

NATIONALISM, FEMINISM & CANADIAN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

Susan Mann Trofimenkoff

NATIONALISM AND FEMINISM have usually been in bad odour in Canada. Hindsight has conferred upon the one a potential for evil that most intellectuals find distasteful although actual expressions of nationalism in Canada's past have been timid voices of regret and concern quickly silenced by more tangible signs of progress and prosperity. Foresight has conferred upon the other a similar potential for evil that most conservatives find horrifying although actual expressions of feminism in Canada's past have also been timid voices of request and concern quickly silenced by more powerful signs of ridicule and control.

Is there something more than a fanciful connection between the two? What role have historians of ideas played in shaping the images that come to us of nationalism and feminism? If one put the two together, might one see both in a different light, avoiding the intellectual historian's greatest pitfall — presentism (seeing and judging the past in terms of the present) — and arriving at a role for women in the formation of ideology and thereby a broader view of the nature of intellectual history?

Origins of ideas are difficult to discern. Traditionally, intellectual historians have contented themselves with unravelling the connections between ideas, tracing the influence of them and, one suspects, passing moral judgment upon them. The history of ideas thus constituted more a commentary upon the present than a study of the past. More contemporary intellectual historians are obliged to take social stock of their past concerns, tracking down the birth, schooling, class and connections of the exponents of various ideas. Rarely in Canada but occasionally elsewhere, psycho-historians have also tried their hand at piecing together the puzzle of ideas. Even the computer can get in on the act with varying attempts at content analysis. But the mix remains a mystery; endless playing with variables still leaves one wondering.

My own wondering about the possible connection between nationalism and feminism began with the reading of a poet writing prose about women. Adrienne Rich's *Of Woman Born* is a far cry from nationalism. But combining my own background of thinking about nationalism with a contemporary interest in

feminism,¹ it occurred to me on reading Rich that the intellectual domains permitted to women whether in image or reality, are precisely the underpinnings of nationalism: myth, poetry, tradition, inspiration, continuity, preservation, morality.

Why should that be so? And was there here a hint of an explanation of the force of nationalism in the contemporary world? Had this particular ideology been able to draw on mythic representations of the male and the female in the psyche of the western world, combining *la patrie* of authority, strength, reason and order with the maternal assurances of nurture, emotion, stability, continuity and even grace? A secular religion indeed.

Historians of any variety never proceed very far on pure speculation. The social scientist in them is too highly developed. Some facts for the fancy then. Nationalism and feminism in French Canada at the turn of the twentieth century are surprisingly similar. Whether one thinks of the Ligue Nationaliste or the more poetic Action Française, the Fédération Nationale Saint-Jean-Baptiste or the more prosaic Ligue des Droits de la Femme, the ideological similarities are too startling to be dismissed. Both harboured a notion of "separate spheres," distinct and proper places for French Canada and for women. Both posited special qualities to accompany, perhaps to justify, the separate sphere: a civilizing mission, perpetuating values, morality and the traditions of the past. Both therefore clearly stated a superiority to the Anglo-Saxon or male world around them. And both believed these qualitative differences, this cultural superiority, to be given by birth and developed by history. Both insisted that theirs was the true path away from the evils of contemporary society, evils from which they both recoiled in the same manner: a moral revulsion to industrialization, urban crowding, unhealthy living conditions, infant mortality, tuberculosis, alcoholism, crime and venereal disease. Both nationalism and feminism promised to cleanse, purify and rectify society of these present plagues. Both flirted with religion and politics, neither ever sure of the sanction of the religious or the secular sphere but both anxious to draw upon the former and have a place in the latter. In that light both posited a series of duties and rights incumbent upon each. Both insisted unsuccessfully on French Canadian and female unity under the banner respectively of nationalism and feminism.

