

HEAR! HEaR! Voices of Canadian Women

Aritha van Herk and Christl Verduyn, editors

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction: Audibly Laudable: Voices of Canadian Women Aritha van Herk and Christl Verduyn	4-16
II.	Refiguring the Public Intellectual: Lessons from Life Stories by Feminists in the Faculty Body Wendy Robbins	17-30
III.	Who Gets to Be a Public Intellectual in Canada? Iga Mergler and Neil McLaughlin	31-39
IV.	Four Contemporary Canadian Women Intellectuals Negotiate the Challenges of Public Sphere Witnessing: Dionne Brand, Samantha Nutt, Sheila Watt-Cloutier, and Janice Williamson Diana Brydon	40-51
V.	Stranger Sociability: Lisa Robertson as Counterpublic Intellectual Heather Milne	52-62
VI.	Is There a Canadian <i>Uncle Tom's Cabin</i>? Canadian Women Writers and Social Change Carole Gerson	63-75
VII.	“Speaking Out”: Gwethalyn Graham’s Non-Fiction Sarah Galletly	76-83
VIII.	Idola Saint-Jean and Flora MacDonald Denison: Two Feminist Intellectuals in French and English Canada Sarah Spear	84-92
IX.	Speaking Your Mind, or Not: The Judicial Careers of Police Magistrates Emily Murphy and Alice Jane Jamieson, 1916-1932 Mélanie Methot	93-104
X.	Speaking from South Africa: E. Maud Graham, Florence Randal, and the South African War Bridgette Brown	105-116
XI.	Margaret Gould (1900-1981): Social Worker, Social Critic, Public Intellectual Marjorie Johnstone	117-126
XII.	Public (Lending) Rights: Women’s Advocacy in The Writers’ Union of Canada Erin Ramlo	127-133
	Acknowledgements	134
	Works Cited	135-170
	Contributors	171-173
	Panel Speakers	174-179

I. Audibly Laudable: Voices of Canadian Women

Aritha van Herk and Christl Verduyn

What difference can women’s voices make? This is the question posed by Shari Graydon, author, speaker, and founder of Informed Opinions, a national initiative aimed at amplifying women’s voices in Canadian public discourse. It is the question explored in *HEAR! HEaR! Voices of Canadian Women* as well.

Contributors to this collection of papers were participants in a pair of conferences, “Discourse and Dynamics: Canadian Women as Public Intellectuals” and “Speaking Her Mind: Canadian Women and Public Presence,” that focussed on the multitudinous but often muffled voices of women in Canada and the intellectual import of their contributions. Speakers included writers, scientists, journalists, social workers, musicians, and academics—both established and emerging scholars. Together on panels and in paper presentations they confronted the under-representation of women’s voices in Canada from a wide variety of perspectives, backgrounds, professions, and pursuits. Excerpts from the panels, recorded and transcribed, appear in inserts throughout this introduction, which offers a contemporary framing for the essays that follow.

In her conference presentation, Shari Graydon spoke about her work with Informed Opinions and about a word cloud exercise comparing the content of commentaries written by men and by women.

We subtracted the words common to both word clouds to see what issues only came up when women were writing. It’s a heartbreakingly predictable list, and it includes: abuse, access, assault, benefit, care, children, cuts, discrimination, education, equality, school, sexual, services, society, treatment, violence, women. We can’t wait for incremental progress; the world needs women’s voices now. (Panel transcription)

Graydon’s observation resonated with those of other conference panelists and participants. Poet and novelist Dionne Brand, for example, spoke of “all the women who have been in the choice movement, the birth control movement, various social justice arenas, or poverty. There is a discourse that has gone on in this country over the last forty years, led by women, that has been responsible for an enormous amount of change in the body politic” (Panel transcription). Poet and documentarian Sylvia Hamilton highlighted the foundational role of “Black women’s labour in their communities and beyond . . . the backbone of communities. Mothers, other mothers, organizers, healers, fundraisers, employers, artists, teachers, lawyers, mourners, lovers, caregivers, farmers, workers, leaders.” “You know the language, coded and uncoded,” Hamilton added. “So often she’s been told, it’s not her place to speak, she did not know her place, she was unruly, uppity, too loud, too Black, has a chip on her shoulder, who does she think she is?” (Panel transcription). Academic Lorna Marsden recalled the difficulty of speaking up. Like many girls, she had learned that “talking publicly” was frowned upon and that consequences for doing so are real. “Women are attacked for speaking out,” writer Margaret Atwood flatly observed (Panel transcription), her long and varied writing career—from poetry to novels to non-fiction and essays—illustrating this time and again. Shari Graydon shared a sobering example triggered by her first column in the *Vancouver Sun*. A letter addressed to “Shari Graydon, President, Bitch of the Year Club,” read in its entirety: “You dog-faced slut.” Playwright and media activist Rita Shelton Deverell recalled threats of violence at forums that she would moderate at the St. Lawrence

Centre in Toronto on the topic of violence against women. “The women of my generation,” Quebec writer Nicole Brossard reflected, “took a lot of risks ... In Quebec in the early 60s we used the words exploited, dominated, and colonized. We tried to define who we were in regard to language, politics, the economy” (Panel transcription). Words like exploited, dominated, and colonized recurred in Quebec women’s writing of the 1960s—and in the writing and voices of Indigenous women from many different communities across Canada. The need to re-word language is even more urgent now, for, as Sylvia Hamilton stated of her Black community, “We were not, are not the language used to describe us, to categorize us, to pin us as specimens or mark us as problems to be solved. So many efforts were made to erase us, to pretend we did not exist” (Panel transcription). And women’s articulations of their experiences are only too often derided or disparaged.

Recent years have seen long overdue attention to the voices of women. Movements like #MeToo and #BlackLivesMatter, the inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG), and organizations like Informed Opinions have helped to turn up the volume on women’s voices. Even so, political scientist Sylvia Bashevkin comments, “Women who are pressing for oxygen in the public realm, outside of spiritual and artistic domains in particular, tend to find that it is just as difficult to be taken seriously in a social media age as it was in the age of older media” (Panel transcription). The public realm, Bashevkin points out, has for centuries been defined as masculine, and for much of Western history, the adjective “public” and the noun “intellectual” have been masculine categories. “To the extent that women are identified in our Canadian historical literature as intellectuals or leaders in the world of ideas,” she notes, “it is usually with the notions that are typically or stereotypically feminine—matters such as spirituality, ethics, peace, and women’s rights. This leaves an enormous domain of just about everything else, including politics and the economy, to the domain of men” (Panel transcription).

We see the adjective “public” and the noun “intellectual” remaining identifiably masculine categories for much of Western History. The political and public realm has been so consistently defined as masculine over the centuries since we started to follow classical Greek philosophy, and, moreover, norms of intellect implicate ideas about rationality, reasoning, analysis, other cerebral attributes, which are not typically associate with women, particularly in discussion of public life.

The notion that women are inherently defective in the political realms, particularly when it comes to responsibility for international relations, is accompanied, of course, by an argument that they are underpowered and ill equipped because of various characteristics, or that they are over-powered. SYLVIA BASHEVKIN

Despite a growing chorus of voices and increasing profile of women in leadership positions, and despite collective belief in equal rights, on the topic of women as intellectuals—not to mention the public realm—few Canadian names rise to the surface. In actuality, women in Canada contribute boundless intellectual work, from many different perspectives and positions. Any list of names would inevitably be incomplete but indicative of the many possibilities: Sally Armstrong, Margaret Atwood, Marie Battiste, Maude Barlow, Sylvia Bashevkin, Francoise Baylis, Rebecca Belmore, Dionne Brand, Nicole Brossard, Maria Campbell, Adrienne Clarkson, Rita Shelton Deverell, Denise Donlon, Mary Eberts, Cheryl Foggo, Katherine Govier, Charlotte Gray, Shari Graydon, Sylvia Hamilton, Michaëlle Jean, Naomi Klein, Amanda Lang, Irshad Manji, Lee Maracle, Lorna Marsden, Beverly McLaughlin, Natalie Panek, Francine Pelletier, Margaret McMillan, Sarah

Polley, Anna Porter, Judy Rebick, Leanne Simpson, Sydney Sharpe, Margaret Somerville, Tanya Talaga, Fibbie Tatti, Sheila Watt-Cloutier, and many others, not least and most recently those health care officials who have performed as leaders throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. These are merely a few of the most visible and audible of voices. While much work has been and continues to be done to raise awareness of the prominent roles that women in Canada play, many other voices remain less audible and less recognized. If contributions to thought and intellect were accorded the attention that is merited, women's influence on Canadian life, history, culture, and politics could fill the pages of a very thick book, of which this collection would comprise a mere chapter.

Canadian women have long contributed to public discourse and dialogue, communal change and renewal, in vital yet unvalued or undervalued ways. The range of interventions can be measured historically, even in broad strokes, from the Indigenous women who enabled the survival of Europeans, to Catharine Parr Traill's *The Female Emigrant's Guide* (1855), which suggested ways to prepare food, to the paintings of Emily Carr, the activism of Viola Desmond, the politics of Annie Gale, Adelaide Hoodless, Agnes McPhail, or Madeleine Parent (Canada's History Society 2016). Despite growing interest in women's involvement in the shaping of a national consciousness, women's contributions to public discourse remain largely invisible and unheard in Canada and beyond (Bashevkin 2013). The conferences sought to engage discussion and highlight overlooked contributions with an eye to Angie Sandhu's statement (2007, 9): "the dismantling of intellectual privilege is surely essential if we are to have any hope of living in an 'intellectual society'" (Sandhu 2007, 9). The aim and hope were to galvanize renewed interest in Canadian women's intellectual work not as a lofty category, such as that accorded "the public intellectual," so much as a broad-ranging and fluid contribution to knowledge, discourse, and social change.

*Whether you want to call me an engineer, a rocket scientist, an intellectual – to me the title isn't important. It's the work I do, the causes I'm a champion for that deserve the most attention. I think it's about using the appropriate language and contexts for what you're asking. **NATALIE PANEK***

*As a writer, I mean to speak into the world. I've always thought this was a way of expressing a set of conditions that I experience and that weren't being expressed and that could use the facility, the subversive chemistry of language in order to express and reach other people and other lives, common lives. **DIONNE BRAND***

*I think it's really important for any kind of dialogue for people to want to communicate with one another and not just show off what they know. There has to be a meeting of the minds. And often, to do as Dionne [Brand] is saying and broaden the groups of people who are engaged in the dialogue, we have to address ourselves to the deficiencies of the dialogic process. I think part of our obligation is to attend to the venues where those speeches take place and make sure it's inclusive. **MARY EBERTS***

*The discourse and the dialogues that we're creating allows us to expand on how we conceive of public space and a public philosophy of thought. (...) The public that I'm interested in engaging with is one that doesn't see a divide between us. **MEASHA BRUEGGERGOSMAN***

In order to communicate you have to be a storyteller. Even as a scientist you have to be a storyteller. New forms of social media are another form of storytelling—just another platform on which we are engaging in an age-old human activity.

MARGARET ATWOOD

It's one of the things Indigenous people are telling us, that telling your story does make you strong. **JUDY REBICK**

I take stories from my sisters and I morph them, and I use myself to tell them.

CHERISH VIOLET BLOOD

Ample research in recent years has determined that the template for what has been deemed a public intellectual is designed for and by men. Nelson Wiseman's 2013 collection, *The Public Intellectual in Canada*, includes only four women, Sylvia Bashevkin, Janice Gross Stein (both speakers at our conference), Maude Barlow, and Margaret Somerville. In her 2013 essay, Bashevkin outlines the conundrum of women who give voice to ideas: "the ability to excel at mental reasoning has been conventionally viewed as a male attribute" (109). She astutely measures the extent to which women's contributions were obscured, and the historical circumstances for that erasure. For the future, one question certainly becomes an important consideration: will social media amplify women's voices more than they have been in the past (111)? Or will women's voices still face quarantine even or especially on those platforms?

Wiseman's collection focusses on Canada's relative public intellectual modesty and self-effacement and its general abjuration of "a media personality [or] celebrity intellectual" (Wiseman 2013, 4). He maintains that "an ethical or political dimension" (5) distinguishes the work of the public intellectual from individuals who merely popularize their knowledge. This category is one comfortably occupied by grand-thinking men ensconced in one armchair or another, whether academic institutions, policy think tanks, or global networks. In fact, the profile of the public intellectual has been outlined by men based on how well they are recognized and the influence on opinion they wield. But questions proliferate: are they pundits, are they experts, or are they self-promoting "mansplainers"? Men are not necessarily more knowledgeable than women on any given topic but are readier to comment, Shari Graydon reports, more confident that they will be listened to and heard. Official recognition seems to follow that confidence. This divide in self-assurance was one of the reasons Graydon founded Informed Opinions. Time and again she noted how often women's statements of ideas and opinions are more nuanced, more self-effacing and how in public and private discourse alike the vehicles they choose, or that choose them, differ from those of men.

Given its patriarchal affiliations, women have often taken distance from the term "public intellectual." In "'I have altered my tactics to reflect the new era': Public Intellectuals and Community," Smaro Kamboureli (2012) discusses not only the difficulty of identification but the extent to which this work is "contingent on the cultural contexts within which it takes place and the particular conditions to which it responds" (192), a primary concern for women no matter what their impetus. Notwithstanding recognition of the work of individuals such as Ursula Franklin, Naomi Klein, Margaret Atwood, and Jane Jacobs, Canadian women are deemed peripheral to the intellectual arena. Wiseman (2013) declares this conundrum overtly:

The relative absence of women . . . speaks to the historical inability of women to claim equal space and attention in public forums. Women have faced daunting cultural and social

barriers and their participation will continue to be underplayed if only issues traditionally considered properly in the public sphere, as opposed to those deemed personal and private, define the work of public intellectuals. (8-9)

At the conferences, it became more than clear that the designation of “public intellectual” is fraught; much attention was diverted to debating the term. Many participants rejected the label, citing its long association with male power and white hegemony. Others disputed its validity on the basis of its ordained hierarchy and positionality. Still others argued that given colonial patterns privileging speech or silence, it is a completely irrelevant term and should be abjured.

*The term “public intellectual” is deeply problematic. **JANICE STEIN***

*Sometimes public intellectual is a bale that is put on you by others, by the media, or opinion leaders or what have you, and it’s much more complicated. I have always worked within the strictures of being an advocate in the legal system, which means ... I speak to judges. **MARY EBERTS***

*We’re paying attention to the term “public intellectual but we’re ignoring the term “Canadian women.” And we have to acknowledge whose history we’re erasing when we call ourselves Canadian women. As an Indigenous woman, I do not identify as a Canadian woman. I am Indigenous before I am “woman.” I think that conversation is really important to have. **NAOMI SAYERS***

*I want to refashion who are public intellectuals. They are women who are activists, who have everything to do with the kind of intellectual feminist work that’s gone on in the country. **DIONNE BRAND***

*I’m more inclined to think of the intersections between public and intellectual. For me the most important intersection is what we may call, within scare quotes, the public intellectual and the cultural activist. My main problem is with the notion of the public. I have a problem talking about the public as if we know what it is—as if it’s an “us and them” kind of paradigm. **SMARO KAMBOURELI***

*I think of myself more [as] being a public citizen. I have a responsibility. **LORI TURNBULL***

*As an intellectual, I feel I have to take an ethical stance. **NICOLE BROSSARD***

For Alice Gregory in *New York Times*, November 24, 2015, “A public intellectual is someone whose opinions help to set the moral and aesthetic standards of her time; she draws fault lines, explains the stakes of present-day conflicts, interrogates collective intuitions. But more specifically—and more strangely—a public intellectual is someone who articulates alliances between seemingly disparate cultural and political opinions” (Mishra and Gregory 2015). In terms of effect and consequence, women welcome and aspire to being heard and having an influence on the outcomes of policies and interpretations,

*I was elected to represent our people on the international stage ... and so you have a political mandate to go out there in the world, to ensure that the rights and interests of the Inuit of the Arctic are well represented at forums such as the United Nations and the Arctic Council where your way of life is being impacted, where sustainable development is being discussed, and decisions are made based on assessments done within the Northern countries and on challenges we've been faced with in our communities. This is real—this is not theory, this is not in the future, the challenges ... and the impacts are today. **SHEILA WATT-CLOUTIER***

*Leadership includes understanding that you have power—not in the sense of dominance and the ability to use force, but rather as a spiritual base, source of empowerment. **FIBBIE TATTI***

The summer 2020 issue of the American journal *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* is a special number on “Public Feminisms.” The journal recently developed the “Feminist Public Intellectuals Project” as a means of engaging “feminist theorizing with pressing political and social issues” (“Feminist” 2012). Its rationale: “Given the fragmentation of feminist activism and the persistent negative freighting of the moniker “feminist,” the “Feminist Public Intellectuals Project” seeks to genuinely reimagine the role a journal can play” (“Feminist” 2012). This is certainly a response to the continued exclusion of women’s voices, but also awareness that the power of women’s voices is splintered by disaffection.

While the term arouses lively discussion, the research outcomes signal a direction that shifts the focus away from the reductive “who” debate to the landscape of recognition and affect, the desire for an impact that seeks to bring about change.

*We have to change the systems in a fundamental way if we're going to get anywhere as women. **JUDY REBICK***

*Scientists have a really important role to play in policymaking. Some have chosen to be there instructing politicians and others have engaged in a different way with our politicians to say, I'll help you understand the science so you can go back to the people and get them to have a chance or an opportunity. **FRANCOISE BAYLIS***

*I speak to inspire those who need to be inspired, and who will go on to changing the world in a positive way. **NATALIE PANEK***

*We need to look at how social systems are marginalizing women's lives and realities and creating violence in their lives. Indigenous women know this. Let's dismantle the system. **NAOMI SAYERS***

*Or create some other systems! For the first half of my life the problem was racism. For about another seven years, sexism. Now the problem is power. Gender, race, and power – these three remain. But the greatest of these is power. **RITA SHELTON DEVERELL***

*For me, as an Indigenous woman, when we talk about power ... that's the essence of colonialism. **NAOMI SAYERS***

There's so much we need to change, and if you can't talk about it, you can't change it.
SHARI GRAYDON

It is evident that women are aware of constraints and boundaries, both using and circumventing those constraints in order to find new paths and to inject their voices and experience into particular moments. This is true both historically and contemporarily: women have wanted and still want to alter unequal social, legal, political, economic, or cultural conventions and structures, and if in the course of that work they garner significant attention, they are willing to endure scrutiny in order to accomplish the goals they have in mind. Do they seek that attention? Not necessarily, because attention for women is often negative. But the more serious problem they face is not being heard with the kind of respect that appreciates their insights, or not being heard at all. Cultural deafness results in the conclusion that women do not effect change, while the more germane issue might be that women apprehend space and attention differently from the conventional and institutional approach to affect. Women do not lack the ability to speak out, but must often clamour to claim equal space, especially when cultural and social barriers disavow what they do accomplish.

We should talk about public space—the spaces that bring people in and the ways that bring people in. There are so many barriers and so many people are excluded for so many reasons. If people aren't in the room metaphorically, there's no dialogue. You need space to have the conversation. Where is that space today? To me the answer is not obvious, and it seems worthwhile talking about where are those spaces for having those conversations with the public or in public. **JANICE STEIN**

If I enter the public space, it's certainly out of a sense of dispossession and injustice ... I needed to speak this into the world. **DIONNE BRAND**

As an Indigenous woman, I think we need to acknowledge that people are already there in the space doing the work whose history we are erasing and whose lives we are dismissing.
NAOMI SAYERS

The public space has shrunk for me and I think that's incredibly violent.
RITA SHELTON DEVERELL

My notion of public space these days is that it's managed, policed, regulated—sometimes in the name of safety or security. But we have lost, I think, the fundamental aspect of what public entails. Women intellectuals have to reclaim that public space.
SMARO KAMBOURELI

The essays that follow unpack examples of women moving toward more expansive and inclusive understandings of the work generally attributed to public intellectuals, work not always perceived as having import. The essayists trace several strands: women's fight for equality in the academy; women's struggle to be heard in different areas; the actual statistics on women being accorded the respect of recognition; the subtleties of public witness and its erasure; the idea of the counter-public intellectual; the successes of women in both professional and domestic arenas; and the ongoing tension between Indigenous/settler knowledge and experiences. They address

historical issues of anti-Indigenous racism, anti-Semitism, Anglo-Francophone tensions, journalism, the legal domain, the field of social work, and women as creative and missionary ambassadors.

Whereas excerpts from the panel discussions included throughout this introduction aim to communicate the wish and intent to recognize, albeit in printed form, the value of oral expression, expertise, and knowledge, the main focus of *Hear! He(a)r!* is the written word. This, and the mainly historical perspective of the essays, reflect the response to calls and invitations for contributions both before and after the conferences. This is not to take away from the importance and value of the spoken word or present-day voices. Orality and its powerful capacity for intervention constitute a major subject of cultural and literary study, and an essential challenge to the printed text as the obligatory medium for intellectual communication. Indigenous oral narrative and knowledge in particular are of pivotal influence, with serious work being done on Indigenous women's contributions. *Hear! He(a)r!* recognizes the pressing urgency and importance of this work—its absence from this collection as a critical gap. So, too, is the absence of essays on more contemporary women's voices, or on those of working/low-wage women who may have little opportunity to interpose in the rarified air of "ideas."

Acknowledging these gaps and, moreover, that much of what women actually accomplish is not committed to paper, these essays nevertheless amplify the weight that voices from the past and in print can lend to voices of the present and the future.

A lot of my activity has been about removing barriers for people like me to work. And I'm defining people like me fairly broadly. RITA SHELTON DEVERELL

We have to be constantly breaking ground, wherever we go trying to break through all the barriers. SHEILA WATT-CLOUTIER

A lot of us are fighting to two fronts. We fight externally and internally. (...) You have to live an authentic life and make a positive contribution if you can. DENISE DONLON

I find myself playing two roles ... bringing in the fact [of] gender [and] writing about women in Canadian history ... thinking of all those women who have completely disappeared. CHARLOTTE GRAY

I want [my] voice to be one that can explain, unpack, and not one that will be punditry. ANTONIA MAONI

In Quebec I feel I really needed to hammer home the question of individual rights because of the history of [collective rights in] Quebec ... By these rights I mean women's rights. One of the big tensions of the women's movement has been the fact that we've been too much a white, middle-class movement. I think we have a job to do here. FRANCINE PELLETIER

I've been building the bridge going toward you. This country needs that. It needs a group of women that cares not just for each other but for the land itself, and it is a she. LEE MARACLE

The subjects and authors of these essays wrote as novelists, poets, journalists, diarists, memoirists or in some other capacity, putting words in print to exert influence on issues of importance. Wendy Robbins' memoir of her experience as a feminist scholar engages with the challenges confronted by women in academia, an overview that stands as a cautionary tale about women's survival, ironic given her own too-early death in 2017. Her frank approach to universities performing as gatekeepers amplifies how platforms that disseminate information inevitably control the "cultural deference" accorded the intellectual. Her distinction between private and public spheres and who controls those spheres in Canada calls out the "pale males" who have unloaded on women "the accumulation of disadvantage" rather than respect or prestige. Her essay is particularly valuable for its delineation of the difference between genuine intellectuals and "armchair" intellectuals. Not least, her uncompromising discussion of racism and dissent, the invisibility of women within the academy, despite the fact that most post-secondary students are now women, is a serious indictment. Even though feminist academics since the 1960s have changed fixed ideas in the disciplines, contributed to public policy and legal reform, headed community organizations, represented political parties, challenged government programs, and helped shape the language and scope of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, they have not enjoyed acknowledgement of that work. Answers lie in three key areas: the biased theoretical literature about public intellectuals, which has been produced mainly by men; the data documenting how universities and mainstream media remain male dominated and fail to take women's expertise seriously; and the life-writing of feminist academics, many subjected to backlash and retaliation. Working on campus and in the community, feminist academics influence public opinion, scholarly discourse, and institutional dynamics, but despite that, have not been accorded respect.

Iga Mergler and Neil McLaughlin further open this question in "Who Gets to Be a Public Intellectual in Canada?" They analyze mentions in two large-circulation English-language dailies, *The Globe and Mail* and *National Post*, and through that tally arrive at a numerical distillation of how often women are consulted and cited, professionally and in terms of their commentary. Although a relatively narrow sample, this quantitative work is a valuable analysis that supports the axiomatic measurement that men are more often asked to provide commentary, and are quoted more than women, regardless of the quality or relevance of their expertise.

Contemporary figures who engage with issues that might not be considered mainstream are seldom accorded the status of public intellectuals, even when they perform that role. Diana Brydon examines the postcolonial, feminist and global presence of poet and writer-activist Dionne Brand, Indigenous environmental activist Sheila Watt-Cloutier, humanitarian anti-war activist Samantha Nutt, and university-based editor Janice Williamson, all "semi-public presences" who are making a difference beyond their specific fields of expertise. Their audience, an "educated reading public," is delineated by their subject matter and their approach; for example, Dionne Brand argues for the political potential of poetry. Brydon's identification of consequential places to intervene in attention is a useful broadening of the realm of public address. Her analysis of "exploratory speaking" as a means of investigating an important question is particularly germane. Any witnessing that provokes public consideration, especially now when the whole nature of debate is subject to stress, becomes a motivation for intellectual engagement. Audiences are increasingly disparate and divided, which impairs the critical reach of women thinkers, but activism and witness, through the written word, can prompt a hybrid text, both personal and the political. The urgency, even necessity, for writers to bear witness argues for the role of personal narrative. Brydon apprehends the reach of these activist-writers and the platforms available to

them. “How wide can the reach of such writing ever be? How wide can it be in current times when many are turning away from printed text for their news, entertainment, and education?” In framing these questions—What is important? Who speaks? Who listens?—Brydon argues for the importance of “a speaker’s embodiment in history, memory, and the ritual of sexual and social encounter.” Ultimately then, she highlights the idea that it is in writing where women find greatest potential for cracking open the borders of a preserve that has always excluded them.

The ubiquitous unwillingness to claim intellectual status or to argue that this status needs to be torn asunder is the crux of the essay that examines Lisa Robertson, an experimental poet who is an unlikely candidate for any designation as a well-known figure. A writer with a dedicated audience who better fits this rubric through her collaborative and community work, especially that focused on public space, Robertson, Heather Milne argues, can be considered a “counterpublic intellectual,” a distinction signaling the extent to which public scholarship is beginning to emerge as a force of change (see *The Oxford Handbook of Methods for Public Scholarship*, edited by Patricia Leavy). Milne’s discussion of “counter publics” is valuable for its identification of how dominant norms inevitably measure a majoritarian approach. The desire to subvert predictable reaction and to escape national or generic boundaries is occupied by the guerilla thinking of the *avant-garde*, the potential strength of the marginal in its effect if not identification. The experimental and the peripheral have contributed to a feminist aesthetic as well as a feminist positioning, but Milne does ask, wryly: can women who own and run bookstores and magazines make a dent in the market and noise-driven world of attention? Is the “salon” (now a writerly rather than a privileged interval) a space where intellectual movements can accomplish change? Are these efforts effective in promoting public engagement? Robertson’s work includes protests and political critique, “intellectual engagement that does not strive for widespread appeal” but “galvanizes and engages a counter public.” It seems then that semi-public figures share much with public intellectuals but are limited to a smaller scope. The larger question may be whether it is possible for a public intellectual to function entirely outside of “market-driven” interests. Milne’s depiction of Robertson as a “feminist flaneuse” who charts, documents, and bears witness suggests she opens up a “discursive circulation” that for all its limitations transcends what has traditionally been expected of public engagement.

Increasingly, these essays demonstrate that women use literature as a platform to advocate for change, even though “the popular appeal of literature to advance a social cause” has been accorded little respect. Do women use the printed page because it offers greater safety, or because entrée to a broader stage (radio or TV) is less easy to access? Carole Gerson outlines how, in her essay on Pauline Johnson, Gwethalyn Graham, Marshall Saunders, and Joy Kogawa, they used the rostrums available to them to investigate what were in their times keen social concerns. One example is Pauline Johnson’s subtle interventions with racism in her poetic essay, published in Toronto’s *Sunday Globe*, “A Strong Race Opinion: On the Indian Girl in Modern Fiction.” Gerson observes that Johnson “castigates the representation of Native women in the Canadian literature of the day, [but it] garnered no response from her contemporaries, yet it is now regarded as a cornerstone of her intellectual analysis and has been frequently reprinted in the last two decades.” This detail is telling. Even when women articulate important denunciations, they are muted, and their declarations need to be unearthed and revisited even a century later. Gerson notes that “another essay, ‘The Stings of Civilization’” by Johnson, remained in manuscript until 2002 because she critiqued wealth and the commercialization of religion. Gerson outlines too how Gwethalyn Graham fought the anti-Semitism festering in 1940s WWII in Montreal. Graham’s willingness to comment on widespread prejudice and racism at that time took incredible courage.

That courage, coupled with awareness of important political and social wrongs, resulted in a powerful calling out. That these voices have been largely ignored again underlines the tone-deaf response to women's intellectual contributions. Joy Kogawa's *Obasan* was visibly effective in bringing about the apology and redress for the Japanese Canadian Redress movement; Kogawa's novel actually helped to change legislation. Literature is one of the platforms used to give utterance to women's concerns; their relative success in garnering attention appears to be tied to their occupying a literary enclave. But does that safely confine these important critiques? Despite the issues that each of these writers fight for, is one of the ways that women have been silenced related to their configuration as literary rather than political or social voices?

These questions are further amplified by Sarah Galletly's paper on Gwethalyn Graham's interventions in questions surrounding war and women's status; Graham's contributions, especially those on refugees, have been "underexplored" and under-acknowledged, with most attention given to her fiction. It can be deduced that women are allowed to write novels, but less welcome to comment on civic affairs. Graham's relegation to a one-novel author, without attention to the many controversies she addressed in her non-fiction, is key: freelance journalists and political speakers are relegated to a periphery, where their work can be dismissed rather than treated seriously, especially if that work dissents from Canada's national narrative as a tolerant nation. Critics are only too eager to address women's writerly "paralysis," but meanwhile fail to consider their writing published in more transitory venues. Again, women may choose to write fiction because "it is the most effective means of getting ideas into the public mind." And if they are committed to social change, and to political engagement, that can be masked by the "entertainment" of fiction.

Sarah Spear's analysis of how Idola Saint-Jean and Flora MacDonald Denison used the women's pages to campaign for suffrage further unfolds how women at the turn of the 20th century sought to intervene in voter's rights for women. Their arguments, generally published as "soft" journalism, sought to erase the divide between women and men, and argued that restricting women to the home contributed to economic disparity. Considered militant and radical, idealists about solidarity, they contributed to conversations about democracy, public policy, even while working within mainstream values, recognizable to their intended audience. There has always been tension between political and domestic roles; and despite their relegation to the women's pages, they argued about tough issues. "Patriarchy was the last aristocracy, and St. Jean argued that patriarchy be dismantled to end women's oppression," says Spear. Interestingly, they used religious values to promote women's rights and attacked the Catholic Church using those same religious values. Their frustration with the alignment of churches and politics meant that they tried to use the tools they had to dismantle the master's house; their awareness of their combatant and subaltern condition nevertheless did not silence them. Determination and precarity together served as inspiration.

While this aspect of their experience is seldom foregrounded, women were also impelled by adventurousness. For example, in Bridgette Brown's discussion of two women who sign up to be teachers to incarcerated prisoners in the Boer war, it becomes obvious that while they are considered the "epitome" of Canadian womanhood, they persist in the adventure and its recording in the full knowledge that they have been denied the status of active military service. Judiciously aware that they were shaped by roles of imperial service, even while they simultaneously negotiated expectations of Victorian women writers, these women used the avenues available to them. Publishing their ideas and experiences on the "women's pages" of newspapers might be considered demeaning but was an instrument that they adapted. "Wading into the public arena of

print meant relying upon the sanction of Empire, leaning on a supportive sisterly network of literary precursors, and acknowledging a (subservient) gendered authorial status.” Entering through the society pages, they were aware that they were re-voicing government and imperial service, even while they adapted their cloth to suit their fashion and followed their own inclinations. Their reports record their experiences and do not hesitate to intervene in commentary on the war camps. Randal and Graham tailored their responses to suit the vehicle available to them—society columns—but their example underlines how women elbowed into public space through journalism, once the exclusive purview of men. They were only able to infiltrate an area of the press that effectively arrogated women’s issues to those motley and “unimportant” pages.

Even in relatively respected areas of legal service, women were impeded by systemic barriers. In “Speaking Your Mind or Not: The Judicial Careers of Police Magistrates Emily Murphy and Alice Jane Jamieson, 1916-1932,” Mélanie Methot unpacks examples of judiciary appointments who had to struggle to do their jobs to the extent that they battled for office space, acknowledgement, and even appropriate jurisdiction over courts for women and cases to be tried. These women fought to have their duties defined, fought the detectives, fought the police departments, and fought the Provincial Attorney General. Most ironically, in the realm of justice, they battled injustice related to their roles, although they occupied landmark positions: Jamieson was the first woman in the British Empire appointed judge of a juvenile court; Emily Murphy was the first female magistrate in Canada and in the British Empire. Political activists and legal pathbreakers, they met resistance at every turn and identified the gap between those who were mouthing a government script and those who fought against government policies.

Marjorie Johnstone’s exploration of Margaret Gould’s influence as a union organizer, labour activist, and social worker is equally telling. The changes that Gould wrought through her involvement with public education and child welfare resonate to this day. A radical social worker when the profession enjoyed little respect, she wrote columns and editorials for *The Toronto Star* for almost thirty years, articles on the cost of living, education, affordable housing, and women’s health; most important, she fought for the “Family Allowance Act” against many who argued that it would promote reproduction as a means of getting “unearned hand-outs.” It seems that such resistance does not die.

Erin Ramlo’s investigative piece on the women who were instrumental in the formation of the Writers’ Union of Canada consolidates the contention that men often got the glory for the work that women did. Marian Engel and Margaret Laurence’s contributions to an organization determined to promote the rights of cultural producers (writers) are often elided, with greater credit given to others. Ramlo unearths the extent to which Engel and Laurence worked to bring about practical and material support of Canadian authorship in terms of standardized contracts, payment for public use, their “countless unpaid hours” enabling amplified representation for 20th century Canadian literature.

Historically, then, while these voices may have seemed to shout into the void, they made a significant difference. We still face the knotty evidence that much remains to be done and that important issues often lie buried until women’s voices are heeded. Listening to and hearing women is key to recognizing the intellectual contributions of their work in its many forms. Myriad examples and sources are available and can be recuperated, if not from conventional and established places, then from “women’s pages,” archives, correspondence, legal documents, and other sites. From the records of the Hudson’s Bay Company, for example, Canadian historian Sylvia Van Kirk (1983) was able to trace the crucial role and economic importance of Indigenous women in the fur trade. Contemporary scholars have access to many new platforms for research

and dissemination of ideas, although rapid changes to information sharing can generate new challenges. Women's interventions in social media, while an effective means for being heard, may face a shrinking of the public space if that media is dominated by male-designed algorithmic structures. Instagram, for example, relies on visuals, which highlight and measure appearance, frequency, fame, and femininity. On that site, women are seen more than heard. The contemporary conjunction of the visible within the public sphere brings with it potential hazards for women: from trolling and doxing, to censorship of their voices. Urgent matters and movements, from #MeToo, the Occupy Movement, Appropriation of Voice, Missing and Murdered Indigenous women, LGBTQIA+ to various environmental concerns, need the amplified voices of women. There is no conclusion to this discussion. These collected essays gesture toward much that has been neglected or ignored, a foray into discussions that demand attention and that will become even more important in future. Let us not forget the work that has been done and that illustrates the multiple ways that women speak and insist on being heard.

II. Refiguring the Public Intellectual: Lessons from Life Stories by Feminists in the Faculty Body Wendy Robbins

The faces and preoccupations of Canada's public intellectuals have not changed
as rapidly as have the faces and concerns of Canada's evolving society.
Nelson Wiseman 2013, 245

In *A Room of One's Own* (1929), that proto-feminist book of British literary criticism, a thinly fictionalized Virginia Woolf as narrator describes her attempt to enter a university library to do her research. As she enters the college grounds, she is intercepted by a horrified man, who indignantly gestures her off the all-male turf. "He was a Beadle; I was a woman. This was the turf; there was the path. Only the Fellows and Scholars are allowed here; the gravel is the place for me" (4). This is a stark image of women's traditional exclusion from higher education, the main path to professional authority and social and political power. It symbolizes what Canadian law professor Sheila McIntyre (1987) has called women's "systemic invalidation" (367). Although women have become the majority of students in universities in Canada and globally, post-secondary institutions, government, media, and socio-economic hierarchies are still firmly male dominated.¹

In "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" (1971), a classic American essay in feminist art history, Linda Nochlin comes to much the same conclusion as Woolf: "things as they are and as they have been, in the arts as in a hundred other areas, are stultifying, oppressive, and discouraging to all those, women among them, who did not have the good fortune to be born white, preferably middle class, and above all, male" (26). The root of the problem lies in patriarchal institutions and socialization: "The fault lies not in our stars, our hormones, our menstrual cycles, or our empty internal spaces, but in our institutions and our education—education understood to include everything that happens to us from the moment we enter this world" (26).

Corroboration comes again from the Austrian-born author of *The Chalice and the Blade* (1987), Riane Eisler, who developed from feminine-mystique-era housewife to celebrated feminist social scientist. Eisler underscores how women intellectuals of her generation worked in isolation, without role models and mentors, and thus lacked the self-confidence that a same-sex tradition provides. As she summoned the courage to propose her radical theory of contrasting dominator and partnership models of culture, Eisler felt that "the task was very difficult because women are not supposed to say, 'I am going to challenge a whole line of authority. I am going to formulate my counter theory—and I'm going to do all this without the beard of the wise man. I, a woman, am going to throw my hat into the arena of intellectual history'" (quoted in Martin 1999, 234).

Canadian feminists thus are far from alone in documenting the effects of patriarchy and charting how our socialization in the domestic sphere and our treatment in public institutions—including universities, media, and governments—create and uphold systemic discrimination. When the landmark *Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada* was released in 1970, it documented how some people still held the view that there was little point educating daughters: "Many people still question a girl's need for education, assuming that 'she is only going to get married'" (Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1970, 172). Others offered the opinion that "education is the best dowry a bride can bring to her marriage" (178). More than four decades later, research conducted for the Council of Canadian Academies and published as *Strengthening Canada's Research Capacity: The Gender Dimension* (2012) noted that even those women privileged enough to be selected as Canada Research Chairs often feel that they are not

taken seriously, and that their work is undervalued. They identify the “valuing by those in power of people like themselves” (Table A5.2) as a greater barrier than work-life balance issues, about which we usually hear much.

At the time of the Royal Commission, the percentage of women graduating with advanced and professional degrees was extremely low, with women earning less than 5% of degrees in law, only 12.5% in medicine, and less than 6% in dentistry. Engineering was not even mentioned; women would have accounted for under 2% (Frize 2009, 135). The percentage of graduate students who were women (20.6% of Master’s students and a mere 7.6% of PhDs) was lower than it had been a half-century earlier in 1921, when it stood at 25% (Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1970, 169-70). Reflecting on her student days at Carleton University in the 1960s and her first decade of teaching, political scientist Jill Vickers (2008) writes:

women were virtually absent from politics and political science. No woman professor taught me, and one lone member of Parliament (MP), Grace MacInnis, sat in the House of Commons (1964-75) throughout my student career. Carleton had two women political scientists when I was hired—Pauline Jewett, who was away trying to get elected, and Teresa Rakowska Harmstone, a Soviet specialist, who became my mentor. (217)

By 2010, the fortieth anniversary of the Commission's report, women were more than 50% in all categories except for the PhD, which had grown to 44.0% (Canadian Association of University Teachers 2010). One of the main transformations of the last part of the twentieth century in North America was this unprecedented increase in women's participation in undergraduate and graduate education. Susan Gubar (2011b) calls it “one of the most momentous transformations in Western culture: the successful integration of women into higher education and therefore also into virtually all the professions” (xviii). Yet there has not been a correspondingly “momentous” transformation of the academic workplace, or of government or mainstream media. The employment rate of women in universities in permanent, full-time positions lags behind the Canadian average for all occupations, 39.5% for universities compared to 45.9% for all occupations (Canadian Association of University Teachers 2013, Fig. 2.15, p. 37). The ratio of women professors to women students has actually worsened (Robbins and Simpson 2009).

Why does Canada seem to have produced so few women public intellectuals? We could equally well ask why Canada seems to have produced so few women leaders in public life generally: in government, media, business, and universities. My main focus is universities, but governments that shape public policy and fund Canadian research, and mainstream media that shape public opinion and open their pages and their microphones to selected “expert” commentators, play key roles too. An important, if rhetorical, question opens Soraya Roberts’ provocative analysis in *THIS Magazine* in 2015: “If a feminist fells Canada's patriarchy and the media isn’t around to hear it, does it make a sound?” (30).

The university remains the main birthplace of the intelligentsia, an older name for public intellectuals. *Wikipedia* defines “public intellectuals” as that “social class of people engaged in complex mental labour aimed at guiding or critiquing, or otherwise playing a leadership role in shaping a society’s culture and politics. This therefore might include everyone from artists to school teachers, as well as academics, writers, journalists and other *hommes de lettres* (men of letters) [sic].” *Wikipedia*, the world’s most frequently consulted online encyclopedia, is infamous for its lack of entries about women, lack of women contributors (Hellard 2015, 42), and here sexist language as well. Its definition of “intellectual”—separate from “public intellectual”—uses more

inclusive language while describing much the same characteristics: “An intellectual is the *man or woman* who engages in critical study, thought, and reflection about the reality of society, and proposes solutions for the normative problems of society, and by such discourse in the *public sphere* gains authority from *public opinion*” (emphasis added).

Michael Ignatieff (1997), widely recognized as a Canadian public intellectual, as well as an academic, author, and former politician, suggests that Voltaire “invented the public intellectual,” a group he describes as “figures whose ideas guided the conversation of the country,” and to whom accrued “prestige,” “cultural deference,” and “moral authority” (394). Of twentieth-century British public intellectuals Ignatieff notes, “Most did have academic jobs, but the audience they sought was never the monastic few but the educated many. Their impact was made possible by social democracy’s triumph—above all, by the creation of a public broadcasting service which gave them a podium” (394). What use a preacher without a pulpit, a public speaker without a microphone?

Therein lies a large part of the problem for women, and not just in Canada. For centuries, women were confined almost wholly to the private, not the public, sphere; the learned woman was a transgressive figure and the butt of men's ridicule. Even now mainstream media, which both report on and shape public opinion, are overwhelmingly male-dominated: men are about 80% of Canada's newspaper editors, “expert” guest commentators, columnists, and Massey lecturers (Vartanian 2013). One Canadian who briefly played a leading role in the public sphere, Canada's first and only woman prime minister, Kim Campbell, as recently as 2014, said: “Much of the power structure of contemporary Canadian society is still the purview of men. . . . I firmly believe that society still communicates messages that women do not entirely belong in the upper echelons of power” (122-23).

In order to change the discourse and dynamics surrounding public intellectuals in Canada (or the apparent lack thereof), we need to challenge the traditional binaries of masculine/ feminine, public/private, and thinking/feeling, and to question why “taking charge tends to be viewed as a male trait, while taking care is associated with women” and correspondingly valued less (Catalyst n.d.; Gold 1983; Moss-Racusin et al. 2012). Margaret Mead's famous observation remains apt: “In some societies the men fish and the women weave, and in other societies the women fish and the men weave.” Citing this observation in *A Dialogue on Comparable Worth*, Michael Evan Gold (1983) sums up: “The conclusion is obvious. Women's work is undervalued everywhere” (40).

Theorizing the Public Intellectual

The theoretical literature on intellectuals has been written largely by men, both outside and inside Canada. Julien Benda's 1928 *La trahison des clercs* described intellectuals (all of them men) in religious terms as clerics called to a vocation “whose activity is essentially not the pursuit of practical aims,” but rather the guardianship of “eternal standards of truth and justice” (43). More than sixty-five years later, Edward Said's 1996 *Representations of the Intellectual* depicts the intellectual as a secular agent of social change “endowed with a faculty for representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for, a public” (11). Said adds: “And this role has an edge to it, and cannot be played without a sense of being someone whose place it is publicly to raise embarrassing questions” (11). Said's examples again are almost all men (Virginia Woolf is an exception). Some current analyses describe intellectuals as a disappearing breed altogether, with little power or influence given postmodernism's “relativization of knowledge claims” (e.g., Russell Jacoby's 1987 *The Last Intellectuals*, Richard Posner's 2001 *Public Intellectuals: A Study in Decline*, or Frank Furedi's

2004 *Where Have All the Intellectuals Gone?* [64]). What these various *seminal* works all have in common is authorship or editorship by a man who describes a tradition dominated by men. The adjective *seminal* itself is derived from the noun *semen*, meaning *seed*, and of course, refers to “a work, event, moment, or figure strongly influencing later developments.”

No wonder that Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar (1979) were moved to ask the rhetorical question, “Is a pen a metaphorical penis?” (3). This is the opening line of their revolutionary feminist literary criticism in *The Madwoman in the Attic* and has been described as “one of the most memorable opening lines in all literary scholarship” (Tromp 2011, 39). Books or articles about public intellectuals in Canada also tend to be authored or edited by men, such as Michael Ignatieff, Mark Kingwell, or Nelson Wiseman, and again they pay women precious little attention. A welcome note is struck, however, by political scientist Sylvia Bashevkin. In her essay “Navigating Gendered Spaces,” Bashevkin (2013) states: “The fact that only men could hold the status of full citizens in the ancient polis, while women were assigned the rank of partial, impaired, or incomplete citizens through the Enlightenment era, reveals the extent to which *both the adjective public and the noun intellectual remained identifiably masculine categories for much of Western history* (109-10; emphasis added). This applies not just to ancient Greece but to Canada into the twentieth century, where initially “laws excluded women generally from public life. They did not enjoy the right to advanced education, to hold public office, to vote or to sit on a jury” (“Women and the Law” n.d.). Women were not even officially declared “persons” until the British Privy Council made it so, in 1929, October 18th, now celebrated as Persons Day.

The last chapter of Nelson Wiseman’s edited collection, *The Public Intellectual in Canada* (2013), acknowledges the dearth of contributions by women and minorities, although very briefly. Wiseman judges that it will seem “to some readers” that “the interests of Canada’s public intellectuals have lagged behind their society’s transformation as Aboriginals, women, and visible minorities have moved from the periphery into the mainstream of Canada’s cultural and political life. With the exception, however, of the four female contributors [out of 15], these newer voices are absent here” (245). Wiseman’s final reflection is germane to this discussion: “As these essays collectively reflect them, the faces and preoccupations of Canada’s public intellectuals have not changed as rapidly as have the faces and concerns of Canada’s evolving society” (245).

Hegemonic “Pale-Male” University Hierarchies

“There can be no question that women ought to have social, economic, political, and cultural equality with men in our society. But they do not. Universities ought to be in the forefront of change in respect to the status of women in our society. But they are not” (Symons and Page 1984, 207). So wrote Thomas Symons and James Page a generation ago in a statement that remains largely true. Statistics and studies continue to document that the truly remarkable progress made by women in the student body in Canada since 1970 has not been matched by commensurate progress in the professoriate and administration, especially in the higher ranks. Women academics are clustered in the lower ranks—the “glass ceiling” effect—and even within the same rank, their salaries are lower than men’s (Council of Canadian Academies 2012, 96, Fig. 5.3). Women form a substantially higher proportion of the faculty in the humanities and social sciences (39.6%) compared to the life sciences (35.0%) or the generally more prestigious STEM subjects (14.8%) (188, Fig. A2.2).

There is a shameful lack of equity data in Canada about academics other than for women as an undifferentiated group.² University of Waterloo biologist Swani Vethamany-Globus, one of the co-editors of *Women in the Canadian Academic Tundra*, maintains that “a steel rather than a

glass ceiling exists for women of colour” (Hannah, Paul, and Vethamany-Globus 2002, 12). From the 2006 Census, data show that 1.0% of university professors self-identified as Indigenous; 14.9% (8,450), as “visible minority.” Of this group, 31.8% (2,685) were racialized minority women. This is 12.1% of women faculty and 4.7% of all full-time faculty (Statistics Canada 2006). The situation is summed up effectively by Delia Douglas, a Black Canadian independent scholar: “In Canada . . . despite twenty years of an equity policy, the representation of Aboriginal and racialized minority women [academics] remains deplorably low” (quoted in Henry and Tator 2009, 51). Douglas continues: “Outside of the ever-growing number of personal accounts that confirm the dearth of Aboriginal and racialized minority groups, there is no adequate official report of the standing of these groups in Canadian postsecondary institutions” (55). Published personal narratives provide information and analysis from under-represented groups.

The discrimination that women and various minorities typically face, whether in universities, media, government, or Canadian society at large, especially those who experience intersecting or interlocking oppressions, is described in terms of punitive “inequity taxes” by Jennifer Bankier (2002), a (now retired) law professor at Dalhousie University in Halifax; the advantages that hegemonic White men accrue, she labels “inequity subsidies.” Bankier identifies three kinds of inequity taxes: group status taxes associated with mere membership in a disadvantaged group; leading edge taxes on those who are trail-blazers for their group in new social contexts, and equity work taxes on people who actively fight the inequities of our society.

Bankier also identifies seven sub-taxes that may be added in various combinations in any of these three categories: an incompetence tax— “an (irrebuttable? [*sic*]) presumption that members of historically disadvantaged groups are incompetent”; a credibility tax; a Catch-22 tax, to punish members of equity-seeking groups both for conforming and for not conforming to “social norms for their own group”; an internalization tax; a health tax, resulting from chronic stress and leading to such problems as high blood pressure and diabetes; a power tax, which makes it harder for those with less institutional power or social capital to get things done; and a retaliation tax, which is “a vicious, intense, personalized form of trashing,” and can manifest itself in “day-to-day harassment,” personal or public attacks, ostracism, discipline, withholding of merit increments, and denial of reappointment, tenure, or promotion (19-20). These factors combine to create “an accumulation of disadvantage” (Valian 1999, 142).

Numerous studies, including major reports by the National Academies of Science in the US and the Council of Canadian Academies, document the current extent of systemic discrimination and also probe its root causes. These underlying causes include unconscious biases, schemas or stereotypes; mentoring and sponsorship or their lack; persisting public/private divides and work-life conflicts; Matthew and Matilda effects (Rossiter 1993); and the tendency to value like-minded people. Even now, the identical resumé when signed with a woman's name is rated lower than when signed with a man's name (Moss-Racusin et al. 2012). Traits perceived as feminine are still viewed as less suited for leadership roles than traits perceived as masculine (Catalyst n.d.). Thus when equally qualified male and female candidates apply for the same position, managers are more likely to hire the man. Yet, new research published in the *Harvard Business Review* shows that a higher collective intelligence accrues to teams that include more women, possibly, in part, because women listen better to other team members and work more collaboratively (Woolley and Malone 2011). The patriarchal forces of government and mainstream media can combine with those of the post-secondary sector to create a perfect storm that buffets and punishes women with paradigm-shifting, game-changing ideas.

Her Stories: Feminist Dissent against the Status Quo

The educational, social, and legal battles waged by women in Canada, from the days of Marie de l'Incarnation, are often better described in their own writings than in standard history books. As the co-editors of *Women in the Canadian Academic Tundra* recognize, "personal narratives . . . convey what data cannot: the uniqueness of each life, each soul" (Hannah, Paul, and Vethamany-Globus 2002, 3-4). But there are often similarities and commonalities in women's academic life-writing, which offers insights, often deeply disturbing, into academic culture with its sticky floors and glass ceilings, its micro-aggressions and major power politics.

This auto/biographical material ranges from individual memoirs (e.g., Judy Rebick's *Transforming Power*); to collections of personal narratives (e.g., *Seen but Not Heard, Minds of Our Own, Feminist Journeys/Voies féministes*); to interviews (e.g., "Sunera Thobani: A Very Public Intellectual"; and even to YouTube videos (e.g., Mary Eberts' "Professor as Citizen"). It is important to recognize that "memoirs are not only representations of women's personal lives but also of their desire to repossess important parts of our culture, in which women's stories have not mattered" (Buss quoted in Chegg Books n.d.). A list of some of the main themes in academic women's life-writing is perhaps as satisfactory an answer as any to the question of why there are so few women who are recognized as public intellectuals. Key themes include:

- Not belonging, not being taken seriously (gender, race, class, motherhood), "outsider within," Matilda Effect v. Matthew Effect, imposter syndrome, self-confidence gap;
- Protesting patriarchal hierarchies and divisions of labour (domestic, academic, and equity work), reinventing curricula and pedagogy, addressing wage gaps, seeking work-life balance;
- Stress of the double bind of needing to succeed (and train students) in a competitive, hierarchal system while valuing collaboration, connection, and friendship;
- "Accumulation of disadvantage," more challenges/fewer resources, being held to higher standards, lack of mentors and role models—especially for Ingeneous, racialized, and other minority women.

While Wiseman (2013) may be correct that "today, most intellectuals . . . are ensconced as academics within universities," he seems to be wrong in characterizing them *all* as "an elite privileged class" (6). Academic women do not generally regard themselves as such. By contrast, academic men often do.³ Men's key themes include:

- An almost exclusively "institutional" identity as an academic within a public network that includes government and business, with little responsibility for family members beyond breadwinning;
- A sense of entitlement and inclusion, through paternal lineage, mentorship, and collegiality—belonging to "the old boys' network" or a "secular priesthood"—often, in the past, acquiring promotions without competition ("feelers and phone calls");
- Self-confidence—even boastfulness about superiority—through an "an accumulation of advantage" and joy in the competition of academic politics;
- Views about women that are often sexist.

According to Said (1996), an intellectual has a role as an "outsider," someone who manifests a spirit of opposition and dissent against the status quo, "someone able to speak truth to

power; a crusty, eloquent, fantastically courageous and angry individual for whom no worldly power is too big and imposing to be criticized and pointedly taken to task” (8). These qualities surely characterize the feminist academic women who have set out to revolutionize post-secondary education and to “challenge the world” (Eichler 2008, 196). Pioneers and current practitioners of feminist scholarship and gender studies typically, and often defiantly, identify themselves as the academic arm of the women’s movement. Speaking of her collaboration with Maggie Benston and others at Simon Fraser University as women’s studies was being invented, Andrea Liebowitz reflected: “When you asked about which theorists we relied upon, my answer would have to be—ourselves. . . . We certainly challenged the monolithic scholarship that denied any diversity or difference and claimed to speak for “Humanity” (Liebowitz, Newcombe, and Kimball 2008, 183). Sociologist Dorothy Smith (2008) elaborates on how introspection and sharing personal experiences led to consciousness-raising, action, and an intellectual revolution:

It’s hard to recall just how radical the experience of the women’s movement was at its inception for those of us who had lived and thought within the masculinist regime against which the movement struggled. For us, the struggle was as much within ourselves, with what we knew how to do and think and feel, as with that regime as an enemy outside us. . . . There was no developed discourse in which the experiences that were spoken originally as everyday experience could be translated into a public language and become political in the ways distinctive to the women’s movement. We began to name “oppression,” “rape,” “harassment,” “sexism,” “violence,” and others. (69-70)

Believing that “intellectuals are the markers of grand narrative,” Ignatieff identifies the battle between communism and capitalism and the conflict between globalism and particularism as the two “grand narratives” of the twentieth century. But surely he might well point to the various “rights revolutions” and praise, alongside Zola and Havel, some leading feminist intellectuals. The fight for women’s rights constitutes a “major social movement” (Eichler and Lavigne n.d.), indeed the “longest revolution” (Mitchell 1984), yet its leaders are not properly honoured; sometimes they are flatly ignored, treated with hostility as “militant feminists,” troublemakers, and “feminazis,” and even punished for their views. Feminist activists do the work that male theoreticians say has been the responsibility of the public intellectual since Voltaire: to be “the scourge of the church, the thorn in the side of the prince.” Yet little of the customary “prestige” and even less of “cultural deference” is generally accorded such women (Ignatieff 1997, 394).

In the 2014 debacle known as Gamergate, after Canadian-born cultural critic Anita Sarkeesian exposed the sexism and misogyny in video game culture, she and two women video game developers were viciously bullied and threatened with the online distribution of pictures of themselves nude, with rape, and even with death threats. Sarkeesian was sent drawings of herself being raped by video game characters. One attacker created the computer game *Beat Up Anita Sarkeesian*, which prompted players to bloody a picture of Sarkeesian by clicking the mouse (*Wikipedia*). While not an academic, Sarkeesian holds a Master’s degree from York University where, as a student, she created her website *Feminist Frequency*; her material is often used in university women’s studies courses, and she speaks on campuses about gender tropes in pop culture. One of Sarkeesian’s speaking engagements on an American university campus was cancelled after officials received a threat of mass violence on the scale of the Montreal Massacre. Women who are perceived as trespassing on prestigious male territory—video games, computing, engineering—risk severe retaliation.

Combining intellectual analysis with social activism is not what Julien Benda expects of “real intellectuals,” whom he defines as “those whose activity is essentially not the pursuit of practical aims, all those who seek their joy in the practice of an art or a science or metaphysical speculation, in short in the possession of non-material advantages, and hence in a certain manner say: ‘My kingdom is not of this world’” (quoted in Said 1996, 5). Feminist activists hold a diametrically opposite view.

For example, feminist literary critic Annette Kolodny (1979), who taught at the University of British Columbia in the 1970s, writes that “Ideology . . . only truly manifests its power by ordering the sum of our actions.” She continues: “What I take to be the underlying spirit, or message, of any consciously ideologically premised criticism—that is, that ideas are important *because* they determine the ways we live, or want to live in the world—is vitiated by confining those ideas to the study, the classroom, or the pages of our books.” She adds: “to include segments on ‘Women in the Labor Movement’ in our American studies or women’s studies courses, while remaining willfully ignorant of the department secretary fired for her efforts to organize a clerical workers’ union . . . is not merely hypocritical; it destroys both the spirit and the meaning of what we are about” (186). This reads like a manifesto for genuine public intellectuals—distinct from “arm-chair” intellectuals.

At the outset of her ultimately very celebrated career, Kolodny fought anti-feminism and anti-Semitism, and she paid a considerable price. Her protracted tenure battle at the University of New Hampshire mired her in debt and emotional turmoil while her reproductive clock ran out. Succeeding as a feminist in a patriarchal institution entails both benefits and costs: influential careers and landmark publications, but also “exhaustion, depression, loneliness, and a higher incidence of cancer and other killing diseases” (150) particularly for women of colour, suggests Ann duCille in “Feminism, Black and Blue” (2011). Sarkeesian, Kolodny, duCille, and others corroborate Bankier’s thesis about heavy taxes.

Feminist academics have recognized that systemic problems require systemic solutions, and we work on many fronts on campus as well as off. Feminism continues to try to transform pedagogy, employment practices, hiring and promotion criteria, research methodologies, and the campus “climate.” The goal is systemic institutional transformation and major social change. Feminist academics have succeeded in changing fixed ideas in many disciplines, especially in humanities and social sciences, but also in science and engineering (Dorothy Smith, sociology; Micheline Dumont, history; Sheila McIntyre or Patricia Monture-Angus, law; Monique Frize, engineering), and have contributed to the development of new branches of study with direct links to public policy development and legal reform (Margrit Eichler, women’s studies; Joanne St. Lewis, critical race theory; Kathleen Lahey, taxation). Academic activists have headed or co-founded community organizations (Judy Rebick or Sunera Thobani, NAC; Mary Eberts, LEAF; the late Michèle Olliver, PAR-L). We have represented political parties (Chaviva Hosek or Monique Bégin, Liberal; Lynn McDonald, NDP). And we have changed government programs (Marjorie Griffin Cohen et al., Canada Research Chairs Program) and helped steer the application of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Shelagh Day, Court Challenges Program).

Clearly, not all women considered public intellectuals work on women’s equality issues (Sheila Watt-Cloutier or Maude Barlow). Yet many do. While some are not connected to universities (Margaret Atwood, Françoise David, or Naomi Klein), others are, and they champion educational equity. The life stories of these courageous academic activist women bear witness to the personal, professional, political, and often very public nature of their triumphs—and trials.

Literary critic Helen Buss (2002) does not hesitate to use the words “public intellectual” to characterize academic memoirists. She argues persuasively that such a woman is concerned “with the wider implications of her own story” (176), joining “hard-won personal wisdom” with “the life of a public intellectual” (182), turning a confessional mode into practical critique, and thus “repossessing the world.” Such texts may open up what Bill Ashcroft calls a “utopian space” in which “the border between memory and the future dissolves” (Édouard Glissant quoted in Ashcroft 2015, 175). But feminists’ memoirs also register the trauma of discrimination, marginalization, and painful battles for professional survival.

