *Canadian Historical Review* 9, 4 (December 1928): 1

12 Lawrence J. Burpee, "Professor Morton and La Vérendrye," *Canadian Historical Review* 10, 1 (March 1929): 54

13 Morton, "La Vérendrye," 1

14 Carl Berger included Morton among an earlier generation of fact finders and footnote chasers "for whom history was an avocation." In a gentle jab, Berger declared that "Morton excelled in establishing the precise locations of trading posts in the West." Carl Berger, *Honour and the Search for Influence: A History of the Royal Society of Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996): 30. Not only is this not true, it is the exact opposite of the truth. Morton considered himself a professional historian; history was his vocation. In 1941 he received the highest award available to Canadian historians, the J.B. Tyrrell Gold Medal from the Royal Society of Canada. For a consideration of Morton's career, see Donald Wright, "History

Also in 1928, W.T. Waugh of McGill published a full-length biography of James Wolfe, the British General who defeated the French on the Plains of Abraham. Wolfe had been lionized in English-Canadian historical writing in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[15] For David Ross McCord, Wolfe constituted an obsession. In addition to renovating the family home, Temple Grove, to resemble the famous Plains, he amassed what he repeatedly claimed to be the world's largest collection of Wolfiana. Among other items in his collection were a lock of Wolfe's hair (for which he paid £40 in a 1914 Sotherby's auction), several letters bearing the General's signature, a silhouette of his mother and, most importantly, Wolfe's personal diary dated 18 June to 16 August 1759. At one point, McCord likened his labours, the building of a national museum, to those of Wolfe: "But one thing is certain—Wolfe had to carry Quebec—and I must carry the museum."[16]

Whereas McCord's Wolfe was unambiguously heroic, galvanic and dashing, Waugh's Wolfe was, well, more fully human, a man of strengths to be sure, but a man of weaknesses as well. Moreover, his Wolfe was far from dashing. "He must have been a very ugly little boy," Waugh surmised.

> His flaming red hair did not go well with his blue eyes. His nose was tilted heavanward. His chin fell away as the chin of no man of action ought to do. He soon began to grow too fast, and throughout his life he was very thin. His legs were much too long, his movements ungainly. From the earliest years he suffered from a delicate chest and other physical weaknesses.

As a young officer in the British army Wolfe proved himself thoroughly average. He could be "pompous and sententious" and, to the end,

---

at the University of Saskatchewan from E.H. Oliver to Hilda Neatby," *Essays: University of Saskatchewan*, 1, 1 (1999): 1-47.

15 For example, see William Wood, *The Fight for Canada* (Toronto: The Musson Book Co., 1906).

16 David Ross McCord to W.D. Lighthall, 13 December 1909, NA, W.D. Lighthall Papers, MG 29 D 93, vol. 1, file 28

"unpleasantly censorious and over free with advice."[17] However, he was ruthless in battle. Although McCord conveniently ignored this fact,[18] Waugh did not. Wolfe, he argued, "would punish breaches of discipline without mercy, he would record with satisfaction a great slaughter of the enemy, he would advise the massacre of a Highland clan, he would burn villages, he would destroy the nets and boats of poor fishermen: he would, in a word, do anything that the laws of war permitted." Waugh credited Wolfe with skill as a military tactician, but he also drew attention to his tactical shortcomings. For example, he blamed Wolfe for the British defeat at Montmorency, the first major confrontation between the French and the British in the summer of 1759. "The whole undertaking, in short, was ill-conceived and ill-prepared."[19] In the final weeks leading up to the Plains of Abraham, a bed-ridden Wolfe suffered from tuberculosis of the kidneys and depression at the failure of the campaign to date. Still, Wolfe somehow managed to overcome his poor physical and mental state to lead his army to ultimate victory. In other words, as a man and as a soldier Wolfe had vices and virtues. In his review, an effusive George Wrong declared *James Wolfe: man and soldier* a fine example of new biography. "This is biography as now, in reaction against the picture of the inspired hero, we like to have it; and Professor Waugh has done it skillfully." The end result, according to Wrong, is a more complete, more balanced picture of the famous general.[20]

---

17 W.T. Waugh, *James Wolfe: man and soldier* (Montreal, New York: Louis Carrier & Co., 1928): 25, 116

18 See Donald Wright, "Remembering War in Imperial Canada: David Ross McCord and the McCord National Museum" *Fontanus: from the collections of McGill* 9 (1996): 97-104.

19 Waugh, *James Wolfe*, 121, 255

20 George Wrong, *Canadian Historical Review* 9, 4 (December 1928): 341-345

E.R. Adair surpassed Waugh in his 1936 presidential address to the Canadian Historical Association. Indeed, the controversial and outspoken Adair took great pleasure in knocking James Wolfe from his pedestal. As George Brown once said of Adair, "He is simply one of those people who like to stir things up."[21] In any event, Adair believed that it was incumbent on the historian to test legends "by the acid of facts." When Wolfe is thus subjected to the known facts, he is little more than an incompetent fool. According to Adair, Wolfe had few friends, he was physically unattractive, he fared poorly with members of the opposite sex and he was ponderous, platitudinous, obsequious and fawning. His ascension through the British army owed more to nepotism and connections than to actual merit and talent. As a strategist, Wolfe proved positively hopeless; his victories owed more to blind luck than well-executed plans. In the final weeks of the campaign against Quebec, he vacillated. Adair even accused Waugh of hero-worship; after all, it was Wolfe's brigadiers, not Wolfe himself, who engineered the ultimately victorious battle on the Plains of Abraham. Still, Adair conceded Wolfe's romantic appeal. "But when we come down to earth and study what actually happened, we soon discover how different the real story is."[22]

---

21 George Brown to Aegidius Fauteux, 7 June 1932, University of Toronto Archives (UTA), University of Toronto Press, CHR Files, A86-0044, Box 5, file The Canadian Historical Association and the Canadian Historical Review

22 E.R. Adair, "The Military Reputation of Major-General James Wolfe," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1936): 31. In 1938 Adair gave a similar address to the Mechanics Institute in Montreal. Wolfe "had no sense of humour, Prof. Adair declared, and was not popular with the ladies, writing of the Scottish girls: 'They are cold—to everything but the sound of the bagpipes.'" Moreover, his victory over Montcalm was as much an accident as it was anything else. See "Gen. Wolfe No Hero Speaker Declares," Montreal, *The Gazette*, 18 November 1938. A McGill student remembered her reaction to Adair's version of James Wolfe. "To this day, I remember the shock of hearing him announce firmly that Wolfe was an inept bungler, that the taking of Quebec was not his plan but a scheme of some of his officers to which he had reluctantly acceded....What's more, Professor Adair continued by explaining testily that Wolfe did *not* recite Gray's 'Elegy' as they rowed to shore from the English ships."

Adair's thorough debunking of Wolfe was not his first attempt at deflating myth: a few years earlier he had subjected the much-loved hero of New France, Adam Dollard, to the test of contemporary evidence. Nineteenth-century and early-twentieth-century Quebec historiography had transformed Dollard and his sixteen brethren into the saviours of New France. Aware of an imminent Iroquois attack against the fledgling colony, these young men decided to strike first. Joined by forty-four Hurons and Algonquins, Dollard met the advancing Iroquois war party at Long Sault. After an eight-day battle Dollard and his compatriots succumbed. But in their self-sacrifice, they surely saved the colony and its Roman Catholic faith. At all of this, Adair scoffed. Dollard, he argued, never intended to sacrifice himself. Indeed, he had no idea of an impending attack. His goal was decidedly less noble: to ambush Iroquois hunters in an effort to re-direct the fur trade through Montreal and to redeem his damaged reputation in France. That he and his comrades happened to engage an advance party of 300 Iroquois was purely accidental. Moreover, there is nothing to suggest that this larger group of Iroquois intended to attack either Montreal or Quebec. In addition, Dollard's folly may have undermined the security of the colony. After all, Adair noted, the Iroquois stepped up their attacks against New France the following year. "As a saviour of his country, Adam Dollard, Sieur des Ormeaux, must be relegated to the museum of historical myths."[23] Even before it was published, Adair's account angered some Quebec historians. In a six-page letter to George Brown, editor of the *CHR*, Aegidius Fauteux stated that Adair's "vigorous attack" against the "revered" Dollard was

---

See Barbara J. Whitely, "Professor Adair: the iconoclast," in E.A. Collard, *The McGill You Knew: an anthology of memories, 1920-1960* (Don Mills: Longman, 1975): 74.

23 E.R. Adair, "Dollard des Ormeaux and the Fight at the Long Sault," *Canadian Historical Review* 13, 2 (June 1932): 128-138

unnecessary. "There is only one explanation [for] his bizarre coup d'éclat," he argued.

> I easily gather from other instances that he disdainfully pities our manner of writing history and feels bound to accomplish a necessary reform....As he himself contends, he is a realistic historian fighting against the old fashioned romantic school.[24]

Fauteux was absolutely correct: in questioning the Dollard legend, Adair wanted to portray himself as a "realistic historian" in opposition to myth makers and romantics.

Also in 1932, Toronto's W.S. Wallace published a short, self-consciously iconoclastic booklet entitled *The Story of Laura Secord: A Study in Historical Evidence*. Wallace acknowledged that Laura Secord's intrepid 1813 journey through a hostile forest to warn British troops of an impending American attack possessed "a romantic quality such as endears it even to the hard heart of the professional historian." But, be that as it may, it is the historian's task to weigh the evidence. "Fortunately, there has survived an unusual wealth of contemporaneous documentary evidence with regard to the battle of Beaver Dam." He pointed out that Secord's version of events, told after the fact, did not coincide with the version of events found in the contemporary evidence. Indeed, he went to great lengths to underscore the discrepancies between the "facts" in Secord's testimony and the facts found in the documents. As Wallace reminded his readers, the "human memory is a notoriously treacherous and fallacious medium for the transmission of historical truth." In the end, "Mrs. Secord's narrative fails

---

24 Aegidius Fauteux to George Brown, 10 May 1932, UTA, University of Toronto Press, CHR Files, A86-0044, Box 5, file The Canadian Historical Association and the Canadian Historical Review. Brown agreed that Adair could be very outspoken and that he was capable of too much "debunking." As editor, he had toned down Adair's manuscript and invited Gustave Lanctôt to write a response. George Brown to Aegidius Fauteux, 13 May 1932 and 7 June 1932, Ibid. See Gustave Lanctôt, "Was Dollard the Saviour of New France?" *Canadian Historical Review* 13, 2 (June 1932): 138-146.

therefore by all the tests we have applied to it." That this woman saved the country "is too absurd for further discussion."[25] Not surprisingly, Wallace's booklet set off a tempest in a teapot. Summarizing the debate, and siding with Wallace, Hector Charlesworth of *Saturday Night* explained that, "Prof. Wallace is one of your modern scientific historians who rely on contemporary documents; whereas the story of Laura Secord was introduced into Canadian history at a time when romance was considered more important than mere records."[26]

Eastman, Trotter and Bailey; Morton, Waugh, Adair and Wallace: each in their own way engaged in boundary-work. In denigrating the work of amateurs—or "cranks," as Arthur Lower once called them[27]—they raised the status of their own work. The professionalization of history thus demanded the simultaneous amateurization of history. Amateur historians were a necessary Other. As a strategy of professionalization, using as a foil the newly created amateur historian was a means to an end: the establishment of authority. In her scholarship on the transformation of history at Oxford, Rosemary Jann similarly observed that "assaults on the literary

---

25 W. Stewart Wallace, *The Story of Laura Secord: A Study in Historical Evidence* (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1932): 3, 4, 17, 25, 25

26 "Historical Question Debated," *Saturday Night* 47, 10 (16 January 1932): 1. Charlesworth clearly sided with Wallace. In a private letter to Wallace he offered the following. "As a matter of fact I was trying to vindicate you by irony in the Laura Secord editorial. The most amusing by-product of the controversy relates to the pretensions of the Fitzgibbon family a shabby genteel outfit who for decades have been exploiting Grandfather's military reputation. It now appears that he and Laura were equally out of it." Hector Charlesworth, Managing Editor, to W.S. Wallace, 14 January 1932, W.S. Wallace Papers, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto (TFRBR-UT) MC 31, Box 37, file Correspondence 1932, A-J.

27 "It is perhaps inevitable that a historical association in Canada should gather round it a number of people who are not professional historians," Arthur Lower explained to a colleague. "That would be all to the good if these persons were people interested in public affairs and in history as a genuine force in the nation's growth. They are, however, frequently one or other species of the abundant genus of cranks. Probably they are our cross and we must bear with them, simply preventing them from becoming dominant." Arthur Lower to Chester New, 15 December 1936, Queen's University Archives (QUA), Arthur Lower Papers, Box 1, file A8

tactics of the amateur tradition became its most effective rhetorical device for signaling this shift in the bases of authority."[28] Amateurization, however, did not mean contempt for, or ignorance of, local history; in point of fact, at the same time as professional historians attempted to distinguish themselves from amateur historians, they also acknowledged their utility. For example, in the preface to *James Wolfe: Man and Soldier*, Waugh publicly thanked William Wood, John Clarence Webster and W.D. Lighthall for their assistance; he also acknowledged a debt to the Wolfe material housed at the McCord National Museum.[29]

III

In a 1932 article entitled "The Importance of Local History in the Writing of General History," D.C. Harvey placed local (i.e. amateur) and general (i.e. professional) historians in a pyramid.[30] At the base of the pyramid were the innumerable local historians; at the apex were the far-fewer-in-number general historians. Moreover, "many local historians must have lived and died before one general historian could undertake to write an adequate general history." The chief function, therefore, "of the local historian is to provide the general historian with verified and verifiable facts about their smaller fields and with the most discerning interpretation of these facts as they can offer." Indeed, Harvey called for a very clear division of labour, or "differentiation in function." Accordingly,

> The local historian must give detailed accurate knowledge. The general historian must select common or differentiating movements,

28 Rosemary Jann, "From Amateur to Professional: The Case of the Oxbridge Historians," *Journal of British Studies* 22, 2 (Spring 1983): 122

29 Waugh, *James Wolfe*, 12

30 A 1931 article in the *CHR* also used local and general to mean amateur and professional. See "Canadian Historical Societies," *Canadian Historical Review* 12, 4 (December 1931): 356-363.

> must place them in perspective, and treat them in due proportion to their national importance.

What might this division of labour look like? At the base of the pyramid we would find the many local historians at work on the history of their family or on biographical sketches of original settlers. "They may tell of the first saw-mill, the first residence. the first town-meeting, the first town officers, the first fire-brigade, the first epidemic, the first church and school, and the first branch road connecting them with the outside world." Moving up the pyramid, we would find the county historian and then the provincial historian. "When all these local historians have done their work and the solid base of the pyramid has been built up to the centre, our general historians must be called upon to act." To the general historian falls the enormous task of synthesis, emphasis, proportion and perspective. Still, the local historian is enormously important. Knowing that he has a vital role to play, he "should walk with a firm step, conscious that his part is one of fundamental importance." However, his energy must be properly directed if "the general historian is ever to go beyond the vaguest generalizations." At the same time then as Harvey acknowledged the importance of amateur historians, he deliberately constructed a hierarchical division of labour (professional historians constitute the apex of the pyramid, amateur historians the base) and a hierarchical relationship (professionals must "properly direct" the work of amateurs).[31]

Western's J.J. Talman would have agreed with Harvey's argument. In an unpublished address entitled "History Must Be More Than An Adornment," Talman stressed the importance of local history to the writing

---

31 D.C. Harvey, "The Importance of Local History in the Writing of General History," *Canadian Historical Review* 13, 3 (September 1932): 244-251. For a similar depiction of the geneologist, the anitiquarian and the professional historian in the Maritimes, see John Bartlet Brebner, "Uses and Abuses of History," *Dalhousie Review* 24 (1944-45): 34-37.

of a national history that would serve as a "dynamic force" in the nation. "All history, no matter how local, is part of the national record." In any community, therefore, "the coming of the first settler, the building of his shanty and later his log house, the erection of the gristmill and sawmill, the building of the first tavern and later a school and churches, the changing of blazed trails to corduroy, plank and gravel roads, the printing of the first newspaper, the coming of the electric telegraph and railways [and] the developing industries" all speak directly to the national experience. Talman acknowledged that a lot of work was being done in the field of local history across the country. "Much of it is of value while much may be of little purpose." Whatever the case, "more could be done than is being done." The trick is to teach those interested persons that "local history is something more than family trees and antiquarianism." Professional historians should come to the "aid and comfort" of amateur historians. Through adult education, community programmes and extension work, university history faculties ought to take the initiative and guide "the amateur along paths of scholarship." "No matter how the guidance and aid may come, local history should not be left to wander."[32]

The desire to acknowledge the significance of local history, to encourage its development and yet, at the same time, to preserve the authority of professional history found its clearest expression at the 1952 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Historical Association. In the fall of 1951 rumours circulated among some members of the CHA that local history associations and societies were planning to federate in order to create a national society. For obvious reasons, the CHA became very nervous: it

32 J.J. Talman, "History Must Be More Than An Adornment," n.d., c. 1940s, J.J. Talman Regional Collection, University of Western Ontario, J.J. Talman Papers, Box 11, file 8

represented a direct challenge to its status as the national history association. Charles Stacey, at this point Vice-President, explained that the CHA must do something, anything, in order "to head off the possibility of the malcontents setting up some new organization."[33] To the President, Jean Bruchési, he predicted a grim future—"the formation of a new society would be almost fatal to the CHA." The Association must take a pro-active stance. Already Dick Preston of the Programme Committee has agreed to include a session on local history; out of this might come some concrete suggestions "for more effective liaison between [the] CHA and the local societies." There is no guarantee, of course, but it "might serve to prevent a serious secession from the Association."[34] Over the next few months Stacey recruited five panelists: Hilda Neatby, Jim Conacher, Dick Preston, Lewis Thomas and Honorius Provost.

In their respective addresses, each speaker stressed the importance of local history. Neatby was very honest: for "intellectual and cultural" reasons, as well as "practical and sordid" reasons, the CHA must take more interest in local history. Not only does local history refine our understanding of national history, but increased membership and thus improved finances "should accrue to the national association from active local and regional societies." Neatby conceded that local history did not mean quality history: it tends towards "the trivial, the picturesque, and the pseudo-dramatic" at that same time as it can lead "endless and aimless counting and listing." But local history need not mean bad history: "local and regional groups could receive valuable help and support from a

33 Charles Stacey to George Stanley, 30 November 1951, UTA, C.P. Stacey Papers, B91-0013, Box 3, file CHA 1946-1952

34 Charles Stacey to Jean Bruchési, 22 December 1951, Ibid

national association with a constant concern for scholarly standards."[35] Representing the *CHR*, Jim Conacher stated that English Canada's leading journal already supported local history through its published bibliographies and "Notes and Comments" section.[36] As editor of the CHA's *Annual Report*, Dick Preston stated that it "would be most unprofessional if historians" did not study their own history when discussing "a practical question like the interest of their own national association in local history." He argued that the CHA had always expressed an interest in local history; however, because of drift, rotation of officers and the annual autonomy of the Programme Committee the CHA did not necessarily follow up its own initiatives.[37] Valuing a place for local history at the Annual Meeting, he called for more co-operation between the CHA's Local History Committee and the Programme Committee. Lewis Thomas of the Saskatchewan Archives placed an enormous value on local history ("What, except for biography, brings us closer to human beings as they really are than local history?") but he also wanted to see the CHA challenge local groups to improve their work. In this way, local historians will see themselves as belonging to "a larger fellowship of scholarship."[38]

Linda Ambrose argued, erroneously, that Hilda Neatby harboured a "disdain" for local history while Lewis Thomas was much more sympathetic. "Professional historians," she concluded, "were never unanimous in their

35 Hilda Neatby, "The Canadian Historical Association, The Canadian Historical Review, and Local History: A Symposium," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1952): 46-50

36 Jim Conacher, Ibid, 50-53. The *CHR* began its Notes on Historical Societies in 1932.

37 R.A. Preston, Ibid, 53-56

38 Lewis Thomas, Ibid, 59-53

ideas about the amateurs."[39] However, both Neatby and Thomas appreciated the many "important contributions"[40] of local history and both wanted to improve its quality. Indeed, professional historians displayed a high degree of unanimity vis-à-vis local historians. As Charles Stacey observed, it is "obviously the sense of the meeting that the CHA should take an interest in and be responsible for the co-ordination of the activities of local societies."[41] Established in 1950, the Local History Section of the CHA resumed with new vigour its mandate to promote greater interest in, and improve the standards of, local history. Among other things, the Section recommended that the CHA give certificates of merit for outstanding contributions in the field of local history. Although it took eight years, the CHA conferred its first awards in 1960.[42]

If professional historians needed amateur historians as an Other, they also needed them for their assistance in the preservation of source material, for their membership dues in the CHA and for their efforts at increasing interest in history generally. However, historians repeatedly asserted a hierarchical relationship while the CHA protected its status as the national historical association. Drawing and policing the professional/amateur boundary was not the profession's only boundary-work. The historical profession, therefore, might be conceived of as a club anxious to enhance and defend its members' status and determined to protect its members' access to the academic labour market.

---

39 Linda Ambrose, "Ontario Women's Institutes and the Work of Local History," in Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory: English-Canadian Women and the Work of History* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997): 89

40 Neatby, "Symposium," 50

41 Charles Stacey, Ibid, 65

42 See Margaret Ormsby, "Report of the Local History Section," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1960): 120-122.

IV

As a club, the historical profession had a restrictive membership policy. Indeed, Jewish graduate students and historians endured discrimination. Based on the counsel of Sir Joseph Flavelle, University of Toronto President, Sir Robert Falconer, did not hire a Polish Jew for fear that he would not sufficiently understand British institutions. For his part, Lewis Namier went on to become Sir Lewis Namier, one of England's greatest historians.[43] In a letter of recommendation for a student, Frank Underhill wrote that, "he is a Jew with a good deal of the Jew's persecution complex, and this makes him unduly aggressive and sarcastic in discussion and writing."[44] A few months later he described the same student as "a Jew with the slightly aggressive attitude which marks some Jews."[45] The Principal of McGill stated that, all things considered, the selection committee would prefer a gentile to a Jew for the Kingsford Chair in History.[46] In private, Donald

---

43 Robert Bothwell, *Laying the Foundation: A Century of History at University of Toronto* (Toronto: Department of History, University of Toronto, 1991): 48. However, George Wrong thought Jewish history should be a topic of research for MA students. He told Adam Shortt that he wanted to increase the research component of the MA degree and that, among other topics, "some work might be done on the Jew in both Toronto and Montreal." George Wrong to Adam Shortt, 29 November 1922, Queen's University Archives (QUA), Adam Shortt Collection, Box 6, file Correspondence July-December 1922.

44 Frank Underhill to Ontario Selection Committee, Rhodes Scholarship Trust, 23 November 1938, (NA), Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 7, file Rhodes Scholarship Trust, 1928-1956

45 Frank Underhill to Herbert Heaton, 25 January 1939, ibid, vol. 7, file Albert Rose 1928-1956

46 In 1945, McGill began its search for an appointment to the Kingsford Chair in History. They solicited names from scholars in England. One responded with two names, one a German, the other a Jew. Of the Jew he said, "The only possible 'out' about him, which, however, may not be an objection to you, is that he is a Jew. But he has none of the undesirable characteristics which people sometime associate with his race." Name deleted to Principal Cyril James, 18 June 1945, McGill University Archives (MUA), RG 2, Container 690, file History Selection Committee, Kingsford Chair Principal James responded that, all things being equal, "we should probably like to appoint a Protestant from North America or Great Britain." Principal Cyril James to name deleted, 6 July 1945, Ibid.

Creighton liked to gossip about "Jews, kikes and the sons of Abraham."[47] Harold Innis did not want to hire any Jews because it would only encourage more Jews to enter the social sciences.[48] Although the historian-turned-headmaster W.L. Grant attempted to secure a position for Lionel Gelber in the federal civil service, and although he expressed his distaste for anti-semitism, he nonetheless relied on the anti-semitic notion of the good Jew. As Grant explained, Gelber "is the only Jew I have ever known without the least touch of Jewish complex. Physically he is tall and good looking and not aggressively Jewish, though a certain curve in his nose betrays him."[49] Underhill also relied on the good-Jew argument. He wanted to hire Gelber because it was wrong that a department as large as Toronto's did not have a Jew on board; and, after all, at least Gelber was a Jew that we knew.[50]

E.R. Adair, however, consistently defended Jewish historians. In 1938 he publicly voiced his concern about the International Congress of Historical Sciences' plan to meet in Rome in 1943. Italy's fascist government had no respect for intellectual freedom. For example, he asked rhetorically, "will historians of Jewish birth be permitted to attend?"[51] A few years later, Adair urged a reluctant candidate for the Kingsford Chair

---

47 Author's interview with Jill Ker Conway, Boston, Massachusetts, 9 June 1998

48 Jean Burnet, "Minorities I Have Belonged To," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 13, 1 (1981): 30

49 W.L. Grant to O.D. Skelton, 2 February 1934, NA, W.L. Grant Papers, MG 30 D 59, vol. 9, file Skelton, O.D.

50 Frank Underhill to Arthur Lower, 28 February 1939, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 1, file A-12. The American historian, C.C. Tansill, did not want Gelber to review his book in the *Canadian Historical Review*. As he told George Brown, "in the United States we regard Lionel Gelber as a bumptious Jew with much talk but with little real learning." George Brown refused to consider Tansill's request; indeed, he forwarded his letter to the American Historical Association. C.C. Tansill to George Brown, 7 January 1944, copy in Columbia University, Rare Book and Manuscript Library (CUL), John Bartlet Brebner Papers, Box 10, file Bartlet, John Brebner.

51 E.R. Adair, "The International Congress of Historical Sciences," *Canadian Historical Review* 19, 4 (December 1938): 393

to at least come to an interview; the fact that you are Jewish does not matter in Montreal, he told him.[52] He proved wrong. Nevertheless, there were not many Jewish students seeking graduate degrees in history nor were there many Jewish historians seeking positions at English-Canadian universities.[53]

There were, however, a lot of women. Precisely because women were so numerous—as undergraduates, graduate students and scholars seeking employment—historians were compelled to articulate/defend their masculinity in ways that they never had to articulate/defend their Christianity. After all, "it is a sociological truism that nothing contributes more to the status of a vocation than the extent to which it is seen as a male calling."[54]

In her book, *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge*, Lorraine Code maintained that mainstream Anglo-American epistemology "works from engrained assumptions about *who* can be a knower."[55] These assumptions are deeply gendered. Far from being transcendent, Anglo-American epistemology relies on a series of binary oppositions: reason/emotion, objective/subjective and knowledge/experience. In turn, these oppositions are hierarchical and gendered: reason, objectivity and knowledge are superior and masculine while emotion, subjectivity and experience are inferior and feminine.

---

52 E.R. Adair to name deleted, 12 May 1945, MUA, RG 2, Container 690, file History Selection Committee, Kingsford Chair.

53 Speculating about anti-semitism and the historical profession in the interwar United States, Peter Novick wrote: "The number of Jews within the profession who were discriminated against in this period was probably smaller than the number of those who, knowing what they were in for, stayed out of it." Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity' Question and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988): 173

54 Ibid, 367

55 Lorraine Code, *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991): xi

According to Code, the representation of woman as the negative of man dates to the Ancients. For example, with reference to the human soul, Aristotle noted that "the slave has no deliberative faculty at all; the woman has, but it is without authority and the child has, but it is immature." This representation of woman "as a creature whose deliberative faculty—her capacity to think, judge, and know—is *without authority*" has endured in its persistent variations.[56] What can she know? The rhetorical question implies its own answer. Emotional, subjective and experiential, her voice lacks authority.

The intersection between the professionalization of history in English Canada and gendered assumptions about who can and who cannot not be a knower constitutes the remainder of this chapter.[57] Although it contributes to the literature on women in higher education,[58] and to the

---

56 Ibid., 181. Code is not the only scholar to point to the gendered dichotomies in Anglo-American epistemology. See Elizabeth Fee, "Women's Nature and Scientific Objectivity," in M. Lowe and R. Hubbard, eds., *Women's Nature: Rationalizations of Inequality* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1981); Genevieve Lloyd, *The Man of Reason: 'Male' and 'Female' in Western Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984); Bonnie Smith, "Gender, Objectivity, and the Rise of Scientific History," in Wolfgang Natter, Theodore R. Schatzki, John Paul Jones, eds., *Objectivity and its Other* (New York: The Guildford Press, 1995); and E. Doyle McCarthy, *Knowledge as Culture: The New Sociology of Knowledge* (London: Routledge, 1996).

57 Feminist scholars have documented the tension between the socially constructed categories of "woman" and "professional." See Nancy Cott, *The Grounding of Modern Feminism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), chap. 7, "Professionalism and Feminism"; and Anne Witz, *Professions and Patriarchy* (London: Routledge, 1992). For the tension between "woman" and "professional scientist" see Margaret W. Rossiter, *Woman Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), chap. 4, "A Manly Profession."

58 On women in higher education in English Canada see Veronica Strong-Boag, *The New Day Recalled: Lives of Girls and Women in English Canada, 1919-1939* (Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1988): 23-26; the essays on women in Paul Axelrod and John G. Reid, eds., *Youth, University and Canadian Society: Essays in the Social History of Higher Education* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1989); Paul Axelrod, *Making a Middle Class: Student Life in English Canada during the Thirties* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1990); and A.B. McKillop, *Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario, 1791-1951* (Toronto: Ontario Historical Studies Series, University of Toronto Press, 1994), 124-146, 420-437. On women in the professoriate see Judith Fingard, "Gender and Inequality at Dalhousie: Faculty Women Before 1950," *Dalhousie Review* 64, 4 (Winter 1984-1985): 687-703; Alison Prentice,

growing interest in the history of women in history,[59] this section most directly complements Alison Prentice's pioneering essay, "Laying Siege to the History Professoriate." Prentice studied women as undergraduates, graduate students and faculty members at six English-Canadian universities prior to 1950.[60] To some extent, what follows covers similar terrain. It documents the experiences of women studying and teaching history and it reveals the sexism—the empirical, observable discrimination based on sex—they endured. However, it starts from the premise that sexism was not simply "the way they did things back then." Again, it was Prentice who pointed in the right direction. In a suggestive remark early in her essay, she noted that as "historians competed for place as experts and creators of knowledge," neither the first generation of professional historians nor their mid-century successors could imagine "women participating in the new professionalism."

> As some departments grew and specialized, their leaders appeared to worry that too much female involvement might undermine the

---

"Bluestockings, Feminists, or Women Workers? A Preliminary Look at Women's Employment at the University of Toronto," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 2 (1991): 231-261; and Mary Kinnear, *In Subordination: Professional Women in Manitoba, 1870-1970* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1995), chap. 2, "Discourse by Default: Women University Teachers."

59 On women in history in English Canada see Boutilier and Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory*. In their very useful introduction, Boutilier and Prentice place the experiences of women in history in English Canada in the larger contexts of women in history in Europe and the United States. See also Michael Hayden, ed., *So Much to Do, So Little Time: The Writings of Hilda Neatby* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1983); and Chad Reimer, "The Making of British Columbia History: Historical Writing and Institutions, 1784-1958," (PhD, York University, 1995), chap. 8, "Margaret Ormsby and a First Generation of British Columbia Historians." For information on women in history in the United States see Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), chap. 9, "American Women Historians, 1884-1984"; and Jacqueline Goggin, "Challenging Sexual Discrimination in the Historical Profession: Women Historians and the American Historical Association, 1890-1940," *American Historical Review* 97, 3 (June 1992): 769-802.

60 Alison Prentice, "Laying Siege to the History Professoriate," in Boutilier and Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory*. I would like to thank Dr. Prentice who kindly allowed me to read a manuscript copy of her article.

> professional status that academic historians sought for themselves and their more serious students during this period.[61]

Although cautious, Prentice was right.

When George Wrong said in 1908 that "the chief charm and strength of woman is in her being unlike man"[62] he both understood it as a self-evident statement of fact and intended it as a compliment. However, the representation of woman as the negative of man weakened women's claims to historical knowledge and worked against women seeking a career in history. To quote feminist theorist Genevieve Lloyd, "Women cannot easily be accommodated into a cultural ideal [science, knowledge] which has defined itself in opposition to the feminine."[63] In point of fact, if women could not be easily accommodated they were also actively excluded from the project of science and knowledge. As Thom Workman rightly observed, "The implied presence of feminine characteristics in any sphere of life undermines its status."[64] Thus, the implied presence of femininity, and the actual presence of women, had to be minimized in the project to professionalize the study of history along rational, objective, scientific and masculine lines.

Sexism not only protected the status of history as a masculine discipline, it also protected the academic labour market for men. Indeed, current thinking on sexual harassment is useful to understanding the

---

61 Ibid., 203. See also Sara Z. Burke, *Seeking the Highest Good: Social Service and Gender at the University of Toronto, 1888-1937* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1996): 80.

62 George Wrong, "A College for Women," *The University of Toronto Monthly* 10, 1 (November 1909): 7. In his scholarship Wrong once argued that, "Nature dictates in every society that the work of man and woman shall be different. To women belong the daily cares of the household and her additional tasks depend on the conditions of life." George Wrong, *The Rise and Fall of New France, vol. I* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1928): 226

63 Lloyd, *The Man of Reason*, 104

64 Thom Workman, *Banking on Deception: The Discourse of Fiscal Crisis* (Halifax: Fernwood, 1996): 57

discrimination women confronted in the historical profession. Sexual harassment is too often understood to only mean unwanted sexual advances by men against women. However, in a 1998 article in the *Yale Law Journal*, Vicki Schultz developed a broader conceptualization of sexual harassment. In a popular summary of her article, Schultz stated that "the real issue isn't sex, it's sexism on the job."

> The fact is, most harassment isn't about satisfying sexual desires. It's about protecting work—especially the most favoured lines of work—as preserves of male competence and authority.[65]

Thus reconceptualized, sexual harassment includes: "characterizing the work as appropriate for men only"; "withholding the training, information, or opportunity to learn to do the job well"; "providing sexist evaluations of women's performance or denying them deserved promotions"; and "isolating women from the social networks that confer a sense of belonging." "Harassment," Schultz concluded, "serves a gender-guarding, competence-undermining function."

> By subverting women's capacity to perform favored lines of work, harassment polices the boundaries of the work and protects its idealized masculine image—as well as the identity of those who do it.[66]

The presence of women, therefore, had to be minimized in order to professionalize the study of history along rational, objective, scientific and masculine lines and in order to protect the academic labour market for men. Of course, those women studying and seeking a career in history would not have described the discrimination they confronted as sexual harassment. Nonetheless, as defined by Schultz, it remains a useful means of interpreting their historical experience. Indeed, that is the thesis of

---

65 Vicki Schultz, "Sex Is the Least of It," *The Nation* (25 May 1998): 11

66 Vicki Schultz, "Reconceptualizing Sexual Harassment," *Yale Law Journal* 107, 6 (April 1998): 1687, 1691

this chapter: the types of sexism Schultz identified were not incidental to the professionalization of history in English Canada to 1960—they were necessary.

Against the above theoretical backdrop, what follows is a study of women as undergraduates, graduates and faculty.

V

Women were very much part of the expanding undergraduate enrolment. While it is impossible to determine the precise number of women undergraduates in history at English-Canadian universities, Prentice demonstrated that prior to 1950 women accounted for anywhere from one third to one half of the history students at the six institutions she studied.[67] It is similarly difficult to generalize the experiences of women as undergraduates. However, there is no doubt that women students encountered sexism. That sexism, furthermore, both stemmed from and perpetuated a discursive association of history with masculinity.

For example, when at the University of Saskatchewan Frank Underhill separated men and women students in his tutorials, "believing that shy females in the group inhibited the men from expressing themselves freely, thus lowering the quality of the tutorial."[68] As he explained in 1930, "no university teacher wants to be condemned to teaching women. He knows that that means an old age of pedantry or empty, meaningless aestheticism."[69] Arthur Lower shared Underhill's reticence. He thought

---

67 Prentice, "Laying Siege," 200. Prentice studied UBC, Saskatchewan, Toronto, Queen's, McGill and Dalhousie.

68 R. Douglas Francis, *Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986): 36

69 Quotation in Paul Axelrod, *Making a Middle Class: Student Life in English Canada during the Thirties* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1990): 91

co-education fine for children, perhaps adolescents and graduate students who are adults. But co-education at the undergraduate level only spelled trouble. As he explained, "pretty girls [are] always attracting young men, the play goes on every day and all day."

> The girls, with their unsubduable social instinct, have a genius for turning every occasion into a social occasion and, in small groups where discussion is called for, they nearly all follow the lead of the 'dominant' males, contribute never a point—and write, if not always the best, then invariably the tidiest essays.

To mitigate the effects of the naturally coquettish but also submissive co-ed, Lower "often informally separated" the women from the men.[70] Yes, he believed separation benefited women as well as men; however, he did not cast blame on any perceived qualities inherent in men for this state of affairs. It was the fault of women, their irrepressible sociability, and their habit, particularly strong in pretty women, of distracting men. How many other professors divided men and women into separate groups is not known.

Meanwhile, women were barred from at least three undergraduate historical societies. Toronto's Historical Club provided the model. Founded by George Wrong in 1904 it did not admit women until the 1960s. Membership was limited to about twenty-five third- and fourth-year students from across the humanities. The Club held fortnightly meetings (often in the home of a prominent Torontonian like Sir Joseph Flavelle, Sir Edmund Walker or Sir Edmund Osler) and arranged an annual dinner each spring in Hart House (complete with dinner jackets and a guest speaker). There is every reason to believe that the History Department took the Club and its members seriously. At a 1933 departmental meeting, Donald Creighton expressed concern about the "unsatisfactory" state of the

---

70 Arthur Lower, *My First Seventy-five Years* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967): 327

Historical Club—there were not enough members from Modern History.[71] Further indicating the importance of the Historical Club, two faculty members sat on the executive and the entire faculty attended the annual dinner. Commenting on the Historical Club's restrictive membership policy in the 1930s, Robert Bothwell simply observed that it was "a very odd development" at a time when more than half the history students were women.[72]

A.L. Burt reproduced the Historical Club at Alberta in the 1910s. As an undergraduate, he had been a member of Toronto's Club before going on to Oxford and then the University of Alberta where he began his teaching career in 1913. Like Toronto's, Alberta's Club was exclusively male and Burt, like his mentor George Wrong, took the Club seriously. Writing to his wife from Britain in 1919, Burt inquired about the Club and expressed an anxious desire to see it survive his temporary absence with the War effort. "You are a dear old soul to keep up the Historical Club," he told his wife. "It is immensely appreciated by the boys."[73] And again like Toronto's, Alberta's Club was not opened to women until 1960s when Sylvia Van Kirk became the first woman to join in 1965 and then, in 1968, the first woman to serve as President. As she recalled, there was considerable concern among the members that a woman President would turn the Club into a "hen party."[74]

McGill too had an all-male History Club. Although founded by Charles Colby in 1897, the Club experienced something of a re-birth in 1923, what

---

71 Departmental Minutes, 28 November 1933, University of Toronto Archives (UTA), A-90-0023, Department of History, box 29, file Minutes 1928-1945

72 Bothwell, *Laying the Foundation*, 86

73 A.L. Burt to Dorrie Burt, 12 March 1919, NA, Alfred L. Burt Papers, MG 30, D 103, vol. 4, file 2

74 Author's interview with Sylvia Van Kirk, St. John's, Newfoundland, 5 June 1997

the yearbook called a "re-organization."[75] Like Toronto's, McGill's Club initiated a new policy of meeting in the homes of prominent Montreal citizens. In 1925 the Club enjoyed a visit from one of England's greatest historians, G.M. Trevelyan.[76] As at Toronto, McGill professors took the Club seriously. Each year at least one professor, and sometimes two, appeared in the Club's annual photograph. Each year, a professor would host one of the Club's meetings. Principal Arthur Currie agreed to be the Club's Patron and in 1930 he too invited the Historical Club to his home. The Club did not open its doors to women members until 1956. In an effort to create a similar institution for women, McGill's first and only woman lecturer until the 1960s organized the Royal Victoria College Historical Club for women in 1919. *The Old McGill* described Vera Brown as the "moving spirit" behind the Club.[77] Beginning in 1926 the two Clubs met for an annual end-of-the year meeting. Yet, none of the history faculty appeared on the Honorary Executive and not until 1942 did anyone from the history staff sit for the RVC Historical Club's annual photograph.