To account for such striking similarities is difficult. They appear to go beyond mere chronological, ideological or social coincidence, although that coincidence is almost as remarkable. Both nationalist and feminist spokesmen can of course be found earlier in the nineteenth century, but the initial outburst of each appears to arise as a response to the economic and social changes brought about by urbanization and industrialization from the 1890's into the 1920's. Nationalists feared for the survival of the French Canadian nation; feminists feared for the survival of the family. Ideological coincidence is also quite apparent, for both

nationalism and feminism can be interpreted as a redeeming myth, a justification, a camouflage or even a hope of change for a group sensing itself a subordinate minority. There may even be social similarities, since ideological spokesmen tend to have the same social, economic and professional backgrounds; that they should make similar utterances is perhaps not too surprising.²

WRITINGS ON NATIONALISM AND FEMINISM have in fact been few and far between, their authors needless to say never hinting at a possible link. Indeed both have been coloured by a world context which has made of nationalism a "great event" and of feminism, at least until very recently, a "non-event." So the feeble strains of Canadian nationalism and the somewhat stronger ones of French Canadian nationalism have been bombarded with the hostility reserved for the awful occurrences of the second world war or the snobbery reserved for an intellectual anachronism.³ At the same time, some of the people have suggested that the *leit motiv* of both English and French Canadian historical writing, in itself a domain of intellectual history, has been the concern for survival, a nationalist concern.⁴ The fear aroused by such a suggestion leads to entire articles bitterly denying the argument that Harold Innis, for example, could have been a nationalist.⁵ And the general belief that nationalism could or should be a potent force in Canadian society is everywhere in evidence from the intentionally feeble efforts of the Foreign Investment Review Agency to the precarious existence of the Committee for an Independent Canada. Of feminism, one need merely note that had it been a dominant force, both our written history and our contemporary society would be vastly different.

The hint of presentism in the approach to nationalism in particular is enhanced by the relative youth and political orientation of intellectual history in Canada. Only in the 1960's did historians take up Frank Underhill's challenge of the 1940's to write intellectual history.⁶ Ramsay Cook in fact followed Underhill's directives to the letter, virtually making of the history of political ideas the mainstay of intellectual history in Canada.⁷ Indeed, by the late 1960's, the history of a specific political idea, nationalism, had narrowed the field even more. Doubtless the Quiet Revolution served as an impetus: here was a political idea that might well destroy another, Canada itself.⁸ In any case the period produced a number of studies of aspects of French Canadian nationalism by Cook and by people who, although influenced by him in their choice of topic, did not always reflect his hostility: Cook's *Canada and the French Canadian Question* and *The Maple Leaf Forever*, Joe Levitt's *Henri Bourassa and the Golden Calf*, Susan Trofimenkoff's *Action Française*, Phyllis Sherrin's "Lionel Groulx," Patricia Dirks' "Union Nationale."

At the same time intellectual history began to be taught in the universities, the course outlines surprisingly similar. The history of political ideas predominated, but the search for the nationalist contours of those ideas seemed to be the main driving force. And so students grappled with the possible effect of an English Canadian nationalist group like Canada First on French Canadian nationalism, with the similarities between the nationalism of Bourassa and J. S. Ewart, of Groulx and Lower. Behold, English Canada had its nationalists too and they even began showing up on the conservative side of the political spectrum, historically in Carl Berger's imperialists and in Sid Wise's preachers, contemporaneously among George Grant's lamenters.⁹

The concern for the present is thus very obvious among intellectual historians, six of them appearing in Peter Russell's very present-oriented *Nationalism in Canada*. A Canada threatened with disruption by a culturally defined nationalism convinced them of the need to see how previous generations of writers, spokesmen and journalists had viewed the destiny of Canada. Conflicting views of nationalism became the very stuff of intellectual history, their contemporary political interest openly admitted.¹⁰ In such an arena, women could scarcely compete since they rarely appeared in the ranks of nationalist spokesmen, politicians or even intellectual historians. Only when an ideology concerned with women appeared on the scene did historians begin noticing. Perhaps not surprisingly, Ramsay Cook was again one of the earliest to spot feminism as an intriguing path of intellectual and contemporary concern.¹¹ Just as he did so, two younger intellectual historians turned away from nationalism and indeed (perhaps as a consequence) away from a present day focus for their interests. Both Sam Shortt and Carl Berger have shunned the explicit political commentary of earlier intellectual history, Shortt insisting on the inherent interest of the ideas of his six *Search[ers] for an Ideal*, Berger now investigating the idea of nature in the late nineteenth century. Intellectual history may be coming of age. Before it does so completely, I would argue, it will have to take women into account.

