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Abstract

Ottawa’s Confederation Square was initially planned to be a civic plaza to balance the nearby federal presence of Parliament Hill. A century of federal planning, with the direct involvement of Prime Minister W.L. Mackenzie King, repositioned it as a national space in the City Beautiful style. Recent renovations have improved its pedestrian amenity and restored much of the original plan by French urban designer Jacques Gréber. The square contains the National War Memorial and the National Arts Centre, yet is a weak public space due to weak edge definition, animation, and spatial enclosure. The war memorial design was selected in a 1925 international competition won by Britain's Vernon March. The Great War monument was not installed until the 1939 Royal visit, and Mackenzie King intended that the re-planning of the capital would be the World War II memorial. However, the symbolic meaning of the Great War monument gradually expanded to become the place of remembrance for all Canadian war sacrifices. The National War Memorial is more successful as a symbolic object than Confederation Square is as a public space, yet both have evolved into important elements of the Canadian capital’s national identity.
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Introduction

Ottawa’s Confederation Square is the product of a century of nation-making, capital-making, and city-making. This exercise in place-making is a result of the conflation of several important and interconnected processes: urban re-development, national capital planning, and commemorative memorialization. Thus, Confederation Square is the site of two powerful symbols of national commitment.
and sacrifice: the National War Memorial and the recently consecrated Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Its very name recalls the constitutional origins of the nation-state. It stands in the shadow of Canada’s Parliament buildings, overlooked by many of the statues of founding figures that make ‘the Hill’ a veritable national pantheon of heroes. It is also located at the vibrant centre of Ottawa’s downtown (Fig. 1). Taken together, it may be claimed that Confederation Square is not only emerging as the centre of Ottawa, but also as the symbolic centre of an imagined and performed Canada.

Of course, for much of Canada’s history the problem has been how to imagine this complex place. In an age of increased recognition of the social and political verities of multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism, and hybridity it behoves us to remember the challenge posed by diversity for past nation-builders. From Confederation to well into the 20th century, Canada has contended with the geo-political challenges posed by its great continental extent and propinquity to an ‘imperial’ power to the south. Social and political fragmentation was long assured by the presence of a marginalized aboriginal population, a conquered minority that sustains a vibrant French–Canadian identity, and a multicultural population that has become increasingly diverse by generations of global immigration. And all of this was sensitised by the maintenance of links to a British monarchy and empire. Initially, Canada attempted to minimize, if not actually overcome, these obstacles by establishing a unitary model of a nationalized-state that was blatantly inclusive of putative core-values. Further, Canada has tinkered with constitutional arrangements from Confederation’s British North America Act (1867), to the emancipating terms of the Statute of Westminster (1931), and culminating in the repatriation of political autonomy by the Constitution Act (1982). These steps along the path of state-making were accompanied by a concomitant nurturing of a sense of distinctive identity in the minds of the people.
And this is where Ottawa fits in: the melding of the political with the symbolic. In the early years of turning Ottawa into the ‘Washington of the north,’ the chief objective was the construction of a capitol complex and grounding it in the national imagination. Buildings, monuments, and ceremonies were effective agencies of national cohesion behind the perimeter of the cast-iron fence surrounding the Hill. But the task of producing a city appropriate for the capital function was more problematical. This was certainly the case for the district that became Confederation Square. Despite its proximity to over a century of nation-building and capital planning, it long reflected the functional, vernacular, and prosaic role of a city centre rather than the symbolic focus of a capital-city.

One man was most influential in overcoming this. Over a 20-year period, Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King directed the re-conceptualization of this important space centred on the National War Memorial. Indeed, he regarded it as one of his greatest personal achievements. King joined the Canadian civil service in 1900 and advanced to the rank of Deputy Minister at the astonishingly young age of 26. Shortly after his arrival, his secretary and closest friend, Henry Harper, drowned in a valiant, albeit futile, attempt to save a young woman in the Ottawa River. King was devastated by his personal loss, inspired by his friend’s heroic death, and determined to ensure his sacrifice would not be forgotten. Accordingly, he led the campaign for a monument to Harper’s heroic death. The statue, ‘Sir Galahad’, was erected just outside the gates to Parliament Hill. King wrote a small book, *The Secret of Heroism*, to celebrate Harper’s romantic chivalry. These actions provided insight into King’s intellectual and emotional make-up, and also provided him with experience in memorialization. Both were to resonate throughout his interventions in planning a capital worthy of Canada and a National War Memorial worthy of her military heroes of the Great War.

Indeed, for much of the 20th century, the planning of Ottawa—and of Confederation Square in particular—was much influenced by King’s sensitivity to, and cultivation of, the national imagination. In particular, he blatantly manipulated the national identification with wartime sacrifices and the evocative power of the symbolic commemoration of the ‘blooding’ of the nation in global conflict to further his mission of building a capital suitable for a nation that was shedding the last of its colonial ties. While often couched in the more prosaic terms of urban re-development and national capital planning, for King and his supporters, the development of the nation’s capital was inseparable from the sentiments prompting the erection of the National War Memorial. This is the theme of this paper.

**National capitals as ‘memory places,’ theatres of identity**

One of the principal strategies of nationalising in overcoming internal difference and plural imaginations is to construct a cohesive collective memory and associate the state with a national ‘symbolic space’. Ever since Confederation, Canada’s ongoing project of nation-building has been accompanied by the growth of state power and the consolidation of territory. What has been more difficult, however, has been the nurturing of a sense of a shared identity and destiny. Such national cohesion requires a sense of collective memory of the past and mission for the future; a national consciousness that has been consolidated within the political framework of a centralized state. Clearly, the development of the national-state involves more than occupying the land, integrating it by transportation and communication systems, and asserting a centralized system of political power. In particular, the *idea* of the nation-state has to be nurtured through symbolic identification with an
‘imagined community’ and ‘collective memory’ through foundation myths and heroic narratives, and the identification with particular places.