The memoir is “a form that has often been dismissed as less important than autobiography, less professional than the novel, and less intellectual than the formal essay” (Chegg Books n.d.). In Indigenous cultures, however, personal stories are a “central vehicle for sharing knowledge,” explains the late Patricia Monture-Angus (1995, 71 n8). For Indigenous people, lived (rather than text-based) learning constitutes expertise. Monture-Angus says, “We must think and feel to truly gain knowledge” (1999, 10). She defends experience over theory:

If we cannot understand the pain that women, that Aboriginal women, that Black women, that Hawaiian women, that Chicano women go through, we are never going to understand anything. All that mega-theory will not get us anywhere because without that understanding, mega-theory does not mean anything, does not reflect reality, does not reflect people’s experience. (1995, 20)

The accepted academic mode of writing is impersonal, but in Monture-Angus’ Mohawk culture, “not speaking from the ‘me’ is a violation” (45).

Monture-Angus’ life-writing charts her growth from law student to law professor to “legal warrior” (1999, 90). Writing about her experience, including a long and bitter tenure battle, is a strategy for survival:

I have a number of stories to tell about what I have learned about *surviving* the contradictions of my life as both a university student and a university professor. The contradictions arise because Aboriginal culture is not the dominant culture of the university and my gender places me in another minority in the university teacher population. Being able to name and describe the contradictions I experience on a daily basis is very much a part of the process I have adopted in order to continue to *survive* within the university. (53; emphasis added)

Although her essays were first published between 1987 and 1994, the issues are still current, as documented in publications such as *Racism in the Canadian University* (Henry and Tator 2009) and demonstrated in the Idle No More protest movement of 2012-2013. Fittingly, Monture-Angus was given the Mohawk name Aywahande, “the one who starts things with words” (Csillag 2010). This expression gets to the heart of what it is to be an academic activist or public intellectual.

Personal narratives reveal the gamut of challenges, as well as successes, experienced by “uppity” or “angry” women, terms which function as a near synonym for public intellectuals who champion feminist values. Sheila McIntyre’s famous “Memo” exposed rampant anti-feminism at Queen’s University Faculty of Law. In order to overcome the “systemic invalidation” she experienced in her first year of teaching law in 1985-86, McIntyre (1988) decided to document “every sexist or anti-feminist incident” (367). She knows “it is a highly subjective account” (364),

yet she also knows that it is decidedly “*not* one woman’s story” (364). Looking back, she judges that “it is being gender female which grounds the widely accepted presumption of incompetence. And it is being feminist and female which triggers the abuse” (391). Among the many outrageous examples of harassment that she endured, one of the worst was viewing malicious, misogynist graffiti about herself in the men’s bathroom. Although she went on to become an outstanding social justice professor, McIntyre, like Kolodny, developed rheumatoid arthritis. Monture-Angus died young, at only 53. While theirs are ultimately stories of heroic endurance and accomplishment, they also serve in part as cautionary tales about whistle-blowers, academic freedom notwithstanding.

Joanne St. Lewis, in “In the Belly of the Beast” (2003), wonders if “academic freedom is for everyone else but us” (77). She records her experience as a Black woman studying, then teaching law, and developing the hugely important and transformative concept of intersectionality. The problems are systemic: “The constant collusion that takes place between the knowledge producers and the makers of laws has resulted in the oppression experience[d] by racialized people” (75). As a graduate student in law at McGill University, she experienced “intellectual bondage” (77). Some “privileged people” (defined in terms of class, race, gender, etc.) make others feel that “we are not wanted there” (76). St. Lewis has given her time and talent unstintingly as a social justice activist with the Canadian Human Rights Commission and the Women’s Legal Education and Action Fund (LEAF), earning respect internationally for her work, including *Virtual Justice: Systemic Racism in the Canadian Legal Profession*.

Just how hostile her workplace became is captured in the defamation suit which St. Lewis filed and won against an offensive and pugilistic colleague at the University of Ottawa who had used the N-word about her and spread “racist cyber libel” online against her for nearly five years.

I could not and would not bend to accept the yoke of servitude implicit in the Defendant’s slur. . . . If it is my fate to be the first Black Canadian so publicly defiled then it is my hope to be the last. It was essential that no other suffer as I have.

The Defendant used the slur as a proxy for an attack on every aspect of my professional being. . . . I was reduced to my skin colour. I no longer was the bearer of expertise.

The Defendant’s attack on the independence of my voice made a sham of the expertise that I had earned. At the time of his attack, I had served as the first Black woman elected as a Bencher of the Law Society in its then 214 year history. I was the recipient of numerous national awards for my social justice work. All evaporated, as his blog trumpeted this false speech to the world. (St. Lewis 2014)

A mentor to countless students and colleagues, St. Lewis appreciates that racialized minorities are “unique as knowledge producers,” with particular expertise in “how issues of racism are analyzed and developed within and outside the classroom.” She attests that, “A lack of protection from racist speech for racialized professionals impoverishes society as a whole.” She concludes: “I stood up for the dignity we are entitled to as Black professionals in our public lives. . . . If we cannot engage in these discussions within the academy then what hope is there for the broader social engagement that is essential for the realization of an enlarged Black humanity in a constitutional democracy?” St. Lewis is clearly someone who “confront[s] orthodoxy and dogma” (Said 1996, 11), fights “intimidation and prejudice” (Ignatieff 1997), and “helps give voice to those who may lack the power of access to address their issues in the traditional venues of the public

arena” (Barlow 2013, 173). These are words that acknowledged public intellectuals use to define the term.

Sunera Thobani, an influential anti-racist feminist scholar and activist who was born in Tanzania and educated in the UK, US, and Canada, acknowledges that these cross-cultural experiences “profoundly shaped” her politics and gave her a useful “internationalist outlook” (13). In addition to her role as a women’s and gender studies academic, she served as president of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women—the first woman of colour to hold that position—at the time that NAC was Canada’s largest feminist organization. Thobani is also a founding member of the pan-Canadian group, Researchers and Academics of Colour for Equity, and author of *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada* (2007). She has given invited speeches in many parts of the world, including Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and the US.

Her most famous speech, “War Frenzy,” delivered in Ottawa in 2001, landed her on national news but for which she was, in interviewer William Carroll’s words “widely vilified” (Thobani 2012, 18). She was rebuked by then Prime Minister Jean Chrétien. This speech was delivered just as then American president George W. Bush announced the US response to the attack on the World Trade Center, the tragically misguided invasion of Iraq now widely recognized as a disastrous failure. Thobani had the foresight and courage to speak out against the war at the start: “US foreign policy is soaked in blood and other countries in the West, including, shamefully, Canada, cannot line up fast enough behind it. All want to sign up now as Americans and I think it is the responsibility of the women's movement to stop that, to fight against it” (19). Thobani describes the backlash that followed her speech as

an ugly moment. One of the ugliest in my life. It did take a huge cost both on me, and of course, my family. My mother was with me at that time, it was painful for her, and my daughter was very young at that time. Of course, I also had to deal with the announcement by the RCMP to the media that I was being investigated for a hate crime, and I had to make sure that I was not vulnerable to a charge like that legally. (19)

And yet she was fulfilling the role of intellectuals as described and defended by Mark Kingwell (2011): “From the time of at least Socrates and Lao Tzu, they saw themselves as performing a necessary function, chiding those in power for their blindness and ambition, warning the rest of us about the dangers that cling to power. Intellectuals were, in this tradition, essential barriers to tyranny” (47).

Thobani (2012) sharply criticizes the lack of Canadian feminist opposition to the war and also to the Islamophobia that followed 9/11, not mincing her words: “the politics of liberal feminisms are very harmful and very damaging” (20). In her analysis, Islamophobia is “a racialization of Muslims,” for “Muslim” is used not just to describe practicing Muslims but “to apply to black and brown bodies,” so that “Islamophobia is a discourse of racialization of our times” (22). Her analysis of the impact of the war on terror, looking back on the decade since 9/11, is that it

has tried to suture over the fissures that multicultural politics gestured to: claims of white supremacy that were destabilized by civil rights movements, by the immigrants' rights movements, by third world struggles for independence. These movements actually split apart this whole category of the West and discredited ideas of white supremacy, of Western

superiority. In a way, the war on terror is re-stabilizing the global institution of white superiority and Western cultural and economic domination. (27)

Her analyses are penetrating and her scope is large, yet she reports that neither Simon Fraser University nor the University of British Columbia has been sufficiently supportive of her work: “They do not value activist scholarship, defining that as a liability rather than as a real asset and as an important thing for departments to value. . . . To be labelled an activist or a public intellectual is treated as a very negative thing, which for me is very hard, even now, to come to terms with” (20). She adds: “I define my scholarship as activist scholarship and it's a struggle to maintain that balance [between academic work and work in the community outside the academy], especially in institutions that do not really reward you for it, that actually punish you for it” (24). As head of UBC’s Centre for Race, Autobiography, Gender, and Age Studies (RAGA), with its priority on developing links with the community outside the university, Thobani finds it “a big challenge to get a centre like that valued” (24). It has to be financially self-sustaining, since it receives no university funding. “There is also a problem in getting it recognized as legitimate work” (24). She rigorously defends networking, especially between Indigenous and racialized minority faculty and graduate students, and “an interdisciplinarity that is grounded in a sound political economy” so that all students have some understanding of such major forces as neoliberalism and globalization, “the major structures, systems and institutions of power that shape the social world” (25).

When *Toronto Star* columnist Heather Mallick (2014) opined that there currently is no “mainstream public face of women’s rights in this country,” comments poured in. Most disagreed with her, suggesting women’s names, including, from historian Veronica Strong-Boag:

There are loads of brave Canadian feminists in the present, as in the past. They just rarely get media attention. Sure wish we had the equivalent of the BBC’s Women’s Hour to bring them more directly to public notice. In Canada think of Mary Eberts, Judy Rebick, Francoise David, Margaret Atwood, Constance Backhouse, Cindy Blackstock, the founders of Idle No More, Elizabeth May, Olivia Chow, Niki Ashton, Carolyn Bennett, Kathleen Wynne.... and many, many more.

A conference held in PEI in fall 2014, on the 150th anniversary of the original Charlottetown conference that led to Confederation in 1867, seeking to identify 23 visionary women to stand in for the initial 23 nineteenth-century Fathers of Confederation, received hundreds of nominations from across the country (*A Bold Vision* 2014).

Some of those who responded to Mallick pointed to a younger generation of feminist journalists and bloggers, such as Meghan Murphy, Steph Guthrie, Anne Theriault, Kady O’Malley, and Shannon Fisher. They faulted the media for being ignorant about and/or simply ignoring feminists. One blogger signing herself “Maritime Woman” pointed to the vibrancy of a youth feminist movement in Atlantic Canada and said, “We don’t get much of a hearing but we’re here!” Steph Guthrie’s own comment posted online after Mallick’s column reads: “My group @WiTOpoli released an online election tool that trended nationally on the same day a columnist said Canadian feminism is dead.”

Still others turned Mallick’s criticism on its head and spoke positively about the lack of a single “public face” of feminism in Canada, suggesting that American-style celebrity culture is not in keeping with deeply held Canadian and feminist values, which are more collectivist. And

comedian Christine Walkinshaw commented, “There are TONS of Canadian feminists. Clearly, you’re more concerned about interviewing a celebrity though.” The responses suggest that, despite the odds, Canada has no shortage of women of ideas—and action.

Conclusion

So why are the achievements of feminist academic activists not more widely recognized, celebrated, and counted among our country’s most significant research and policy developments of the last four decades? Why is the term “public intellectual” rarely used when the reformer is a woman, especially one who identifies as feminist, especially if one is also Indigenous, racialized, or lesbian? Is “feminist intellectual” an oxymoron? Do women actually want to claim the title “public intellectual”? Does it seem affected, pretentious? Does the term falsely valorize the intellect to the neglect of the important connection between heart and head, emotion and reason? Does singling out individual women for acclaim run counter to the spirit of feminist collaboration and collective action?

Sometimes the self-esteem or self-confidence of even apparently strong women leaders may be low; possibly we don’t “lean in” enough (Sandberg and Scovell 2013). Dorothy Smith early in her stellar career admits that she “had difficulty in recognizing [her] own authority to speak in the discourse of male-dominated sociology” (Maxwell Syracuse University n.d.). CBC producer Talin Vartanian reports that even now, when she calls up women to invite them onto a panel as experts, they are often reluctant to accept, proposing others whom they consider to be better qualified—perhaps a lingering manifestation of that centuries-old feminine virtue of modesty. On the other hand, women who “toot their own horn” are often put down as mere “self-promoters.” It is a double-bind conflict.

When feminists do occupy public space and “own the podium,” they risk becoming targets of bullying and backlash. Sheila McIntyre was threatened with job loss and pilloried in sexist graffiti on the men’s bathroom wall at her workplace, Queen’s University. Kolodny and Monture-Angus had to fight fiercely for tenure. Thobani was threatened with an RCMP investigation. Joanne St. Lewis was tagged with a racist slur and cyber-bullied for years. Since 1995, there has been a progressive reduction or elimination of federal funding to women’s groups across Canada and a serious erosion of feminist infrastructure. On campus, Gender and Women’s Studies programs in universities have been under attack in the press (Carlson 2010; Kay 2010), had their budgets reduced, and even closed down (at the University of Guelph).

Another major factor is the ongoing marginalization of women’s expertise and women’s equality issues by mainstream media (Vartanian 2013). Mallick’s article is a tangible manifestation of this ignorance or neglect. Steph Guthrie @amirightfolks writes, “Hard not to be insulted by the ‘where are the Canadian feminists’ column. . . . We’re not amplified bc of #cdnmedia economy.” Zeb Pike writes, “Where are Canada’s young feminists? Everywhere, being ignored by our media.” Jessica Martin similarly blames the press: “Ms. Mallick clearly didn’t look very hard. The question is not ‘Why can’t Canada build a feminist? It’s ‘What is preventing Canadian feminists from getting a public platform and who is responsible for their erasure from the public eye?’”

In the end, as Wiseman (2013) admits, “Any selection of Canada’s public intellectuals is arbitrary if not randomly chaotic. One man’s [*sic*] public intellectual is another man’s [*sic*] propagandist and what public intellectuals produce varies in quality and appears in an imperfect market” (6). Ditto for any one woman’s criteria and choices. However, acknowledging imbalances and gaps, eliminating sexist language, debunking gender stereotypes, and heeding the lessons to be learned from life-writing by equity activists are good places to begin to change the dynamics of

the discourse. Years after the ordeal that produced her “Memo,” McIntyre (1988) reflected on the powerful results of sharing personal experience: “When women break our silence, our voices resonate in other women’s muted selves and something permanent shifts” (372). Let’s make it so.

Notes

¹ Women outnumber men in worldwide university enrolments and graduation rates, according to UNESCO’s 2009 Global Education Digest. The number of female students in tertiary education rose six-fold between 1970 and 2007 compared with a quadrupling of male enrolments during the same period (Fine, Sawahel, and Jarjour 2009).

² The fullest discussion is by Frances Henry and Carol Tator (2009). Another resource is “A Partial Picture: The Representation of Equity-Seeking Groups in Canada’s Universities and Colleges” (Canadian Association 2007).

³ It should be noted that men’s texts include a larger number written by academics at the higher ranks, including several university presidents; they date back to earlier decades, before there were many women faculty; and they are less likely than the women’s texts to be penned by academics of colour, members of the LGBTQ community, or the increasingly large contingent labour force who are precariously employed.

III. Who Gets to Be a Public Intellectual in Canada? Iga Mergler and Neil McLaughlin

Public intellectuals help define political and social debates in democratic societies, it is often argued, so one important way to study the place of women to those debates is to ask, “Who gets to be a public intellectual?” We will try to answer that question by examining two major Canadian English language newspapers, *The Globe and Mail* and the *National Post*, in order to address the role of women in the public sphere in English Canada. Updating research on the public intellectual debates from 1987 to 2005 (McLaughlin and Townsley 2011) we will analyze findings from the period 2006-2016. We will document how the concept of public intellectual is used, by whom, and who attributes the status of public intellectual to whom by emphasizing the gendered aspects of the process by which some individuals are accorded that designation. What exactly is meant by “public intellectual”?

Public Intellectuals: from Dreyfuss to Posner

Public intellectuals can be defined as academic scholars, independent intellectuals, journalists or other media professionals who write or speak clearly on issues of culture, politics, morality, or economics to a broad public outside narrow academic or policy circles in a capacity that goes beyond their professional and occupational roles (Jacoby 1987; Coser 1965; Kadushin 1974). It is neither a formal profession nor a set of standards by which we can judge the success and career progress of people who play the role (Colloni 2006; Townsley 2009; McLaughlin and Townsley 2011). In other words, there is no widely agreed upon definition of what a public intellectual actually is. And not everyone recognizes that giving a bigger platform to public intellectuals will contribute to the betterment of societies (Posner 2001). Some argue that public intellectuals are essential to a democratic society (Jacoby 1987); others maintain that expert professionals who only speak and write about what they know about improve public deliberations (Posner 2001).

Although discussion of the significance of public intellectuals is a recent phenomenon, the concept itself can be traced back to the late nineteenth century when a group of “intellectuals” defended a Jewish officer, Alfred Dreyfus, falsely accused of treason by the French government. This intervention came to symbolize the powerful role that intellectuals would play in opposing the status quo, educating the public, and thinking the unthinkable (Sassower 2014). Jacoby’s *The Last Intellectuals* (1987) laments that the public intellectual is an endangered species: academic professionalism, corporate and government sponsored think tanks, and a mass media-saturated culture make the independent social critic a relict. Jacoby was criticized for ignoring public intellectuals who come from marginalized groups: women, people of colour and sexual minorities (Brint 1994; Royce 1996; Said 1996). Members of these groups, including Cornel West, Toni Morrison, Henry Louis Gates Jr., bell hooks, Stephen L. Carter, and Patricia Williams (Boynton 1995; McLaughlin and Townsley 2011) critiqued the white male dominance of the public intellectual role. Despite criticism, *The Last Intellectuals* reinvigorated the debate among academics, journalists and intellectuals in the United States and internationally as the debate spread (Jacoby 1987; Posner 2001; Townsley 2004). Richard Posner took the discussion to a new level of media attention with his widely read book *Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline* (2001). Posner argues that the historic model is an example of market failure (Townsley 2004). Academics, he points out, are hired, paid and tenured for peer-reviewed scholarly work tightly controlled by professional norms (Whitely 1984). When they engage with issues outside their narrow expertise,

however, they can be drawn away from serious scholarly work (Posner 2001). Less is more for Posner when it comes to the matter of public intellectuals.

Debate on Public Intellectuals in the USA and Canada

Public intellectual debate spread to English Canada in earnest several years after the publication of *The Last Intellectuals* (1987) and *Public Intellectuals* (2001). In Canada professors have been criticized for their narrow professionalism, mediocre writing, and insularity, traits that have come to dominate current academic life, in contrast with prior more intellectually engaged decades (Townsend 2004; McLaughlin and Townsend 2011). What distinguishes the Canadian context from the American one is an enormous concern with the threat of public debate being hijacked by either British or American intellectuals. Consequently, some journalists have focused on the fragility of the category “Canadian” public intellectuals, more reliant than their southern neighbour on foreign models (see McLaughlin and Townsend 2011).

In both countries the debate has been dominated by white male representatives; as Raphael Sassower demonstrates, the most widely read lists of public intellectuals, created and published annually by *Foreign Policy* and *Prospect Magazine* have fewer than 30% women, 28.5% and 19.4% respectively (Sassower 2014, 101). From the late 1980s to the early twenty-first century not one woman figured among the top ten public intellectuals mentioned in Canadian newspapers. Among those cited were John Ralston Saul, Michael Ignatieff, Mark Kingwell, Noam Chomsky, Stephen Jay Gould, George Grant, Isaiah Berlin, Milton Friedman and Richard Posner (McLaughlin and Townsend 2011). Where are the Canadian women public intellectuals on these lists?

Missing Canadian Women Public Intellectuals

There has been very little systematic analysis of the gender aspects of who gets to be a public intellectual (Evans 2009). Bashevkin's contribution to the first major book published in Canada on this issue suggests that we are only beginning to look at the question of women who are public intellectuals in Canada. Who have been the most prominent spokeswomen in English Canada over the past ten years, and how does their representation compare to that of men? Most significantly, what are the implications of the gendered nature of intellectual life in light of broader debates about ideas and the public sphere?

The absent women's voices in Canada are linked to the larger phenomenon of underrepresentation of women in politics, journalism, the academy, and the media. We know that women have a significantly lower profile than men among op-ed writers (Kowalchuk and McLaughlin 2009; Powers 2005) and TV pundits, likely connected to their lesser representation in the professions dominating public debate. Politics, journalism and the academy are formalized occupations, and the underrepresentation of women has been studied and discussed in these fields with evidence from the sociology of organizations, work and gender (Bashevkin 2009; Trimble and Arscott 2003). The public intellectual, however, is neither a formal profession nor a set of standards by which we can judge the success and career progress of those who occupy the role (Colloni 2006; Townsend 2009; McLaughlin and Townsend 2011). Thus, not all women who might be considered candidates for the title want to be identified as such (Royce 1996; Paikin 2012a; Paikin 2012b).

Where are the Women Public Intellectuals?

The question of who is identified as a public intellectual is therefore not as simple as accounts in the media might suggest (Salutin 2010). An answer would require inquiry into complex

social, political and institutional circumstances where some are attributed the status or attribute it to others. One is given that particular label by others, or one can decide to describe and promote oneself using the term. One of the aims of this analysis is to explore how gender dynamics limit individual chances of being called a public intellectual. Alternatively, what motivates individuals to accept or claim this label? It is not possible to simply count public intellectuals in a straightforward way; a discourse analysis of the attribution and claiming of the term is required.

We identified instances of the term “public intellectual” in two English language newspapers, *The Globe and Mail* and *The National Post*, between 2001 and 2016. These were selected because both papers have large national circulations (nearly 2 million weekly and about 900,000 respectively). *The Globe and Mail* is widely regarded as the most influential national paper, and *The National Post* was identified in earlier research as being important for the diffusion of the term public intellectual in Canada (McLaughlin and Townsley 2011). The papers are similar in terms of their agenda; juxtaposing them allowed us to make comparisons, recognize emerging patterns and reach limited, yet still valuable generalizations about the debate in the national journalistic field in English Canada. We focussed on English Canada, leaving analysis of the debate in Quebec, largely because the term is not used commonly in French, and the context is very different in a civil society that values social criticism to a greater extent.¹

We conducted a textual analysis of each mention of the term, updating McLaughlin and Townsley (2011). We read three hundred articles from *The National Post* (n=166) and *The Globe and Mail* (n=138), counting the term to determine the frequency with which men and women have been recognized as public intellectuals. We identified articles that either attributed the status of public intellectual to men and women or offered a more general debate on the role and the relevance of public intellectuals, while mentioning particular individuals in that context. We did not code articles that used the term without attributing it to particular individuals. After screening for relevance, we read in a hundred general articles, 111 from *The Globe and Mail* and eighty from *The National Post* that used the term “public intellectual” and attributed it to individuals. Combined data from both papers demonstrated that on average men were eight times (8.6) more likely than women to be attributed the status of public intellectuals (for details see Appendix 1). On average seven times more men (117) were branded public intellectuals as compared to women (17). This was a consistent finding for both papers. The major difference between *The Globe and Mail* and *The National Post* was that the former still debated and discussed what the term means; the latter seemed to have accepted the term and concentrated on creating a ranking of the most prominent Canadian intellectuals, nominating far more men. Among the most often mentioned or quoted public intellectuals were Michael Ignatieff, Mark Kingwell, Conrad Black, Malcolm Gladwell, Charles Taylor, John Ralston Saul. Margaret Atwood was the only woman who appeared in that group of mostly academics, writers, journalists and politicians, as well as some activists and lawyers.

Only fifteen women were assigned the label of public intellectual in these newspapers: among them were eleven Canadians including Margaret Atwood, Naomi Klein, Linda McQuaig, Laura Penny, Jane Jacobs, Janice Gross Stein, Irshad Manji, Barbara Amiel, Septembre Anderson, Ursula Franklin, Margaret McMillan, and Michelle Swenarchuk (among non-Canadians were Susan Sontag, Annie Cohen-Solal, Dambisa Moyo, and Aung San Suu Kyi).

In addition to the difference in numbers, the status of public intellectual is ascribed to women differently. In both papers, attribution often takes place while introducing or quoting particular intellectual’s views for both genders. Thus, women as well as men are remembered: like Susan Sontag, Jane Jacobs, Lister Sinclair; praised like Ursula Franklin (“Franklin is pretty much

in a league of her own” [Dobbin 2006]) or Richard Florida (“one of the world’s leading public intellectuals on economic competitiveness” [Allemang 2008]); or simply introduced to readers (“Dambisa Moyo, celebrity economist” [Haupt 2011]).

Women are less often referred to as authors of opinions; instead, they are mentioned as one of a “rare species.” Exceptions to this occur when a journalist writes about how Annie Cohen-Solal interprets changes taking place in the world of art (Conlogue 2002), or responds to a Margaret Atwood review of a book by Conrad Black (Wente 2012), or when Linda McQuaig is criticized by a member of the journalism establishment because she “[wants] to raise rates [of taxes] to 70% for the super-rich” (Iverson 2013). Overall, only six articles in both papers cited and presented the opinions of women public intellectuals.

The opinions of men are discussed far more often. In *The Globe and Mail* we read about Régis Debray’s concept of “digital intellectuals” (Valpy 2001), George Ramsay Cook’s concepts of “limited identities” (Valpy 2006), Timothy Garton Ash’s balanced understanding of the “West” (Welsh 2004), or we became familiar with Bertrand Russell’s support for “free love” (Tucker 2006), Gore Vidal’s respect for Al Gore (Brean 2007), and Howard Gardner’s theory of intelligence (O’Toole 2009). In short, far more men than women are attributed public intellectual status, and the ideas of the few women called public intellectuals tended to be marginalized in the debates. What explains these patterns?

Historicizing “the Public” and “the Intellectual”

An analysis of this exclusion can help to provide a contextualization for, if not a partial explanation of, the relatively small presence of women public intellectuals today. The concept of itself contains contradictions that reflect its patriarchal history, both with regards to the idea of the “intellectual” and the notion of the “public.” Since women have been seen as intellectually inferior to men for centuries (see Small 2002), the term “female intellectual” was in the past seen as an oxymoron (Hind 2010). Even though the exclusion of women from intellectual life was challenged by individuals and by the feminist movement (Evans 2009, 30), until very recently the life of the mind and the social role of the intellectual was gendered male (Michael 2000, 34).

The contradictions of the “public” aspect of the public intellectual are just as deep-seated. This history of dual concepts of “intellectuals” and “public” can to a certain extent explain why there are still few women designated as public intellectuals today (Wisselgren 2009, 225). Since the 1960s, women in western societies can claim major victories in their fight against structural discrimination and the patriarchal mindset (Bashevkin 2013) and there are now far more women engaged in the public sphere as thinkers, writers, politicians and activists than was the case at any time in human history (Pleck 1990; Bashevkin 2009). Why then are there so few women public intellectuals?

Gender Gap in High-Rank Intellectually Oriented Professions

The absence of women can be more fully understood by looking at the contemporary status of women in the professions tending to produce public intellectuals. Empirical sociological research on the status of woman in the academy (Valian 2004; Pleck 1990), journalism (Lennon 2012), and politics (Krook 2010; Kenney 2008; Armstrong and Armstrong 2010) suggests that while there has been progress in each of these fields, women still play secondary roles. In such a landscape, the term public intellectual can only remain gendered.

Since the 1970s women have significantly altered their presence in academia (Pleck 1990). One third of all PhDs are awarded to women and they have served as board members, chairs of

committees, deans, presidents of universities as well as of major professional associations (Pleck 1990; Lin 2008; Ramos 2012). Additionally, they enrol in very high numbers in law and business degrees (Bashevkin 2009). Despite those unquestionable gains, women in academia have some distance to go to reach equality of opportunity. Systemic sexism remains a common occurrence in Canadian universities, affecting the position that women occupy (Samuel and Wane 2005; Warman et al. 2010). Women's work is still devalued compared to their male colleagues' work (Monreo et al. 2008). On a larger scale, female-dominated disciplines (such as nursing or social work) are often seen as less relevant than male-dominated STEM disciplines (Side and Robbins 2007). Because a large part of childcare is still done by women and because employers have been slow to create flexible work schedules (Finke 2005), the gap is hard to close.

As a consequence, female academics are less likely to be promoted to the rank of full-professors (Rosenwald 2011) or to occupy other positions such as research chairs. Instead, they are relegated to part-time or sessional work, earning far less money than men (Valian 2004, Monreo et al. 2008). In addition, women tend to publish less (Nakhaie 2002; Billard 1993), hence fewer awards and prizes are awarded to them and they are "underrepresented at top-tier institutions" (Valian 2004, Kay and Brockman 2000) and in the Canada Research Chairs program (Gullason 2017). Yet, more than 50 percent of graduate students are now female (Monroe et al. 2008).

The status of women in journalism does not differ much from that of women in academia. Historically, women were seen as unfit to work in the vulgar, aggressive and masculine environment of the newsroom, an occupation that also required working long and flexible hours (Volz and Lee 2013). In the United States, few women sit on the boards of media institutions and few are leaders, or executive directors (Lennon 2012). They also earn less than their male colleagues (Lennon 2012). Women journalists are also awarded fewer prizes (Volz and Lee 2013) and they write fewer opinion pieces (Kirsten 2005). In Canada women are less likely to be promoted to senior management positions and their salaries are lower (Hong 2013). In *Who Makes the News?* Kathleen Cross (2010) demonstrates that the status of women in Canadian media is still a problem. Women are underrepresented among newsmakers (5), rarely quoted as "experts, spokespersons for organizations," and rarely interviewed in the realms of politics, crime, international affairs and economics. Men are four times more likely to appear in the major Canadian newspapers, talk shows, and radio programs than are women (Graydon quoted in Dionne 2013). Finally, women are less likely to be authors of opinion pieces (Kowalchuk and McLaughlin 2009). Given the relatively marginal positions that women hold in the field of journalism, only a very small number are nominated as influential intellectuals ("2013 Media Monitoring Research" n.d.).

Canadian politicians are still overwhelmingly men (Tremblay and Andrew 1998). It has been well documented that women are a minority in high-ranking roles "such as candidates and office holders" (Bashevkin 2009; Trimble and Arscott 2003; Trimble and Arscott 1996, 3; Megyery 1991), and especially underrepresented in key positions such as premiers, cabinet ministers and legislators (Trimble and Arscott 2003). Women have "uncertain opportunities for alliance building within and across parties" (Trimble and Arscott 2003, 158) and they are easily judged and ostracized for behaviour considered inappropriate to women. Such conventions limit women's effectiveness and ability to demonstrate leadership skills. Since women are still underrepresented there (Bird 2003), despite Justin Trudeau's cabinet appointments, few will be recognized as public intellectuals.

Internal organizational dynamics may well explain the absence of women public intellectuals in academia, journalism and politics, but this misses a key feature of the role of the public intellectual for it is not a profession at all (Posner 2001). From a third shift perspective (the extra work expected of women), few women can scale the hierarchy of established intellectual professions while juggling the second shift of family responsibilities, let alone the third shift as public intellectuals (Johnston 2005). This was well articulated in the widely publicized debate about the lack of gender balance in Steve Paikin's *Agenda*,² an important public affairs show run by TV Ontario. Paikin has a national profile as an independent voice in the field of journalism. He regularly invites academic, politicians, journalists, writers, and scientists from Canada and around the world to comment, reflect on and debate public affairs, culture and politics. The show has been criticized for being male-dominated, and Paikin set off a Twitter firestorm³ by suggesting that his staff struggles on a weekly, if not daily basis, to book female academics, journalists, politicians, and thinkers (2012). Paikin claimed that sexism was not to blame but that program guests such as Sheri Graydon, Kathy English and Armin Yalnizyan cited family responsibilities as a major reason why women decline to appear as experts or public intellectuals.

Women also declined invitations from the conviction that they “are not the best people to ask,” a response producers interpreted in two ways. Women reported that they rarely felt expert enough to address a particular topic. Second, they sent a message that they were aware of the risks commentary could entail, i.e., ruining their reputations among their peers who have greater expertise. Numerous studies corroborate women's propensity to undervalue themselves when negotiating a raise, applying for a job, taking exams, competing with male colleagues, expressing opinions, or exerting control over their employees (Heward 1996; Fischlmayr 2002; Colbeck et al. 2001; Barron 2003; Major et al. 1984). Shari Graydon has found that Canadian journalists who approached women experts for commentary were often told that there were better and more qualified people to contact.

However, Sylvia Bashevkin (2009) suggests that women should not be judged harshly for projecting insufficient levels of confidence; those who speak out have been penalized, ridiculed, called masculine, and “not properly socialized” (38). Such rhetoric described the media treatment of Linda McQuaig of the NDP and her competitor Christia Freeland of the Liberal Party during the 2013 Toronto Centre by-elections: “Who knew how well each woman would embody her leader's main calling card, McQuaig channelling Tom Mulcair's fearless—some would say ruthless—prosecution of the PMO's role in the Senate scandal during Question Period; and Freeland emulating Justin Trudeau's ‘I'm on the high road here’ civility he argues voters really want” (Timson 2013). The media dissects women's personality traits, age and looks far more than those of their male colleagues (Bashevkin 2009; Graydon, Yalnizyan, and English in Paikin 2012). Women receive different treatment than men and their confidence must be affected.

The Role of Journalists in the Attribution Process

The debate about the absent women public intellectuals on the *Agenda* reflects larger debates about the dynamics of the intellectual professions, women's own choices or the internal processes within the journalism. Among other reasons explaining lower numbers of women, identified by guests on Steve Paikin's *Agenda Plus*, included the role of journalists in the attribution process (e.g., Kathy English). Many journalists in the broader field in Canada may, consciously or not, fail to label women academics, politicians and journalists as public intellectuals or they draw on insufficient networks or referral systems among women in high-rank positions. Pressures of time may push journalists to book the most easily accessible or the most visible

individuals, who still tend to be men. Even when women are mentioned, those few journalists who attribute the status of public intellectual to women often overlook them as the authors of ideas. Instead, women public intellectuals function as tokens or members of a rare species.

An Integrated Explanation: The Problem of Numbers

The under-representation of women in our sample can be explained by a combination of all these factors, but Rosabeth Kanter in her classic *Men and Women of the Corporation* (1997) provides a powerful lens that helps us to understand the lack of engagement with women's intellectual ideas. For Kanter, women who are the first to enter professional or occupational fields, face a barrier more intense than simply the chauvinistic attitudes of men or the tensions created by the second shift of household responsibilities. According to Kanter, drawing on the earlier insights of German sociologist Georg Simmel, the numbers game has its logic. From this perspective, being among the first few women to enter into a field at its higher echelons is far harder than the situation faced when numbers are closer to parity as they are in some sectors of the professional world today. Thus, women public intellectuals are outnumbered at this point in time despite the academy, journalism and politics slowly becoming more gender- balanced.

Kanter's theory has to be modified for this study, however, because her work and the extensive literature that flows from it focuses on corporate power. Public intellectuals are generally designated as such only *after* having secured employment and status within the academy, journalism and politics. It makes sense for women to put less emphasis on claiming public intellectual status, given the demands on their time, the professional risks of public visibility and the discrimination they face in their own fields and from the journalists who attribute public intellectual status. Because there are so few women considered public intellectuals in the Canadian context, despite intense public pressure for more gender parity, it seems only logical that women who are assigned that category are discussed as breaking the gender barrier and not for the ideas that found them audiences in the first place.

This picture is however even more complex when we recognize that addressing the question of women public intellectuals is not the same as addressing gender parity among professors, journalists or politicians *precisely* because of debates about whether being a public intellectual is a desirable aspiration. This is not only an issue of exclusion and access, since some women might refuse to express their opinions or share their expertise in the style practiced by male public intellectuals. Some women eschew the role because they reject its traditional and essentially gendered nature, rooted, one could argue, in authoritative, self-referential, confrontational, self-confident, exclusionary and elitist norms that are hard to separate from masculine norms (Vickers 1993; Trimble and Arscott 2003). Those who do not fit that mould will be criticized and dismissed.

Women might want to enter the public sphere on their own terms, creating their own definitions. Some might want to enter elite academic professions, establishing scholarly credentials partly by avoiding generalist commentary and polemic. There is no reason to assume that women will agree with Jacoby that we need more public intellectuals, or disagree with Posner, who argues for more academic knowledge production. Women journalists may want to follow the norms of balanced reporting, presently under siege in our politically polarized and wired world, thus gaining reputations as quality journalists rather than public intellectuals. And for some women, becoming the leader of a political party in Canada, or bringing more gender parity to our parliament may be a far more important goal than being regarded as the next Mark Kingwell or Michael Ignatieff.

Moreover, to Indigenous intellectuals and political activist-intellectuals who have insightful and important contributions to make to contemporary culture and politics, the mantle of

the public intellectual signals the white male dominated world of the eighteenth-century Western-centered vision (Bauman 1987). Indigenous writers, artists and activists (Lee Maracle, Ellen Gabriel, Pamela Palmater and the new social media voice of Erica Violet Lee) who are organic intellectuals challenging the neo-colonial *status quo* reject being labelled, do not fit into the category and model of intellectuals engaging with the bourgeois public sphere defined and created by settler-colonialism itself. Similar attitudes can be seen in women from other disenfranchised groups (people of colour, immigrants, members of religious minorities, LGBTQ plus communities); they often do not want to be identified through the homogenizing, identity-disappearing signifier “Canadian” or the gendered and mainstream term “public intellectual.” Other racialized and marginalized women, however, embrace the label, status and potential influence with enthusiasm.

Sociological patterns observed in the past fifty years suggest that there will be increased gender parity in the academy, journalism and politics in North America. With numerical barriers broken or at least breached, will we be more likely to see women’s ideas discussed more prominently? From the perspective of equity, the goal should be ensuring that more woman claim to be and are considered as public intellectuals.

Some will insist on a deeper question, asking if it might be possible to transform the role of the public intellectual itself, replacing it with “dialoguing intellectuals” (both men and women) who are critical and passionate, who engage academic knowledge, yet try to locate a common language with public interlocutors outside peer-reviewed and elite audiences. We are convinced that women will play a central role in re-envisioning intellectual roles into the twenty-first century.

By the Numbers:

Appendix 1

8 Canadian women labelled PI in <i>National Post</i>:	number of times labelled PI
Margaret Atwood writer commentator	2
Linda McQuaig journalist author	2
Naomi Klein- journalists, author, activist	2
Jane Jacobs journalists, activist, urban thinker	1
Irshad Manji educator, author	1
Margaret McMillan historian professor	1
Laura Penny academic	1
Septembre Anderson- free-lance writer, journalist	1

5 Canadian women labelled PI in <i>The Globe and Mail</i>:	number of times labelled PI:
Margaret Atwood- writer, literary critic	4
Naomi Klein-journalists, author, activist	2
Ursula Franklin- metallurgist, physicist	2
Janice Gross Stein- political scientists	1
Michelle Swenarchuk- activist environmentalist	1

17 Canadian men labelled PI in the <i>National Post</i>	number of times labelled PI:
Michael Ignatieff- author, academic, politician	20
Malcolm Gladwell- author, journalist speaker	6
Mark Kingwell - professor of philosophy	5
Conrad Black - newspaper publisher, writer	5

Don Cherry - Canadian ice hockey commentator	4
John Ralston Saul- author essayist	4
Richard Florida - professor urban theorist	3
Tom Flanagan- author political activist professor	2
Charles Taylor - philosopher	2
Michael Bliss- historian author	3
Mark Steyn- writer, political commentator	2
Charles Krauthammer-author, political commentator	2
Sky Gilbert-writer academic	2
Jean-François Lisée- politician	1
Tom Mulcair- politician	1
Steven Pinker- academic	1
Robert Holmes Thomson- actor	1

21 Canadian men labelled PI in *The Globe and Mail*: number of times labelled PI:

Michael Ignatieff- politician, academic	30
Stephen Harper- politician	5
Mark Kingwell- professor, philosophy	4
Pierre Trudeau- politician	4
Conrad Black- publisher, author	3
Malcolm Gladwell- journalist, author	3
Charles Taylor-philosopher	3
Don Cherry, Sports- commentator	3
Northrop Frye, literary critic, literary theorist	2
George Parkin Grant- educator, author	2
John Ralston Saul- essayist, author	2
Lister Sinclair, Broadcaster	2
Jeet Heer- freelance writer	1
Richard John Neuhaus- cleric, writer	1
Andrew Potter author, editor-in-chief	1
George Jonas-writer, poet, journalist	1
Abraham Rotstein- economist	1
Paul Forster- academic	1
Claude Ryan- journalist, politician	1
Noah Richler-author, journalist, broadcaster	1
Ramsay Cook-historian	1

Notes

¹ France is, of course, the original home to the engaged public intellectual and a preliminary analysis of the French language media in Quebec did not yield enough use of the term for an analysis to be useful (McLaughlin and Townsley 2011). In France the concept of the “intellectual”, however, does require the public modifier, and generally the same pattern is found in French language newspapers in Quebec, thus making this kind of comparative analysis more difficult.

² Since then *The Agenda* producers seems to have managed to change the situation.

³ See “#WomanOnlyExcusesForPaikin.”

IV. Four Contemporary Canadian Women Intellectuals Negotiate the Challenges of Public Sphere Witnessing: Dionne Brand, Samantha Nutt, Sheila Watt-Cloutier, and Janice Williamson

Diana Brydon

The subject of intellectuals has been about as gender-neutral as pro football.
Wendy Robbins 1990, xvii

Working at the intersection of postcolonial, feminist, and globalization studies, this essay considers the generic choices and rhetorical strategies adopted by four Canadian women intellectuals who address such matters of public importance as global violence, environmental destruction, and national and global citizenship in their published writing, which is intended for the broader educated public. These women—poet and writer-activist Dionne Brand, indigenous and environmental activist Sheila Watt-Cloutier, humanitarian anti-war activist Samantha Nutt, and university-based editor Janice Williamson—are semi-public presences who are making a difference beyond their specific fields of expertise, yet who are seldom discussed as public intellectuals, even when they are sometimes called upon to perform such roles. I label them semi-public to suggest they do not have the reach of mainstream entertainment figures or successful politicians and thus do not directly influence a mass audience, but their work is relatively well known within educated circles. Although they do not have the widespread name recognition of a Margaret Atwood or a Naomi Klein, their work has been well-received and afforded varying degrees of significant recognition. Dionne Brand received the Order of Canada in 2017. Watt-Cloutier's book *The Right to Be Cold* (2015) was a contender in the 2017 CBC Canada Reads contest. Samantha Nutt has appeared on television panels addressing international issues and received an honorary degree from the University of Windsor in 2016. The sole academic in this group, Janice Williamson, is herself less well-known but the subject of her 2012 book, Omar Khadr, has been very much in the news, on a sporadic basis, since his incarceration as a child soldier in Guantanamo Bay in 2002, and the subsequent 2017 awarding of an apology from the Canadian government with a compensation package for the injustices he suffered during that time.

These women are intellectuals in the sense that their work is well informed, carefully reasoned, and works with both the intellect and emotions of their readers to communicate a reasoned and passionate critique of how the world works today. They fit Edward Said's definition of the intellectual as someone who opens spaces "to raise embarrassing questions, to confront orthodoxy and dogma (rather than produce them), to be someone who cannot easily be coopted by governments or corporations, and whose *raison d'être* is to represent all those people and issues that are routinely forgotten or swept under the rug" (1996, 11). In fulfilling these functions, they are the opposite of what Daniel W. Drezner (2017) disparagingly calls "thought leaders" in *The Ideas Industry* (234).¹ Yet neither do they comfortably fit the category of the academic public intellectual, a category that has received considerable attention since the last two decades of the twentieth century along with variously articulated concerns about the decline of the humanities and the role of public humanities under neoliberal globalization. Much of this work addresses the role of intellectuals based in the North American higher educational system, a discussion I will not enter here.

Although Brand now works as a creative writing instructor within a university setting, her influence comes largely through writing that is non-academic in nature. Only Williamson performs

the role of the academic intellectual, yet even she, in choosing to commission and edit a wide-ranging collection of responses to the human rights case of Omar Khadr, mutes her own voice and expertise in English literary studies in favour of bringing his story and its implications into the arena of interdisciplinary public debate. In each of these examples, I am interested in the extent to which a combined focus on gender and writing compels a rethinking of public intellectual discourse, especially as it is practised in Canada in 2017. By looking at what these women have published, I ask what their work can tell us about Canadian public sphere politics and poetics; the status of women's expertise; the nature of women's interventions; and the challenges faced by women who assume a role that continues to be conventionally gendered masculine. The texts I examine here are addressed to an educated reading public. They require a response in which the intellect is actively involved. Understanding that such an approach limits their audience, these writers employ various strategies to engage intellect and emotion in tandem. I stress this point because some may wonder why I choose to stretch the assumed, highly gendered definitions of the public intellectual to include these women writers rather than simply accept a new term for the kind of influence they seek to exert through their writing.

In "What's 'New' about Public Intellectuals Today?" David Palumbo-Liu (2016) asks what roles "differentiate the intellectual from any other public voice?" (157). He argues that academic intellectuals have a responsibility to employ various social platforms, including those afforded by emergent new media. But he does not address the rise of opinion leaders based outside the academy whose postings may operate according to other standards of truth-seeking, truth-telling, or general persuasiveness. Jeffrey Di Leo and Peter Hitchcock (2016) argue two important points about this changing context. Firstly, that "public intellectuals today operate within a set of conditions very different from those of Sartre and Beauvoir—or even Said and Sontag" (x). Secondly, that "the more 'public' or 'popular' the intellectual, the less seriously he or she is regarded, particularly by other intellectuals" (x). This situation creates a difficult navigational terrain for contemporary intellectuals who wish to retain their traditional authority while also reaching out to broader audiences.

The "thought leaders" Drezner critiques feel no such compunctions. In setting up a binary opposition between skeptical thinkers who acknowledge complexity and thought leaders who promote a single "big idea," he raises questions of a diminishing audience attention span and desire for quick fixes that further limit the audience for public intellectual work. In naming their featured public lectures at the yearly academic Congress, "Big Ideas," the Humanities and Social Sciences Federation of Canada risks falling into this trap. Drezner's warning is salutary. However, this binary itself is too simplistic. We live in a time of multiple reframings of the public intellectual category. Academic public intellectuals and "movement intellectuals" (Machado-Casas, Bustos Flores, and Murillo, Jr. 2015) seek to reframe the concept of the public intellectual in relation to education for social influence or change respectively. Erin Wunker and Travis V. Mason discuss poet Sina Queyras' blog *Lemon Hound*, describing it "as now an indispensable website for public debates about politics and poetics—debates that often spill out into other social media—yet Queyras is ambivalent about starting (and continuing) the blog" (12). Queyras herself works through the complexities of taking up public space and speaking from an explicitly gendered position in her essay, "Public Poet, Private Life: 20 Riffs on the Dream of a Communal Self." The women whose work I discuss here may not fit easily into any of these sub-categories. In the breadth of its coverage, public intellectual may remain the better fit.

Each of these Canadian women has functioned as activist and witness to injustice in ways that differentially locate the Canadian public sphere in its historical and global contexts. Brand is

a black feminist, lesbian, and anti-racist writer-activist who has published poetry, fiction, short stories, a memoir and has served as poet laureate for the city of Toronto. Nutt is a practising physician, Executive Director of War Child Canada and War Child U.S.A., who has extended her humanitarian international activism into writing the book *Damned Nations: Greed, Guns, Armies and Aid* (2011), which uses episodic accounts of her adventures in a variety of overseas arenas to humanize her causes. Watt-Cloutier has headed the International Inuit Circumpolar Council, been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, and extended her activism into writing an autobiography, *The Right to Be Cold: One Woman's Story of Protecting Her Culture, the Arctic and the Whole Planet* (2015), in the hope of drawing further attention to the issues she espouses. Williamson (2012) is an English professor alarmed by the “human rights abuses and Islamophobia in the post 9/11 environment of fear” and the ways in which these implicate Canada through the horrifying story of Omar Khadr, whose case represents “the first modern-day prosecution of a child soldier and the only captive to be held responsible for a battlefield killing of a US service member in Iraq or Afghanistan” (4). Her anthology, *Omar Khadr, Oh Canada* (2012), published with a university press, asks Canadians “to reflect on what has been done in our name during the era of Omar Khadr, not only to the person but to our country” (3). As a multi-voiced text, her anthology enlarges the conventional single-voiced function of a public intellectual who “speaks truth to power,” to amplify the voices of others and complicate the debates around a pressing yet under-examined issue.

The need for her book was made very clear in July 2017 when news of the apology first surfaced. While informed opinion and a majority of editorials in the mainstream press treated the decision responsibly, the opposition party at the time stirred angry emotional responses based on misinformation and biased accounts of the issues at stake. Her book did not play the role that it might have in informing such discussions, had it been able to reach a wider audience. In an effort to make the book more accessible, it included a timeline, brief personal responses, and creative reflections in poetry and drama alongside various documents and the script of a documentary film. These function alongside academic analyses provided by lawyers and cultural critics to illuminate the stakes and educate readers about the facts of this case. The achievement is significant, yet without a wide readership what can one conclude about the scope of its public intellectual effect? How wide can the reach of such writing ever be? How wide can it be in current times when many are turning away from printed text for their news, entertainment, and education?

Like Williamson, each of these writers raises matters of concern that go beyond the national while also stressing Canadians’ implications in their development. In this sense, each challenges Canadian myths of innocence along with the idea that national borders insulate what happens “here” from “there.” Each example puts pressure on conventional notions of the public intellectual; each text addresses key contemporary concerns; yet these contributions to shaping public debates, well received as they have been in certain circles, have not yet been accorded the attention they deserve as works of public intervention. In seeking to rectify that situation, this essay will also seek to understand it.

Despite the evidence that there remains considerable academic and media investment in the idea of the public intellectual, it may be that the term has outlived its usefulness. To the extent that recognition as a public intellectual now performs a branding function, which expands a person’s reach even as it constrains his or her ability to move outside branded limits, such recognition might prove counter-productive. But in a personality-obsessed age, is it possible to move beyond the identity of an individual to a consideration of the function of their work in addressing and raising questions and changing minds through the quality of the arguments

presented and the emotional impact of the stories shared? To what extent can the work speak for itself, and to what extent does it depend on the name recognition of its author or the respect that person can command?

Who Is the Public Intellectual?

The question of how to frame a discussion of Canadian women as public intellectuals, free to speak their minds, be heard, and exert influence within public arenas, is more challenging than it might at first seem. Commonly assumed understandings of what constitutes *a* public, or in another view, *the* public, where it is to be found, and who counts as an intellectual are thrown into doubt with the insertion of gender into the mix. Despite the odd exception that usually serves to prove the rule, the normative figure of *the* public intellectual remains male. Feminism has certainly challenged this norm but the very terms in which that challenge still needs to be put indicates its failure, as yet, to take hold. Slogans such as “women’s rights are human rights” or like “black lives matter” show clearly that even claims to full humanity, let alone to the exalted (or increasingly castigated) status of the intellectual, remain controversial because they are not yet part of a taken-for-granted reality. Bruce Robbins (1990b), in the epigraph to this paper, notes the problem of the gendered specificity of the intellectual and notes also, briefly, his failure to address it (xvii). Given conventional associations of women with the private, as opposed to the public sphere, the idea of the *public* intellectual only exacerbates this problem. In coining the phrase, “the personal is political,” second stage feminists sought to change the epistemological frame through which public and private were ordered, but such a strategy has proved a double-edged sword. In seeking to meld autobiographical anecdote and political commentary, both Nutt and Watt-Cloutier risk producing texts that fail to challenge the entrenched boundaries separating public and private. Although both may claim considerable expertise, their books rely on personal and affective experiences to make their claim to readers’ attention. I will consider the implications of these decisions further below.

In “What Is a Public Intellectual?” Australian writer Robert Dessaix (1998a) explains that “almost all of those public intellectuals who are female are forced to assume cameo roles: they’re wheeled out for a quick grab on abortion, lesbianism or women in the church and then pushed off abruptly back into the wings before they can start chattering on about wider, weightier issues” (5). In such a scenario, women are consigned to the sphere of the “special interest,” whereas men retain claim to the universal. The situation he describes in 1998 Australia may have changed somewhat thirty years later, yet possibly not as much as one might assume. Brigid Rooney’s 2009 *Literary Activists: Writer-Intellectuals and Australian Public Life* includes three women and four men, but without addressing gender as an issue. Her interest, like that of Dessaix before her, falls instead on the relation of intellectuals and writers to the national public sphere. Yet by shifting the focus from the public intellectual to writer-intellectuals, she implicitly discovers more scope for women, especially in the role of literary activists. This essay pursues the idea that it is in writing where women may find their greatest potential for cracking open the borders that preserve the function of the public intellectual for primarily male participants.

The 1990 anthology *Language in Her Eye* pursues “the relationship of feminism to writing” (Scheier, Sheard, and Wachtel 1990b, 14) in ways that remain illuminating today. The diversity of voices and experiences included in this anthology cautions against generalization. Margaret Atwood’s opening article, while recognizing what she describes as women’s “shoddy lot in this world” (1990, 21), embraces what she seems to see as the implicitly non-gendered roles of “citizen” and “writer,” rather than that of “woman.” While it might seem obvious that not all writers may be conflated within the Writer and not all citizens can be reduced to the Citizen, it is

only the category of Woman that she cautions against, insisting that “Women are not Woman” (22). Her ambivalence about the status and function of this gendered category emerges even more in her conclusion. In answer to her rhetorical question, “Does it make sense to silence women in the name of Woman?” she affirms, “We can’t afford this silencing or this fear” (25). Rhetorically, this is fascinating. Does this “we” refer only to women, to certain women, or to everyone, whatever their gender? It is hard to say. Atwood makes it clear that it is other women who are silencing women writers and citizens with their insistence on the primacy of gender as a category of analysis so that an essay that begins with the many ways in which women are silenced concludes with an emphasis on the ways in which women, even in seeking liberation, remain complicit with such strictures of polite colonial society as that inscribed in her title, “If You Can’t Say Something Nice, Don’t Say Anything at All.” Clearly such a command forbids women from performing the critical functions of the public intellectual, and clearly much of Atwood’s career has developed in defiance of that command. Yet her ambivalence about what she terms “isms” (21), and her readiness to accept the reduction of feminist critique to an “ism,” shows the tenacity and insidiousness of the barriers faced by the female public intellectual. Atwood’s essay implicitly performs and re-inscribes some of the rules of what Daniel Coleman subsequently has analyzed as “white civility” in his *White Civility: The Literary Project of English Canada* (2006).

Many of the personal essays in *Language in Her Eye* testify to writing “as a profoundly transgressive act” for women (Brandt 1990, 54) and an entrance into spaces implicitly or explicitly gendered as less open to them. Some describe the self-censorship that comes with the recognition that attention to gender invites hostility from many quarters. Susan Crean (1990), for example, confesses that given such a context, “the truth is there are limits to one’s desire for public attention” (88). Those limits, far from decreasing in the years since she made this observation, appear to be exacerbated in current times, especially through the opportunities for harassment afforded by social media.

So perhaps it is no surprise that the introduction to Joel Faflak and Jason Haslam’s 2013 collection *The Public Intellectual and the Culture of Hope* contains only two brief acknowledgements of gender, explaining (much as Robbins had earlier): “This (gendered) sense of intellectual cum moral progression is endemic to classical ethical, aesthetic, and political thought (think of Plato’s or Aristotle’s anxieties about the potentially de-rationalizing and emasculating effects of metaphor)” (Faflak and Haslam 2013a, 12). That bracketed reference to gendered Greek anxieties is repeated a page later in the claim: “It is no coincidence, then, that Katherine R. Larson’s chapter for this volume traces the (gendered) role of the public intellectual to early modern culture” (13). In other words, gender is no longer invisible. It requires a nod, if only a bracketed one. But its fundamental role as a game-changer remains less obvious, or at least less often discussed, except in feminist circles.

In an important essay, “Navigating Gendered Spaces: Women as Public Intellectuals,” published in 2013, Sylvia Bashevkin explains that “Women’s visibility as public intellectuals . . . tended to ebb and flow with the fortunes of feminist movements, such that quiescent times (including the present) tend not to be promising in terms of breaking out of this pattern” (111). This pattern is that of a public/private split that “not only constrained the discursive space in which a small number of female public intellectuals could operate, since that terrain was narrower than the turf available to males, but also obscured women’s contributions” (110). Her analysis of the obstacles that remain in place is sobering. In particular, the arrival of web-based alternatives to traditional academic and mainstream media dissemination is unlikely to make much of a positive difference. It tends to fragment readership into predetermined and more separated communities

and increase emphasis on visibility in ways that continue to disadvantage women. It opens new avenues for trivializing women's achievements through a focus on body image, and it enables new forms of harassment.

Bashevkin's article is especially important for its focus on Canadian spheres of engagement within a book addressing the specificity of this national context. Contemporary writing investigating the figure of the public intellectual often assumes a normative context based in the United States. Texts discussing public intellectuals in non-American contexts are required to indicate their deviation from this assumed norm in their titles. Thus, books such as Robbins' *Intellectuals: Aesthetics, Politics, Academics* (1990), cited earlier, need not specify a grounding in American politics in their titles, even though that grounding is clearly specified in the book's introduction, whereas. By contrast, further modification is needed upfront in texts that designate alternative contexts, such as Oliver Lovesey's, *The Postcolonial Intellectual: Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o in Context* (2015), or Robert Dessaix's collection, *Speaking Their Minds: Intellectuals and the Public Culture in Australia* (1998), cited above. Even a text published out of Canada that provides a relatively broad historical and geographical range such as Faflak and Haslam's *The Public Intellectual and the Culture of Hope* (2013) locates the origins of its inspiration in "the 2008 U.S. election" and the rhetoric of Barack Obama's presidential campaign before moving into a broader global context (Faflak and Haslam 2013a, 3).

Dessaix (1998b) cites Stanley Fish: "A public intellectual is someone who takes as his or her subject matters of public concern, and *has the public's attention*" (10). Despite the gesture to gender inclusivity, this definition begs the issue of who qualifies as "the public," what counts as "attention," and who makes those determinations. Indeed for many, it is the changing quality of public attention that is at stake for determining the influence of a public intellectual. A seldom-examined dimension of the quality of public attention is its duration and its capacity to ensure that a public intellectual's intervention enters public memory as a precedent that might change perceptions. I think here of Marlene Nourbese Philip's (usually credited as M. NourbeSe Philip) essay in *Language in Her Eye* (reprinted from *Fuse*) in which she patiently explains the politics of the "quantum leap from racism to censorship" that she observed in a number of controversies during the late 1980s as a feature of the "dominant cultures of liberal democracies like Canada" (1990, 209). She notes that "The annual General Meeting of the Writers' Union in May [1989] has, in fact, confirmed how little interest the union has in even acknowledging the existence of racism in writing and publishing in Canada" (216). The intractability of that problem—of what Gayatri Spivak (1999) might term a "sanctioned ignorance" (279, 337)—was again revealed by Hal Niedzviecki's editorial in the *Writer's Union of Canada* magazine, *Write*, introducing their special issue of indigenous writing in Spring 2017, in which he argued in favour of a "cultural appropriation prize" (see Lederman and Medley 2017). He felt free to ignore the structural analyses provided by Philip and others, as if in his mind they were erased from the public record; and equally free to refuse to engage the arguments made by indigenous writers against his position within that very issue. Although in the short term, there was a public outcry against his position and the support he received from the media establishment, and there remains a chance that this time the analysis may stick, my point is that earlier interventions by racialized women intellectuals had not been registered or remembered by many holding privileged media positions.

While some borders shift over time, this incident reveals that others remain intransigent. Boundaries between public and private, however, do seem to be shifting, and if women are no longer consigned solely to a private sphere, their occupation of public space, in person, archival memory, and digital spaces, remains contested. Michael Warner's book *Publics and*

Counterpublics (2002) brings together eight essays problematizing the idea of a public in order to show its complexity, its contingency, and its situatedness in place and time. As Ian Angus (2001) notes, citing Nancy Fraser, “there is always a plurality of competing public spheres” (89). These can be designated in multiple ways. Not all intellectuals qualify as public intellectuals. What differentiates these two? Most intellectuals make their work public in some shape or form, usually in writing, yet increasingly only certain kinds of public address seem to qualify. Eleanor Townsley (2015) differentiates public intellectuals from media and academic intellectuals. To this list, we might add activist intellectuals and writer-activists.