The elusive search for a Canadian identity has in fact led historians to see nationalism — but few women — in the oddest of places. Carl Berger manages to suspend the reader's initial disbelief and argue persuasively that turn-of-the-century imperialists were really nationalists. It was only a *Sense of Power* that led people like George Denison, George Grant, George Parkin, Stephen Leacock and Andrew Macphail to see potential for Canada in the imperial tie; the real sustenance came from Canada itself. These "imperialists" had a particular, loyalist, view of Canada's past, a whig notion of Canadian political development, an agriculturalist ideal of the rural life, a conservative antipathy to industrial society, a frontier lad's delight in militarism and a moralist's disdain for the social decadence of England and the United States. Their nationalism and their imperialism were, however, decidedly masculine affairs. Berger's first chapter is

simply and pointedly entitled "Men." These men saw wheat and soldiers springing full grown out of the Canadian prairies. It did not occur to them that the evolution of liberty and self-government, so much admired, might entail women. Nor did they spot any women among the factories and the slums of the industrial order they so much despised. Perhaps there is more than the first world war to explain the gradual irrelevance of imperialism in Canada.

Sam Shortt, on the other hand, makes no attempt to transform his six turn-of-the-century worriers into nationalists. The *Search for an Ideal* of Andrew Macphail, Archibald MacMechan, James Cappon, Maurice Hutton, Adam Shortt and James Mavor involved excursions into philosophic ideas, none of which led to nationalism. In an effort to explain their worries and their eventual ideals, Shortt does in fact go back to family roots. He spots religion and, for once, women, in the form of mothers. The wives of his worriers are less obvious, a half-sentence suggesting their removal from the intellectual lives of their husbands, a half paragraph on Elizabeth Smith Shortt hinting that much remains to be seen. Among the six intellectuals themselves, only one noticed the presence of women (as cause or effect?) in their crumbling world order. Andrew Macphail's ideal society was in fact very much like that of Groulx: women in the family held the entire social fabric together.¹² All of the men grasped at philosophic straws, Shortt detailing in order the strains of idealism, romanticism and empiricism in their thought. Even though someone like Adam Shortt contributed to the contemporary critique of imperialism and to the historical bases of a subsequent English Canadian nationalism, his grandson Sam Shortt shies away from the national question as purposely as Berger and Cook placed it in centre stage.

Literary historians and critics, often the sources of much intellectual history, have however often abetted the historian's penchant for studying nationalism. Indeed, they may even have shown the way. Much of their work is an attempt to pin down a "Canadianness" or a "French Canadianness" in the texts they study, revealing thereby the nationalist desire for differentiation and identity. Northrop Frye, for example, suggests an optimistic willing away of distance as one of the hall-marks of Canadian literature.¹³ He finds it among the poets. Historically one would find it among the women. The men had fur trades and railroads to construct, tangible means of conquering the distance; the women had only their will to defy the distance to family in France, in England, in eastern Canada, to overcome the distance to husband *dans le grand nord, aux chantiers, aux Etats, à la guerre*. The poets may sing, but it is the women who have spun the fabric of the nation, for the critics to admire. Until very recently however no one has raised the question, in history or literature, "What about the women?"

Admittedly some French Canadian writers have done so. Both literary critics and sociologists have, however, limited their enquiry to the mythic mother,¹⁴ their concern being more with the dire effect an omnipresent and omnipotent mother

has had on the national psyche than with the experiences of the women themselves. These women are not real, they are images, harboured, one suspects, in the minds of men, and developed over time through the institutions of men. But it is precisely of such images that nations are made.

FRENCH CANADIAN HISTORIANS are in a more ambivalent position. Conscious that they have "played perhaps the largest single role in developing the nationalist ideology,"¹⁵ and often despairing of contemporary expressions of such nationalism, many of the younger historians have turned deliberately to social, economic and urban history. Others have attempted to investigate past ideologies with a critical eye, the impulse for their investigations being threefold. A concern for contemporary French Canada — a nationalist concern — guides all their studies. And yet most of them study the conservative clerical ideology of the latter half of the nineteenth century, painfully aware that what they do so obviously believe to have been rank soil produced one of the varieties of nationalism which still nourishes them. At the same time, they tend to disdain intellectual history *per se* (one even suggesting a distinction between French Canadian historiography and English Canadian historiography with the first more socially oriented, the second more political)¹⁶ and investigate ideologies in a particular context of social class, power relations and economic change.