If the all-male Historical Club obviously excluded women at the undergraduate level it could work against them at the graduate level as well. Writing a letter of recommendation for a male undergraduate seeking a scholarship to pursue graduate studies, Underhill stressed the young man's membership in the Department's oldest and most prestigious society. "I know from my experience of him as president of our Historical Club...that he has very great social gifts, which are more than just a capacity for being pleasant with people. He has run the Historical Club

75 McGill University Archives (MUA), *Old McGill*, 1924
76 Ibid., 1925
77 Ibid., 1921

with greater skill than any of its recent presidents have shown."[78] Lacking the opportunity to join, women lacked the opportunities to make such an impression.[79] For his part, Lower looked back on his membership in Toronto's Historical Club with fondness. He liked the elitism and "the enjoyable social occasions." The highlight of his membership was meeting a former American president, William Howard Taft. In a brief, but insightful comment, he noted that the Historical Club, and others like it, "had a good deal to do with giving an atmosphere of professionalism to the study of history."[80] Here young men were trained in the informal rules of academic culture, how to give a learned paper, how to ask good questions and how to socialize after the proceedings. It was here that young men might be inspired to pursue a career in academia.

Indeed, the list of historians who had been members of the Club before 1960 is impressive: W.S. Wallace, G.M. Smith, Walter Sage, A.L. Burt, Frank Underhill, Fred Soward, David Spring, J.M.S. Careless, Gerald Craig, Paul Cornell, Kenneth McNaught, William Kilbourn, Laurier Lapierre and Graeme Patterson.[81] Careless explicitly recalled that it was the friendships he formed with the staff that encouraged him to think about a career in history. "Coming to know the staff pretty well, after all it was a very small department then, and liking them and I think generally admiring them and thinking they had a very good life," I decided upon graduate school.[82] Although not a member of Toronto's Historical Club, it was also through his

---

78 Frank Underhill to Secretary, J.S. McLean Scholarship Committee, 30 March 1937, NA, Frank H. Underhill Papers, MG 30, D 204, vol. 7, file S-General no. 4

79 In 1939 Toronto students created a second history club open to both men and women, the Modern History Club. However, it did not enjoy the same status as the older Historical Club.

80 Lower, *My First Seventy-Five Years*, 48

81 Bothwell, *Laying the Foundation*, 54

82 Interview with J.M.S. Careless, 13 July 1983, UTA, B86-0038, Tape II

friendships with the Toronto staff that Charles Stacey also decided to pursue a career in academia. In his memoirs, he noted that by the end of his undergraduate degree at Toronto he had decided on two things: "I wanted an academic career, and one in history."

> The friendships I had formed among the University of Toronto's teaching staff influenced me in both matters. They were a pleasant society, I thought, the sort I would like to belong to, and while I should never grow rich pursuing such a career, riches was not what I was after.[83]

These examples—the separation of men and women in tutorials and the all-male Historical Clubs—should be read as more than examples of sexism. True, exclusion communicated an unmistakably sexist message—young men are more important than young women. But it also communicated another message—only young men are capable of doing history. The exclusion of women at the undergraduate level indicates a gendered understanding of the discipline as history was being constructed along masculine lines: young men alone embodied the attributes necessary for historical investigation. Recalling his undergraduate years at Toronto in the 1910s, Arthur Lower said that history attracted more men than, say English, because it was regarded as being of "masculine fibre."[84] Early on in their university lives, therefore, some women received the message that they could not be historians, that they did not conform to the ideal type.[85] In other words, there was nothing odd about Toronto's Historical Club.

---

83 C.P. Stacey, *A Date with History* (Ottawa: Deneau, 1982): 26

84 Lower, *My First Seventy-five Years*, 53

85 That message could take the form of sexist jokes. H.N. Fieldhouse was reputed to have cracked sexist jokes in his class. In his memoirs, H.S. Ferns recalled that in a lecture on some English aristocratic politician Fieldhouse remarked, "And he admired and appreciated equally the beautiful limbs of horses and women." At which point, "Fieldhouse paused momentarily and without the suggestion of a leer or of any feeling at all he allowed his eyes to scan the form of the most beautiful girl in the class sitting with her wonderfully attractive legs crossed in the front row. She blushed, and Fieldhouse went on as cooly as ever." See H.S. Ferns, *Reading from Left to Right: One Man's Political History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983): 37.

Borrowing Vicki Schultz's language, "isolating women from the social networks that confer a sense of belonging" protected both the discipline and the profession.

This is not to say that exclusion was the whole story (women were welcome in the various undergraduate historical clubs and societies at UBC, Saskatchewan and United College); nor is it to say that women did not go on to graduate school. Indeed, some women did receive encouragement to pursue graduate studies. Of course, it was not easy to win funding. Certainly the very prestigious Rhodes Scholarship was closed to women, and hence much chance of being right with Wrong. So too was the Parkin Travelling Scholarship. Founded in 1924 and named in honour of Sir George Parkin, this scholarship allowed young Canadian men in any discipline to study in England. When the criteria were being defined, it was W.L. Grant who suggested that it be restricted to "members of the male sex." "For this my reason is that I think that the recipient should be someone whose aim in life we might hope would resemble that of Sir George himself."[86] Since women could never resemble Parkin, it did not make sense to fund their studies in England. At least three young men who received the scholarship went on to enjoy a career in history: Charles Stacey, Gerald Graham and R.O. MacFarlane.[87] Moreover, women experienced discrimination in open scholarship competitions. In a revealing letter of recommendation, Underhill admitted that while the woman in question had written a superior MA thesis she did not get a scholarship. "She was considered very seriously for another scholarship but it was finally given to a man student who, in my opinion, hasn't half

86 W.L. Grant to Marian Buck, 11 November 1925, NA, W.L. Grant Papers, MG 30 D 59, vol. 11, file Correspondence Parkin Traveling Scholarship, 1924-1929. Marian Buck provided the money for the scholarship.

87 Ibid

the intellectual ability that she has." As Underhill explained, she is a "very quiet retiring girl and this rather told against her with some of the staff who hadn't seen much of her."[88] Despite the patent discrimination, women did receive scholarships. Based on the number of awards women won, and the number the scholarships women received, Prentice concluded that women were encouraged to study history and to go on to do graduate work at the master's level in particular. At the next and most important level, however, the "numbers (and proportions) of women students dropped dramatically."[89] Prior to 1960, women completed five out of thirteen history PhDs at McGill and six out of forty-one at Toronto.

As at the undergraduate level, it is difficult to generalize about the experiences of women at the graduate level. McGill's E.R. Adair is reputed to have been particularly mean-spirited. Writing about his graduate student experience at McGill after the Second World War, Bill Eccles remembered that Adair "could be unfair in his criticism of his students' work, even cruel at times" and that he aimed his cruelty at women students in particular. "He seemed to enjoy reducing female students to tears, and they, it seemed to me, took masochistic pleasure from the experience; at least they always came back for more."[90] How many women Adair's aggressive teaching methods deterred from academia is impossible to determine. Still, women could and did enjoy support at graduate school. Even Adair went to bat for one woman doctoral candidate, Alice Lunn. In support of her 1936-1937 application for a Royal Society Fellowship, he

---

88 Frank Underhill to Margaret Cameron, University Women's Federation, 29 January 1937, NA, Frank H. Underhill Papers, MG 30, D 204, vol. 6, file Margaret MacLaren

89 Prentice, "Laying Siege," 201-202

90 W.J. Eccles, "Forty Years Back," *William and Mary Quarterly* 41, 3 (July 1984): 411

referred to her as "One of the best women students I have had at McGill," stressing her "Sound judgment and great capacity for work."[91] In the end, Lunn received the Fellowship which allowed her to conduct research both in Ottawa and Paris.

Two men in particular stand out as supportive of women graduate students. A.L. Burt was one. Except for his re-creation of Wrong's all-male History Club at Alberta, Burt consistently adopted a progressive position on the so-called woman question. While in England during the closing months of the War, he wrote his wife a series of long, detailed letters. Occasionally he would comment on women and their status in society. He once worried that, while the Army was not entirely "lewd," it nevertheless had a "coarsening influence" on men in "their attitude toward women."[92] On another occasion he said that women should have careers and that they should not be compelled to abandon them upon marriage. He could even imagine that in some situations it would be better for the woman to be the wage earner and for the man to stay home. In any event, he concluded, a wife "should be more than a housekeeper, as too often she only is."[93] Several years later he said that marriage must be an "equal union" between husband and wife, and that he refused to believe that men are predators and women parasites in a marriage.[94] Given that he viewed marriage as a partnership and that he believed women ought to have careers, it is not surprising that Burt should have encouraged his brilliant women students to continue their studies. One was Aileen Dunham. Appreciating her

---

91 This quotation is taken from a summary of the candidates prepared for jury member W.S. Wallace. TFRBR-UT, W.S. Wallace Papers, MC 31, Box 32, file Royal Society, Section II (1936)

92 A.L. Burt to Dorrie Burt, 23 October 1918, NA, A.L. Burt Papers, MG 30, D 103 vol. 4, file 1

93 A.L. Burt to Dorrie Burt, 25 December 1918, Ibid., vol. 1, file 1,

94 A.L. Burt to Dorrie Burt, 27 July 1926, Ibid

capacity for graduate work, Burt sent her to Toronto where she completed her MA in 1920. From Toronto Dunham went to the University of London where she completed her PhD in 1923. Writing on behalf of Dunham in 1922, Burt stated unequivocally: "She is by far the most brilliant student that I have ever had and I expect that it will be many years before I encounter her like again."[95] A classmate of Dunham's, Lillian Cobb, similarly went on to an academic career in England with Burt's support.[96] And finally, he supervised Hilda Neatby's PhD thesis at Minnesota from 1931 to 1934. She even became an honorary member of the Burt family, Burt's children referring to her as "Aunt Hilda."

Like Burt, Alfred Bailey of the University of New Brunswick assisted female graduate students. Having secured a 1943 Rockefeller Foundation grant to work on the history of New Brunswick, Bailey used a portion to fund the MA work of three women, including Katherine MacNaughton, a teacher in Campbleton, New Brunswick. Although clearly intelligent, she lacked self-confidence. In a 3 June 1943 letter to Bailey, MacNaughton presented him with the opportunity to rescind his offer. After all, she said, "My lack of knowledge of New Brunswick history, or indeed of any history, is disgraceful, and the mediocrity of my ability undeniable."[97] Bailey responded immediately with an encouraging letter; "I am quite convinced

---

95 A.L. Burt to Frank Underhill, 28 November 1922, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30, D 204, vol. 1, file A.L. Burt, 1907-1927. George Wrong also wrote well of Dunham: "Miss Dunham has remarkable industry and a spirit of thoroughness which guarantees that her work will be of high character. She has an original mind and the promise of an admirable literary style." George Wrong, 28 January 1924, UTA, Department of History, A70-0025, Box 8, file 52

96 Lewis Thomas, *The Renaissance of Canadian History: A Biography of A.L. Burt* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1975): 14

97 Katharine MacNaughton to Alfred Bailey, 3 June 1943, University of New Brunswick Archives (UNBA), Alfred Goldsworthy Bailey Fonds, RG 80, Series 8, case 36, file 6

you are the best person for the job."[98] MacNaughton began her research on the history of education in New Brunswick in the Fall of 1943. Although she completed her degree requirements, and although her thesis was published in 1946, her capacity for self-doubt remained unabated.[99] Even as her book was going to the binder, it was all she could do to steel herself to attend an interview for a Beaverbrook Scholarship for a year's study in London. Exasperated, Bailey responded: "For goodness sake!...Such humility humiliates your friends and supporters who have faith in you."[100] Two years later, MacNaughton captured the essence of her relationship with Bailey. "Anything I have ever done, you pushed me into it, and the push has always been to my advantage."[101]

However, if a woman was encouraged to do graduate work, and if she did find a supportive advisor, her sex followed her. Recall Adair's recommendation of Alice Lunn: "One of the best women students I have had at McGill." In otherwise very strong letters, Underhill referred to one woman as "best girl student I have had in history for some years"[102] while he referred to another as "the ablest girl we have had for a long time."[103] Arthur Lower said of one student, "she is among the best women students I have had."[104] Western's Fred Landon once described one of his female MA

---

98 Alfred Bailey to Katharine MacNaughton, 8 June 1943, Ibid

99 See Katherine MacNaughton, *The development of the theory and practice of education in New Brunswick, 1794-1900: a study in historical background* (Fredericton, University of New Brunswick Historical Studies, no. 1, 1947).

100 Alfred Bailey to Katharine MacNaughton, 4 March 1947, UNBA, Alfred Goldsworthy Bailey Fonds, RG 80, Series 8, case 36, file 6

101 Katharine MacNaughton to Alfred Bailey, 30 May 1949, Ibid

102 Frank Underhill to Registrar, University College, 3 March 1938, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 6, file L-General, 1928-1956

103 Frank Underhill to David Owen, Chair, Dept. of History, Harvard, 9 February 1948, Ibid, vol. 8, file Universities-Harvard, 1928-1956,

104 Arthur Lower to J.E. Reid, Dept. of External Affairs, 14 March 1942, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 1, A 18

students as a "nice kid."[105] Although his letters of recommendation for female students were always positive,[106] even Bailey on at least one occasion reported that "if you need a good girl" on staff then he was "happy to recommend" his former student.[107] In a separate letter of recommendation for the same woman, he commented on her "very good appearance."[108] Even when recommended positively, then, women continued to be identified as women historians.

Indeed, sex was an indelible and negative marker of difference that set women apart from their male counterparts. William Aiken, a lecturer in Modern History at McMaster University from 1938 to 1940, commented on the differences between "boys" and "girls" in a particular history class. The boys, he said, are for the most part "much better" than the girls. Boys have "more speculative minds—more imagination" while "girls are quick on the facts, but rarely go farther than the facts."[109] In other words, the female was immediate and focused on particulars while the male was transcendent and capable of abstraction. In at least three letters of recommendation Underhill unwittingly revealed his understanding of woman as the opposite of man. Of one woman he wrote, "she has shown a capacity for grasping political ideas which is not usual in girls."[110] Of

---

105 Fred Landon to Frank Underhill, 25 September 1950, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 5, file Fred Landon, 1928-1956,

106 In two separate letters for the same student, Bailey referred to her as "one of the most brilliant students now enrolled at the University" and as "the most brilliant student that we have here this year." UNBA, Alfred Goldsworthy Bailey Fonds, RG 80, Series 5, case 50, file 2, 6 April 1949; 14 March 1950

107 Ibid, 14 February 1948

108 Ibid, 19 February 1949

109 Report of W. Aiken, Lecturer in History, 1940, McMaster University, Canadian Baptist Archives, Box McMaster University Chancellor's Reports, Annual Reports, 1938-1942, file Reports to Chancellor 1939-40

110 Frank Underhill to Registrar, University College, 3 March 1938, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 5, file L-General, 1928-1956

another he wrote, "she appears to differ from most girls in having a good political mind."[111] In what Underhill considered high praise indeed, he said of a third woman, "She has a good clear political mind like a man."[112] The capacity for political thought, he believed, was masculine. Meanwhile, Arthur Lower once wrote of a female graduate student that she "seems to have rather more than the average feminine difficulty in making up her mind, and she doe not seem to know her ultimate aim."[113] For Lower, indecisiveness is feminine. Decisiveness is masculine.

Again, it would be a mistake to read the above comments as only sexist comments. That these male historians felt compelled to rate women according to a pre-invented standard of masculine capabilities and strengths shows a representational system in which women were categorized as "unlike men," to borrow George Wrong's phrase. The success or inclusion of women in history was contingent on their ability to conform to the masculinized ideal of the historian. Marked not-male and thus set apart as different, women could not compete at the next level, the labour market.[114]

VI

Formal competitions, job advertisements and hiring committees did not exist in the historical profession to 1960. Rather, the labour market worked

---

111 Frank Underhill to Dean, School of Graduate Studies, University of Michigan, 9 February 1948, Ibid, vol. 6, file McLaughlin to McVannel, 1928-1956,

112 Frank Underhill to David Owen, Chair, Dept. of History, Harvard University, 9 February 1948, Ibid, vol. 8, file Universities-Harvard, 1928-1956

113 Arthur Lower to National Research Council, 10 December 1952, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 52, D34

114 History was not the only academic labour market to exclude women. "The proportion of women university teachers in Canada changed little between the 1920s and the 1970s, when the Royal Commission on the Status of Women found that the number of men was 'roughly six times greater than number of women' and that the women were concentrated in the lower ranks." Kinnear, *In Subordination,* 30-31

informally, by word-of-mouth, reputation, nepotism, networks and attempts by supervisors to secure a position for their students. Not only was the history labour market to 1960 informal, it was also male.

Anticipating an appointment, department chairs and sometimes university presidents would send letters to senior colleagues in Britain, the United States and, because of its graduate school, the University of Toronto. The letters were explicit: we are looking for a new man; can you give us a name or two? "I am looking for a young man for the position of lecturer in History....We would like a young man with natural ability and growing power," wrote J.H. Riddell to the Acting Head of History at Toronto in 1919.[115] "Each year for the last five, I have been hoping to get another man," Burt wrote Underhill in 1927.[116] Seeking a replacement for Jack Pickersgill, Arthur Lower wrote to his alma mater in 1937: what can you tell me "about young men available at Harvard to teach mainly European history"?[117] He made a similar request of Underhill two years later. "Have you any bright young men who may be wishing a junior post next fall?...I must have a man of personality and a reasonable range of knowledge."[118] Writing to Underhill in December 1939, the President of the University of Saskatchewan stated, "I want a man who could become a junior professor....Have you any names you could bring to my knowledge?"[119] To Reginald Trotter, Thomson explained that "I should like a younger man who

---

115 J.H. Riddell to Acting Head, Toronto, 28 February 1919, UTA, Department of History, A70-0025, Box 7, file 2,

116 A.L. Burt to Frank Underhill, 17 December 1927, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 1, file A.L. Burt, 1907-1928

117 Arthur Lower to W.C. Abbott, 4 May 1937, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 51, D1

118 Arthur Lower to Frank Underhill, 10 January 1939, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 5, file A.R.M. Lower, 1928-1956,

119 James S. Thomson to Frank Underhill, 8 December 1939, Ibid, vol. 8, file Universities-Saskatchewan

could make the teaching of Canadian History a special contribution to the work of our Department."[120] Anticipating another appointment in the fall of 1946, Lower again wrote to Underhill: "I suppose you yourself can find work for almost all your young men, but if there is anyone you think could be spared, I would be glad to have his name."[121] In the early 1950s, Western's J.J. Talman requested a list of potential candidates for a possible opening. Of the nine qualities the candidate should possess, that he be "a man with an agreeable personality" topped the list.[122] To no one in particular, the Acting Dean at Waterloo College informed the Toronto History Department in 1953 that "We are looking for a qualified man to give the general under-graduate History courses."[123] Writing to Sir Lewis Namier, Noel Fieldhouse outlined the ideal candidate: "What I want is a man who would be at least on the 'short list' for a Chair in the United Kingdom and who would, as soon as he had time to settle in here, take over the Chairmanship of the Department."[124]

Within this context, how many women were hired? That depends, of course, on how one counts. Certainly, departments hired women to fill low status, temporary positions. McGill's Charles Colby allowed the Warden of Royal Victoria College, Hilda Oakeley, to teach Ancient History from 1901 to 1906, when she returned to England. However, as she recalled in her memoirs, "The path of the women members of the McGill staff was not

---

120 James S. Thomson to Reginald Trotter, 8 December 1939, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 26, file Correspondence, Queen's, Lockhart, A.D.

121 NA, Frank H. Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 5, file A.R.M. Lower, 1928-1956, Arthur Lower to FHU, 22 February 1946

122 "[E]vidence of administrative ability" ranked seventh while the capacity for independent research and the desire to publish ranked ninth. J.J. Talman to Frank Underhill, 9 June 1952, Ibid, vol. 8, file J.J. Talman, 1928-1956

123 L.H. Schaus to Department of History, Toronto, 18 June 1953, Ibid, vol. 8, file Universities-General

124 Noel Fieldhouse to Sir Lewis Namier, 17 February 1955, MUA, RG 2, Box 179, file History Department, 6236

altogether smooth." The "very conservative" Dean of Arts, Dean Johnson, was less than enamoured with women teaching at the University: "He saw every encroachment of the monstrous regiment of women with disfavour."[125] McGill then listed Oakeley's successor, Ethel Hurlbatt, as a tutor in the History Department between 1907 and 1915. It also hired graduate student assistants from 1928 to 1930 and from 1933 to 1938 when the Calendar stopped listing assistants. Unfortunately, the departmental records are incomplete but there is evidence to show that the Department employed women assistants in the 1940s and 1950s as well. However, for only four years did it employ a woman as a lecturer and that was Vera Brown from 1916 to 1920. Her time at McGill ended on an unfortunate note. Although she had an MA, in 1920 the Faculty of Arts passed a resolution condemning the Department of History for allowing Brown to lecture to third- and fourth-year Honours students. Rumour had it that the BA Advisory Committee was preparing a resolution for the Faculty to suspend first year lectures in history until Brown stopped lecturing. "But one thing seems clear," Fryer explained to Colby, "we really must have more weight in the department next year,—someone in addition to Miss Brown if she remains."[126] The issue was not her lack of a PhD. In the same letter that Colby argued that the Department retain Brown for another year as a courtesy to her while she looked for another appointment, he also recommended the appointment of another McGill alumnus with an MA, T.W.L. MacDermott.[127] MacDermott came to McGill three years later as a lecturer; significantly, his career was singularly unimpressive as a scholar

---

125 Hilda Oakeley, *My Adventures in Education* (London: Williams and Norgate 1939): 88

126 C.E. Fryer to Charles Colby, 20 January 1920, MUA, RG 2, Box 61, file Department of History, 1920-1925

127 Charles Colby to F.D. Adams, 31 March 1920, Ibid

and in 1935 he left the university altogether to become Headmaster of Upper Canada College. Meanwhile, McGill hired Basil Williams in 1920. He too had an MA. But he had other attractive qualifications. In a revealing letter, Principal Arthur Currie claimed that he had hired Williams because of his "scholarly productiveness." However, he admitted his attraction to Williams' record of military service: his "general experience as a soldier in the South African War, and as a Major of the Artillery in the late War also appealed to me."[128] Military service as an informal skill necessarily excluded women. In a 1924 letter to Principal Currie, one woman wrote, "It does seem as if it should be possible for a Canadian woman with a Ph.D. degree to find work in a Canadian University. I, therefore, hope that it will be possible for you to consider this application favourably."[129] She was not considered.

The situation at Ontario universities was similar to that at McGill. Queen's regularly employed female assistants from the 1920s through the 1950s. However, only Anna Wright worked as an instructor and then only for three years, from 1943 to 1946. In working as an instructor at a university, Wright surpassed the expectations of Toronto where she received her PhD. According to the Department of History, "Miss Wright's performance in her "fields" last year was the best we have had in recent years. She has a real gift for exposition and ought to have a career before her in secondary education in this province."[130] The University of

---

[128] Sir Arthur Currie to Sir Campbell Stuart, 11 August 1921. Ibid, file History: Prof. Basil Williams, 1921-1925

[129] [name deleted] to Principal Currie, 17 March 1924, Ibid, file History Applications 1920-25

[130] n.a. to Miss Mackenzie, School of Graduate Studies, Toronto, 23 March 1942, UTA, Department of History, A70-0025, Box 8, file 68. Anna Wright taught at Queen's from 1943 to 1946 as a replacement to Eric Harrison who was in the Army. In 1946 she went to the University of London on a British Council Scholarship. According to Rex Trotter, she wanted to return to teach in Canada. Reginald Trotter to Arthur

Western Ontario employed only two women: Ruth Davis was a reader in 1926-1927 and an assistant from 1929 to 1931 while Helen Hughes also worked as an assistant from 1927 to 1929. McMaster hired Gwendolen Carter as a Reader in 1932. She had a BA from Toronto and a BA from Oxford. She stayed at McMaster for three years. However, the Minutes of the Board of Governors make it clear that her third year would also be her last year.

> Miss Carter has been reappointed Reader in History for next year, with the intimation that, in the judgment of the [Executive Committee of the Board of Governors,] it will then be better to secure the services of a man who has completed more post-graduate work.[131]

The necessity of a graduate degree was eminently reasonable; the insistence on securing the services of a man, however, was the clear product of a sexist and epistemological bias against women historians.

Meanwhile, Toronto certainly hired women, but never to a permanent position. From 1914 to 1926, there was always at least one woman listed as an instructor in the calendar: these included, Winnifred Harvey, Helen McMurchie, Marjorie Reid and Margaret Wrong, daughter of George Wrong. However, George Wrong viewed women's employment in general with trepidation: what will befall men as women enter the labour market?

> Now all but extinct is the young lady whose education was "finished" at eighteen and who then waited at home for her marriage. Many of these now look for jobs exactly as do their brothers, engage in works for social betterment and exercise in politics influence backed up by the vote. Sometimes I wonder a little how, since they hold positions

---

Lower, 24 March 1947, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 1, file 27. She eventually married and remained in England. In 1950 she delivered the Neil Matheson McWharrie lecture at the Royal Society of Arts in London on the subject of Education in Canada. See *Queen's Review* 24, 1 (January 1950).

131 The William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University, Minutes, Board Of Governors, McMaster University, vol. 3, 176. Gwendolen Carter went to the United States; she taught at Smith University from 1943 to 1964. In in 1964 she went to Northwestern University where she worked for the remainder of her career.

> formerly held by men, the man will be able to find employment that will make possible his taking a bride and making a home.[132]

In any event, not until Neatby's appointment as a special lecturer in 1944 did Toronto employ another woman above the rank of tutor. Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, Toronto regularly employed women as readers to assist professors with grading.

In the Maritimes, Dalhousie did not hire women historians; Acadia employed a woman lecturer for two years in the 1920s; and the University of New Brunswick hired Frances Firth as an assistant for three years (1946-1949). Mount Allison was an exception in that it employed two women as lecturers throughout the Second World War. Although one of the women, Ella Smith, did remain until 1951, it was by default more than by design. As a Catholic women's college, Mount Saint Vincent was chiefly staffed by members of the Sisters of Charity. Although a 1951 fire destroyed all university records, it is clear that from 1938 through to her retirement in 1965, Sister Francis d'Assisi taught history in addition to performing administrative duties first as dean and later as president. Sister d'Assisi earned her doctorate from Fordham University, but her career was primarily as an administrator. Indeed, she was the driving force behind the Mount's survival as a women's college.[133] Moreover, Elizabeth Smyth argued that women religious "represent a unique subset" of women historians in English Canada.[134] Although some were serious, even

132 George Wrong, "What Has Befallen Us," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 4, 1 (1934-35): 44

133 See Theresa Corcoran, SC, *Mount Saint Vincent University: A Vision Unfolding, 1873-1988* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1999).

134 Elizabeth Smyth, "'Writing Teaches Us Our Mysteries': Women Religious Recording and Writing History,' in Boutilier and Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory*, 123

accomplished historians, women religious were not part of the historical profession that was unfolding in the first half of this century.

Only at Western Canadian universities were women hired to full-time positions; however, the numbers are hardly staggering. At the University of Manitoba, Dr. Ursilla Macdonnel lectured in the Department of History from 1922 to 1931 at the same time as she also served as the Dean of Women. When Chester Martin replaced George Wrong at Toronto in 1928, Macdonnel was appointed Acting Head until H.N. Fieldhouse's appointment in 1930. Alberta had only one woman on staff; after completing the course work for her doctorate at Chicago, Jean Murray worked as an instructor for two years from 1928 to 1930 at the U of A before heading east to Saskatchewan. Indeed, Saskatchewan listed Isabel Jones (1918-1921), Elsinore MacPherson (1922-1923), Hilda Neatby (1928-1931) and Jean Murray (1931-1935) as instructors. The University of Saskatchewan also gave permanent appointments to women. For Neatby and Murray the breakthrough came in 1936 and 1937 respectively when they made Assistant Professor, Neatby at Regina College and Murray at Saskatoon. In the 1930s, UBC had women assistants: Gwen Musgrave in 1930-1931; Margaret Ross in 1931-1932; Margaret Ormsby in 1935-1936 and 1936-1937; and, finally, Patricia Johnson in 1937-1938. Another woman, Sylvia Thrupp was an instructor for several years, from 1935 to 1944. In 1944 she went to Toronto where she worked for one year as an assistant in the history department. Her career next took her to the United States. Meanwhile, Margaret Ormsby returned to British Columbia as a lecturer in 1943. Like Saskatchewan, UBC also gave a full-time appointment to a woman when Ormsby was appointed Assistant Professor in 1946. The Canadian Federation of University Women understood the closed door women academics confronted. Writing to

Queen's historian Rex Trotter, Dixie Pelleut noted, "The Committee [on Academic Appointments] feels that it is rather disappointing to offer scholarships to encourage women to go on to graduate work, if there is to be little opportunity to give the recipient a chance to pursue her profession when she is adequately qualified."[135]

Because women could not expect open and fair competition in the Canadian academic labour market, it was best to leave the country altogether for doctoral studies. That was the advice George Wrong gave to a young woman in 1925. If you did well at Radcliffe, he advised, "they would back you for an appointment."[136] A few years later, Hilda Neatby received the same counsel. Although she very much wanted to do her doctorate at Toronto with Underhill, she resigned herself to the reality of the academic labour market in Canada and anticipated a career in the United States where it was important to have an American degree. "It has recently been pointed out to me," Neatby informed Underhill, "...that it might be wiser for me to apply for a fellowship in an American university as my having studied in the United States would make it easier to secure a position there if I wished to do so later on."[137] While there is no record of Underhill's response, it is clear from Neatby's next letter that he advised her to pursue doctoral studies in the United States.

> It is a great disappointment in every way...to give up the idea of coming to Toronto. I feel, however, that if a Toronto student has not a good chance of a position in the United States it would be better to try for an American university as in Saskatchewan at least, even the better high school positions seem to be more or less closed to women.

---

135 D. Pelleut to Reginald Trotter, 25 July 1947, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 26, file History Dept., Applications 1946-1950. For a brief discussion of Pelleut's career at Dalhousie see, Fingard, "Gender and Inequality at Dalhousie," 695-697.

136 Quotation in Prentice, "Laying Siege," 212

137 Hilda Neatby to Frank Underhill, 27 October 1930, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 6, Hilda Neatby 1928-1956

> All the same, although common sense makes me follow your advice, I can't help hoping that some chance may yet take me to Toronto.[138]

Neatby went to Minnesota. On at least two occasions, once in 1933 and again in 1934, she told her sister that she had little hope of securing an academic appointment in Canada because of her sex.[139] The assumption that women should set their sights on the American academic labour market seems to have been common, at least in the 1920s and 1930s. After completing her doctorate at London, Aileen Dunham secured a position at Ohio's College of Wooster in 1924. Here she taught history for over forty years.[140] In an unsigned and undated letter, McGill's Department of History attempted to secure a teaching position in one of America's women's colleges for one of its female graduates who had returned to Canada with a higher degree. Effusive with praise, the letter was sent to Bryn Mawr, Wellesley, Mount Holyoke, Smith, Vassar and Barnard. It was not sent to any Canadian universities.[141]

The answer to the original question—how many women were hired—is three: Jean Murray, Hilda Neatby and Margaret Ormsby. According to Prentice, Saskatchewan's and UBC's focus on regional history may have been a factor in their decisions to hire women at a time when permanent academic appointments for women were few and far between. "History department heads like Walter Sage [of UBC] and Arthur Morton [of Saskatchewan] may have been able to perceive women as potential fellow workers in a way that their counterparts in central and eastern Canada could not, perhaps in large part because of their interest in promoting local and regional history." But as she quickly points out, "this was by no

138 Hilda Neatby to Frank Underhill, 19 November 1930

139 See Hayden, ed., *So Much to Do, So Little Time*, 136, 142.

140 At the College of Wooster there is today an Aileen Dunham Chair in History.

141 MUA, RG 2, Box 61, file History Applications Junior, 1928-1933, n.a., n.d.

means the whole story."[142] Indeed, not all departments that taught regional history hired women. There were no women at Dalhousie, for example. Prentice credited Daniel Cobb Harvey, a member of the graduate program in history at Dalhousie, with a certain progressiveness on the question of female historians. Certainly, Harvey promoted the history of British Columbia when at UBC from 1928 to 1931 and the history of Nova Scotia when at the Public Archives of Nova Scotia and Dalhousie from 1931 onwards. But when it came time to select a protegé who would eventually succeed him at the Public Archives of Nova Scotia he made it clear that he wanted a man despite the presence of two very capable women on his staff, both of whom he had supervised as MA students.[143] Furthermore, there were no permanent appointments for women at the University of New Brunswick despite Alfred Bailey's interest in regional history in the 1940s and 1950s. Although the Second World War interrupted George F. G. Stanley's plans for a regional history program at Mount Allison University, he considered his two female, war-time replacements as strictly temporary appointments. He did not think he could work with his war-time replacement. As he explained to a friend, "I doubt very much whether Miss Smith and I would get along together in the same department. Nor have I a great deal of respect for her qualities as a University Lecturer."[144] Moreover, as Chad Reimer suggested, Sylvia Thrupp's experience at UBC was exploitative. For nine years, from 1935 to 1944, Sage hired Thrupp on year-to-year contracts. Intimidated by her intelligence and thus reluctant to have her in the department on a permanent basis, Sage also knew that

142 Prentice, "Laying Siege," 216

143 Daniel Cobb Harvey to John Clarence Webster, 15 September 1946, New Brunswick Museum Archives (NBMA), John Clarence Webster Papers, F-266

144 George Stanley to John Clarence Webster, 16 April 1946, Ibid, F-353

Thrupp had no choice but to accept one-year contracts because she needed to be in Vancouver to care for her ailing father.[145]

Still, Saskatchewan was an exception to the otherwise very strict rule that women not be given permanent appointments. Why? Because there were unique circumstances at Saskatchewan, circumstances that did not exist elsewhere. Jean Murray was the daughter of the President. While not incompetent, she was not brilliant either. She did not excel at Toronto and, given who her father was, she was actually given more attention.[146] Likewise, she was reputed to have had some difficulty in completing her dissertation at Chicago.[147] She never produced a monograph; indeed, she spent the bulk of her career as a compiler of documents and a gatherer of records. Nevertheless, she was employed as an instructor at Saskatchewan in the winter of 1926 and between 1931 and 1935; she was hired as an assistant professor in 1937. How much influence her father brought to bear is impossible to determine. But given that his daughters did not marry

---

145 Reimer, "The Making of British Columbia History," 381-382. Both Reimer and Prentice also note that Thrupp eventually went to Chicago and became a leading medievalist in North America.

146 Arthur Morton wrote a personal letter to Toronto's Chair of History, George Wrong, asking that he give "Miss Jean Murray, the daughter of our President...such guidance as she may need." Arthur Morton to George Wrong, 8 October 1923, USA, Arthur Morton Papers, MG 2 I.30, Students—General, 1917-1923. In a letter to the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies at the University of Toronto, George Wrong wrote: "The only case which I wish to particularly mention is that of Miss Murray. At first she seemed to have difficulty in dealing with Historical material, and, until recently, I thought it would be impossible for her to take the degree this year. Her time was extended a little and now she has submitted a thesis which Professor Flenley and I agree in thinking worth the degree. We have also given her an examination which she passed satisfactorily. I am gratified at this result because her case gave me considerable cause for thought, *and the fact that she was the daughter of the President of a University made one feel it important that we should do her full justice* (italics mine)." George Wrong to J.P. McMurrich, 30 May 1924, UTA, Department of History, A70-0025, Box 2, file 52. See also George Wrong to Frank Underhill, 17 March 1924 and 23 April 1924, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 1, file G.M. Wrong, 1907-1927

147 Kate (Neatby) Nicoll to Michael Hayden, 18 February 1981, Saskatchewan Archives Board, Saskatoon (SABS), James Michael Hayden Papers, A-493

he must have felt concern for their financial welfare. Indeed, we do know that he paid from his own pocket her instructor's salary in 1932.[148] Moreover, Murray, Morton, and their respective wives were good friends. Perhaps Morton felt a loyalty to the Murray family and agreed to Jean's appointment. Kate Nicoll, Hilda Neatby's sister, always figured that the fix was in, that Murray and Morton had been "keeping the place warm" for Jean.[149] Given the closed doors women confronted at universities across the country, it would seem that having a university president for a father undoubtedly helped.

In the case of Hilda Neatby we see that she too was unique: uniquely brilliant, that is. In his 1923-1924 annual report Morton noted that "Miss Neatby was so far ahead of the others I took her by herself once a week."[150] A.L. Burt thought Neatby to be one of the two best students he had ever encountered.[151] Even Frank Underhill, who disliked teaching women and believed that Saskatchewan's Historical Association was poorly served by its open membership, conceded that Neatby was brilliant. "On

---

148 Walter Murray explained the situation to the Premier as follows. "I am bringing to your attention a personal matter since it is possible that a question may be raised about the remuneration which I am receiving from the University. As you will notice in the Estimates my salary has been reduced $2,000. My daughter, Jean, is giving instruction in History. For this she receives no salary from the University. Her predecessor in this position last year received $2100 from the University. I am giving my daughter an allowance out my salary. The impropriety of the President recommending his daughter for a salaried position in the University is obvious." Walter Murray to J.T.M. Anderson, 28 December 1931, USA, Presidential Papers, RG 1, Series 1, B.6, Anderson, J.T.M. Murray also hired his daughter Lucy Murray to teach English at Regina College

149 Kate (Neatby) Nicoll to Michael Hayden, 18 February 1981, SABS, James Michael Hayden Papers, A-493

150 Department of History Annual Report, 1923-1924, USA, Presidential Papers, RG 1, Series 1, B.38: Annual Reports, History, 1923-1924

151 Burt "has told me that he has had only one other student...the equal of Miss Neatby." Arthur Silver Morton to Secretary, Royal Society of Canada, 28 January 1933 USA, Arthur Morton Papers, MG 2, I.32, Students-Rec., 1919-1942

the whole she was the best student that I had while in the West."[152] Indeed, they remained life-long friends. After teaching in the Department on a part-time basis from 1927 to 1931 she decided to pursue doctoral studies. In 1934 Neatby received a teaching position at Regina College and, in 1936, she was appointed assistant professor. In 1944 she went to Toronto as a Special Lecturer in History but her appointment was never considered permanent. The simple fact is, Toronto refused to give a permanent position to a woman, even one of Neatby's obvious calibre. The departmental minutes for 16 September 1944 reveal Toronto's blindness. Despite Neatby's presence on campus, the Department looked past her in its discussion on "the problem of future staff appointments." The names of four men (who all had done at least one degree at Toronto) were bandied about in relation to a junior, but permanent, position; one member of the Department suggested that "letters of inquiry be sent to several English and American universities with regard to young men who might be available in future for limited temporary appointments."[153] Neatby's future did not include Toronto.

