NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) missing in number only; text follows. Page(s) were scanned as received.

58

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

Canada's National War Memorial:
Reflection of the Past or Liberal Dream?

by

Susan Phillips-DesRoches, B.A, (Hons.)

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in Canadian Studies

Carleton University

OTTAWA, Ontario

15 July, 2002

2002, Susan Phillips-DesRoches

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 référence

Our file Notre référence

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.

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 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.

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.

0-612-79653-1

Canada

**The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies and Research acceptance of the thesis**

**“Canada’s National War Memorial:
Reflection of the Past or Liberal Dream”**

submitted by Susan Phillips-DesRoches, B.A., B.A., Hons. B.A.

**in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts**

.....
Thesis Supervisor

.....
**Director
School of Canadian Studies**

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

July, 2002

Abstract

The National War Memorial is an important source of political history that has been overlooked by academics. Conceived of by Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King and his Liberal government in 1923 as a commemorative monument dedicated to Canadians who died in the Great War, it appears that the monument's didactic value had multiplied by the time of its official unveiling in 1939. Circumstantial evidence suggests that Mackenzie King desired to have the war memorial possess a greater symbolic meaning than remembrance, wanting the monument to be an emissary of a myth of nationhood premised upon Canadian unity and the power of history. This layering of messages has proved to be unsuccessful as the War Memorial is generally perceived of as a tribute to Canada's war dead, not a symbol of nationhood.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank Professor John Taylor for all of his help and guidance during the researching and writing of this thesis. Your knowledge and patience is greatly appreciated. I would also like to express my love and gratitude to my husband Michael, my son Jason, my mom and step-dad Paul, and my good friend Helene- your unending support kept me going when I sometimes felt like giving up. Thank you all.

Table of Contents

Introduction: <i>The National War Memorial: Conflicting Views</i>	5
Chapter One: <i>Commemoration in Canada: A Precarious Journey</i>	16
Chapter Two: <i>The National War Memorial Competition</i>	48
Chapter Three: <i>William Lyon Mackenzie King: Canadian Dreamer</i>	87
Conclusion.....	116

Introduction

The National War Memorial: Conflicting Views

The National War Memorial was officially unveiled to the Canadian public on 21 May 1939, as a monument commemorating those who sacrificed their lives in the Great War (1914 to 1918) in the cause of peace and freedom¹. With the additions of the dates 1939-1945 and 1950-1953 the monument's symbolic value has grown, becoming an icon of Canadian culture that symbolizes the sacrifice of all Canadians who have defended the nation against tyranny (Gardam 2). On the 11th of November each year the nation meets at the monument to grieve, remember, and pass on the lessons of war to the young (Young 5). This ritualistic gathering is reflective of how Canadians conceive of their past, as "memorial devices are not self-created; they are concerned and built by those who wish to bring to consciousness the events and people that others are inclined to forget" (Wagner-Pacifini & Schwartz 382).

Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King and his Liberal party made public their intention to erect the National War Memorial in 1923. A competition to design the monument was launched February 1925, and in 1926 the winning design, *The Great Response*, by British sculptor Vernon March was selected (Figure 1). After numerous financial problems and delays the memorial was unveiled to the public by King George VI in 1939. Although the monument was originally intended to be a simple cenotaph of

¹ This is according to King George VI speech at the unveiling of the monument 21 May 1939.

Figure 1- National War Memorial, Ottawa, Canada.

remembrance, it appears that the monument's didactic meaning grew through the years to become more multidimensional as Prime Minister Mackenzie King conceivably saw an opportunity to use statuary dedicated to the Great War as a political tool to unite a fragmented nation.

Circumstantial evidence suggests that the monument would not only be an aesthetic component of his plan for the renewed downtown core of the capital Ottawa, but would become a sculptural narrative symbolically announcing the birth of the Canadian nation. The sculpture would also hold strong personal elements for Mackenzie King as he attempted to re-write Canadian history. The grandson of the banished rebel, William Lyon Mackenzie², became prime minister and erected a monument dedicated to nationhood in the heart of the capital. One may also deduce that the memorial was conceived of partially by Mackenzie King in order to alter the wide spread and politically damaging perception he had not been supportive of the Great War. It is this convoluted layering of messages: the myth of nationhood, the perception of history, and the expression of personal desire that makes the National War Memorial more than a mere military commemoration, as the memorial also seems to be a reflection of Mackenzie King's political, personal, and national ambitions.

As in many other situations, it is difficult to directly connect Mackenzie King to the choice of the winning design for the National War Memorial, as there is no written evidence of his having any correspondence with the selection committee until after the monument was chosen. However, a plausible case can be made in regards to his influence

² Scottish immigrant, newspaper editor, and leader of the Upper Canada Rebellion 1837.

on the competition guidelines and the symbolic message the monument was to convey. In a letter dated 15 February 1924 addressed to J.B. Hunter, Deputy Minister of Public Works, Mackenzie King lists the revisions he wants to the competition rules, and offers to discuss these changes with the Committee of Council³: “As I have taken a special interest in this matter (the war memorial), I should be happy to make the recommendations to council myself.” With this and other personal correspondence, what he stated publicly through the House of Commons, and in newspapers, it becomes possible to create a circumstantial argument supporting Mackenzie King’s participation in the evolution of the monument.

The most significant of findings concerning Mackenzie King’s involvement in the conceptualization of the National War Memorial is found in his 11 May 1923 House of Commons speech concerning the monument. When introducing the plan to erect a war monument in the heart of downtown Ottawa, he states: “The government felt that a monument should be erected in the capital of Canada expressive of the feelings of the Canadian people as a whole to the memory of those who had participated in the Great War and lost their lives in the service of humanity.” (2686). Two years later, these same words are reproduced in the guidelines, *A National Commemorative War Monument* (1925), in section 2⁴.

³ The Committee of Council was established as an order-of-council 21 May 1922 at the suggestion of Mackenzie King to “organize a body to aid and advise the selection of sites for public buildings, monuments, and styles of architecture.” It consisted of Mackenzie King, Hewitt Bostock (Speaker of the Senate), Rodolphe Lemeux (Speaker of the House of Commons), Charles Murphy (Post Master General), and H.S. Beland (Minister of Soldier Re-Establishment).

⁴ “The Government feels that a monument should be erected in the Capital of Canada, expressive of the feelings of the Canadian people as a whole, to the memory of those who participated in the Great War and lost their lives in the service of humanity.” (4)

Mackenzie King's diaries offer little aid in studying the early development of the monument. At crucial points in the monument's development Mackenzie King does not write in his diary or he simply does not discuss it. He remains silent about the monument until its actual erection in Confederation Square in 1937⁵. It is within these writings that Mackenzie King's personal reasons for erecting the monument are revealed.

Academically, relatively few studies have been carried out on military commemorations (local or national) in Canada. This is surprising due to the vast array of monuments that dot the landscape of our country, as virtually every city, town, and village in Canada has some sort of monument dedicated to a rebellion, battle, or war. Robert Shipley's *To Mark Our Place* is a unique study of local military monuments as a source of personalized statements expressed by various communities across the land. These local monuments offer the viewer a glimpse into the mournful soul of the nation, providing great contrast to the resolute message espoused by the National War Memorial in Ottawa. American historian John Bodnar conceptualizes this divergence of public memory to be a competition between official and vernacular cultures, in which the more dominant of the two becomes the steward of a singular public memory that is passed down.

Alan Young in the article "We Throw the Torch", John Gardam's *The National War Memorial*, and Jonathan Vance in his book *Death So Noble*, all read the monument as solely a tribute to the fallen soldiers from the Great War. Young and Gardam both stress that the War Memorial is an important icon, but is one of many national tributes erected

⁵ In 1937 the granite pedestal was erected, followed by the twenty-two bronze figures. The monument was completed by 19 October 1938. The site was officially unveiled to the public 21 May 1939. Also for simplicity, the site on which the monument rests will be referred to as Confederation Square throughout the thesis though Mackenzie King refers to it as Connaught Square.

by the federal government after the Great War, like the Peace Tower or the Memorial Chamber, used to perpetuate the socially and politically valuable myth of sacrifice for the nation. Vance furthers this analysis by arguing that the monument possesses an almost “cult-like” testament to the immortality of the soldiers. The privileged fallen will live on forever in our memory and hearts, attaining glory because they died for a just cause, our freedom. This view is premised upon the contention that the soldiers are depicted “going west,” which is military slang for dying and finding everlasting life (45)⁶. While these three researchers have made important contributions to realizing the didactic nature of the monument, there is much more to uncover.

One academic who has studied the symbolic value of the monument is Architect Nan Griffiths in her essay “In Search of Confederation Square” in which she proposes the idea that the monument holds a spiritual, rather than political sentiment. She acknowledges the monument’s unifying message, but limits her study to the location of the monument citing its “unique siting at the center of the capital, the junction of the two Canadas, at the edge of the wilderness, it is an archingly open, provocatively inarticulate tablet.” (181). Griffiths concludes that the monument’s location is intrinsically connected to the natural and spiritually imbued works of Group of Seven painter Lawren Harris and the writings of Northrop Frye which both profess the difficulties of living in a hostile, isolated northern climate. In essence she argues that the monument itself is a reflection of the growing English Canadian nativist sentiment emergent from the Great War. Griffiths

⁶ The soldiers are actually depicted marching south.

would seem to be correct in her conclusions, as the memorial is a reflection of nationalism, but not the nationalist tendencies of modernity as Griffiths seems to define.

Monuments related to war are often important political, social, and aesthetic elements of urban design plans as exemplified by the Arc de Triomphe in Paris and the Cenotaph in London. There is little doubt that monuments are used as visual centerpieces with deep national meaning which frequently conflate remembrance and national unity. Modern capitals such as Canberra, Australia, positioned their national Great War Memorial at the opposite end of the land axis from Capital Hill (Vale 87) (Figure 2). Lawrence Vale in his study *Architecture, Power, and National Identity*, writes that the combining of these two elements in Canberra created a symbolic center which represents the “functional and perceptual hierarchy of the capital’s center” (87). Mackenzie King attempted to create a similar ‘symbolic center’ in Ottawa with the establishment of a capital core defined by Parliament Hill, the Wilfrid Laurier monument, the Harper monument, and the National War Memorial, but appears to have been unsuccessful. This is due in part to Ottawa’s lack of a centralized Baroque plan, leading to numerous planning problems in restructuring the capital.

Much research has been conducted into the various plans commissioned for the improvement of living conditions, transportation routes, architectural unity, and the physical beautification of Ottawa carried out by special interest groups, prime ministers, and governors general. Ken Hillis, David Gordon, William DeGrace, and many others have published such studies in which King’s plans to make the capital a city to rival those of Europe is central to the discussion. The National War Memorial does not play an important role in any of these examinations as the monument appears to be regarded as a

Figure 2- View of Capital Hill, with the Australian War Memorial at bottom center

(1990)

Figure 3- Aerial View of the National War Memorial in relation to Parliament Hill ca. 1966. Photo courtesy of Haut-Monts Recherche (Quebec City).

purely aesthetic addition to the Parliamentary precinct, not a manifestation of one man's dreams for the nation.

The War Memorial was erected in some respects by Mackenzie King as propaganda and therefore cannot be defined as an "inarticulate tablet" (Griffiths 181) as the work speaks to Mackenzie King's vision of Canada as interpreted through the function of the Liberal Party. The National War Memorial is a didactic vision of political heritage that attempts to remedy the factionalization that occurred during and after the Great War. Canada did not emerge from the war as a coherent nation, but to some extent a collection of alienated groups for whom the war's promise of national regeneration did not occur.

After the war, Mackenzie King as Liberal leader was faced with a disgruntled electorate, one with many different concerns for which consensus would be a difficult task. Regardless of its divisive nature, the Great War did present a unique opportunity for the Liberal government to commemorate an event that had touched the lives of virtually all Canadians. Other military endeavors such as the Riel Rebellions and the Boer War had played a role in the development of the Canadian nation, but were both too politically, socially, and regionally divisive to commemorate on the national level. The Great War had come to symbolize the recognition of Canada as an important nation on the international stage touted for its bravery, resolve, and determination and King wanted this image to shape the Canadian consciousness.

The winning design, *The Great Response*, is unique when compared to World War I monuments erected in other western nations or any other erected in Canada. While most countries mounted simple Cenotaphs of remembrance, Canada sought a memorial that would not only commemorate the sacrifice of her soldiers, but also recognize and

celebrate the emergence of Canada as an independent nation. This allegory of autonomy was symbolically achieved through the image of the soldier. But the Canadian soldiers of *The Great Response* were not the solitary, mournful figure of traditional commemorative art; they were part of a group representing all branches of the Armed Forces resolutely parading through an archway onto the national and international stage.

Mackenzie King's monument, through the use of high-style vocabulary and a strategic location (at the head of Elgin street, in-between the Sappers' and Dufferin Bridges)⁷, attempted to foster nationalist sentiment by capitalizing on Canada's current martial record. In essence, Mackenzie King was fashioning a 'foundation myth' of nationhood based upon Canadian success during the Great War. This dimension of reading and comprehending the symbolic national value of the monument has been generally overlooked in Canadian history. For most, the National War Memorial is regarded as a commemoration of military bravery erected in part to remember, in part to beautify the national capital rather than an informative source of political and national history. Consequently, this monument and its surrounding square has become one of the most misunderstood pieces of heritage in Canada, because the symbolic expression of the memorial may be seen in large measure as the dreams of one man, and his vision of a Canadian nationalism. The contradictory messages stemming from the monument have altered the way Canadians have historically commemorated war perhaps because a "national heritage depends upon the prior acceptance of a national history." (Tunbridge and Ashworth 46).

⁷ Now Plaza bridge

Chapter One

Commemoration in Canada: A Precarious Journey

Heritage, Jean Friesen argues, is “the moral tale that history has to offer. It derives from various streams of the past but finds its purpose in the public presentation and interpretation of a collective inheritance” (193). In Canada this finds its expression in many forms: monuments, archives, preserved landscapes, plaques, architectural and archaeological conservation. Therefore heritage becomes a tangible object that visually and socially expresses the values and norms of the country. But heritage and culture vary across the nation, emerging in part from “collective memories, in part from scholarship, and selections of the past for communal purposes” (Lewis 12), thereby creating a complex web of narratives that must be sorted through to project a solitary national voice.

Canada is a nation founded upon uncertainty, a partial victory of the British over the French and Native populations on the Plains of Abraham in 1759. These groups were never conquered by the British and continued to enjoy resilient cultures independent of what in time became the numerically dominant British. The lack of a decisive victory, the multiplicity of various cultures and traditions, and no formative event to rally the peoples of Canada has made the search for mutual military and political heroes, dates, and documents as subjects for commemoration an arduous and politically sensitive task.

The visual arts are among the most sophisticated forms of human communication, “simultaneously shaping and being shaped by the social context in which they find expression . . . (as) Art is enlisted to serve social ends as they provide elaborate settings to educate the public about history, doctrine, or a certain belief system” (Stokstad 24). Historically, the image most strongly associated with public art in the urban landscape has been monumental sculpture; most often in the form of large scale formal memorials. Sculpture has become part of our world, its realistic form inviting the viewer to engage with the space and contemplate the environment surrounding it (Martin 60).

Before the nineteenth-century, western war memorials were generally dedicated to the leaders and generals of battles. The honour of commemoration was only bestowed upon the military, religious, and political elite. But the nineteenth-century was to mark a significant shift in how death was commemorated in the western world. According to Philippe Aries’ book *L’homme devant la mort*, commemorative practice personalized, becoming more intimate and sentimental: “On one level, memorializing the deceased reflected the deepening bonds of personal affection, which characterized the sensibilities of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries culture. It also signified a new awareness that the lived experience of the past can never be directly retrieved” (Hutton 2). This remarkable social change in commemoration is reflected in the numerous monuments erected after the American Civil War (1861-1865).

National monuments to fallen soldiers began to be erected in the United States in the 1890s when the United States congress began a program of commemorating national battlefields such as Gettysburg (Bodnar 31). After the war, both North and South commissioned public statuary that not only satisfied vernacular interest of grieving the

dead, but to explain why the epic sacrifice was made (Stokstad 999). Americans commemorated the fallen of the Civil War in a novel manner by erecting monuments to all the war's participants, rather than its individual military leaders (Figure 4). The common soldier emerged as the most prolific figure in public sculpture, appearing in the tiniest village and in metropolitan environments (Savage 161). The Civil War soldier was supposed to be universal in reference, but soon grew to become a specialized 'American type' which differentiated itself from other nations in what Americans referred to as "its nobility and frankness" (Savage 163). Another significant shift in commemoration that emerged from the Civil War was how the soldier was viewed by society, as common military men were now regarded as patriotic citizens of the nation, not professional paid mercenaries. Therefore the common soldier was fighting for the preservation of his nation, not remuneration.

