

The Memory of Mackenzie King: American Philanthropy, “a Canadian biography and Canadian History.”

By Jeffrey D. Brison

Associate Professor, Department of History
Queen’s University
Ontario, Canada

jeffrey.brison@queensu.ca

© 2010 by Jeffrey D. Brison

On 6 April 1949 the Board of Trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) announced that it was awarding McGill University \$100,000 for the purpose of supervising “the production of studies in the public and private life of W.L. Mackenzie King...”¹ The object of the grant, King noted in a statement to the press the following day, was to provide him with assistance in the collection and organization of his papers and thus to “expedite the writing and early publication of Memoirs....”² Under its terms, King had “complete liberty in making arrangements for the use of these funds in the study and preparation of his materials.”³ The ultimate goal of this “quite exceptional expression of international friendship and good-will,” King informed the public, was to produce “a Canadian biography and Canadian history.”⁴ For its part, the RF saw the project as no less than “a significant opportunity to use the desire of a national and international leader to record his final views on the meaning of democracy.”⁵

Over the years the project was to take many turns –the most fundamental occurring with King’s death on 22 July 1950. King’s passing transformed the autobiography in-progress to official biography but did little to dampen the enthusiasm of the American philanthropists. King’s old confidante, John D. Rockefeller, Jr. (JDR Jr.), (who considered the Canadian his closest friend),⁶ and the RF officers saw sufficient value in the project to transfer the original grant to King’s literary executors and, subsequently, to support it with two more grants. By the

time its final grant expired in 1958, the RF had contributed \$187,000 to the King project –as much or more than the organization had spent on any comparable American project.⁷ Relative to support granted by the organization to other Canadian projects in the same era, the level of sponsorship was no less impressive –exceeding, for instance, earlier support for McGill University’s Social Science Research Project in the 1930s, and even all RF grants made to the Humanities Research Council of Canada (HRCC) from 1943 to 1957.⁸

This research report focuses on the autobiography stage of the project, when King began to seriously consider writing his life history and when he, Rockefeller, and RF officers worked out the terms of their collaboration. Here, in short, I examine how interaction between King and Rockefeller philanthropy was crucial in establishing the scope of, setting the course for, and ultimately facilitating the writing of the official Mackenzie King record. In a longer article-length paper, I will extend the analysis forward to discuss the transformation from autobiography to biography, and to assess the role played by the RF in the production of the authorized biography. There I will scrutinize the working relationship between Rockefeller officials and the Canadian administrators of King’s official record, arguing for the existence of an on-going subtle, but formative, philanthropic influence. I will, as well, explore the multifaceted construction of Mackenzie King’s memory –the private and public figure that survives in the archival files, the published texts, and, perhaps most vividly, in the pages of his now digitized and key worded online diaries.⁹

Today in the era of the state-funded and apparently almighty Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) the very idea of a private American philanthropic foundation contributing so heavily to efforts to collect, collate and write King’s personal and public history may seem, at very least, a little odd. This kind of historical fact complicates our essentialist and largely historical notions of contrasting national identities and

cultural economies. Where does this fit, for instance, in the matrix of Canadian-American difference, in the now mythologized juxtaposition of an American culture fueled by the free market and a Canadian one sustained by state support?

In 1940s and early 1950s Canada, when public funding for post-secondary education and research (particularly in the humanities and social science disciplines) was sporadic at best, however, the RF, along with its near New York City neighbour, the Carnegie Corporation, were primary pillars of support for Canadian intellectuals and artists. In addition to an ongoing series of grants to the University of Toronto and McGill University – institutions deemed by RF officers to be Canada’s foremost educational “centers of excellence” – less sizable but still significant support was provided to designated regional centres including Queen’s University, Dalhousie University, and each of the provincial universities of western Canada. In fact, no Canadian university was untouched by Carnegie or Rockefeller beneficence in this era. Canada’s authoritative cultural institutions, including the National Gallery of Canada, the Art Gallery of Toronto, the Montreal Art Association and the Royal Ontario Museum, all received substantial support from American philanthropists as well.¹⁰

In the area of social research, American philanthropy had, during the otherwise cash-strapped 1930s, supported the publication of scores of monographs through the *Frontiers of Settlement* series, McGill University’s Social Science Research Project, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace text series on American/Canadian relations. Perhaps of most significance in the climate of the late 1940s –when the federal government was on the verge of endorsing the creation of a permanent state-funded system of support for the arts and letters– the forerunners of the modern day SSHRCC, the Canadian Social Science Research Council (CSSRC) and the HRCC had, since their creations in 1939 and 1943, survived almost exclusively on funds provided by the Carnegie Corporation and the RF.¹¹ It was with crucial Rockefeller

and Carnegie support, in other words, that leading Canadian scholars including Harold Innis, Arthur Lower, Donald Creighton, Frank Underhill, and S. D. Clarke, conducted their research, published the fruits of their labour, and built the infrastructure vital to the development and professionalization of several academic disciplines. By 1949 the Carnegie Corporation and the RF had contributed almost \$20 million to the economy of Canadian culture.¹² That cultural capital, in turn, had a formative influence on the structuring of the arts and letters in Canada.

