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Introduction

As a comparatively recent and powerful category of historical research, masculinity continues to inspire new questions and inquiries by students of gendered relationships in the past. Masculinity historiography took shape in the 1990s, as the work of Raewyn Connell, Michael S. Kimmel, John Tosh, and others was quickly taken up by historians moving beyond studies of women and gender. This was a major advance in gender history, as a series of new questions, inquiries, and debates emerged from logical, if not inevitable, roots in studies of the mapping of women’s gender power in patriarchal societies. That it is today a fresh and vibrant field speaks to the multiple approaches that scholars have pursued and to the important fact that masculinity histories are plural and relational, even as they apply to the masculine power men exert over other men. They are constructed with crucial connections to place, class, ethnicity, life stage, health, expertise, and a matrix of varied power relationships shaped by historical context. Masculine categories emerge, as historians have taken pains to reveal, in the everyday flow of making gendered boundaries, and they do so in response to male identities that are communicated and experienced individually and collectively over time.

From the beginning, Canadian experiences of manhood and masculinity have been part of this conversation. Yet there have been few attempts to take stock of the major contributions or to outline directions for further discussion and research. Making Men, Making History seeks to fill that gap by offering both a wide-ranging, collective exploration of historical masculinities in Canada and a thematic framework in which to situate the ongoing work. Our project began as a call for submissions in 2012 and took shape over the next several years as we received proposals and invited authors to prepare and later revise their essays. From the outset, the goal was to identify emerging themes in masculinity history in Canada – specific directions in which this diverse and growing body of scholarship seemed to be heading. As the project progressed, we came to detect, define, and then refine the six themes that link the chapters and
structure the book; we have named them expertise and authority, masculine spaces, performing masculinities, boys to men, men in motion, and faces of fatherhood. The idea of “emerging themes” is by its nature a moving target, of course, especially for a project that has played out over a six-year span in which the scale of the enterprise has grown apace. Yet we are struck by the salience of these themes, which lend structure to a diverse body of scholarship and, we maintain, represent some of the major axes along which masculinity history in Canada has emerged and continues to flourish.5

We return to our six emerging themes toward the end of this introduction, where we present the twenty chapters that comprise this anthology. Before we get there, however, it is worthwhile to pause and consider some fundamental questions that will help to situate both this collection and the field of masculinity history as a whole. First, how has the category of masculinity been applied to the evidence of the past? Why was this a necessary project, one that emerged from women’s and then gender history? Second, and connected to this, how and why did masculinity as a category of human experience attract such a significant body of research? What has been its appeal, historiographically, as a relatively new category? Finally, by way of a brief status report, what is the current standing and reputation of the discipline, both in a wider context internationally and, for the purposes of this volume, in Canada?

Masculinity as a Category of Historical Analysis

The terms “masculinity,” “manliness,” and even “manhood” are comparatively modern, twentieth-century concepts when applied to widely held understandings of what it means to be a boy, or a boy becoming a man, or a man in society. Although the etymology of the English-language term “masculine” has roots in French usages of “masculinité” – which, as Sonya Rose notes, appeared in French dictionaries as far back as the mid-eighteenth century – language, rather than historical understandings, was dominated by distinctions of virility and manful power that stood in contrast to feminine traits.6 At the same time, and well into the twentieth century, much of the history written about nation and empire building or disintegration, about war and revolution, about race and conquest, and about the actors who moved such narratives forward overwhelmingly took the form of “manmade” historical accounts. The deeds of men were equated with the deeds of all history. Women, when they did appear, were embodied in notions of sexual difference; men were not. Men made history; history did not create men as a distinct category. “Mankind,” “man,” and “his” place in the universe were for historians, until recent times, conflated with historical change, pivotal events, and even society as a whole. From studies of men working in groups, often in productive ways, to the negative histories
of patriarchy, violence against women, or the new emphasis on “toxic masculinity” – which refers to the ways that patriarchy itself can be harmful to both men and women in terms of its predisposition toward violence, sexually aggressive behaviour, or unemotional detachment – significant new areas have opened up, prompting fresh readings of the evidence from the past.

Masculinities arise both in specific historical contexts and through their effects on the subjective experiences of particular communities that make up the wider social fabric. Since the rise of second-wave feminist scholarship, gender has been approached as a fluid construct, the outcome of power struggles that divide men from women, or more broadly the masculine from the feminine, which led to historical studies of masculinity in the first place. But a glaring oversight had long endured. By the 1990s, the time had come to introduce the specific category of masculinity into historical analysis. Men as men or boys as boys, as masculine beings, were now being approached more consistently as historically constituted, whether in relation to specific contexts or as the outcomes of struggles among masculine actors. In retrospect, a salient absence of masculinity analysis in much of the relevant literature prior to the 1990s should be placed on a historiographical timeline, one that starts with path-breaking studies on women’s history in the 1970s and leads toward gender history in the 1980s, before moving on to a growing number of key works on masculinity history by the end of the 1990s.⁷

Some concern among feminist historians was expressed, in these early years, that masculinity history would prove to be a continuation of men’s history, with little critique of patriarchy included.⁸ This seemed a legitimate worry. Too much of history had centred on the deeds of men; too much, as well, had been written by men. But it soon became obvious that masculinity scholars, especially those who focused on the power of patriarchy, were closely allied with feminist critiques and sensibilities. John Tosh’s work in England on the Victorian family and masculinity, Robert Griswold’s work in the United States on the history of fatherhood, and Raewyn Connell’s work in Australia on sociologically based theories of “hegemonic masculinity” led the way toward further scholarship in masculinity studies that was keenly aware of its conceptual roots in both women’s and gender history.