It is precisely that social context where French Canadian intellectual historians see ideas having their greatest impact. Indeed, the common thread between people as diverse as Michel Brunet, Fernand Ouellet, Maurice Séguin, Pierre Trudeau, Jean Hamelin and Nadia Eid is their tendency to see past nationalist ideas as a deterrent to the social and economic development of French Canada. Much ink has been spilled in both English and French Canada to amplify or attack Brunet's "trois dominantes de la pensée canadienne-française"; the point here is simply that Brunet treats "agriculturalisme," "anti-étatisme" and "messianisme" as powerful, and damaging, political ideas.¹⁷ Ramsay Cook in fact adds another political idea — that of conquest — to the trio to enhance an ideological explanation of French Canada's present situation.¹⁸ Fernand Ouellet's wide ranging synthesis of the economic underdevelopment of Quebec pinpoints a conservative *mentalité* as prime cause.¹⁹ Maurice Séguin reinterprets French Canada's past in the light of what he admits regrettably to have been a minority idea — that of separatism; while lending the weight of intellectual history to a present political option, he also hints that the adoption of such an idea long ago would have permitted Quebec a more natural development. In his case, a pan-Canadian political nationalism has been detrimental to his *pays*.²⁰ Trudeau's intellectual antipathy to nationalism, shared by Ramsay Cook, is reinforced by

his conviction that it has had deleterious effects on present day Quebec. Even Jean Hamelin's ambitious attempt to chronicle *Idéologies au Canada français* rests on the assumption that the developing clerico-nationalism of the late nineteenth century stifled something in the French Canadian spirit, that the virtual ossification of that nationalism in the early twentieth century prohibited an adequate response to changing economic and social conditions and that even the beginnings of doubt in the 1930's had to be expressed in such traditional terms that it could not produce a thorough critique of the depression.²¹ Nadia Eid scrutinizes a particular variety of clerico-nationalism, ultramontanism, to point out its political purpose and its social results: power to the Church and the politicians, "immobilisme" for society and the mass of the people.²²

French Canadian historians, however, have seldom been any more aware of the existence of women than their English Canadian counterparts. True, as an adjunct of religion or the family, two topics that cannot be avoided when studying traditional nationalism in French Canada, women occasionally do appear, shadowy figures at best. The essayists in *Idéologies au Canada français* who do record a given newspaper's views on the family express no surprise at families which exist solely for the sake of paternal authority or the father-son relationship.²³ Indeed, the relatively few mentions of the family in the various studies of newspapers in the *Idéologies* series could lead one to believe that the nationalist concern for the family was mere lip service. If an individual such as Henri Bourassa foresaw immense social evil as a result of feminism, a newspaper such as *L'Action Catholique* was far more troubled by freemasons, Jews and Bolsheviks.²⁴ Since freemasons and Bolsheviks were hardly more numerous than feminists in the Quebec of the 1920's, the newspaper must have perceived feminism as being less of a threat. Had someone already spotted similarities to nationalism? Author Jones is silent. As undoubtedly will be the forthcoming final volume of *Idéologies*. The period since 1940 has apparently room for only two essays concerning women, the second one only hastily added in the late summer of 1979. Even the most recent study of an ideology, written by a woman, has only a few pages devoted to the education of young girls of different classes.²⁵

Intellectual historians then have largely chosen to study the conservative ideological past of Canada. Not surprisingly, since most of them are liberal academics, they have given us a basically negative view of nationalism. And by ignoring women in their studies, they have not only passed over a potentially fruitful area of intellectual and historical speculation and research, they have abetted the notion that women are not important.

Small wonder then that an interest in feminism and feminist ideas stemmed from another source. Social history and the women's movement, not intellectual history, gave rise to women's history.²⁶ And one of the first areas of study in that field was feminist organizations, feminist ideas. Like the French Canadian students

of nationalism, the authors here are also tainted by the very subject they study. The taint of course colours their work. Carol Bacchi laments the fact that early English Canadian feminists did not take the path to total liberation (in the 1910's!) but settled for political compromise, respectability and the vote.²⁷ Veronica Strong-Boag analyzes somewhat wistfully the "maternal feminism" of the middle-class National Council of Women, documenting how easily the women's energies could be diverted to national, patriotic causes during the first world war, only to lose their reform momentum thereby and, like other reform movements, peter out in the 1920's.²⁸

The same hint of disappointment with their foremothers can be discerned in French Canadian historians. Yolande Pinard remarks rather plaintively that some early feminists in French Canada, coloured already by nationalism, imported a strain of *féminisme chrétien* from France, and therefore developed an organization distinct from that of English Canadian feminists: the *Fédération Nationale Saint-Jean-Baptiste* in 1907.²⁹ That organization itself, although displaying the same fairly successful search for unity among various women's groups as evinced by its Canadian counterpart, the National Council of Women, lost an early radical colouring under constant harassment from the clerico-nationalists, much to the chagrin of authors Micheline Johnson, Marie Lavigne, Yolande Pinard and Jennifer Stoddart.³⁰

