Enchanted Owl -
Kenojuak Ashevak

Minerva: An Undergraduate History Journal

A curated collection of the strongest fourth-year papers from the Reading or Research seminars from History Department.

Pandemic Edition 2

This is the seventh year of our journal celebrating the best essays from our fourth-year capstone seminars. These seminars are a form of learner-centered instruction in which students take responsibility for crafting a topic and researching their major papers, thereby empowering themselves through independent study. They hone their skills of oral and written expression by sharing ideas and writing with other seminar participants. The instructors guide students in their exploration of historiography in the fall and in their research in primary documents in the winter. These courses promote discussion of historical literature and research on specific historical periods and themes.

All History majors must complete at least one reading/research combination seminar; students in the Research Specialization Option take two reading/research seminars. These classes are relatively small and have a maximum size of 15 students. This year, students had to complete their work in unprecedentedly difficult conditions as they struggled to find resources and faced the anxiety of a developing pandemic. All of their classwork was held via zoom and virtual meetings. Library resources were unstable at best, and as the pandemic evolved, they had to be increasingly creative about finding both primary and secondary resources. The success of these papers is a tribute to the students published, and emblematic of the resiliency of our history majors. And we congratulate all our graduates this year who truly understood why it is not always best to live in "interesting times."[1]

These papers represent the best of those research papers; only one paper per class can be nominated, and not all classes had an essay nominated.

Congratulations to all our authors.

---

[1] This expression itself has a fascinating history. It is an English expression that was widely attributed to be a "Chinese curse." This is apocryphal. The earliest written example of the phrase is from a memoir written by the British Ambassador to China in the 1930s. Hughe Knatchbull-Hugessen, *Diplomat in Peace and War* (London: John Murray, 1949), p. ix.

Table of Contents

Owl Bottle, Peruvian,
9th-4thC C BCE

Megan Hamilton, "Writing the History of the Dieppe Raid: Historical Liaison and its Influences"

The historiography of Canadians in the Second World War was largely shaped by the work of official historian Charles P. Stacey. However, Stacey's ability to produce the early histories of the war was inhibited by a lack of access to important archival material guarded by the British Cabinet Office.[1]

Until late 1947, the British Cabinet Office was generous in allowing Canadian historians access to their archives in London. However, in early 1948 the British began to place heavier restrictions on the material deemed above "military level," or private to the British government.[2] This was problematic for the Canadian historians, as some of that material directly related to the employment of the Canadian Army during the war. This struggle for access lasted until 1950 and forced diplomatic manoeuvring between the two governments. The 1948 tightening of access demonstrates a reluctance by the British government to release uncensored records produced during wartime. The tightening of control increased the difficulty of the Canadian Army Historical Section research process.

Stacey's histories of the 19 August 1942 Dieppe Raid provide a case study to examine his sometimes-tumultuous relationship with the British Cabinet Office. This event was one in particular that Canadian historians struggled with. The Raid lasted only a few hours on the morning of 19 August, but resulted in fifty-five percent of the 4,963 Canadian troops becoming casualties.[3] It was a devastating outcome for the first combat the Canadian Army experienced against Hitler's forces in France.

This paper examines historical liaison between Canada and Britain, and its influence on the piecing together of the Dieppe narrative. The later historiography was shaped by the narratives Stacey produced. Consequently, the restrictive attitudes held by the British in the late 1940s impeded future historians from reaching a consensus on the Raid's planning and execution. Using recently released correspondence files from the Department of National Defence, it is clear that the writing of Canada's official histories of the Second World War were bogged down by the secretive temperament of the British Cabinet Office. These records form the basis of the following analysis.

In order to understand this topic properly, one must be introduced to Canada's most influential military historian, Charles P. Stacey. Born in Toronto in 1906, Stacey received a bachelor's degree from the University of Toronto. He then traveled to Britain for another bachelor's degree at the University of Oxford, which he completed at the age of twenty-three. Stacey was a keen historian and decided to pursue a doctoral degree at Princeton University. He graduated in 1933, and then stayed at Princeton as an instructor until 1939 when he was appointed to the position of assistant professor.[4] Stacey's dissertation focused on American, British, and Canadian military affiliations in the 1840s-1860s, and was published in 1936. It was well received, and two years later he began to write on current Canadian military affairs.[5]

---

1 The author is indebted to Dr. Roger Sarty for the primary sources he provided, as well as the ideas and research he shared.

2 "Notes of a Meeting Held in the East Block, 1600hrs, Thursday, 29 January 1948, Between Representatives of the Department of External Affairs and Historical Section, A.H.Q," 29 January 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, Library and Archives Canada [LAC], Record Group 24 [RG 24], box 31893.

3 C.P. Stacey, *Official History of the Canadian Army in the Second World War, Volume I, Six Years of War: The Army in Canada, Britain and the Pacific* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1955), 384-385.

4 C.P. Stacey, *A Date With History: Memoirs of a Canadian Historian* (Ottawa: Deneau, 1982), chapters 1-4.

5 Roger Sarty, "Writing the Official History of the Canadian Army in Normandy," (unpublished): 3.

Stacey also had an interest in the active military. He joined the University of Toronto's Canadian Officers Training Corps in his first year, and then joined the actual militia the following year.[6] When the war broke out in 1939, Stacey continually wrote to his old militia asking if they needed him, to which they replied in the negative. However, Stacey received a much more unique offer in October 1940 from Chief of the General Staff, Major-General Harry Crerar – as the Historical Officer of the General Staff, Canadian Military Headquarters (CMHQ) in London, with the rank of major.[7] Stacey eagerly accepted and was brought back to Ottawa for training under the director of the Army Historical Section in Canada, Colonel Archer Fortescue Duguid. Duguid's reputation stemmed from being the official historian of the Canadians in the First World War. However, it had been twenty years since he started the project, and he had only published one volume in two parts on the first year of the war. Stacey knew that he could not make the same mistake, and Crerar emphasized this.[8] Stacey headed to England in December 1940 with the mission of gathering material for the unnamed future official historian. He was committed to the project and took it seriously.

Stacey started this project on his own, but was able to convince his superiors of his need for a small staff in 1942 after the Dieppe Raid took place. His team of historians grew as the Canadian Army saw an increasing amount of action in the later years. Two Field Historical Sections were formed in 1944, with one heading to Italy and the other for northwestern Europe. In his effort not to repeat the delayed start in writing that had so slowed Duguid's work, Stacey followed the British method of drafting detailed 'narratives' from the raw records throughout the war; from these well-organized accounts work could quickly begin on published volumes after the end of hostilities.[9]

Stacey was able to gain momentum in September 1945 when he took over Duguid's position as director of the Army Historical Section. While the CMHQ remained in London until 30 September 1947, Stacey spent his first year as director traveling between London and Ottawa.[10] The goal of the Canadian Historical Section was to publish a one volume summary as quickly as possible, which required direct access to the available documents in London.[11] Stacey was able to publish the summary volume in 1948, titled: *The Canadian Army, 1939-1945: An Official Historical Summary*. Canada's history program was almost completely shut down at that point, due to large budget cuts. However, it was the influences of Stacey and the under-secretary of state for External Affairs, Lester B. Pearson, that were able to save the Army's history from the same cancellation that the histories of the navy and air force faced.[12] The next project was a detailed three-volume series of the Canadian Army, which required much more work. The series faced a number of delays, and was therefore not published until 1955, 1956, and 1960. Nonetheless, these books were a great achievement. They were narrative and chronological, aiming for a general reading level that would be accessible to the public.[13] Stacey finally retired from the military in 1959 and headed back to the University of Toronto to teach.[14] This prominent Canadian historian passed away on 17 November 1989.

---

6 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 22.
7 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 63.
8 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 64-66.
9 Sarty, "Writing the Official History of the Canadian Army in Normandy," 3-4.
10 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 171, 178.
11 Sarty, "Writing the Official History of the Canadian Army in Normandy," 8.
12 Sarty, "Writing the Official History of the Canadian Army in Normandy," 9.
13 Sarty, Roger. "The Origins of Academic Military History in Canada, 1940-1967." *Canadian Military History* 23, no. 2 (2014): 100.
14 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 246-247.

Fig. 1: C.P. Stacey while overseas with the Canadian Army Historical Section.

For a thorough summary of the Dieppe Raid, Stacey's 1955 narrative is a useful source. By the end of 1941, the Allied situation in the European theatre was rather grim. Germany made a great push into the Soviet Union, almost reaching Moscow before the deadly weather conditions paused the advance. The Battle of Britain had concluded and there was no real risk of a cross-Channel invasion, but the Allies had yet to crack open the European fortress. Soviet leader, Joseph Stalin, was adamant that the Allies needed to open a second front and relieve pressure on his forces. With the Americans now involved in the European theatre, there was serious talk of striking at the continent. The Americans wanted to do the full-scale invasion right away, as they had agreed to focus on Germany before turning their full might to Japan. However, the Allies were in no way prepared for such a monumental task on such short notice.

Therefore, it was decided in April 1942 that a series of medium-sized raids would be undertaken against the French coast, keeping the Germans on their toes.[15] The coastal resort town of Dieppe was deemed a suitable target due to the ability of the Royal Air Force (RAF) to provide effective air coverage within that range, and the fact that Dieppe had a sizable port, which was a great concern for the future invasion of the continent. This raid, known at this point as Operation *Rutter*, had a closer tie to the future invasion of France than any other raid planned or executed.[16] The Canadian forces had been training in the UK since 1940 and

---

15 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 313.
16 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 326-327.

were anxious to see action. Thus, when British Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery proposed the plan to Canadian General Andrew McNaughton on 30 April 1942, it was eagerly agreed upon.[17] Canadian forces quickly began to be trained in combined operations, as the raid was planned for July. The intention of the raid was to seize the town of Dieppe and some of its surrounding areas. These were to be held for several hours while a number of tasks were carried out, including the destruction of infrastructure and the capture of secret documents and prisoners.[18] The raid was set for 4 July or the following few days, depending on weather conditions. However, by 8 July the conditions were still unfavourable. Due to the fact that so many troops now knew the raiding plan, the chain of command was forced to disband the force and consider staging the attack at a later date.[19]

There was little written evidence on the revival of the Dieppe Raid for Stacey to work from, but it was a chiefly British decision which occurred on approximately 14 July.[20] The Russian front was not improving, and the citizens of the western Allied nations were calling for action.[21] The plan for Dieppe was already developed, so it was revived as Operation *Jubilee* by 25 July. On the evening of 18 August 1942, the raiding force set off from five different British ports. The force consisted of about 6,100 men (all ranks), including 4,963 Canadians, over one thousand British, 50 Americans, and a handful of French.[22]

The Raid was a disaster, but Stacey could see that this was not due to a lack of effort from the soldiers. A run-in with a small German convoy scattered one group of landing craft and potentially alerted some of the coastal forces to an incoming attack.[23] The timing of the attack was carefully calculated, but errors and unexpected variables shook things up. As the dawn crested on 19 August, there were five attacking points, each with different missions. Three of these attacking points were chiefly Canadian responsibilities, including the frontal attack on Dieppe and the two pincer attacks at Puys and Pourville. Unfortunately, only one British unit achieved their objectives, while the action faced by the Canadian units was chaotic.[24] By 11am a withdrawal was staged, but the casualty rates were already astronomical. Only 2,211 out of 4,963 Canadians returned to England. 1,946 Canadians were taken prisoner, and the rest had been killed in action.[25] In fact, Stacey explains that "the Canadian Army lost more prisoners than in the whole eleven months of the later campaign in Northwest Europe, or the twenty months during which Canadians fought in Italy."[26] The Dieppe Raid was the first European action the Canadian Army had seen in this war, but its disastrous outcome left Canadians reeling.

---

17 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 329.
18 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 330.
19 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 339-340.
20 This is one of the key areas of contention in the Dieppe debate. Few written records have made for a difficult time in pinpointing the specifics of the revival.
21 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 340.
22 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 345.
23 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 359-359.
24 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 360-382.
25 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 384-385.
26 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 387.

Fig. 2: An Allied vehicle abandoned during the Dieppe Raid.

Fig. 3: Canadian prisoners of war being marched through the city of Dieppe after the failed attack.

Due to their shared history and close relations, there was a high degree of cooperation between the fighting forces from Canada and the UK during the Second World War. This relationship extended to the historical sections of both countries as well. Stacey worked to build a strong connection with the British historians in late 1941 and 1942, which served him well later on. Britain served as Canada's overseas home base during the war, and working within the central hub of the western Allied effort was key to the piecing together of the Canadian history. Situational structures of command, such as the organization of the Dieppe Raid and the fact that First Canadian Army fought in Northwest Europe as a part of Field Marshal Montgomery's 21st Commonwealth Army Group, meant that it was essential that there was liaison between the historical teams of the two countries after the war. Stacey headed the CMHQ in London during and after the war, and followed the British model of writing short 'narratives' in order to organize the details of events for the eventual writing of the official history.[27]

As it became clear that the war would be concluding in 1945, Stacey began planning for the official histories. He was not named the official historian until October of that year, but it was vital to get the plan moving along before it became a repeat of the First World War official history program. Again following a British model, Stacey recommended a five-year plan for the Canadian official histories, which the Army approved. Unfortunately, as the military demobilized and significantly cut their budget, Stacey lost some of his best historians to the booming university sector. He had to fight for those he was able to keep, as this part of the project was vital to its overall success.[28] Nonetheless, he and his capable team got right to work on the significant task.

Stacey's team found an advantage in the fact that they were able to remain located in London for more than two years after the war concluded in Europe. The British Cabinet Office established an archive for the records of the British Army, which became the "second home" for the Canadian historians as they hurried to complete their one volume summary work.[29] This is where Stacey's strong relationships with the British Historical Branch paid off, as the Canadians were welcome in the British archives. However, by 1946, the British began to realize that there was sensitive information that could not be freely published. On 19 July 1946, they laid out a blanket procedure for access to British documents that applied to all Dominion historians. Within this memorandum, any work containing reference to British records had to be submitted to the UK authorities before publication. Additionally, the most significant point on the memorandum was a paragraph that declared all records above "military level" to be restricted access. In order to access the information of these high-level files, Dominion historians had to submit a questionnaire through their High Commissioner, which the British would then respond to after doing some research into their records.[30] This was not good news for Stacey and his team, as they were attempting to complete their narratives and summary volume as quickly as possible. Nonetheless, they agreed to the terms by December 1946 and offered reciprocal procedures for British historians wanting access to Canadian files.[31] Despite the previously mentioned agreement and a productive working relationship between the British and Canadian historical teams, Stacey began to notice a negative shift in early 1947.

---

27 Sarty, "Writing the Official History of the Canadian Army in Normandy," 3, 7.

28 Sarty, "Writing the Official History of the Canadian Army in Normandy," 7.

29 Sarty, "Writing the Official History of the Canadian Army in Normandy," 8.

30 "Provision of Information from UK Records to Accredited Dominion Histories: Note by the Cabinet Office," 19 July 1946, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893; It must be noted that this memorandum said nothing of American or Combined Chief of Staff records.

31 Riddell to Robertson, 19 December 1946, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

Fig. 4: Members of the CMHQ Historical Section in London, England, 19 April 1944. Stacey stands in the very centre.

The Historical Section was hard at work in early 1947 when Stacey began to face a specific stubbornness from the British. In reference to the memorandum of 19 July 1946, the Canadians had requested that the British define "military level", as they urgently needed to know which files they could or could not scour freely. This was essentially refused by the British, but they did mention that if they were to define it, "military level" would only be up to and including the war diaries at the army headquarter level until they could sort out the Cabinet-level files from anything 'higher up'.

An example they gave that particularly concerned the Canadians was that of the 21st Army Group, which the First Canadian Army fought with in Northwest Europe. The files from the 21st Army Group's headquarters were considered to be property of both the US and the UK, as it was a force under the Combined Chiefs of Staff. Due to their dual ownership and inclusion of Cabinet-level files, like personal letters between Prime Minister Churchill and Field Marshal Montgomery, these records were to be restricted to the 'questionnaire method' until they could be sorted.[32] Stacey was unsatisfied with this answer, as he believed that the Canadians were entitled to the records of the headquarters that their Army fought under. However, the British were not looking to negotiate informally and requested that the issue be left alone. Such a strong refusal left a sour note with Stacey, and it was clear that the historical liaison relationship between the Canadians and the British was heading down a bumpy path. The Canadian historians had to be wary of

---

32 Robertson to St. Laurent, 8 May 1947, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

making a rash decision, as they had to keep their options open for future requests. Unaware of the storm that was coming, a senior staff member of the Department of External Affairs wrote: "In practice, however, I do not feel that there should be any great difficulty in dealing with requests [for Combined Chiefs of Staff records]…"[33] Adding to any potential dilemmas, the CMHQ was dissolved as of 30 September 1947. The Army's Historical Section was relocated back to Ottawa, while a single historical liaison officer remained in London. Lieutenant-Colonel Gerald Nicholson held the position for a short time, and was later replaced by Captain Murray Hunter, who remained until the spring of 1951. As we will see, Murray would have his work cut out for him.

With Stacey, Nicholson, and the rest of the Historical Section in Ottawa, Hunter's position was important for maintaining historical liaison with the British. It was of value to have a Canadian representative in direct access to the British documents that were unrestricted, making for a smoother research process. Stacey gave Hunter the task of sorting out the narrative of Operation *Overlord*, amongst his other liaison tasks. Hunter found that he needed access to three specific files above "military level" in late October 1947. He attempted to ask the British authorities for them informally, but they replied that he must follow protocol and use the questionnaire method, or have Ottawa formally request them through diplomatic channels.[34] The necessary steps for the latter option were performed, but two of the files were not passed on until early February 1948. The third file took even longer, as the British were sure that the Canadians already had a copy of it. Thus, after a thorough search of the Canadian archive confirmed what Stacey already knew, the British released the third document.[35] This situation caused delays for the Canadian history program. When the Canadian historians requested a document, it was generally an urgent matter. The summary volume was not released until early 1948, slightly over a year later than Stacey had hoped for. It was an accomplishment to have it published by then. However, the increasing sentiment of secrecy from the British took its toll on the Canadian progress.

It was decided that there would be a conference between English-speaking historians in February 1948 to discuss a number of matters. This was good timing, as Stacey was becoming increasingly frustrated with the British restrictions. In a summary memorandum to Chief of the General Staff, Lieutenant-General Charles Foulkes, Stacey wrote:

The fact of the matter is that the British have been extremely difficult about granting us access to high-level documents, and whenever the matter has been brought up in conversation they always remark that such access by us would require American concurrence. The Americans, on the other hand, whether through policy or inadvertence, have always given me to understand that they consider Canada a partner in "combined holdings" of documents, and I have been informally assured that we can have access to the [Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force] papers. We have in fact lately received from the US Department of the Army a clearance for a visit by [the Deputy Director of the Historical Section] to work in those papers.[36]

---

33 Riddell to Robertson, 12 June 1947, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.
34 Mills to the Under Secretary of External Affairs, 20 October 1947, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.
35 McKay to Stacey, 4 February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.
36 "Access to Historical Information – UK and US," 16 January 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

This upcoming conference gave Stacey an opportunity to dive into this issue face-to-face with the British representatives. In fact, he had extended an invitation for the British to visit Ottawa while they were in North America. UK Chief Military Historian, Dr. James Butler, politely declined, citing a need to keep the trip brief. However, he proposed a separate meeting of Commonwealth historians while everyone was already in Washington, which Stacey agreed to.[37] Several days before Stacey and Nicholson were set to leave for the conference, they held a meeting with three senior staff members of the Department of External Affairs. The purpose was to secure the backing of External Affairs as Stacey planned his course of action for confronting the British, in addition to the support he already had from the Minister of National Defence, Brooke Claxton. He suspected that Butler and his team would push the Americans towards a more restrictive policy. The meeting was successful in getting External Affairs onside.[38] Action was also taken by Foulkes, who sent a memorandum to the British High Commissioner to Canada, Sir Alexander Clutterbuck, explaining the situation and expressing urgency.[39] Nonetheless, the forthcoming conference would be a critical point in Anglo-Canadian historical relations.

Armed with the information surrounding Stacey's historical liaison situation before February 1948, it can now be discussed as to how the Dieppe narrative was written for the 1948 *An Official Historical Summary*. On 19 August 1942, Stacey was on leave in Scotland. It was a well-deserved break, as he had worked continuously for almost twenty months. When he learned of the Canadian Raid that had taken place that morning, Stacey quickly put in a call to CMHQ to ask if he should cut his leave short and return to London. His superiors did not seem to be too concerned about his return, but Stacey felt an urge to get to work right away. Two days later he was back in London.[40] He had not previously known of the Raid, but once briefed, understood that an enormous task was ahead. Until late 1942, Stacey had been working on his own. This was a minor issue while the Canadian Army was training in the UK, but now that there was increasing action to sort out, it was too much for one person. As mentioned, Stacey's request for additional historical officers was approved in late 1942.[41] Of the forthcoming task, Stacey later wrote: "Dieppe provided me with the heaviest job of historical research that fell to me during the war...Putting together documented narratives of it took up all the time I could spare from other tasks for the better part of two years."[42]

Stacey got to work immediately. His sources included war diaries, orders and reports. Command had organized that each man who returned from Dieppe would write "a personal narrative of his experiences", which offered further evidence for Stacey.[43] He was authorized to interview survivors, which he did for both the Army and Navy, as no Royal Canadian Navy historian had been appointed yet. He spent an evening on a battleship with Rear-Admiral Hughes-Hallett, who had been the Naval Force Commander during the Raid.[44] Using oral accounts was a logical solution to an incomplete record, despite the caveats that come

37 Butler to Stacey, 5/12 January 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

38 "Notes of a Meeting Held in the East Block, 1600hrs, Thursday, 29 January 1948, Between Representatives of the Department of External Affairs and Historical Section, A.H.Q," 29 January 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

39 "Memorandum: Access to Documents for Historical Purposes," 30 January 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

40 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 87; Tim Cook, *Clio's Warriors: Canadian Historians and the Writing of the World Wars* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006), 99.

41 Sarty, "Writing the Official History of the Canadian Army in Normandy," 3.

42 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 97.

43 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 98.

44 Cook, *Clio's Warriors*, 99; Stacey, *A Date With History*, 99; C.P. Stacey, "Operation 'JUBILEE': The Raid on Dieppe 19 Aug 42. Additional Information on Planning," 5 October 1946, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 159, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/CMHQ-159.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

with memory recollection of a traumatic event. Stacey's personal opinion on the credibility of oral testimony was unfavourable, but he did realize that there was some value to the interviews, especially when other sources were lacking.[45] In progressing towards an account of the Raid, Stacey used the short 'narrative' method that he had adopted from the British. His first narrative, "CMHQ Report no.83: Preliminary Report on Operation 'JUBILEE' (The Raid on Dieppe)", was complete by mid-September 1942.[46] This written work was of value to officers investigating what went astray, as well as helped to win over senior officers as to the value of Stacey's position.[47] He would produce one other narrative on Dieppe before the end of 1942, which focused on the oral testimonies he was collecting.[48]

Due to his strong writing skills and knowledge of the event, Stacey was tasked with two other assignments that were outside his historical jurisdiction. Firstly, the job of drafting citations and awards for the Dieppe Raid was given to him. After such a disaster, there needed to be a boost in morale for both the Army and the civilians back in Canada. This was given such value that General Crerar got involved in editing Stacey's drafts.[49] His other task was to write an initial account of the Raid for the Canadian Government. Time to research and write this report was in short supply, but Stacey was capable of the task. He had it complete just days after being given the task in early September. It was understood that this was not to be a depressing recount of an utter failure, and despite strong pushback from Vice-Admiral Louis Mountbatten, Stacey was able to present a generally balanced account. It was received positively in Canada, which gave Stacey further credibility. While this White Paper did not necessarily expand his knowledge of the Raid, it helped Stacey convince the Army that the Historical Section needed to be warned of upcoming major operations.[50]

There was much attention given to the Dieppe Raid at the Canadian Historical Section in 1943. Seven narrative reports were completed, the most that would be done in a single year on Dieppe.[51] These reports on multiple aspects of the Raid kept Stacey and his new staff busy, as well as a deepening historical liaison relationship with the British. The British maintained a steady stream of requests for information on Dieppe, which meant that Stacey was obligated to fulfill them. The Combined Operations Recorder confidentially published a short book on the Raid, which Stacey found useful in the way of sources. Mountbatten was transferred out of the Combined Operations Headquarters (COHQ) in August 1943, and his successor, Major-General Sir Robert Laycock, was much more approachable. Laycock gave Stacey full access to the COHQ records, which was vital in order to conduct a thorough investigation.[52] Dieppe was still being worked on in 1944 and 1945, with four narrative reports produced in those years, as well as three more in 1946 and a final report in 1950.[53] The record of Dieppe was truly a puzzle, and these reports helped Stacey

---

45 Tavis Harris, "C.P. Stacey and the Use of Oral Testimony in the Dieppe Narratives," *Canadian Military History* 21, no. 4 (2015): 68-69.

46 C.P. Stacey, "Preliminary Report on OPERATION 'JUBILEE' (The Raid on Dieppe) 19 Aug 42," 19 September 1942, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 83, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq083.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

47 Cook, *Clio's Warriors*, 99; Sarty, "Writing the Official History of the Canadian Army in Normandy," 3.

48 C.P. Stacey, "The OPERATION at Dieppe, 19 Aug 42: Personal Stories of Participants," 31 December 1942, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 89, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq089.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

49 Sarty, "The Origins of Academic Military History in Canada," 18.

50 Cook, *Clio's Warriors*, 99-100.

51 CMHQ Reports no. 90, 98, 100, 101, 107, 108, 109 (see bibliography for full titles).

52 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 98-99.

