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Abstract

Mainstream Canadian national feeling in the late 1960s was expressed through a "new nationalism" that demanded an end to what its adherents perceived as the Americanization of Canada, especially in terms of economics. The Canadian nationalism expressed by the Voice of Women was similar to the new nationalism that impacted Canada from the late 1960s onward. Generally speaking this new nationalism has been understood through its male proponents leaving the Voice of Women and women in general outside its scope and limits. Yet the Voice of Women was clearly a part of this movement. Its concern with community was predicated upon an often overlooked component of nationalism: gender and the roles which flow from it.

With the Voice of Women as its focal point, this study seeks to reinterpret nationalism, continentalism, internationalism, and identity through the lens of gender. The goal is not to use the Voice of Women to show the most prevalent or significant form of Canadian nationalism or Canadian identity: the aim rather is to delineate one of many understandings of who Canadians believe they are. In this particular case, who Canadians, as represented by the Voice of Women and its members, believed they were was fostered by gender and its roles for women. Initially the Voice of Women based itself upon a maternal justification which demanded that Canada be a nurturing, motherly figure internationally. Through the Voice of Women’s maternalism, a sense of Canadian nationalism was created that saw the United States as the threat to its vision of what the Canadian way of life should be. Shifting its focus from maternalism to equality, becoming involved in a more nationalist opposition to the United States, it ended by becoming as central to the new nationalism as were Gordon, the Waffle, and the other ingredients of that still not fully
understood movement. The Voice of Women's very real place in the new nationalism shows that there was another element - gender - working to foster Canadian nationalism.
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Mainstream Canadian national feeling in the late 1960s was expressed through a “new nationalism” that demanded an end to what its adherents perceived as the Americanization of Canada, especially in terms of economics. Traditionally that national feeling has been viewed through the lens of the many men - Walter Gordon, George Grant, Mel Watkins, and Robin Matthews, to name a few - involved in it. Regrettably women and gender have not been included as significant contributors even though the Voice of Women, a Canadian antinuclear and peace group begun in 1960, was a strong and early proponent of Canadian nationalism. Its concern with community was predicated upon an often overlooked component of nationalism: gender and the roles which flow from it. Initially the Voice of Women based itself upon a maternal justification which demanded that Canada be a nurturing, motherly figure internationally. Through the Voice of Women’s maternalism, a sense of Canadian nationalism was created that saw the United States as the threat to its vision of what the Canadian way of life should be. As the 1960s progressed the Voice of Women changed, as did the gender roles ascribed to Canadian women. As the feminist movement, which sought equity for women as human beings rather than mothers, became more concrete the Voice of Women moved away from maternal to more mainstream nationalistic justifications. The Voice of Women’s very real place in the new nationalism shows that there was another element - gender - working to foster Canadian nationalism.

The connection between gender and nationalism takes on two similar yet different manifestations. First, gender has historically been used as a metaphor to describe the modern nation-state. Although some nations were gendered in terms of male representations - the German Fatherland for example - most others involved metaphorical expressions which accentuated the feminine - as was the case in Canada. Second, gender was used to define the

public (political) and private (non-political) roles of men and women. Men were given the tasks of being paternalistic, public defenders of the nation, while women were relegated to the private, domestic sphere. Traditionally, then, "theories of nationalism have ignored the active participation of women in nationalist projects," instead focussing "on the actions of men."\(^2\) Women have not been included because many mainstream studies of nationalism have tended to emphasize public arenas like state bureaucracy and the intelligentsia, where men played major roles.\(^3\) The private and domestic world that women were left with did not allow, or so it was believed, for implicit or explicit expressions of national consciousness because "citizen rights" were "non-domestic and, in this way, public spaces."\(^4\)

The significance of the relationship between gender and nationalism has, however, received greater attention in the last few decades as understandings of the complexity of nationalism and national identities have emerged. Benedict Anderson asserts that nationalism must be associated with realities such as family and religion even more than with ideologies of liberalism and socialism.\(^5\) Building on this contention, Micheline Dumont argues that though Anderson himself did not explicitly come to emphasize gender, the idea of family nonetheless


raises many questions about the influence of gender and gender roles upon nationalism.\(^6\) As Nira Yuval-Davis states, “it is women - and not [just] the bureaucracy and the intelligentsia - who reproduce nations, biologically, culturally and symbolically.”\(^7\)

Among Canadian scholars there has been a similar confirmation of the relationship between women and nationalism. For Naomi Black many feminist groups saw themselves as guardians of national identity because they believed they “were more capable than their male counterparts of protecting values intrinsic to the identity and unity of their nation.”\(^8\) Most often this belief was based upon the premise that the maternal attributes of women were a valuable resource for the nation. Recently several studies have also shown that women contributed to conventional nation building exercises, confirming the interest and participation of women in nationalism.\(^9\) Gender, then - certainly as it relates to women - is an important lens through which to view the phenomena of nationalism.

In spite of the fact that a greater awareness of the role of gender in nationalism is emerging among students of Canadian nationalism there are still many avenues to be explored. One such area of interest is the new Canadian nationalism of the 1960s and 1970s, which has largely been examined without reference to the dynamics of gender and gender roles. The Canadian new nationalism of the 1960s and 1970s was most strongly expressed through the fight against the Americanization of Canada, even though the issues of bilingualism/biculturalism as

\(^7\) Yuval-Davis, Gender and Nation, 2.
well as Native rights were also important. Through the threat of nuclear war, the Vietnam war, race riots, environmental degradation, and political corruption, many Canadians became disenchanted with their southern neighbour and began to decry the Americanization of the Canadian way of life, thus spurring on a period of unprecedented Canadian nationalism.

Such nationalism had begun to ferment and take shape earlier in the 1950s, most notably through the work of the Liberal nationalist Walter Gordon who disparaged the perceived Americanization of Canada’s economic sovereignty.\(^10\) Three years later, James Minifie’s *Peacemaker or Powder Monkey* (1960) argued that Canada needed to reject the role of American “powder monkey” that its participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD) had given it. Minifie proposed that Canada become a “peacemaker” for the world by working through multilateralism and the United Nations.\(^11\) Similarly, James Eayrs, a Canadian political scientist, argued in *Northern Approaches* (1961) that Canada needed to moderate its commitments to the West, particularly the United States, embrace a kind of “neutralism,” and thus become an international peacemaker.\(^12\)

As the 1960s advanced, works such as George Grant’s *Lament For a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism* (1965), Mel Watkin’s report on the dangers of foreign ownership within Canadian industry (1967), and Ian Lumsden’s *Close the 49th Parallel etc: The Americanization of Canada* (1970) presented nationalist views of Canada-United States relations which expressed a desire for both greater Canadian autonomy and greater Canadian divergence from Americans and their way of life. The Canadian mood of the time was best summed by journalist Robert Fulford: writing in

---

\(^10\) Gordon’s views are expressed in the Royal Commission on Canada’s Economic Prospects (Gordon Commission) *Final Report* (Ottawa 1957).
\(^11\) James M. Minifie, *Peacemaker or Powder Monkey* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited, 1960), 126. At the time Minifie was the Washington correspondent for the Canadian Broadcast Corporation.
1970 as he looked back on the events of the past decade, he noted a “new anti-Americanism,” which held “that the United States is a colossal empire and a corrupt one, and that its imperial designs are forcing its corrupt nature on us, crushing the Canadian Spirit.”

It was this that fuelled the new nationalism as Canadians sought to contain the American “threat” to the Canadian way of life. Yet as the previously mentioned proponents of the new nationalism reveal, it was men that are held as its representatives - a problem, it can now be seen, for defining the Canadian way of life cannot so simply be surrendered to the male point of view. Canadians, indeed, were describing Canada in a variety of ways, including ones that were highly gendered.