The title of the second conference of the two that have given rise to the book in which this chapter appears was “Speaking Her Mind: Canadian Women and Public Presence.” What does it mean to speak one’s mind? I am afraid that to most people it means speaking from a position of certainty and authority, out of a belief that one is right. This model of the public intellectual as the pundit or the expert is far too dominant in our world. Edward Said can be credited with reviving the heroic figure of the unaligned intellectual who bravely “speaks truth to power,” often from a position of exile. Such a model is in tension with that of a Gramscian organic intellectual who speaks out of and for a community, as do the writers discussed here. Whereas Nutt and Watt-Cloutier speak out of their observations in the field with a clear sense of policy prescription, Brand and Williamson present works that think through a question by examining it from multiple perspectives. Theirs is a more tentative and exploratory speaking as a thinking through, a moving in and around and out from a question to examine it from many sides. These two models are not rigidly gendered. There are men and women who speak their minds in both ways. Both are necessary. In this essay, I am more interested in the second model, which itself can be broken down in relation to ideas about speech, who can speak and be heard in a public forum, and who can gain recognition as a public presence. Internet trolling and the harassment of women journalists make it very clear that women who assume a public role are taking more risks than men who do the same. Many see such acts on the parts of women as a threat or a violation of previously assumed norms. Of course, some women speak out anyway and manage to make a difference. Nonetheless, even more women choose writing over speech as their preferred mode for communicating their ideas. The written text still has the capacity to reach a large number of people so that even those who are primarily activists, such as Nutt and Watt-Cloutier, find producing a book a necessary extension of their work. Activists who tell their stories to further their causes, they have produced hybrid texts that combine the personal and the political in ways designed to make complex problems more accessible.

Generic Choices of the Contemporary Public Intellectual

Much of the current work on the academic public intellectual asks whether the printed text in the form of the book is the necessary medium for intellectual communication. While many conclude with J. Hillis Miller (“Should We Read or Teach Literature Now?” 2016) that long-form and intensive reading of the kind demanded by the book is dying, his co-author, Ranjan Ghosh, chooses to avoid the question of what Miller (2016b) calls “ubiquitous digitalization” (176), choosing to focus instead on the educative value even of resistance to reading and learning in the classroom (Ghosh 2016b). Ghosh (2016a) expands on the dialogue created in their book in his “Epilogue”: “Our transactional listening to each other has, hopefully, opened literature as a democratic community where readers are welcome to install and invest their inputs through a separate level of listening that may not be docile always” (259). Although much of the discussion on intellectual outreach now focusses on the strengths and weaknesses of new media platforms, it

is too early to declare the death of the book. Within that medium, it may be helpful to consider the generic choices made by each of the women under consideration here.

Brand's poetry and fiction perform important acts of intellectually-informed and affect-laden witnessing to contemporary injustices, but because they have received significant critical attention elsewhere, I focus on the early personal essays in *Bread Out of Stone* (1994). Like her other writing, these texts attest to the powerful entanglements of fictive imaginings, local and global imaginaries, and the demands of "the real," which Brand (1994a) describes in the opening essay, "Bread Out of Stone," as "more pressing than any rendering" (10). The personal essays in *Bread out of Stone: Recollections on Sex, Recognitions, Race, Dreaming and Politics* constitute a generically experimental interweaving of each of the elements named in the collection's subtitle. Her essays also challenge the borders separating imaginative fiction from both reality and the imaginary, however one conceives of this latter term. While thinkers such as Charles Taylor (2004) stress the shared social function of what he calls "modern social imaginaries" to indicate the kinds of understandings that often pass under people's conscious radar², others such as Cornelius Castoriadis (1987) and Wolfgang Iser (1993) stress the imaginary's radical and more open-ended potential. That usage strikes me as closer to Brand's utopian desire for an alternative world imaginary.

J. Hillis Miller (2016a) argues that for Iser, "the matrix of the literary text is not the real and it is not fictive language. It is rather 'the multiplicitous availability of the imaginary'" (64). Miller claims that Iser's use of "*Generative matrix*, as a name for the imaginary must be read with the full force of the obstetric image in matrix as 'mothering source'" (64). For Iser, as explicated by Miller, fiction gives form to "the formless plasticity of the imaginary" (65). This is, I think, what Brand (1994a) means by writing, "There is always something more, whether we say these things today or tomorrow, or whether silence is a better tactic. There is never room, though there is always risk" (23). In such contexts, she avers, a writer may find possibility in the apparent impossibility of "making bread out of stone—so that stone becomes pliant under the hands" (23). The power of Brand's imagery and the beauty of her language infuse these essays with a materialist sensibility that moves fluently across, around, and within the entanglements of the speaker's embodiment in history, memory, and the rituals of sexual and social encounter.

The long paragraph in "Bread out of Stone" that begins with the question, "How was it for you? A simple question about a dream at the window" (18) repeats the phrase through a variety of oppositional encounters between what "They say" and what the speaker refuses. These encounters move through multiple attempts "they" launch to sever and name her identity, into "a Black dream where a woman tells the story," finally turning the question around to the reader: "In the black gauze of our history how was it for you?" (18). I read this question as concurrently invoking individualism within the various black collective experiences, the ongoing complicities of those who have benefited from that history, the varieties of white privilege that history has enabled, and the disavowals of those who choose to believe that history has nothing to do with them. To each, the speaker queries: "Your face might appear if I ask this. I would ask you this whatever the price. I am not afraid of your voice. How was it for you?" (18). In the early reception of Brand's work, such impassioned writing led many reviewers to see anger and bitterness whereas readers are now better placed to see complexly interwoven oscillations of a sharp-sighted intellectual impatience with obfuscation and a welcoming of emotions of love, desire, and celebration. This is public intellectual witness at a very high level, and over the years, Brand herself has educated her readers to open themselves to its complexities.

In “Bread out of Stone,” Brand shows the entanglements of what convention teaches are the separate strands of the personal and the political. Writing about Toronto, she claims, “the air stinks with the sanguine pronouncements of Canadian civility” and its unwritten rule, “Don’t talk about the skeletons!” (10). In breaking that taboo, she launches a blistering critique, not in a spirit of grievance but out of a deep commitment to the truth and its requirement that she “insist away any erasure” of the women she is filming: “erasure is their life. Yes, but it is not the truth” (19). Brand’s double witness—to the hypocrisy, self-deception, and violence of the privileged—is strengthened by her ability to bear witness and reveal the beauty and possibility in what the privileged cannot see or fear to see. Brand’s witnessing functions through indirection, redirection, and circling around and into the thoughts she conveys.

In contrast, Nutt, Watt-Cloutier, and Williamson each preface their books with some initial guidance to their readers. *Damned Nations* begins with a short epigraph from George Bernard Shaw, “Peace is not only better than war, but infinitely more arduous,” which in many ways sums up the message of the book (Nutt 2011, n.p.). *The Right to Be Cold* claims the role of the public intellectual to speak truth to power but also returns to an uncertain world (citing American poet Louise Bogan), “a portion of its lost heart” (Watt-Cloutier 2005). Williamson employs two epigraphs as frames for reading to make much the same point. The command from Rumi to “Take an axe to the prison wall” is answered by a call for justice and a lament for lost beauty by Sami al Haj: “After the shackles and the nights and the suffering and the tears / How can I write poetry?” (Williamson 2012, v).

Williamson’s collection was compiled out of her realization of “the importance of bringing . . . to public debate” the story of Omar Khadr and its entanglement within issues of “human rights abuses and Islamophobia in the post-9/11 environment of fear” (xii). Her faith in the democratic value of informed debate aligns her text, in part, with Habermasian ideals of the public sphere. Her inclusion of many voices, perspectives, and genres of engagement, however, moves the multi-generic nature of her text closer to the agonistic politics of Chantal Mouffe (2013). While there is a testamentary quality to many of the accounts, there is also room for a full working through of the questions Khadr’s story raises about accountability, justice, the rule of law, Canadian multiculturalism, the so-called “War on Terror,” torture, national security agendas, child soldiers, human rights, and Canada’s place in the world. Published by an academic press, the book is carefully documented and footnoted. It assumes an educated audience but is also structured so that readers can dip in and out of its various entries.

In contrast, Nutt and Watt-Cloutier publish with trade publishers, and write personal narratives to marshal evidence and advance arguments in support of their causes: advancing global peace and reducing global climate change respectively. Although their experiences are primarily with non-governmental groups and civil society global actors, the generic form of their writing shares beliefs with academics such as Robert Nash (2015) who argues that scholars should share their research through what he calls the “Scholarly Personal Narrative” (39). He defines this “as a new form of non-fiction essay writing and argues that it is every bit as rigorous and vigorous as other types of academically certified quantitative and qualitative research” (42). In an “age of memoir writing,” he continues, this kind of writing carries the potential to reach more people (42).

Writing within this context, Nutt and Watt-Cloutier write personal narratives, which, while not scholarly, also rely on a lifetime of learning about specific worlds of endeavour through their advocacy work. Watt-Cloutier pens what her subtitle claims is “one woman’s story,” covering many dimensions of her life from birth to the present, enfolding her story within that of her community. Nutt’s loosely connected examples, each set within a different crisis around the globe,

tell the stories of others as she encounters them at moments of crisis. Beginning with her first youthful adventures in a war zone and concluding with what she has learned and what she now believes her readers should learn, each relies on the conventional assumption associated with the “autobiographical pact” (Lejeune 1989), the idea that the author of an autobiographical text will tell the truth as best she can, even though she is not writing conventional autobiography but rather analyses of the conclusions resulting from her life’s work. In other words, Watt-Cloutier and Nutt use personal anecdote for public witness.

Nutt provides readers with an actionable agenda. Watt-Cloutier (2015) pleads for understanding for her community, respect for their age-old cultural practices and deep reverence for the land. Arguing that her people “are in a position to be a powerful bridge between North and South, between Western scientists, biologists and conservationists and Aboriginal traditional knowledge,” she claims, “we Inuit are the ground-truthers of climate-change. We are on the front lines of the cataclysmic environmental shifts that are affecting the world” (324). Thus each speaks from the disparate front lines of conflicts begun through imperialist and capitalist expansion, where the legacies of such adventures play out in violently observable fashion. Each looks at contemporary practices around the world and concludes that, “The global community must take another approach” (Watt-Cloutier 2015, 323). Nutt (2011) cautions that “the best of intentions do not guarantee the best outcomes” (142), and explaining why, concludes that “In the end, the most important thing any of us can do is to continue advancing a more inclusive, respectful, and considered world view” (187). Each of them deploys her role as public intellectual by receding from the forefront of her text as much as possible, while also relying on the appeal of a personal story to advance the cause of others.

Each book is informative and engaging, yet the tensions between expectations for personal information (generated in an age of memoir) and for edification that come with a social justice perspective are not always easily negotiated, as the early exclusion of Watt-Cloutier’s text from the 2017 Canadian Broadcasting Corporation’s Canada Reads competition demonstrates.³ Readers looking for what they deem a good story can be put off by details of meetings and policy negotiations, even if these consume most of an activist’s life and reveal the complex nature of addressing such problems on the global level. The educational goals of these writers take precedence over their willingness to entertain, even if they forfeit the attention of a broader public.

Nutt’s narratives of the risks encountered by a young white woman in various African war zones bring different problems. Given the widespread familiarity of readers with the stereotypes and narrative patterns of the “colonial adventure tale” (Tsing 2005, 54), travel writing, and frontier stories, some of Nutt’s accounts of what she experienced risk reaffirming Western prejudices about African society and especially African men. Anna Tsing (2005) advances an intriguing argument that such stories enabled so many Canadian investors to be duped by the Indonesian Bre-X gold scandal in the early 1990s (58-68). Tsing asks: “Why does the frontier story have any power at all, considering what it erases?” (68). Like Tsing, Nutt’s account works to show what the frontier story erases but in the process cannot always help invoking the stereotypes on which those erasures rely. The parallels between what Tsing sees in the Bre-X story and what Nutt finds in her investigation of the entanglements of international humanitarian relief efforts and proliferating civil wars is not exact, but it is revealing. Of Bre-X, Tsing concludes, “It was the Canadian imagination of the combined frontier of investment and mining that made this drama possible” (73). Just as Tsing shows the global entanglements of colonial romance and extractive capitalist action, so Nutt shows the co-dependencies of humanitarianism, mining, war, and the global arms industry. She writes: “By understanding how we are a part of war, as people occupying this shared space, we may come

to terms with what is needed if we are ever to put a stop to it” (Nutt 2011, 17). She reflects: “There is a cost to every commercial transaction, and yet the question so rarely asked when it comes to the sale and transfer of weapons globally is this one: Who pays? In the end, we all do” (45). Her book seeks to convince Canadian readers of this conclusion: that we all bear responsibility for the horrors she describes, which we are otherwise encouraged to see as both separate and distant from our own choices at home.

Nonetheless, many of Nutt’s anecdotes, even when contextualized within the “chronic imbalance between economic and development interests” (69), risk reaffirming the stereotype of the failed African state, as when she writes, “Cases of rape in the Congo are rarely pursued because there is simply no one to prosecute them, to reach a verdict, or to carry out sentencing” (61) or when she reflects on a misogynist society: “A woman I met in a displaced people’s camp in Goma, eastern Congo, was sent to prison for two years because her husband paid a local politician \$40 to ‘teach her a lesson’ after she protested his decision to take a second wife” (61). When threats of sexualized violence are turned against Nutt herself, as the narrator or chief actor in these accounts, the impact can seem even more chilling to the white Canadian reader (41-42, 67). Nutt’s focus on the women as both victims and the best hope for these societies risks conscription into what Spivak (1999) has famously summarized as “white men are saving brown women from brown men” (284). For Spivak, this sentence “runs like a red thread through today’s ‘gender and development’” (284). As the default narrative of Western encounters with colonized others, Nutt’s straightforward account of what she has experienced may seem to reinforce Spivak’s view.

By characterizing her younger self as completely unprepared for what she encounters, Nutt seeks to show that on the ground experiences are ultimately much more complicated than such outsider views might lead one to expect. “For as long as we invest in outdated or self-serving models of humanitarian action, we will continue to trade in missed opportunities” (Nutt 2011, 160). Looking back on her well-meaning and idealistic young self, she writes:

And yet what I failed to grasp in my rush to help was the extent to which such injustices are courted and sustained by forces often well within our control, but we recklessly choose to ignore. Those same forces routinely implicate us in the death, mutilation, and extermination of other human beings, whose lives we degrade by casting ourselves in the role of saviours offering ever-shifting cures for their misery. When war is understood as self-destruction—as an assault against reason and the sanctity of human life—it no longer seduces us with its tales of heroism and altruism. (161)

These two testamentary narratives conform to the contemporary wisdom that whatever cause a public intellectual espouses it will prove more persuasive when woven through with anecdotes of personal experience told in an accessible form of plain speaking. For some readers, this is likely true. For others, the lyric intensity and complexity of Brand’s essays may provide more thought-provoking and disturbing witness. In an age when so many contemporary “thought leaders” seek to manipulate popular understanding, each of these women public intellectuals writes with an integrity that respects the intelligence of her readers and the intractability of the issues they engage. These diverse acts of witnessing each demonstrate the truth of Tsing’s reminder that “Analytic tools with which to think about the global picture are still rudimentary” (2005, 58). Given this situation, efforts by Brand, Watt-Cloutier, Williamson, and Nutt to expand the generic range of witnessing into other modes of expression, beyond the conventional limits of the personal story, are welcome.

Acknowledgments

The research for this paper was conducted, in part, with support from the Canada Research Chair's program. I am grateful to my research assistant, Vanessa Nunes, for her help in the preparation of this article.

Notes

¹ He contrasts the pundits and celebrities who are promoted by the "ideas Industry" with traditional intellectuals, while acknowledging that "The Ideas Industry has stacked the deck in favor of thought leaders, but obviously, valuable intellectual debates still occur" (Drezner 2017, 234).

² Taylor (2004) explains that his approach "is not the same as one that might focus on the 'ideas,' as against the 'institutions' of modernity. The social imaginary is not a set of ideas; rather, it is what enables, through making sense of, the practices of a society" (2). He expands on this definition in his second chapter, "What is a 'Social Imaginary'?" where he writes: "the social imaginary is that common understanding that makes possible common practices and a widely shared sense of legitimacy" (23).

³ The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's Radio One (CBC) first broadcast a competition aimed at choosing a work of Canadian literature "that all of Canada should read together" (Fuller and Sedo 2006, 5) in 2002. CBC later extended the coverage to include its television channel. Celebrity champions (thought leaders?) are chosen for each text, and one book a day is eliminated in their voting until only a winner remains. The "Canada Reads" 2017 debates took place March 27-30, when Watt-Cloutier's book, which was seen as challenging, was the first to be eliminated. For further analysis of the "cultural work that 'Canada Reads' performs" as "a mass reading event and a media spectacle" (5), see Fuller and Sedo's "A Reading Spectacle for the Nation."

V. Stranger Sociability: Lisa Robertson as Counterpublic Intellectual Heather Milne

In recent years, Lisa Robertson has become known as one of Canada's leading innovative and experimental poets. Books like *Cinema of the Present*, *XEclogue*, and *The Weather* have earned her a committed readership both within Canada and beyond its borders. While Robertson's poetry is widely recognized, less well known are her editorial and curatorial projects, her collaborations with writers and artists, and her magazine articles. When she lived in Vancouver in the 1990s and early 2000s, Robertson edited numerous poetry magazines; curated reading series; ran a bookstore that functioned as a vital community hub for writers, academics, and artists; wrote essays on urban space, architecture, and visual art for magazines and journals; and wrote catalogue essays for galleries and reviews of artists' exhibits for visual art publications. Much of Robertson's work in these capacities was collaborative and community-oriented and she often worked with other feminist poets and artists in a concerted effort to promote visual art and writing by women.¹ Robertson's projects from this time period reflect a vital community-based public, political, creative and intellectual engagement that has not been addressed in critical writing on her work. Robertson's work is unified by an ongoing concern with the privatization and gentrification of public space and the need to create contexts for the circulation of feminist writing and visual art. Her writings from this time are of historical value because the Vancouver in which she lived, worked, and wrote has been radically transformed over the past two decades by gentrification.

There is a framework for thinking about Lisa Robertson as a counterpublic intellectual, specifically in relation to local artistic, literary, academic, and activist communities in Vancouver in the 1990s and early 2000s. The concept of the counterpublic intellectual is helpful for thinking about Robertson's public engagement as a thinker, writer, editor, and activist whose work does not circulate in dominant, mainstream publics but who was nevertheless a vital participant in and shaper of an intellectual counterpublic in Vancouver that cohered around radical visual, textual, and performance-based cultural production and that assumed an oppositional stance with regard to the forces of gentrification and a market-driven approach to art that began to reshape the cultural, artistic, and architectural landscape of Vancouver in the 1990s.

The term "counterpublic" was first used by Nancy Fraser in "Rethinking the Public Sphere," her feminist engagement with Habermas' work on the public sphere. Fraser (1990) notes that the public sphere in the eighteenth century was "constructed in deliberate opposition to a more woman-friendly salon culture" that was "stigmatized as 'artificial,' 'effeminate,' and 'aristocratic,'" and argues that the construction of the public sphere "drew on classical traditions that cast femininity and publicity as oxymorons" (59). Fraser considers the groups that were excluded from the public sphere and coins the term "subaltern counterpublics" in an effort to think through the ways in which groups excluded from dominant publics actively engaged in the formation of alternative publics; these groups include women, LGBTQ people, racialized individuals, and those of limited economic means. Subaltern counterpublics function as "parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counterdiscourses, which in turn permit them to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs" (67). These counterpublics function as "spaces of withdrawal and regroupment" as well as "bases and training grounds for agitational activities directed toward wider publics" (68).

Michael Warner expands the concept of the counterpublic in *Publics and Counterpublics*. For Warner (2002), a counterpublic emerges when "a dominated group aspires to re-create itself

as a public and in doing so, finds itself in conflict not only with the dominant social group but with the norms that constitute the dominant culture as a public” (112). Counterpublics are not the opposite of publics; on the contrary, a counterpublic is a type of public that marks itself off from a dominant public through an awareness of its outsider status. It is defined by its “tension with a larger public” (56). As Warner argues, “Counterpublics are publics too. They work by many of the same circular postulates. It might even be claimed that, like dominant publics, they provide a sense of active belonging that masks or compensates for the real powerlessness of human agents in capitalist society” (113). Like publics, counterpublics are called into being through the circulation of speech to indefinite strangers. What sets counterpublics apart, what makes them “counter” is “the extent that they try to supply different ways of imagining stranger sociability” (121-22). The “strangers” that constitute counterpublic are “not just anybody. They are socially marked by their participation in this kind of discourse; ordinary people are presumed not to want to be mistaken for the kind of person who would participate in this kind of talk or be present in this kind of scene” (120). Counterpublics often cohere around minority sexual identities, radical politics, and a shared interest in forms of cultural production that lie outside of mainstream culture.

Many of the cultural groups with which Robertson was involved in Vancouver in the 1990s could be categorized as counterpublics. For example, the Kootenay School of Writing (KSW), a group with which Robertson has had close ties, could be construed as a kind of intellectual counterpublic not only in terms of its embracing of an innovative and language-oriented writing and theory that marginalized the KSW from mainstream poetry and from the frameworks that tended to dominate national literature in the 1980s and 1990s, but also in terms of the political circumstances that informed the groups’ origins (the closing of David Thompson University Centre by the Social Credit government in the 1980s and the anti-neoliberal stance that continues to inform the KSW’s politics). Similarly, The Western Front, an artist-run centre dedicated to the exploration of innovative interdisciplinary art practices, including poetry, dance, performance and visual art, functions as a counterpublic space marked off from more mainstream arts institutions. The KSW and the Western Front were activist-oriented cultural sites somewhat at odds with mainstream national literary and artistic public cultures due to their political orientation and aesthetic sensibilities as well as their geographic location on Canada’s west coast. They called into being an audience and a readership through publications and performances and Robertson played a crucial role in facilitating discursive circulation among strangers by writing about these organizations, engaging with and promoting the work produced in these spaces, and providing occasions for reflection, analysis, and contact across these groups.

Robertson’s journalistic writing, her involvement with organizations like the Western Front and the Kootenay School of Writing, her multifaceted engagements with feminist cultural production, and the activities of her bookstore together constitute counterpublic intellectual labour. If, as Warner contends, counterpublics function in much the same way as publics, then counterpublic intellectuals function as semi-public figures who share much in common with public intellectuals but whose address is limited to a smaller public. Counterpublic intellectuals are not burdened by the same expectations of accessibility as public intellectuals because they are freed from the responsibility of having to address and engage large publics. However, as Warner (2002) argues, recent interest in the public intellectual is frequently accompanied by calls for accessibility and clarity of expression that can constrain the political potential of the public intellectual: “When people complain, as many do, that intellectuals are not writing clearly enough, their yardstick of good style often turns out to be not just grammatical or aesthetic but political. . . . They want language that will bring a certain public into being, and they have an idea of what style will work.

The question of style, at any rate, entails a worry about the nature and duty of the intellectual” (129). Warner questions the assumptions underlying claims that opaque writing is somehow “a hollow substitute for political engagement” and wonders if the opacity of dense theoretical prose might function as a placeholder for a future public that the writing is attempting to call into being (129-30). For Warner, the “false aesthetic of transparency” privileges the majority point of view over less familiar perspectives. “The tastes and ideas that become those of the majority do so because people need to believe that their tastes and ideas will be widely shared. The result is a kind of invisible power for dominant norms” (135). The counterpublic intellectual occupies a space outside of these dominant norms and is not beholden to the obligation of engaging a mainstream or mass public.

While Robertson’s prose is not marked by the opacity that characterizes the theoretical writing Warner discusses, she brings forth in her writing a perspective and a point of view that is decidedly not majoritarian and her poetic prose does not strive for transparency. Her essays function through metaphor; many of them are experimental in form and execution. They are expansive; they address and champion the minoritarian, feminist, queer, and esoteric. They demand a certain level of attentiveness from the reader and a willingness to be led through her labyrinthine arguments. Her essays defamiliarize, and in so doing, push against what Warner calls the “false aesthetic of transparency” and the dominant norms that transparency reproduces. Robertson’s essays compliment her poetry but offer a glimpse into a different thought process and a different aesthetics. But most importantly, her essays function along with her editorial activities and community engagement to provide a context for counterpublic civic, artistic, and intellectual engagement.

Robertson’s projects helped to create a context for innovative feminist writing and conceptual art in Vancouver; through her collaborations with other poets as she worked to create contexts in which innovative and experimental writing, especially writing by women, could circulate. One such context was the editorial collective *Barscheit Nation*. Catriona Strang, Christine Stewart, and Lisa Robertson co-founded *Barscheit Nation*, published a zine which began in 1988 and ran for three or four issues, and wrote a manifesto to outline their political and aesthetic mission statement. The manifesto, published in the first issue of the *Barscheit* zine, playfully articulates a dissenting feminist poetics ironically and perhaps oppositionally tethered to the nation as it both invokes and rejects national stereotypes and seeks to expand beyond the borders of the nation. Its opening lines read:

A. WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS TO BE SELF-EVIDENT

1. Dissensual language is a machine of enchantments.
2. This machine, with all its archaisms, is a means of locomotion toward polysexual features.
3. Wrenched history is our machine’s border

B. THE MACHINE IS THE NATION

Borders: We cannot contain our pleasure.

Language: Stolen without ransom.

Trade Policy: Those whose fantasies condemn them.

Currency: We have no currency.

Constitution: Camped in the hinterland, basking in the rectitude of our intentions, we renounce entropic capital; we renounce the bogus repertoires of gender; we renounce post-historical gloating; we renounce prescribed rebuttal or memory; we renounce boredom. We

know that beyond the Fantasy Empire lurks an improbable nation of subjects composed of countless tendrils, each with a new little sensory tissue at its tip. We travel there. (Robertson, Stewart, and Strang n.d.)

Having no borders, Barscheit Nation is not confined by the traditional dictates of nationalism and regionalism. Since it has no currency it is liberated from the financial marketplace and the dictates and limitations of consumer-driven cultural production. It is interesting to note that this manifesto was written for Barscheit's special "USA Invasion" issue. According to Robertson, they attended a poetics conference at the University of Buffalo where they considered themselves enacting an invasion of American poetry. The manifesto and the zine in which it appeared were created to commemorate their tongue-in-cheek invasion (Robertson, email message to author, June 22, 2017). Robertson and her collaborators attempt to carve out a space for bold and inventive feminist writing located at the interstices of "dissentual language" and "polysexual features." As a manifesto, this document serves a performative function by calling into being a feminist poetic counterpublic of writers, artists, activists, and thinkers. The Barscheit Manifesto and Barscheit Nation are avant-garde, tactical interventions into stereotypes of nationhood and masculinist literary aesthetics; Robertson and her collaborators sought out, and indeed helped to facilitate, a feminist experimental poetic counterpublic that they felt was actively marginalized from larger literary and creative publics both regionally and nationally.

Robertson joined the Kootenay School of Writing (KSW) a few years after her involvement with Barscheit Nation. As an active member of the KSW, she engaged in numerous collaborations with other members of the collective. She co-edited *Raddle Moon*, the KSW's poetry journal, with Susan Clark and Catriona Strang for several years. Robertson (2009) speaks of the KSW in the early 1990s as a "feminist project" when she, along with Nancy Shaw, Catriona Strang, Kathryn McLeod, Susan Clark, and Julia Steele were on the collective, and argues that Vancouver was known as a centre for feminist writing because of the work they were doing on the KSW collective (370).² Clark, Strang, and Robertson also co-edited a single-issue zine called *Giantess* at the same time as they edited *Raddle Moon*. Robertson was the "writing editor" at *Front* magazine from 1990-1993 (the magazine linked to the artist-run centre The Western Front) and did a full special poetry issue of *Front* once a year. *Front* was instrumental in providing a space where conceptual visual art and poetry could be discussed together. One year, she called the poetry issue the "Giantess" issue and featured the work of women poets including Jam Ismail, Rhoda Rosenfeld, Maxine Gadd, Renee Robin, Judith Copithorne, and Trudy Rubenfelf (Robertson, email message to author, June 22, 2017). Through projects like *Raddle Moon*, *Barscheit Nation*, *Giantess*, and *Front* Magazine Robertson, along with Strang and others, helped to develop channels through which innovative and experimental cultural production and intellectual engagement could circulate. This work was pivotal for the development of a feminist avant-garde in Vancouver in the 1990s.

Robertson (2009) has noted that one of the features that distinguished feminist poetics in Vancouver was its "strong involvement with feminist visual art practice" and she refers to Vancouver in the 1980s and 1990s as a "hotbed of feminist conceptualism" (370). Robertson's own critical engagements, and in particular, her involvement with the Western Front and *Front* Magazine in the 1990s and early 2000s were situated at the nexus of poetry and visual art. She wrote extensively about feminist artists and was involved in several editorial projects that helped to provide a critical context for innovative and experimental art and poetry. She wrote essays on artists Lorna Brown and Liz Magor and on the Kiss and Tell collective's "Drawing the Line"

exhibit, a groundbreaking and controversial exploration of queer eroticism. She published an article in *Parallelogramme* on Vancouver's Association for Non-Commercial Culture, a group whose public art projects engaged with urban corporate landscapes by buying ad space on public benches and placing brochures on the BC Ferries to disseminate art with feminist and queer messages; Robertson's interest in this group's activities reflects her ongoing commitment to promoting politicized visual art by women and resisting the corporatization and privatization of public space. She describes the Association for Non-Commercial Culture as "exploring women's negotiations of competing identities in the public sphere" (Robertson 1994, 28), an issue that informs Robertson's own interest in the facilitation of a feminist artistic and poetic counterpublic through her writing and editorial work. Robertson (2005) explains her commitment to women artists and their influence on her own writing:

my own relationships with artists have mainly been with women—there is a complicated community of artists in Vancouver who have developed a strong, funny, rich, critical and joyous relation to feminism, as a series of discourses and a series of public stances and practices. This has inspired me, and still does, this intellectual network, this commitment to take no shit, to work together and help one another, and to challenge one another always. It seems important to name people particularly now as "The Vancouver School" institutionalizes itself around a coterie of male artists and their students.

She goes on to name several female artists: Liz Magor, Allyson Clay, renee van halm, Miriam Nichols, Jenny Penberthy, Karen Henry, Kate Rimmer, Margot Butler, Kelly Wood, Hadley Howes, Robin Mitchell, and Lorna Brown and notes that their work has directly influenced her own writing.

From 1988 to 1994, Robertson owned and operated Proprioception Books, a small bookstore in downtown Vancouver that specialized in cultural and literary criticism as well as contemporary poetry and poetics. Her bookstore was a key site of counterpublic intellectual engagement that complemented, but was distinct from, her other projects. Proprioception functioned as a crucial community hub; Robertson had a policy of launching books by her regular customers, she hosted literary readings, lectures, and community meetings, and provided texts for courses at the Kootenay School of writing and for some courses at SFU and UBC. As Robertson (n.d.) explains, "The shop's strength was its active collaboration with existing communities of readers, often within the university structure and the visual arts. The identification of such groups as markets, and a committed participation in their intellectual cultures, both directed buying patterns and positioned the shop as the site of an active cultural discourse." Proprioception functioned as a kind of salon that provided a space for, and called into being, intellectual counterpublics comprised of artists, poets, readers, academics, students and activists; as such, the bookstore was implicitly aligned with a feminized history of salon culture, a history that, according to Nancy Fraser (1990), was marginalized by the rise of male-dominated publics (59). Robertson curated a reading series at the Vancouver Art Gallery in the early 1990s in conjunction with Proprioception Books that featured local poets including Maxine Gadd, Roy Miki, Catriona Strang, Jam Ismail, Roy Kiyooka, and Dorothy Trujillo Lusk. The series was conceived to compliment exhibitions of VAG Video. She also hosted readings by local, national and international poets at the bookstore. The bookstore's demise in 1994 coincided with the rise of large bookstore chains like Chapters and Indigo, which did not offer the same kind of opportunities for fostering counterpublic engagements. Proprioception, like many other independent businesses, fell victim

to the wave of gentrification that began to sweep Vancouver in the 1990s and transform the possibility and potential for counterpublic engagement.

In the mid-to-late 1990s, Robertson turned her attention to writing for small arts magazines. She documented the shifting landscape of the city in articles published in *Mix: A Magazine for Artist Run Culture*, *Parallellogramme: Contemporary Art/Art Contemporan*, *West Coast Line*, and *Front*. While these essays highlight the economic, social, and cultural shifts that were making counterpublic engagement increasingly difficult in Vancouver by the late 1990s, they also functioned as a tenacious example of counterpublic intellectual engagement in their own right. The “Beneath the Pavillions” series that Robertson wrote for *Mix: a Magazine of Artist-Run Culture* in the late 1990s deftly weaves analyses of the politics of gentrification with an awareness of the layered economic, cultural, political and architectural history of Vancouver. These essays are characterized by unexpected turns and capacious engagements with literature, history, art, architecture and urban planning. They address, and call into being, a reading counterpublic interested in how civic spaces and architecture facilitate—and also limit—art, literature, and other forms of creative and conceptual work. Central to many of Robertson’s contributions to *Mix* is a critical examination of the viability of radical creative praxes in the context of neoliberalism and the privatization and commercialization of public space. Lisa Robertson functions as critical witness to the effects of gentrification and the increasing influence of the market on cultural production.

“Visitations: A City of Ziggurats,” her essay on visiting Vancouver City Hall to protest cuts to the Kootenay School of Writing, moves between an analysis of the architecture of Vancouver’s City Hall and a reflection on neoliberal austerity and market-driven approaches to arts funding. This essay warrants close analysis because it illustrates Robertson’s skill in weaving together seemingly unrelated observations to enact a savvy political critique and serves as a good example of a politics and aesthetics of intellectual engagement that does not strive for widespread appeal and readability but that nevertheless galvanizes and engages a counterpublic. “Visitations” begins with a description of Vancouver’s City Hall, a space that is framed as opulent and imposing yet also almost comically excessive and verging on decay:

Torn from April’s dusk, the semi-ethical alley lilacs are not unrelated to the morning’s spectacle: a ring of bored city councilors at the cultural funding appeal hearing, wreathed in the red naugahyde of their high tilting seats. The council chamber is paneled entirely in oiled Philippine mahogany, the carpet a plush burgundy, the councilors’ chairs both papal and la-z-boyesque, and Vancouver City Hall’s ominously massed ziggurat from Bertolucci’s conformist Italy. The lilacs rot in their vase. A city plays out its fantasy across a civic site and duration, a fantasy of power’s structures and gestures --- architectural, sartorial, botanical, governmental, pedestrian. From a certain point of view, polis is style.

The rhetorical mode of the new right is achingly familiar. Cozy vocabulary items such as ‘community’ implode into ideological caskets. Vancouver’s Non Partisan Association (NPA) city government wields a double-barrel use of the term. NPA’s ‘community’ seems to refer to immediate neighbourhood, a sort of grass-roots co-responsibility bounded by a specific site or district. But at the same time, community means those with purchasing power, social visibility, expansionist potential. In the paper-scissors-rock game of civic politics, the second version persists when the first is marginal. Community has become a soft term for capital. Cash is style. (Robertson 1998b)

Robertson identifies the NPA's conflation of "community" with capital and suggests that this narrow understanding of community actively works against the kinds of civic, public and urban spaces that can foster the emergence and sustenance of artistic counterpublics. She describes mounting the steps of City Hall with the "obedient social nervousness which certain architectures are meant to impel" as she enters the building to meet with an appeal board to contest civic funding cuts to the Kootenay School of Writing. She then launches into an historical account of the construction of Vancouver's City Hall as an economic stimulus project during the Depression. Robertson implicitly contrasts the economic philosophy that informed the building of City Hall with the neoliberal austerity that governs the current civic administration's cuts to arts organizations; she implies that such an ambitious construction project would never be undertaken today unless funded by private capital. Immediately following the description of the "unembellished poured concrete exterior" that "express[es] a stern austerity" yet houses "incredibly opulent interiors" of gold leaf, marble, brass, and buffed wood," she articulates a critique of the market-driven approach to arts-funding that increasingly informs civic grants and public funding models. She notes: "The application of market profit expectations and the correlative collapse of the idea of cultural community into the imperative role of consumer has forcibly molded companionable margins." She mentions the Burnaby Arts Council's shutting down of the Burnaby Art Gallery because its support of conceptually-driven art was, according to the arts council, "not addressing the community," as well as Harper Collins' cancellation of contracts with writers they considered "inadequately marketable."³ She offers an account of how the KSW narrowly managed to save its skin in the face of budget cuts; Michael Ondaatje, former small press poet recently made famous through the successful adaptation of *The English Patient* into a blockbuster film, offered to give a benefit reading for the KSW. Robertson explains: "Ondaatje's name functioned like a glowing seal, attracting a zealous public charity. Even City Hall's Cultural Services offices made approving sounds, letting us know they'd be pleased to 'monitor our development over the coming year.' Ondaatje's interest, intended to help us protest the city's funding decision, functioned as a dominant sanction of the collective's fourteen-year history." She concludes the essay with an acknowledgment that powerfully captures the tension between public and counterpublic artistic work: "cultural work needs mass media sanction in order to present a marketable façade, and that sanction often erases the fertile and convoluted path of minor aesthetic trajectories."⁴ "Visitations: A City of Ziggurats," reflects Robertson's ongoing interest in charting the clash between creative counterpublics that strive to exist outside the dictates of market-driven tastes, and a city that prioritizes commercially successful work. Robertson champions minor aesthetic trajectories that do not appeal to the masses or to market-driven demands for transparency and accessibility; at the same time, she carves out a critical discourse on gentrification and its impact on art, culture, and public space.

Other essays that Robertson published in *Mix* further probe the implications of the commodification of the arts in Vancouver and its impact on counterpublics. In "Good Grooming" Robertson (1997a) describes the façade of Moshe Safdie's then-newly designed Vancouver Public Library (VPL) as a "Roman doodad" and "a logo before it's a building," firmly linking the library to the late capitalist context that brought it into being. The library's "brand" supersedes its function as a repository of knowledge or a space of learning and contemplation. Her discussion of the new library morphs, via a meditation on the library's escalators, into a reflection on childhood memories of department stores, and more specifically of department store escalators and floor plans, which is then woven back into her discussion of the library through reference to its slick,

commercial design. Robertson implies that the library's architecture directly references the department store, a comparison that works to solidify the connection between the new library and the privatization and corporatization of civic spaces:

Here at VPL, capital's ancient hierarchy expresses itself as General Fiction, then Art and Literature, the Business, then Science, and I'm moving upwards through it on the ultimate flaneuring device, the mythological machine of my childhood, feeling that at any moment I will make my little hop and arrive at Lingerie. Ascending the core of this ludicrous folly I'm having a truly modernist experience, the escalator itself having remained virtually unaltered since its first appearance in New York department stores in 1912. As such, this moving device seems the perfect conductor for my foray into spatial spectacle.

As in her discussion of City Hall, Robertson considers the ways in which a capitalist approach to arts funding and public space privileges marketability over other factors. She notes that the former library building on Robson Street, which she describes as a "functional icon of coastal design and simplicity," has now become a Virgin Records megastore. "Good Grooming" uses the occasion of the then-new Vancouver Public Library to reflect on the privatization and commodification of public space, and its implications for public (and counterpublic) engagement.

"Marketing Artist-Run Chic," another column published in *Mix*, also explores the uneasy relationship between the market and creative and political counterpublics in the context of a rapidly gentrifying city. Robertson (1997b) begins by describing the challenges that artist-run organizations like Artspeak, the KSW, The Or, Access, the Pitt, Sansair, the Perel Gallery, and SFU Studios, located on a two-block stretch of East Hastings between Homer and Abbot Streets, were facing due to rising rents, gentrification, and funding cuts. Condominiums were rising in the area, and Robertson notes that condo marketers are eager to capitalize on the area's edgy reputation even as it pushes artists out. She describes visiting a model suite in one of these new developments that is being built in close proximity to the struggling arts organizations:

I mount a dark ramp and rise into the halogen-lit glamour of the live/work studio. Inside the fantasy, each finished surface glows: the buffed stainless steel kitchen island, the tinted, waxed concrete floors, the patterned chrome fireplace skirting lull me into a chic daydream of ownership. I graze my shin on the plate-glass coffee table as I inspect the ikea-style accouterments. I don't notice anything resembling a workspace in this suave décor, but leading up the open stairs to the sleeping loft, a series of black-and-white photographs of a rubber-clad supple-whipped dominatrix speak the ubiquitous vocabulary of 'excess' and 'transgression.' My browsing experience culminates at the crisp sage-sheeted bed: twinkling chrome handcuff chains dangle from wall-mounted hardware. I'm looking at the merchandizing of space, the cachet of erotic sophistication that flaunts S/M accessorization as real estate sales kit.

Robertson offers a critical commentary on how gentrification homogenizes neighborhoods by pushing artists, writers, queers, and sex workers out of the area while simultaneously capitalizing on and commodifying the very communities it displaces. The articles Robertson wrote for *Mix* can be read as a kind of artistic and intellectual witnessing; the essays are animated by a kind of performative irony in which they demonstrate a counterpublic engagement that documents and demonstrates the increasing difficulty and precarity of its own existence. These articles call into

being and address a counterpublic affected by neoliberal austerity and the subordination of artistic and creative value to monetary and market value, and offer a vocabulary and a framework for thinking about the implications of gentrification and neoliberalism on counterpublic cultural engagement and intellectual production. They trace the tensions between publics and counterpublics in a city undergoing a rapid transition into what will, by the second decade of the twenty-first century, become one of the world's most expensive cities in which to live.

It is important to note that Robertson distances her own critical engagement with the politics of gentrification from critiques of the changing landscape of Vancouver that emerged in the 1990s, those fuelled by racist sentiment and colonial nostalgia. She concludes a review of the Vancouver Art Gallery's "The New Spirit—Modern Architecture in Vancouver 1938-1963" by questioning the racial and class politics behind Vancouver's sudden reclamation of its Modernist architectural history and linking the "eco-rhetoric" of many preservationist arguments and "romance of these values" to the "white romance that promoted the destruction of Strathcona's working class Chinese and African communities under the rubric of hygienic 'slum clearance'" and the construction of residential schools. She sees this as the "same parochial romance that finds pleasure in slagging Hong Kong real estate development aesthetics" (Robertson 1998a). While Robertson is critical of the implications of gentrification, her essays are not awash in nostalgia for a pre-gentrified Vancouver. Rather, they are intent on thinking about Vancouver as a palimpsest; she wants to draw the reader's attention to the rich and layered relationship between architecture and culture and the effects of urban transformations on minoritarian aesthetics, identities, and politics.

Shortly after writing her "Beneath the Pavilions" column for *Mix*, Robertson began writing under the identity "The Office for Soft Architecture." These essays were funded by a B.C. Arts Council grant and were initially published in *Giantess*, *Front Magazine* and *West Coast Line*.⁵ Robertson (2006) describes this time, as well as her interest in charting the shifts that were happening in the civic, cultural, and architectural dimensions of Vancouver, in her introduction to *Occasional Work and Seven Walks from the Office for Soft Architecture*: "I watched the city of Vancouver dissolve in the fluid called money. Buildings disappeared into newness. I tried to recall spaces, and what I remembered was surfaces. Here and there money tarried. The result seemed emotional. I wanted to document this process. I began to research the history of surfaces. I included my own desires in the research. In this way, I became multiple" (1). She explains,

In this period of accelerated growth and increasingly globalizing economies, I thought I should document the physical transitions I was witnessing in my daily life, and in this way question my own nostalgia for the minor, the local, the ruinous; for decay ... I wanted to make alternative spaces and contexts for the visual culture of the city, sites that could also provide a vigorously idiosyncratic history of surfaces as they fluctuate. (1)

The voice in these essays is that of a feminist flaneuse charting and documenting a changing landscape, bearing witness to gentrification, but also taking notice of small details that defamiliarize and disrupt that landscape. Robertson's prose is more abstract and poetic in these essays than in her earlier "Beneath the Pavilions" series. Consider, for example, this excerpt from her Third Walk published in *Front* magazine:

My guide and I were ruminating on the strange mutability of human affairs. As we ruminated we walked. At times, when our skin brushed, what I experienced was not a sensation but an environment: the sky over the defunct light industrial district was still the

sky, less sublime, but more articulate. And walking what we witnessed was like a flickering appetite, the real end of sunlight, buildings torn out of the earth and forgotten, the superabundant likeness of pictured products collapsed into our dream and our diet, and over and over in the dark the flickering appetite now bunched under the ribs. (Robertson 2000, 7)

These alternative spaces are counterpublics of a sort, called into being through the Office for Soft Architecture and its address to indefinite strangers with a shared appreciation for the minor, the local, and the ruinous. Robertson offers a poetics of civic space that is at once aesthetic and political and that demonstrates a counterpublic engagement with urban spaces.

Robertson's writings on Vancouver from the 1990s to the early 2000s reveal a critical engagement with the politics and complexities of gentrification; the privatization and commercialization of public space; and its effects on artists, writers, and other cultural workers. This body of writing, along with her editorial work, her multifaceted engagements and collaborations with other writers and artists, her bookstore, and her own poetic praxis played a vital role in calling into being a counterpublic with a shared interest in conceptual art, feminist cultural production, politics, and urban spaces. Robertson worked across multiple sites and communities to create critical contexts for counterpublic engagement with minoritarian forms of cultural production. She fostered these spaces in ways that spanned intellectual modes of inquiry, creative modes of engagement, activist orientations, and what Michael Warner (2002) calls "stranger sociability" or a "discursive circulation among strangers as a social entity" (121). Counterpublics "incorporate personal/impersonal address and expansive estrangement of public speech as conditions of their common world" (121). The person calling a counterpublic into being through address "commit[s] [her]self and the fate of [her] world-making project to circulation among indefinite others" (121). This address can be "laden with intimate affect" but it also must be "extended impersonally, available for co-membership on the basis of mere attention" (121). Robertson's writing, activist orientation, and community involvement enact conflicted relationships with dominant publics. Her critical engagement with the implications of urban gentrification; her commitment to providing space for writing that exists outside both the dominant literary conventions that characterized poetry and national literature and the market-driven dictates of commercial art; her interest in promoting the work of women artists and writers in contexts where women's cultural production was often marginalized are key examples of counterpublic intellectual labour. Her ability to reflect not only on the work being produced within these counterpublic contexts, but also to historicize and theorize it, and perhaps most importantly, to draw connections between writers, artists, and activists, as well as her ability to build what Michael Warner calls "stranger sociability" speak to her vital role in as a counterpublic intellectual.

Notes

¹ Much of this material is archived in Simon Fraser University's archives and special collections. I would like to thank Lisa Robertson and the special collections librarians at Simon Fraser for granting me access to these materials. I am also grateful to Lisa Robertson for providing additional information over email.

² Although Robertson refers to the KSW as a feminist project during her years of involvement, fellow KSW writer Catriona Strang (2009) has commented on the marginalization of women from the group and the need to create space for feminist work:

it seemed that women who didn't want to write just like men were writing had to push and create the space themselves. . . . There were women on the collective when I joined. In fact, Lisa Robertson and I joined at the same time, but as I said, at times it was a battle. In lots of ways KSW could be a very supportive space, and I certainly don't regret the time I spent on the collective. But for me it was not without difficulties. (274)

³ Robertson's frustration with the limitations of contingencies of value that favour mass market appeal over other factors resonates with Michael Warner's frustration with the demands placed on public intellectuals to appeal to the masses and to strive solely for transparency and accessibility.

⁴ Robertson's analysis of the ways in which market value tends to trump cultural, artistic and aesthetic value, not to mention the value of community or coalition building resonates strongly with Wendy Brown's critique of neoliberalism. Under neoliberalism, Brown (2005) explains, all dimensions of human life are cast in terms of market rationality. While this entails submitting every action and policy to a consideration of profitability, equally important is the production of all human and institutional action as rational entrepreneurial action, conducted according to a calculus of utility, benefit, or satisfaction against a microeconomic grid of scarcity, supply and demand and moral value-neutrality. (40)

⁵ Robertson's "Office for Soft Architecture" essays were republished in 2003 by Coach House Books under the title *Occasional Work and Seven Walks from the Office for Soft Architecture*.

VI. Is There a Canadian *Uncle Tom's Cabin*? Canadian Women Writers and Social Change Carole Gerson

In January 1944, when the influential Toronto newspaper critic W. A. Deacon (1944b) lamented the absence of a Canadian “equivalent of ‘Uncle Tom’s Cabin’” because Canadians are “still pioneering, still afraid of ourselves intellectually and emotionally,” little did he know that a significant candidate was on the horizon. Gwethalyn Graham’s second novel, *Earth and High Heaven*, which appeared later that year, launched an analysis of anti-Semitism that was quickly embraced by cultural arbiters and the general public in both Canada and the United States. Deacon warmly welcomed Graham’s book, but he had little interest in feminist matters and no inclination to identify or promote the Canadian women who had written literature to advocate for social change prior to Graham. Nor have later critics or scholars focused on the history of creative texts that were authored by Canadian women who used the popular appeal of literature to advance a social cause. While the authors discussed in this chapter shared a common goal of seeking to improve the situations of those who were marginalized by class, race, ethnicity, or species (in the case of Marshall Saunders’ animal stories), it would be an overstatement to present their works as a lineage. Although there is little evidence that these writers paid direct attention to one another, all were certainly aware of the power of fiction and poetry to marshal empathy. Pursuit of this thread brings together a collection of otherwise very different Canadian writers: in the following discussion, Pauline Johnson, who spoke on behalf of Indigenous Canadians, and Gwethalyn Graham, who addressed anti-Semitism, are bookended by Marshall Saunders at the end of the nineteenth century, and Joy Kogawa at the end of the twentieth.

It is commonly believed that in 1862, when Abraham Lincoln first met Harriet Beecher Stowe, he greeted her with the words, “So you’re the little woman who started this great war” (Stowe 1852, 40). Of course, Stowe did not start anything; rather, her novel provided a critical point of emotional identification for a socio-political movement that had long been gathering force. While this anecdote may be apocryphal, the legendary role of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (1852) in galvanizing the American anti-slavery campaign exemplifies how creative writing has long been a medium through which women in North America and Western Europe have effectively addressed social issues.¹ The printed page offered a relatively safe space in which to overcome political and cultural marginalization in order to articulate many concerns, while reading provided an effective (and often private) way for people in all walks of life to connect with larger issues and events. Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Canadian female reformers admired both the content of Stowe’s book and its legitimation of a woman’s public voice as they harnessed fiction to such causes as labour reform in Agnes Maule Machar’s *Roland Graeme: Knight* (1892); property rights in Minnie Smith’s *Is It Just?* (1911); suffrage and pacifism in two novels, Francis Marion Beynon’s *Aleta Day* (1919) and Alice Chown’s *The Stairway* (1921); and temperance and other current issues in many stories and poems in newspapers and magazines (Gerson 2010, 146-57).² Most of these works did not circulate widely and have received more attention from recent scholars searching for lost feminist “classics” than from the readership to which they were originally addressed.³ Such was not the case with the works by the authors described here. Far from being disregarded, these Canadian women writers captured the public imagination of their time, impacted individual readers, and demonstrated the power of literature as an agent of change. While none of these authors took up Stowe’s topic of slavery or discrimination against people of colour, Stowe’s legacy remains evident in Canada through the support of the Ontario Heritage Trust for the Uncle Tom’s Cabin Historic Site in Dresden, Ontario.⁴

The first internationally visible Canadian intervention into the sphere of social justice concerned the humane treatment of animals—in the nineteenth century, a movement aligned with campaigns for the rights of women and children—with the publication of *Beautiful Joe*, Marshall Saunders' story of an abused dog. In the words of the editor of the most recent edition, "If Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was the story that ignited the Civil War, then Margaret Marshall Saunders' 1894 *Beautiful Joe* was the book that revolutionized a generation's view of animal welfare" (Chez 2015, 11).⁵ An animal autobiography modelled on British writer Anna Sewell's *Black Beauty* (1877), itself inspired by the focus of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* on "others' capacity for suffering" (13), *Beautiful Joe* reputedly sold over a million copies by 1900⁶ and has remained continually in print since 1894, most recently appearing in a Broadview annotated edition issued in 2015. This Canadian-authored book initially became an international bestseller because of its American production and distribution—a pattern that would reappear in 1944 with Graham's *Earth and High Heaven*. To qualify for publication by the American Humane Society, Nova Scotia-born Saunders had to transform the Ontario dog that inspired her story into a resident of Maine. The success of *Beautiful Joe* propelled Saunders into a lifetime pattern of writing fiction to promote social betterment; in addition to her many books about animals, she also wrote about the protection of children in such works as *The Story of the Graveleys* (1903) and *The Girl from Vermont: The Story of a Vacation Schoolteacher* (1910). The message running through Saunders' fiction is that the ills of urban, industrialized society can be cured by banning child labour, providing constructive recreation programs, and inculcating compassion by teaching kindness to animals. By awakening the North American reading public to the plight of brutalized pets and work animals, her books contributed to the climate that saw the inclusion of animal welfare in Canadian and American legislation at the end of the nineteenth century.

In turn-of-the-century North America, humane societies, suffrage organizations and aligned reform movements organized by White middle-class women to improve the lot of the marginalized paid scant attention to the situation of Native peoples, who were believed to be destined to disappear. While several Native American women (such as Susette La Flesche, Sophia Alice Callahan, Zitkala-Ša, and Sarah Winemucca) became known in the United States as lecturers about Native rights, Canadian author Pauline Johnson made her case primarily through creative writing and dramatic performance. Today, Indigenous literary critics frequently affirm that political significance is intrinsic to the work of all Native North American writers because they "live resistance," to cite Patricia Monture Angus (1999, 26), and all their writing is "a call for liberation, survival, and beyond to affirmation" in the words of Armand Garnet Ruffo (1999, 110). This direction was established at the end of the nineteenth century when Johnson achieved celebrity as a charismatic interpreter of Native culture and spokesperson for Indigenous concerns. In her personal life as a turn-of-the-century New Woman, Johnson presented many challenges to prevailing conventions of race and gender. An examination of her entire oeuvre yields a continuous (albeit not uniform) sense of advocacy as Johnson used her platform as an exotic performer of "Indian" poems and stories to provoke as much as entertain her audiences and readers. It is no coincidence that several notable non-native female activists were among her friends: writer Agnes Maule Machar, whose summer cottage she visited; pioneer Saskatchewan journalist Kate Simpson Hayes; and suffragist Nellie McClung, whom she remembered in her will. In much of her writing Pauline Johnson reversed the gaze of both race and patriarchy, breaking new ground in her depictions of Aboriginal female agency on the page and on the stage.

Born in 1861 on the Six Nations Reserve at Ohsweken, Ontario, Emily Pauline Johnson was the youngest child in an unusual mixed-race family. Her Mohawk father, George Henry

Martin Johnson, was an elected chief and professional translator who spoke six Aboriginal languages. Her English-born mother, Emily Susanna Howells, was a cousin of the American author, William Dean Howells. After the death of her father in 1884, Pauline followed the path often taken by needy genteel women and turned to writing as a means of support. Once she realized that people would pay to see her perform her poems, she adopted her great-grandfather's Mohawk name of "Tekahionwake" (meaning double wampum) and developed her signature stage persona by appearing in "Native" dress, with her hair down, for the first part of her program, returning for the second part transformed into a Victorian lady with her hair up. At a time when touring performers circulated regularly through the villages and towns of North America, Johnson was distinctive for the dual identity highlighted in her programming and for only presenting work that she had written. Between 1892 and 1909, she crossed Canada many times, visited the north-eastern United States, and sailed to England on three occasions. She never married and much has been made of the publicly announced engagement that was subsequently broken. Some of Johnson's 165 poems appeared in the three volumes of verse issued during her lifetime; there were also three volumes of selected stories and journalism. Much of her prose has remained uncollected and is now being digitized by "The People and the Text" project at Simon Fraser University. Pauline Johnson spent her last years in Vancouver where she died of breast cancer in 1913, three days before her fifty-second birthday.

To her Canadian audience of the early twentieth century, Johnson symbolized an idealized blending of the Native past with a British-oriented future where Canada's various ethnic strands stand "shoulder-to-shoulder" (Johnson 2000, 119) in "one common Brotherhood" (21). Although most of her poems make no reference to Aboriginal concerns, displaying her ability to write into the literary mainstream associated with the major White poets of her generation, her audience especially welcomed her contribution of Native content to Canada's nascent national identity and many recognized that her powerful dramatic monologues addressed colonial abuses. Finding herself quickly cast as a spokesperson for all Natives in Canada, Johnson acknowledged the responsibility of this role early in her career when she stated in 1890 that one of her goals was to "upset the Indian Extermination and Non-education Theory—in fact to stand by my blood and my race" (xvi).

This perspective suggests that we should regard her buckskin dress as a mandate rather than a costume. Despite public acceptance of her Native garments as "authentic," what she wore was not the dress of any one tribe but a collage of various artifacts that represented Aboriginality, based on an illustration of Minnehaha, the fictional heroine of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's popular narrative poem, *The Song of Hiawatha* (1855). Johnson ornamented her costume with evocative objects, including pieces of Iroquois silverwork, a wampum belt, ermine tails, a Sioux scalp, and her father's hunting knife. The resulting image played into the popularity of such attractions of the 1880s and 1890s as Buffalo Bill Cody's Wild West Show and ethnological Aboriginal exhibits at large-scale expositions; hence it offered a dramatic contrast to the upper-class lady created by her other costume, an elegant silk evening gown. The composite nature of Johnson's buckskin outfit dovetailed with the composite nature of her public role as the embodiment of Indigenous Canada. While she often spoke as a Mohawk from Six Nations, many of her texts voice concerns of other Native groups, especially those in western Canada. She severely criticized the tendency of White Canadian writers to homogenize all Natives into a single generic "Indian" (Johnson 2000, 177-83) and usually ascribed a specific identity to the persona or characters in her writings. These range from the Iroquois of her home territory to plains tribes who

are sometimes identified as Cree (“The Cattle Thief”) or Sioux (“Silhouette”), to the coastal cultures of British Columbia whose stories she interpreted in *Legends of Vancouver* (1911).

Some of Johnson’s strongest comments did not circulate widely during her lifetime. Her 1892 article in the *Toronto Sunday Globe* titled “A Strong Race Opinion: On the Indian Girl in Modern Fiction,” which castigates the representation of Native women in the Canadian literature of the day, garnered no response from her contemporaries, yet it is now regarded as a cornerstone of her intellectual analysis and has been frequently reprinted in the last two decades. Until it was published in 2002, another essay, “The Stings of Civilization,” remained in manuscript, presumably because its attacks on the commercialization of religion and on the capitalistic accumulation of wealth were too strong for its intended outlet, *Mother’s Magazine* (Chicago), which published some thirty pieces of Johnson’s prose between 1906 and 1911.

However, other works with overt political implications were on Johnson’s regular performance programs. The dramatic monologue, “A Cry from an Indian Wife,” first published in 1885, directly states, “By right, by birth, we Indians own these lands” (Johnson 2000, 15). This poem served as her signature piece; in 1892 a reviewer claimed that hearing Johnson perform it “was like [hearing] the voice of the nations who once possessed this country, who have wasted before our civilization, speaking through this cultured, gifted, soft-voiced descendant” (“Canadian Literature” 1892). In a later poem, “The Cattle Thief” (1894), Johnson (2002) speaks through the daughter of a murdered Cree chief who had sought food for his starving band, berating British settlers for robbing her people of land and food: “How have you paid us for our game? How paid us for our land? / By a *book* to save our souls from the sins *you* brought in your other hand” (99). Such powerful words prompted newspaper reviewers to remark that “more striking even than the elocutionary power is the train of thought that is awakened” regarding “the hardships of the Indians at the hands of the white man,” (“Elocutionary Entertainment” 1897) and that “when Miss Johnson stood before the audience and said ‘the land is ours’ it was enough to cause a shrinkage of the conscience” (Thomas 1892).

A number of Johnson’s texts meant for print rather than performance also draw attention to Native concerns. Her poem “The Corn Husker” attributes the hunger of a people “banished from their lands” to “might’s injustice” (Johnson 2000, 121), a phrase all the more powerful for its unspecified insinuation. In another brief poem, “Silhouette,” Johnson makes a similar point about the starvation of the Sioux by “fate’s decree” (104). Equally direct in addressing Native loss are several of Johnson’s stories written for juvenile readers: “The Potlatch” (1910) legitimizes the practice of the potlatch, ignoring the official ban first imposed in 1884 and reiterated in the revised Indian Act of 1895; and “We-hro’s Sacrifice” (1907) condones the outlawed Onondaga white dog ceremony.⁷ More subtle is Johnson’s tale of Aboriginal resistance to commercial pressure in “Hoolool of the Totem Poles,” one of her last contributions to *Mother’s Magazine*. Hoolool, a widow with a small son and presumably Tlingit or Tsimshian from her location “far north of Queen Charlotte Sound”, solves her economic woes by carving miniature replicas of her family’s “great Totem Pole”—much like the detailed models made in the late nineteenth century by renowned Haida artist Charles Edenshaw—to sell to tourists, thereby keeping the original “extraordinary carving” (Johnson 2000, 257) safe from the White “curio-hunters” (258) who want to purchase it for their collections.