When a position opened at Saskatoon in 1946 Neatby expressed a desire to return to her alma mater. Charles Lightbody, who had been an undergraduate at the same time as Neatby and who was at this point working as a lecturer in the Department, also sought the appointment. According to the President, James S. Thomson, George Simpson, who had replaced Morton as Chair in 1940, wanted to hire Lightbody: "Simpson still wants Lightbody—to avoid excessive femininity on his staff—Burt of Minnesota thinks Lightbody would be a mistake, Frank Underhill thinks

---

152 Frank Underhill to The Dean, School of Graduate Studies, University of Minnesota, 1 March 1931, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 6, file Neatby, Hilda 1928-1956

153 Departmental Minutes, 16 September 1944, UTA, Department of History, A90-0023, box 29, file Minutes 1928-1945

the appointment would be all right."[154] In the end Neatby got the appointment. Lightbody lacked her publication record. Besides, he was by all accounts a strange and at times difficult bird; an odd combination of brilliant and petulant, he embodied the absent-minded professor, the eccentric egg-head.[155] Neatby herself once referred to him as a "freak."[156] And so, argued Hayden, "the university invited [Neatby] only because it could find no other suitable candidate."[157]

Clearly, Jean Murray, Hilda Neatby and Margaret Ormsby were exceptional. They also never married. Careers and marriage and children were mutually exclusive to women: a career or a family, one or the other, but not both. That was the rule. As Dalhousie historian George Wilson explained in 1953, "Having a baby ends a woman's appointment. She can't have her cake and eat it too."[158] The constraints this placed on women historians, constraints that men did not experience, cannot be overstated. The understanding of what a historian should be was based on the male experience. By definition, pregnancy and motherhood cast women outside what it meant to be a historian. Although not in history, Irene Spry (née Biss) was a graduate student and lecturer in Toronto's Department of Political Economy in the 1930s. There she worked closely with Harold Innis, encountering his deep, almost monastic devotion to the scholar's vocation. It was Innis who arranged her participation in the Canada-

---

154 James Thomson to W.P. Thompson, 23 May 1946, USA, MG 72, Michael Hayden Papers, F. So Much to Do, 6. Neatby, U of S, 1919-1967

155 See Michael Taft, *Inside These Greystone Walls: An Anecdotal History of the University of Saskatchewan* (Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan, 1984): 174-190.

156 Hilda Neatby to her mother, 11 January 1924, SABS, Hilda Neatby Collection, A-139, I.3 (2)

157 Hayden, ed., *So Much to Do, So Little Time*, 25

158 Wilson was referring to Louise Thompson Welch, a Dalhousie psychology professor. Quotation in Fingard, "Gender and Inequality at Dalhousie: Faculty Women Before 1950," 699.

America relations series funded by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. But in 1938 Spry's career arrived at the crossroads: one path led to a life of scholarship, the other to marriage and family. As Spry recalled,

> I let Innis down. He was training me to carry on the work that he thought should be done by social scientists. And instead I went out, got married and had children and did war work; I never produced the book I was supposed to write about the energy sources in Canada. And I perfectly understand why Innis wrote me off; he had every right to do so.[159]

They never spoke again. Neither Innis nor Spry understood that the ideal social scientist was gendered masculine; male social scientists simply never found themselves having to decide between a career and a family. Although he had a wife and four children, Innis was freed from the sphere of necessity in a way that Spry never could be. Although he supported Spry's graduate work, Innis did not want to hire women in the same way he did not want to hire Jews: it would only encourage more women to enrol as students, "and there were already too many in the social sciences."[160]

VII

To say that the labour market to 1960 was informal and male tells only part of the story. In what follows, it becomes evident that the gendered epistemology underlying the discipline of history and the desire "to claim [historical] work as masculine turf"[161] necessitated that male historians, seeking to protect the boundaries of their discipline and access to the

159 Irene Spry, interviewed by David Cayley, "The Legacy of Harold Innis," part 3, CBC Radio, *Ideas*, 20 December 1994

160 Burnet, "Minorities I Have Belonged To," 30. Innis hired Burnet in 1945. "Because of the grave need for faculty to meet the great demand from students, there had to be a few [women], but they were kept few." Interview with Jean Burnet, 23 November 1979, UTA, B92-0014.

161 Schultz, "Sex Is the Least of It," 12

academic labour market worked against women's inclusion in the profession.

The exclusion of women could be a matter of policy. In 1915 the Principal of McGill informed Wrong that no "additional appointment will be made in the way of a woman teacher."[162] However, it is the example of Marjorie Reid that most clearly illustrates blatant sexism. Although she had lectured at Toronto for several years, in 1925 Marjorie Reid came to the unhappy realization that she would have to look elsewhere. In a long letter to Frank Underhill, then at Saskatchewan, Reid acknowledged the impossibility of ever getting a full-time job at Toronto. "I have been re-appointed Lecturer at Toronto for 1924-25, but my appointment here has never been considered permanent, and I think that it is high time I began to work up in a new place." When she heard of Underhill's move to the Department of Political Science, she thought there might be a vacancy in the Department of History. However, in a magnanimous gesture she expressed her reluctance to encroach on another woman's territory.

> To be quite frank, I am very reluctant to become a rival of Miss McFarlane or Miss Murray for any position that might be open to a woman. I do not know whether they are looking forward to University work, but I think they are able and well trained for it, and they might find it difficult, because they are women, to make a beginning elsewhere.[163]

Underhill promptly responded that, no, there would not be an opening at Saskatchewan. Reid could not have been more right about her status at Toronto. Not only did Toronto not consider her appointment permanent, it refused to give permanent appointments to women. Writing to the

---

162 Wrong had been attempting to get an appointment for his daughter. W. Peterson to George Wrong, 25 January 1915, MUA, Information file, History Department, no. 2

163 Marjorie Reid to Frank Underhill, 13 July 1925, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 1, file R-General, 1907-1927

University of Wisconsin on behalf of Marjorie Reid in 1925, W.P.M. Kennedy wrote: "As she is one of my old pupils who has had a distinguished course, I am only anxious that she be given a fair chance to develop her academic ability as a teacher."[164] However, Kennedy's definition of "fair chance" did not include Toronto. As he had already explained, "our policy is not (whether rightly or wrongly does not matter) to give higher appointments to women."[165] Reid left Toronto in 1926 and never again taught at an English-Canadian university. While Kennedy's remarks are uniquely explicit, the policy was not. Only because it was possible to not accept women could Burt write the following to Rex Trotter: "If you are willing to accept a woman into your department, you would find Miss Hilda Neatby, now teaching in Regina College, far superior to either of these men."[166]

Kennedy's remarks were uniquely explicit. After all, the evidence of discrimination is, for the most part, indirect: qualified women did not get academic appointments. Moreover, one clear example of discrimination from the 1940s cannot be recounted because of restrictions imposed by the Mount Allison University Archives.[167] Still, the exclusion of women

---

164 W.P.M. Kennedy to Dean Sellery, 14 May 1925, UTA, Department of History, A70-0025, Box 5, file 150

165 W.P.M. Kennedy to Dean Sellery, 9 May 1925, Ibid. In a letter to Mack Eastman, Kennedy tried to secure something for Reid at UBC. "She has been with us a for a couple of years as a junior, but, as you know, there is not much chance of promotion for a woman here. I was just wondering if your developments would allow you to take on another junior. If so, I wonder if you could make a place for the fall of this year? An immediate appointment such as that would be very welcome." W.P.M. Kennedy to Mack Eastman, 9 May 1925, Ibid. In a third letter Kennedy was again explicit. "Our departmental organization...does not permit for anything like prospects especially for a woman, and Miss Reid has decided to seek another appointment. If it were at all possible, I should like if she could obtain this in the fall of 1925." W.P.M. Kennedy to King, 9 May 1925, Ibid

166 A.L. Burt to Reginald Trotter, 11 February 1936, QUA, Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 26, file History Dept. Applications, 1933-1943

167 See Mount Allison University Archives, Accession no. 7804, A. Administrative Records, Subject Correspondence, file 1A/173.

persisted well into the 1950s and, for that matter, well into the 1960s.[168] The example of Margaret Banks illustrates.

Upon completing her MA with Underhill in 1950, Banks decided to pursue a doctorate under his supervision. While Underhill was encouraging, he did caution her: it was unlikely that, as a woman, she would get an academic appointment.[169] What he did not tell her was that he, as her supervisor, would make it impossible. Looking to make a junior appointment for September 1952, UNB's W.S. MacNutt asked Underhill in early January for a list of suitable candidates.[170] Meanwhile, Banks too had learned of UNB's opening and approached Underhill for a letter of recommendation. In her diary, Banks recorded the following. "January 22—Saw Professor Underhill at Baldwin House in the morning. He had already heard about the vacancy at UNB and had told several people who might apply. [Because he did not tell me] I expect my chances of getting the job aren't very good. However, he would write about me."[171] Banks'

---

168 Toronto had an unofficial policy of not hiring women to full-time positions until the 1960s. Even then Toronto was not overly welcoming. For a description of Toronto's anti-female culture in the 1960s, see Jill Ker Conway, *True North* (Toronto: Vintage Canada, 1995): 148-166. For a discussion of women historians and women's history in Canada in the 1970s see, Deborah Gorham, "Making History: Women's History in Canadian Universities in the 1970s," in Boutilier and Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory*. Finally, there have been three separate studies on the status of women in the profession of history, each confirms that women continue to confront sexism and that they are under-represented in the professoriate. See Judith Fingard, "Women Historians in Canada/Les Historiennes au Canada," *CHA Bulletin* 3, 3 (Summer 1977): 2-3; Linda Kealey, "The Status of Women in the Historical Profession in Canada, 1989 Survey," *Canadian Historical Review* 72, 3 (September 1991): 370-388; Working Group on the Status of Women Graduate Students in History, "Highlights of the Preliminary Report on the Status of Women as Graduate Students in History in Canada," *CHA Bulletin* 17, 1 (Winter 1991): 1, 8. CHA Council member, Ruby Heap has undertaken a fourth study on the status of women in history to be completed in 1999.

169 Author's interview with Margaret Banks, London, Ontario, 15 October 1997

170 As MacNutt said, "In September we shall have a vacancy for a third man in the Department." W.S. MacNutt to Frank Underhill, 4 January 1952, UNBA, Alfred Goldsworthy Bailey Fonds, RG 80, Series 2, case 7, file 1

171 Personal Diary of Dr. Margaret Banks, 22 January 1952. I would like to thank Dr. Banks for sharing some of her personal papers with me.

instincts hit the mark. A week later, Underhill responded to MacNutt's letter with a list of six names, five men and one woman. On balance, he thought Lovell Clark would be the best bet; he is a "most promising man." Then, almost as an after thought, Underhill mentioned his "girl" graduate student.

> We have a girl, Miss Margaret Banks, who has done most of her work under me in Canadian and British History. She came to us from Bishop's. She is a very good student, but very mousy and quiet; and I doubt whether she would serve your purposes as well as one of the men, though I expect she'll do the best Ph.D. thesis of the lot.[172]

On the one hand, Underhill recognized the superiority of Banks' intellect and acknowledged her competence as a historical knower. On the other hand, the masculinity of the historical discipline was so deeply engrained in Underhill that he proved unable to envision Banks as a member of the profession. To protect the profession from women, Underhill recommended inferior men. Banks did not get the job. Lovell Clark did. In an interview, Banks confessed her initial shock at Clark's appointment. "I was very surprised when Lovell Clark got the job at UNB. Of course, I congratulated him when he told me. That was how I found out I did not get the job. But it surprised me. He had failed his orals! I passed mine but he failed and had to redo them."[173]

Between 1952 and 1961 Banks launched an annual search for a university appointment. Applying to every English-speaking college and university in Canada and to several colleges and universities in the United States, her annual search amounted to an annual ritual of rejection. Obviously unaware of Underhill's damning letter, Banks inquired about

---

172 Frank Underhill to W.S. MacNutt, 29 January 1952NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30, D 204, vol. 8, file Universities-New Brunswick, 1928-1956

173 Author's interview with Margaret Banks, London, Ontario, 15 October 1997. See also Margaret Banks, "Response from a Mouse," *CHA Bulletin* 24, 1 (Winter 1998): 6.

possible vacancies at UNB in 1953 and 1954.[174] Twice Bailey responded politely, thank you, but no thank you.[175] However, in the winter of 1954 he had been looking to line someone up to replace MacNutt should he decide to take a year's leave of absence. Although aware of Banks, Bailey did not consider her. Moreover, Creighton did not recommend her in his response to Bailey's initial general inquiry to Toronto.[176] That Creighton did not recommend a woman is not surprising. He once told Banks that women could not teach in a university because, owing to the high pitch of the female voice, they could not be heard in a large lecture hall.[177] In any event, despite the importance of a PhD, and despite the fact that Banks had completed hers, Bailey considered two men, neither of whom had completed theirs. However, in the spring of 1954 Queen's short-listed her for the McLaughlin Lectureship, a one-year appointment in British history. At first the interview was to take place in Kingston. But she received a telegram asking her to meet with Arthur Lower who was in Toronto and staying at the King Edward Hotel. There, in the lobby of the King Eddie, Lower proceeded to ask a series of unacademic questions, his "great blue eyes piercing into me." One in particular stood out. "Have you any other girlfriends who have gone into academia?" The subtext of the question is forever lost; however, it is clear that women and academia were incongruous to Lower. According to Banks, Lower could not understand why she would want to leave her job at the Ontario Archives to teach at a

174 Margaret Banks to Alfred Bailey, 15 January 1953, UNBA, A.G. Bailey Fonds, RG 80, Series 2, case 7, file 1; Margaret Banks to Alfred Bailey, 9 March 1954, Ibid, case 2, file 5

175 Alfred Bailey to Margaret Banks, 1 May 1954, Ibid, case 7, file 1; Alfred Bailey to Margaret Banks, 21 January 1953; Ibid, case 2, file 5

176 Donald Creighton to Alfred Bailey, 25 January 1954, Ibid, case 2, file 5

177 Author's interview with Margaret Banks, London, Ontario, 15 October 1997

university. Upset by the meeting, Banks left the hotel and walked a full two blocks before realizing that she was walking in the wrong direction.[178]

On 19 January 1955, her frustration mounting, Banks wrote a pointed letter to Dr. Sidney Smith, President of the University of Toronto. Smith had been quoted in the *Globe and Mail* about an approaching crisis in university staffing: because the university cannot offer competitive salaries, he warned, there will be too few professors to meet the expected increase in enrolment. "We must attract and train men and women now to be ready for that crisis when it arrives, or else we will fail in our duty to the nation's youth."[179] Banks could not help but wonder if Smith really appreciated the problem. Based on her experience, the problem was not low salaries, the problem was lack of academic positions. With real insight, Banks added that women had to contend with the added reality of sex discrimination.

> You say that the university must attract and train men and women now to be ready for the crisis when it arrives. This will constitute a marked change in policy, especially with regard to women. If men have been discouraged in the past, it is doubly true of women, who are told quite openly that most universities, if given the choice between employing a man and a woman, will appoint the man, even when his qualifications are the lower of the two.[180]

In the fall of 1959 Banks travelled across western Canada in order to visit each history department. At the University of Saskatchewan she had lunch with Hilda Neatby. Neatby was pleasant but not hopeful. As de facto Chair of the Saskatchewan History Department in the winter of 1958, she had conceded that she could not hope to hire a particular female candidate because she was not only of the wrong fields but of the wrong sex as

---

178 Ibid

179 "Lack Cash for Top Men, Fear Crisis at U of T As Enrollment Mounts," *Globe and Mail* 18 January 1955

180 Margaret Banks to Sydney Smith, 19 January 1955. Letter in possession of Margaret Banks.

well.[181] As Chair throughout the 1960s, a decade when there were more openings than scholars, Neatby hired only one woman to a permanent position. It was as if she forgot her own frustration at the hands of discrimination. In a 1961 letter she sketched her thoughts on the question of hiring women, in particular women who might have children. In it she clearly pathologizes pregnancy, likening it to pneumonia at one point and a physical disability at another.

> It seems to me that a department head or dean has a perfect right to "discriminate" against a woman who might have a baby in March, as he could "discriminate" against a man likely to develop pneumonia in January. I cannot see any unfair discrimination in taking into consideration all factors relating to the efficiency of the individual. Other things being equal, it is surely fair to choose the person not liable to physical disability for whatever cause. In fact, choosing between two young men of apparently equal qualifications, it would be natural to give some consideration to health.

Although she quickly added that she personally did not subscribe to such a view, that she would "accept the babies as they come," she also said that, at the same time, she would "defend the administrator who hesitated to take this risk."[182] Such an ambivalent answer to the question of women, pregnancy and academia might explain her track record on female appointments.

In December of 1960 Banks launched her final search for an appointment in history. In a letter to the Principal of Bishop's University, her alma mater, she explained that for many years she had been seeking a university appointment. Echoing the frustration of Marjorie Reid's 1925 letter to Underhill, Banks explained that, "Before admitting defeat and

---

[181] Hilda Neatby to Frank Underhill, 13 March 1958, NA, Frank H. Underhill Papers, MG 30, D 204, vol. 13, file H. Neatby 1957-1971. Neatby was referring to Margaret Prang. In 1959 Prang received a part-time position at UBC. However, UBC did offer her a full-time position in the 1960s. Like Murray, Neatby and Ormsby, Prang did not marry.

[182] Hilda Neatby to J. H. Stewart Reid, Executive Secretary, CAUT, 14 April 1961SABS, Hilda Neatby Papers, A-139, V-151

proceeding to train for other work I am making a final attempt to secure an appointment for the fall of 1961."[183] There was nothing at Bishop's. A few months later, in February 1961, Banks accepted the position of Law Librarian at the University of Western Ontario where she remained for the next twenty-five years.

The example of Margaret Banks is unique only insofar as it is well-documented. Placed in the context of history's professionalization in English Canada to 1960, it corresponds to an observable, demonstrable pattern of discrimination in the labour market. Whereas women could be, and were, historians when history was understood as an avocation, they confronted a much different reality when history was understood as a vocation. The example of Banks also corroborates the argument that there was a deeper, gendered epistemology underlying the discipline. This epistemology first emerged in the pages of George Wrong's *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada* and it continued over the course of the first five decades of this century as women studied history at the undergraduate and graduate levels and as they pursued academic careers. True, the barriers women confronted were not impermeable as many did study history and a handful even managed to build successful careers. But, "Where the position of women is clearly subordinate, a few exceptional achievers do not threaten the system and their achievement gains salience over their womanhood."[184]

To say that sexism indicates an unenlightened generation or that it was "just the way they did things back then" is unsatisfying. It fails to account

---

183 Margaret Banks to Ogden Glass, 1 December 1960. Letter in possession of Margaret Banks.

184 Rose Coser. Quotation in Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Expansion and Exclusion: A History of Women in American Higher Education," *Signs* 3, 4 (Summer 1978): 767.

for the very real disciplinary and professional boundaries historians erected and policed. History's professionalizing drive made claims to reason, objectivity and knowledge. Gendered masculine, these attributes only made sense in opposition to their feminine inferiors: emotion, subjectivity, and experience. In minimizing the presence of the feminine in the discipline of history and in minimizing the presence of women in the profession of history, the profession was not incidentally sexist. It was necessarily sexist.

In the final analysis, boundary-work constituted an important strategy in the professionalization of history. Related to boundary-work, but distinct in its own right, was the imperative to protect scholarly independence.

Chapter V. Protecting Scholarly Independence: a professional imperative

Frank Underhill had been a thorn in the University of Toronto's side since his arrival in 1927.[1] Throughout the 1930s he was regularly called into the President's Office to explain himself. Each time he escaped dismissal. But with the spectre of war in Europe on the immediate horizon, the anti-imperialist Underhill became an easy target. In April 1939, for example, leading members of the Ontario legislature launched a vicious attack against the Toronto history professor for remarks he had made some four years earlier. Premier Hepburn announced his personal disappointment "that the University Board of Governors has not up to now disciplined Underhill in a manner befitting the crime he has committed. It smacks of rank sedition."[2] According to Doug Francis, the 1939 assault against Underhill "was part of the general hysteria that erupted any time that an individual criticized the imperial connection, especially if that individual was a university professor who was not expected to have disloyal thoughts, or at least not to express them publicly."[3] Thus, when McGill's E.R. Adair described Chamberlain's foreign policy as "stupid" in a November 1939 public talk, he ignited a debate on academic freedom and freedom of speech in war time. Although his job was never in jeopardy, the Principal's Office received a cryptic death threat: "This is a call to tell you [that] you had better put a guard on Adair at once. And I ask you to make a record of this

1 Frank Underhill's battles with University administration have been well-recounted. For more detailed analysis see A.B. McKillop, *Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario, 1791-1951* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994): 377-398, 541-543; Carl Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing since 1900*, second edition (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986): 79-84; and R. Douglas Francis, *Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986): 109-127

2 Quotation in R. Douglas Francis, *Frank H. Underhill*, 110

3 Ibid, 110

call."[4] Meanwhile, President Cody threatened Underhill with dismissal. As Underhill recalled, Cody was "terribly worked up when I saw him first and abused me as a trouble-maker who was costing the University untold sums of money."[5] In the end, however, Underhill was saved by the intervention of his colleagues, in particular Samuel Beatty, the Dean of Arts, Malcolm Wallace, Principal of University College, Chester Martin, Head of the History Department and Harold Innis who collectively promised Cody "a hard time" if Underhill were dismissed.[6] Innis in particular stood as "the chief tower of strength on my side," Underhill observed.[7]

Underhill's reprieve proved a short one. In August 1940 he delivered an address at the Couchiching Conference—the annual meeting of the Canadian Institute on Economics and Politics on the shores of Lake Couchiching—which landed him in the hottest water of his career. Canada, Underhill noted, must reconfigure its defence policy in light of the war. "We in Canada are now committed to two loyalties, the old one to the British connection involving our backing up of Britain, and the new one to North America involving common action with the States....And so we can no longer put all our eggs in the British basket."[8] Anodyne in any other context, Underhill's remark set off a firestorm in the context of war. The Toronto *Telegram* accused him of treason "by advocating the abandonment of the British cause in the hour of her greatest need."[9] Again, pressure

4 Record of telephone call, n.a., n.d.; the Principal's Office received the call on 23 November 1939. McGill University Archives (MUA), RG 2, Box 61, file Dept. of History, Morgan and Douglas, 1935-1939

5 Frank Underhill to George Ferguson, 21 April 1939, National Archives (NA), Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 4, file G.V. Ferguson, 1928-1956

6 R. Douglas Francis, *Frank H. Underhill*, 113

7 Frank Underhill to George Ferguson, 21 April 1939, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 4, file G.V. Ferguson, 1928-1956

8 Quotation in R. Douglas Francis, *Frank H. Underhill*, 115

9 Ibid, 115

mounted against Cody to rid the University of its perpetually disloyal professor once and for all. Underhill too felt the heat. "Altogether the whole thing has been as nasty as possible. People call up on the phone to denounce me, and yesterday a car load of young fellows (students presumably) passed me on St. George St. and, recognizing me, one of them shouted 'Down with Underhill!'"[10] But the beleaguered Underhill was not without friends. When a special committee of Board of Governors asked Underhill to resign on 2 January 1941, his fellow academics rallied to his defence and urged him to stand firm. Six days later Underhill submitted his response: he would not resign.[11] Although he and Underhill "were not on friendly terms,"[12] Harold Innis was quite prepared to lose "his own academic position to save his colleague's."[13] Faced with a hardened faculty opposition, the President and the Board of Governors backed down and Underhill—although shaken—was again saved.[14]

The Underhill affair was a question of academic freedom and scholarly independence. To defend him as his colleagues did was, in effect, a professional imperative.[15] As Donald Creighton stated, "your dismissal will

10 Frank Underhill to Donald Creighton, 24 September 1940, NA, Donald Creighton Papers, MG 31 D 77, vol. 1, file General Correspondence 1940

11 Frank Underhill to D. Bruce Macdonald, Chairman, Board of Governors, University of Toronto, 8 January 1941, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30, D 204, vol. 8, file Universities, Toronto, no. 1

12 Arthur Lower, "Harold Innis As I Remember Him," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 20, 4 (Winter 1985-86): 9. Donald Creighton noted that although Innis and Underhill had "crossed swords" in the past, Innis came to his defence. Donald Creighton, *Harold Adams Innis: Portrait of a Scholar* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957): 109.

13 R. Douglas Francis, *Frank H. Underhill*, 123

14 It was not only the hard line taken by the Toronto faculty that saved Underhill. Hugh Keenleyside and Jack Pickersgill used their considerable influence in Ottawa to persuade Mitch Hepburn to relax his pressure on the University. See Jack Pickersgill, "The Decisive Battle for Academic Freedom in Canada," University of Toronto Archives (UTA), Robert Bothwell Collection, B90-0034, Box 7, file Article, Pickersgill

15 In addition to Harold Innis, Underhill's colleagues in the Department of History stood by him: these included, Chester Martin, George Brown, Bertie Wilkinson and Ralph Flenley. See Robert Bothwell, *Laying the Foundation: A Century of History at University of Toronto* (Toronto, 1991): 99.

be a black reflection upon the state of Canadian universities in general and, indeed, upon the whole intellectual life of the country."[16] To protect universities and intellectual life, it was necessary to protect Underhill. According to W.J. Goode professions—by definition—seek freedom from "lay evaluation and control."[17] The Underhill affair, however, was only the most striking example of that imperative. In other words, the defence of scholarly independence was an ongoing process. This process, moreover, was most clearly manifest in the relationship between historians and American philanthropic foundations from the late 1920s through to the 1950s.

I

Historical research requires money. For English-Canadian historians in the pre-Canada Council era,[18] however, research dollars were few and far between. It was not an accident that the 1905 organizing meeting of the Champlain Society took place "in the [Toronto] board room of the Canadian Bank of Commerce."[19] With the assistance of Bank President Sir Edmund Walker, George Wrong and Charles Colby raised the necessary money

16 Donald Creighton to Frank Underhill, 9 January 1941, NA, MG 30 D 204, vol. 3, file D.G. Creighton, 1928-1956

17 W.J. Goode, "Encroachment, Charlatanism and the Emerging Profession: Psychology, Sociology and Medicine," *American Sociological Review* 25 (1960): 903

18 Although it had been a recommendation of the 1951 Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, it was not until 18 January 1957 that Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent stood in the House of Commons to announce the creation of the Canada Council. As a federally funded agency, the Canada Council would at long last make money available to Canadian artists, writers and scholars. For too long, St. Laurent explained, "Our scholars and our students have had to rely mainly on foreign sources for grants-in-aid and for scholarships." The "exclusive reliance on the generosity of others," he continued, "is not worthy of our real power and does not exemplify our real sense of values." Besides, "it is generally felt that more financial assistance is now urgently needed if our nation is to continue to make progress in the arts, the humanities and the social sciences." Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, 18 January 1957, 393-394

19 W. Stewart Wallace, *A Sketch of the History of the Champlain Society* (Toronto, 1937): 3

through individual subscriptions. In 1924 Wrong floated the idea of expanding the mandate of the Champlain Society to include publication subsidies for academic monographs. As he explained to John Clarence Webster, if the Champlain Society could convince "a few rich men" to create a fund of fifty to one hundred thousand dollars, the interest generated could be used to publish books that, as things now stand, are not being published. "I have already approached one rich man, who is pondering the problem, and I shall hope to do some more work on the scheme later."[20] In the end, nothing came of Wrong's plan.

Indeed, nothing came of all the attempts to raise money for historical research and publication. In 1920 W. Stewart Wallace expressed his (ultimately unfulfilled) hope that the Public Archives would create a research fund for university teaching staffs. "I find that historical students have comparatively little on the stocks, not because of lack of inclination or lack of time, but in many cases because of lack of ability to finance themselves during a prolonged stay at the Archives."[21] Out of his desire to see a "revolution" in historical research, A.L. Burt suggested that professional historians undertake to convince "a group of moneyed men" to put up "the necessary money to support a serious organization to conduct research in Canadian history."[22] In 1929 Arthur Lower similarly told his colleagues that they could do worse than asking Canada's wealthy citizens

20 George Wrong to John Clarence Webster, 11 July 1924, New Brunswick Museum Archives (NBMA), John Clarence Webster Papers, F304

21 W. Stewart Wallace to Adam Shortt, 22 June 1920, Queen's University Archives (QUA), Adam Shortt Papers, Box 5, file Correspondence 1920

22 A.L. Burt to Dorrie Burt, 29 July 1923, NA, A.L. Burt Papers, MG 30 D 103, vol. 1, file 1. Frank Underhill was only half joking when he called upon someone among Canada's "intelligent millionaires" to provide Canadian historians with copies of S.E. Morison's *History of American Life* and Charles Beard's *Rise of American Civilization*. These books, he believed, should serve as models for the writing of Canadian history. Frank Underhill, "Canadian and American History—And Historians," *The Canadian Forum* 8, 93 (June 1928): 685

to support the publication of academic research. "There is plenty of money in Canada if it can only be got at," he said. "Historians might pursue less worthy objects than devising means of getting at it."[23] In 1930 Chester Martin led a lobby of the National Research Council to include history within its mandate. Playing the nationalist card, he explained that the centre of historical research on Canada may well shift to the United States where the availability of "unlimited wealth" will allow both large and small universities to create graduate programmes in Canadian history. Already, "Many universities and libraries in the United States are accumulating some of the most valuable 'Canadiana' on the continent." He therefore recommended that the National Research Council provide travel and living allaowances for work at the Public Archives. "This is a national problem and it ought to be dealt with on a national scale."[24] Martin's effort failed.

Historians, therefore, survived on what little they could scrape together from their universities and their own pocket books. Commenting on his early career, Creighton remarked that he had undertaken a 1928 research trip to Paris on his "own meagre savings." There he lived in "abject poverty," surviving on *les sandwichs au jambon.*[25] With their money running out and their health weakened by an inadequate diet, he and his wife returned home—in steerage. "I desperately wanted to write something, but I knew I had to give up European history. So I decided to find a

23 Arthur Lower, "Some Neglected Aspects of Canadian History," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1929): 71

24 Chester Martin, "Memorandum on the Claims of History Upon the National Research Council," University of Saskatchewan Archives (USA), Arthur Morton Papers, MG 2 I.9. Other Universitities, 1921-1943. In 1940 the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations recommended the creation of a funding agency for the social sciences similar to the National Research Council. It fell on deaf ears. *Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, Book II: Recommendations* (Ottawa, 1940): 52

25 Donald Creighton, "Harold Adams Innis: A Special and Unique Brilliance," in Donald Creighton, *The Passionate Observer: Selected Writings* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1980): 152

Canadian subject. It was a poor second. I had a real sense of deprivation."[26] It was in this context that Canadian historians sought to tap America's "unlimited wealth."

Beginning in the late 1920s historians turned to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation for research and publication grants. Since its creation in 1911 the Carnegie Corporation had provided over $7 million to Canadian universities, colleges, libraries, museums and art galleries.[27] Similarly, since its creation in 1913 the Rockefeller Foundation had provided nearly $14 million to similar institutions and projects.[28] An analysis of the relationship between American philanthropy and Canadian arts and letters is, of course, beyond the scope of this chapter.[29]

Instead, a much more specific question is asked: did American foundations threaten the independence of professional history in English Canada? The answer is neither simple nor direct. After all, to say that philanthropy was good or that it was bad is to say nothing. This chapter takes its cue from the sociologist Lewis Coser. In his seminal book on the history and function of intellectuals, Coser dedicated a chapter to the role foundations play in contemporary intellectual life. Foundations, he

---

26 Quotation in Charles Taylor, *Radical Tories: The Conservative Tradition in Canada* (Toronto: Anansi, 1982): 28

27 "Grants in Canada of the Carnegie Corporation of New York," Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Rockefeller Foundation (RF), RG 2-1949, 427, box 480, file 3089

28 "The Rockefeller Foundation and Canada," 1 December 1955, RAC, RF, RG 2, 427, box 5, file 321

29 See Jeffrey Brison, "Cultural Interventions: American Corporate Philanthropy and the Construction of the Arts and Letters in Canada, 1900-1957," (PhD, Queen's University, 1998). For brief discussions of American philanthropy and Canada see Maria Tippett, *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and Arts before the Massey Commission* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990); and Robin Harris, *A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663-1960* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976).

argued, function as the gatekeepers of ideas: "With the power of the purse, they are in positions to foster certain ideas or lines of inquiry while neglecting or de-emphasizing others."[30] As an analogy, the foundation as gatekeeper is at once helpful (because it reminds us that foundations retain real power, that they are not disinterested patrons of research) and imperfect (because it implies that foundations retain absolute power when, in point of fact, scholars exercise considerable autonomy). Simply put, the relationship bewteen foundations and scholarship was not unidirectional. Within this framework, three different case studies are examined: the Social Science Research Council's Frontiers of Settlement Series, the Carnegie Endowment's Canadian-American relations series and the Rockefeller Foundation's North American regional studies initiative. What unfolds is a pattern of imposition and resistance between American foundations and English-Canadian historians: the foundations had research agendas but historians worked to protect their independence. This chapter, then, dissents from the work of Donald Fisher on American foundations and the development of the social sciences. Quickly, he argued that philanthropy drew academics into an informal alliance with the state and capital.[31] English-Canadian historians, however, wanted to be useful and relevant with or without the financial assistance of American foundations.

II

Conceived in the mid-1920s and published in the 1930s, the Frontiers of Settlement Series represented the first collaborative social science

30 Lewis Coser, *Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View* (New York: The Free Press, 1965): 339

31 Donald Fisher, *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences: Rockefeller Philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993)

research project in Canada to be funded by American research dollars and to involve the participation of English-Canadian historians. As Marlene Shore has argued, the project was the brainchild of American social scientists eager to demonstrate their utility. "In their attempt to reach a wider audience, to gain financial support for their research, and to influence public policy, there was no better issue for American social scientists to turn to in the early 1920s than immigration."[32] In 1926 the Social Science Research Council—an American body funded by the Laura Spelman Memorial Fund of the Rockefeller Foundation—constituted an Advisory Committee on Pioneer Belts. Its purpose was to devise a study of pioneer belts, or frontiers of human settlement, from a variety of disciplinary angles—historic, economic, social and geographic—with an eye to developing a science of settlement.[33] After all, the problem of immigration and frontier communities was not unique to the United States. It was a global problem: Africa, Asia, Australia, South America and North America had all experienced, and were experiencing still, the problems associated with human settlement in previously unsettled territory. As a 1926 Committee memorandum stated, what is needed is "disinterested advice" from experts to guide public policy.[34] Indeed, this was Isaiah Bowman's vision. As Director of the American Geographical Society and intellectual force behind the study of pioneer belts, Bowman wanted to bring together researchers from all the social sciences in an organized, co-ordinated

32 Marlene Shore, *The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origins of Social Research in Canada* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1987): 162

33 On the importance of interdisciplinary work with specfic reference to the Frontiers of Settlement Series see R.C. Wallace, "Co-operation in the Natural and Human Sciences," *Canadian Historical Review* 14, 4 (December 1933): 371-374.

34 "Committee on Pioneer Belts, Memorandum for March 27, 1926," RAC, SSRC Collection, RG 1, Series I, subseries 19, Box 188, file 1116: Committee on Pioneer Belts Minutes. December 31, 1925 to 1934

effort to develop a "science of settlement." In turn, this body of knowledge would function as "a guide to *the makers of government policies*."[35] The SSRC Advisory Committee recommended that western Canada be made the focus of any study. According to Shore, "pragmatic" considerations led American social scientists to consider Canada. Understanding its history and its policies would cast light on the American experience. In addition, Canada had become something of a "back door" for immigrants seeking entry into the United States at the same time as Americans from the western and southwestern parts of the United States were migrating to western Canada. "Having been excluded from influencing American legislation, it would seem, the social scientists saw and seized the opportunity to shape Canadian policy."[36]

But there was another reason why at least one Advisory Committee member wanted the focus to be Canada. An economic analyst in the Department of Agriculture in Washington, O.E. Baker argued that in the future America would increasingly depend on Canadian agriculture.

> Canada is almost certain to supply us with a considerable quantity of bread stuffs and dairy products in the near future, not only because of her natural resources and proximity, but also because her land is lower priced and she can produce grain and milk cheaper than we, while our cities our growing in their food requirements and their political influence.[37]

At an Advisory Committee meeting a few weeks later, Baker re-argued his case for a study of western Canada. "It would be valuable also because the Canadian North West, with its great wheat producing potentialities, is the reservoir upon which before long the people of the United States must

---

35 Italics not mine. Isaiah Bowman, "The Scientific Study of Settlement," *Geographical Review* 16, 4 (October 1926): 653

36 Shore, *The Science of Social Redemption*, 166

37 O.E. Baker, "Memorandum for Dr. Bowman, Chairman, Committee on Pioneer Belts," 31 July 1926, RAC, SSRC Collection, RG 1, Series I, subseries 19, Box 188, file 1116: Committee on Pioneer Belts Minutes. December 31, 1925 to 1934

depend for their food."[38] Because some members were uncomfortable with the purely practical considerations that seemed to be determining the decision, the Advisory Committee decided to study Rhodesia as well; here the investigation would follow "more theoretical and abstract lines" in an effort to arrive at an understanding of the "fundamental laws of human behavior."[39] However, because Baker's proposal was so much more developed and the Rhodesia proposal so embryonic, it was his that received the most attention—and, by extension, the most money. Led by Bowman, the American Geographical Society (AGS) assumed responsibility for the study of pioneer belts in 1928. And in 1929, the SSRC approved a $15 000 grant to the AGS to be followed by a second grant of $30 000.

It was at this point that the AGS struck the Canadian Pioneer Problems Committee (CPPC) in 1928. Headed by W.A. Mackintosh, it included two historians, Duncan McArthur at Queen's and Chester Martin at Manitoba and, after 1929, Toronto. The Canadian Pioneer Problems Committee was further divided into five disciplinary sub-committees; Martin headed the history sub-committee. The sub-committees worked closely together. The goal was not simply to avoid overlap and duplication but to bring as many different social-scientific perspectives to bear on the problem of pioneer settlements. It is important to note that the CPPC enjoyed its independence. Although Baker had expressed his desire for the research to be of such a nature as as to be useful to American interests, he did not press it upon Canadian social scientists. Indeed, he left the picture altogether in the late 1920s when he took a position at Stanford. Shore rightly observed that "the committee was given full control over the direction of the Canadian study."

38 Committee of Pioneer Belts, Minutes of Meeting, 12 August 1926, Ibid
39 Ibid

Although the CPPC "was instructed to consult with the American Geographical Society...on all essential matters of policy," there is nothing in the record to suggest that the AGS interfered with either the series as a whole or individual research projects.[40] Quite the opposite is true: Canadian social scientists, including historians, welcomed the research money and the opportunity to show their usefulness. As a CPPC memorandum stated: "This plan again aims to conduct research in a manner that will affect matters of practical policy."[41] For Chester Martin, Duncan McArthur, Arthur Morton, Arthur Lower and Harold Innis the series represented a wonderful opportunity to undertake important research, to publish the results and, ideally, influence policy decisions.

The Frontiers of Settlement Series, however, pointed to an outstanding problem in Canada: academic publishing. In July 1932 Mackintosh approached Hugh Eayrs, President of Macmillan Canada. He acknowledged that it would be highly unlikely that any publisher would assume the cost of publishing the series. However, if a subsidy could be arranged, would Macmillan be interested?[42] Eayrs responded that he was "keen" on the idea; but, he thought, a subsidy of $1 000 per volume would be ideal.[43] In December 1932 the SSRC approved a $9 000 subsidy for the publication of the series. Out of this grant, $4 500 would be a direct subsidy to the

40 Shore, *The Science of Social Redemption*, 170. In a foreward to the fist volume, Isaiah Bowman stated: "A committee, composed exclusively of Canadians, was set up and given virtually complete liberty of action." W.A. Mackintosh, *Prairie Settlement: The Geographical Setting* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1934): x.

41 "Memorandum Concerning the Social Sciences in Canada, with special reference to the present need of Canadian Graduate Scholarships," 31 January 1930, RAC, SSRC Collection, RG 1, Series I, subseries 19, Box 188, file 1116: Committee on Pioneer Belts Minutes. December 31, 1925 to 1934. No author is listed although presumably it was W.A. Mackintosh. See also Mackintosh, *Prairie Settlement*, xv; and Shore, *The Science of Social Redemption*, 172.