In assessing key works and advances internationally, we might begin with the first publication and edition of Lynne Segal’s *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men* (1990). In many respects, this book served as a feminist indictment of the exercise of masculine power by men in many roles: as absent fathers, as rapists, and as perpetrators of violence in both the home and public sphere. As a polemic, Segal’s work did two things: it identified areas where masculinity had run amok over the lives of women and children; and it shed
light on how this had been an outcome of an oppressive set of gender powers. In so doing, Segal’s work raised questions about how, precisely, masculinity as a category of human relationships can operate and can be improved. Beginning with examples drawn from the 1950s, she showed how men, as well as women, can fall victim to the enormous weight of masculine identities. “Sometimes in the life of every man,” Segal wrote in a chapter calling for the reconstruction of “good” fatherly practices, “the weight of male tradition must prove burdensome. We are now used to hearing of some of these burdens: men die younger than women; they are more prone to coronary disease; they find it difficult to seek help when they need it – regarding illness, for example, as a sign of weakness: something to be denied.” Segal also took pains to enter the debate over the making of masculinities by stressing their relational component, that making men masculine happens in relationship, or in response, to notions of the feminine, from womanly behaviours to the effeminate man castigated by his macho rivals. “To be ‘masculine,’” she wrote, “is not to be ‘feminine,’ not to be ‘gay,’ not to be tainted by any marks of ‘inferiority’ – ethnic or otherwise.” In an important way, Segal picked up on Natalie Zemon Davis’s insistence in much of her foundational work, taken up by feminist historians since, that women’s oppression has to be understood in the context of a masculine gender politics.

Masculinity, however, is often constructed without reference to femininity or to women at all. Competition to assert physical and mental competence, if not dominance, between men rather than between men and women, in fact, was one of the first areas to attract research, especially in studies of “manhood” (equated with acquiring the status of adult male behaviours according to widely accepted gendered ideals), which is but a part of the wider category of “masculinity” (equated with acquiring the status of being male at various ages according to gendered ideals). Mark C. Carnes and Clyde Griffen’s Meanings for Manhood: Constructions of Masculinity in Victorian America (1990), in examining industrializing societies across the social classes, recognized the importance of masculinity as a relational construct among and between men. In recognizing the roots of historians’ concerns with masculinity in feminist-inspired critiques of patriarchal societies, and the importance of relationships between the sexes, Carnes and Griffen sought to select works that “analyze the evolution of cultural definitions of what it means to be male,” often as a result of male associational life.

Meanings for Manhood drew from a growing number of gender historians who were then at the point of making significant contributions to masculine historical topics, scholars such as E. Anthony Rotundo, Robert Griswold, and Margaret Marsh. Constructions of masculinity took place, they recognized, wherever and whenever men came into association with each other. They also
highlighted the potential for insightful and revealing research on all-male net-
works of labour and leisure, or as they put it, essays that “focus on formal in-
stitutions, such as lawyers’ associations, psychiatric hospitals, fraternal orders,
or labor unions.”13 “The absence of essays on blacks and homosexuals,” they
wrote in introducing their anthology, “is glaring.”14 These early efforts, none-
theless, indicated key and inviting openings in the field that have now pro-
gressed considerably.15

American historians joined with a growing number of British and continental
scholars throughout the rest of the 1990s to map, survey, and present fresh work
in a field that was clearly on the rise by the end of the decade. Writing in the
mid-1990s, Kimmel pointed to the paucity of masculinity histories among the
work being produced at that time by many gender historians.16 This was a
significant gap in gender history but one that was rapidly closing, as indicated
for instance by the publication of Rotundo’s *American Manhood: Transformations
in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (1993). Rotundo offered
a compelling outline of changing definitions of American masculinity – with
attention paid to transitions from a communal sense of manhood in eighteenth-
century New England contexts to an individual sense of self-made manhood
in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries – and illustrations, from many parts
of the country, of how masculinity was experienced and shaped from boyhood
to manhood.17 By this time, insightful new approaches that centred on “hegem-
onic masculinity” were making their way into historical debates on masculinity
as a social category. Published in 1995, Connell’s *Masculinities* became famous
for its explication of this pivotal concept, which combined Antonio Gramsci’s
notion of “hegemony” as a process of class domination with the new attention
that patriarchal gender relations were receiving from a host of scholars. Connell
argued that “hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of
gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem
of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position
of men and the subordination of women.” It has never been seen as a stable
category of gender relations. As Connell conceived it, hegemony, or for that
matter hegemonic masculinity, “is a historically mobile relation.” Plotting its
“ebb and flow,” she argued, lent direction to her work.18