Women’s roles have not found much of a place in academic work on Canadian nationalism during the Cold War and in the context of Canada-United States relations. A review of two of the more inclusive works on the relationship confirms that certain individuals and groups receive the brunt of the attention when it comes to Canadian nationalism.

Previously mentioned nationalists like Gordon, Grant, Lumsden, and Watkins, as well as groups like the student movement, are the traditional faces of Canadian nationalism. Philip Resnick characterizes the nationalism of the 1960s and 1970s as influenced by “important sectors of the intelligentsia, students, middle class professionals, the trade union movement, political parties, small businessmen, and more exceptionally, large.”

J.L. Granatstein’s *Yankee Go Home?*, which connects such nationalism with anti-Americanism, characterizes politicians, academics, artists, writers, and even American draft dodgers, as the key proponents of Canadian nationalism.

---

Stephen Azzi's *Walter Gordon and the Rise of Canadian Nationalism* boldly claims that Gordon "was the father of the new nationalism," thus displaying the predominately male, political face which Canadian nationalism has been given. It also, however, unintentionally poses the question this study seeks to answer: If Gordon is the father of the new nationalism, who is the mother? In other words, how did women's gendered roles in Canadian society affect the emergence of the new nationalism.

One group not often mentioned as a significant bearer of the "new nationalism" is the Voice of Women. Begun in Toronto in 1960 as a response to the breakdown of the Summit Peace Talks in Paris between the two nuclear superpowers of the time, the United States and the USSR, the Voice of Women was a Canadian women's organization dedicated to the causes of peace and nuclear disarmament. Helen Tucker, President of the Voice of Women in 1962, stated that its goal was:

> to mobilize the voices of women all over the world to speak as one against war, and to do all in our power to insure freedom from war and the threat of war... We have already voiced our opposition to the spread of nuclear weapons and we have joined with many other groups in urging our government that Canada remain a non-nuclear nation."18

It also emphasized that it was a "democratic non-partisan organization."19 With significant public support from across Canada the organization went from one hundred members in September of 1960 to two thousand paid memberships and over ten thousand subscriptions to the *Voice of Women Newsletter* only six months later.20 In the early years the Voice of Women

---

attained as many as six thousand members and tens of thousands of subscriptions to its national newsletter. All in all, however, the membership maintained itself at around two or three thousand throughout the 1960s and 1970s. Its membership consisted mainly of middle to upper class housewives and mothers, many of whom were fairly well educated, either with secondary or post secondary qualifications. This “homogenous image of a ‘typical’ Voice” should not, however, obscure the fact that there were also women from a variety of backgrounds including “farm women, working-class women, and women of ethnic and racial minority groups.” Nonetheless, those who took leadership roles, especially on a national level, came from the first group of women.

The Voice of Women was part of a larger international antinuclear and peace movement that touched many Western countries like Great Britain and the United States. Yet it could not escape its particular context as a Canadian organization with ninety-five percent of its members Canadian citizens. As the 1960s progressed the Voice of Women inevitably constructed a sense of Canadian nationalism and Canadian identity which flowed from its members’ roles as mothers and women in Canadian society, and from their belief that the United States represented the most real threat to peace and to Canada. As Jo-Anne Lee and Linda Cardinal

\begin{quote}
23 The social backgrounds of the women involved in the VOW are obviously diverse, but the examples I have found, such as Helen Tucker (the first president of the Voice of Women, 1960-62), Therese Casgrain (President 1962-63), Kay Macpherson (President 1963-67), Muriel Duckworth (President 1967-71) confirm that most had an education, most were married, and many were involved in extracurricular activities like Sunday School or good will societies. Moreover, the large quantities of time such women spent facilitating the organization suggests they had the financial freedom to be dedicated to an organization like the VOW. For an in-depth social, cultural and contextual analysis of many of the key leaders of the Voice of Women see Ball’s “The History of the Voice of Women,” 88-100.
24 Ibid., 490.
\end{quote}
assert, a group like the Voice of Women could not have escaped nationalist influences, which in the 1960s and 1970s often took the form of anti-American nationalism.25 However, conceding that the Voice of Women could not have avoided more popular forms of nationalism should not take away from the unique role that gender played in its growth and development. Initially, the gendered maternal roles of many Voice of Women members laid the foundation for the organization’s nationalistic tendencies. Later, as the gender roles of Canadian women began to shift with the onset of the feminist movement in the 1960s, many women became part of the more mainstream new nationalism. The Voice of Women’s history, then, not only reveals the importance of a unique women’s perspective and of maternal desires for peace; it also shows the influence of gender on more conventional forms of nationalism.

The Voice of Women echoed many of the sentiments of the new anti-Americanism and nationalism of its time; its utterances nonetheless came from very different sources, many of which lay in the members’ roles as mothers and women. While nationalists like Gordon, Minifie, Eayrs, Grant, Lumsden and Watkins were motivated by a variety of concerns - conservatism, culture, economics - the Voice of Women - initially at least - viewed Canada’s relations with the United States through the eyes of mother, wife, and woman. In one sense the organization developed a seemingly unique notion of Canada and its place in the world, one stressing the need for Canadian sovereignty in order that the nation be able to operate internationally as a spokes-nation for peace and freedom from all things nuclear. Such a recasting of Canadian identity also sought to empower negative feminine notions of Canada so as to create a strong, nurturing figure internationally protecting the interests of children and adults around the world. Over time, however, the Voice of Women’s idea of Canadian sovereignty came to resemble

---

more mainstream concepts that saw the Americanization of the nation's economics, culture, and politics as symptomatic of Canada's inferior position relative to the United States. This shift was facilitated by the changing gender roles for Canadian women, allowing the Voice of Women's initial maternal motivation for peace to fit comfortably into the mainstream demonstrations of the new Canadian nationalism.

With the Voice of Women as its focal point, this study seeks to reinterpret nationalism, continentalism, internationalism, and identity through the lens of gender. The goal is not to use the Voice of Women to show the most prevalent or significant form of Canadian nationalism or Canadian identity; the aim rather is to delineate one of many understandings of who Canadians believe they are. In this particular case, who Canadians, as represented by the Voice of Women and its members, believed they were was fostered by gender and its roles for women. Whereas Black and Ball tend to see the Voice of Women and groups like it through their impact on the evolution of the women's movement, placing issues of national identity in the background; this study seeks to tangibly prove the affect of gender upon nationalism. In effect, the goal is to take the peripheral treatment that the relationship between gender and nationalism has received and provide it an opportunity for further development. The Voice of Women was by no means a small or minor group within Canadian history. Its membership and reach, both nationally and internationally, were significant. Ernie Regher and Simon Rosenblum argue that the Voice of Women was "one of the most persistent and effective of Canadian peace organizations."26 Christine Ball contends that the Voice of Women's "size belied its impact."27 All of this suggests that while the organization may have been only one of many groups espousing a national

---

position, its comments on Canada and its place in the world in relation to the United States had a special role.

On the 17th of May 1960, Lotta Dempsey, a women's writer for the *Toronto Daily Star*, wrote an article in response to the breakdown of the Summit Peace Talks in Paris. Citing the Summit's failure as the result of the inability of men to think and act in the way women would, Dempsey called on Canadian women to use their maternal, nurturing attributes in order to bring about peace in the world.

"Men," she argued in her follow-up article on the 21st of May, "seem too much concerned with economic considerations," while "women always have been more concerned with people themselves." The response was immediate and significant as hundreds of Canadian women wrote letters supporting Dempsey's call for a peace based on the positive characteristics of women. Over the course of the next several months, interest culminated in the official creation of the Voice of Women on July 28th, 1960.