In her journalism, Johnson used the printed page to legitimize other Aboriginal cultural practices, as in her articles about Iroquois silverwork that explained its sophisticated artistry to readers of *Boys’ World* in 1910. She also called attention to the Indigenous presence in sports. In addition to writing many pieces about canoeing, she highlighted the accomplishments of runner

Tom Longboat and presented lacrosse, regarded as Canada's national sport since the middle of the nineteenth century, as a bridge uniting Canada's multiple cultures: "It is singularly appropriate that the national field game of Canada should be originated by Indians, whipped into shape for practical sport by the English, and given a French name—Lacrosse" (Johnson 1908).⁸ Whether writing about Native mothering in a generalized fashion or retelling Coast Salish stories attached to specific features of the landscape, Johnson continually depicted Native moral values as respectful, caring, and unselfish. Her assertion that avarice is "absolutely unknown to the red man" and among Native people is termed "the white man's unkindness" then continues, "All red races are born Socialists, and most tribes carry out their communistic ideas to the letter" (Johnson 1999), an analysis commended by left-wing activist Margaret Fairley, writing in *New Frontiers* in 1954, for underscoring "the basic virtues of primitive communism" (Fairly 1954).⁹

Promotion of Native rights and values was not Johnson's only public concern. Her social consciousness may owe something to her maternal grandfather, a stern Quaker who moved his family from England to Ohio in 1832 in order to work in the abolition movement. His desire to name Pauline's older sister after "Little Eva" in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (E. H. C. Johnson 2009, 28) provides evidence that Stowe was part of the family's cultural inheritance. Possibly inspired by family stories of earlier participation in the Underground Railroad (19), Pauline responded to the Dreyfus case with "'Give us Barabbas.'" While she claimed this poem was "written after Dreyfus was exiled" (Johnson 2000, 313), an event that occurred in 1895, it did not receive publication until it appeared in several Manitoba newspapers in late September 1899, just after Dreyfus was pardoned. This strongly worded poem may be the only Canadian verse ever written in defence of the wrongly accused Alfred Dreyfus, whose case revealed the entrenched anti-Semitism in France. For Johnson, it marked a rare intervention into the realm of international affairs where her usual focus was the British Empire, which she supported in principle as part of her staunch Canadian nationalism. However, she did not hesitate to spell out her opinion of Americans: in "Canadian Born," the poem that provided the title of her second book, she celebrated being "born in Canada beneath the British flag" and proclaimed, "The Yankee to the south of us must south of us remain" (125-26).

Throughout her career, Johnson had much to say about the lives of women. An expert solo canoeist, she wrote about the excitement of paddling rivers and rapids and about the joys of camping, in adventure sketches and canoeing poems that injected a distinctively female presence into these normatively masculine activities. In 1892-93, she published a series of articles titled "Outdoor Pastimes for Women" in *Outing*, a prominent American recreational magazine, that promoted snowshoeing, skating, tobogganing, archery, cycling and canoeing through a maternal-feminist argument about the health of future mothers. Although she did not speak directly about women's suffrage in Canada, Johnson frequently mentioned the long-standing political power of Iroquois matrons. Typical is "The Lodge of the Law-makers," published in London in 1906: "I have heard that the daughters of this vast city cry out for a voice in the Parliament of this land. There is no need for an Iroquois woman to clamour for recognition in our councils; she has had it for upwards of four centuries" (Johnson 2000, 217). Johnson's many stories, articles, and poems about the historical and current value of Native women as peacemakers (in the poem "Dawendine" and the story "The Two Sisters") and as effective mothers (in her magazine articles "Mothers of a Great Red Race" and "Heroic Indian Mothers") confronted the denigration of Indigenous family life that underpinned the implementation of the residential school system. During her relatively brief life, Johnson opened many eyes to normative injustice in Canada, undoubtedly reaching the family of Gwethalyn Graham, who was well aware of the repression of Indigenous people.¹⁰ Three

decades after Johnson's death, Graham's *Earth and High Heaven* (1944a) picked up the thread from Johnson's Dreyfus poem to turn the spotlight on Canadians' overt and covert anti-Semitism.

Like Pauline Johnson, Gwethalyn Graham grew up in an unusual family. She inherited her social conscience from her parents, particularly her mother, a suffrage activist whose sense of justice had been fostered in turn by her father, a distinguished orientalist who would not tolerate racist attitudes or verbal slurs. A precocious child who published her first poem at the age of twelve (Meadowcroft 2008, 36), Graham experienced an erratic education that included four months in a Swiss finishing school and a year at Smith College before a disastrous marriage at the age of nineteen left her a young single mother. Her first book, *Swiss Sonata*, which projected the social and political tensions of the 1930s through the international roster of girls and teachers at a boarding school in Lausanne, won the Governor General's Award for Fiction for 1938. Between 1936 and 1948, while working on her fiction (including a novel that remains in manuscript), Graham also published articles voicing her feminist and progressive social views, an important aspect of her literary career that is examined by Sarah Galletly in a separate contribution to this volume. Along with her mother and her sister, Graham was active in the Canadian National Committee on Refugees; two pieces on the plight of European refugees, issued in November 1938, focussed on Canada's restrictive immigration policies, foreseeing the terrible story that would be fully revealed many decades later in Irving Abella and Harold Troper's *None is Too Many* (1982).

While the plot of *Earth and High Heaven* is a middlebrow romance of two mature lovers overcoming obstacles, its style and content reflect the social realism that has long been identified as the dominant mode of twentieth-century Canadian literary fiction. The opening scene, a cocktail party in the upper Westmount home of the downwardly mobile Drake family, establishes the complexities of the moment. In Montreal in June 1942, shortly after the conscription plebiscite that divided the country along linguistic lines, frictions intensify as French-Canadians resist participation in the war while many English-Canadian men are in uniform, awaiting assignment overseas. The recent marriage of the Drakes' son Tony to a French-Canadian woman has forced unexpected intimacy between the separate enclaves of French Catholics and English Protestants. Unmarried 28-year-old Erica Drake is a labour union advocate who has reached a glass ceiling as women's editor at the *Montreal Post*. Her relationship with her loving, manipulative father is problematic and she resists his invitation to become his partner in the family's declining mercantile business. Into this web of political, gendered, and Freudian tensions enters Marc Reiser (brought to the Drakes' party by a friend), a soft-spoken 33-year-old Jewish lawyer whose appeal is reciprocated by Erica and repudiated by her father. As the lovers' connection quickly develops, Graham focuses less on their emotions than on the insidiousness of racism, showing how easily the ideas of basically decent, liberal-minded individuals can be poisoned by the stereotypes they unthinkingly absorb. While English and French Canadians openly banter about their generalized perceptions of one another (Graham 2003, 73-74), anti-Semitism tacitly festers throughout the English community, normalizing discriminatory practices that include "Select Clientele" signs in hotels and restaurants (127), restricted apartment buildings (24-25), and quotas for Jewish university students (295). The love story concludes with the objecting parents reluctantly accepting their daughter's engagement, but without Shakespeare's reconciling embrace of Montagues and Capulets. Wartime uncertainty accentuates the book's open ending in September 1942, when Marc's unit is sent overseas and Erica quits her newspaper job to join the Canadian Women's Army Corps. The social issues have been aired, not resolved; Canadians would long maintain the country's "None is too many" immigration policies and permit open racial discrimination.¹¹

After Graham's manuscript was rejected by Houghton Mifflin "on the grounds that it wouldn't sell" (Meadowcroft 2008, 120), her persistent agent landed a contract with Lippincott in New York for publication in the fall of 1944. The book became an instant success, with adoption by the Literary Guild of America contributing to its sale of about 1,250,000 copies within a year (120). A significant factor in building this readership was the novel's advance serialization in *Collier's Weekly*, for which Graham received \$7500.¹² The magazine's editor justified his decision to publish this potentially controversial novel as a "public service" that made a "solid and valuable contribution to the cause of informed and enlightened tolerance in a war-wracked world" ("Earth and High Heaven" 1944). The magazine's wartime readership of some 2.5 million¹³ received an abridged version lacking material that was regarded as controversial, such as Erica's support for the unionization of newspaper staff and her agency in obtaining an abortion for her sister,¹⁴ as well as details that were viewed as too specifically Canadian for the American general reader, such as references to British Imperialism and to the complexities of French-English relations. In addition to sanitizing Graham's text, *Collier's* sought to pre-empt negative reactions by securing endorsements from a range of prominent writers and public figures whose testimonials complimenting the magazine's courage in publishing a novel on such a sensitive topic accompanied the first and second installments. These endorsers included a Jewish religious leader (Rabbi Sidney Tedesco), a Jewish performer (Eddie Cantor) and a Black leader (William White, Secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People), alongside representatives of organizations that stood for ethnic harmony (the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the Institute of American Democracy), as well as the Writers' War Board. Individual supporters included feminist Catholic writer Margaret Culkin Banning, popular Lutheran novelist Lloyd C. Douglas, and conservationist Louis Bromfield. As befitting a popular magazine, each opening page of the four installments (August 26, September 2, September 9, September 14) was highlighted with a large illustration that dramatized key moments of confrontation or recognition. The same kind of illustration accompanied the Literary Guild of America's full-page advertisement that was headed "Can Love and Religion Mix Without Exploding?" (Literary Guild of America 1945).

When the full book appeared in October of 1944, most British, Canadian, and American reviewers praised Graham's ability to negotiate the tricky genre of the "thesis-novel" (Benet 1944), with at least one noting a parallel with *Uncle Tom's Cabin* ("Race Prejudice" 1944). W. A. Deacon (1944a) welcomed the book into the tiny category of current Canadian fiction dealing with controversial issues (in his view, thus far occupied only by Morley Callaghan's *Such Is My Beloved* and Irene Baird's *Waste Heritage*), claiming that "No Canadian novel heretofore has exercised the slightest influence on the mass thinking of our people. Now that the process of social criticism is beginning, an increasingly intelligent interest will be taken in affairs because our writers are feeling deeply about our behaviour as a people." Reviewers' negative comments largely related to the gender of the author, with some male critics finding the novel too close to the style of women's magazines (Preston 1944; Prescott 1944); its only devastating review issued from the caustic pen of fellow Montrealer John Glassco (1945), who flayed Graham's book for portraying "the symbolic castration of the hero."¹⁵

In Canada, Graham's Montreal details were regarded as one of the strengths of *Earth and High Heaven*¹⁶ and contributed to its winning of the Governor General's Award for fiction. The book's geographical setting was of less interest to Americans, whose welcoming of Graham's timely discussion of racial prejudice enabled her book to top the *New York Times*' best-seller list for the weeks of April 22 and April 29 in 1945.¹⁷ In addition to being the Literary Guild of

America's selection of the month for October 1944, which led to sales of about 500,000, along with the Lippincott edition that sold some 300,000 and a Doran reprint that sold about 150,000 (Graham 1945),¹⁸ *Earth and High Heaven* was also one of the few Canadian titles to appear in an Armed Services edition, a format that guaranteed distribution of a further 300,000 copies to enlisted American soldiers.¹⁹ As well, it was both the first Canadian work and the first novel to receive the Anisfield-Wolf Book Award, established in 1935 by Cleveland poet and philanthropist Edith Anisfield for "books that make important contributions to our understanding of racism and cultural diversity" (Anisfield-Wolf Books Awards n.d.).²⁰ This award has mostly gone to works of non-fiction and to books about the core American problem of black/white relations, with occasional attention to titles about other groups, including Jews and Native Americans.²¹

The romantic aspects of Graham's novel appealed to Hollywood, resulting in the story of the movie that was never made. In late September of 1944, before the release of the hardcover book on October 4, Metro-Goldwyn Meyer purchased the film rights for \$100,000 and nearly two years later announced that Gregory Peck was to play Marc Reiser, with Joan Fontaine as his co-star ("Peck to Play Lead" 1946; "Joan Fontaine" 1946). However, in 1947 the theme of anti-Semitism was scooped by Twentieth-Century Fox's Oscar-winning film of *Gentlemen's Agreement* adapted from the book by Laura Z. Hobson, also starring Gregory Peck (here playing a fake Jew rather than a real Jew). While *Gentleman's Agreement* topped the *New York Times'* bestseller list in 1947, it lacks the subtlety and style of Graham's book; however, its New York setting offered familiarity to its American audience and its post-war time frame gave it greater currency than the 1942 wartime setting of *Earth and High Heaven*. After the film aborted, there were promising newspaper stories about adapting *Earth and High Heaven* into a stage play ("2 Novels" 1950), but that too failed to materialize.

An Oscar-level film with major Hollywood stars would certainly have enhanced the long-term canonicity of Graham's book. While its Canadian context of English/French tensions contributed to its lack of enduring appeal in the United States, in Canada Graham's book was canonically scooped by Hugh MacLennan's *Two Solitudes*, published a year later, in 1945. Likewise set in Montreal, this novel makes grand claims for recognition as a national narrative and uses the motif of cross-cultural romance to examine the gulf between English and French Canada.²² MacLennan's cleverest move was his choice of title, which quickly became a national catchphrase. The phrase "Two Solitudes" could have equally applied to Graham's story and the Housman epigraph that supplied Graham's title could have been attached to MacLennan's epic narrative; one wonders how the eventual status of the two books might have altered if their titles had been exchanged. However, canonicity requires visibility. Graham did not publish another novel, made a second disastrous marriage, and spent the 1950s as an unhappy faculty wife in the United States, whereas during the 1950s and 1960s MacLennan forged an enduring presence as a prolific author and public intellectual.²³

Also contributing to the sidelining of *Earth and High Heaven* was Gabrielle Roy's remarkably successful novel depicting the francophone under-class of Montreal, which appeared as *Bonheur d'occasion* in 1945 and as *The Tin Flute* in 1947. In its English translation, it too was a monthly choice of the Literary Guild of America, leading to spectacular sales. In the 1950s, *Two Solitudes* and *The Tin Flute* captured the attention of the English-Canadian literary realm by addressing the otherness of French Canada through their depictions of the social geography of Montreal. At the same time, these books' lack of attention to the city's substantial Jewish community enabled English-speaking Canadians to disregard their internal otherness of anti-Semitism.²⁴ The Quiet Revolution of the 1960s and the 1969 report of Royal Commission on

Bilingualism and Biculturalism did much to enshrine this pattern of canonicity, leaving it to later Jewish writers such as Irving Layton and Mordecai Richler to take up Graham's project of expanding the English/French dyad by triangulating with Canada's Jewish community, soon identified as the country's "third solitude" (Marshall 1978; Greenstein 1989).²⁵

Despite being an early selection for the New Canadian Library with an erudite introduction by Eli Mandel, *Earth and High Heaven* slipped off the radar. It did not make the list of the one hundred most important works of Canadian fiction generated for the 1978 Calgary Conference on the Novel although it did appear on the ballot, nor was it taught at any Canadian university in 1997-98 or 2007-08 according to Paul Martin's compilations in *Sanctioned Ignorance* (2013). This novel remained out of print from 1969 until it was re-issued by Cormorant Books in 2003. This edition received more attention in the general press than among academics,²⁶ but it has now also been discontinued. However, in 2017 *Earth and High Heaven* was republished in London by Persephone Books, a press dedicated to reprinting "neglected fiction and non-fiction by mid-twentieth century (mostly) women writers" (Persephone Books n.d.)²⁷ with an intelligent introduction by Emily Rhodes that points out the book's relevance to current social issues in Britain.

Graham's last major publication appeared in 1963 and is discussed in Sarah Galletly's chapter. *Dear Enemies*, a vibrant dialogue with Solange Chaput-Roland about English-French relations that was published simultaneously as *Chers ennemis*, suggests that Graham would have returned to visibility with the fresh wave of Canadian writers who rose to prominence in the late 1960s and 1970s, had she not died of a brain tumour in 1965 at the age of 52. In the annals of Canada's literary history, she is often better recognized for her leadership in the Canadian Authors Association's lobbying to change legislation in order to permit writers to average their incomes for tax purposes (Meadowcroft 2008, 126-32) than for her actual writings.

The year 1942, when *Earth and High Heaven* takes place, saw the enactment of one of the most dramatic examples of Canadian racism when, after the bombing of Pearl Harbour, all residents of Japanese extraction were swiftly removed from the west coast, where most of them worked in the fishing industry. Some 22,000 Japanese Canadians (14,000 of whom were born in Canada) lost their property and their civil rights as they were interned in makeshift camps in various inland sites where they often served as forced labour. After the war there was minimal restitution for property loss. In the 1970s, the redress movement took on fresh momentum, resulting in further restitution and a formal apology from the federal government in 1988. So perhaps the most obvious Canadian parallel to *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is Joy Kogawa's novel, *Obasan* (1981), whose powerful fictionalization of the Japanese internment gave resonance to the redress movement.

Obasan was not the first literary work by a Canadian woman writer to address Canada's mistreatment of its Japanese citizens during the Second World War: Dorothy Livesay had articulated their plight in her radio verse drama, *Call My People Home* (1950), and Jessie Louise Beattie had done the same in her novel, *Strength for the Bridge: A Chronicle Of Japanese Immigration* (1966). As with *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, which had been preceded by a substantial body of anti-slavery literature in both Britain and the US, *Obasan* owed its success in part to the timeliness of its appearance, cresting a movement that was gathering momentum and was ready to attach itself to a specific human story. Ken Adachi had previously published a detailed history of Canada's racist treatment of the Japanese in *The Enemy That Never Was* (1976), and Kogawa had written poems about her childhood trauma of losing her home and community,²⁸ but it was the novel that engaged readers.

The fictional memoir of Naomi Nakane, *Obasan* reflects Kogawa's childhood experience of being thrust from middle-class urban comfort into the disorientation of being redefined as an "enemy alien." While Kogawa's own family remained intact during the internment, the fiction heightens the child's destabilization when Naomi's mother disappears while on a visit to Japan. The figure of the lost mother hovers over the entire novel, to be resolved only at the end when Naomi learns that her mother had perished during the atomic bombing of Nagasaki. Kogawa's structurally sophisticated narrative balances the child's pain and bewilderment against the perspective of several adults: the adult Naomi, who has retreated into silence, and activist Aunt Emily, who seeks justice and restitution. By the end, Naomi has learned to articulate her grief and comes to terms with her past, but it is left to Canadian readers to recognize and resolve the injustice of the internment.

Like *Earth and High Heaven*, *Obasan* quickly garnered prizes, including the First Novel Award from the magazine *Books in Canada* and the Canadian Authors Association's "Book of the Year" Award. In 1983 it received an American Book Award from the Before Columbus Foundation and it was later named as one of the most important books in Canadian history by the *Literary Review of Canada (The LRC 100 2006)*. This novel played a significant role in recruiting participants into the Japanese-Canadian redress movement (Miki 2004, 200) and in establishing Kogawa's own commitment while living in Toronto, where she was "a driving force behind the formation of the National Coalition for Japanese Canadian Redress, enlisting the support of many high profile contacts in the arts community" (Sugiman 2000, 187).²⁹ National recognition of her novel penetrated the process of obtaining the federal government's formal apology of 1988, which included then NDP Leader Ed Broadbent reading passages from *Obasan* in the House of Commons (Kogawa 2013). Unlike *Earth and High Heaven*, *Obasan* remains in public view, particularly in Vancouver. It was the 2005 selection of the Vancouver Public Library for its "One Book, One Vancouver" community reading program, and the house in south Vancouver from which Kogawa's family was expelled in 1942 has been rescued from demolition and restored as the Historic Joy Kogawa House, with programming as a literary centre (Metten 2011). In 2008, a cutting from the dying cherry tree in the house's back yard was planted and plaqued in the garden at Vancouver's City Hall where it now flourishes.

Obasan owes some of its ongoing visibility to Kogawa's subsequent retelling of Naomi's story in modified versions for younger readers with *Naomi's Road* (1986, revised in 2005) and *Naomi's Tree* (2008); the attractive cover art of these stories depicts an increasingly younger Naomi. A stage adaptation of *Naomi's Road* premiered in the 1991-92 season of Toronto's Young People's Theatre³⁰ and an operatic adaptation is frequently performed for student audiences, most recently in Toronto in November 2016.³¹ These versions focus on the trauma of the displaced child, without the political and historical context provided by the figure of Aunt Emily and other adult characters, a pattern further reinforced by the publisher's decision to issue *Obasan* in 2014 as a Puffin Classics edition for younger readers (age 12+ according to the back cover), which was the only available edition for several years.³² It has long been common for adult books to appeal to younger readers (and vice versa), a phenomenon now identified as "crossover" literature. Such books as *Robinson Crusoe* and the works of Jules Verne engage with both adult and youthful readerships and are marketed to both; indeed, it is often the publisher who determines a book's target audiences (Beckett 2009, 1-15; 181-87).³³ While *Obasan* reappeared in an adult edition in the Penguin Modern Classics series in 2017, the effect of Penguin/Pelican's decision to package it as a book for adolescents as well as adults has been to recast a novel that analyzes racism and history through the effects of war on a child, into a story for children about a child's suffering. In

contrast to the animal stories of Marshall Saunders, which deliberately address a juvenile readership under the theory that children should learn empathy at an early age (an approach also taken by Pauline Johnson in her stories written for *Boys' World*), *Obasan* was originally directed toward adults who can understand the history of racism and do something about it. It is important for Canadian children to learn about the Japanese internment, but I would argue that this shift of audience to specifically addressing juvenile readers diminishes *Obasan's* examination of discrimination and injustice. While mature adolescents might well be attracted to the adult text, with its cover photo of a little girl looking out the window of a train, a book that looks as though it is meant for ten-year-olds will appeal to few adults. Hence the book's publishing history supports Scott McFarlane's argument that Ed Broadbent's invocation of Naomi Nakane alongside Prime Minister Mulroney's official 1988 apology in the House of Commons confirmed the association of a child-like identity with Japanese Canadians, thereby reducing the ground breaking "contribution to human rights exemplified by the redress agreement" (MacFarlane 1995, 409). This pattern of devaluation may account for the fifty percent drop in *Obasan's* appearance on Canadian literature course lists between 1997-98 and 2007-08, according to Paul Martin's calculations (Martin 2013, 221; 250). The apparent decline in the standing of *Obasan* contrasts with the rise of interest in *Beautiful Joe* and Pauline Johnson's writings, which have recently been elevated to the level of serious literature through their appearances in scholarly editions from Broadview Press and the University of Toronto Press.

While there is no Canadian *Uncle Tom's Cabin* that can be mythically credited with starting a Civil War, there are certainly creative writings that have had what I would describe as an *Uncle Tom's Cabin* effect. These woman-authored works humanize the other by seizing the popular imagination with sympathetic portrayals of those who have been victimized because of their race, religion, ethnicity, or species (in the case of animal-welfare stories). While it is difficult to credit many of these publications with directly influencing Canadian legislation, they certainly expanded the social consciousness of their thousands of contemporary readers and for the most part continue to have an impact today.

Notes

¹ In *Mightier than the Sword: Uncle Tom's Cabin and the Battle for America*, David S. Reynolds (2011) documents the breadth of the book's influence. For example, in Russia, 67 editions of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* were published between 1857 and 1917 (174) and a Yiddish version was performed in Chicago in 1900 (176). In the US, the popularity of "Tom plays" created opportunities for black actors (180).

² Women's causes were not always progressive; for example, Hilda Glyn-Ward's *The Writing on the Wall* (1921) cautioned Canadians about the "yellow peril" of Oriental immigration.

³ Publishers of reprints sometimes elevate books as "classics" even though their initial production and readership were limited. For example, the front cover of Minnie Smith's *Is It Just?* (2011) claims it as a "classic feminist novel" and the front cover of Alice A. Chown's *The Stairway* (1988) describes it as "an early feminist classic."

⁴ This site centres on the restored home of Rev. Josiah Henson, a former slave whose autobiography was one of Stowe's sources, enhanced with historic structures that have been moved to this locale to commemorate the underground railroad. See www.heritagetrust.on.ca/uncle-tom-s-cabin-historic-site/home.aspx.

⁵ For an analysis of the historical involvement of women in Canada's animal welfare movement, see Ingram 2017, 87-113.

⁶ In her chapter on Saunders in *Silenced Sextet*, Elizabeth Waterston (1992) claims that “The first American edition sold out in ten days and by 1900 had sold 625,000 copies. The Canadian edition had sold 558,000 by 1900 and the British 146,000 by the same date” (147), but the source of these figures is not cited and the Canadian number is questionable.

⁷ These were published in *Boys’ World* (Chicago)—“We-hro’s Sacrifice” in 1907 and “The Potlatch” in 1910—and included in *The Shagganappi*, a posthumous collection of Johnson’s juvenile stories issued in Toronto in 1913 with a dedication to “the Boy Scouts.”

⁸ See also Johnson’s “The Game of Lacrosse,” (1892) and “La Crosse” (1911).

⁹ Margaret Fairley had already enlisted Johnson into her progressivist cause with the inclusion of two substantial selections in her anthology *Spirit of Canadian Democracy* (1945): the daughter’s accusatory speech from “The Cattle Thief” (137-38) and Joe Capilano’s account of cooperation in saving Salish children from the legendary deluge, taken from “The Deep Waters” (145-48).

¹⁰ In Graham’s unpublished novel, “West Wind” (c. 1940), the major characters visit an Ontario Indian reservation, ironically named “Christian Island,” where “the Indians, or what remained of them . . . had been left with a government pension of \$10.00 a year for each, to scratch a living from the stony soil, sell berries and sweet-hay baskets trimmed with porcupine quills to the summer visitors, and to die of tuberculosis and many other diseases due to under-nourishment and poverty” (83).

¹¹ In addition to echoing *Romeo and Juliet*, *Earth and High Heaven* may contain an oblique reference to Stowe. Michèle Rackham (2010) calls attention to the significance of the print of Van Gogh’s *L’arlésienne* hanging in the Drake living-room, noting that in one of the six versions of this work, the books on the table can be identified as French versions of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* and a collection of Dickens’ Christmas stories (132).

¹² My thanks to Crystal Bjerke for her work on the book’s serialization in *Collier’s* while a student in my English 841 graduate class at Simon Fraser University. *Earth and High Heaven* was also serialized in Australia in 1945 in the *Argus Weekend Magazine*.

¹³ This figure is taken from *Wikipedia*: [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collier’s](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collier's).

¹⁴ My thanks to Jennifer Chung in my English 111 class for noticing that the three paragraphs concerning the abortion were cut from the undated impression of the 1944 Lippincott edition that has been digitized by archive.org.

¹⁵ While I have found no evidence of interaction between Graham and Glassco, it is possible that the vehemence of Glassco’s attack on Graham derived from his anger with *First Statement’s* editor John Sutherland, who had refused to issue Glassco’s *En Arrière* with First Statement Press due to the likelihood of censorship. See Brian Busby’s *A Gentleman of Pleasure: One Life of John Glassco* (2011), 115-18. History has its ironies, and today plaques to both Graham and Glassco adorn the same wall the Montreal Writers’ Chapel.

¹⁶ For example, see W. J. Hurlow’s “Under the Reading Lamp” (1944).

¹⁷ See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_New_York_Times_Fiction_Best_Sellers_of_1945.

¹⁸ As well there were translations into major European languages for which sales figures aren’t available.

¹⁹ See www.armedserviceseditions.com/ASElistingauthor.htm.

²⁰ Over the years the value of this prize has risen from \$1,000 to \$10,000.

²¹ The majority of the winners have been Americans, with a sprinkling of writers from Europe, South Africa, and the Caribbean; on the Canadian side, Graham was followed by Farley Mowat for *People of the Deer* (1953) and Esi Eduygan for *Halfblood Blues* (2012).

²² As Graham and the MacLennans were friends in Montreal and active together in the Canadian Authors Association, it is likely that the two writers discussed the similarities between their books. Graham (1945) stated that she “started cooking *Earth and High Heaven* in the autumn of 1940.” Early drafts in MacLennan’s fonds at McGill University indicate that he began *Two Solitudes* in 1941/42, but it isn’t clear when he added the concluding romance between Paul Tallard and Heather Methuen. MacLennan had mixed feelings about *Earth and High Heaven*. In public, he praised it as an example of a Canadian writer finding a universal topic (MacLennan 1946), but in personal correspondence he revealed his jealousy about Graham’s success. He told Dorothy Dumbrille that Graham’s book was “not really Canadian as yours is” (“MacLennan to Dumbrille” 1945) and described *Earth and High Heaven* to Marian Engel as a book that “is not deep enough to endure into another age” (quoted in Verduyn 1995, 49). His bitterness about the greater economic success enjoyed by *Earth and High Heaven* in comparison with *Two Solitudes* underlies his view that American reviewers missed the significance of *Two Solitudes* and read it as “simply another mixed marriage story” (quoted in Cameron 1981, 184).

²³ The material production of the two novels reflects the contrasting positions of their authors. From the first hardback editions to later paperbacks, publishers’ packaging of *Two Solitudes* and *Earth and High Heaven* represented the book by the male author more seriously, with cover images and blurbs connoting significance, whereas the paperback editions by the female author were usually cast as lighter romances.

²⁴ There is one brief reference to Jews in chapter 27 of *Two Solitudes* when Emilie works for a Jewish clothing manufacturer, and one in chapter 28 of *The Tin Flute* noting an old Jew who gave a guitar to Pitou. On a different occasion, Roy depicted Jews sympathetically in an article in the *Bulletin des agriculteurs* (39, no. 2, February 1943) about the Jewish farming community of Edenbridge in Northern Saskatchewan; this was later translated as “Palestine Avenue” and included in *The Fragile Lights of Earth* (1982). For a rare comment about Canadian anti-Semitism by another writer, see Earle Birney’s poem “Restricted Area” (1947).

²⁵ Graham’s most obvious successor as a critic of English Canada’s normative anti-Semitism was Mordecai Richler, who often integrated the issue of intermarriage into his ongoing inquiry into what it means to be Jewish in the modern world. While his own marriage to a gentile was long and happy, in his novels similar marriages contribute to the anxieties of his protagonists.

²⁶ Dorothy Lipovenko (1992) mentions having read *Earth and High Heaven* in high school.

²⁷ This is their second Canadian title, following their reprint of Ethel Wilson’s *Hetty Dorval* in 2005. My thanks to Sarah Gellatly for this reference.

²⁸ In Kogawa’s *A Choice of Dreams* (1974), see “When I was a Little Girl,” 52, and “What Do I Remember of the Evacuation,” 54-55.

²⁹ See also Kogawa’s Epilogue in Sugiman 2000, 351-53.

³⁰ It was remounted in 1995-96 and performed in Edmonton in 2000 (Young People’s Theatre n.d.; “Wing, Paula” 2012).

³¹ Commissioned by Vancouver Opera in 2005, the forty-five-minute opera of *Naomi’s Road* was composed by Ramona Luengen with a libretto by Ann Hodges. It was performed by Tapestry Opera in Toronto in November 2016.

³² The current edition appears within the Puffin Classics series aimed at juvenile readers. See www.penguinrandomhouse.com/series/DT1/puffin-classics?page=2.

³³ My thanks to Nicky Didicher for the recommendation of Beckett’s book.

VII. “Speaking Out”: Gwethalyn Graham’s Non-Fiction Sarah Galletly

Gwethalyn Graham (1913-65) was a leading literary figure in Montreal’s intellectual community throughout the 1940s, yet she remains relatively obscure in contemporary Canadian literary scholarship. She was the recipient of two Governor General’s Awards: her first novel, *Swiss Sonata* (1938), ending up on the Nazi blacklist (“The Week’s Work” 1944); and her second novel *Earth and High Heaven* (1944) becoming “the first Canadian novel to top the American bestseller list” (Rackham 2010, 121).¹ Graham managed to secure serial release in *Collier’s* magazine for \$7,500 before *Earth and High Heaven’s* publication, with Sam Goldwyn (of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer) purchasing the movie rights to the story for \$100,000 (Rackham 2010, 121). A profile for *Collier’s* which accompanied the first instalment of *Earth and High Heaven’s* serialisation, outlined how this novel’s publication boosted Graham’s career: “She sold occasional articles to newspapers and magazines, but she did not exactly make a living at it. ‘I kept telling myself that, even so, I was doing better than Bernard Shaw did at first. He earned \$30 in nine years of writing. I earned \$1,200 in the same length of time. Now if I could only follow his footsteps the rest of the way...’” (“The Week’s Work” 1944). Her footsteps now demand to be retraced.

Throughout the 1940s, Graham frequently spoke out in magazines such as *Canadian Forum*, *Saturday Night*, *Chatelaine* and *Maclean’s* on issues surrounding the war, refugees, and women’s place in Canadian society and the workplace. While she experienced the stigma of single-motherhood in the 1940s, Graham also discovered the freedom to write. Although her literary output significantly declined during the 1950s due to her new marriage and status as a faculty wife, she nevertheless returned to the public intellectual forum in the 1960s with a dialogue on the emerging tensions in Montreal between English-Canadians and French-Canadians. In *Chers ennemis/Dear Enemies* (1963), an epistolary dialogue co-authored with Solange Chaput-Rolland, Graham covers topics as wide-ranging as conscription, the need for greater translation of Quebecois novels, racism, and social justice; she also shared her fears about the increasing political violence of the 1960s. This work was generally well-received, the two authors obtaining grants of \$5,000 each from the Canadian Centennial Commission to prepare a joint diary entitled “The Picnic Papers,” based upon their travels across Canada (E. Cameron 1997, 159). Unfortunately, this proposed trip was never undertaken because of Graham’s rapidly declining health and subsequent death from brain cancer in late 1965.

These critically underexplored, yet decidedly public (and arguably more overtly political) avenues of Graham’s literary output help to build a portrait of her status in Montreal’s intellectual community of the 1940s and 1960s, and demonstrate her engagement with the pressing issues of her day through her work as a freelance journalist and political speaker. In her pioneering attempts to bring Graham’s work back into the public eye—as well as to scholarly attention—Elspeth Cameron (1997) argued in the 1990s that Graham’s “interest in internationalism was out of step with the anxious nationalism that swept the wartime Canadian literary scene” (161) and that “her political activism . . . was far ahead of its time, and would be, with rare exceptions, the exclusive territory of male writers until the feminist revolution that began in the mid-1960s” (160). Elspeth Cameron, Barbara Opala and Barbara Meadowcroft have all drawn attention to the importance of Graham’s writing, but focus their attentions on her fiction rather than her non-fiction.

Although scholars in recent years have sought to reinforce Graham’s tentative position in the Canadian literary canon by stressing the value of *Earth and High Heaven* beyond its outstanding commercial success, they nevertheless continue to focus on Graham’s bestselling novel. For instance, Colin Hill (2012) recuperates Graham’s fiction into the genre of English-Canadian “modern realism,” classifying Graham as a “social realist” through her exploration

of the issues of her day in *Earth and High Heaven*. For Hill, Canadian social realists are defined by their tendency to “situate everyday, commonplace occurrences in relation to encompassing historical events and patterns,” and their work explores “the ways in which the lives of ‘real’ individuals are bound up in larger forces” (150). Conversely, Michèle Rackham (2010), focusing on the common criticism of *Earth and High Heaven* as a romance novel, argues that

[t]he popular romance novel serves as an ideal genre through which to explore issues of citizenship and national identity precisely because its narrative elements work toward recognition. In this way, the romantic narrative of Graham’s novel facilitates the re-establishment of a Canadian heritage of tolerance and inclusion and a reworking of the Canadian national identity to include hyphenated subjects. (123)

Both studies reinforce Graham’s ongoing significance and value for future scholarly work, yet they inadvertently buttress the image of Graham as an author who wrote “one great novel,” a perspective which overlooks the contributions she made to Canada’s intellectual community through her work in non-fiction and magazine journalism both before and after the success of her bestselling novel.

Graham herself seems to have been acutely aware of her characterisation as a one- novel author. When she accepted her second Governor General’s Award at Montreal’s Ritz-Carlton, she admitted:

Personally, I am worried to death about my next book, having done five so far of which only two were even worth publishing. At the risk of sounding ungrateful—which Heaven knows I am not—being so strongly identified with one book and one title gives one an awful feeling at times, and I should like to forget all about *Earth and High Heaven* and get on to something else if I can, and, with luck do a better job next time. (quoted in Meadowcroft 2008, 126)

Meadowcroft and Cameron have both addressed the creative “paralysis” Graham felt following the meteoric success of *Earth and High Heaven*. Yet it does a disservice to Graham’s legacy to limit her cultural impact to one novel, especially given her active presence in Canada’s intellectual community both before and after her bestseller, and during her return to the public arena in the 1960s.

In *City Unique: Montreal Days and Nights in the 1940s and ‘50s*, William Weintraub (2004) claims that “[i]n the 1940s and ‘50s, the best novels that had ever been written in Canada were being written by Montreal authors” (203). What is most significant about Weintraub’s depiction of Montreal in this era is that it is “almost exclusively English-speaking” (Rodgers 2010, 2). In an early survey of contemporary English-Canadian fiction from Quebec, Linda Leith (1990) argues that the 1940s was the era when English-Canadian fiction “came of age” in Quebec. After listing many English-writing Quebecers who gained prominence then, she notes the short-lived cultural and scholarly interest in these writers: “Surely as striking as this galaxy of names from the Quebec of the 1940s and 50s, however, is the extent to which the English writers of Quebec subsequently dropped almost entirely out of sight on the English Canadian literary horizon.” For Leith, this lack of recognition is also gendered, as “[t]he lack of powerfully effective women’s voices in English fiction from Quebec has been all the more marked in comparison with the prominence of feminine voices among both francophone and English Canadian writers outside Quebec, and in comparison with the relative prominence of male writers within English Quebec.” Leith identifies how “Anglophone writers” in 1960s Quebec felt marginalised or “ghettoised” by their labelling, side-lined from the bicultural canon-building strategies of the decade (n2). Sherry Simon (2012) has argued that “the 1940s

emerge as a kind of retroactive corrective to the bifocal vision of the 1960s. The postwar years saw a huge influx of immigrants and refugees, contributing to the sudden diversification of the city—and prefiguring the more recent waves of immigration into the city” (123). Graham’s non-fiction writing during and after the war provides valuable insight into how “the third modernity of the 1940s . . . created spaces of expression which continue to act upon the city” today (124). Her active presence in magazines and newspapers drew attention to the increasingly multicultural makeup and attendant tensions of Montreal and, most significantly for Graham, the opportunities social change offered to both English- and French-speaking Canadians.

In *Great Dames*, Elspeth Cameron (1997) introduces Graham as a romanticised figure: As if she were the subject of a compelling documentary film, she whirled into purposeful action: amassing statistics on the refugees pouring into Canada; identifying the insidious and pervasive anti-Semitism of the time; writing articles to make Canadians see the terrible truth she had witnessed; pitching her impassioned plea to dispel hypocrisy wherever and whenever she could; opening her home to the “displaced persons” who arrived destitute in Montreal during the early years of the war. (146)

Although such a description may feel inflated, it reinforces how central Graham’s non-fiction writing was to her political and social agenda. In an attempt to draw public attention to the plight of European refugees, many of whom she temporarily housed when the need arose, Graham expended a great deal of time throughout the war writing on such issues for Canadian magazines like *News Chronicle*, *Canadian Forum* and *Saturday Night*. One of her first published articles appeared in December 1936 in the *Canadian Forum* and was eye-catchingly entitled, “Women, Are They Human?” In it, Graham (1936) argues that a major outcome of the Depression in Canada was “that the position of women ha[d] begun to slip back and that women in general during that time [the last six years] ha[d] lost a good many of the advantages which took more than a hundred years to obtain” (21). Most controversially, Graham found “a basic idea in common” between a decision by the Board of Governors of a Canadian university to dismiss married female instructors and Hitler’s “three Ks” (Kinder, Küche, Kirche): “That idea is the traditional view of women as people of a purely secondary existence—wives, mother[s], sisters, sweethearts—rather than as people with an existence of their own as individuals” (Graham quoted in Meadowcroft 2008, 52). This highly combative article was followed by an article in *Saturday Night* about the “unjustifiably high infant and maternal mortality rates” entitled “Canadians Die Much Too Fast” (Graham 1937, 39). These articles demonstrate Graham’s determination to argue for better rights and conditions for women in Canada, alongside her activism on behalf of immigrants and refugees affected by the Second World War. Graham critically and unapologetically addressed the problems within Canada, long before she began writing about them in her popular fiction.

Eva Mackey (1999) has argued that “[f]rom early versions of Canadian history through to the Quebec referendums . . . official definitions of English-Canadian history and identity present the past as a ‘heritage’ of tolerance,” even though immigration policies in Canada up to Second World War remained hierarchized based on “preferred” racial groups (15). As Donna Ryan (1996) outlines, “[n]ot only did the director of immigration from 1936 to 1943, Frederick Charles Blair, voice anti-Semitism, but Prime Minister Mackenzie King expressed fears about admitting Jews who might disturb religious and cultural unity in Canada” (135). Max Beer (2007) has argued that the interwar period was typified by a “mood across the country [that] was decidedly against immigration” (202). Such clear opposition to immigration, and particularly Jewish immigration, highlights the extent to which Graham was working against the public “mood.” Her early journalistic pieces tried to gain sympathy for European refugees

long before her 1944 novel cast a critical eye on Montreal society's prejudices surrounding Jewish Canadians.

Following the British success of *Swiss Sonata*, in 1938 Graham rented a flat in London so that she could "mak[e] notes on the political situation with a view to writing some articles" (Meadowcroft 2008, 79). Upon her return from Europe, her article for *Saturday Night* entitled "Refugees: The Human Aspect" (1938) focused on those who had been denied entry to Canada due to anti-immigration policies. She attempted to fashion a sense of kinship between Canadians and Jewish-Germans through their shared status as products of an immigrant society:

Not very long ago the pattern of these people's lives was very like your own: they had roots like yours in their community, and thought of themselves as an integral part of that larger community, the German state. They believed they *were* Germans. As one of them said to me in London two months ago, "I don't suppose we remembered our Jewish blood much oftener than you think of your Scottish blood. We thought we were German, as you consider yourself Canadian." (Graham 1938)

The Canadian government's unwillingness to aid refugees, especially because Canada did not suffer from the same overcrowding faced by England and France, caused Graham severe shame. She explained: "At dinner parties and teas and cocktail parties the refugees I met used to question me about Canada until I came to dread any reference to my nationality and hoped that I would be taken for English." By December 1944, Graham began to argue for new immigration policies within Canada. In "Let's Have Immigrants and Not All Farmers" she adopted a more clinical, economically focused approach, stating, "[u]nder peacetime conditions, the Dominion needs more consumers and needs them badly. Whether those consumers or immigrants should necessarily be confined to prospective farmers is highly questionable" (Graham 1944b). Using the examples of England and Palestine, she articulated how:

In both countries it was found that *the demand for capital goods created by large-scale immigration exceeds the amount which the immigrants can produce, and even under the worst conditions of depression, a static or actually contracting economy becomes dynamic*. In other words, during a depression, things either stand still or slide backwards. The problem is to get them moving forward again. A war is one way of doing it; large-scale immigration is another.

Instead of appealing to readers' national pride, Graham prioritised the material gains and economic benefits immigration could offer everyday Canadians. She concluded: "Sooner or later we will either have to open our doors or go out of business. Let it be sooner, for our own sake."

Graham's growing cultural and intellectual capital during the 1940s is evident in the editorial commentary introducing her journalism. In *Saturday Night* (November 1938), Graham is framed for readers as "a Toronto girl who has spent much time recently in Switzerland and elsewhere in Europe in close contact with victims of the Refugee Problem which she here describes, and has written a very poignant novel, 'Swiss Sonata,' describing the results of the current racial animosities as shown in an international girls' school in an Alpine city" (Graham 1938). Her "authority" to speak on such divisive issues appears to stem from her hands-on experience, where she has been in "close contact" with the victims of the refugee crisis. By 1944, however, her political and economic journalism is eclipsed by her newfound literary celebrity.

The author of “Earth and High Heaven”, this season’s great fiction success, and of the less known but also important “Swiss Sonata”, Gwethalyn Graham is a Canadian who writes fiction because she knows it is the most effective means of getting ideas into the public mind. A hater of every kind of race prejudice, she is convinced that considerations not only of humanity but of economic interest dictate a generous immigration policy for Canada. (Graham 1944b)

Graham is lauded for her willingness to mobilise her fiction to serve larger social and political purposes. She is portrayed as a bombastic figure (“a hater of race prejudice of every kind”) who can approach these issues with an eye towards Canada’s economic future and “humanity.” *Saturday Night* perhaps chose to maximise Graham’s influential value while she remained a key figure in the public’s literary consciousness, yet their references to her as “this season’s great fiction success” work to reinforce the transitory nature of Graham’s literary renown.

Graham also appeared in high-circulation mainstream Canadian magazines such as *Chatelaine* and *Maclean’s* in the 1940s. Her 1946 article for *Chatelaine*, “We Are A Self-Satisfied Nation,” focused on tolerance—an issue her name had become synonymous with following the success of *Earth and High Heaven*. The magazine’s editorial copy stressed that she was “the inevitable choice to look into the subject of group tolerance—how much we now have, [and] how much we should have for our own salvation as a vigorous, cohesive people” (Graham 1946, 10). This *Chatelaine* piece consolidates Graham’s status within Canadian society as a public intellectual, constructing her as a writer hard at work on her “new book” but who felt the necessity of taking up this “assignment” as

The book (which will take at least two years to finish) could wait; the challenge of discussing a problem which is both national and individual, and of paramount importance on each of these levels, was of immediate urgency. Such decision offers a clue of no small significance to the personality and public consciousness of this young Canadian writer who spares neither herself, her subject nor her public when she feels the necessity for speaking out. (Graham 1946, 10)

Not only does the article stress the importance of the issues Graham discusses but her significance as a “young Canadian writer” valued for her willingness to “speak out” on uncomfortable issues, “sparing no-one” in her commentary on Canadian society and its flaws.

Writing for *Maclean’s* Graham shifted her focus to the state of Canadian publishing and book prices, an issue she became actively involved with throughout the late 1940s through her work for the Canadian Authors Association. In “Why Books Cost Too Much,” she argued that many Canadians could not afford to buy them, leading to a nationwide book shortage which was particularly apparent in rural areas where public libraries were scarce. She called for the “the removal of both duty *and* sales tax on all imported books” (Graham 1947, 39) before turning her attention to the perils of Canadian publishing rights being “automatically thrown in” with American and British contracts (40). Likely drawing upon her own experience with royalties for *Earth and High Heaven*, she relates how “a well-known Canadian author” only made “\$575 in Canadian royalties on a book which, according to the advertisements of his Canadian publishers who were jobbing the American edition, had sold 100,000 copies in Canada” (40). Her assertions were considered inflammatory by Macmillan’s John Morgan Gray, who felt the need to respond in “Books Too Dear? No, Miss Graham!” Gray (1947) damningly called Graham’s article a “dramatic failure,” insisting that book production and sales had increased in Canada but were held back by the “high cost of doing business in a vast, thinly populated country” (46). Despite the biased nature of both articles—Gray toward the rights of the publisher, and Graham towards the author—they nevertheless serve as valuable

evidence of Graham's engagement with emerging debates around authors' rights, and her willingness to use her role as a public figure to argue for change on behalf of her peers.

Graham first raised the issue of authors' contracts at the 1945 Canadian Authors Association convention, suggesting that the CAA establish standard book contracts and minimum royalty rates (Meadowcroft 2008, 129). Shortly thereafter, a book contract committee was created with Graham serving as chair. Her preliminary report encouraged writers to negotiate separate contracts with Canadian publishers, rather than ceding their rights to international publishers (130). Together with Dorothy Duncan, Graham drafted a "standard contract" requiring Canadian publishers to adopt the same minimum standards as their American and British counterparts for royalties, subsidiary rights, and so forth (MacLennan 1980, 41; Meadowcroft 2008, 130). This contract was unanimously approved and a revised version circulated to all members. Graham thereafter served as vice-president of the CAA from 1946-49.

In a feature titled "Canadian Literature Ends Quarter-Century," William Arthur Deacon (1946), literary editor for *The Globe and Mail*, reported on the 25th annual CAA meeting in 1946:

Today starts with the report of the national treasurer, Leo Cox of Montreal, who is a distinguished poet and vice-president of J.J. Gibbons Ltd. Your literary editor then reports from the Governor-General's Award Board, and Gwethalyn Graham, author of *Earth and High Heaven* [*sic*], brings in the report of her committee on publishers' contracts. These lead to policy-making debates.

Significantly, this is the only mention of Graham's active role in the CAA, despite a subheading, "Friends Welcome Gwethalyn Graham," which focuses on her social interactions with other authors. Deacon describes Gwethalyn Graham as an author "who makes you think more of *High Heaven* than *Earth*, cool and charming despite the sweltering heat of the afternoon." This focus on the Graham's glamour, at the expense of her professional work, was likely linked to her emerging literary celebrity. Deacon was clearly keen to make the most of Graham's cultural significance, as seen by the only illustration of the event, a photograph of Graham and E. J. Pratt.

In her 2005 review of *Earth and High Heaven* for *Canadian Literature*, Eva-Marie Kröller explains how she first came across Graham, not through her bestselling novel, but through her epistolary exchange with journalist Solange Chaput-Rolland in *Chers ennemis/Dear enemies*. Describing the authors of these letters as "two formidably intelligent women," Kröller (2005) recalls how "[a]t the time, I was intrigued by the contrast between the coiffed and laquered [*sic*] look of the two women in their photographs, and the impassioned urgency with which they addressed the tensions smoldering between anglophone and francophone Canadians at the beginning of the 1960s" (198). This tension also emerges in the media coverage of Graham and Chaput-Rolland's work. Were their shared statuses as public intellectuals helped or hindered by their "coiffed and laquered" appearance, or by the lingering glamour and celebrity of Graham's name despite her absence from the Canadian literary scene throughout the 1950s?

Capitalising on public discussion surrounding the preliminary findings of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, published in February 1965, Macmillan reprinted *Dear Enemies* with an eye-catching blurb that marketed it as a "dialogue on French and English Canada that reveals the angry feelings now driving Quebec towards separatism, and the English to a crisis of conscience. 'Speak white,' a westerner orders a French-Canadian officer; 'Touriste,' sneers a Québécois at a fifth-generation Westmouter—and the gap between the two Canadas spreads" (Graham and Chaput-Rolland 1965, front and back cover).

The authors refused to take one side at the expense of the other. In their preface, they remind the reader that “[t]his book is neither a scholarly analysis nor a wholesale denunciation; it is rather an effort to find out, simply and amicably, why it is so difficult for French- and English-speaking Canadians to have any real sense of unity” (x). Unsurprisingly, Graham and Chaput-Rolland address the impact of this cultural and societal division on Quebec’s female population, with several of Graham’s letters exploring the role women might play in trying to push back against the limitations placed upon them by the language divide in Canada:

It is doubtless a limitation of feminine as opposed to the masculine view of things that the English-Canadian mother, informed that her children can’t have French-Canadian teachers to teach them French because Quebec can’t afford to train them in such numbers and the federal government isn’t allowed to, will *not* bow her head before the majesty of the law, but will say, “If the law is as silly and illogical as that, then get rid of it.” (108)

Graham saw the opportunity to learn a second language as a lesson in humility, and felt strongly that this “lesson” should extend to all Canadians.

Graham’s return to the public intellectual sphere in the 1960s coincided with the publication of *Dear Enemies* in October 1963. She gave many of her interviews in French, and was photographed with Chaput-Rolland exchanging different language editions of the book (Meadowcroft 2008, 195). The *Montreal Star* commented on the tonal difference between the two authors, Graham freely admitting her responses were less emotional than Chaput-Rolland’s: “After all, why should I feel resentment, as an English-Canadian I have little to resent?” (Bieler 1963, 44). Another article in the *Star*, with the title “Writers Swap Letters on Touchy Subject,” emphasised the authors’ gender, informing readers “[i]t’s a good thing when two women let their hair down in a series of no-holds-barred letters” (McMahon 1963, 4). Despite its dismissive tone, the fact that this article appeared on page four of the *Star* suggests that, at least for a short time, the launch of Graham and Chaput-Rolland’s dialogue was considered significantly newsworthy to justify multiple articles and prime reader space. By November 1963, excerpts from *Dear Enemies* were appearing in *Maclean’s* along with the results of a poll on separatism, indicating interest in this work outside the bounds of French Canada (Meadowcroft 2008, 196).

Graham and Chaput-Rolland promoted the book across Canada for the next few months, and *The Globe and Mail* reported on a luncheon at the Park Plaza where both were speakers in November 1963:

Miss Graham said French Canada is a Gallic province where intellectuals carry more weight than in English Canada or in the United States. They are the elite. And separatism is a widespread feeling among French-Canadian intellectuals, she warned. It isn’t a phenomenon of 1960 either, but comes and goes every generation or so.

“There is no word for egghead in French,” Miss Graham continued. (“Authors Debate Bilingualism” 1963)

Graham suggests here that public intellectuals hold greater status and respect in French-Canada than elsewhere. Although she spoke French, as an Anglophone Montrealer Graham must have felt a certain peripheral status. She was a loud voice for French-Canada’s right to retain their cultural autonomy, reminding English-Canadians that “[u]nlike the United States, we are not a melting pot. . . . There are 4,250,000 French-speaking Canadians in Quebec and 1,500,000 in other provinces, and the British North America Act guarantees their right not to be melted down in an English pot” (“Authors Debate Bilingualism” 1963). However, even with her

crucial role in arguing this case to predominantly English-Canadian audiences, her status as a non-francophone author and as a woman may have played a large part in her erasure from histories of Canadian biculturalism and bilingualism.

Even early scholarly reviews of *Dear Enemies* foresaw its limited cultural significance. D. A. Cameron (1964) stated that the epistolary narrative would be “justifiably forgotten”: “it has no pretensions to artistic merit; it was conceived as having an immediate social purpose in dealing with an immediate social problem. The problem, and the book, are extremely important now, but they will be of only slight interest after Canada has moved beyond the current French-English estrangement—as both authors hope and believe it will” (76). While it would be heartening to think that Graham and Chaput-Rolland’s narrative has been forgotten due to irrelevance, ongoing tensions between Francophone and Anglophone cultures suggest that many of its arguments still hold interest today. These letters remain valuable as exemplars of their cultural moment, specifically focusing on female responses to the crises and conflicts of the time.

In his 1960 introduction to the New Canadian Library edition of *Earth and High Heaven*, Eli Mandel (1969) warns that “we have to be careful not to do a distinguished novel the disservice of making it merely appropriate, merely opportune, merely journalistic” (v). Mandel’s comment is germane to the potential peril of limiting Gwethalyn Graham’s non-fiction writings to the categories of “merely appropriate” or “merely journalistic.” Although her articles might be of only historical interest to contemporary readers, to limit Graham’s legacy to the success of her bestselling novel undermines both her memory and her repeated attempts to engage with the cultural and political unrest of her time. By widening Graham’s literary status beyond that of an author of popular fiction to include her non-fiction and journalism, her role as a public intellectual who spoke for both English- and French-Canadians in Quebec and beyond can be more fully explored.

As the *Montreal Star*’s obituary in November of 1965 asserts: “The word for Gwethalyn Graham was *committed*. . . . [This] does not mean going overboard for causes. It does mean the holding of some steadfast convictions and the willingness to translate them into action. Miss Graham in her all too short life had beliefs which burned like a steady flame. She did something about them” (“Award-Winning Novelist” 1965). As scholars, we must be equally committed to recovering and recognising the valuable contributions of public intellectuals such as Graham, and not allow them to remain lost to literary history.

Note

¹ *Earth and High Heaven* and *Swiss Sonata* were reprinted by Cormorant Press in 2003 and 2005 respectively, and the first full-length published biography of Graham’s life, *Gwethalyn Graham: A Liberated Woman in a Conventional Age* (2008), was written by Barbara Meadowcroft for Women’s Press’ “Women Who Rock” series. Meadowcroft’s volume acknowledges its debt to Barbara Opala’s research for her unpublished PhD dissertation “Gwethalyn Graham: A Critical Biography” (1980). More recently, Persephone Books have released an edition of *Earth and High Heaven* in 2017.

**VIII. Idola Saint-Jean and Flora MacDonald Denison: Two Feminist Intellectuals in
French and English Canada
Sarah Spear**

It is only by crossing swords in the intellectual world that our wits are sharpened
and we see things in focus.
Flora MacDonald Denison 1910b

Flora Macdonald Denison, leader of the Canadian Women's Suffrage Association in Toronto (1867-1921) considered herself to be a public intellectual--and indeed she was. She penned newspaper articles, speeches, pamphlets, and from 1906 to 1914 wrote a column devoted to women's suffrage and social progress in *The Toronto Sunday World*. Her column, "Under the Pines," tackled issues on social and political rights, ranging from fashion and spirituality, to the state of Canadian democracy. She was complimentary about those with whom she agreed and biting sarcasm about those who mocked women's suffrage. Denison's writings demonstrate that she was one of the most militant and radical of the Ontario suffragists of the early twentieth century (Gorham 1975; Bacchi 1983; Cook and Lacombe 2003).

Idola Saint-Jean (1880-1945) was the founder and president of *l'Alliance canadienne pour le vote des femmes du Québec*, the only French Canadian women's organization explicitly devoted to the campaign for women's provincial suffrage in Québec. Called the "sabre" of the Montreal suffrage activists (Lamoureux 1993, 60), from 1929-1930 Saint-Jean edited a woman's page in the progressive English-language newspaper, *The Montreal Herald*. She set out to recruit workers and gain popular support for her cause through public education. Saint-Jean's page was published, as was her independent journal for *l'Alliance canadienne*, *La Sphère Féminine* (1933-1946), in French and English. This reflected her vision of solidarity for an inclusive feminist movement.

The writings and speeches of both these women comprise a discursive bridge of social justice and intellectual work spanning English and French Canadian suffrage history. In their columns, Denison and Saint-Jean provided histories of international suffrage campaigns and reported on news from regional suffrage groups around Canada. To achieve social change, they advocated for a reorganization of class and gender roles and they critiqued culturally dominant religious authorities, making them significant historical figures and public intellectuals.

Sylvia Bashevkin (2013) identifies early suffragists as "[a]rguably the first collective appearance of Canadian women as public policy advocates, experts, and activists . . . in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with the rise of Progressivism" (113). Bashevkin names Denison as one of these suffragists and thus a public intellectual because she contributed to conversations on Canadian democracy, public policy, and societal norms. Saint-Jean is comparable to Denison; both use heterodox rhetoric in their writings to examine women's issues, enabling here a comparison of suffragist work in English and French (Forestell 2005, 8; Fahrni 2009, 20). French philosopher Pierre Bourdieu's (1930-2002) thoughts on heterodoxy are useful to this comparison. There are significant cultural and nationalist divisions between the doxa of English Ontario and French Québec. Saint-Jean's and Denison's discourses on class and religious authority helped to bridge radical women's suffrage ideology in Anglophone and Francophone Canada.

Doxa and Heterodoxy

Denison and Saint-Jean created alternative spaces for women in the areas of Canadian democracy and social justice. The doxa, Bourdieu (1998) explains, is formed and maintained by the dominant: “Doxa is a particular point of view, the point of view of the dominant, which presents and imposes itself as a universal point of view, the point of view of those who dominate by dominating the state and who have constituted their point of view as universal by constituting the state” (57). The ruling Protestant or Roman Catholic male elite and political class created, sustained, and perpetuated the doxa in Ontario and Québec, in keeping with French and British norms and white settler colonization of Indigenous peoples. English Canada was demographically dominated by Anglican, Methodist, and Presbyterian forms of Protestant Christian denominations (Allen 1973, 382) while French Canada was dominated by Roman Catholicism. The heterodox challenges the doxa with new forms of social and political organization; it implies “awareness and recognition of the possibility of different or antagonistic beliefs” and exists outside and counter to doxic thought (Bourdieu 1977, 164). Those who express opinions counter to the doxa are, according to Bourdieu, likely able to do so because of their low economic and high cultural capital. This rhetoric encapsulates the social positions of Saint-Jean and Denison. Through their writings, they empathized with and claimed to understand the needs of the working class. Their activism in the Quebec and Ontario women’s movements earned them cultural capital within political and intellectual circles (McCann 2012, 27; Cook and Lacombe 2003; Jean 1981, 121).

This is not to state that Denison and Saint-Jean were in complete disagreement with the mainstream women’s movement and Canadian politics. They professed heterodox views and created alternative spaces and discussions, but as historical actors they were products of the dominant discourses of their time. Cecil Deer (2008) points out, “though it may seek to be critical and even heretic, heterodoxy often remains mediated by the ruling doxa” (124). These two women’s writings furthered the suffrage movement and advanced discussions on patriarchy and women’s roles in Canadian society and politics; however, their discourse was still mediated by mainstream values and thus recognizable to their intended publics; ideologies of race, nation, and the moralistic ideas of late nineteenth-century “civilization” are evident in their writings.