The construction of a ‘capitol complex’ has always been a central strategy for nation-builders. Apart from the prosaic function of hosting the national government, the ‘capitol complex’ is intended to be a symbolic focus which consists not only of the capitol/parliament building itself, but also all of the other structures which are intended to be an imposing evocation of the dignity and power of the state. It communicates the ‘government visually to the governed’. To do so, states render the symbolic bases of their power through ritualized mass gatherings performed in specially constructed ‘new ritual spaces’. Ottawa had no space of this kind, save for the lawns and courtyards enclosed by the Parliament Buildings. Throughout the late 19th century, capitals such as London, Paris, Berlin, and Washington constructed landscapes of sovereignty suitable for choreographing the theatricals of state power. They became ‘ceremonial cities’ places where city space was appropriated by the ‘democratic public sphere’ through arrays of didactic monuments, imposing state architecture, and recognizable ceremonial venues in a ‘frenzy of the visible’.

Monumental sculpture has long served as an appropriate device for rendering allegorical statements of national values and national chronicles, and it is not surprising that ‘Statuemania’ flourished in Europe and North America in 1870–1914, a period of romantic nationalisms. Intended to function as visual prompts for the collective memorizing of official state narrative, capitol complexes incorporated pantheons of heroic figures into the public grounds and ceremonial spaces. Some monuments were accompanied by texts, but most relied upon the depiction of the human form: colossal heroic statues, bas-reliefs, and female allegories of abstract principles. According to Wolfgang Braunfels, ‘One cannot build for strangers; history cannot be planned in advance; what is necessary needs aesthetic exaggeration’. To this end, there were certain requirements for didactic public architecture and sculpture:

- It must be rigorous, of spare, clear, indeed classical form. It must be simple. It must have the quality of ‘touching the heavens’. It must transcend everyday utilitarian considerations. It must be generous in its construction, built for the ages according to the best principles of the trade. In practical terms, it must have no purpose but instead be the vehicle of an idea. It must have an element of the unapproachable in it that fills people with admiration and awe. It must be impersonal because it is not the work of an individual but the symbol of a community bound together by a common ideal.

If effective, public monuments were consensus builders. They were focal points for identifying with a shared past, representing an agreed upon national chronicle, and served as a record of heroic accomplishments, acts, sacrifices, and achievements. In short, as visual condensations of the past, public monuments are supposed to be stable and conservative fixtures in the material and cognitive landscape, they ‘attempt to mold a landscape of collective memory, to conserve what is worth remembering and discard the rest’. Consciously intended to be the focal point of the public gaze, the siting of these heroic pantheons underscore the symbolic role of capitol-capital complexes. They became populated by a cast(e) of heroic personae dramatis—mostly male—who had been cast in bronze and elevated on pedestals to commemorate their leading role in the historical theatre of national history. Politicians, jurists, churchmen, explorers, and military men became frozen figures in the panoply of the national chronicle.

This particularist and elite perspective on commemorating national meta-narratives was challenged, however, by the logistics of death and the populist power associated with modern war. If it is true that
‘nations make war, wars make nations’, then certainly there is much to suggest that war memorials do much to construct national identities. The Crimean War, the United States’ Civil War, the South African War, and, most especially, The ‘Great War’—World War I—generated a new culture of commemoration. No longer the domain of the professional soldier, the scale and conduct of modern warfare meant that it had an impact on the lives of the nation as a whole. Few families were untouched by sacrifices. The suffering had been immense. During the war, a barrage of xenophobic and patriotic propaganda had sustained public participation. Following the war, the celebration of victory was muted somewhat by the recollections of horrendous suffering and sacrifice, attended by a not insignificant popular realisation that it had been a futile and unnecessary exercise in power politics. For the nation-state, therefore, the post-war mission was to incorporate the war into the national agenda of identity construction by centrally coordinated programmes of memorialization, commemoration, and ritualized performance.

Establishing a centre for Ottawa: Connaught place, 1912–1918

If Parliament Hill was becoming established as the symbolic centre of the body politic, Ottawa had a long way to go to capture the national imagination. It lacked a cohesive image. It lacked places of public concourse and processional routes that would accommodate the exercise and displays of performed sovereignty. It lacked a concept that would integrate the political presence with the material form of the total setting of the capital and facilitate the public gaze on the visual expressions of power in an age of pageants and state occasions. What it did have was quite inadequate. Even before Ottawa was selected as the seat of government in 1857, the intersection of Wellington Street and the Rideau Canal—the site of the present Confederation Square—was the most important node in Ottawa. The town-site developed by its founder, Lt. Col. John By, in the 1820s, was divided by the new Rideau Canal, with the largely Protestant, English-speaking Upper Town to the west and the Catholic, French-speaking Lower Town to the east. Wellington and Rideau Streets were the baselines of the two grids. They met at the only bridge over the canal, the Sapper’s Bridge, built by the engineers c. 1830. From the outset, therefore, the site was marked by social division rather than ideological cohesion, and by the pragmatics of function rather than imagination.

However, Wellington Street became even more important after the Parliament Buildings were completed in 1865 on the Crown Lands at Barracks Hill. Ottawa prepared itself for its new role as national capital. By 1870, the capital function had been established at three sites: Parliament Hill, Major’s Hill Park, and Rideau Hall, the governor general’s residence, located several miles to the northeast. There was a demand for even more space as Canada expanded both its territory and attendant bureaucracy—and a more powerful visual presence in the eyes and minds of the people. To aid this task, attention was also directed to the public grounds surrounding Parliament. Gradually, they became populated by an array of political figures in poses appropriate to their roles as monarchs, ‘Fathers of Confederation’, and Prime Ministers: Sir Georges Etienne Cartier (1885); Sir John A. Macdonald (1895); Queen Victoria (1901); Alexander Mackenzie (1901); George Brown (1913); Robert Baldwin and Sir Louis-H. Lafontaine (1914).