That the early feminists might share a common outlook with the clerico-nationalists did not occur to these authors, convinced as they seem to be that feminism and nationalism are opposites. In fact, French Canada's early feminists, like most of those in the western world, resolutely denied any revolutionary intent, looking askance at the antics as well as the ideas of a radical minority fighting physically for the suffrage in England. As one of the founders of the *Fédération Nationale Saint-Jean-Baptiste* expressed in 1907:

On pourra peut-être se demander si ce n'est pas là [la FNSJB] du féminisme? Je répons oui sans hésiter, mais je me hâte d'ajouter qu'il y a deux sortes de féminisme. Le féminisme révolutionnaire qui a pour but d'éloigner la femme de son rôle et de son foyer, et le féminisme chrétien qui a pour but l'amour du prochain et le devoir.³¹

Such sentiments are of course grating to the ears of feminists in the 1970's, anxious as they are to find historical precedents for their own more radical stand. But as historians of ideas their priorities must lie elsewhere. Even if they suspect a tailoring of feminism to the prevailing winds of orthodoxy (thereby one can draw a pleasing parallel to Laurier's famous speech on liberalism in 1877), they must recognize that feminists and priests alike thought the women were engaged in the same activities: self-help, moral development, wifely and maternal duties, philanthropic and religious works.³² Even if they point to the long struggle for female

suffrage in Quebec against tremendous clerico-conservative odds, they must acknowledge that the suffrage constituted only one activity among many that fired feminist activity in the early twentieth century. Even a study of the ideas of the French Canadian suffragists, a study yet to be undertaken, would still not reveal the full extent of feminist ideas.

Another aspect of the intellectual history of feminism has been the study of images of women. Here too the impetus for such studies is a present one and the danger of both personal disappointment and historical falsification can be great. For by seeking the intellectual and ideological roots of the segregation and oppression of women, historians can easily become enraged by exponents of the notion of "separate spheres." The rage is likely to blind them to the fact the notion was very commonly held at the turn of the century, by men and women of most political persuasions.³³

One of the more intriguing suggestions for the study of images has been to see the Canadian nation itself in sexual terms. Developing an analogy that can be found in early twentieth-century French-Canadian writings about Confederation, Ralph Heintzman toys with Henri Bourassa's idea of a marriage between an "apostolic, intellectual, artistic, rural" (and female) French Canada and a "practical, aggressive, economic, political" (and male) English Canada.³⁴ The contemporary interest is clear. If abbé Groulx in the 1920's could suggest that Confederation was a mixed marriage and therefore, by Catholic implication, dissoluble, so in the 1970's a French Canada, stretching its limbs along with the women's movement, could reject a marriage based upon an outmoded image. Perhaps it is not surprising that the Quiet Revolution and the women's liberation movement are contemporaneous occurrences.

Nor should it be surprising that intellectual historians in Canada have anchored their studies to the question of nationalism, for intellectual history dates from the Quiet Revolution too. The image they have given us is that the nation is all important (even Ramsay Cook by his very denunciation of nationalism contributes to that image). At the same time they have implied that women are virtually non-existent. When and where the women do timidly begin to appear, they form but pale reflections of something the historians would have preferred them to be.

THE FOREGOING PAGES have hinted that a fruitful marriage might be possible by combining feminism and nationalism. A new look at intellectual history might emerge from such a union, the role of women in the formation of ideology might be explored, the origin and transmission of ideas might be plumbed. And one might avoid the greatest danger of existing studies of national-

ism and feminism; the danger of presentism is in fact far greater than the possible perils of the two ideologies themselves.

Needless to say, intellectual history has been and can be done without taking women into account. Most intellectual historians have been men and, as shown above, few of them have considered the role of women in the thought of their male subjects. Their primary concern has been the study of nationalism as a political idea, again necessarily excluding women. In this, they are no different from any of the more general students of nationalism: Cobban, Deutsch, Kedourie, Kohn, Shafer, and Smith, to name only a few, write about a masculine world. There is of course some justification for their approach. Until relatively recently women did not leave tracts for study, did not write, and therefore by implication did not think. Barren terrain indeed for an intellectual historian, biased as he is towards the written record. Moreover, women's history has developed largely as an outgrowth of social history, therefore in isolation from intellectual history. And after the initial stage of legitimation, a stage few other fields of enquiry have had to go through, the biggest problem confronting women's history has been a methodological one: how to unearth the silent, often uneducated, illiterate and certainly private women of the past. Here, too, the intellectual historian could easily pay no heed.