In the beginning, the Voice of Women made what its members believed to be the peaceful, nurturing nature of women the central foundation of its stand against nuclear weapons. Such a focus upon the maternal attributes of women conformed to the conventional gender roles

---

28 On the first of May 1960, several weeks before the Summit was to take place, Soviet forces downed an American U-2 spy plane, capturing the American pilot. Although the United States denied any malevolent intent, the Soviet Union demanded that further missions be permanently halted. When the United States refused Soviet Premier Nikita Khruschev left the Summit meeting thus making any discussion with American President Dwight Eisenhower impossible. George Brown Tindall and David E. Shi, *America: A Narrative History*, Volume 2, Fourth Edition (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1996), 1389-1390.


of the day. In one sense, then, the Voice of Women pushed certain boundaries as it discussed the place of women in the political sphere. As co-founder Josephine Davis argued:

Imagine a woman at this session of the United Nations, for example, standing before the assembly with the authority to say, 'I do not speak for any country, or any bloc of countries. I speak for women of all countries - your wives, your mothers, your daughters. We stand together, and we say, 'Remove from us and from our children the horror of war.'

Such a statement about women speaking at the United Nations did not, however, undermine the focus on women as maternal rather than political advocates. As Helen Tucker maintained:

It is a fact of nature that the female of the species is the giver of life and instinctively is endowed with concern for the preservation of life, at least of the young and helpless. All women share this concern for the family, the basic unit of society, regardless of the complex structures of politics and economics which evolve in highly developed civilizations. It is a rare female indeed who does not try to keep alive that to which she has given birth. Her tools are maternal urges to feed, to protect and to love. Her feminine contributions to life, if normal development is allowed, are love rather than hate, gentleness rather than might and co-operation rather than conflict. These are the qualities of creation not destruction . . .

The traditional role of might exercised by the male of the species is no longer valid, since to use the force now possible is to destroy the entire family of man. So we, the woman [sic], must ask ourselves, 'What is our responsibility under these new circumstances? Has nature not put an answer in our very being? Is the law of survival not within us, the instrument nature has provided to give birth and to preserve the race? We believe that it is time for women to speak up and to say to the leaders of the world, 'Let there be no war!' We have only to take the 'vow' together and other ways to resolve differences must be found. We can determine that 'where nations are suspicious, we can inspire trust': 'where men are inconsistent, we can bring purpose and integrity:' 'where there is cold war, we can create a climate of understanding, co-operation and sympathy.'

This statement reveals not only the maternal motivations of the organization, but also its belief that the maternal could transcend political boundaries. It does not attempt to portray women as overly political, but rather as complementary to the predominantly male political leaders of the

---

time. Thus the Voice of Women validated its advocacy of peace and the non-nuclear by embracing the need for a maternal as well as a feminine force within international affairs.

In these early years, the Voice of Women’s maternal justification for its members’ involvement in Canada’s political affairs paralleled, in many ways, the case made by the suffragettes of the early twentieth century. “Akin to their suffragette foremothers,” Ball argues, “the early [participants in the Voice of Women] cited motherhood (and related ideologies concerning the family) as a major reason for their participation.”

34 The women’s suffrage movement in Canada, the first wave of the women’s movement, was not aimed towards goals of equality for women but towards introducing maternalism into the political sphere. The idea that “women should have political rights and public roles because they were mothers, and had acquired values that would contribute positively to cleaning up politics and to nation-building” guided the suffragettes.

35 They were not motivated by strongly political concerns, but rather by a wish to augment those who were in power, generally men, with a maternal point of view.


35 Maternalism has also been termed as the first wave of the feminist movement. “Scholars are divided, however, as to whether maternalism constitutes a form of feminism. Proponents of this idea point to the fact that maternalism and feminism have sometimes overlapped within movements and individuals and that, at occasional junctures, maternalism has been used by women to advance their interests in society. Some also contend that the capacity to bear children unites women and, therefore, sharpens their conflict with patriarchal institutions. Opponents, however, have contended that maternalism reinforces the idea that two genders have ‘separate spheres’ and, therefore, has bolstered sexist efforts to limit opportunities for women. Indeed, they have argued, maternalism promotes a very limited notion of women’s nature, while feminism is genuinely egalitarian, stressing equal abilities, rights, and opportunities.” Lawrence S. Wittner, “Gender Roles and Nuclear Disarmament Activism, 1954-1965,” Gender & History 12:1 (April 2000): 205. This study tends to agree that maternalism and the suffragette movement should not be considered one and the same as feminism. Feminism was a later movement that differed significantly from maternalism. Both can, however, be placed under the broader category of the women’s movement.

Just as the suffragettes portrayed themselves as complementary to the political process, the Voice of Women denied wanting to act as a political organization. In response to the question "Is Voice of Women a Political Organization?" the organization unequivocally stated:

No. VOICE OF WOMEN is not a political organization. It is a non-partisan movement. It does not attempt to prescribe exactly how war can cease to be a threat to civilization and mankind. But it takes the position that construction, not destruction, must be the objective to which the minds of men are applied: it proposes a program for its members that supports and implements that position: and it maintains that faith, not fear, should be the dominant factor in thinking and planning for the future.37

Many members of the Voice of Women recognized their interconnection with the Canadian women who had fought for the right to vote as citizens. Countering those critics who viewed the Voice of Women as an overly idealistic organization, Helen Aikman stated:

Think of the suffragettes, this was an equality that women wanted and by dint of hard work, and speaking out and sacrificing, they got it. With survival at stake - we can and must make an effort again, although frankly I'm awfully glad we won't have to wear bloomers!38

Such allusions to the women's suffrage movement allied the Voice of Women with a well-respected movement of the past, helping to create an image of respectability and legitimacy.

Creating such an image was important for two reasons. First, the Cold War context was one of great suspicion and fear towards communism. By connecting itself to a democratic movement like that of the suffragettes, the Voice of Women reinforced its commitment to the institutions and policies of the West. In the early 1960s the reality was that the term peace was often linked with communism, making it necessary for the organization to carefully consider how

38 Helen Aikman, "Women Ask Weapon Abolition For Sake of Human Survival," Oakville Journal 24 (November 1960): 36. Quote found in Ball, "The History of the Voice of Women," 201. The "equality" that Aikman is speaking of in this quote must not be understood to mean the same type of equality that the second wave feminist movement would come to support. The equality she talks of relates to the suffragettes' desire for the right to vote, which was based on the unique maternal characteristics. Maternal characteristics that the second wave would come to seemingly reject or at least de-emphasize.
it would present itself to both potential members, as well as the larger Canadian public.  

Additionally, the Voice of Women's close affiliation with women's movements of the past made the organization less threatening to husbands and males fearful of women's ever-increasing public position. Great efforts were made to present the organization's commitment to "good manners" and "ladylike" actions. Emphasis was placed upon "prominent" and respectable women, who were generally given such a title because they were the "wife of a well-known" politician or businessman. But though the Voice of Women's orientation towards movements from the past gave it its foundation, as it progressed it would also look towards the future of women and their place in Canada. Ball thus asserts that the Voice of Women acted as a "bridge" between the first wave - maternalism - and second wave - feminism - of the women's movement. Nonetheless, while the organization asserted itself in the public sphere, it did so in a way that did not drastically disturb the largely domestic roles ascribed to Canadian women in the early 1960s.

The Voice of Women's emphasis on the need for the feminine and maternal had an impact on its expectations concerning the role Canada should play. Dempsey, for example, thought Canada already possessed the foundation for a kind of maternal identity. Canadians, she maintained, "are received wherever they go on this earth as a nation of non-aggressive, non-acquisitive citizens with malice toward none." This, she thought, positioned Canada to play an important role internationally. Canada's internationalism had assisted in "producing a Korean armistice and resolving (if only temporarily) the Suez Crisis [and this] had helped make

---

41 Ibid., 208.
43 Ibid., 8.
Canadians more conscious of their worth in the world and hence more proud of themselves at home.\textsuperscript{45} It seemed clear that Canada's national objectives and goals, and therefore its national identity, could meet and exceed the promise of the 1950s by following the lead of women and mothers.