Meanwhile, Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall’s *Family Fortunes: Men
and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1850* (1987) had clearly broken
new ground as a study of both masculine and feminine identity formation dur-
ing a period of rapid change.19 What they saw as a salient retreat into “separate
spheres,” dividing men in the public worlds of work from women in the private
worlds of domestic home lives, established a basis for subsequent historians to
test the applicability of this defining structure for masculinity and femininity
in modernizing times, especially for the emerging middle class.\textsuperscript{20} Class, economic development, and the gendered politics of the family, in effect, connected private life to the public realm of the wider society. Victorian middle-class men came increasingly to identify with their breadwinning roles outside the home, whereas women came to identify with their nurturing function within it. “Masculine identity was equated with an emerging concept of ‘occupation,’ while women remained within a familial frame.”\textsuperscript{21} Although a narrowly deployed “separate spheres” approach to gender has attracted its critics, more nuanced and grounded assessments have followed since this work first appeared.\textsuperscript{22}

Writing from the United Kingdom, with a research foundation very much located in the same class- and ethnic-based materials (i.e., Protestant Victorian middle class) used by Davidoff and Hall, John Tosh emerged as one of the preeminent practitioners of masculinity history from its earliest days. Tosh praised \textit{Family Fortunes} as a key work, especially for its emphasis on the centrality, not merely the presence, of gender politics in class formation. “It is precisely because Davidoff and Hall structure \textit{Family Fortunes} around masculinity and femininity,” he observed, “that we now have a different view of the middle class in the early nineteenth century; their achievement is not to fill out the gender attributes of a class we already know about, but to place gender at the centre of class formation itself.”\textsuperscript{23} Tosh himself made a considerable contribution with \textit{A Man’s Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England} (1999),\textsuperscript{24} which was followed by his periodic reflections on debates in the field. In his work, Tosh emphasized the relational basis on which masculine boundaries and identities are formed, with the implication that historians should resist “the tendency to study masculinity in isolation.”\textsuperscript{25} This marked a turning point in broad acceptance of the relational aspects of masculinity. Among the prominent connections that must be considered are masculinity in relation to femininity; heterosexual masculinity in relation to homosexual masculinity; working-class masculinity in relation to middle-class masculinity; masculinity and race; and masculinity, nation, and empire.

Tosh embraced Connell’s concept of hegemonic masculinity, while acknowledging its limits when applied to all historical periods. But when consideration turns to the salience of patriarchy, particularly since the end of the nineteenth century, it is impossible to proceed without some notion of its historical presence and force. “Hegemonic masculinity,” Tosh argued, “is a convenient phrase because it reminds us that masculinity carries a heavy ideological freight, and that it makes socially crippling distinctions not only between men and women, but between different categories of men – distinctions which have to be maintained by force, as well as validated through cultural means.”\textsuperscript{26} Tosh also recognized that “any system of hegemony is by definition liable to insecurity.”\textsuperscript{27}
Threats to masculine hegemony imply threats to manhood altogether, something that much of the discourse of the modern era has confronted as a “crisis of masculinity,” especially but not exclusively since 1945.

Challenges to patriarchy and to virtually all forms of male privilege, from comparisons between boys’ and girls’ scholastic performance to the gender wars in contemporary political life, often attract the anxious cries of commentators who invariably ask the question “Whither masculinity? Whither modern boyhood or modern manhood?” As traditional forms of masculinity become blurred, what does it mean to be a “real man”? Often more manufactured than real, these “social panics” themselves reveal the significance and salience of very real gender power struggles; they also help to bring into focus the lines that are drawn around such all-encompassing historical trends as childhood and adolescence, immigration, colonization, industrialization, and globalization. The idea of a mid-century masculinity crisis in the United States, for instance, was addressed by James Gilbert in *Men in the Middle: Searching for Masculinity in the 1950s* (2005). Gilbert used societal fears of emasculated men as a launching point for individual chapters on the sociologist David Riesman, the sexologist Alfred Kinsey, the evangelist Billy Graham, the sitcom star Ozzie Nelson, and the playwright Tennessee Williams. “In some respects,” Gilbert wrote,

> gender malaise was deemed a national calamity during the 1950s and projected backwards into a reinterpretation of American history. It found innumerable expressions, first in the attack on powerful, emasculating mothers and women, then in a critical literature deploiring humiliating corporate work, fears of spies and homosexuals in government, distrust of youth and worries about juvenile delinquency, and a tense film culture which lionized war heroes, misfits, cowboys, and wandering poets.\(^{28}\)

Gilbert found that these stereotypes did not reflect a broader, richer, and in many ways more inspiring search for masculine authenticity carried out by his protagonists, who studied, acted, preached, and lived fully as masculine beings in a world that was indeed undergoing fundamental changes but not one that was leaving men behind.\(^{29}\)

Masculinity has now become a firm, arguably indispensable category that must be addressed in historical studies on topics ranging from local community formation and family life to imperial exchange and global transformation. Comparing dominant representations of masculinity with the evidence of lived experience has also attracted sustained interest, and historians now regularly assess both the signs and the practices that form the most striking discourses...
of masculinity in a given historical setting. In exploring the dissonance between representations of masculinity, on the one hand, and masculinity as lived experience, on the other, our contributors seek to reposition a variety of histories – from the social to the architectural, the professional, and the iconic – around the dynamics of being and becoming a man.