Some scholars equate this commemorative shift to the arrival of battlefield photographers, whose pictorial work demonstrated to the families at home the atrocities occurring on the fields to the fighting men⁸ (Stokstad 998) (Figure 5). Also the advent of field artists who covered the war on-site and published their caricature sketches in magazines and newspapers contributed to the changing image of the regular soldier. The regular foot soldier went from a virtually unrecognized figure in the commemorative landscape to being immortalized as a disciplined and thoroughly competent man who, regardless of the inhumanity around him, "nevertheless retained his civilian

⁸ This was not the first time there were battlefield photographers. There were photographers who captured the Crimean War on film, but generally these men were commissioned by Royalty and governments, so the pictures they took were biased towards the positive aspects of war.

Figure 4 – 7th Regiment Memorial, 1869-74 by Richard Morris Hunt and Quincy Adams Ward. Central Park, New York City.

Figure 5- Photograph of dead Confederate Soldiers at Petersburg, ca. 1864.

independence of mind.” (Thompson 185).

War Memorials dedicated to the memory of the Great War abound in almost every city, town, and village throughout Canada. These monuments act in a two-fold manner: they are physical manifestations of the grief of losing fallen soldiers and reminders of the past. Geographer Yi-Fu Tuan contends we build monuments because the human race longs to remember: “ Experience as it occurs has immediacy, but no permanence; its value is ephemeral... Artifacts are thrust into the world. They have the power to stabilize life, and sacred rituals reinforce them” (Mayo 11)

Most of the war memorials in Canada today were erected after the First World War. They were generally not erected or funded by local governments or wealthy individuals or groups, but were more often the result of community-based groups or veteran’s associations (Shipley 66). Before the Great War, the energetic figure of the soldier engaged in some activity associated with battle served to capture the vigorous spirit of heroism of those who died in combat. This is typified by the Boer War memorial in Ottawa in which the soldier lifts his helmet in victory. This sort of triumphant figure, however, was inadequate as a means to convey the enormity of Canadian loss in the Great War, and sculptors in Canada turned to “more allegorical figures which embodied more universal concepts of mourning” (Boyanoski 31). This may be seen in the numerous works of Toronto sculptor, Walter Allward. Allward’s war memorial for Peterborough, Ontario, (Figure 6) iconographically depicts the figure of Humanity as he heroically turns his back to aggressive Barbarism. Alternatively, the introspective figure of a solitary uniformed soldier, complete with weapons, standing like a saint or martyr, is

on guard to symbolically represent his fallen comrades, such as Frances Loring's monument for the city of St. Stephens, New Brunswick (Figure 7).

There is a great difference between the message of war offered by vernacular monuments at the community level and the state-sponsored, official narrative expressed in the National War Memorial. Vernacular memorials, in Canada and elsewhere, are almost universally concerned with the personalized suffering of war: the uncontrollable grief of losing loved ones and community members. Seldom do these artistic expressions celebrate or glorify war; rather they are a personal contemplation on the martyrdom of the young men and women who lost their lives. John Bodnar in *Remaking America* contends 'Vernacular culture':

represents an array of special interests that are grounded in parts of the whole. They are diverse and changing and can be reformulated from time to time by the creation of new social units. . . . Defenders of such cultures are numerous and intent on protecting values and restating views of reality derived from firsthand experience in small-scale communities rather than the "imagined" communities of a large nation. . . . But normally vernacular expressions convey what social reality feels rather than what it should be like. Its very existence threatens the sacred and timeless nature of official expressions (14).

Vernacular culture stands in opposition to 'official culture' which represents "the concerns of cultural leaders or authorities at all levels of society" who "share a common interest in social unity, the continuity of existing institutions, and loyalty to the status quo. They attempt to advance these concerns by promoting interpretations of past and present reality that reduce the power of competing interests" (Bodnar 13).

Though clearly a public commemoration of wartime sacrifice, the National War Memorial is also alive with the energy and vigor of the blossoming nation. The

Figure 6- Peterborough War Memorial, Ontario by Walter Allward . ca. 1920.

Figure 7- St.Stephens War Memorial, New Brunswick by Frances Loring, 1920.

monument mediates the vernacular expression of personal suffering with the official narrative of nation building through the symbolism of resurrection. Those heroic men and women killed during the war are not really dead, but they have found immortality as the heart and soul of the Canadian nation (Vance, *Death* 45). Ordinary people appear to have accepted the government's official interpretation of the war because "the memory of the war as a nation-building experience would not have caught on had it not been able to accommodate the widespread need to find meaning in the war" (Vance, *Death* 267). The sacrifices made by families had to hold some greater meaning other than the senseless slaughter of innocent men or else the whole war effort was fought in vain.

In 1914, Canadians entered their first large-scale war. Few Canadians could have anticipated that the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand in the distant Bosnian city of Sarajevo would escalate into a full-fledged international conflict. Between the years 1914 and 1918 Canadians sent 625, 000 men to the battlefields of Europe, an admirable and remarkable feat for a country of approximately eight million people. More than 60,000 - one in ten- never returned (Francis et. al. 176).

Few events of the twentieth-century have been as mythologized as the Great War, regarded by many Canadian conservative historians to be the birth of nationhood for Canada. These historians promote the myth that the Great War was a baptism of nationhood for Canada that set it on the road to greatness. For the first time in its history Canadians soldiers fought in their own army battalions and performed with distinction.

As a direct result of their military achievements and efforts Canada participated in the Paris Peace Conference (1919), garnered independent signatory rights on international documents, and became a member of the League of Nation's General Assembly. In the

1920s, Canada began negotiations with Britain that evolved into the Statute of Westminster in 1931, granting Canada independence and equality with Britain in the Commonwealth.

Historian J.L. Granatstein, an avid proponent of a national Canadian history beginning with the successes of the Great War, states in his book *Who Killed Canadian History?* “...the Great War made Canadians conscious they were a nation” (131). This book is a tirade against other academic historians, who, Granatstein laments, have abandoned the historical reality that the Great War (among other things) was the genesis of Canadian national political history, choosing instead to focus on group histories that detract and challenge this interpretation of the national narrative. Academics focusing on fields such as ethnic history, Women’s studies, and labour history have all played active roles in the degeneration of an ‘official’ Canadian history, and this lack of a national foundation has led to a fractured Canadian identity premised on multiculturalism. According to Granatstein: “In this multicultural Canada, the history of the world wars is seen as a divisive force, something almost too dangerous to teach in primary and secondary schools.” (115). By forgetting the import of the Great War, Granatstein believes we are dismissing our collective history and identity. History is important to national development because “it helps people know themselves. It tells them who they were and who they are; it is the collective memory of humanity that situates them in their time and place” (5).

Granatstein believes that history is essentially the official memory that a society chooses to remember, but in Canada historical studies are multi-leveled. His contention that the Great War made Canada an independent nation may be correct on the political

level, but social historians have demonstrated that on the home front war had been highly divisive. The Great War was a time of great dissent as conscription broadened the hostilities between the French and English, and the common man was implored to serve his country but came home to a society and government that did not know how to cope with him. Women who had answered the governments' call to work outside the home to support wartime industrial growth were sent home to make way for men, labour strife was rampant translating into strikes and riots, and this anger did not dissipate after the war, it carried over into the turbulent 1920s and 1930s.

A.B. McKillop in his critique of *Who Killed Canadian History?* states that Granatstein's argument for a national history is invalidated by his strong belief that his vision of Canadian nationhood is a replica of truth: "The ideal of historical objectivity, in which the 'real' events of Canadian or any other history are embedded, is, instead, just that: an ideal, a 'noble dream,' a much-valued but forever unfulfilled aspiration" (284). In so far as historical writings are a historian's interpretation of truths, historians presume that nothing should be forgotten, but select subjects and approaches to them. The act of creating heritage myths is different. The creation of a country's heritage is enhanced by what historical realities it erases, changes, and stresses in order to eliminate competing insights (Lowenthal 156). In essence, Granatstein is not fighting for a national *history* as he contends but a national idealized *heritage* continuing King's 'invented tradition' as encapsulated in the National War Memorial.

J.E Tunbridge and G.J Ashworth in their book *Dissonant History* contend history and heritage share common elements but greatly differ in how each is used to serve political means: "Both history and heritage make selective use of the past for current purposes and

transform it through interpretation. History is what a historian regards as worth recording and heritage is what contemporary society chooses to inherit and pass on. The distinction is only that in heritage, current and future uses are paramount” (6).

Through judicious historical adaptation Granatstein, like Mackenzie King, wants to create a seamless course of idealized history on which Canadians can build their identity. David Lowenthal furthers this notion in *Possessed By the Past* emphasizing that heritage stewards, like Mackenzie King and Granatstein, often omit historical fact to propagate exclusive “myths of origin and continuance, endowing a select group with prestige and common purpose” (128). To exclude other wartime voices such as labourers, women, and ethnic minorities in order to elevate the importance of the soldier makes their narrative of the Great War a source of heritage: “What heritage does not highlight it often hides... heritage is enhanced by erasure” (Lowenthal 156).

Official Canadian commemorative practice began circa 1759, when British soldiers physically marked the site where their commander, General Wolfe, died on the Plains of Abraham (Shipley 14). Throughout the nineteenth-century, commemoration in British North America consisted of memorializing imperial heroes- Wolfe, Montcalm, and Brock- and the protection of battlefields where numerous battles were fought against American expansionism by British Imperial soldiers and the Canadian militia (Miller 7). War and war heroes were popular icons that inspired songs, legends, literature, and paintings. In the majority of these accounts, war was a nation-building stimulus, “an experience in which courage and stamina triumphed over organization and efficiency, though often at the cost of death” (Miller 8). Many of these cultural innovations grew into what Carmen Miller refers to as the “Canadian militia myth”, where the superiority

and dependability of the untrained citizen-soldier triumphed over the disciplined, barrack-bred British regular. While admitting to the valiant qualities of the individual British regular generals in building and defending Canada, the Canadian militia myth exaggerated occasions when the British fled and the Canadians fought on. Miller points to battles such as that at Moraviantown when the day was saved by Tecumseh and his men. The Feinian raids, the Red River expedition, and the North-West Rebellion provided further evidence of their claims (9).

By the twentieth-century commemorative practices in Canada shifted towards a more “populist and nativist focus on military and prosaic figures” (Osborne 436). The federal government became more interested in celebrating Canada’s past establishing the National Battlefields Commission in 1908 and the Historic Sites and Monuments Board in 1919 to further Canadian commemoration of seminal events (Osborne 436).

One of the first military events in post-Confederation Canadian history to challenge our internal security as a nation was the Northwest Rebellion of 1885. Although a small affair in the grand designs of international conflict, its legacy is significant to the development of Canada. It was Canada’s first military endeavor independent of British regulars. The commanders and generals were of British service, but the foot soldiers were Canadian recruits with imperialistic tendencies (Morton 106). According to Paul Maroney, “The rebellion did produce an outpouring of patriotic fervor in many parts of the Dominion. Particularly striking were the public demonstrations marking the departure and return of the Northwest contingents” (110).

The city of Ottawa erected a statue to the two local men who participated suppressing the rebellion, Private William B. Osgoode and John Rogers, both members of the

Governor General's Foot Guard who died in the Battle of Cut Knife Hill, 2 May 1885.

The monument stands today in Confederation Park but was originally installed in Major's Hill Park in 1888, on the site now occupied by the Chateau Laurier (Figure 8). The monument was designed and executed by British sculptor Percy Wood. The monument is rendered in the traditional manner of military commemoration that emerged from the American Civil War, but is personalized by the addition of two medallion portraits of Privates William B. Osgoode and John Rogers on its perch. The perch is surmounted by a solitary bronze figure of a Guardsman, resting on his arms reversed in the traditional pose of military mourning (Shipley 41).

The Boer War was another seminal event in linking Canadian nationalism with wartime activity. When the war in South Africa broke out, Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier did not immediately offer Canadian military support to help British troops because "There is no menace to Canada..." (*Globe*, Toronto, 4 October 1899). Canada was divided over the war as many English-speaking communities demanded that troops be sent to aid the mother country; while in French Canada, "there was uncertainty, tinged with deep resentment at the racial arrogance of the English" (Morton 26). Imperialist sentiments and agitation became so strong in parts of English Canada that by 14 October 1899, Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier, in an effort to placate both sides, stated that Canada would unofficially help the British cause by aiding and financing the many Canadians who wanted to volunteer their services to the British army (Morton 27).

The departure of Canadian troops for the front in October 1899 brought forth another round of civic celebrations that demonstrated a distinct sense of local Imperial consciousness, not a nationalist sentiment. The *Globe* referred to the departure of the

Figure 8- The Riel Rebellion Memorial, by Percy Wood, 1888.

Toronto contingent in October “a notable one for Toronto and for this Province.”

According to Patrick Maroney, Imperialist- leaning Canadian newspapers, especially in Toronto and Montreal, used one-sided coverage to have their readers support the British cause. But there was a slowly mounting movement towards the development of Canadian identity as some of the papers began to refer to troops overseas as “our men,” or “fellow Canadians.” (114)

One of the most well known images to come out of Canada’s participation in the Boer War was Richard Caton Woodville’s *The Dawn of Majuba Day* (Figure 9) which depicts members of the Royal Canadian Regiment celebrating their victory at Paardeberg in February, 1900. The event was to become legendary in Canada, as the press and the citizenry would celebrate the Canadians’ heroism. During a tense battle, the Canadians were to take the lead in a night attack in order to rush the Boer defenses. The Boers heard their advance and began to fire. Canadians and their British support fired back, but then suddenly without warning, the Canadian line broke and numerous companies fled back to the security of their trenches. Only Company G and H remained in their positions and fought on. Their tenacity saved the contingent’s reputation and their victory was regarded by many to be the turning point of the war (Miller 108-109).

The authorities of countless Canadian towns and cities, provincial legislatures, commercial, patriotic, educational, and voluntary organizations joined the chorus of the Empire’s praise as the battle was to become a symbol of Canada’s military prowess (Miller 110). This new found pride in her military made many anglo-Canadians anxious to commemorate the war’s heroes and propagate patriotic rhetoric. Many citizen

Figure 9- Dawn of Majuba Day, by Richard Caton Woodville. 1900.

Figure 10- Boer War Memorial, Ottawa by Hamilton MacCarthy. 1902.

organizations went out and solicited public, corporate, and private funds to erect monuments to the success of Canada's soldiers. For some, these statues would be a visual source of the "utility of imperialism, for others it was a statement on Canada's future independence, others it was the futility of war, and for others it represented race degeneration as the failure of London to protect itself was very evident" (Miller 436). Commemorations to the Boer War began to appear all over Canada, as memorials and plaques were erected in towns where the volunteer soldiers had come from.

Ottawa had its own vernacular dedication to the Boer War Memorial, financed by a penny collection from 30,000 school children (Figure 10). The monument was designed by sculptor Hamilton MacCarthy and was unveiled to the public on 6 August 1902 by Lord Dundonald. The federal government did not mount a national monument to the Boer War, as there was no "official" participation and the war was a divisive event for Canada as many English and French speaking Canadians had opposed Canada's participation. The same linguistic and cultural divisions were to haunt the war effort in Canada during the Great War, but the international recognition Canada was to receive for its bravery altered the federal government's perception towards national commemoration.

On 4 August 1914, Canada following in the shadow of Great Britain declared war on Germany. Lord Beaverbrook established the Canadian War Memorials Fund (CWMF) in 1916 to commemorate Canadian activity and participation in the Great War. Prior to the Great War Canadians held a fragmented image of themselves, in part characterized by regionalism, imperialism, and continentalism, and not nationalism. Most art, music, books, and plays were of a local nature, but the Great War challenged this as "artists and writers were forced to look beyond their immediate environment in an effort to motivate

the people of Canada to help the nation at war” and to find in it national values (Tippett, *Expressing* 20). The Canadian War Memorials fund gave Canadians a permanent memorial of their involvement in the Great War, at almost no cost to the government. According to Sir Edward Kemp MP for Toronto East: “I think that owing to the efforts of Lord Beaverbrook we have the finest collection of historical documents, war paintings, and photographs of any of the Allied Nations.” (House of Commons, *Debates*, 27 May 1919, 2872) And, according to Maria Tippett, “it brought Canada’s critic, artists, and art gallery officials together for the first time; after the war Canada had an infrastructure of artists, patrons, and critics which enabled a national school of art to flourish” (*Art* 4).

The art produced by the CWMF provided a new kind of war art that centered not only on the front lines, but also on the home front war effort that included shipyards, training camps, munitions plants, and hospitals. Home front art visualized Canadians working together as a nation. It is this sentiment of quiet courage, unity, and determination that is reflected in the in National War Memorial demonstrating that all efforts, both those on the front lines and participating on the home front, contributed to the establishment of the nation. The home front support as a unifying experience as seen in Mabel May’s *Women Making Shells* (1918) (Figure 11). In this painting women (and a few men) are working furiously in a labyrinth of belt-drives “whose operation transferred steam power from the generating plant to each floor of the factory and to the individual machines” (Donegan 28). The heat and noise are visualized by the colours of orange, gray, and yellow that floods the canvas. The workers are committed to hard labour, but seem content to do so because they are helping those at the front. Much of the Canadian public could relate to

Figure 11- Women Making Shells by Mabel May. 1917.

the sentiments expressed in home front painting as this was a reflection of their own wartime experiences. The paintings produced by the painters who worked from Canada demonstrated that “war art could represent a variety of experiences, encompassing all phases of warfare, and still be accessible to all sectors of society” (Tippett, *Stormy* 107-108).