However, another source of the interest in and outpouring of women's history in the 1970's has been the feminist movement throughout the western world in the 1960's and 1970's. This has provided a theoretical base for women's history which should be of immense concern to intellectual historians. Two major ideas have fostered the feminist movement and ultimately the writing of women's history: the idea of patriarchy and the idea of the relations between the sexes. Both imply that the major driving force of history is not the struggle between classes or the oppression of one class by another but rather the relationship between the sexes whether that relationship be solely one of domination by the male (patriarchy) or a more complex web touching the family, religion, politics, the economy, even, as I am suggesting here, ideas. Here is surely sustenance for intellectual historians whether they choose to trace the development of ideas over time or the wider social ramifications of particular ideas in a given context. One suggestion in fact of the measure of a civilization is the status accorded to women at any given time.³⁵ And that status is as much a mixture of ideas about and images of women as it is a combination of economic, demographic and political factors. If intellectual historians are looking for new fields to conquer, they might well consider the women.

Once they do so, intellectual historians may open up another new area, the role of women in the formation of ideology. For the very strength of nationalism may lie in its appropriation of what has traditionally been seen as women's sphere. Nationalist propaganda in any form and any language has drawn heavily on the

female trio of *Kinder, Küche* and *Kirche*. Early twentieth-century feminist movements throughout the western world, sharing such notions, both contributed to nationalist ideology and lost their own *raison d'être* as nationalism flourished during and after the first world war. A promising field indeed for intellectual historians: they may be able to assist historians of women in accounting for the demise of feminism in the 1920's and they may well show that women have provided much of the intellectual sustenance for an ideology like nationalism. In attempting the latter, they will have to take issue, as I am doing, with the many feminist theoreticians who see the entire ideological superstructure as another instance of patriarchy: intellectual means and justification for keeping women in a subordinate position.

Combining the study of nationalism and feminism could provide some clues to another problem of immense importance to intellectual historians, how and why ideas are transmitted across generations. Historians of nationalism and feminism have independently spotted similar agents of transmission: the clergy (notably for French Canada), the educational system and the family. Somewhat ironically many contemporary nationalists and feminists despair of two of those very agents, the clergy and the family, both seen as conservative, inhibiting forces. Perhaps intellectual historians can help overcome this presentist bias by looking critically at such institutions. To do so will, however, necessitate their delving more deeply into social history, notably the history of the family, of child rearing and of education. Such studies are being done,³⁶ but not by intellectual historians. Rather they are undertaken as a result of developments in social history and in women's history — the attempt to place ordinary folk, notably women, in centre stage. And yet the question of the cultivation and transmission of ideas through such social institutions is a legitimate one for intellectual historians. Perhaps one of the ways to push them towards it is to suggest, once again, their potential interest in the cross-generational link *par excellence*, women.

Still another reason why intellectual historians should consider nationalism and feminism together is the peculiar interest such historians tend to have in the nature of history itself. For the two ideologies both raise fundamental questions about the meaning of history, although both do so in a different yet complementary way. Nationalism raises the nineteenth-century question asked by historians and philosophers of history alike: *what* does history mean? Feminism raises the twentieth-century question posed by the same groups: *how* does history mean? Nationalist history posits purpose and ultimate significance (its detractors even suggesting apocalypse); feminist history questions methods, classification, periodization and importance. The combination of the two may be a particularly potent source for intellectual history.

Finally, such an approach may lead historians to a reconsideration of nationalism. For by investigating the possible connection between feminism and national-

ism, they may decide that the link, while accounting for the strength, is also the Achilles' heel of nationalism. If nationalism truly is the evil that some of our historians would have us believe, then the means of stamping it out may well be to destroy the image of women upon which it is based. That nationalism should develop towards the end of the nineteenth century is not surprising, at a time when the state began taking over many of the traditional functions of the family: education, care of the sick and the elderly, philanthropy. Indeed, in some ways nationalism is the legitimation of such a take-over.³⁷ But if the image behind such functions ceases to be a female figure, what will happen to nationalism? Perhaps nationalism will be with us, wreaking whatever havoc its proponents or detractors surmise, just as long as a particular and peculiar image of women, propagated by turn-of-the-century feminists, remains alive. Contemporary feminists of the 1970's know this instinctively, their biggest battle one against the millstones of images and attitudes hung about the necks of female infants. Contemporary nationalists probably do not. Perhaps a path of relevance without presentism for intellectual historians can begin with the question "What about the women?"