42 William Mackintosh to Hugh Eayrs, President, Macmillan of Canada, 28 July 1932, The William Ready Division Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University, The Archive of the MacMillan Company of Canada, Box 82, file 2

43 Hugh Earys to W.A. Mackintosh, 13 August 1932, Ibid

publisher while $4 500 would cover "the cost of editorial work and the preparation of maps."[44] However, the subsidy did not prove nearly enough. In 1935, with three volumes published and a fourth at the printer's, Eayrs expressed his dissatisfaction with the series. "We have come to an impasse I am afraid in respect of the Pioneer Problems Series," he told Mackintosh. Macmillan is losing money and the printer is losing money. The tables, he explained, are very expensive to reproduce.[45] Mackintosh responded that any further subsidy was out of the question. Perhaps we could agree to limit the number of tables in future volumes? "For the sake of both our reputations we cannot allow the work to fall through."[46] Macmillan agreed to continue the series and, in total, it published eight volumes. Duncan McArthur never completed his manuscript. In 1944 it was decided to finally give up on the dilatory McArthur and not publish a ninth volume. "I do not need to tell you that on the whole scheme we have lost money," a Macmillan executive informed Mackintosh.[47]

As the first large-scale social science project to be funded by American research dollars, the Frontiers of Settlement Series is important for three reasons. First, it demonstrated a pattern which would be repeated in subsequent projects, both large and small. The SSRC had a research agenda when it selected western Canada as its focus of research. In this sense, it functioned as a gatekeeper. However, Canadian academics insisted on, and won, their independence. No one policed their research or their conclusions. Second, the series highlighted the desire of Canadian social scientists to be relevant and useful. They were not drawn into an informal

44 W.A. Mackintosh to Hugh Earys, 28 January 1933, Ibid, file 3
45 Hugh Eayrs to W.A. Mackintosh, 4 May 1935, Ibid, file 4
46 W.A. Mackintosh to Hugh Eayrs, 20 May 1935, Ibid
47 Ellen Elliott, Macmillan, to W.A. Mackintosh, 2 May 1944, Ibid, file 6

alliance with the state through American philanthropy—they wanted to prove their social utility. In 1928-1929 Chester Martin "had acted as an adviser to the Manitoba Government in its negotiations with the Manitoba Resources Commission."[48] Not surprisingly, Martin dedicated the final chapter of his book to what he termed "Federal Policies and Provincial Problems."[49] Arthur Lower identified the early phase of his career by its emphasis on science. As a young historian working on settlement and the forest frontier in eastern Canada, Lower spent, in his words, "many a month compiling price indexes, tables of imports and exports, and the like." He wanted to be a scientist; he wanted to be "useful."[50] Indeed, his contribution to the series, *Settelment and the Forest Frontier in Eastern Canada*, commented on public policy and urged the authorities to learn from the past and "keep the settler off the land from which he cannot earn a living."[51] Even Innis, who viewed with tremendous caution the idea of a government/academic alliance, remarked on the usefulness of the project to Canadian policy formation. "These volumes constitute a first preliminary in the attack on the difficulties of provincial-federal relations, and their importance is enhanced by the opportune date of the study and their appearance in the years of the depression."[52] Third, the series underscored the problem of academic publishing in Canada. Without

48 Chester Martin, *"Dominion Lands" Policy*, with an introduction by Lewis Thomas (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973): xi

49 See Chester Martin, *"Dominion Lands" Policy* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1938): 495-545

50 Arthur Lower, "Foreward," in Welf H. heick, ed., *Arthur Lower and the Making of Canadian Nationalism* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1975): xiii

51 Arthur Lower, *Settlement and the Forest Frontier in Eastern Canada* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1936): 146

52 Harold Innis, "Canadian Frontiers of Settlement: A Review," *The Geographical Review* 25, 1 (January 1935): 106. In his review of Mackintosh's volume D.C. Harvey commented on the importance of the series: "In a word, these studies are assembling a vast amount of authoritative information for the use of provincial and Canadian statesmen." *Dalhousie Review* 14 (1934): 261

a sizable subsidy, commercial publishers were reluctant to take on academic projects.

These three themes would resurface in the next—and much larger—project: The Relations Between Canada and the United States funded by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

III

Throughout the 1930s and early 1940s, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (CEIP) organized and funded an enormous research project on the Canadian-American relationship. Under the leadership of James Shotwell, a former Canadian who built his career at Columbia, the project brought together historians, economists, sociologists, political scientists and legal scholars from across Canada and the United States. At its peak in the second half of the 1930s, there were sixty-three scholars working on the projected forty-three volume series. Indeed, nearly every English-Canadian historian was in some way involved. Between 1936 and 1945 three different publishing houses published twenty-five volumes known collectively as The Relations Between Canada and the United States. The series included such classics as Donald Creighton's *The Commercial Empire of the St. Lawrence*; Harold Innis' *The Cod Fisheries*; and Arthur Lower's *The North American Assault on the Canadian Forest.* In addition, CEIP sponsored four conferences between 1935 and 1941. Held at St. Lawrence University in Canton, N.Y. and Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario, and dedicated to some aspect of the Canadian-American relationship, these conferences were well attended by both Canadian and

American academics, journalists, civil servants and politicians.[53] In total, the project cost $215 000, a staggering sum for social science research in the 1930s.[54]

Carl Berger argued that the series represented a fundamental shift in English-Canadian historical writing as historians rejected "an essentially Britannic orientation" and embraced the "North Americanness of Canadian experience."[55] Moreover, he carefully placed it in the larger context of Canadian-American relations in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. After all, it is simply a matter of fact that in the decades after the First World War, American capital, American popular culture and American tourists entered Canada at unprecedented rates.[56] That a new generation of historians—many of whom had done graduate work in the United States—should re-write Canadian history in North American terms is not surprising. Meanwhile, Sandra Campbell has studied the project as part of her research on the career of Lorne Pierce. As editor of Ryerson Press, Pierce published

---

53 This chapter will not discuss the conferences. See Carl Berger, "The Conferences of Canadian-American Affairs, 1935-1941: An Overview" in Frederick W. Gibson and Jonathon G. Rossie, eds. *The Road to Ogdensburg: The Queen's/St. Lawrence Conferences on Canadian-American Affairs, 1935-1941* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1993).

54 After endowment grants, general operating grants and medical school grants, it was the single largest grant the Carnegie Corporation, through the Carnegie Endowment, made to higher education in Canada.

55 Carl Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing since 1900*, 2nd edition (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1986): 137 See also Carl Berger, "Internationalism, Continentalism, and the Writing of History: Comments on the Carnegie Series on the Relations of Canada and the United States," in Richard Preston, ed., *The Influence of the United States on Canadian Development: Eleven Case Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972).

56 Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 138. See also Jack Granatstein, *How Britain's Weakness Forced Canada into the Arms of the United States* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989); Mary Vipond, "Cultural Nationalism and the Plight of Canadian Magazines in the 1920s," *Canadian Historical Review* 58, 1 (March 1977): 43-63; Donald F. Davis, "Dependent Motorization: Canada and the Automobile to the 1930s", *Journal of Canadian Studies* 21, 3 (Fall 1986); and John Herd Thompson with Allan Seager, *Canada 1922-1939: Decades of Discord* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1986): 158-192.

the Canadian volumes in the series. According to Campbell, both Pierce and Innis practised "a gritty, pragmatic nationalism" in their dealings with their American counterparts.[57] Still, there is more to the story. Berger's emphasis on the intellectual re-orientation of English-Canadian historiography and Campbell's emphasis on nationalism leave unexplored the question of the impact of American philanthropy on the historical profession.

It is naive to assume that American foundations represented disinterested patrons of research. All action is interested. To understand the CEIP's interest in the series, it is necessary to understand James Shotwell's interest. Born in Strathroy, Ontario in 1874, James Shotwell never saw himself as a Canadian. Nor did he see himself as an American. Rather, he was a "North American." On the opening page of his autobiography, he metaphorically located western Ontario on a continental map. His hometown, he said, was part of the Middle West. Indeed, the various interconnections between Canada and the United States figured prominently in his boyhood recollections. Burning Pennsylvania coal, the trains that passed through Strathroy opened doors "to the far-off world of Toronto or Niagara Falls in the East, or Chicago in the West." Each summer his family travelled to Sarnia by train and then by boat down the St. Clair River to Walpole Island or, sometimes, to Detroit. "It was always a moving experience to see the lake boats with their cargoes of ore for Cleveland or Pittsburgh." Young men from his community, in search of farmland of their own, went to Michigan, the western States and the Canadian northwest "in what was the last chapter in the great westward movement

57 Sandra Campbell, "From Romantic History to Communications Theory: Lorne Pierce as Publisher of C.W. Jefferys and Harold Innis," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 30, 3 (Fall 1995): 91

for the conquest of the continent." Later, the young men would go to Detroit and Chicago for the high wages of an industrial economy. Although Shotwell remembered reading "Shakespeare, Milton and a galaxy of classic English poets," it was the American magazine *Century* that captured his imagination. In its pages he found himself swept away by Civil War stories. Still, he was not unaware of Canada's separate political existence. When he and his friends used to re-fight the Battle of Queenston Heights, no one wanted to be on the American side. "The school yard was as flat as a table, but one could charge up the woodpile with gallant General Brock."[58] For Shotwell, there was an essential unity to North America even if there happened to be two political units, Canada and the United States. Although he never proposed erasing the political boundaries he did speak of a "North American nationality."[59]

In his final year at the University of Toronto, Shotwell decided that he wanted to continue his studies and that he wanted to be a historian. Because there were no graduate history programs in Canada in 1898, he set his sights on American universities. Only Columbia offered him a scholarship. There he studied with James Harvey Robinson. A leading figure in the professionalization of history in the United States, Robinson built a veritable dynasty at Columbia. A founder of New History, the school of history located principally at Columbia, he insisted that the study of the past be based on the rigorous study of primary documents. He would not tolerate references to secondary sources in his seminars, Shotwell noted, "only the original sources."[60] Further, history should not separate itself

---

58 James T. Shotwell, *The Autobiography of James T. Shotwell* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961): 1, 17, 18, 20, 19, 27

59 James T. Shotwell, "A Personal Note on the Theme of Canadian-American Relations," *Canadian Historical Review* 28, 1 (March 1947): 42-43

60 Shotwell, *Autobiography*, 43

from the other social sciences; instead, it ought to embrace other approaches and methods.[61] Robinson's New History was very much related to Progressive History in its championship of progressive reform. Not surprisingly, Robinson had no patience with the notion of history for its own sake. History should tell us about our world, about who we are now and about who we want to be in the future. "History, the New Historians argued, is not a celebration of past heroes but an instrument for controlling the future."[62] Robinson's New History left an indelible impression on Shotwell.

Invited to join Columbia's prestigious faculty of History and Political Science in 1904, Shotwell established himself as a highly regarded medievalist and faithful disciple of New History. When the United States entered World War I, Shotwell took a leave of absence from Columbia to assist with the war effort. He chaired the National Board for Historical Service, a controversial body dedicated to explaining the historic causes of the war to the American public.[63] A few months later he joined the Inquiry, a panel of experts charged with surveying the legal, economic, political and historical questions related to future peace negotiations. In 1919, Shotwell and twenty-two other Inquiry members attended the Paris peace talks as an advisory team to President Wilson and the American Commission to Negotiate Peace. Although a marginal figure in the negotiations, the experience confirmed Shotwell's commitment to the utility of history and of the social sciences. Rational planning by trained

---

61 See James H. Robinson, *The New History* (New York, 1912).

62 Richard Hofstadter, *The Progressive Historians: Turner, Beard, Parrington* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968): 185

63 See Harold Josephson, "History for Victory: The National Board for Historical Service," *Mid-America* 52, 3 (July 1970): 205-224. See also Harold Josephson, *James T. Shotwell and the Rise of Internationalism in America* (Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1975), chap. 3, "The Historians Mobilize."

experts was essential to progress and peace in international relations. Very much a Progressive, Shotwell's commitment to the professional, scientific management of society never waned.[64] It guided the remainder of his life. As Charles DeBenedeti wrote, Shotwell "assumed that a rational order undergirded human relations and that the main path toward the comprehension (and control) of that order lay in the empirical wisdom of organized experts."[65]

It was after the War that Shotwell's association with the Carnegie Endowment began. In 1919 he assumed the position of General Editor of CEIP's *Economic and Social History of the World War.* A massive project, it took seventeen years to complete and eventually consisted of 152 volumes. In 1924, Shotwell was named director of CEIP's Division of Economics and History, a position he would hold for the next twenty-four years. From his office, he promoted a vision of liberal internationalism and American participation in the League of Nations, the World Court and the International Labour Organization. He also broadened his contacts with the social science community and in 1927 he was named the first chairman of the Social Science Research Council's (SSRC) Advisory Committee on International Relations. It was in this capacity that he proposed a blueprint for the scientific study of international relations in June 1931.

Entitled "Scientific Method in Research and Discussion in International Relations, A Proposal for Institutes of International Relations," Shotwell's blueprint was a statement of scientific progressivism. The War and the depression were irrefutable evidence of the growing interdependence of

---

64 See Samuel Haber, *Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964); Robert Weibe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967).

65 Charles DeBenedetti, "James T. Shotwell and the Science of International Politics," *Political Science Quarterly* 89, 2 (June 1974): 381

nations, he began. Nineteenth-century assumptions about nation-states and national economies were profoundly out of touch with twentieth-century realities. At the same time, the social sciences must assume a more active role. The "ominous menace of increasing unemployment offers a positive danger to the structure of society." It is incumbent upon social scientists to engage in "creative thinking and constructive planning" in order to secure the "intelligent consideration" of human problems. "This is the supreme task of the social sciences." The field of international relations offered enormous possibilities; after all, the problems of war and peace and depression and unemployment were international problems. To study these problems, he maintained, a new technique is required. Teams of researchers from different countries must be brought together in some kind of federal arrangement and they must be allowed to study international problems from a variety of angles. Only on the basis of careful, deliberate research can intelligent, scientific planning proceed. The social scientist—dispassionate, objective and wholly factual—must answer the call of duty and provide the state with expert knowledge and disinterested advice.[66]

Shotwell originally intended to establish Institutes of International Relations in Europe; however, he almost immediately saw in the Canadian-American relationship an opportunity for the sort of co-ordinated research he envisioned. While Shotwell never did explain why he turned his attention to international relations across the 49th parallel, the context is clear. In the aftermath of the Great War, Canada's principal trading partner had become the United States. Canada enjoyed a period of

66 "Scientific Method in Research and Discussion in International Relations, A Proposal for Institutes of International Relations," Columbia University, Rare Book and Manuscript Library (CUL), Carnegie Endowment Collection, Box 144, item no. 41230

prosperity and expansion in such important sectors as pulp and paper, base metals, hydro-electricity and automobile manufacturing. Of course, the 1920s closed with the stock market crash of 1929 and the 1930s opened with a global depression. Canadian-American relations worsened. In an attempt to protect American industry and agriculture from foreign competition, a protectionist Congress passed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff in 1930, the highest tariff in American history.[67] In response, Mackenzie King raised Canadian tariffs; shortly thereafter, the Bennett government raised tariffs even further at the same time as it sought to re-invigorate trade with Great Britain and the other Dominions. It took two years but an agreement on imperial preferences was reached at the 1932 Imperial Economic Conference in Ottawa. To the United States it looked like a British Empire trading bloc from which it would be shut out.[68] To an ardent free-trader like Shotwell the state of affairs was grave indeed.[69]

Although he made very tentative inquiries in the spring of 1931 regarding a possible study of American interests in Canada, it was not until the following spring that Shotwell initiated the much larger, more ambitious Canadian-American study. As chairman of the SSRC Advisory Committee on International Relations, Shotwell suggested Canadian-American relations as a topic of investigation. As he wrote in an April 1932 memorandum, "I believe that the time has come for a very important

---

67 See Richard Kottman, "Herbert Hoover and the Smoot-Hawley Tariff: Canada, A Case Study," *Journal of American History* 62, 3 (December 1975): 609-635.

68 See Tim Rooth, "The Political Economy of the North Atlantic Triangle in the 1930s," in C.C. Eldridge, ed., *Kith and Kin: Canada, Britain and the United States from the Revolution to the Cold War* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1997); Ian Drummond, *Imperial Economic Policy, 1917-1939* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974).

69 For an overview of Canadian-American relations in the 1930s see John Thompson and Stephen Randall, *Canada and the United States: Ambivalent Allies* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994), chap. 5, "Acquaintance to Alliance, 1930-1941."

shaping up of Canadian-American questions."[70] A few months later, he reported to the SSRC that "The tariff is an important phase of the Canadian-American problem, though there is no history on the subject, and no survey of the so-called American invasion of export of American capital in Canada. Great difficulties were found in regard to the feeling in Canada toward the United States." It was at this meeting that Shotwell floated the idea of a $175 000 SSRC grant to study the Canadian-American relationship.[71] In the end, Shotwell did not put a formal motion on the floor. As director of CEIP's Division of Economics and History, he had also looked to the Carnegie Corporation as a source of funding. At the Annual Meeting of CEIP's Board of Trustees in May, Shotwell explained that now was not the time to suspend basic research. If anything, basic research into international relations ought to be stepped up as "this world crisis of economics [brings] us to the verge of dangerous situations." Although he did not put a motion on the table Shotwell did mention his SSRC plans for a study of the Canadian-American relationship. He then added, "The underlying relations with Canada are very serious in the future with possible breakdown of the situation." Rightly or wrongly, Canadians will blame the United States for its "interference with their economic life."[72]

By the fall of 1932 Shotwell had prepared a discussion paper; in it, he outlined the context and his plans. "From the standpoint of economic interest," he began, "the most important of the foreign relations of the

---

70 "Memorandum for Dr. Crane on Canadian-American Relations," 8 April 1932, CUL, James T. Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, H.A. Innis

71 RAC, Social Science Research Council Collection, Accession 1, Series 2, subseries 1, Box 312, Minutes of the Committee if Problems and Policy, 9 April 1932-9 September 1932, Minutes of 7-9 September 1932, pp. 180-181

72 Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Board of Trustees, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 5 May 1932, CUL, Carnegie Endowment Collection, Box 22, item no. 1256

United States are those with Canada." For too long, however, sentimental references to 3 000 miles of undefended frontier have governed relations between the two countries. The time has come for hard-headed analysis. Fortunately, conditions for scientific investigation are very promising, "with experts both sides of the line who have identical technical training, and with no barrier of language or diverse customs to confuse the issues or misinterpret the results." Unaffected by modern notions of doubt and relativism, Shotwell believed in the existence of an objective reality which social scientists could know unproblematically and that the knowledge of that reality would necessarily set, in this case, Canadian-American relations on a rational plane.

Towards achieving this end, Shotwell insisted that the "scope of investigation" be very broad, that it "be planned to cover all phases of Canadian-American relations, because no one subject exists wholly apart from the others." Tariff policy, capital mobility, transportation and communication networks, the fisheries, population movements, national attitudes and legal systems: all must be studied in their economic, political, sociological and historical contexts. He therefore proposed a federal committee structure. A General Advisory Committee made up of eminent Canadian and American citizens would provide long-range vision. It would neither conduct research nor interfere with the results. The actual research would be supervised by a series of international and national committees; ie., a History Committee, an Economics Committee, a Sociology Committee, etc. As a provisional budget, Shotwell estimated $185 000 to be

spent over a two-year period of research and a one-year period of publication.[73]

What did Shotwell hope to achieve in all of this? Simply put, he wanted to better Canadian-American trade relations. Measures, counter measures and imperial preferences jeopardized America's economic interests. As he explained at the outset of his 1932 discussion paper, "From the standpoint of economic interest the most important of foreign relations of the United States are those with Canada. Not only is our trade with Canada larger than any other single nation, but we have four billion dollars invested in Canadian industries." Likewise, he justified the study of Canadian-American transportation systems "in view of our interest in the proposed waterways treaty."[74] In a letter to Nicholas Murray Butler, President of the Carnegie Endowment, Shotwell reiterated his point: "We have taken for granted far too much...the attitude of Canada toward the United States, and the economic and financial considerations that are involved."[75] When a formal motion was put before the CEIP Executive Committee in May, 1933 the question of business and economic interests was emphasized: CEIP had a rare opportunity to fund a research project which can count on the willingness of "the outstanding leaders of Canadian big business and academic life to cooperate with similar groups in the United States."[76] In passing the resolution the Executive Committee provided an initial $25 000 for the project. Shotwell did not have a hidden agenda. Rather, his was an

---

73 "Survey of the Economic, Social and Political Relations of Canada and the United States," 6 October 1932, CUL, Carnegie Endowment Collection, Box 144, item no. 41236

74 Ibid. In July 1932 Canada and the United States signed a treaty to build a St. Lawrence seaway. However, the Senate refused to ratify the treaty. A seaway was not built until the 1950s.

75 James Shotwell to Nicholas Butler, 11 October 1932, CUL, Carnegie Endowment Collection, Box 142, item no. 40622

76 Executive Committee Resolution, 1 May 1933, Ibid, Box 142, item no. 40635

open one: he wanted to improve economic and business relations between Canada and the United States.

In addition to improving trade relations between Canada and the United States, Shotwell also intended the series to demonstrate the universality of the Canadian-American relationship. As a result, history gradually assumed a greater and greater prominence in the series. At the organizing meeting throughout the fall of 1933, Shotwell asserted that while the series would respect the different academic disciplines, each individual volume ought to include the pertinent "historical background."[77] A few months later, in a letter to the President of the Carnegie Corporation, Shotwell stated that an agreement had been reached "on all sides that the underlying synthesis, the scheme around which all of the special studies group themselves, is to be History."[78] The history of the Canadian-American relationship was unique, he believed. Despite differences between the two countries, theirs was fundamentally a relationship that worked. Here, along the 49th parallel, was what Shotwell once called the "largest single laboratory for the study of international relations in the world today."[79] To study the Canadian-American relationship was also to study the sources of peace. And in that relationship was an unmistakable universality. As Berger observed, for Shotwell the relationship between Canada and the United States was "a model of how nations might live together peacefully if only the correct lessons were followed."[80]

---

77 "Canadian-American Conference on Research," 28-29 October 1933, Ibid, Box 525, item no. 114891

78 James Shotwell to Frederick Keppel, 15 February 1934, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, K-General

79 James T. Shotwell, "Annual Report for 1938 of the Division of Economics and History," CUL, Carnegie Endowment Collection, Box 2, item no. 237

80 Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 156

A liberal internationalist, Shotwell intended to "purchase" a body of knowledge that "proved" his rightness and the wisdom of liberal internationalism. In this sense, Berger was wrong when he wrote that Shotwell did not attempt to impress "an ideology on the series."[81] Indeed, Shotwell was very much a gatekeeper. Using Coser's words, with the power of the Carnegie purse Shotwell hoped to foster a certain line of inquiry and thus neglect or de-emphasize others. Even so, when all was said and done, the series was very different from the one Shotwell had envisioned. In large part, the explanation lies with Harold Innis.

IV

Shotwell's decision to include Harold Innis in the project was not surprising. After all, his books on the CPR and the fur trade had established his reputation as a brilliant and original thinker. As Canada's leading social scientist, Innis knew everyone and everyone knew Innis. He therefore offered Shotwell both intellectual authority and entry into the Canadian social scientific community.

As early as March 1931 Shotwell had conferred with Innis about his possible participation in a proposed study of "American interests in Canada." Although he expressed an interest he also added that he could not commit to anything for at least a year.[82] The following spring, Shotwell invited him to New York City to attend an important meeting with the Social Science Research Council to discuss Shotwell's proposal for a study of Canadian-American relations. Innis attended, although he did not feel he

---

81 However, Berger quickly noted that "most of the volumes did support the generalizations Shotwell sought to establish." Ibid, 151

82 Harold Innis to James Shotwell, 20 March 1931, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, H.A. Innis

added anything intelligible to the discussion.[83] He went to a second and similar meeting a few months later, in July 1932. It was after this meeting that he spelled out the conditions of his participation.

Innis was adamant on two points. First, he did not intend to surrender the autonomy of Canadian scholarship. It was not for sale. Except for Shotwell as the series general editor, he would not tolerate any American interference in Canadian projects. As he explained, "So important do I regard this principle and with such difficulty has it been conceded in the case of similar projects directed from Great Britain and from the United States [that] I cannot afford, for the sake of my position in the University and in the project, to be charged with conceding a principle which has been gained at considerable costs."[84] In a draft version of the letter, Innis made specifc reference to the principle having been "fully conceded in the Pioneer Belt project."[85] Second, the series must make sense in terms of Canadian research needs. Shotwell proved agreeable. He responded that, "From my knowledge of Canada I agree with you heartily about the misunderstandings that may arise if our work looks like an investigation of Canadian things by an American corporation of any kind, even a scientific one."[86] A few months later, he wrote Innis again: "I heartily agree with you that research is not a thing to be bought and sold on the money market."[87]

---

83 Harold Innis to James Shotwell, 6 May 1932, Ibid

84 Quotation in Creighton, *Harold Adams Innis*, 79. Carl Berger referred to Innis as "jealous guardian of the independence of Canadian scholarship." Berger, "Internationalism, Continentalism, and the Writing of History," 52.

85 Quotation in Shore, *The Science of Social Redemption*, 306

86 James Shotwell to Harold Innis, 27 July 1932, UTA, Harold Innis Papers, B72-0025, Box 11, file 14

87 James Shotwell to Harold Innis, 6 October 1932. Quotation in A.B. McKillop, *Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario, 1791-1951* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994): 479.

What were "Canadian research needs" to Innis? Research must focus on the history of the country's key staple industries. The Canadian economy is unique in North America. As he tried to explain to Shotwell, "I have argued that at considerable length elsewhere...that the boundary line is not accidental and that the economic background is fundamentally different in the two countries."[88] A year later, at a New York meeting of the Economics Committee, Shotwell and Innis staked out their positions. Shotwell opened the meeting with a comment on what the series was, and what it was not: it was, he explained, for the betterment of Canadian-American relations; it was not "purely a study in economics." However, and obviously, studies had to be done. He asked the meeting to consider, therefore, which made more sense, studies of comparisons or relations. Innis stressed that both the comparative approach and the relations approach were flawed when it came to understanding the history of the Canadian economy: "...there is an autonomous Canadian economy which must be considered apart from the problems of American or British influences upon [the] Canadian economy." Later in the meeting Shotwell reiterated his concern that the studies must be relevant and practical; "they must," he said, "be focused upon the realities of the present situation." Innis disagreed. Perhaps in the United States the basic research necessary to policy formulation had been completed; in Canada, however, "it is still necessary to build up the basic studies" on the key staples.[89]

---

88 Harold Innis to James Shotwell, 11 August 1932, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, H.A. Innis

89 "Canadian-American Relations Conference on Research," 12 November 1933, CUL, Carnegie Endowment Collection, Box 525. In the introduction to a collection of essays on the Canadian economy published in 1934, Innis elaborated: "...we lack vital information on which to base prospective policies...." Harold Innis, "Introduction," in Harold Innis and A.F.W. Plumptre, eds., *The Canadian Economy and Its Problems* (Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1934): 17-18.

Upon returning to Toronto, Innis penned his thoughts and sent them to Shotwell. The series must make room for specialized monographs on Canadian staples: fish, lumber, mineral and pulp and paper. The comparative method introduces a "danger."[90] The two economies cannot be compared until the Canadian economy has been studied. Shotwell showed Innis' letter to J. Bartlet Brebner, another Canadian-born Columbia historian and his principal adviser on the series.[91] Brebner hit the proverbial nail on the head: "...Innis is likely to think in terms of Canadian economic history and temporarily lose sight of our study of relations."[92] When Innis submitted his proposed outline of studies a few months later, in January 1934, Brebner's concerns were realized. "This program seems to be designed to produce materials of a research character for chapters in a book on the basic industries of Canada. These chapters might be very useful in an economic history of Canada without reference to its relations to the United States." Brebner explicitly recommended dropping the proposed Creighton study on commercial organization—what did it have to do with Canadian-American relations?[93] But Innis insisted. As he had reported a few months earlier, Creighton is "alive" and does "excellent work."[94]

When the economic studies were finally approved in June 1935, Innis had succeeded; through dint of will, he had effectively turned a series on

---

90 Harold Innis to James Shotwell, 15 November 1933, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, H.A. Innis

91 For a discussion of Brebner's career see Paul T. Phillips, *Britain's Past in Canada: The Teaching and Writing of British History* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1989), chap. 5, "The View from Morningside Heights."

92 J. Bartlet Brebner to James Shotwell, n.d., c. November 1933, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, H.A. Innis

93 J. Bartlet Brebner, "Memorandum on the Innis Budget," 23 January 1934, Ibid, Box 284, file Can-American Relations, J.B. Brebner

94 Harold Innis to James Shotwell, 15 November 1933, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, H.A. Innis

the economic relations of Canada and the United States into a series of monographs in Canadian economic history. The project outline listed ten "Special Industrial Studies." For the most part, the studies were divided by staples: lumber, fish, pulp and paper, hydro-electricity, minerals and agriculture. In addition, there would be Creighton's study of commercial and financial organization before the concentration of capital and two regional economic studies, one on the Maritimes and the other on British Columbia. The latter two projects reflected Innis' interest in marginal economies vulnerable to the economic policies of the centre. The project outline explained the sudden focus on Canada: "While it is true that the major objects of investigation in this field are North American in character, it has proved profitable to include some particular examinations of separate elements in the Canadian economy because it is the weaker of the two and has been deeply affected by the economic and political policies of both countries."[95]

Shotwell did not complain. On one occasion, he himself insisted that the comparative focus be dropped, although for a different reason than Innis. Originally, Irene Biss' study of hydro-electricity was to have been a comparative study of its development in Canada and the United States. Biss was a brilliant graduate student and part-time lecturer in Toronto's Department of Political Economy. However, Shotwell grew uneasy. As he explained to Innis, allowing a Canadian to write about American hydro-electricity "would open us to an attack that would get us into domestic politics here" at a time when "the power problem is one of the most serious issues" in American politics. "I don't wish to pussy-foot on any of these

95 "A Survey of Canadian-American Relations," June 1935, CUL, Carnegie Endowment Collection, Box 525, item no. 114931

questions if they are absolutely within the orbit of Canadian-American relations, but I don't want to rush headlong into this without having some idea where we are coming out." On the whole, it would be better if Biss concentrated her research on the Canadian side of the line. Indeed, Shotwell wanted to drop Biss altogether in order to cut costs.[96] Although Innis did not push the comparative approach, he was insistent that Biss remain. Shotwell agreed.

Shotwell's caution was typical. His repeated pronouncements on the "scientific objectivity" of the project notwithstanding, he proved more a politician than a social scientist. As he said, unless he was more or less certain of the conclusions, of "where we are coming out" to repeat his phrase, it was best to avoid the subject altogether. In this case, he subordinated the interests of scholarship to the interests of politics. According to the logic of Shotwell's politics, it was better to keep the research topics safe than it was to ignite controversy. Controversy would only undermine his ultimate goal: to improve economic and business relations between Canada and the United States by highlighting North America's natural and historic affinity.

In addition to securing funding for the historical studies he deemed important to Canadian scholarship, Innis also arranged for the Canadian volumes to be published by a Canadian press. It was a matter of considerable importance to him. In February 1935 the Endowment circulated a memorandum on the status of the project to date. In addition to the usual lists of who was doing what and where they were doing it, the document contained a remark about spelling. "In order to ensure

96 James Shotwell to Harold Innis, 20 February 1935, CUL, John Bartlet Brebner Collection, Box 10, file Sept. 1933-Mar. 1937. As it turned out, Biss did not complete the research and the volume was never published. She married and became Irene Spry.

uniformity in copy for the printers, it has been decided to follow American rather than English usage. The latter has become rare in Canada and Canadians are accustomed to American forms and spelling."[97]

Canadian academics were wounded. Historian George Glazebrook wrote Brebner in complaint. "Personally I am rather vague about American spelling except that honour is spelt honor, etc. Does this memo mean that Canadian writers have to change their MSS into US style? If so, I shall personally have a good deal to do."[98] But it was Innis who led the charge. He explained to Shotwell that the series ought to follow both English and American spellings. "Considerable controversy" has erupted over this point.[99] Shotwell was genuinely surprised that something so trivial could matter so much. I must confess, he said, that I am "a little puzzled about your suggestion of following English spelling. Is it really so important?" Besides, there is to be a single publisher for the entire series "and we may get into a terrible snarl if we spell half the volumes one way and half the other."[100]

Innis admitted that it was much ado about nothing, or "nonsense to a very great extent," but it mattered nonetheless. Upping the ante, he doubted the "advisability of having all the volumes published in Canada or in the United States and [he thought] it would be safer to divide them between Canadian and American publishers."[101] There matters stood for a few weeks: Innis wanted a Canadian publisher for the Canadian volumes; Shotwell wanted a single American publisher for the whole series. He

97 "A Survey of Canadian-American relations," February 1935, Ibid.

98 George Glazebrook to J. Bartlet Brebner, 26 April 1935, Ibid,

99 Harold Innis to James Shotwell, 21 February 1935, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, H.A. Innis

100 James Shotwell to Harold Innis, 25 February 1935, Ibid

101 Harold Innis to James Shotwell, 26 February 1935, Ibid

wanted a series, not a bunch of books that happened to be subsidized by Carnegie money. However, Innis gradually wore Shotwell down. As Brebner explained, "I think Shotwell is coming around to the idea of publishing some of the volumes in Canada. He has a very low idea, however, of the quality of printing and book-making in Canada, and I wish there were some way of demonstrating that on a project of several volumes with some subsidy, a Canadian publishing company could do a decent piece of work."[102] Five days later Shotwell gave in; if the Canadian volumes must be published in Canada then so be it. He even accepted Innis' recommendation of Ryerson Press and its editor, Lorne Pierce. In addition to being good friends, Pierce had published two of Innis' books as well as his wife's book on Canadian economic history. Meanwhile, Shotwell cautioned Innis that his funds were not limitless and that he would "drive as hard a bargain" as he could on the question of subsidies.[103] In the ensuing memorandum of agreement between the Endowment and Ryerson Press, it was agreed that the Canadian volumes "shall conform in spelling and English usage to the Oxford practice" while the American volumes shall conform "to the University of Chicago hand-book."[104]

The association with Lorne Pierce and Ryerson Press turned out to be an unfortunate one as Shotwell's low regard for Canadian publishing was realized. Sandra Campbell noted that "The volumes, with footnotes and often specialised maps and charts, were technically demanding to produce and often required heavy editing."[105] As a result, there were complaints

---

102 J. Bartlet Brebner to Harold Innis, 15 March 1935, CUL, John Bartlet Brebner Collection, Box 10, file Sept. 1933-Mar. 1937

103 James Shotwell to Harold Innis, 20 March 1935, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, H.A. Innis

104 "Memorandum re. The Canadian-American Research Project," 7 May 1935, Queen's University Archives (QUA), Lorne Pierce Collection, Box 6, file 3, no. 42

105 Campbell, "From Romantic History to Communications Theory," 109

about interminable delays, the quality of the production and the prices Pierce charged for each volume. Lower's volume in particular caused headaches for its author, its publisher and its sponsor alike. In October 1937 a frustrated Lower complained in rather harsh terms to Pierce about the quality of a particular map. "Apart from the omissions, a long list of which I enclose, it is amateurish in execution with its great sprawling lettering."[106] Shotwell too was frustrated by Ryerson Press and, in November 1937, he sent an editor to Toronto to assist Pierce and Innis with the editing of manuscripts and the correction of proofs.[107] It brought a temporary respite.

Meanwhile, there was another problem in the late fall of 1937; again, it related to English vs. American style. A full year earlier, Shotwell had asked George Glazebrook to adopt a different style of capitalization in his volume on the history of transportation in Canada; "the text will seem queer to the American reader," he explained. Glazebrook complied. Thus, the great lakes became the Great Lakes. A year later, Shotwell made a request for further changes. This time an indignant Glazebrook resisted. When Innis was informed, he drew the line. In Canada, he told Shotwell, we dislike excessive capitalization. Canadian authors, therefore, ought to be allowed to follow the style of the *Canadian Historical Review;* "we should not be compelled to adopt any American style."

> I do not need to remind you again that we are fighting continually against the danger of being labeled pro-Americans and we cannot afford to have authors disgruntled with an actual grievance against us because of a trivial matter of type. These are danger spots which are very real to us and may seem trivial to you. My advice would be emphatically to the effect that the Glazebrook volume should go on

---

106 Arthur Lower to Lorne Pierce, 18 October 1937, QUA, Arthur Lower Collection, Box 25, B 669. See also Arthur Lower to Harold Innis, 16 November 1937, Ibid.

107 James Shotwell to George Finch, 12 November 1937, CUL, Carnegie Endowment Collection, Box 525, item no. 115007

> as it has been begun, and it would help much, if you can see your way clear, to write a letter to Glazebrook explaining the difficulties.[108]

In the interests of maintaining the peace, Shotwell conceded the point to Innis. However, he also made it clear to Glazebrook that "my desire for capitals was not an invasion of Canadian sovereignty." In Shotwell's opinion the use of capitals was more British than American. Nevertheless, Glazebrook could follow any style he desired as long as it was uniform.[109]

Of course, solving the problem of capital letters did not solve the problem of Ryerson Press. In March 1938, Innis sent a confidential letter to Shotwell. Alluding to "problems" with Ryerson, he admitted that it would be best to switch publishers altogether. The remaining Canadian volumes should be published by the University of Toronto Press.[110] Shotwell responded that he would have Norman Donaldson of Yale University Press, the publisher of the American volumes in the series, write Pierce a "stiff" letter, especially as to the high price they are charging.[111] Innis was not satisfied. "We have made more than our contribution to Ryerson Press." Besides, "Such a move would strengthen enormously the position of the University of Toronto Press....From the standpoint of intellectual development I can think of few more important steps than the building up of the University of Toronto Press as a national press for University work."[112] A year later, a weary Shotwell decided that the "infinite trouble"

---

108 Harold Innis to James Shotwell, 6 December 1937, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, G. de T. Glazebrook

109 James Shotwell to George Glazebrook, 17 December 1937, Ibid

110 Harold Innis to James Shotwell, March 1938, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, H.A. Innis

111 James Shotwell to Harold Innis, 31 March 1938, Ibid

112 Harold Innis to James Shotwell, 2 April 1938, Ibid

with Ryerson Press must end.[113] Donaldson gave Pierce six-months notice that YUP and CEIP would be terminating their contract with Ryerson.[114] Of course, Pierce protested.[115] When a compromise was struck that YUP would edit all of the remaining manuscripts and Ryerson would print the Canadian volumes, it was Innis who was furious. True, he had wanted to remove Ryerson Press from the editorial process for some time;[116] but, he did not want to concede that process to Yale. "We cannot afford to give the general impression that we have become a branch office of American concerns," he told Brebner. "I don't need to tell you this but we are in a sensitive mood and always ready to the raise the cry of American domination. I think a solution could be reached by which the U of T Press did the editing and the Ryerson Press the printing and distributing."[117] A few days later, in early October, Shotwell gave in to Innis' demand that UTP become the printer's editor.[118] Innis was pleased. "I would like to look at this development as an opportunity of building effective editorial work in

---

113 James Shotwell to George Finch [CEIP], 28 April 1939, CUL, Carnegie Endowment Collection, Box 525, item no. 115010

114 Norman Donaldson to Lorne Pierce, 2 May 1939, QUA, Lorne Pierce Collection, Box 7, file 5, no. 60

115 Lorne Pierce to Norman Donaldson, 1 June 1939, Ibid, Box 7, file 5, no. 62.

116 Campbell stated that together Innis and Pierce protested to save the contract for Ryerson. [See Campbell, "From Romantic History to Communications Theory," 109.] This is not true. Innis was happy to leave Ryerson. As he explained to Shotwell after Donaldson's notice of termination, Ryerson was not marketing the series, it was charging too high a price and it was using the series to subsidize its greater interest in popular books. "There is little point in arguing with [Pierce] on many matters," he told Shotwell, "because he cannot grasp our point of view." Harold Innis to James Shotwell, n.d., c. May 1939, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, H.A. Innis

117 Harold Innis to J. Bartlet Brebner, 23 September 1939, CUL, John Bartlet Brebner Collection, Box 10, file August 1937 to August 1940

118 Memo, by J. Bartlet Brebner, 4 October 1939, Ibid

Canada."[119] UTP thus acted as the printer's editor for the final four volumes printed in Canada.[120]

Campbell attributed Innis' actions to what she calls a "gritty, pragmatic nationalism"; however, there was more at play. In a 1935 article on the social sciences, Innis listed a series of biases which exerted "persistent corroding effects" on the position of the social scientist. For example, a "danger to social science has arisen from foundations to subsidize research, because of the statement of objectives and of the extent of the subsidies." In addition, poorly paid social scientists "are attracted to the prospects of remuneration from foundations with standards of research adaptable to the achievement of an objective." Although he did not mention any names, there is no doubt which foundation Innis had in mind in the spring of 1935: the Carnegie Endowment. Aware of the potential bias in foundation grants, Innis made every effort to, in his words, tear off its "mask" and to "correct" it.[121]

Against this backdrop, his early statements on the independence of Canadian scholarship, his insistence on historical studies in Canadian economic history, his determination to have a Canadian publisher publish the Canadian volumes, and his passionate defence of the right to keep editorial responsibilities in Canada may well add up to a pragmatic

---

119 Harold Innis to J. Bartlet Brebner, 6 October 1939, Ibid

120 These were: Fred Landon, *Western Ontario and the American Frontier;* F.W. Howay, W.N. Sage and H.F. Angus, *British Coumbia and the United States;* R.H. Coats and M.C. MacLean, *The American Born in Canada: A Statistical Interpretation;* and Gustave Lanctôt, ed., *Les Canadiens Français et leurs Voisin du Sud.* Lanctôt's volume, however, was not printed by Ryerson but by M. Valiquette of Montreal. Although Campbell could find no evidence that UTP ever became involved in the series, see the letters between UTP and Brebner in CUL, J. Bartlet Brebner Collection, Box 10, file August 1937 to August 1940 and file Bartlet, John Brebner. See also James Shotwell to Lorne Pierce, 8 August 1941, QUA, Lorne Pierce Collection, Box 8, file 6, item 36.