In defining Canada in a particular manner the Voice of Women found itself confronting those nations and peoples that did not fit its model. Sylvia Bashevkin has defined Canadian nationalism "as the organized pursuit of a more independent and distinctive in-group on the North American continent" particularly in areas of culture, trade and investment.\textsuperscript{46} Nationalism, through the quest to distinguish in group and out-group, has been one way in which Canadians (the in-group) have sought to differentiate themselves from the United States (the out-group). In fact, Canadian identity has long been built upon opposition between Canada and the United States. Thompson and Randall state that:

To every generation of Canadians, the American presence has been an unavoidable fact of everyday life. Since there was no other external threat to Canadian autonomy and identity save the United States, it was against Americans that Canadians repeatedly pledged to "stand on guard" in the lyrics of their national anthem.\textsuperscript{47}

The Voice of Women's attempt to define Canada, and the impact that the United States would have upon such a definition, has been a constant component of Canadian life for many years.

The Voice of Women's characterization of Canada as feminine reflects both the impact of American influence and the role of gender in defining the Canadian nation. Patricia K. Wood's "Defining 'Canadian'" frames the anti-American nationalism of Sir John A. Macdonald and the Conservative party in the late nineteenth century as a powerful example of the


\textsuperscript{47} Thompson and Randall, \textit{Ambivalent Allies}, 4.
relationship between Canadian identity and the American presence. Wood contends that the anti-American rhetoric of Macdonald and his party was part of a discourse involved in specifying not only how Canadians would be defined in relation to the United States but also how race, ethnicity, class, and gender would enter the picture.\textsuperscript{48}

In one sense, Macdonald utilized the notion of gender to characterize Canada in feminine terms. Canada was portrayed as both a boy, though this occurred to a lesser extent, and a young woman in need of a paternal protector.\textsuperscript{49} Macdonald believed that Canada, as a vulnerable and innocent nation, needed to be sheltered from dangers, whether internal or external. The external proved or at least appeared to be the most real threat, as the United States emerged as “the wol[f] at the door” of “Miss Canada.”\textsuperscript{50} The representation of a “Miss Canada” requiring protection from the United States not only framed Canada as a weak, feminine entity, but also characterized and defined Canadian citizenship as vulnerable as well. Paternalism was required if American power was to be resisted.

Macdonald’s imagery of course marginalized women in the life of the nation. It formed part of the discourse opposing public and private spheres by placing women, home, and family in the confines of the private. The public sphere was created as a masculine arena, not a place for weak and vulnerable women. As Wood writes, “men were to be strong, loyal, white, heterosexual, providers and protectors while women were to be protected, silent and uninvolved, except to support their husbands.”\textsuperscript{51} Thus while Canada, as a nation, was projected as feminine, it was a negative projection that reduced Canadian women to a marginalized status in the workings of the Canadian nation-state. Though the women’s suffrage movement and subsequent

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 4.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 5.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 10.
enfranchisement of women in 1918 enhanced their political role, they remained largely outside the public, political sphere when, in 1960, the Voice of Women was founded.\textsuperscript{52}

Though Macdonald's definition of Canada and Canadians was articulated in the nineteenth century, Wood argues that its legacies "are still visible today."\textsuperscript{53} They can certainly be seen in relation to the Voice of Women, though with important changes. The Voice of Women embraced a notion of Canada and Canadian citizenship that was in stark contrast to the weak femininity of "Miss Canada," and the relegation of Canadian women to the private sphere. The notion of a feminine Canada was not, to be sure, dismissed. The characterization of the feminine as weak, innocent, and vulnerable was, however, rejected. The young, impressionable "Miss Canada" was replaced with the mature, nurturing, peace-loving, strong motherly Canada. The creation of a motherly Canada also eliminated the metaphor of the young boy. The emphasis was on strength, maturity, and the capacity to give direction. A major objective was:

To urge Canada to assume leadership wherever possible among peoples and nations to encourage peaceful resolution of differences, especially through supervised international disarmament, support of international law and order through the United Nations, strengthening the International Court of Justice and the United Nations Police Force, and through aid to less developed countries through United Nations channels.\textsuperscript{54}

This goal was originally envisioned as involving several initiatives that would encourage and facilitate peace. First, it would mean the establishment of a "Ministry of Peace" that would use at least one percent of the Canadian defence budget to "initiate and coordinate a program of research into the problems of peace."\textsuperscript{55} The idea of a Ministry of Peace was to be complemented by an international "Peace Research Institute" that would be based within Canada as "she begins to use her wealth and scientific knowledge for research into the preservation of peace,
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instead of atomic armament.”\(^{56}\) A Peace Corps, goodwill travel missions, and World Peace Year were additional goals envisioned by the Voice of Women.\(^{57}\)

The language and initiatives of the Voice of Women attempted to “cut across international barriers”\(^{58}\) by drawing attention to the “entire family of man,” which was “worldwide.”\(^{59}\) This internationalism was an expression of the maternal focus of the Voice of Women. In fact as early as 1961 it had become an international organization, when new Voice of Women supporters and contacts were being established in the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Ceylon, India, Japan, Yugoslavia, Austria, and even the Soviet Union.\(^{60}\) A campaign was also initiated to communicate through Esperanto,\(^{61}\) so as to find a common linguistic ground on which to relate to the larger international community.\(^{62}\) All of these initiatives for creating peace were based upon Canada acting as the maternal leader in the international family of humankind. Canada would thus no longer be a passive nation, acting only when called upon; “she” would be a strong international initiator of peace and co-operation.

The Voice of Women was also concerned to recast the role of Canadian citizenship, although in a non-threatening manner. In the 1960s women were still not active on formal “policymaking bodies at any government level.” As, however, they “involved themselves in

---
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organized groups” like the Voice of Women their understanding of their place began to change.\textsuperscript{63}

Those who participated in the Voice of Women did not see its role as secondary or unimportant: they believed they were doing their parts as citizens (although it must be remembered that it was citizenship in limited form, based as it was on maternalism). Nonetheless, embracing the importance of democratic citizenship, Helen Tucker stated that “just being a citizen of a democratic country means making critical decisions about basic values and how one should be using his skills and his life.”\textsuperscript{64} Josephine Davis echoed Tucker’s sentiments:

I further believe that Voice of Women gives me the opportunity of expressing my faith in democracy, and the worth of the individual in a free and democratic society. Nothing annoys me more than those who say, ‘Sure it all sounds fine but what can one person do?’ I maintain that anyone who says ‘What can I do?’ hasn’t grasped the first essential of democracy, hasn’t accepted his responsibility as a citizen in a democracy, and is, in fact, reacting to problems which confront him in exactly the same way as he would under Communism, where the plea ‘What can I do?’ would have some validity. Keeping the peace is everyone’s responsibility. Making democracy work is everyone’s responsibility. Both are vital to my children’s future, and both are the objectives of Voice of Women. That’s my answer to ‘What can I do.’\textsuperscript{65}

Muriel Duckworth believed that it was the duty of a good citizen to “become knowledgeable about important issues and persuade the government, through well-researched briefs and letters, to act in the best interest of the country.”\textsuperscript{66} Directing Canadian identity towards peace signalled a significant shift in the way citizenship in Canada, and many other Western nations, was viewed. Christine Ball contends that the Voice of Women reduced “the notion of military service as the hallmark of patriotism and citizenship,” replacing it with the idea that “true patriotism in the nuclear age would involve a courageous struggle for peace.”\textsuperscript{67} “There is no higher loyalty,”
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Voice of Women president Casgrain asserted, "than the devotion to the welfare of the human family." As the public, political sphere came to seem to be a real threat, the private, familial sphere surged forward, and women asserted their democratic right to be active in the public life of the nation. Such maternalism, though it laid the foundation for the orientation of the Voice of Women, also continued to perpetuate the notion that women were only valuable as domestic advocates. For the Voice of Women, however, the changing gender roles within Canada during the 1960s provided the organization with an ability to change, ultimately facilitating its growing nationalism.