NOTES

- ¹ Eg., *Abbé Groulx: Variations on a Nationalist theme* (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1973); *Action française: French Canadian Nationalism in the 1920s* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1975); "Henri Bourassa and the 'Woman Question'," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 10 (Nov. 1975), 3-11.
- ² The two paragraphs draw upon the conclusions of analysis of the image of women in the nationalism of Lionel Groulx: "Les femmes dans l'oeuvre de Groulx," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, 32, 3 (déc. 1978), 385-98. They arise from the observation that a particular image of women constitutes the basis of Groulx's view of society and hence of Groulx's nationalism; that same image of women was also fostered by the feminist movement in French Canada (and elsewhere, one might add) at the beginning of the twentieth century. I have of course considered the possible differences between feminism and nationalism. They are much less numerous, much less striking, and probably hold true more for the nationalist and feminist movements of the 1970's than for those of the 1900's and 1910's.
- ³ Pierre Trudeau and Ramsay Cook curiously enough use another "anachronism" from the nineteenth century, Lord Acton, in their battles against nationalism. P. E. Trudeau, *Le fédéralisme et la société canadienne-française* (Montréal: HMH, 1967); G. R. Cook, *Canada and the French Canadian Question* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1966) and *The Maple Leaf Forever* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1971).
- ⁴ G. R. Cook, "La Survivance French Canadian Style" and "La Survivance English Canadian Style" in *The Maple Leaf Forever*, pp. 114-40; 141-65. Also Kenneth Windsor, "Historical Writing in Canada to 1920," in Carl Klinck, ed., *Literary History of Canada* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1966), p. 250.
- ⁵ W. Christian, "Inquisition of Nationalism," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 12 (Winter 1977), pp. 62-72.

- ⁶ "Some Reflections on the Liberal Tradition in Canada," presidential address to the Canadian Historical Association, 1946, in *In Search of Canadian Liberalism* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1961), pp. 3-20.
- ⁷ G. R. Cook, *The Politics of John W. Dajoe and the Free Press* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1963).
- ⁸ William Kilbourn has a happy phrase: "one is sometimes left with the odd sensation that Canada is nothing but a figment of the historical imagination, a concept nurtured in the minds of a small minority of Canadian leaders, aided and abetted by a few historians." "The Writing of Canadian History" in Klinck, p. 497.
- ⁹ Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1970); S. F. Wise, "Sermon Literature and Canadian Intellectual History," *Bulletin of the Committee on Archives, United Church of Canada*, 18 (1965), 3-18; George Grant, *Lament for a Nation* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1965).
- ¹⁰ G. R. Cook, "Nationalist Ideologies in Canada," text of a lecture delivered at the Univ. of Ottawa, Jan. 19, 1978, p. 6 or even the subtitle of his *Maple Leaf Forever: Essays on Nationalism and Politics in Canada*.
- ¹¹ Cook's political interest remained foremost. He edited and introduced a new edition of Catherine Cleverdon, *The Woman Suffrage Movement in Canada* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, [1950], 1974) and he wrote an article on a female western reformer and social gospeller: "Francis Marion Beynon and the Crisis of Christian Reformism" in C. Berger and R. Cook, eds., *The West and the Nation* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1976), pp. 187-208.
- ¹² S. E. Shortt, *The Search for an Ideal* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1977), pp. 28-29.
- ¹³ *The Bush Garden* (Toronto: Anansi, 1971), pp. x, 10.
- ¹⁴ Jean LeMoine, "La femme dans la civilisation canadienne-française," *Convergences* (Montréal: HMH, 1962), pp. 69-100; Guy Rocher, "Les modèles et le statut de la femme canadienne-française," *Revue internationale des Sciences Sociales*, 14, no. 1 (1962), pp. 132-39.
- ¹⁵ R. Cook, "The Historian and Nationalism," *Canada and the French Canadian Question*, p. 121.
- ¹⁶ F. Ouellet, "Historiographie canadienne et nationalisme," *Royal Society of Canada, Proceedings and Transactions*, 4th series, 13 (1975), pp. 25-39.
- ¹⁷ The article first appeared in *Ecrits du Canada Français*, 3 (1957) and is reproduced in M. Brunet, *La Présence anglaise et les canadiens* (Montréal: Beauchemin, 1958), pp. 113-66.
- ¹⁸ "Conquétisme," *The Maple Leaf Forever*, pp. 99-113.
- ¹⁹ *Histoire économique et sociale du Québec 1760-1850* (Montréal: Fides, 1966).
- ²⁰ *L'idée d'indépendance au Québec, genèse et historique* (Trois-Rivières: Boréal Express, 1968).
- ²¹ *Idéologies au Canada français 1850-1900* first appeared as a special issue of *Recherches sociographiques*, 10, 2-3 (mai-déc., 1969); *Idéologies au Canada français 1900-1929* (Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1974); *Idéologies au Canada français 1930-1939* (Québec: PUL, 1978). Hamelin's collaborators in editing the series are two sociologists, Fernand Dumont and Jean-Paul Montminy.
- ²² *Le clergé et le pouvoir politique au Québec* (Montréal: HMH, 1978).