53 CMHQ Reports no.116, 128, 130, 142, 153, 159 (see bibliography for full titles); AHQ Reports no.10, 36 (see bibliography for full titles).

to piece together the knowledge he had at the time. Substantial information was derived from German documents as information was captured, along with pictorial and cartographical materials once Dieppe was liberated in September 1944. Of importance to the Dieppe story was the planning of the Raid, which multiple narrative reports focused on. The planning of the Raid is what occupied historians for many decades, as the written record is murky. Obviously Stacey's team was also struggling to tackle the issue.

The 1948 *An Official Historical Summary* was sent to publication before the Washington conference in February, and thus was saved from too many of the historical liaison issues that would arise from the conference. The preface of the summary states its purpose as "in order that the people of Canada may have in their hands at as early a date as possible an authentic comprehensive outline of the work of their Army in the War of 1939-1945…"[54] It was meant to be a brief summary so that Canadians could appreciate the Canadian Army's contribution to the Second World War.

Stacey tells his readers that this summary has in no way exhausted the Allied records, and has only just scratched the surface of the German records. However, the events that Stacey's team had been able to dig into the German records for were the Dieppe Raid and the campaign in Southern Italy. Due to the time that had passed since the fateful day on 19 August 1942, the Dieppe narrative was quite fleshed out already. Stacey admits that the thirty-seven pages (two chapters) given to all aspects of Dieppe was unbalanced when compared to the coverage of other events, but he felt that the available details should be provided to the public without delay.[55] The first project was complete, leaving the Historical Section to switch their focus to the much more detailed, three volume series.

There was much weight riding on the 1948 'Conference of Commonwealth and US Military Historians' in Washington. Stacey and his team had some of their most detailed work currently in progress, and needed a liberal access policy from the British. Before leaving on 2 February, Stacey typed up a list of his "proposed points of discussion."[56] He realized that he had to be prepared in order to face the British. His points of focus were accessing Allied and enemy documents, the exchange of drafts, and the terms of publication. Illuminating Stacey's priority is his very first point: "Historians accredited by any military services of each Government have access to all the combined records which were produced in the operation of the Headquarters in which two or more of the Allies participated."[57]

Stacey and Nicholson made it to Washington in time, however, the arrival of the British delegation was delayed until the evening of 4 February by an Atlantic storm. Nonetheless, the first couple of days were devoted to an American display of their historical program and archives, with the important discussions not occurring until the afternoon of 6 February.

The first round of discussions began the dive into the key issues of the conference. Firstly, the British classification of the 21st Army Group HQ as Cabinet-level combined records surprised the Americans, who did not consider them to be so. This was in Stacey's favour, as the British agreed rather quickly to downgrade the files. However, this was one of the conference's few moments of agreement between the Canadians and British. The second topic of the afternoon was the issue of restricted access to combined records. Straight away the British declared that they could not be opened to any historians, other than the

---

54 C.P. Stacey, *The Canadian Army, 1939-1945: An Official Historical Summary* (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1948), vii.
55 Stacey, *An Official Historical Summary*, viii.
56 "Proposed Points of Discussion with British Historians," February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.
57 "Proposed Points of Discussion with British Historians," February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

official historical teams of the UK and US. In response, Stacey made it clear that the Canadians could not agree to lock themselves out of files that related to their own fighting forces.[58] The discussion was then put on pause until the next day.

The tense discussion on combined records was continued in the morning on 7 February. With an American representative presiding over the meeting, the delegates drafted a paper to present to the Combined Chiefs of Staff on the issue of historical access. It was largely based on the list of recommendations that Stacey had brought to Washington. Unfortunately, the British sensitivity to the subject prevented the paper from recommending that all Dominion historians be welcome into the combined records. Stacey negotiated with Brigadier Latham for some time, but to no avail. Latham accused Stacey of going back on the questionnaire method they had agreed to in 1946-1947, but Stacey argued that there had been no mention of combined records on that document. Latham insisted that it was implied, but Stacey did not back down from his position. Knowing that Stacey respected the privacy of Cabinet papers, Latham came in from a different angle and argued that the combined files were intermixed with Cabinet-level files, though they might be distinct in the American holdings.[59] Latham then proposed that Stacey apply formally to the British government, and that he might find success that way. This debate concluded with a decision to not include it in detail on the paper currently being crafted, but only to say that it was being dealt with through other channels.[60]

In the same meeting, the American historians brought up the topic of referencing combined records. They feared that without proper and complete citations their official histories would lack legitimacy when scrutinized by American scholars. Stacey supported them on this point. They also hoped to refute the writings of some private individuals who were making unwarranted claims. Continuing to be the inflexible party at the meeting, the British declared that they followed a policy of not citing any documents that were not accessible to the public. They did finally promise to take the American request to their government, but Stacey noted that "it seemed fairly clear that [the British] championship of the American idea would not be particularly warm."[61]

The British tried to use their seniority again in the next topic that was brought up, which was access to German records. The British and Americans both held complete copies of the collections, and a number of the documents from the British holdings had been loaned to Canada. The British attempted to suggest that the Dominion historians should submit requests for German information through London, instead of the current procedure of loaning out entire files. In regard to this case study, this suggestion would have consequences on the Canadian ability to study the Dieppe Raid from the German perspective, which was

58 "Notes on Matters Discussed During Meeting of US and Commonwealth Military Historians, Washington, DC, 4-7 Feb 48," 13 February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

59 In fact, the Americans did have their Cabinet-level papers separated from their combined records. They were also quite willing to provide the Canadians access to their archives, which occurred in a small quantity both before and after the 1948 Washington conference. However, when this fight was still going on in 1950 and the Canadians proposed just doing the research in Washington, the British were hesitant to allow it. This leads one to the conclusion that the biggest motivation of the British restrictions was a reluctance to risk any embarrassing being published, rather than administrative difficulties; "Memorandum of Discussion on Combined Records, Held in Mr. Sedwick's Room at Commonwealth Relations Office, London, at 1530 HRS, 22 Aug 50," 22 August 1950, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893; Claxton to Pearson, 5 February 1950, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893; "Note on Access to 'Combined Records' for Canadian Official Historians," 4 May 1950, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

60 "Notes on Matters Discussed During Meeting of US and Commonwealth Military Historians, Washington, DC, 4-7 Feb 48," 13 February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

61 "Notes on Matters Discussed During Meeting of US and Commonwealth Military Historians, Washington, DC, 4-7 Feb 48," 13 February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

vital. Stacey refused to agree to this, and the Americans would not abandon their policy of loaning out German records. Stacey lightly snubbed the British delegation by stating that his team's narratives based on the loaned German documents would be available to any Dominion historians who requested them.[62]

 After the meeting concluded Stacey had to return to his commitments at Queen's University, leaving Nicholson as the sole Canadian representative. However, before departing, Lieutenant Clark from the US delegation spoke to Stacey privately. He expressed surprise at the issue regarding combined records, as the Americans had always considered Canada to be entitled to these files. Just before the conference, the US authorities had granted clearance to Nicholson to examine the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF) records in Washington. Nicholson would be remaining behind after the conference to examine the records. Clark reassured Stacey that this commitment would be honoured, despite the conference proceedings.[63] In his reflection of the conference, Stacey wrote that the Americans were generally more supportive of the Canadian position. The opposing force was always the British delegates, who consistently "[dwelled] on the 'dangers' involved in a more liberal policy."[64] Interestingly, the representatives from the other Dominions were generally passive participants for most of the conference. Unfortunately, this left Nicholson essentially on his own in the fight for liberal access at a meeting of the Commonwealth historians on 8 February.

The meeting of Commonwealth representatives dealt with a number of points. Important to this study was a reluctance from the British and South Africans to draw conclusions and lessons from this recent historical event. Lieutenant-Colonel Agar Hamilton of South Africa claimed that the purpose of these official histories was to provide the facts, rather than a fleshed out historical interpretation. Nicholson replied that the Canadian histories would most certainly be drawing conclusions on Dieppe, which speaks to the Raid's importance in the Canadian experience of the war. The historians from New Zealand also intended to analyze their failures from the war. The topic of access to German records was brought up once again, and while it was decided that the other Dominions would request information or certain files, Nicholson was able to hold the British to the current loaning procedure for the Canadians.[65] The meeting was concluded without real mention of the combined records, but the British were not done throwing their weight around.

On 9 February the delegates from the Dominions, including Nicholson, were taken on a recreational tour of Gettysburg by the US Government. While they were out, the British and American representative deliberately had a private meeting to rework the paper from 7 February. The result was the "Coordination of Official War Histories" document that would be the bane of Stacey's existence for the next few years. Nicholson did not see the revised document until 12 February when an American officer shared it with him. Immediately expressing concern, Nicholson knew that Canada could not agree to the terms it set out.[66]

It was paragraph three "A" that concerned access to combined records, giving free rein to British and American historians while Dominion historians had to be approved by both countries each time they

---

62 "Notes on Matters Discussed During Meeting of US and Commonwealth Military Historians, Washington, DC, 4-7 Feb 48," 13 February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

63 "Notes on Matters Discussed During Meeting of US and Commonwealth Military Historians, Washington, DC, 4-7 Feb 48," 13 February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

64 "Notes on Matters Discussed During Meeting of US and Commonwealth Military Historians, Washington, DC, 4-7 Feb 48," 13 February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

65 "Notes of Meeting of Representatives of Military Historical Sections of the UK and the Dominions held in the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, at 1000 hours, Sunday, 8 Feb 48." 8 February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

66 Claxton to Heeney, 20 March 1950, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

requested information. The most underhanded part of the revised document was that it had been completed without approval of the Dominion historians, yet stated their agreement in the document's introductory remarks.[67] Nicholson sent urgent word to Stacey and confirmed with the Americans that the Canadians would take the issue up directly with the British.[68]

This "family squabble", as American Major General Ward called it, continued heavily through 1948, 1949, and 1950.[69] Stacey was forced to jump through all kinds of diplomatic hoops as the British purposely stalled. They made a number of excuses, but the truth was that they feared "political bombshells that might be lurking in the millions of pages of unprocessed material."[70] The Canadian Department of External Affairs was involved frequently, as well as the British and Canadian High Commissioners. A message between the two Prime Ministers was suggested on several occasions, but was left as a last resort. All of this was occurring while Stacey was attempting to complete the three detailed volumes of Canada's official histories. What angered the Canadians further that was the fact that private individuals, such as Robert Sherwood, had already been given access to the restricted files.[71] Finally, due to pressure from the Canadian government and Stacey's continued efforts, which culminated in a liaison trip to London in August-September 1950, the British finally compromised. They agreed to Stacey's most urgent demand, which was access to the proceedings of major Allied conferences during the war. Other combined records would remain under the special application protocol.[72] Upon returning from Europe, Stacey wrote to Foulkes that "it is now safe to assume that the long controversy over combined records has now terminated in a satisfactory manner."[73] Unfortunately, Stacey felt that the British still did not recognize Canada's entitled right to the combined records, but decided that it was not worth pursuing further.[74] Nonetheless, the progress that was achieved was an important stand for freedom of information and historical accuracy.

The result of Stacey's partial victory was the detailed three-volume Canadian official history. The first to be published was titled, *Six Years of War: The Army in Canada, Britain and the Pacific*. It is clear that Stacey had already faced many challenges in the official history program thus far, and it would not be smooth sailing for a while to come. However, there was a fairly productive period after the British compromised in the fall of 1950. A.B. Acheson of the British Historical Branch became a key contact point for Stacey, and he submitted many questions to Acheson. In regard to Dieppe, Stacey was chiefly concerned with which details of the planning the British knew. Since many of the necessary files were combined records, Stacey was forced to use the questionnaire method instead of sending Hunter's successor, Major Cunningham, to search the archives. He and Acheson liaised through the spring of 1953 on this issue, focusing on the approval of Operations *Rutter* and *Jubilee*, Operation *Sledgehammer*'s connection to Dieppe, and Churchill's involvement. Acheson was helpful by providing thorough answers to Stacey's inquiries, but the fact was that the written record for the planning of the Raid was minimal.[75]

---

67 "Coordination of Official War Histories," February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.
68 Nicholson to Stacey, 14 February 1948, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.
69 Ward to Stacey, 13 September 1950, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.
70 Sarty, "Writing the Official History of the Canadian Army in Normandy," 11.
71 Cook, *Clio's Warriors*, 181.
72 Brook to Stacey, 18 October 1950, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.
73 "Combined Records," 23 September 1950, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.
74 "Combined Records," 23 September 1950, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.
75 Acheson to Stacey, 1 April 1953, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 2, LAC, RG 24, box 31893; "Raiding Operations Policy, 1941-1942," April 1953, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 2, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

Back in 1950, while Stacey had been in London on the liaison trip that was the breaking point for the British holdout on combined records, he had held a meeting with Sir Norman Brooke, Secretary of the British Cabinet. As they discussed access to combined records, Stacey brought up a question in regard to a meeting Churchill held on the potential Dieppe Raid in June 1942. He used it as an example of being willing to follow the rules for Cabinet-level files, as he mentioned that he would be submitting it in questionnaire format soon. In response, Brooke brought out the draft of Churchill's book that dealt with Dieppe, which did not mention the meeting. Brooke said that Churchill had planned on telling the story of Dieppe, but then changed his mind and referred the reader to Stacey's 1948 *An Official Historical Summary* instead.[76] A month later, Stacey submitted the aforementioned question to Acheson. Unfortunately, Acheson did not answer this questionnaire until 19 January 1953, and he did not have any documentation of the meeting anyway. Such a significant time delay from Acheson pushed Stacey to get creative and inquire with Hughes-Hallett. The naval officer also took a notable amount of time to respond, but he confirmed with his diary that the date of the meeting was 30 June 1942. Churchill had recently returned from the US and expressed concern about Dieppe due to the recent disaster at Tobruk.[77] For Stacey, putting together the pieces of the Dieppe narrative was truly a puzzle.

Back in Canada, Stacey received assistance from top generals and officers. Most notably was General Guy Simonds, who had taken over from Foulkes as the Chief of the General Staff in 1951. Simonds was interested in Stacey's work, and offered comments of draft chapters.[78] Additionally, thanks to Nicholson standing firm at the Commonwealth meeting in Washington, Stacey had German files to draw from. In regard to the Dieppe Raid, they allowed him to confirm that the Germans did not have advanced knowledge of the attack, and he would publish this finding in the completed book. Nonetheless, this fact remains a lingering controversy, which speaks to Dieppe's persistence in the modern literature.[79]

Stacey's next obstacle came not from the British, but from the Canadian Minister of National Defence. Finally, after such hard work, Stacey was able to submit the first volume to Claxton in March 1953, hoping to have it published by the end of the year. Claxton had been hesitant to publish the 1948 volume, and he was even more difficult about this current work. His grudges included the way Stacey covered Canada's biggest controversies of the war, Hong Kong and Dieppe. Claxton's response was to leave them on his desk and ignore them. This was extremely frustrating for Stacey and his team, who had worked tirelessly to complete the project quickly. Stacey went to Simonds several times to discuss the issue, which led Simonds to warn Claxton of the potential for a fiasco like the historical program of the First World War. Despite the fact that the Liberals had announced to the House of Commons that the official histories would be published in 1953, Claxton continued to ignore the issue.[80]

---

76 "Memorandum of Interview with Sir Norman Brook, Secretary of the Cabinet," 15 September 1950, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893; Churchill's original draft was much different than the two pages that ended up being published. He wrote that Mountbatten was responsible for the revival of *Rutter* into *Jubilee*. On 1 September 1950, he sent the draft to Mountbatten for approval, who immediately became defensive and rewrote the section. By the time it got back to him, Churchill had become uninterested and moved on, leaving the Dieppe narrative very much incomplete and free of any blame on Mountbatten. For more, see David Reynolds, *In Command of History: Churchill Fighting and Writing the Second World War* (New York: Basic Books, 2007), 344-347.

77 "Information Requested by Canadian Army Official Historian from UK Records 'Above Military Level'," 24 October 1950, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 1, LAC, RG 24, box 31893; Acheson to Stacey, 19 January 1953, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 2, LAC, RG 24, box 31893; Stacey to Acheson, 23 January 1953, HQC 1450-34/336, pt. 2, LAC, RG 24, box 31893.

78 Cook, *Clio's Warriors*, 181.

79 Cook, *Clio's Warriors*, 186-187; For more on the controversy over German advanced knowledge, see John P. Campbell, *Dieppe Revisited: A Documentary Investigation* (London: Frank Cass, 1993).

80 Cook, *Clio's Warriors*, 181-182.

Over a year after Stacey had submitted the draft, Claxton was replaced by Ralph Campney in June 1954. Campney held the same sentiment as his predecessor, and avoided the task of approval. He also felt that there was an issue with the fact that government documents were referenced and cited. Straying from reality, Campney hoped that the official histories would just die away without a protest. That was hardly something Stacey could allow to happen to years of his work. By the fall of 1954, the unpublished book was beginning to be a source of embarrassment for Stacey and Simonds. Stacey even considered quitting his positions and going public with the scandal, but he was talked out of it. Finally, Simonds got him a series of meetings with Campney in 1955. Stacey was able to negotiate with the minister and put pressure on him, which led to *Six Years of War: The Army in Canada, Britain and the Pacific* being published in the fall of 1955.[81]

To say that Stacey faced a series of political challenges in the decade between 1945 and 1955 is a significant understatement. Thankfully, he was an intelligent and determined individual. Otherwise, it is questionable whether the official histories of the Army would have been as thorough, or even published.

Dieppe held a notable place in this first detailed volume. A total of two chapters and 112 pages covered all aspects of the event, including Operation *Rutter* and the revival, German defences, the actual Raid and all five landings, the losses on both sides, how the public was told, and the influences on German strategy. Stacey argued that Dieppe was not a complete waste, as lessons learned were applied in the invasion of France two years later. However, he stopped before agreeing with Mountbatten's comment that "the battle of Normandy was won on the beaches of Dieppe."[82] Some sections were carried over from the 1948 narrative, though this version boasted further detail, more topics, and some new information.[83] Stacey spoke to the murkiness of the Dieppe paper trail when he wrote:

Although the Dieppe Raid is in general a very well documented operation, the documentation with reference to its origins and objects—points of special importance—is far from complete. In these matters the historian is obliged to rely to a considerable extent upon the memories and the verbal evidence of informed persons. The fact that "security" was of such great importance militated against complete records being kept.[84]

Stacey was able to win over Campney in regard to the publication of citations and references, which gave the book further legitimacy. Many of the files referenced were still closed to the public, but Stacey realized that future historians would make use of his notes.[85] He was forced to honour the British system of not specifying restricted records, instead filling the citation with a simple phrase: "United Kingdom record." Regardless, the publication of *Six Years of War* was a substantial accomplishment on the part of Stacey and his team at the Historical Section.

---

81 Cook, *Clio's Warriors*, 183-185.
82 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 101-102.
83 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 325.
84 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, 326.
85 Stacey, *Six Years of War*, xi.

Fig. 5: Stacey presents a copy of *Six Years of War*, translated into French, to the Vice Chief of the General Staff, Major-General Jean Victor Allard, on 27 April 1959.

In 1982 Stacey published an account of his time as a historian, titled *A Date With History*. Writing with hindsight, Stacey summarizes the struggles discussed in this paper. This personal reflection is insightful for the observations he offers on his career, which has become a key period of development for Canadian military history. In regard to Dieppe, the controversy endured forty years on from the Raid. Stacey noted how the Canadian media seemed to "rediscover" the story every few years.[86] In terms of historiography, his 1948 and 1955 books did the 'heavy-lifting' for future historians. Dieppe had been covered by several authors by the early 1980s, but Stacey found that it tended to be overly sensationalized; particularly calling out Terence Robertson for *Dieppe: The Shame and the Glory*. Stacey brings up the topic of Mountbatten's responsibility for the revived Raid. While he does not deny Mountbatten's "ambition and egotism," Stacey does not believe that personal motivation had anything to do with the commencement of the Raid.[87] This would be heavily disputed by Brian Villa, a Harvard-trained University of Ottawa professor, in his 1989 book, *Unauthorized Action: Mountbatten and the Dieppe Raid*.

In 1989, Villa's *Unauthorized Action* stood out amongst the growing pile of publications trying to explain how Operation *Jubilee* had been allowed to proceed. He spent over eight years researching this history,

---

86 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 100.
87 Stacey, *A Date With History*, 102.

resulting in an original manuscript of 1700 pages.[88] The length of his work alone illustrates the complex nature of the event. Villa states that the aim of his book is to prove responsibility for the failed attack, as well as explain why the evidence has become so convoluted. His focus is settled on the decision making process before the actual Raid, which brings him to write that his work becomes more so a study of political science.[89]

In his introduction Villa speaks to the emotional attachment to the memory of the Raid, writing that Dieppe "represents a problem of acceptance, particularly for Canadians."[90] He questions whether this debate and emotional attachment would exist if the Raid had been a success. He argues that it is the fact that Dieppe failed and became controversial that allows room for such a growing list of scholarship on the topic.[91] Villa claims that elements of mystery have come to define the politics of the Raid, particularly in terms of the inability for individuals to justify their participation.[92]

The main character of Villa's narrative is Mountbatten, who was the Chief of COHQ in 1942. For reasons that are further spelled out in the book, Villa claims that Mountbatten can be singled out for the responsibility of Operation *Jubilee* proceeding. He explains that Mountbatten was concerned about a lack of action to prove the efforts of COHQ. It has been established that just weeks before Dieppe, Mountbatten had been granted the ability to sidestep the Chiefs of Staff Committee regarding medium-sized raids. Villa then argues that Mountbatten is to blame because he never obtained formal approval to relaunch Operation *Rutter*; a thesis that diverges from studies prior to Villa's. This is a part of the reason why Dieppe has failed to be shelved as a research topic; the ongoing discovery and reinterpretation of sources feed a growing body of literature.

One must remember that Villa did not have the same level of difficulty accessing British archives as Stacey and his team did, due to the amount of time passed since the event.[93] Villa draws on primary sources from Canadian and British national archives. Aiming to get to the bottom of the situation himself, Villa did not rely much on Stacey's work. However, the interesting difference between Stacey and Villa is the opposing conclusions they came to. Both men were well-versed on the primary evidence, yet came to different verdicts regarding Mountbatten and the revival of *Rutter*.

A question that must be posed then, is whether the British restrictions on high-level documents hindered Stacey's ability to come to a satisfactory conclusion. Since the topic haunted him for so many years, yet Villa was able to argue definitively, it would suggest so. However, it is questionable whether Stacey could have made such a bold accusation as Villa in a narrative official history published while Mountbatten was still alive. Villa had much more time and space to delve into the niche topic, as well as an absence of the political drama Stacey dealt with as an official historian employed by the government. Nonetheless, historiography is meant to grow and develop; but perhaps it would not have taken forty-five years for a thesis like Villa's to come out if the British had not been such sticklers in their historical liaison with Stacey.

---

88 Brian Loring Villa, *Unauthorized Action: Mountbatten and the Dieppe Raid* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989), 6.
89 Villa, *Unauthorized Action*, 6.
90 Villa, *Unauthorized Action*, 2.
91 Villa, *Unauthorized Action*, 1.
92 Villa, *Unauthorized Action*, 4.
93 By the time Villa's research was being conducted, the Commonwealth Relations Office file on Stacy's struggle for access was available at the Public Records Office in London (Stacey, *A Date With History*, 204).

Fig. 6: Admiral Louis Mountbatten in the fall of 1943. He had been promoted in August and appointed the Supreme Allied Commander, South East Asia Command.

The publication of *Unauthorized Action* helped to spur on the Dieppe literature. A historian who made a major contribution was Villa's former student, Peter J. Henshaw. His first article on Dieppe was in 1994, titled: "The British Chiefs of Staff Committee and the Preparation of the Dieppe Raid, March-August 1942: Did Mountbatten Really Evade the Committee's Authority?" This article built on Stacey and Villa's labours, and reviewed the decisions, knowledge, and consent of the Chiefs of Staff Committee.