However, beyond the immediate precincts of Parliament Hill, the capital was a mess. Although Wellington Street was initially the boundary between ‘crown and town’ federal offices soon spilled over to its south side to appropriate much of it for the federal government. Accordingly, Sparks Street became
the main commercial street of Upper Town, connected by a bridge to Rideau Street, Lower Town’s main thoroughfare. This offset pattern continued for over a century, reinforced by the introduction of an electric streetcar route along Rideau and Sparks Street in the 1890s (Fig. 2). The tangle of infrastructure was worsened by the introduction of a railway along the east bank of the Rideau Canal in the late 19th century. In 1912, the main station for the Montreal line was expanded into a true Union Station, thus consolidating the location’s role as a traffic nexus. Clearly, these developments were not in harmony with the grand plans being executed nearby on the Hill. In 1899, the federal government appointed the Ottawa Improvement Commission to create a city worthy of a capital, and a capital worthy of the nation. Thus, the preliminary landscape plan prepared in 1903 by Frederick G. Todd recognized that ‘the scheme for parks and general improvements for the Capital must be of a national character...commensurate with the importance of the Capital City of the Dominion’. He added, ‘[a]s a Capital city,
the parks and open spaces should be numerous, and ample boulevards and parkways should skirt the different waterways, as well as connect the principal parks and the different public buildings.28

There was some evidence of developments appropriate for a city with aspirations. The construction of the Union Station was accompanied by the opening of the new Château Laurier hotel across the street. In 1912, it was one of the leading examples of the new railway hotels being erected across the country, each featuring a distinctive architectural design that was coming to be known as a ‘national style’.29 That year finally saw the replacement of the two narrow bridges across the canal with one larger structure. The deck between the bridges was named Connaught Place, after the Governor General of the day, and a public space—albeit a tiny one—became available at the heart of civic Ottawa.

From the beginning, Connaught Place was a congested area. The addition of the new hotel and station to the existing post office, Russell House Hotel, and City Hall a block to the south had turned Connaught Place into a traffic snarl. The first major attempt to confront this problem was made by Chicago architect, Edward Bennett, in the 1915 report of the Federal Plan Commission Report, chaired by Herbert Holt.30 Bennett’s classic ‘City Beautiful’ plan for Ottawa and Hull called for a central municipal plaza (Fig. 3) produced by further decking over much of the Rideau Canal to create a much larger public square there.31 It was intended to be the civic heart of Ottawa, balancing the federal presence on Parliament Hill. Bennett’s plan also opened up a diagonal vista of the picturesque neo-gothic ensemble on the Hill. However, the plan was not realized. The outbreak of the Great War in 1914 and the fire in the Centre Block of Parliament in 1916 both served to deflect government’s attention from the ambitious FPC report.32 However, over the next 50 years, successive plans attempted to pursue this initiative to untangle

Fig. 3. Edward Bennett’s plan for an Ottawa municipal plaza. Source: Federal Plan Commission 1916, Drawing 5, rendering by Jules Guérin.
the knot of infrastructure at Connaught Place to make a better public place in the heart of the city. Ironically, while interfering with Bennett’s plan, the Great War—together with the focussed imagination of William Lyon Mackenzie King—was to be the catalyst for implementing change.

Placing a National War Memorial, 1918–1930

While Bennett’s plan sat on the shelf after the Great War, the Chairman of the Ottawa Town Planning Commission, Noulan Cauchon, prepared several schemes for Connaught Place. His designs attempted to sort out the conflicting traffic movements on the site, using small-scale improvements typical of the City Scientific school of planning. By the late 1920s, Cauchon developed larger plans that accommodated the siting of the proposed National War Memorial connected by a dramatic ‘Vimy Way’ (Fig. 4). From 1926 to 1928, Cauchon’s plans for an imposing memorial in an enlarged Connaught Place fell on deaf ears. The OTPC had neither the authority nor the funds to implement them. More importantly, the Prime Minister had grander plans and was determined to carry them out.

But first, there was the need to decide on the appropriate means of commemorating Canada’s wartime role. The campaign to embed the ‘Great War’ into the nation’s collective memory moved forward on two fronts. At the local level, communities were advised that it was essential that war memorials should ‘embody and make plain to the present and future generations, that spiritual quality of noble sacrifice
which above all else they should commemorate’. There was no shortage of ideas by which this could be achieved: fountains, public buildings, flag-staffs, murals, tablets, stained glass windows, obelisks, crosses, and realistic renderings of heroic figures. Others preferred the prosaic and utilitarian to the symbolic and representational and favoured such philanthropic projects as scholarships, hospitals, and community centres. Thus, an initial plan in 1919 called for the construction in Ottawa of a Memorial Hall to hold some 2000–4000 persons. A select committee including British planner Thomas Adams and Noulan Cauchon recommended that the Holt Commission plan be ignored, and the auditorium be built beside City Hall. At the national level, of course, the focus was on a structure whose mass and allegorical form communicated the power and sense of common purpose of a united people. Indeed, there were two: one at Vimy Ridge in France and the proposed National War Memorial in Ottawa. For Vimy, a patriotic gaze that looked back to France and the site and events of that nation-forming battle dictated the location. For the National War Memorial in the capital, a no-less patriotic gaze that looked to the monument’s role in the nation’s future influenced the proposed site in Connaught Place. It was to be part of a concerted effort to enhance Ottawa’s image as a truly national capitol-capital complex.