Lived Experience and Biography

Denison’s and Saint-Jean’s lived experiences informed their intellectual development and reasoning. As young women, both left home to study and then worked as teachers. Denison began to write articles while living in Detroit, where she became involved in the suffrage movement there. Along with her teaching, Saint-Jean also published books on French grammar and diction. Both were single mothers, which shaped their critique of social institutions, structures, and hierarchies.

Flora MacDonald Denison (nee Merrill), was born February 20, 1867 in the rural Upper Canadian village of Picton the sixth of eight children to George A. Merrill and Elizabeth MacTavish Thompson (Cook and Lacombe 2003). Her father was a practicing Methodist and spiritualist. His failed mining attempts and alcoholism required that Denison’s mother support the family as a teacher. Denison left home at the age of 15 (1881), and became a schoolteacher, which she found boring and insipid. She attended business school, briefly moved to Montreal, and may have worked at an insurance company in Toronto before settling in Detroit in the mid-1880s. She began her writing career and was involved in suffrage work in Detroit, where she met and married Howard Denison in 1892. They had one son, Merrill. The Denisons’ life was unstable, with Flora often responsible for the household income (Cook and Lacombe 2003). Moving to Toronto after

Merrill was born, Denison obtained employment as a dressmaker for Simpson's department store, later starting her own dressmaking business for upper class Toronto women. She became involved in the women's suffrage movement, as secretary in 1906 and as president of the Canadian Association of Women's Suffrage from 1911 to 1914 (Gorham 1979, 49). She also joined the Progressive Thought Society and bought an inn for artists and intellectuals interested in theosophy and spiritualism at Bon Echo (now an Ontario Provincial Park), dedicated to the memory of Walt Whitman and his nature poems. In 1916, she moved to New York and worked on the suffrage campaign as a speaker and organizer. She died in 1921 from pneumonia and complications from the Spanish Flu (Cook and Lacombe 2003).

Idola Saint-Jean was born in 1880 into an upper-middle class family in Montréal, the daughter of a lawyer, Edmond Saint-Jean, and Emma Lemoine. When she was 14 her father died, necessitating that the adolescent Saint-Jean find work outside the home to help her mother (Lévesque 2002). In her youth, Saint-Jean studied theatre and diction in France, which likely contributed to her persona as a confident political activist (Jean 1981, 121). She returned to Montréal and became involved in the women's movement. She joined Marie Gérin-Lajoie in the women's Catholic social reform organization *Fédération nationale Saint-Jean Baptiste* and in 1921, joined Thérèse Casgrain in the *Comité provincial pour le suffrage féminin* (Jean 1981, 131). The *Comité* was renamed by Casgrain as *Ligue des droits de la femme*, and in 1927 Saint-Jean founded *L'Alliance canadienne pour le vote des femmes du Québec*. She was an avid writer and teacher, taught French at McGill University, wrote poetry, and published two books on French dictation. A working woman and public figure, Idola Saint-Jean supported herself and remained unmarried throughout her life—unusual for women of that time. Like Denison, she too was a single mother; through her involvement in the *Société d'aide aux enfants catholiques*, she adopted an orphaned Black girl. The child unfortunately died a few years later (Forster 2004, 221). An active social reformer, Saint-Jean had political aspirations. In 1930 she campaigned in Saint Denis, Montreal, for a seat in the House of Commons. Her campaign pamphlet was published in English, French and Italian, indicating her linguistic fluency (Saint-Jean 1930a).

These two women's experiences of working outside the home at early ages and supporting themselves financially as independent adults sets their intellectual reasoning for women's rights apart from other women leaders in Ontario and Québec. Saint-Jean and Denison were aware and inclusive of working women's needs and comfortable critiquing powerful institutions such as the Church. This is not to state that other suffrage leaders such as Thérèse Casgrain were not supportive of working women, but that their activist rhetoric was not as heterodox and militant, and their experiences more removed due to class and social status.

Suffrage Discourses in Quebec and Ontario

Their radical ideas about women's roles and society clashed with the maternalist suffrage movement. Flora MacDonald Denison's militancy, and her friendship with the famous Emmeline Pankhurst (Gorham 1979, 62) lost her the presidency of the Canadian Women's Suffrage Alliance in 1914. Saint-Jean was similarly unfavourably compared to the more maternal Casgrain and Gérin-Lajoie (Lamoureux 1991, 56), class often the divider between the mainstream social reform and the militant suffragists, in terms of ideas and opinions. These two women struggled to maintain financial independence, while their bourgeois contemporaries in the movement benefitted from marriages and status in upper class families, hence did not have the same experiences and perspectives as Denison and Saint-Jean.

Maternalism and its discourse spread throughout both Québec and Ontario, but instead of promoting British imperialist ideals, Québec's brand was linked to Catholicism and French Canadian nationalism. Quebec nationalism emphasized motherhood; women were expected to participate in the "revenge of the cradle," a struggle for population growth against the English Canadian majority (Maroney 1992, 9). Mothers were "guardians of the race" and the "angels of the home," protectors and procreators (Trofimenkoff 1983, 101). Women adhered to gender-specific traditional maternalism in suffrage organizations such as the foundational *Fédération nationale Saint-Jean Baptiste*, led by devoted Catholic Marie Gérin-Lajoie (Hébert 1999, 15). Thérèse Casgrain, with four children and a busy political career, used maternalism to make suffrage more appealing to conservative French Catholic women (Jean 1981, 137). Political scientist Diane Lamoureux (1993) labeled Saint-Jean's activism as "choc" and her colleague Thérèse Casgrain's as "charme" (60). Casgrain tried to win over politicians with her charisma, while Saint-Jean was criticized for her assertiveness as an unfeminine "harpie" (Tremblay 2005, 41). Idola Saint-Jean's status as a single woman, paired with her critique of the Catholic Church, made her seem radical and even treasonous to Québec nationalism (Jean 1981, 120).

Similarly, Flora MacDonald Denison's non-conformity and unconventional spirituality eventually marginalized her from Ontario's mainstream suffrage movement. Maternalism helped women suffragists appeal to traditionalists because it tied women to a specific image of femininity; they could vote and work outside the home, but only if they ascribed to domesticity and motherhood. In Ontario, maternal feminist rhetoric developed in upper class, Christian-based organizations such as the National Council of Women and the Women's Christian Temperance Union. These national groups included women like Nellie McClung, who used dominant gendered ideals as reasons for women obtaining the vote (Bacchi 1983, 32); maternalist rhetoric supported campaigns for women's rights without seeming radical or unfeminine. Flora MacDonald Denison and members of the Canadian Women's Suffrage Alliance used that rhetoric to defend and celebrate women's abilities, but their arguments were inclusive of working women and their capacity (and necessity, for economic independence) and ability outside of the home. More strictly maternalist reformers concentrated on the moral depravity of society and were convinced that mothers would help clean up the "mess" that male politicians made (Roberts 1979, 15). Dirty politics were viewed as in need of a woman's purifying presence and abilities: "The moralistic and maternal tangent for the new woman's reform thinking became aligned with conservative notions of social order in conjunction with another social process: the conversion of the lives of upper-class matrons from ones of ostentatious idleness to ones as overseers of a social spring cleaning" (19). This logic of women filling a moral gap in Canadian politics, while conservative, was effective, but perpetuated the gendered division of societal roles.

The National Council of Women, based in Toronto and one of the most prominent and broadly maternalist women's organizations in Canada, included women such as Dr. Augusta Stowe-Gullen, who replaced her mother, Dr. Emily Howard Stowe, the founder of the CWSA, as president when she died in 1903 (Feldberg 1994). Denison took over as president in 1911. Her replacing Stowe-Gullen, leading both the CWSA and the NCW, two very different organizations (Bacchi 1983, 35, Kinahan 2008, 7), reveals the extent to which Dr. Stowe-Gullen was both radically progressive and conservatively maternalist.¹ The leisured conservatism of upper class women in the National Council annoyed and disappointed Flora MacDonald Denison. In her *Toronto World* column she often complained about the apathy of the upper classes toward women's political rights and the NCW's caution in supporting campaigns that might lure women away from their domestic roles; the NCW did not support women's enfranchisement in Canada

until 1910, when it was clear that there was social and international support (Bacchi 1983, 30). In November 1909, Denison (1909b) wrote that, “[a]s a member of the National Council of Women, and speaking from within, I would say that the policy of this organization seems to be to endorse measures after it is quite sure it is the popular thing for it to do. The initiative in most reforms affecting women has been taken by other organizations.” In keeping with the imperialist discourses of English Canada at the turn of the twentieth century, the Council supported suffrage on the basis of Whiteness and women’s positions as “mothers of the race” (Kinahan 2008, 6). Their idea of Canadian women’s citizenship “was predicated on the exclusion of First Nations women and female racialized minorities from the category of citizen” (6). This exclusion was mirrored by the state, as Indigenous women did not win the right to vote in Canada until 1961 (Milen 1991, xvii). This brief overview of maternalist discourses contextualizes the critical positions of Flora MacDonald Denison and Idola Saint-Jean. They at times argued through a maternalist lens, typically as a rhetorical tool to convince the public that women’s talents could extend beyond the domestic sphere.

Ideas in Heterodoxa

Idola Saint-Jean and Flora MacDonald Denison each viewed democracy as an equalizing means for women’s rights. As public intellectuals promoting their political ideals, wanting to “expand the democratic imagination” (Misztal 2007, 4), both women contributed to national discourses on gender roles, women’s independence, labour and class inequalities, and to the critique of patriarchal oppression perpetuated by state and church.

The Toronto World and *The Montreal Herald* touted the politicized “women’s page” columns by Denison and Saint-Jean as evidence that they published active suffragists who were experts on women’s political struggles. Denison’s column “Under the Pines” appeared in the Sunday edition of *The Toronto World* from 1906 to 1914. Saint-Jean edited and wrote bilingual columns for the Woman’s Page of *The Montreal Herald*, which hired her to use the page to campaign for women’s right to vote provincially—Quebec, in 1940, was the last Canadian province to give women suffrage (Cleverdon 1950, 214). Saint-Jean was also editor of her organization’s bilingual annual journal *La Sphère féminine*, or *The Woman’s Sphere* (1933-1946), published independently, but with the advertising support of local Montreal businesses.

Saint-Jean and Denison were each involved with the labour movements in Québec and Ontario and acknowledged and promoted women’s having to work outside the home for economic independence. In their expansion of the democratic imagination, they created discursive spaces to critique the institutional power of state and church. Their writings encouraged early feminist, egalitarian interpretations of Christian scripture.

Women, Class and Labour

In their activism, Saint-Jean and Denison blamed social and economic inequalities for women’s oppression. The necessity for women to attain financial independence was important to these socialist suffragists. They promoted the idea of women working outside the home in their newspaper columns. “Why shouldn’t men and women work side by side,” Denison wrote in 1909. “They have the same faculties, the same appetites and the same capabilities, and the sooner the eternal female sex and male sex get out of our consciousness and we meet in business as human beings the better for the morale of the world” (Denison 1909d). She succeeded as a dressmaker and independent businesswoman (Cook and Lacombe 2003), although many middle and upper

class women regarded business and women as incompatible and believed business to be unfit for “respectable” women (Bacchi 1983, 36).

Idola Saint-Jean also promoted women’s economic independence, although she did not own a business. Her “Woman and the Home” page in *The Montreal* featured taglines were “For the Woman Who Is Seeking a Career” and “Pour la femme qui travaille et pour la mère de famille.” The addition of motherhood in the French version reflects Saint-Jean’s awareness of the primacy of motherhood for French Canadian women. The page directed and framed political messages to include women in and outside the home, implicitly arguing that all women would benefit from political emancipation. Denison too wrote in favour of wages for stay-at-home mothers; like American feminist Charlotte Perkins Gilman, she viewed the home as a workplace (Gilman 1898, 7). After attending a labour meeting in Toronto, she expressed her dismay at the false dichotomy between private and public spheres:

One very chivalrous speaker said: “We want to do away with not only child labour but we want to take women out of the industrial world and put her back in the home where she rightfully belongs.” This sounds real nice- but one might imagine by this that women in homes were not in the industrial world. Mothers and wives, what do you think? Is home a place where women have nothing to do but arrange roses and wait around for pretty speeches from men?- not at all. The home is an industrial institution, only most of the managers of homes have no eight-hour labor law nor a scale of wages. The home-makers have been the workers with too often neither freedom, hours nor wages. But women are not complaining so much about work as they are about conditions. They want just what the workingman—a square deal. (Denison 1909b)

Because she was often in financial distress, Denison aligned herself with the working class. Despite her critiques, she viewed labour organization as an important step, along with women’s political emancipation, in the creation of a more just and socially responsible society (Denison 1910a). Her optimistic activism saw societal progress as a slow march that would eventually defeat patriarchy. She delighted in the solidarity forged among women in the suffrage campaign, which she claimed was removing class and social barriers: “If the suffrage movement did nothing else but find out the splendid self-sacrificing women, the brilliant and talented women, who are willing to stand for principle, it would have done a great work. It is breaking down caste and women are meeting on a different basis than that made by the positions their husbands occupy or the locality they live in or the size of their bank accounts” (Denison 1909a). She advocated for the erasure of class differences as a way to strengthen women’s independence, agency, and friendships; this position accorded with her New Age Theosophical ideas on unity, where all humanity is viewed as a brotherhood based on equality (McCann 2012, 7).

Saint-Jean too was involved with women workers and the labour movement in Québec. She maintained that the l’Alliance canadienne pour le vote des femmes du Québec was different from other suffrage groups, as its foundational purpose was to mobilize on behalf of working women (Jean 1981, 138). In 1929 she made a bid for a seat in the Senate and was largely supported by labour organizations (Saint-Jean 1929). Her socialism and is evident in her articles for *La Sphère féminine*. At the request of working women, Saint-Jean left the Casgrain-led Comité provincial and in 1927 founded l’Alliance canadienne: “En 1927, un groupe de femmes, la plupart d’entre elles gagnant leur vie, vinrent me demander de réorganiser le Comité provincial. . . . Et, c’est alors que fut fondée l’Alliance canadienne pour le vote des femmes du Québec” (Saint-Jean

1937). She claimed that the women chose her to represent them because their needs were not met by the upper class organizations. She both viewed and represented herself as the major supporter of the Québec working class women.

Like Denison, Saint-Jean argued that the causes of social inequality were rooted in economic disparity and the restriction of women to the home (Jean 1981, 138). In an article for the labour journal *Le Monde ouvrière*, titled “L’Aristocratie des sexes,” she condemned the historical oppression of women: “Le souffle d’égotisme qui a créé l’état de chose que nous combattons, la condition subalterne des femmes, état résultant des époques primitives où seule la force brutale primait le droit, sera graduellement étouffé et les derniers vestiges de l’aristocratie disparaîtront ” (Saint-Jean 1928). Arguing that patriarchy was the last aristocracy, Saint-Jean boldly suggested that it be dismantled to end women’s oppression. Saint-Jean shared Denison’s annoyance with the feminine upper class in Montréal. In her column, she countered the common anti-suffrage argument that women were not interested in politics and the vote, and charged that women in privileged social and economic positions were apathetic towards the suffrage campaign. She critiqued upper class women’s apparent lack of political and class awareness, stating:

S’il y avait plus de femmes qui s’occuperaient de la politique, il y en aurait moins qui chercheraient à tuer le temps dans les thés et les bridges!

L’on craint aussi la désertion des foyers! Ce n’est certainement pas la politique, ni le vote féminin que a contribué à ce qui se passe aujourd’hui dans bien des jeunes ménages? On laisse à la classe ouvrière le soin d’élever de nombreuses familles, et que fait-on pour les protéger? (Saint-Jean 1930b)

Denison too critiqued the lack of political solidarity amongst women, especially those who had the time and resources to support the cause. She reasoned that, given the educational disparity between women and men, women were understandably ignorant of their rights and the plights of others (Denison 1909c).

The Doxa and Religious Authority

Denison and Saint-Jean both used their religious values to promote women’s suffrage in Canada. They interpreted and emphasized the Christian message of equality and justice in their activist rhetoric. They also critiqued hypocritical messages from the Church as a function and perpetuation of patriarchy. Saint-Jean’s critique was aimed at the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec, while Denison addressed the Roman Catholic Church in Ontario, and the church at large, as a symbol of sexism. These critiques flowed from their frustration with the hypocrisy of Christian dogma, and the alignment of religious institutions and politics in Canada. This was particularly evident in Quebec, where politicians and Roman Catholic bishops colluded in societal governance (Cleverdon 1950, 243; Trofimenkoff 1983, 215). Framing of women’s oppression as natural frustrated Idola Saint-Jean; sexist sentiments were popularized by politician and journalist Henri Bourassa, who placed women in the home as their Catholic, Christian duty, supporting the view that political women were monstrous and overly masculine. In a 1937 edition of *La Sphère féminine*, Saint-Jean points out the oppressive theology used by Bourassa and like-minded politicians and Roman Catholic bishops, whom she described as “comme certains faux prophètes le proclament avec un manque total de compréhension et de savoir” (16). She offered alternative social justice interpretations of Christian theology. Saint-Jean believed that women’s rights and equal partnership with men would be restored through feminism and “grâce au respect des droits

de chacun et à un idéal fait de justice de compréhension et d'amour calqué sur le sublime contrat social que nous a laissé le Maître des Maîtres dans le Sermon sur la Montagne" (16). Her focus was the rights of the individual through social contract, contradicting the French Canadian Catholic anti-suffrage arguments by invoking the higher authority of Jesus. Saint-Jean repeatedly used Biblical scripture against the Church to point out its hypocrisy and to argue for men and women working hand in hand for the good of the family unit and the French Canadian nation.

In the English Canadian context, Denison too critiqued the influence and power of the Church. Raised in a religious and spiritual mix of Catholicism, Methodism, Universalism and Spiritualism, a *mélange* stemming from her father's eclectic ideas on religion and spirituality (Cook and Lacombe 2003), she often spoke out against the hypocrisy of churches and their treatment of women and the lower classes. In an article titled "Old Girls," she derided traditional gender roles and expectations and painted a bleak picture of employment opportunities for young women; sewing and domestic work meant long hours and low pay. She critiqued the church's complicity: "And our ministers, our preachers and priests offered no protest, but suggested that women should be silent" (Denison n.d.). Denison attempted to raise women's figurative power; "It has been truly said that women are the foundations of the churches. Don't be satisfied with that. Be the stained glass windows and the steeples, and let the men take a turn at washing dishes in the basement" (Denison n.d.). As a Theosophist she did not adhere to a dominant view on religion and spirituality (McCann 2012, 25).

Like Saint-Jean, Denison introduced Christian thought in her weekly column, but anti-suffrage arguments in Ontario were based more on fears of women's economic independence and its impact on the patriarchal family (Bacchi 1983, 48). Nevertheless, she chastised Christian Canadian society for gender and class inequalities and used the teachings of Jesus to reinforce her position: "Christ came to bring the sinner to repentance and the suffrage movement is to reorganize society and make the world better and more just" (Denison 1910c). Her comparison of Christ and suffrage as social equalizers echoes social gospel evangelism, the ideology behind early 1900s social reform activism in English Canada (Christie and Gauvreau 1996, 14). Preachers saw social gospel groups and their reforms as a means of evangelizing, and Denison viewed the women's suffrage movement and its transformative social possibilities for women in a similar vein. Women's enfranchisement, like the redemption found in Jesus Christ, would right the wrongs of the world.

Naturalized, gendered discourses of men and women's roles in Ontario and Québec in the early and mid-twentieth century were systemically produced by the patriarchal and moralistic structures and teachings of the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches. Through their ecclesiastical critiques, Flora MacDonald Denison and Idola Saint-Jean opened heterodox spaces for women to evaluate the church's authority. These two activists encouraged individual relationships with spirituality and scripture, unmediated by a male priest or minister. Through their writings and campaigns, they performed what feminist academic and activist Patricia Hill Collins (2013) labels as "intellectual activism"—"speaking truth to power" (xii-xiii). Saint-Jean and Denison spoke their truths on women's social, economic, and political positions, in their writings, speeches and activist organizing. They imagined new possibilities for women, particularly working class women. If getting the vote was the avenue through which social change could occur, their feminist discourses opened radical alternatives to moderate suffrage campaigns, and thus created a bridge between doxic and heterodox versions of social justice.

Note

¹ This varied characterization of Stowe-Gullen points to the need for more nuanced studies of Canadian suffrage leaders and their organizations. It is likely that she followed her mother, Dr. Emily Stowe's notions of women's role within the home as underappreciated by society and that women need more education in order to adequately fulfill that role, and others in society (Feldberg 1994).

**IX. Speaking Your Mind, or Not: The Judicial Careers of Police Magistrates
Emily Murphy and Alice Jane Jamieson, 1916-1932.¹
Mélanie Methot**

If Canadians are familiar with the name Emily Murphy (after all, she has her own *Heritage Minute*), fewer recognize Alice Jamieson. In 1975, a Calgary journalist complained that no one knew about Jamieson (Reid 1975). Calgarians may have since heard of the all-girls' school that proudly bears her name—the Alice Jamieson Girls' Academy founded in 2003—but few could tell who she was. Within six months of one another, the two women were appointed magistrates of their respective city's Women's Court: Murphy in Edmonton in July 1916 and Jamieson in Calgary in January 1917. Provincial governments had the responsibility to make such appointments. The Northwest Territories named its first police magistrate in 1886, yet nearly fifteen years later, only two police magistrates were serving the prairies (Thorner and Watson 1984, 45). By the time Murphy and Jamieson received their postings, most Alberta cities had their own police magistrates. Colonel Gilbert E. Sanders, former Royal North West Mounted Police (RNWMP) inspector, occupied the Calgary post from 1911 to 1933. Walter S. Davidson, an Osgoode-trained lawyer, became assistant police magistrate in 1913, replacing Sanders as main magistrate from October 1915 to February 1919 while the Colonel accompanied the Second Canadian Pioneers overseas (Blue 1924, 10). Jamieson first worked with Davidson and encountered Sanders only when he came back to exercise his magistrate functions in 1919. Edmonton had its own former RNWMP inspector as chief police magistrate. Colonel Philip C. H. Primrose received the mandate in 1915 and served Edmonton for twenty years. He had been in position less than a year when Murphy became magistrate of the Women's Court. Both Calgary and Edmonton experienced the pressures of cities growing rapidly, with the inevitable increased criminality, although during the Great War crime per capita declined in Calgary (Thorner and Watson 1981, 227). Historian Stephen Grandpre (2014), writing about Winnipeg, aptly points out that: “All those summoned or arrested on any charge, whether for bylaw infractions or serious criminal offences, could expect to appear before the police court bench. Indeed, for most citizens it was likely the only level of the justice system that they would experience” (2). Primrose judged 40,000 cases in his career, and Sanders twice as many. (Legislative Assembly n.d.; Therner and Watson 1984, 45). Murphy and Jamieson caseloads were more modest: Murphy presided over 3800 cases and Jamieson around 3400 (Provincial Archives 1916a-h; Provincial Archives 1922).

While statistics for Sanders and Primrose are easily available on the legislative assembly website or in academic literature, those for the two women magistrates had to be collected from archival records. The collective amnesia on Jamieson can be explained by the lack of sources. Murphy kept a detailed account of her public life and donated her personal papers to the Municipal Archives of Edmonton, but no such papers exist for Jamieson. Staff of the Glenbow Archives have gathered newspapers clippings over the years, and now the archives maintain a slim file. Fortunately, the Provincial Archives of Alberta (PAA) hold numerous documents relating to their judicial careers. In addition to monthly reports enumerating and summarizing all the cases they presided over,² correspondence between Alberta magistrates and the Office of the Attorney General is readily found, along with other documents relating to their functions. Careful examination of the data rectifies some common misconceptions, for instance, the dates of Jamieson's judicial appointments or the story behind the Person's case. Newspaper articles from local media outlets further reveal how their distinct personalities oriented their judicial careers.

Thorough analysis of this new corpus reveals the visibility of Murphy's crusade for gender equality, while Jamieson toiled in the shadows.

To Use the Media, or to Remain in the Shadows?

Jamieson may have "made the news," as the *Calgary Herald* reported in 1942, but during her time as magistrate she did not attract much media attention (Lang 1942). On March 13, 1920, however, the *Calgary Herald* boasted, albeit only on page sixteen: "CALGARY HAS FIRST WOMAN MAGISTRATE IN THE WORLD IN MRS. ALICE JAMIESON." As if this bold title was not enough to convince Calgarians of the very special status of one of their police magistrates, a box above Jamieson's picture read: "The World's First Woman Magistrate Lives in Calgary." In the article, the city's claim to fame was highlighted seven times. Jamieson became the first female judge in the British Empire in April 1915 when Alberta Premier Arthur Sifton, officially appointed her "Justice of the Peace in and for the Province of Alberta." Although named Justice of the Peace, Jamieson was to limit her activities to Juvenile Court. This appointment supplemented the one the Premier made a few days earlier when he named her Commissioner for the protection of neglected children (Provincial Archives 1915a). Once the Attorney General received her signed oath of allegiance and oath of office, he replied: "You are fully authorized to act" (Provincial Archives 1915b).

In May, Jamieson received a copy of the Canadian criminal code and she took up her duties. The federal government had passed the Juvenile Delinquent Act a few years earlier, giving exclusive jurisdiction over young offenders to juvenile courts (Myers 2006). The Department of the Attorney General reported on the experiment of appointing women as Juvenile Court judges: "The splendid services which have been rendered in this connection by Mrs. Jamieson and Mrs. Langford would indicate that the presence of a kindly lady on the bench, especially in cases of delinquent girls, would soon be universally recognized as the right and proper thing" (Department of Attorney General 1915, 14). These developments were taking place at the same time that suffragettes were advocating for the right to vote, part of the social reform movements of the turn of the twentieth century (Valverde 2008).

Jamieson qualifies as a social reformer. She helped organize the Calgary Children's Aid Society, she was a founding member of the Young Women's Christian Association and of the Calgary Local Council of Women, participating directly in the suffrage campaign through her work with those two organizations. In her dissertation on Prairie women judges, Pernille Jacobsen (2014) points out: "Motivated to improve legal rights for women and children, Jamieson initiated the Calgary petition for signatures in support of suffrage in 1912." Jacobsen also mentions that "Jamieson was approached by a committee of women voters to run as a citizen's candidate in a Calgary by-election. She refused, stating that her work in juvenile court was important to her and that 'I am no politician'" (67). By her own account, Jamieson was "not of the militant nor stump-speaking type." A reporter pointed out that she did not welcome attention, that she "was not a publicity seeker" ("Calgary Has" 1920).

Her disinclination towards fame might explain why the *Herald* seems to have followed her judicial career from a distance. The Calgary paper had been silent on her initial appointment as Juvenile court judge in 1915 but in 1920, printed nearly an entire page about her. More than one year prior to Jamieson's historic appointment, however, the newspaper had announced on its front page: "Mrs. R.R. Jamieson is First Woman Judge of Juvenile Court." The paper specified: "She will have the same powers as a police magistrate and judge of the district court, but will only try cases where the accused persons are under eighteen years of age" ("Mrs. R.R. Jamieson"

1914). Five months later, the *Calgary News Telegram* mentioned that the Calgary Women's Council "has heard with pleasure the intention of the provincial government to appoint women judges in connection with the administration of the juvenile delinquent act and we desire in this connection to express our hearty approval and endorsement at the appointment of our president, Mrs. R. Jamieson as its first woman in the capacity indicated" ("Women Endorse" 1914). The Calgary press may have been too zealous in its reporting of the reformist impulse. The *Telegram* had announced in 1913 that Police Chief Cuddy would appoint Mrs. R. R. Jamieson police officer, something that never materialized, and she only assumed her role as magistrate in April 1915. Two days later the paper printed how women entering this field would benefit society (8 and 10 November 1913) but announced Jamieson's police magistrate position only in its "women's section" ("Mrs. Jamieson" 1916). By contrast, the *Edmonton Bulletin* printed the news about Murphy on its front page. Apart from their different titles and locations, the articles were identical. Interestingly, both papers ignored completely how Jamieson had for a year and a half presided over Juvenile Court, highlighting instead Murphy's pioneering appointment as first woman police magistrate ("Mrs. Jamieson" 1916; "Woman Police Magistrate" 1916).

As much as Jamieson stayed out of the limelight, Emily Murphy attracted fanfare. When she became police magistrate, the *Bulletin* printed: "MRS. MURPHY IS APPOINTED POLICE MAGISTRATE." Displaying the reformist spirit of the time, it added: "Edmonton will have its first woman police magistrate and Alberta will have taken another step in the path of social reform, leading every other province in the Dominion when, on 1 July, Mrs. Arthur Murphy takes her seat on the bench as the specifically selected official to adjudicate upon the cases of women and girls arising in the community" ("Mrs. Murphy" 1916a). On the same page, in "News of the Day," the appointment was mentioned again: "First appointment of the kind made in Canada." Even the *Toronto Globe* reported the news ("Janey Canuck" 1916). Toronto had its own Women's Court, but the city would have to wait until 1922 for a woman to dislodge Colonel Denison as magistrate (Gordon 1984).

The excitement surrounding Murphy's appointment continued in Alberta's capital. Three days later, the First Unitarian Church proudly advertised: "Mrs. Arthur Murphy, 'Janey Canuck' and the first woman police magistrate in Canada will speak at the morning service." The church warned members of the congregation to arrive early, since they expected a full house ("Mrs. Murphy" 1916b). The popular author often made newspaper headlines. Although reporters were not allowed in the courtroom, the *Bulletin* covered Women's Court and often related her verdicts (Méthot 2016). The Edmonton City Archives (n.d.) hold four scrapbooks filled with articles by and about Murphy.

Murphy stands out in every record of the time. In *The Alberta Club Woman's Blue Book*, her entry is three times as long as any other woman's. One learns how she "served as the only woman member of the Charter Committee of the City of Edmonton; served as the only woman member of the Board of Directors of Edmonton's three municipal hospitals" in addition to many other accomplishments (MacGregor 1917, 125). Jamieson's entry is kept to a minimum, although it mentions that she "was appointed first woman judge of the Juvenile Court" (123). Murphy even made it into *Woman's Who's Who of America: A Biographical Dictionary of Contemporary Women of the United States and Canada, 1914-1915*. The editor specified how the volume "is a new publication, freshly made from original data secured for it with much pains and great expense. Not a line of the biographical sketches in the book has been inserted from any financial consideration or because of any subscription past, present or prospective" (Leonard 1914, 20). He did not disclose his methodology. He only mentioned the volume provided biographic data and

personal statistics about women locally prominent in all parts of the United States and Canada and from all sectors of activities (the arts, sciences, professions, religion, missionary efforts, education, philanthropy, charity, reform work, social service, literature, journalism, business, official life, club life, feminist activities) (21). A section titled “A Suffrage Referendum” elucidates his approach. Chosen women, members of important charitable and suffrage organizations, had to complete a survey (25). It is possible that since Jamieson was not part of the volume, she simply did not accept the invitation to participate. B. M. Greene (1922), editor of the 1922 *Who's Who in Canada: An Illustrated Biographical Record of Men and Women* specified: “If I have omitted any name of importance the fault is more likely to be with the person concerned, who for one reason or another, may be reluctant to supply such information” (iii). The media coverage (or lack) of Murphy’s and Jamieson’s respective career reinforces their differing characters. Murphy used the power of the press to transmit her message, while Jamieson preferred to work quietly.

Writing or Not Writing?

Like the media coverage, their respective correspondence with the Office of the Attorney General also illustrates their distinctive personalities. They both worked as police magistrates for fifteen years, but Murphy’s files contain many examples of her proactive and forceful approach. As soon as she was appointed magistrate, she took steps to find a suitable room to hold her court. She noticed the resistance to her appointment in some segments of the judicial apparatus and not easily defeated, she enlisted the help of a sympathetic ally, Arthur George Browning, Deputy Attorney General, and she canvassed buildings to find an appropriate room. Briefed by Murphy, Browning informed Edmonton mayor William Thomas Henry and expounded on the virtue of the new court:

Mrs. Murphy tells me that there are vacant rooms in the Civic Block, which would suit the purpose very well, and I would be glad to know if you could furnish the Government with such rooms. I feel sure you feel the importance to the community of having a police magistrate to preside exclusively over a women’s court and that the room in which such hearings are held should be in keeping with the importance and dignity of the position. (Provincial Archives 1916c).

Despite Browning’s support, it took time to settle the space problem. Although expected to start on July 1, 1916, Murphy judged her first case the last day of that month. Her colleague, Colonel Primrose, tried eleven of the twelve cases involving women that month (Provincial Archives 1916i). He presided over cases involving seven women in August, while Murphy recorded only four cases on her monthly return, the first one on the 14th, which happened to be two days after Browning sent a friendly reminder to Edmonton police chief George Hill, advising him that: “So far as possible women who are being charged separately from men shall be tried by her” (Provincial Archives 1916a). Chief Hill had not wholeheartedly embraced the appointment of Murphy as police magistrate and it seems he did not make her transition into the job easy.

Murphy’s first monthly returns illustrate the slow launch of her judicial career. Not content with the number of cases she tried, she investigated why so few women were tried in the Women’s Court. As proof of the adversarial attitude of the police chief, Murphy drew on the case of Mary Slater, charged with “false pretenses” who appeared in front of Primrose. Murphy directed her grievance to Chief Hill and the police but did not complain about her magistrate colleague who

seems to have accepted his new collaborator. Murphy specified: “For your information, I might say that the police did not ask me to sign this warrant. I can hardly think that Magistrate Primrose has been accurately reported in that he was aware the case belonged to the Women’s Court, and because the warrant he signed was not an exclusive one, in that it ordered the constables ‘to bring the accused before (ME), or some other Justice of the Peace’.” The interaction proves Murphy confronted Hill, and not satisfied with his explanation, addressed her concerns to higher authorities, demonstrating her keen understanding of the administration of justice and her sharp argumentative skills:

Where the charge of keeper has been preferred against a male, Chief Hill has sent the case to Magistrate Primrose, also those of the females charged with being inmates. Recognizing the wisdom, convenience and dispatch of such an arrangement, I made no objections. It has, however, since transpired that when the keeper is a woman, and she is sent before me for trial, the male inmates are sent by Chief Hill, to the other Court. This is an unfair and unwarranted distinction. If it be advisable that male inmates be heard in the men’s court, it is equally advisable that females be heard in the women’s court.

To reinforce her point, she referred to the Women’s Court in Toronto where male frequenters of bawdy houses were tried, and “no woman on any charge whatsoever was tried in the men’s court.” She did not mention that in Toronto a male judge presided over the Women’s Court. Murphy ended her letter to Browning by pointing out that reporters were not present in the Women’s Court, “a matter of great convenience for a certain class of men frequenters or found in certain resorts” (Provincial Archives 1916e). The letter illustrates Murphy’s technique of always using concrete examples to make her point.

Murphy did not succeed in convincing Chief Hill of the benefits of the Women’s Court since he stubbornly continued to send accused women to Primrose. Not discouraged by the resistance, Murphy persisted, routinely scrutinizing the court docket. In her next letter to Browning, she enumerated fifteen cases that she believed should have been tried before her. She concluded her detailed report with an overt accusation: “Two of these charges were laid by Detectives of your own Department” (Provincial Archives 1916f). She was exposing the opposition she faced not only within the city police department, but with the provincial police, who were under the direct authority of the Attorney General. Three days later, she wrote to Browning, referring again to the “Slater case”: “While Magistrate Primrose was asked to sign this warrant, he had no jurisdiction to try it, the exclusive jurisdiction of all cases of women and girls in the City of Edmonton having been given to the Women’s Police Court by the Honorable Attorney General.” She added for good measure: “The right and authority of the Attorney General so to do having been unquestionably granted to him under the provisions of the North American Act” (Provincial Archives 1916g). This missive seems a response to a letter she received from Browning, who must have tried to appease her. Murphy declared: “In your letter you state that Magistrate Primrose has assured Mr Popple, and subsequently wrote you, that he would be at all times pleased to do anything in his power to carry out the wishes of the Department with respect to the trial of women, and that the Chief of the City Police tells you that, so far as possible, he also will direct the laying of information in such cases, before me.” She showed she had read carefully Browning’s letter: “This would seem to be in every way satisfactory if, alas, one could place the slightest confidence in the sincerity of Chief Hill. His attitude toward the Women’s Court is a demonstration of an old text concerning the voice of Jacob and the hands of Esau.” She added:

“The ‘willingness’ of the Chief Constable to ‘direct’ these cases is manifest only in their mis-directing.” She concluded, “I would respectfully urge upon you the serious necessity of sending definite instructions concerning the jurisdiction of the Women’s Court to Chief Hill and that a copy of this letter of instructions be sent to Magistrate Primrose and myself for our information and assurance” (Provincial Archives 1916g).

Browning, who had seemed sympathetic to the women’s cause, put Murphy in her place: With reference to that part of your letter in which you state that the exclusive jurisdiction of all cases of women and girls in the city of Edmonton has been given to the Women’s Police Court, I beg to say that such statement is not quite accurate. You have concurrent jurisdiction with Police Magistrate Primrose and are as much entitled to try cases of men as he is to try those of women, but it was hoped that when your appointment was made all cases in which women and girls were involved would, so far as possible, be brought before you for trial, and all that can be done by the Department to this end will be done. (Provincial Archives 1916d).

True to his word, Browning wrote a “confidential” memo to Attorney General Charles Cross:

Attached you will find Mrs. Murphy’s letter of September 21st. I am to-day definitively asking Mr. Morris to instruct members of his Force to lay information in cases in which women are interested before Mrs. Murphy, and am also writing to Chief Constable Hill to do the same as far as possible. In case Chief Constable Hill disregards this request, the matter will be brought to the attention of the Police Commission” (Provincial Archives 1916b).

Browning was acknowledging that the police Chief was acting faultily. As much as some resisted women entering fields historically reserved for men, others labored to open doors. A few days later, a satisfied Murphy sent Browning a thank you letter: “For your kind interest and practical intervention in this matter” (Provincial Archives 1916h).

Browning’s intervention worked. Primrose did not hear any cases involving women in October. The following month, he saw twice a certain Mrs. Lewis, and at the end of the month he heard the cases of Mary Longmore, Maggie Coleman, and Rosie Goodwin, accused of being common prostitutes. Charges were dismissed, but three days later Longmore was accused of keeping a bawdy house and her comrades of being inmates. Primrose sentenced each one to four months of hard labor. During her first six months on the job, Murphy tried thirty cases and Primrose thirty-three (Provincial Archives 1916i). Murphy worked hard to change established practices and to elevate the status of the Women’s Court and women judges.

Murphy continued her campaign to have accused women tried in the Women’s Court. Nearly four years after she became magistrate, she wrote to Browning: “As cases relating to women both from Edmonton and outside points are being heard in the Provincial Court before Colonel Macleod, I would respectfully request that you make a standing order that the police who have charge of the liquor or any other cases, may make these charges in the Women’s Court.” She suggested: “As numerous orders to this effect have already been given, and as the matter tends to be provocative of annoyance and misunderstanding, it might be well to consider the advisability [*sic*] of making a breach of your orders a misdemeanour on the part of the police.” Her tone reflects confidence, self-righteousness. She specified how other male colleagues collaborated: “I quite

understand that Colonel Macleod should properly hear the cases which are brought before him, but I would point out that Colonel Primrose and Mr. Barnsley Hughes J.P. always refer these cases to the Women's Court unless we have, for any special reason, arranged it otherwise between ourselves. I have the same privilege when their cases are places on my docket" (Provincial Archives 1920d). Murphy felt herself the equal of her colleagues. During her career, she dealt with close to a thousand offences perpetrated by men, a quarter of the total offences she reported on her monthly returns. They ranged from frequenting or keeping a bawdy house to opium possession, liquor act violation, motor vehicle bylaws, non-support, theft and insanity.

Despite the higher level of crime prosecutions at the Police Court in Calgary, hence a need to share the workload with other magistrates, Jamieson appears to have tried only eleven men during her career.³ The exact number is unclear since she included on her monthly return Juvenile Court cases. In 267 instances, she recorded "school attendance act." According to the *Alberta Act Respecting Truancy and Compulsory School Attendance*, children aged between seven and fourteen had to be sent to school, and if they did not have a legitimate excuse, parents could be fined or given a bond in the penal sum of one hundred dollars. The act also stated no one could employ a child during school hours (Alberta Law Collection 1910). The *Act Respecting Juvenile Court* specified that Juvenile courts "shall also have power to try any child charged with an offence against the laws of Alberta and deal with truants and offences under the Truancy Act" (Alberta Law Collection 1913). Most of those tried under the School Attendance Act were males, but were they parents or children? To add to the confusion, juvenile courts also held jurisdiction over neglected children, and prosecuted adults for promoting delinquency (Myers 2006). Whether neglected children, the most numerous Juvenile Court infractions are included, Jamieson tried very few men, a stark contrast to Murphy.

Jamieson had known since she was appointed juvenile court judge that she would "have the same powers as a police magistrate and judge of the district court, but will only try cases where the accused persons are under eighteen years of age" ("Mrs. R.R. Jamieson" 1914). As soon as she was appointed police magistrate, she wrote to the Office of the Attorney General and asked him to: "Define my duties so if at any time the question should arise I may have your letter in file" (Provincial Archives 1917c). "Your jurisdiction is exactly the same as that of Mr. Davidson," replied Browning, "and I am sure he will be very glad to give you any information possible that will assist you in the performance of your duties." He did not compare her to Murphy, but rather to her male colleague in Calgary, specifying:

While, as I have said, you are entitled to try all cases, which are properly triable by a Police Magistrate and the Order in Council does not restrict this in any way, you are asked only to take the cases where women are charged with offenses. In some cases, it will be rather difficult for all such to be brought before you as it may be necessary to try them along with men, but I have no doubt you and Mr. Davidson will have no difficulty in deciding what cases should properly come before you" (Provincial Archives 1917a).

The letter put her on an equal footing with Davidson even if Browning specified that inevitably some women would still be tried in the Police Court. Having dealt with Murphy, Browning was establishing ground rules, which Jamieson obeyed throughout her career.

Contrary to Murphy, Jamieson's correspondence is negligible, suggesting that she did not voice many grievances. Her file contains other documents such as a copy of a letter Browning wrote to Superintendent McDonell, urging his Calgary and Edmonton inspectors: "To have

charges against women brought, so far as possible, before the Police Magistrates appointed for that purpose, namely Mrs. Murphy at Edmonton and Mrs. Jamieson at Calgary” (Provincial Archives 1917b). The polite request did not have the desired effect. The following month, Jamieson tried only three cases while Davidson judged sixteen women amongst the 274 cases he heard that month (Provincial Archives 1922; Provincial Archives 1918). Replying to a case query from Murphy, Jamieson wrote: “I am well and have not much to do in our line of work. I would love to see you and compare notes. I am leaving in a few days for Winnipeg. I expect to be gone about ten days. One of our lawyers here is threatening to put me out of office as he claims no woman can be a police magistrate. Do you see what I am up against? I will let you hear what comes from it” (Provincial Archives 1917d).

Did Jamieson know she would goad Murphy into action? Jamieson’s situation alarmed Murphy since at that very moment her own appointment was being challenged. Murphy heard the case of Mary Laderoute accused of illegally having liquor in her possession and imposed a fine of a hundred dollars. Laderoute’s counsel, Gordon Winkler, appealed the case on seven grounds, the first, “That the said Emily F. Murphy who purported to convict the said Mary E. Laderoute upon the said offence, and signed said conviction, being a married woman, cannot and is not, and is incapable of being appointed a Police Magistrate under the laws of the Province of Alberta” (Provincial Archives n.d.).

Hearing about Jamieson’s troubles, Murphy reacted immediately. She sent Jamieson’s letter to the author of *Being a Manual of Elementary Information for Justices of the Peace*, who had published a few months earlier an article on constitutional liberties (Popple 1917). Mr. Arthur E. Popple of the Office of the Attorney General received in addition, Murphy’s account of her own predicament: “I would argue as if the action to remove the women magistrates was a concerted one and doubtless originates with the liquor interests. At any rate, so far as I am concerned, it is in a liquor case that my competency is to be argued out” (Provincial Archives 1917e). Earlier, *The Calgary News Telegram* had printed an article that made it clear certain elements of Calgary society were determined to keep women away from the bench:

For the first time in Calgary’s history a woman occupied the magistrate chair at the city police court yesterday afternoon, when Mrs. R.R. Jamieson newly appointed justice of the peace tried Katie Shpenka, charged with theft of a set of furs, a pair of glasses, a half a dozen handkerchiefs, Bible and a “wrist” watch. J. McKinley Cameron conducted the case for the defence, and Detective Tom Turner appeared for the prosecution. Mrs. Jamieson handed the case very commendably, and after hearing the evidence, deferred sentence until this afternoon. Mr. Cameron put up a strong argument for the girl, though he called no evidence for the defence. The technical phrase and high calibre language of the lawyer somewhat astonished the court in this particular instance, and the magistrate was left with considerable doubt in her mind as to the wisest course to pursue. Mr. Cameron stated that the Shpenka girl had been up before, and sending her to prison would not improve matters. If given another chance that is being liberated on a suspended sentence, she might reform. Counsel referred to severe important errors made by the police in proceeding to lay the information against the girl and if she was sent to prison, he would take the case to higher authorities and have a judge of the Supreme Court decide as to the legality of the charge. (“Mrs. Jamieson” 1917)

The reporter stated Jamieson handled the case “commendably,” he insinuated in the very next sentence that she did not understand the sophisticated language of the court. He then highlighted how defence counsel did not call evidence and yet he succeeded in keeping his client out of jail, no small feat since she had already been in trouble with the law. Finally, the journalist specified that Jamieson “was left with considerable doubt.” Certainly, doubt was not the greatest quality in judges. Both the lawyer and the reporter were questioning Jamieson’s judicial aptitudes.

Cameron did not wait long to challenge Jamieson’s competence. The following May, Jamieson sentenced Lizzie Watters, alias Cyr, to six-month imprisonment. Cameron proceeded to have the conviction quashed, one of the grounds being that as a woman Jamieson did not have the right to be a police magistrate. *The Calgary News Telegram* printed a sensational account of the case, although it did not state the specific reason for appealing the verdict.

When Mrs. R.R. Jamieson, woman magistrate, sentenced Lizzie Watters, a half-breed to six-month imprisonment with hard labor on a charge of vagrancy, without giving her an opportunity to put in a defense, J. McKinley Cameron, counsel for the accused, immediately informed the court that proceedings would be taken to have the conviction quashed on the ground that the defendant was not called upon to put in her defence. The magistrate was willing to withdraw the conviction until after the evidence for the defence was given, but Mr. Cameron stated that such action would be illegal, and no further proceedings could be taken.

“Recall the prisoner and I shall give her an opportunity to put in a defence,” ordered Mrs. Jamieson. “Oh, no your worship, we couldn’t do that,” said the lawyer. “For once a prisoner is sentenced and the conviction recorded by the stenographer, no further proceedings can be taken until the conviction is quashed in the supreme court. And I shall see that that your decision is overruled.” At the opening of the case Mr. Cameron disputed the jurisdiction of Mrs. Jamieson to act as magistrate contending that there was no capacity for her being appointed a police magistrate. “I suppose it is under section of the status of 1916 that you have received the appointment,” continued Mr. Cameron, “but I must say that it has been wrongly interpreted to mean that every man and woman in the province of Alberta had the same rights and can be given the same public appointments.” Mrs. Jamieson said that her jurisdiction had been disputed before, but she had no time to argue the matter out in the court and Mr. Cameron would have to take it up to the attorney-general’s department. “No indeed I won’t. I am going to take it up right here,” retorted the lawyer. “Well, I won’t listen to it,” ejaculated the magistrate. “Call the first witness for the prosecution.” Mr. Cameron was contented to go on with the case then, as long as his objection was noted by the court reporter. “Until I am notified otherwise by the attorney-general’s department I shall continue to try cases in this court,” said Mrs. Jamieson. “Well, that’s all right, you can go ahead, but I shall do my very best to stop you,” threw back the lawyer. After hearing a portion of the witnesses’ evidence, Mrs. Jamieson noted that the accused had entered no plea. Her counsel stated that subject to his objection to Mrs. Jamieson’s jurisdiction, his client would plea not guilty. It is understood that Mr. Cameron will proceed with the appeal in the Supreme Court to have the conviction quashed immediately. (“Counsel Disputes” 1917)

The report depicts Jamieson as helpless whereas Cameron emerges as a powerful lawyer. Cameron “informed,” “stated,” “disputed,” “retorted,” and “threw back,” while Jamieson “said,”

“ordered” (and was disobeyed), and “ejaculated.” Readers understand that Jamieson admitted she made a mistake when she decided that she would hear the accused, after Cameron reproached her for not giving his client a chance to testify. According to the journalist she “ordered” prisoner recalled, but Cameron refused, taking charge, directing the court. The reporter quoted Jamieson: “Until I am notified otherwise by the attorney-general’s department I shall continue to try cases in this court.”

The *Bulletin* had been much more supportive in its portrayal of Murphy, relating how the Edmonton judge established her authority in court. The headline, “Not Allowed to Speak in Women’s Court: Magistrate Murphy Insists That Jackson Shall First Apologize,” paints Murphy as a magistrate in charge. When Mr. Jackson made disparaging comments on women judges and Murphy sent him a letter demanding formal apologies. The next time he found himself defending a client in her court, before he had the opportunity to plead his case, she asked if he had received the aforementioned letter. Since his affirmative answer was not followed by an apology, she dismissed him without further ado (“Not Allowed” 1916). Jamieson did not enjoy the same endorsements.

The actual court transcript of the Cyr case reveals a different story than that published by the *Herald*. The newspaper stripped Jamieson of her agency in failing to report her comments in detail, rendering a portrait of an incompetent judge. The court transcript reveals that she took charge and remained in control of her court. The contrast between the transcript and the newspaper account shows Jamieson had control of the court, but not her public image. This negative portrayal may explain her reluctance to engage with the media.

The two *Herald* articles indicate that Cameron was intentionally using this case to discredit Jamieson. He had already challenged her in the first case she tried, threatening to have a judge of the Supreme Court decide the legality of the charge. It is likely that Cameron expressly used Cyr’s situation to challenge the legitimacy of women judges. Cyr’s appeal was heard on June 14, 1917, four days before Laderoute’s appeal. The *Edmonton Bulletin* reported on the latter: “Judgement was given by Mr. Justice Scott on the ground that as the liquor was not found in the defendant’s rooms, but in the women’s lavatory in the block, the defendant was not rightly convicted” (“Conviction Quashed” 1917b). In spite of a quashed judgement, Murphy could celebrate a victory. Scott’s decision reconfirmed women’s right to hold a magistrate position.

After initial hostilities, Jamieson’s court ran smoothly. The Calgary magistrate rarely communicated with the Office of the Attorney General. Once Sanders returned from the front, and resumed his magistrate’s functions, Jamieson once more experienced resistance. She communicated her frustrations, drawing Browning’s attention to the lack of stenographic service for her court, highlighting the inequities between the two police courts:

I have to wait around until I can secure the official reporter of the police court. In order that the reporter may report the evidence in such a case, counsel on both sides, as well as accused and all witnesses, have to wait until the reporter is through with cases of Col. Sanders. As there is no regular hour for adjournment of that Court, no definite hour can be fixed for the case to come up so as to use the official reporter. This puts everyone interested in the position of having to wait around for hours before I can try one case” (Provincial Archives 1919b).

Browning was not sympathetic to her plight: “Dear Madam, in reply to yours of the 31st ultimo, I am afraid that present conditions will have to be put up with for some time. In other provinces

police magistrates are not provided with stenographers and in the Women's Court here, Mrs. Murphy gets along as best she can, taking down the evidence in longhand except in occasional cases when a stenographer can be provided for her" (Provincial Archives 1919a). Indeed, Women's courts had to do with less. Jamieson did not pursue the matter further.

Despite the opposition she faced, her salary increased in November 1919 from \$1200 to \$1500 annually. Perhaps encouraged by her raise, she asked to have her own letterhead the following month (Provincial Archives 1919c). Browning replied: "I beg to say that it has not yet been decided to supply police magistrates, other than those already supplied, with special letter heads" (Provincial Archives 1920a). Jamieson's troubles were not restricted to stationary and limited access to essential resources. Sanders' return shifted the power balance. If Davidson had accepted Jamieson, Sanders did not recognize her at all. Jamieson complained to Browning:

Sir,

Police Magistrate Sanders considers himself responsible for all cases that come before the Police Court, including my Court, and has given orders that all cases of indictable offences be heard before him, including cases of female offenders.

The matter came to an issue this morning when a woman Evelyn Jones came up on a charge under Section 274 of the Criminal Code. This was absolutely a separate case, no male offenders being connected with it, and I claimed my right to hear the case. Magistrate Sanders said he has never received any instructions from your Department as to what my duties here were and felt himself responsible for all cases and heard the evidence in the case in question.

I do not consider Magistrate Sanders is in any way responsible for my cases or my decisions and regret exceedingly that this discussion took place and I would be glad if you would do me the favour of communicating with Magistrate Sanders and give him instructions as to my right and power to hear the cases of female offenders, so that an understanding may be reached, as I wish to avoid any further discussion on the matter (Provincial Archives 1920c).

The letter shows Jamieson was ready to relinquish her right to hear the cases of women that were tied to men; her language points to her understanding of her role, but the possessives indicate that she felt she belonged in the judicial world, even if she accepted that her powers and responsibilities were limited. She took ownership of her court.

Instead of backing Jamieson, as he had done in the past, ordering provincial police constables and encouraging city policemen to lay charges in the Women's Court, Browning offered a defence for Sanders: "In reply to yours of the 4th instant you have jurisdiction in all cases in which information has been taken before you, and the same applies to Mr. Sanders" (Provincial Archives 1920b). It seems she did not pursue the matter further.

We can understand Jamieson's frustrations in light of Sanders' letter to the Premier, declaring: "I am the only Police Magistrate in Calgary and that my jurisdiction extends not only to the city, but to the province as well ("Correspondence" 1919). Calgary did not foster a positive milieu for women entering fields reserved for men. Edmonton's Murphy was a forceful, opinionated and successful author who established her place in the judicial system. She exploited the local press and worked alongside a receptive male colleague. In Calgary, a more reserved Jamieson preferred to act less vociferously in dealing with a magistrate disinclined to progressive reform (Therner and Watson 1984, 53).

This chapter aims to elucidate how Murphy occupies collective memory while Jamieson sank into oblivion, except for her role in the development of the Person's Case (Stone 1979; Bright 1998; Burton 2004). Murphy's forceful personality and astute use of the media helped her to forge a special place among her contemporaries and in historical consciousness. Jamieson's subdued character and her tendency to avoid conflict did little to assure her place in history. Analyzing media reports on their respective careers reveals differences in newspaper coverage and the cities where they worked. While the *Calgary Herald* had a few flattering headlines for Jamieson, it also presented subtly hostile reporting. Edmonton offered a more positive reportage of Murphy's role. Was this the result of the different personalities of the two women? Or the result of two different media profiles? Is there a lesson here for public activists?

Notes

¹ Special thanks to Corinne Boudreau, Marie-Frédérique Heinrich, Arianne Lepage and Sarah Morin for the help gathering the data. As well to the students who took the Collaborative research seminar, not only entering the data, but engaging in stimulating discussions. Thank you, Aubrie Duncan, Nikki Hay, Casey Koenig, Lyndon Stanzell and especially Madison Nickel who worked on Jamieson and commented on different versions of the article.

² Only a few months for each magistrate are missing, making the data nearly exhaustive.

³ Compiled from Jamieson's "Monthly returns" from February 1917 to February 1929.

X. Speaking from South Africa: E. Maud Graham, Florence Randal, and the South African War
Bridgette Brown

Florence Randal and E. Maud Graham were two adventurous women. Educated, athletic, Protestant, and unmarried, they were spectacular examples of Canadian-Anglo womanhood. And they were being sent to a war zone. In 1902, together with thirty-eight fellow Canadian teachers, Randal and Graham departed for the war zone of South African “concentration camps”¹ on a mission to educate and Anglicize incarcerated Boer² women and children. In the waning days of the protracted South African War (1899-1902), these “Teachers for South Africa” were recruited to civilise a soon-to-be conquered white population and mitigate the humanitarian disaster caused by British mismanagement of the camps. While in South Africa, Graham and Randal wrote home to a Canadian audience who eagerly followed their tales of cross-cultural encounters.³ Maud Graham sent occasional dispatches to the Montreal *Weekly Witness*, which formed the basis of her memoir, *A Canadian Girl in South Africa*, published in 1905. Florence Randal, an established society columnist, was ambitious about furthering her journalistic career. She sent monthly letters to *The Ottawa Journal* (many reprinted in the *Winnipeg Telegram*) and published occasional pieces in *Canadian Good Housekeeping*. Randal later shaped her accounts into a short essay published in 1904 in *The Canadian Magazine of Politics, Science, Art and Literature* entitled: “A Year in a Boer School.”⁴

Teachers were characterized by contradictions. Aware of being implicated in a hastily-organized public relations effort, they were nevertheless independent, emboldened by new employment opportunities, and willing to publish their experiences. Few women had reported from wars, and Randal and Graham reflect new journalistic roles being claimed by middle-class white women at the dawn of the twentieth century. Their writing conformed to traditional domains: observations on domestic life, social reportage, and travel writing. Little did they know how important these missives would become in telling of their involvement in war. For while the teachers were part of a much-publicized imperial scheme that twinned benevolent education with territorial conquest, the Canadian women also worked in the camps for a short period before the war ended. Consequently, their role in this conflict is often omitted in historical narratives, as they were not considered to be under active military service.⁵ Randal’s and Graham’s testimonies from South Africa are thus powerful reminders of omissions neglecting women’s tangential participation in war, while revealing the gendered divisions of labour under Empire.

The Canadian teachers were shaped by their dual roles as teachers and journalists. First, they were depicted in widely circulated news accounts as exemplary colonial women; their reports provide an understanding of how teachers contributed symbolically to national ideals of whiteness and femininity. Second, their written accounts from South Africa bore witness to the often-underreported effects of war policies on women and children. As such, the teachers were astute observers who sought opportunities to speak their mind while documenting their unique experience. The women’s mobility (and privilege) was structured around inherent subordinations: while they were able to write about their experiences, others’ voices were rendered silent, either through physical incarceration (the Boers) or through early segregationist policies (Black women). Randal and Graham thus narrate how projects of colonial rule were effected through English education; how policies intervened in the personal and domestic lives of subordinated people; and how these ideals were replicated through accounts that spread widely through print networks. Their writing exposes how women’s linkage to imperializing efforts shaped ideals of national and global whiteness at the end of the Victorian era.

Women “Helping” Women

During the war, the concentration camps were conceived when what was to be a quick battle turned into a three-year military conflict, where the guerrilla tactics of the Boer commandoes constantly outmanoeuvred the Empire’s forces. The camps were initially designed to contain refugees and surrendered Boers; however, with victory elusive, Lord Horatio Kitchener, British commander-in-chief, responded to Boer manoeuvres in 1901 with a vicious “Scorched Earth Policy.” This order directed that all sources of food and shelter sustaining the Boer soldiers be burned to the ground, simultaneously disrupting communications networks by incarcerating Boer women who had been accused of relaying strategic information to Boer soldiers. Burning homes and property displaced women and children, who were then “concentrated” into camps that had been established along railway lines on British-controlled territory.⁶ Over 130,000 women and children were housed in these poorly administered camps, where inadequate housing and sanitation, poor nutrition, and disease led to soaring mortality rates: “in all, 27,927 people died in the white camps, of whom about 22,000 were under sixteen” (Riedi 2005, 1317). Although the destruction of farms was justified as a course of military action, the concentration camps proved more controversial, as they were ill-equipped to deal with the enormous influx of civilian populations.

The incarceration of women and children resulted in a public relations crisis for Britain. In Canada, the press followed the “camps controversy” closely, commenting on poor living conditions and mortality rates, but firmly siding with the British on the need for the camps. On March 22, 1902, *The Globe* printed verbatim Mr. Chamberlain’s address in Britain’s House of Commons wherein civilizing goals were cited as justification for the camps, premised upon offering “protection” to Boer women and children (13). Paula Krebs (1992) argues that in Britain, discourses of civilization and race depicted Boer women as combatants in war who were “primitive [and] unchanged since their arrival in South Africa from Holland two hundred years earlier. This put them lower on the scale of civilisation than the British, different in what would have been seen as a racial way while they were also a different class—a nation of peasants” (44). This discussion of the Boers as an uncivilized and primitive race was perpetuated by the Canadian media. In May 1902, for example, *The Canadian Magazine*’s editor, John A. Cooper, penned “The Boer Women and Children,” arguing (relying on source material from Arthur Conan Doyle’s 1901 novel *The Great Boer War*) that it was the duty of the British as “a civilized people, to form camps of refuge for the women and children, where, out of reach . . . of all harm, they could await the return of peace” (31). Reading the camps as justification for what was essentially a “war upon women,” Krebs (1992) explains how hygiene education and missionary obligations were presented as duties that British women must assume: “where women and children were in distress, it was women’s help that was needed” (40). Britain (and Canada) consequently attempted to portray the camps as a humanitarian necessity and deployed female teachers from around the Empire to provide education and “protection to helpless women and children” (Riedi 2005, 1318).