Canadian Masculinities

Canadian studies of manhood and masculinity began in the early 1990s and have maintained a constant and maturing output ever since. We can trace the origins of the current, multifaceted inquiry into Canadian masculinities back more than a quarter-century to the publication of Joy Parr’s *The Gender of Breadwinners* (1990), which widened the field of gender studies by centring it not just on women and work but on men and work as well. With her dual focus on female workers at Penman’s Limited, a knit-goods company in Paris, Ontario, and on male workers at Knechtel Furniture Company in Hanover, Ontario, over a long period of industrial change, Parr explored the relationship between gender formation and breadwinning. Parr pointed out that the “entitlements of the single fellow and the family man emerge as distinctively as those of man and woman, the behaviours of husbands and single girls as starkly different between the two communities.” In an essay published five years later, Parr pushed the feminist-inspired concept of hegemonic masculinities to embrace discussion of how “some masculinities are marginalized among the powerful.” With reference to class and racial identities, she observed that “whereas some masculinities are forged in relationships between men and women, others are defined by their difference from other masculinities.” Her entreaty was timely and has since resonated in subsequent research in Canada that continues to the present and has inspired many of the authors whose work is collected in this volume.

The emerging class- and ethnic-specific models of manhood that Andrew Holman, for instance, described for the southern Ontario Victorians he studied were calculated, measured responses to modernity – to the rise of professional expertise, to the norms of conformity and self-confidence, and to widely recognizable standards of self-aware behaviour, which ordinary middle-class men, as ideal exemplars, reinforced. These emerging masculine moderns exerted their power through expressions of competence, restraint, and resistance to temptations of the senses. They also displayed an ability to set goals directed at logical, often economic, ends. New norms for modern manhood seemed enshrined in the settled worlds of hegemonic masculinity associated with imperial nationalism and with the class-based and racial assumptions of the latter nineteenth century that served to justify it. But this could go only so far. Holman’s
comprehensive portraits of the Victorian middle-class man show that he projected a style of masculinity that in the first half of the twentieth century faced a series of disruptions that challenged the power of serene, purpose-driven, disciplined comportment. Victorian masculinity became outmoded when faced with terrifying displays of technology on the modern battlefields of the First World War, the rise of what George L. Mosse has called “fascist man,” anonymous forces that disrupted market exchange systems during the Great Depression, and the horrors of mass violence and death, which, by the end of the Second World War, had brought with them a disquieting realization of the fragility of civilization itself.

Beginning in the late 1980s, a growing number of historians in Canada embarked upon specific studies of work, leisure, and masculine camaraderie in various settings. Stephen Maynard’s essay “Rough Work and Rugged Men: The Social Construction of Masculinity in Working-Class History” (1989) helped to adjust the focus toward intersections of gender and work. While Maynard went on to complete studies of gay culture and history, and was joined in this work by Gary Kinsman, masculinity histories in Canada continued to map out the contours of both work and leisure. Thomas Dunk’s It’s a Working Man’s Town: Male Working-Class Culture in Northwestern Ontario (2003) is a good example. Joy Parr and Mark Rosenfeld’s ground-breaking collection Gender and History in Canada (1996) – by including Elizabeth Vibert’s study of masculinity evident in the Plains Buffalo hunt, Colin Howell’s work on early baseball in the Maritimes as a “manly” sport, and Stephen Penfold’s contribution on work and masculinity in the Cape Breton coalmines of the early 1920s – showcased the new interest that social historians of work and leisure were taking in masculinity. Along lines similar to Gail Bederman’s American-based study of masculinity and hunting cultures, Tina Loo’s sophisticated article “Of Moose and Men: Hunting for Masculinities in British Columbia, 1880–1939” (2001) offered a nuanced interpretation of the contrasting masculinities that hunting as sport imbued. Sportsmen constructed themselves as masculine and bourgeois, with identities that displayed both sexualized and racialized traits; their Indigenous guides, in contrast, displayed the characteristics of the Trickster figure and carried out their services on the basis of deceiving their prey. It was a complicated game of competing masculine powers.

Ceremonies, too, attracted renewed attention through the lens of masculinity. In an important article published in 2002 in the Canadian Historical Review, for example, Carolyn Podruchny examined the rituals of French Canadian voyageurs in the Montreal fur trade, showing how symbolic “baptism” ceremonies, involving a whiskey toast, were performed to confirm into manhood the novices who travelled with seasoned paddlers. Craig Heron’s 2005 study of
the increased restrictions on working men’s patronage of Hamilton’s public
drinking establishments also appeared in the Canadian Historical Review,
shining a similarly powerful light on masculinity, class, and drinking rituals.\textsuperscript{42} Julia Roberts’s Mixed Company: Taverns and Public Life in Upper Canada (2009)
extended consideration of drink and masculinity back to the first half of the
nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{43} Each is an excellent example of how masculinity was
deployed to explain the origins and patterns of male behaviour in particular
historical contexts. So, too, is Tim Cook’s 2013 study of the “trench slang” fa-
voured by men in the ranks of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, which took
seriously the swearing and related colloquialisms used by fighting men in the
horrific circumstances of trench warfare during the First World War.\textsuperscript{44}