- ²³ See, for example, Gérard Bouchar, "Apogée et déclin de l'idéologie ultramontaine à travers le journal *Le Nouveau Monde*," *Idéologies au Canada français 1850-1900*, p. 269.
- ²⁴ J. Levitt, "Henri Bourassa: the Catholic Social Order and Canada's Mission," *Idéologies au Canada français 1900-1929*, pp. 199-200; Richard Jones, "*L'Action catholique*, 1920-1921," *ibid.*, pp. 332-43.
- ²⁵ Eid, pp. 224-26.
- ²⁶ This development is sketched in the introduction to S. M. Trofimenkoff and A. Prentice, eds., *The Neglected Majority* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1977).
- ²⁷ "Liberation Deferred: The English Canadian Woman's Suffrage Movement, 1877-1918," unpub. Ph.D. thesis, McGill Univ., 1976.
- ²⁸ *The Parliament of Women: the National Council of Women of Canada 1893-1929* (Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1976).
- ²⁹ "Les débuts du mouvement des femmes," in M. Lavigne and Y. Pinard, eds., *Les femmes dans la société québécoise* (Montréal: Boréal Express, 1977), p. 85. It is difficult to discern which of the three elements dismays Pinard most; I suspect it is the *féminisme chrétien*.
- ³⁰ M. Johnson, "Histoire de la condition de la femme dans la province de Québec," in *Tradition culturelle et histoire politique de la femme au Canada*, études préparées pour la Commission royale d'enquête sur la situation de la femme au Canada, #8 (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1971), p. 24; M. Lavigne, Y. Pinard, J. Stoddart, "La Fédération Nationale Saint-Jean-Baptiste et les revendications féministes au début du 20^e siècle," in Lavigne and Pinard, pp. 89-108.
- ³¹ Mme Carolina [Dessaulles] Béique, *La Presse*, 27 mai 1907, p. 9.
- ³² Mme Marie [Lacoste] Gérin-Lajoie speaking at the first annual meeting of the FNSJB, quoted in *La Fédération Nationale Saint-Jean-Baptiste célèbre le cinquantenaire de sa fondation, La Bonne Parole* (1956-58), p. 18. Mgr Bruchési, Archbishop of Montreal, speaking on the same occasion said virtually the same thing.
- ³³ I think I avoided both traps in my "Henri Bourassa and the 'Woman Question'," although there is only the tiniest of hints of what I am developing here: on p. 4 of that article I suggest that Bourassa could not have known his feminist protagonists very well or he would have recognized many common beliefs.
- ³⁴ "Till Death do us part," editorial in the *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 10 (Nov. 1975), 68.
- ³⁵ Joan Kelly-Gadol, "The Social Relations of the Sexes: Methodological Implications of Women's History," *Signs*, 1 (Summer 1976), 811.
- ³⁶ For example, in Canada, the studies of David Gagan, Michael Katz, Alison Prentice, Susan Houston and Robert Stamp.
- ³⁷ Most French Canadian nationalists, particularly those of a clerical hue, abhorred this shift from the family to the state, and said so. So, I suspect, did most feminists, depriving women as it did, of considerable autonomy, control, and perhaps even meaning. The denunciations were, however, of no avail, as Quebec, like other provinces and states in North America, moved towards active state intervention in education, adoption, prohibition, social welfare, etc.