This was quite evident in the terms of reference for the ‘National Commemorative War Monument’ released by the Minister of Public Works in February 1925. The design competition was open to architects, artists, and sculptors who were British subjects or citizens of her Allies during the Great War. The government gave a budget of $100,000 and explicit directions on the spirit and purpose of this important project. It was to be ‘expressive of the feelings of the Canadian people as a whole, to the memory of those who participated in the Great War and lost their lives in the service of humanity’. As if in recognition of the complexity of the post-war reaction to the Great War, the government terms of reference walked the narrow line between humility and self-righteous vindication and urged a representation that commemorated sacrifice for a better world. It was to render,

…the spirit of heroism, the spirit of self-sacrifice, the spirit of all that is noble and great that was exemplified in the lives of those sacrificed in the Great War, and the services rendered by the men and women who went Overseas; it is that vision which the Government wishes to keep alive in erecting a monument of this kind.

But, at the same time, the monument should not,

…glorify war or suggest the arrogance of a conqueror. While the spirit of victory is essential it should be expressed so as to not only immortalize Canada’s defenders, but convey a feeling of gratitude that out of this great conflict a new hope has sprung for future prosperity under peaceful conditions.

Certainly, there was no question about ‘the most appropriate centre in the Capital’ for the monument:

The location on Connaught Place, between the Château Laurier, Post Office and Central Station would seem to be the most suitable, and the monument could take the form of a column or other design which might be considered most appropriate for this location.

An accompanying map of Connaught Place and five photographs (Fig. 5) identified the favoured site on the widened bridge-deck, just above the edge of the Rideau Canal. This was the site that Prime Minister Mackenzie King had insisted on a month before the announcement of the terms of reference.

Clearly, Mackenzie King nurtured a sustained focus on Connaught Place. In 1927, he transformed Laurier’s Ottawa Improvement Commission into the Federal District Commission (FDC), expanded
their budget and mandate, and installed a dynamic Ottawa businessman, Thomas Ahern, as its chairman. The mood in Parliament was expansive: even the Leader of the Opposition suggested that the funding was perhaps too small!41 Perhaps 1927 was a particularly propitious year for advancing plans for enhancing the nation’s capital. Not only was the economy in good shape, but the country was also in a patriotic mood as a result of the Diamond Jubilee celebration of Confederation. The festivities on 1 July were truly impressive and inclusive: the laying of a corner-stone of the new Confederation Block on Parliament Hill; the dedication of the Peace Tower carillon; the planting of a maple tree by the wife of the Governor General, Viscountess Willingdon; a live nation-wide broadcast of a speech prepared by King George V and delivered by the Governor General; and the commemoration of former Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier in a ceremony at his tomb in Notre Dame cemetery.42 Those on 3 August were no-less choreographed. The Prince of Wales unveiled a statue honouring Mackenzie King’s mentor, Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier, at the southeast corner of the Hill, overlooking Connaught Place, King’s imagined focal point of the emerging nation-state. As if to keep the theme of national sacrifice and national service to the fore, the good Prince was also called upon to dedicate a shrine in the Memorial Chamber in the Peace Tower, the architecturally dominant element of the Parliament building that proclaimed the nation’s determination to remember the 60,000 Canadians who had died in the Great War.43 The events of 1927 did much to reinforce the commemorative and performance function of Parliament Hill and, to a degree, Mackenzie King’s initiatives in Connaught Place.

Certainly, he did what he could to keep up the momentum to create a grand plaza there. When late in 1927 the Russell House Hotel burned down, Mackenzie King blocked the owner’s proposal to rebuild and expropriated the entire block. Holding Bennett’s 1915 plan aloft in the House of Commons as he introduced the legislation, he proposed a $3 million fund to transform Connaught Place into a grand
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Fig. 5. Connaught Place. View looking west to Parliament Hill, late 1924, with the Peace Tower under construction at the right. The proposed site for the National War Memorial was approximately in the centre of the photograph. The Ottawa Post Office is at the left. It was demolished in 1936 to provide the final site for the memorial. Source: Canada Department of Public Works 1925, Fig. 2.
‘Confederation Square’. Although the opposition parties now protested such a huge expenditure on dreary Ottawa, King drove the bill through, giving what he regarded as one of his finest speeches to the Commons:

\[\text{We may not come to have the largest, the wealthiest or the most cosmopolitan Capital in the world, but I believe that with Ottawa’s natural and picturesque setting, given stately proportions, and a little careful planning, we can have the most beautiful Capital in the world. So I would ask my fellow members of this House of Commons to view not only with sympathy but with enthusiasm a project which everyone will recognize as beyond the consideration of party, that has for its object solely and wholly the development and beautification of Ottawa as the Capital of this great Dominion, something that will give some expression of all that is highest in the idealism of the nation and something which those from beyond our gates and those who may follow in future years will come to recognize as an expression in some degree of the soul of Canada today…}\]

Mackenzie King knew that he had made an impression. His diary for that day recorded his assessment, his rhetorical powers, political astuteness, and vision:

\[\text{Spoke for an hour in all, and with little effort and I believe on the whole to good effect… I did not meet with an interruption and held the attention of the House fairly well… There is now 3 millions, a large sum, which should mean real and vast improvements within the next two years—a quite different Ottawa in the heart of the city. It is really a great achievement, and future generations will thank me for it.}\]

With parliament on side, King pressured the Ottawa City Council to expand the proposed site by demolishing their existing City Hall and police station and expropriating buildings on the east side of Elgin Street to create a wide boulevard to the south. The Mayor and Council reluctantly agreed to relocate City Hall in the future, perhaps lured by Edward Bennett’s 1915 image of a magnificent new City Hall dominating the new plaza (Fig. 3). Whatever the reasons, City Council’s agreement marked the beginning of 20 years of poor treatment of the local government by a federal government determined to remake the historic core of the city in its own image.