The maternal role that the Voice of Women adopted during its early years affected not only how it would see Canada's place in the world but also set the stage for confrontation with the United States. The United States, through nuclear testing and prosecution of the Vietnam war, was considered a threat to the Voice of Women's maternal vision for Canada. This anti-American nationalism, however, was able to take its full form because of a growing feminist awareness that women needed to become more political. The politicization and feminization of the Voice of Women allowed it to tackle issues that a solely maternal organization might have avoided. Accordingly, the Voice of Women "became increasingly nationalist and critical of U.S. Policies," seeing "national independence as the key to Canada's role in achieving peace." The issue of nuclear weapons and their place in Canada during the early 1960s served to plant the seeds of a Canadian nationalism that came to understand the United States as the central threat to the Canadian way of life. These seeds, however, grew in the very political climate created, in part, by changing gender roles for Canadian women.

---

Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, following the requirements of NATO and NORAD, hesitantly acquired Genie and Bomarc missiles from the United States in 1959. Such missiles, which needed nuclear warheads to be effective, caused a dilemma for the Diefenbaker government. The idea of having nuclear weapons on Canadian soil jointly controlled by the United States and Canada seemed controversial, especially in light of James Minifie's popular *Peacemaker or Powdermonkey*. Minifie argued that Canada was in danger of becoming a military subordinate to the United States because of the arrangements within NATO and NORAD. These issues not only received much attention in the early 1960s, but continued to face scrutiny during the rest of the decade. Faced with a divided cabinet, Diefenbaker feared that accepting nuclear weapons on Canadian soil would create a domestic problem. He therefore stalled on making a final decision as to whether the Bomarcs would be made nuclear capable. Ultimately Diefenbaker lost the ability to make that decision as he was defeated in 1963 by Liberal Lester Pearson who, sensing that many Canadians actually wanted Canada to fulfil its military commitments, changed his position from that of opposition to nuclear weapons to acceptance, with an undertaking - never fulfilled - to renegotiate those commitments.
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The debate over the place of nuclear weapons in Canada awakened many to the problems with Canada's defence arrangements with the United States. For the Voice of Women the idea that Canada could become - and eventually did become - a nuclear nation served to set the tone of the organization for the 1960s and 1970s. Ball argues that in the post-war era "Canadian foreign policy gradually developed a basic paradoxical or contradictory stance," as it attempted to strike a balance between collective security, multilateralism and military commitments. For the Voice of Women it was clear that there should be no nuclear arms for Canada: the organization supported "any proposal that will keep Canada free of nuclear involvement, thereby strengthening Canada's leadership role among the non-nuclear powers." Both NATO and NORAD threatened Canada's potential as a leader of the non-nuclear world: if Canada acquired "warheads we become committed to the defence policy of another country." Consequently the Voice of Women proposed that "Canada renegotiate her commitments with NATO and NORAD, and . . . reconsider [her] policy on nuclear armament." With the election of 1963 looming the message was clear: "a nation that cannot resist pressure to take [an] active part in the fearful nuclear arms race cannot, at the same time, work honestly and effectively for international co-operation."

After Pearson became Canada's leader the Voice of Women was "shocked and disheartened" to find out that not only would Canada accept nuclear warheads, but it would also permit the United States to store nuclear weapons in Newfoundland. The idea that Pearson,
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who had been a strong supporter of the Voice of Women and whose wife was a member, could so quickly abandon his non-nuclear stance created great angst. In light of the Conservative party's inability to decide on a formal policy on nuclear weapons, Pearson and the Liberal party in 1960 had made clear that they did not support nuclear weapons for Canada. Such a position made Pearson and the Liberal party popular among many Voice of Women members even though their organization claimed to be non-partisan.\(^79\) However, when Pearson changed his position the Voice of Women experienced a difficult time as its members were forced to consider how close it should be to a particular political party.

The 1963 debate over the political nature of the Voice of Women was part of the shifting nature of gender roles in Canada and had an impact on the organization. Moderates who tended towards the traditional maternalism of the suffragettes called for less political emphasis. Those more politically oriented, who were finding greater comfort in the feminist movement, fought for a greater political role.\(^80\) The tensions between these two groups was symbolized by the disagreement between cofounders Jo Davis and Helen Tucker. Davis was representative of the traditional school within the Voice of Women as she believed it should be fully non-political and only complementary to the political process.\(^81\) Women, she believed, should not become involved in the policy side of disarmament as that was not their purpose.\(^82\) Helen Tucker, on the other hand, wanted to see the Voice of Women involved in the political process by initiating tangible policies.\(^83\) The passive approach of the moderates had, she argued, left the important political decisions in the hands of Pearson, a man who, in spite of his close ties to the organization, had not been able to make the correct decision. Not surprisingly, Davis was older
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and sympathetic to the maternal gender roles of her past, while Tucker was a young mother influenced less by the maternal and more by feminist influences. Many members were lost during this time, including Maryon Pearson, and the Voice of Women did in fact emerge as a more politically oriented group.  

This new political orientation was part of the organization’s transformation, which paralleled the changing gender roles of women in Canada. The “politicization” of the Voice of Women “reveals patterns of political awakening representative of the experience of many middle class women” during the 1960s. Most notably, the emerging feminist movement began placing pressure on the Voice of Women to become a more productive participant in the life of the nation. Several years prior to the crisis of 1963, a Chatelaine article by Carol Chapman titled “How Effective is the Voice of Women?” questioned the organization’s ability to bring about actual political change. At the time Chatelaine was the leading women’s magazine in Canada and an early proponent of the feminist movement. With such pressure both internally and externally, combined with the disappointment over nuclear weapons in Canada, the Voice of Women began its shift away from political passivity. The organization remained, however, committed to the need for maternal attributes among the nations, simply adding a political emphasis to its maternal orientation

Changing gender roles in Canada combined with disappointment over the Liberal policy change facilitated the transformation of the Voice of Women into a more politically directed
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entity. As a result, the Voice of Women shed its non-political stance and began developing clear policies and seeking real results. It did not, however, dispose of its desire see Canada act a an international broker for peace, a desire which, though tied to maternalism, remained an important part of the organization after 1963. Of continuing concern, too, was the close military co-operation that nuclear weapons entailed which, it was feared, was making “Canada into a nuclear satellite of the United States.”

As the Voice of Women’s goal of peace was closely tied to Canada’s acting as a strong, independent nation, the belief that the United States could exert control over the sovereignty of Canada meant that peace was threatened. Thus as the 1960s moved forward the Voice of Women was on the lookout for any signs of American attempts to influence Canada’s ability to determine its destiny.

The Voice of Women’s new political face did not mean an end to its maternalism. It simply meant an end to the notion that maternalism entailed a lack of political ambition. Many of the organization’s most successful initiatives in the 1960s were based upon maternal protection and nurturing, especially in regards to children. Initial efforts such as the Baby Tooth collection program, which sought to trace nuclear fallout in Canada’s children, continued after the organization’s shift in 1963. A push to eradicate the sale of war toys to children was made. Campaigns against the Vietnam war included the nurturing task of knitting blankets that were to be distributed to mothers and their children in Vietnam. The Voice of Women also supported measures to help American and South Vietnamese draft-dodgers find a new home in Canada.

Vietnamese women were brought to Canada to speak about the devastation they faced in the war against the Americans. The Voice of Women’s maternal campaigns after 1963 continued
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to be important, but they were increasingly viewed as the foundation for more political organization.