Two years later, Henshaw released an article that was rather ground shaking in the debate on responsibility for the reinvigorated Raid. His article, "The Dieppe Raid: A Product of Misplaced Canadian Nationalism?", argued that Canadian nationalism could be blamed for the rebirth of Operation *Rutter* into Operation *Jubilee*. He reminds his fellow historians that the Canadian generals had agency and autonomy. Henshaw's research found that "[the Canadian generals'] struggle for autonomy, and for a leading Canadian role in

raids, interacted with British interservice rivalries in a way that was decisive for the progress of the planned raid on Dieppe."[94]

This thesis was in direct opposition to Villa's, and thus there were grounds for an interesting debate between the former student and teacher. The pair published a conversational debate article in 1998, titled: "The Dieppe Raid Debate." In the article, Villa was aiming to discuss Henshaw's Canadian nationalism thesis before turning his attention to a new 1996 doctoral thesis by Hugh Henry at Cambridge University, who leaned towards Henshaw's argument. Both Villa and Henshaw state in the article that this debate still has life to it, and that future historians should continue the investigation.[95]

Since the publications by Villa and Henshaw, the Dieppe debate has not seen any real bombshell publications. That does not mean that the debate has been settled, but no recent historians have taken a solid run at the mess that Stacey and Villa dealt with, despite a wider access to documents now available. Instead, the last decade has produced popular histories, broad surveys, and journal articles dealing with niche topics. In 2012, popular writer Mark Zuehlke published *Tragedy at Dieppe: Operation Jubilee, August 19, 1942* in time for the 70th anniversary of the Raid. On brand with his other Second World War books, it is a broad survey written for a public audience. The following year, historian David O'Keefe published *One Day in August: The Untold Story Behind Canada's Tragedy at Dieppe*. This work is academic, and does attempt to contribute to the general debate of Dieppe's details. However, as one reviewer claims, "*One Day in August* asks more questions than it answers."[96]

In 2014 there was another survey published – Tim Cook's *The Necessary War: Canadians Fighting the Second World War, 1939-1943*. Dieppe was given a chapter within the book, but Cook was not looking to dive into any controversial or confusing topics. While this work is academic, it straddles the line between an academic and popular history. The Canadian Military History journal published two articles on the RAF and its role in the Dieppe Raid in 2015 and 2016, by Ross Mahoney and David Stubbs respectively. In 2019 the British official account of Dieppe was republished by the UK War Office. Originally released in the late 1950s, *The Dieppe Raid: The Combined Operations Assault on Hitler's European Fortress, August 1942: An Official History* aimed to emphasize the fact that Dieppe provided invaluable lessons for the forthcoming invasion of France. However, the 2019 version did nothing new for the debate, as virtually nothing had been updated. Finally, Tim Cook published *The Fight for History: 75 Years of Forgetting, Remembering, and Remaking Canada's Second World War* in 2020. Once again, Cook straddles the line between academic and popular history. This work did not look at Dieppe directly, but instead studied the memory of the Dieppe Raid in Canadian memory and media representations. The last decade had failed to push the Dieppe debate in any new directions.

The Canadian official histories of the Second World War are foundational to the historiography of the subject. Thus, it is important that Stacey's struggle for access against the British Cabinet Office is brought to light. The restrictive attitude held by the British between late 1947 and 1950 influenced the research and progress of the Canadian Army Historical Section. Previous historians, namely Tim Cook and

---

94 Peter J. Henshaw, "The Dieppe Raid: A Product of Misplaced Canadian Nationalism?" *The Canadian Historical Review* 77, no. 2 (1996): 252.

95 Brian Loring Villa and Peter J. Henshaw, "The Dieppe Raid Debate," *The Canadian Historical Review* 79, no. 2 (1998): 304.

96 Thomas K. Fitzgerald, review of *One Day in August: The Untold Story Behind Canada's Tragedy at Dieppe*, by David O'Keefe, *The Canadian Army Journal* 15, no. 2 (2013): 103.

Roger Sarty, have covered the broad history of this situation. However, this paper takes a new perspective by using the Dieppe Raid as a case study in the influences of historical liaison.

The Dieppe Raid occurred within a matter of hours on 19 August 1942, yet has left decades of controversy as its legacy. Stacey was the first to research the event in-depth, but the planning of the Dieppe Raid was complex and left few written records. His work was further hindered by British decision in 1948 to restrict access to the sections of their archives deemed above "military level." This is important for the fact that Stacey's narratives of Dieppe would shape the later historiography. Thus, future historians were hampered from reaching a unified version of the Raid's planning and execution by the prohibitive actions of the British Cabinet Office in the decade after the war's conclusion.

Annotated DND Files and Legend

Photographs

Figure 1: *Lieutenant-Colonel Charles P. Stacey*, Unattributed, c.1941-44, Library and Archives Canada, MIKAN 3239914.

Figure 2: *Scout Car Abandoned During the Raid on Dieppe*, Unattributed, 19 August 1942, Library and Archives Canada, Item ID 3194752.

Figure 3: *Captured Canadian Troops*, Unattributed, 19 August 1942, Library and Archives Canada, Item ID 3195158.

Figure 4: *Personnel of the Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section, London, England*, Private R.W. Hole, 19 April 1944, Library and Archives Canada, MIKAN 3221307.

Figure 5: *Presentation of Book to Vice Chief of the General Staff*, Unattributed, 27 April 1959, Library and Archives Canada, Item ID 4274082.

Figure 6: *Lord Louis Mountbatten*, Yousuf Karsh, 12 September-12 November 1943, Library and Archives Canada, Item ID 3511188.

Bibliography

Campbell, John P. *Dieppe Revisited: A Documentary Investigation*. London: Frank Cass, 1993.

Cook, Tim. *Clio's Warriors: Canadian Historians and the Writing of the World Wars*.

Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006.

—. *The Fight for History: 75 Years of Forgetting, Remembering, and Remaking Canada's Second World War*. Toronto: Allen Lane, 2020.

—. *The Necessary War: Canadians Fighting the Second World War, 1939-1943*.Toronto: Penguin Canada, 2014.

Fitzgerald, Thomas K. Review of *One Day in August: The Untold Story Behind Canada's Tragedy at Dieppe*, by David O'Keefe. *The Canadian Army Journal* 15, no. 2 (2013): 102-103.

Harris, Tavis. "C.P. Stacey and the Use of Oral Testimony in the Dieppe Narratives." *Canadian Military History* 21, no. 4 (2015): 67-78.

Henshaw, Peter J. "The British Chiefs of Staff Committee and the Preparation of the Dieppe Raid, March-August 1942: Did Mountbatten Really Evade the Committee's Authority?" *War in History* 1, no. 2 (1994): 197-214.

—. "The Dieppe Raid: A Product of Misplaced Canadian Nationalism?" *The Canadian Historical Review* 77, no. 2 (1996): 250-266.

HQC 1450-34-336, part 1, Library and Archives Canada, Record Group 24, box 31893.

HQC 1450-34-336, part 2, Library and Archives Canada, Record Group 24, box 31893.

Mahoney, Ross. "'The support afforded by the air force was faultless': The Royal Air Force and

the Raid on Dieppe, 19 August 1942." *Canadian Military History* 21, no. 4 (2015): Article 3.

O'Keefe, David. *One Day in August: The Untold Story Behind Canada's Tragedy at Dieppe*. Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf Canada, 2013.

Reynolds, David. *In Command of History: Churchill Fighting and Writing the Second World War*. New York: Basic Books, 2007.

Robertson, Terence. *Dieppe: The Shame and the Glory*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1962.

Sarty, Roger. "The Origins of Academic Military History in Canada, 1940-1967." *Canadian Military History* 23, no. 2 (2014): 79-118.

–. "Writing the Official History of the Canadian Army in Normandy." Unpublished.

Stacey, C.P. *The Canadian Army, 1939-1945: An Official Historical Summary*. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1948.

–. *Official History of the Canadian Army in the Second World War, Volume I, Six Years of War: The Army in Canada, Britain and the Pacific*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1955.

–. *A Date With History: Memoirs of a Canadian Historian*. Ottawa: Deneau, 1982.

–. "Preliminary Report on OPERATION 'JUBILEE' (The Raid on Dieppe) 19 Aug 42." 19 September 1942, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 83, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq083.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "The OPERATION at Dieppe, 19 Aug 42: Personal Stories of Participants." 31 December 1942, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 89, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq089.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "The OPERATION at Dieppe, 19 Aug 42: Further Personal Stories of Participants." 19 February 1943, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 90, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq090.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "Article Dealing with the OPERATION at Dieppe, 19 Aug 42." 15 July 1943, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 98, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq098.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "Operation 'JUBILEE': The Raid on Dieppe, 19 Aug 42. Part I: The Preliminaries of the OPERATION." 16 July 1943, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 100, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq100.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "Operation 'JUBILEE': The Raid on Dieppe, 19 Aug 42. Part II: The Execution of the OPERATION. Section 1: General Outline and Flank Attacks." 11 August 1943, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 101, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/CMHQ101.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "The OPERATION at DIEPPE, 19 Aug 42: Further Personal Stories of Participants." 29 November 1943, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 107, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq107.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "OPERATION 'JUBILEE': The Raid on Dieppe, 19 Aug 42. Part II: The Execution of the Operation. Section 2: The Attack on the Main Beaches." 17 December 1943, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 108, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq108.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "OPERATION 'JUBILEE': The Raid on Dieppe, 19 Aug 42. Part III: Some Special Aspects." 17 December 1943, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 109, National Defence

Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq109.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "OPERATION 'JUBILEE': The Raid on Dieppe, 19 Aug 42. Additional Information from German Sources." 10 May 1944, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 116, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/CMHQ116.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "The OPERATION at DIEPPE, 19 Aug 42. Some New Information." 20 November 1944, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 128, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq128.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "The OPERATION at DIEPPE, 19 Aug 42: Pictorial and Cartographical Material." 27 November 1944, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 130, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/cmhq130.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "OPERATION JUBILEE: The Raid on Dieppe, 19 Aug 42. Further New Information." 18 July 1945, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 142, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/CMHQ142.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "Operation 'JUBILEE': The Raid on Dieppe, 19 Aug 42. New Light on Early Planning." 22 March 1946, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 153, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/CMHQ-153.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

–. "Operation 'JUBILEE': The Raid on Dieppe 19 Aug 42. Additional Information on Planning." 5 October 1946, Canadian Military Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 159, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/cmhq/CMHQ-159.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

Stacey, C.P. and E. Skutezky. "Operation 'Jubilee': The Raid on Dieppe, 19 Aug 42 (Info from German War Diaries)." 5 December 1946, Army Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 10, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage. http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/ahqr-rqga/ahq010.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

Steiger, A.G. "The Development of the German Defences in the Dieppe Sector." 31 March 1950, Army Headquarters Historical Section Report No. 36, National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/dhh-dhp/his/rep-rap/doc/ahqr-rqga/ahq036.pdf, accessed 11 March 2021.

Stubbs, David. "An Analysis of Factors Affecting the Royal Air Force Contribution to the Raid on Dieppe, 1942." *Canadian Military History* 25, no. 1 (2016): Article 12.

UK War Office. *The Dieppe Raid: The Combined Operations Assault on Hitler's European Fortress, August 1942: An Official History.* Barnsley: Frontline Books, 2019.

Villa, Brian Loring. *Unauthorized Action: Mountbatten and the Dieppe Raid.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Villa, Brian Loring, and Peter J. Henshaw. "The Dieppe Raid Debate." *The Canadian Historical Review* 79, no. 2 (1998): 304-315.

Zuehlke, Mark. *Tragedy at Dieppe: Operation Jubilee, August 19, 1942.* Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 2012.

François Pompon Owl Sculpture (1923)

Cody Mudge, "A memorial masterpiece: Chava Rosenfarb's *The Tree of Life* as a literary *yizker-bikher*"

Six blank pages representing six million Jewish victims of German lead and fire.[1] This is how ghetto and Holocaust survivor Chava Rosenfarb (1923-2011) concludes the final volume of *The Tree of Life, A Trilogy of Life in the Łódź Ghetto*. After over one thousand pages of vivid prose, readers confront the inevitable, foreordained conclusion. Before those six pages, readers and victims alike, companions in a journey spanning several "years" and hundreds of pages, encounter a final glimpse of madness before the end. "Chapter Twenty-nine… Thirty… Thirty-One… ad infinitum. AUSCHWITZ. WORDS STOP, UNDRESSED, NAKED, THEIR MEANING, THEIR SENSE SHAVEN OFF. LETTERS EXPIRE IN THE SMOKE OF THE CREMATORIUM'S CHIMNEY…"[2] And then, nothingness. Just six blank pages. The gravitational pull of tragedy in Holocaust literature is so immense that even an "uplifting" trilogy like *The Tree of Life* cannot escape it.

With such a powerful, sombre ending, it may seem discordant to argue that Rosenfarb's *The Tree of Life* is, at root, a life-affirming tale. But this apparent paradox only strikes the reader in those final pages, so effectively does Rosenfarb ensure that "life" remains the focus of the narrative. Reactions to extreme lived experiences vary widely but Rosenfarb was not alone amongst survivors in considering the story of the ghetto to be one of life rather than death.[3] This revelation indicates why the trilogy ends when and how it does. Readers do not follow the remaining survivors of the ghetto after it is liquidated and they are deported to the death camps. They were perhaps facets of the same genocidal apparatus, but to Rosenfarb, the ghetto and the camps were, conceptually at least, worlds apart. In the ghetto, there remained some semblance of life; the same could not be said for Auschwitz. The Łódź ghetto, remarkable in so many other aspects, was entirely characteristic from this perspective. Life in the ghetto ended with deportation and death for many. But for survivors like Rosenfarb, that the ghetto failed to break the spirit of the Jewish people even if it had broken some of their bodies and minds, seemed to profess a collective cultural transcendence. A kind of existential elevation through degradation. To contemplate what *The Tree of Life* has to teach a student of the Holocaust is to encounter many facets of an incredible and complex story.

Born in Łódź, Poland in 1923, Chava Rosenfarb was the eldest of two daughters. Her parents had moved to Łódź from a shtetl near Kraków seeking work and later built a family, illustrating how the city attracted skilled workers because of its economic promise and foreshadowing its later importance to the Nazi's. Rosenfarb's family was neither wealthy nor poor; her father was a restaurant waiter and her mother was a worker in a textile factory. She spent her childhood and teenage years soaking up the socialist political leanings of her Bundist parents while receiving a secular Yiddish education. That her parents were "active [members] in the Jewish Socialist Bund" no doubt informed her later fiction, which often portrays such organizations, and helped to reinforce the cultural importance of Yiddish upon a young Rosenfarb, the language that the Bund advocated "as the lingua franca of the Jewish masses."[4] When she reached the end of high school, the age when most young people consider what to do with their future, the Jews of Łódź were no longer free citizens.[5] Poland, the country of her birth, if not her "nation," effectively ceased to

[1] David G. Roskies and Naomi Diamant, *Holocaust Literature: A History and Guide* (Lebanon: Brandeis University Press, 2012), 136.

[2] Chava Rosenfarb, *The Tree of Life, A Trilogy of Life in the Łódź Ghetto, Book Three: The Cattle Cars Are Waiting, 1942-1944*, translated by the author and Goldie Morgentaler (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 362-8. All caps from the original text. The original Yiddish edition of the novel was published in 1972.

[3] Alan Adelson, Robert Lapides and Marek Web, *Łódź Ghetto: Inside a Community Under Siege* (New York: Viking, 1989), xxi.

[4] Chava Rosenfarb, *Confessions of a Yiddish Writer and Other Essays* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2019), xi. The introduction to this work was written by Rosenfarb's daughter, Goldie Morgentaler, who also translated the collected works.

[5] Goldie Morgentaler, "Chava Rosenfarb: The Yiddish Woman Writer in the Post-Holocaust World," Canadian Jewish Studies/Études Juives Canadiennes 11 (January 2003), 39.

exist.[6] For several years, Rosenfarb and her family endured in the ghetto until it was liquidated and the family was deported to Auschwitz. She would never see her father again. Along with her mother and sister, she was later sent to Bergen-Belsen where she remained until the camp was liberated by British troops in the spring of 1945.[7]

Rosenfarb's memory of prewar Łódź and its people, as well as the wartime shift to the ghetto, made a deep impression on her psyche and artistic expression during these formative years. Despite her affectionate nostalgia for her hometown, Rosenfarb, like so many east European Jews, never returned. After the war, along with her mother and sister, Rosenfarb became a Displaced Person before sneaking across the German border into Belgium. By 1950, Rosenfarb had married her boyfriend, Henech Morgentaler (later known as "Henry," Morgentaler would later rise to national prominence in Canada as a champion of abortion rights), and the couple made their way to Montreal where they had two children of their own (she was pregnant with their daughter, Goldie, before arriving in Canada - thus, the transatlantic voyage was not a pleasant one for Rosenfarb).[8] Their first three decades in Canada saw the birth and growth of their children, as well as the publication of Rosenfarb's novel, but also the eventual breakdown of their marriage and the couple divorced in 1979.[9]

The first Yiddish Holocaust novel, *The Tree of Life* was written over two decades. She began writing shortly after she arrived in Canada and finished in time for the publication of the first Yiddish edition in 1972.[10] Throughout that period, Rosenfarb grappled with how to translate her experience before settling on a new medium, narrative prose, which would dominate the rest of her career. Rosenfarb had mostly written poetry in the ghetto but she believed that the vast scope of the story she had to tell could only work as a novel.[11] Not a writer prone to reflective autobiography, Rosenfarb penned a contemplative essay after her magnum opus first appeared in print that addressed her initial challenges.[12] Like so many other survivors who testified, regardless of their medium, Rosenfarb grappled with how to translate her lived experience into a coherent literary expression - and even whether she should make the attempt at all.[13]

> I feared to approach the world that I had lost. I was terrified of plunging once again into the abyss of suffering, of reliving the reality that had nearly destroyed me. I wanted to enjoy my life, to relish every moment… I wanted to forget the nightmare, I deplored the fact that my memory was so vivid and would not allow me to forget. And I felt too weak, too incompetent,

---

[6] Adelson, *Inside a Community Under Siege*, xiv-xviii; and, Norman Ravvin, "Poland, Yiddish and a Canadian Writer's Life: Interview with Chava Rosenfarb," *Literature and Theology* Vol. 24, No. 2 (June 2010): 190.

7 Morgentaler, "The Yiddish Woman Writer," 38

[8] Ibid, 37.

[9] Rosenfarb, *Confessions*, xx. Before her divorce was official, Rosenfarb had developed a relationship with another Łódź ghetto survivor whom she had known previously, Bono Wiener. Their relationship would last until Wiener's death in 1995. Wiener originally emigrated to Australia after the war and was financially successful in business there (which is possibly the reason that Rosenfarb was able to sell her work to a relatively small Yiddish audience until the final decade of her life). Ibid, xx-xxii.

[10] Jan Schwarz, *Survivors and Exiles: Yiddish Culture after the Holocaust* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2015), 50.

[11] Goldie Morgentaler, "'I Am Still There:' The Recreation of Jewish Poland in the Canadian Novels of Chava Rosenfarb," *Studies in American Jewish Literature* Vol. 35, No. 2 (1981), 188.

[12] The essay in question, "Confessions of a Yiddish Writer," gave its name to Rosenfarb's non-fiction collection and was delivered as a speech in Yiddish hotspots around the world like New York, Melbourne, Tel Aviv, and Montreal to publicize the book to Yiddish-speakers. It is interesting to note that this title reveals a fascinating aspect of Rosenfarb's personality: she viewed herself as an author first and a Holocaust survivor second. Though these two pillars of her identity were deeply interwoven: "…what is writing is not a form of confession in disguise? No matter what the subject, all literary roads lead back to the self. The writer descends like a miner into the deepest shafts of her soul in order to unearth the blackest coals of her torment, or to retrieve the most glittering diamonds of her memories, and bring them back to the surface in the form of fictions that she wishes to share with the world. Rosenfarb, *Confessions*, xxvii.

[13] Milton Teichman, "How Writers Fought Back: Literature from the Nazi Ghettos and Camps," *Judaism* Vol. 47, No. 3 (1998) - page numbers were unavailable on the electronic pdf version.

in the face of the enormity of what I had to describe. How could I encompass and give life to all those who populated my memory? Was not the novel too elegant and too polished a literary form for such a story, was it not too detached from any lived reality, too much a game of cleverly concocted plots? In writing a novel about the Holocaust would I not end by sinning against a reality that was impossible to encompass? Was I capable of recreating the specific atmosphere of those nightmarish days, assuming that it was possible to recreate it in the first place? As time went on, it became increasingly clear to me that no one, not even the most gifted writer, would be able to capture the true atmosphere of the ghetto. Even if the writer succeeded in writing a masterpiece, it could not be the real thing.[14]

With time, however, Rosenfarb's pen became more focused and she gained confidence in her ability to tell not just her own story but that of the community that had been lost.

Originally written in Yiddish, Rosenfarb's mother tongue and preferred literary language, *The Tree of Life* was first translated into English in 1985 over a decade after it first appeared in print, though it was not until the second English edition in 2004-6 that the novel gained much attention from English-speakers.[15] A life-long writer, Rosenfarb published poetry, essays, novels, and dramas in both Yiddish and English, often relying on her daughter, Goldie Morgentaler, a Professor of English at the University of Lethbridge, to assist in the translation process.[16] Lauded as a masterpiece of Yiddish literature by the Yiddish press and diaspora with the accolades to prove it, *The Tree of Life* features a diverse cast of ten principal characters around whom the multi-year tale revolves.[17] The narrative follows these characters, as well as a considerable entourage of secondary and tertiary characters, as they live and die in the ghetto. Each of the novel's chapters shifts the focus from one character to the next revealing that the true protagonist of *The Tree of Life*, omnipresent throughout the narrative, is the city and ghetto of Łódź itself.

Comprised of three volumes, *The Tree of Life* tells an interconnected story in chronological order. The first volume, subtitled *On the Brink of the Precipice*, takes place during 1939, a year marked by rising antisemitism but also notable for its relative normality. The second volume, *From the Depths I Call You*, moves the narrative through 1940 and 1941, capturing the first years of ghetto life before the massive waves of deportations. With the third volume, *The Cattle Cars Are Waiting*, the tone and atmosphere become more dire and tragic as Rosenfarb outlines the final years of the ghetto from 1942 to 1944. Throughout, *The Tree of Life* focuses on the daily lives of ghetto residents as they acclimate to the increasingly grim reality of life in the ghetto.[18]

The Tree of Life is an excellent micro-history of Łódź, albeit, within a work of fiction, that attests to the uniqueness of the city and its ghetto.[19] Little more than a village in 1800, the city was "transformed…

---

[14] Rosenfarb, *Confessions*, 17-8.

[15] Goldie Morgentaler, "Chava and Zenia," *Tablet Magazine*, January 26, 2018, https://www.tabletmag.com/sections/arts-letters/articles/chava-and-zenia. The 1985 edition was published in Australia and condensed into one massive volume, which no doubt played a role in stifling its potential and caused doubts amongst publishers about its appeal in the much more crowded English-language literary world. Rosenfarb, *Confessions*, xvi.

[16] Morgentaler, "Chava and Zenia."

[17] The trilogy's accolades include the J.J. Segal Prize in 1972 and the 1979 Manger Prize in Yiddish Literature. Rosenfarb was decorated throughout her career for her accomplishments in the Yiddish language in various mediums. Rosenfarb, *Confessions*, xxii-xxiii. English-language reviews have also been favourable in recent decades as her works have been translated and republished.

[18] Morgentaler, "The Yiddish Woman Writer," 37-41.

[19] Chava Rosenfarb, *The Tree of Life, A Trilogy of Life in the Łódź Ghetto, Book One: On the Brink of the Precipice, 1939*, translated by the author and Goldie Morgentaler (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), 3-6.

into one of the largest centres of economic activity in Europe" by the twentieth century.[20] Jews formed the second largest ethnic group in Łódź and played a significant role in the city's ascent. Jews, like Rosenfarb's own parents, flocked to the city as it grew and offered more economic opportunities. This cycle of demographic and economic growth fostered the development of a highly skilled industrial workforce. Unfortunately, this also meant that the Jewish population of Łódź was large enough to make its ghetto second only to Warsaw in size. Due to its location within the Reich-annexed *Warthegau*, the entire prewar community was slated for eventual destruction in service to Nazism's genocidal colonial policy. Jews and Poles, whose histories and populations were more deeply rooted in Łódź than that of the tiny German minority, were to be eliminated from the city in preparation for a racially pure German future. This pending conquest was foreshadowed when Łódź was renamed Litzmannstadt after it fell to the Wehrmacht in 1939. The city's large skilled labour force became a tool used by Jewish ghetto leader Chaim Mordechai Rumkowski (1877-1944) in a bid to forestall armageddon. It was hoped that integrating the ghetto into the Reich's wartime economy would make its inhabitants indispensable to the war effort. Although the Łódź ghetto did not escape ultimate destruction at the hands of the Nazis, its economic importance did help to stave off its annihilation relative to other ghettos which were liquidated sooner.[21] By August of 1944, Rosenfarb and around 70,000 others, accounting for less than half of the ghetto's initial 1940 population, remained alive to witness the German retreat west and the emptying of the ghetto.[22]

As a survivor of the Łódź ghetto and the Holocaust, Rosenfarb found herself in a unique position in the aftermath of the war. Few could claim such endurance, and even fewer possessed the talent to write about their experience. At first, the ethical implications of doing so troubled her but the desire to write was powerful. In facing these concerns, Rosenfarb was not alone.[23] As Zoë Vania Waxman has argued, many other survivors felt similarly: "Holocaust survivors… had to confront the fact that whereas they survived, millions did not. This had a significant effect on the giving of testimony; many felt… a moral duty to testify…"[24] Rosenfarb admitted to feeling this compulsion once she began writing: "As I immersed myself in my writing, I was never confronted by the problems I had anticipated before I began. The subject itself imposed its form on me. No longer did I worry whether what I was writing was art or mere testimony. The question of whether one can create a true work of art on the subject of the Holocaust stopped tormenting me."[25] What she eventually produced was a work that bulwarked a language and community which had suffered one of the greatest assaults in human history and created a powerful memorial to its many victims. Whether conscious of the fact or not, Rosenfarb was emulating a cycle of cultural rebirth rooted in Jewish history.

The Tree of Life can be understood as a "fictional" or "literary" *yizker-bikher* or Yiddish "memory book."[26] Modern *yizker-bikher* are memorial books composed by Jewish survivors of the Holocaust to

---

[20] Isaiah Trunks, Israel Gutman and Robert Moses Shapiro, eds., *Łódź Ghetto: A History* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2006), xxix.

[21] Ibid, xli.

[22] Gordon J. Horwitz, *Ghettostadt: Łódź and the Making of a Nazi City* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), 316-7.