The concentration camps struck a nerve in the public imagination where the image of the Boer woman combatant contrasted to that of her as a dispossessed mother in a prisoner-of-war camp. In Britain, three influential women were vocal about the Boer women’s plight. Flora Shaw, the first colonial editor with *The Times* in London, provided an “optimistic view” of the camps: “No one can pass through the camps and see the happy faces of the thousands of children who cluster round the schools and soup kitchens” (quoted in Helly and Callaway 1999, 61). Millicent Fawcett, a British aristocrat and advocate for women’s rights, equated the Boer women’s

incarceration with necessary British military policy; because the Boer women had been participants in the war (as spies and informants), they should share with men the consequences of war (Krebs 1992, 46). Emily Hobhouse, after touring camps in the Cape and Orange River colonies, collected stories from Boer women who had been burned out of their homes, raising sympathy for their living conditions. She released in 1901 a report of her findings; it was discussed by the British Parliament and received widespread international media attention.

The “Teachers for South Africa” Campaign

As reports of the poor living conditions and disease outbreaks spread, public opinion became critical of the camps’ mismanagement. Action was needed, and the British education secretary Edmund Beale Sargant spearheaded the effort to establish camp schools, to Anglicize the Boers, and to make them amenable to British rule. In 1902, Britain requested forty female teachers from Canada and Australia, twenty from New Zealand, and one hundred from Britain; they were recruited in a public relations effort to humanize the camps through a unified effort from across the “sister colonies” of the Empire. The response was overwhelming in Canada and over five hundred women applied. Print media followed the teachers’ selection and departure closely. Candidates were presented in the press as local celebrities, an instant source of pride and curiosity. Representatives were selected from across Canada, including Ontario (16 teachers), Quebec (7), New Brunswick (6), Nova Scotia (6), Prince Edward Island (3), and Manitoba (2). Educational and religious periodicals along with daily papers followed their story, making the women subjects of interest from Winnipeg to Halifax. On April 2, 1902, *The Globe* announced the “Teachers for the Boers”:

the forty young ladies who are going out to South Africa from Canada to instruct the young Boers in the English language and train them up in the ways of civilization are handsome, athletic specimens of Canadian womanhood. The Canadian soldier boys won the admiration and respect of brother Boer by their prowess upon the field of battle. It now becomes the duty of the Canadian maidens to bring the blessings of education and refinement into the homes of the Dutch. (“Teachers for the Boers” 1902)

The role the teachers would play in South Africa was premised upon idealized womanhood, suited to a civilizing mission that extended from the schoolroom into the domestic sphere. Randal (1904) wrote how they were the “first Canadian women to invade the land, though on a more peaceful mission than that of their brothers” (412), and Isobel Perry, from Montreal, recorded in her personal diary that their “mission was . . . equally as important as that of the soldiers, for it was to implant feelings of loyalty to the British flag in the hearts of the Dutch children and to endeavour to reconcile Dutch women to British rule” (quoted in Dawson et al. 2015, xi). Imperial conquest was premised upon gendered assumptions, where a feminine civilizing presence and English as a language of colonial rule were used as tools of subordination. Further, media representations of the Canadian teachers placed them at the centre of a scheme to organize white populations in South Africa around the model of the English woman.⁷

In order to be selected, the teachers had to be English, white, unmarried, Protestant,⁸ and educated. They personified a specific form of Anglo womanhood based on their symbolic civility and embodied strength (indeed, they had to pass a physical exam in order to qualify). When *The Ottawa Journal* on March 29, 1902 displayed photographs and listed local candidates selected to form part of “Ottawa’s First Contingent to South Africa’s School House,” the portraits included captions describing the women’s physical fitness and emphasizing their credentials. Florence Randal was described as being “[o]f the Evening Journal Staff who was Formerly a Teacher [who]

has also been a frequent contributor to other Canadian periodicals and publications [with] considerable experience as a teacher both in public and private schools in Canada, and in a private school in New York City” (“Ottawa’s First Contingent” 1902). *The Globe* underscored their physical adaptability and attractiveness: “In [their] list of accomplishments also figures proficiency in the use of the rifle and in equitation and swimming. As to the personal attractions of the teachers their photographs demonstrate perfection in a marked degree, and it is well known that photographs do not lie” (“Teachers for the Boers” 1902). Their athleticism qualified the women for travel, as they could “be trusted to look out for themselves.” The same article reflects how women signified reproductive potential: “there will be many opportunities of matrimony open to the Canadian teachers. . . . What greater guarantee could there be for the future happiness and prosperity of the King’s dominions in South Africa?” Randal admits in her personal diary on March 25, 1902, that romance and marriage were a common topic of conversation, recording how “all of the gossips have decided that I am to be married out there. It is all considered ‘so romantic’ and ‘so interesting.’ For my part, I don’t expect a picnic by any means” (Randal n.d.). Graham’s (1905) notes emphasize how six of the teachers “have married in South Africa” (15). The women embodied physical and metaphorical potential because they were strong enough to withstand rugged life in a war zone, educated and attractive, and suitable for marriage and colonial population. This discourse typifies early eugenic arguments, which Jennifer Henderson (2003) has argued, exemplified “a relationship between female agency, race regeneration, and empire that inflects the term ‘daughter of empire’ by articulating the telos of colonial self-rule with the realization of woman’s ‘essence’ as the ‘organ of the future’” (172). Before the women had even departed for South Africa, the media had defined them as the best and strongest “girls” Canada had to offer.

Feminine Civility and Imperial Mobility

Discourses of Victorian nation-making often overlook women’s public roles. Carl Berger’s (2013) influential *The Sense of Power* argues that male public intellectuals shaped imperial ideals in Canada during late nineteenth-century nationalism (4). Daniel Coleman’s (2006) *White Civility* centres the predominant figure of the white, Anglo-Saxon male in literature,⁹ while Jennifer Henderson (2003) foregrounds settler women’s role in white race-making (18-19). The Anglo-Protestant woman was charged not only with the “production of a ‘healthy, hardy, virtuous, dominant race’” but also with improving her inferiors through her natural maternal character (16). While Henderson discusses the construction of colonial womanhood, recent scholarship by Katie Pickles (2002) and Jessica Schagerl (2006) shows how institutions like the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire (IODE) give evidence of a “female imperialism” that contributed to the making of an Anglo-Canadian identity through women’s philanthropic work. During the Boer war, Canadian women were supportive of the war effort, devoted to patriotic charity and fervent in spreading propaganda. Pickles’ (2002) work usefully highlights the contradictory notions behind women’s volunteer involvement, where they are “on the one hand, extending help to those perceived to be in need, while, on the other, supporting the patriarchal and imperial practices which had led to that need in the first place” (7). The “Teachers for South Africa” add a layer of knowledge to understanding the construction of early gender ideals, as they were marked by their public attachment to a foreign war effort. Indeed, Graham’s title, *A Canadian Girl in South Africa*, reflects her authorial subject position, where her colonial identity distinguishes her in international space—she is an independent Daughter of Empire. Her memoir reflects how national and imperial identities were closely related; she refers to herself interchangeably as both “British” and “Canadian.” Diana Brydon and Jessica Schagerl (2005) argue that Graham’s work “usefully reminds readers of Canada’s complicity in the policing of colonialism globally and locally” (40-

41) where the “author and autobiographical subject of her text, remains secured through the privileges of race and class fostered by empire” (29). The women were thus doubly defined by national and imperial expectations: media coverage reveals how the development of Canadian whiteness was imbricated within Empire’s larger scheme of bio-political control.

Randal’s (1904) description of the forty teachers speaks to the women’s figurative function. The relationship between a child and parent is emblematic of Canada’s duty to a sister colony, as Randal dramatizes in “A Year in a Boer School,” the tensions between perceived female autonomy, youthful independence, and duty:

[T]here was consternation in many a mother’s heart. Could she allow her daughter to live for a year in one of those dreadful, unsanitary places . . . to spend hours in close contact with dirty little urchins speaking a foreign language—to brave the perils generally of life in South Africa; enteric, bubonic, Kaffir risings, perhaps, in a country then in the grip of war! And there stood her adventurous daughter accepted as one of forty Canadian teachers for Government service, and highly delighted at the fact. She laughed at all her mother’s fears . . . (411)

The courageous daughters of the mother country are adventurous ambassadors who are undaunted by African threats of disease, native inhabitants, and political unrest. Indeed, a tone of defiance is struck as the child “laughs” off her mother’s fears, relishing the opportunity for adventure. Both Graham and Randal write about the campaign as a great success, reflecting how normalized ideas of progressive civilization were. Florence Randal notes in her essay that she has “not the slightest doubt of the great good accomplished by the camp schools in furthering Imperialistic aims,” an idea she makes explicit by quoting a “high official of the education department” who says: “‘Give me the little ones’ . . . ‘and I will make South Africa British in one generation’” (413). Graham (1905) frames her memoir as great adventure, conceding how “[t]hrough the influence of the humane treatment received at the hands of the British Government there promised to spring up, generally, amongst the Dutch a feeling of kindly friendship towards the British” (161). These comments reveal how sentimental language—“little ones” and “kindly friendship”—disguised the coercive nature of their campaign.

Dispatches from Canada’s Sister Colony

If the circumstances under which the teachers were recruited and the nature of their teaching mission made them newsworthy, then Randal and Graham knew that their South African experiences would continue to foster curiosity. When working in refugee camps and, after peace was announced, in rural towns, they shared their first-hand experiences with Canadian readers through letters published in newspapers. A number of synchronous events, access to new employment opportunities, the possibility of global travel, and burgeoning Canadian print markets, enabled publishing opportunities, which sought unique accounts by women for a growing female readership. The growth in mass-circulating newspapers in late nineteenth-century Canada, argues Paul Rutherford (1982), served as a force of change “akin to the process of industrialization or the idea of democracy in its ability to transform the social environment” (8). The speed and rapidity with which news was transmitted from the colonies to Canada was enhanced by two concurrent developments. First, a cable that circled the globe was completed in 1902, connecting Canada, England, South Africa and Australia. Second, a direct shipping route was established between Canada and South Africa. These connections ensured that Canada and South Africa were brought closer together, both materially and in the Canadian imaginary. This boom in transatlantic

communication coincided with newspapers seeking to attract a larger readership; Randal's and Graham's eyewitness accounts from South Africa were both timely and ground-breaking.¹⁰

As foreign journalist, the teachers can be considered typical of the New Woman, who, as Jean Marie Lutes (2008) has argued, "embodied many of the possibilities of her age: new avenues for female wage-earners, as well as new technologies and new models of time, space, and motion—models that seemed even newer when they involved women, whose increased mobility outside domestic space was itself an innovation" (167). Marjory Lang (1999) describes how "women's opportunities in journalism stemmed directly from the advent of popular newspapers that depended on mass sales," with Canadian newspapers attempting to reach family audiences and women readers (31-33). Carole Gerson (2010) emphasizes the importance of understanding "women's published writing as an intervention in the public sphere of national and material culture" and calls attention to the various "social, cultural, and material conditions that propelled them onto the printed page" (xi). Gerson's analysis echoes Anne Innis Dagg's (2001) index of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Canadian non-fiction women writers, in which Maud Graham is listed as telling "the story of a woman reaching out from the private world to which, it would seem, culture has relegated her, to a public world where her particular expertise would have its chance to affirm, shape or change the larger culture" (vii). These conditions help shape our understanding of how unusual Randal's and Graham's voices were. They reported from a country in the midst of war, as insiders who were able to witness first-hand the details of Boer domestic life. Randal's (n.d.) personal diary records how she embarked on the teaching project as an opportunity to further her career in journalism: "I would love the trip and the writing of it" (March 25, 1902). She repeatedly reflects on her dedication to writing (more so than teaching), in one case commenting, "I have been working nearly all the week at writing instead of teaching" (August 9, 1902). For Randal and Graham, travel, employment, and publication were intertwined motivations for sailing to South Africa. Their writing contributed to a growing body of public discourse on the state of affairs in South Africa, and their voices skirted the boundaries of political commentary and war reportage. The women were judiciously aware that they were shaped by roles of imperial service while they simultaneously negotiated the expectations for Victorian women writers.

Florence Randal and *The Ottawa Journal*

Prior to her South African trip, Randal had spent five years with *The Ottawa Journal* as society editor, chronicling the activities of "the capital's debutantes and dowagers" (Lang 1999, 35). In 1900, the *Ottawa Journal* (1885-1980) was the city's leading newspaper, with a circulation of approximately 14,218 (Rutherford 1982, 237). Randal's monthly reports from South Africa were then widely re-printed in other daily newspapers, a common practice at the time. For example, the *Montreal Weekly Witness* on September 23, 1902 reprinted "'A School Teacher's Life,' by Miss Florence H. Randall [*sic*] one of the interesting letters to the Ottawa 'Journal' dated of August 1902" (Randal 1902a, 11). Despite the prestige of corresponding from Camp Irene¹¹ during the closing days of the war, Randal's writing was never deemed to be official reportage; instead, the *Ottawa Journal* printed her columns as personal letters, referring to her as a "special correspondent." The editorial title of her first column undercuts the value of her observations. Published on July 21, 1902, it is sensationalized: "With the Teachers in Concentration Camps. Miss Randal Writes of Life as She Found It Among the Boers on the Hot, Bare Veldt of South Africa (Special Correspondence of the Journal)" (Randal 1902b) Similarly, her next letter, August 5, 1902, was prefaced with an editorial comment: "The Journal has received another very interesting letter from Miss Florence Randal, with the lady teachers in South Africa" (Randall 1902c). In short, the editor contextualized Randal's work, foregrounded her gender, and rendered her columns as

personal, “interesting” dialogue from the rugged veldt, diminishing how the accounts were written from places marked by war. Randal’s writing thus registered a personal tone between writer and reader that conveyed intimacy; she addressed the reader as “you” and employed the first-person voice. Portrayed as correspondence, her letters illustrate the persistent categorization of women’s writing and experiences as private. In “A Stormy Sunday in a Burgher Camp” (Monday, September 29), Randal (1902d) writes, “I don’t know whether all these details are of interest to you who will read this. Still what I have written is a phase and part of our life, and to most of us a quite new experience. I begin to think, though, that you will be in danger of forgetting that we teach.” Each of her monthly letters included tales of touristic and social events, while acknowledging that her real mission—to educate women and children—was not exactly the “stuff” of interesting journalism. Some of the reportage discusses the rough conditions under which teaching was undertaken, but more of the observations resound with cultural and social commentary.¹²

Maud Graham’s Letters and Published Memoir

Whereas Randal’s letters were personal and informative, E. Maud Graham’s monthly dispatches struck a moralistic tone. Published in the *Montreal Witness* (1846-1938), a newspaper that Rutherford (1982) characterises as “replete with rules and uplift in the form of reports of Christian lectures, temperance tracts, moral tales, and Sunday School lessons” (129) these letters were then shaped into a book memoir, and it is likely that Graham “on her return to Canada in July 1904 . . . must have immediately begun writing the narrative, which is completed by 1 November 1905 (when she dates her acknowledgements)” (Schagerl 2006, 140).¹³ Like Randal’s letters, which were contextualized by an editor, Graham employed what Carole Gerson (2010) terms a “strategy of legitimation” (xv) to authorize her text, including a “Dedication” to describe her writing as a series of “notes” from her time in South Africa (Graham 1905, 3). This strategy positioned her book as a compilation of personal travel observations recorded for pleasure, rather than political purpose or message. Her memoir *does* contain outspoken observations about repatriation, education and the future of the South African colony in chapters neatly framed by the travel narrative; yet, the framing of her work as “notes” diminishes the persuasive content, thus constructing her text as amateurish, unscientific, and lacking literary merit. Graham gestures to her “South African and Canadian friends,” who urged her to publish her notes. In doing so and by dedicating her work to “the eight ladies of Fauresmith and Kroonstad, whose birthplaces number almost as many parts of the Empire” (3), she frames the book as a personal, sisterly offering.

The women with whom Graham taught were not the only female counterparts to whom she tipped her hat. The title, *A Canadian Girl in South Africa*, echoes Sara Jeannette Duncan’s *An American Girl in London* (1891), and Graham may have been alluding to Duncan as one of Canada’s first woman journalists; Duncan had written dispatches during her travels around the world, which were published in the *Montreal Daily Star* and formed the basis of her *A Social Departure* (1890). With this allusive title, Graham inserts her book into a larger discourse of literary sisterhood, showing her awareness of notable female literary predecessors, including famed novelist Olive Schreiner, quoted in the chapter on “Farming”; Alice Balfour, whom Graham meets in London (author of *Twelve Hundred Miles in a Wagon* about her travels in South Africa); and American humourist Marietta Holley’s “Samantha Allen” (Graham 1905, 69). From the first pages of her memoir, Graham emphasizes an overt tension in her work: while the teachers were privileged travellers with important employment opportunities, reporting from places of war was still new territory for women. Wading into the public arena of print meant relying upon the sanction of Empire, leaning on a supportive sisterly network of literary precursors, yet acknowledging a (subservient) gendered authorial status.

Domestic Cultural Contact

If literary gestures positioned the women's written missives from rough camp life in South Africa, as socially-acceptable, so too did employing the discourse of travel, another suitable subject for female writers. Travel functioned as both organizing principle and thematic concern, emphasizing a tourist's gaze. Graham (1905) diminishes the seriousness of her mission as simply a "trip to Africa," which "was unique and scarcely to be duplicated in this generation" (18). *A Canadian Girl* is structured with book-ending chapters documenting the journey to and from South Africa, with stopovers in London for sightseeing. Both women portray themselves as tourists, travelling by steamships, "first-class corridor coaches" (Graham 1905, 48), mail carts, and open trucks. When Graham first sees a concentration camp, she "exclaimed with delight at the picture," a serene landscape framed with "enormous kopjes [hills] . . . the Orange River, winding along between green banks . . . lines of tents glistening in the morning sun" (56-57). An outsider, she sees the beauty of the surroundings, scarcely noting the barbed wire, guard houses, or trauma experienced by the refugees.

By privilege and political permission, the teachers enjoyed mobility in South Africa and the nonchalant tone with which they described their touristic adventures belies the conditions that enabled their freedom of movement. A photograph of Graham's railway permit, reproduced in her memoir, documents how the teachers "could go where we please[d] in daylight, but were required to have a general pass for the evenings" (86-87). In contrast, "refugees were strictly forbidden to leave the boundaries of camp without a special pass" (86). Black Africans too had limited mobility; Graham explains how "the Kafirs [a derogatory, collective term to describe non-white populations] are not allowed to live intermingled with the whites, but must keep to themselves in 'locations,' or settlements, at one side of a town or farm. Secondly, no Kafir is allowed to wander about the towns or country without having in his possession a 'pass,' signed by his employer, renewed monthly, to certify that he is in regular employment" (139). Population movement was controlled through segregation, a pass system, and curfew hours, while the teachers, touristic surveyors, moved easily across physical and cultural terrain marked by war. Graham's observations, reflecting pervasive racist attitudes of the time, portray segregation in a sister colony as natural.

Metaphorically depicted as locked in their European-peasantry pasts, the Boer women and children were literally confined in camps, trapped in a purgatory-like existence. Living arrangements put the teachers in close contact with the Boer women outside of their time spent teaching children. These spaces of interaction can be considered an example of Mary Louise Pratt's (2008) "contact zones" (7). Pratt highlights how travel writing creates narratives of encounter, differing cultures coming into contact within asymmetrical power relations. Randal and Graham pay much attention to social conditions, hygiene and daily routine, with particular attention to the customs and culture of the Boers. When Graham's text was first printed in Canada, it was reviewed by the *Manitoba Free Press* as "the clearest impression . . . of the even tenor of every-day life in England's newest colony" (quoted in Graham 1905, xlii). More than simply women's writing, the focus on domestic life and travel narrative then illustrates how imperial policies rendered the political personal in an uneven power struggle.

Both Randal and Graham write about their social lives, where: "there was always something going on. Someone was sure to drop in for afternoon tea, after which there would be tennis, at which game the Dutch people are experts . . . And everybody played field hockey. . . We also had several concerts in the big tin school shed" (Graham 1905, 72). The hockey field and tennis court serve as metaphors for intra-cultural sociality, arenas for displaying feminine athleticism outside the schoolroom. The women's physicality and bravery displayed to a Canadian audience their

hardiness and suitability for life on the veldt. Randal's April 28, 1903 letter about "Ladies as Snake Killers" (*Ottawa Journal*), an anecdote she repeats in "A Year in a Boer School," tells how "many a timid girl has killed her snake[,] who in England would have screamed at a mouse" (Randal 1904, 416). These anecdotes serve as testimony of the ways in which the teachers "bravely" modelled Englishness and social norms. By contrast, the Dutch women were perceived to fall short of gendered expectations.

Randal (1902e) paints a dour picture of the "Dutch Vrow" in her column of November 10, 1902: "nearly all the women in camp are long and lank and lean, dressed in faded black or dusty calico, and not too clean in appearance" (5). Graham (1905) echoes this characterization, describing how "every woman and girl wore a 'kappe,' or sun-bonnet, and a mother-hubbard apron, usually of dark dingy print" (61). About a common scene of evening cooking, Randal (1902e) describes how "thin crone-like women stoop" over "three-legged cauldrons set on glowing braziers, around mud ovens" (5). Boer women were depicted as apathetic, sorrowful, unenterprising; the crone-like Mother Hubbard clothing perpetuates the image of Boer peasantry. Even their morning and evening devotional routines are "extravagantly doleful" (Graham 1905, 60). The teachers' observations convey detached ambivalence. On the one hand, they cannot represent a people too backward, outside the realm of assimilation; on the other hand, they must represent people with potential for incorporation into a ruling white population. The vital link in bridging this gap was the task of reform. When Graham describes how the poorer classes were dirty and susceptible to disease, she amends this statement by offering that "such people were never so well off in their lives as when in camp, for they received lessons in cleanliness and sanitary living" (63). The teachers also had to "report to the officials all the ragged children" (66) who, Graham remarks, benefitted from the daily soup provided, the schooling and free medical attention (68). More than simply offering childhood education, the teachers contributed to surveillance. Even Boer men showed potential and benefitted from the women's teaching. Randal (1903) proudly explains how the "Teachers have formed semi-weekly night classes for the Boer men who wish to learn English, at their own request; for many doubtless find it to their business advantage to know the language, and besides, the instruction is free." Anne McClintock emphasizes that race and gender "all too often put white women in positions of decided—if borrowed—power, not only over colonized women but also over colonized men. As such, white women were not the hapless onlookers of empire but were ambiguously complicit both as colonizers and colonized, privileged and restricted, acted upon and acting" (6). The issues raised by the teachers reflect how socially gendered roles were co-opted in service of assimilation projects.

Few Boer women are given voice. They remain a collective, unknown population, in stark contrast to the enterprising colonial teachers. Elizabeth Van Heyningen (2002) explains how the meagre camp rations of inedible meat and next to no fresh fruit and vegetables, contributed to a state of widespread malnutrition, apathy and exhaustion among the Boers (193). Lethargy could have been symptomatic of the trauma of forced home removal, separation from spouses and family, loss of children, and widespread disease. Noticeably absent, or mentioned dismissively, is an awareness of the trauma Boer women suffered. Graham (1905) recounts how "there was also a large class who undoubtedly suffered many hardships in camp. . . . [T]hey did suffer, and greatly, as some are bound to do in every war" (68). Likewise, Randal's (1904) essay emphasized the success of the strategy, only modestly acknowledging the human impact of the through three excerpts from letters written by Boer children telling of the scorched earth policy, of "when Englishman going they burn houses and catch the people and bring it in camp" (417). Rather than dwelling on the Boers' suffering, Graham (1905) how some were "quite friendly" (61), while Randal observes how the richer women were proud, and "always had Kaffir servants to work for

them, [they] do not care very much for domestic service under other people's direction . . . many in the camp are cultured people whom it is a pleasure to meet." Yet she considers Boer culture as needing modulation and correction. Noting how some Dutch wives appeared to enjoy equality with their husbands, Randal (1902e) remarks: "Womankind is rather spoiled by the men out here, the latter seeming to live in wholesome awe of their wives. Indeed the Woman's Rights question would never need to be raised; the vrouw (sic) has long ago seen to that. Her 'man' helps her with the housework, when he is not one of the loafing kind, and generally 'flaxes round' at her behest." These critiques reflect the nuanced cultural differences the teachers observed.

Depictions of black women are noticeably absent; they appear as spectral domestic servants, caricatured as simple and childish. The indigenous population in South Africa, unlike that of Canada, outnumbered white settlers by more than five to one, so the omission of black people in the women's writing mirrored both their limited personal interactions and their racial bias. Graham (1905) interacted with their servant, "Maria, our Kafir," who "could speak no English," but "smiled sweetly" and "was beautifully clean" (106). Maria remains a marginal presence in the text, as does "Joanna," who "was a continual source of amusement. She was an older woman, an excellent cook, but always talking to herself and apparently enjoying some joke at our expense. These Kafir girls were like mischievous children" (119). Simplified as mischievous and childlike, black women hover in the shadows, lacking voice, personality and personhood. In "A Year in a Boer School," Randal (1904) includes a photograph of a black woman washing clothes in the river, while an English woman reclines on the bank, as "a typical bit of South African farm scenery in its prettiest aspect" (417). Visually and descriptively, then, black women are portrayed with peasant-like simplicity. Exploited for their domestic labour, they are arrested as part of the "scenery," rendered as unthreatening and subdued.

Domestic contact with Boer and black women in Randal's and Graham's writings reveal their colonial perspective; as touristic surveyors, they are able to move around the country describing the newest British colony to a Canadian audience. Their missives from South Africa, novel for women at the turn of the century, reached Canadian readers through the booming press, which in turn depicted them as exemplary models of Canadian womanhood. When they arrived in South Africa, the war was ending; consequently, they were not considered to have been on active military service and never received official recognition, excluding them from policies that rewarded other war participants. Elisions like these illustrate how war is often defined in terms of armed conflict between men, women's roles are often overlooked.¹⁴ Graham's and Randal's texts remain as important historical records of the women's experiences. They claimed the right to speak of their encounters and experiences within the socially accepted discourses of women's domestic and travel writing. They caricatured and often omitted Boer and Black women, revealing how colonial narratives of English normativity and femininity enacted the project of British assimilation and Anglicization shared by Canada and South Africa.

Notes

¹ The camps were commonly called concentration camps or refugee camps. The word "concentration" had not yet been associated with the horrors of the camps in the Second World War and reflects the nomenclature of the South African War period.

² "Boer" literally translates as "farmer," and is a term used during the war to describe a population descended from Dutch settlers, who had landed in the Cape as early as 1652. Graham (1905) notes how "the educated classes resented the term 'Boer,' which they said meant a peasant" (59).

³ I focus on Randal and Graham, who were the most prolific reporters of the South African experience; however, occasional photographs and columns from other Canadian teachers appeared in various publications across Canada. For example, photographs by Florence J. Wilkinson were published in *The Globe* on September 13, 1902, and a letter by Edith Murray was printed in the *Education Journal of Western Canada* in October 1902.

⁴ Florence Randal's South African writing is little known; her South African letters can be accessed through archives of *The Ottawa Journal*, while her short essay in *The Canadian Magazine* can be found in bound, volume editions of the periodical, as well as on *Early Canadiana Online*. Upon returning to Canada, Randal embarked on a successful career as a journalist at the *Winnipeg Free Press* (writing under the pseudonym of Kilmeny). She is also recognised as a translator of Ukrainian folk literature and songs into English, and as the mother of esteemed Canadian poet Dorothy Livesay (Gerson 1990, 205). Maud Graham's memoir remains her only major written work; she published one additional article "Christmas in Quebec" in *The Farmer's Advocate* on December 9, 1909.

⁵ Neither Carman Miller's (1993) comprehensive history of Canadian participation in the Boer War, *Painting the Map Red*, nor Gordon L. Heath's (2009) study of the Protestant press' focus on missions, *A War with a Silver Lining*, mention the teachers.

⁶ White and black civilians were housed in separate camps. At war's end there were about fifty camps for whites and sixty-four for black people. The separate camps for black Africans were significantly worse in terms of food and accommodation than the white camps, and by war's end approximately fifteen thousand African people had perished (Dawson et al. 2015, xxi).

⁷ While I discuss the teachers, women from Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand served as nurses in the South African colonies during the war, where more people died of disease than enemy fire. Shula Marks (2002) has researched British nurses in the war, to argue that "the acceptance of nurses at the front in the First World War owed more to the experience of the South African War than to any previous military encounter" (159).

⁸ Most of the Boers belonged to the Dutch Reformed Church, a Protestant denomination. As religious education was mandatory and conducted in Dutch in the schools, it was believed that Protestant English teachers would minimize conflict in the camps.

⁹ Coleman's work contributes to a large field of critical whiteness studies, including, but not limited to, scholarship by Carl Berger (1966) "The True North Strong and Free," Himani Bannerji (2000) *The Dark Side of the Nation*, and Eva Mackey's (2002) discussion of multiculturalism in *The House of Difference*.

¹⁰ Few women prior to Randal and Graham had reported from war zones. One of these was Kit Coleman who in 1898 became the "world's first officially accredited woman war correspondent" when she went to Cuba to cover the Spanish-American War (Lang 1999, 60).

¹¹ Randal taught in Camp Irene in the Transvaal; Graham was stationed first at Norval's Pont in the Orange River Colony before teaching in the towns of Fauresmith and Kroonstad.

¹² Edith Murray (1902), a fellow Canadian teacher, noted that instruction was "done somewhat under difficulties" and that the inspector, who provided directions when they arrived, said to the teachers, "Do as you please regarding methods of teaching, discipline etc.; we know you will do your best" (167).

¹³ I use the 2015 version of Graham's text throughout this essay. The recent republication in 2015 signals a shift in historical inquiry and literary analysis that seeks to include underrepresented accounts of people's involvement in the war. Some of these studies include work by Peter Warwick (1983) *Black People and the South African War 1899-1902*, Elizabeth Van Heyningen's (2013) *The Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War: A Social History*, Donal

Lowry's (1999) edited volume *The South African War Reappraised*, and *Writing a Wider War: Rethinking Gender, Race, and Identity in the South African War, 1899-1902*, edited by Greg Cuthbertson, Albert Grundlingh, and Mary-Lynn Suttie (2002).

¹⁴ When the Canadian Government through the "Volunteer Bounty Act" of 1908 gave land grants in the Northwest to war participants (at the expense of Indigenous people), the Canadian teachers were excluded from the order. Twice the teachers petitioned the Government: in 1909, Isabel Perry wrote to Governor General Earl Grey asking, "Do I not come under the Act also, for I was one of the volunteers who went to Africa during the war on service for my country"? (quoted in Schagerl 2006, 172-73), and Ruby Rothwell, Sara Drysdale and Julia Urquhart lobbied for "the same recognition . . . as the Canadian Contingents, and Canadian nurses" (173). The petitions were declined because the Committee of the Privy Council concluded that the South African teachers were not on active military service.

XI. Margaret Gould (1900-1981): Social Worker, Social Critic, Public Intellectual Marjorie Johnstone

Intellectuals have traditionally been understood as having superior reasoning and analytic capabilities. These attributes were historically identified as masculine traits and public intellectuals were men. Given this presupposition, when were women able to make their voices heard as intellectuals—either individually or publically? What did they say? How did they engage in civic debate? (Bashevkin 2013). “Public intellectual” is a contested term. Bashevkin (2013) relies on a definition by British sociologist Barbara Misztal, who identified courage and creativity as critical factors (2007). For Stein (2013), “it is their commitment to engagement with the public that justifies the term ‘public intellectual’” (15). Furthermore, women must contribute to public conversation in a manner that can be readily understood and that helps the public see a problem differently. In Stein’s view, the public intellectual is a crucial actor in an effective democracy. In his Reith lectures for the BBC, Edward Said (1996) sought to characterize the public intellectual as “an individual endowed with a faculty for representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for, a public” (11). He pointed out that this role involves someone who is not co-opted by government, business, or employer to adopt a certain “party line” and who is committed to represent public issues that are routinely forgotten or swept under the rug. He described this as a vocation, one advancing the cause of freedom and justice. He identified “commitment and risk, boldness and vulnerability” (13) as part of the profile of a public intellectual.

In “Fearless Speech,” Foucault (2001) traced the genealogy of “truth telling” from its appearance in ancient Greek texts as *parrhesia*, which he described as a social role of truth telling which requires courage because it involves the truth teller in potential risk or danger. The *parrhesia* or truth-teller recognised qualities required to know the truth and to convey the truth; he regarded truth telling as a moral duty and an important part of a democracy. All these accounts identify courage and risk-taking as integral to public intellectual work, an agreed sense that these individuals speak from a personal frame of justice on topics of universal significance and importance. What they have to say is grounded in well-informed knowledge and not just opinion. The public intellectual fulfils a social role, which is accepted as a vocation by the truth-teller.

Margaret Gould (1900-1981) was a public intellectual: she sustained a significant voice in pursuit of universal political, economic, and social rights. She maintained this position during the cold war years when adherence to socialist left-leaning ideas was subject to extreme censure. Her life path took her through several different careers but the linking vocational thread was her commitment to public education and consciousness-raising. While her activism and writing spanned a wide spectrum of issues, her viewpoint was consistently, balanced and clear, reflecting an integrated personal frame of social justice which guided her thinking.

Gould’s life story exists only in a fragmentary form, passing references in studies of women and the left (Sangster 1989; Rifkind 2009), women in social welfare history (Jennissen 2011; Wills 1995), women and journalism (Irvine 2008), civil rights activism (Lambertson 2005; Bangarth 2003; Patrias 2001) and the history of the needle trades (Frager 1992). Part of a larger historical project that aims to assemble the fragments of Gould’s story through archival research, this essay traces Gould’s life in broad strokes, chronicling her path to radicalism and the development of her personal frame of justice. Her interest in public education contributes to her stature as a public intellectual.

From Minsk to Toronto: Becoming an Activist

Gould's father fled the pogroms and mandatory military conscription in Russia for the New World in 1904, leaving his wife and three children alone in their village in Minsk. Shortly afterwards, the remaining family was smuggled from the Russian Pale through Germany and eventually to Toronto. Once in Toronto, the family moved often. From no water, electricity or indoor toilets in the first shack on Elizabeth Street, they arrived several years later at a downtown Jewish enclave, known as The Junction, which Gould describes in the following way:

An outsider could see little reason for pride. Number 176 Maria Street was one of a row of semi-detached, cheaply built, two-storey houses with brick-faced fronts. Like all the others on the street (put up by a developer), ours had four small rooms, two upstairs and two downstairs, with a small "summer" kitchen tacked on the back. The street was narrow, the road unpaved, and our side of the street adjoined the CPR tracks. When the rains came, our yard and the front road became seas of slimy mud. Being an extension of the railroad tracks not only kept us awake nights, it covered the family wash with heavy soot. North of the railway tracks stood Toronto's huge abattoirs wafting stench our way, especially on hot nights. Social workers would later classify our street as "under-privileged." (Gould, 1987, 20)

Here Gould attended the local public school as well as a local Peretz school or Jewish National Radical School. Sympathetic to the working classes, communism, and preserving secular Jewish culture, Isaac Matenko, a Russian-Jewish intellectual who emigrated in 1905, founded these schools in Toronto (Speisman 2005). Gould was taught by Matenko, a clothing worker and labour organiser as well as a volunteer teacher in The Junction community. He became a mentor and model to the young adolescent. Gould wrote:

The Peretz Schule awoke children and mothers, to culture; opened windows to their minds, gave them pride in their past, invited examination of their past and future; brought the entire street along to higher standards. . . . The Peretz Schule was paid for by pennies and dimes, mostly by women for their daughters. The occasional father came to listen and a few others helped, to repair, paint etc. . . . On Saturday evenings in Maria Street, the Peretz Shoola had special parties, readings, discussions, concerts. Parents and teachers were "verknippt and verbinden" as they were not in the city school. . . . Matenko could dance a Sholam Eleichem dance with mothers in Maria Street as he could not do in the city. To him came mothers asking to be taught how to sign their names, and he would take their grimy careworn hands and help them to learn to guide pencils over paper. (Toronto Reference Library n.d.a)

Gould attributed learning independent thinking to the Maria Street Peretz school. She recalled a student voting against Matenko when he was running to become a delegate to the first Jewish Congress. Matenko accepted this dissension, which was debated in class. To Gould, the freedom to exercise independent judgement was an important lesson. She commented that most of the girls "went left" through these schools, and learned the principles of universal humanity, integrity, and pride in origin, "Where else should a working girl go but left?" she asked rhetorically (Toronto Reference Library n.d.a.).

Gould excelled at school. As the eldest child in a family of twelve, however, immediately after high school, she sought employment in a factory so she could contribute to the family income. Her desire for a university education had to wait until she could save enough to subsidize herself at the University of Toronto. Despite these obstacles, she graduated in 1923 with a B.A. in political science, economics, social science, and philosophy. She later won a Rockefeller scholarship and graduated in 1928 with an M.A. from Stanford University, California. At that time the disciplines of economics, sociology, and social work were interconnected subdivisions of political economy. Guided by a philosophy of Fabian social reform, labour conditions and housing were important foci of research and analysis in the discipline of political economy (Chambon 2012; Burke 1996; Graham 1996). While Gould doubtless had already established a Marxist perspective on capitalism and social problems, her university education would have exposed her to a broader perspective. In 1923 she was hired as a union organizer for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of Toronto and later went on to work as a researcher for the Canadian Brotherhood of Railways. It is conceivable that her university education modified her views to a more social democratic position as her paid work shifted from labour activism to social work.

Representing Her Ideas in the World: Social Work as Public Education

When she returned to Toronto from Stanford University in 1929, Gould accepted an executive position with the Child Welfare Council of Toronto. These were busy years for her. In addition to her duties at the Child Welfare Council and in the community, Gould lectured at the University of Toronto, was an active member of the Canadian Association of Social Work, and a member of the League for Social Reconstruction (Toronto Reference Library 1926). The Council was a federation of eighty-two organisations actively engaged in child welfare work in Toronto. As Gould described to an annual meeting in 1935, it was founded to unify and co-ordinate child welfare work, to eliminate duplication, but also to pool experience and thinking on the topic (CTA 1935). In the course of this work, Gould became very involved in public education. She stated that:

We are deeply concerned with changes in mental attitude and in social criteria. We are not selling bricks for a temporal building; we are consciously trying to fashion and to sell bricks and the structural steel works and the furnishings of that abode called “a happier world for children.” Therefore our annual stocktaking can never have that finality about it, as does a report about the manufacture and sale of red and grey bricks . . . our prosperity also, cannot be defined in the ordinary sense of the word, for it is not the prosperity as evidenced by material possessions, but the prosperity as evidenced by the possession of ideals. (CTA 1930, 2)

Gould conceptualized her job as influencing public opinion and contributing to a public mindset, which supported her vision of a better world. She used democratic and collaborative approaches to achieve her goals, regularly invited guest speakers and arranged conferences and mass meetings to stimulate conversation, debate and the dispersion of ideas. She used social media of the time to further disseminate information and to influence public thinking. A weekly column on child welfare work was organised to run in *The Toronto Daily Star*, and a weekly forum was aired on the radio (CTA 1931).

In 1929, the Toronto Child Welfare Council collaborated with the Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare and the National Council of Women to promote child welfare issues at the Canadian National Exhibition (CNE). These women-led organisations used theatrical

performance to communicate their message, thus turning a national festive event into an occasion for education with a play called “The Right of the Child to Homecare.” Under Gould’s leadership, participation in the CNE became an annual event and each year they spotlighted a different issue. “Organised social work in a community” in 1930, included seven four-foot-square and five-foot-high illuminated stages, peopled by photographic cut-outs; unfolding the meaning of family welfare work, health services, prevention of delinquency, child protection, recreation, special training classes, and services to the physically handicapped child. To augment the exhibit the Council handed out pamphlets on the display topics. Gould reported that the public took the exhibit very seriously. Many came to consult council members on specific problems, and when the Council was not able to respond they referred the query to other appropriate agencies. These exhibitions became a resource not only to the social work community but to out-of-town nurses, teachers, and clubwomen who attended the exhibition, often leaving with samples of the literature. Gould hoped that some of the ideas implemented in Toronto would be introduced to rural settings. After the Exhibition, the display went to the storefront of Simpsons for four days and then to another store on Bloor St. for a week (CTA 1931).

Gould worked collaboratively with two other social service agencies to make eleven radio broadcasts about a family with ten children, called “The Newcomes.” Each week explored a different social problem that the Newcomes were experiencing. These programs were very successful and wrapping a social issue into a story proved an effective tool for public education (CTA 1931). In a reflective piece that Gould wrote in her latter years, she commented that

most people think advances in the world come about by themselves. This, of course, is not so. Our life span is now longer, that diseases have declined in threat or vanished, that children are taller, that slavery is declining, is due not to natural forces but to the efforts of dedicated men and women. Due largely to organised efforts of small, determined groups. What they lacked in numbers they made up in dogged persistence. Usually action was sparked by one or two individuals who never let their energies flag, despite opposition and hardship, gathering followers until enough people were convinced to push through a law. (Toronto Reference Library n.d.b, 9)

As a social worker, Gould operated in a macro perspective, developing ways to influence public opinion, to disseminate knowledge and to change processes. She believed that the profession of social work should adopt a political approach to social problems:

We haven’t their confidence because we have not shown them what we really stand for. Politicians have no use for us because they think we are impractical, sentimental “uplifters” and “busybodies.” The unemployed put up with us in silent disdain as a necessary evil. Other professionals charge us with hypocrisy and self-interest. Those interested in social issues call us fence straddlers. We have made no impression on the general public because we move among them in a colourless spineless sort of way. What is the matter? Is it that we do not know ourselves what we are and what is our mission? Have we a mission? (Gould 1934, 3)

Gould was ahead of her time; her peers were not as clear-minded or as committed to her strategies and ideas about the directions social work should take. She was part of a cluster of radical social

workers who shared her views and networked with one another. She showed strength and strategic intelligence but was also vulnerable to criticism and isolation.

One contemporary social worker who shared many of her political views was Dorothy Livesay. Although Livesay was a similar age, their life trajectories were very different. Livesay was middle class and her parents could afford to foster her creative and artistic talents; she went directly from high school to university as she did not have financial obstacles. By the time she graduated from the Sorbonne she had begun publishing literary articles and poetry (Thompson 1987). When Livesay began the social work program at the University of Toronto, the Great Depression and the realities of poverty, hunger and need radicalized her and she became a political Marxist: “Life in Paris, with its turmoil of demonstrations against unemployment, against war, against the fascist tendencies of the police, had quickened my interest in the state of the world. I resolved to learn more at first hand by taking a social-work course” (quoted in Livesay, 1968, 15). Livesay and Gould worked together as editors on *New Frontier*, established in 1936; Livesay sought to disseminate the proletarian voice, which she believed would promote the development of a Canadian literature. Gould, on the other hand, was a member of the League for Social Reconstruction. Formed in 1932 in Toronto and in Montreal, this activist group of university scholars was united in a commitment to “discover the necessary measures of reconstruction and to formulate them into a policy which would fit Canadian conditions” (League 1938, 152). They were convinced that the economic system was unjust and inefficient and while they declared themselves apolitical, their recommendations were left-leaning. They used sociological methods of surveying, analysing and documenting social problems as a way to advocate for change, and as a foundation for the formulation of new policies. This strategy of documentation was adopted by the literary as well as the political left, powerfully illustrated by the League for Social Reconstruction (LSR). Rifkind (2009) has observed that the documentary techniques which were mobilized for radical change by the left in the 1930s, were hijacked in the postwar years by liberal democracy as tools of social control. Documentation and data collection became central to the bureaucracy surrounding the welfare state.

I Visit the Soviets

In 1935 the Soviet Union was admitted to the League of Nations, precipitating a renewed interest in Russia and in the changes that had occurred since the revolution in 1917. Joe Atkinson, the owner of *The Toronto Star*, had met Gould in the course of her work at the Child Welfare Council and the two formed an immediate bond, a shared interest in social reform and the rights of the “common man.” Atkinson contracted Gould to tour the Soviet Union, investigate the welfare programs there, and write articles on her observations and experiences for *The Star*. As she spoke Russian and still had relatives in Russia, this was an opportunity Gould eagerly accepted.

On April 10, 1936 Gould and two social work colleagues, Kathleen Gorrie (Executive Secretary of the Protestant Children’s Homes) and Dora Wilensky (Executive Secretary of the Jewish Family Welfare Bureau and wife of the communist Member of Provincial Parliament in Toronto, Joe Salsberg), set out on a ten week trip to visit Scandinavia (Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland) because “of their early leadership in social legislation and reform,” followed by England (the mother country), and the Soviet Union because “it is the latest frontier in social development” (Gould 1937, 1). She reported in her book *I Visit the Soviets*, a compilation of *Toronto Star* articles on her trip, supplemented with new writing, that upon her return she was in demand as a speaker about social developments in the Soviet Union.

It is the world's first laboratory where plans for human betterment are being put into practice by and for the whole population, on a national scale and according to a national plan. We saw modern services in public health, child training, technical education, nutrition, housing and community recreation supplied to all their people as a matter of human right, on the basis of work and earnings and not charity. We did not see many new techniques in social services, but an entirely new system of making these available to all citizens, regardless of race, color, class or creed. (Gould 1937, iii)

She noted the differences in availability and accessibility of social services: and argued for a different society's new and comprehensive vision. She began writing an article a day for *The Toronto Star*, reporting highlights of her trip and commenting on social welfare issues from an international, comparative perspective. The articles discussed education, recreation, nutrition, and housing, the family, women and children. Gould personalized the pieces with travel anecdotes, the circumstances of her visit, and comparisons with Canada ("Pages of the Past" 1936a), her coverage of Russia the key focus. She concluded the series with articles on Sweden's response to illegitimate children ("Pages of the Past" 1936b) Denmark's comprehensive social security package ("Pages of the Past" 1936c), and Britain's Open Air Nursery movement ("Pages of the Past" 1936d).

Editorial Journalist: Representing a Standpoint

For Edward Said (1996) a public intellectual takes a stand despite opposition and barriers. This description is particularly pertinent to Gould during her final years at the Child Welfare Council; she had become the target of red-baiting and was publicly criticized for her social values. Undeterred in her capacity as editorial writer, Gould mobilized her political position and frame of justice to advocate for social protection legislation and the public provision of services. Said (1996) cites Gramsci, who identified organic intellectuals as persons actively involved in society who struggle to change minds and gain voter approval: Gould lived her life in accordance with her core beliefs, which in essence remained consistent. After moving on from her social work position, she used the media of the day as a conduit for her vision of social justice.

Gould described journalism as embracing education, commerce and assessment, reporting news and offering different perspectives: "Because the influence of the printed word is so powerful the daily press is often a crusader for social reform. It is able to bring to the attention of millions of people the existence of social evils and at the same time to solicit sympathy for the sufferers and measures to correct the conditions" ("Press Social Mirror" 1940). A newspaper, she asserted, only too commonly supports existing agencies in their social reform work, when it could encourage a social movement. Those men and women admired as public benefactors—Charles Dickens, Lincoln Steffens, John Ruskin, Octavia Hill and Jane Addams—all worked through the press. Gould cited how changes to child labour, slums, long working hours, unsafe working conditions, and prisons, were enabled by the press. Gould was aware that the commercial competitive nature of the newspaper business sometimes produced a conflict of interest; to adhere to principles, newspapers sometimes incurred losses. With respect to *The Star* she said: "The Star has espoused principles which entailed losses of revenue. Those who enter the vocation with the attitude of performing a social service find in it a satisfying experience." ("Press Social Mirror" 1940). Between 1937 and 1960, Margaret Gould was well-known as a feature and editorial writer for *The Toronto Star*. She specialized in reporting on social legislation, social and public health services, the status of women, labor standards and global social change. In her editorial capacity she

performed the role of public intellectual; she accepted her position at *The Star* in full knowledge of the newspaper's political position. During the 1930s, *The Toronto Star* was dubbed *the Red Star of Toronto* as it was known to be sympathetic to Russia and to communism. When in 1931 Prime Minister Bennett ordered a crackdown on communism, *The Star* declared that the way to defeat communism was to provide "unemployment insurance, health insurance, minimum wages and maximum hours of work for men, old age pensions at sixty-five, a national works program, and a federally administered relief system" (Harkness 1963, 296). Gould actively contributed to *The Star*'s resistance and wrote regular articles which promoted social welfare reform.

As an editorial writer, Gould covered a gamut of issues from local, provincial, and national standpoints. She unpacked whatever new welfare legislation was topical or under discussion. She mobilized her network and requested copies of briefs in advance of submission so she could write preparatory articles and be well prepared when changes were proposed. The Canadian Welfare Council archives contain a file on the Cost of Living (1947-1948), an exchange of letters between Gould and key social workers in the Council, sharing briefs and discussing upcoming initiatives, and clippings from subsequent articles published in *The Star* (LAC n.d.). She explained complex legislation, reports and recommendations clearly and simply. In discussing the broad recommendations of the Rowell-Sirois report, Gould focussed on education as a way to address a wide audience and illustrate the key issue of the Report--federalism and the importance of public finance for social services. The commission's recommendations were formative in the rise of the welfare state (Rice and Prince 2013); Gould of course supported those recommendations. Her April 1938 article on the Rowell-Sirois Commission, entitled "Teachers Speak for the Children" documented educational discrepancies between provinces and between urban and rural locations. She showed how teachers' salaries, the availability of public libraries, and standards of education varied. She argued that in a democratic industrial world education is key, pointing out that education must be standardized across the country. She concluded by endorsing the recommendations of the Rowell-Sirois Commission.

In "Looking at Both Sides," Gould identified the problem of affordable housing and provided a detailed case study of an unemployed breadwinner with a sick wife and children. She illustrated the concrete realities of their living conditions and connected these with the relief housing rates of the time. She noted that new bylaws required landlords improve slum condition housing, resulting in increased rents but no equivalent increase in relief rates: "To keep to a low rental, the unemployed must seek houses of low tax values. Hence the unemployed must go into even lower than substandard places. The by-law which was supposed to "fix up" the slums is actually causing misery to the people on relief and low wages. Which shows that a plaster won't cure a fever. And the question still remains Why do they do it this way?" (*Toronto Daily Star* 1938a). Gould illustrated that "a plaster won't cure a fever" by showing how a piecemeal bylaw is inadequate as a way to address a problem like affordable housing. By using a case study, she opened the social issue to common understanding; by "looking at both sides" she showed how neither tenant nor landlord were in a position to resolve the problem. Once again she exposed to public view the structural and systemic dimensions of the issue.

A strong supporter of equal rights for women, Gould was interested in political representation and participation, women and work, and in social protection measures such as daycare, maternity leave, and family allowances. Her interest in women's health, including childbirth and maternal mortality, were areas of activism for her long before she became a reporter. On the eve of World War 2, in 1938, she wrote in support of women's participation in the paid workplace, stating:

In this country where industry, science, education, art are on the threshold of development, where a small population is dotted over a huge expanse of land, the energy and intelligence of women are of vital importance. In a pioneering democratic land women are equal partners with men. Were the throttle removed from our national economic engine, there would be a serious shortage of human labor. We would consider ourselves fortunate to have a supply of educated trained women, capable of engaging in the nation's work as well as building the nation's home. (*Toronto Daily Star* 1938b)

Gould challenges her readers to recognise that supporting women's rights contributes towards Canada's collective national strength.

The Intellectual Voice

In Edward Said's words (1996), "the intellectual is supposed to be heard from, and in practice ought to be stirring up debate and if possible controversy" (69). Gould entered the public arena through the debate about family allowance. In accordance with the recommendations of the Marsh Report, the Federal government passed the *Family Allowance Act* in 1944. This initiative, motivated by Keynesian economics (Christie 2000), was largely well received. This new allowance provided a universal tax-free benefit to families with children under sixteen and was distributed monthly, directly to mothers (Jennissen 2011; Struthers 1994). Long a supporter of Mothers Allowance, introduced in 1920, Gould promoted the *Family Allowance Act* as an initiative which would improve the quality of life for families. The new act was controversial. Although there was strong public consensus in favour of postwar social reconstruction, some viewed this as a dangerous initiative which would weaken Canada. Among critics of the Act, Reverend Claris Silcox was a case in point. An Anglo-Canadian activist intent on preserving the dominance of British traditions and ideals (Patrias 2001, 18), he published a tract on the new *Family Allowance* act, called *The Revenge of the Cradles*. Virulently anti-Catholic, he argued that the Act was a subsidy for reproduction which would promote irresponsible family planning. Using a eugenic argument, he noted the decline in population of white Anglo protestant Canadians and spoke of "race suicide" as a national threat. Shifting the discussion to Quebec, he stated, "After the conquest, Canada became dominantly Anglo-Saxon by immigration, while the French cherished the hope of outbreeding their conquerors by their 'natural virility.' They spoke openly of the 'revanche des berceaux' (the revenge of the cradles). In all this they seem to have the support of Roman Catholic moral theology" (Patrias 18). He argued that family allowances would cause a huge spike in Quebec's population and in the number of Roman Catholic and French-speaking Canadians, which would lead to national disunity. Instead, Canada should pursue a program of selective immigration and increase the population in a planned and socially cohesive manner.

The Revenge of the Cradles was published with a companion pamphlet called *Baby Bonuses: Dollars or Sense?* by Charlotte Whitton, the founder and Executive Director of the Canadian Welfare Council (1920-1942) and a well-known public figure. Social worker and delegate from Canada to the Commission on Social Questions of the League of Nations, she was later to become the first woman mayor of Ottawa. For many years she led the social work profession in the area of child welfare reform, fighting against child labour and juvenile immigration. Also a staunch member of the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire (IODE), she shared Silcox's views on the importance of British ideals and traditions (Johnstone 2015). On the basis of economic and political arguments, Charlotte Whitton entered the fray in full support

of Silcox, describing the program as a reward for reproduction instead of production. She promoted the importance of a decent living wage for workers and decried any program premised on what she considered unearned hand-outs: “The automatic mailing of cheques or remitting of actual cash to families of such type and areas is equivalent to pouring public money into a cesspool which will enlarge and seep through to the poisoning of the life of those stable sections of the population upon which it will thrive and batten” (20). She echoed Silcox’s concern that rewarding reproduction would encourage the wrong kind of people to have children, further weakening the fibre of Canada.

Gould countered with a pamphlet entitled *Family Allowances in Canada: Facts versus Fiction*. She supported her arguments with well-researched examples and documented evidence from around the world. She set up 21 “fictions” or common beliefs around welfare allowances and disputed them one by one. She discredited assertions of race “purity,” asserting that all nations are of mixed peoples and homogeneity occurs as a result of social measures. She pointed out that indiscriminate reproduction for gain is unlikely to motivate parents who do not desire children. In fact, low wages produce health and social problems, which can be mitigated through the allowance. While supporting universal benefits, she challenged the claim that recipients would waste the money and avoid work. This is the first piece of legislation in the Dominion which treats every child equally, provides to all parents on an equal basis, a healing hand in the task of rearing children, the future citizens of the nation. For the first time, no child will suffer discrimination on the ground of race, colour, creed, place of birth or residence in the country” (25). To argue for the allowance’s affordability, Gould cited dramatic improvements in the wartime economy with increased production, higher employment rates, and a controlled cost of living. She noted that on a global scale Canada had become the fourth industrial power, the fourth air power and the fourth naval power. Adopting a Keynesian position, she stated that “Family Allowances will pay for themselves because they will create employment, create business activity and therefore maintain a level of income. This measure will pay for itself in the saving to be effected in public expenditures on ill health, invalidism, delinquency and other social ills” (28). Gould applauded this first step in the implementation of the Marsh Commission recommendations and observed that “[t]he family Allowances will help to take the meanness, the destructiveness and the economic fears out of the everyday struggles of life. This will release energy for constructive living” (15).

Margaret Gould’s ideas and her lifelong involvement in the social and political arena of Canada establish her as a public intellectual. Said (1996) stated that “the exile standpoint for an intellectual is that you tend to see things not just simply as they are, but as they have come to be that way. Look at situations as contingents not as inevitable, look at them as a series of historical choices made by men and women, as facts of society made by human beings” (60). As a trained sociologist, political scientist and social worker, Gould had an unusual ability to condense complex and contentious ideas into simple, clear, understandable and straightforward language. This gift is apparent throughout her writing. Her sophisticated understanding and mastery of this material, alongside her life experience and her keen and sensitive intelligence, enabled her to draw on examples of everyday life to unmask injustice and to expose the structural causes behind social ailments. She was always clear and to the point, able to explain complex legislation in simple terms, and in an accessible manner.

Foucault (2001) stated that while the truth-teller is not forced to speak, “he feels that it is his [her] duty to do so” (19). Gould told truth throughout her life, mostly through the written word. She promoted public education, she advocated for social work as a vehicle to raise awareness of the need for protection against unregulated capitalism. In her work with the League for Social Reconstruction, as co-editor of the *The New Frontier*, and as a member of the Communist Party,

her political position was public and unapologetic. She maintained her adherence to socialist ideas throughout the cold war years and supported the welfare state during its contested formative years. Women often had to “perform” their public selves in opposition to dominant cultural trends (Margadant 2000; Butler 2006). Margaret Gould models a resistant public intellectual whose accomplishments warrant revisiting.

XII. Public (Lending) Rights: Women's Advocacy in The Writers' Union of Canada Erin Ramlo

In a 1983 interview Marian Engel was asked what event, in her opinion, had made her into “something of a public figure?” The interviewer postulates that it was, perhaps, winning a Governor General’s Award for her acclaimed novel *Bear* in 1976. Engel’s response, however, ascribes her rise to public consciousness not to her literary production, but to her activism in service of her literary community. “I think,” she says, “it was when I was chairman of The Writers’ Union of Canada. I did a lot of press work and a lot of television work, so I leapt into prominence” (“Marian Engel” n.d.). Engel’s repeated invocation of the word “work” is striking, as it gestures to the incredible amount of volunteer labour she dedicated to her role as the head of this prominent Canadian literary organization. Elected at the founding meeting in 1973, Engel became one of the driving forces behind the grassroots advocacy work of the Writers’ Union, which would, with her labour, and the labour of other friends and colleagues, become one of the most influential writer’s organizations in Canadian history. Ironically, while Engel credits this work with heightening her public visibility, the extent of her labour in the service of Canadian authorship—and the labour of several of her female colleagues—has, over time, largely been forgotten. I would like to consider how a particular group of Canadian women authors contributed to public discourse about writers and artists in Canada, as they advocated for structural reforms in support of literary producers through the Writers’ Union. An initial trifecta of women—Margaret Laurence, Marian Engel, and Alma Lee—established the roots of both the organization and its key initiatives in the 1970s, and female Union members continued their author-advocacy through the 1980s and beyond. The Writers’ Union’s founding narratives, which often privileged the concerns and interventions of their mainly male demographic, belie the fact that much of the work required for the Union’s founding was female-driven. Indeed, feminist praxis and affective labour were pivotal to both the organization’s founding and some of its most celebrated successes.

According to Marian Engel, her involvement with the burgeoning organization began in early 1971, when Graeme Gibson nudged her at a cocktail party and said “Psst! Want to form a union?” (Engel 1974). Around the same time, Gibson wrote to Timothy Findley about the details of an upcoming interview, and in a post-script asked if Findley would be “interested in a union of Canadian writers?” (Gibson 1971).¹ This letter is one of the first pieces of written evidence so far discoverable that dates the inception of the idea for a formal “union” of Canadian authors. This word—union—would later become pivotal, as the organization positioned itself as a form of trade union, advocating for the value of literary labour. The initial group of interested authors began to meet in Marian Engel’s living room, at her home on Brunswick Avenue in Toronto. Perched on the edges of sofas or tables, often with drinks in hand, the group raucously discussed what they wanted and needed as cultural producers in a developing publishing industry. Fair compensation, copyright protections, and standard contracts were central concerns that emphasized the material value of the practice of Canadian authorship. In 1972, Margaret Atwood publicly hailed the group’s intentions in *Survival*, noting that “writers have to eat too, and at the moment there is no union to protect their interests” (266). As the number of authors at each informal gathering expanded, the group applied for seed money from the Canada Council, and eventually set up a formal planning session at Ryerson, where they began to draft the constitution for an organization that would represent their interests, their concerns, and their voices in the industry emerging around them. Alma Lee was hired as an administrator, organizing that first meeting and enacting

the operational labour of bringing a disparate group of Canadian writers together. Margaret Laurence agreed to be the interim chair, until one could officially be elected by the membership. Given her celebrity as one of the most established Canadian prose writers at the time, the founding members wanted to leverage her name and prestige to encourage other authors to join, particularly authors from outside of Southern Ontario. The founding meeting of The Writers' Union of Canada occurred in November of 1973 in Ottawa—sixty-three prose writers from across the country came together to ratify the constitution of an organization that would eventually have deep and lasting effects upon the shape and structure of the Canadian literary industry.

