

that de Gaulle was working toward liberation. In time, however, the government said they agreed with the aims of the movement but could not give official recognition to it. Arnold and de Miribel gave interviews on the radio, for the press, and their movement spread across the country, in spite of the propaganda that flowed into Quebec from the Vichy government. The propaganda said the Free French movement members were "soldiers of fortune, traitors and turncoats." If this were not enough, a Nazi agent named Fua came claiming he had orders from de Gaulle to remove Elisabeth from Canada and send her to the United States. In a short time the agent was removed by officials in Canada. This convinced the Free French members that they were getting sympathy from the Canadian government. After the Normandy invasion in 1944 that marked the beginning of France's liberation, the Free French movement was officially recognized.

Arnold returned to France in 1945 in order to observe the conditions and needs

of the people coping with the liberation. Many spoke of rebuilding the destroyed towns and cities. Arnold marvelled at the spirit of the French and their will to survive. They were happy the war was over and grateful that the Canadians had helped in Normandy, even at the cost of some French lives. In the opinion of the French, such was the price of liberty. The spirit that kept the resistance movement going at such great risk was enough to keep many alive. She saw women return from the concentration camps, heads hung low and shaved, only to die a short time thereafter. The only thing that had kept them alive was their spirit of survival. Other women met their fate at the Struthof concentration camp. Arnold travelled to Struthof and found the barber shop and a shed full of human hair, the ovens and the meat hooks: "I went to bed and tried to wipe away the scenes these terrible mute testimonies had conjured up in my mind. I could not."

Her story is a compelling one. Still I am saddened by Arnold's treatment of the

women in her story. On the one hand, she tells us of the many women who helped her in Paris, London and Canada, and yet, on the other, it is men like General de Gaulle that she says she greatly admired. The presence of women is obvious to the reader, but Arnold only names them. Nowhere does she identify a woman she admires, despite their help.

Arnold reflects on the war itself forty years after the events. She is angered by those who view the war with a cynical attitude or "with so-called objective judgements." To her the war was not just a struggle for territory, but a struggle for spiritual ideals and values. It was a time when people rose to meet tremendous odds with courage and selflessness. She does not say war is wrong, so much as imply that from her first-hand experience she can tell you what war is: what she saw and heard. Her story is worth the telling and the hearing because it is a personal account of one Canadian woman's attempt to help liberate the French from fascism.

"WHY DO WOMEN DO NOTHING TO END THE WAR?"

An essay by Barbara Roberts. Ottawa: CRIAW, 1985.

Milnor Alexander

The title "Why Do Women Do Nothing to End the War?" of Barbara Roberts' paper on Canadian feminist-pacifists and the Great War is a bit misleading. It comes from the part on Gertrude Richardson, whose columns in the *Canadian Forward* brought letters from readers, such as the woman who had nursed at the front and had heard dying soldiers cry out for their mothers. They asked their nurses, "Why do women do nothing to end the war?" Richardson appealed to the women of Canada to put an end to the horror that was claiming these men. But the point of this paper is to show how much women *were* doing to try to end the war. One *could* ask, "Why did *men* do nothing to end the war?"

Barbara Roberts explores the ideas and activities of four feminist-pacifist-socialists in this paper: Laura Hughes of Toronto, Francis Marion Beynon of Winnipeg, Violet McNaughton of Saskatchewan, and Gertrude Richardson of Swan River, Manitoba.

Laura Hughes was the niece of Sir Sam Hughes, a career soldier in charge of Canada's military effort during the Great War, and her activities were so embarrassing to him that he "offered her a half-section of prairie land if she would give up her interest in peace work." Needless to say, she didn't, and continued to be an organizer for the Canadian Branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF).

Francis Marion Beynon wrote for the Grain Growers Guide, and she was outraged by the increasing moral hypocrisy, injustice, and suffering she saw around her. She believed that the causes of war were economic and cultural: "imperialism motivated by greed, and the jingo nationalism so carefully propagandized at every level of society by the militarists." She lost her job and had to flee the country under possible threats to her life, but she continued her writing in farm and labour papers.

Violet McNaughton used her personal networks among the farm women's organizations, and her newspaper columns, to publicize women's peace proposals and link women on isolated prairie farms with the international feminist peace movement. She was less radical in her views than Francis Beynon, but she did

reprint some of Beynon's columns, even the one advocating conscription of *wealth* if the lives of young men were going to be conscripted.

Gertrude Richardson's columns in the *Canadian Forward* were the vehicle for her "International Women's Crusade" against the war. She equated militarism with slavery and imperialism, and she was dismayed at the churches' betrayal and distortion of the Christian message. Her main organizing device was a leaflet which women would sign as a pledge, and she suggested that women should send signed pledges to candidates as a lobbying device in the 1917 election. Here we are, 70 years later, doing much the same thing in the Canadian Peace Pledge Campaign!

Roberts concludes her excellent paper with a suggestion that we need more information about individual feminist pacifists in Canada in order to make some generalizations about the movement as a whole. She also questions the relation between motherhood as an experience and maternalism, feminism and pacifism as ideologies and social movements. Hers is an interesting paper, and one that should be required reading for all Canadian women in the peace movement.