[23] Milton Teichman, "How Writers Fought Back: Literature from the Nazi Ghettos and Camps," *Judaism* Vol. 47, No. 3 (1998): no page numbers are available for the electronic version of the article.

[24] Zoë Vania Waxman, *Writing the Holocaust: Identity, Testimony, Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 88.

[25] Rosenfarb, *Confessions*, 19.

[26] There has been some debate around how to categorize Holocaust literature of this kind and I have decided to use "literary" rather than "fictional" as the latter implies a purely invented work created whole cloth from a writer's imagination. One of the most prominent examples of this debate was between writer and artist Art Spiegelman and the *New York Times Book Review*. Spiegelman's semi-autobiographical, semi-biographical depiction of his family's Holocaust experience in comic book form, *Maus*, was originally categorized, much to Spiegelman's dismay, under the "fiction" category. The *Review* later invented a new

honour the Jewish communities lost in the Shoah. They were typically compiled for the cities and towns of prewar Poland but similar tomes have been dedicated to destroyed communities across Eastern Europe. Naturally, *yizker-bikher* were written in Yiddish and Hebrew, linguistic choices predicated on their historic religious and cultural significance as well as their unique ability to capture "Jewish experience."[27] The use of Yiddish or Hebrew roots memorial books as expressions of Jewish cultural life, allowing them to fulfil their symbolic purpose as "substitute gravestones for martyrs who never received proper Jewish burial."[28]

As with so much of the modern Jewish canon, the post-Holocaust reemergence of *yizker-bikher* is rooted in ancient Jewish tradition. With stylistic and symbolic ties to the biblical Book of Lamentations, modern *yizker-bikher* have continued the long historical Jewish chronicle of "disaster" and "catastrophe."[29] Indeed, the word "*yizer*" comes from the Hebrew word for "remember," *yizkor*, which features in religious practices to this day, emphasizing the endurance of the concept of Jewish memorialization.[30]

The first *yizker-bikher* to appear in the historical record was published around 1296 in Nuremberg, Germany as a testament to Jews murdered by Christian Crusaders on their way to the Holy Land in 1096.[31] The resurrection and proliferation of *yizker-bikher* after the Holocaust demonstrates the ingrained Jewish cultural capacity for reflection and memorialization. *The Tree of Life* was both a continuation of this tradition and an effort to honour the legacy of one of Rosenfarb's literary mentors, the great Yiddish poet Simcha Bunim Shayevitch (1907-1944). In the ghetto in 1940, Shayevitch identified the burgeoning talent of a then-17-year-old Rosenfarb and brought her into the ghetto's unofficial writer's guild. The two shared a similar guiding principle in their writing, an ethos affected by their Holocaust experience. While in the ghetto, Shayevitch produced the epic poem "*Lekh-Lekho*," which proclaims this ethic. Famous in Yiddish literary circles, the poem is "characterized by the phrase *Kiddush Hashem*, In His Blessed Name… [which is a] belief [that] holds that Jews killed in a time of persecution are martyrs to God."[32] The same life-affirming purpose lies at the heart of *yizker-bikher* and *The Tree of Life.* As Shayevitch wrote, "But let us not weep, let us not/ moan, and to spite all enemies,/ Let us smile, only smile, that they/ May be amazed at what Jews are capable of…"[33]

This research paper will argue that *The Tree of Life* contains all three of the necessary hallmarks of a *yizker-bikher.* It focuses on the life, rather than the death, of the community it memorializes. It names and humanizes the victims of the Nazi genocidal project, a direct contravention of Nazi policy. Finally, it is an expression of Jewishness, and especially Yiddish culture, a living testament to a destroyed community, a cultural memorial for those without tombstones.[34] In his study of post-Holocaust Yiddish fiction, Jan Schwarz compared *The Tree of Life* to a *yizker-bikher* because both were "published as hardcover volumes and printed on the best paper, signifying their function as 'substitute gravestones' for the nameless victims,

---

category entirely to appease Spiegelman and avoid definitive categorization. Aukje Kluge and Benn E. Williams, *Re-Examining the Holocaust Through Literature* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publisher, 2009), 175.

[27] Tara Kohn and Magdelena Waligórska, *Jewish Translation - Translating Jewishness* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018), 237-8. In another parallel between *The Tree of Life* and *yizker-bikher,* an increasing proportion of the latter have been translated into English in recent decades.

[28] Jonathan Boyarin, "Yizker-bikher," YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe. https://yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Yizker-bikher. Accessed February 14, 2021.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Daniel H. Magilow and Lisa Silverman, *Holocaust Representations in History: An Introduction* (London: Bloomsbury Academic Press, 2015), 36.

[31] Ibid, 37.

[32] Adelson, *Inside a Community Under Siege*, xiii.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid, 36-8.

none of whom were afforded a proper burial according to Jewish religious law."[35] Schwarz's comparison only went skin deep, however. This paper seeks to demonstrate that the contents of *The Tree of Life*, not just its physical appearance, emulate the memorial qualities of a *yizker-bikher*.

Even though Yiddish memorial books were created in response to the killings of the Holocaust, the content of a typical *yizker-bikher* is focused far more on the history of a community and the details of its daily life before the cataclysm than any grim illustration of death. Of course, *yizker-bikher* were dedicated to real people and real events. This is what makes them such potent reservoirs of cultural remembrance. If *The Tree of Life* was the mere product of imagination, it would be unworthy of the "literary *yizker-bikher*" mantle. However, despite its necessary categorization as "fiction," the overall authenticity of Rosenfarb's recreation gives it immense symbolic value, enabling it to stand alongside *yizker-bikher*. And there can be no doubting Rosenfarb's authenticity; an accurate map of the ghetto appears in the front matter and a significant portion of the cast features "real-life" and "composite" characters such as Chaim Mordechai Rumkowski, the controversial leader of the Jewish Council in the Łódź Ghetto or Rachel Eibushitz, "a portrait of the author as a young woman."[36] The level of detail, the variety of experiences presented, the scope and scale of the narrative, and the sheer number of characters demonstrate Rosenfarb's collective memorial purpose.

Ruth Franklin, a scholar of Holocaust survivor literature, has argued that fictional works like *The Tree of Life* can be indistinguishable from memoirs on the same subject. Works of this nature are "*both* a novel and a memoir" encapsulated together.[37] *The Tree of Life* is especially valuable because of the dichotomy alluded to by Daniel H. Magilow and Lisa Silverman in *Holocaust Representations in History: An Introduction*, "We typically view fact and fiction as diametrically opposed categories. Fact reveals something that is considered to be true or actually existing. Fiction is defined as imaginary or invented. But facts alone can obscure reality, while fiction can reveal truths that facts obscure."[38] What makes *The Tree of Life* worthy of note compared to other fictionalized memoirs is that it is not about Rosenfarb herself, since the trilogy lacks a clear human protagonist, but instead is devoted to memorializing the community as a whole. Norman Ravvin has drawn a connection between the synchronicity of reading Rosenfarb's fictional trilogy and the collection of testimonial survivor accounts contained within *Łódź Ghetto: Inside a Community Under Siege* by Adelson, Lapides, and Web. Quoting Raul Hilberg, Ravvin argues that the effect of reading both works gives the impression that "'these people were speaking in unison about virtually identical experiences: what it was like during the last moments of peace, what happened when the Nazis came, how rapidly the Jewish community was engulfed, how family and friends vanished.'"[39] Rosenfarb's authenticity, her ability to capture at least a piece of her lived experience and her desire to showcase the beating heart of her community, rather than its dying breaths, enable *The Tree of Life* to act as a literary *yizker-bikher*.

---

[35] Schwarz, *Survivors and Exiles*, 54.

[36] Morgentaler, "The Yiddish Woman Writer," 41. Rosenfarb's composite features the last name

[37] Ruth Franklin, *A Thousand Darknesses: Lies and Truth in Holocaust Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 9.

[38] Magilow and Silverman, *Holocaust Representations in History*, 119.

[39] Norman Ravvin, *A House of Words: Jewish Writing, Identity and Memory* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997), 87. Ravvin dedicates an entire chapter in this work to *The Tree of Life*, noting its historical accuracy and Jewish progeny as well as contrasting its Yiddish and English editions. Outside of Ravvin, the English-language historiography of the trilogy is almost non-existent save for a dedicated chapter by Jan Schwarz in his study of the Yiddish literature produced by the diaspora. Outside of Ravvin, Schwarz, and this research paper, there seems to be little to no analysis of *The Tree of Life* in English - most mentions of the work are limited to brief overviews in broad studies of Holocaust literature. This absence is less shocking given that the novels have only been reliably available in English and North America for the last fifteen years.

Rosenfarb's commitment to portraying a lively community is evident from the beginning of the first volume, *On the Brink of the Precipice, 1939*. This is because it takes place before the ghetto is established, though its foreboding ending alludes to the difficult times to come.[40] This approach sets the tone for the trilogy and identifies for readers that Jews are the focus of the narrative. Indeed, one of the most striking aspects of *The Tree of Life* is the relative absence of Germans from the overall narrative, who do not make their first appearance until well into the second half of the first volume (corresponding to the capture of Łódź in September 1939).[41] Germans appear throughout the trilogy, of course, but they are more often alluded to, cursed, and veiled in mystery. This stylistic framing works methodological wonders by ensuring that the story remains quintessentially Jewish throughout. Focused on their trials and tribulations, rather than the decisions and actions of their oppressors, *The Tree of Life* devotes its pages to demonstrating the liveliness of the Jewish community and revealing the fundamental humanity of its members. By seeing how characters lived in the first volume before the establishment of the ghetto, we can appreciate how they continued living and retained their humanity after their internment at the start of the second. It also allows readers to appreciate the immense and varied changes to the psychology, personality, fortune, and physical and mental health of the characters by providing a prewar baseline of comparison once the story of the ghetto begins in earnest.

By focusing on the journey, rather than the destination, Rosenfarb can portray the inhabitants of the ghetto in a state of less-than-blissful ignorance, living from moment to moment, just as she experienced it.[42] It is the regular course of everyday life in the ghetto, its numerous and varied difficulties, which form the heart of the narrative from the second volume onward and fulfils Rosenfarb's commitment to telling a story about Jewish life once the powerful force of death is unleashed on the narrative and ghetto. This includes detailed descriptions of the operation of the ghetto from several vantage points throughout the second and third volumes. Through the eyes of ghetto leader Rumkowski, for example, we see Rosenfarb blend fact and fiction as she portrays the old man as being reinvigorated by the amount of work to be done in the ghetto. Prewar organizations of all sorts needed to be dissolved and new ones resurrected in their place, political order under Rumkowski's control needed to be established, industry needed workers and organization, and children needed direction.[43] While other writers might have focused almost exclusively on the extreme and repressive aspects of life in the ghetto, that most demonstrate the unique horror of the experience to deliver a shock to readers, Rosenfarb, like *yizker-bikher*, did not allow the horrific side of the ghetto experience to overwhelm the narrative. It is not that Rosenfarb ignored the ugly side of life in the ghetto, Rumkowski is used to illustrate that aspect as well, but even dire moments are linked to the challenges of, and desire for, life.

The tonal shift in the third volume is palpable in this regard. The ugliness of the second volume was personal, reflecting the challenges faced by characters as they transitioned from prewar life to life in the ghetto. By the final volume, whole segments of the community were under siege on a scale hitherto unseen. Mirroring a famous episode from the history of the Łódź ghetto, Rosenfarb depicts the emotional speech that Rumkowski made as a plea to ghetto mothers to "give up" their children to "save the ghetto."[44] As readers, we know that this plea is tantamount to a death sentence, a horrible truth Rumkowski was aware of as well. In reality, the children, along with the elderly and infirm, were marked for destruction

[40] Rosenfarb, *On the Brink of the Precipice*, 310.
[41] Ibid, 179.
[42] Adelson, *Inside a Community Under Siege*, xiv.
[43] Chava Rosenfarb, *The Tree of Life, A Trilogy of Life in the Łódź Ghetto, Book Two: From the Depths I Call You, 1940-1942*, translated by the author and Goldie Morgentaler (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005) 36-9.
[44] Rosenfarb, *The Cattle Cars Are Waiting*, 124.

because they consumed precious resources without commensurate economic or industrial production. The decision by Rumkowski to support the deportation of the ghetto's children was based upon his belief that it was a necessary sacrifice that might ensure the survival of at least those Jews who could continue to prove their productivity.[45] It was a deadly decision, to be sure, but a rather "choiceless" one as well. Rosenfarb depicts Rumkowski as a megalomaniac convinced of his own genius and ability to outwit the Germans but also as a tragic figure forced to send beloved members of his community to slaughter against his will, a decision which he justified by believing that it might give others a chance to survive.[46] A focus on the life of the community did not necessitate ignoring death, just the contrary as this example suggests, but rather an acknowledgement of how death fit into the lived experience of ghetto residents.

It is through detailed arcs portraying the lives of the ghetto's inhabitants that Rosenfarb best demonstrates the power and vividness of life in the ghetto. One character that exemplifies this is Itche Mayer. When readers first encounter Mayer in the first volume, he lives with his wife Sheyne Pessele, and their four adult sons, Israel, Mottle, Yoshi, and Shalom, in a small basement cellar. A working-class family living in Baluty, a poor area of Jewish Łódź which would later form the ghetto, Mayer and his family were not leaders in their community. That said, all four of Mayer's sons were politically active in one of the diverse political movements of the day which attracted young Jews: Bundism, Communism, Zionism, and Socialism.[47] Though Mayer was a woodworker of some renown in Łódź and considered the foremost Jewish carpenter, his working-class status restricted his political influence and legitimacy within the community. By the second volume, with the establishment of the ghetto, Mayer found himself thrust into a world that freed him from his internalized silence. Life in the ghetto had altered Mayer's circumstances and he was altered as a result. Ultimately, Mayer became something of a political firebrand. His convictions, joined by those of his sons, led Mayer to play a leading role in a large protest against the treatment of ghetto workers.[48] From humble woodworker to the instigator of the most significant organized resistance to the ghetto's policies, the example of Itche Mayer is one of many within *The Tree of Life* that shows how Jews retained agency even in abject captivity. It demonstrates how they could offer vociferous opposition to their circumstances without resorting to the kind of deadly violence which was inflicted upon them. And like *yizker-bikher*, it exemplifies that there was passionate life to be lived even within the confines of the ghetto.

Despite the extreme circumstances, life in the ghetto featured celebrations and moments of joviality that demonstrate the liveliness of the community. Romance, for example, budded, bloomed, and even blossomed in the ghetto. Rachel and David, a couple at the end of their teenage years, found their passions more difficult to control in the ghetto than they had been before.[49] A husband and wife renewed their sexual appetites, albeit, in a very altered form than earlier in their marriage.[50] A dedicated Communist fell in love, against her better judgement, with the "king" of the Łódź underworld, each yearning for the other but unable to consummate their love before his deportation.[51] All of these romantic liaisons could have formed the typical, mundane background of everyday life outside of the ghetto. Their presence and perseverance within the ghetto, despite the dreadful conditions faced by inhabitants, demonstrated the life-affirming qualities that Rosenfarb, and *yizker-bikher*, wished to highlight.

---

[45] Horwitz, *Ghettostadt*, 195-213.

[46] Rosenfarb, *The Cattle Cars Are Waiting*,

[47] Rosenfarb, *On the Brink of the Precipice*, 33-8.

[48] Rosenfarb, *From the Depths I Call You*, 108-11.

[49] Rosenfarb, *From the Depths I Call You*, 239.

[50] Ibid, 304-5.

[51] Ibid, 227.

If joy and romance could endure in the ghetto and demonstrate the liveliness of those trapped inside, then children also personified those life-affirming qualities. Rosenfarb outlined how this was so in a section where her authorial voice shines through the omniscient narration:

> They did not as yet feel the hunger so badly, their parents saw to that. If they did begin to feel it, their strange new life made them forget it… The ghetto was one big marketplace, full of adventures, true ones, not imagined. They could play all kinds of games, for their parents were busy with their worries and had relaxed their vigilance. The children could even play at being adults, gather firewood, carry pails of water and learn to cook. When they tired of that, they could scamper through the streets and watch the workers build the fence being erected and encircled with a barbed wire fence - a spooky place…[52]

As readers, we know the fate that is going to befall these children, and indeed the vast majority of the people that demonstrated the liveliness of the ghetto throughout *The Tree of Life:* starvation, disease, violence, death. But even though events are headed toward that inevitable conclusion, that is not the purpose of the narrative. Rosenfarb knew, emulating the authors of *yizker-bikher*, that a focus on the lives of the victims was the most appropriate memorial for those murdered, an acknowledgement that their life was about more than just their tragic death in a grand historical event.

Any discussion of the ghetto and the Holocaust, however, inevitably turns to death. This too plays an important role in Jewish memorialization. No *yizker-bikher* is complete without a section that names the deceased victims of the town or city that the book is dedicated to. Though complete biographies of individuals are rare, even the simple inclusion of a list of names helps to humanize the victims of Nazi terror.[53] Reversing Nazi efforts to anonymize and dehumanize victims of genocidal violence is an important and intentional function of *yizker-bikher*. The Nazis set out with an explicit goal to permanently erasing not only the Jewish people but all aspects and influences of their culture as well.[54] The *yizker-bikher*, and Rosenfarb's *The Tree of Life*, have denied them success.

As a writer, one of Rosenfarb's greatest talents was the ability to humanize her characters. One imagines that all of her characters could have been real people, not just those based on historical figures. The changes elicited by the progression of life in Łódź and the ghetto provided the characters with a humanizing arc over the full course of the narrative. For example, in the first volume when readers meet the character of "Miss Diamand," a literature teacher at the Jewish girls 'gymnasium, she is extremely dismissive of Jewish culture with chauvinistic opinions that become downright venomous regarding the artistic potential of the Yiddish language.[55] After Rachel, one of her pupils, decided to highlight a Yiddish writer for a project that asked students to pen an essay about "The Writer Closest to my Heart," Miss Diamand explained why Rachel failed the assignment, "If the writer is in fact all that you claim him to be, how is it that the world doesn't know about him? Why have I, for instance, never heard of him? You say that he was the founder of modern Yiddish literature. Very nice, but is it not an altogether questionable assumption that a jargon can have a literature and that people living shut up in a Ghetto can be modern, let alone capable of producing modern literature?"[56] By the second volume, the experience of living in the ghetto had changed Miss Diamand and enlightened her, one might say, to the beauty of the culture and

[52] Ibid, 42.
[53] Boyarin, "Yizker-bikher," YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe.
[54] Horwitz, *Ghettostadt*, 3-4.
[55] Rosenfarb, *On the Brink of the Precipice*, 103-7.
[56] Ibid, 105.

community she had rejected for the previous 65 years of her life. Having grown as a person because of her encounter with new experiences, Miss Diamand became a kind of secular, literary rabbi, bestowing wisdom and providing succour to community members struggling to endure the ghetto.[57] Yet Rosenfarb did not attempt to portray the ghetto as an exclusively redemptive force; there was plenty of pain to go around too. Miss Diamand, forced into the ghetto against her will, had to endure the loss of her oldest and most faithful friend, a Polish woman who had been her roommate for many years and was forbidden from entering the ghetto, to facilitate the growth of her Jewish identity.[58] Life in the ghetto was lived moment to moment, not in anticipation of the final march to the gas chamber. It wrought changes in those who experienced it and Rosenfarb's description of why those changes occurred in the context of the ghetto humanized the characters, adding weight to her effort to honour real Jewish victims.

Even when characters changed in negative ways, the turn toward immorality was often instigated by a stubborn instinct to survive, an unwillingness to wither away into nothingness. In the context of the ghetto, every breathe drawn by a Jew was an act of defiance. To Rosenfarb, in such an extreme, morally confused world, a willingness to accede to one's darker impulses did not signal a lack of humanity. The task of naming and humanizing victims is an all-inclusive one; neither the crematoria nor the Nazis cared if the victim was an altruistic saint or an opportunistic collaborator. These traits are best personified by the character of Adam Rosenberg, a fictional creation not based on a historical figure. Before the war, Rosenberg was one of the wealthiest men in all of Łódź, not just amongst the Jews. A factory owner, Rosenberg was chauffeured to work every day in an automobile and took great pleasure in sexually harassing his female secretary and humiliating his floor manager. At home, Rosenberg vastly preferred the company of his hunting dog, Sutchka, to that of his wife and son.[59] This should give some approximation of his temperament and character. During the second volume, Rosenberg lost his fortune and found himself in a state of deep depression after his precious Sutchka was killed before his very eyes due to his arrogant dismissal of the rule against owning pets in the ghetto.[60] Perhaps more than any other character, Rosenberg experienced the ghetto like a roller coaster, with immense peaks and valleys. Later in the second volume, to hide from the *Kripo* (Jewish ghetto police), Rosenberg became a volunteer "fecalist," whose duty it was to take "a large wooden scoop… and a pail" and "with these they would draw the excrement out of the cesspools [throughout the yards of the ghetto] and fill the long brick-red barrels which lay horizontally on the framework of a wagon."[61] From this fetid vantage point, Rosenberg would soon see an opportunity to make good his earlier boast to become a "knight" of the ghetto, advancing "sideways, increasingly closer to his goal [of remaining alive]."[62] Unable to escape the *Kripo*, even with a false identity, Rosenberg made a deal with the devil and agreed to become an informant, a job that kept him alive and even proved enjoyable because of his cruel nature.[63] While readers might see nothing but a monster, some of those who shared a similar experience believed figures like Rosenberg to be somewhat morally ambiguous. As literary scholar Frieda W. Aaron, herself a Warsaw ghetto and concentration camp survivor, recounted: "At rock bottom, even such prisoners as the *Sonderkommandos* were not, necessarily, dehumanized - though they were forced to herd their own people into the gas chambers where they, too, ultimately died. After all, the

---

[57] Rosenfarb, *From the Depths I Call You*, 148-57.

[58] Ibid, 13-5. The relationship between Miss Diamand and Wanda, her Polish roommate, is platonic rather than romantic but their affection and devotion to each other rivalled and even surpassed some of the married characters in the narrative.

[59] Rosenfarb, *On the Brink of the Precipice*, 58-68.

[60] Rosenfarb, *From the Depths I Call You*, 134-40.

[61] Ibid, 389.

[62] Ibid, 316.

[63] Rosenfarb, *The Cattle Cars Are Waiting*,

moral choices of the *Sonderkommandos* were reduced to zero… It is the bestial Nazis who made the fire of Auschwitz, not they who were forced to feed it and then burn in it."[64] While readers might not "like" the character of Rosenberg very much, it is impossible not to see the humanity in him, even if it is a rather unpleasant reflection of our more selfish qualities.

A passion for Jewish socialism had humanized the character of Itche Mayer but Rosenfarb most often turned to art to humanize her characters. It is in the chapters that explore characters' relationship with art that the most "confessional" aspects of Rosenfarb's writing are put on display. Her own ghetto experience had provided fuel for her artistic impulses and she wrote poetry and diaries during her final years in Łódź. Her daughter, Goldie Morgentaler, identified that writing was a coping mechanism for Rosenfarb and a medium through which she could engage with her traumatic past.[65] Throughout the novel, many characters reflect and debate the nature of art, humanity, and the ghetto. Rosenfarb also recreated the "artists'" circle that she had been a member of.[66] In one scene, an artist explains to a poet that for creatives like them, psychological strength must be drawn from their work. Their ability to "immortalize" was a far greater weapon than any that might be wielded by a soldier.[67] From this, they could draw meaning from their experience and continue to survive. Yet to lose one's art in the ghetto, given its potential to uplift the spirit, was a dreadful curse that allowed the crushing reality of the ghetto to sap one's physical and mental strength. In a letter to his lover abroad, Doctor Michal Levine explained his concern about an artist friend, "Guttman has stopped painting… I am sure that if he found the courage to work for a few hours a day, it would help us both. But he keeps on screaming that an artist is not a clock one can turn on to make it work; that an artist has to have his creative impulses. I ask him why the present reality does not boost these impulses sufficiently. So he replies that painting means contact between the artist's soul and reality, and that he has lost that contact."[68]

For Rosenfarb, there was no doubt about the value, even the necessity, of artistic expression in the ghetto. "During those horrible months and years of incarceration in the ghetto, I never stopped writing. I produced hundreds upon hundreds of poems, filling with stanzas the pages of bookkeeping registers, which were covered with calculations on one side, but blank on the other. There, despite the hunger, the cold and the fear, I wrote poems more ardently than ever before - or since."[69] The idea that artistic expression provided palpable emotional, psychological, and spiritual support in an extreme situation should be taken quite seriously.[70] Given that she saw art as necessary to her own survival, it is fitting that she endeavoured to give countless victims a piece of that survival in her narrative creation, a life that they were forever denied by their untimely, unnatural deaths. In "Confessions of a Yiddish writer," Rosenfarb wrote, "What I always kept in mind was that in the ghetto, despite hunger, disease, and the threat of death, I had spent the richest and most inspiring years of my life. Mine is a brutal, nightmarish story, but also one of extraordinary endurance and nobility of heart, a story of moral strength and defiance."[71] Her ability to imbue her characters with these same values, humanizing them as proxy victims of Nazi genocide, connects her work to broader cultural acts of remembrance like *yizker-bikher*.

---

[64] Frieda W. Aaron, *Bearing the Unbearable: Yiddish and Polish Poetry in the Ghettos and Concentration Camps* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1990), 206.