121 Harold Innis, "The Role of Intelligence: Some Further Notes," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 1, 2 (May 1935): 280-286

nationalism but they also point to an ongoing struggle in the professionalization of history in English Canada: to both gain and retain control over the work environment and the labour process. Simply put, his various determinations and efforts took direct aim at the right of historians to govern historical work. Looked at in this way, his early statements about the independence of Canadian scholarship were really statements about the independence of scholarship; his insistence on historical studies in Canadian economic history constituted a declaration of the right of scholars to set their own research agenda; his determination to have a Canadian publisher edit and publish the Canadian volumes was part of a long-term goal to develop the institutions necessary to autonomous scholarly activity. In short, if his desire to spell 'honour' with a 'u' and his wish to limit the number of capital letters were expressions of English-Canadian nationalism, they were also expressions of his fierce commitment to do things his way, to control the production of scholarship. Campbell's scrappy nationalist was also a self-conscious professional who jealously protected and enlarged the independence necessary to intellectual life.[122]

Still, there is an obvious irony. In working against the bias of foundations to define "the statement of objectives," Innis himself became a bias. He set the research agenda (studies in Canadian economic history), he selected the individual topics (commercial organization, lumber and hydro-electricity) and he selected the researchers (Creighton, Lower and Biss). In addition, Innis secured the publishing contract for his friend and he later secured a contract for his university's press. Despite his intellectual disdain for careerism, for "leaders," "strong men" and "the frictions which

122 If Arthur Lower remembered his friend with fondness, he also recalled their disagreement on accountability. Lower believed a grant recipient ought to be held accountable for the grant. Innis would have none of it. "He seemed to think that this cut into academic freedom." Lower, "Harold Innis As I Remember Him," 9.

accompany them,"[123] Innis used the Carnegie Endowment to become a strong man and to build an academic empire. Because of his intimate contact with Shotwell, he was able to direct the flow of a large share of the money. Creighton observed many years later that in the 1930s, Innis was at the height of his influence and "everybody was writing and talking about staple production."[124]

However, there were limits to the Innis empire. Although he was the key Canadian player in the series, there were other Canadian historians directly involved.

V

In its optimistic beginnings the series included projected volumes from Walter Sage and Arthur Lower in the West to D.C. Harvey in the East; en route, there would be volumes from Fred Landon, Reginald Trotter, Duncan McArthur, Gustave Lanctôt, George Brown, Frank Underhill, George Glazebrook, Chester Martin and Donald Creighton. Finally, C.P. Stacey at Princeton, A.L. Burt at Minnesota and the always-wandering Menzies Whitelaw had been drafted as well.[125] Like Innis, they attached their own agendas to their involvement and they wrote the books they wanted to write.

At first, Arthur Lower hesitated. The project, he explained to Innis, "would be by no means a labour of love for me" as it would take me away from my current interests; "I think [Shotwell's] terms would have to be

123 Harold Innis, "A Note on Universities and the Social Sciences," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 1, 2 (May 1935): 286

124 Donald Creighton, Presidential Address, Canadian Historical Assoication, *Annual Report* (1957): 3

125 Harvey, Trotter, McArthur, Brown, Underhill, Martin and Whitelaw never completed their volumes.

decently attractive if I were to undertake it."[126] But when the poorly paid United College historian heard the terms he was delighted to participate; as he had earlier confessed, he was "quite unashamedly willing to write for money."[127] Indeed, the honorarium of $500 equaled about two-months income. Although he did not write for the money *per se*, Donald Creighton could not believe his good fortune when he received an advance of $200 on his honorarium for it made an extended research trip to Ottawa possible.[128] A young C.P. Stacey certainly needed the honorarium, but he also liked the opportunity the series presented. It would mean getting a book in print and that was important. "It's a fine scheme from my point of view, but don't let's start cheering until it's a certainty," he told his mother.[129] When applying for a job, Stacey was careful to note his association with the Endowment and the series.[130] Reginald Trotter, who was a member of the Historical Committee overseeing the Canadian history volumes in the series, used his clout to advance the career of his star graduate student, John Pritchett. Pritchett had completed his doctorate with Trotter in 1931 and was precariously employed by the cash-starved University of North Dakota. Knowing that a book would help his cause in a tight labour

---

126 Arthur Lower to Harold Innis, 2 December 1933, QUA, Arthur Lower Collection, Box 7, A 127

127 Arthur Lower to Harold Innis, 19 November 1933, UTA, Harold Innis Papers, B72-0025, Box 11, file 13

128 Donald Creighton to James Shotwell, 6 June 1934 and 17 July 1934, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 285, file Can-American Relations, D.G. Creighton

129 Charles Stacey to his mother, 22 January 1934, UTA, Charles Stacey Papers, B93-0021, Box 1, file 2

130 Charles Stacey to George Throop, Chancellor, Washington University, 13 December 1935, UTA, Charles Stacey Papers, B90-0020, Box 1, file Applications for positions

market. Trotter secured Pritchett's participation despite his junior status.[131]

The degree of autonomy Canadian historians enjoyed varied. For example, some proved able to write the books they wanted to write. Conceived before the series itself, Creighton's research project focused on commercial organization in the St. Lawrence valley in the first half of the 19th century. Although Creighton agreed to add more "biographical and explanatory material" in order to make the book more easily accessible to American readers, and although he "expanded passages dealing with the United States," he was not prepared to alter its focus. "But, as you say," he told Shotwell, "the book has its focus in Canada rather than in North America as a whole; and to make it otherwise would, I am afraid, have involved writing another book."[132] Although Shotwell occasionally expressed concern over the Canadian focus of the series,[133] he was genuinely ecstatic about *The Commercial Empire of the St. Lawrence.* He called it "high literature"[134] and "a splendid contribution."[135] Like Creighton, Fred Landon wrote the book he wanted to write. Although it had

---

131 Reginald Trotter to John Pritchett, 28 May 1934, QUA Reginald Trotter Papers, Box 23, file Correspondence, Pritchett, J.P. (iii). Not surprisingly, Pritchett dedicated his volume in the series to Trotter.

132 Donald Creighton to James Shotwell, 3 November 1937, Ibid, Box 285, file Can-American Relations, D.G. Creighton

133 When a Brown University historian asked Shotwell if the series had room for a book on Canadian land colonization policies, Shotwell responded negatively but conceded the series Canadian focus. "I have already interpreted the scope of our enterprise in a way which, as you say, almost seems to imply a general interest in Canadian things. This, however, was a somewhat special bit of cooperation with Canadian economists and historians on which we were attempting to build a larger synthesis. But in granting this interpretation of our purpose for the completion of these works, I made it a matter of principle not to extend beyond the program which the Canadians had presented." James Shotwell to James B. Hedges, 8 August 1938, Ibid, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, H—General

134 James Shotwell to H.F. Angus, 10 May 1937, Ibid, Box 284, file Can-American Relations, H.F. Angus

135 James Shotwell to Lorne Pierce, 28 November 1938, Ibid, Box 285, file Can-American Relations, D.G. Creighton

much more to do with the United States than Creighton's it was still a book on western Ontario with references to American influences. Brebner was troubled when he received the manuscript. "The great problem is, of course, that Mr. Landon naturally wants to write a social history of western Ontario and, therefore, brings in other than American influences."[136] The manuscript went forward nonetheless and became *Western Ontario and the American Frontier*. Calling it "an exceptionally fine contribution to Canadian history," Shotwell tried to get it reprinted (albeit unsuccessfully) in 1944.[137] As for Pritchett's volume, it was in effect a re-worked and expanded version of his doctoral thesis on the Red River settlement. He even commented on its Canadian focus. "The reason why the part played by the Americans is given such comparatively little space is a simple one: Americans played little part in the story."[138]

At the same time, other historians experienced tighter editorial supervision. This fact qualifies Berger's assertion that Shotwell did not distort the conclusions that others had reached.[139] When Shotwell received Lower's manuscript he commented on its remoteness from contemporary issues and concerns. He therefore explained to Lower that Innis' introduction must make the connection. "I have been very anxious that [Innis] should cover the history right up to the day before yesterday, as it were. The interest in Canadian-American commercial relations is one

---

136 J. Bartlet Brebner to James Shotwell, 7 February 1940, Ibid, Box 287, file Can-American Relations, F. Landon

137 James Shotwell to Frank Flemington, Ryerson Press, 4 March 1944, QUA, Lorne Pierce Collection, Box 11, file 4, item no. 39

138 John Pritchett, *The Red River Valley, 1811-1849* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942): xvi

139 Admittedly, Shotwell did not find much need to distort the conclusions that others had reached. As Berger observed, and as has already been noted, "most of the volumes did support the generalizations Shotwell sought to establish." Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 151

of the most valid reasons for undertaking this volume in the first place. So we must meet that obligation as fully as possible."[140] Lower was unapologetic. "I am afraid however that my text will not impress the public as emphasizing the present state of the trade. As a matter of fact my interest has been almost purely historical, not current."[141] To Innis, Shotwell repeated his point about the purpose of the project. "One criticism which is sure to be made of our whole enterprise is that it gives a lot of information about the nineteenth century and not enough about the drift and current of affairs today."[142] Through Innis' introduction and an added chapter and appendix by Lower, *The North American Assault on the Canadian Forest* brought the story up to the reciprocity agreement of 1935.

In the Sage-Howay manuscript on British Columbia and the United States, Shotwell displayed a heavier editorial hand. From the beginning this particular volume had caused Shotwell grief. Judge Frederic Howay was not an academic but he was the leading authority on the history of British Columbia and a past-president of the Canadian Historical Association. As such, it was the Canadian historians themselves who insisted that the Judge be associated with the BC volume.[143] As Chester Martin explained, "Howay is indispensable and Sage must contrive

---

140 James Shotwell to Arthur Lower, 10 December 1937, QUA, Arthur Lower Collection, Box 25, B 669

141 Arthur Lower to James Shotwell, 26 December 1937, Ibid

142 James Shotwell to Harold Innis, 9 January 1938, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 287, file Can-American Relations, A.R.M. Lower—W.A. Carrothers—S.A. Saunders

143 In reference to a November 1933 conference of those Canadian historians involved in the project, Shotwell wrote: "At a conference of the Canadian historians, held in Ottawa, the request was made that Judge Howay be invited to associate himself with Professor Sage in shaping up the projects in the Pacific area. Could you manage this?...The conference seemed to put great importance upon our having Judge Howay associated with us." James Shotwell to H.F. Angus, 5 January 1934, Ibid, Box 284, file Can-American Relations, H.F. Angus

somehow to work with him."[144] Between the two west coast historians, it was agreed that Howay would write those chapters dealing with the period up to BC's entry into Confederation and that Sage would write those chapters dealing with the period following Confederation. The partnership was anything but fruitful. Howay thought little of Sage as a historian[145] and, indeed, Sage proved dilatory.

When the Howay-Sage manuscript finally appeared in 1940 it was a mess. At this point, Shotwell secured the UBC economist H.F. Angus as an editor and co-author. Although Shotwell promised Howay that he would never "doctor" history "in the interests of any political tenet"—not even for "one so valid as that of good relations between Canada and the United States"—that is precisely what he authorized Angus to do.[146] Harsh and to the point, Angus criticized the manuscript. "The two authors did not co-operate in the least and they have produced a series of disjointed papers. Even within the papers the arrangement of material is unsystematic. No general themes are developed. There is no introduction and no conclusion. There is some overlapping and some unaccountable omissions, e.g. lumber and fisheries. The uncorrected slips of typing and even of spelling are numerous."[147]

But there was a more troubling matter. Judge Howay had written his chapters in what Shotwell referred to as a strong "nationalist tone."[148]

---

144 Chester Martin to James Shotwell, 20 April 1934, Ibid

145 Judge Howay thought little of academics in general ("the energetic amateur can beat them [academics] every time) and of Walter Sage in particular (he once referred to a piece of "SAGEAN research" as "valueless.") Quotations in Chad Reimer, "The Making of British Columbia History: Historical Writing and Institutions, 1784-1958," (PhD, York University, 1995): 181.

146 James Shotwell to F.W. Howay, 30 July 1940, Ibid, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, F.W. Howay—W.N. Sage

147 H.F. Angus to Chester Martin, 4 October 1940, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, F.W. Howay—W.N. Sage

148 James Shotwell to Chester Martin, 24 June 1940, Ibid

Although Shotwell did not refer to any specific instances of nationalism, Brebner was explicit. "There is no adequate account of the Alaska Boundary Award. Howay includes it in his last chapter, but briefly and in a way which Canadian and American scholars would certainly deplore. He pretty well confines himself to Canadian indignation over Roosevelt's methods." Moreover, Brebner explained, Howay is "obsessed" with British Columbia's apparent preference for "law and order and general decency north and south of the international boundary." Really, it is "overdone." "It is as if he were presenting a long legal brief for the Hudson's Bay Company and British institutions generally."[149] Indeed, the Judge liked to compare the Americans to the British to the detriment of the Americans: for example, the American frontier was marked by violence while the British frontier was marked by a relative peace.[150] It was Angus who "modified"[151] the tone of Howay's chapters through the occasional and judicious addition of a "cheery continentalism."[152] In a memorandum for Shotwell, Brebner reported that "Angus has been very successful in cutting out Howay's homilies on the virtues of the British and the vices of the Americans, and in interjecting sections of comment which give proper setting and interpretation to the early expressions of rivalry. The handling of San Juan and Alaska boundaries is no longer invidious."[153]

---

149 "Memorandum on Howay-Sage Manuscript," 12 June 1940, CUL, J. Bartlet Brebner Collection, Box 10, file Bartlet, John Brebner

150 Reimer, "The Making of British Columbia History," 186

151 H.F. Angus to J. Bartlet Brebner, 7 October 1940, CUL, James Shotwell Collection, Box 286, file Can-American Relations, F.W. Howay—W.N. Sage

152 This phrase belongs to Chad Reimer. However, without access to the James Shotwell and J. Bartlet Brebner Collections, Reimer found it necessary to qualify his statement, saying that "the cheery continentalism of the text was almost certainly grafted onto [Howay's] chapters by Angus." Reimer, "The Making of British Columbia History," 187

153 "Howay-Sage-Angus MSS," n.d., c. July 1941, CUL, J. Bartlet Brebner Collection, Box 10, file Brebner, John Bartlet

Indeed, the final chapter of the volume, written by Angus and designed to bring the narrative up to the present, was a statement in "cheery continentalism." Entitled "The Age of the Good Neighbours," its final sentence happily pronounced that the two Pacific communities possess "one of the few joint histories which can be brought up to date and yet have a happy ending."[154]

In addition to his editorial changes to the Lower and the Howay-Sage-Angus volumes, Shotwell canceled one volume in the interests of Canadian-American amity. Charles Stacey had been invited to participate in the series through a volume on Canadian-American military history. The purpose of the volume was, in Stacey's words, to present "a completely realistic examination of the historical process which has produced the present demilitarized boundary between Canada and the United States."[155] A semi-popular book, it would survey the Canadian-American military relationship from its colonial beginnings to the present. It was Shotwell who wanted the study brought to the 1930s and to include a discussion of the "Japanese menace."[156] Stacey agreed. However, he found the going slower than he had anticipated. In 1939 he informed Shotwell that it was unlikely that his manuscript would be ready in the near future; indeed, "we would be lucky to publish the book in 1940, even if Hitler doesn't upset the applecart, as seems so likely."[157] Of course, Hitler did upset the applecart and in 1940 Stacey joined the Canadian Army as a military

---

154 F.W. Howay, W.N. Sage and H.F. Angus, *British Columbia and the United States: The North Pacific Slope from Fur Trade to Aviation* (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1942): 408

155 Charles Stacey to James T. Shotwell, memorandum, 12 June 1934, UTA, Charles Stacey Papers, B90-0020, Box 42, file Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1934-46; 1971

156 J. Bartlet Brebner to Charles Stacey, 21 February 1934, Ibid

157 Charles Stacey to James Shotwell, 30 March 1939, Ibid

historian. Before doing so he submitted a manuscript to Shotwell which covered the story of Canadian-American military relations to 1871. As he had said all along, to bring the story to the present would create a frightfully long book. Although Shotwell the editor liked the manuscript, Shotwell the politician decided against publication. As Brebner explained, Shotwell and his editorial assistant Arthur McFarlane have decided to set the manuscript aside until after the War. "I do not think that I am breaking any confidence when I say that one serious consideration in this decision is their feeling that it would probably be undesirable to publish a study which concludes with the last really bad period of Canadian-American relations at a time when those relations are unprecedentedly close and trusting."[158] When the War ended and Stacey made inquiries as to the status of his manuscript he was summarily informed that the project had exhausted its funds and that he could pick up his manuscript in New York at his convenience.[159] It was never published.[160]

Shortly after he decided not to publish Stacey's manuscript, Shotwell found himself having to defend the series itself. When Japan attacked

---

158 J. Bartlet Brebner to Charles Stacey, 27 May 1941, Ibid. Similarly, Shotwell changed the proposed title of Charles Tansill's volume. "I am not wholly carried away by the title 'Rival Partners'," he told Brebner. "It seems to me that it may be just a little too challenging in wartime. It is the 'rival' part of it that bothers me. We historians have a tendency to be too honest!" The volume in question was published as *Canadian-American Relations, 1875-1911*. James Shotwell to J. Bartlet Brebner, 8 September 1942, CUL, J. Bartlet Brebner Collection, Box 10, file Bartlet, John Brebner

159 J. Bartlet Brebner to Charles Stacey, 1 April 1946 and James Shotwell to Charles Stacey, 8 May 1946, Ibid

160 In his memoirs Stacey commented on the experience. Shotwell, he wrote, never "fully recovered from his experiences at the Peace Conference in 1919, when he was a member of the American 'Inquiry'." For the remainder of his long life he harboured an exaggerated sense of self-importance. Throughout the Canadian-American relations series, he "thought he was being an international statesman when he was in fact merely organizing a respectable scholarly project which few except scholars would be interested in and which certainly would have little influence on international events." Arthur McFarlane, Stacey observed, was an "embittered Canadian" who found the manuscript "anti-American." Charles Stacey, *A Date With History* (Ottawa: Deneau, 1982): 54

Pearl Harbour and the United States entered the War, the CEIP Board of Trustees appointed a special sub-committee to review the Endowment's programmes. In its report the sub-committee questioned the relevance of the Canadian-American relations series to the promotion of international peace. In particular, it singled out Lower's volume, *The North American Assault on the Canadian Forest.*[161] An indignant Shotwell responded. The series, he argued, had done much to clear away "age-old prejudices that have kept opinions bitter north of the line." Arthur Lower, meanwhile, "was one of the strongest nationalists in the northwest and, as a result of his contact and study of the situation as a whole, he has become a leader in Canadian-American rapprochement."[162] From Shotwell's perspective, it was money well spent. Had Lower read these remarks, he would have dismissed them as so much nonsense. After all, he was never anti-American and his participation in the series did not transform him. The sub-committee's assessment of the series was closer to the truth: *The North American Assault on the Canadian Forest* fell outside the Endowment's mandate to "hasten the abolition of international war." Forcing Shotwell to make compromises and concessions, Canadian historians in effect took the money and ran. Had the sub-committee been aware of the extent to which Canadian scholars manipulated the series to their own ends, its comments might have been even stronger.

This pattern of imposition and resistance between American foundations and Canadian historians repeated itself—albeit on a smaller scale—in the 1940s when the Rockefeller Foundation assumed an increased

---

161 Leon Fraser, Eliot Wadsworth and William Marshall Bullitt, Confidential Report, 26 January 1942, CUL, Carnegie Endowment Collection, Box 33, item no. 4579

162 James Shotwell and Philip Jessup, "Memorandum of the Work of the Endowment," 4 February 1942, Ibid, Box 33, item no. 4588

role in Canadian intellectual life. Of particular interest is its North American regional history initiative.

VI

As Director of the Social Sciences Division of the Rockefeller Foundation (RF), Joseph Willits circulated a memorandum among his fellow officers in March 1941 in which he outlined his concern over the state of the social sciences in Canada. In conversations with Cyril James, the Principal of McGill, and with Harold Innis, he had learned that Canadian academics could not get access to American dollars owing to wartime shortages; as a result, they could neither join American learned societies nor attend American conferences. "Such incidents raise the general question of our attention to Canada." The RF had done much, he pointed out, to develop scholarly work in Great Britain, Europe and South America but it had perhaps neglected Canada. After all, "we ought to remember that the area to the north of us, which intellectually and industrially has so much in common with us, is entitled to an equally great share of our interest." In addition, "However the war goes, it is inevitable that the countries in the western hemisphere which will have the closest ties with us are Canada and Mexico."[163] In a second memorandum Willits recommended sending Anne Bezanson—a former Canadian, Professor at the Wharton School and a part-time consultant for the RF—on a fact-finding mission to Canada. It would be her task to paint a general picture of the conditions for social science research in Canada.[164] At the same time, the RF retained Charles

163 Joseph Willits, Memorandum, "Scholarly Work in Canada," 11 March 1941, RAC, RF, RG 2, 427S, Box 222, file 1548

164 Joseph Willits, Memorandum, 1 April 1941, Ibid

McCombs of the New York Public Library to prepare a report on Canadian libraries.

The RF's 1941 interest in Canada was less sudden than it appears. After all, when John D. Rockefeller made his final gift of $50 million to the Foundation in 1919, he specifically mentioned his interest in Canada. "The Canadian people are our near neighbours," he said. He therefore recommended that the Board take an active interest in "promoting medical education" in Canada. The next two decades saw the RF give millions of dollars to Canadian medical schools, public health initiatives and university endowments. Although the social sciences did not command as much attention, McGill University received a $110 000 grant for its Social Science Research Project in 1930.[165] In 1936 the RF began to fund the Canadian Institute of International Affairs with an annual subvention of $5 000; in 1939 it was increased to $10 000. The CIIA used a part of these grants to assist scholars in the social sciences and humanities, including several historians.[166] Still, 1941 marked a turning point in RF interest in Canadian social sciences and humanities. The War either curtailed or terminated many RF projects in Europe and the Far East. And as Willits stated, whatever the outcome of the War, Canada will be an important North American ally. Now was not the time to let scholarly contact between Canada and the United States evaporate due to a lack of American dollars; indeed, now was the time to increase scholarly contact.

In their respective reports, both Anne Bezanson and Charles McCombs stressed the unique opportunity before the RF: because Canada's needs were modest, it would not require a great outlay of money to materially assist

---

165 For a detailed analysis of this grant, which was extended in 1936 with a second $50 000 grant, see Shore, *The Science of Social Redemption*, chaps. 6-7.

166 See RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427S, Box 30, files 310-314

scholarship. As well, both were struck by the abiding fact of Canadian regionalism. Bezanson specifically warned against large grants to single universities. To build up a first-rate graduate school at one university, for example, would draw students and faculty alike and it would only exacerbate the persistent problem of regionalism.[167] McCombs echoed Bezanson's remarks. There are really five Canadas, he reported: the Maritimes, Quebec, Ontario, the Prairies and British Columbia. Moreover, these regions have closer ties to their American counterparts than to each other. "Winnipeg is closer to Minneapolis and St. Paul, in both a social and geographic sense, than it is to Toronto or to Vancouver."[168] Charles Acland and William Buxton wrote that the reports of Bezanson and McCombs "reinforced the Rockefeller Foundation's increasing commitment to the study and cultivation of North American regionalism."[169]

Indeed, the question of regions and local cultures intrigued John Marshall, Associate Director of the Humanities Division and an important Foundation officer. Between 1933 and 1947, the Humanities Division funneled some $3 million into regional studies in the Asia, Latin America, Eastern Europe and North America. Animating this broad program was the conviction that "Americans had not only neglected to develop an understanding of other cultures, but that they had failed to establish a vital

---

167 Anne Bezanson, "Report on Social Sciences in Canada," 4 June 1941, pp. 22-23, RAC, RF, RG 2-1941, 427, Box 222, file 1548

168 Charles McCombs, "Report on Canadian Libraries," p. 3, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427S, Box 26, file 258. See also William J. Buxton and Charles R. Acland, "American Philanthropy and Canadian Libraries: The Politics of Knowledge and Information," Occasional Paper, McGill University, Graduate School of Library and Information Studies and The Centre for Research on Canadian Cultural Industries and Institutions, 1998.

169 Charles R. Acland and William J. Buxton, "Continentalism and Philanthropy: A Rockefeller Officer's Impressions of the Humanities in the Maritimes, 1942," *Acadiensis* 23, 2 (Spring 1994): 76

and balanced image of their own."[170] Furthermore, any understanding of American culture must take into account its regional diversity. As the principal architect of RF funding to Canadian arts and letters throughout the 1940s, Marshall extended the study of American regions into a study of North American regions. Moreover, he enjoyed real power. "If he believed that a proposed project fell within the foundation's mandate, he would encourage a submission for Rockefeller support. Once a proposal was made, Marshall would submit his own recommendations, which, more often than not, would determine whether funding was approved for the project."[171] In this sense, he was like Shotwell: a gatekeeper. And although he lacked Shotwell's zeal, he shared a similar continental vision of regions extending north and south across the 49th parallel.

Between 1941 and 1942 Marshall made a series of five investigative trips to Canada in an effort to get a feel for the lay of the land.[172] He deliberately cultivated a network of Canadian "informants" upon whom he could rely for information, gossip, contacts, advice and frank assessment. He also kept a detailed diary, recording his impressions and conversations. His continentalism emerges very quickly. When discussing Canadian-American relations, he wrote in the third person,

> JM found it always amusing...to cite the remark of a Canadian friend to the effect that Maine, JM's home state, should really have been part of Canada. JM said that this idea was initially shocking, but that the more one thought of it the more reasonable it became. Portland, after all, had always served as Canada's ice-free port and now it was proving necessary to set up the Portland-Montreal pipe line. This anecdote invariably elicited comments about the necessity for

---

170 Philip J. Nelson, "Regionalism and the Humanities Division of the Rockefeller Foundation," *Research Reports from the Rockefeller Archive Center*, (Spring 1998): 13

171 Acland and Buxton, "Continentalism and Philanthropy," 73, n. 7

172 Marshall's itinerary was as follows: Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto (29 September-3 October 1941); Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Edmonton, Vancouver, Victoria (20-30 October 1941); Montreal and Quebec City (12-23 January 1942); Maritimes (22-30 April 1942); Toronto, London, Kingston (22-27 November 1942).

> economic and political action which took into account economic and geographic realities.[173]

In other words, the boundary was not necessarily rational. On his trip to western Canada in October 1941, Marshall found an enormous sympathy for this position. At a dinner at the University of Saskatchewan—attended by two historians, George Simpson and Menzies Whitelaw—the discussion centred on "forgetting the border—which after all, hardly existed until recent times—in the study of the Canadian West." However, historians at the Universities of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta found it hard to make contact with their peers "across the line." "This led JM to ask why these universities did not propose a conference with selected American historians to agree on proper approaches and correlation in further research. He felt [that] if a well-formulated proposal were submitted, funds might be formed to meet the costs." Meeting with historians George Smith and Morden Long at Alberta, Marshall discovered a keen interest in some kind of Canadian-American conference. As Smith pronounced, "In many ways the border exists only in scholarship." In British Columbia, historians Walter Sage and Fred Soward were similarly enthusiastic about the possibility of a conference "to coordinate regional studies on both sides of the border." Still it was Saskatchewan that captured Marshall's attention. Because Arthur Morton had built such an impressive regional history archives, and because the University would house a branch of the Provincial Archives, Marshall believed it to be better placed to begin serious interpretive work on the Canadian west in its North American context.[174] Shortly after Marshall's visit, Morton told Hilda Neatby—in

---

173 John Marshall, "Canada—Diary of a Visit," Part IA, p. 8, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427R, Box 27, file 264

174 Ibid, Part II, pp. 13-17

"strictest confidence," of course—that it was very likely that the Univserity would receive a "considerable" Rockefeller grant. "The aim," he explained, "would be to bring about a certain understanding of the history, economics, sociology etc. of the American and Canadian West treated as essentially one region."[175]

Marshall returned to New York inspired by the possibilities of regional interpretations of North America. In December 1941 he secured a $25 000 grant for a series of conferences on the theme of North American regions.[176] According to the RF Annual Report, "Canadian interest in participation in studies of regions extending across the border is clearly evident."[177] It was against this backdrop that Marshall visited the Maritimes in April 1942.[178] Although his purpose was exploratory, he explicitly indicated his interest in meeting people "who might be interested in a study or in the interpretation of the continental region which is roughly comprised by New England and the Maritimes. After all, I know from growing up in Maine, there is a real consciousness of this region in the minds of the people who live there, and it is with that consciousness which we humanists begin."[179]

Because Marshall's Maritime tour lasted only eight days, his observations were necessarily impressionistic. Indeed, they revealed more about Marshall than about the Maritimes. However, his observations were

---

175 A.S. Morton to Hilda Neatby, 3 November 1941, University of Saskatchewan Archives (USA), MG 2, Morton Papers, I.33, U of S History Department, 1914-1941

176 Throughout 1942, he organized six conferences on four different regions: the Great Plains, French Canada, the Eastern Maritime region and the Conneticut Valley. Marshall termed these four regions a sample; he did not pretend they constituted a totality.

177 Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report* (1941): 287

178 For a detailed analysis of Marshall's trip to the Maritimes see Acland and Buxton, "Continentalism and Philanthropy."

179 John Marshall to Bruce Wilson, 15 April 1942, RAC, RF, RG 2-1942, 427R, Box 239, file 1653

nevertheless important because they determined who got money and who did not. Acadia, Marshall believed, lacked energy and spark. Its historians, Ronald Longley and Thomas Dadson, were unimpressive. Longley "gave no evidence of originality or vitality," although Dadson did seem "more aware of the world outside Wolfville." George Wilson and D.C. Harvey of Dalhousie, meanwhile, expressed "considerable skepticism" towards Marshall's proposed regional studies project. In what he described as a "two-hour inquisition," Wilson and Harvey questioned Marhall's premise and his intention. Neither thought "anything essentially new or illuminating would result from this approach." Wilson asked if this focus on the continent was "a kind of American intellectual imperialism." Marshall protested even the suggestion. Still, Wilson persisted. "I just don't see why the Continent need be the frame. If you are trying to define regional outlook, that is one thing. But I don't see why you force that inquiry into a continental perspective." In the end, Harvey confessed his reticence. "If I were twenty years younger," he said, "perhaps I should be ready to try a new approach. But I have laid out the lines of my work, and at my age I must hold to them."[180]

In Fredericton, Marshall met a historian nineteen years younger than Harvey: Alfred Bailey. Bailey, Marshall believed, was an impressive young man with a bright future before him. In point of fact, UNB President Norman MacKenzie confided his concern that Bailey might leave New Brunswick altogether. Moreover, and perhaps more important, Bailey proved sympathetic to Marshall's continental regionalism. In his diary, Marshall resolved to do something concrete for UNB in general and Bailey

---

180 John Marshall, "Canada—Diary of a Visit," Part IV, pp. 5, 16-17 RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427R, Box 27, file 264

in particular. He intended to make it a priority to find assistance for Bailey, "both for the sake of the man himself and for the sake of the example such encouragement might give to the few others like him in other Maritime institutions."[181] Marshall's impressions were confirmed a few months later, in August 1942, at the RF-organized Conference of the Eastern Maritime Region in Rockland, Maine. On short notice, Bailey gave the opening address. In his opinion, there was a distinctive region comprising the Eastern States and the Maritime Provinces. They were bound together by a common geography, historic trade routes and cross-border cultural exchanges.[182] After the meeting Marshall thanked Bailey for his participation, adding that he was anxious to do whatever it takes to assist your work in Fredericton.[183] To Norman MacKenzie he reiterated his high regard for Bailey; he is "a man of unusual promise who ought to get all possible support and encouragement."[184]

What did Marshall hope to see emerge out of these conferences? He had four goals. First, he intended to define "an approach to the problem of regional studies." Second, he wanted to "uncover and preserve good source materials." Third, he sought the "wider appreciation of a region by making useful interpretation of material." These goals are straightforward, even banal. But Marshall also took aim at a fourth goal. He saw in these conferences an opportunity "to develop a consciousness of common heritage."[185] Canadians and Americans, he believed, were heirs to a

---

181 Ibid, Part IV, p. 28

182 Transcript of Eastern Maritime Region Conference, Rockland, Maine, 29-31 August 1942, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 200R, Box 276, file 3293

183 John Marshall to Alfred Bailey, 2 September 1942, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 200R, Box 276, file 3292

184 John Marshall to Norman MacKenzie, 2 September 1942, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427R, Box 29, file 297

185 "Re. Special Grant for Regional Studies 1942-1943," n.d., c. 1943, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 200R, Box 276, file 3296

common heritage with regional variations. In a revealing comment in his diary, he repeated with agreement a comment made by Raleigh Parkin, an executive at Sun Life Assurance and keen North Americanist. Parkin believed that the Carnegie series on Canadian-American relations had produced important books. But Shotwell, he maintained, focused too much on research—some of which was already dated—and not enough on interpretation. "Findings such as those volumes comprise, in turn need reworking, interpretation of a general character, which will bring out their salient relevance to the past, and to the present. This, Parkin felt, is typically the job of the specialist in values, the humanist."[186] Marshall could not have agreed more. This was precisely what he hoped to accomplish through the regional history initiative: to stimulate and cultivate in both Canadians and Americans a sense of, and appreciation for, their common heritage, a heritage that was at once regional and continental. It was a task uniquely suited to the humanist. The humanist is best able to answer the great questions now before us. "What do North Americans now think about themselves? What do they feel that they belong to? What are they conscious of—What is in their minds? Answers to such questions...are needed to provide an adequate understanding of what North American culture is."[187]

Notwithstanding his claims of disinterest, Marshall pushed a continental interpretation of Canada; indeed, he functioned as a gatekeeper. In western Canada, he visited United College and the University of Manitoba; he was particularly impressed with Arthur Lower and D.C. Masters. However, he also reported that United College had a

---

186 John Marshall, "Canada—Diary of a Visit," Part III, p. 13, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427R, Box 27, file 264

187 "Summary Report by JM," 10 December 1942, RAC, RF, RG 3, 911, Box 3, file 25

reputation for ultra nationalism. Lower, he wrote, "has been somewhat extreme in his statement of the nationalist position, as for example at the [1939] Canton conference, where...Shotwell was up nearly all night trying to see that the papers did not print Lower's exaggerated statement of Canadian distrust of the U.S."[188] Although the Alberta and British Columbia historians expressed an interest in his project, it was the Saskatchewan historians who were most enthusiastic. In the Maritimes, Marshall was unmoved by Longley and Dadson at Acadia. And although Harvey protested Marhsall's "exaggerated" characterization of their meeting as an attempt by Harvey and Wilson to put him "in a corner," Marshall's impression of the two Dalhousie historians remained unchanged.[189] However, Marshall liked what he saw in Bailey. In the end, Saskatchewan and UNB received sizable Rockefeller grants to develop their regional history programmes. In May 1943, the RF approved a three-year $15 000 grant to Saskatchewan "towards studies in Western history."[190] Likewise, between May 1943 and June 1946 the RF approved three grants totaling $14 500 to UNB for the study of New Brunswick.[191] It appears, then, that Marshall rewarded Morton, Whitelaw, Simpson and Bailey for their continental vision; and, in a sense, this is precisely what he did. However, to stop here is to ignore how the money was actually spent.

The University of Saskatchewan used the money to augment and complete a project that Arthur Morton had initiated in 1922: the collection and preservation of primary documents relating to the history of

188 John Marshall, "Canada—Diary of a Visit," Part II, p. 12, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427R, Box 27, file 264

189 D.C. Harvey to John Marshall, 11 June 1942, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 200R, Box 276, file 3292

190 RF Action Report, 21 May 1943, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427R, Box 30, file 305

191 RF Action Report, 4 May 1943, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427R, Box 28, file 297; RF Action Report, 19 May 1944, Ibid; RF Action Report, 24 June 1946, Ibid

Saskatchewan. Although he officially retired in 1940, Morton remained directly involved in the primary document project. However, his health was failing him and the systematic organization of the primary material was simply too great a task. That task became the focus of Saskatchewan's grant application. Drafted by George Simpson and submitted by the Acting President, W.P. Thompson, the grant application requested support for three independent but related projects: the cataloguing of the primary document collection; the training of a student in library and archival techniques; and assistance with the creation of the University branch of the Provincial Archives.[192] The RF agreed: "the most urgent present need lies in the organization of materials already collected and others still to be brought together."[193] In other words, there was no mention of a North American or continental interpretation in the grant application and the RF agreed with Saskatchewan's assessment of its immediate need. The grant thus enabled Lewis Thomas, a graduate student, to undertake doctoral studies at the University of Minnesota and to make a "special investigation of the administration of historical records in St. Paul and other centres of the mid-west."[194] After one year, he returned to Saskatoon as Morton's assistant. Saskatchewan also used a portion of the grant to purchase very expensive microfilming equipment. It would be wrong to argue that this Rockefeller grant drew the historians at Saskatchewan into a continental interpretation of western Canada. In his annual reports to the President of the University explaining how the Rockefeller grant was used, Simpson never once mentioned Marshall's original goal of encouraging a

192 W.P. Thomson to John Marshall, 5 February 1943, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427R, Box 30, file 305

193 RF Action Report, 21 May 1943, Ibid

194 George Simpson, "Report om the Development of Historical Studies...", n.d., c. June 1944, USA, MG 7, George Simpson Papers, 5. Provincial Archives

continental regional consciousness. From Simpson's perspective, the grant was helpful in the extreme.