The CWMF looked to the past to search out Canadian heroes in order to inspire people to join or support the war effort. In French Canada, many recruiting posters had images of regional legends Adam Dollard Des Ormeaux, voyager Etienne Brule, and Madeleine de Vercheres coaxed men to sign up to join the war as a volunteer (Vance, *Death* 156). English Canada resurrected Isaac Brock, Montcalm, and General Wolfe, hero of the English imperial ‘victory’ on the Plains of Abraham. Wolfe appeared in the Victory Loan campaign, posters, and, most importantly Benjamin West’s painting, *The Death of General Wolfe* (1770) (Figure 12) was acquired by the CWMF. The significance of West’s painting lay neither in its historical accuracy (most of the people represented had not been present at Wolfe’s death) nor was it for the work’s uniqueness as there were three subsequent copies made. The picture was artistically significant because it played a role in the shaping of the Anglo-Canadian foundation myth of Canada by depicting the dauntless hero at the time of his martyrdom for his great victory for the Empire (Tippett, *Art* 45). For Sir Edmund Walker the painting was “almost invaluable to Canada” and to Lord Beaverbrook the painting gave Canada “a means of comparing the new battle pictures with one of the greatest of the old, bringing the second battle of Ypres into touch with the battle of the Plains of Abraham” (Vance, *Death* 154)).

Figure 12- The Death of General Wolfe by Benjamin West. 1770.

The painting's propagandistic value to the Canadian campaign was its visual metaphor that history is "teleological" (Vance, *Death* 152) and its ultimate expression is nationhood. Soldiers who went to the battlefronts of Europe in 1914 were fighting for the salvation of the Canadian homeland just like those who had fought on the Plains of Abraham, the battle of 1812, the Riel Rebellions, or the Boer War. It comforted the Canadian public that the First World War was a continuation of Canada's greatness as a unified nation, rather than a departure from it. Soldiers were now regarded as the personification of Canada's history; a symbol of its potential and vitality (Vance, *Death* 157).

The artists who officially participated in the CWMF were all males. Many went to the front line to paint the battles and were caught in enemy fire. These artists generally depicted the soldiers they saw and met in two manners: the individual man who "by the tip of his helmet, his swaggering walk, or his rolled up sleeves showed he was unique or they were depicted as a subservient grouping- slaves to their guns and commanders" (Tippett, *Art* 132). But there were those who sought to reveal through their art an intimate experience of every man in the trench as exemplified by Eric Kennington's *Mustard Gas* (Figure 13). The soldier in the painting is recovering from the agonizing burns he received during an enemy gas attack. His covered eyes depersonalize his face, making him a symbol of all suffering soldiers. Some, such as A.Y. Jackson, attempted to depict the mindlessness of horrific activities occurring around him, as the soldiers of his art became detached from their humanity. This is seen in *A Corpse, Evening* (Figure 14), as the soldiers walk by decaying corpses on the ground, ignoring their innate sense of compassion.

Figure 13- Mustard Gas by Eric Kennington. 1915.

Figure 14 – A Corpse, Evening by A.Y. Jackson. 1917.

One female did dare to go to the front to paint after the war was over, and witnessed the carnage, savagery, and desolate condition the war had left in Europe. Commissioned by the Canadian magazine *The Gold Stripe*, Mary Riter Hamilton went to battle sites trying to capture the war experience so graphically experienced by Canadian men.

Similar to the National War Memorial, Riter Hamilton's canvases relate to the viewer the destruction of war, but there is an innate sense of renewal in her art. Paintings such as *First Celebration at Zillbek After the War* (Figure 15) depict the hope that Europe will emerge from its anguish. There is neither hero, nor victory in the scenes she witnessed (Davis 12). Riter Hamilton's paintings make the viewer feel as though the carnage of battle was horrible, but out of this horror would emerge beauty, hope, and social renewal. When her art is compared to that of CWMF artist Fred Varley, the competing messages of war emerge.

While Riter Hamilton sees beauty arising from the destruction, Varley who lived through the battles sees only destruction. This may be seen in his work *What For?* (1918) (Figure 16) in which he questions the validity of the war itself. In this painting, Varley depicts a gravedigger resting from his job of burying men killed in battle wherever he can find a place in the ground. There is no honour in these men's sacrifice; they are merely a stack of corpses to be disposed of. This painting not only denies the soldier a decent burial but questions the purpose of his sacrifice. The work also goes a long way towards bringing the horror of the front to the viewer (Tippett, *Making* 65). By showing soldiers being dumped in a pit, Varley made a mockery of the Imperial War Graves Commission's assertion that every soldier got his own grave (Tippett, *Stormy* 109)

Figure 15- First Celebration at Zillbek After the War, by Mary Riter Hamilton. 1920.

Figure 16- What For? by Fred Varley. 1916.

The scale of the venture of the CWMF impressed all reviewers. It was the largest art project in Canadian History, and all recognized the importance of the collection both as a memorial to those who died and as a diverse collection of art styles which Lord Beaverbrook wanted to remain in Canada (Hill 69). In order to house the collection, Lord Beaverbrook suggested a special art gallery be built to house the collection (Hill 72) (Figure 17). The final building design released by the Canadian War Memorials Committee in 1919 was a pantheon style of building in which the “memorials should constitute as complete a historical-artistic record as possible of Canada’s great share of the war.” (1). The building was designed in a monumental style, symmetrical in plan and elevation. The plan was devised under the Borden Conservative government and was presented to the House of Commons by the War Memorials Board in early 1919. Mackenzie King appears to be aware of the historical value of the collection as Jonathan Vance in *Death So Noble* points out that both Mackenzie King and Beaverbrook “acted with alarm when Arthur Doughty attempted to transfer the historical paintings to the Dominion Archives” (154), but at the same time Mackenzie King appears to be against the erection of the building to house the art. In the House, he questioned the motivations of the Conservatives by challenging them with a rumor he had heard about the design of the new building, asking of the government:

The War Memorials Board recently presented to Parliament a report in regard to a memorial building to be erected in this country. I have been asked on behalf of the Canadian Architects to inquire as to whether a report which has appeared in the press to the effect that the contract for this building has been awarded to an Old Country architect is or is not correct (House of Commons, *Debates*, 20 June 1920, 3228)

Figure 17- Sketch of the Canadian War Memorial, by E.A. Rickards. 1919.

It is possible that at this time Mackenzie King had already decided that this building would not become an icon of Canada's war effort as it was his war memorial in the heart of Ottawa that would express the desires of the nation.

When Mackenzie King became the leader of the government, he soon ruled out the memorial building plan citing its vast expense. So the paintings, sculptures, prints, and drawings totaling more than 900 works had no home (Hill 72). The exhibition's success on tour and the support given to it by the press and retired servicemen did nothing, however, to arouse the Mackenzie King government's interest in preserving the pieces of art. When Sir George Perley in the House of Commons asked about the preservation of the collection in April, 1928, Mackenzie King stated simply that "up to the present time we have felt that there were other demands more imperative than the demand for a building for the purpose of housing these particular works of art." (House of Commons 16 April, 1928).

While the war memorial building was too vast of an expense to hold Canada's collection of commemorative art, the erection of a war monument in the capital was not. Despite the depressed economic conditions of post-war Canada, Mackenzie King's government first proposed the mounting of a commemorative monument on 9 March 1923, requesting funding for a national commemorative monument noting that "the Great War it has been suggested that the efforts of the Canadian soldier in France should be commemorated and that it would be a fit and appropriate thing to have a monument of that character in the capital of Canada" (1021). The request was denied as many in Parliament felt that this was an important gesture, but would be too much of a financial burden. The Liberals would not be deterred from their goals as two months later, on 11

May 1923, they again raised the issue in the House, debating the values of the commemorative project, and this time proceeded to execute their plans.

Chapter Two

The National War Memorial Competition

The unveiling of the National War Memorial in Ottawa on 21 May 1939, was a day tinged with both sorrow and pride for Canadians. Commemoration of the men and women who lost their lives in the Great War (1914-1918) was the impetus for erecting this grand monument located in the recently redesigned and renamed Confederation Square. Unveiling the monument to the crowd of over 100,000 veterans and civilians was Great Britain's King George VI, who solemnly praised the bravery and sacrifice made by the Canadian people in order to preserve world peace and freedom. The King's speech drew the crowd's attention to the monument's didactic meaning by stressing Canada's valiant response to the overseas conflict: "But the symbolism of the memorial is even more profound. Something deeper than chivalry is portrayed. It is the spontaneous response of the nation's conscience. The very soul of the nation is here revealed" (Gardam 12) (Figure 18).

For the spectators, the Royal visit, and the opening of the monument was a grand affair that captured their imagination and provided a much-needed distraction from the social, economic, and political problems facing Canada. Gustave Lanctot in *Canadian Geographical Magazine* wrote of the unveiling ceremony: "to Canada, the Royal presence lifted people out of the morass of the business depression, war scares and contentious politics, to the nobler level of national exaltation and solidarity...." (3). This

Figure 18- King George VI addressing the crowds, 1939.

moment of respite and unity was to be short lived as Canada would declare war on Germany four months later, plunging the nation into its second world war in twenty-five years.

Only just in the shadow of the King was Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King, the champion of both the monument and the occasion. For Mackenzie King, this was a day of mixed emotions: a mournful time to remember the fallen, yet a day that filled him with great pleasure as the first stage of his plan for the urban reconstruction of Ottawa was officially unveiled to the public. But for Mackenzie King, the National War Memorial was more than an aesthetic commemoration of sacrifice and heroism or an icon of capital beautification. It was above all a visual means of promoting a national consciousness in a country deeply divided. The bronze soldiers rendered in the National War Memorial were not dead and forgotten in far away European battlefield; their spirit resided in Canada and continued to serve their country as inspiration for national unity. Their collective spirit, in Mackenzie King's mind, was embodied in the emergence of Canada as an independent nation on the international stage.

On 11 May 1923, Prime Minister Mackenzie King had stood up in the House of Commons to propose that the government of Canada should erect a national war monument to honour the dead of the Great War⁹:

In every country in the world the spirit of the nation has found some expression in regard to great events in the form of a permanent monuments if the occasions have been sufficiently worthy of recognition from the national point of view. The government felt that a monument should be erected in the capital of Canada expressive of the feelings of the Canadian people as a whole to the memory of those who had lost their lives in the service of humanity (House of Commons, *Debates*, 2686).

⁹ The intention to erect a monument was raised by the Minister of Public Works, Dr. J.H. King who at one point states that he wished that Mackenzie King was in the House to explain the project because he had more knowledge about the monument plan. Soon after, Mackenzie King suddenly enters the debate.

The Great War was a very divisive force in Canadian society, exposing fissures in almost every aspect of Canadian life. To Mackenzie King, this strife was an affront to his vision of Canada as a “partnership” of competing cultural, regional, and economic groups who could achieve harmony through negotiation, not conflict (Neatby, *Prism* 6). Mackenzie King, aware of the social discord in his country, sought to remedy this concern by promoting Canada’s recent achievements as a nation:

It is the spirit of heroism, the spirit of self-sacrifice, the spirit of all that is noble and great, that was exemplified in the lives of those sacrificed in the Great War, and the services rendered by the men and women who went overseas; and the nation will be dead the minute it loses that vision...It is that vision which the government wishes to keep alive in erecting a monument of this kind (House of Commons, *Debates*, 11 May 1923, 2687)

Mackenzie King and his Liberal government hoped that mounting an epic sculpture in the capital, one that would provide the people of Canada with a visual allegory of pride in their war time achievements, might foster a greater sense of national unity. Mackenzie King was not alone in stressing the positive aspects of the Great War, according to Jonathan Vance during the 1920s and 1930s it was acceptable to hold the belief that war solidified Canada: “The war evolved into a tool that could weld together the nation. If new Canadians, members of the First Nations, French, and English could simply focus on the positive aspects and forget the negative, then the country was destined for greatness...giving birth to national consciousness that would carry the country to the heights of achievements.” (*Death* 11).

When the Minister of Public Works, Dr. J.H. King, first proposed to the House of Commons on 11 May 1923, a plan to mount a war memorial in the heart of Ottawa, there was great opposition to it. The issue was raised as part of a series of debates over the question of allocation of supply for the department of public works. The erection of the monument appears to have been a novel idea to the house as both the Conservatives and the Independent Labour Party (I.L.P) appeared to be taken aback by the financial commitment. The preliminary amount for the project requested by the Liberals was \$10,000 and would grow as the monument materialized. The Minister of Public Works, sensing the hostility to the request, drew the house's attention to the costs of the project by referring to some of the Liberals' uneasiness: "As I say some objection was taken when the vote was brought forward but I do not think it is at all unreasonable- in view of the fact that we have undertaken the expenditure of a very large sum of money in France to erect fitting memorials...." (House of Commons, *Debates* 2685). It is at this point when the silent Mackenzie King enters into the debate in the Commons to promote his and his party's vision for the monument.

The Conservatives were primarily concerned with the costs associated with such a grand gesture and were quick to note that there already was a memorial dedicated to the Great War mounted on Parliament Hill. One member pointed out that the central pillar of the entrance to the Parliament buildings had already "an inscription denoting that it had been erected in recognition, among other things, of the valour of our men who went overseas." The most significant and telling exchange was between the leader of the I.L.P, J.S. Woodsworth, and Prime Minister Mackenzie King, as their views are reflective of the deep chasm that existed within Canadian society after the war.

Woodsworth was concerned about costs, not in the economic sense, but for the emotional and physical well being of the returned soldiers. For many returned soldiers, the return to civilian life was arduous. There were few rewards for their bravery overseas, pensions for the disabled were paltry, and those who were physically well were expected to make their own way without government support. The Borden government's attempts to make soldiers farmers through the *Soldiers Settlement Act* of 1919 had been a dismal failure as much of the land allotted to the returned soldiers was marginal, and the market failed to yield enough financial return to make a decent living as a farmer (Vance *Aftermath*, 22). Woodsworth, as a prominent social reformer, was keenly aware of the problems encountered by these citizen-soldiers, stating:

I speak for at least one section of the people when I say that, however desirable it may be to add works of art to the capital, we ought not at this particular time, with the people burdened with debt as they are, to incur any more expense than is absolutely essential. Further than that, there are a great many of those who went overseas who are not fully provided for at the present time. This government cannot see its way to provide anything for the unemployed, and there are thousands of men who spent several years overseas who are to-day suffering and whose families are suffering (House of Commons, *Debates*, 2686).

Woodsworth went on to state that the proposed war monument would be a sanitized glorification of war that did not reflect the true outcome of the war: a distinct lack of social change. These men and women risked their lives for freedom and justice only to be welcomed as heroes and then shunned. Woodsworth furthered his contention by saying: "The monument ought to commemorate the failure of the war to obtain one of the slightest things for which we went to war." Prime Minister Mackenzie King then answered that the monument would in no way "glorify war" but would celebrate "patriotism and sacrifice" of the those who went to Europe. The monument would express the gratitude of both the government and the nation to those who fought and died.

He finished this exchange by declaring that man cannot live by bread alone, and that the nation needed to aspire to loftier goals. Woodsworth simply answered “Man cannot live very well without bread.” (2687).

This attack made Mackenzie King retort: “There is a side of life loftier than that of the mere material satisfaction of daily physical needs”. He then stated: “The least the nation can do is to erect in its capital some memorial that will be worthy, in its appearance, in its symbolism, in the greatness of its noble position, structure, proportion and beauty of the spirit that was exemplified in the great sacrifice.” The spirit of the nation was to lie in the monument, as it would reflect to the viewer those values that made Canada great: “When a nation loses what is signified by its art it loses its own spirit, and when it loses the remembrance of the sacrifices and heroism by which it has gained the liberty it enjoys, it loses all the vision that makes a hero great.” (2689).

Mackenzie King’s interest in architecture, landscape, and town planning were well developed by the time he became Prime Minister in 1921. He had seen a few plans for the capital commissioned and not be fully implemented. The first of these plans was that produced in 1903 by Frederick Todd who proposed to the Ottawa Improvement Commission that the city create a system of parks and parkways to promote its natural beauty, while retaining its industrial growth and prosperity (Bellamy 441).

The next major plan for the cityscape was issued in 1916 under the guidance of Herbert Holt who hired Chicago town planner E.H. Bennett to make recommendations on how to improve Ottawa’s appearance. Bennett suggested to Holt and his commission that Ottawa be declared a federal district encompassing the city of Ottawa, Hull, and its surrounding areas. He also stated that the capital should represent the will of the nation,

and should therefore be funded through monies from all over the country. This notion gave impetus to King's later creation of the Federal District Commission.

While these two recommendations were feasible, Bennett's physical plans for the city were quite grandiose (Figure 19). His plan to beautify the capital consisted of rebuilding the city centre to accommodate the modernization of Ottawa. Among the plan's highlights were to move industrial sites located in the core to four less populated outer zones, the promotion of a comprehensive government building plan, and he called for the improvement of urban services. Budgetary problems associated with the Great War and its aftermath and the rebuilding of the Centre Block of Parliament prevented the implementation of Holt's report (Hillis 51-52).