Masculinity has also been associated with men’s responses to risk, particu-
larly in the workplace and in sport. It was obvious by the end of the horrors of
the Second World War that the \textit{risks} of modern – if not “mass” – society, defined
by unprecedented levels of industrial production and consumption and by the
unparalleled power of the state by 1945, would necessitate yet another set of
masculine responses, built around new notions of gendered conformity to
postwar conditions. Christopher Dummitt addressed these dynamics in The
Manly Modern: Masculinity in Postwar Canada (2007), an influential study of
the intersections of masculinity, risk, and modernity from the end of the
Second World War until the late 1960s. Regulatory bureaucracies to mitigate
myriad economic, workplace, and mass transit dangers – from veteran re-
establishment to mountain climbing, mental health and crime, and driving
accidents – were fashioned as masculine responses, “manmade” solutions to
“manmade” problems. “Canadians put men at the centre of the modernist
project,” Dummitt wrote.\textsuperscript{45} “Modern life created new risks and demanded a
great deal of trust in the engine of progress. One of the ways that this trust was
consolidated was by coding as masculine the expertise needed to ensure suc-
cessful risk taking and risk management.”\textsuperscript{46} Since bureaucratic, engineering,
and urban-planning measures required rational approaches to risk management
aimed at increasing public confidence and bolstering trust in new systems as
they came into being, they were inherently exercises of masculine endeavour.
They were, in short, the responses of the “manly modern.”

Recent work in Canada also demonstrates, as noted above in a broader context,
that manhood – the state of being or becoming a fully mature male – has to be
approached as a specific aspect of masculinity rather than as a synonym for
masculinity itself. Doing so recognizes, as Christopher Greig did in Ontario
that boyhood masculinity – the stages through which boys move from child-
hood to adolescence – presents an inviting opportunity for historians to explore
the perceptions and experiences of boyhood cultures in countless historical settings. With a focus on the postwar years, the same historical period in which Dummitt located the bulk of his work, Greig explored the ways that anxieties about boys’ growth and development in Canada’s largest province shaped public policy responses and much of the public discourse on boyhood.47 Fears of juvenile delinquency were expressed in combination with concern over a regression in educational standards and in youth recreational opportunities. Although girls were part of the picture, the prime focus was on boys. In this sense, the postwar “crisis of masculinity” was extended to include boys as well as men, although the problems of boys were seen as part of the challenge of dealing with what were considered normal or “ideal” growth and development. The framing of ideal boyhood was explicitly masculine in orientation, as educators and allied social reformers and commentators sought solutions to the perceived challenges that Ontario boys faced based on ideal conceptions of what it should mean to be a boy growing up in the postwar years.48

It has been more than a quarter-century since Parr’s *The Gender of Breadwinners* appeared. In that interval, the category of masculinity in history has assumed prominence across a considerable array of Canadian-based doctoral dissertations, historical monographs, and journal articles that investigate the gendered experiences of being or becoming a man. Masculinity research in Canada has reached a critical mass, so to speak, and the body of scholarship we have just described continues to inspire and inform further work in Canadian contexts. From earlier studies in Canada on work, family life, boyhood, and leisure, the contours of how masculinity has intersected with class, ethnicity, and the life cycle have begun to appear. This volume advances our understanding of this powerful category of analysis by undertaking to identify the areas of research currently attracting the most attention and to present fresh contributions in a widely accessible form. The time has come to consider the historical category of masculinity broadly in Canada, applying the most innovative research methods, from architectural analysis to oral history, in order to cast light on a wide spectrum of masculine experiences across time and place, from middle-class fathers raising their families in the suburbs to leather-clad bikers out on the road “raising hell.”

**Six Emerging Themes**

From the rugged paddlers of voyageur days and the buttoned-down company men of mid-twentieth-century Canada to a courageous Terry Fox in the 1980s, these men and the diverse constructions of masculinity they represent are the focus of this anthology. Except for two chapters that have appeared elsewhere in French, these are all entirely new contributions to the emerging field of
masculinity history, some by established scholars and others gleaned by younger historians from their recently completed dissertations. The theoretical and empirical groundwork laid by Connell, Tosh, Parr, Dummitt, and others has inspired and informed our authors; yet their questions, approaches, sources, and conceptual frameworks are as varied as their subject matter. Amidst this diversity, we have identified six emerging themes, connecting these chapters to each other and to new and innovative areas of masculinity dynamics in Canadian history.

Expertise and Authority
If certain constructions of masculinity are understood to be dominant in a given place and time, then others, whether based on race, ethnicity, social class, age, ability, sexual orientation, or something else, must necessarily be framed as secondary, subaltern, subjugated, or even oppositional. This is one of the key lessons of Connell’s path-breaking work on hegemonic masculinity and an important premise, as we shall see, for many of the chapters throughout this volume. The four assembled under the heading “Expertise and Authority” throw these dynamics into sharp relief, sharing as they do a focus on accomplished, powerful, generally white men: professionals, managers, and technical experts whose reputations and authority depended to a large extent on their ability to demonstrate expertise, judgment, and high ethical standards in their business and professional lives.