The same story unfolded at UNB. Well before he met John Marshall in the spring of 1941, Alfred Bailey had been interested in the history of New Brunswick. Between 1935 and 1938 he served as the Assistant Director of the New Brunswick Historical Museum in Saint John. There he developed an interest in the history of the province; in particular, he was inspired by the example of John Clarence Webster, the founder of the Museum and indefatigable champion of New Brunswick history. When he became the first professor of history at UNB in 1938 he offered a research seminar on the history of New Brunswick. Although he taught the course for only two years, it nevertheless speaks to the importance he placed on provincial history. Indeed, in his 1943 grant application he stressed the importance of history to understanding—and ultimately solving—contemporary social problems. To this end, he requested $3 000 for the collection, preservation and organization of documentary materials relating to the history of New Brunswick. He also listed thirty-one New Brunswick research topics he wanted to see pursued and published in pamphlet form. Not one topic referred to the United States, the New England States or New Brunswick in a continental framework. The topics ranged from "Why the Europeans came to N.B." to "The quality of New Brunswick life."[195] The following year Bailey requested and received a two-year $8 000 grant to continue the original project. He proposed to collect and preserve documentary material and to fund graduate students to undertake theses on the educational and

195 Alfred Bailey, "Proposals Concerning the Expansion of Archives and Historical Studies at the University of New Brunswick," n.d., RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427R, Box 29, file 297

cultural history of New Brunswick.[196] In 1946 Bailey received a final one-year $3 500 grant. In the end, three MA theses were completed, one was published and the University created a nucleus of archival material for the study of New Brunswick.[197] However, Bailey did not suggest a North American interpretation and the RF did not request it. Although the work was all-consuming at the time,[198] Bailey could look back ten years later and say that the Rockefeller grants "had put new life into the University."[199]

The RF's North American regional history project had for its stated goal the cultivation of a North American perspective. On the one hand, it reveals the continentalist bias of American philanthropy; on the other hand, it hardly constitutes a nefarious plot for the takeover of Canada. Although Marshall selected Saskatchewan and UNB because they confirmed his vision, at the end of the day both Saskatchewan and UNB used the grants to create archival collections for the study of provincial history. Marshall exercised a gatekeeping function; but the historians involved

196 It was in this context that J. Bartlet Brebner used his 1944 Founders' Day Address at UNB to urger the people of New Brunswick to support its historians: "...you must support your historians. They need fellowship and travel expenses so that they may both study under fresh masters and work in the great collections of source material." J. Bartlet Brebner, "Uses and Abuses of History," *Dalhousie Review* 24 (1944-45): 38-39

197 Three students completed their theses Rockefeller money under Bailey's supervsion: Katherine McNaughton, Frances Firth and Joan Vaughn. McNaughton's thesis was published as a monograph. See See Katherine MacNaughton, *The development of the theory and practice of education in New Brunswick, 1794-1900: a study in historical background* (Fredericton, University of New Brunswick Historical Studies, no. 1, 1947).

198 "Rockefeller support for my project has now ended and what the future will be I do not yet know," a relieved Bailey told Bartlet Brebner. "Moreover, it was the most time-consuming task I have ever undertaken, and one must decide the extent to which it is worth further sacrifice of one's own research time." Alfred Bailey to Bartlet Brebner, 2 August 1947, University of New Brunswick Archives, UA RG 80, Alfred Goldsworthy Bailey Collection, Series 8, Case 34, file 10

199 Diary of John Marshall, Excerpt, 29 September 1954, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427R, Box 30, file 298

exercised considerable autonomy to assess their own needs and pursue their own projects.

Although it is unclear why, RF interest in regionalism waned in the late 1940s. Besides, regionalism did not define all Foundation grants to Canadian historians in this period. In the fall of 1943, the RF Social Sciences Division dispatched Anne Bezanson on a second fact-finding mission to Canada, this time to the four western provinces. On balance, she recommended small grants-in-aid to individual scholars. There were no co-ordinated projects and owing to the small departments and great distances between each university it did not make sense to initiate any large research projects. Furthermore, she added, given the general war-time flux in Canada it would be best not to make any long term commitments. From this perspective, she listed the names and research interests of western-Canadian scholars. Of particular interest here, of course, are her comments about historians. At the University of Manitoba, Noel Fieldhouse had just completed a study of Bolingbroke; Bezanson described it as "a polite, and probably literary, essay." Fieldhouse does not feel at home in western Canada and takes no interest in local history. In other words, his research interests were not RF research interests. Whitelaw at Saskatchewan was "unhappy" and very much a "lone wolf." Furthermore, his research plans were very vague. Jean Murray was young. Although Bezanson would have personally liked to see her work in the field of American history, she also doubted Murray's capacity to write. At Alberta she met Morden Long. Although he has just published the first of a three-volume series on the "History of the Canadian People," Bezanson remarked that, "It is the type of work that I find hard to get excited about." At UBC, she met and was unimpressed by Sage. "He is one of the kindly, second-rate men, who would deaden any group. Early in

life he discovered that British Columbia had a history, and proceeded to write pamphlets, often on minor subjects." Sylvia Thrupp is very strong, Bezanson noted, but she will be leaving UBC next year to take up a Guggenheim Fellowship at Harvard University.[200] On the whole, Bezanson was most impressed by what she saw in Arthur Lower at United College.

Echoing Marshall's own observation, Bezanson remarked that Lower "is an intense nationalist, who believes in Canadianization." Indeed, "part of his outrightness shows in his belief that every teacher of Canadian history should spend some time in his career [writing] his own history of Canada." That is precisely what Lower is currently occupied with. However, his interest in metropolis and hinterland in Manitoba has direct relevance to RF interest in the North. Perhaps through a small grant Lower could be encouraged to focus on this research, Bezanson suggested. Armed with Bezanson's report, Marshall contacted the Principal of United College. He was intrigued by the possibilities of Lower's metropolitan-hinterland approach as a means to gathering "a real understanding of the economic and cultural problems of northern Manitoba."[201] Graham responded enthusiastically; in the meantime, he would have Lower propose something concrete.

Again, the RF is clearly acting out of its own self-interest. Based on its own interest in the North,[202] it did not fund Fieldhouse whose interest lay in British history nor did it fund Long whose work Bezanson found personally uninspiring; rather, it selected Lower, despite his intense

200 Anne Bezanson, Report of Trip to Western Canada, 8 October-2 November 1943, RAC, RF, RG 2, 427S, Box 257, file 1768

201 John Marshall to W.C. Graham, 22 November 1943, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427S, Box 35, file 371

202 See Matthew Evenden, "Harold Innis, the Arctic Survey, and the Politics of Social Science during the Second World War," *Canadian Historical Review* 79, 1 (March 1998): 36-67.

nationalism. However, Lower submitted a grant application for $350 to complete his general survey of Canada. He made no mention of the Manitoba North or metropolitan-hinterland studies.[203] Not only did the RF approve his request, it provided him with a two-year $1 000 fluid fund to be disbursed at his discretion to support the research of other social scientists at United College.[204] In other words, the RF deliberately selected Lower but it did not police his research.

VII

Much of the historiography on American foundations and the development of the social sciences in the interwar decades stresses cultural imperialism and capitalist hegemony.[205] In his work, Donald Fisher argued that American philanthropy represented ruling-class interests and thus took aim at the reproduction of existing economic and social relations. Referring to the American and British contexts, he further maintained that through its capacity to "buy" practical, relevant, results-oriented research, research that could be used in the planning and execution of efficient policy, the Rockefeller Foundation drew social scientists into an informal alliance with state and capital. "The new pragmatism meant that research should be applied, that social scientists should become the technical servants of power, and that, as servants, they should produce disciplined knowledge that would increase social control and thereby maintain the

203 Arthur Lower to Anne Bezanson, 10 April 1944 and 20 May 1944, RAC, RF, RG 1.1, 427S, Box 35, file 371

204 Roger Evans to W.C. Graham, 19 December 1944, Ibid

205 See Robert Arnove, ed., *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982); and Edward Berman, *The Influence of Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy: Ideology and Philanthropy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984).

status quo."[206] In exchange for their knowledge, social scientists received status and legitimacy and authority as experts.

On the one hand, Fisher is correct. As the only game in town, American foundations were able to set the object of the game in the 1930s: "to prevent the collapse of liberal democratic capitalism."[207] It was certainly true that foundations did not fund Marxist of fascist alternatives. On the other hand, Fisher leaves a false impression. If the object of the game was to prevent the collapse of liberal democratic capitalism, it was an object that Innis, Lower, Creighton, Bailey and even Underhill shared. True, American foundations strengthened these men as leaders in the Canadian academic field. But that field did not contain any radical players.[208]

More importantly, the trend towards relevance and practicality and usefulness among English-Canadian historians predated the Carnegie Endowment and the Rockefeller Foundation by some thirty years.[209] For example, George Wrong and Adam Shortt had wanted to create a Good Government League which would offer policy makers expert and impartial advice. Because they lacked the necessary money their initiative never

---

206 Fisher, *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences*, 242. See also Fisher, "The Role of Philanthropic Foundations in the Reproduction and Production of Hegemony: Rockefeller Foundations and the Social Sciences," *Sociology* 17, 2 (May 1983): 206-233.

207 Fisher, *Fundamental Development*, 232

208 A communist, Stanley Ryerson was an exception. However, he was a marginal figure in the English-Canadian historical profession independent of American philanthropy. He abandoned an acdemic career in the early 1930s because, as he told his parents in 1934, "University work & political work are mutually exclusive." Stanley Ryerson to Edward Stanley and Tessie Ryerson, 13 April 1934, in Andrée Lévesque, "Les années de formation du militant" in R. Comeau and R. Tremblay, eds., *Stanley Bréhault Ryerson, un intellectual de combat* (Hull: Éditions Vents d'Ouest, 1996): 39. See also Interview with Stanley Ryerson, n.d., c. 1990s, in UQAM, Service des archives et da gestion des documents, Fonds Stanley Bréhaut Ryerson, 27P-010/4.

209 Theodore S. Hamerow made a similar observation: "To begin with, all of the tendencies in history which philanthropy encouraged originated within the discipline itself." See Theodore S. Hamerow, *Reflections on History and Historians* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987): 71 and Appendix A, "The Philanthropic Foundations and Historical Scholarship."

materialized. However, in the 1920s and 1930s historians—and social scientists in general—were much more visible in politics, policy formation and expert advice. For his part, Underhill believed that it was the duty of the university professor to participate in organized politics. In 1931-1932 he was a key player in the founding of the League for Social Reconstruction, a socialist intellectual organization.[210] According to the LSR's manifesto, Canada needed a "new social order which will substitute a planned and socialized economy for the existing chaotic individualism."[211] Underhill's biographer described the LSR as "a forum of individuals who met to debate ideas and to provide guidance for the new society."[212] From the LSR it was a short step to organized politics. In 1932-1933 Underhill participated in the creation of a new political party, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. He even drafted its famous Regina Manifesto which outlined the party's left-of-centre platform. The President of the University of Toronto took a dim view of Underhill's political activity. As early as June 1931 he had warned his outspoken history professor that a professor ought not participate in politics, including political journalism. Underhill responded by pointing out that George Wrong, Chester Martin, Duncan McArthur, George Glazebrook, George Brown and W.P.M. Kennedy had all practised political journalism. Besides, it is a matter of principle: if professors "must keep their mouths shut in order to preserve the autonomy of the University then that autonomy is already lost." The University, he

210 See Michiel Horn, *The League for Social Reconstruction: Intellectual Origins of the Democratic Left in Canada, 1930-1942* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980).

211 "The LSR Manifesto," reprinted in Michiel Horn, *The League for Social Reconstruction: Intellectual Origins of the Democratic Left in Canada, 1930-1942* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980): 219-220.

212 R. Douglas Francis, *Frank H. Underhill*, 86

continued, must raise "its voice for freedom of speech."[213] Unmoved, Falconer reiterated his disdain; in his opinion a professor ought to "restrain himself from taking part publicly in party matters."[214] In 1933 the University forced Underhill to resign from the provincial executive of the CCF Clubs.

Still, Underhill continued to speak out. "In such an era as this," he asked rhetorically in a 1932 paper, "what is to be the function of the intellectual, and especially of the student of the social sciences?" His answer was unambiguous. Dismissing the idea of objectivity as a myth, as "the opiate of our academic intellectuals," he mocked those social scientists who refused to consider solutions to social and economic problems. He mocked economists for their self-imposed roles as "minor technicians" to the capitalist engine. Equipped with "little statistical measuring instruments," they do odd repair jobs on Royal Commissions, such as putting new brake linings into the financial mechanism, happy in their unambitious way as the intellectual garage mechanics of Canadian capitalism." As for historians, "they have played a rather flashier role."

> Not for them the greasy grimy jobs of testing and repairing in the workshop. They have been among the white-collar boys in the sales-office in front, helping to sell the system to the public with a slick line of talk about responsible government and national autonomy.

"If our social scientists will not help us in making judgments about ends, in choosing between objectives," Underhill cautioned, "the judgment and the choice will still be made, and they will be made as the result of a destructive

---

213 Frank Underhill to Sir Robert Falconer, 24 September 1931, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 8, file Universities Toronto no. 1

214 Francis, *Frank H. Underhill*, 79

class struggle or in a storm of hysterical emotion whipped up by unscrupulous demogogues."[215]

Innis disagreed.[216] Admittedly, he did not subscribe to the ideal of objectivity. Indeed, he was well aware of the limitations and biases inherent in the social science project. Still, he rejected the alliance of social scientists and partisan politics. Taking a jab at Underhill, he observed that political parties, "particularly new parties anxious to seize upon the intellectual limitations and sympathies of any group" will employ intellectuals. And yet, "intellectuals will sink the raft of any party, and if allowed to write a program will kill it." Like Underhill, he used mockery to dismiss the "travelling comedians" masquerading as "economists and prophets." "The task of the social scientist," he said, "is to discover, not to persuade." But no one, it seems, is prepared to concede their ignorance or to admit that they have not got the solutions. "And yet that is what the social scientist must continually keep saying if he hopes to maintain any hold on intellectual life. Constant admission of ignorance is not popular in lecturing, to say nothing of its impracticability as a means of winning elections."[217] With the country in the throes of a global depression, Innis worried about the demands placed on social scientists for "pronouncements" on this or that question. For their part, he continued, social scientists are only too happy to respond "to the warmth of popular acclaim with statements of certainty about which privately they must entertain grave doubts." In this context, "the social sciences tend to

215 Frank Underhill, "The Conception of a National Interest," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science and Economics* 1, 3 (August 1935): 404-408

216 See Donald Creighton, "The Ogdensburg Agreement and F.H. Underhill," in Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook, *The West and the Nation: Essays in Honour of W.L. Morton* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976): 310-311.

217 Harold Innis, "Discussion in the Social Sciences," *Dalhousie Review* 15 (January 1936): 405, 406, 408, 408

become the opiate of the people."[218] A few years later, Innis offered this equation: "Extension of governmental activities leads to the withdrawal of social scientists from research work of a fundamental character....The social scientist reaches the stage when he cannot work independently."[219] Inherent to the relationship between academics and government work, Innis believed, was the threat to scholarly independence.

Although he viewed the world of patisan politics as one of "expediency and falsehood,"[220] and although he worried about the imposition of a "technocratic dictatorship" upon "an increasingly meaningles parliamentary democracy,"[221] Innis also believed—passionately—"in the power of ideas to change what happened in the political arena and to shape the policies governments ultimately introduced."[222] As already noted, he welcomed the Frontiers of Settlement Series for the light it might cast on the question of dominion-provincial relations. Through an introduction, he brought Lower's volume in the Canada-America relations series up to the 1935 reciprocity agreement. And in 1934 he served as a member of the Nova Scotia Royal Commission of Economic Inquiry. Despite himself, Innis did not retreat into the rarefied world of academia.

In point of fact, Underhill and Innis had much in common in that they belonged to a larger community of social scientists that sought a public and useful role in the 1920s and 1930s. According to Barry Ferguson and Doug Owram, for academic social scientists "involvement in public policy

218 Innis, "The Role of Intelligence," 286

219 Harold Innis, n.t., *Canadian Historical Review* 22, 2 (June 1941): 119, n2

220 Daniel Drache, "Celebrating Innis: The Man, the Legacy, and Our Future" in Harold Innis, *Staples, Markets, and Cultural Change: Selected Essays*, ed. Daniel Drache (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1995): xv

221 Barry Ferguson and Doug Owram, "Social Scientists and Public Policy from the 1920s through World War II," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 15, 4 (Winter 1980-81): 10

222 Drache, "Celebrating Innis," 15

questions...became the norm rather than the exception by the outbreak of World War II."[223] The "high-water mark"[224] of academic participation in questions of public policy was the 1937-1940 Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations. "Not only did it use the expertise of historians, political scientists, economists and others, but three of the five Commissioners who completed the Report were academics."[225] In the words of the Report itself, "In view of the many highly technical problems posed by the terms of reference, the Commission decided...that it was impossible to fulfill its obligations by public hearings alone and that an extensive program of independent research should be carried on contemporaneously with the public hearings."[226] The only historian asked to prepare a research paper was Donald Creighton.[227]

In the spring of 1939 Creighton submitted his study of "certain elements in the life of the British North American provinces on the eve of Confederation."[228] In it the Toronto historian emphasized the centralizing thrust of the British North America Act. "From their speeches at the time of the Charlottetown and Quebec Conferences, and from their explanations in the debates in the different provincial legislatures, it is apparent that all matters of a general or national importance should be entrusted to the

223 Ferguson and Owram, "Social Scientists and Public Policy," 13

224 Ibid, 13

225 Michiel Horn, "Professors and Public Policy: The Depression and War Years," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 13, 4 (Winter 1978-79): 7

226 *Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, Book I, Canada: 1867-1939* , (Ottawa, 1940): 14-15. A complete list of the independent research programme can be found here.

227 Alfred Bailey assisted the Government of New Brunswick in the preparation of its brief to the Royal Commission. As he explained to W.F. Ganong in 1938, "The New Brunswick Government has asked me to go to Ottawa next week to help them in the presentation of their brief to be presented to the Rowell Commission on Dominion Provincial Relations. This involves research in the Archives among unpublished Confederation documents." Alfred Bailey to W.F. Ganong, 14 January 1938, NBMA, W.F. Ganong Collection, F2

228 Donald Creighton, *British North America at Confederation* (Ottawa, 1939): 9

general legislature, and that all matters of merely local significance should be confided to the local legislatures."[229] To Joseph Sirois, Chairman of the Commission, Professor of Constitutional and Administrative Law at Laval University and the only French-Canadian Commissioner, Creighton's report constituted a direct attack on the compact theory of Confederation. In a letter to Alex Skelton, Commission Secretary and Director of Research, Sirois noted that in using Creighton's own evidence about the division of economic powers he could come to "entirely different conclusions."[230] Skelton communicated Sirois' objections to Creighton and asked him to consider making a very minor addition. Would it be possible to make "some reference to alternative schools of thought in the historical interpretation" of Confederation?[231] Creighton agreed. After all, neither his integrity nor his independence were being challenged. In the final version, then, he simply noted the existence of scholarly objections to his interpretation.[232] As a professional historian Creighton was conscious of the need to protect his independence. In a letter to Sirois, he specifically thanked him for the "freedom which you have granted me in the pursuit of my studies." Indeed, "I am grateful as a historian for the maintenance of these ideal conditions for research."[233]

In a 1948 address, Bartlet Brebner noted the importance of history to the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations. "That remarkable contribution to the world's understanding of modern federalism could never have been produced had it not been for the labours of Canada's

229 Ibid, 49
230 Joseph Sirois to Alex Skelton, 21 July 1939, NA, RG 33, 23, vol. 56, file Sirois
231 Alex Skelton to Donald Creighton, 10 August 1939, NA, Donald Creighton Papers, MG 31 D 77, vol. 7, file Correspondence Royal Commission 1937/40
232 Creighton, *British North America at Confederation*, 58, n. 26
233 Donald Creighton to Joseph Sirois, 31 October 1939, NA, Donald Creighton Papers, MG 31 D 77, vol. 7, file Correspondence Royal Commission 1937/40

historians, particularly their enterprise in weaving together into meaningful relationships many kinds of hitherto unrelated investigations into the past."[234] Although Brebner surely exaggerated his claim, it did contain a kernel of truth: history constituted an important backdrop to the final Report. To stop here, however, is to stop short. Ferguson and Owram made a very suggestive observation when they remarked that it was a matter of "good tactics" for social scientists to engage in public debate and to provide expert opinion. In their words,

> ...there appears to be a cumulative thrust to the work and self-promotion of these social scientists as they actively sought to give their knowledge practical application. In this sense, it may be that the depression was not the 'cause' but an 'occasion' for social scientists in that it forced politicians to look to new sources of expertise.[235]

The depression, therefore, afforded historians the occasion to articulate the professional ideal of service. Participating in Royal Commissions and applying their knowledge was an exercise in professionalization. It strengthened their legitimacy. Simply put, the depression was an occasion "to translate one order of scarce resources—special knowledge and skills—into another—social and economic rewards."[236] With respect to the social rewards, a cynical but insightful Underhill once noted that there were two types of economists: "those who have already served on Royal Commissions...[and] those who are still hoping to do so."[237] And with respect to economic rewards, government research work paid handsomely. Between 1938 and 1940, Creighton earned $3 059.60 for his work with the

234 J. Bartlet Brebner, "History and Today: Forces of Change," 16 October 1948, CUL, John Bartlet Brebner Collection, Box 6, file Winnipeg

235 Ferguson and Owram, "Social Scientists and Public Policy," 13

236 Magali Sarfatti Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977): xvii

237 Frank Underhill, "On Professors and Politics," *The Canadian Forum* 15, 182 (March 1934): 7

Royal Commission.[238] Considering that his 1939 salary at the University of Toronto was $3 000, his research contract proved most lucrative.

In their dealings with American philanthropic foundations, then, English Canadian historians protected and preserved their scholarly independence. They were not drawn into any alliance, informal or otherwise, with government; however, they did seek to be useful. In the meantime, the outbreak of the Second World War precipitated a period of introspection among English-Canadian historians. Perhaps, they wondered, our task is not only to be immediately useful and practical; perhaps our task also includes a consideration and defence of Western civilization's values and a consideration and definition of what it means to be a Canadian.

---

238 See the letters pertaining to Creighton's remuneration in NA, Donald Creighton Papers, MG 31 D 77, vol. 7, file Correspondence Royal Commission 1937/40

Chapter VI: The 1940s and Early 1950s: introspection and redefinition

The situation in Europe was bleak when historians gathered at the University of Western Ontario in May 1940 for the annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association. Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium and France had fallen to Hitler's army and now Great Britain appeared to be next in line. "The news of the war these days is alarming," Fred Landon confided in his diary. "The 10 pm broadcast reported the Germans moving along the coast opposite England. This was a rainy day all through."[1] On the surface, the profession continued with business as usual throughout the war. Agreeing with a 22 May 1940 editorial in the *Winnipeg Free Press* urging academics to "carry on,"[2] the *Canadian Historical Review* reported that Canadian historians were "fully conscious" of their responsibilities to a country at war. Scholarly work and intellectual debate must not be suspended.[3] The CHA organized a lobbying effort designed to raise awareness about the need for "governments, historical societies, libraries, newspapers [and] business leaders" to preserve "records not only of the war effort but of the effect of the war on every aspect of Canadian life."[4] Future historians, they said, will depend on these records when it comes

1 Diary of Fred Landon, 24 May 1940, University of Western Ontario, J.J. Talman Regional Collection, Fred Landon Papers, Box 4210, file 48

2 Entitled "Carry On!", the editorial implored academics not to suspend their activities. "These learned societies, in keeping their memberships as intact as possible, and in continuing their various investigations into Canadian affairs of both the past and the present, will set a fine example for the rest of the citizenry. We must all carry on, as best we can, to lessen the shock of war upon our social whole." *Winnipeg Free Press*, 22 May 1940, 15.

3 "Canadian Historical Association Annual Meeting, May 22-24, 1940," *Canadian Historical Review* 21, 2 (June 1940): 238

4 "Historical Records and the Canadian War Effort," *Canadian Historical Review* 21, 2 (June 1940): 239-241. See also Fred Landon, "The Preservation of War-time Material," *Ontario Library Review* (November 1940): 401-402; and "An Appeal for the Preservation of Historical Material," *Canadian Historical Review* 24, 2 (June 1943): 336-337.

time to write the history of this most momentous struggle. As the war progressed and political leaders called on Canadians to make voluntary sacrifices, historians decided not to cancel the annual meeting of the CHA. It was more important for intellectuals to gather and to share their work—scholarly life must not be allowed to decay.[5] Individual historians, therefore, carried on with their research; departments continued their active programmes of undergraduate and graduate instruction; and the Universities of Saskatchewan and New Brunswick undertook Rockefeller-funded initiatives in regional history. In many ways, then, it was business as usual. But the commitment to "carry on" belied a more fundamental change—precipitated by World War II—taking place within the historical profession.

The 1940s and early 1950s found historians taking stock of a professionalization project that began at the turn of the century and then picked up steam in the interwar years. Of course, there was much to which they could point with satisfaction: history was a well-established undergraduate programme at every university; Toronto, McGill and Queen's boasted graduate programmes; the *Canadian Historical Review* was a

5 Arthur Lower was adamant on this point. As he told George Brown, "Government is dependent upon its experts and for the expert these annual meetings are valuable. Nor do I see that a line can be drawn between immediately available experts such as economists and the more removed, such as historians. More generally the cultural life must not be allowed to disintegrate, if our professed war objectives mean anything, and it is our responsibility to carry it on." In a letter to Guy Stanton Ford of the American Historical Association, Lower explained that the travel of "womenfolk moving around the country after their men" put more of a strain on the transportation systems "than any demand our societies might make." In an undated circular letter, the following agreed that it was more important to continue the annual meeting than it was to suspend it: Ralph Flenley, Donald Creighton, Noel Fieldhouse and D.C. Masters. See Arthur Lower to George Brown, 2 October 1942; Arthur Lower to Guy Stanton Ford, 16 December 1942, Queen's University Archives (QUA), Arthur Lower Papers, Box 47, C 47; and n.a., n.d., Ibid. In May 1943 the CHA Council decided to continue meeting throughout the war: "...it seemed to us that continuance of such meetings was necessary if the values of our civilization, for which we fight, are to be maintained." Quotation in n.a., "The Social Sciences and the War," *Canadian Historical Review* 24, 4 (December 1943): 451

respected academic journal; the Canadian Historical Association was vibrant and alive and fully committed to the protection and promotion of history and historians; when the University of Toronto threatened Frank Underhill with dismissal, other historians successfully rallied to his defence; and, in addition to the several individual monographs, historians participated in two multi-volume series, the Frontiers of Settlement Series and the Canadian-American relations series. Admittedly, there were still some outstanding issues: professors' salaries were meagre at best; pensions were wholly inadequate;[6] and academic freedom, despite the victory in Underhill's case, was hardly guaranteed.[7] Nevertheless, by 1940 history had been established as both a discipline and a profession.

Yet, historians also began to question what they had wrought. What is history? they asked themselves. What is the role of the historian? Had history become too privatized? The answers to these questions saw Canadian historians re-embracing the idea of history as the humanistic study of human values. In this, they were not alone. As Paul Litt has demonstrated, a deep liberal humanism underpinned both the submissions to, and the 1951 final report of, the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. After all, "A century which had begun with great promise had instead been characterized by world war, depression, genocide, and ideological schisms that called into question

6 According to Frank Abbott, university teachers' salaries "were little, if at all, higher in 1950 than they had been a generation before, while the real income of all other occupational groups had risen an average of sixty per cent." In this context, the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) was founded in 1951 with the intention of improving professors' salaries and pensions. Frank Abbott, "Founding the Canadian Association of University Teachers, 1945-1951," *Queen's Quarterly* 93, 3 (Autumn 1986): 509.

7 See Frank Abbott, "The Crowe Affair: The Academic Profession and Academic Freedom," *Queen's Quarterly* 98, 4 (Winter 1991): 818-839.

the fundamental values of Western civilization."[8] An antidote to this spreading poison, many intellectuals believed, would be found in the Western humanist inheritance. And that is precisely where historians looked. "There was hardly one appraisal of the direction in which historical scholarship should move," Carl Berger stated, "that did not recognize the contemporary crisis of values and beliefs in Western civilization."[9] To meet the crisis, the country needed to know what values it stood for; these, in turn, would be found in its history.

The 1940s and early 1950s, then, might be best characterized as a transition period as an older generation of historians began to re-think the historical project and as a younger generation had yet to come into its own.

I

J. Bartlet Brebner opened his 1940 presidential address to the Canadian Historical Association on a solemn note. "Since November, the course of world affairs has been like the angry, urgent accumulation of towering storm clouds which is so familiar a feature of our Canadian summers. Tonight we are in the midst of an awe inspiring storm which can only be described as a general crisis in world affairs." The historian, he said, cannot but ask himself what he "can bring to bear on a present which seems unprecedented." Answering his own question, Brebner opined, "The historian can bring history to bear, a history which is not mere antiquarianism, but the living stuff, the marrow of a nation and its peoples." Of course, historians must not give into inflated rhetoric.

8 Paul Litt, *The Muses, the Masses and the Massey Commission* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992): 85

9 Carl Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing since 1900* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986): 173

Jingoism and emotional appeals are best left to the politicians and the generals. Instead, the historian must make every effort "to present the successes and failures in the story which he records, so that the living may know and profit by what their predecessors have been able to do, and unable to do, with their land and its peoples." To this end, historians ought to consider—with all the objectivity that is possible—what it means to be a Canadian. They ought to define "Canadianism" in order that Canadians will be able to confront the future united in a guiding knowledge of itself and for what it stands. Brebner proceeded to offer his own definition of Canada. Canadianism, he argued, is constituted by three essential features: its "frontier qualities," its "political virtues" and its "conservatism or canniness." More than this, however, it is the kind of self-knowledge required to guide a country through times of crisis. Canadianism "is no mean instrument" with which to face a difficult and uncertain future "for it is made up 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."[10]

Brebner had struck a resonant chord. After the First World War, historians had attempted to transform their discipline into something more immediately useful, more practical, in a word, more scientific. True, not everyone in the profession shared this view. Although he had a PhD from Harvard, Dalhousie's George Wilson did not have an active career in research. For Wilson, history was really philosophy teaching by example. "Whatever else the study of history may do it ought to make a man a

10 J. Bartlet Brebner, "Canadianism," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1940): 5-15

philosopher. The student is forever brought face to face with the most profound questions that can enter the human mind. Why and whither?"[11] At its most basic, history was a humanity, a civilizing, liberalizing, humanizing discipline. It was a consideration of the good. After spending an enjoyable evening with Wilson, Donald Creighton commented that "he is one of the most sensible liberals I've met, with a really philosophical approach to history."[12] But in the 1940s Wilson's conception of history became more widely shared.[13] Historians grew less satisfied with the history-is-a-science model. And like Brebner, they took aim at defining the essential features of Canada, its essence, its values.

As early as 1938, Arthur Lower began to doubt what he did as a historian. "One wonders these days whether the research worker is not just fiddling while Rome is burning," he told James Shotwell. "It is very hard for me to keep in the remote regions of the academic [sic]." After all, what "we are doing just now [the Carnegie series] may have no meaning within a few years. It seems to me that we are actually witnessing the second world war: it is going on bloodlessly at present but it is being fought none the less." Indeed, the fate of Western civilization may well hang in the balance. "Few people seem to see that a revolution is proceeding under our eyes, a revolution perhaps as significant as the fall of Rome itself."[14] As events continued to unfold in Europe and as Canada found itself drawn

---

11 George Wilson, "Why Study History?" *Queen's Quarterly* 40, 3 (August 1933): 412-413. In point of fact, Wilson once described himself as "more of a philosopher than an historian." George Wilson to President Mackenzie, Dalhousie University Archives (DUA), 2 August 1930, MS-1-3, President's Office Staff Files, no. 543. See also Henry Roper, "The Lifelong Pilgrimage of George E. Wilson, Teacher and Historian," *Collections of the Royal Nova Scotia Historical Society* 42 (1986): 139-151.

12 Donald Creighton to Frank Underhill, 29 September 1940, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 3, file D.G. Creighton 1928-1956

13 Perhaps it was not a coincidence that Wilson was appointed President of the CHA in 1950.

14 Arthur Lower to James Shotwell, 10 April 1938, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 10, file A 10

into a second European war, Lower continued to agonize. Too old to join the war effort, he felt impotent. As he recalled in his memoirs, "We older men had to play the parts usually reserved to the women—to stay at home and worry."[15] In May 1940, he told a friend that humanity seemed determined to destroy itself. "One sometimes believes that would be small loss. Just clever enough to commit suicide, we are, just clever apes."[16]

But Lower did not give into despair. Rather, he began to re-think the role of the historian. To this end, he organized an informal but urgent conference on the teaching of history and the other social sciences. Held at Frank Underhill's Muskoka cottage in August 1940, and attended by George Brown, Gerry Riddell, Alex Brady, D.C. Masters, Underhill and, of course, Lower, the agenda included a discussion of "The Nature of the New World [and] the Social Scientist's Place in it."[17] Unfortunately, no one took any minutes. However, George Brown invited Lower to write an article on this very subject for the *Canadian Historical Review*. "The subject is very timely," he told him.[18] Lower duly complied.

In his March 1941 article entitled "The Social Scientists in the Post-War World," Lower opened with a eulogy to the post-1918 world. Marked by "indecision, apathy, irresponsibility...economic cataclysms and political earthquakes," these two decades of "malaise" have ended. The new social, political and economic order will be—indeed, must be—rooted in greater state control. Although he did not have any absolute objections to this likely future, Lower did implore his colleagues to do more than merely

---

15 Arthur Lower, *My First Seventy-five Years* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967): 239

16 Arthur Lower to Arthur Phelps, 20 May 1940, Ibid, 243

17 N.A., "Muskoka, 1940—Lower's Conference!" n.d., QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 1, file A 14; and n.a., circular letter, 15 August 1940, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 13, file B 142

18 George Brown to Arthur Lower, 17 December 1940, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 13, file B 142

describe and record. The economic historian, he wrote in a thinly veiled reference to himself,

> is like the man cuts the grass or cleans the windows: he performs meritorious but somewhat external services, and he certainly does not get into the life of the family....[O] ne economic historian, at any rate, is about ready to stop cleaning windows.

The social scientist, he concluded, "must be more than a mere scientist," "a mere dissector of society." He must cease pretending that he is somehow removed and detached from his community. In other words, "The social scientist will have something to do with creating and affecting society as well as describing it." One of the primary tasks confronting the social scientist, he said, is to articulate what he called the "enduring values that western civilization has created."[19]

At the May 1941 CHA annual meeting, historians met in a special session to discuss Lower's article. There was a general consensus that Lower had sounded the right note. Frank Underhill observed that, "The social scientist had discovered that the community had values, now under attack, and that he must go out and take his part in their defence." George Brown thought that, as historians, "we have dealt with the more specialized aspects of a subject, and have not dealt with the more fundamental assumptions of the society in which we live." Indeed, we have ignored altogether the place of religious values. Harold Innis, who disagreed with the idea of the social scientist as planner, argued that the scholar's function was not to provide answers but to undertake "fundamental research...in some problem of far-reaching importance." "When anyone appears who claims that he has found an answer, he should be regarded with great suspicion." Reginald Trotter said that as a student he was taught that the historian must refrain

---

19 Arthur Lower, "The Social Sciences in the Post-War World," *Canadian Historical Review* 22, 1 (March 1941): 1-13

from taking sides. Now, however, I realize that "this was a kind of negativism, a retreat from the obligation of drawing a conclusion." In other words, people need our guidance. Summarizing the discussion, Lower noted that, as we speak, "Power is passing into the hands of those who are strong enough to wield it, and we must ask ourselves the question whether or not, in this process, there is any chance of preserving the values of our civilization."[20]

In a second article published in 1942, Lower continued this line of argument. "In Canada," he began, "the Philistine is always just around the corner." Everyone demands utility. In war time, that demand becomes deafening. "'After all,' [the Philistine] would say, 'you can't make guns out of history'." True enough, Lower responded. But that is not the job of history or any other social science. When civilization is in a state of protracted crisis it needs liberal education more than ever.

> Yet surely never was there a time when the people were more in need of the guidance which can come from those whose knowledge enable them in some measure to see the experience of humanity as a whole, whose special business it is to have that vision without which the people perish....

Cast from its moorings and set adrift, Canada cannot hope to govern itself, Lower argued, "unless we can provide our own version of western civilization, our own national culture." Of course, the fault lies not just with the Philistines among us. "Perhaps the failure is that of the scholar." He writes important books and he attends learned meetings. But he does not reach a broad audience. His "fellow countrymen...go their way, serenely unaware of the books he writes and the point of view he entertains."[21] For Arthur Lower, in the early 1940s, the attempt to provide Canada with its

---

20 "The Social Scientist in the Modern World," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1941): 83-86

21 Arthur Lower, "The Social Sciences in Canada," *Culture* 3, 4 (Décembre 1942): 433-440

"own version of western civilization," to provide the country with something more than clean windows and a trim lawn, was a new synthesis of Canadian history.

II

Raised in a strongly Methodist home, Lower never forgot the most basic teachings of his parents' faith. Indeed, it provided him with his core set of beliefs. Even if I never felt the evangelical fervour of conversion, he wrote, "I nevertheless remained deeply influenced by the church. It seemed to satisfy something in me." As he explained, religion, or more precisely Protestantism, satisfied his need for what he termed a code, or "the religious sanction of the law." At the same time as Protestantism guaranteed individual decision, it also provided society with a necessary higher authority. "Individual decision can produce anarchy (as it often has) unless channeled; hence the necessity of a code. The compromise, also legitimately Protestant, brings us to a balance between society and the individual."[22] In Lower's case, that "channeling" came from Methodism's strong sense of duty to the greater good,[23] from its historically deep sense of social conscience.[24] Had he been born a few decades earlier the intellectually-inclined Lower might have become a minister. But coming into adulthood in the early-twentieth century he set his sights on the social sciences, economic history in particular.

Although Lower firmly planted his early career in the social sciences—he wanted to be useful and relevant and ready with expert advice—his scholarship began to change in the mid-1930s. In addition to his remarks

22 Arthur Lower, *My First Seventy-Five Years* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967): 25
23 Ibid, 9
24 Arthur Lower, *Colony to Nation: A History of Canada* (Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946): 164

about not wanting to cut grass or clean windows any longer, he had this to say about his early career. Following the path of the "scientist," he spent "many a month compiling price indexes, tables of imports and exports, and the like." Although "useful" his work was also "the extreme of aridity." He described his volume in the Carnegie Endowment series as "objective, statistical [and] based mostly on original material." But it was useful, useful "in the sense that snow shovels or cars are useful."[25] Surely, he began to wonder, the historian is more than a snow shovel. In 1936 he shared his growing reservations about the historical project with a colleague. Canadian history, he argued, "will always remain a dull and unattractive subject...as long as it continues to be a mere discipline in method." If it is to "live" it must be made more "imaginative." After all, in other countries imaginative history "has been found in the consciousness of nationalism."[26] A few months later he sensed a creeping religiosity taking root in him. "At what point in life does a man, after a middle age if vigorous skepticism, begin to become religious again?" he asked Harold Innis. "Sometimes I think I feel it creeping on:—not formal religion of course but a sort of semi-religious spirit, one that requires affirmations or certainties, rather than self-assertion. I do not think I am alone."[27]

Colony to Nation represented Lower's attempt at affirmation. Completed in 1944 and published in 1946, it was his attempt to define Canada to Canadians, to express those values inherent to Canada, to articulate what J. Bartlet Brebner meant by Canadianism. Given his Methodist upbringing and his renewed religiosity, it is not surprising that, at its most basic,

25 Arthur Lower, "Foreward," in W.H. Heick, ed., *History and Myth: Arthur Lower and the Making of Canadian Nationalism* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1975): xiii

26 Arthur Lower to Chester New, 15 December 1936, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 1, file A 8

27 Arthur Lower to Harold Innis, 18 April 1937, Ibid, Box 7, A 127

Canadianism was for Lower its Christian heritage. "We have fought two wars, not on majority votes, but in defence of our conviction that man is an individual, with a unique value, that he must not be deprived of his natural dignity as man or of his fundamental human rights: we have fought for the Christian conception of man, with which the English-speaking peoples have closely bound up the concept of freedom and the traditional guarantees they have worked out to safeguard it." What did Lower mean by the Christian conception of man? All men, he explained in another context, "are equally the children of God."[28] Here were Canada's values; here was its myth. Carl Berger observed that Lower "frequently spoke of nationalism in the language of religion."[29] True, but Lower did not just speak of nationalism in religious terms; religion was at the foundation of his nationalism. He could not have been more clear when he wrote that Canadians fought in the Second World War to defend their "whole way of life which, notwithstanding so many misconstructions and so much overburden, may properly be called liberal and Christian democracy."[30]

Ten years after the publication of *Colony to Nation* Lower raised the stakes when he warned that history without myth "is dead." Scientific history, he argued, "is removed too far from its roots, made too rarefied and those who write it discover themselves left without readers."