The Voice of Women continually displayed its political will as it developed ideas that spoke the political language of the day. Through a variety of outlets - protest activities, the media, its own publications - the Voice of Women did not shy away from expressing an opinion on a wide variety of matters. The most consistent aim of the Voice of Women in the 1960s, and most persistently post 1963, concerned its desire to see Canada renegotiate its commitments within NATO and NORAD. Each year at the Voice of Women’s annual meetings it was resolved that Canada either ensure that it not be required to be a nuclear nation, or withdraw from both organizations. Ultimately, however, NORAD became the primary focus, largely because it was a defence agreement solely between Canada and the United States. In December of 1967 the Voice of Women published a well-written and politically charged 14 page article titled “Why Canada Should Withdraw from NORAD.” The article, which was written with no reference to maternal motivations, challenged the notion that the United States was the spokes nation for morality:

The justification for NORAD accordingly rests on the fundamental assumption regarding the intentions of the super-powers. We are in NORAD because we believe that the intentions of United States are pacific, and because we believe that the intentions of the U.S.S.R. are aggressive. Each of these assumptions requires an act of faith, for neither is supported by evidence.91

In fact, the evidence suggested to the Voice of Women the opposite: the United States was the aggressive, militaristic superpower. “War or the threat of war has greatly extended the zone of U.S. influence and military occupation, without any corresponding expansion of the Russian zone.” Additionally, the United States, with more than “3300 foreign military bases,” would
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"continue to expand" and "be on the offensive," while the Soviet Union would "remain stationary" or "contract still further." The article thus concluded that "the function of NORAD . . . is to shield the flank of the United States during its advance into Asia," meaning Vietnam. Therefore, NORAD stood as an example of Canadian complicity in the American military machine that was attempting to assert its influence over Southeast Asia.

The Voice of Women took a strong political stance by regularly challenging the Canadian role in the Vietnam war. The American war in Vietnam was seen as enhancing American influence over Canada, and therefore as a threat to the type of Canada that the Voice of Women sought to create. The Vietnam war was of such importance to the Voice of Women that Muriel Duckworth, president from 1967-1971, claimed it as the "central issue during her term as president." Early on in the war, the Voice of Women argued that "if Canadians condone this U.S. war, we are despicable, apathetic and toadying hypocrites." It also stated that "[t]he Canadian Government and people must accept the full implications of their claim to be a peace-making nation - an independent nation - and express openly their disapproval of the United States actions in Vietnam." The Canadian government did eventually become somewhat critical of the war in Vietnam, as evidenced by the efforts - both public and private - Pearson and Canadian Minister of External Affairs Paul Martin made to pressure the United States to end the war. The Voice of Women, however, saw the hypocrisy in this: Canada criticized the United States, while simultaneously selling the Americans millions of dollars of military equipment and arms. "We . . . are convinced," Voice of Women President Macpherson
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argued in 1966, “that the greatest contribution Canada can make towards achieving an early peace is by withdrawing publicly this tacit and tangible support (helicopter parts, copper, etc.) of the US war effort in Vietnam.”

Though Canada had built a reputation during the post-war period as a peacemaking nation, the Voice of Women believed that in profiting from the Vietnam war severe damage was being done to Canada’s image. Canada was becoming “two-faced:” it was therefore time to “match words with deeds, and face up the fact that we stand to be labelled as the most hypocritical nation in the world, unless some changes are made, NOW.” As Muriel Duckworth, president in 1967, argued:

In order to do this with the singleness of purpose which this urgent task requires and with the full confidence of other less wealthy nations. Canada must act to free herself from her present satellite position in relation to the United States, from the economic uncertainties and limitations of this relationship, from the immoral benefits of exploitation and devastation of other peoples and lands, from the continued waste of money, men and materials on so-called ‘defence’ when there is no defence for Canada but peace.

The Voice of Women was strongly opposed to the Canadian government’s 1970 White Paper which, the it believed, placed economic growth, social justice, and quality of life above issues such as sovereignty and independence, peace and security. Duckworth argued that Canadian foreign objectives and policies must go “the way of sanity and survival” by using “daring, courage and imagination” to pursue nonalignment. Instead, the government report recommended a greater focus on and awareness of economic growth as well as a continued close friendship with
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the United States. "So," the Voice of Women argued, "in spite of all the evidence that our membership in NATO and NORAD make a barrier between us and most of the rest of the world, there we remain."\(^\text{103}\)

Most of the Voice of Women's yearly resolutions from 1968 were designed not only to give Canada more independence, but also to disrupt the policies of the United States. The first two endorsed Canada's withdrawal from both NATO and NORAD, while the third recommended that Canada not join the Organization of American States (OAS), which was seen as an American controlled body intended to direct and manipulate the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Resolutions five and six asked Canada to halt all exports of military materials to the United States, in protest against American aggression against Vietnam. Resolution seven declared that Canada stop research into chemical-biological warfare, which the Voice of Women believed was heavily funded and controlled by the American government. Resolution eight asked the Canadian government to formally recognize the People's Republic of China and support its admission to the United Nations, steps the United States vigorously opposed. Also supported was the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and its goal of providing truly Canadian television programming. Finally, a strong statement advocated "all measures which will free Canada from economic, social, political and military control by the U.S. It is time to stop Canada's acquiescence in U.S. imperialism as evidenced by the presence of U.S. Bombers based in Canada and the participation of Canada in chemical biological warfare research."\(^\text{104}\)

The concern of the Voice of Women about the American influence over Canada was thus confirmed in a very explicit way. The other resolutions, all implicitly centring upon the same theme, were reinforced: Canada must be a strong, independent, peace-loving nation and this could not be
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done with so much in the way of United States interconnections. Though the Voice of Women claimed an international scope and reach, its true foundation was its nationalistic desire to see Canada act independently of its powerful neighbour. The Voice of Women’s transformation throughout the 1960s was remarkable. It had gone from an organization that did not wish to be political to one that routinely challenged the policies and actions of the American and Canadian governments. Gender and its roles played a significant role in this change, as the maternal vision for Canada made the United States a threat, while the changing gender roles for Canadian women facilitated greater political action.

As the new nationalism from the late 1960s onward began to solidify, taking shape as a consequence of action by numerous movements and organizations, the Voice of Women was already a well-established organization for the protection of Canada and Canadians. The expression “new nationalism,” which was initially used in the late 1960s to describe the concerns and fears over the ever growing American influence, designated a broad and seemingly all-encompassing movement. John Warnock’s *Partner to Behemoth* and Stephen Clarkson’s compilation *An Independent Foreign Policy for Canada* spoke out, like the Voice of Women, against Canada’s role as a nuclear satellite within NATO and NORAD. Meanwhile, Robin Matthews contended that the overabundance of American-born professors teaching in Canadian universities threatened Canada’s society and culture. A survey of the chapter titles of the essays in Lumsden’s *Close the 49th Parallel, etc* shows that the concern over Americanization touched many different facets of Canadian life. Topics included: the Canadian bourgeoisie, business, foreign ownership, the union movement, print media, culture, universities, politics,
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resource management, and even the national past time of hockey. The common ground was economic. All authors felt that Canada's economic reliance upon the United States was the critical factor. Indeed, the new nationalism may be characterized as an attempt to see Canada become an independent economic nation, free from American influence.

Naturally, the Voice of Women's concern over the perceived Americanization of Canada allowed it a role in the emergence of the new nationalism from the late 1960s onwards. Indeed, the Voice of Women may be seen as a forerunner of this Canadian nationalism. From its beginning in 1960, the Voice of Women constructed an identity for Canada that focused upon the strong, motherly attributes of women. As NATO, NORAD and the Vietnam war surfaced as key threats to the Voice of Women's desired image and role for Canada, nationalistic notions took centre stage, placing the organization's early emphasis on a maternal Canada in the background. It becomes necessary to examine why the organization became virtually indistinguishable from the larger nationalistic movement: the reason, ironically, has much to do with gender itself.