As Dummitt has emphasized, hegemonic masculinity in postwar British Columbia was wrapped up in discourses of professional and technical expertise, especially the effective management of risk. 49 This concern with expertise and risk management was shared, to at least some extent, by middle-class managers and professionals in other places and times in Canadian history, whereas the hegemonic masculinity of the later twentieth century stands in sharp contrast to the various and competing ways that medical manhood, for instance, was understood and performed in the mid-nineteenth century. In Chapter 1, Lisa Chilton shows this distinction in her study of the Quebec Marine and Emigrant Hospital, focusing on doctors like James Douglas, an accomplished hunter and angler who, as a physician, was widely recognized for his surgical skill, speed, and efficiency. But his many critics considered this the wrong set of manly qualities for a leadership role, in which “control of temper, good social judgment, and dignity without arrogance” might be more valuable. In Chapter 2, focusing on the same province but a century later, Magda Fahrni looks at risk-management discourses, organizations, and proponents in interwar Quebec. Her discussion of masculine expertise within the emerging accident-prevention
movement reveals a transitional situation, one in which the “reasoned expertise” of the high-modern postwar era “clearly coexisted with other forms of masculinity rooted in experience and on-the-job training.”

In Chapters 3 and 4, David Theodore and Cynthia Loch-Drake move us forward into the postwar years and offer fresh perspectives on the “manly modern” described by Dummitt, with its dominant tropes of technology and risk. Theodore’s essay is about a Canadian best known for his application of automation and Fordist principles to the design, construction, and management of hospitals. Theodore unpacks Gordon A. Friesen’s vision for the twentieth-century hospital, a project that both “prescribed a crucial role for women in a vast, mechanized, masculine architecture” and incorporated a “spiritual vision of care,” which has most often been missed in treatments of postwar, modernist masculinity. Conflicting expressions of male managerial authority are the focus of Loch-Drake’s chapter on the Alberta meatpacking industry after the Second World War. As with so many contributions to this anthology, the emphasis here is on individual men – in this case, the mid-level managers who implemented the directives of senior executives and who, most importantly for present purposes, represented “a technocratic ideal of middle-class masculinity” that accompanied and helped to legitimize the new technologies that so profoundly affected the power relations between capital and labour in this industry. We are a long way, of course, from the colourful and fractious Quebec City physicians of the previous century introduced by Chilton. These essays, nonetheless, are linked by their emphasis on patterns of leadership in the workplace, which drew on specific bundles of masculine characteristics and which certainly changed over time as the dynamics of patriarchy shifted from one generation to the next.

Masculine Spaces
From its inception, gender history has been replete with spatial metaphors, beginning with the “separate spheres” image used by Davidoff and Hall, among many others, to describe men’s and women’s gendered roles and identities. The ideological and cultural distance between a male-dominated public sphere and a private sphere peopled and managed largely by women often corresponds to a physical boundary, such as the exterior wall of a private home. Gender historians, however, have usually been more interested in socially and ideologically constructed spaces and boundaries than in those built of bricks and mortar. Yet there is room, we submit, for a more physical reading of the history of gendered space, some exciting examples of which can be drawn from the neighbouring disciplines of architectural history and historical geography.
By studying the physical spaces designed and occupied by particular groups of men, especially for work and leisure, we can learn much about the particular sets of gendered ideals that informed their conception and use. These masculine spaces must certainly include the stately men’s clubs examined here by Annmarie Adams in Chapter 5, which adroitly juxtaposes gender and social class while revealing a particular concern with the ways that historians can move beyond spatial metaphors in order to “link real architectural spaces with changing cultures of masculinity.” The contemporary mining and logging camps discussed by Norman Knowles in Chapter 6 were as distant as one can imagine, in social and economic terms, from the grand private clubs of Montreal’s famed Square Mile. Yet in the Canadian context, it would be difficult to find a more quintessentially masculine space, one with its own mix of class, ethnic, and religious dynamics and one where rough and respectable notions of appropriate manhood were in constant contact and competition. The study of masculine space in Canada, furthermore, must surely attend to all manner of bars, taverns, and nightclubs, from Joe Beef’s iconic canteen on the Montreal waterfront to the late-twentieth-century gay bars of the same city, as Olivier Vallerand reminds us in Chapter 7. Although the contrast with the private clubs of the Square Mile is dramatic, the focus persists on same-sex sociability in leisure spaces reserved for men but defined now in terms of sexual orientation – and, increasingly, the politics of sexuality – rather than social class.