> I doubt if the "scientific" historian can have much of a run: few men can live in the full glare of intellectualism. Man will have his myths. Let us hope they do him less harm than certain by-products of the pure intellect which, whether from the study of the eroding critic or the laboratory of the scientist, seem to have as his effect or end, his destruction.[31]

---

28 Lower, *Colony to Nation*, 532, 5

29 Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 136

30 Lower, *Colony to Nation*, 552

31 Arthur Lower, "Time, Myth and Fact—The Historian's Commodities," *Queen's Quarterly* 64, 2 (Summer 1957): 248-249

He was not alone.

III

While Lower busied himself with the writing of *Colony to Nation* in the early 1940s, other historians began to comment on the state of the discipline. One was Noel Fieldhouse from the University of Manitoba. When Frank Underhill invited Fieldhouse to give a paper at the 1942 annual meeting of Canadian Historical Association, he told him that he wanted a general paper, one that would serve as a springboard to discussion. "Most historical papers, being collections of detailed facts, don't serve this purpose, and I should like to get something on the ideas of by which men live."[32] Fieldhouse quickly agreed. As he explained to Underhill, he wanted to begin "from a query as to why we study history."[33]

Over the course of the next few months Fieldhouse wrote, and then circulated among CHA members, an essay entitled "The Failure of Historians." That failure, he believed, was the failure "to contribute to the discussion of current international affairs." He did not mean, however, that historians should plead this or that case; nor did he mean that historians should seek to solve international problems. Indeed, he rejected the proposition that "we should use history as a source from which to draw practical lessons which will enable us to construct a science of politics." In other words, "history for history's sake is a perfectly tenable position." From here Fieldhouse proceeded to outline what he called the by-products of studying history for its own sake: recognition of difference; tolerance of that difference; understanding broadly conceived; and a deep sense of continuity. This, he said, is why we study history. The challenge to

32 Frank Underhill to Noel Fieldhouse, 22 July 1941, University of Toronto Archives (UTA), Department of History, A70-0025, Box 7, file 15

33 Noel Fieldhouse to Frank Underhill, 1 August 1941, Ibid

historians, therefore, is to bring these perspectives to bear not only across time but across space as well. To do otherwise is to continue in our failure to contribute to the discussion of international differences.[34] For his part, Chester New agreed with the main point of the paper—"that we, whose training enjoins tolerance, allows us to perceive differences, and creates a sense of tolerance, have used these qualities less than we should"—but he went even further. The historian, he said, "must take sides, condemning what he [thinks] worthy of condemnation and approving what he [finds] worthy of approval." Richard Saunders echoed his colleagues Scientific history is impossible, he said. We all have "convictions." Therefore, "we should find some ideals in history that we prefer to others and [we should] express these preferences." George Brown believed that the historian must retain his willingness to judge. For example, the development of the parliamentary system in the English-speaking world was a matter of "great importance." He therefore refused to "surrender his right" to say as much.[35]

---

34 Noel Fieldhouse, "The Failure of Historians," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1942): 52-65. In an unpublished 1949 rumination on history, Fieldhouse stressed the autonomy of history "against that positivism, so powerful in the nineteenth century, and still by no means dead, which raised the methods of natural science to the level of a universal method, and maintained that natural science was the only kind of knowledge." Moreover, history is not a social science. "Indeed, the attempt of the latter to formulate laws from the facts which it supposes the historian to discover produces eschatology, and not science." In the end, history is a humanity. "It aims...to provide man with a knowledge of himself. It shows man what he is by showing him what he has done." See "Revised and Continued Interim Report of the General Committee of the Humanities Group," Appendix on History, Authorized abstract of a statement by Dean Fieldhouse, 10 June 1949, McGill University Archives (MUA), Accession 256, Box 2-3, file Graduate Studies Misc.

35 "Discussion," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1942): 65-70. In 1946 Saunders stated that, "Too many of us are rootless. We have lost touch with the spiritual sources of our life. We do not know what we believe. We drift in a sea of chaos." He therefore called for a return to the study of our values and our beliefs, a process, he believed, that was essential in the coming battle against our very way of life. The fundamental question before is this: "Are we to produce utilitarians or men of faith?" See Richard M. Saunders, "Introduction," in Saunders, ed., *Education for Tomorrow* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1946): ix-xiii.

Continuing its practice of hearing an introspective paper on some matter of general importance to the profession, the CHA invited Reginald Trotter to discuss the teaching of history in the contemporary world at its 1943 annual meeting. The fact that this session has been arranged at all, he began, "is indication enough that we who profess history are aware that we need to re-examine our relation to society." Our work is self-evidently important to us, but not to "the mind of the general public." Moreover, despite the remarkable advances made in the study of history throughout the interwar decades, Canada now finds itself in a second world war. Trotter did not want to suggest that historians could have prevented war; however, he did wonder if they had lived up to their trust to provide "a prompter view and a clearer view of the issues that were at stake in the growing world crisis."

> Have we—again I mean those of us who have got our living out of society by professing history in one way or another—have we been worth our salt? Perhaps we have been innocuous, but I fear that at times we may also have been inept....Is it possible that sometimes we have been little more than misers in antiquarianism, interested in our own preserve and valuing it in proportion as it could be kept exclusive?[36]

These were tough questions and the answers even tougher.

The historical profession prized facts, footnotes and bibliographies, Trotter proclaimed. It was the *apparatus criticus* that the profession valued, not the ability to make judgments. In pursuing the ideal of objectivity, historians have "abstained from raising fundamental questions as to the values at issue." In their refusal to make judgments, historians have refused to see their "professional calling as involving any larger responsibility than a recording clerkship." The emergence of graduate

36 Reginald Trotter, "Aims in the Study and Teaching of History in Canadian Universities Today," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1943): 50-60

programmes and the insistence on technique only exacerbated the problem. "The resulting tendency was for young PhDs to belittle the historian's main task, in his relation to his students and the public, of helping them to a truer understanding of the large and permanent elements and values in civilization." As a profession, he concluded, we need not be ashamed. After all, we have done good work and produced valuable scholarship. Nevertheless, history risks the danger of falling "into technical pedantry despite the greatness of its opportunity and its responsibility for ensuring due place in our world for the permanent values of civilized life."[37] In the ensuing discussion W.N. Sage doubted that there was an over-emphasis on technique; however, he did agree that the real trouble with this generation of historians is that it lacked vision. W.L. Morton pointed to the commonality of the poet and the historian. "Each is a maker of myths, only the historian has neglected his job of making myths in this decadent, analytical age." Frank Underhill suggested that Trotter had not stressed enough the question of values. "What is needed," he said, "is a much deeper contact with poets and philosophers."[38]

It was in this direction that the University of Saskatchewan had been moving since the late 1930s. Appointed President in 1937 following Walter Murray's retirement, James Thomson believed that the times had transformed the student and the university alike. In his first Annual Report he complained that the "primary objective" in attending university had become "getting a job." "The disinterested pursuit of learning is a rare appearance even in mature life, and we can hardly look for it in youth." But is that not the essence and mission of the university? To cultivate "a certain culture of spirit and character whereby truth becomes an ideal and

37 Ibid
38 "Discussion," Ibid, 60-62

the source of mankind an ethical principle"? But the "temper of the age," the uncertainty and economic dislocation, makes for a pre-occupation "with the present and immediate" rather than an engagement with "some classical period of settled attainment that has passed securely into the region of permanence that belongs to the past." Thomson thus called for a "miniature renaissance" at Saskatchewan whereby art, dance and music, along with the study of history and literature, might be pursued "simply for their own sake."[39] In his next report, Thomson again stated that "the domination of study by the narrowly practical and useful has tended to defeat the ends for which a University ought to exist."[40] In his third report Thomson outlined changes to the curriculum of the College of Arts and Science. In a deliberate attempt to recover the "cultural ideal" of an educated individual, one broadly steeped in the *artes liberales*, there would be mandatory courses in English and at least one other language, in one of the pure sciences and in one of the social sciences, in which history was included. When for the second time war engulfed Europe, Thomson's vision was brought into sharp focus. He spoke of a "crisis in civilization" and the need to pursue a course "informed and inspired by a belief in the noble purpose of existence which ought to be the working faith of the wise and the good." As to the modern university, it "can conceive of no higher aim than to provide the leaders."[41]

George Simpson, Chair of the Department of History, was a keen participant in the changing College of Arts and Science curriculum detailed by President Thomson. As part of the initiative, the Department

---

39 University of Saskatchewan Archives (USA), J.S. Thomson, The President's Report, 1937-38, 7-8

40 USA, J.S. Thomson, The President's Report, 1938-39, 9

41 USA, J.S. Thomson, The President's Report, 1939-40, 9

changed History 2 in 1941: no longer Introduction to European Civilization, it became Historic Background to Contemporary Civilization. The shift in emphasis was subtle but important. Contemporary civilization is heir to enduring values. Further, Simpson expressed great concern at the declining enrolments in both the humanities and social sciences. After all, the war effort's demand for scientists and technicians was insatiable. Simpson accepted this reality but he refused to accept it on all-or-nothing terms: either the university concentrates on science and technology or it concentrates on nothing. Society must not be allowed to neglect its traditions, its culture and its history. Given the very fact that the world was at war the need for the social sciences and literary subjects "was never more apparent," he said.

> It must become one of the first tasks of post-war reconstruction to revive [the humanities and social sciences] if the proper balance in university education is to be restored as between technical and scientific training on the one hand and the liberal Arts on the other.[42]

In his 1943-1944 departmental report, he noted that the "emphasis on science, and various public plans envisaging large scale social transformations, tend to produce an anti-traditional frame of mind."[43] Society was losing its traditions; it was losing itself. In a letter to George Brown and Donald Creighton, Simpson suggested that the *Canadian Historical Review* ought to place more emphasis on philosophy. By necessity, historians must dig up "vast quantities of historical material"; but, they need not operate in a philosophic vacuum. "Few are naive enough to believe that a definitive philosophy is possible, but the subject

---

42 George Simpson, Annual Report of College of Arts and Science, USA, J.S. Thomson, The President's Report, 1942-43, 16

43 USA, Annual Report, 1943-44, Department of History, RG 13 S.8, I. Departmental a) Annual Reports, 1939-40—1961-62

itself should be kept alive as necessary for the vitalizing of history. Philosophy, moreover, is the real storm centre of the social sciences."[44] History must be accompanied by philosophy, a consideration of the good. Although Simpson never presented a sustained answer, he nonetheless asked the question animating his profession: had history as a discipline failed itself and society in its emphasis on the social science model and its concomitant neglect of moral good?

Edgar McInnis certainly thought this to be the case. In an unpublished, undated address entitled "The Contribution of the Social Sciences to the Importance of Living," the University of Toronto historian stated that historical investigation was, in essence, "a scientific process and calls for the application of scientific methods." But if history "must make full use of scientific methods in establishing its data and checking its conclusions," it does not follow that history is a science. "History is an art, and it is an art that it makes its most vital contribution." The justification for history will not be found in its utility and its practicality, in its supposed capacity to solve problems. Rather, its justification will be found in its capacity "to illuminate in the clearest possible way some aspect of essential truth, even though it may be one that appears to be remote from the problems that immediately beset us. If that can be achieved, the question of its practical value can be left to take care of itself." Looked at in this way, history will assist us in making a new myth. By myth, McInnis meant the "focal point of reference that expresses the basic qualities and the inherent goals which characterize a given society at a given time." The historian, moreover, must not retreat from the obligation to make judgments. The

---

44 G.W. Simpson to Editor, *The Canadian Historical Review*, 30 October 1944, UTA, University of Toronto Press, CHR Files, A86-0044, Box 5, file CHR, 25th Anniversary Letters, no. 2

average reader, after all, is not strong enough to draw the correct judgment from so many facts. If the historian retreats, however, the void will be filled by others less qualified and at least potentially more dangerous.

> Perhaps more than any other group, the social scientists have a responsibility for helping us to avoid the maladjustment into which we have fallen or with which we are threatened. Their guidance may not always be welcomed, still less accepted; but unless they are ready and able to offer it, we shall have an even harder time in getting out of our present slough of despond.[45]

In other words, when there is no vision, the people perish.

James Kenney, the historian and archivist, would have certainly agreed with McInnis but, at the same time, he went even further. In a 1943 paper entitled "The War and the Historian," Kenney asked the question animating his profession: what is the historian to do? After all, the only scholars who are noticed "are those who obviously, directly, and materially contribute to the fighting power." Still, historians have a unique and important role to play: they can offer a sense of depth and a longer scale of time to a country caught up in the immediacy of the here and now. In his words, "The historian above all should see the life of our poor humanity steadily, see it whole, see it in the perspective of ten thousand years, and see it cleared from the clap-trap, the prejudices, the hysteria, and the panic of the present." Moreover, and more important, the historian must engage in a self-conscious defence of Western civilization against those who would destroy it. At the center of our civilization, he said, lay Christianity. We are at war to defend "the fields of morals and religion as well as those of politics and economics." We are fighting against "a fanatical assault on

45 Edgar McInnis, "The Contribution of the Social Sciences to the Importance of Living," c. 1940s, York University Archives, Edgar McInnis Papers, 1973-004, Box 17

that whole Christian way of life which has constituted, up to now, the progress of the human race."[46]

When two leading university principals suggested that Arts faculties be curtailed for the duration of the war, it looked like the assault came from within as much as from without. Historians promptly joined in protest with their counterparts across the social sciences and humanities: close the Arts faculties, they said, and the people really will perish.

IV

Science, engineering and medicine will contribute to a more efficient war effort; a more efficient war effort will ensure victory; therefore, the university must direct its energy to the creation of more scientists, more engineers and more doctors: this argument could be heard over and over again throughout the war. Indeed, so great was the demand for this type of worker that entire graduating classes in science, "such as that of McMaster University in 1941, were absorbed by the Wartime Bureau of Technical Personnel for domestic war service in production plants and laboratories."[47] In this context, the social sciences and the humanities were seen as unnecessary, and therefore expendable, luxuries. "The trend today is to science, applied science and medicine, and our best students follow that path," Principal R.C. Wallace of Queen's University said in 1942. "The humanities are in eclipse in university life."[48] He had a point: enrolment in the sciences increased throughout the war while enrolment in the humanities decreased. In the fall of 1942, Principal Wallace and

46 James F. Kenney, "The War and the Historian," Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* 3rd series, 37 (1943): 121-129

47 A.B. McKillop, *Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario, 1791-1951* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994): 529

48 Quotation in ibid, 531

Principal Cyril James of McGill suggested that, for the duration of the war, arts programmes be "severely curtailed." Enrolment in the arts might be limited to two years—after that, students would "be released for full-time military service."[49] The *Globe and Mail* supported the idea. In an editorial the paper acknowledged the importance of Arts faculties but, at the same time, questioned their utility in wartime. True, there is always a future danger to cutting university programmes, but "it is needless to repeat that there will be no future unless the war is won. And those thousands of young men taking non-essential courses are not making any immediate contribution to the winning of the war." To this end, "The Government at Ottawa, together with the universities, will soon have to make up their minds about fitting the universities into the total war picture."[50] Meanwhile, a special meeting of the National Conference of Canadian Universities was planned for early January 1943. Rumours quickly circulated that the NCCU would make a formal recommendation for cuts to the social sciences and the humanities. According to Watson Kirkconnell, a prominent English professor at McMaster University, "it was understood by the grapevine that the Prime Minister was ready to implement the scheme immediately thereafter."[51]

As the rumour mill worked overtime about the possible closure of all Arts faculties, historians rallied to defend their interests. Arthur Lower was livid. Such talk only confirmed his suspicion that in Canada "the Philistine is always just around the corner." He implored Innis to get involved, to lend his status and authority to the cause. Reginald Trotter was already active in a campaign aimed at the highest level of government to

49 Ibid, 533
50 "Arts Courses in Wartime," *Globe and Mail*, 24 December 1942, 6
51 Watson Kirkconnell, *A Slice of Canada: Memoirs* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967): 236

forestall any attack on the social sciences and the humanities. A founding member of the Canadian Social Science Research Council and a leading member on its Council, Trotter was an obvious choice.[52] But Lower did not think him up to the task. Confidentially, he told Innis, Trotter "is much too deferential to make a good case by himself." You must get involved, he continued, you must "strengthen" Trotter's hand. Unless we act now, unless we go straight to the Prime Minister, "the axe will have fallen at least on senior years in Canada, possibly junior years as well." The stakes are high: "If we lose, barbarism seems to lie ahead."[53]

Innis did not need convincing. He too was appalled at even the suggestion of cutting back the country's Arts faculties. As President of Section II of the Royal Society of Canada, Innis took it upon himself to organize the humanities along the lines of the social sciences. In the fall of 1942, he established an *ad hoc* committee with the well-known and well-respected Watson Kirkconnell as chair. For his first task, Kirkconnell circulated a memorandum among his colleagues in November 1942 and elicited overwhelming support: the Arts faculties must not be allowed to become a casualty of the war.[54] The humanities, Kirkconnell told Innis, are vital "in leavening a civilized state and preventing a mechanized 'fascist' type of mind."[55] Innis, of course, could not have agreed more. As a scholar he was already moving away from economic history towards a broad consideration of civilization and communication. Talk of the curtailment of the country's Arts faculties only intensified his commitment

52 For a history of the CSSRC see Donald Fisher, *The Social Sciences in Canada: Fifty Years of National Activity by the Social Science Federation of Canada* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991).

53 Arthur Lower to Harold Innis, 8 November 1942, QUA, Arthur Lower Papers, Box 48, C 73

54 See responses to Kirkconnell in Acadia University Archives (AUA), Watson Kirkconnell Papers, Box 45, P20/4-A

55 Watson Kirkconnell to Harold Innis, 10 December 1942, Ibid

to the university as a detached community of intellectuals involved in that process of face-to-face communication necessary to the always ongoing search for truth. As he told Kirkconnell, "It is not easy to find a solution but the attitude is to let this generation go down the drain the way ours went down. Civilization will not stand this process very long."[56]

Both the social scientists and the humanists, therefore, submitted a strong defence of the country's Arts faculties to the Prime Minister. As a special sub-committee of the CSSRC, Innis and Trotter stated that to dismember or disband Arts faculties would be a grave mistake. Nothing less than "the interests of civilization for which we are fighting" are at stake, they concluded.[57] For his part, Kirkconnell submitted a memorandum signed by forty-one humanists. "Everyone," the document stated, "recognizes the inevitability, even the necessity, of an increase in natural and applied science in the new world. Yet science brings its own hazards to the human mind, and requires its antidote in social and humane studies."[58] Mackenzie King, of course, was non-committal aside from his recognition of the importance of maintaining "the Liberal tradition of education in the humanities."[59] The suggestion that Arts faculties be curtailed did not, in the end, amount to official policy. Still, it did serve a positive end. Out of the struggle to defend the arts came the effort to organize for the humanities an equivalent to the Canadian Social Science Research Council. In May 1943, Section II of the Royal Society of Canada passed a resolution authorizing Innis, as out-going President, and R.H. Coats, as in-coming President, to appoint a committee "to consider the

56 Harold Innis to Watson Kirkconnell, 14 December 1942, Ibid

57 The Canadian Social Science Research Council, *Correspondence with the Prime Minister Concerning Liberal Arts Courses in Canadian Universities* (Ottawa, 1943): 10

58 Quotation in Kirkconnell, *A Slice of Canada*, 238

59 The Canadian Social Science Research Council, *Correspondence with the Prime Minister*, 11

desirability of organizing a Humanities Research Council in Canada."[60] This they duly did and in December 1943 the Humanities Research Council of Canada was born in the Upper Club Room at Hart House.[61] Innis, of course, was present. According to Kirkconnell, the first Chairman of the HRCC, the country's leading scholar had played an "obstetrical" role throughout.[62]

Innis' participation in the campaign to protect Canada's Arts faculties confirmed his "decision to recover the religious foundations of individualism as the bulwark against the new idolatry of the modern state in the social-science disciplines."[63] According to Michael Gauvreau, Innis' Baptist faith had always been present in his scholarship. However, if in the early phase of his career it lurked in the background then in the later phase it occupied a more leading place in the foreground. This transition began in the second half of the 1930s as he grew more and more disillusioned with the present-mindedness of the social sciences. By the 1940s the transition was complete. It was at this point that Innis turned his attention away from economic history and toward the consideration of a question first put to him by James Ten Broeke, his undergraduate philosophy professor at McMaster University: "Why do we attend to the

60 Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, series 3, vol. 37 (1943): 50

61 For a history of the HRCC see n.a., *Humanities Research Council of Canada/Canadian Federation of Humanities, 1943-1983: a short history* (Ottawa, Canadian Federation of the Humanities, 1983).

62 Kirkconnell, *A Slice of Canada*, 240

63 Michael Gauvreau, "Baptist Religion and the Social Science of Harold Innis," *Canadian Historical Review* 76, 2 (June 1995): 195. Brian McKillop wrote that Innis' work on "nature and implications of communications" grew out of his nineteenth-century cultural inheritance, the moral project which "sought to reconcile inquiry with affirmation." See A.B. McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1979): 230-231.

things to which we attend?"[64] Innis' answer—which was vague, difficult to discern, enigmatic and often opaque—is beyond the scope of this thesis.[65] However, that he asked the question at all is important for what it reveals about the social sciences in the 1940s and early 1950s in English Canada.

In the last decade of his life, Innis harboured an abiding skepticism of the social science project. In a 1944 convocation address at the University of New Brunswick, Canada's leading academic lamented the current fate of academia. Besieged by political, business and ecclesiastical interests, the beleaguered and battle-weary university no longer functioned as "a repository of the highest traditions of western culture." For Innis, the highest tradition of western culture was not the truth; rather, it was the pursuit of the truth. However, the pursuit of the truth was altogether neglected in the demand for solutions, for finality. In his wooden prose he explained that,

> Growth of science meant an interest in laboratories and buildings: also the neglect of the humanities and of an interest in individuals. The social sciences followed science and talked of organization and planning.[66]

It was precisely this predisposition in the social sciences for utility, for "organization and planning," that worried Innis. As he explained in a 1947

---

64 Harold Innis, *The Bias of Communication* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1951): xvii. This question also appeared in his notes from 1948-1949. See William Christian, ed., *The Idea File of Harold Adams Innis* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980): 17/21.

65 See Rick Salutin, "Last Call From Harold Innis," *Queen's Quarterly*, 104, 2 (Summer 1997): 245-259; Judith Stamps, *Unthinking Modernity: Innis, McLuhan, and the Frankfurt School* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1995); Graeme Patterson, *History and Communications: Harold Innis, Marshall McLuhan, the Interpretation of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990); John Watson, "Marginal Man: Harold Innis' Communication Work in Context," (PhD, University of Toronto, 1981).

66 Harold Innis, "A Plea for the University Tradition," *Dalhousie Review*, 24 (1944-1945): 298-305. On Innis' determined defence of the university see Donald Creighton, *Harold Adams Innis: Portrait of a Scholar* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957): 106-116.

letter to John Marshall of the Rockefeller Foundation, I am "disturbed at the trend in the social sciences towards the methodology of the natural sciences and in turn by what appears to be a widening gulf between the social sciences and the humanities." Standardization and routine in the social sciences "deadens the sensitivity" to the humanities and leads to "sterility" in both.[67] In an important essay written in 1950, Innis wrestled with these issues. "Work in the social sciences has become increasingly concerned with topical problems," he wrote, "and social science departments become schools of journalism." But there was more. The exaltation of science, he explained, led to the mechanization and specialization of knowledge in both the social sciences and the humanities. In turn, the mechanization and specialization of knowledge marginalized morality. Consideration of the good could not be accommodated. Innis quoted with approval the work of the nineteenth-century Swiss thinker, Henri-Frédéric Amiel who wrote in 1852, "It is curious to see scientific teaching used everywhere as a means to stifle all freedoms of investigation in moral questions under the dead weight of facts." Innis left his audience with this final thought: "Without vision the people perish."[68]

---

67 Harold Innis to John Marshall, 22 September 1947, UTA, Harold Innis Papers, B72-0025, Box 11, file 3

68 Harold Innis, "A Plea for Time," in Innis, *The Bias of Communication*, 61-91. This concern with the marginalization of philosophy and morality found expression in a 1944 article in which Innis quoted a personal letter from his friend, E.J. Urwick: "The whole trend today is to exalt the rationalist scientific approach and to discard the philosophical. I am not thinking only of the worship of the physical and mechanical sciences, but rather of the attempt to make ethics, philosophy, sociology, etc., conform in method and language to the physical sciences—with disastrous results. Specialization runs mad, and when it does so, *never* leads to understanding. Its natural result is strife and violent dogmatism." Quotation in Harold Innis, "Political Economy in the Modern State," reprinted in Innis, *Political Economy in the Modern State*, (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1946): 144. For the original letter see E.J. Urwick to Harold Innis, 24 April 1944, UTA, Harold Adams Innis Papers, B72-0025, Box 11, file 15

In an attempt to re-privilege values in the social sciences, Innis created what he called the Values Discussion Group. Throughout the winter of 1949 a group of University of Toronto academics—with Innis at the centre—gathered to discuss questions of objectivity, values and empiricism in the social sciences and the humanities. "The consensus of the Values Discussion Group," Gauvreau observed, "was that the methods of the physical sciences could contribute only to a limited extent to the development of the social sciences." But even if absolute objectivity was impossible, it was still possible to discern "the underlying moral principles of individual and social behaviour."[69] As Innis declared, new means of mass communication had "upset the old [value orders] and leave no means for controlling them."

> One of the results of this situation is an obsession with the immediate. Our civilization is dominated by this. Nothing lasts. Everything must change. Civilization becomes cut off from a concern with continuity, with the long term approach. Values in this situation take on the same complexion as their surroundings.[70]

From a condition where values "take on the same complexion as their surroundings" it was a short step to nuclear annihilation. The atom bomb, Innis believed, "belonged to the same knowledge network that had nurtured machine industry. Its hallmark was specialization, a thoroughly modern condition that was now in danger of destroying Western scholarship."[71]

Innis' concern for human values emerged out of his larger concern for the sanctity and the dignity of the human individual. Although Creighton wrongly believed that Innis ceased to be a Baptist after the First World War,

---

69 Gauvreau, "Baptist Religion and the Social Science of Harold Innis," 199-200

70 "Notes on Values Discussion Group," 5 April 1949, UTA, Harold Adams Innis, B72-0003, Box 30, file 5

71 Stamps, *Unthinking Modernity*, 45

he nonetheless appreciated the lasting influence of the Baptist faith on Innis' life. Innis, he wrote, "clung tenaciously to certain convictions and values which have always been characteristic of his sect. He believed in the independence, dignity, and self-sufficiency of the individual."[72] Monopolies of knowledge, narrow nationalisms, centralized bureaucracies, mass communications, fanatical political movements: in the 1940s the autonomy of the individual seemed in peril. He criticized his colleagues in the social sciences who devised public policy initiatives in Ottawa and in the provinces that only served, in his words, "to thwart the human spirit and to fasten the chains more tightly."[73]

Hilda Neatby certainly agreed. In 1944 she expressed her unease with what she called "the generally mechanistic approach of other social studies—economics, sociology, and psychology." History ought to move against this trend through a focus on biography, on "case studies" of individuals. Such detailed studies "might be a useful corrective to the dangers inherent in the attempt to weigh, measure, and classify human activities in the mass." While it was the individual that mattered, it was the individual that historians ignored. If we, as historians, are to understand mass society we must first understand individuals in all their complexity.[74] Within this intellectual context, and against the backdrop of the Cold War and the bomb, Neatby presented Canadians in 1953 with *So Little for the*

72 Donald Creighton, "Harold Adams Innis: A Special and Unique Brilliance," in Donald Creighton, *The Passionate Observer: Selected Writings* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1980): 146. William Christian made the same observation. "For Innis, without doubt, the most important moral fact was the value of the individual." Christian, ed., *The Idea File*, xv

73 Innis, *Political Economy in the Modern State*, xii

74 Hilda Neatby to George Brown, 6 November 1944, UTA, A86-0044, Box 5, file CHR, 25th Anniversary Letters, no. 1. For Neatby's defence of biography see also Hilda Neatby, "National History," in *Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences* (Ottawa, 1951): 208-209.

Mind, a controversial critique of so-called progressive education. All of the talk about values and Western civilization was really an extended conversation about Christian values and Christian civilization. The education system has failed, she argued, because individual students are unable to choose good and refuse evil.[75] *So Little for the Mind*, then, constituted much more than a critique of Deweyite education. It was, at its most basic, a plea for Christian values. For Neatby, the failure of progressive education marked only the tip of the iceberg: "western society today is fundamentally dissatisfied, restless and insecure" because "[it] has lost, or almost lost the Christian faith."[76] She did not suggest that society abandon the quest for knowledge but that it renounce "the false rationalism which implicitly denies the power of faith for good or evil in human society." Rational inquiry must take place within an unquestionable recognition of a transcendent good. She called, therefore, for "a return to the habitual and deliberate contemplation of greatness."[77] Truth without good, rationalism without contemplation of greatness, are dangerous and misguided and will lead inevitably to Western civilization's collapse.

What did all of this mean for the historian and the practice of history? Neatby did not believe that historians should abandon the archives for contemplation unencumbered by primary documents and long hours of research. History, she explained, must remain "an objective examination of all the available evidence with a view to an imaginative (but accurate) reconstruction."[78] But by objective she meant research tested by empirical

---

75 Hilda Neatby, *So Little for the Mind* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1953): 18

76 Ibid, 318

77 Ibid, 324-325

78 Hilda Neatby, "University Studies in a Christian Framework," unpublished address, November 1955, SABS, Hilda Neatby Collection, A 139 VIII.202.6

evidence; objective did not mean value-free research. After all, historians "can never achieve the natural detachment of the man who surveys a colony of ants and whose observations on them may be sublimely free from the influences of time and space."[79] Neatby, and here she was explicit, believed that historians should abandon the fruitless attempt to compartmentalize reason and faith vowing "that never the twain shall meet." Not only was it intellectually impossible it was undesirable. Christian faith and historical research, she argued, "must ultimately be completely integrated if they are to be real." The two must meet and mingle and inform each other. Not compartmentalizing Christianity but taking it into the archives will necessarily, Neatby maintained, allow the historian to uncover the deeper patterns to the human story. Without Christianity the historian will be "confronted with questions which all his historical method, all his particular science and art are powerless to answer. What are men? Why are they what they are? What destiny really governs their lives?"[80] Taking Christianity into the archives will allow the historian to judge right from wrong thereby defending Christian values in the present. Neatby's present was the age of anxiety and uncertainty and unease. That science and technology embodied in the atom bomb might well destroy humanity caused real concern. Civilization needed to recover its core Christian values and the historian had a role to play in that process.

Donald Creighton did not wear his faith on his sleeve, but he did share Innis' and Neatby's commitment to the individual. Not coincidentally, it

---

79 Hilda Neatby, "Christian Views of History: Toynbee and Butterfield," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 52 (June 1958): 34

80 Hilda Neatby, "University Studies in a Christian Framework," unpublished address, November 1955, SABS, Hilda Neatby Collection, A 139 VIII.202.6

was Innis who encouraged Creighton to consider a biography for his next project.

V

At the same time as Innis was undertaking his work on communications, civilization and individualism, his close friend and colleague, Donald Creighton, was at work on what remains perhaps his greatest contribution to Canadian historiography: a biography of Sir John A. Macdonald. And he would do so with the assistance of a Rockefeller grant. During his trip to Ontario in November 1942, the Rockefeller Foundation officer John Marshall met Creighton and was instantly struck by his intelligence and strength. Clearly, this was someone worthy of support. Anne Bezanson, another Foundation officer, came away with the same impression. "There is no question, either in AB's mind or JM's, that [Creighton] is one of the ablest if not the ablest of historians they have encountered in Canada," Marshall recorded.[81] It was now a matter of figuring out how the Foundation could best support him and his work.

Oddly enough, it was Frank Underhill who answered this question, albeit unintentionally. In the 1942-1943 academic year, Underhill was living in New York City on a Guggenheim Fellowship. Coming on the heels of that bitter attempt by the Board of Governors and the President of the University to fire him, the Fellowship proved a god-send. Arranged by Harold Innis,[82] it allowed Underhill to leave Toronto and to lay low for a

81 John Marshall, Interview with Anne Bezanson, Rockefeller Archives Center (RAC), Rockefeller Foundation (RF), RG 1.2, 427R, Box 14, file 128

82 Through his friendship with Henry Allen Moe of the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation, Innis secured Guggenheim Fellowships for Donald Creighton and Gerald Graham as well. See Creighton, "Harold Adams Innis: A Special and Unique Brilliance," 152; and Paul T. Phillips, *Britain's Past in Canada: The Teaching and Writing of British History* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1989): 130.

while. It also allowed him an opportunity to study Canada at a distance. From his Morningside Heights apartment at the corner of West 121st Street and Amsterdam Avenue, he sent a long, ten-page memorandum to John Marshall. Living in New York City had convinced Underhill of two things: first, Canadians matter very little to the outside world; and second, Canadians are themselves out of touch with the "centre of things." As an example, he argued that in the present world crisis, "when all the inherited values of our civilization are under challenge, no Canadian has said or written anything about the great themes of our day—democracy and liberty—which goes beyond the conventional clichés of newspaper editorials or politicians' speeches. Once again we are reading what Englishmen and Americans have to say on the subjects, the fundamental issues of our generation." He therefore wanted to find a way to "fertilize Canadian intellectual life."

> My main thesis is that Canadian universities in the field of the humanities and social sciences might have their life quickened and made more fruitful by closer relations with their American fellows....Something might be done to bring Canadian universities into the fuller current of intellectual life of this continent.[83]

Underhill had sounded the right note and Marshall promptly invited him to lunch. In the meantime, an excited Marshall altered a funding proposal he had already initiated. He now wanted to include senior Canadian scholars in his plan to free a select group of historians and literature professors from their teaching and administrative obligations so that they might concentrate on the study of human values in history and literature. In an internal memorandum Marshall called it "a strategic move" to bring Canadians into a discussion of North American values.[84] At their lunch

83 Frank Underhill to John Marshall, 7 April 1943, RAC, RF, RG 2, 427R, Box 256, file 1767

84 John Marshall, Memorandum, 15 April 1943, Ibid

meeting, Underhill concurred with Marshall's proposal. In addition, both Underhill and Marshall agreed that one man in particular stood out as an ideal choice: Donald Creighton.[85]

What did Marshall mean by values that ought to be realized in the study of history? World War II, European fascism and the collapse of France had precipitated a concern for western civilization and its attendant values. Democracy, the Foundation believed, hung in the balance. In his original letter to Creighton, Marshall explained his intent to release senior American scholars from their duties and obligations and to assign them the task of defining those values in history which historians might realize. He specifically mentioned his desire to include a Canadian. "Feeling as strongly as I do about the place which Canada has and certainly is to have in North American life, I find myself drawn to the idea."[86] Creighton was enthusiastic. After all, historians in Canada have begun to consider the question of values in history. This process, he explained, "dates back probably to the summer of 1940 when the collapse of France forced us to undertake a reconsideration of [history] in the emerging world."[87] However, in another letter, he also expressed his confusion. The question of values in Canadian history is "very general and inclusive."

> Such a study surely calls for both a mature historian and a mature philosopher. It seems to me to involve an examination of the political and social heritage of western civilization which we in Canada have derived, to a large extent, through the two main sources of France and Great Britain; and it involves further the question of how these more permanent values of western civilization have been modified or changed by our experience as colonial communities and, more recently, as a Canadian nation....At all events, the subject is a

85 John Marshall, Interview with F.H. Underhill, 20 April 1943, Ibid. Underhill and Marshall also thought Abbé Maheux would be a suitable choice for French Canada. Although he expressed an interest, Maheux was not in the end funded.

86 John Marshall to Donald Creighton, 22 April 1943, RAC, RF, RG 1.2, 427R, Box 14, file 128

87 Donald Creighton to John Marshall, 10 May 1943, Ibid

> huge one in which one could not get very far without a lot of hard thought.[88]

Besides, Creighton had already committed himself to teaching summer session. Still, Marshall was persistent. He also questioned Creighton's premise that there was a fundamental continuity between Europe and North America followed by adaptation. According to Marshall, the North American tradition was different from that of Western Europe.[89] However, this was as far as Marshall ever went in defining either Creighton's project or his approach. Indeed, he knew that Creighton thought little of continental regionalism. In no uncertain terms, Creighton informed him that he doubted the "validity" of North American regions which, he added, "break apart at the international boundary in more than one important way."[90] The fact of the matter is that Marshall did not care. Creighton nonetheless remained non-committal. In addition to summer school there was his general survey of Canadian history that demanded his undivided attention.

Here matters stood until January 1944: with *Dominion of the North* at the printer, Creighton could turn his attention elsewhere. He was now even more convinced by Marshall's project and of its importance. Historians must strive, he said, to help citizens realize the "fundamental values or objectives" in history.[91] Marshall was thrilled. Although Creighton had yet to decide on a specific research question, Marshall did not attempt to pressure him into this or that topic. It was always understood to be entirely Creighton's decision. In March 1944, Marshall paid Creighton a visit. Over lunch the two men tossed a few ideas around—one possibility was a study in

---

88 Donald Creighton to John Marshall, 9 June 1943, Ibid
89 John Marshall to Donald Creighton, 11 June 1943, Ibid
90 Donald Creighton to John Marshall, 6 January 1943, Ibid
91 Donald Creighton to John Marshall, 5 January 1944, Ibid

Canadian foreign policy, another was a study in the history of education—but still Creighton equivocated.[92] He wanted to pursue the question of values in Canadian history but he did not see a definable, manageable means. Over the next few days he talked to various friends and colleagues, including Innis.[93] Everything seemed to point to a biography: a biography would provide a convenient frame through which to view what it meant to be Canadian, what values Canadians stood for and ought to continue to stand for. Of course, it could not be a biography of just anybody. It had to be somebody of defining significance in Canadian history. If everything pointed to a biography then everything also pointed to Sir John A. Macdonald. As Creighton explained, his would not be a purely factual reconstruction but an "interpretive study of the man and of the whole generation to which he belonged."[94] Marshall could not have been more pleased. "I can say that this proposal recommends itself to us most highly, above all because it is the thing that you yourself came to after what I know to be full and mature deliberation."[95] By the end of April the die was cast. Creighton would be released from his university duties on 1 July 1944 for a period of one year; the Foundation would pay his salary ($4 000) and provide him with a research budget ($2 500).[96] An ecstatic Creighton could not believe the opportunity now before him; in his own words, it was "almost too good to be true" and he was a "little dazzled" by it all.[97]

It was not an accident that Creighton decided to write a biography. Not only did the decision reflect the concern over values animating the

92 John Marshall, Interview with Donald Creighton, 22 March 1944, Ibid
93 Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 127
94 Donald Creighton to John Marshall, 31 March 1944, Ibid
95 John Marshall to Donald Creighton, 4 April 1944, Ibid
96 Action Report, 19 May 1944, Ibid. Nine years later the RF provided Creighton with a $2 000 grant to complete the archival research in England. Action Report, 14 January 1953, Ibid
97 Donald Creighton to John Marshall, 21 April 1944, Ibid

profession, it also reflected the concern over the fate of the individual in mass society. In a 1945 public talk at the University of New Brunswick Creighton offered his conception of history. "History," he said, "is not made by inanimate forces and human automatons; it is made by living men and women, impelled by an endless variety of ideas and emotions, which can be best be understood by that insight into character, that imaginative understanding of people, which is one of the great attributes of literary art."[98] Carl Berger rightly observed that, within the historical profession at this time, "Biography became a vehicle for re-asserting the ability of men to make their own history. Fascism and the Communism were threats to the democratic importance of the individual, and these challenges may have contributed to a renewed concern with the single person in history."[99] But Creighton was also attracted to Macdonald as Macdonald. Here was an opportunity to study the making of Canada, to define what J. Bartlet Brebner had termed "Canadianism" in his 1940 CHA presidential address; here was a chance to define what it meant to be Canadian. Creighton's Macdonald embodied a vision of the country that was as relevant in the late-nineteenth century as it was in the mid-twentieth century: a strong central government and a transcontinental economy would best protect Canada's British heritage and its autonomy in North America.