[65] Goldie Morgentaler, "Chava Rosenfarb's Tree of Life," *Hamilton Jewish News*, March 26, 2016, https://hamiltonjewishnews.com/home-page/voices/chava-rosenfarbs-tree-of-life

[66] Rosenfarb, *From the Depths I Call You*, 265; and, Morgentaler, "The Yiddish Woman Writer," 39.

[67] Rosenfarb, *From the Depths I Call You*, 103.

[68] Rosenfarb, *On the Brink of the Precipice*, 293.

[69] Rosenfarb, *Confessions*, 4.

[70] Ibid, 4-5; and, Sidra DeKoven Ezrahi, *By Words Alone: The Holocaust in Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 16.

[71] Rosenfarb, *Confessions*, 20.

Produced by a Yiddish-speaking Jew, reflecting the outpouring of *yizker-bikher* in the postwar era, *The Tree of Life* is an important piece of Jewish and Yiddish culture. This is the third and final necessary component linking the novel to *yizker-bikher*: both works were created for a Jewish audience by Jewish creators to defy Nazi annihilation, proliferate their culture, and reaffirm those lost to genocidal violence. Yiddish culture in the aftermath of the Second World War found itself in a rather fascinating historical paradox. On the one hand, the Nazi regime had murdered an incredible proportion of Yiddish speakers. Of the eleven million Yiddish speakers in the world in 1939, the Nazis killed about five million, nearly half, including the majority of the over two hundred thousand Yiddish speakers of Łódź.[72] On the other, the aftermath of the genocidal tragedy witnessed a boom of Yiddish literature and cultural production in the first few decades after the war which outpaced the prewar artistic output of that community. Jan Schwarz has argued that in the decades immediately following the Holocaust, Yiddish art and culture underwent an intentional resurgence in defiance of Nazi attempts to eliminate all traces of Jewry.[73] Motivated by the same defiant and memorial purpose as the historians and survivors who assembled *yizker-bikher*, Yiddish poets and authors also wielded their pens in service to lost friends, families, neighbours, and communities. For Rosenfarb, the use of Yiddish is one of the many factors that made her effort to memorialize her community and experience noteworthy. As she put it, "The Yiddish language, written with the Hebrew letters of the Bible, automatically places every Yiddish text within the context of Jewish history, of Jewish national and religious experience, and so endows it with a near-sacred quality. The mystical power that Jews ascribe to the Hebrew letters seems to influence the texture of even the most secular Yiddish works, endowing them with an additional lustre."[74] The same cultural potentiality that animated *yizker-bikher*, making them symbolic indicators of historical importance, enabled *The Tree of Life* to perform the same memorial function.

The significance of Rosenfarb's decision to write in Yiddish held religious and not just linguistic and cultural value, even in a secular work by a secular author because it deepens the novel's connection to the Jewish experience. This is reflected by the intrinsic nature of the Yiddish language itself. Rooted in Jewish history and tradition, Yiddish contains many words of deep religious and cultural resonance. Rosenfarb's title, an allusion to the Torah, is rooted in Judaic mythology with the titular tree in Łódź mirroring the biblical Tree of Life in the Garden of Eden from which Adam and Eve were barred after eating the apocryphal apple. In Jewish theology (mirrored in Rosefarb's novel), the Tree of Life carries ethical implications, namely that knowledge of one's inevitable, unavoidable death links all humans in a common struggle.[75] This theme is evident throughout *The Tree of Life* and its egalitarian attention to suffering further parallels the intention of *yizker-bikher* to acknowledge the shared experience of a community. Therefore even secular works like *The Tree of Life* can be embedded with "sacred attributes."[76] The same blending of secular and religious meaning is encapsulated within Yiddish *yizker-bikher* as well since the Yiddish language is filled with symbolism and historical meaning.[77]

The Tree of Life is a work that helped to perpetuate the cultural rebirth of Yiddish after the war but it was also a work that was nurtured by the Yiddish community during its creation. This symbiotic

---

[72] Rebecca Margolis, "Chava Rosenfarb's Yiddish Montreal," *Canadian Jewish Studies* No. 18-19 (2010), 160; Schwarz, *Survivors and Exiles*, 244; and, Trunk, *Łódź Ghetto*, xxix.

[73] Schwarz, *Survivors and Exiles*, 3-5.

[74] Rosenfarb, *Confessions*, 177.

[75] James A. Diamond, *Jewish Theology Unbound* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 154. The many theological references in Rosenfarb's work stem from linguistic and cultural sources. Rosenfarb went to a secular school as a girl and did not seem to hold personal religious convictions nor adhere to the tenets of any sect of the Judaic faith.

[76] Schwarz, *Survivors and Exiles*, 54.

[77] Boyarin, "Yizker-bikher," YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe.

relationship demonstrates the intrinsic cultural connection, nature, and purpose of *The Tree of Life*. When Chava Rosenfarb arrived in Montreal in 1950, she found herself in one of the literary hotspots of the Yiddish diaspora and the largest Yiddish community in North America outside of New York City.[78] The presence of a sizeable and organized diaspora of Yiddish speakers on the new continent proved essential to her ability to continue to write in that language by furnishing a reliable market for her work and providing her with a supportive interpersonal social network. According to Schwarz, *The Tree of Life* took on quasi-religious importance for the community which elevated Rosenfarb to near-mythical status as its author.[79] Integration into the Yiddish diaspora was one of the main differences that Rosenfarb saw between herself and Jewish writers like Paul Celan, Jerzy Kosinski, Adolf Rudnicki, and Primo Levi who had taken their own lives after the war. She felt a kinship with these men as fellow survivors and writers and she agonized over, "What compelled them, of their own free will, to shut the light of day from their eyes - that miraculously rescued day, which was such a dearly bought gift from Fate."[80] It seemed to her a most pitiable tragedy that these individuals, "carried their own lives back to the altar of annihilation, to enlarge further the German victory over the Jews."[81] It seemed to her that what those writers had in common was that they placed little emphasis on their Jewish identity, further exemplified by the fact that they wrote in "non-Jewish languages."[82] Having never developed an internal sense of their own Jewishness and yet forever marked as outsiders amongst non-Jews, they found themselves in almost total isolation after the war. Such alienation, combined with the horrific trauma of their experience, made their tragic suicides more likely. Celan, Kosinski, Rudnicki, Levi, and too many other assimilated writers "never found the moral and spiritual support," that she found in "Yiddish Montreal."[83] Indeed, without the Canadian Yiddish community and her literary skill in that language, Rosenfarb may have even been denied entry into Canada.[84] A fitting encapsulation of how the Yiddish language helped to shape her life.

Rosenfarb's choice to write in Yiddish was rich in symbolic importance because of the post-Holocaust context in which she wrote. With almost half of the world's Yiddish speakers so recently killed, the language had become a post-vernacular tongue whose "symbolic meaning… came to outweigh its communicative functions."[85] By definition, the use of Yiddish eschewed the traditional artistic commercial imperative of commanding the attention of the largest possible audience. It was not that Rosenfarb was only able to produce her novel in Yiddish, with assistance it could have been published concurrently, or even exclusively, in English. But as with the authors of *yizker-bikher*, Rosenfarb was not working in a vacuum. By writing her novel in Yiddish, she was perpetuating her culture and drawing on its symbolic meaning. A fitting tribute to the victims of the Nazi genocide. Like historians cataloguing *yizker-bikher* at Vad Yashem, Rosenfarb memorialized while simultaneously constructing a new sedimentary layer of Yiddish culture. *The Tree of Life* and *yizker-bikher* did more than just pay homage to the past, they provided a rallying point around which survivors could flock and flourish.

---

[78] Margolis, "Chava Rosenfarb's Yiddish Montreal," 161; and, Chava Rosenfarb, "Canadian Yiddish Writers," in *New Readings of Yiddish Montreal*, edited by Pierre Anctil, Norman Ravvin and Sherry Simon (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2007): 11.

[79] Schwarz, *Survivors and Exiles*, 54; and, Margolis, "Chava Rosenfarb's Yiddish Montreal," 163-4.

[80] Rosenfarb, *Confession*, 101.

[81] Ibid.

[82] Ibid, 104.

[83] Ibid, 117.

[84] Margolis, "Chava Rosenfarb's Yiddish Montreal," 164-5. Rosenfarb was "sponsored" by her Montreal publisher, which made her immigration case more credible in an era when Canada's immigration policies remained quite hostile to Jews. The publisher, Harry Hershman, paid for their transatlantic passage and helped Rosenfarb integrate herself into Montreal's literary milieu.

[85] Schwarz, *Survivors and Exiles*, 10-2, 44-5.

The fundamental Yiddish essence of *The Tree of Life* and its author is on display even in the English translation of the novel. Furthermore, the English version is an additional source of memorial value because it has expanded the novel's potential audience, though, judging from the dearth of academic engagement with the novel, the work has yet to win the attention of many English readers (odds are the work is far too long and sophisticated to engage any large popular audience). *The Tree of Life* hangs onto its definitive Yiddish characteristics even in English translation, thereby allowing those without the prerequisite language skills to appreciate its unique cultural heritage. The eventual translation of *The Tree of Life* into English may have been a necessary attempt to grow her readership and achieve some literary relevancy in her adopted country (though the 2004-6 translation may have been issued too late to achieve these ends), but it is clear that these were secondary priorities. The novel was composed with a focus on its Yiddish nature and Rosenfarb believed that this could be captured in translation which she considered, "the most optimistic of literary endeavours" because it allowed "idioms, phrases, and sayings that have no equivalents in other languages… [to be] transmuted, so that those who speak an entirely foreign language and belong to an entirely different culture may nevertheless understand… through the medium of translation."[86]

When she wrote about the difficulty of achieving a transcendent translation, Rosenfarb identified the intense challenge of ensuring that the unique cultural and linguistic qualities of the original remain intact. Sometimes this led to fights between Rosenfarb and her primary translator, her daughter, Goldie Morgentaler.[87] Translating *The Tree of Life* from Yiddish into English presented unique challenges to the mother-daughter duo. "Yiddish is a language of overstatement, of highly charged emotion. Translated into English, this kind of emotion appears overwrought, too much of a good thing, too sentimental. For instance, English frowns on redundancy; Yiddish thrives on it. Nobody ever just cries in Yiddish; they cry tears, they cry out their eyes, they cry so as to sink a ship with buttermilk."[88] This quintessential Yiddish capacity for exaggeration is apparent in the English translation of the trilogy. At the start of the second volume of *The Tree of Life*, the carpenter Itche Mayer and his wife, Sheyne Pessele, debate the merits of taking a mattress that had been abandoned by Polish neighbours who had been forced to move out of the designated ghetto area. When Mayer stubbornly refuses, his wife voices her displeasure, "Hands folded over her breast, she approached the two cots, shaking her head at them with disgust and revelation. 'This you call a bed? These miseries full of bedbugs? Since beds have been beds, there has never been a bed like this. This is an inquisition, not a bed. Have you ever spent a smooth night on it? Have you ever gotten up in the morning without aching bones?'"[89] When Mayer remains unconvinced, Pessele maintains her unrelenting argument, "'Never in your life have you tasted the pleasure of such a mattress. It doesn't squeak, it doesn't pinch. It's butter, not a mattress.' She cast a hate-filled glance at the sunken cots and grimaced. 'Where have you ever seen such bumps, such holes? The beds in Sodom must have been more comfortable.'"[90] The ability to retain distinct cultural elements despite the translation process lends *The Tree of Life* exactly the sort of memorial power that it was created to express.

When the war ended in Europe, Rosenfarb was coalescing in Bergen-Belsen from a fierce bout with typhus that had almost killed her. It was there that she was "visited by a feverish vision of Shayevitch and her father. They demanded that she never forget them and that she take up her pen to make the Łódź

---

[86] Ibid, 188.

[87] Goldie Morgentaler, "Love and Translation," *Forward*, May 13, 2012, https://forward.com/articles/156028/love-and-translation/. Accessed February 5, 2021.

[88] Rosenfarb, *Confessions*, 188.

[89] Rosenfarb, *From the Depths I Call You*, 25.

[90] Ibid.

Ghetto live on in the memory of the next generation."[91] Though her wretched experience could have formed a creative block, Rosenfarb resolved to use her creativity to express her experience and honour the memory of the victims who did not survive. What she produced was not only a literary masterpiece, but a fitting tribute to a destroyed community, a love letter and poignant farewell to the place where she was born thrice; first, as a human being, then as a writer, and, finally, as a Holocaust survivor. At some point, she realized the importance of honouring the legacy and memory of that community. In her own words,

> I wrote *The Tree of Life* in the hope that I might bring the next generations a little closer to the awareness of what it means to have survived the Holocaust. I bore witness in the belief that there is no future for mankind if it refuses to face itself in the mirror of the Holocaust, disturbing and horrifying though that mirror might be. It is a mirror that tells us that man is not the most beautiful and noble of God's creatures, but the most tragic. It tells us that man's potential for aggression and evil, for hating others and for self-hatred, for committing suicide through acts of homicide and genocide, may lead to his own eradication from the face of the earth. Moreover, if we forget the Holocaust, we deprive ourselves of the knowledge of the human soul, with its hidden recesses of love and care, of dignity and courage, for those were in fact the qualities that the humiliated, spat upon, doomed Jews displayed every day of the tortured lives they led between the barbed wire fences of the ghetto.[92]

The Tree of Life is, in form and intention, a literary *yizker-bikher*. It recreated Łódź in stunning detail, as both a city and a ghetto, and told a life-affirming story, demonstrating the victims' innate human stubbornness to persevere and endure. By retelling the history of a destroyed community and placing great emphasis on Jewish life in the ghetto, by naming and humanizing victims (even fictional ones), and by merely existing as a masterpiece of Yiddish literature in a post-Holocaust world, *The Tree of Life* exemplifies the memorial, life-affirming, and humanizing qualities of *yizker-bikher* and it deserves to stand as one of the greatest pieces of Holocaust memorial literature ever produced.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Rosenfarb, Chava. *The Tree of Life, A Trilogy of Life in the Łódź Ghetto, Book One: On the Brink of the Precipice, 1939*. Translated by the author and Goldie Morgentaler. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004.

Rosenfarb, Chava. *The Tree of Life, A Trilogy of Life in the Łódź Ghetto, Book Two: From the Depths I Call You, 1940-1942*. Translated by the author and Goldie Morgentaler. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005.

Rosenfarb, Chava. *The Tree of Life, A Trilogy of Life in the Łódź Ghetto, Book Three: The Cattle Cars Are Waiting, 1942-1944*. Translated by the author and Goldie Morgentaler. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.

Rosenfarb, Chava. *Confessions of a Yiddish Writer and Other Essays by Chava Rosenfarb*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2019.

Secondary Sources

---

[91] Schwarz, *Survivors and Exiles*, 52.

[92] Rosenfarb, *Confessions*, 21.

Aaron, Frieda W. *Bearing the Unbearable Yiddish and Polish Poetry in the Ghettos and Concentration Camps.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

Adelson, Alan and Robert Lapides. *Łódź Ghetto: Inside a Community Under Siege.* New York: Viking, 1989.

Diamond. James A. *Jewish Theology Unbound.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Ezrahi, Sidra DeKoven. *By Words Alone: The Holocaust in Literature.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Franklin, Ruth. *A Thousand Darknesses: Lies and Truth in Holocaust Fiction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Horwitz, Gordon. *Ghettostadt: Łódź and the Making of a Nazi City.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Horowitz, Sara R. *Voicing the Void: Muteness and Memory in Holocaust Fiction.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.

Kluge, Williams. *Re-Examining the Holocaust Through Literature.* Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publisher, 2009.

Kohn, Tara and Magdelena Waligórska. *Jewish Translation - Translating Jewishness.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.

Magilow Daniel H. and Lisa Silverman. *Holocaust Representations in History: An Introduction.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015.

Margolis, Rebecca. "Chava Rosenfarb's Yiddish Montreal." *Canadian Jewish Studies* No. 18-19 (2010): 159-77.

Morgentaler, Goldie. "'I Am Still There:' The Recreation of Jewish Poland in the Canadian Novels of Chava Rosenfarb." *Studies in American Jewish Literature* Vol. 35, No. 2 (August 30, 2016): 187-99.

Morgentaler, Goldie. "Chava Rosenfarb: The Yiddish Woman Writer in the Post-Holocaust World." *Canadian Jewish Studies*, No. 11 (2003): 37-51.

Morgentaler, Goldie. "Love and Translation." *Forward*, May 13, 2012. https://forward.com/articles/156028/love-and-translation/.

Ravvin, Norman. "Poland, Yiddish and a Canadian Writer's Life: Interview with Chava Rosenfarb." *Literature and Theology* Vol. 24, No. 2 (2010): 182-91.

Ravvin, Norman. *A House of Words: Jewish Writing, Identity and Memory.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014.

Rosenfarb, Chava. "Canadian Yiddish Writers." In *New Readings of Yiddish Montreal*, edited by Pierre Anctil, Norman Ravvin and Sherry Simon, 11-8. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2007.

Roskies, David G. *Holocaust Literature: A History and Guide.* Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2012.

Schwartz, Jan. *Survivor and Exiles: Yiddish Culture After the Holocaust.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2015.

Teichman, Milton. "How Writers Fought Back: Literature From the Nazi Ghettos and Camps." *Judaism: A Quarterly Journal of Jewish Life and Thought* Vol. 47, No. 3 (Summer 1998): 338-50.

Trunk, Isaiah, Israel Gutman, and Robert Moses Shapiro. *Łódź Ghetto: A History.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.

Waxman, Zoë. *Writing the Holocaust: Identity, Testimony, Representation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Barn Owl, John James Audubon's Birds of America

Alexander Vlachopoulos, "The Evolution of Ethical Archaeology in the 20th and 21st Centuries" (Historiography)

       Ethics is a branch of philosophy with some of its earliest forms stemming back to Ancient Greece with Aristotle and Socrates. As time has progressed, the study and practice of ethics has been further developed, with key ethical philosophers such as Immanuel Kant and René Descartes working to refine what it means to be ethical. Ethics can ultimately be defined as the study of determining right from wrong. Ethics is something which plays a prominent role within modern society, serving as a hot topic of conversation. Questions of ethically sourced food, clothing, and overall ethical practices are prominent concerns within modern society. However, despite ethics being studied for centuries and playing a major role in modern society, ethics and ethical practices have not always been in the forefront of people's minds. This is especially true in the practice of archaeology, as ethics within the field of archaeology is something that has taken shape relatively recently. This paper will have a chronological focus on how ethical archaeology has developed and evolved throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, ultimately demonstrating how ethics went from essentially being nonexistent within the field, to being one of the most important considerations within archaeological practice. The goal of this paper is not to judge the actions of past archaeologists and their practices, but rather to look at a historiographical approach as to how archaeology has evolved and changed over time. This paper will utilize a number of secondary sources written by historians and archaeologists alike in order to demonstrate this evolution, including sources written in the mid-to-late 20th century, leading up to more modern scholarship. This paper will begin by focusing on two early 20th century archaeologists along the Silk Road and the lack of ethics within their practices when compared to modern archaeology. Followed by a look into the founding of the SOPA and a UNESCO convention in the 1970s and 1990s where we see ethical archaeology beginning to take shape. Continuing on by looking at ethical issues surrounding First Nation's cultural heritage and property, which is similar to the issues surrounding China and Silk Road heritage, leading to the eventual creation of NAGPRA in 1990. Finally concluding with modern examples of ethics within archaeological practice, as well as looking at some of the prominent questions surrounding the overall ethics of archaeology, such as the question of cultural property, the role of museums, and if ethical archaeology has been ultimately effective. This will all be done by referring to a number of books and articles which provide an explanation as to how and why this evolution has occurred.

       In the early 20th century, archaeology was essentially devoid of an ethical considerations regarding cultural property and heritage when compared to more recent practices. Many early 20th century archaeologist and explorers were from Europe, meaning that these men were often products of their country's imperialist systems. As imperialists, these early 20th century archaeologists often entered foreign countries with little respect, regard, or care for the people, the culture, or the history they were interacting with. Often times these imperialist archaeologists would enter a foreign country looking for an opportunity to bring artifacts back to Europe, thus leading these men to fame and riches. Peter Hopkirk's *Foreign Devils on the Silk Road: The Search for the Lost Treasures of Central Asia* (1980) is a book which looks at the accounts and experiences of a number of early 20th century archaeologists and explorers during their time in Central Asia along the Silk Road. Hopkirk's text provides an interesting look into the lives of these men, yet Hopkirk is never overly critical of the actions of these men. As a product of British imperialism himself, being born in 1930, it is interesting to see this lack of criticism regarding the actions of the numerous archaeologists and explorers discussed in his book. While Hopkirk looks at a numerous individuals, for the purpose of this paper however, only two of the archaeologists discussed by Hopkirk will be explored. By looking at the lives, actions, and practices of these two men along the Silk Road, it will ultimately be demonstrated how there was less of an emphasis on ethics within early 20th century archeology. However,

while ethics was not at the forefront of their minds, these men are not entirely to blame, with some exceptions. These men worked under different cultural, racial, and imperialist views which impacted their practice and shaped their world views. Additionally, the time period these men existed within was much different, the idea of ethical guidelines within archaeology was non-existent at this point-in-time. So, while historians and archaeologists are allowed to be critical of these men, it must be kept in mind that often times these men were merely products of their time, that is, with some exceptions which will be discussed within this paper.

The first of the early 20th century explorers that Hopkirk describes as a "brilliant figure"[1] is Sven Hedin. Born in 1865, Swedish explorer Sven Hedin would take part in four different expeditions to Central Asia, traveling along the Taklamakan Desert looking for ruined and lost cities. Hopkirk describes Hedin as being extremely determined to become the "first European to explore the lost cities of the Taklamakan"[2]. Despite his first expedition nearly costing him his life[3], Hedin was hellbent on making his discovery. Hedin set out on his second expedition on December 14, 1895[4], once again looking for more lost cities along the Taklamakan. This time however, Hedin found the remains of a lost city where he discovered Buddhist stuccos and other artifacts upon which Hedin and his team dug up what they could and returned to Sweden, taking with him the artifacts he had uncovered[5]. While Hedin marked his second expedition as a success, it was his third expedition which Hopkirk refers to as Hedin's "greatest archaeological triumph"[6]. In September 1899 Hedin embarked on his third expedition, this time financed by the king of Sweden, wherein he discovered Lou-lan, an ancient Chinese garrison town[7], largely by accident in 1901. It was during this third expedition where Hedin receives the most criticism from scholars, especially Chinese scholars, with Hopkirk even commenting on this criticism himself, yet not providing any criticism of his own on the matter. During Hedin's time in Lou-lan, he removed countless Chinese manuscripts dating back to the third century[8]. The removal of these manuscripts is what scholars criticize the most about Hedin with regard to his expeditions. By removing these manuscripts and bringing them back to Sweden, Chinese scholars accuse Hedin of robbing them of their cultural heritage and property, a concept which will be focused on throughout this paper. Had Hedin never accidentally discovered Lou-lan, the site could have likely been left for China's own archaeologists to discover down the line. While Hedin did remove important Chinese manuscripts, effectively robbing China of their cultural heritage, Hedin does not appear to be an overly unethical man, but rather, was a product of his time. I believe that Hedin was not an unethical man largely because of his first expedition where he saved his Asian guide Kasim's life by bringing water back to him after both Hedin and Hasim nearly died from dehydration[9]. Hedin could have easily left this foreign man to die and have simply saved himself, but instead he chose to save his life. Whether Hedin saved him because Hasim was Hedin's only guide through the desert or because he cared for the man I do not know, yet I feel that regardless of his intentions this demonstrates that Hedin at the very least cares for the wellbeing of Hasim. As for Hedin's removal of the manuscripts from Lou-lan, this does not make him an overly unethical person, but rather, it demonstrates the popular view and practice of Europeans at the time. Hedin was

---

[1] Peter Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils on the Silk Road: The Search for the Lost Treasures of Central Asia* (Great Britain: John Murray Publishers, 1980), 54.
[2] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 60.
[3] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 58-60.
[4] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 60.
[5] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 62-63.
[6] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 63-64.
[7] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 63-64.
[8] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 64.
[9] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 59-60.

employed by the king of Sweden to go out and uncover more artifacts and bring them back to Sweden, just like after Hedin's second voyage. Hedin's removal of the Lou-lan manuscripts demonstrates the view of Europeans, more so than the views of Hedin himself. While Hedin was certainly excited to find and bring home these manuscripts, his methods themselves were not unethical per say, but rather, frowned upon compared to modern archaeological practices. While Hedin's actions are frowned upon more so than they are unethical, the same cannot be said for the second archaeologist that Hopkirk discusses within his book.

The second archaeologist discussed by Hopkirk is Aurel Stein. Like with Hedin, Hopkirk praises Stein as being a "brilliant orientalist"[10], once again showcasing Hopkirk's underlying pro-imperialist views and lack of criticism towards these figure. Born in Budapest in 1862, Stein took on an early interest in the travels of Alexander the Great and Attila the Hun, laying the foundation for Stein's eventual studies at Oxford, where studied classical and oriental archaeology[11]. Throughout Stein's life he went on four different expeditions to Central Asia, with each expedition brining back with him different Buddhist manuscripts and artifacts taken from the cites he excavated. During Stein's first expedition, he arrived in the abandoned oasis town named Dandan-uilik. Within Dandan-uilik Stein found three finely painted wooden panels, containing elements of Indian, Chinese, and Persian influence[12]. In Dandan-uilik Stein also found wooden tables showcasing Greek deities which Hopkirk describes as being "powerful evidence of how western iconography, travelling eastwards along the Silk Road, had penetrated far into … Central Asia"[13]. Stein concludes his first expedition, bring back to Khotan with him as many of the documents and artifacts as he and his team could carry. However, this is only where Stein's thievery begins.