By 1922, Noulan Cauchon, a Canadian-born town planner, had formulated a new plan for Ottawa under the guidance of the Ottawa Town Planning Commission entitled the Cauchon Report. The Report supported the previous suggestion of forming a federal district, the creation of Vimy Way, a memorial drive near Parliament Hill. More important to the development of the National War Memorial is how he laid out the downtown core to accommodate Major's Hill Park and Confederation Square in 1928 (DeGrace 51) (Figure 20).

Mackenzie King, for his part, had long ago decided that the War Memorial should be situated in the heart of Ottawa and should be located where the largest number of people could view it. The creation of a national square in the middle of the city would feed this need and its strategic location would be associated with the national symbolism of Parliament Hill. Cauchon recommended the placement of the National War Memorial in Confederation Square but directly in the center of the already existing circle. Cauchon's

Figure 19- Bennett's Plan for the capital core, 1916.

Figure 20- Nolan Cauchon's Plan for the capital core, 1922.

plans for these sites were to become influential in the creation of a “Parliamentary Precinct” in Jacques Gréber’s 1938 plan of the Parliamentary area. As he explained in his 1950 *Plan for the National Capital*: “The Cauchon report embodies much in the way of recommendations which are fundamental to the basic consideration of planning of the Capital Area and which to some extent, have fallen within the purview of the present report” (142).

Mackenzie King had not remained passive about these reports on city planning. According to William DeGrace, Mackenzie King worked with Noulan Cauchon in his development of Confederation Square in 1928 (51). Mackenzie King throughout his first and second terms as Prime Minister in the 1920s made ambitious plans for the city, building the Peace Tower in 1927 and then constructing a major public plaza between Elgin, the Rideau Canal, and Wellington Street named Confederation Square. The location of this square was quite important as it stood in the heart of Ottawa at the juncture of two major transportation bridges and had been the location of numerous parades, meetings, and riots. Mackenzie King had taken a vernacular meeting place of local residents, and tried to impose upon it centre spot of contemplation of war and nationhood (Figure 21). The location would prove to be tedious to design and be impractical for circulation in the downtown core.

The creation of this space was loosely defined by Edward Bennett and appeared in the plan of 1916 as a civic plaza in Ottawa. This site was quite urban in its design as three substantial buildings flanked it: Ottawa City Hall, the main post office, and the Russell Hotel (Gordon, *Noblesse* 19) (Figure 22). Mackenzie King felt that the presence of these buildings would detract from the site and seized the opportunity for the federal

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) missing in number only; text follows. Page(s) were scanned as received.

58

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

Figure 22- Confederation Square, ca. 1900.

government to buy the land the Russell Hotel and Theatre had occupied after it was destroyed by fire in 1928 (Hillis 56). Mackenzie King then asked Parliament to provide the Federal District Commission with additional \$3 million of capital funding to buy the Russell site and redevelop the core of the Ottawa. Mackenzie King shepherded the bill through the House saying "... the development and beautification of Ottawa as the Capital of this great Dominion, something that will give some expression of all that is highest in the idealism of the nation.... Those who follow in future years will come to recognize it as an expression in some degree of the soul of Canada today." (*Debates*, 24 April 1928, 2313-19). He used the federal mandate he received to convince Ottawa City Council to agree to relocate City Hall away from Confederation Square and to pay a large portion of the cost of widening Elgin Street to accommodate the square (Figure 23). Mackenzie King lost the federal election in 1930 to Conservative R.B. Bennett but was still able to keep his project of Confederation Square alive. Bennett, facing the depression, did not alter any of Mackenzie King's plans for the core during his leadership 1930 to 1935.

When Mackenzie King returned to power in 1935, he continued his plans to create a civic space at the head of Elgin Street, but the physical state of the location hampered the square's development. The complicated infrastructure of bridges, streetcars, streets, and a canal proved almost insurmountable. This was all to change in 1936 when Mackenzie King met Chief Architect and well-known city planner Jacques Gréber at the coming year's World Exposition in Paris. The men established a good relationship and King invited Gréber to come to Ottawa to prepare the plans for Ottawa's core. Mackenzie King

Figure 23- Confederation Square 1938. National Archives of Canada, PA 210975.

felt pressed to complete his plans for Confederation Square for Canada's Jubilee celebrations. Gréber came to Ottawa in 1937 and quickly realized the circulation problems associated with the location of Confederation Square. Gréber felt that locating the monument in Confederation Square would be too problematic due to the parcel of land's shape and its influence on traffic flow. Gréber produced a series of drawings in order to solve the problems, the first being the placing of the monument in Major's Hill Park (Figure 24 a-b). Mackenzie King would not agree to this or to any other plan unless the monument was located on Confederation Square. Mackenzie King noted in his diary dated 12 August 1937 that:

It was a return to the original idea of the monument on Connaught Place- he had found the space could be made large enough by a "V" development, instead of a circle The monument should be centered on Elgin Street He asked me which way it should face- down Elgin or towards the Parliament buildings. I told him I thought down Elgin The March brothers wanted it the other way- (all of which shows artists think mostly of the effects of their works, as seen at different points, etc.)

Gréber looked to past plans to mediate a solution and decided to combine Bennett's formal building compositions with the basic elements of Cauchon's circulation plan. Gréber's detailed plans took over eighteen months to realize, and the site and monument were ready to be unveiled officially to the public in May 1939 (Gordon, *Planning* 21-22)

The desire to have the monument at the head of Elgin Street was a personal matter for Mackenzie King. Regardless of all the opposition he faced, he steadfastly held to the contention that the monument needed to be situated on Confederation square. This is perhaps because he seemed to believe that he was writing a new visual history for Canada as the monument's location would "link up my old residence at the Roxborough, and

Figure 24 a-b: Plan for Major's Hill Park and sketch of monument in park.

Parliament Hill, Laurier Avenue etc. (thereby) increasing the significance of the location of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's monument and the association of France, Canada and England etc. . ." (*Diary* 12 August 1937). His mentioning of the Roxborough is important, as it was King's residence during the Great War. This may therefore provide a connection to the contention that Mackenzie King partially erected this monument as a sign that he had in fact supported the war effort.

The restoration of familial history was also to become a relevant issue in regards to the monument. This is highlighted by a diary entry dated 13 August 1937, in which the real motivation for the location became evident,

I feel the vision of years are at, at last being realized, from the Harper monument on Wellington Street, to the Bank of Canada, and the War Memorial at the head of Elgin, marks a long and great period of Canadian History. Elgin having pardoned grandfather Mackenzie, it is fine to think his grandson has succeeded in having the War Memorial crown the street- the great avenue that bears his name.

He again reiterates that importance of this familial lineage in a speech he gave at the inauguration of the Canadian History Society, London, England, and on 7 November 1923 by stating: "Then I see before me, Lord Elgin. I must thank him for the pardon granted by his grandfather to mine. The Lord Elgin of that day sanctioned the measure, which enabled my rebel ancestor to return to Canada . . . I do not know where I should been but for the ancestors of these two gentlemen." (King, *Message* 122). A friend of King's H.P. Hill wrote to King of the grandeur of the monument at the head of Elgin, and praised King's perseverance in locating it there, "Not being gifted with the proper amount of imagination, I had no idea that Elgin Street would look so impressive and add so much to the National Memorial." (No date)

The location of the monument was almost an obsession with King; it was imperative for him that it be located in Confederation Square. When King had lost the election of 1930 to the Conservative government of R.B. Bennett, he worried that the location of the monument would change. On the 23 February 1934 he felt the site was sufficiently compromised that he stated in the House of Commons that he had heard that the government had decided to switch the location: "A rumour has been circulated-and I imagine that there is no foundation for it-that some place other than the capital, Ottawa, might be chosen; again with respect to the capital, that the original site proposed, namely Connaught Place, might be altered to some other site." (House of Commons, *Debate* 864). Mackenzie King then proceeded in a long speech to list reasons why the monument should be situated in Confederation Square: its centrality, the sculptor's designs were made in reference to the site, its symbolism vis-à-vis Parliament Hill, the monies paid to have the site constructed, and that other nations had erected their great monuments in their cities' most central point.

Many were against the war monument being located in Confederation Square. The Board of Trade of the City of Ottawa in a letter dated 27 February 1925 and signed by H.K. Carruthers wrote 'the war memorial not be erected in Connaught Place as this is not a suitable location from a commercial standpoint and that other sites be considered.' This view was echoed by many others including Ottawa Mayor J.P. Balharrie who wrote to the *Ottawa Journal* editorial page, "the square was altogether too small for such a pretentious memorial." (1 February 1926). Veteran's groups, such as the Tuberculous Veteran's Association, complained the most, urging in numerous letters that the site should be moved to Parliament Hill. Mackenzie King dismissed this option by stating

that there were already enough commemorative aspects to the hill: the central pillar to the entrance of the Centre Block, the Peace Tower and the Hall of Remembrance, adding: “Some suggestion has been made that the monument should be placed on Parliament Hill. . . . As far as other memorials on Parliament Hill are concerned I think they have been confined to some association with the political life of the nation as distinct from its other activities.” (House of Commons, *Debates*, 23 February 1934, 866). Therefore to place the war monument on the hill would be a redundant and inappropriate act.

Mackenzie King issued a reply to all those who had spoken out against the location of the memorial in an article published in the *Ottawa Citizen* on 5 January 1925. In this statement Mackenzie King stressed it was because of its centrality to the city that this unique point of intersection “would permit the monument being seen by the largest amount of points, and also the largest number of people at any given time.” He also pointed to the March’s comment on the site stating “Mr. Sidney March, brother of the artist and architect of the memorial, said that in his opinion, the site selected by the government is the best in the world. If it were placed anywhere else, he said, something in the movement of the troops from west to east would be lost.”¹⁰ Mackenzie King also wrote that placing the memorial in a busy traffic area was not a novel idea as the British had erected their World War I cenotaph in the center of a busy street leading towards the Houses of Parliament. Mackenzie King concluded the reply by indicating that moving the monument would be unfair to all those who had entered the design competition, amounting to a breach of contract to change the site.

¹⁰ The monument actually runs on a North-South axis.

The federal government on 12 February 1925 officially launched the competition for the War Memorial. In consultation with Eric Brown, Director of the National Gallery of Canada, and Colonel H. Osborne, Secretary of the Canadian Battlefields Memorial Commission, the general conditions of the competition were drawn up, and a public notice inviting designs was issued (Boyanoski 34). Mackenzie King appears to have been quite active in the early stages of the competition suggesting numerous changes to the rules governing the competition. The first thing he requested was to have the title of the competition changed from “National Monument Commemorative of the War” to the “National Commemorative War Monument”. Mackenzie King justified this alteration by stating “the monument is really commemorative of the Canadians who participated in the war, not of the war itself or of all who participated.” He also asked that the rules be quite clear that the “government must have a final say and not necessarily be bound to accept any one of the designs or models submitted.”¹¹ (Letter from Mackenzie King to Deputy Minister Hunter, dated 29 December 1924),

Mackenzie King was also very concerned with the timing of the release of the guidelines for the memorial, as they would coincide with the launch of the competition for the Wilfrid Laurier monument on Parliament Hill. Deputy Minister Hunter wrote to Eric Brown and Col. Osborne, explaining that Mackenzie King had asked that the launch of the War Memorial competition be slightly delayed in order to have the “best method of securing wide publicity and as large a number of entries as possible from the best

¹¹ While this is not a new idea, the same stipulation had been in place during the competition for the Laurier monument, Mackenzie King felt compelled to state this in numerous correspondence. This stems perhaps from the dismal reaction he had to the entries to the Laurier competition, stating in a letter to Hunter “Frankly, if a statue modeled on any of the photographs sent out by the Department of Public Works were to be accepted by the committee, I should do everything in my power to prevent its erection on Parliament Hill.” (6 March 1924)

sculptors of highest reputation in the different countries.” (18 February 1924) The conditions of the competition established by the government stated that the monument should express the feelings of Canada as a whole and be inspired by the spirit of heroism, self-sacrifice, and “the spirit of all that is noble and great that was exemplified in the lives of those sacrificed in the Great War and the services rendered by the men and women who went overseas...” (Competition Guide 4). The government explicitly states that the monument should not glorify war or be arrogant in victory: “While the spirit of victory is essential it should be expressed so as to not only immortalize Canada’s defenders, but convey a feeling of gratitude that out of this great conflict a new hope has sprung for future prosperity under peaceful conditions.” (6).

The competition was to be in two stages. The first stage had the artists submit designs drawn on paper with typewritten description. Six to ten of the designs would then be invited to submit plaster models. The competition was open to all artists, architects, and sculptors resident in the British Empire and British subjects by birth, resident elsewhere. The competition was also open to citizen or subjects of countries that were Allies or Associated Powers of the British Empire during the war. Unlike his earlier complaint to Borden that the architect chosen to build the new gallery that would have housed the war art collection be Canadian, Mackenzie King decided to make the competition more open. In a letter to J.B. Hunter, Deputy Minister of Public Works, King wrote: “my feeling is that the competition should be restricted to artists who are British subjects, or subjects of counties allied with the British Empire in the war” (18 July 1923), therefore making it clear that no axis members need apply to the competition.

Another interesting specification of the competition was that should the designer be an architect, he or she would be required to associate with a sculptor approved by the assessors, and vice versa. This followed the precedent set by the Canadian Battlefields Competition. The cost of the monument above ground level, including the erection and all professional charges (exclusive of foundations) was not to exceed \$100,000. The site was to be on Confederation Square¹² (Connaught Place) (Figure 25).

There were in the event 127 entries for the National War Memorial: 66 from Canada, 24 England, 21 France, 7 United States, 5 Belgium, 1 Scotland, 2 Italy, and 1 Trinidad. The three assessors were announced¹³, the first being Henry Sproatt, a New York architect who was a Royal Canadian Artist (R.C.A). Sproatt was well known in Canada for his work at the University of Toronto, designing Hart House, Trinity College, and Birge Carnegie Hall. The second assessor was Hermon MacNeil, an American, acting President of the National Sculpture Society of New York, known internationally for his sculptures of Native peoples. The last of the judges was Dr. F.J. Shepherd, a medical doctor who specialized in anatomy who was the Dean of Medical Sciences at McGill University in Montreal. Shepherd was also an art connoisseur who was well-versed in the arts and served as President of the Art Association of Montreal and on the Board of trustees at the National Gallery of Canada. These were all learned men who were capable of making a sound decision, but their winning selection would not necessarily be approved by the government. The guide book of rules governing the competition clearly

¹² The plans for confederation Square under went under many revisions until Greber's final plan was issued in 1937.

¹³ The assessors were all nominated by independent artistic bodies, not the government.

Figure 25- Jacques Greber's final plan for Confederation Square, 1937.

stated that the decision reached by the judges could be overturned if the government felt that their selection had not met the government's prescribed goals.

When the notion of erecting a monument was first raised in the House of Commons by Minister of Public Works, Dr. J.H. King and by Prime Minister King in 1923, the form of the monument was to be a Cenotaph. This is further reinforced by a letter King wrote to J.H. King on 8 December 1924: "You will recall that at two different sessions we have informed the public through Parliament of our intention to have a suitable war memorial erected in the capital of the Dominion. At a meeting of the Art Committee of cabinet, it was decided that this memorial should take the form of an appropriate column or shaft to be erected on Connaught Square."

In the course of the competition, the emphasis shifted. The seven chosen designs competing in the second stage, 16 July 1925, were peopled monuments that used classical elements on which to surmount the statuary. The seven candidates selected sent plaster models of their works to be judged. But this selection process was significantly longer than expected as one of the judges, Dr. Shepherd of Montreal, was in precarious health. In a letter to deputy minister Hunter, Henry Sproatt even went as far as to suggest that the judging be done at the Art Gallery of Montreal to accommodate Dr. Shepherd (4 December 1925). Eventually Dr. Shepherd's health improved and after the models were displayed for the public at the National Archives building with the permission of Arthur Doughty, Dominion Archivist, a decision was reached.

The winning design was announced in Ottawa 18 January 1926. It was entered by Vernon March of Farnborough, Kent, England, and entitled "The Great Response" and it was strikingly different from the other entries in its vision of the emergence of Canada

onto the world stage. March, while still focusing on war commemoration, produced a design alive with energy and inspiration. The sculpture had an enlightening affect on the viewer as the more positive aspects of the war took precedence over the symbolism, overt despair, and morose expression of the six other competitors. March's design spoke to the typical Canadian as it centered on the everyday man and woman on the street who had sacrificed so much for his or her nation, and longed for national recognition. The other six entries were all valid artistic expressions of the war experience¹⁴, but did not really meet the criteria set forth by the government in expressing Canada's new social and cultural reality.

One of the finalists was F. Brook Hitch, of London, his design portraying "Canadian Heroism". It consisted of a great bronze group of males entitled "Chivalry Triumphant" after the medieval style of warrior being greeted on his return homewards by supporting figures of a processional character, with the warrior bearing his sword, shield, and helmet made of white marble. These Arthurian figures would be flanked on each side by a winged figure of self-sacrifice gazing upwards, clasping victory to its breast. The defeated subsidiary figures of fear and temptation would make sacrificial offerings to the figures of life and the joys of living. Above the warriors would be the allegorical figure of peace and her handmaidens, rising from clouds of discord emitted by strife represented as a dragon, bringing prosperity to the nation. On the bottom portion of the monument, set in the base would be two bronze plaques with Maple Leaves, eight shields with the eight Regiment badges of those Canadians who fought in World War I.