While the involvement of private American philanthropy in Canadian arts and letters was by the late 1940s a well-entrenched tradition –at least as well-entrenched and secure a tradition then as federal state support for post-secondary education and research is now – the RF grant in support of the King autobiography was, nonetheless, an anomaly. By 1949, the RF had become the model of scientific and incorporated philanthropy. Where the Rockefellers and a small band of advisers once directed the flow of capital to favored individuals, causes and institutions; programs and policies were now negotiated through a complex network of advisors, professional administrators and trustees. RF philanthropy had, in short, evolved as a technology of power, and a means by which personal wealth was transformed into social, cultural, and political capital.

Support for King's autobiography was, in contrast to most RF-funded activities, directly attributable to the former Prime Minister's ties to the Rockefeller family and particularly to his friendship with JDR Jr. The two men developed a close personal bond during King's tenure, from 1914 to 1918, as Director of Industrial Relations for the newly formed RF.

The bond was reinforced by the then former Canadian Labour Minister's efforts to deflect public criticism from the Rockefeller family in the aftermath of the "Ludlow Massacre" in the Colorado coal fields in 1914.¹³ In short JDR Jr.'s personal interest in King's memoirs and the RF's support for the project represent what was, by the late 1940s, an unusually direct collusion of public and private Rockefeller interests.

To be sure, the idea of a King autobiography predated the involvement of the RF. Since 1893 King had recorded, on an almost daily basis, his most private thoughts on matters ranging from his relationship with successive “little Pats” (his dogs), and his experiences in spiritualism, to the development of the liberal tradition in Canada. Nearing the end of his active political career in September 1946, King hired historian Frederick Gibson in order to begin work on organizing his papers. Upon leaving the Prime Ministership in November 1948, King began to seriously consider writing some sort of memoir.¹⁴ He was, however, immediately intimidated by the task – by this time his personal diary included 12,000 handwritten and another 17,500 typed pages and his public and private papers numbered in the millions of pages. Finding retirement was keeping him very busy, he wrote Ferris Greenslet, editor with the American publishing firm Houghton Mifflin, that “it will take some time to get my house in order, having left undone many of the things which should have been attended to years ago.” He did note politely that interest on the part of Houghton Mifflin, publishers long ago of his book *Industry and Humanity*, written during King’s stint with the RF, was “in the nature of an inspiration.”¹⁵

More meaningful “inspiration” awaited the involvement of his old friend JDR Jr. and the promise of financial support by the RF. Just a month after King’s retirement as Prime Minister, Rockefeller received a memorandum which contained an interesting proposal for the officers of the RF to consider. In it, Kenneth T. Chorley, President of the Rockefeller-funded Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, praised King as “one of the great figures of the world.”¹⁶ Pointing out that King was “the only man that was the head of the government of a great country during both World Wars,” (in fact King was only Canada’s leader during World War II) and that at the time of his retirement “he had held office as Prime Minister of a country in the British Empire longer than any man...,” Chorley suggested that it would be “nothing short of a calamity if anything should happen to Mr. King before he had been able to edit his papers and write a real history of

his public life and the events that took place during the period that he held public office.” Noting that the former prime minister was “not too well,” that he might not have long to live, and voicing the common misconception that King had little in the way of savings, Chorley suggested that the RF consider employing a small staff to help King in the task.¹⁷

It took little time for JDR Jr. to endorse Chorley’s proposal and once informed of his personal interest, RF officers quickly began to lay the groundwork for supporting King’s work. In early February 1949, RF President, Chester Barnard, and David Stevens, Director of the Humanities Division, discussed the idea and agreed to pursue the matter.¹⁸ At a full officers’ conference held only days later it was decided that Joseph Willits, Director of the Social Science Division, should ask F. Cyril James, Principal of McGill University, an old friend and his former colleague at the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania, if he would formally administer the project.¹⁹