Like with Hedin, Stein too is guilty in robbing China of their cultural property and heritage, yet where the two men differ is in their methodology. The biggest example of this difference can be seen during Stein's second expedition which occurred from 1906-1908. Following Stein's sweeping success in Dandan-uilik, he was hungry for more. Stein was able to satisfy this hunger in Dunhuang where Stein discovered the 'Cave of the Thousand Buddhas', as well as an unknown cave library pilled high with ancient Chinese and Buddhist manuscripts[14]. Stein's second expedition was regarded by 20th century Europeans to be "Stein's greatest triumph"[15], yet is considered by the Chinese to be an act of shameless trickery and theft[16]. These conflicting views alone demonstrate the perspective that 20th century Europeans had versus the views that 20th century Chinese had. Since stein was bringing many of these manuscripts and artifacts back to Britain, he was considered to be one of the most successful archaeologists of his time, whereas the Chinese consider Stein to be one of the biggest thieves to emerge out of European archaeology. The British believed that these artifacts were better off in European hands, tying directly into the racist and imperialist 20th century European view that they were superior to everyone that was not themselves European. In many ways, both Hedin and Stein fall into this view, yet while Hedin himself is more a product of the time, Stein plays into this ideology, directly believing that he is superior to others, especially the Chinese. Stein's views can quite clearly be seen during his time in Dunhuang, especially during his excavation of the unknown library. This unknown cave library within Dunhuang was protected and guarded by a self-appointed Taoist priest named Wang Yuan-lu[17]. Having heard rumours of manuscripts and other artifacts hidden inside, Stein was

---

[10] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 69.

[11] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 69-70.

[12] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 87.

[13] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 92.

[14] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 156.

[15] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 160.

[16] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 161.

[17] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 158.

determined to enter. Stein met with Wang on May 21st, 1907 where Stein, in his personal accounts, described Wang as being a "difficult person to handle"[18], knowing that it would be a challenge to get past Wang and into the library. Stein decided to come up with what Hopkirk describes as a "two-pronged strategy" in order to get past Wang[19]. While Hopkirk calls it a strategy, I am more compelled to call it deception. It is Stein's so called 'strategy' that leads to his biggest criticism, yet none of this criticism comes from Hopkirk. Stein's 'strategy' has clear connections to European racism and imperialism, directly linking to the method with which Stein chose to employ to get past Wang. Stein's deception was to take place in two parts as Hopkirk describes. Both parts involved getting Wang's guard down by attempting to relate to him and make it seem as though Stein was genuinely interested in Wang. First, Stein asked to look at the shrine that Wang was restoring[20]. By doing this, Stein hoped to give off the persona that he was interested in Wang's work, thus establishing a connection between the two men, and increasing Wang's trust in Stein. Second, Stein furthered his attempts to gain Wang's confidence by mentioning the name of Wang's patron saint, Hsuan-tsang and the connection that Stein and Wang had to Hsuan-tsang[21]. Stein used connection to trick Wang into thinking there was, what Stein called, a "quasi-divine hint"[22]. Stein's efforts to gain the confidence and trust of Wang proved to be effective, as Stein was granted access into the cave library. After a days of rummaging through ancient manuscripts, Stein eventually returned to Britain with twenty-nine cases full of manuscripts and other similar artifacts, all taken from Wang's library to be put into the British Museum[23].

Ultimately, Stein and Hedin are two central figures within Hopkirk's book that demonstrate how ethics was not something that got very much attention within early 20th century archaeology. Both men, Stein especially, demonstrate the popular view that Europeans had about others, this view of non-Europeans as being lesser. With Hedin, his views were likely products of his time, molded by imperialism. However, with Stein, his deception of Wang demonstrates the clear disregard for ethics. Stein lied and manipulated Wang in order to get what he wanted, later returning to Britain with priceless manuscripts, while only paying Wang £130 for it all[24]. Together, both Stein and Hedin represent the popular European approach to archaeology in the early 20th century. An approach which was dominated by white imperialists who felt they had the right to any and all foreign artifacts, so long as they found them first. Ethics had little place in early 20th century archaeology, guidelines were non-existent, questions of cultural heritage and property had not yet been asked, and imperialism molded the views of many early archaeologists. This, however, was all about to change as the 20th century progressed onwards.

The 1970s marks an important beginning for the evolution and establishment of ethical archaeology, followed by an equally important event in the 1990s. These two major events that occurred helped further the development of ethical archaeology. The first being a 1970 UNESCO Convention which is the focus of Maria Kouroupas's article, and the second being the founding of SOPA in 1976 and the creation of archaeological principals in 1995 which is the focus of Mark J. Lynott's article. Together, these events mark a turning point in ethical archaeology, for they demonstrate that ethical considerations within archaeology are beginning to take shape.

---

[18] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 161.
[19] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 162.
[20] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 162.
[21] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 163.
[22] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 165.
[23] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 169.
[24] Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils*, 169.

Looking at Kouroupas's article first, she explores the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property[25]. This 1970 Convention marks an important turning point in the evolution of ethical archaeology, as now questions are beginning to be asked about the import and export of cultural property. But what is cultural property? The 1970 Convention specified that

> cultural property constitutes one of the basic elements of civilization and national culture, and that its true value can be appreciated only in relation to the fullest possible information regarding its origin, history, and traditional setting … it is essential for every State to become increasingly alive to the moral obligations to respect its own cultural heritage[26].

Or as Kwame Anthony Appiah puts it in *Whose Culture?: The Promise of Museums and the Debate Over Antiquities* (2012), cultural property is "all [the] antiquities that originate within [a country's] borders [are] state property, which cannot be freely exported"[27]. The goal of the 1970 UNESCO Convention was to "reduce the incentive for pillage by restricting the illicit movement of archaeological and ethnic material across international boundaries"[28]. In other words, the Convention provided the framework for State Parties to prevent the import, export, and transfer of cultural property between countries[29]. Essentially, the 1970 Convention worked to prevent the actions of men like Hedin and Stein. It works to prevent the illicit transfer and theft of cultural property from one country to another, without the direct approval from the country of origin. With this Convention, no longer will the rule of, as Kwame Appiah puts it, "finders, keepers"[30] be acceptable in archaeological debate. This 1970 Convention marks an important leap for ethical archaeology, as it actively worked to limit and prevent the actions of men like Hedin and Stine. The Convention demonstrates the growing consideration for ethical archaeology in the mid-late 20th century, as important questions and considerations are beginning to take shape. Questions of cultural property and heritage are beginning to take shape, ethical considerations within archaeology are beginning to become a thought in the minds of governments and archaeologists alike. These ethical considerations and questions continue to evolve and cement themselves as the 1970s progressed, with the founding of SOPA in 1976 being another important event in the evolution of ethical archaeology along with the creation of ethical principals within archaeology in 1995.

In addition to the 1970 UNESCO Convention, the 1970s marks another important advancement in the evolution of ethical archaeology with the founding of the Society of Professional Archaeologists, or SOPA. The founding of SOPA serves as one section of Mark J. Lynott's article titled Ethical Principles and Archaeological Practice: Development of an Ethics Policy (1997), with the second portion of the article being dedicated to the establishment of an ethics policy within archaeological practice. The development of this ethics policy discussed in the latter half of Lynott's article marks a crucial point in the evolution of ethical archaeology, as these policies helped to shape the modern standard of archaeological practice. Lynott states in his article that SOPA was "founded in 1976 to meet a perceived need by the archaeological community and federal agencies to identify stands of professional conduct and recognize the archaeologists that met those standards"[31]. In other words, SOPA attempts to standardize archaeological

---

[25] Maria Papageorge Kouroupas, "U.S. Efforts to Protect Cultural Property: Implementation of the 1970 UNESCO Convention." *African Arts* 28, no. 4 (1995): 32.

[26] Kwame Anthony Appiah, "Whose Culture Is It?" in *Whose Culture?: The Promise of Museums and the Debate Over Antiquities*. James Cuno. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012. 76.

[27] Appiah, "Whose Culture Is It? 76.

[28] Kouroupas, "U.S. Efforts", 32.

[29] Kouroupas, "U.S. Efforts", 32.

[30] Appiah, "Whose Culture Is It? 77.

[31] Mark J. Lynott, "Ethical Principles and Archaeological Practice: Development of an Ethics Policy." *American Antiquity* 62, no. 4 (1997): 591.

conduct and practices, working to ensure that archaeologists meet the required standards. SOPA continues to emphasize the growing considerations for ethics within archaeological practice in the mid-late 20th century. The 1970 UNESCO Convention was one of the early foundational movements towards establishing the place of ethics within archaeology, and the founding of SOPA continues to build upon that foundation. SOPA demonstrates that there still is growing considerations and efforts to further ethical archaeology. Lynott publishing his article in 1997 states that "for nearly 20 years, SOPA has taken the lead in advising the profession on ethical issues in archaeology"[32]. Interestingly enough, one year after Lynott's article was published, SOPA was transformed into the RPA or the Register of Professional Archaeologists, which is still around to this day, working to establish a standard code of ethics among its members within archaeology, similar to the goals of SOPA.

The discussion of SOPA is one portion of Lynott's article, additionally, he also discusses another important advancement in ethical archaeology, this time moving away from the 70s and into the 90s. In 1995, the Society for American Archaeology, or the SAA, with the help of a standing Ethics Committee and Executive Committee, drafted eight different principles of archaeological ethics, "intended to identify ethical ideals or goals"[33]. Lynott describes these principles not as a code of conduct similar to that which is maintained by the SOPA, but rather, to serve as ethical guidelines[34] which archaeologists should consider while out in the field. The eight principles of archaeological ethics drafted by the SAA and discussed by Lynott are stewardship, accountability, commercialization, public education and outreach, intellectual property, public reporting and publication, records and perseveration, and lasty, training and resources[35]. While Lynott goes into each of the eight principles to a degree of depth, for the purpose of this paper all eight principals can briefly be summarized as principals that work to increase public and professional knowledge and accountability surrounding the ownership and preservation of cultural property and heritage within the practice of archaeology.

Ultimately, the drafting of these principals demonstrates the growing consideration for archaeological ethics, a growing consideration which had early origins in the 1970s with the UNESCO Convention and the creation of SOPA in 1975. The founding of SOPA and the SAA, as well as the drafting of these eight principles, helps to show how ethical archaeology has evolved throughout the 20th century. In the time of Stein and Hedin, archaeological ethics was not something at the forefront of many archaeologists minds, yet as time and society progressed, questions of ethics and cultural property began to be asked. The contents discussed in the Kouroupas and Lynott articles demonstrate this evolution, they demonstrate the rising consideration for ethics within archaeology, and they work to ensure that past archaeological practices remain a thing of the past.

While the late 20th century marks an increase in the consideration for ethical archaeology with the 1970 UNESCO Convention, creation of SOPA and the SAA, and the drafting of the eight principles, First Nations cultural property and heritage is one area of archaeology where ethics has not quite caught up, with First Nations property and heritage still being debated amongst archaeologists and scholars. Like with other cultures and backgrounds, early 20th century First Nations archaeology lacked a great degree of ethical considerations. Similar to how early European views about other cultures and people were molded by imperialism and racism, so too was the views of First Nations culture and heritage. However, while great strides had been made in the mid-late 20th century with the UNESCO Convention, SOPA, the SAA, and the

---

[32] Lynott, "Ethical Principles and Archaeological Practice", 591.
[33] Lynott, "Ethical Principles and Archaeological Practice", 593.
[34] Lynott, "Ethical Principles and Archaeological Practice", 594.
[35] Lynott, "Ethical Principles and Archaeological Practice", 592-593.

eight principals, First Nations archaeology is an area that did not get the same degree of attention, that is not to say however that it received none. T. J. Ferguson's article, Native Americans and the Practice of Archaeology (1996), demonstrates how there has been a more recent focus on First Nations archaeology with the passing of the Native American Graves Protection and Reparation Act, or NAGPRA, in 1990. However, even with the passing of NAGPRA, Chip Colwell's *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's culture* (2017) explores how issues surrounding First Nations heritage and property still are prominent in the 21st century.

It is no secret that Indigenous peoples have been treated extremely poorly throughout history, especially in the United States and Canada. With regard to archaeology and cultural property, Indigenous peoples experience the same difficulties that the Chinese faced during the early 20th century, with foreign archaeologists and explorers coming to their land to take from them and bring what they found back to their own country. However, one major difference between Indigenous relations and Chinese relations is that the efforts of Indigenous peoples to prevent cultural theft has largely gone unheard. While the UNESCO Convention, SOPA and the SAA have helped to increase awareness for ethical archaeology and have worked to reduce cultural theft, First Nations had not received the same degree of attention, at least not until 1990 with the passing of NAGPRA. Prior to the passing of NAGPRA, T.J. Ferguson in his article states that "early archaeology in the Americas was essentially a colonialist endeavor … Native peoples were denigrated by a colonialist belief that native societies lacked the initiative and capacity for development"[36]. This colonialist view had a similar impact on First Nations as the early 20th century imperialist European view did in Central Asia by men such as Hedin and Stein. The colonialist view "dehumanized and objectified [Indigenous peoples] when the remains of their ancestors were collected for craniology"[37], with colonists treating Indigenous peoples as "racially inferior and naturally doomed to extinction"[38]. This was the dominating view of many colonists in the 19th and early 20th centuries, as can be seen with the cases of Stein and Hedin, these colonists and imperialists believed they were above others simply because of their race, culture, and home country. However, in more recent years with the increasing evolution and emphasis of ethical archaeology, Ferguson discusses that in the 1990s, archaeologists are actively working to reconstruct their relationships with Indigenous peoples[39]. One of the first steps in rebuilding this relationship was the passing of the Native American Graves Protection and Reparation Act, or NAGPRA, in 1990. In his article Ferguson states that "NAGPRA has fundamentally changed the way American archaeology is practiced in the United Sates"[40]. The passing of NAGPRA was an incredibly important moment within ethical archaeology and First Nations archaeology, as NAGPRA made it so that Native Americans now had "property rights in grave goods and cultural patrimony, as well as the right to repatriate human remains from federal and [Indigenous] lands"[41]. This was a massive victory for ethical and Native American archaeology, as now Native Americans had increased property rights and the ability to take their ancestor's remains back from government property and governments now have to consult with Native Americans on archaeological investigations[42]. While this should have always been the case for Native Americans and Indigenous peoples, as their ancestor's remains have deep cultural and religious significance, NAGPRA is a step in the right direction for the reconstruction archaeologists' relationships with Indigenous peoples.

---

[36] T. J. Ferguson, "Native Americans and the Practice of Archaeology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25 (1996): 64.
[37] Ferguson, "Native Americans", 65.
[38] Ferguson, "Native Americans", 65.
[39] Ferguson, "Native Americans", 64.
[40] Ferguson, "Native Americans", 66.
[41] Ferguson, "Native Americans", 66.
[42] Ferguson, "Native Americans", 66.

However, despite NAGPRA's implementation, its rules were not always followed by governments and sometimes there were thin lines that governments treaded on in order to attempt to bypass NAGRPA. Attempts to bypass and work around NAGPRA can be seen in one of the greatest controversies surrounding Native American archaeology. The controversy of the Kennewick Man demonstrates that while efforts have been made to reconstruct the relationship between archaeologists and Native Americans, and implement more ethical practices, there is still progress that can be made.

The controversy of the Kennewick Man serves as one of Chip Colwell's discussions in *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture* (2017). Colwell states in his discussion of the Kennewick Man two prominent questions that were asked by archaeologists and scientists during the Kennewick Man controversy. "Is it possible that some skeletons are from so remote a past that they can never be connected to living people? Are some skeletons from such a distant time that they might not even be considered Native American?"[43]. These questions led to one of the largest controversies within Native American archaeology. The controversy all began in 1996 when "two college students noticed a skeleton eroding out of the Bank of the Columbia River, near Kennewick, Washington"[44]. Under NAGPRA, the remains of the so-called Kennewick Man were deemed to be affiliated with a number of five different local Native American tribes[45]. Despite this affiliation and the rules of NAGPRA, scientists wanted to study the remains, with scientists stating that the remains were "the most important … ever found in North America"[46]. While scientists wanted to further study the remains, the Native American tribes wanted the remains to be reburied, as the remains had important significance to the tribes' culture, history, and heritage. This debate on what was to be done with the remains led to a nine-year-long court case, where in 2004 the court deemed that the remains were "not even Native American under the law"[47], as the judge was not convinced that the remains bore a relationship with the tribes, but rather with Indigenous peoples in Polynesia or Japan[48]. Because of the judge's ruling, the remains of the Kennewick Man were "federal property under the Archaeological Resources Protection Act"[49]. The judge's ruling created an uproar amongst Native Americans, demanding amends to NAGPRA be made to return the Kennewick Man to them[50]. Eventually the remains were returned to the Native American tribes for reburial after President Obama signed legislation in 2016.

Ultimately, the case of the Kennewick Man contributes to why "many Native Americans continue to see archaeologists as determined to appropriate a heritage that is not theirs"[51]. The case of the Kennewick Man is important to look at within the discussion of the evolution of ethical archaeology. It demonstrates that while attempts have been made, such as the passing of NAGPRA, ethical archaeology is still not entirely practiced, followed, respected, and implemented within all branches of archaeology. While ethical archaeology has come a long way since the early 20th century, it took twenty years for the Kennewick Man to finally be given back to his descendants, demonstrating that there are still flaws within the system and questions that still need to be asked.

---

[43] Chip Colwell, *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2017. 243.
[44] Colwell, *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirts*, 243.
[45] Colwell, *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirts*, 243.
[46] Colwell, *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirts*, 243.
[47] Colwell, *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirts*, 244.
[48] Colwell, *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirts*, 244.
[49] Colwell, *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirts*, 244.
[50] Colwell, *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirts*, 245-246.
[51] Colwell, *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirts*, 257.

The final section of this paper will be dedicated to three of prominent questions that are still highly debated within ethical archaeology. These three questions are how has colonialism impacted archaeology? Is culture a commodity? And lastly, are museums imperial institutions? These three questions are among some of the prominent debates with regard to ethical archaeology. By looking at what scholars think about these questions, it demonstrates the modern approach to considerations of ethical archaeology. Looking at the first of the three questions, Tamima Orra Mourad explains how colonialism has impacted archaeology over time in Yannis Hamilakis and Philip Duke's *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics* (2007). In the early 20th century, colonialism and imperialism were still prominent ideologies which molded and shaped the views of many Europeans, as seen with Hedin and Stein. Like with Hedin and Stein, Mourad states that "archaeologists became servants to empires, as capitalist agents, diplomats and intelligence officers"[52]. This can especially be seen with Hedin who was funded by the king of Sweden to go out on his second expedition to Central Asia. Within the 19th and 20th centuries, Mourad argues that "archaeological discourse could be bought, sold or sponsored, and served the purposes of career promotion"[53]. Once again this can very clearly be seen with Stein and Hedin, who took from China in order to gain fame and riches back home. Like with imperialism, Colonialism molded the minds of many Europeans into believing that they were culturally superior to the uncivilized other. Colonialism taught them that they had the right to control "both past and living creatures and populations"[54]. Ultimately, colonialism has had a monumental impact on early archaeology, as these colonialist ideas cemented into the minds of European archaeologists and explorers often trumped any underlying ethical considerations. It was really only until periods of decolonization where these outdated views began to slowly fade away, being ultimately replaced by the rising ethical considerations put forth by the 1970 UNESCO Convention and SOPA.

Is culture a commodity? This is another prominent question within the field of 21st century ethical archaeology. Robert Layton and Gillian Wallace attempt to answer this question within Christopher and Geoffrey Scares' *The Ethics of Archaeology: Philosophical Perspectives on Archaeological Practice* (2006). This question looks at if culture and cultural property are things that can be "freely bought and sold through the market economy"[55], similar to buying coffee or grain. Layton and Wallace describe cultural property as "artifacts and buildings that embody the values and traditions of a community to such an extent that concern about their fate transcends legal ownership"[56]. The question of is culture a commodity, refers to if cultural property is something that can be freely bought and sold in a market economy, or if cultural property should not be allowed to be bought or sold. This question is highly debated amongst archaeologists and scholars alike, while specific countries, especially those with rich cultural histories such as China, Greece, and so on, deny that cultural property is something that can be bought and sold. This opposition can specifically be seen with regards to Silk Road histories, as Stein was accused by China of robbing them of their cultural property through all the ancient Chinese and Buddhist manuscripts that he brought back to Britain. A similar example can be seen in Greece with the Elgin marbles that were taken from the Acropolis in Athens, later being sold to the British Museum in 1816[57]. Greece has for a long time

---

[52] Tamima Orra Mourad, "An Ethical Archaeology in the Near East: Confronting Empire, War, and Colonization" in *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*, Yannis Hamilakis and Philip Duke. One World Archaeology Series. (Walnut Creek, Calif: Routledge, 2007), 154.

[53] Mourad, "Confronting Empire, War, and Colonization", 156.

[54] Mourad, "Confronting Empire, War, and Colonization", 157.

[55] Robert Layton and Gillian Wallace, "Is culture a commodity?" in *The Ethics of Archaeology: Philosophical Perspectives on Archaeological Practice*, Christopher Scarre and Geoffrey Scarre, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 46.

[56] Layton and Wallace, "Is culture a commodity?", 47.

[57] Elisabeth Kehoe, "Working hard at giving it away: Lord Duveen, the British Museum and the Elgin marbles". *Historical Research*, 77, (2004): 503.

been asking that the Elgin marbles be returned but unfortunately have not had any success as of yet. Both of these examples relate to the question of is culture a commodity. Is cultural property something that can be bought and sold, or should there be restrictions in place to prevent the sale of cultural property? This question also relates directly to ethical archaeology, as it asks if it is ethical to buy and display another country's cultural property? Why these questions have no clear-cut answers as of yet, they are amongst some of the most prominent discussions within archaeological debate in the 21st century.

The last question looks at if museums are imperial institutions. This paper has already discussed how imperialism and colonialism shaped the minds of many early 20th century archaeologists, yet this question looks specifically at museums as an imperialist institution. Emily Duthie discusses this question in her article titled "The British Museum: An Imperial Museum in a Post-Imperial World" (2011). Duthie argues that the British Museum is a prime example of how imperialism still has an effect on the so-called post-imperial world. Duthie discusses how the British Museum holds some of the most prominent artifacts from classical antiquity yet acquired them in contentious ways[58]. As discussed in the previous question about cultural property, many countries are requesting stating that their antiquities belong in the nation that they were found in and demand their return[59]. Duthie states that "the museum was a powerful symbol of empire and the representations of the world that it offered were deeply imbued with the culture of British imperialism"[60]. In many ways, museums put on for display the cultural property of another country, sometimes with permission, and like with the case of the Elgin marbles, sometimes not. Ultimately, this question looks at how imperialism still has echoes within an allegedly post-imperial world. It questions if museums are obligated to return artifacts that they received in contentious ways, or if the so-called 'finders keepers' rule still trumps modern debates of ethics and cultural property.

While these three questions only represent a small portion of the questions within modern archaeology, each encompasses a different theme relating to the evolution of ethical archaeology. These three questions look at the impact that the past has had on ethical archaeology and why ethics was not always at the forefront of archaeologists' minds. These questions look at the modern debate over cultural heritage and property, two very prominent topics of discussion within archaeological debate. And lastly, these questions look towards the future, questioning the roles of museums and ownership of cultural property by both governments and private institutions.

In conclusion, this paper has aimed to discuss how ethical archaeology has chronologically evolved overtime, using a variety of books and articles written by numerous archaeologists, scholars, and historians alike to explore this evolution. Beginning with a dive into the lives of Hedin and Stein to demonstrate how early 20th century archaeology was dominated by imperialism and colonial ideology rather than ethical considerations. Moving into the mid-late 20th century where the 1970 UNESCO Convention and the founding of SOPA, the SAA, the eight principals, and the passing of NAGPRA demonstrate a growing consideration for ethics within archaeological practice. This paper also addressed how despite the growing considerations and attempts to increase the role of ethics within archaeology, the systems are not yet perfect which can be seen in the case of the Kennewick Man. This paper concluded by discussing and addressing three prominent questions about ethical archaeology, cultural heritage and property, as well as the impacts and echoes that colonialism and imperialism still have in modern 21st century archaeological thought. Overall, ethical archaeology has evolved considerably over the past two centuries, going from

---

[58] Emily Duthie, "The British Museum: An Imperial Museum in a Post-Imperial World", *Public History Review*, (Australian National University, 2011), 12.
[59] Duthie, "The British Museum", 12-13.
[60] Duthie, "The British Museum", 15.

being essentially nonexistent within a field dominated by colonialism and imperialism, to being at the forefront of many archaeologists minds within the 21st century. While the implementation of ethics within archaeological practice is not yet perfect, as seen by the Kennewick Man case and the Elgin marbles, it has come a long way since the time of Stein and Hedin, where the theft of cultural property was considered the norm. Important questions are being asked, discussions are being had, and archaeological practices continue to evolve as society does, resulting in increasing optimism for the future of ethical archaeology and culture property going further into the 21st century.

Bibliography

Anthony Appiah, Kwame. "Whose Culture Is It?" in *Whose Culture?: The Promise of Museums and the Debate Over Antiquities.* James Cuno. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012).

Colwell, Chip. *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture.* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2017).