However, with money and backing in hand, Mackenzie King was unable to find a design that was both functional and monumental enough for his taste. The complicated tangle of bridges, streetcars, streets, and a canal resisted the efforts of a generation of planners to design an elegant solution. Noulan Cauchon’s 1928 scheme was perhaps the best, but his constant criticism of the FDC as chairman of the City of Ottawa’s Town Planning Commission annoyed King. King’s problem was that he too found the FDC architects’ proposals to be unsatisfactory. Toronto architect Henry Sproatt, a member of the memorial competition jury, evaluated the schemes and he also recommended against the federal proposals. Canada simply did not have much talent in town planning and urban design in the 1920s.

**Establishing confederation place, 1930–1945**

With matters of design at an impasse, the *real politik* of electoral politics intervened to exacerbate the problem: Mackenzie King lost the national election of 1930. Even in opposition, however, he urged his replacement, Prime Minister R.B. Bennett, to prevent the City from wriggling out of its agreement for Confederation Square. Once again, fire came to Mackenzie King’s aid. In 1931, the Ottawa City Hall
burned and the City negotiated with the federal government to obtain accommodation. The City Council was offered ‘temporary quarters’ in a nearby federal building and was kept there for the next 20 years while debate raged upon the site of the new City Hall. After rejecting several schemes where the municipal government was incorporated in a major building facing the square, City government was shunted out of the downtown altogether and the way cleared for the federal plans for Confederation Square. However, all progress in developing the grandiose project ground to a halt in the face of the grim economic realities of the Depression years that for a decade generated vacant lots rather than grand architectural or monumental designs.

On his return to power in 1935, and with the promise of a more prosperous economy, Mackenzie King dusted off his plans for Confederation Square. However, he first had to face the embarrassment of the delays in the erection of the National War Memorial in the former Connaught Place. An English sculptor, Vernon March, had won the design competition in 1926 but he died in 1930. His six brothers and a sister completed the memorial in 1932. Their task finished, they were disappointed to find that Canada and Ottawa were not ready for the memorial. It was put on temporary display in London’s Hyde Park, where it met with general public acclaim. The terms of reference had called for the depiction of the spirit of heroism, self-sacrifice, gratitude for victory, and hope for the future. The March family’s evocative rendering, ‘The Great Response of Canada’, represented 22 military figures passing through a massive 60-ft high granite arch, topped by the allegorical figures of ‘Peace’ and ‘Freedom’ (Fig. 6). As reported in London’s Evening Citizen, the figures

stand for the 68,000 men who went from Canada to the war-front and now rest beneath the poppies of Flanders. Infantrymen, airmen, artillerymen, even the medical corps and nurses are all portrayed with meticulous detail. And yet the careful realism in no way detracts from the memorial’s inherent
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Fig. 6. Sketch by Jacques Gréber showing the War Memorial located in Major’s Hill Park, just north of the Château Laurier. This plan was vetoed by Prime Minister Mackenzie King. Source: Gréber 1950.
artistic quality. None of the figures...shows any signs of affection or strain, nor are they forced into any excessive demonstration of power.\textsuperscript{55}

While the appreciation of Londoners must have been satisfying, Canadians and Ottawans must have questioned when their memorial would be available in Canada. The problem was that the Prime Minister was still determined that it should be the centrepiece for the proposed Confederation Square, citing the Nelson monument in London’s Trafalgar Square and the Arc de Triomphe in Paris as precedents.\textsuperscript{56} His memorial was ready; all that was missing was an appropriate urban design.

Mackenzie King found the designer he needed during a 1936 tour of the Paris World’s Fair site. The chief architect, Jacques Gréber, was near the peak of his career as a classically trained architect, planner, and professor.\textsuperscript{57} He had a trans-Atlantic urban design practice in the inter-war period, advising the French government on American innovations and designing the Benjamin Franklin Parkway in Philadelphia. Gréber had been the landscape architect for six American war cemeteries in France and would also act as an advisor to the 1939 New York World’s Fair. He was appointed to the faculty of the Institute of Urbanism in Paris, and took a leading role in the reconstruction and expansion of French cities between the wars. Gréber prepared plans for Paris (1919), Lille (1923), Belfort (1925), Marseilles (1930-37), Abbeville (1932), and Rouen (1940) among many others.\textsuperscript{58}

During his 1937 Ottawa visit, Gréber quickly produced a series of designs for Ottawa’s core that resolved many issues. He combined Bennett’s formal building compositions with the basic elements of Cauchon’s circulation plan.\textsuperscript{59} However, despite this propitious start, Gréber ran afoul of Mackenzie King when he suggested that the traffic congestion in the square was so severe that the war memorial should be placed in the adjacent Major’s Hill Park on Nepean Point (Fig. 6). Somewhat predictably, given the last decade of planning, King forcefully over-ruled the architect. A chastened Gréber returned to his hotel room to try another design:

I was almost fired. The monument should not be in the centre of turmoil; it should be in a quiet, calm and restful place. Nepean Point would have been much better, you see. So I made a sketch and showed it to Mr King. He said that it is beautiful, but it is too late. The government and parliament have decided that the monument will be there, so it will be there I didn’t want to be fired, you know, so I obeyed.\textsuperscript{60}

All was forgiven when King saw the next sketch, which set the memorial at the centre of the square (Fig. 7):

The moment I saw the Monument at the head of Elgin St,—on an elevation, which could be seen from the new Knox Church, and facing down the grand avenue, I at once saw that I had my Champs Elysées, Arc de Triomphe and Place de la Concorde all at a single stroke. As I pointed out to Gréber it made a magnificent approach to the parliament buildings, if regiments were parading from Cartier Sq. they wd. be thrilled beyond measure, marching towards the face of the Monument and past it on one side to the Prlt. Bldgs. or on the other to the City in an opposite direction.\textsuperscript{61}