Gibson's 1971 letter to Findley notes: "Anyway, none of us (so far as I know) want to run it... but we'd like to see it begin." There were sixty-three founding members of the Writers' Union—18 women and 46 men—all of whom worked together between 1971 and 1973 to discuss the parameters of a potential organization and to hash out its intentions. Their collective work was what brought the organization into being. Gibson's letter, however, reveals his own—and his colleagues'—unwillingness to engage in the actual management of the organization. In the end, the brunt of this operational labour fell—as it so often does—to a group of determined and dedicated women. These women became the public faces of the burgeoning Union, deploying their names, their work, and their affective labour to nurture the developing organization. Margaret Laurence agreed to the role of Chairwoman for 1972/73, before the organization was officially launched, directing the first interim executive as they crafted the Union's founding documents. Marian Engel became the Union's first elected Chairman,² taking on a year of intense advocacy work: lobbying, letter writing, and, in her words, "politicking"³ for the betterment of Canadian authorship. Alma Lee supported both of their chair-ships, becoming the first Executive Director and managing the Union's daily operations for several years. The membership was seventy-two percent male, but it was a group of women who stepped up to get the Union off the ground. In so doing, these women worked together to become the de facto representatives for this particular group of Canadian authors. Yet they receive very little credit for the amount of time, energy, and commitment this foundational work cost them. Laurence and Engel's positions as the first chairs of the organization would have involved a degree of risk. Should the Union have failed, the blame would have been theirs, just as the pressure of its potential sat squarely on their shoulders. The work of the Chair also allowed little time for Laurence's or Engel's own writing. As Engel noted in a 1974 letter to Robert Weaver: "I wish I could get back to writing-as-writing...my thinking time has got absorbed by public life and my rhetoric is used up mostly writing long letters to people like the Bureau of Intellectual Property, so it will be a long time before I get down to serious work again" (Verduyn and Garay 2004, 135). Engel's language betrays her own lack of valuation of the unpaid labour she was devoting to the developing Writers' Union. This was, however, "serious work"—maybe not of the literary kind, but Engel, Laurence, Lee, and others were performing integral public advocacy, as they tried to better the opportunities for a whole community of Canadian cultural producers.

In her memoir, *Dance on the Earth*, Margaret Laurence (1989) reflects on the Writers' Union's founding meeting: "It was a heady time for us," she writes,

and indeed it was an extremely important time, for it brought together writers from all over Canada and gave us a sense of true community in this enormous land. Canadian writers have so often felt isolated, separated from one another by vast geographical distances and differences. The union, over the years, has done a great deal to alleviate that sense of

isolation. It has also raised important questions about writers' rights and status in our society. (207)

Not only did the Union raise important questions, but thanks to women like Engel and Laurence it made important interventions on the literary landscape. From the outset, the Union positioned itself as a public-facing organization, proposing that fair and equitable payment and support of Canadian authorship would ultimately benefit the population of the country as a whole, allowing for more and better stories from and about Canada to be produced. Laurence herself described her work as the first interim chair in largely figurative and modest terms, noting in her memoir that: "at the founding conference all I did was to welcome the members of our tribe who were there, many of them friends" (206), a devaluation of her affective contribution, which was important in setting the tone for a community-oriented organization. It was, after all, the leveraging of Laurence's name, her celebrity, and her contacts (i.e., her "friends") which had drawn authors to that meeting in the first place.

Archival holdings reveal Laurence's other, more material, interventions upon the documents and structures of the Union's founding. Early newsletters, for example, penned by Laurence, were circulated throughout the literary community. These articulated core concerns of the developing organization and functioned as early recruitment documents, encouraging members to participate in the fledgling Union. In her first official statement, Laurence insisted on being referred to as the "Chairwoman" of the organization, injecting the concerns of women writers into the Union's agenda and rhetoric from the very outset. Her "Message from the Chairwoman," circulated in August of 1973, six months before the official founding of the Union, notes the "practical difficulties of having chosen a trade in which there is no guaranteed income, no pension, no side benefits, [and] no group health plan" (Writers' Union of Canada, n.d.b, 2)—material concerns that were central to why a "union" of Canadian authors was necessary. Laurence called on other Canadian writers to attend the founding conference, and appended her "personal hopes" for the organization, which included: more French language representation, the collaboration of writers from all across the country, and a question that materially addressed the conditions of women's writing in Canada. "How do we" Laurence writes, "persuade the Canada Council that a woman writer with a husband and a couple of kids needs a grant to get a cleaning person for a year?" (3). She calls this a "practical thing" that needs to be addressed by what she hopes will be "a practical organization" (3).⁴ As the woman at the helm, Laurence advocated for the material betterment of all Canadian authors, but she also fought for the rights and freedoms of women writers within that broader system.

Following her chair-ship, Laurence's Union work continued behind the scenes. She supported the ongoing initiatives of several committees, including the Union's emergency committee. In this capacity she worked to support the wellbeing of emerging or struggling authors within the community, arranging for simple but necessary assistance—like accommodations, if they could not otherwise afford to put a roof over their heads. Laurence also sat on the committee which drafted the official membership requirements for the Union, continuing her involvement in shaping and directing its operational structures. Laurence's belief in the practical and material support of Canadian authorship led her, later, to the Union's contract committee, a group of authors charged with preparing the Union's standard contract, intended to be used by members to achieve fair compensation in their dealings with publishers.⁵ Laurence's faith in the necessity and efficacy of a standard contract got her into trouble with her own long-time publisher and friend, Jack McClelland of McClelland and Stewart. As revealed in their letters, anthologized by Laura K.

Davis and Linda Morra, they argued at length about such an agreement, never accepting the other's position. McClelland believed the Union's standard contract was a "dangerous document" (Davis and Morra 2018, 419), one that would inspire "an adversary relationship between author and publisher" (420).⁶ Laurence vehemently defended the Union's position, arguing that "it is in fact our labour which gives you your product, and no amount of public recognition or handsome publicity can obscure the fact that professional writers are entitled to a living wage for their work" (426). She echoed the documents she penned for the Union, asserting that "writers want better conditions in this country and we have a perfect right to work towards that end, which we shall continue to do" (426).⁷ The Union's membership accepted and passed the standard contract, which asked for a minimum ten percent royalty on all trade books and copyright ownership of their own work, in 1976. While not all publishers agreed with the contract, and some refused to sign it, it became an important template, particularly for emerging authors negotiating contracts for their work. Through the contracts committee's efforts, the Union eventually wrote standard minimums into its constitution, declaring that "members shall not sign contracts or enter into other agreements" that "fall below the standards . . . established by the Union" (Writers' Union of Canada 1983, 4). In this way, they hoped that members would act as a coalition, pressing publishers into more equitable compensation packages. According to Davis and Morra, Laurence's involvement in the Union's founding "may be seen as part of her early efforts, even as part of her legacy in relation to advocacy," for she argued that the "constitution was essential . . . to support writers, to provide them with advice about the publication process, and to create a writing community that extended across the country" (LII). In her work for the Union Laurence became not only the first public voice for this community of writers, but she made lasting structural interventions upon the literary industry through her lobbying and advocacy.

Marian Engel took up the mantle of this work upon her election as Chairman in November 1973. She publicly advocated for governmental reforms in everything from copyright law to funding for reading tours. The Public Lending Right program (PLR) in particular—a program that would compensate authors for the use of their books in libraries—was Marian Engel's "baby,"⁸ which she worked for years to try and effect. The archives reveal that her year as Chairman of the Union was largely spent lobbying both provincial and federal governments in service of the idea, speaking to library associations and at conferences about its structure, and writing to scores of Canadian authors and librarians to explain the concept and its potential effectiveness. In the draft of one address, titled "Solutions: Public Lending Right," Engel explained that "what the Union is determined to do is [to] obtain for its writers due compensation for the use of their work" (Engel n.d., 5).⁹ Reflecting on the desperate financial state of many of her peers she noted: "it is clear from the situation of Canadian writers that many public institutions expect him to live off that vaporous substance known as 'prestige'" (5). Explaining how a small lending right stipend for each book included in a public library could provide steady and ongoing income to writers for the repeated use of their books, Engel added that "lending right money will not make anyone rich, but it will help equalise an unfair situation" (6). She called on citizens to write to their MPs, and for writers to contact the Writers' Union to get involved. Her consistent calls to equity and material subsistence aligned with Laurence's approach. Both women operated as spokespersons for the community of literary producers they represented, raising their voices, calling attention to inequity, and advocating, ultimately, for the financial stability of Canadian authorship. Engel, however, was considerably more visible in public media than Laurence had been. She took her advocacy to the pages of *The New York Times*, with a "Guest Word" column entitled "Writers of Canada Unite," in March 1974. Proclaiming the existence and intentions of the newly formed Writers' Union of

Canada on the international stage, she drew a direct correlation between feminist activism and her work for the Union, calling their movement “writers’ lib” (Engel 1974). Engel noted that “after a frantic three months” since the founding meeting, they had “raised [their] voices, at public hearings, on broadcasting [and] done a bit of everything in fact”¹⁰ underlining the highly visible, public-facing nature of her work for the Union.

While the PLR remained Engel’s primary focus, it encountered a raft of opposition. One of the Union’s main stumbling blocks was helping people to understand what a pay-per-use library book royalty program actually meant—many librarians were concerned that it would be readers who shouldered the burden of the cost, which was never the initiative’s intention. The Canada Council agreed to the idea in principle, and spent a year researching how it could function practically, ultimately devising a scheme based on Engel’s and the Union’s initial plan, one that remains in effect to this day. Still, after over a decade of advocacy, the Union and the Canada Council could not secure federal funding for the initiative. Union members’ frustration boiled over in 1983, when they decided to team up with the League of Canadian Poets to organize a series of demonstrations to rally public interest in support of the initiative. They hoped to parlay that attention into increased pressure on then Minister of Communications Francis Fox. Union members and supporters gathered at rallies across Canada, the biggest of them at Toronto’s Metropolitan Reference Library, headed by Marian Engel. Engel reportedly addressed the crowd with the words: “We’ve worked our butts off writing books you obviously like. But very little is coming in” (“Authors Want” 1983). Drawing attention to the precarious labour of being a writer in Canada at the time—even if you were a Governor General’s Award winning writer like Engel—she proclaimed: “we’re all fairly pinched!” (“Authors Want” 1983).

While the PLR was only instituted after Engel’s death—following thirteen years of concerted effort—the thrust of the concept’s development can be traced to Engel herself, who made it a core campaign of her early Union leadership. Even before the Union’s founding, she had advocated publicly for the idea, as demonstrated in a scathing letter to the editor of *The Globe and Mail* in 1973, where she declared, “I’m not against free libraries. I’m against ripoffs” (Engel 1973, 7). Andreas Schroeder recalls a meeting on Engel’s front porch in 1972 where she introduced the idea to the informal assembly of authors interested in forming a union. “PLR was a major topic that day,” Schroeder (2013) says, “[and] Marian knew all about it. She had heard about it from Denmark.” Nevertheless, it is often Schroeder himself who gets credit for bringing the PLR into being. Schroeder took over the Union’s initiative in 1976, and, eventually, headed up the committee that officially launched the PLR in the Spring of 1986.¹¹ His decade of work for the project was, undeniably, integral. But, according to Schroeder, it was only because of Engel’s advocacy for the idea that the Union pursued it in the first place. “There were a whole bunch of ideas being bandied about” at that informal front porch meeting, Schroeder (2013) recalls, “but [the PLR] was the one she insisted we pay attention to.” After handing the committee’s reigns over to Schroeder in 1976, Engel remained intimately involved in PLR advocacy, right up until her death in 1985. She sat on advisory committees, wrote letters of support, and publicly hailed the initiative in speeches, protests, and in the media. Yet Marian Engel’s name is only mentioned twice in the 2011 publication *Public Lending Right in Canada: Policy Foundations*, written by Roy MacSkimming and published by the Canada Council. The omission of the majority of Engel’s very public advocacy from the official, Canada-Council-sanctioned history of the PLR speaks volumes about how women’s work and contributions are excluded from narratives about public life. The tacit devaluation of Engel’s contributions to the PLR initiative highlights inequities in our literary, publishing, and public institutions, which elide the labour of women.¹² Yet Canada’s much-lauded

Public Lending Right would not exist without Engel's persistent work. The program remains one of the Union's most effective fiscal interventions—in 2016-2017, it paid out \$9.75 million, distributed between more than seventeen thousand eligible authors, for over 98,000 registered book titles (Canada Council for the Arts 2017, 15). When this idea was first discussed on Engel's porch on Brunswick Avenue, the not-yet-Union had a mere twenty-three informal members. The material and wide-reaching effects of Engel's advocacy cannot be overstated.

In her essay, "Cavewomen Div(in)ing for Pearls: Margaret Laurence and Marian Engel," Christl Verduyn (2001) notes the "both/and condition that women writers of Laurence's and Engel's generation experienced, as both mothers and writers, women and artists" (34). To this, a third conjunction could be added: both/and/also. These women were both mothers and writers, but they were also organizers, activists, and disruptors. Laurence and Engel dedicated countless unpaid hours to the Union's support of Canadian authorship, let alone to the other causes they advocated for. In Engel's case, this included a position on the Board of the Toronto Public Library, while Laurence dedicated herself to advocating for nuclear disarmament.¹³ Alma Lee continued her advocacy on behalf of Canadian authors, becoming the founding director of The Writers' Development Trust, and, later, founder and artistic director of The Vancouver International Writers Festival. Laurence and Engel worked to nurture not only their homes, their children, and their books, but they also, at the same time, crafted and nurtured an industry for their work. That industry was, at nearly every turn, hostile to their efforts, and as such, this "also"—which represents an enormous amount of organizational and public labour—is often effaced in Canadian literary history. These women, though, materially influenced the production and dissemination of Canadian writing through their work on behalf of the community of authors they represented.

Laurence and Engel were certainly not alone in these efforts either. Other women, including June Callwood, Sylvia Fraser, Alice Munro, and Heather Robertson, held executive positions in the Union at the time of its founding. They, too, participated in important public advocacy work on behalf of the organization and its members. As that membership grew and developed, female members began to bring the concerns of women writers to Union AGMs, initiating surveys on gender inequity and recommending structural change. Status of Women Writers Committee members Sandy Duncan, Anne Innis Dagg, Myrna Kostash, Daphne Marlatt, Heather Menzies, Audrey Thomas, Adele Wiseman, and Aritha van Herk, among others, worked to change Canadian public consciousness and policy, eventually challenging gender-based inequity in everything from book reviews to Canada Council juries to university creative writing departments. Later, as racial inequity in the Writers' Union and the Canadian publishing industry came to the fore, it was women members of colour who drew attention to structural imbalances within and outside of the organization. Lenore Keeshig-Tobias chaired the Union's first Racial Minority Writers Committee, initiating pivotal action in the service of Indigenous authors and authors of colour within the Union. In 1992, she, Althea Prince, and Yvonne Bobb-Smith organized the Appropriate Voice Planning Session, where sixty-three "racial minority writers" came together to discuss and "define [their] place in the literary community of Canada" (Writers' Union of Canada 1992, 2). Throughout the Writers' Union's history women have carried out important public advocacy work on behalf of the organization's members. While these pages have focused on Laurence's and Engel's interventions as its first publicly visible representatives, the narratives of other women who were integral in shaping the Canadian literary landscape through—and sometimes against—the Writers' Union still need to be recuperated. Laurence's and Engel's work provides one example, of many, of how communities of women authors have come together

around the Writers' Union to challenge inequity in public discourse and structures, advocating for fair and equitable practices in Canada's cultural arenas.

Notes

¹ My thanks to Graeme Gibson, who has generously allowed me to quote from his correspondence. I draw on archival holdings from several institutions for this paper and would like to also thank the staff of Library and Archives Canada in Ottawa; the staff of The University of Calgary's Archives and Special Collections, particularly Allison Wagner; and the staff of McMaster's William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, Bev Bayzat, Renu Barrett, Myron Groover, and Rick Stapleton. Their assistance, expertise, and kindness make work like this possible.

² In contrast to Laurence, who turned the gendered name for the chair-ship on its head, once Engel was elected, she chose to claim it. As George Payerle recalls, she stood in front of the membership at the founding meeting, "and she reared up, all sort of five feet whatever of her, and yelled 'I am the chairman of this organization and don't you forget it!'" (Moore 2015, 71).

³ See letter to Robert Weaver, March 8, 1974, where Engel apologizes for missing a lunch with him, because she was "politicking with a librarian about PLR" (Verduyn and Garay 2004, 127).

⁴ It is important to remember that these women worked, in the Union's early years, from their homes—very materially entwining their activist labour on behalf of Canadian authorship with their domestic spheres. Marian Engel, in particular, had two small children at home when she was elected as Chairman of the Union in 1973.

⁵ Laurence discusses her role on this committee in a letter to Gabrielle Roy, June 9, 1976, noting that she "worked for a solid week, together with several others, on the final draft of the Writers' Union standard contract" (Socken 2004, 16-17).

⁶ Letter to Margaret Laurence, May 26, 1977 (Davis and Morra 415-23).

⁷ Letter from Laurence to Jack McClelland, June 15, 1977 (Davis and Morra 424-26).

⁸ See letter to Francis Fox, Canadian Secretary of State, April 1, 1982 (Verduyn and Garay 2004, 228).

⁹ There are two drafts of the address included in the file, both undated. I quote, here, from the second version included in the file, which is likely the document's first draft.

¹⁰ Engel's typescript of the article can also be found in the Marian Engel Fonds, First Accrual, Box 26, File 14, William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University. A clipping of the published article is appended to the Union's "Newsletter #7," dated April 1974 (Writers' Union of Canada 1974).

¹¹ See William French's "Authors' Library Dues Are Long Overdue" (1986) for information on the formation of the first Public Lending Right executive. For a more detailed discussion of the history of the establishment of the PLR program see Roy MacSkimming's *Public Lending Right in Canada: Policy Foundations* (2011), produced by the Canada Council upon the twenty-five-year anniversary of the organization.

¹² Indeed, obscuring female public labour from the record extends so far as to be seen in some of the Writers' Union's own documents. An early "History of the Writers' Union of Canada," for example, makes no mention at all of Margaret Laurence's involvement in the Union's founding, and incorrectly dates Engel's adoption of the chairmanship. See Writers' Union of Canada. n.d.a.

¹³ See Laurence's "My Final Hour" (1984) for a discussion of her views on disarmament, social justice, and the moral responsibility of the artist. The piece includes her stirring call to action that: "as we grow older we should become not *less* radical but *more* so" (188).

Acknowledgements

We wish to acknowledge the contributions of all the participants in the conferences, with added thanks to those whose essays appear in this collection. We thank our universities and the Social Sciences and Research Council of Canada for supporting the conferences and their online outcome *HEAR!HEaR! Voices of Canadian Women* <https://mta.cairnrepo.org/islandora/object/mta%3A27096> and accompanying website <https://speakinghermind.ca/> which have had the benefit of technology expertise from individuals at both Mount Allison and the University of Calgary. We mourn the too-early loss of Dr. Wendy Robbins, whose voice continues to be heard in her writing and publications.

Works Cited

- Alberta Law Collection. 1910. "An Act Respecting Truancy and Compulsory School Attendance." *Our Future Our Past*. www.ourfutureourpast.ca/law/page.aspx?id=2955983.
- Alberta Law Collection. 1913. "An Act Respecting Juvenile Court." *Our Future Our Past*. www.ourfutureourpast.ca/law/page.aspx?id=2900590.
- Allemang, John. 2008. "We Will Rock U: Canadian Universities Have Plunged Giddily into the Age of Celebrity, Poaching Big-Name Academics from Rival schools to Head Flashy New Foundations and to Attract Students and Donors. But Does It Hurt Serious Scholarship and Intellectual Exchange When You Turn the Ivory Tower into a Platform for Superstars?" *Globe and Mail*, February 2, 2008.
- Allen, Richard. 1973. *The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada 1914-1928*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Angus, Ian. 2001. *Emergent Publics: An Essay on Social Movements and Democracy*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring.
- Angus, Patricia Monture. 1999. "Native America and the Literary Tradition." In Hulan 1999, 20-46.
- Anisfield-Wolf Books Awards. n.d. "The Anisfield-Wolf Book Awards." www.anisfield-wolf.org/
- Armstrong, Pat, and Hugh Armstrong. 1994. *The Double Ghetto: Canadian Women and Their Segregated Work*. 3rd ed. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Aron, Raymond. 1957. *The Opium of the Intellectuals*. Garden City NY: Doubleday.
- Arscott, Jane, and Linda Trimble. 1997. "Introduction—In the Presence of Women: Representation and Political Power." In *In the Presence of Women: Representation in Canadian Governments*, edited by Jane Arscott and Linda Trimble, 1-17. Toronto: Harcourt Brace.
- Arun, Shoba V., Thankom G. Arun, and Vani K. Borooah. 2004. "The Effect of Career Breaks on the Working Lives of Women." *Feminist Economics* 10, no. 3: 65-84.
- Ashcroft, Bill. 2015. "A Borderless World: Literature, Nation, Transnation." *Ethnic Literatures and Transnationalism: Critical Imaginaries for a Global Age*, edited by Aparajita Nanda, 163-76. New York: Routledge.
- Atwood, Margaret. 1972. *Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press.

- Atwood, Margaret. 1990. "If You Can't Say Something Nice, Don't Say Anything at All." In Scheier, Sheard, and Wachtel 1990a, 15-25.
- "Authors Debate Bilingualism." 1963. *Globe and Mail*, November 14, 1963: 16.
- "Authors Want Slice of Library Action." 1983. *The Globe and Mail*, September 16, 1983: E9.
- "Award-Winning Novelist Gwethalyn Graham Dies." 1965. *Montreal Star*, November 25, 1965: 1, 5.
- Bacchi, Carol Lee. 1983. *Liberation Deferred? The Ideas of the English-Canadian Suffragists, 1877-1918*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bangarth, Stephanie. 2003. "'We are not asking you to open wide the gates for Chinese immigration': The Committee for the Repeal of the Chinese Immigration Act and Early Human Rights Activism in Canada." *The Canadian Historical Review* 84, no. 3: 27.
- Bankier, Jennifer. 2002. "Paying the Inequity Tax." In Hannah, Paul, and Vethamany-Globus 2002, 17-21.
- Barlow, Maude. 2013. "A People's Intellectual." In Wiseman 2013, 173-82.
- Barron, Lisa A. 2003. "Ask and You Shall Receive? Gender Differences in Negotiators' Beliefs about Requests for a Higher Salary." *Human Relations* 56, no. 6: 635-62.
- Bashevkin, Sylvia B. 2009. *Women, Power, Politics: The Hidden Story of Canada's Unfinished Democracy*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Bashevkin, Sylvia. 2013. "Navigating Gendered Spaces: Women as Public Intellectuals." In Wiseman 2013, 109-21.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1987. *Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Beckett, Sandra L. 2009. *Crossover Fiction*. New York: Routledge.
- Beer, Max. 2007. "The Montreal Jewish Community and the Holocaust." *Current Psychology* 26, nos. 3-4: 191-205.
- Benda, Julien, and Richard Aldinton. 1928. *The Treason of the Intellectuals [La trahison des clercs]*. New York: W. Morrow.
- Benet, Rosemary Carr. 1944. "Drawing Room 'Abie's Irish Rose.'" *Saturday Review*, October 7, 1944: 9.

- Berger, Carl. 2013. *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bieler, Zoe. 1963. "'Dear Enemies' Find a Path to Deeper, Surer Friendship." *Montreal Star*, October 23, 1963: 44.
- Bird, Karen. 2003. *The Political Representation of Women and Ethnic Minorities in Established Democracies: A Framework for Comparative Research*. AMID Working Paper Series.
- Birney, Earle. 1947. "Restricted Area." *Saturday Night*, December 6, 1947.
- Blue, John. 1924. *Alberta, Past and Present: Historical and Biographical. Volume III*. Chicago: Pioneer Historical Publishing Company. www.archive.org/details/albertapastprese03blue
- A Bold Vision*. 2014. Charlottetown: Women's Network Inc.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1988. *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Practice*. Translated by Randal Johnson et al. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Bowness, Suzanne. 2014. "The Endangered Public Intellectual." *University Affairs* (October): 24-28.
- Boynton, Robert. S. 1995. "The New Intellectuals." *Atlantic Monthly* (March).
- Brand, Dionne. 1994a. "Bread Out of Stone." In Brand 1994b, 9-24.
- Brand, Dionne. 1994b. *Bread Out of Stone: recollections sex recognitions race dreaming politics*. Toronto: Coach House.
- Brandt, Di. 1990. "letting the silence speak." In Scheier, Sheard, and Wachtel 1990a, 54-58.
- Brean, Joseph. 2007. "National Edition Overly Vintaged Vidal; Novelist Challenges 'Moronic' Bush, Ill-Read Schoolchildren, the Self-Absorbed and the Stupid." *National Post*, June 9, 2007.
- Bright, David. 1998. "The Other Woman: Lizzie Cyr and the Origins of the Persons Case." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 13, no. 2: 99-115.
- Brint, Steven. 1994. *In an Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Brown, Laura K., Elizabeth Troutt, and Susan Prentice. 2011. "Ten Years After: Sex and Salaries at a Canadian University." *Canadian Public Policy / Analyse de Politiques* 2 (June): 239-55. www.jstor.org/stable/23050175.
- Brown, Wendy. 2005. *Edgework: Critical Essays on Knowledge and Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brydon, Diana, and Jessica Schagerl. 2005. "Empire Girls and Global Girls: A Dialogue on Space of Community in the Twentieth Century." In *Moveable Margins: The Shifting Spaces of Canadian Literature*, edited by Chelva Kanaganayakam, 27-45. Toronto: Coach House.
- Burke, Sara. 1996. *Seeking the Highest Good*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Burton, Sarah. 2004. "The Person Behind the Persons Case." *Beaver* 84, no. 5: 14-19.
- Busby, Brian. 2011. *A Gentleman of Pleasure: One Life of John Glassco*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Buss, Helen M. 2002. *Repossessing the World: Reading Memoirs by Contemporary Women*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Butler, J., and J. Scott. 2006. "Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of Postmodernism." In *The Feminist History Reader*, edited by S. Morgan. London: Routledge.
- "Calgary Has First Woman Magistrate in the World in Mrs. Alice Jamieson." 1920. *Calgary Herald*, March 13, 1920: 16.
- Cameron, D. A. 1964. "Defining A Problem." Review of *Dear Enemies*. *Canadian Literature* 20: 75-76.
- Cameron, Elspeth. 1981. *Hugh MacLennan: A Writer's Life*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Cameron, Elspeth. 1997. "The Wrong Time and the Wrong Place: Gwethalyn Graham, 1913-1965." In *Great Dames*, edited by Elspeth Cameron and Janice Dickin, 145-64. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Campbell, Kim. 2014. "Gender Parity: Boldness Achievable." In *A Bold Vision* 2014, 121-26.
- Canada Council for the Arts. 2017. *PLR Annual Report, 2016-17*, June 9 2017. Accessed June 16, 2018. publiclendingright.ca/-/media/Files/Plr/AnnualReports/AnnualReport2016-2017.pdf.
- Canada's History Society. 2016. "Canada's Great Women." *Canada's History*, January 8, 2016. www.canadashistory.ca/explore/women/canada-s-great-women_

- Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). 2007. "A Partial Picture: The Representation of Equity-Seeking Groups in Canada's Universities and Colleges." *CAUT Equity Review* 1 (November): 1-5.
- Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). 2010. *CAUT Almanac of Post-Secondary Education in Canada, 2009-10*, Table 3.13, p. 32. www.caut.ca/docs/almanac/2009_caut_almanac_en.pdf?sfvrsn=2.
- Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). 2013. *CAUT Almanac of Post-Secondary Education in Canada, 2012-2013*. www.caut.ca/uploads/2012_2_Staff.pdf.
- "Canadian Literature: An Evening with Canadian Authors." 1892. *Globe*, January 18, 1892: 5.
- Canning, Kathleen. 1999. "Feminist History after the Linguistic Turn." In *Feminist Approaches to Theory and Methodology*, edited by Sharlene Hesse-Biber, Christina Gilmartin, and Robin Lydenberg. New York: Oxford University Press.
- "The Capitulation of Chief Cuddy to the Ladies." 1913. *Calgary News Telegram*, November 10, 1913. Glenbow Archives, Alice Jamieson, newspaper clipping.
- Carlson, Kathryn Blaze. 2010. "Is Feminism Dying on Canadian Campuses?" *National Post*, January 22, 2010. www.nationalpost.com/story.html?id=2447138#ixzz0dlGfnpKN.
- Castoriadis, Cornelius. 1987. *The Imaginary Institution of Society*. Translated by Kathleen Blamey. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Catalyst. n.d. "Who Cares for the Carers? NHS Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in England." *HSJ*. www.hsj.co.uk/leadership/remove-the-glass-ceiling-for-undervalued-staff/5074713.article?blocktitle=Resource-Centre&contentID=8630#.VDxkcEu4kRp.
- Chambon, A. 2012. "Disciplinary Borders and Borrowings: Social Work Knowledge and Its Social Reach, A Historical Perspective." *Social Work and Society: An Online Journal* 10, no. 2: 12.
- Chametzky, Jules. 2004. "Public Intellectuals: Now and Then." *MELUS* 29, nos. 3-4: 211-26.
- Chegg Books. n.d. "Details about Repossessing the World." www.chegg.com/etextbooks/repossessing-the-world-ebook-1st-edition-9780889209411-0889209413?.
- Chez, Keridiana. 2015. Introduction. *Beautiful Joe*, by Margaret Marshall Saunders. 1894. Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 11.
- Chown, Alice A. 1988. *The Stairway*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Christie, Nancy. 2000. *Engendering the State: Family, Work, and Welfare in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Christie, Nancy, and Michael Gauvreau. 1996. *A Full-Orbed Christianity: The Protestant Churches and Social Welfare in Canada, 1900-1940*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Cleverdon, Catherine L. 1950. *The Woman Suffrage Movement in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Colbeck, Carol L., Alberto F. Cabrera, and Patrick T. Terenzini. 2001. "Learning Professional Confidence: Linking Teaching Practices, Students' Self-Perceptions, and Gender" *The Review of Higher Education* 24, no. 2: 173-91. DOI: 10.1353/rhe.2000.0028.
- Coleman, Daniel. 2006. *White Civility: The Literary Project of English Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2013. *On Intellectual Activism*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Conlogue, Ray. 2002. "Transatlantic Explorer of the Arts Meets French Scholar and Author Annie Cohen-Solal; Who Combines Her Exotic Glamour with a Beautiful Mind." *The Globe and Mail*, June 1, 2002.
- "Conviction Quashed." 1917a. *Edmonton Bulletin*, June 16, 1917.
- "Conviction Quashed." 1917b. *Edmonton Bulletin*, June 17, 1917.
- "Conviction Quashed." 1917c. *Edmonton Bulletin*, June 18, 1917.
- "Conviction Quashed." 1917d. *Edmonton Bulletin*, June 19, 1917.
- Cook, Ramsay and Michèle Lacombe. 2003. "Merrill, Flora MacDonald (Denison)." In *Dictionary of Canadian biography, volume XV, 1921-1930*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- "Correspondence and Reports." 1919. Sanders Family Fonds. Series 7, M1093-71. March 17, 1919. Glenbow, Alice Jamieson, newspaper clipping.
- "Correspondence and Reports." n.d. Sanders Family Fonds. Series 7, M-1093-70. Glenbow, Alice Jamieson, newspaper clipping.
- Coser, Lewis A. 1965. *Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View*. New York: Free Press, 1965.
- Council of Canadian Academies. 2012. *Strengthening Canada's Research Capacity: The Gender Dimension*. Report of the Expert Panel on Women in University Research, Ottawa. www.scienceadvice.ca.

- “Counsel Disputes Right of Woman Magistrate to Sit.” 1917. *Calgary News Telegram*, May 18, 1917: 9. Glenbow Archives, Alice Jamieson, newspaper clipping.
- Crean, Susan. 1990. “Writing along Gender Lines.” In Scheier, Sheard, and Wachtel 1990a, 83-90.
- Cross, Kathleen. 2010. *Who Makes the News: Canada: Global Media Monitoring Project. 2010 National Report*. Toronto: World Association for Christian Communication.
- Csillag, Ron. 2010. “Aboriginal, Indigenous, Native? She Preferred Haudenosaunee, or ‘People of the Longhouse.’” *The Globe and Mail*, December 2, 2010.
- CTA. 1930. Report of the Secretary, Annual Meeting, May 28, 1930. Annual Reports 1921-1946. SC 40, Box 79, File 3.
- CTA. 1931. Report of Executive Secretary, May 27, 1931. Annual Reports 1921-1946. SC 40, Box 79, File 3.
- CTA. 1935. Report of Executive Secretary 1935. Annual Reports 1921-1946. SC 40, Box 79, File 3.
- Dagg, Anne Innis. 2001. *The Feminine Gaze: A Canadian Compendium of Non-Fiction Women Authors and Their Books, 1836-1945*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- David Asper Centre for Constitutional Rights. n.d. “2014: Mary Eberts.” University of Toronto. aspercentre.ca/who-we-are-2/constitutional-litigator-in-residence/past-constitutional-litigators-in-residence/.
- Davis, Laura K. and Linda Morra, eds. 2018. *Margaret Laurence and Jack McClelland, Letters*. University of Alberta Press.
- Dawson, Michael, Catherine Gidney, and Susanne M. Klausen. 2015. Introduction to *A Canadian Girl in South Africa: A Teacher’s Experiences in the South African War, 1899-1902*, by E. Maud Graham, edited by Michael Dawson, Catherine Gidney, and Susanne M. Klausen, xi-lxxii. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Deacon, William Arthur. 1944a. “Canadian Novel Challenges Montreal’s Race Prejudice.” *Globe and Mail*, October 7, 1944: 10.
- Deacon, William Arthur. 1944b. “Gearing the Arts in Canada to Postwar Nation-Building” *Globe and Mail*, January 1, 1944: 13.
- Deacon, William Arthur. 1946. “Canadian Literature Ends Quarter-Century.” *Globe and Mail*, June 29, 1946: 8.

- Deer, Cécile. 2008. "Doxa." In *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts*, edited by Michael Grenfell. Stocksfield: Acumen.
- Demers, Patricia. 2019. *Women's Writing in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Denison, Flora MacDonald. 1909a. "Under the Pines." *Toronto Sunday World*, October 24, 1909.
- Denison, Flora MacDonald. 1909b. "Under the Pines." *Toronto Sunday World*, November 21, 1909.
- Denison, Flora MacDonald. 1909c. "Under the Pines." *Toronto Sunday World*, December 19, 1909.
- Denison, Flora MacDonald. 1909d. "Under the Pines." *Toronto Sunday World*, December 26, 1909.
- Denison, Flora MacDonald. 1910a. "Under the Pines." *Toronto Sunday World*, January 2, 1910.
- Denison, Flora MacDonald. 1910b. "Under the Pines." *Toronto Sunday World*, April 17, 1910.
- Denison, Flora MacDonald. 1910c. "Under the Pines." *Toronto Sunday World*, June 26, 1910.
- Denison, Flora MacDonald. n.d. "Our Girls." In *Toronto World*, undated scrapbook clipping. Thomas Fisher Rare Book Archives, University of Toronto.
- Department of Attorney General. 1915. *Annual Report of the Superintendent of Neglected Children of the Province of Alberta*. Edmonton. peel.library.ualberta.ca/bibliography/9525.html.
- Dessaix, Robert, ed. 1998a. *Speaking Their Minds: Intellectuals and the Public Culture in Australia*. Sydney: ABC Books.
- Dessaix, Robert. 1998b. "What Is a Public Intellectual?" In Dessaix 1998a, 3-29.
- Di Leo, Jeffrey R., and Peter Hitchcock. 2016. "Introduction: Before the Beginning, after the End: Toward the New Public Intellectual." In *The New Public Intellectual: Politics, Theory, and the Public Sphere*, edited by Di Leo and Hitchcock, ix-xxix. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dionne, Evette. 2013. "Why Do We Have More Female Scholars, but Few Public Intellectuals?" *Bitch Magazine*, July 8, 2013. bitchmagazine.org/post/why-do-we-have-more-female-scholars-but-few-public-intellectuals.
- Dobbin, Murray. 2006. "The Good Life Is the Good Fight." *Globe and Mail*, December 23, 2006.
- Drezner, Daniel W. 2017. *The Ideas Industry: How Pessimists, Partisans, and Plutocrats Are Transforming the Market Place of Ideas*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- duCille, Ann. 2011. "Feminism, Black and Blue." In Gubar 2011a, 147-56.
- Duxbury, Linda Elizabeth, and Christopher Alan Higgins. 1991. "Gender Differences in Work-Family Conflict" *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76, no. 1: 60-74.
- "Earth and High Heaven." 1944. *Collier's Weekly*, September 2, 1944: 82.
- Edmonton City Archives. n.d. MS2. Emily Murphy Fonds.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. 2001. *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting By in America*. New York: Macmillan.
- Eichhorn, Kate, and Heather Milne, eds. 2009. *Prismatic Publics: Innovative Canadian Women's Poetry and Poetics*. Toronto: Coach House.
- Eichler, Margrit. 2008. "To Challenge the World." In Robbins et al. 2008, 179-202.
- Eichler, Margrit, and Marie Lavigne. n.d. "Women's Movement." *The Canadian Encyclopedia Online*.
www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ARTA0008684
- "Elocutionary Entertainment." 1897. *Emerson Journal*, December 17, 1897. Clipping in Johnson fonds, McMaster University.
- Engel, Marian. 1973. "Libraries Forget Why They Exist, Says Writer Protesting Ripoffs." *Globe and Mail*, October 6, 1973: 7.
- Engel, Marian. 1974. "Guest Word: Writers of Canada Unite." *New York Times Book Review*, March 17, 1974: 46.
- Engel, Marian. n.d. "Solutions: Public Lending Right." Marian Engel Fonds, First Accrual, Box 26, File 31. William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario. May 31, 2017.
- England, Paula. 2005. "Gender Inequality in Labor Markets: The Role of Motherhood and Segregation." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 12, no. 2 (2005): 264-88.
- Evans, Mary. 2009. "Can Women Be Intellectuals?" In *Intellectuals and Their Publics: Perspectives from Social Sciences*, edited by Christian Fleck, Andreas Hess, and E. Stina Lyon, 29-40. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Faflak, Joel, and Jason Haslam. 2013a. "Introduction: Public Hopes." In Faflak and Haslam 2013b, 3-28.

- Faflak, Joel and Jason Haslam, eds. 2013b. *The Public Intellectual and the Culture of Hope*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Fahrni, Magda. 2009. "Reflections on the Place of Québec in Historical Writing on Canada." In *Contesting Clio's Craft: New Directions and Debates in Canadian History*, edited by Michael Dawson and Christopher Dummitt. London: University of London, Institute for the Study of the Americas.
- Fairley, Margaret. 1945. *Spirit of Canadian Democracy*. Progress Books.
- Fairley, Margaret. 1954. "Pauline Johnson." *New Frontiers* 3, no. 2: 43-45.
- Feldberg, Gina. 1994. "Jennings, Emily Howard (Stowe)" In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Volume XIII*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- "Feminist Public Intellectuals Project." 2012. *Signs*. signsjournal.org/feminist-public-intellectuals-project/.
- Fife, Robert. 2004. "Globalization's Dead, Ralston Saul Says: Harper's Article: 'Grand Economic Theory' Reverts to Ethnic Nationalism." *National Post*, February 25, 2004.
- Fine, Philip, Wagdy Sawahel, and Maya Jarjour. 2009. *University World News*, no. 98, October 25, 2009. www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20091023110831548.
- Finke, Laurie A. 2005. "Performing Collegiality, Troubling Gender Source." *Symplokē* 13, nos. 1-2: 121-33. www.jstor.org/stable/40550621.
- Fischlmayr, Iris C. 2002. "Female Self-Perception as Barrier to International Careers?" *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 13, no. 5: 773-83.
- Forestell, Nancy. 2005. "Mrs. Canada Goes Global: Canadian First Wave Feminism Revisited." *Atlantis* 30, no. 1: 7-20.
- Forster, Merna. 2004. "Are Women People? Idola Saint Jean 1880-1945." In *100 Canadian Heroines Famous and Forgotten Faces*. Toronto: Dundurn.
- Foucault, M. 2001. *Fearless Speech*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Fragar, Ruth. 1992. *Sweatshop Strife Class, Ethnicity, and Gender in the Jewish Labour Movement of Toronto 1900-1939*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1990. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Social Text* 25/26: 56-80.

- French, William. 1986. "Authors' Library Dues Are Long Overdue." *Globe and Mail*, November 18, 1986: D7.
- Frize, Monique. 2009. *The Bold and the Brave: A History of Women in Science and Engineering*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Fuller, Danielle, and DeNel Rehberg Sedo. 2006. "A Reading Spectacle for the Nation: The CBC and 'Canada Reads.'" *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadienne* 40, no. 1 (Winter): 5-36.
- Furedi, Frank. 2004. *Where Have All the Intellectuals Gone? Confronting 21st Century Philistinism*. New York: Continuum.
- Gerson, Carole. 1990. "Florence Randal Livesay (3 November 1874-28 July 1953)." In *Canadian Writers, 1890-1920*, edited by William H. New, 205-08. Dictionary of Literary Biography Vol. 92. Detroit: Gale.
- Gerson, Carole. 2010. *Canadian Women in Print, 1750-1918*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Ghosh, Ranjan. 2016a. "Epilogue." In Ghosh and Miller 2016, 259-61.
- Ghosh, Ranjan. 2016b. "Reinventing the Teaching Machine: Looking for a Text in an Indian Classroom." In Ghosh and Miller 2016, 155-76.
- Ghosh, Ranjan, and J. Hillis Miller. 2016. *Thinking Literature across Continents*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Gibson, Graeme. 1971. "Letter—October 25, 1971." Correspondence, Gibson, Graeme, 1971-1984. Timothy Findley and William Whitehead Fonds, Box 98, File 20. Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, Ontario. May 15, 2015.
- Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. 1979. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gillet, Margaret, and Kay Sibbald, eds. 1984. *A Fair Shake. Autobiographical Essays by McGill Women*. Montreal: Eden Press.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. 1898. *Women and Economics: A Study of the Economic Relation Between Men and Women as a Factor in Social Evolution*. New York: Humanity Books, 2001.
- Glassco, J. S. 1945. Review of *Earth and High Heaven*. *First Statement* 2 (April/May): 33-34.
- Gold, Michael Evan. 1983. *A Dialogue on Comparable Worth*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.

- Gorham, Deborah. 1979. "Flora MacDonald Denison: Canadian Feminist." *A Not Unreasonable Claim: Women and Reform in Canada 1880s-1920s*, edited by Linda Kealey. Toronto: Women's Educational Press.
- Gorman, Elizabeth. 2005. "Gender Stereotypes, Same-Gender Preferences, and Organizational Variation in the Hiring of Women: Evidence from Law Firms." *American Sociological Review* 70, no. 4: 702-28.
- Government of Canada. 2017. "New Measures to recruit more women, underrepresented groups to Canada Research Chairs." *Canada Research Chairs*, May 4, 2017. www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/media-medias/releases-communiqués/2017/equityequite-eng.aspx.
- Government of Canada. 2018. "Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan." *Canada Research Chairs*. www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/program-programme/equity-equite/action_plan_plan_action-eng.aspx.
- Graham, E. Maud. 1905. *A Canadian Girl in South Africa: A Teacher's Experiences in the South African War, 1899-1902*. Edited by Michael Dawson, Catherine Gidney, and Susanne M. Klausen. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2015.
- Graham, Gwethalyn. 1936. "Women, Are They Human?" *Canadian Forum* 16, no. 191 (December): 21-23.
- Graham, Gwethalyn. 1937. "Canadians Die Much Too Fast." *Saturday Night*, April 17, 1937: 39.
- Graham, Gwethalyn. 1938. "Refugees: The Human Aspect." *Saturday Night*, November 12, 1938: 8.
- Graham, Gwethalyn. 1944a. *Earth and High Heaven*. Toronto: Cormorant, 2003.
- Graham, Gwethalyn. 1944b. "Let's Have Immigrants and Not All Farmers." *Saturday Night*, December 30, 1944: 6.
- Graham, Gwethalyn. 1945. "Gwethalyn Graham Replied." *Canadian Author and Bookman*, supplement, (December): 20.
- Graham, Gwethalyn. 1946. "We Are a Self-Satisfied Nation." *Chatelaine* (August): 10-11, 58-9, 62, 72.
- Graham, Gwethalyn. 1947. "Why Books Cost Too Much." *Maclean's Magazine*, September 15, 1947: 22, 39-43.
- Graham, Gwethalyn, and Solange Chaput-Rolland. 1965. *Dear Enemies*. Toronto: Macmillan.

- Graham, John. 1996. *The History of the University of Toronto School of Social Work*. Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Granpre, Stephen. 2014. "The Justice Mill: George William Baker at the Winnipeg Police Court, 1901-1903." *Manitoba History* 74 (Winter): 2-14.
- Gray, John Morgan. 1947. "Books Too Dear? No, Miss Graham!" *Maclean's Magazine* December 1, 1947: 46-7.
- Greene, B. M. 1922. *Who's Who in Canada: An Illustrated Biographical Record of Men and Women*. Toronto: International Press Limited.
- Greenstein, Michael. 1989. *Third Solitudes: Tradition and Discontinuity in Jewish-Canadian Literature*. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Gregory, Abigail, and Susan Milner. 2008. "Editorial: Work-Life Balance: A Matter of Choice?" *Gender, Work and Organization* 16, no. 1: 1-13.
- Gould, Margaret. 1934. For Whom do Social Workers Work? *The Social Worker*, 3(2),1-4.
- Gould, Margaret. 1937. *I Visit the Soviets*. Toronto: Stafford Printers Ltd.
- Gould, Margaret. 1945. *Family Allowances in Canada. Facts versus Fiction*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press.
- Gould, Margaret. 1987. "Mama's Mogen David." *Outlook Canada's Progressive Jewish Magazine*.
- Gubar, Susan, ed. 2011a. *True Confessions. Feminist Professors Tell Stories out of School*. New York: Norton.
- Gubar, Susan. 2011b. Introduction. In Gubar 2011a, ix-xviii.
- Gullason, Linda. 2017. "Still Not There: Inequity Endures in the Canada Research Chairs Program." *Ottawa Citizen*, January 20, 2017. ottawacitizen.com/opinion/columnists/gullason-still-not-there-inequity-endures-in-the-canada-research-chairs-program.
- Guthrie, Steph. n.d. *Twitter*, twitter.com/amirightfolks/status/514629824158371840.
- Hannah, Elena, Linda Paul, and Swani Vethamany-Globus, eds. 2002. *Women in the Canadian Academic Tundra: Challenging the Chill*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Harkness, R. 1963. *J. E. Atkinson of the Star*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Heath, Gordon L. 2009. *A War with a Silver Lining: Canadian Protestant Churches and the South African War, 1899-1902*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

- Hébert, Karine. 1999. "Une organisation maternaliste au Québec la Fédération nationale Saint-Jean-Baptiste et la bataille pour le vote des femmes." *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 52, no. 3: 1-29.
- Hellard, Tyler. 2015. "Wiki Gap. Where Are the Women of Wikipedia?" *THIS Magazine* (March-April): 42.
- Helly, Dorothy O., and Helen Callaway. 1999. "Journalism as Active Politics: Flora Shaw, *The Times* and South Africa." In *The South African War Reappraised*, edited by Donal Lowry, 50-66. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Henderson Jennifer. 2003. *Settler Feminism and Race Making in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Henry, Frances, and Carol Tator. 2009. *Racism in the Canadian University: Demanding Social Justice, Inclusion and Equity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hill, Colin. 2012. *Modern Realism in English-Canadian Fiction*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hind, Emily. 2010. *Femmenism and the Mexican Woman Intellectual from Sor Juana to Poniatowska: Boob Lit (Breaking Feminist Waves)*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hochschild, Arlie. 2003. *Second Shift*. London: Penguin Books.
- Houpt, Simon. 2011a. "The Private Life of a Public Intellectual: The Celebrity Economist Is Keen to Talk About Her Books, but Not So Eager to Discuss the Money She Made at Goldman Sachs." *Globe and Mail*, April 23, 2011.
- Houpt, Simon. 2011b. "Uncompromising Man Pans Wisner's Whisky Ad, Calling It 'Tasteless, Ignorant Trash.'" *Globe and Mail*, April 8, 2011.
- Huffington Post Canada. 2014. "Steve Paikin Female Guests Blog Spurs Angry Response." *Huffington Post*, March 18, 2014. www.huffingtonpost.ca/2014/03/18/steve-paikin-female-guest_n_4985266.html.
- Hulan, Renée, ed. 1999. *Native North America: Critical and Cultural Perspectives*. Toronto: ECW Press.
- Hurlow, W. J. 1944. "Under the Reading Lamp." *Ottawa Citizen*, October 21, 1944: 13.
- Ignatieff, Michael. 1997. "The Decline and Fall of the Public Intellectual." *Queen's Quarterly* 104, no. 3 (Fall): 394-403.
- Informed Opinions. 2020. www.informedopinions.org/.

- Ingram, Darcy. 2017. "Wild Things: Taming Canada's Animal Welfare Movement." In *Animal Metropolis: Histories of Human-Animal Relations in Urban Canada*, edited by Joanna Dean, Ingram, and Christabelle Sethna, 87-113. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
- Irvine, Dean. 2008. *Editing Modernity: Women and Little-Magazine Cultures in Canada, 1916-1956*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Iser, Wolfgang. 1993. *The Fictive and the Imaginary: Charting Literary Anthropology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ivanič, Roz. 1998. *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Philadelphia: Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Iverson, John. 2013. "Mulcair Details Tax-Hike Plans; 'Dead Money'; NDP Would Raise Corporate Rate to Pre-Tory Level." *National Post*, October 10, 2013.
- Jacobsen, Pernille. 2014. "Bench-Breakers? Women Judges in Prairie Canada 1916-1980." PhD Diss. University of Calgary.
- Jacoby, Russell. 1987. *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe*. New York: Basic Books.
- James, Donna. 2001. *Emily Murphy*. Markham, ON: Fitzhenry and Whiteside Limited.
- "'Janey Canuck' Now a Police Magistrate." 1916. *Globe*, June 15, 1916: 5.
- Jean, Michèle. 1981. "Idola Saint-Jean, féministe." In *Mon héroïne: Conférences du théâtre expérimental des femmes Montréal 1980-1981*. Montréal: Les Éditions du remue-ménage.
- Jennissen, T., and C. Lundy. 2011. *One Hundred Years of Social Work: A History of the Profession in English Canada 1900-2000*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- "Joan Fontaine Signs to Co-Star with Peck in 'Earth and High Heaven' for Goldwyn." 1946. *New York Times*, October 12, 1946: 22.
- Johnson, E. Pauline. 1892. "The Game of Lacrosse." *Weekly Detroit Free Press*, July 14, 1892: 1.
- Johnson, E. Pauline. 1908. "Canada's Lacrosse." *Boys' World* 7, no. 25 (June 20, 1908): 6.
- Johnson, E. Pauline. 1911. "La Crosse." *Vancouver Daily Province*, June 10, 1911: 10.
- Johnson, E. Pauline. 1999. "The Sea Serpent." In *Legends of Vancouver*, 49. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre.

- Johnson, E. Pauline Tekahionwake. 2002. *Collected Poetry and Selected Prose*. Edited by Carole Gerson and Veronica Strong-Boag. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Johnson, Evelyn H. C. 2009. *Memoirs*. Ohsweken, ON: Chiefswood Board of Trustees.
- Johnston, Josée. 2005. "'The Second Shift' of Canadian Sociology: Setting Sociological Standards in a Global Era," Invited response to Neil McLaughlin's article "The Coming Crisis of Canadian Sociology." *The Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie* 30, no. 4: 513-27.
- Johnstone, Marjorie. 2015. *Diverging and Contested Feminisms in Early Social Work History in Ontario (1900-1950)*. PhD. Dissertation. Faculty of Social Work. University of Toronto.
- Kadushin, Charles. 1974. *The American Intellectual Elite*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Kamboureli, Smaro. 2012. "'I have altered my tactics to reflect the new era': Public Intellectuals and Community." In *Tracing the Lines: Reflections on Contemporary Poetics and Cultural Politics in Honour of Roy Miki*, edited by Maia Joseph, Christine Kim, Larissa Lai, and Christopher Lee. Vancouver: Talon.
- Kanter, Rosabeth M. 1997. *Men and Woman of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kay, Barbara. 2010. Editorial. *National Post*, January 26, 2010.
- Kay, Fiona. M., and Joan Brockman. 2000. "Barriers to Gender Equality in the Canadian Legal Establishment." *Feminist Legal Studies* 8, no. 2: 169-98.
- Keren, Michael, and Richard Hawkins, eds. 2015. *Speaking Power to Truth: Digital Discourse and the Public Intellectual*. Edmonton: Athabasca University Press.
- Kinahan, Anne-Marie. 2008. "Transcendent Citizenship: Suffrage, the National Council of Women of Canada, and the Politics of Organized Womanhood." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 42, no. 3 (Fall): 5-27.
- "The King v. Lizzie Cyr (Alias Lizzie Watters)." n.d. J. McKinley Cameron Papers. MS-684098. Glenbow, Alice Jamieson, newspaper clipping.
- Kingwell, Mark. 2011. "What Are Intellectuals For? A Modest Proposal in Dialogue Form." Reprinted in Wisemam 2013, 53-66.
- Klein, Naomi. 1999. *No Logo: Taking Aim at the Brand Bullies*. Toronto: Knopf Canada.
- Klein, Naomi. 2008. *Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Picador.

- Klein, Naomi. 2014. *This Changes Everything: Capitalism Vs. the Climate*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Kogawa, Joy. 1974. *A Choice of Dreams*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Kogawa, Joy. 2013. "‘I Think It’s Miraculous’: Joy Kogawa Talks About the Legacy of ‘Obasan.’" Interview by George Stroumboulopoulos. *YouTube*, July 11, 2013. www.youtube.com/watch?v=zK8c_Q7Ev4w.
- Kolodny, Annette. 1979. "Dancing through the Minefield." Reprinted in *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*, edited by Robyn R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl, 171-90. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997.
- Kowalchuk, Lisa, and Neil McLaughlin. 2009. "Mapping the Social Space of Opinion: Public Sociology and the Op-Ed in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 34, no. 3: 697-728.
- Kramer, Lloyd. 2001. "James Baldwin in Paris: Exile, Multiculturalism and the Public Intellectual." *Historical Reflections / Réflexions historiques* 27, no. 1: 27-47.
- Krebs, Paula M. 1992. "‘Last of the Gentlemen’s Wars’: Women in the Boer War Concentration Camp Controversy." *History Workshop Journal* 33, no. 1: 38-56. doi:10.1093/hwj/33.1.38.
- Krebs, Paula M. 2005. "Narratives of Suffering and National Identity in Boer War South Africa." *Nineteenth-Century Prose* 32, no. 2: 154-72.
- Kröller, Eva-Marie. 2005. Review of *Earth and High Heaven* by Gwethalyn Graham. *Canadian Literature* 184: 197-98. canlit.ca/full-issue/?issue=184.
- Krook, Mona Lena. 2010. "Studying Political Representation: A Comparative-Gendered Approach." *Perspectives on Politics* 8, no. 1: 233-40.
- LAC. n.d. "CWC Survey: Cost of Living 1948-1951." Canadian Council for Social Development Fonds, MG 28 I 10 Vol. 46, File 414.
- Lacombe, Michèle. 1998. "Songs of the Open Road: Bon Echo, Urban Utopians and the Cult of Nature." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 33, no. 2: 152-67.
- Lambertson, R. 2005. *Repression and Resistance*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Lamoureux, Diane. 1991. "Idola Saint-Jean et le radicalisme féministe de l’entre-deux-guerres." *Recherches féministes* 4, no. 2: 45-60.
- Lamoureux, Diane. 1993. "Féminisme de charme et féminisme de choc." In *Thérèse Casgrain: Une femme tenace et engagée*, edited by Lorraine Archambault and Anita Caron. Québec: Presses de l’Université du Québec.

- Lang, Marjory Louise. 1999. *Women Who Made the News: Female Journalists in Canada, 1880-1945*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Lang, Naomi. 1942. "Women Who Make News Include Judge Magistrate." *Herald*, February 14, 1942.
- Laurence, Margaret. 1984. "My Final Hour." *Canadian Literature*, no. 100 (Spring): 187-97.
- Laurence, Margaret. 1989. *Dance on the Earth: A Memoir*. McClelland and Stewart.
- "Law Professor 'Abused' for Feminist Perspective." 1986. *Globe and Mail*, October 20, 1986: A16.
- League for Social Reconstruction. 1938. *Democracy Needs Socialism*. Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons.
- Lederman, Marsha, and Mark Medley. 2017. "Writers' Union of Canada Editorial Sparks Outrage, Resignations." *Globe and Mail*, May 10, 2017. www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/books-and-media/writers-union-of-canada-editorial-on-cultural-appropriation-sparks-outrage-resignations/article34952918/.
- Legislative Assembly of Alberta. n.d. "The Honourable Colonel Philip C.H. Primrose, 1936-37." *Legislative Assembly of Alberta*. www.assembly.ab.ca/lao/library/lt-gov/p-primrose.html.
- Leith, Linda. 1990. "Quebec Fiction in English during the 1980s: A Case Study in Marginality." *Studies in Canadian Literature / Études en littérature canadienne* 15, no. 1. journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/SCL/article/view/8110/20449.
- Lejeune, Philippe. 1989. *On Autobiography*. Edited by Paul John Eakin, translated by Katherine Leary. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Leonard, John William. 1914. *Woman's Who's Who of American: A Biographical Dictionary of Contemporary Women of the United States and Canada, 1914-1915*. New York: American Commonwealth Company.
- Lévesque, Andrée. 2002. "Idola Saint-Jean (1900-1945): Une combattante féministe." *L'aut'journal* 209 (mai).
- Liebowitz, Andrea, Honoree Newcombe, and Meredith M. Kimball. 2008. "Women's Studies at Simon Fraser University, 1966-76: A Dialogue." In Robbins et al. 2008, 78-87.
- Lin, Jane. 2008. "The Teaching Profession: Trends from 1999 to 2005." *Education Matters: Insights on Education, Learning, and Training in Canada (81-004-X)*. www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/81-004-x/2006004/9540-eng.htm.
- Lipovenko, Dorothy. 1992. "Fifth Column," *Globe and Mail*, May 18, 1992, A12.

- Literary Guild of America. 1945. "Can Love and Religion Mix Without Exploding?" *Liberty*, July 14, 1945: 5.
- Livesay, Dorothy. 1968. *The Documentaries*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press.
- Lovesey, Oliver. 2015. *The Postcolonial Intellectual: Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o in Context*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- The LRC 100 (Part Two)*. 2006. A special feature of the *Literary Review of Canada* (March). reviewcanada.ca/magazine/2006/03/the-lrc-100-part-two/.
- Lutes, Jean Marie. 2008. "Journalism, Modernity, and the Globe-Trotting Girl Reporter." In *Transatlantic Print Culture, 1880-1940: Emerging Media, Emerging Modernisms*, edited by Ann Ardis and Patrick Collier, 167-81. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Luther, Rashmi, Elizabeth Whitmore, and Bernice Moreau, eds. 2003. *Seen but Not Heard: Aboriginal Women and Women of Colour in the Academy*. Ottawa: CRIAW.
- MacFarlane, Scott. 1995. "Covering *Obasan* and the Narrative of Internment." In *Privileging Positions: The Sites of Asian American Studies*, edited by Gary Y. Ohikoro, Marilyn Alquizola, Dorothy Fujita Rony, and K. Scott Wong, 401-11. Pullman WA: Washington State University Press.
- Macgregor, Daisy. 1917. *The Alberta Club Woman's Blue Book*. Calgary: Canadian Women's Press Club.
- MacGregor, Karen. 2013. "Speaking Out: Women Academics (Not) in the Media." *University World News* 278. www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130628112822515.
- Machado-Casas, Margarita, Belinda Bustos Flores, and Enrique Murillo, Jr. 2015. "Reframing: We Are Not Public Intellectuals: We Are Movement Intellectuals." In *Reimagining the Public Intellectual in Education: Making Scholarship Matter*, edited by Cynthia Gerstel-Pepin and Cynthia Reyes, 31-37. New York: Peter Lang.
- Mackey, Eva. 1999. *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. London: Routledge.
- MacLennan, Hugh. 1946. "Canada Between the Covers." *Saturday Review of Literature* 29, no. 7 (September): 30.
- MacLennan, Hugh. 1980. "Fiction in Canada—1930 to 1980." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 50, no. 1: 29-42.