¹⁴ In the course of my research I was only able to find written descriptions of the monuments; no photographic materials appear to exist within the collection of the National Archives.

The second finalist's monument was submitted by T.A. Lodge of London, England, and was tripartite in form with a shaft crowned by a winged victory in bronze, and at the base were four bronze, symbolic groups. The first was of supreme sacrifice representing the nation of Canada mourning. The second group at the rear of the monument was allegorical Canada with uplifted shield and drawn sword defending the weak and helpless. Facing the site to the north, a right hand side group consisted of remembrance pointing out to future generations the benefits of deeds of valour and heroism. On the opposite side was a representation of patriotism as a young man is urged forward by his aged father to draw his sword in the case of justice, honour, and freedom. On the lower section of the base were to be carved lions representing courage, fortitude, strength, and reliance of the defenders. This memorial was dedicated to the death and resurrection of the soldiers who had passed on in the cause of nation building.

Scotland's William J. Smith's entry was of a rectangular form, made of gray granite, that stood 70 feet high, approximately the same height as the Post Office. The front of the memorial would hold a simple dedicatory panel, which simply read: PRO PATRIA 1914-1918. There would be a sculpted frieze of processional figures standing 6'9 feet tall in low relief representing the sacrifice and voluntary service of all classes. Allegorical Canada would be central to the frieze, standing in the center as an 8'6 woman. Below this frieze would be a band of maple leaves inter-spaced with the eight shields of the Regiments. The crowning feature of the monument would be a bronze 9'6 lion stamping out evil represented by an eagle, presumably a European one.

Canadian sculptor Frances Loring collaborated with fellow Canadian architect W.L. Summerville to create an entry consisting of figures carved in high relief, appearing to be

emerging from the wall against which they are set and sculpted in three-quarter round style (Figure 26). If Loring used the rules governing scale, the figures would have been more than nine feet tall (Boyanoski 34). On the face of shaft, emerging from the stone was a male figure of victory with sword of sacrifice bearing the inscription "To the Unconquered Dead". On the opposite face was a female mourning, emerging from the stone with the inscription "These died That mankind Might be Free". At the side of the monument would be female groupings dedicated to the sacrifice of women, the mothers and nurses (Figure 27). The monument would be executed in stone or granite. Upon losing the competition she subsequently submitted this very design for the war memorial competition in Galt, Ontario, and was successful (Figure 28). Due to lack of funds, the Galt memorial had to be pared down and had to eliminate the side groupings. This left the single figure of "victory" on one face and that of "peace" on the other. It was unveiled in 1930 and still remains the same to this day (Boyanoski 35). Loring was also commissioned to create a model of a central group of three figures and a tympanum figure panel for the memorial chamber of the Parliament buildings in Ottawa in 1927 (Boyanoski 37).

R.W.G. Heughan and J.A. Aird the second of the Canadian finalists created a monument representing what they believed was the will and character of the Canadian people. It was to be of simple lines with a granite shaft and base, symbolic of the country. The base would be enriched by laurel swag with the shields of the nine provinces interspersed, and surmounted by the dominion coat of arms framed by two bronze figures of victory and peace placed at either end. These all would form a base for

Figure 26- Loring and Summerville's entry for the National War Memorial. 1926.

Figure 27- details of side figures of Loring and Summerville's entry. 1926.

Figure 28- Galt Memorial, Galt, Ontario. 1930.

the main and crowning bronze group at the top. The top group of figures would symbolize and commemorate the character of the armed forces. In the center would be a mounted horseman of the Middle Ages going forth in defense of his rights, just as the men and women of this country had gone forward as they did during the Great War in the defense of peace and justice.

The last of the finalists were Americans Lucien Smith and Gaetano Cecere of New York who conceived of a war monument they stressed was symbolic of the Canadian nation. The symbolic figure of the nation at peace with a sword at rest upon the palm branch occupies the lower portion and greets the visitor coming from the railroad station. One side of the relief demonstrates a soldier leaving his wife and mother for the front and on the other shows him returning home, being greeted by his wife and child. The side facing the Post office would hold a dedicatory inscription crowned by a shield upon a carved coat of arms of Canada. Decorating the top of the pedestal would be laurel leaf garlands winding over the trench helmets at corners with machine gun cartridge belts used as a decorative symbolic motif. Around the base of the pedestal extends a wide seat for the public to rest on. The shaft was a fluted Greek style crowned with a tripod symbolic of the sacrificial character of the composition. It would be executed in pink marble.

The winning design was *The Great Response* by Vernon March. Prime Minister Mackenzie King approved of this selection in a letter to Minister of Public works Dr. J.H. King dated 22 January, 1926: "I have viewed the memorials referred to herein and cordially approve the award of the assessors. In the monument selected, if executed in a manner worthy of the design, the capital will, I believe, have one of the finest war

memorials in the world.” This was not the first commission March had received in Canada, as he was the sculptor of the *Champlain Monument* in Couchiching Park in Orillia, Ontario.

The assessors in a letter to Minister J.H. King dated 18 January 1926 wrote that they had come to a unanimous conclusion that March’s design was to be erected. They said that March’s intention was to create a monument that was imposing and arresting through its human interest, rather than one in which the importance would lie in its architectural elaboration or grandeur for visual effect. The monument possessed a group of soldiers representing *The Great Response* of the Canadian people to the cries of Britain and their allies. In March’s opinion, the group was, “the most effective way in which to interpret and exemplify the spirit of heroism and self-sacrifice, and which would at the same time avoid any suggestion of glorifying war.” (Assessors remarks, Department of Public Works)

March’s notion was to symbolically represent the people of Canada through this group of men and women who went overseas to fight in the Great War, and record them as being historically accurate, as to record their actions for future generations. Each figure would be historically correct in detail of uniform, equipment, and typical of the branch they were representing. The grouping would not look to the viewer to be in “a fighting attitude,” but their bodies would express movement and eagerness and enthusiasm of the people. The pedestal design helped carry out and accentuate the general idea and effect of the central group of figures passing through the archway symbolizing the going forth of the people and the triumph of their achievements overseas.

It is this graceful, yet determined attitude of the military characters that differentiate this sculpture from other entries, especially that of first stage entrant Canadian Robert Tait McKenzie. McKenzie's design entitled "Over The Top" (Figure 29) was similar in form and intent to that of March: a group of soldiers moving together in unison towards their destiny, but it is their warlike demeanor that sets the two sculptures apart.

Mckenzie's men are moving in a wave to attack the enemy, while March's men and women move tenaciously towards an organized goal: to answer the call of their fellow man to save, not destroy humanity (Hussey 58).

The top of the monument would be crowned by the classical, allegorical figures of Peace and Freedom in the process of inspiring the marching figures below and by extension, the spectator below. While these two symbolic figures would be relatively straightforward to execute, March was very concerned with the accuracy of each of the bronze figures that would proceed through the arch. In order to have these characters be as authentic as possible, March and his sculptor siblings worked closely with Brigadier J. Sutherland Brown, Commanding Officer at the Canadian High Commission in London to perfect the figures. Brown had written to the Canadian government stating that he was highly critical of the lack of accuracy of the figures and that the monument did not recognize all the corps that participated in the war effort, such as the Military Police. One of the figures originally conceived for the monument was wearing a Stetson hat, which in actuality was worn by only one squadron of the army, the 13th Canadian cavalry in France. He also stressed that a VAD nurse¹⁵ needed to be added to the monument to

¹⁵ Although Brown refers to the VAD as nurses, they actually were not. The VAD's were members of the Voluntary Aid Detachments that originated during the Boer War. These detachments were primarily staffed by women and provided comfort to soldiers in hospitals, ambulances, and gave out care packages to the men going to the front. They had little or no medical training

Figure 29- Over The Top by Robert Tait Mackenzie. Never executed, 1926.

remember their sacrifices. March willingly makes these changes in a letter addressed to the deputy Minister of Public Works dated 31 December 1928.

The figures took many years to complete and to keep the public informed of the progress of the work, Mackenzie King went to England to see them himself and let photographers take pictures of the works to be published in Canada. Vernon March was assisted by his six brothers and his sister Anna who completed the work after Vernon's death in 1930. The work to create the figures was conducted in March's studio in London and they were to be shipped over to Canada when finished. The figures were completed in July 1932, but could not be transported to Canada due to a difficult economy and the halting of construction on the site in Ottawa. On the 21 January 1932, Minister of Public Works, J.B. Hunter, wrote to Sidney March that the delay in the shipment of the sculptures was due to the fact that the "Decision has not yet been reached as to the layout of Confederation Park." The memorial arch had not yet been completed and the landscaping had been started. In 1933, the figures were mounted temporarily in Hyde Park for six months, but the insurance costs were very high for the government. They were then moved to be stored in the March family studio until 1937 when they were moved to Ottawa.

Many veterans' groups wanted the erection of the site and the monument to be a work-program for returned soldiers. There are numerous letters of correspondence between C.D. Sutherland of the Department of Public Works, and numerous Veterans' associations demanding that returned soldiers should be employed to erect the monument (Figure 30). In a letter dated 17 August 1938, Sutherland wrote to the President of the Veteran's Re-establishment Association to report that there were nineteen men employed

to work on the monument and that of these nineteen, six, nearly 32 per cent were returned soldiers. He stressed that the government was making a conscious effort to hire veterans but the association had to remember that: “we will employ as many returned men as possible, but they must be men of tried experience in heavy work.”

While the March family kept the sculptures in London, Confederation Square was being prepared for the monument (Figure 31). The site was constructed under the watchful eye of Sydney March (Vernon’s brother) with the granite pediment and arch contracted in 1937 to a Montreal company, E.G. M. Cape and Company. Jacques Gréber was retained as a consultant and watched A.W. Robertson Limited prepare the surrounding terraces, walks, and grading which used seven varieties of Canadian granite (Gardam 8-9). The whole monument stands twenty-one metres from its base and contains twenty-two statuary figures, each standing 2.44 metres tall and historically correct in uniform and equipment (Figure 32). The movements of the figures are full of enthusiasm and eagerness to defend their nation, and by extension, the world from evil. Leading the way are seven infantrymen, the mainstay of the army, including a Lewis gunner and a kilted soldier with a Vickers machine gun. One of these infantry men is, according to the National Capital Commission and Col. John Gardam, a male of Aboriginal descent representing one of the 3,500 Native peoples who served during the Great War, but this was not substantiated during the my course of research. A pilot and an air mechanic are quick on their heels, as are a cavalryman on horseback pulling an 18-pounder gun, a sailor and two riflemen press through the arch, and behind them are the support figures. These figures represent the service corps, a nursing sister, a VAD,

Figure 30- Men building monument, National Archives PA 210976.

Figure 31- Frame for the monument being erected, National Archives Pa 210977

Figure 32- Views of the figures, National War Memorial

a sapper, railway man, the forestry corps, stretcher-bearer, dispatch rider, signaler, and a lumberman. The pedestal had to be redesigned to fit all the characters, and was intended to accentuate the figures passing through the archway, symbolizing the going forth of the nation; a symbolic birth of a triumphant people. The figures are all individual characters as some are old, some are young, one has a curly moustache, and others wear gas masks, or carry items of their trade (Figure 33).

On the top of the monument are the allegorical figures of Peace and Freedom expressing visually the notion that they are “alighting on the world the blessings of Victory, Peace and Liberty in the footsteps of the people’s heroism and self-sacrifice who are passing through the archway below” (Gardham 6). The symbolism of Peace and Freedom were important to Mackenzie King as he wanted these two values to be expressed as purely Canadian values. In an article that appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* 10 October 1938 entitled “King Likely to Unveil War Monument” Prime Minister Mackenzie King clarified an error he had made earlier in describing the memorial as possessing the figures of Peace and Liberty, not Peace and Freedom. He states, “Freedom, to my mind suggests a condition one enjoys, whereas liberty is more something that has been acquired. Freedom, therefore, is a word I think which carries peculiar aptness concerning the British people. We have enjoyed and preserved freedom.” The figures took on a greater significance when, by pure coincidence, these two figures were placed in position on 30 September 1938, the same day the Munich Agreement was signed (Figure 34).

Figure 33- Statues ready to be mounted on the memorial, National Archives PA 210978.

Figure 34- Picture of Sidney March, Mackenzie King, Percival March, and Walter March, with caption "Coincident with the signing of the four-power peace pact at Munich 29th September, 1938, the figures of Peace and Freedom were placed on top of the National War Memorial at 4.30 o'clock September 30th, 1938, in the presence of Prime Minister King, which gives the Memorial outstanding historical significance." National Archives PA 210979.

Chapter Three

William Lyon Mackenzie King: Canadian Dreamer

Above all the war memorial appears to owe its existence to Mackenzie King, and may be seen as the realization of Mackenzie King's dream for the nation. It is also very much bound up with his personal history and the times in which he lived.

William Lyon Mackenzie King is an enigma in Canadian history. Unassuming in speech and stature he became Canada's longest serving Prime Minister (1921-1930, 1935-1948). With the release of his personal *Diaries*, Mackenzie King was revealed to be a man of great contradictions: a staunch pragmatist in fiscal matters who sought spiritual guidance from the ghosts of Wilfrid Laurier, his mother, and his deceased dogs to validate his political and personal choices. He was also a man who categorically detested social and economic privilege, yet consciously gave patronage appointments and cabinet ministries to established businessmen and wealthy party supporters. It is Mackenzie King's ambiguous mixture of rational and irrational thought that has come to characterize his political legacy, leaving many scholars wondering how this complex man was able to govern a country as diverse as Canada (Finkel & Conrad 229).

Mackenzie King's personal idiosyncrasies may have tempered some academic opinion of his legacy, but many others look past the activities of the private man to focus upon Mackenzie King's remarkable vision for Canada demonstrated in the 21 April 1997, edition of *Macleans* magazine. *Macleans* published a survey of twenty-five prominent

Canadian historians asked to vote on Canada's most successful Prime Minister, and Mackenzie King was ranked number one. This, according to Patrick Brennan of the University of Calgary, is because "He was, after all the spiritualist and other jokes about his private life, our greatest prime minister. He tried to understand the country, he was capable of intellectual flexibility and change, and he attracted and held able colleagues. He was an intellectual who was sympathetic to our ideas- our first!" (34).

This praise is echoed by the numerous historians, fourteen of whom ranked King first or tied for first, impressed by King's political skills and devotion to unity. King was also commended for his steering of Canada on to the international stage, and his crucial policy decisions that established the beginnings of a national social safety net. None sanctioned the activities of the private man but recognized King's keen political intelligence and his "profound sense of his country's strengths-and weaknesses" (*Macleans* 37).

Mackenzie King's 'political intelligence' lay in his ability to negotiate a consensus on most of the political and social policies that he and his Liberal Party implemented. A great majority of these policies were intended for the good of the nation, not individual provinces or special interest groups, in order to define national Canadian values. Mackenzie King was very aware that a common identity was difficult to establish in a country as diverse as Canada, and viewed Canada as a complex political association in which cultural, regional, and economic groups were interdependent and each group's success was dependent upon the contribution of all to the partnership (Neatby, *Prism* 6).

When Mackenzie King entered the University of Toronto, he had career inclinations towards the practice of law and the Christian ministry, but a political career was always in the back of his mind. Mackenzie King's life choices would not only be fuelled by

ambition, but also driven by a sense of destiny to complete the reformist work of his grandfather, William Lyon Mackenzie (Dawson 43). The specter of his grandfather would play an immense role in King's life, but its presence began as a gradual arousal of pride as seen in a letter to his parents dated 18 October 1891. Mackenzie King wrote of the positive sensation he felt when showing fellow undergraduate students at the University of Toronto his grandfather's grave, writing "... as if led by instinct I very soon found it. It made me feel proud to see it with all the boys around, although there is no great monument to mark the spot, after all what a great monument is but a cold piece of stone it speaketh not as much as Nature's beautiful green turf and the few white stones that adorn its countenance."

The year 1895 marked an important turn in Mackenzie King's life, as he became more entrenched in political thought in respect to his grandfather by reading Lindsey's *Life and Times of Wm. Lyon Mackenzie*. Politically, Mackenzie King had a growing admiration for Mackenzie for his role in securing a more democratic form of government for Canada and this aspect appealed to Mackenzie King's social reform. His grandfather's legacy also appealed to him because he too felt hatred towards entrenched privilege and his concern for the poor and the oppressed (Dawson 47). Mackenzie King reflected on the similarities between him and his grandfather in his diary 22 June 1895, writing: "I understand perfectly the feeling that prompted his actions. I can feel his inner life in myself." Three years later Mackenzie King also wrote in his diary that his grandfathers' legacy weighed heavily on him and he accepted his destiny for: "His mantle has fallen upon me, and it shall be taken up and worn. His voice, his words shall be heard in Canada again and the cause he so nobly fought shall be carried on." (26 February 1898).

Mackenzie King felt that greatness was his destiny, and he sought out this future for himself by earning several degrees at some of the world's best institutions of higher learning in order to establish a career for himself in which he could carry out his fate.