Duthie, Emily, "The British Museum: An Imperial Museum in a Post-Imperial World", *Public History Review*, (Australian National University, 2011), 12-25.

Ferguson, T. J. "Native Americans and the Practice of Archaeology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25 (1996): 63-79.

Hopkirk, Peter. *Foreign Devils on the Silk Road: The Search for the Lost Treasures of Central Asia* (Great Britain: John Murray Publishers, 1980).

Kehoe, Elisabeth, "Working hard at giving it away: Lord Duveen, the British Museum and the Elgin marbles". *Historical Research*, 77, (2004): 503-519.

Kouroupas, Maria Papageorge. "U.S. Efforts to Protect Cultural Property: Implementation of the 1970 UNESCO Convention." *African Arts* 28, no. 4 (1995): 32-41.

Layton, Robert and Gillian Wallace, "Is culture a commodity?" in *The Ethics of Archaeology: Philosophical Perspectives on Archaeological Practice*, Christopher Scarre and Geoffrey Scarre, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Lynott, Mark J. "Ethical Principles and Archaeological Practice: Development of an Ethics Policy." *American Antiquity* 62, no. 4 (1997): 589-599.

Mourad, Tamima Orra, "An Ethical Archaeology in the Near East: Confronting Empire, War, and Colonization" in *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*, Yannis Hamilakis and Philip Duke. One World Archaeology Series. (Walnut Creek, Calif: Routledge, 2007).

SchungLee, Rapid Owl

Helena Wahl, "Multiculturalism and the Canadian Identity: Canadian responses to the 1971 Multiculturalism Policy"

Multiculturalism can hardly be said to have always been integral to Canada's identity. Immigration policies for its first century were prejudiced and restricted based on cultural and ethnic identity to enforce the preservation of the identity of the colonial majority. For example, the Chinese Immigration Act banned all Chinese immigrants from 1923 to 1947, the country's rate of acceptance of Jewish refugees from Nazi-dominated Europe in the 1930s and early 1940s was the worst of any accepting country, and immigration restrictions on the basis of race and ethnicity were only lifted in 1967. And yet today, many of us think of the Canadian identity as inherently multicultural – a compilation of complementary cultures and languages. When and how did this understanding of a multicultural Canada take shape?

Some would say that that understanding was the product of the federal government's announcement of an official policy of multiculturalism by the federal government of Pierre Trudeau in 1971. But was this the case? The purpose of this paper is to explore how Canadians understood multiculturalism and their perception of Canadian identity in the years immediately after the introduction of the new policy. Although that policy initially evoked skepticism and rejection, it did prompt a necessary discussion amongst Canadians to analyse and re-evaluate what Canadian identity meant to them and what it was becoming.

On October 8th, 1971, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau announced the implementation of a multiculturalism policy which recognized Canada as a multicultural society within a bilingual framework. He stated that Canada had no official culture and that a policy of multiculturalism more accurately embodied its cultural pluralism. For many, this was a moment of rejoicing, since cultural minorities were recognized as vital components of Canadian identity. Yet others refuted the policy, claiming it disregarded the cultures of Canada's founders and inevitably eroded what they saw as traditional aspects of Canadian identity. In his announcement, Trudeau outlined the policy's four main principles: to provide assistance to cultural groups in their development and growth; to provide assistance to members of cultural groups to overcome barriers to full participation in society; to promote creative exchanges between cultural groups; and to assist new immigrants in learning French or English.[1]

The Trudeau government's multiculturalism policy acts as a point of reference for a much larger conversation about Canadian identity in the twentieth century. It acts, for the purpose of this paper, as a snapshot of the moments when a significant dialogue surrounding the subject of culture, identity, language, Canadianism, and ethnic groups began to emerge. This paper will explore the responses of cultural groups from 1971 to 1973 in the initial years of the implementation of the multiculturalism policy. An analysis of the attitudes and arguments of these responses will reflect how different Canadians viewed and understood Canadian identity to argue that this period is best characterized neither as a time of intolerance, nor of great acceptance, but rather as a moment when Canadians started to re-evaluate the Canadian identity.

In the years following the implementation of the policy, in the wake of the Royal Commission of Bilingualism and Biculturalism (published in 1967-1970) and the Official Languages Act (1969), academics measured its success, seeking to understand to what extent it had genuinely achieved unity and cultivated national identity. The scholarship surrounding the policy and Canadian identity was interdisciplinary in its approach. The policy itself received criticism for its ambiguity. Guy Rocher, sociologist and academic, described it as an unsustainable, nebulous concept without a clear focus.[2] Manoly R. Lupul, member of the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism, considered it a failed attempt at unity, arguing it should have targeted a specific issue such as immigrant integration, combatting prejudice and discrimination, or even second language learning.[3] Many criticized Trudeau's idealistic conception of multiculturalism as an unattainable attempt at national unity.

---

[1] Canada, Parliament, *House of Commons Debates*, 28th Parl, 3rd Sess, Vol 8 (8 October 1971): 8545-8548.

[2] Guy Rocher, "Les ambiguités d'un Canada bilingue et multiculturel," *Le Québec en mutation,* (Montréal: Hurtubise, 1973), 97-99.

[3] Manoly R. Lupul, "The Political Implementation of Multiculturalism," *Journal of Canadian Studies* (January 1, 1982): 94.

The sociological scholarship chiefly included surveys and analyses of Canadian attitudes and responses to shifting global ethnic ideologies and increasing decolonial thought.[4] These surveys sought to investigate how Canadians were responding to diversity and immigration in their community. This research concluded that Canadians were generally not tolerant of immigration and that their concept of the Canadian identity was less accepting of multiculturalism.

The focus of these surveys was the attitudes of English Canadians, French Canadians, and the 26.7% of Canadian cultural minorities – people of neither English nor French background.[5] For their part, English Canadians were divided in their response to the policy – both supportive and opposing. Psychologists Berry, Kalin and Taylor observed that they were generally supportive of the ideology of multiculturalism yet had a less positive view of the implications of a multicultural society. It seemed English Canadians wanted "folk festivals and community centres," yet rejected minority language rights and increased immigration.[6] French Canadians entirely rejected the policy under the pretext of desiring cultural and lingual autonomy. Lambert and Kalin found French Canadians to be less tolerant of minorities and immigrants linguistically rather than racially.[7]

In general, these surveys recognized several influential variables affecting individual responses to multiculturalism: ethnicity, regionality, language, and socioeconomic status. Berry, Kalin and Taylor found people of higher socioeconomic status to be more accepting of the policy, whereas people of lower status were less accepting.[8] This suggests a policy of multiculturalism did not promote socioeconomic aid and therefore held little benefit for those of lower status, which is reflected in the responses of minority groups as discussed later. Despite the controversy and conflicting attitudes, Kalin and Berry's 1995 survey analysis found that for Canadians ethnic identity was less important than civic identity, which emphasizes the importance of a unifying national identity and its strong connection to all ethnic groups.[9] It is within this framework that I begin to explore the exponentially diverse and complex Canadian responses to multiculturalism and the factors that contributed to people identifying as Canadian.

Given the complexity of the survey findings and contributing variables, it would be too simple to conclude that all Canadians were or were not tolerant of multiculturalism and its contribution to the Canadian identity. The ambiguous and unsettled response actually confirms that the Canadian identity was being re-evaluated. I am not particularly attempting to demonstrate the bigotry and prejudice of the Canadian majority; in fact, I hope to argue the opposite, that the multiculturalism policy was reflective of a moment when Canadians began to reconsider what it meant to be Canadian. This paper will argue that responses to the multiculturalism policy reflect a point in time when Canadians began to understand what it meant to be multicultural, which initiated the cultivation of a new and inclusive Canadian identity. Canadian identity was not static, and Canadians were debating, arguing, and grappling with what it meant. Even those who rejected the policy demonstrated a reanalysis of the Canadian identity and what it meant in order to be reconciled within the larger conversation.

For my methodology, I looked at Canadian responses to the multiculturalism policy in the years 1971-1973 to understand initial reactions and how Canadian identity was discussed. Though this will not allow for a discussion of change over a broader period of time, it does reflect major themes surrounding the concept of multiculturalism and the Canadian identity. In order to capture a diverse cross-section of Canadian responses, I examined French and English newspapers such as *The Globe and Mail*, the *Toronto Daily Star*,

---

[4] Jean Burnet, "Multiculturalism, Immigration and Racism: A Comment on the Canadian Immigration and Population Study," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 7:1 (1975): 36.

[5] Jean Burnet, "We and They: Remarks about Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 10:1 (January 1, 1978): 52.

[6] John W Berry, Rudolf Kalin, and Donald M. Taylor, "Attitudes Toward Multiculturalism," In *Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada*, (Ottawa: Minister of State for Multiculturalism, 1976), 170-171.

[7] Ronald D. Lambert and James E. Curtis, "The French- and English- Canadian Language Communities and Multicultural Attitudes," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 14:2 (1982), 50.

[8] Berry, Kalin, and Taylor, "Attitudes Toward Multiculturalism," 173.

[9] Rudolf Kalin and John W. Berry, "Ethnic and Civic Self-Identity in Canada: Analyses of 1974 and 1991 National Surveys," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 27:2 (June 1, 1995), 13.

Le Devoir, and *La Presse*, published in Toronto and Montreal. The country's two largest cities at the time function as representative hubs of French and English public opinion and this bilingual analysis allows for a more representative and wholistic survey of Canadian attitudes than would be possible through study of just one of the two main linguistic groups. I have also included an interview published in *Le Soleil* which provides a political perspective on behalf of Quebec. These publications also included opinion pieces and letters to the editor from cultural minority groups.

The survey findings largely guided the methodology for my research and reflect my own observations of Canadian attitudes. My methodology traces the responses of Canadians along divisions of ethnicity, grouping ethnic communities and their responses. Admittedly, much of the research along ethnic lines omits the complexity within each cultural group. New immigrants compared to earlier immigrants represent two distinctive groups within cultural minorities, and each presented conflicting responses.[10] I will highlight these distinctions in my analysis, as well as include the omitted categories of cultural minorities. The attitudes of Indigenous Canadian communities were largely neglected in the national surveys. This is interesting because in my research of public opinion in newspapers, the neglect of the Indigenous cultural groups was recognized and voiced by Canadians. As such, I have devoted a portion of my analysis to Indigenous Canadians, their responses, and Canadian reactions to this group.

Overall, this paper will be structured into categories of ethnic responses beginning with English Canadians, then proceeding to French Canadians, Ukrainian Canadians, other cultural minorities, and Indigenous Canadians. Each category will be divided, if relevant, into supportive or rejecting strains of attitude. Within each category, questions of language, region, and socioeconomic status emerge. I then examine the arguments that these attitudes present to critically analyse the opinion of each group and its understanding of what it meant to be Canadian.

The opinion of the majority is fascinating. English Canadians had an official language, widely accepted cultural traditions, English history taught in education systems, and representation on radio and television. So if Canada was to officially identify as multicultural, how might this have impacted those who found themselves in the majority? English Canadians seem to have been divided on the subject into three major streams of thought.

The first stream includes those who rejected the notion of multiculturalism. In general, this was due to a fear of the "splintering" of the Canadian identity which they believed to be English Canadian.[11] This could also be interpreted as fear of the foreign or "other" and the introduction of new languages and traditions that might compromise what they felt it meant to be Canadian.

This stream of English Canadian response believed multiculturalism would compromise their own culture and language and was fearful of the policy's implications. Mrs. M. Morris of Thornhill was worried "plain Canadians" would fade from the scene as multiculturalism would cancel out Canadian culture.[12] I. Carroll from Ottawa felt Ontario had an obligation to "protect the English language" as they were fearful multiculturalism would dissipate Canada's official language. Carroll called English, spoken by 77% of Ontarians, the language that made communication possible which therefore had to be protected, for without it, "we'll have no heritage at all."[13] Interestingly, Carroll was not opposed to all other languages but specifically to French words and expressions. This suggests a perceived separation between what was Canadian and French Canadian; English Canada with its language and customs was the foundation of Canada.

English-Canadian opponents of multiculturalism were also opposed to the financial support of the policy through taxation. Ben Otis of Willowdale agreed that he did not want to have to pay taxes to support the cultures of other ethnic groups. In his opinion, "an ethnic or minority culture that cannot flourish on its

---

[10] Burnet, "Multiculturalism, Immigration and Racism," 38.

[11] "Canada's Heritage is Two Cultures," *Toronto Daily Star*, 06 June, 1972: 6.

[12] M. Morris, "Mowat was doing his bit to promote ethnic heritage," *Toronto Daily Star*, 15 December, 1971: 7; "Canada's Heritage is Two Cultures," *Toronto Daily Star*, 06 June, 1972: 6. See also: Steve MacDonald, "Canadian heritage must come first," *Toronto Daily Star,* 11 May 1972: 7.

[13] I. Carroll, "Ontario has a duty to protect English language," *Toronto Daily Star*, 13 June, 1972: 7.

own enthusiasm, and its own funds, will certainly die sooner or later."[14] To Otis, it was from his pocket that minorities were to become Canadian. This attitude reflects an ideology of multiculturalism in which a cultural majority would sustain a minority. On average, Berry and Kalin discovered that Canadians said "they would not vote for, would not try to convince others about, and would not pay taxes for, a policy of multiculturalism."[15] In true cultural pluralism there is meant to be reciprocity between and amongst groups. Otis's views, reflecting the majority, suggest a misunderstanding of what multiculturalism could mean for the Canadian identity, though it is significant as it explains the frustration and rationalization on behalf of English Canadians who rejected the policy.

The arguments of this first stream of English-Canadian thought demonstrate the components of Canadian identity with which they associated strongly: language, education, and economic participation. These English-Canadians' identities had to be reinforced to accommodate the increasing multiculturalism they witnessed throughout society and which they regarded as a threat. The fearful response of English Canadians suggests their superior influence on Canadian identity was beginning to shift and multiculturalism was beginning to take hold of Canadian society.

The second stream of English-Canadian response to multiculturalism I have called "conditionally supportive." A portion of English Canadians appear to have interpreted multiculturalism as an invitation for other cultures to exist *within* English Canada and to benefit from *its* values, systems, and culture. This view of multiculturalism is one-sided and rejects the notion that each diverse culture offers the country its own rich tradition, language, and history. This stream represents English Canadians who were supportive of the policy if it meant increased immigration would support their perception of the Canadian identity and newcomers would integrate with the majority.

B. Loveridge of Toronto observed this nuanced differentiation in his own city, writing to the *Toronto Daily Star* in a letter titled "Toronto's filled with bigots."[16] Loveridge debunked the theory that English Canadians were overwhelmingly accepting of multiculturalism and argued it was not an honest representation. Dr. Anthony Richmond, a sociology professor at York University, had conducted a survey of Canadian tolerance and stated it surpassed that of the United States, Australia, and the United Kingdom, declaring Torontonians were content in mixed neighbourhoods and that the concentrations of ethnic minorities had not resulted in ghettos.[17] Loveridge denied this claim, suggesting other countries were only "more honest about their feelings," and that on many occasions he had witnessed physical and verbal hatred directed at minority groups in Toronto.[18] Loveridge represents the English-Canadian attitude that recognized the discrepancies of Canadian identification: Canadians said one thing, but meant another. His argument was reflective of Canadians who were cognisant of the interaction between cultural groups and sought to draw attention to it, that a discussion of honest Canadian society might be engaged.

When Marilyn Camp described her idea of Canadian identity, she described it as "one of freedom and hope. It is one welcome to any race or creed. Most important, it is one of peace."[19] At first glance, Camp's attitude seems inclusive and pro-multiculturalism, but there is a subtle indication of her conditional support. This interpretation of multiculturalism believes cultural minority groups are to glean from the virtues already existing in the Canadian identity, suggesting a lack of recognition of the cultural values of others. This more nuanced stream of English-Canadian response is suggestive of the re-evaluation of Canadian identity. Although they were neither entirely supportive, nor did they entirely reject multiculturalism, there was a recognition of the undeniable multicultural society and its influence on Canada. This recognition reflects an attempt to participate in a more equitable society while simultaneously remaining attached to the virtues and traditions of the majority.

---

[14] Ben Otis, "Multicultural policy," *The Globe and Mail*, 18 April, 1973: 7.

[15] Kalin and Berry, "Ethnic and Civic Self-Identity in Canada: Analyses of 1974 and 1991 National Surveys," 171.

[16] This is an incorrect use of the apostrophe, but it was the actual headline.

[17] "Toronto residents 'remarkably tolerant' to minorities: Study," *Toronto Daily Star*, 09 November, 1971: 41.

[18] B. Loveridge, "Toronto's filled with bigots," *Toronto Daily Star*, 17 Nov, 1971: 7.

[19] Marilyn Camp, "Maple Syrup in my veins boils at foolish phrases," *Toronto Daily Star,* 13 June, 1972: 7.

For conditionally supportive English Canadians, multiculturalism meant identifying first and foremost as Canadian citizens. The terminology here is significant as it subtlety omits the cultural heritage of many Canadians. Ontario Premier William Davis expressed his concern with using the word "ethnic" to categorize Canadians by their cultural heritage. He felt that to be Canadian one should be introduced by province and citizenship.[20] While inclusive in regarding Canadians as open to all, it is possible the incentive behind this change in language was to separate Canadians from their ethnic diversity to encourage a more effective integration into the majority.

Similarly, Jack Cahill, writer for the *Toronto Daily Star,* shared a conversation he had with a man who escaped from Eastern Europe who became a Canadian citizen. For that man, being a Canadian allowed him to be himself – not a hyphenated citizen, but a Canadian.[21] Recognizing the implications and connotations of terminology and language in a multicultural society can be reflective of assumptions and prejudice that divide cultural groups. What is most significant is the "Canadian first" attitude that emphasized the inclusion of immigrants into the majority, but in a way that demonstrated a conditional support of multiculturalism as it aligned with a pre-existing understanding of Canadian identity and citizenship.

The third stream consisted of English Canadians who viewed multiculturalism as a recognition of the diversity that existed within Canada and that each culture's contribution would produce a new mosaic of identity to be defined as Canadian. For example, Diane Smith, a young student of Willowdale whose school was introducing new religion culture classes, recognized that "the understanding of others is what the world needs more than anything else."[22] English Canadians of the third stream believed multiculturalism embodied the values of freedom and equity for which Canada stood, and genuinely desired to learn from and interact with the various ethnic cultures that surrounded them.

For his part, Ken P. Raudys believed so strongly in the unification of multiculturalism he used the example of division in Hungary: "if cultural equality had been carried out and a multi- cultural state preserved, World War I might not have happened."[23] Raudys rejected the *Toronto Daily Star*'s concept of a "splintering Canada," as it denied the very cultural equity the nation proclaimed. In Raudys' opinion, multiculturalism was not to be taken lightly and was a tool to eradicate cultural and political alienation. The policy was a conduit through which Canadian identity could be effectively formed.

David Archer, a self-identified representative of the White Anglo Saxon Protestant (WASP) community, viewed multiculturalism as a way for each cultural group to gain from one another: "In a multicultural society the best of everything is retained and this gives you a much higher level. Culture cannot be imposed, however, it has to grow... Eventually a pattern will emerge that is distinctively Canadian."[24] His observation suggests that when the multiculturalism policy emerged, Canadians felt disconnected. Archer hoped, however, that through growth *together,* the various components of the mosaic would come to form the Canadian identity. The third stream of English Canadians recognized the need to *cultivate* the Canadian identity, whereas the first and second stream would have argued it already existed under the English majority. This cultivation was the re-configuration of the Canadian identity along multicultural lines.

The greatest dialogue surrounding the multiculturalism policy was that between French Canadians and English Canadians. The majority of English Canadians "conditionally" supported the policy, whereas French Canadians took an entirely opposite view. French Canadians had long sought for their cultural heritage and language to be protected from the English majority and an increasingly multicultural demographic, which had prompted the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (Bi-Bi). The Bi-Bi Commission sought to bring change to both federal and provincial cultural and language policies to achieve greater equity for both founding groups. French Canadians saw this policy of bilingualism and biculturalism as a way to preserve their heritage, so when in 1971 Trudeau announced the multiculturalism

[20] Jack Cahill, "Davis 'uncomfortable' with the world ethnic wants it eliminated," *Toronto Daily Star*, 03 June, 1972: 4.

[21] Jack Cahill, "Davis 'uncomfortable' with the world ethnic wants it eliminated," *Toronto Daily Star*, 03 June, 1972: 4.

[22] Diane Smith, "Students look forward to new religion course," *Toronto Daily Star*, 01 Nov, 1971: 7.

[23] Ken P. Raudys, "Cultural diversity aids Canadian unity," *Toronto Daily Star*, 06 June, 1972: 7.

[24] Bob Pennington, "A WASP: 'Culture cannot be imposed'," *Toronto Daily Star*, 29 April, 1972: 23.

policy, rejecting the bicultural emphasis of the Bi-Bi Commission's report, it is not surprising there was great uproar in Quebec.[25]

Premier Robert Bourassa claimed this new policy "clearly contradicted" the Bi-Bi Commission and refused to adopt the federal approach to what he called "the multicultural question." Bourassa spoke on behalf of Quebecois when he stated that the multiculturalism policy "is not compatible with Quebec reality."[26] Rocher cautioned that the multiculturalism policy was dangerous and erroneous and he warned of its potential to erode French language and culture.[27] This sociological perspective emphasized language and culture to be inextricably linked, which emerged as a significant theme in many of the cultural minority responses as well.

The sheer number of articles in French-language publications demonstrates the magnitude of the issue in Quebec. Articles in both *Le Devoir* and *La Presse* referred to multiculturalism as a myth.[28] Quebecois Thomas Meloné even questioned the Canadian identity: "la nation est un mythe, la société est un mythe, la religion est un mythe."[29] Multiculturalism as an official policy sparked a crisis for Quebec and the Quebecois identity. Quebec did not view itself as an equal part of a mosaic of culture and language, but a province founded upon French culture and language. Multiculturalism threatened the integrity of Quebecois identity in that it perpetuated the identity of the English-Canadian majority while French Canadians involuntarily joined the less significant cultural minority groups. The policy in this way rejected the notion of French Canadians being an equal founding group alongside English Canadians. Rocher believed multiculturalism would further push the Quebecois to separate from the rest of Canada as they would not be sufficiently represented in the new country the policy proposed.[30] Many French Canadians called it a step backwards in the establishment of cultural equity.[31] The policy was seen as the ultimate threat to unity within French-speaking Canada as it would remove the cultural common denominator upon which all other cultures could convene.

To clarify, the French did not deny or ignore the multicultural element of Quebec. The issue at hand was how to prevent diversity from causing division within the province.[32] Sentiments reflected in news publications suggest French Canada did not reject multiculturalism as an ideology; rather it was rejected as a federal policy. Laurent Laplante explained that, for Quebec, French must come first, English second, and multiculturalism third.[33]

For French Canadians, multiculturalism meant each culture could, and would, push for language rights, which would prove an endless struggle for legitimacy and representation. Allowing equal representation in culture would add pressure and further exclusion to cultural minority groups already existing in Canada. If Ukrainian Canadians succeeded in having five dollar bills printed in the Ukrainian language, argued *La Presse,* German, Italian and Chinese Canadians would expect the same treatment.[34]

The question of the Ukrainian Canadian community in the West was a common concern in French articles. Ukrainian Canadians sought recognition as founding peoples of the Prairies. This, for French Canadians, was what they saw as their central contribution to the establishment of the Canadian nation. Articles referred to the Ukrainian-Canadian advocacy in this issue as "la troisième force," the push to be the

---

[25] Canada, Parliament, *House of Commons Debates,* 28th Parl, 3rd Sess, Vol 8 (8 October 1971): 8545-8548.

[26] "Bourassa says Quebec ignoring Ottawa's ethnic culture plan," *Toronto Daily Star,* 17 November, 1971: 24.

[27] Rocher, "Les ambiguités d'un Canada bilingue et multiculturel," 97.

[28] Albert Deloras-Billot, "Le mythe du multiculturalisme," *Le Devoir,* 25 October, 1972 : 4.
See also : Serge Losique, "Libre Opinion: Le mythe dangereux du multiculturalisme," *Le Devoir,* 14 octobre, 1971: 4.

[29] Translation: "nation is a myth, society is a myth, religion is a myth."Thomas Meloné, "Le multiculturalisme serait-il plus favorable à la créativité?" *La Presse,* 27 September, 1972: E1.

[30] Rocher, "Les ambiguités d'un Canada bilingue et multiculturel," 102.

[31] Guy Rocher, "Opinion Libre : « Les ambiguïtés d'un Canada bilingue et multiculturel »" *La Presse,* 01 juin 1972: A4.

[32] Benoit Houle, "Le multiculturalisme est un fait que la politique doit encourager," *Le Devoir,* 26 September, 1972: 7.

[33] Laurent Laplante, "Charte ou plan de développement," *Le Devoir,* 18 Avril, 1973: 4.