By the late 1960s the Voice of Women spoke the language of the new nationalism, claiming that the American influence over Canada was the result of economic dependency. Like many other nationalist groupings, the Voice of Women had originally focused on Canada's economic complicity in the Vietnam war, using it as the most urgent example of what could result from Canada's dependence. By the end of the decade the concern had become much more comprehensive. As Voice of Women member Lorraine Chaplin of Ottawa wrote, "I have felt for a long time that the lack of Canadian sovereignty has prevented our group and others from having a significant effect on our Government"; it was therefore "time to stop Canada's
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continuing acquiescence to U.S. Imperialism." In the same issue Chaplin discussed the newly formed group "Canadian Sovereignty," to be headed by Robin Matthews. Committed "to an independent Canada, politically, economically and culturally," it showed that the concern about nuclear weapons and Canada's role in Vietnam had come full circle and now struck at the heart of Canada's identity. As Chaplin bluntly put it:

The desire for an independent Canada has been growing for the last 25 years even as Canada has more and more lost its own voice in Canadian culture, its own hand in Canadian economics, and its own will in the political decisions of the nation. The most disturbing fact about these losses is that the natural leaders - the Canadian governments - have consistently failed to speak with voice of the Canadian people, and have failed to plan and to lead the people in a defence of the nation from the increasing takeover by an alien power.

Canadians are losing basic freedoms: they complain of being forbidden to speak of Canadian problems by their foreign employers in 'Canadian' firms; of being forbidden to run for office in Canada by these foreign owners; of being forbidden to express pro-Canadian ideas in magazines published by these owners. Canadians know that foreign companies often get better deals in Canada than they do in their own countries, and they know that Canadians are often forbidden to buy stock in foreign-owned so-called 'Canadian' companies. Canadians complain that branch-plant companies stifle Canadian inventions. Canadians complain that our newspapers publish more second-line news from the US that first-line news from other Canadian provinces. Canadians complain that major political parties get more of the election funds from non-Canadian contributors than from Canadians . . . Many anti-nationalists in Canada say that nationalism is a thing of the past. What they mean is that Canadian nationalism should become a thing of the past as U.S. nationalism moves into Canada.  

Chaplin's statement of support for Canadian Sovereignty echoes with comments about the centrality of Canada's subordinate economic relationship with the United States.

In 1971 the United States planned several nuclear tests at Amchitka Island, a part of Alaska's Aleutian Islands. This led to strong protest from many Canadians, including the Voice of Women, which linked the proposed tests to economic matters, most notably Nixon's famous surcharge of that same year. The surcharge was a result of international economic pressures, in

---
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which the European and Japanese economies had rebounded from the economic perils of World War II to once again become thriving economies. This change influenced the United States to determine that it was no longer practicable to continue financing the balance of payments deficits of its allies. Consequently Nixon and the United States introduced a New Economic Policy.\textsuperscript{112}

This new policy, introduced on August 15, 1971, imposed, among other things, a ten percent surcharge on dutiable imports in order to stimulate domestic manufacturing rather than foreign manufacturing by American multinationals.\textsuperscript{113} In a departure from previous practice in similar circumstances, Canada was not exempted from the sanctions. The United States justified this stance as necessary both because the American economy required it and because the American government believed that Canada's economy was no longer deserving of special treatment due to its strength and diversity in the early 1970s.\textsuperscript{114} This new policy angered many Canadians because approximately seventy percent of Canadian exports went to the United States which meant the surcharge would have a serious impact on Canada. It was projected that the new American policies represented the possibility of a three hundred million dollar loss in exports, the likelihood of factory closures, and the rising of unemployment rates.\textsuperscript{115} A Gallup Poll reported that of those who said they knew something of the new American policies, sixty-three per cent thought such policies would be “bad” for Canada's economic well-being.\textsuperscript{116}
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Macpherson used the Nixon measures to undergird the Voice of Women's attack on the plans for nuclear tests at Amchitka and the American military control over Canada. She charged:

Following so closely on the blatant disregard of the economies of other countries, shown by President Nixon in the recent imposition of the surcharge, his latest decision to go ahead with the nuclear explosion on Amchitka Island is yet another example of his complete disregard for the well-being of the people of Canada and other countries. . . Nothing short of a declaration of Canada’s intention to withdraw from NORAD, the so-called North American [Air] Defense Pact, which puts Canadian air space and Canadian armed forces under the control of such a callous and irresponsible leader, will demonstrate our Government's determination to look after the interests of the Canadian people.\textsuperscript{117}

In the early 1960s such a focus would have been out of character for a group that was based on the premise that men had bungled peace because they were too concerned with economic interests and not people.\textsuperscript{118} The Voice of Women, setting aside its quest to define Canada in motherly terms, had, by the late 1960s and early 1970s become part of a more mainstream nationalism.

The Voice of Women’s connection to this more political and economic nationalism was a function of the shifting political and social roles of women in Canada. When the organization was first formed it did not wish to be politically oriented. It also did not define itself as a feminist group. Instead of placing its focus upon equality for women the Voice of Women initially declared itself to be a group concerned simply with protecting “the very survival of the human race.”\textsuperscript{119} As it became more political and as the feminist movement became more prominent the Voice of Women began to be affected by feminist thought, thus becoming what Ball describes as a “bridge” between the first and second waves of the women’s movement.

\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Voice of Women Newsletter} 3 (1960): 5.
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Influenced by the first wave, “the Voice of Women initially adopted the structures, procedures, activities and strategies employed by earlier [suffragette] foremothers.” These included the adoption of a national executive, hierarchical structures, and the stress placed upon the “need for women’s unique qualities and expertise to be applied to the public agenda.” As the second wave - feminism - became more prominent, and as it developed a focus on the goal of equality as citizens, the Voice of Women moved away from its emphasis on the special attributes of women as mothers, nurturers, and protectors.

Jill Vickers argues that “[t]he main arena in which old and new feminists interacted was in the Voice of Women.” The Voice of Women, like any other organization or group, was not static as it changed and redefined itself in the course of the 1960s. Maternalism, the foundation on which the organization was initially based, had created an atmosphere in which the Voice of Women spoke out for others, most notably the women and children of the world oppressed by war, poverty, and injustice. At the same time its members were “learning to become agents of change on their own behalf as women and not just on the behalf of others.” Though the issues of militarism and peace would remain the hallmarks of the Voice of Women’s platform throughout the 1960s and 1970s, that platform also created an awareness of women’s solidarity and the reality of gender inequality. This allowed the organization to act as a counter force against “issues of women’s social and political segregation” in Canada. Solange Chaput-Rolland framed the shift, in its early stages, in this way:
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35
We have inherited our democracy without ever really fighting for its privileges and the time is NOW to begin to recompense for our unbelievable security. But before we weigh the responsibilities of liberty, let us forget our divine mission as women and put aside our maternal virtues to reappraise our femininity in its true light. I am first and foremost a human being; if I am a woman it is by a delicious accident in which I had nothing to say. Therefore instead of always looking at the world from the standpoint of feminine ineffectuality, shouldn't we face it with a maximum of human responsibility? In 1963, in a world torn by revolution, the threat of atomic suicide, widespread and concentrated hunger, we, the women of Canada, must play a role in society not only because we are women, but because as human beings we cannot reach maturity without having fully lived.127

Emphasizing the need for women to think and act as human beings, rather than women, Chaput-Rolland’s comments point to the beginnings of the organization’s transformation from a first to a second wave women’s movement.

The shift in the orientation of the Voice of Women was particularly evident in its changing policies and goals, which increasingly became representative of the more equality based second wave. The feminist movement in the 1960s revolved around several key issues including: “equal work legislation, birth control, abortion, divorce legislation reform, working wives and mothers, the hardships felt by working-class women, and the high degree of sexism that pervaded politics, the workplace, and society.”128 As early as 1961 several members of the Voice of Women began to express interest in supporting measures to make birth control legal in Canada.129 In these early years support for such measures remained limited due to the continued prevalence of more traditional notions about women and their place in society. However, significant change occurred by the summer of 1964 when the Voice of Women itself officially resolved that laws against contraceptives be abolished.130 A resolution under the heading of “civil
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rights” in 1970 showed continued support of birth control for Canadian women, and there was also a formal declaration that “Section 237 ([specifying that] abortions [were] a criminal offence) be removed from Criminal Code.”  