Mackenzie King is perhaps the most educated Prime Minister that Canada has ever produced. In 1891 Mackenzie King entered the University of Toronto to pursue an undergraduate degree in political economy, and after his graduation continued on to be granted an LL.B. King then went on to continue his studies at the University of Chicago where he earned a Master of Arts, followed by a Doctorate at Harvard University (Stacey 18). Mackenzie King was one of the new breed of intellectuals to be trained in the burgeoning field of social sciences whose reasoning would be profoundly influenced by the rapidly changing intellectual climate of his time. His late Victorian mind was being shaped by the dramatic discoveries in science whose ramifications went beyond the laboratory to impact society at large. Scientific knowledge had led to positive social change: improving physical health by curing diseases, bettering nutrition, and extending life expectancy. But scientific development led Victorians to question their mere existence on a large scale as many of these new discoveries challenged traditional moral and religious beliefs (Kishlansky et al. 770).

One of the more provocative theories was put forward by Charles Darwin in his *On the Origin of Species* (1859) advancing the case for evolution being biological, not God-centered. This and other new belief systems dismantled traditional convictions, giving way to a new hierarchy in which conventional knowledge was constantly changing or expanding. The social sciences paralleled the growth of science as the methodological principles that governed science, such as observation and experimentation, would now be

applied to human interactions (Kishlansky et al. 770). The maturing fields of sociology, economics, history, anthropology, and political science all held the belief that their professions had important benefits to offer society leading to new social experimentation to improve and understand society as a whole. This scientific analysis of social reform is found in Mackenzie King's book *Industry and Humanity* written in 1919 to offer advice on how to resolve labour disputes in a humane manner. Mackenzie King stressed in the book that for the benefit of all society, it was necessary for management and labour to negotiate in good faith and work together towards viable solutions to end social unrest (Conrad & Finkel 229). Mackenzie King's analysis of social regeneration was premised upon arbitration, conciliation, and co-operation in an effort to rejuvenate the individual to transform society into a unified whole (Cook 209).

In *Industry and Humanity*, King stressed that society is an organic whole, but the actions of certain men, nations, and institutions disrupt this unity and unleash chaos upon the world. To King, this unrest was not only manifested in strikes and lockouts but in the greatest calamity of all, world wars. The rise of Germany was due to "the emergence on a national scale of the very forces and influences which produced intransigence and maliciousness in the smaller realm of industrial relations" (Bercuson xiv). Mackenzie King asserts that there would have been no war, as there would be no industrial strife, if humanity had followed the methods of vigorous, impartial, and scientific investigation of grievance and of justice because: "Investigation gives to the worker, where his claims are just, a better chance of redress than striking affords . . . Investigation, if it reveals injustice, is irresistible." (491). Mackenzie King's stance on mediation rather than war tarnished his reputation, leading many to question his potency as a viable leader in times

of conflict. Also adding to this perception was his past association with Sociologist and social reformer Jane Addams, an ardent pacifist who was labeled a traitor in the United States for her anti-war stances during the Great War (Deegan 201).

After Confederation in 1867, the new dominion of Canada faced three main possibilities in terms of its placement in the world: greater unity with Britain, closer economic and political association with the United States, or increased independence. According to historian Carl Berger in *The Sense of Power*, these conflicting views “added up to a struggle between the past and future, the desire to remain a colony, and the wish to be a free nation” (9). All of these choices: imperialism, continentalism, and independence were in their own manner forms of Canadian nationalism, since each was discussed within the context of Canadian interests.

Imperialist thought touted the idea that the Canadian nation should define itself through a nationalism that promoted independence while at the same time remaining loyal to the British crown. Imperialism therefore, became a desire to be an independent nation within the British system of colonies. This belief is reflected in the values typified by the young men who founded the Canada First movement in the years preceding Confederation (Berger, *Sense* 49). When the foremost proponent of this view, D’Arcy McGee, was assassinated in 1868, five men in Ottawa- Henry J. Morgan (civil servant and author), Robert Grant Haliburton (Nova Scotia Coal Owners’ Association Lobbyist), Charles Mair (poet), George Taylor Denison III (militia officer and lawyer), and W.A. Foster (lawyer)- became the nucleus of the Canada First movement. The group and their supporters sought to identify and promote a national spirit within the British Empire

premised upon Canada's superior characteristics developed through living in a rugged Northern climate and their Anglo-Saxon heritage (Conrad & Finkel 158).

Canada Firsters philosophically constructed a Canada nationalism that was initially anti-American, but soon realized the strategic value of Canada as a mediator between the United States and Great Britain. French Canadians and Native peoples were not important groups to the formation of the new nation, in fact they were deterrents to its establishment. Mair, who resided in the Red River colony during the Riel Rebellions in 1869, declared that Canadian development was being held back by the inferiority of the Native population and the medievalism of the French. The Canada Firsters preferred to present Canada as a country peopled by robust Nordic races disciplined by their efforts to survive in a harsh environment, promulgating a unique perspective of Canada being separate and superior to other nations because of its vitality (Berger, *Sense* 52). R.G. Haliburton wrote of this belief in 1869, stating:

Equating the adjective northern with toughness, strength, and hardihood, he argued that the diverse nationalities within Canada all shared a northern ancestry, and that the climate tended to instill and maintain the strenuous attributes of the Nordic races. Because of this racial heritage and their stern environment, Canadians were destined to assume in the new world the dominant role played by the people of northern Europe (Berger, *Sense* 53)

Imperialists believed that their version of Canadian unity would be positive for both Canada and Great Britain. These two countries would share a mutually beneficial relationship as they would each profit from each others strengths. The Dominion of Canada could offer the Empire increased trading possibilities, military assistance, and a common language and cultural values. In return, Canada would receive an elevated status as they envisioned a nation financially prosperous, free from economic depression,

fewer ethnic tensions, and a lessening of American annexation threats. These factors would permit Canada to flourish in a peaceful climate and become the strong nation it was destined to be. By 1875 the Canada First movement had failed to make a great impact on Canadian society and disbanded (Francis et al. 107)

During the 1880s and 1890s Canadian-American relations were a central concern of Canadian politics. The period was characterized by the Liberals, rather than the Conservatives, lobbying for freer trade with the United States in order to establish closer economic ties with the United States. This sentiment may be associated with Canadians feeling part of the North American continent and market, free from the matriarchal governance of Great Britain. Goldwin Smith, a British-born academic who was teaching in Toronto stressed in his 1891 book *Canada and the Canadian Question* that annexation with the United States was the ideal situation for Canada (Berger, *Writing* 128). The border that separated the two nations was artificial, placed there by old quarrels of the past (Cook 101). The removal of the border would consolidate the peoples of North America into one coherent state, establish global power of English speaking peoples, and resolve the nationalist French question. The appeal of continentalism was quite limited as many Canadians, especially in the western and eastern sections of Canada, supported the notion of freer trade, but resisted total absorption into the American sphere.

Independent Canadian nationalism was exemplified in the work of O.D. Skelton. Skelton was a Professor of Political and Economic Science at Queens University who shared King's vision of nationalism, liberalism, and individualism. According to Carl Berger in *The Writing of Canadian History*, Skelton had become acquainted with the Liberal Party and King when he helped King prepare a case for reciprocity in 1911.

Shortly afterwards, he was encouraged to write the autobiography of King's mentor, Wilfrid Laurier. Skelton in *The Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier* (1921) promoted the idea that Laurier was a true nation builder as he would not back down to imperialists, and was continually fighting for Canadian unity (50-51). Skelton and his colleagues at Queen's University (Adam Shortt and William Mackintosh) developed a new social science approach to Canadian economic history which hypothesized that while imperialism and continentalism struggled to define the Canadian nation, a new reality was emerging. In Skelton's opinion "imperialism and continental union were both cancelled by the new national strength derived from contemporary economic expansion." (Ferguson 77). Therefore, Canada was becoming an independent nation due to its economic power without even being conscious of it.

This notion was furthered by Skelton in a speech given at the Canada Club in Ottawa in 1922 with Mackenzie King in the audience. Skelton stressed the notion that economic activity was defining the nation and this financial strength represented Canada's self-sufficient independent national character:

The nation's autonomy was thus a further indication that it had generated something like a national identity based on national self-interest and that identity was economic and political. Just as Canada's economic achievements and prospects led Skelton to argue that its economic identity was secure, so did its political and cultural traits enable him to reach the same conclusion about its political identity. Similarly, the determinants of economic identity were crucial to Canada's political character and interests. These factors together showed that there was indeed a distinctive national interest that was economic, political, material, and social upon which Canadian calculations and policies were based (Ferguson 87)

Skelton, like Mackenzie King, believed that Canada was already an independent nation, but needed to make its citizens cognizant of this reality. Skelton's perspective on

Canadian foreign policy impressed Mackenzie King so much so that in 1923 he invited him to help the Canadian government prepare for the Imperial Conference of the same year, and two years later Skeleton became Under-Secretary of State for External affairs (Berger, *Writing* 52).

Mackenzie King's message of unity and nationalism was often misunderstood, as his style of governance was considered by some to be a sign of weakness. Mackenzie King was also perceived to be a man who had no vision for the nation, as his isolationist policies were viewed as being problematic, making Canada a pawn between the United States and Great Britain. Canadian writer Hugh MacLennan views Mackenzie King in this manner and bases his obnoxious character Huntley McQueen in his classic novel *Two Solitudes* on Mackenzie King. The main character Athanase and his idealistic French nationalism fall prey to the machinations of the immoral McQueen, an Anglophone financier with visions of a trans-Canadian economic empire. Athanase is a Francophone politician who has lost faith in Catholicism and the agrarian ideal; he turns instead to a vision of modified industrialization, hoping his village can modernize without falling entirely under the sway of alien cultures. Athanases's protective nationalism with which he is associated with receives MacLennan's authorial endorsement (Irr 88).

For McQueen, Canadianess is important only so far as it is profitable; in his analysis, Canadians "had definite advantages over the British and Americans, for they could always play the other two off against the others" (93). This opportunistic nationalism recalls Colonel Wain's assertions in the book that Canada is a "second rate" nation, pinned between the United States and the United Kingdom. But, even more powerfully,

the portrait of McQueen recalls a contemporaneous depiction of Mackenzie King. McLennan's McQueen is a wealthy, forty-something, church-going bachelor, tending toward fat and unconsummated romantic friendships with ladies of high society (Irr 88-89). This image of Mackenzie King as a man without a true vision of Canada has dogged his legacy, as his contemporaries and those who came after have misunderstood Mackenzie King's mediator approach to unity as a sign of indecision.

King's perception of Canadian nationalism conforms to Peter Alter's contention that: "The aim of nation-building is to integrate and harmonize socially, regionally, or even politically and institutionally divided sections of people" (21). Mackenzie King viewed Canada's 1867 Confederation as "a voluntary association of diverse cultural, regional, and economic groups" (Neatby, *Prisim* 5) that should live together in unity through the process of compromise. The Canadian nation would differentiate itself from other countries and become unified within its own borders by promoting Canada as a place where cultural plurality was embraced. This policy was openly promoted by Mackenzie King as he stated in a national address on 21 September 1923 that: "to-day we (Canadians) are a united people, seeking first and foremost an enduring unity; not a unity which aims at uniformity, but a unity which delights in diversity" (King, *Message* 103).

The foundation for Mackenzie King's vision of a unified Canada appears to have come into fruition with his year academic year abroad in Europe (1899). It is during this period that Mackenzie King, as an idealistic man in his twenties, realized that there was something missing from his homeland's national life. His *Diaries* from this period tell of his extensive travels around England and of his visiting of important and historically relevant buildings, sites, and museums and commenting on their value. Mackenzie King's

intellectual development was furthered by his contact with professors and students at Oxford University who opened his mind up to new ideals about society. Although the diary entries from this period are mostly itineraries of his activities, one may surmise through his visits and visitors that he has learned much about what defines a nation. This becomes evident with the outbreak of the Boer War in 1899.

In his diaries, Mackenzie King makes it clear that he does not intellectually support the Boer War, but was fascinated by the spirit of the British people as they rallied and paraded in the streets, toasting the recruits and, most of all, Mother Britain. He fretted he would never see such patriotism, spirit, and unity in his own country. He wrote to his parents 1 November 1899, that “something of pride & glory, something, which makes people one...common heirs to the enjoyment of its liberties, its historic past and its present greatness. This sense of national life...Everything is history, nothing dates from today... There is no break with the past and the future is directed by it.”

Mackenzie King strongly believed that the role of the Liberal Party was to unify the country under one common identity, Canadian. This was important to Canada because,

Such a conciliatory and mollifying influence was indispensable in a country like Canada where the bonds of national unity were weak and the centrifugal forces of race, religion, geography, economic interests, etc. were unusually strong; if not held in some restraint, might quite conceivably disrupt the state itself (Dawson 319).

Between the years 1914 and 1939 Canadian society changed at a dramatic pace, leaving the leadership of the nation with numerous challenges. Within this period, Canada had experienced one world war, a major depression, American cultural and economic incursions, the onslaught of a mass consumer economy, and was on the verge of a second world war. While the majority of voters looked to the traditional parties of the Liberals

and Conservatives to meet the diverse and changing needs of the country, many Canadians created and joined new parties to satisfy their specific concerns. Labour and Communist parties emerged out of the perception of inequality of the economic system and growing dissatisfaction with working conditions. Protests from other interest groups spawned new political parties such as the Progressives, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), Social Credit, and the Union Nationale, all ready to challenge the traditional two-party system of the Liberals and Conservatives.

The depression of the 1930s led to rampant unemployment and further regional and class protest. The threat of new parties produced a malaise in Mackenzie King as he viewed them as a source of destruction for uniting the nation. But Mackenzie King would retain his philosophical and political dedication to an independent and united Canada through the Liberal Party which, in his mind, represented all the country.

Mackenzie King strongly stressed that unlike the Farmer and Labour dominated Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and the elitist Conservatives, the Liberal Party was free from class domination and corruption. The Liberals welcomed all Canadians, as long as they ascribed to the belief of unity. The party's openness became a model of social harmony that demonstrated the plausibility of uniting the country as a whole nation. Through electoral victories in every province, the Liberal Party would reach out and "uplift the poor and remind the rich of their noblesse oblige" (Whitaker 47) by representing all Canadians in the government and cabinet. Mackenzie King's concept of the egalitarian political party was philosophically compatible with how he tried to lead the Liberals.

Mackenzie King did not rule the party with an iron will, imposing his beliefs or policies on his party. He instead treated the party as though he was a mediator, stressing that “the party and the cabinet had to be consulted or thoroughly convinced before a policy could be adopted” (Neatby, *Chaos* 75). Neatby also remarks that Mackenzie King often got his way on many policy issues with little convincing, and by the end of the 1920s, his opinion was highly regarded in the party as he had proven himself to be a wise and shrewd politician (8). Consensus was the only way to achieve unity, and Mackenzie King tried to reach out to other parties to demonstrate to them that this form of governance was the only way Canada could remain united.

According to Mackenzie King’s logic, the CCFers were not inherently bad people; their basic beliefs systems were correct but they had been blinded by socialist policies that were premised upon adversarial class struggles. The notion of class struggle threatened national unity by utilizing political power for the benefit of only one group, the labour movement (Neatby, *Prism* 29). Mackenzie King, always the practical tactician when it came to political maneuvering, in the time of political turmoil felt comfortable forming political coalitions with the Progressives and the CCF because they had more politically in common with the Liberals than did his rivals the Conservatives.

In Mackenzie King’s political dialect, Conservatives were people concerned only with maintaining privilege for the elite. Toryism, he wrote in his diary on the 25 April 1915, is the: “maintenance of privilege against all sense of right Privilege is always blind and will never make way for justice save by some force which will overthrow it; that is why I hate Toryism with all my heart”. The Conservative party was also a threat to national

unity through their steadfast devotion to the Union Jack and supporting big business regardless of its damage to the people of Canada and the nation (Neatby, *Prisim* 7)

Mackenzie King's notions about Canadian unity were closely bound to the success of the federal Liberal Party. In his conceptualization of Canada, the Liberal party was the only option for unifying the divided nation. But problematic to King and his Liberals was the social unease that was disrupting Canadian nationalism. King realized that the Great War had offered him and his Liberals a unique opportunity to create a starting point in Canadian history on which to promote his vision of Canada as a unified, yet culturally diverse nation. King wanted the symbolic values expressed by the National War Memorial to be the birth of a common heritage for Canadians, not a divisive one that would imply one group's superiority over another's. The Prime Minister and the Liberal Party were laying the foundation of an "invented tradition" on which nationalism could be built because as Ernest Gellner states in *Thoughts and Change*: "nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness; it invents nations where they do not exist." (169).

Eric Hobsbawm's introduction to *The Invention of Tradition* defines the 'invented tradition' as:

a set of practices normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual, or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past. In fact, where possible, they normally attempt to establish continuity with a suitable historic past (1).

This process of historical reinvention emerged on a large scale during the nineteenth-century when the world was changing at a dramatic pace. The industrial revolution, the growth of cities, the rise of nation-states, and competing ideologies such as Marxism and

Conservatism, displaced historical references and led to the marginalization of traditional customs. In order to create social stability and understanding in their newly emergent cultures, many nations looked to reinvent their past to create historical continuity with their new social reality (Hutton 5).