Performing Masculinities
Since the 1990s, Judith Butler’s thesis about the performative character of feminine and masculine identities has been part of the stock-in-trade of gender studies across North America and beyond. Butler’s ideas are complex and their implications far-reaching. But her key insight – that “gender reality is created through sustained social performances” – can be stated quite simply and is all the more powerful and influential for that reason. From this perspective, masculinity involves an active process of performing attributes and expectations that are coded male. That these characteristics vary from place to place, among social classes and ethnic groups, and across time – both over the life course and through historical time – makes their study all the more rewarding for historians. As with the best new work on ethnicity, the essays in this section reveal that masculine identities must be performed – like the traditional German folk songs performed during the lager-enlivened singing festivals of nineteenth-century Waterloo County – in order to be real and meaningful and, indeed, to be understood or decoded by others.

Taken together, these four contributions remind us that the performative character of Canadian masculinities – hegemonic and otherwise – must be
studied in a wide range of temporal, social, and cultural settings. In Chapter 8, aptly titled “Scales of Manliness,” Jane Nicholas’s examination of the performance of a particular nonhegemonic masculine identity – that of little people on display in the fairgrounds and sideshows of twentieth-century Ontario – leads her to some fascinating insights, especially as she juxtaposes physical stature with gender expectations. Nicholas reveals how “midget” scripts and identities were framed by the familiar tropes of family, ethnicity, and social class. In Chapter 9, Allan Downey develops similar themes with respect to racialized men, describing how Aboriginal lacrosse players in British Columbia reappropriated an activity that was imposed on them by British Canadian colonizers. Ultimately, the Skwxwú7mesh people took pride in the sport’s Iroquoian origins and absorbed it into their own culture, at a time when the Indigenous traditions of their own region, the potlach in particular, were under attack. In Chapter 10, Willeen Keough explores three distinct expressions of contemporary “eco-masculinity” in late-twentieth-century anti-sealing campaigns, revealing another set of competing but complementary masculinities, the performance of which – whether out on the Labrador pack ice or in the glare of television lights – could be dramatic indeed. Finally, in Chapter 11, Eric Fillion introduces readers to a little-known group of nationalist jazz musicians whose unbridled improvisations provided a metaphor and a distinct voice for their utopian project of a politically and socially liberated Quebec. Especially through the performance of their music and their communal lifestyle, the members of Petit Québec libre offered an unexpected critique of the breadwinner-homemaker model and of the dissipated, often violent, politically inert working-class masculinities that they explicitly located in one of the province’s most sexist institutions: the tavern.

Boys to Men

Youth, particularly the emotionally fraught passage from boyhood into manhood, is a time of life where the weight of social and cultural expectations can be intense, not least around what Christopher Greig calls standards of “appropriate” masculinity. Yet youth and its associated physical grace, strength, and beauty, as Julie Perrone reminds us in her chapter on Terry Fox, are also key elements in many constructions of an ideal masculinity. This is especially the case for those variants – and they are legion – that emphasize athleticism and physical ability, whether in an attempt to run across the country on a prosthetic leg or on the field of battle, as with the returning veterans of the Second World War studied by Patricia Jasen. So the fourth part of this anthology explores youthful masculinities, focusing in particular on twentieth-century performances, expressions, and experiences – anxious, heroic, and otherwise – of
boyhood, adolescence, and nascent manhood. It begins with Louise Bienvenue and Christine Hudon’s exploration in Chapter 12 of three coming-of-age novels of the 1920s and 1930s. These works share not only a focus on male adolescence but also a common setting, as each of the protagonists has been a student at one of Quebec’s classical colleges. The authors situate this chapter within their broader exploration of identity formation in these all-male educational spaces, where the sons of the French Canadian elite were trained not just in literature, history, and catechism but also in a particular code of Catholic, middle-class masculinity. From interwar Quebec and its boarding schools, the focus then shifts westward to Windsor, Ontario, forward several decades to the post-war era, and from novels to another kind of story altogether. Chapter 13 is built around Christopher Greig’s oral-history interviews with nine men who grew up in this working-class factory town in the immediate postwar years of 1945–1960. Their memories of boyhood are rich in detail and interconnected through masculine tropes such as aggression, sports, independence, and freedom – in this case, symbolized by the bicycle – but also through fears and anxieties rooted in “the intensified homophobia of the postwar period.”

The tension between postwar ideals and anxieties is also present in Jasen’s discussion of student veterans of the Second World War. In Chapter 14, however, the narrative is about returning soldiers negotiating the transition from the heroic, hyper-masculinity of the victorious fighting man to the “normalcy” of civilian manhood, specifically as university students preparing for white-collar careers while benefiting from the educational provisions of the Veterans Charter. Another, more recent expression of youthful, heroic masculinity, finally, is at the heart of Chapter 15, where Perrone looks at the commemoration of Terry Fox and his 1980 Marathon of Hope. Her insight here is to approach Fox’s heroism through the process of its construction – that is, through a broad range of commemorative tributes, including books, articles, films, physical monuments such as statues and postage stamps, and much more – with an emphasis on the particular masculine archetype that the Marathon of Hope reflected and revealed.