[34] "L'opinion Canadienne: La multiplication des pressions," *La Presse,* 27 October, 1971: A4.

third founding people of Canada.[35] It would be inevitable for such cultural minority groups to advocate for their language rights, leaving Canada multicultural and multilingual.[36]

English Canadians could not reconcile this negative response with their own views and misunderstood the significance of language and culture to the French. William Johnson wrote that "*both* English and French Canada are uncertain about what makes them distinctive," but the French clearly disagreed.[37] Rocher argued that it was precisely English Canadians' weak sense of identity that allowed them to accept multiculturalism more easily.[38]

Other French Canadians did not view English Canada as overwhelmingly accepting. As Francois Aubin, a Montreal reporter, wrote of his experience in Toronto, "it will go on being English and unilingual, while just tolerating minorities."[39] Aubin criticized Ontario's false acceptance of cultures and emphasized the divisions between communities, asserting that unity in multiculturalism is unattainable. English Canadians, even in the context of a multicultural nation, would remain the majority, Aubin argued, but the French would be now on "equal footing" with all other minority groups despite their central role in Canada's founding.[40]

French Canadians rejected the policy, not multiculturalism. In this way, French Canadians were also conditionally supportive of multiculturalism. Much of the same sentiment from English Canada was reflected in French Canada although for different reasons. French Canadians were supportive of immigration and diversity as long as it accommodated their existing concept of the Quebecois identity. Serge Losique, writing in *Le Devoir*, emphasized "des éléments nouveaux extrêmement précieux" of immigration. He argued the integral value of immigration and multiculturalism to the construct of Canadian society. Yet, amidst this rich diversity, Losique stated, "si on a deux on ne peut pas s'entendre, ce qui arrivera avec au moins 30 groupes importants."[41] If French and English cultural identity could not equally coexist, how could Canadian identity survive giving every cultural minority group equal representation? French Canadians conditionally supported multiculturalism and immigration as long as it did not threaten their right to identify as a founding people of Canada. Their reaction to the multiculturalism policy only emphasizes the importance of Quebecois identity to French Canadians as it was critical to protect, cultivate, and nurture it in a way that would truly be reflective of its people.

The scope of this paper does not allow for an individual analysis of each cultural minority group. The Ukrainian-Canadian community, though part of the cultural minority category, has been given its own section of analysis in this paper. Also, given the sources of my research, minority group responses other than French or Ukrainian were already collected together as one entity, so for the sake of organization it will be similarly structured here. Overall, there were no minority groups who were fervently opposed to the multiculturalism policy though there was significant hesitation and skepticism from certain of them.

Before analysing the cultural minority group responses, it is vital to recognize a major theme that emerged in my research surrounding terminology. Cultural minority groups resented certain language when referring to their national identity. "Hyphenated Canadians," "ethnic minority Canadians," or "foreign language and culture" were terms that isolated or "othered" the cultural minority groups and restricted their identification as being wholly Canadian. The basis of the multiculturalism policy was to allow for this "otherness" to manifest throughout Canadian life, but, as Burnet points out, cultural minority groups did not want to be further identified by this terminology. Instead they wanted to be accepted as Canadian and to fit into society.[42] This did not mean a relinquishing of heritage, but a redesign of what Canadian identity meant, an identity that would remove the notion of "foreign" altogether and allow for a new identity to be cultivated.

---

[35] "Samson, Loubier et Lévesque sont d'accord : Le multiculturalisme, c'est un ballon électoral," *Le Soleil*, 18 novembre 1971 : 16.

[36] "Le Multiculturalisme peut-il conduire au multilinguisme? » *Le Devoir,* 20 July, 1972: 6.

[37] William Johnson, "Identity Crisis?: A Quebec view of English Canada," *The Globe and Mail*, 15 March, 1973: 7.

[38] Guy Rocher, "La politique multiculturelle du Canada pourrait amener la Québec," *La Presse,* 17 July 1972: E7.

[39] Francois Aubin, "Metro surprises Quebecker: He could 'live in French' here," *Toronto Daily Star*, 11 June 1973: 9.

[40] "L'ACELF refuse sa politique multiculturelle," *Le Devoir,* 13 November, 1971: 3.

[41] Serge Losique, "Le mythe dangereux du multiculturalisme," *Le Devoir*, 14 octobre 1971 : 4.

[42] Burnet, "We and They: Remarks about Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada," 39.

The Ukrainian-Canadian group was active in the Bi-Bi Commission and the implementation of the multiculturalism policy and was also incredibly vocal on behalf of cultural minority groups demanding greater rights and representation from fellow Canadians. Ukrainian- Canadian Senator Paul Yuzyk was the first person to use the term "multiculturalism" in Parliament, and linguist Jaroslav Rudnyckyj conducted research on regionality and language for the Bi-Bi Commission.[43] Ukrainian Canadians were a cultural minority group who understood Canadian identity differently from the majority and they actively discussed cultivating a new definition of Canadianism.

The Ukrainian Canadian community, whose language was intricately woven into their conception of identity, longed for their fellow Canadians to no longer see other languages as "foreign."[44] In response to having Ukrainian-language radio stations, Jack Craine, director of English-language CBC radio said, "it would be better for Ukrainians to talk to Canadians, rather than for Ukrainians to talk to Ukrainians."[45] For Jack Craine, and for his listening public on whose behalf he spoke, Ukrainian language was "foreign" and should not be on the radio.

Ukrainian Canadians frequented news articles and wrote letters to the editor in their pursuit of greater cultural minority rights. It was suggested that the multiculturalism policy was conjured to appease the Ukrainian Canadians, though it seems only to have spurred Ukrainian Canadians to seek greater representation.[46] In theory, Ukrainian Canadians were supportive of the multiculturalism policy as it was a conduit through which they could finally be equitably represented throughout Canada and voice their demands on behalf of their

cultural group. Paul Shewchuk, vice-president of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, called it a "milestone in Canadian history."[47] What became immediately evident in reading their attitudes and responses were the demands that were not being met and downright refused despite the multiculturalism policy. Gloria Ochitwa was skeptical of what a multiculturalism policy would mean. She called Canada a "vertical mosaic with the Anglo Saxon ethnic group still very much at the top."[48]

Ukrainian Canadians saw a significant lack of representation in education and media and they demanded that their language and culture no longer be recognized as "foreign" but as other facets of Canadian identity. The lack of language representation in education and on radio stations demonstrated a failure of the multiculturalism policy. The Ukrainian Canadians argued that it was easier to learn about foreign cultures than about minority groups within Canada. Many Ukrainian Canadians such as Andrij Semotiuk, President of the Ukrainian Canadian Student Union, advocated for allowance of Ukrainian language on CBC radio, as many Canadians spoke Ukrainian.[49]

The Ukrainian-Canadian community was integral to the development and establishment of the Canadian Prairies, and the group desired to be recognized for this contribution. B. Yarymowich, President of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, recognized: "Canada's heritage may have been two cultures, but Canada's future is many."[50] Through this claim, he was recognizing the current understanding of Canadian identity to be French and English, but, speaking on behalf of the 26.7%, he was demanding change. Greater acceptance of multiculturalism would not create division but allow for greater unity as Canada recognized the many cultural groups that were *already* Canadian citizens making up the famed "mosaic." Yarymowich saw the future of the Canadian identity and argued its re-evaluation could be inclusive and

---

[43] Thomas M. Prymak, "The Royal Commission and Rudnyckyj's Mission: The Forging of Official Multiculturalism in Canada, 1963–71," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 88:1 (January 1, 2019): 51, 44.

[44] Yuriy Weretelnyk, "True unity is not the absence of differences," *Toronto Daily Star,* 20 Dec. 1971: 1.
See also: J. B. Rudnyckyj, "Reginal languages proposal misunderstood," *Toronto Daily Star*, 17 Nov 1971: 7.

[45] "CBC rejects Ukrainian radio," *Toronto Daily Star,* 29 August, 1973: G14. [47] Prymak, "The Royal Commission and Rudnyckyj's Mission," 58.

[46] Prymak, "The Royal Commission and Rudnyckyj's Mission," 58.

[47] Jack Cahill, "Ottawa's new plan for a Canada of many cultures," *Toronto Daily Star*, 04 December, 1971: 23.

[48] Bob Pennington, "Ontario's Cultural Mosaic," *Toronto Daily Star*, 29 April, 1972: 3.

[49] Media, education systems said failing minority groups,*" The Globe and Mail*, 02 June, 1972: 39. See also: "CBC Rejects Ukrainian Radio," *Toronto Daily Star*, 29 Aug 1973: G14. See also: "Minorities told to tap their own power," *Toronto Daily Star*, 28 Aug 1973: B1.

[50] B. Yarymowich, "Multiculturalism is not a new concept," *Toronto Daily Star*, 13 June, 1972: 7.

equitable for all cultural groups, new and old. This multiculturalism policy was not merely for grants and cultural festivals; Ukrainians wanted physical and ideological change to the Canadian identity.

The sub-field of minority groups in itself was not homogenous and consisted of distinct divisions within each culture, language and experience. There was a division between older and recent arrivals to Canada and how they responded to the multiculturalism of the Canadian identity. The Ukrainian-Canadian community, of whom 82% were Canadian-born in 1971, pushed for the multiculturalism policy to ensure the preservation of and respect for their culture. The Italian community, of whom only 46% were Canadian-born in 1971, showed very little concern for the policy but were highly engaged with the obstacles of immigration, integration, and socioeconomic status.[51] Burnet argues recent arrivals to Canada were "more concerned about being treated like everyone else...than about having their rights to be different respected."[52] This supports the socioeconomic variable of the survey responses. Some cultural minority groups did not want a multiculturalism policy that would emphasize and support their cultural heritage; they wanted a policy that would create a greater space for them within the existing Canadian society, a space that would accommodate their needs. Greater demands such as increased welfare, jobs, and education were prioritized over simply achieving representation.

Some members of cultural minority groups resented the politicization of multiculturalism as they felt it would further isolate them as "other" or "ethnic" within the Canadian community. Japanese-Canadian Robert Kadoguchi argued, "There is a danger in stressing ethnicity too much, that you neglect the fact that you're a Canadian first."[53] George C. Koz of Ottawa stated of cultural minorities that "they are Canadian, that they feel Canadian, that they are bent on building a Canadian nation with a new and distinct identity: to be simply Canadians, not hyphenated ones."[54] This understanding of the desires of cultural minorities represents an entire group of Canadians that were actively seeking to re-establish the Canadian identity as one that included them.

Reverend Sang Lee of the Korean United Church felt Ontario's "mosaic" was a vertical one. He stated that English Canadians were supportive of multiculturalism but only if cultural backgrounds were not imposed on the majority, a recognition of the conditional nature of that support.[55] He wanted more than a recognition of multiculturalism, but a reciprocal action on the part of the majority, so that minorities would not be compromised by the influence of English Canadians. In this way, Lee described true multiculturalism: a society in which cultural groups reciprocally benefit from the value of each other. Therefore, his skepticism of the policy suggests this type of multiculturalism did not exist and was not felt by cultural minority Canadians.

Furthering this "other" complex was the Canadian media, which cultural minority groups felt had failed to accurately reflect cultural pluralism.[56] German Canadians resented being stereotyped as Nazis in movies and television and the neglect of 200 years of German pioneers in Canadian history books.[57] In 1973, the CBC would receive similar criticism for its language policy that disallowed unofficial languages on air. Minority groups demanded greater language rights given the federal multiculturalism policy.[58] What was important to minority groups, given the implementation of the policy, was the deconstruction of perceived stereotypes to cultivate a more complex and inclusive Canadian identity.

A conference initiated by the Ontario government called "Heritage Ontario" was organized to gather representatives from all cultural groups to gather feedback and reactions to the policy as well as to provide an opportunity for the government to discover the needs of its multicultural society. It was to be attended

---

[51] Burnet, "Multiculturalism, Immigration and Racism," 37.

[52] Ibid., 39.

[53] Joe Serge, "Haidasz says multiculturalism essential for unity," *Toronto Daily Star*, 20 October, 1973: A6.

[54] "Meeting looked to future despite title based on past," *Toronto Daily Star*, 13 June, 1972: 7.

[55] Peter Whelan, "So many nationalities...all giving grievances," *The Globe and Mail*, 05 June, 1972: 5.

[56] "Press, TV accused of poor coverage for minority groups," *Toronto Daily Star*, 3 June, 1972: 4. See also: Peter Whelan, "So many nationalities...all giving grievances," *The Globe and Mail*, 05 June, 1972: 5. 20

[57] "Germans, Italians, Indians, French protest 'images': Largest Group," *Toronto Daily Star*, 03 June, 1972: 4.

[58] Andrij Semotiuk, "Gaelic," *The Globe and Mail*, 22 Aug, 1973: 7.

by 54 cultural groups totalling 72 languages.[59] The newspaper coverage of this conference reflects much of the dialogue surrounding the multiculturalism policy at the time. Interviewed representatives from each cultural group were suspicious that the conference would be a political ploy. Polish attendees were disappointed with the unbalanced representation and Italian attendees understood it as an obligation to appease public pressure.[60] What is important to highlight is that there *was* public pressure. Canadians were pushing their government to recognize Canadian diversity and cooperatively discuss the demands of all those who identified as Canadian.

The conference produced a list of demands to present to the provincial government which included language rights, greater financial support, and representative education.[61] One attendee stated, "Heritage Ontario reeks of hypocrisy" as these demands were never met, and, as it seems, barely considered.[62] The lingering frustration of the conference points to the major argument in response to the multiculturalism policy from minority groups. Despite the professed acceptance of multiculturalism, the real needs of cultural minority groups were not being met.

Fernando Dias Costa, trustee of the Canadian Portuguese Congress, was not interested in the professed benefits of the policy. What concerned Costa was the significant number of newly immigrated Portuguese who were on welfare, the challenges of language barriers, and the lack of interpreter services in legal aid. Costa stated, "in Toronto, no Portuguese has yet graduated in law or medicine" but are rather put into vocational education.[63] The big budgets touted by the federal government's policy could have been put to much better use.

Polish and Slovakian Canadians saw this same challenge. Civil service jobs were unfeasible for cultural minorities when the majority of voters were of British background and more likely to vote within their cultural group.[64] C. K. Kalevar wrote about this discrepancy in the composition of the power elite, recognizing that its sociological composition was English- Canadian leaning, and demanded, in the name of multiculturalism, that the needs of minority groups including new Canadians and Indigenous Canadians be given attention.[65] The clear demands of minority groups to receive this sufficient aid, or changes to economic and educational structures, reflect the extent to which minority groups understood their Canadian identity. They were entirely Canadian, and they expected their Canadian government to see them as such and to respond to their needs. Heritage Ontario was an opportunity for many cultural groups to engage in the conversation of multiculturalism alongside the majority to begin the process of re-evaluating the Canadian identity.

Clearly, Canadians were not yet in full support of multiculturalism as there was significant denial of the needs of minorities. Nevertheless the publication of these demands and concerns marked the initiation of Canadians into a broader conversation about identity.

A cultural minority group omitted from the attitude surveys was Indigenous Canadians. This is interesting because at the time of the implementation of the policy the federal government received serious backlash from other parties and Canadian citizens for their omission.[66] Progressive Conservative M.P. Flora MacDonald questioned the Liberal government in the House of Commons about this omission of Indigenous persons in the throne speech that addressed multiculturalism, stating that "the new national policy must spare no effort to provide a full partnership to the native peoples."[67] Canadians of various

---

[59] Joe Serge, "Government calls meeting to bring cultures together," *Toronto Daily Star*, 01 June, 1972: 3.

[60] "Few Heritage Ontario delegates expect to see major changes," *Toronto Daily Star*, 03 June, 1972: 4.

[61] "Ethnic affairs department needed in Ontario," *The Globe and Mail*, 05 June 1972: 5.

[62] I. Carroll, "Ontario has a duty to protect English language," *Toronto Daily Star*, 13 June, 1972: 7.

[63] Bob Pennington, "The Portuguese: 'A deprived group,'" *Toronto Daily Star*, 29 April, 1972: 23.

[64] "Little hope for ethnics in politics, meeting told," *Toronto Daily Star*, 03 June, 1972: 4.

[65] C. K. Kalevar, "French and English," *The Globe and Mail*, 19 July, 1972: 6.

[66] Steve MacDonald, "Canadian heritage must come first," *Toronto Daily Star*, 11 May 1972: 7.

[67] Canada, Parliament, *House of Commons Debates,* 29th Parl, 1st Sess, Vol 112, No 01 (January 11, 1973): 195.

cultural groups recognized this neglect and voiced their concern.[68] The participation of Canadians regarding the issue of Indigenous representation highlights a progressive component of the Canadian identity at this time. Canadians accepted a degree of responsibility for the misconduct toward Indigenous peoples. This dialogue suggests that despite the absence of Indigenous peoples from the historiography of multiculturalism, at least some Canadians at the time recognized they were integral components of the Canadian identity.

Still, Indigenous groups were highly suspicious of the policy.[69] Leslie Currie, President of the Ontario Native League for Youth, was skeptical of the government's claims, calling the new policy "another fancy idea" from the government. The concept of a multiculturalism policy, essentially a distribution of funds, left the Indigenous community wary about the sincerity of the government's efforts. Currie rejected grants for cultural demonstrations and festivities and demanded greater support for the genuine needs of her community. Indigenous peoples struggled with alcohol addiction, high numbers in penal institutions, and prostitution, but, as Currie stated, "nothing is being done to find out how they got there."[70] Walter Currie, chairman of Indian Eskimo Studies at Trent University and a non-status Ojibway native, accused Canada of eliminating its Indigenous cultural heritage and promoting Canada's history of the "melting pot theory" when it came to Indigenous people groups.[71]

As was the case with cultural minorities, the Indigenous community felt underrepresented in the education system. Currie recalls learning more about Doukhobors than her own people, native to Canada. Non-Indigenous Canadians were teaching about Indigenous experiences in universities, calling themselves "experts" whereas, as Currie points out, they did not even live them.[72] Clearly, for Indigenous Canadians, there were far greater issues to be addressed in order to achieve genuine equity before Canada could boast its value of multiculturalism.

Throughout my review of the scholarship, I did not find any secondary source research on the attitude of Indigenous persons toward the multiculturalism policy or any sociological analysis on how to reconcile Indigenous identity and culture within the broader conversation of Canadianism. This is absolutely a shortcoming in the academic literature. The number of references to Indigenous peoples in news publications suggests that their concerns were not unaddressed, but rather highly publicized and therefore a component of the re-consideration the Canadian identity.

The diversity of cultural groups and their associated attitudes and arguments reflects the diversity and multiculturalism of the Canadian nation. This research reveals the subtle obstacles to genuine reciprocal multiculturalism in which all groups contribute to and receive from the richness of cultural heritage. Writing in 2011, almost 40 years after his original survey research, Berry comments on the development of Canada's plural societies in light of the multiculturalism policy. Still a strong advocate of the policy, Berry highlights the need for cultural maintenance and development to sustain its success. He calls this approach mutual accommodation with reciprocal engagement.[73]

Refuting the suggestion that Canada was less tolerant of multiculturalism than it had been, Berry saw Canadians by the early 2010s as progressing toward a greater manifestation of equitable multiculturalism. When Trudeau announced that Canada was multicultural, an embodiment of this multiculturalism did not yet exist in Canadian society, as many were only conditionally supportive of the policy. Nevertheless, the introduction of the policy is significant as it opened the conversation to redefining the Canadian identity. The initial stages of the multiculturalism policy demonstrate this progression clearly, as Canadians were

---

[68] Yuriy Weretelnyk, "True unity is not the absence of differences," *Toronto Daily Star,* 20 December, 1971: 7. See also: George C. Koz, "Meeting looked to future despite title based on past," *Toronto Daily Star,* 13 June, 1972: 7. See also: Bob Pennington, "A WASP: 'Culture cannot be imposed,'" *Toronto Daily Star,* 29 April, 1972: 23.

[69] Bob Pennington, "Most delegates-but not all-are happy about our big multicultural conference," *Toronto Daily Star*, 29 April, 1972: 3. See also: "Culture dominated by U.S., Indian says," *Toronto Daily Star*, 03 June, 1972: 4.

[70] Bob Pennington, "An Indian: 'Native people are subject to racial slurs," *Toronto Daily Star*, 29 April, 1972: 3.

[71] "Germans, Italians, Indians, French protest 'images,'" *Toronto Daily Star*, 03 June, 1972: 4.

[72] Bob Pennington, "An Indian: 'Native people are subject to racial slurs," *Toronto Daily Star*, 29 April, 1972: 3.

[73] John W. Berry, "Intercultural relations in plural societies: research derived from Canadian multiculturalism policy," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 43:3 (2011), 7.

finally talking about what it meant to retain heritage and be Canadian. In this context, Leonard Wertheimer, head of the language centre at the Metropolitan Toronto Central Library, introduced new material to the library to accommodate new Canadian heritage. He commented that even books in the Urdu language were being acquired that every Canadian might preserve and celebrate their heritage. Wertheimer articulated this redefinition of identity well in 1972:

Neither government nor librarians can create or force creation, understanding or growth of multiculturalism in Canada. Much can be done, however, to establish a climate and condition which allow the awareness of other than the familiar culture to penetrate the consciousness of more and more Canadians.[74]

This echoes the attitudes of cultural minority groups, and recent and old immigrants. Many cultural minorities did not believe they were "ethnic" or "foreign," as they were part of Canada, and to it they brought rich cultures and heritage they desired to share. Indeed, internationally Canada's multiculturalism policy is viewed as an anomaly in that its acceptance of diversity was to unify and cultivate a national identity.[75] Though they seem insurmountable, these contentions, arguments, and attitudes in the early 1970s were clearly essential in critiquing the Canadian identity and re-examining how each individual could find their place in the mosaic.

To reiterate, the importance of the multiculturalism policy lies not in Canadians' support or rejection of it, but in how they responded to it. The responses of Canadians suggest that Canada's contemporary multiculturalism was not realized by increasing immigration and diversity alone, but rather through a redefinition of Canadian identity and a recognition of the values and contributions of other peoples. Canadians were evaluating matters of ethnicity, foreignness, language, and representation as they impacted Canadian identity. Due to the introduction of the policy, there was a demand to reconstruct Canadian society to be more equitably accommodating of all cultural groups so that no minority would be pushed to the margins, and so that Canadians could function in reciprocal multiculturalism.

This research, looking at public sentiments of Canadian identity, both reaffirms and refines the existing historiography. The conditional support of both English and French Canadians toward the multiculturalism policy highlights the perceived Canadian identity for each group – one that existed outside of cultural minority groups. News sources also contribute a unique perspective on the frustration and skepticism of the minority groups as to their genuine inclusion in a multicultural society. Whereas this research only just introduces the conversation about and perception of Canadians toward the Indigenous contribution to the Canadian identity, its presence in public media presents a revealing component of the discussion of that identity in the wake of Trudeau's policy.

Trudeau's multiculturalism policy did not make the Canadian mosaic. In fact, the response to it demonstrates that many Canadians were opposed to it. Canada was still adjusting to its multicultural nature; cultures and languages were still unfamiliar with coexistence. Yet the introduction of the policy in 1971 initiated a crucial conversation about defining the new and future Canadian identity. That diverse cultures and languages are now celebrated for their contribution to the Canadian identity is due in large part to the process of rethinking and reimagining sparked by that conversation fifty years ago.

<div align="center">Bibliography</div>

Primary Sources
News Sources:
La Presse Historical Newspapers, 1971-1973.
Le Devoir Historical Newspapers, 1971-1973.
"Samson, Loubier et Lévesque sont d'accord : Le multiculturalisme, c'est un ballon électoral." *Le Soleil*, 18 novembre 1971 : 16.
The Globe and Mail Historical Newspapers, 1971-1973. *Toronto Daily Star Historical Newspapers,* 1971-1973.

---

[74] Leonard Wertheimer, "We're filling the gap left in bilingualism policy, says librarian," *Toronto Daily Star,* 09 December, 1972: 27.
[75] Varun Uberoi, "Multiculturalism and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms," *Political Studies* 57:4 (December 1, 2009): 807.

Government Documents:

Canada. Parliament. *House of Commons Debates,* 28th Parliament, 3rd Session, Volume 8 (8 October 1971): 8545-8548.

Canada. Parliament. *House of Commons Debates*, 29th Parliament, 1st Session, Volume 112, Number 01 (January 4th, 1973): 317-320.

Canada. Parliament. *House of Commons Debates*, 29th Parliament, 1st Session, Volume 112, Number 01 (January 30th, 1973): 772.

Secondary Sources

Berry, John W. "Intercultural relations in plural societies: research derived from Canadian multiculturalism policy." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 43:3 (2011): 5-18.

Berry, John W., Rudolf. Kalin, and Donald M. Taylor. "Attitudes Toward Multiculturalism." In *Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada*. (Ottawa: Minister of State for Multiculturalism, 1976):131-177.

Burnet, Jean. "Multiculturalism, Immigration and Racism: A Comment on the Canadian Immigration and Population Study." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 7:1 (1975): 35-39.

Burnet, Jean. "We and They: Remarks about Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 10:1 (January 1, 1978): 51–55.

28

Kalin, Rudolf and John W. Berry. "Ethnic and Civic Self-Identity in Canada: Analyses of 1974 and 1991 National Surveys." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 27:2 (June 1, 1995): 1–15.

Lambert D. Ronald, and James E. Curtis. "The French- and English- Canadian Language Communities and Multicultural Attitudes." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 14:2 (1982): 43-58.

Lupul, Manoly R. "The Political Implementation of Multiculturalism." *Journal of Canadian Studies* (January 1, 1982): 93–102.

Prymak, Thomas M. "The Royal Commission and Rudnyckyj's Mission: The Forging of Official Multiculturalism in Canada, 1963–71." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 88:1 (January 1, 2019): 43–63.

Rocher, Guy. "Les ambigui tés d'un Canada bilingue et multiculturel." In *Le Québec en mutation*. Montréal: Hurtubise (1973): 93-103.

Uberoi, Varun. "Multiculturalism and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms." *Political Studies* 57:4 (December 1, 2009): 805–27.

Owl Vessel, Chimú, 14th–15th C