To Hobsbawm, this method of historical alteration provided people with “imaginary places immune to the process of change, even if its images of stability were themselves, little more than representations of present-minded notions about the past” (Hutton 5). King attempted to establish a ‘foundation myth’ that would see Canadians through the difficult transition from a war-time to peace-time society and economy and realize the sacrifices made by the men and women had a positive outcome for the nation. Out of the horror of war a proud nation emerged which was commended by the world for its valor and spirit. The icon chosen to deliver King’s message of the emergent nation was the image of the Great War soldier, whose bravery and spirit had brought the country together. The soldier was the physical manifestation of: “three hundred years of Canadian history, while his youthful vitality hinted at the immense potential in the coming decade. In short, he was the nation’s past, present, and future, and the embodiment of all its aspirations and potential. The soldier *was* Canada.”¹⁶ (Vance, *Death* 136)

Anthony D. Smith argues in *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* that warfare may be an impetus for the creation of a people, “It remains true however, that with a few exceptions prolonged interstate warfare has crystallized and strengthened an incipient sense of common ethnicity” (40). A belief in the nation-building power of war gives a people a sense of common purpose, and a clear division of the world into “good vs. evil.”

Regardless of ethnic origin, religion, or region the Great War had touched the lives of

many Canadians, changing the way Canadians looked at the world and how it looked at them. Therefore the creation of an origin 'myth' premised upon the unifying experience of war, the role of soldiers in Canadian history, and the international recognition of an independent Canada all coalesced into a logical common heritage reference point on which to build a new vision of Canada. Mackenzie King, however, had a personal problem with such a reference point. As a young, eligible man he had not signed up for active service during the Great War, and this perceived cowardice was to haunt his political career.

According to Jonathan Vance in his Great War study *Death So Noble*, veterans of the Great War had established 'the cult of the service roll' that separated them from the rest of civilian society (136). This 'cult' was a closed society in which comradeship of the trenches had created a distinct society, one that the uninitiated could not comprehend and were excluded from (134). When Mackenzie King ran for public office after the Great War, his non-participation in the war caused him grief with the ex-soldiers. This only worsened with the widely held belief that Mackenzie King was a pacifist.

The accusations were not completely unfounded. In the years prior to the war, Mackenzie King's promising political career had stalled due to the decline in the popularity of the Laurier Liberals in 1911, leading to his defeat in the election of that year. During the years 1911 to 1914 Mackenzie King dabbled in pacifism, "associating himself with the American peace movement, and earning himself a reputation of being Pro-German in some circles" (Vance, *Death* 122). Then in June 1914, the Rockefeller Foundation invited him to New York to discuss various aspects of industrial relations, and was offered a job as head of the Rockefeller foundation's new department of

¹⁶ Emphasis mine.

industrial relations. For the next five years Mackenzie King acted as a labour sharpshooter with some of the largest corporations in the United States on labour-management issues (Vance, *Death* 123). Mackenzie King was to remain a Canadian citizen, and be free to participate in Canadian politics (Dawson 230)

When Mackenzie King returned to reside in Canada full time in 1919, he was elected as Liberal leader, but he could never shake his reputation that he had shirked his duty to serve his nation at the front. Opponents accused Mackenzie King of taking advantage of the situation by earning a great deal of money while working and residing in the United States while his country suffered the injustices of war. On 1 March 1920, debates in the House of Commons demonstrate the pressure the Conservatives were applying to Mackenzie King: Sir George E. Foster (Acting Prime Minister) in response to some of Mackenzie King's sarcastic questioning, asked where the honorable Member had been the last five years: "Where has my honorable friend been living during the time in which Canada has been so very much taken up with external affairs? I observe him sitting opposite me; one honorable gentleman who passed several years and showed his devotion to the cause of Canada and the Empire in foreign fields." (36). Mr. Herbert Mowat of Parkdale added on 2 March 1920 "My honourable friend has not been here regularly. Where has he been during the war? For he seems not to have learned the great lesson of the war that no campaign, no sortie can be successfully carried out unless ample preparation is made." (56). Mr. William Foster Cockshutt of Brantford stated on 3 March 1920:

Because there are yet in the same community of Ontario a very respectable portion of people who measure a man's worth by what he did in the war and by what he said or where he was; and I fear that, measured by that standard when my

friend goes before the people of Canada he will have some very knotty points to clear with regards to himself (99)

Mackenzie King was very sensitive to these accusations and it became a major issue for him to overcome during a by-election he was running for in Prince Edward Island in 1920. Despite the efforts of some of his friends to dissuade him, he insisted on bringing up the matter in the House of Commons on the 20 April 1920, where he gave a full account of his wartime activities. Mackenzie King had already contacted Rockefeller on the 15 September, 1919 by letter announcing that:

My political opponents are seeking to make capital out of the circumstance that during the war, part of my time was spent in the United States, when it should have been spent, in their opinion at the front. I, of course, have always believed that there was no war service I could render in the Army compared to that which I was specially qualified to render in industry.

He asked Rockefeller to write a letter of support for him stating that he had served his country well during the war by helping its industrial relations with other nations.

Mackenzie King also sent this letter to fourteen other business associates he had contact with during this period.

Along with this request for support of his war efforts, Mackenzie King's war service file at the National Archives contains a vast array of documentation chronicling his life during the war. The file holds his national service card with his dismissal from service due to his role as sole financial supporter of the King clan and his age (Mackenzie King was forty when the war began). His detractors were virtually groundless in their attacks on Mackenzie King, as Vance writes: "Throughout this episode, Mackenzie King and his defenders were entirely right. A forty-year-old paunchy academic with no aptitude for things military would have been no asset to the CEF (Canadian Expeditionary Force)"

(*Death*, 124). The file also holds detailed logs cataloging his presence and absences from Canada for the duration of the war. In 1914, he spent only twenty-five days in the United States, in 1915 one hundred sixty-eight, 1916 twenty-nine, 1917 only seven, and in 1918 he spent seventy-nine. According to Mackenzie King's final calculations, in-between the years 1914 through 1918, he spent a total of 308 days in the United States and 765 days in Canada, therefore spending 72 per cent of his time in Canada.

Mackenzie King, when addressing the House, gave a full account of his whereabouts during the war. He pointed out that he had never relinquished his Ottawa residence at the Roxborough and that his absences from Canada were never of long duration. He explained that his association with the Rockefeller foundation was patriotic as he was aiding the Canadian war effort through "promoting better relations between labour and capital and had materially helped the Allied cause by increasing the production of war materials in vital industries." To substantiate these claims he produced letters from the heads of such companies as Bethlehem Steel and General Electric who spoke of his wartime activities with praise. He concluded his speech by stating that he was in his fortieth year when the war broke out and that he had family responsibilities to take care of:

As I look back upon those years of the war, so full of poignant suffering for the whole of mankind, I cannot but experience a sense of gratitude, that in that ordeal it was given to me to share in so intimate a way the sufferings of others, and, with it all, so large a measure of opportunity to do my duty, as God gave it to me to see my duty, at that time.

While Mackenzie King had his detractors, he also was protected by his supporters, as seen in John Lewis' *Mackenzie King: The Man, His Achievements* in which he lists the important things Mackenzie King had done for the war effort. He noted that Mackenzie

King had remained in Canada and retained an association with Canadian politics, as well as the importance of his work in labour relations in supporting the Canadian war effort. He noted and his heavy family responsibilities (54). Mackenzie King's own campaign literature from 1940, a short pamphlet entitled *Who is this Man King?* defended Mackenzie King's war record by stating: "From 1914 to 1917 and subsequently he rendered extensive service in furthering continuous and maximum production of essential war supplies through the adjustment of relations between workers and employers in several of the most important war industries on this continent." (5)

Mackenzie King's attempts at rectifying his reputation as a man who fulfilled his duty to his family and his nation were quite extensive, and the accusations seemed to have caused Mackenzie King much personal distress. While Jonathan Vance concludes that King was so damaged by this episode that he attempted to "secure documentary evidence that he had played a leading role in the creation of the Vimy Ridge monument. . . . It suggests Mackenzie King's desire to remove the perceived stain of failing to enlist" (*Death*, 68). Vance, does not, however, extend this characterization to include Mackenzie King's participation in the establishment of the National War Memorial. While the commemorative monument at Vimy is elaborate in its physicality and grandeur, it stands as a tribute to the war dead only, a testament to sacrifice. The National War Memorial is also an attempt by Mackenzie King to promote his dedication to the war effort, as well as Mackenzie King's message for the resident or visitor to the capital city that Canada is a nation.

While King was studying in England (1899), he was profoundly shaped by late Victorian attitudes towards social reforms and society. Ken Hillis in his article "A Story

of Commissions: Threads of an Ottawa Planning History” writes that King’s archival papers demonstrate his awareness of town planning and its aims. A file in the *King Papers* at the National Archives of Canada entitled “Town Planning” contains a profusely annotated copy of “The Garden Cities of England” by F.C. Howe and a response to King’s enquiry about attending the 1913 Summer School of Planning at Hamstead Garden Suburb (56). King was well versed with the garden city movement as he makes it part of his plan of social reform in *Industry and Humanity* in which he stresses that town planning was an important component of the overall program of change:

Town-planning and rural planning and development were almost unthought-of a generation ago. To-day they are subjects of scientific study, and compel the recognition of Government. It is to be hoped that ere long public opinion will no more tolerate the slum and the overcrowded tenement than it would tolerate plagues such as were prevalent a generation ago.

The garden city movement was founded in England in 1899, and has spread to different countries throughout the world. It recognizes the slum as the product of bad means of transit and high land values, combined with the necessity of men living near their work (359)

King often equated city planning with social reform, believing one’s environment greatly influenced how one felt about the world and one’s self. How the capital of Ottawa expressed its civic message was always a concern for King as he was aware that: “every capital city express(es) power and promote(s) national identity through the design and construction of government buildings and capital district.” (Vale 55)

When King arrived in Ottawa on 24 July 1900 it was a much undeveloped capital in way of aesthetics and symbolism. He wrote in his diary: “The first glimpse of the city was from the lately fire swept district and it was gloomy enough. The business part of the town is small & like that of a provincial town, not interesting but tiresome.... I will miss greatly the University society and the pleasant surroundings of Cambridge. Ottawa

is not a pretty place save about the princely bldgs” Ottawa was a lumber town “chosen” by Queen Victoria as capital of the united Province of Canada in 1858, after the seat of government had shifted among Kingston, Montreal, Toronto, and Québec City. There were many good logistical reasons for situating the capital at Ottawa: its centrality to Upper and Lower Canada, the encouragement of trade via the Rideau Canal and the Ottawa River which also provided facilitation of military movement in case of aggression from the United States.

Most pressingly however, the selection of Ottawa as the capital would further offset the jealous rivalries among competing cities, which caused friction in the newly united Province (Bellamy 433). Governor General Sir Edmund Head suggested to Queen Victoria that Ottawa be the capital because of the aforementioned factors despite the city’s small population of approximately 10,000 people. Ottawa’s physical condition was also a deterrent, as it was inferior relative to other cities, leading the Governor General to point out to the Queen that the lack of built environment in the area was changing everyday as the population expanded and businesses developed. Beautiful sketches made by Lady Head of the different scenes of Ottawa over the summer of 1857 supported this contention (Gordon, *Planning* 5-6). Queen Victoria made her decision public on 31 December 1857, stating that Ottawa was to be the new capital. (Bellamy 435)

With the arrival of a new Governor General, Lord Aberdeen, and his wife Lady Ishbel Gordon, in the spring of 1893 came the impetus for a revitalization movement for the beautification of Ottawa. Lady Aberdeen, disappointed with the city’s lack of sophistication, recruited her friend Prime Minister Laurier to help her implement a plan to beautify the city. Laurier was in full agreement that the capital was in need of major

alterations and presented this view in a speech in which he laid out his intentions to make Ottawa the “Washington of the North.” (Gordon, *Planning* 10). He and Finance Minister W.S. Fielding acted upon Lady Aberdeen’s plan of creating an improvement commission (similar to that of Washington D.C) on August 11 1899. The newly established commission was named the Ottawa Improvement Commission (OIC) with a budget of \$60,000 per year and reported to the Minister of Finance. According to David Gordon,

The OIC cleared the west bank of the Rideau Canal and built a parkway that improved the view when entering the capital by train. Parks for recreation were built and enlarged along the Rideau and Ottawa rivers, and landscaping projects of parks began. It also improved the downtown avenue and built two bridges across the Rideau River to provide a circuitous route connecting the governor general’s residence to Parliament Hill (*Planning* 10-11).

Many new arrivals to the city of Ottawa came from the British Isles and brought with them new ideals about urban design and city planning. One of the most influential of these approaches was Ebenezer Howard’s Garden City movement which had begun as a social protest to the squalid living conditions of some British neighbourhood’s (Bellamy 440).

When Earl Grey became governor general of Canada in 1904, he brought along with him a penchant for Howard’s garden city movement and became quite involved with altering Ottawa’s urban landscape. The Garden City movement, originating in Ebenezer Howard’s book *Tomorrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (1898) greatly influenced many reform- minded people as an approach to city planning. Howard was primarily concerned with the destruction and waste he saw in London and other industrial cities and argued for more humane methods of city planning. The Garden City favoured new

communities of manageable size, in which rural and urban worlds would be brought together in happy synthesis. Howard was much influenced by the moral strain of socialist criticism that descended from William Morris and John Ruskin. Ruskin profoundly changed the face of Britain with his architectural treatise *The Stones of Venice* and writing in 1865 of city planning in *Sesame and Lilies* of his preference for: “clean streets with free countryside all around; a belt of fine gardens and orchards, so that from every point in the city one can reach the pure air, the grass and the distant horizon.” (56).

Changing a person’s environment was the goal of the women and men who founded the English garden city movement but they “conjured their vision of the future from a mythic past, constructing a green and pleasant heaven to replace an ugly and unhealthy urban hell” (Meacham 1). But as they faithfully followed Howard’s ideal and made the garden city their ultimate goal for social salvation, their fear of what may lie ahead for British society led them to attempt to re-create a non-existent conservative English past based upon a utopian vision of country living (Meachum 2). The propagandization of this sanitized past is referred to by Meachum as the promotion of ‘Englishness’, with Englishness in the garden city context being “a myth in that it obscures or ignores whatever does not respond to present need” (Meachum 3). Englishness, both within and beyond the garden city movement, partook of anti-urban sentiment. Virtuous living was associated with humble country ways, folksy country things, and soft, rolling countryside (Meachum 5). The transference of this pastoral environment to the urban reality led many advocates of the garden city movement to believe that their re-created communities would be conducive to moral and physical regeneration of the people and by extension, the nation (Meachum 67). Mackenzie King carries on this vulgarization of the past by

stressing that the garden city was a holistic community, in which the occupants would work in common for the mutual goal of health, happiness, and longevity:

In effect its own landlord. Indirectly it is a house builder and a house owner. The garden city, whether promoted by cities, co-operatives companies, or private individuals, and whether it be a self-contained industrial community, a garden suburb, to a factory village built about a manufacturing plant, is a community intelligently planned and with the emphasis always on the rights of the community rather than the rights of the individual property owner. The aim of the garden city is to bring dividends in human health and happiness as well as a return on property investment. It has plenty of places for rest, recreation, and play. Building restrictions are imposed, and the conditions of employees due to better homes and the open air, yield a return that pays for investment (King, *Industry* 231)

Mackenzie King was to transfer many of the objectives he learnt from the garden city movement into his public life. While his dream of a garden city plan for the city of Ottawa never materialized, he did, however, use the utopian dream of an idyllic, mythologized rural past to formulate a vision of what the Canadian nation should be.

Mackenzie King had learned much from his travels in Europe; one of these lessons was the social value associated with public art. Public art could influence people's belief systems, and create a new way of thinking about the nation. Realizing the power of sculptural art, Mackenzie King erected a statue in honour of his mentor, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Upon the unveiling of this statue on 3 August 1927 by the Prince of Wales, Mackenzie King announced: "Laurier was, first and foremost, a great Canadian. I do not, I trust, take from the greatness of other lives . . . when I say that of all the personalities in our history, his was the most distinctly Canadian. It embodied much of Canada's past as well as of its present. It spoke to us of the two great races that have shaped our destiny, and of a broad toleration in religious faiths." (King, *Message* 48).

When King returned to Ottawa in 1900 to begin his job as editor of the liberal monthly publication, the *Liberal Gazette*, he rekindled a friendship with a man he knew at the University of Toronto, Albert (Bert) Harper. They were to become very close friends and shared a residence together in downtown Ottawa. When they were not together, they would send correspondence back and forth so as not to lose touch. But in December, 1901, King suffered the loss of his closest friend as Harper was drowned in the Ottawa River in an effort to save the life of Miss Bessie Blair. Miss Blair and a companion had skated onto a patch of melted ice surfacing fast flowing water, and fell through the ice. Reports stated that although any attempt to rescue the girls would be dangerous and perilous, Harper heroically plunged into the river to make the attempt to save the girls. Miss Blair's companion was saved, while she and Bert Harper both perished (Granatstein, *King* 54).