In Rockefeller’s and Barnard’s eyes King himself was the chief obstacle to the project. Both men feared he would resist accepting financial aid or, if he did accept it, he would underestimate the scope of the project and thus his needs for assistance. “This matter of your autobiography,” Rockefeller wrote King, “you have naturally thought of as a more or less personal, private enterprise and have had in mind to swing its cost as best you could even at substantial personal sacrifice.” Mentioning a personal gift of \$100,000 he had given King in 1947, Rockefeller noted that this was given for King’s personal use and was not to be consumed by such concerns as memoirs. “What I have so gladly done for you,” Rockefeller wrote his friend, “was done having in mind its being used...wholly for your own living and well being.” “You will see, therefore,” he continued, “how important it is, if help from the outside is available for the autobiography, to conserve every cent of your own resources for your own personal well being and health.” While Rockefeller felt that it was “quite natural and wholly like you” for

King to be modest, he impressed upon his old friend that his memoirs were not merely of personal importance. “[A] record of your life will be a history of the national life of Canada during the most interesting and critical quarter century of its existence,” Rockefeller advised King, noting as well that “[your] autobiography, therefore, becomes a matter of public, yes, national and inter-national significance.” “Viewing it from that aspect I am sure you will agree,” Rockefeller continued

that if cooperation in the better performing of the task comes to you unsolicited and through sources from which you feel free to accept it, you would have no right to let any personal feeling of modesty prevent you accepting such cooperation and your availing of it to the fullest extent possible.

For the sake of good form Rockefeller informed King that he was in no position to speak for the RF or to commit it to the project. He did, however, mention that he had discussed it with Barnard and that the two men agreed that the job would require a staff of secretaries and research assistants and that a RF grant would have to be “of a minimum of \$100,000” and could “foreseeable be double that.” Barnard, he noted, would soon visit King in Ottawa to assess the situation. “If and when he does,” Rockefeller advised King, “I hope you will not let your modesty cause you to minimize the probable ultimate cost of the autobiography or your self-effacement to lead you to spend a cent of your own resources....”²⁰

For his part, Barnard wrote King to schedule a visit to Ottawa in early March “to get a glimpse of the material.” Barnard noted that he and his colleagues felt, as he put it, “that long and successful experience must have given you the personal knowledge and insights and the documentary material which would permit an invaluable account of the nature and the problems of government and public affairs.” What form the project took was, Barnard assured King, entirely in his own hands. “It seems to us that whatever you would wish to do would satisfy our interest in making available to the public here and abroad the knowledge and understanding

which your exceptional career and extraordinary talents could make so useful.” Echoing Rockefeller’s comments, Barnard concluded

There is only one thing on which we would express positive views, and that is that we should avoid being too little and too late.... [It] would seem to us that we would not be doing justice to you nor to the project...if we should underestimate the extent of the assistance you could use effectively in carrying on the work. I speak of this now because it is entirely possible that in your own plans, which presumably have not included the prospects of the RF’s interest in this matter, you may have been constrained to think in more limited terms than we think appropriate in view of our judgment of the importance of what you are now in the position to do. Beyond this expression of our desire that our contribution to this project should be sufficient to enable you to carry on with the maximum of convenience and effectiveness, we would, of course, have nothing more to say. Whatever you want to do is what we want done...²¹

Despite the ‘philanthropoids’ fears that King’s dignity and modesty would act as a barrier to their scheme, the Canadian was only too glad to pursue the matter. In responding to their inquiries, King pointed out that, now retired, he hoped “to prepare something in the nature of an autobiography, or Memoirs.” Confirming the Americans’ suspicions that his vision might have been restricted by what he felt able to afford on his own, and recognizing the liberating effect RF resources could have, King wrote Barnard that Rockefeller interest “opens up vistas much wider than anything I had deemed possible.”²² Indeed his only concern, which he expressed to Barnard later when the deal was about to be finalized, was with his own “ability to cope with...in a manner worthy of what...you have in mind.” Recognizing the mammoth nature of the task before him, he confessed “that (before being approached by the RF) the mere sight of much of it, with what it served to recall of years of strenuous activity, left me with a sort of hopeless feeling of ever being able satisfactorily to tackle the job of writing my memoirs in a large way.” But the interest of Rockefeller and Barnard had changed all that, and in King’s words, gave “back to me so much of confidence and encouragement that I now feel quite differently about what it may be possible to achieve.”²³

Confidence restored, King began to ponder his life's story. "It seemed," he confided to his diary on 20 February, "that some 'unseen influence' was guiding me. I had prayed I might get out of 'the slough of despond' I have been in, and not bury my talents, but make myself equal to the great opportunity and great responsibility that is now before me."²⁴ Reading Norman Roger's biography, Mackenzie King,²⁵ King was impressed by the significance of his career and convinced that it was essential that he tell his story