- “MacLennan to Dumbrille, October 26, 1945.” 1945. Queens University Archives Location #2055, Box 1.
- MacSkimming, Roy. 2011. *Public Lending Right in Canada: Policy Foundations*. Canada Council for the Arts. canadacouncil.ca/research/research-library/2011/12/the-policy-foundations-of-public-lending-right-in-canada.
- Major, B., D. McFarlin, and D. Gagnon. 1984. “Overworked and Underpaid: On the Nature of Gender Differences in Personal Entitlement.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47: 1399-412.
- Mallick, Heather. 2014. “Why Can’t Canada Build a Feminist?” *Toronto Star*, September 23, 2014.
www.thestar.com/opinion/commentary/2014/09/23/why_cant_canada_build_a_feminist_mallick.html.
- Mandel, Eli. 1969. Introduction. In *Earth and High Heaven*, by Gwethalyn Graham, v-xi. New Canadian Library No. 13. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Margadant, Jo Burr, ed. 2000. *The New Biography: Performing Femininity in Nineteenth-Century France*. Edited by Victoria Bonnell and Lynn Hunt. Studies on the History of Society and Cultures. London: University of California Press.
- “Marian Engel.” n.d. *Contemporary Authors Online. Literature Resource Center*. Accessed 12 June 2018.
link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/H1080027572/LitRC?u=ubcolumbia&sid=LitRC&xid=fd67b9e8.
- Marks, Shula. 2002. “British Nursing and the South African War.” In *The South African War Reappraised, and Writing a Wider War: Rethinking Gender, Race, and Identity in the South African War, 1899-1902*, edited by Greg Cuthbertson, Albert Grundlingh, and Mary-Lynn Suttie, 159-85. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Maroney, Heather J. 1992. “‘Who Has the Baby?’ Nationalism, Pronatalism, and the Construction of a ‘Demographic Crisis’ in Quebec 1960-1988.” *Studies in Political Economy* 39 (Autumn): 7-36.
- Marshall, Tom. 1978. “Third Solitude: Canadian as Jew.” In *The Canadian Novel, Here and Now*, edited by John Moss, 147-55. Toronto: NC Press.
- Martin, Katherine. 1999. *Women of Courage: Inspiring Stories from the Women Who Lived Them*. Novato CA: New World Library.
- Martin, Paul. 2013. *Sanctioned Ignorance: The Politics of Knowledge Production and the Teaching of Literatures in Canada*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

- Maxwell Syracuse University. n.d. "Dorothy Smith." Department of Sociology at Syracuse University. faculty.maxwell.syr.edu/mdevault/dorothy_smith.htm.
- McCann, Gillian. 2012. *Vanguard of the New Age: The Toronto Theosophical Society, 1891-1945*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge.
- McIntyre, Sheila. 1987. "Gender Bias within a Canadian Law School." *CAUT Bulletin* 34 (January): 7-11.
- McIntyre, Sheila. 1988. "Gender Bias within the Law School: 'The Memo' and Its Impact." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 2, no. 2 (1987-1988): 362-407.
- McLaren, John. 1988. "Maternal Feminism in Action—Emily Murphy, Police Magistrate." *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice* 8: 234-51.
- McLaughlin, Neil and Eleanor Townsley. 2011. "Contexts of Cultural Diffusion: A Case-Study of 'Public Intellectual' Debates in English Canada." *Critical Review of Sociology / La Société canadienne de sociologie* 48, no. 4: 341-68.
- McMahon, Max. 1963. "Writers Swap Letters on Touchy Subject." *Montreal Star*, October 24, 1963: 4.
- Meadowcroft, Barbara. 2008. *Gwethalyn Graham: A Liberated Woman in a Conventional Age*. Women Who Rock Series. Toronto: Women's Press.
- Megyery, Kathy. 1991. *Women in Canadian Politics: Towards Equity in Representation*. Toronto: Dundurn Press.
- Méhot, Mélanie. 2016. "Revoir Emily Murphy: Première magistrate de police de tout l'empire britannique." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 50, no. 1: 150-78.
- Metten, Ann-Marie. 2011. "The Little House That Joy Saved." In *Joy Kogawa: Essays on Her Work*, edited by Sheena Wilson, 256-77. Toronto: Guernica.
- Michael, John. 2000. *Anxious Intellectuals. Academic Professionals, Public Intellectuals and Enlightenment Values*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Miki, Roy. 2004. *Redress: Inside the Japanese Canadian Call for Justice*. Vancouver: Raincoast.
- Milen, Robert A. 1991. "Aboriginal Constitutional and Electoral Reform." In *Aboriginal Peoples and Electoral Reform in Canada*, edited by Robert A. Milen. Volume 9 of the Research Studies of the Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing. Toronto: Dundurn.

- Miller, Carman. 1993. *Painting the Map Red: Canada and the South African War, 1899-1902*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Miller, J. Hillis. 2016a. "Literature Matters Today." In Ghosh and Miller 2016, 45-68.
- Miller, J. Hillis. 2016b. "Should We Read or Teach Literature Now?" In Ghosh and Miller 2016, 177-203.
- Minister of Supply and Services Canada. 1970. *Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women*. Ottawa.
- Mishra, Pankaj, and Alice Gregory. 2015. "Is It Still Possible to Be a Public Intellectual?" *New York Times*, November 24, 2015. www.nytimes.com/2015/11/29/books/review/is-it-still-possible-to-be-a-public-intellectual.html.
- Misztal, Barbara A. 2007. *Intellectuals and the Public Good: Creativity and Civil Courage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell, Juliet. 1984. *Women, the Longest Revolution*. New York: Pantheon.
- Monture-Angus, Patricia. 1995. *Thunder in My Soul: A Mohawk Woman Speaks*. Halifax: Fernwood.
- Monture-Angus, Patricia. 1999. *Journeying Forward. Dreaming First Nations Independence*. Halifax: Fernwood.
- Monture-Angus, Patricia. 2003. "In the Way of Peace: Confronting 'Whiteness' in the University." In Luther, Whitmore, and Moreau 2003, 29-49.
- Moore, Christopher. 2015. *Founding the Writers' Union of Canada: An Oral History*. Writers' Union of Canada.
- Moss-Racusin, Corrine, et al. 2012. "Science Faculty's Subtle Gender Biases Favor Male Students." *PNAS*, September 14, 2012. www.pnas.org/content/109/41/16474.full.pdf.
- Mouffe, Chantal. 2013. *Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically*. London: Verso.
- "Mrs. Jamieson to Be Police Magistrate." 1916. *Calgary Herald*, December 20, 1916: 10.
- "Mrs. Jamieson Tries Police Court Case." 1917. *Calgary News Telegram*, February 22, 1917: 5. Glenbow Archives, Alice Jamieson, newspaper clipping.
- "Mrs. Murphy Is Appointed Police Magistrate." 1916a. *Edmonton Bulletin*, June 14, 1916: 1.
- "Mrs. Murphy Is Appointed Police Magistrate." 1916b. *Edmonton Bulletin*, June 17, 1916: 3.

- “Mrs. R. R. Jamieson Is First Woman Judge of a Juvenile Court.” 1914. *Calgary Herald*, January 24, 1914: 1.
- Murray, Edith. 1902. “A Message from South Africa.” *Educational Journal of Western Canada* (October): 166-69. *Early Canadiana Online*.
- Myers, Tamara. 2006. “Juvenile Delinquency.” *Oxford Companion to Canadian History* 333-34.
- Nakhaie, Reza. M. 2002. “Gender Differences in Publication among University Professors in Canada.” *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 39, no. 2: 151-80.
- Nash, Robert J. 2015. “Scholarly Personal Narrative as a Way to Connect the Academy to the World.” In *Reimagining the Public Intellectual in Education: Making Scholarship Matter*, edited by Cynthia Gerstel-Pepin and Cynthia Reyes, 39-52. New York: Peter Lang.
- National Academies of Science. 2007. *Beyond Bias and Barriers. Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering*. Washington: National Academic Press. www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11741#toc.
- “*The New York Times* Fiction Best Sellers of 1945.” n.d. *Wikipedia*. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_New_York_Times_Fiction_Best_Sellers_of_1945.
- Nochlin, Linda. 1971. “Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?” *ARTnews* (January): 22-39, 67-71.
- “Not Allowed to Speak in Women’s Court: Magistrate Murphy Insists that Jackson Shall First Apologize.” 1916. *Edmonton Bulletin*, December 19, 1916: 3.
- Nourbese Philip, Marlene. 1990. “The Disappearing Debate: Racism and Censorship.” In Scheier, Sheard, and Wachtel 1990a, 209-19.
- Nutt, Samantha. 2011. *Damned Nations: Greed, Guns, Armies, and Aid*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Opala, Barbara. 1980. “Gwethalyn Graham: A Critical Biography.” PhD Diss. Université de Montréal.
- O’Toole, Megan. 2009. “National Edition Five Kinds of Smart; Children Have Very Distinct Thinking Skills: Expert.” *National Post*, September 5, 2009: A11.
- “Ottawa’s First Contingent to South Africa’s School House.” 1902. *Ottawa Journal*, March 29, 1902: 6.
- “Pages of the Past.” 1936a. *Toronto Star*, June 24-August 27, 1936.

- “Pages of the Past.” 1936b. *Toronto Star*, August 28, 1936.
- “Pages of the Past.” 1936c. *Toronto Star*, August 29, 1936.
- “Pages of the Past.” 1936d. *Toronto Star*, September 1, 1936.
- Paikin, Steve. 2012a. “Agenda Plus: Binders Full of Women.” *YouTube*, November 28, 2012. www.youtube.com/watch?v=kwhHdoWboeM.
- Paikin, Steve. 2012b. “Agenda Plus: On Representing Women.” *YouTube*, November 21, 2012. www.youtube.com/watch?v=jvO4IA5iOb4.
- Paikin, Steve. 2015. “Where Oh Where Are All Female Guests?” June 30, 2015, theagenda.tv.org/blog/agenda-blogs/where-oh-where-are-all-female-guests
- Palumbo-Liu, David. 2016. “What’s ‘New’ about Public Intellectuals Today?” In *The New Public Intellectual: Politics, Theory, and the Public Sphere*, edited by Jeffrey R. Di Leo and Peter Hitchcock, 149-59. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- PAR-L. n.d. “Calls to Action: Human Rights Complaint Concerning the Canada Research Chairs Program.” www2.unb.ca/parl/CRC_index.htm.
- Patrias, C., and R. Frager. 2001. “‘This Is Our Country, These Are Our Rights’: Minorities and the Origins of Ontario’s Human Rights Campaigns. *The Canadian Historical Review* 82, no. 1: 35.
- “Peck to Play Lead in Goldwyn Film.” 1946. *New York Times*, August 2, 1946: 24.
- Perreux, Les. 2012. “Quebec’s Defining Moment,” *Globe and Mail*, June 2, 2012: 7.
- Persephone Books. n.d. “Welcome to Persephone Books.” persephonebooks.co.uk/.
- Pickles, Katie. 2002. *Female Imperialism and National Identity: Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Pleck, Elizabeth. 1990. “The Unfulfilled Promise: Women and Academe.” *Sociological Forum*, 5, no. 3: 517-24.
- Pople, Arthur E. 1917. “Constitutional Liberties.” *The Canadian Law Times* 37, no. 2: 639-51.
- Posner, Richard A. 2003. *Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Powers, Kirsten A. 2005. “More Women on Op-Ed, Please.” *Washington Post*, March 26, 2005: A13.

- Pratt, Mary Louise. 2008. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Prescott, Orville. 1944. "Books of the Times." *New York Times*, October 4, 1944: 17.
- Preston, John Hyde. 1944. "Six Novels and a Chore." *New Republic*, October 30, 1944: 573.
- "Press Social Mirror, States *Star* Writer." 1940. "Pages of the Past." *Toronto Star*, January 23, 1940: 10.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1915a. "Arthur Sifton to Jamieson." 69.210 n° 1860. April 21, 1915.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1915b. "Letters between Jamieson and Attorney General." 69.210 n° 1860. April 27 and 28, 1915.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1916a. "Deputy Attorney General to Chief Hill." 69.210 n° 2159. August 12, 1916.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1916b. "Deputy Attorney General to Cross." 69.210 n° 2159. September 25, 1916.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1916c. "Deputy Attorney General to Mayor." 69.210 n° 2159. July 3, 1916.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1916d. "Deputy Attorney General to Murphy." 69.210 n° 2159. September 25, 1916.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1916e. "Murphy to Deputy Attorney General." 69.210 n° 2159. September 6, 1916.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1916f. "Murphy to Deputy Attorney General." 69.210 n° 2159. September 18, 1916.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1916g. "Murphy to Deputy Attorney General." 69.210 n° 2159. September 21, 1916.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1916h. "Murphy to Deputy Attorney General." 69.210 n° 2159. September 30, 1916.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1916i. "Primrose July 1916 Monthly Return." 69.210 n° 112.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1917a. "Deputy Attorney General to Jamieson." 69.210 n° 1860. January 23, 1917.

- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1917b. "Deputy Attorney General to Superintendent McDonell." 69.210 n° 1860. March 21, 1917.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1917c. "Jamieson to Deputy Attorney General." 69.210 n° 1860. January 20, 1917.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1917d. "Jamieson to Murphy." 69.210 n° 1860. May 20, 1917.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1917e. "Murphy to Mr. Popple." 69.210 n° 1860. May 25, 1917.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1918. "Davidson's Monthly Returns." 69.210 n° 1332. January 1917-December 1918.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1919a. "Deputy Attorney General to Jamieson." 69.210 n° 1860. June 2, 1919.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1919b. "Jamieson to Deputy Attorney General." 69.210 n° 1860. May 31, 1919.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1919c. "Jamieson to Deputy Attorney General." 69.210 n° 1860. December 30, 1919.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1920a. "Deputy Attorney General to Jamieson." 69.210 n° 1860. January 5, 1920.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1920b. "Deputy Attorney General to Jamieson." 69.210 n° 1860. June 7, 1920.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1920c. "Jamieson to Deputy Attorney General." 69.210 n° 1860. June 4, 1920.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1920d. "Murphy to Deputy Attorney General." 69.210 n° 2159. March 3, 1920.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1922. "Jamieson's Monthly Returns." 69.210 n° 1860. February 1917-December 1922.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1929. "Jamieson's Monthly Returns." 79.105, 43, n° 929 and 930. January 1923-December 1929.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. 1979. "Fort Saskatchewan Prison Registry." 139, Box 33, #306.
- Provincial Archives of Alberta. n.d. King v. Mary Laderoute, 72.26, 11, 881c.
- Queyras, Sina. 2015. "Public Poet, Private Life: 20 Riffs on the Dream of a Communal Self." In Vautour et al. 2015, 27-42.

- “Race Prejudice Is the Theme of a Fierce Canadian Novel.” 1944. *Saturday Night*, December 9, 1944: 28.
- Rackham, Michèle. 2010. “Romantic Recognition in Gwethalyn Graham’s *Earth and High Heaven*.” *English Studies in Canada* 36, nos. 2-3: 121-40.
- Ramos, Howard. 2012. “Does How You Measure Representation Matter?: Assessing the Persistence of Canadian Universities’ Gendered and Colour Coded Vertical Mosaic.” *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 44, no. 2: 13-37.
- Randal, Florence Hamilton. 1902a. “‘A School Teacher’s Life,’ by Miss Florence H. Randall [sic] one of the interesting letters to the Ottawa ‘Journal’ dated of August 1902.” Reprinted in *Montreal Weekly Witness*, September 23, 1902.
- Randal, Florence Hamilton. 1902b. “With the Teachers in Concentration Camps.” *Ottawa Journal*, July 21, 1902.
- Randal, Florence Hamilton. 1902c. “The Journal has received another very interesting letter from Miss Florence Randal, with the lady teachers in South Africa.” *Ottawa Journal*, August 5, 1902.
- Randal, Florence Hamilton. 1902d. “A Stormy Sunday in a Burgher Camp.” *Ottawa Journal*, September 29, 1902.
- Randal, Florence Hamilton. 1902e. *Ottawa Journal*, November 10, 1902.
- Randal, Florence Hamilton. 1903. *Ottawa Journal*. April 28, 1903.
- Randal, Florence Hamilton. 1904. “A Year in a Boer School.” *The Canadian Magazine of Literature, Science and Politics*: 411-17. *Early Canadiana Online*.
- Randal, Florence Hamilton. n.d. Personal Diary. Dorothy Livesay Fonds. University of Manitoba Archives and Special Collections, Winnipeg, Manitoba. MSS 37, Box 5, Folder 18.
- Rebick, Judy. 2009. *Transforming Power: From the Personal to the Political*. Toronto: Penguin Press.
- Reid, Eva. 1975. “Alice Jamieson Was a First.” *Albertan*, June 28, 1975.
- Reynolds, David S. 2011. *Mightier than the Sword: Uncle Tom’s Cabin and the Battle for America*. New York: Norton.
- Rice, James J. and Michael J. Prince. 2013. *Changing Politics of Canadian Social Policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Riedi, Eliza. 2005. "Teaching Empire: British and Dominion Women Teachers in the South Africa War Concentration Camps." *English Historical Review* 120, no. 489: 1316-47.
- Rifkind, C. 2009. *Comrades and Critics. Women, Literature, and the Left in 1930s Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Robbins, Bruce, ed. 1990a. *Intellectuals: Aesthetics, Politics, Academics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Robbins, Bruce. 1990b. "Introduction: The Grounding of Intellectuals." In Robbins 1990a, ix-xxvii.
- Robbins, Wendy, Meg Luxton, Margrit Eichler, and Francine Descarries. 2008. *Minds of Our Own: Inventing Feminist Scholarship and Women's Studies in Canada and Québec, 1966-76*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Robbins, Wendy, and Vicky Simpson. 2009. "Pyramids of Power: A Statistical Snapshot of Women in Post-Secondary Education in Canada and Some Ideas for Making Change." *Atlantis* 33, no. 2: 6-18.
- Roberts, Soraya. 2015. "Why Can't Canada Build a Feminist Brand?" *THIS Magazine* (March-April): 30-31.
- Roberts, Wayne. 1979. "'Rocking the Cradle for the World': The New Woman and Maternal Feminism, Toronto, 1877-1914." In *A Not Unreasonable Claim: Women and Reform in Canada 1880s-1920s*, edited by Linda Kealey. Toronto: Women's Educational Press.
- Robertson, Lisa. 1994. "Benched Art: Negotiating the Rhetorics of Taste." *Parallelogramme: Contemporary Art/Art Contemporan* 20, no. 3: 27-34.
- Robertson, Lisa. 1997a. "Good Grooming" *Mix: A Magazine for Artist Run Culture* 23, no. 1 (Summer).
- Robertson, Lisa. 1997b. "Marketing Artist-Run Chic." *Mix: A Magazine for Artist Run Culture* 22, no. 4.
- Robertson, Lisa. 1998a. "Dry Rot: Modernism's New Spirit of Eco-Rhetoric." *Mix: A Magazine for Artist Run Culture* 23, no. 3 (Winter 1997/98).
- Robertson, Lisa. 1998b. "Visitations: City of Ziggurats." *Mix: A Magazine for Artist Run Culture* 29, no. 1 (Summer).
- Robertson, Lisa. 2000. "Third Walk." *Front Magazine* 11, no. 1 (January/February): 6-11.
- Robertson, Lisa. 2005. Letter to Kai Fierle-Hendrick. Lisa Robertson Fonds, August 5, 2005. Special Collections, Simon Fraser University, Box 19.

- Robertson, Lisa. 2006. *Occasional Work and Seven Walks from the Office for Soft Architecture*. Toronto: Coach House.
- Robertson, Lisa. 2009. "Interview." In Eichhorn and Milne 2009, 368-84.
- Robertson, Lisa. n.d. "Curriculum Vitae." Lisa Robertson Fonds. Special Collections, Simon Fraser University, File 7.
- Robertson, Lisa, Christine Stewart, and Catriona Strang. n.d. "The Barscheit Manifesto." Lisa Robertson Fonds. Special Collections, Simon Fraser University, Box 16, File 4.
- Rodgers, Guy. 2010. "Quebec's English Speaking Artists: Reinventing a Cultural Landscape. Canadian Diversity." *English Language Arts Network*, 1-12. www.quebec-elan.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Reinventing-a-Cultural-Landscape-2010.pdf.
- Rooney, Brigid. 2009. *Literary Activists: Writer-Intellectuals and Australian Public Life*. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.
- Rossiter, Margaret W. 1993. "The Matthew Matilda Effect in Science." *Social Studies of Science* 23: 325-41.
- Royce, Edward. 1996. "The Public Intellectual Reconsidered." *Humanity and Society* 20, no. 1: 3-17.
- Ruffo, Armand Garnet. 1999. "Why Native Literature?" In Hulan 1999, 109-21.
- Rutherford, Paul. 1982. *A Victorian Authority: The Daily Press in Late Nineteenth-Century Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ryan, Donna F. 1996. *The Holocaust and the Jews of Marseille: The Enforcement of Anti-Semitic Policies in Vichy France*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Said, Edward. 1996. *Representations of the Intellectual: 1993 the Reith Lectures*. New York, Vintage Books.
- Saint-Jean, Idola. 1928. "L'Aristocratie des sexes." *Monde ouvrière* (January).
- Saint-Jean, Idola. 1929. "La Campagne féministe présente des difficultés à la directrice de cette page." *Montreal Herald*, December 14, 1929.
- Saint-Jean, Idola. 1930a. *Idola Saint-Jean Candidate libéral indépendante pour la division Saint-Denis*. 1930 Campaign pamphlet, Collection Gagnon, Archives de la Ville de Montréal.
- Saint-Jean, Idola. 1930b. "Seules des raisons égoïstes empêchent les femmes de s'intéresser à la politique." *The Montreal Herald*, March 4, 1930.

- Saint-Jean, Idola. 1937. *La Sphère Féminine*. L'Alliance canadienne pour le vote des femmes du Québec.
- Salutin, Rick. 2010. "His Secret? Respect for Listeners." *Globe and Mail*. February 26, 2010.
- Samuel, Edith, and Njoki Wane. 2005. "'Unsettling Relations': Racism and Sexism Experienced by Faculty of Color in a Predominantly White Canadian University." *The Journal of Negro Education* 74, no. 1 (Winter): 76-87.
- Sandberg, Sheryl, and Neil Scovell. 2013. *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead*. New York: Knopf, 2013.
- Sandhu, Angie. 2007. *Intellectuals and the People*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sangster, Joan. 1989. *Dreams of Equality. Women on the Canadian Left: 1920-1950*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Sangster, Joan. 2012. "Madeleine Parent (1918-2012): Historical Legacies." *Labour / Le Travail: Journal of Canadian Labour Studies* 70. www.lltjournal.ca/index.php/llt/article/view/5663.
- Sassower, Raphael. 2014. *The Price of Public Intellectuals*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schagerl, Jessica Anne. 2006. "Global Imaginaries: Reading the International Interventions, Interactions, and Imaginings of Women in English-Canada, 1899-1919." PhD Diss. University of Western Ontario.
- Scheier, Libby, Sarah Sheard, and Eleanor Wachtel, eds. 1990a. *Language in Her Eye: Writing and Gender*. Toronto: Coach House Press.
- Scheier, Libby, Sarah Sheard, and Eleanor Wachtel. 1990b. "Preface." In Scheier, Sheard, and Wachtel 1990a, 13-14.
- Schroeder, Andreas. 2013. "Writers' Union of Canada, Founding the Union Oral History Interview #3: Andreas Schroeder, Interviewed by Phone at Roberts Creek, B.C. on March 21, 2013, by Christopher Moore in Toronto." *Andreas Schroeder*. apschroeder.com/About/TWUC-Oral-History.html.
- Sheehy, Elizabeth, and Sheila McIntyre, eds. 2006. *Calling for Change: Women, Law and the Legal Profession*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006.
- Showalter, Elaine. 2013. "Laughing Medusa: Feminist Intellectuals at the Millennium." *Women: A Cultural Review* 11, nos. 1-2: 131-38.

- Side, Katherine, and Wendy Robbins. 2007. "Institutionalizing Inequalities in Canadian Universities: The Canada Research Chairs Program." *NWSA Journal* 19, no. 3: 163-81. www.jstor.org/stable/40071234.
- Simon, Sherry. 2012. *Cities in Translation: Intersections of Language and Memory*. New York: Routledge.
- Small, Helen. 2002. *The Public Intellectual*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Willey.
- Smith, Dorothy. 2008. "Women's Studies: A Personal Story." In Robbins et al. 2008, 67-73.
- Smith, Minnie. 2011. *Is It Just?* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Socken, Paul G., ed. 2004. *Intimate Strangers: The Letters of Margaret Laurence and Gabrielle Roy*. University of Manitoba Press.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Statistics Canada. 2006. "Occupation—National Occupational Classification for Statistics 2006 (720C), Sex (3) and Selected Demographic, Cultural, Labour Force, Educational and Income Characteristics (273) for the Population 15 Years and Over of Canada, Provinces, Territories, Census Metropolitan Areas and Census Agglomerations, 2006 Census—20% Sample Data—ARCHIVED." *Statistics Canada*, Table 97-564-X2006005. www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/catalogue/97-564-X2006005.
- St. Lewis, Joanne. 1999. *Virtual Justice: Systemic Racism in the Canadian Legal Profession*. Ottawa: Canadian Bar Association.
- St. Lewis, Joanne. 2003. "In the Belly of the Beast." In Luther, Whitmore, and Moreau 2003, 73-84.
- St. Lewis, Joanne. 2014. "Professor Joanne St. Lewis: Why I Stood Up to Racist Cyber Libel." *Slaw: Canada's Online Legal Magazine*, June 25, 2014. www.slaw.ca/2014/06/25/professor-joanne-st-lewis-why-i-stood-up-to-racist-cyber-libel/.
- Stone, Olive M. 1979. "How Alberta Combined Judicial, Executive and Legislative Powers to Win Full Legal Personality for All Canadian Women." *Alberta Law Review* 17, no. 3: 331-71.
- Stone, Pamela. 2007. *Opting Out? Why Women Really Quit Careers and Head Home*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stowe, Harriet Beecher. *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. 1852. Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 2009.
- Strang, Catriona. 2009. "Interview." In Eichhorn and Milne 2009, 268-77.

- Struthers, James. 1994. *The Limits of Affluence: Welfare in Ontario, 1920-1970*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Stubbs, Roy St. George. 1978. "The First Juvenile Court Judge: The Honorable Thomas Mayne Daly K.C." *Transactions of the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba* 34/35: 49-66.
- Sugiman, Momoye, ed. 2000. *Japanese Canadian Redress: The Toronto Story / Ad Hoc Committee for Japanese Canadian Redress: The Toronto Story*. Toronto: HpF Press.
- Symons, Thomas H. B., and James E. Page. 1984. "Some Questions of Balance: Human Resources, Higher Education and Canadian Studies." In *To Know Ourselves: The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies*, 188-214. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.
- Taylor, Charles. 2004. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- "Teachers for the Boers: List of the Ladies Selected with the Qualifications." 1902. *Globe*, April 2, 1902: 1. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
- Therner, Thomas, and Neil Watson. 1981. "Patterns of Prairie Crime: Calgary, 1875-1939." In *Crime and Criminal Justice in Europe and Canada*, edited by Louis Knafla, 219-55. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Therner, Thomas, and Neil Watson. 1984. "Keeper of the King's Peace: Colonel G. E. Sanders and the Calgary Police Magistrate's Court, 1911-1932." *Urban History Review* 12, no. 3: 45-55.
- Thobani, Sunera. 2012. Interview by William K. Carroll. *Socialist Studies/Études socialistes* 8, no. 2 (Autumn): 12-30. www.socialiststudies.com.
- Thomas, Uncle. 1892. "Impressions." *Globe*, January 18, 1892: 4.
- Thompson, Lee Briscoe. 1987. *Dorothy Livesay*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Timson, Judith. 2013. "Chrystia Freeland's Win Proves Nice People Can Finish First: Timson." *Toronto Star*, November 27, 2013. www.thestar.com/life/2013/11/27/chrystia_freelands_win_proves_nice_people_can_finish_first_timson.html.
- Toronto Daily Star*. 1938a. October 19, 1938: 6.
- Toronto Daily Star*. 1938b. October 28, 1938: 4.
- Toronto Reference Library. 1926. Margaret Gould Wechsler, resume. Social Welfare, August 1926. Margaret Gould Fonds, Baldwin Room S236, Box 5.

- Toronto Reference Library. n.d.a. Margaret Gould Fonds, Baldwin Room S236, Box 5.
- Toronto Reference Library. n.d.b. Plays 1930-1950. Margaret Gould Fonds, Baldwin Room S236, Box 5.
- Townsley, Eleanor. 2004. "Media Intellectuals and Public Sociology: The Case of Op-Eds in the New York Times." Presentation, Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, August 2004.
- Townsley, Eleanor. 2015. "Public Intellectuals, Media Intellectuals, and Academic Intellectuals: Comparing the Space of Opinion in Canada and the United States." In Keren and Hawkins 2015, 41-68.
- Tremblay, Manon. 2005. *Québécoises et représentation parlementaire*. Laval: Presses Université Laval.
- Tremblay, Manon, and Caroline Andrew, eds. 1998. *Women and Political Representation in Canada*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Trimble, Linda, and Jane Arscott. 2003. *Still Counting: Women in Politics across Canada*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.
- Trofimenkoff, Susan Mann. 1983. *The Dream of Nation: A Social and Intellectual History of Quebec*. Toronto: Gage.
- Tromp, Marlene. 2011. "Modeling the *Madwoman*. Feminist Movements and the Academy." In *Gilbert and Gubar's The Madwoman in the Attic after Thirty Years*, edited by Annette R. Federico, 34-59. Columbia MO: University of Missouri Press.
- Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. 2005. *Friction: An Ethnography of Connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- "2 Novels by Canadians Due Soon on Broadway." 1950. *Globe and Mail*, June 7, 1950: 8.
- "2013 Media Monitoring Research." n.d. *Informed Opinions*. Accessed April 29, 2015. www.informedopinions.org/our-story/why-its-important/research/.
- "Two Women Will Be Appointed to the Police Force." 1913. *Calgary News Telegram*, November 8, 1913: 29. Glenbow Archives, Alice Jamieson, newspaper clipping.
- University of Ottawa. n.d. "Social Justice Professors: Sheila McIntyre." Social Justice Biography, Common Law Section, Law and Social Justice. www.commonlaw.uottawa.ca/en/programs/social-justice/social-justice-professors-sheila-mcintyre.html.

- Valian, Virginia. n.d. "Tutorials for Change: Gender Schemas and Science Careers." Hunter College, City University of New York, www.hunter.cuny.edu/gendertutorial/index.html.
- Valian, Virginia. 1999. *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Valian, Virginia. 2004. "Beyond Gender Schemas: Improving the Advancement of Women in Academia." *NWSA Journal* 16, no. 1 (Spring): 207-20. www.jstor.org/stable/4317043.
- Valpy, Michael. 2006. "Is the National Dream Over? About to Retire, Distinguished Historian Michael Bliss Revealed This Week He Now Feels Canada's Traditional Sense of Itself Is in Large Measure a Failure." *Globe and Mail*, March 11, 2006.
- Valverde, Mariana. 2008. *The Age of Light Soap, and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Van Heyningen, Elizabeth. 2002. "Women and Disease." In *Writing a Wider War: Rethinking Gender, Race, and Identity in the South African War, 1899-1902*, edited by Greg Cuthbertson, Albert Grundlingh, and Mary-Lynn Suttie, 186-212. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Van Heyningen, Elizabeth. 2013. *The Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War: A Social History*. Sunnyside: Jacana.
- Van Heyningen, Elizabeth. 2015. "The South African War as Humanitarian Crisis." *International Review of the Red Cross* 97, no. 900: 999-1028.
- Vartanian, Talin. 2013. "How the Mainstream Media Fail Women." Unpublished manuscript developed from the Irving Lecture presented at St. Thomas University, October 24, 2013. soundcloud.com/stu-journalism/talin-vartanian-irving-lecture.
- Vautour, Bart, Erin Wunker, Travis V. Mason, and Christl Verduyn, eds. 2015. *Public Poetics: Critical Issues in Canadian Poetry and Poetics*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University.
- Verduyn, Christl, ed. 1995. *Dear Marian, Dear Hugh: The MacLennan Engel Correspondence*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Verduyn, Christl. 2001. "Cavewomen Div(in)ing for Pearls: Margaret Laurence and Marian Engel." In *Margaret Laurence: Critical Reflections*, edited by David Staines, University of Ottawa Press, 23-37.
- Verduyn, Christl, and Kathleen Garay, eds. 2004. *Marian Engel: Life in Letters*. University of Toronto Press.
- Vickers, Jill. 1993. "Review of." *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique* 26, no. 1: 169-70. www.jstor.org/stable/3229011.

- Vickers, Jill. 2008. "Surviving Political Science... and Loving It." In Robbins et al. 2008, 217-225.
- Warman, Casey, Frances Woolley, and Christopher Worswick. 2010. "The Evolution of Male-Female Earnings Differentials in Canadian Universities, 1970-2001." *The Canadian Journal of Economics / Revue canadienne d'économie* 43, no. 1: 347-72.
- Warner, Michael. 2002. *Publics and Counterpublics*. Cambridge: Zone Books.
- Waterston, Elizabeth. 1992. "Margaret Marshall Saunders: A Voice for the Silent." In *Silenced Sextet: Six Nineteenth-Century Canadian Women Novelists*, edited by Carrie Macmillan, Lorraine McMullen, and Waterston, 137-68. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Watt-Cloutier, Sheila. 2005. "Speech by Sophie Prize Winner Sheila Watt-Cloutier." *The Sophie Prize*, June 15, 2005. www.sophieprisen.no/Articles/23.html.
- Watt-Cloutier, Sheila. 2015. *The Right to Be Cold: One Woman's Story of Protecting Her Culture, the Arctic and the Whole Planet*. Toronto: Penguin.
- "The Week's Work." 1944. *Collier's*, August 26, 1944: 8.
- Weintraub, William. 2004. *City Unique: Montreal Days and Nights in the 1940s and '50s*. Toronto: Robin Brass Studio.
- Welsh, Jennifer. "Saturday He Rings the Chimes of Freedom." *Globe and Mail*, October 23, 2004.
- Weneras C., and A. Wold. 1997. "Nepotism and Sexism in Peer-Review." *Nature* 387: 341-43.
- Whitton, Charlotte. 1945. *Baby Bonuses: Dollars or Sense?* Toronto: The Ryerson Press.
- Williamson, Janice, ed. 2012. *Omar Khadr, Oh Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Wills, Gale. 1995. *A Marriage of Convenience. Business and Social Work in Toronto 1918-1957*. 1st ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- "Wing, Paula." 2012. *Canadian Theatre Encyclopedia*. www.canadiantheatre.com/dict.pl?term=Wing%2C%20Paula.
- Wiseman, Nelson, ed. 2013. *The Public Intellectual in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wisselgren, Per. 2009. "Women as Public Intellectuals: Kerstin Hesselgren and Alva Myrdal." In *Intellectuals and Their Publics: Perspectives from Social Sciences*, edited by Christian Fleck, Andreas Hess, and E. Stina Lyon, 225-42. Farnham: Ashgate.

- “#WomanOnlyExcusesForPaikin.” n.d. *Twitter*. Accessed June 30, 2015. twitter.com/hashtag/WomenOnlyExcusesForPaikin?src=hash.
- “Woman Police Magistrate for Calgary: Mrs. R.R. Jamieson Gets Position Similar to Mrs. Murphy in Edmonton.” 1916. *Edmonton Bulletin*, December 29, 1916: 1.
- “Women and the Law.” n.d. *The Canadian Encyclopedia Online*. www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/women-and-the-law/.
- “Women Endorse Appointment of Mrs. Jamieson.” 1914. *Calgary News Telegram*, May 8, 1914: 8. Glenbow Archives, Alice Jamieson, newspaper clipping.
- Woolf, Virginia. (1929) 2015. *A Room of One's Own*. UK: Albatross.
- Woolley, Anita, and Thomas Malone. 2011. “What Makes a Team Smarter? More Women.” *Harvard Business Review* 89, no. 6 (June): 32-33.
- Writers' Union of Canada. 1974. “Newsletter #7—April 1974.” TWUC—73/74. Timothy Findley and William Whitehead Fonds, Box 210, File 28. Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, Ontario. May 19, 2015.
- Writers' Union of Canada. 1983. “Constitution (1983).” Writers' Union of Canada, 1983-84, Marian Engel Fonds, Second Accrual, Box 32, File 8. William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario. June 5, 2017.
- Writers' Union of Canada. 1992. “Report on the Planning Session.” Racial Minority Writers Committee: The Appropriate Voice Conference, May 21-24, 1992. Writers' Union of Canada Fonds, Third Accrual, Box 133, File 12. William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario. June 14, 2017.
- Writers' Union of Canada. n.d.a. “History of the Writers' Union of Canada.” Writers' Union of Canada, 1981-83, Marian Engel Fonds, Second Accrual, Box 32, File 6. William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario. June 5, 2017.
- Writers' Union of Canada. n.d.b. “Newsletter #2.” George Ryga Fonds, Box 29, File 3. University of Calgary Archives and Special Collections, Calgary, Alberta. November 13, 2015.
- Wunker, Erin, and Travis V. Mason, “Introduction: Public Poetics.” In Vautour et al. 2015, 1-23.
- Young People's Theatre. n.d. *YPT Production History, 1966-2015*. www.youngpeoplestheatre.ca/50/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/ALL-SEASONS-revised-Spring-2015.pdf.

Contributors

Bridgette Brown is an adjunct professor in Ottawa, teaching at the University of Ottawa, Carleton University, and Algonquin College. Her research and teaching interests include the history of reading, Victorian-Canadian and South African print culture, settler colonialism, and early realism in Canada. Her dissertation (2020) explored imperial interactions among peripheral colonies of empire during the South African War (1899-1902), drawing particular attention to Anglo-imperial women writers whose work and whose involvement in the War has remained largely unacknowledged and unconsidered. Her next project explores the production of a public memory of the South African War and expands her investigation into the transperipheral exchanges between settler colonies that the War engendered.

Diana Brydon (FRSC) is Distinguished Professor Emerita at the University of Manitoba. She has published books and articles in the fields of postcolonial literary and cultural studies, globalization, and Canadian literature. She has worked in interdisciplinary team projects on “Globalization and Autonomy,” “Building Global Democracy,” “Brazil/Canada Knowledge Exchange,” and “Concurrences.” Her current research examines fictional thought experiments, primarily by feminist writers whose work crosses the boundaries between science fiction, myth, and fantasy, providing alternative forms of an experimental realism set in contexts of economic, social, and technological change.

Carole Gerson (FRSC) is Professor Emerita in the English Department at Simon Fraser University. Co-editor of volume 3 (1918-1980) of *History of the Book in Canada / Histoire du livre et de l'imprimé au Canada*, she has published extensively on Canada's literary and cultural history with a focus on early Canadian women writers, from well-known figures such as Pauline Johnson and L.M. Montgomery to more obscure figures who can be found in her two databases: Canada's Early Women Writers (cwrc.ca/project/canadas-early-women-writers) and the more inclusive Database of Canada's Early Women Writers (dhil.lib.sfu.ca/doceww/). In 2011, her book, *Canadian Women in Print, 1750-1918*, won the Gabrielle Roy Prize for Canadian criticism. In 2013 she received the Marie Tremaine medal from the Bibliographical Society of Canada. Her most recent book, co-authored with Peggy Lynn Kelly, is *Hearing More Voices: English-Canadian Women in Print and on the Air, 1914-1960* (Ottawa: Tecumseh Press, 2020).

Sarah Galletly is an Adjunct Research Fellow at James Cook University. She previously held the position of Margaret and Colin Roderick Postdoctoral Research Fellow at JCU where she explored depictions of travel, geography, and colonial modernity in Australian print culture in the early twentieth century, and co-authored *The Transported Imagination: Australian Interwar Magazines and the Geographical Imaginaries of Colonial Modernity* with Victoria Kuttainen and Susann Liebich (2018). Her current research explores the nineteenth- and early twentieth century mass market periodical cultures of Canada and Australia.

Marjorie Johnstone is Assistant Professor at the School of Social Work, Dalhousie University. She has an active research agenda of social justice and equity, Canadian social work history and professionalization, and Canadian multiculturalism. She is interested in feminism, post colonialism and white settler history. From her front-line work with various marginalized populations over two decades in community mental health agencies, she brings insight into how

to integrate social justice and equity issues into front-line practice. Currently, she is teaching both online and campus courses in the BSW and MSW programs for both clinical and social justice related topics.

Neil McLaughlin is professor of Sociology at McMaster University. He teaches sociological theory and researches the sociology of knowledge, ideas and intellectuals. He has published extensively on the critical theory of Erich Fromm and has written on the institutional crisis of Canadian sociology, the reception of Noam Chomsky's social criticism in Canada and United States (with James Lannigan) and is writing on the conspiracy theories directed at philanthropist and currency speculator George Soros. His newest published work will be Erich Fromm's *Global Public Sociology: Escape from Orthodoxy* (Bristol University Press: 2021).

Iga Mergler is a PhD candidate at McMaster University. Her research interests include women public intellectuals in Poland and in Canada, sociology of generations, conspiracy theories combining Islamophobic, anti-Semitic and anti-feminist discourses on the far right. She has taught courses in the areas of sociological theory, sexuality and human rights, and global studies.

Mélanie Méthot is professor of History at the University of Alberta, Augustana Campus. She is the recipient of SSHRC grants for her research on bigamy in Canada and more recently on bigamy in Australia (2020-2024). She is completing a monograph on the judicial saga of Julie Morin, a Quebec woman accused of bigamy who becomes embroiled in a will contestation. Méthot also works on the Administration of justice in Alberta, especially at the level of police magistrates. Passionate about teaching, she is the founder of the Augustana Conference on Undergraduate Research and Innovative Teaching.

Heather Milne is an associate professor of English at the University of Winnipeg. She is the author of *Poetry Matters: Neoliberalism, Affect, and the Posthuman in Twenty-First Century Poetry and Poetics* and editor of *Social Poesis: The Poetry of Rachel Zolf* and *Prismatic Publics: Innovative Canadian Women's Poetry and Poetics*.

Erin Ramlo is a PhD Candidate and SSHRC Doctoral Fellow in the Department of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University. Her work focuses on activism in contemporary Canadian literature and arts advocacy movements in Canada. Erin's dissertation project, a critical history of The Writers' Union of Canada, draws on extensive archival sources to document the paradigmatic shifts the Writers' Union and its members facilitated in the Canadian publishing industry and literary culture through community organizing and collective action. The project will offer a critical assessment of the role the Writers' Union has played in the formation and questioning of a national culture via its advocacy and policy work.

Sarah Spear has an MA in Gender, Sexuality and Women's Studies from Simon Fraser University and is pursuing doctoral studies at the School of Indigenous and Canadian Studies at Carleton University. She is interested in the varied historical manifestations of Canadian nationalism in French and English Canada and its intersections with politics, religion, and gender. Her primary research interrogates the political, religious, and gendered discourses and ideologies of women suffragists in Ontario and Quebec at the turn of the 20th century.

Wendy Robbins (1949-2017) was co-founder of Gender and Women's Studies and professor of English at UNB (Fredericton). She guest-edited the pioneering "Women Writers of the Commonwealth" issue of *World Literature Written in English* in 1978, and in 1995 co-founded PAR-L, one of the world's first feminist discussion Listserves. She served on the executive of CAUT and CFHSS, and as a member of the Expert Panel on Women in University Research for the Council of Canadian Academies.

Aritha van Herk is the author of five novels, two books of criticism, and many non-fiction and ficto-critical texts, especially works investigating the perspectives of women, both contemporary and historical. Her latest publications are *Prairie Gothic* and *In This Place* (with photographer George Webber) and the prose/poetry work, *Stampede and the Westness of West*. She has published hundreds of stories, articles, reviews and essays on Canadian literature and culture. She teaches Canadian Literature and Creative Writing in the Department of English at the University of Calgary in Alberta. She has been a recipient of the Lorne Pierce Medal; she is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, a Member of the Alberta Order of Excellence, and a Member of the Order of Canada.

Christl Verduyn joined Mount Allison faculty in 2006 after teaching at Wilfrid Laurier (2000-2006), Trent University (1980-2000), and Queen's University (1979-1980). Her research and publications span the fields of Canadian and Québécois literatures, women's writing and criticism, multiculturalism and minority writing, life writing and Canadian Studies, and she is the author, editor, or co-editor of over a dozen books in these areas. Mount Allison's Davidson Chair in Canadian Studies (2010-2020) and Director of the university's Centre for Canadian Studies (2010-2018), she has been an active organizer of conferences and cultural events. Former President of the Association for Canadian Studies (2000-2002), recipient of the Governor General's International Award for Canadian Studies (2006), and past Editor of the *Journal of Canadian Studies* (2008-2012), she is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, a Member of the Order of Canada, and a 3M National Teaching Fellow.

Conference Panel Speakers

Discourse & Dynamics: Canadian Women as Public Intellectuals

Mount Allison University
Sackville, New Brunswick
16-18 October 2014

Speaking Her Mind: Canadian Women and Public Presence

University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta
20-22 October 2016

Margaret Atwood is an internationally renowned author and one of Canada's best-known public intellectuals and activists. A pioneer of Canadian literature and a prominent voice on wide-ranging issues of concern to the Canadian public and beyond, she has actively shaped public discourse in a changing technological and environmental landscape. Author of more than fifty books of poetry, fiction, essays, and graphic novels, her work has been published in more than 45 countries. Her 1985 novel *The Handmaid's Tale*, winner of the 2000 Booker Prize, was made into an award-winning TV series and its sequel *The Testaments* was co-winner of the 2019 Booker Prize. Her work has been recognized by numerous additional awards, from the Giller Prize for *Alias Grace* (1996) to the Pen Centre USA Lifetime Achievement Award.

Sylvia Bashevkin is a professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto. A fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, she is known for her research contributions in the field of women and politics, including numerous articles and six books, of which the most recent is *Women as Foreign Policy Leaders: National Security and Gender Politics and Superpower America*. She is the recipient of numerous awards including the Canadian Political Science Association Prize in International Relations, the Bertha Lutz Prize for highest quality public writing and research on women in diplomacy from the International Studies Association, the Mildred Schwartz Lifetime Achievement Award in Canadian Politics from the American Political Science Association, the Jill Vickers Prize from the Canadian Political Science Association and the Ursula Franklin Award in Gender Studies from the Royal Society.

Françoise Baylis is Professor and Canada Research Chair in Bioethics and Philosophy at Dalhousie University, a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada and the Canadian Academy of Health Sciences, and a Member of the Order of Canada. Her innovative work in bioethics, at the intersection of policy and practice, has stretched the very boundaries of the field. Baylis's research focuses on women's health with particular attention to novel genetic technologies, assisted human reproduction and research involving humans. This work aims to move the limits of mainstream bioethics and develop more effective ways to understand and tackle public policy challenges in Canada and abroad. Baylis believes bioethicists need to exercise their moral imagination and find creative ways to make the powerful care about justice and fairness. A public intellectual for the modern age, she is a frequent guest on CBC and Radio Canada and the author of many news stories with a "behind the scenes" look at ethical issues.

Cherish Violet Blood is a Blackfoot woman from the Blood reserve in southern Alberta. She is an actor, writer, vocalist, storyteller and comedian. A graduate of the Center for Indigenous Theatre in Toronto, Cherish has numerous production credits to her name, including *Making Treaty 7*, *New Life* by Cliff Cardinal and *After the Fire: Based on Interviews about Idle No More*. Cherish is a great believer in the power of storytelling and humor to help you learn where you come from.

Dionne Brand is an internationally acclaimed writer, educator, and human rights activist and a Member of the Order of Canada. One of Canada's strongest literary voices, her work interrogates boundaries of identity and belonging, exposing racism and bringing equality to the forefront of the Canadian public sphere. She is the recipient of numerous awards for her poetry, fiction, and non-fiction works.

Nicole Brossard is a Montréal born poet, novelist, and essayist who has been at the forefront of intellectual discourse and the development of feminist and lesbian writing since the 1960s. Twice awarded the Governor General Award, she has published more than 35 books including *Mauve Desert*, *The Aerial Letter*, *Notebook of Roses and Civilization*. Internationally renowned, many of her books have been translated and continue to shape new perspectives on women's experience of the world. In 2019 the Griffin Trust for Excellence in Poetry awarded her the Lifetime Recognition Award. In 2020 Coach House Books published *Avant Desire: A Nicole Brossard Reader*.

Measha Brueggergosman is an internationally renowned Canadian soprano acclaimed for her performances as both an opera singer and concert artist and for her recordings of both classical and popular music. She has been recognized by numerous honours; twice nominated for Juno Awards, in 2010 she won the Juno Award for Classical Album of the Year for *Surprise*. Brueggergosman is a member of the Canadian charity Artists Against Racism and a continuing Goodwill Ambassador for the African Medical & Research Foundation (AMREF). She is active in leading Canadian children across the country in song and in championing the education and involvement of new audiences in music. Her memoir *Something is Always on Fire: My Life so Far* appeared in 2017.

Rita Shelton Deverell is a theatre and media artist, scholar, a founder of Vision TV, and former News Director at APTN where she mentored her Indigenous successor. Deverell's honors include two Geminis, the Black Women's Civic Engagement Award, and the Order of Canada. She was the Nancy's Chair in Women's Studies at Mount St. Vincent University from 2009-2012 and Adjunct Professor of Women's Studies at Mount Saint Vincent as well as at Lakehead University in 2019-2020. That year saw the production of an award winning script "Who You Callin Black Eh?" and the publication of her book *American Refugees: Turning to Canada for Freedom*. Deverell serves on the Advisory Committee of the Canadian Senior Artists Resource Network (CSARN), is a Trustee of the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM), and a Member of the Order of Canada.

Denise Donlon has been a leader in the Canadian Cultural landscape as GM of CBC English Radio, President of Sony Music Canada, and various media executive and on air/producer positions at ChumTelevision, including The NewMusic, MuchMusic and MuchMoreMusic. A member of the Order of Canada, Denise is a fellow of the Royal Conservatory of Music, and the Royal Canadian Geographical Society, and received the Walt Grealis Industry Builder Award at

the 2018 Junos – only the second woman in 34 years to receive this honour. Denise is an acclaimed public speaker and author. Her book *Fearless As Possible (under the circumstances)* was shortlisted for the Kobo Emerging Writers' Prize. She devotes her volunteer efforts to positively affect the arts, environmental and social justice issues through organizations such as Waterkeeper (Swim Drink Fish), MusiCounts, WarChild Canada, Soulpepper Theatre and the Governor General's Performing Arts Awards Foundation. "*She is, in equal parts, Canada's Sheryl Sandberg, Gloria Steinem and Nora Ephron*" (*MacLeans* 11/17/2016).

Mary Eberts is a lawyer, professor, equality activist, specializing in public law, Aboriginal litigation, and constitutional equality, and a Member of the Order of Canada. Co-founder of LEAF (Women's Legal Education and Action Fund), she has been litigation counsel to NWAC (Native Women's Association of Canada) and has played a key role in shaping the equality guarantees of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Charlotte Gray is one of Canada's best-known biographers and writers of popular history. Her award-winning books look into Canadian history and the people and ideas that have shaped the country, including the bestselling *The Promise of Canada: People and Ideas That Have Shaped Our Country* (2016) and *Sisters in the Wilderness: The Lives of Susanna Moodie and Catharine Parr Traill* (2008). Gray is an adjunct professor at Carleton University, a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, and a Member of the Order of Canada.

Shari Graydon is an award-winning author, educator and advocate. She founded and leads the non-profit initiatives, Informed Opinions and ExpertWomen.ca, which amplify women's voices for a more equitable Canada. Shari has taught communications, written commentary for many newspapers and CBC radio and TV, and served as press secretary to a BC premier. She produced a 13-part TV series for WTN about women and the media, and served as president of Media Watch for ten years. She received the Governor General's Award in Commemoration of the Person's Case for her advocacy work on behalf of women in 2007 and was honoured as one of Canada's Top 100 Most Powerful Women by WXN. She has written two best-selling media literacy books for kids (*Made You Look* and *In Your Face*), and edited a collection of essays by 40 women over 50 about the benefits of aging (*I Feel Great About My Hands*). Her most recent book, *OMG! What if I Really AM the Best Person?* inspires women to speak up more often.

Sylvia Hamilton is a multi award-winning Nova Scotian filmmaker and writer who is known for her documentary films as well as her publications, public presentations and extensive volunteer work with artistic, social and cultural organizations on the local and national levels. Her films include *Black Mother Black Daughter*, *Speak It: From the Heart of Black Nova Scotia*, *Portia White: Think on Me* and *The Little Black School House* among others. She has received many awards for her work, including a Gemini, The Portia White Prize, the CBC Television Pioneer Award, and the Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal. *And I Alone Escaped To Tell You*, her poetry collection, published by Gaspereau Press, was short listed for the League of Canadian 2015 Gerald Lampert Memorial Award and the East Coast Literary 2015 J.M Abraham Poetry Award. She teaches part-time at the University of King's College where holds the Rogers Chair in Communications.

Smaro Kamboureli is the Avie Bennett Chair in Canadian Literature at the University of Toronto and a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. Her most recent publications include her introduction to the *University of Toronto Quarterly* special issue she co-edited, “Literary Solidarities: ‘Should I be here?’,” her article “Diaspora” in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Literature*, and a bilingual English / Italian edition of her poetry book, *in the second person, in seconda persona*. She is the author, editor, or co-editor of over two dozen books such as *Scandalous Bodies: Diasporic Literature in English Canada*, *On the Edge of Genre: The Contemporary Canadian Long Poem*, two editions of *Making a Difference: Canadian Multicultural Literatures*, Lee Maracle’s *Memory Serves: Oratories*, Barbara Godard’s *Canadian Literature at the Crossroads of Language and Culture*, and most recently with Larissa Lai, *Land / Relations: Possibilities of Justice in Canadian Literatures*.

Antonia Maioni is Dean of Arts at McGill University where she is jointly appointed to the Department of Political Science and the Institute for Health and Social Policy. Her research focuses on health-care reform and the Canadian political process. She holds a BA from Université Laval, an MA from the Norman Paterson of International Affairs at Carleton University, and a PhD in political science from Northwestern University. Professor Maioni served for ten years as the Director of the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada, and is a past President of the Federation for the Social Sciences and Humanities. She has regularly engaged audiences in thoughtful dialogues about public policy issues with major news media across Canada. She is currently a member of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research.

Lee Maracle is an award-winning poet, novelist, storyteller and “knowledge keeper” of the Stó:lō Nation. Her critically acclaimed texts include *Sundogs*, *Daughters Are Forever*, *Ravensong*, *Celia’s Song*, *Sojourner’s Truth and Other Stories*, *First Wives Club: Coast Salish Style*, *Bent Box*, *Talking to the Diaspora*, *Will’s Garden*, *Bobbi Lee: Indian Rebel* and *I Am Woman*. She is currently an instructor and student mentor in the University of Toronto’s Aboriginal Studies Program, as well as the Traditional Teacher for First Nations’ House at Toronto’s Centre for Indigenous Theater. Maracle’s work has been recognized by many awards, including the JT Stewart Award, the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee Medal, and the Premier’s Award for Excellence in the Arts for Ontario.

Lorna Marsden is Professor emerita of Sociology at York University, where her areas of teaching and research included social movements, population studies, and economic sociology with a special emphasis on the lives of women in Canada. Her most recent publication is *White Gloves Off: The Work of the Ontario Committee on the Status of Women* (with Beth Atcheson, 2018). President of York University from 1997-2007, Dr. Marsden is a member of the Order of Canada.

Judy Rebick is one of Canada’s best-known feminists. A journalist and political activist for women’s rights and social justice, she is the former president of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women and the founding publisher of *rabble.ca*, Canada’s independent online news and discussion site. She was a spokesperson for the pro-choice campaign that won legal abortion in Canada in the 1980s and in the 1990s she hosted two national TV shows on CBC. From 2002-2011 she was the Canadian Auto Workers-Sam Gindin Chair in Social Justice and Democracy at Ryerson University. Contributing columnist for an array of newspapers and magazines, she is the author of *Ten Thousand Roses: The Making of a Feminist Revolution* (2005),

Transforming Power: From the Personal to the Political (2009), *Occupy This* (2012), and the memoir *Heroes in my Head* (2018).

Natalie Panek is a rocket scientist and explorer. Extraordinary experiences have shaped her dreams of becoming an astronaut; whether learning to fly, driving a solar-powered car across North America, or building space robotics. With degrees in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Natalie has contributed to a number of high profile space projects, including MDA's satellite servicing initiative and ESA's 2018 ExoMars rover program. Natalie was named one of Canada's Top 100 Most Powerful Women by the Women's Executive Network, a Forbes 30 under 30 2015, and one of Flare Magazine's inaugural 30 under 30 in 2015. The *Financial Post* has recognized Natalie as "a vocal advocate for women in technology." She is also a member of the prestigious Explorer's Club.

Francine Pelletier has worked as a journalist for four decades, both in print and for electronic media, in French as well as English. Her career includes co-founding the feminist monthly magazine *La Vie en Rose*, writing a weekly column for Montreal's largest French daily, *La Presse*, and a regular contributor to Peter Gzowsky's Morningside on CBC radio, CTV's *Sunday Edition* and PBS' *The Editors*. She spent five years (1995-2000) as co-host of CBC's flagship current affairs program, *the fifth estate*. Since 2001, she has pursued a new career as an independent documentary filmmaker and screenwriter and she has written and directed 11 documentary films. In 2013, she began a weekly column for Montreal daily *Le Devoir* and she has been teaching at Concordia University's Journalism Department since 2015.

Naomi Sayers is an Anishinaabe-kwe, Indigenous lawyer and feminist practicing primarily in the area of public law, with a focus on Indigenous law, administrative/regulatory law, and environmental/energy/mining law. A dedicated volunteer and peer mentor, she has worked with organizations like Native Youth Sexual Health, POWER (Ottawa), and Maggie's (Toronto). She also created the well-cited blog, www.kwetoday.com and is considered a subject matter expert in the areas of Indigenous rights and the effects of government acts and policy on Indigenous women and girls.

Janice Gross Stein is the Belzberg Professor of Conflict Management in the Department of Political Science and the Founding Director of the Munk School of Global Affairs and Public Policy at the University of Toronto. She is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada and an Honorary Foreign Member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. She was awarded the Molson Prize by the Canada Council for an outstanding contribution by a social scientist to public debate. Her research currently focuses on the micro-foundations of decision making and strategy and on the impact of technology on decision-making.

Fibbie Tatti was born to the Sautugotine First Nation on Great Bear River in the Northwest Territories, Canada, and she is a fluent speaker, writer, and storyteller of the North Slavey Language. Tatti is a powerful advocate for Aboriginal languages and culture. For 23 years, Tatti worked with the Department of Education of the Government of the Northwest Territories, during which time she continued to work with the Elders. Based on her vision of Dene teachers as scribes for the Elders, Tatti undertook the tremendous task of bringing together Dene elders, teachers, and language specialists to develop the first Dene languages curriculum. Tatti was also a one of

the first Aboriginal people to work with the communication media in the NWT. She produced and hosted a half hour news and community affairs radio program in the Aboriginal language for CBC North in 1973. She was also the host for the first CBC North TV current affairs program in 1980.

Lori Turnbull teaches political science at Dalhousie University where she is the Director of the School of Public Administration. Her research focuses on parliamentary democracy and governance, public sector ethics, and democratic reform, and her book *Democratizing the Constitution: Reforming Responsible Government*, co-authored with Mark Jarvis and the late Peter Aucoin, won the Donner Prize in 2011 and the Donald Smiley Prize in 2012. From July 2015 until July 2017, she was on secondment to the Privy Council Office (PCO), first as a Policy Advisor in the Machinery of Government Secretariat, then as Departmental Liaison to the Office of the Minister of Democratic Institutions, and finally as a Policy Advisor at the Priorities and Planning Secretariat. She is a featured columnist with the *Canadian Government Executive* magazine and a frequent commentator on CBC radio and television.

Sheila Watt-Cloutier is a Canadian Inuit leader in international discussions of environmental preservation and the protection of Canada's North and its peoples. Her book *The Right to be Cold* (2015) about the effects of climate change on Inuit communities was part of the 2017 edition of CBC's Battle of the Books. An activist for solutions to the environmental and social challenges affecting the Inuit, she served as International Chair for the Inuit Circumpolar Council. In 2007, she was nominated along with former U.S. Vice President Al Gore for the Nobel Peace Prize in recognition of her global leadership and commitment to Arctic Indigenous people. She has received many awards and honours for her work, including numerous university honorary doctorates and the Order of Canada.