---

98 Donald Creighton, "The Writing of Canadian History," Founders' Day Address, University of New Brunswick, 19 February 1945, (n.p., n.d.): 16. Copy in University of New Brunswick Archives and Special Collections. Arthur Lower said much the same thing. "When all the impersonal factors are set out, a large gap still remains, for history, after all, consists in the inter-action, not of blind forces, but of human beings. It is the role of individuals which is of ultimate significance." Lower, *Colony to Nation*, 319-320.

99 Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History*, 220. For a similar argument about biography today see Sven Birkerts, "Losing Ourselves in Biography," *Harper's Magazine* (March 1995): 24-26.

Finally, Creighton's two-volume biography of Canada's first prime minister represented his commitment to reaching a wider audience. Historians had accomplished much in the past twenty-five years, he wrote in 1945. But we have tended to write for each other; we have neglected our obligation to write for the educated, reading public. The historian must strive to capture the Canadian soul and the Canadian imagination. Echoing W.D. Lighthall, the nineteenth-century historian, poet and novelist, the founder of the Historic Landmarks Association and the first Vice-President of the Canadian Historical Association, Creighton explained that,

> The historian must have a feeling for design; but there are other literary qualities which he must seek just as earnestly to capture. He must try for pictorial vividness, for good characterization, for rapidity of action. It is only thus, for example, that he can bring out the real romance of the St. John River Valley—the excitements of the French period, the hard pioneering Loyalist days, the picturesque and strenuous life of the lumber trade.[100]

In this way history will become something more than a narrow, scientific and professional pursuit at the same time as it will reach a wider public.[101] Creighton thus answered those questions animating the profession in the 1940s and early 1950s: what is history? what is the role of the historian? has the profession become too private? Like Brebner, Wilson, Lower, Underhill, Brown, Fieldhouse, Trotter, Morton, Simpson, McInnis, Kenney, Innis and Neatby, Creighton wanted to define Canada's values, to articulate Canada's myths and to reach as large an audience as possible through his writing. As he explained in a 1959 interview, "history is not a science. It is a humane study; and not merely its end-products, but its whole process has

100 Creighton, "The Writing of Canadian History," 16

101 Arthur Lower could not have been in greater agreement. Historians, he said, have failed to reach a wider audience. They must strive to write for the "general public" and to "bind" Canadians together through their writing. "That will probably be the chief task of the Canadian historian." See "Discussion," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1945): 13-14.

got to be made available to the lay reader. History cannot be too much professionalized. It's got to be made available to the lay reader, so that the lay reader can really understand it."[102] By professionalized, Creighton meant privatized. History is not only a private conversation between professional historians. It is also a public conversation. The profession, he believed, ignores this fact at its peril.

But the ongoing imperatives of professionalization continued to work against this fact in the 1950s and 1960s as a new generation of historians emerged. Departments expanded very quickly to meet expanding post-war enrolments. By 1960 the University of Toronto had a permanent staff of twenty historians. The University of Saskatchewan increased its staff from four to six during the 1950s. Even the small Maritime universities saw their history staffs double in size. By 1960 Acadia had four full-time professors; for its part, Dalhousie had five. Names like James Careless, Gerald Craig, Jack Saywell, H. Blair Neatby, Peter Waite and Ramsay Cook now dominated the profession. It was not so much that this new generation deliberately ignored the general reader. But the continued growth of the profession meant continued specialization. Fields like Canadian history were divided into sub-fields: political history, intellectual history, regional history and

---

102 Transcript of CBC Interview with Paul Fox, 1959, NA, Frank Underhill Papers, MG 30 D 204, vol. 34, file 172. In a special study prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Science, W.L. Morton made the same point. "It might be," he wrote, "that such activities [the promotion of popular history] by the larger [historical] societies would help to soften the rigid professionalism of Canadian historians. The situation must not develop that the scholar will win most reputation and gain promotion most quickly by writing a book for other scholars. There are ought to be such books...but if history is to play a role in Canadian culture, then some historical books must be written to be read by laymen, and must be written to please by their art and insight." W.L. Morton, "Historical Societies and Museums," in *Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences* (Ottawa, 1951): 253

In 1950, the Canadian Historical Association created a Local History Section for the encouragement and improvement of local history. A year later, the CHA launched the Historical Booklets series in an attempt to reach high school history teachers.

economic history. Advancement through the ranks was dependent on learned monographs and scholarly articles in academic journals. None of this was new, of course. But specialization and academic writing continued to highlight the problematic nature of history's professionalization. Despite the books and the journals and the conferences and the graduate students, professionalization came at a price: history's professionalization was also its privatization.

Conclusion

The professionalization of history in English Canada did not just happen. Rather, it was the result of character(s) and circumstance(s). Nineteenth-century historians were men and women who studied the past in their leisure time. History was not yet a career, it was not something one did for a living. W.D. Lighthall may have been a lawyer, but according to the contemporary definition of the term, he was also a historian. W.D. LeSueur was a career civil servant, but he did much to raise the standards of historical criticism. And following her retirement as a school teacher, Janet Carnochen dedicated her life to writing, preserving and promoting the history of the Niagara region. However, the twentieth century brought innumerable changes. Very quickly, Canada became a modern country: urban, industrial, multicultural. Twentieth-century English Canada required a different kind of knowledge to assist in the drive to find solutions to the modern ills. Knowledge must be rational and scientific and applied. It was in this context that history began its migration from the world of Lighthall, LeSueur and Carnochen to autonomous departments in universities across English Canada. True, the migratory route was not direct nor the migration immediate. For example, Lighthall continued to exert an influence in the early decades of this century. He even served as the first vice-president of the Canadian Historical Association in 1922. Slowly but surely, however, history became the domain of full-time university professors—George Wrong, Charles Colby and W.L. Grant. It took on the trappings of a modern, academic discipline—archival research, textual criticism and argumentation—at the same time as it took on the trappings of a modern, academic profession—a journal, a professional association and graduate programmes.

In addition, professional historians practised various strategies to both enhance and defend their status. Thus, they criticized the work of earlier historians as patriotic and hagiographic, as unprofessional and amateur. In doing so, they effectively cast their work as detached, reliable and professional. In other words, the professionalization of history also witnessed its amateurization. Similarly, professional historians also practised gender discrimination. Fearing that the presence of women would undermine their claim to rationality and reason, and fearing that the profession would be turned into a low-wage ghetto like teaching, male historians excluded women from the professoriate. By 1960, only three women had permanent appointments. The professionalization of history, then, also saw its masculinization.

Central to any profession is the drive for independence and the historical profession in English Canada was no exception. However, too much attention has been paid to Frank Underhill and his various battles with the University of Toronto over academic freedom. Although obviously important, these incidents detract our attention from the struggle to protect scholarly independence against the demands of American foundations which, in the absence of a Canadian granting agency, funded historical research in English Canada to 1957. Both the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation funded multi-volume series and both foundations had a research objective. However, historians successfully pursued their own research objectives and goals. Moreover, critics of American philanthropy charge that foundations, representing the interests of the ruling class, drew social scientists into an informal alliance with the state and capital. But, English-

Canadian historians—who were a conservative lot to begin with—wanted to be useful, they wanted to demonstrate their utility and relevance.

Like many of her fellow historians in the 1940s and early 1950s, Hilda Neatby assessed the state of the profession and found it wanting. Although a member of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, the University of Saskatchewan historian also prepared a special study for the Commission's consideration. In it, she pointed to history's many accomplishments over the past three or four decades. There have been excellent studies in Canada's constitutional history and in its economic history. The "elaborate and detailed investigations represented in the series of volumes on Canadian-American relations" were exceptional. "It may be said that the body of Canadian history has been multiplied many times in the last few decades; and that the level of scholarship has been much raised." But Hilda Neatby was no Pollyanna Sunshine. Indeed, she more closely resembled Jeremiah. Historians were profoundly out of touch with Canadians, she argued. They were isolated and specialized and wrote only for each other. On top of this, historians themselves were a rather "dispirited" lot. They have heavy teaching loads to carry; they dwell in the academy's "lowest place," the College of Arts; they endure starvation wages; and they lack access to research monies. "Without any compensation in the way of opportunity for rewarding work, and with no hope of gaining any recognition for achievement," young, "vigorous minds" choose other paths. In short, "The professional historian, operating almost exclusively within university walls where he is overworked and underpraised, has produced a sound and creditable, if not distinguished volume of work, but he has produced it too exclusively for an academic public. He has not reached or touched the

Canadian public." The root of the problem, Neatby believed, was to be found in the decision by professional historians to pursue history as a science when, if the truth be told, it is an art. "The true appeal of history is philosophic, moral and aesthetic; it is killed by purely scientific dissection."[1] In other words, professional history had become too privatized.

Fifty years after Neatby penned this jeremiad, another University of Saskatchewan historian delivered a similarly bleak assessment of the historical profession. In his 1997 presidential address to the Canadian Historical Association, Jim Miller likened the profession to Lewis Carroll's Chesire Cat. Our profession, he said, "seems alarmingly to be receding from prominence in public discourse, and even in the public's consciousness." True, Miller conceded, signs of history's presence abound: the five hundredth anniversary of Giovanni Caboto relied heavily on academic historical scholarship; the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples made extensive use of historical evidence; historically-based novels and television programmes have enjoyed not insignificant commercial successes; and Donald Creighton was featured on a Canada Post stamp. But there is another way of interpreting all of this, Miller contended. Survey after survey have confirmed that students at all levels lack even a basic understanding of their country's history. Popularized history on television is replete with errors and oversimplifications. And Donald Creighton was honoured not as a historian but as an author who contributed much "to the growth and development of Canadian literature." But for Miller, two incidents in particular pointed to the invisibility of historians. First, the

1 Hilda Neatby, "National History," in *Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences* (Ottawa, 1951): 205-216

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada proposed a new Code of Conduct for Research Involving Humans without any prior consultation with the historical community. Second, Bill C-32 dealing with copyright reform precluded the making of a single copy of copyrighted material for research purposes. Both incidents found historians scrambling to have their voices heard and their interests considered. Confronting their own invisibility, Miller recommended that historians be more pro-active and more assertive in making claims to the importance of their discipline. He therefore encouraged historians to cultivate more alliances with non-professional historians and to make more use of new media in an effort to reach larger audiences. In the end, however, there is no magic solution, "but with luck our efforts to reverse the fading of the historian to invisibility will turn out differently."[2]

Still, I cannot help but wonder if Miller did not get it wrong. His assessment of a fading profession, it seems to me, missed the mark. After all, the profession is as strong now as it was in the salad days of Donald Creighton, Harold Innis, Frank Underhill and Arthur Lower. Admittedly, some dissertations are so narrowly conceived that, quite frankly, one cannot help but ask, who cares? But W.S. Wallace asked the same question in the mid-1920s when he found himself "filled with a sense of futility" at the tragic narrowness of the history dissertation.[3] Besides, there are dozens of brilliant graduate students doing fascinating, exciting and important research. Now, it is true that the academic labour market cannot provide jobs for even one-tenth of today's young PhDs. But, it never could. To say nothing of the numerable well-qualified women historians who

2 J.R. Miller, "The Invisible Historian," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 8 (1997): 3-18

3 See W.S. Wallace, "Some Vices of Clio," *Canadian Historical Review* 7, 2 (June 1926): 197-203.

never got jobs, Alfred Bailey and C.P. Stacey lived hand-to-mouth as young historians throughout the better part of the 1930s. And if policy makers do not pay attention to historians, then one might well ask, what else is new? Arthur Lower made the same complaint in 1939 when he remarked that policy is made by politicians who, "as a rule," are blithely unaware of what it is academics talk about: "We may conjure up great schemes and have great thoughts, but...somebody sitting in a government office decides what is going to be done."[4] Similarly, there is nothing new in the fact that Canadians do not read history. Writing in 1933, George Wrong observed that the influence of the historian had declined over the course of the last half century. In addition to the problem of historians writing for other historians and not for the general reader, the simple fact remains, he explained, that women prefer to read gossip columns and advertisements while men prefer to spend their leisure time reading the sports section "or listening to jazz and vulgar humour on the radio."[5]

The problem is not a fading historical profession but the fading past. And that is a function of modernity. It is not, as Jack Granatstein would have us believe, a function of politically-correct bureaucrats in provincial ministries of education who emphasize self-esteem at the expense of actual content, nor is it a function of social historians waging war against dead, white male élites and writing unreadable articles on the housemaid in Belleville.[6] With its commitment to change over continuity, its preference for newness over tradition and its affirmation of the future over the past, modernity kills time. W.D. Lighthall and David Ross McCord understood

4 Arthur Lower in A.B. Corey et al., *Conference on Canadian-American Affairs, 1939: Proceedings* (Boston: Ginn, 1939): 153

5 George Wrong, "The Historian and Society," *Canadian Historical Review* 14, 1 (March 1933): 7

6 See J.L. Granatstein, *Who Killed Canadian History?* (Toronto: Harper Collins, 1998).

this.[7] So too did Harold Innis when he made his plea for time.[8] The malaise infecting our profession is the malaise of modernity.

This does not mean that we should resign ourselves to cruel fate and call it quits. Nor does it mean that we should sit back and watch history reduced to a great game of trivial pursuit (for three points, who was Canada's first prime minister?) or become a day trip to Kings Landing (gosh, wasn't life so simple and innocent in nineteenth-century New Brunswick?). If Jim Miller was wrong about a fading historical profession, he was right in his recommendation that, as professional historians, we must attempt to work against the bias of our profession towards privatization. With an eye to reaching larger, non-academic audiences, historians must seek to cultivate links and associations with non-professional historians and they must be willing to explore new media. Of course, this is easier said than done. But, to paraphrase Miller, with luck our efforts to reverse the fading of *the past* to trivia and banalities will turn out differently.

---

7 See Donald Wright, "W.D. Lighthall and David Ross McCord: Antimodernism and English-Canadian Imperialism, 1880s-1918," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 32, 2 (Summer 1997): 134-153.

8 See Harold Innis, "A Plea for Time," in Harold Innis, *The Bias of Communication* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1951).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archival Collections:

Acadia University Archives

Watson Kirkconnell
Ronald Longley

Archives of Ontario

William Canniff
Lennox and Addington Historical Society
Lundy's Lane Historical Society
Niagara Historical Society
Ontario Historical Society
Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto

Bytown Museum Archives, Ottawa

Womens Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa

Canadian Baptist Archives, McMaster University

McMaster University Chancellor's Reports

Columbia University, Rare Book and Manuscript Library

J. Bartlet Brebner
Carnegie Corporation
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
James Shotwell

Dalhousie University Archives

President's Office Staff Files

J.J. Talman Regional Collection, University of Western Ontario

J.H. Coyne
Fred Landon
J.J. Talman
University of Western Ontario Scrap Books

McCord Museum of Canadian History, Archives

McCord Family

McGill University Archives

E.R. Adair
John Irwin Cooper
Department of History

McGill University, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections

W.D. Lighthall

Mount Allison University Archives

Administrative Records, Subject Correspondence

National Archives

Robert Borden
A.L. Burt
Canadian Historical Association
Donald Creighton
A.G. Doughty
Norman Fee
Eugene Forsey
W.L. Grant
Historic Landmarks Association
W.D. LeSueur
W.D. Lighthall
George Parkin
L.B. Pearson
Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences
H.M. Tory
Frank Underhill
J.C. Webster

New Brunswick Museum Archives

W.F. Ganong
J.C. Webster

Public Archives of Nova Scotia

D.C. Harvey

Queen's University Archives

Arthur Lower
Lorne Pierce
Adam Shortt
Reginald Trotter

Saskatchewan Archives Board

James Michael Hayden
Hilda Neatby

Stanstead Historical Society Archives

Charles Colby

Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto

George Wrong
Chester Martin
W.S. Wallace

University of British Columbia Archives

President's Office
W.N. Sage

Université du Québec à Montréal, Service des archives et de gestion des documents

Stanley Bréhaut Ryerson

University of Manitoba Archives

Department of History, Annual Reports

University of New Brunswick Archives

A.G. Bailey
W.S. MacNutt

University of Saskatchewan Archives

A.S. Morton
E.H. Oliver

Presidential Papers, Walter Murray
Presidential Papers, James Thomson

University of Toronto Archives

Robert Bothwell
Jean Burnet, Oral History
Canadian Historical Association, Committee on Historical Broadcasting
J.M.S. Careless, Oral History
James Conacher, Oral History
Department of English
Department of History
Harold Innis
Gerry Riddell
R. Saunders, Oral History
C.P. Stacey
University Historian
University of Toronto Press, Canadian Historical Review

Rockefeller Archives Center, North Tarrytown, NY

Rockefeller Foundation
Social Sciences Research Council

William Ready Division, Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University

Board of Governors, McMaster University
MacMillan Company of Canada
W.L. Morton

Printed Sources:

University Calendars

Acadia University
Dalhousie University
McGill University
McMaster University
Mount Allison University
Queen's University
University of Alberta
University of British Columbia
University Manitoba
University of Saskactchewan
University of Toronto
University of Western Ontario

Articles

Adair, E.R., "Dollard des Ormeaux and the Fight at the Long Sault," *Canadian Historical Review* 13, 2 (June 1932)

— "The Military Reputation of Major-General James Wolfe," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1936)

— "The Study of History at McGill University," *Culture* 2, 1 (mars 1941)

— "The Canadian Contribution to Historical Science," *Culture* 4, 1 (mars 1943)

Brebner, John Bartlet, "Canadianism," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1940)

— "Uses and Abuses of History," *Dalhousie Review* 24 (1944-45)

Burpee, Lawrence, "Presidential Address," The Historic Landmarks Association of Canada, *Annual Report* (1921)

— "Professor Morton and La Vérendrye," *Canadian Historical Review* 10, 1 (March 1929)

Burt, A.L., "On the Study of History," 1927; reprinted in Lewis Thomas, *The Renaissance of Canadian History: A Biography of A.L. Burt*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975

Brown, George, and Creighton, Donald, "Canadian History in Retrospect and Prospect," *Canadian Historical Review* 25, 4 (December 1944)

Burnet, Jean, "Minorities I Have Belonged To," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 13, 1 (1981)

Carnochen, Janet, "Some Mistakes in History," *Ontario Historical Society: Papers and Records* 13 (1915)

Colby, Charles, "History and Patriotism," *Proceedings of the Canadian Club, 1904-1905*, Toronto, 1905

Creighton, Donald, "The Ogdensburg Agreement and F.H. Underhill," in Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook, *The West and the Nation: Essays in Honour of W.L. Morton*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976

Cruikshank, E.A. "The Study of History and the Interpretation of Documents," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 15 (1921)

Curzon, Sarah, "Historical Societies," *Journal and Transactions of the Wentworth Historical Society* 1(1892)

Eccles, W.J., "Forty Years Back," *William and Mary Quarterly* 41, 3 (July 1984)

Fieldhouse, Noel, "The Failure of Historians," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1942)

Grant, W.L. "The Study of History in Ontario," *Canadian Magazine* 22, 5 (March 1904)

— "The Teaching of Colonial History," *Queen's Quarterly* 18, 3 (January 1911)

Harvey, D.C., "The Importance of Local History in the Writing of General History," *Canadian Historical Review* 13, 3 (September 1932)

Innis, Harold, "The Role of Intelligence: Some Further Notes," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 1, 2 (May 1935)

— "A Note on Universities and the Social Sciences," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 1, 2 (May 1935)

— "Discussion in the Social Sciences," *Dalhousie Review* 15 (January 1936)

— "A Plea for the University Tradition," *Dalhousie Review*, 24 (1944-1945)

Kenney, James F., "The War and the Historian," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 37 (1943)

LeSueur, W.D., "Science and Materialism," 1877; reprinted in A.B. McKillop, ed., *A Critical Spirit: The Thought of William Dawson LeSueur*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977

— "The Scientific Spirit," 1879; reprinted in A.B. McKillop, ed., *A Critical Spirit: The Thought of William Dawson LeSueur* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977)

— "History: Its Nature and Methods," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 7 (1913)

Lighthall, W.D., "A New Hochelagan Burying-Ground discovered at Westmount on the Western Spur of Mont Royal, Montreal, July-September 1898," Montreal: n.p., 1898

Loudon, James "The Universities in Relation to Research," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2nd series, 8 (1902)

Lower, Arthur, "Some Neglected Aspects of Canadian History," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1929)

— "The Social Sciences in the Post-War World," *Canadian Historical Review* 22, 1 (March 1941)

— "Time, Myth and Fact—The Historian's Commodities," *Queen's Quarterly* 64, 2 (Summer 1957)

— "Harold Innis As I Remember Him," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 20, 4 (Winter 1985-86)

Martin, Chester, "Fifty Years of Canadian History," in *Royal Society of Canada: Fifty Years Retrospect*, Ottawa, 1932

McArthur, Duncan, "The Teaching of Canadian History," Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records* 21 (1924)

Miller, J.R., "The Invisible Historian," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 8 (1997)

Morison, J.L., "Some Recent Historical Literature: European and British," *Queen's Quarterly* 19, 3 (January 1912)

Morton, Arthur S., "La Vérendrye: Commandant, Fur-Trader, and Explorer," *Canadian Historical Review* 9, 4 (December 1928)

Morton, W.L., "Historical Societies and Museums," in *Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences*, Ottawa, 1951

Neatby, Hilda, "National History," in *Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences*, Ottawa, 1951

— "Christian Views of History: Toynbee and Butterfield," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 52 (June 1958)

Shortt, Adam, "Social Evolution, According to Mr. Kidd," *Queen's Quarterly* 2, 4 (April 1895)

— "The Aims of the Canadian Political Science Association," *Proceedings, Canadian Political Science Association* (1913)

— "The Significance for Canadian History of the Work of the Board of Historical Publications," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, 13 (1919)

Shotwell, James T., "A Personal Note on the Theme of Canadian-American Relations," *Canadian Historical Review* 28, 1 (March 1947)

Smith, Pemberton, "President's Address," Historic Landmarks Association, *Annual Report* (1915)

Trotter, Reginald, "Aims in the Study and Teaching of History in Canadian Universities Today," Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report* (1943)

Tweedsmuir, Lady, "The Amateur Historian," *Canadian Historical Review* 20, 1 (March 1939)

Underhill, Frank, "Canadian and American History—And Historians," *The Canadian Forum* 8, 93 (June 1928)

— "On Professors and Politics," *The Canadian Forum* 15, 182 (March 1934)

— "The Conception of a National Interest," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science and Economics* 1, 3 (August 1935)

Wallace, W.S., "Some Vices of Clio," *Canadian Historical Review* 7, 2 (June 1926)

Williams, R. Hodder, "The Tutorial Experiment," *University of Toronto Monthly* 15, 4 (February 1915)

Wilson, George, "Why Study History?" *Queen's Quarterly* 40, 3 (August 1933)

Wrong, George, "History in Canadian Secondary Schools," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* (1898)

— "A College for Women," *The University of Toronto Monthly* 10, 1 (November 1909)

— "The Historian's Problem," *Annual Report of the Canadian Historical Association* (1927)

— "The Historian and Society," *Canadian Historical Review* 14, 1 (March 1933

— "What Has Befallen Us," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 4, 1 (1934-35)

— "The Beginnings of Historical Criticism in Canada: A Retrospect, 1896-1936," *Canadian Historical Review* 17, 1 (March 1936)

Books

Bourinot, John G., *Canada Under British Rule, 1760-1900*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900

Colby, Charles, *Canadian Types of the Old Régime, 1608-1698*, New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1908

Creighton, Donald, *British North America at Confederation*, Ottawa, 1939

— *The Passionate Observer: Selected Writings*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1980

Ferns, H.S., *Reading from Left to Right: One Man's Political History*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983

Innis, Harold, *The Bias of Communication*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1951

Kirkconnell, Watson, *A Slice of Canada: Memoirs*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967

LeSueur, W.D., *William Lyon Mackenzie: A Reinterpretation*, edited and with an introduction by A.B. McKillop, Toronto: Macmillan, 1979

Lighthall, W.D., *An Account of the Battle of Chateauguay*, Montreal: W. Drysdale, 1889

Lower, Arthur, *Colony to Nation: A History of Canada*, Don Mills: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946

—*My First Seventy-Five Years*, Toronto: Macmillan, 1967

Neatby, Hilda, *So Little for the Mind*, Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1953

Newman, Albert Henry, *A Manual of Church History*, vol. 1, Philadelphia: American Baptist Society, 1900

Pearson, Lester B., *Mike: The Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson, vol. I: 1897-1948*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972

Saunders, Richard, ed., *Education for Tomorrow*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1946

Shotwell, James T., *The Autobiography of James T. Shotwell*, New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1961

Smith, Goldwin, *Canada and the Canada Question*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971; originally published in 1891

Stacey, C.P., *A Date With History*, Ottawa: Deneau, 1982

Wallace, W.S., *The Story of Laura Secord: A Study in Historical Evidence*, Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1932

Waugh, W.T., *James Wolfe: man and soldier*, Montreal, New York: Louis Carrier & Co., 1928

Wilson, George Earle, *All for Nothing?* (n.p., 1972) [A copy of this self-published memoir is located in Dalhousie University Archives, MS-1-Ref]

Wrong, George, *Application and Testimonials of George M. Wrong, BA, for the post of Professor of History in the University of Toronto*, Toronto, 1894

Wrong, George, *Historical Study in the University: An Inaugural Lecture*, Toronto: The Bryant Press, 1895

Secondary Sources

Unpublished Theses:

Barnhart, Gordon Leslie, "E.H. Oliver: A Study of Protestant Progressivism in Saskatchewan 1909-1935," MA, University of Regina, 1977

Bowker, Alan, "Truly Useful Men': Maurice Hutton, George Wrong, James Mavor and the University of Toronto, 1880-1927," PhD, University of Toronto, 1975

Breazeate, Jerry, "Albert Henry Newman: Historian and Theologian," Doctor of Theology, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1960

De Pencier, Marnie, "Ideas of the English-Speaking Universities in Canada to 1920," PhD, University of Toronto, 1977

Jasen, Patricia, "The English Canadian Liberal Arts Curriculum: An Intellectual History, 1800-1950," PhD, University of Manitoba, 1987

McConnell, David, "E.A. Cruikshank: His Life and Work" MA, University of Toronto, 1965

Meikle, William Duncan, "And Gladly Teach: G.M. Wrong and the Department of History at the University of Toronto," PhD, Michigan State University, 1977

Nicholson, Norman, "The Evolution of Graduate Studies in the Universities of Ontario, 1841-1971," PhD, University of Toronto, 1975

Reimer, Chad, "The Making of British Columbia History: Historical Writing and Institutions, 1784-1958," PhD, York University, 1995

Ross, P.N., "The Origins and Development of the PhD at the University of Toronto, 1871-1932" PhD, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972

Stevenson, Hugh Alexander, "James H. Coyne: His Life and Contributions to Canadian History," MA, University of Western Ontario, 1960

Vipond, Mary, "National Consciousness in English-Speaking Canada in the 1920s: seven studies," PhD, University of Toronto, 1974

Wilson, Ian E., "Shortt and Doughty: The Cultural Role of the Public Archives of Canada, 1904-1935," MA thesis, Queen's University, 1973

General Articles:

Jann, Rosemary, "From Amateur to Professional: The Case of the Oxbridge Historians," *Journal of British Studies* 22, 2 (Spring 1983)

Freidson, Eliot, "Are Professions Necessary?" in Thomas Haskell, ed., *The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984

Gieryn, Thomas, "Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists," *American Sociological Review* 48 (December 1983)

Goggin, Jacqueline, "Challenging Sexual Discrimination in the Historical Profession: Women Historians and the American Historical Association, 1890-1940," *American Historical Review* 97, 3 (June 1992)

Goldstein, Doris, "History at Oxford and Cambridge: Professionalization and the Influence of Ranke," in Georg Iggers and James Powell, eds., *Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of the Historical Discipline*, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990

Goode, W.J., "Encroachment, Charlatanism and the Emerging Profession: Psychology, Sociology and Medicine," *American Sociological Review* 25 (1960)

Graham, Patricia Albjerg, "Expansion and Exclusion: A History of Women in American Higher Education," *Signs* 3, 4 (Summer 1978)

Schultz, Vicki, "Reconceptualizing Sexual Harassment," *Yale Law Journal* 107, 6 (April 1998)

Soffer, Reba, "Nation, Duty, Character and Confidence: History at Oxford, 1850-1914," *Historical Journal*, 30, 1 (1987)

Trofimekoff, Susan Mann, "Gossip in History," *Historical Papers* (1985)

General Books:

Arnove, Robert, ed., *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982

Bender, Thomas, *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993

Bergman, Jörg R., *Discreet Indiscretions: The Social Organization of Gossip*, New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1993

Berman, Edward, *The Influence of Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy: Ideology and Philanthropy*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984

Bledstein, Burton, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America*, New York: W.W. Norton, 1976

Carr-Saunders, A.M. and Wilson, P.A., *The Professions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933

Code, Lorraine, *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991

Coser, Lewis, *Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View*, New York: The Free Press, 1965

Durkheim, Emile, *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals*, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958

Fisher, Donald, *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences: Rockefeller Philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993

Hamerow, Theodore S., *Reflections of History and Historians*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987

Haskell, Thomas, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977

Larson, Magali Sarfatti, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977

Novick, Peter, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988

Oleson, Alexandra and Voss, John, eds., *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979

Reuben, Julie, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996

Scott, Joan Wallach, *Gender and the Politics of History*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1988

Smith, Mark C., *Social Science in the Crucible: The American Debate Over Objectivity and Purpose, 1918-1941*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1994

Witz, Anne, *Professions and Patriarchy*, London: Routledge, 1992

Canadian History Articles:

Abbott, Frank, "The Crowe Affair: The Academic Profession and Academic Freedom," *Queen's Quarterly* 98, 4 (Winter 1991)

Acland, Charles R. and Buxton, William J., "Continentalism and Philanthropy: A Rockefeller Officer's Impressions of the Humanities in the Maritimes, 1942," *Acadiensis* 23, 2 (Spring 1994)

Ambrose, Linda, "Ontario Women's Institutes and the Work of Local History," in Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory: English-Canadian Women and the Work of History*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997

Berger, Carl "Race and Liberty: The Historical Ideas of Sir John George Bourinot," *Annual Report of the Canadian Historical Association* (1965)

— "Internationalism, Continentalism, and the Writing of History: Comments on the Carnegie Series on the Relations of Canada and the United States," in Richard Preston, ed., *The Influence of the United States on Canadian Development: Eleven Case Studies*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972

— "The Conferences of Canadian-American Affairs, 1935-1941: An Overview" in Frederick W. Gibson and Jonathon G. Rossie, eds. *The Road to Ogdensburg: The Queen's/St. Lawrence Conferences on Canadian-American Affairs, 1935-1941*, East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1993

Boutilier, Beverly, "Women's Rights and Duties: Sarah Anne Curzon and the Politics of Canadian History," in Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory: English-Canadian Women and the Work of History*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997

Campbell, Sandra, "From Romantic History to Communications Theory: Lorne Pierce as Publisher of C.W. Jefferys and Harold Innis," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 30, 3 (Fall 1995)

Cook, Stella, "The Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto, 1895-1970," Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto, Transaction no. 29, Toronto, 1970

Creet, Mario, "H.M. Tory and the Secularization of Canadian Universities," *Queen's Quarterly* 88, 4 (Winter 1981)

Crowley, Terry "*Ontario History* at 100," *Ontario Historical Society Bulletin*, no. 114 (May 1998)

Dick, Lyle, "The Seven Oaks Incident and the Construction of a Historical Tradition, 1816 to 1970," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 2 (1991)

Drache, Daniel, "Celebrating Innis: The Man, the Legacy, and Our Future" in Harold Innis, *Staples, Markets, and Cultural Change: Selected Essays*, ed. Daniel Drache, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1995

Evenden, Matthew, "Harold Innis, the Arctic Survey, and the Politics of Social Science during the Second World War," *Canadian Historical Review* 79, 1 (March 1998)

Ferguson, Barry and Owram, Doug, "Social Scientists and Public Policy from the 1920s through World War II," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 15, 4 (Winter 1981)

Ferguson, Katherine, "George Dalrymple Ferguson: First Professor of History at Queen's University," *Historic Kingston* 14 (January 1966)

Fingard, Judith, "Women Historians in Canada/Les Historiennes au Canada," *CHA Bulletin* 3, 3 (Summer 1977)

— "Gender and Inequality at Dalhousie: Faculty Women Before 1950," *Dalhousie Review* 64, 4 (Winter 1984-1985)

Flynn, Louis, J. "The Early Years of the Kingston Historical Society, 1893-1906," *Historic Kingston* 11 (March 1963)

Fyson, Donald and Young, Brian, "Origins, Wealth and Work," in Pamela Miller et al., *The McCord Family: A Passionate Vision*, Montreal, 1992

Gauvreau, Michael, "Baptist Religion and the Social Science of Harold Innis," *Canadian Historical Review* 76, 2 (June 1995)

Gorham, Deborah, "Making History: Women's History in Canadian Universities in the 1970s," in Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory: English-Canadian Women and the Work of History*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997

Hallman, Diane "Cultivating a Love of Canada through History: Agnes Maule Machar, 1837-1927," in Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory: English-Canadian Women and the Work of History*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997

Horn, Michiel, "Professors and Public Policy: The Depression and War Years," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 13, 4 (Winter 1978-79)

Humphries, Charles W., "The Banning of a Book in British Columbia," *BC Studies* 1, 1 (Winter 1968-69)

Kealey, Linda, "The Status of Women in the Historical Profession in Canada, 1989 Survey," *Canadian Historical Review* 72, 3 (September 1991)

McCaffrey, Moira T., "*Rononshonni*—the Builder: McCord's Collection of Ethnographic Objects," in Pamela Miller et al., *The McCord Family: A Passionate Vision*, Montreal, 1992

Moore, Christopher, "Of Heroes and Housemaids," *Beaver* 75, 6 (December 1995-January 1996)

Owram, Doug, "Narrow Circles: The Historiography of Recent Canadian Historiography," *National History* 1, 1 (Winter 1997)

Prentice, Alison, "Bluestockings, Feminists, or Women Workers? A Preliminary Look at Women's Employment at the University of Toronto," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 2 (1991)

— "Laying Siege to the History Professoriate," in Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory: English-Canadian Women and the Work of History*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997

Régimbald, Patrice, "La Disciplinarisation de l'histoire au Canada français," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 51, 2 (Automne 1997)

Shore, Marlene, "Remember the Future: The *Canadian Historical Review* and the Discipline of History, 1920-95," *Canadian Historical Review*, 76, 3 (September 1995)

Trigger, Bruce, "Hochelaga: History and Ethnohistory," in Bruce Trigger and J.F. Pendergast, *Cartier's Hochelaga and the Dawson Site*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's, 1972

Wallace, W.S., "The Establishment of the *Canadian Historical Review*," *Canadian Historical Review* 26, 1 (March 1945)

— "The Life and Work of George M. Wrong," *Canadian Historical Review* 29, 3 (June 1948)

Wright, Donald, "Remembering War in Imperial Canada: David Ross McCord and the McCord National Museum" *Fontanus: from the collections of McGill* 9 (1996)

— "W.D. Lighthall and David Ross McCord: Antimodernism and English-Canadian Imperialism, 1880s-1918," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 32, 2 (Summer 1997)

— "History at the University of Saskatchewan from E.H. Oliver to Hilda Neatby," *Essays: University of Saskatchewan*, 1, 1 (1999)

Canadian History Books:

Axelrod, Paul, *Making a Middle Class: Student Life in English Canada during the Thirties*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1990

Berger, Carl, *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970

—*The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing since 1900*, second edition, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986

—*Honour and the Search for Influence: A History of the Royal Society of Canada* , Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996

Bothwell, Robert, *Laying the Foundation: A Century of History at University of Toronto*, Toronto, 1991

Brown, Robert Craig, *Robert Laird Borden: a biography*, vol. II, Toronto: Macmillan, 1980

Comeau, R., and Tremblay, R., eds., *Stanley Bréhault Ryerson, un intellectual de combat*, Hull: Éditions Vents d'Ouest, 1996

Conway, Jill Ker, *True North*, Toronto: Vintage Canada, 1995

Cook, Ramsay, *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985

Corbett, E.A., *Henry Marshall Tory: A Biography*, Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1954; reprinted with an introduction by Doug Owram, Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1992

Creighton, Donald, *Harold Adams Innis: Portrait of a Scholar*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957

Drummond, Ian, *Political Economy at the University of Toronto: A Histort of the Department, 1888-1982*, Toronto: n.p., 1983

English, John, *Shadow of Heavan: The Life of Lester Pearson, vol. I: 1897-1948*, Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1989

Ferguson, Barry, *Remaking Liberalism: The Intellectual Legacy of Adam Shortt, O.D. Skelton, W.C. Clark and W.A. Mackintosh, 1890-1925*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1993

Fisher, Donald, *The Social Sciences in Canada: 50 Years of National Activity by the Social Science Federation of Canada*, Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991

Francis, Daniel, *National Dreams: Myth, Memory, and Canadian History*, Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1997

Francis, R. Douglas, *Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986

Frost, Stanley Brice, *McGill University: for the advancement of learning, vol. II: 1895-1971*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1984

Gagnon, Serge, *Quebec and its Historians: 1840-1920*, Montreal: Harvest House, 1982

— *Quebec and its Historians: The Twentieth Century*, Montreal: Harvest House, 1985

Gibson, Frederick W., *Queen's University, vol. II: 1917-1961*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1983

Harris, Robin S., *A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663-1960*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976

Hayden, Michael, ed., *So Much to Do, So Little Time: The Writings of Hilda Neatby*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 1983

— *Seeking a Balance: The University of Saskatchewan, 1907-1982*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 1983

Horn, Michiel, *The League for Social Reconstruction: Intellectual Origins of the Democratic Left in Canada, 1930-1942*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980

Johnston, Charles, *McMaster University, vol. 1: The Toronto Years*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976

Knowles, Norman, *Inventing the Loyalists: The Ontario Loyalist Tradition and the Creation of Usable Pasts*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997

Lacasse, Danielle and Lechasseur, Antonio, *The National Archives of Canada, 1872-1997*, Canadian Historical Association, Historical Booklet, 1998

Lamarre, Jean, *Le Devenir de la nation québécoise, selon Maurice Séguin, Guy Frégault et Michel Brunet*, Sillery: Les éditions du Septentrion, 1993

Lanning, Robert, *The National Album: Collective Biography and the Formation of the Canadian Middle Class*, Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1996

Litt, Paul, *The Muses, the Masses and the Massey Commission*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992

McKillop, A.B., *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1979

— *Contours of Canadian Thought*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987

— *Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario, 1791-1951*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994

Morton, W.L., *One University: A History of the University of Manitoba, 1877-1952*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1957

Neatby, Hilda, *Queen's University, vol. 1: 1841-1917*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978

Owram, Doug, *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986

Phillips, Paul T., *Britain's Past in Canada: The Teaching and Writing of British History*, Vancouver: UBC Press, 1989

Rudin, Ronald, *Making History in Twentieth-Century Quebec*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997

Shore, Marlene, *The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origins of Social Research in Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987

Shortt, S.E.D., *The Search for an Ideal: Six Canadian intellectuals and their convictions in an age of transition*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976

Taylor, C.J., *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Canada's National Historical Parks and Sites*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1990

Taylor, Charles, *Radical Tories: The Conservative Tradition in Canada*, Toronto: Anansi, 1982

Taylor, M. Brook, *Promoters, Patriots and Partisans: Historiography in Nineteenth-Century English Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989

Thomas, Lewis, *The Renaissance of Canadian History: A Biography of A.L. Burt*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975

Tippett, Maria, *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and Arts before the Massey Commission*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990

Waite, Peter, *The Lives of Dalhousie University, vol. 1, 1818-1925*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's, 1994

Wallace, W.S., *A Sketch of the History of the Champlain Society*, Toronto, 1937