I was astonished how much these chapters contained and could see at a glance the joy it would be writing in the first person, in autobiographical form - the story that is already recorded so well in outline in this book. Most of it is forgotten by those active in affairs today and yet it is all prophetic of the larger developments now taking place - a pioneering in social fields - just as [King's grandfather, William Lyon] Mackenzie was in political. It would be a pity were all this lost.²⁶

King's reference to an "unseen influence" indicates that in addition to Rockefeller and the RF, less worldly (or other-worldly) forces were providing vital inspiration. In a manner that should not be surprising to students of the King diaries, King mixed discussion of these forces with his more concrete plans for the memoirs project. Over the previous couple of days he had been conscious of his "dear mother's spirit being very near...like an angel's presence, not visible and yet not invisible, but both Her lovely face as if floating by and leaving a consciousness of its presence." He was comforted by her presence and felt that, in some way, it was a sign of support for his new memoirs project. While he felt that she had "divined my loneliness and dejection" at some point in the past, King was sure that his mother was now "letting me know that she and father are well and inspiring me to go on." This, he noted was "a curious thing, this morning's reading has all been as it were the first real beginning on my autobiography."²⁷

Not surprisingly, given the flurry of correspondence relating to his memoirs passing between King and members of the Rockefeller brain-trust at the time, King's mind quickly also leapt to the RF and to its significance to his career. He noted particularly "the remarkable parallel of the writing of 'Industry and Humanity' being due to the RF, and now my 'Memoirs' if

written due to the same support.” This was to King, the culmination of some ill-defined but grand design. Reflecting on “the interrelation of Mr. Rockefeller’s life and my own,” King saw “the story more and more in the rounding out of the circle - e.g. Foundation the beginning there and the ending now there as well, in the fulfillment of its purpose.”²⁸

For the RF officers, after meeting with King at his Ottawa residence, Laurier House, on the 2nd of March 1949 to examine a sample of his personal and public papers, all that was left was to finalize arrangements for a RF grant. Writing King immediately upon his return to New York, Barnard outlined the project he envisioned. Thanking King for his hospitality, he noted that he and Stevens, were “amazed” with the volume of material King had at hand. “[I]ndeed,” he continued, “the possibilities are so numerous that it would only be good sense initially to restrict the endeavor to proportions manageable in the reasonably near future.” To facilitate the cataloguing of the King papers and to support King’s efforts to work through the material, Barnard suggested that he recommend to the Trustees of the RF a 3-year grant totaling \$100,000 with the understanding that if King accepted, the RF would encourage him to spend as much as possible in the first two years of the grant and that the organization would be more than willing to extend the grant.

Privately, RF officers were concerned about the political implications of such a large grant to a close personal friend of the Rockefeller family. Connecting the autobiography project to the early history of the RF and to King’s role following the Ludlow Massacre, Willits noted

The only real political panning the RF ever got was when King was appointed to make the Colorado study. We don’t want to make another personal grant to cause someone with a long memory to revive the earlier event.²⁹

Likewise, there was concern over the appearance of private American interference in Canadian cultural affairs. Noting that “Mr. King’s work will not be entirely, but chiefly be a Canadian biography and a Canadian history,” Barnard addressed both concerns, stipulating that the project

be “under the aegis of a Canadian institution rather than directly (administered) by an American foundation, even though the funds ultimately came from the foundation.”³⁰ The RF had long treated McGill and the University of Toronto as Canada’s “centers of excellence” for education and research, and given King’s connections with Toronto it seemed like the obvious choice to sponsor the project. RF officers had, indeed, first thought of approaching Toronto’s principal Sidney Smith about working through his institution. Always attuned to the intricacies of Canadian politics, however, they decided that given Smith’s recent defeat in the federal Conservative party leadership race it could prove politically embarrassing for either King (as the former leader of the Liberal Party) or Smith to approach the other about support for the project.³¹ Keen to respect the balance of power and influence between the two central-Canadian institutions, the officers also noted their recent support of University of Toronto historian Donald Creighton’s biography of Canada’s first Prime Minister, the Conservative Sir John A. Macdonald.³² Given the RF’s long-standing relations with McGill and its principal, James, turning to Canada’s other great institution was an easy choice.