This time there was no hesitation. In a matter of months, the central post office was demolished and rebuilt facing the new square. The memorial was finally shipped from England and a contract for its granite pedestal and arch was awarded in late 1937.\textsuperscript{62} Gréber’s revised design for Confederation Square was quickly built to be ready for the 1939 Royal visit.
On 21 May 1939, over 100,000 people packed Confederation Square for the dedication of the National War Memorial by King George VI and Queen Elizabeth (Fig. 8).63 Mackenzie King wrote the King’s speech and, once again, his diary affords remarkable insights into his personal role in, and reaction, to what he clearly considered to be ‘his’ monument.64 More particularly, he made much reference to the ‘Sir Galahad’ monument erected to commemorate the heroic death of his friend, Henry Harper. He compared ‘this War Memorial which is the largest monument in the Capital, the most significant in Canada’, to that of Galahad, ‘the first in the way of an idealist monument to find its place in the Capital’. He also turned to the book he had written on the occasion of Harper’s death—The Secret of Heroism—and concluded that the similarity of the national wartime sacrifice to that of Harper’s heroic deed was such that the National War Memorial might well be entitled, ‘The Secret of National Heroism’.65 And given these personal associations, it is not surprising that he was convinced of the correctness—even divine plan—of his past decisions:

On 21 May 1939, over 100,000 people packed Confederation Square for the dedication of the National War Memorial by King George VI and Queen Elizabeth (Fig. 8).63 Mackenzie King wrote the King’s speech and, once again, his diary affords remarkable insights into his personal role in, and reaction, to what he clearly considered to be ‘his’ monument.64 More particularly, he made much reference to the ‘Sir Galahad’ monument erected to commemorate the heroic death of his friend, Henry Harper. He compared ‘this War Memorial which is the largest monument in the Capital, the most significant in Canada’, to that of Galahad, ‘the first in the way of an idealist monument to find its place in the Capital’. He also turned to the book he had written on the occasion of Harper’s death—The Secret of Heroism—and concluded that the similarity of the national wartime sacrifice to that of Harper’s heroic deed was such that the National War Memorial might well be entitled, ‘The Secret of National Heroism’.65 And given these personal associations, it is not surprising that he was convinced of the correctness—even divine plan—of his past decisions:

What is particularly interesting is that I had to do, at the outset, with the character of the Memorial, its location, the competition by which the choice was made, with increase in its size, and have had everything to do of late with determining its approaches, surroundings, etc. I had thought, at one time, that I might have occasion to prepare a speech to deliver myself, if when the time of

Fig. 7. Jacques Gréber’s plan for Confederation Square. Note the new bridge (later named for Mackenzie King) in the middle of the drawing. Source: Gréber 1950, 185.
the unveiling came, I should then be in office. Little did I dream that the speech which I would write would be one for the King himself to deliver. That, too, came as it were a part of a plan…

Predictably, King George VI’s speech at the unveiling echoed many of the Prime Minister’s thoughts and addressed the symbolism of the monument for the nation.66 The monarch’s speech touched on all of
ideological and emotional prompts. He referred to ‘this beautiful Capital’ and ‘the noble Memorial to Canada’s spirit and sacrifice in the Great War’; he acknowledged the ‘symbolism’ evoked by ‘The Response’ of ‘zeal…chivalry…the voice of the nation’s conscience…the very soul of the nation’. But as Mackenzie King had prompted him to do, King George alluded to the monument’s didactic role for the nation:

...This Memorial, however, does more than commemorate a great event in the past. It has a message for all generations and for all countries—the message which called forth Canada’s response. Not by chance do the figures of Peace and Freedom, which crown its summit, stand inseparable. Peace and Freedom cannot long be separated. It is well that we have, in one of the Capitals of the world, a visible reminder of so great a truth.

The timing couldn’t have been better. A mere three months later, Canada entered the Second World War, the patriotic fervour of the Royal Visit having helped swell the volunteer ranks of the Canadian armed forces. The further sacrifice of 44,893 lives brought calls for more war memorials.67

The national capital as war memorial, 1945–2000

Mackenzie King never lost sight of his plans for a dignified capital, even as the war dragged on. On 21 April 1944, he announced to the House that the memorial to the Second World War would be the redevelopment of the national capital as a whole:

...as a memorial to the service and sacrifice of men and women who have participated in the present war, a capital city which would be a model to other cities and other countries. As now we had the War Memorial symbolical of the last war, as the memorial of this war, the National Capital in the form of a greater Ottawa, with the Ottawa River running through the heart of the Capital instead of being a boundary on one side. It would be a great symbol of the elements that have gone to make the present Canada what it is, and the future of Canada what it will become...68

Once again, the Prime Minister was mobilizing the Canadian patriotic spirit and desire to commemorate the wartime sacrifice to pursue his objective of developing a capital worthy of the nation. King wasted little time in launching the project. Jacques Gréber was recalled from France to develop a new plan, only days after Japan’s surrender.69 King himself announced that:

the government has decided that no form of a memorial could be more worthy of the service and sacrifice given in the war than to give the Capital of our country as worthy a place amongst the national capitals of the world as Canada occupies amongst the nations as a nation.70

But if Mackenzie King was yet again turning to wartime sacrifice and patriotic spirit to further his plans for improving Ottawa, the scale had shifted. No mere incremental addition of a plaza around a monument; the monument was to be the city itself. At last, Ottawa was to be transformed into a capital worthy of the nation.71