With the 1970 release of the Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women, which called for numerous changes concerning women’s roles in relation to work, politics, education, and the home, the Voice of Women’s concerns became broader still. By 1972, it could credit the Royal Commission for “making women aware that political action is necessary for legislative change.” By the early 1970s reference to the merits of maternal feminism had virtually disappeared. Concern with equality, rather than the superior position of women, moved into the foreground, and the Voice of Women began to deal with important issues less as mothers and women, and more as equal citizens and human beings. Promoting the idea that women could be equal citizens, the Voice of Women readily and easily became a participant in the more mainstream forms of the new nationalism.

Gender roles for women also affected which manifestation of the new nationalism the Voice of Women would find most attractive. The more popular forms of nationalism were represented by two very different movements that appeared in the 1960s and 1970s, one socialist and the other conservative. Conservative nationalism, best exemplified in the writings of George Grant, stressed that Canada needed to remain loyal to its British legacy and European virtues. Consequently, “Grant’s anti-modern nationalism rejected everything associated with American liberal modernity, from abortion to technology . . . leaving no place for progressive women.” Socialist nationalism, the main vehicle for which was the Waffle Group in the NDP, was
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intrinsically anti-imperialist, with much of its focus upon the American control of Canada.\textsuperscript{135} This socialist oriented form of nationalism advocated social justice in a manner similar to that of the Voice of Women.

The socialist branch of the new nationalism embraced many of the same goals as the Voice of Women. First, it argued that socialism connoted internationalism: all peoples must work together in a constructive manner through a sort of "republic of mankind."\textsuperscript{136} From its beginnings the Voice of Women had similarly advocated a stronger role for the United Nations in building peace. Nationalists such as Charles Taylor and Mel Watkins also argued that Canada must embrace the biculturalism of Canada, by working together with Quebec to remedy its grievances.\textsuperscript{137} The Waffle Movement, which took the issue of biculturalism further, supported the recognition of Quebec as an independent, sovereign nation.\textsuperscript{138} The Voice of Women, for its part, "urged the Canadian Government to adopt legislation to establish Canada as a bilingual and bicultural nation, in order that [the] two cultures may flourish together in peace and mutual respect."\textsuperscript{139} Indeed, its involvement with the matter went back to October of 1961 when it began publishing its newsletter in both French and English.\textsuperscript{140} Voice of Women members Gwethalyn Graham and Solange Chaput Rolland, one English and one French, penned a book titled \textit{Dear Enemies} (1963), which was a survey of the issues dividing the French and English in the hopes of creating tolerance and, ultimately, a bilingual national community.\textsuperscript{141} By 1971 the Voice of
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Women echoed socialist nationalism as it “unequivocally support[ed] the right of Quebec people to self-determination.”142 Similarities existed between socialist nationalism and the Voice of Women in other areas as well. Both focused upon the need for social justice for minorities, most notably First Nations. “[M]embers of the [Voice of Women],” a resolution in 1964 asserted, “concern themselves with civil rights of minorities . . . [p]articularly in [relation to] education, employment and housing.”143 In 1968, the organization supported “the Indians, Metis, and Eskimo peoples in their striving for full citizenship.”144 Thus, the new nationalist sentiment that was expressed through the framework of socialism mirrored many of the concerns within the Voice of Women. Common ground was not difficult to find.

The Voice of Women’s relationship to the socialist nationalist movement is also evident in the fact that Voice of Women leaders and members openly participated in the NDP and/or leftist groupings of other kinds. Casgrain, president of the Voice of Women from 1962-1963, often treated the Voice of Women and the NDP as if they were closely affiliated or even one organization.145 In the early 1970s Macpherson felt empathy with the NDP, though she “considered [her]self too left . . . to consider joining.”146 Realizing, however, that membership in a political party would enhance her chances of being elected to Parliament, she became a member of the NDP for pragmatic purposes. Macpherson’s left leanings are also reflected in her commitment to the Waffle movement. The movement, she believed, “seemed to present an inspired new hope for renewed socialism in the party [the NDP]: equality for women and a general progressive attitude.”147 Macpherson would go on to run in three elections as a
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representative of the NDP in the riding of York East. Another former president, Duckworth, would also run as an NDP candidate in the Halifax Cornwallis riding in which she lived. Though it is difficult to know the political orientations of many other members of the Voice of Women, the fact that its leadership was openly left and willing to participate as leftist in the political process is significant. After all, those leading the Voice of Women were often the ones guiding the organization’s direction because they were in a position - as its public face - to focus on whatever they wished.

The Voice of Women’s place in the new nationalism from the late 1960s onward is clear. The organization and its members, generally speaking, spoke out about the same issues and concerns as the mainstream proponents of nationalism. Initially, the Voice of Women’s concern over the perceived Americanization of Canada was shaped and formed by its desire for a maternal Canada. By the end of the 1960s, however, both its greater political focus and the shift in feminist politics drove it to change its orientation. That the new nationalism in its socialist incarnation spoke the same language as the new Voice of Women certainly made for a simpler transition. The shift to feminism from the first to the second wave of the women’s movement also helped, as it encouraged the Voice of Women and its members to participate in the political process as people who saw themselves as equal human beings, rather than maternal, nurturing and in a real sense limited.

The Voice of Women experienced a variety of changes during the 1960s and 1970s. Initially the organization was based upon a maternal justification, which echoed the suffragettes of the early twentieth century. Arguing that women deserved a voice in the affairs of the nation because of their maternal, nurturing attributes, the Voice of Women reconstructed feminine
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notions of Canada and Canadian citizenship. Macdonald and the Conservative party had, in the late nineteenth century, defined Canada as a weak, young and feminine nation in need of paternal protection, thus underscoring the marginal role of women in Canadian public affairs. The Voice of Women rejected the equation of feminine and weakness by arguing that females could be influential and strong, that, indeed, it was their identity as mothers that allowed and permitted this. The result: Canada was to be a nation guided by the virtues of motherhood, one that could become an international leader for peace.

As the Voice of Women became organized around its goal of a mother-inspired, nurturing, and peace-loving Canada, it quickly came to see the United States as the threat to its objective. Beginning with the issue of nuclear weapons and their place in Canada, the controversy over Bomarc missiles laid the foundation for the organization’s focus on American influence over Canada. When Pearson flip-flopped on nuclear weapons in 1963, the Voice of Women came to a cross roads in terms of its purpose. It could remain loyal to its maternal, non-partisan roots or it could move forward by becoming more politically active. Inspired by the feminist movement it became more political. As the 1960s progressed, issues such as NATO, NORAD, and the Vietnam war became the focus of the Voice of Women’s political activism. The organization also began to see the United States as racist, imperialist, and politically corrupt. As a result, the Voice of Women embraced a Canadian nationalism that placed great stress upon the necessity for increased independence from the United States.

The Canadian nationalism expressed by the Voice of Women was similar to the new nationalism that impacted Canada from the late 1960s onward. Generally speaking this new nationalism has been understood through its male proponents leaving the Voice of Women and women in general outside its scope and limits. Yet the Voice of Women was clearly a part of this
movement. Acting as a bridge between the first and second waves of the women's movement, the Voice of Women also functioned as a part of the new nationalism. Shifting its focus from maternalism to equality, becoming involved in a more nationalist opposition to the United States, it ended by becoming as central to the new nationalism as were Gordon, the Waffle, and the other ingredients of that still not fully understood movement.
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