Men in Motion
Terry Fox was also the quintessential “Man in Motion,” although the phrase itself is associated with another Canadian athlete, Rick Hansen. The active tropes of travel, movement, exploration, and adventure are certainly coded male in Canadian history and culture, whether linked to the selflessness and courage of Fox and Hansen pushing their bodies for medical research in the 1980s, to the young boys of the 1950s exploring the streets, parks, and vacant lots of towns like Windsor on their cherished two-wheelers (CCMs, Gliders,
and Raleighs), or to the beat nihilism of a Jack Kerouac, the son of French Canadian parents born in 1920s Massachusetts, whose iconic 1957 novel *On the Road* is evoked so often in our culture, including in the title of Graeme Melcher’s chapter on outlaw motorcycle clubs in postwar Ontario. Performing a surprisingly wide range of masculinities through movement and travel, or taking Canadian manhood “on the road,” is another emerging theme for Canadian scholars working in this area. As the authors in this part of the book show, the social, cultural, and political meanings attached to a long paddle, a raucous road trip, or a self-imposed exile can be as compelling as the journeys themselves.

The travellers examined here used the transportation technologies of their time – from the birchbark canoes of the fur trade era discussed by Carolyn Podruchny in Chapter 16 to the customized “choppers” and “bobbers” ridden by the bikers Melcher discusses in Chapter 18 – reminding us of another strong connection evoked in other chapters in this collection as well, namely between men and their machines. Central to biker culture was an idealized masculinity that, as with the voyageurs, had more to do with physical power, individual merit, disdain for authority, and personal freedom than with, in the case of the bikers, the postwar, middle-class, domestic, and white-collar masculinities against which these road warriors were rebelling so loudly. The northward journey of the draft dodgers discussed by Lara Campbell in Chapter 17, similarly, was widely understood as an act of rebellion against the power of an American “establishment” that embodied hegemonic masculinity every bit as much as it did wealth, racial whiteness, or political conservatism. In this way, they were not unlike Fillion’s revolutionary-nationalist jazz heads; they shared an era, a rebellious spirit, and a willingness to hit the road with Melcher’s outlaw bikers – although as peace-loving members of the Woodstock generation, they performed their masculinity quite differently.

**Faces of Fatherhood**

Canadian masculinities, finally, can be located in domestic settings as profitably as they can in the country’s workplaces and clubs, in its fields and streams, or on its streets and highways. Toward that end, scholars currently use a variety of sources and methodologies to focus on the full range of experiences associated with fatherhood in this country. Gone are the days when the study of fatherhood could be conflated with a kind of “recovery effort” for neglected and embattled family men, overwhelmed by the weight of their responsibilities and in need of greater understanding, including by historians. Today’s approaches are richer, more varied, and more attentive to persistent patriarchal power than this assessment would have allowed. They include efforts to understand the shifting ideologies and prescriptions that underlie widely circulated discourses
around men as parents, as with Chapter 19 by Peter Gossage on the rise of Father's Day celebrations in Quebec. They also include textured studies grounded in oral history and life writing, such as Robert Rutherford's discussion in Chapter 20 of failed fatherhood in postwar Canada, seen through the particularly troubling lens of alcoholism. The contrast between these two chapters illustrates both the range of experiences and narratives that can be included under the heading “Canadian fatherhoods” and the scope for continued study along several promising avenues in this area.

Running through all six themes and all twenty chapters, finally, are the constant tensions and interactions between hegemonic ideals on the one hand and personal, everyday experiences and narratives on the other. There is a sense, then, in which all of the essays in this volume invite reflection and discussion about ideal masculinity. The general notion that an ideal of Canadian manhood might exist somewhere in the popular imagination will create a dissonance for many – just as we were flummoxed in 2004 when the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation asked us to vote on the greatest Canadian of all time. This was not explicitly, of course, a poll about Canada’s great men – although it may as well have been given that only four women, Laura Secord and three singers (Shania Twain, Céline Dion, and Avril Lavigne), made it into the top fifty. But it makes a useful point about masculine ideals just the same: that there is nothing fixed or monolithic about them and that, depending on the context, the rough, testosterone-driven pugnacity of a Don Cherry (ranked seventh) is perhaps as likely to be deemed an “ideal” masculinity as the calm, principled, and approachable paternalism of a Tommy Douglas (ranked first).

At the same time, the agency expressed by individual men and boys in the conduct of their own lives and in the performance of their identities as men and boys is one of the strongest recurring motifs in this entire anthology. *Making Men, Making History*, in other words, is really about the nineteenth-century fur trader and recorder of extraordinary voyageur tales Alexander Ross; the Montreal architect, fisherman, and Olympic fencer Percy Nobbs; the Skwxwú7mesh residential school survivor, athlete, and lacrosse promoter Andy Paull; the reluctant and insecure Alberta slaughterhouse manager Bill McLean; the intrepid schoolteacher Henry Ferguson, also from Alberta, whose life of financial insecurity and domestic tension ultimately dissolved into alcoholism and liver disease; the radical nationalist jazz musician and utopian commune member Yves Charbonneau; and the interview subject identified only as “James” who grew up black and gay in postwar Windsor, surrounded by racial prejudice and homophobia. Who were these men, and how did they come to understand and perform their identities as men at various times and places in Canadian
history? These are the questions that inform and propel this project as much as any other. We have been privileged to get to know these men, and dozens of others, through the talented and thoughtful work of our contributors. It is a privilege that we value deeply and are now most pleased to share with a broader readership.
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