The place that Harper held in Mackenzie King's affections was never again filled. King did much in subsequent years to cultivate what may be referred to as the Harper legend: the noble, unselfish, and idealistic man whose great promise was stifled by a sacrificial death. This glorification of Harper was to make a great impression on Ottawa society as a few days after the tragedy a public meeting decided to erect a monument in his memory, and took the form of a bronze *Sir Galahad* on Wellington Street. It was unveiled in 1905 by Governor General Earl Grey, and accepted by Sir Wilfrid Laurier on behalf of the Government of Canada (Dawson 130-131).

In 1906 Mackenzie King published a little volume entitled *The Secret of Heroism*, an appreciation of Harper's life and character, illuminated by extensive extracts from Harper's diary and correspondence. Mackenzie King's purpose was not just to pay a

tribute to Harper's memory, but also to present a study in character that might afford the same kind of inspiration which he as a student had derived from the character of Arnold Toynbee. He summarized the type of man Harper was in the opening of the book by stating:

The quality of a man's love will determine the nature of his deeds; occasion may present the opportunity, but character alone will record the experience. To a life given over to the pursuit of the beautiful and true, the immortal hour only comes when conduct at last rises to the level of aim, and the fulfillment in the realm of the actual. "Greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life for his friends" (21)

Mackenzie King also prints a letter Bert Harper wrote to him, in which Harper raves about Mackenzie King (or Rex) that his "strength lies in the fact that what you seek is fairness, truth and justice, as well as the promotion of industrial peace and the country's welfare." (152). His intention to inspire the public may be surmised from two letters found in Mackenzie King's correspondence. In the first letter, Glenn Stanford, an unpublished writer, wrote to Mackenzie King asking him how to find success in life, as he felt that his career was going nowhere. Mackenzie King wrote back, sending the man a copy of *The Secret of Heroism*, with a note stating "(the book) indicated his views concerning the underlying principles that lead to success." In a letter written to B.K. Sandwell thirteen years after the book's original publication, Mackenzie King wrote of the book:

I believed that the revelations of (Harper's) spirit through letters and papers in my possession might serve as a like inspiration to younger men, especially as his heroic sacrifice of self had appealed so strongly to the public imagination. This was my motive for writing the book. It is perhaps as much an expression of my own convictions on some of the fundamental things of life as it is of Harper's character and aims." (22 August 1919)

The importance of the Harper memorial was stated by Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier in a speech given at the unveiling, “The stranger to our city will pause as he passes the monument and wonder what deed called for this erection. He will be told of the noble act of sacrifice- of a life given in effort to save another . . . (citizens and government) shall look, upon this memorial as a national monument in every sense of the word” (King, *Secret* 16).

It can be argued that it was Mackenzie King’s sense of destiny that shaped the erection of the National War Memorial. It is clear that Mackenzie King’s experiences in Europe with city planning and the value of national created landscapes had shaped his views of how the capital of Ottawa should express itself to the everyday citizen and visitor alike. He fully understood the value of sculptural art over that of the painted arts and perhaps over buildings, as the former was a more progressive medium, which served a greater didactic purpose by reaching a larger audience. The Bert Harper monument and that of Wilfrid Laurier began the narrative of commemoration for Mackenzie King, expressing the values he saw in Canadians: unity and bravery. These values were soon translated to the National War Memorial where the Mackenzie King was allowed to fully express his interpretation of Canadian society.

Conclusion

The National War Memorial stands as the first federal attempt on Canadian soil to commemorate a national event that touched the lives of Canadians. Initially erected by Prime Minister Mackenzie King and his Liberal government as a tribute to Canadians who sacrificed their lives in the Great War, the monument's symbolic meaning appears to have evolved into a conflation of remembrance, national meaning, and personal ambition. Historical evidence points to the possibility of Mackenzie King manipulating history, past and present, to create a visual legacy which would unite the nation, and propagate his interpretation of history. It appears that the layered messages embodied in the memorial have not been successfully communicated, leading to the monument being perceived of as a military commemoration. This interpretation of the monument has negated Mackenzie King's influential participation in the National War Memorial and his role in shaping Canadian consciousness.

With the addition of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the monument's military symbolism has only been reinforced, propagating the traditional view of the monument expressed by Jonathan Vance, Robert Shipley, and Col. John Gardam. The Tomb emphasizes the harsh reality of war, graphically demonstrating the fate of many of the brave volunteers who sacrificed themselves for Peace and Freedom. The Tomb's presence creates a more introspective, not shared remembrance. King's message of unity and the study of history have become lost in this narrower interpretation.

Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread Of Nationalism*. (Revised ed.). New York: Verso Press, 1991.
- Aries, Philippe. *L'Homme devant la mort*. Trans. Patricia Ranum. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Assessors of the National War Memorial. Letter to J.B. Hunter. 18 January 1926. Department of Public Works, RG 11, Vol.4004, National Archives of Canada.
- Bellamy, Rhonda. "The Architecture of Government." *Construire une capitale Ottawa/ Making a Capital*. Eds. Jeff Keshen and Nicole St-Onge. Ottawa: University Of Ottawa Press, 2000. pp. 433-466.
- Berger, Carl. *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism 1867-1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.
- Berger, Carl. *The Writing of Canadian History*. 2nd. Ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.
- Bondar, John. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism In the Twentieth-Century*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Board of Trade of the City of Ottawa. Letter to William Lyon Mackenzie King. 27 February 1925. Department of Public Works, RG 11, Vol.4004, National Archives of Canada.
- Boyanoski, Christine. *Loring and Wyle: Sculptors' Legacy*. Toronto: Art Gallery of Ontario, 1987.
- Brown, J. Sutherland. Letter to Department of Public Works. 1 December 1928. Department of Public Works, RG 11, Vol.4004, National Archives of Canada.
- Canada. Department of Public Works. *Conditions of Open Competition for the Selection of A Design for a National Commemorative War Monument*. 12 February, 1925.

Canada. Department of Public Works. *Verbal Descriptions of Finalists for the National War Memorial*. National Archives of Canada, RG 11, Vol. 4004, file 9238-1-A.

Cook, Ramsay. *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in late Victorian English Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

Davis, Angela. *No Man's Land: The Battlefield Paintings of Mary Riter Hamilton*. Winnipeg: University of Winnipeg Gallery, 1989.

Dawson, Macgregor R. *William Lyon Mackenzie King- A Political Biography 1874-1923*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Deegan, Mary Jo. *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892-1918*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, 1988.

Donegan, Rosemary. *Industrial Images*. Hamilton. On: Art Gallery of Hamilton, 1988.

DeGrace, William. "Canada's Capital 1900-1950: Five Town Planning Visions." *Environments*. Vol.17, No.2, 1985. pp. 43-57.

Dominion of Canada. *Official Report of the Debates of the House of Commons*. Second Session- Thirteenth Parliament. 9-10 George V, 1919. Vol. CXXXVI. Ottawa: J. De Labroquerie-Tache Printer of the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1919. 27 May, 2872.

---. *Official Report of the House of Commons*. Fourth Session- Thirteenth Parliament, 10-11 George V, 1920. Vol. CXLI. Ottawa: J. De Labroquerie-Tache, Printer of the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1920. 1 March, 36.

---. *Ibid.* 2 March, 56.

---. *Ibid.* 3 March, 99.

---. *Ibid.* 20 April, 1416.

---. *Ibid.* 8 June, 3228.

---. *Official Report of the House of Commons*. Second Session- Fourteenth Parliament, 13-14 George V, 1923. Vol. CLV. Ottawa: F.A. Acland, Printer of the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1923. 9 March, 1021.

---. *Ibid.* 11 May, 2685.

---. *Ibid.* 11 May, 2686.

---. *Ibid.* 11 May, 2687.

---. *Ibid.* 11 May, 2689.

---. *Official Report of the House of Commons*. Fifth Session- Seventeenth Parliament, 24-25 George V, 1934. Vol. I, 1934. Ottawa: J.O. Patenaude, Printer of the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1934. 23 February, 864-866.

Finkel, Alvin & Margaret Conrad. *History of the Canadian Peoples, 1867 to the Present*. Vol.II. Toronto: Copp Clark Ltd., 1998.

Ferguson, Barry. *Remaking Liberalism: Intellectual Legacy of Adam Short, O.D. Skelton, W.C. Clark, & W.A. Mackintosh, 1890-1925*. Montreal: McGill- Queens Press, 1993.

Francis, Douglas R., Richard Jones, and Donald B. Smith. *Destinies: Canadian History Since Confederation*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart & Wilson, 1988.

Frisen, Jean. "Introduction: Heritage Futures" *Prairie Forum*, Vol. 22, No.1. Spring, 1997. pp. 193-198.

Gardam, John. *The National War Memorial/ Le mémorial national de guerre*. Canada: Veterans Affairs, 1982.

Gellner, Ernest. *Thought and Change*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1964.

Gordon, David. "From Noblesse Oblige to Nationalism: Elite Involvement In Planning Canada's Capital." *Journal of Urban History*. Nov. 2001, Vol.28, No.1. pp. 3-34.

Gordon, David. "Weaving a Modern Plan for Canada's Capital: Jacques Gréber and The 1950 Plan for the National Capital Region." *Urban History review/ Revue D'histoire urbaine*. Vol. XXIX, No. 2. March 2001. pp. 43-61.

Granatstein, J.L., Mackenzie King: *His Life and World*. Ed. W. Kaye Lamb. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1977.

Granatstein, J.L., *Who Killed Canadian History?* Toronto: A Phyllis Bruce Book- Harper Collins Publishing, 1998.

Griffiths, Nan, "In Search of Confederation Square." *Metropolitan Mutations: The Architecture of Emerging Public Spaces*. Royal Architectural Institute of Canadian Architects: Little, Brown & Co., 1983.

Greber, Jacques. *Plan for the National Capital, Canada 1950: General report submitted To the national Planning Committee*. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1950.

Globe. Toronto, ON. 4 October, 1899, p.1.

Hill, Charles C. *The Group of Seven: Art For A Nation*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1995.

Hill, H.P. Letter to William Lyon Mackenzie King. No date. Department of Public Works, RG 11, Vol. 4004, National Archives of Canada.

Hillis, Ken. "A History of Commissions: Threads of an Ottawa Planning History." *Urban History Review/Revue d'histoire urbaine*. Vol. XXI, No. 1. October, 1992. pp. 46-60.

Hobsbawm, Eric and Terrence Ranger (eds.) *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Hussey, Christopher. *Tait Mackenzie: A Sculptor of Youth*. London: Country Life Ltd, 1929.

Hutton, Patrick H. *History as an Art of Memory*. Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1993.

Irr, Caren. *The Suburb of Dissent: Cultural Politics in the U.S. and Canada During the 1930s*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.

Johnson, Nuala. "Cast in stone: monuments, geography, and nationalism." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 1995. Vol. 13, pp. 51-65.

King, William Lyon Mackenzie. *The King Papers*. MG 26 J13 (Diary). National Archives of Canada. 22 June 1895.

---. *Ibid.* 26 February 1898.

---. *Ibid.* 24 July 1900.

---. *Ibid.* 25 April 1915.

---. *Ibid.* 12 August 1937.

---. *Ibid.* 13 August 1937.

---. *Industry and Humanity*. Ed. Michael Bliss. Introduction by David Jay Bercuson. Toronto: University of Toronto

Press, 1973.

- . Letter to J.B. Hunter. 18 July 1923. *The King Papers*. MG 26 J4 (Memoranda and Notes). National Archives of Canada.
- . *Ibid.* 8 December 1924.
- . *Ibid.* 22 January 1926.
- . Letter to Isabel and John King. 18 October 1891. *The King Papers*. MG 26 J4 (Memoranda and Notes). National Archives of Canada.
- . Letter to Isabel and John King. 1 November 1899. *The King Papers*. MG 26 J4 (Memoranda and Notes). National Archives of Canada.
- . Letter to B.K Sandwell. 22 August 1919. *The King Papers*. MG 26 J4 (Memoranda and Notes). National Archives of Canada.
- . Letter to Rockefeller. 15 September 1919. *The King Papers*. MG 26 J4 (Memoranda and Notes). National Archives of Canada.
- . *Message of the Carillon And Other Addresses*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1927.
- . Military Records. *The King Papers*. MG 26 J4 (Memoranda and Notes). Vol. 124, file 136.
- . *The Secret of Heroism*. Toronto: Thomas Allen, 1919.
- Kishlansky, Mark, Patrick Geary, & Patricia O'Brien. *Civilization in the West*. 2nd. Ed. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1995.
- Lancetot, Gustave. "The King and Queen Visit Their Kingdom of Canada." *Canadian Geographer Magazine*. Vol. XIX, No. 1. July, 1939. pp. 3-83.
- Lewis, Bernard. *History- Remembered, Recovered, Invented*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University, 1975.
- Lewis, John. *Mackenzie King: The Man, His Achievements*. Toronto: Morang, 1925.
- Liberal Party of Canada. *Who Is This Man King?*, 1940.
- Lowenthal, David. *Possessed By The Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. New York: The Free Press, 1996.
- Macleans Magazine*. "Historians Rank the Best and Worst Canadian Prime Ministers."

April 21, 1997. pp. 34-38.

MacLennon, Hugh. *Two Solitudes*. Toronto: Collins Press, 1945.

March, Vernon. Letter to J.B Hunter. 31 December 1928. Department of Public Works, RG 11, Vol. 4004, National Archives of Canada.

Maroney, Paul. "Lest We Forget: War and Meaning in English Canada, 1885-1914." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadiennes*. Hiver 1998 Winter Vol. 32, No. 4. pp. 108-124.

Martin, David F. *Sculpture and Enlivened Space: Aesthetics and History*. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1966.

Mayo, James. *War Memorials as Political Landscape: The American Experience and Beyond*. New York: Praeger, 1988.

Mckillop, A.B. "Who Killed Canadian History? A View from the Trenches." *The Canadian Historical Review*. June 1999. Vol. LXXX, No. 2. pp. 269-299.

Meachum, Standish. *Regaining Paradise: Englishness and the Early Garden City Movement*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Miller, Carmen. *Painting the Map Red: Canada and the South African War 1899-1902*. Montreal: Canadian War Museum, 1993.

Morton, Desmond. "Canada's First Expeditionary Force: The Canadian Contingent in South Africa, 1899-1900." *Canadian Military History*. Ed. Marc Milner, 1998.

Neatby, Blair H. *The Politics of Chaos: Canada in the Thirties*. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd., 1986.

Neatby, Blair H. *William Lyon Mackenzie King: Prism of Unity 1932-1939*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Osborne, Brian. "Constructing Landscapes of Power: The George Etienne Cartier Monument." *Journal of Historical Geography*. Vol. 24, No. 4 (1998), pp. 431-458.

Ottawa Citizen. 5 January 1925. *King's Response*. Department of Public Works. RG 11, Vol. 4004, file 9238-1-A. National Archives of Canada.

Ottawa Citizen. 1 February 1926. *The King Papers*. MG 26 J2 (PMO Correspondence). Vol.47, Arc-114, file 21989. National Archives of Canada.

- Ottawa Citizen*. 10 October 1938. "King Likely to Unveil War Monument."
The King Papers. MG 26 J4 (Memoranda and Notes). Vol. 227, file 2179.
- Plumridge, Lt. Col. John., *Hospital Ships and Ambulance Trains*. London: Seeley, Service & Co., 1975.
- Ruskin, John. *Sesame and Lilies, Two Lectures*. Michigan: Scholarly Press, 1972.
- Savage, Kirk. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth Century America*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Shipley, Robert. *To Mark Our Place: A History of Canadian War Memorials*. Toronto: NC Press, 1987.
- Sproatt, Henry. Letter to J.B. Hunter. 4 December 1925. Department of Public Works, RG 11, Vol. 4004, National Archives of Canada.
- Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. New York: Basil-Blackwell, 1986.
- Stacey, C.P., *A Very Double Life: The Private Life of Mackenzie King*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1976.
- Stokstad, Marilyn. *Art History*. New York: H.N Abrams, 1995.
- Tippett, Maria. *Art at the Service of War: Canada, Art, and the Great War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.
- Tippett, Maria. "Expressing Identity." *The Beaver*. February/ March, 2000, Vol. 80:1, pp.18-27.
- Tippett, Maria. *Making Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Tippett, Maria. *Stormy Weather, F.H. Varley: A Biography*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1998.
- Tunsbridge, J.E. & G.J. Ashworth. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past As a Resource in Conflict*. J. Wiley: Chichester, N.Y., 1996.
- Vale, Lawrence J. *Architecture, Power, and National Identity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Vance, Jonathan. *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning and the first World War*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997..

Vance, Jonathan. "Aftermath" *The Beaver*. October/ November, 2000, Vol. 80:5, pp. 22-27.

Whitaker, Reginald. "Political Thought and Political Action of Mackenzie King." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études Canadiennes*. Vol. 13, No.4, (Winter 1978-79). Pp.40-60.

Young, Alan R. "We Throw the Torch: Canadian Memorials of the Great War and the Mythology of Heroic Sacrifice." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études Canadiennes*. Vol. 24, No. 4, (Hiver 1989-90 Winter). pp. 5-23.