Gréber did not disappoint his patron. The French planner and his Canadian associates continuously referred to their plan as a great national memorial undertaking, drawing nation-wide political support for the comprehensive re-development of Ottawa and Hull during a period when other cities struggled to meet their own needs after 20 years of Depression and war.72 Within a year, Gréber had devised
a remarkable scheme to cut a viewing terrace on a rocky bluff at the south end of the Gatineau Hills. A great granite tower recalling France’s Vimy Ridge monument would be visible from Parliament Hill, only three miles away (Fig. 9). Visitors to the monument itself would have a fine view of the national capital from the terrace, which Gréber compared to the vista from the Piazzale Michael Angelo near Florence. Gréber’s associate, Quebec architect Éduoard Fiset explained the details of the design with Gallic exuberance. Speaking of visitors as ‘pilgrims’, Fiset referred to the essential elements of the grandiose projects: a large ‘light-flooded’ terrace carved out of the side of the mountain; a wall inscribed with the names of the ‘our heroic soldiers’ and their military engagements; a central tower facing the city and bearing the arms of Canada and of the nine provinces; a bronze-doored mortuary chapel containing a large black marble slab gold-inlaid with the plan of the future Capital; a vista of the Ottawa River, the cities of Ottawa and Hull, and ‘the picturesque or proud stateliness of the steeples and towers’. From this perspective, the ‘pilgrim’ will have revealed the grand purpose of the project:

He will realise that the whole life and collective efforts, henceforth planned and harmonized, are a tribute to a sacred memory. He will understand that the slow re-organization, the painstaking upheaval, which some day will ensure a setting worthier of the statue of Capital City of a large country, will have been undertaken in commemoration of the men whose supreme sacrifice will have given Canada a new and powerful impulse toward the attainment to the status of a great nation.

In the short term, however, Gréber and others recommended that ‘1939–45’ be inscribed into the existing memorial as a temporary measure. The World War II veterans were opposed, wanting a separate memorial to commemorate their service. Mackenzie King championed Gréber’s Gatineau scheme until the end of his prime ministerial career in 1948 and endorsed it in the forward to Gréber’s Plan for the National Capital, published just after his death in 1950.

With or without Mackenzie King’s dreams, the 1950 Plan for the National Capital is one of the most significant documents in Canadian planning history. The report was the guide for the rapid transformation of Ottawa and Hull from dreary industrial towns into an attractive modern capital. Mackenzie King followed every move of the National Capital Planning committee, chairing some of the initial meetings and reviewing the 1948 draft plan shortly before he retired. In addition to making
the plan a war memorial, the Prime Minister gave it an additional push by giving the FDC a national mandate and stacking it with handpicked representatives from across the country.\textsuperscript{77}

Mackenzie King also made sure that implementation of the plan would be properly financed, pushing a $25 million National Capital Fund through Cabinet.\textsuperscript{78} The FDC began implementation with a rush, building a bridge across the Rideau Canal to finally solve the traffic congestion in Confederation Square. Completed in 1950, it was named in Mackenzie King’s honour as he lay dying at his cottage in the Gatineau Hills.\textsuperscript{79} Indeed, most of the \textit{Plan for the National Capital} was implemented after King’s death, and the federal government had spent $243 million (close to $2.0 billion 2003) to implement the plan by 1970.\textsuperscript{80} Remarkably, some of the most important commitments were made after King’s Liberal party was swept out of power in 1957. The \textit{National Capital Plan} had bipartisan political momentum, not only as King’s legacy, but also as a memorial to World War II.

But this time, Mackenzie King’s plans slowed down without the emotional impetus of an integrated plan for a war memorial. While Gréber’s \textit{National Capital Plan} was eventually implemented, his grand design for the World War II monument became enmeshed in politics. The Canadian Legion wanted the Confederation Square memorial to retain its Great War association, while a new cenotaph should be raised in front of the Peace Tower on Parliament Hill. In 1956, Veterans Affairs Minister Lapointe announced that an interdepartmental committee had recommended that the government erect a new memorial to the dead of all wars on Nepean Point, near the Major’s Hill Park site originally suggested by Gréber in 1937.\textsuperscript{81} Not surprisingly, Gréber’s proposal for the Gatineau Hills slowly slid off the table, as objections were raised about the inconvenience of the site for tourists. Perhaps left unsaid was reluctance by some veterans to locate the memorial in Québec, which was the only province that voted against conscription. Proposals to honour the Korean War veterans further clouded the issue. While the debate over the location of a new monument dragged on, the annual ceremonies to celebrate the Great War armistice on 11 November gradually became a national commemoration of the dead of all wars. The monument on Confederation Square became the focus of Remembrance Day ceremonies, with the annual participation of the Governor General and Prime Minister and televised to a national audience. Gradually, the Department of Veterans Affairs came to accept that the Confederation Square monument was the central national memorial to all the dead of all the wars. The dates ‘1939–45’ and ‘1950–53’ were added to the pedestal and the monument was re-dedicated as the National War Memorial in 1982.\textsuperscript{82} It had captured the national imagination and consolidated its location in Confederation Square.

This site was still problematic, however, and a series of subsequent developments did not serve to enhance it. The Rideau–Sparks streetcars cut off the bottom of Gréber’s triangular plaza until they were removed in the 1950s. Further road ‘improvements’ nibbled away at the plaza making pedestrian access more difficult, except on 11 November, when the streets were closed for the annual ceremonies. The nadir came in the mid-1960s, when the NCC proposed to separate pedestrian and vehicular traffic, pedestrians being re-located to an underground plaza to extend from Sparks Street to the Rideau Canal.\textsuperscript{83} Thankfully, this proposal was dropped, but the new National Arts Centre did not improve the Square with its entrance fronting on the Rideau Canal, offering only blank walls, garage entrances, and a tourist booth to Ottawa’s civic plaza. The construction of a pedestrian shopping mall on Sparks Street in 1962 was a mixed blessing. The main transit routes were deflected north and south of Confederation Square, but pedestrian access to the plaza was still difficult.

Since the 1980s, however, the NCC has made Confederation Square a key node in its plan for urban development and it has won several international awards for its forward-looking design concepts.\textsuperscript{84} The latest plan for the national capital calls for a shift of Confederation Square’s primary role and links to
five other nodes in a grand circular boulevard and ceremonial route connecting both sides of the Ottawa River. Once again, patriotic rhetoric has been used to promote an urban design project. The ceremonial route has been named Confederation Boulevard, A Pathway of Heroes with national symbols incorporated into its street furniture and sidewalks. Plans call for statuary to focus attention on ‘people, events or ideas which have meaning and value for the community at large’ as a means of ‘reinforcing and transmitting collective values’.

The second node already exists: the Peacekeeping Memorial in the traffic circle beside the National Gallery. Four more sites are reserved for future major monuments. Together, they will diminish the symbolic overload currently presented by Parliament Hill and Confederation Square.

However, it appears that Confederation Square and the National War Memorial will not lose their primary focus. In 2000, the square was extensively renovated to re-create the triangular plaza envisioned by Gréber in 1937, the surface being partly reclaimed from the automobiles and attractively paved in Canadian granite, with new stairs cut down to the Rideau Canal. Further, the symbolic significance of the square has been reinforced by the addition of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, unveiled on 11 November 2000. The simple red granite casket contains the remains of one of the many unidentified Canadian World War I soldiers buried at France’s Vimy Ridge. The tomb was built into the ground in front of the 1939 monument, set in soil from all ten provinces, three territories, and Vimy Ridge. Canada’s National War Memorial now appears to be complete.

Confederation Square: urban plan, national symbol?

Confederation Square was listed as a National Historic Site in 1984, cited as ‘a rare instance in Canada of implementation of proposals for urban re-development based upon the tenets of the City Beautiful movement’. It is a ceremonial centre for the national capital, located in an historic context beside the Rideau Canal (itself a National Historic Site) and formed on two sides by an eclectic mix of buildings, many of which have been designated as having significant architectural and historic interest.

Yet, Confederation Square still seems ‘achingly empty’ in Nan Griffiths’ words. The square is actually a triangle. It has poor spatial containment, lacking enclosure on the Rideau Canal side and, until recently, pedestrian access was poor. The silhouette of the National War Memorial against the sky has been interrupted by a pavilion of the National Gallery, which is perhaps appropriate, and an apartment tower in Hull, which is certainly not. The edge uses do not animate the space. Government office lobbies, an optician, and a post office line the west side of the triangle, while the other two sides are open to the canal on the east, and a long view to the Gatineau hills to the north.

Perhaps there is something peculiarly Canadian about this lack of enclosure and views to the hills and the picturesque gothic Parliament Buildings. Urban design critics note that the nation has few good squares in the European tradition. Perhaps Canadians do not need these urban squares as much as Europeans because even in the largest cities, the wilderness is only a couple of hours away for most families. Ironically, while Mackenzie King strove to realize his dreams for the national capital, his own heart was in his beloved cottage in the Gatineau hills, where he lived every summer.

But national proclivities aside, the limitations of the Confederation Square may be sought elsewhere. It is an exceptionally difficult site. It slopes sharply to the south, has a depressed canal in a cut on one side and a tangle of roads and bridges with odd geometries due to the collision of two grids. A square with good containment on all sides could only have been achieved by decking over the entire canal, as
Bennett proposed in 1915 (Fig. 3). This proposal would have ruined the terminus of the historic Rideau Canal, and been extraordinarily expensive. Indeed, despite its connections to City Beautiful planning, Confederation Square developed in discrete increments over the past century. Gréber’s 1937 plan built upon the functional designs prepared in the 1920s by Noulan Cauchon and the 1915 design by Edward Bennett. He did well with a tough set of problems that had defeated an earlier generation of urban designers. Gréber’s 1937 plan for Confederation Square was gradually ruined over the next three decades, but the diagonal view of Parliament Hill, remains its greatest strength. Recent renovations and the earlier deflection of vehicular traffic from Sparks to Wellington Street have improved Confederation Square’s quality as a pedestrian space. Mackenzie King may not have got the Arc de Triomphe or Trafalgar Square, but the view of Parliament, the Château Laurier, and the National War Memorial make Confederation Square a distinctly Canadian place.

And, certainly, it is a place loaded with national symbolic meanings. The historic Rideau Canal, the railway hotel in the ‘national style’, and the Parliament Buildings were all there in 1912, but opening up the square allowed them to be read at a glance, against the backdrop of the Gatineau hills. The Marches’ war memorial added another layer of national meaning, recalling the remarkable nationbuilding experiences of the Great War. Mackenzie King instinctively understood the nature of these symbols and took deliberate action to combine them into a critical mass of nationalistic meaning. He skilfully wrapped the entire package in patriotic rhetoric to give irresistible political momentum to his plans to transform Ottawa and Hull from industrial towns into a national capital.

On balance, the National War Memorial is more successful as a symbolic object than Confederation Square as a public space. However, it is the combination of the two that has made the place a focal point in the capital—and the national imagination. Over the past seven decades, the annual commemorations on Remembrance Day, the 1982 inclusion of World War II and Korean War tributes, and the 2000 addition of the Tomb of The Unknown Soldier have all reinforced this expanded role. The country seems comfortable with these developments. There are few calls for additional memorials, perhaps due to the inclusive imagery of The Response.

The recent renovations to the memorial and square have improved Confederation Square’s function and symbolic content, but it appears that further significant improvements will be difficult, given the awkward nature of the site. It will never be the single dominant symbolic space of the Canadian capital in the manner of the Mall in Washington. As a result, the current plan to reposition the square as one of six important nodes in Confederation Boulevard appears to be a good strategy for the future.

One lesson from the experience of Confederation Square is that the new nodes will likely take decades to emerge as important symbolic space in Canada’s capital. And the fact that there is no one central place or theme might be appropriate given the country’s rejection of simple national meta-narratives in favour of a celebration of pluralism.
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