The involvement of McGill, King was promised, was merely a formality. Reiterating his earlier assurances, Barnard pointed out that “if our proposal is agreeable to you, the matter would thereafter be completely in your hands.” While the officers would be willing to assist in any way possible “we would,” he added, “in no sense remain in a supervisory or managerial position.”³³ Representing McGill, Principal James was only too glad to take on the project on those terms. Informing King that RF officers had suggested a \$100,000 appropriation to his institution to sponsor the autobiography project, he expressed his delight with any role he could play in supporting King’s work. He added that he could “think of no living individual, except perhaps Mr. Winston Churchill, who could contribute from his own records and experiences so much that would be of immediate interest to this generation and lasting value to our successors.”³⁴

Informing Barnard that McGill would be “very proud” to participate in the project, James expressed his “profound admiration for...[King’s] wisdom and grasp of affairs.”³⁵

Despite their words of assurance to King that he would be free to do whatever he wished in fashioning his memoirs, from the start Rockefeller, Barnard, and James devoted a good deal of effort to persuading King to preserve a large portion of his voluminous diaries despite his desire to destroy them. And when by the time he died they had failed to get his consent to do so, they and others used their influence to save much of the material from destruction anyway.

Barnard brought up the sensitive matter in a letter to King in early March 1949 even before the grant was formally made. In response to King’s concern about students “pawing over” his personal material after his death, Barnard suggested that instead of destroying all the material, as King had hinted he might, the former Prime Minister could “in the process of the major initial task,... select out the material which you would want destroyed and could then make provision for the preservation of the remainder.” “It is my belief,” he concluded “that at least a very large part of your diary...is too valuable to be destroyed, including some parts that you might wish to withhold from public knowledge until after some future date or dates.”³⁶ At this early stage, full of energy and still basking in the initial glow of Rockefeller beneficence, King was more than agreeable. His previous plan to destroy parts or even all of his diaries had, he wrote Barnard, “arisen from a consciousness that my years being what they are, it might not be possible for me ever to go through these very personal writings, eliminating parts that others might not interpret aright, and retaining only such parts as might serve a useful public purpose.” But “that feeling,” he noted, “has already modified considerably in the light of the assistance that I now see as possible. Should there be time to select, there is much I should like to preserve.”³⁷

Despite his confidence that, given the RF support and the clerical help it would bring, there would, indeed, now be time, both his Canadian advisors and RF officers were not so sure.

Not long after the RF grant was announced to the press in early April members of the brain trust were corresponding about their concerns about King's health, his unpredictability, and his resistance to accept the help of others particularly where his personal papers were concerned.³⁸ They brain-stormed to come up with strategies to, as Barnard put it in a letter to James, "give a push in the right direction without intruding."³⁹

Ironically, Rockefeller, the primary force behind the RF's support for the project in the first place, used his influence on the former prime minister for the opposite purpose. During King's late spring visit to the Rockefeller estate in Pocantico Hills, New York, he gently cautioned his old friend not to pursue his work on his memoirs at the expense of his health. "As we walked down stairs," King noted in his diary entry for 23 May 1949, "he put his hands on my shoulders and said not to let anyone push me in my work - don't be in any hurry to conclude it - he thought the fall soon enough to begin a heavy part."⁴⁰ When King visited Rockefeller's Seal Harbor estate a few months later, the American repeatedly advised King to "forget all about the Memoirs until the Autumn or even later." "He seemed to feel," at least according to King who clearly had no stomach for the work at that time, "that I would approach the task with more enthusiasm were I to wait a little longer before attempting to enter upon it in earnest."⁴¹

While progress was slow on the autobiography, machinery for what, after King's death in the summer of 1950, became the biography project was set firmly in place. RF staff was, Stevens noted in an internal foundation memorandum late in 1949, "particularly happy...[to have] James as negotiator with his long-standing friend, Mr. King."⁴² While King lived, McGill served as little more than an "official post office box"⁴³ for the former prime minister, but following King's death, James became the invaluable, if often resented, chief Canadian administrator of the RF grant. By late 1949 a clerical staff of four people was employed on a full-time basis to assist Gibson and his assistant Jacqueline Côté in processing King's public

papers at Canada's National Archives. The RF grant paid the salaries of two of the staff, and funded the purchase of a dictation machine, two transcribing machines and two typewriters.⁴⁴ While RF officers despaired of the lack of progress on King's personal papers they were more optimistic about this work on the public papers. Following an interview with Dominion Archivist W. Kaye Lamb late in the summer of 1949, Stevens was pleased to report that "the archives job will work out successfully to produce data that a trained historian can put into final form."⁴⁵

By early 1950 there was even good news concerning the future of his personal papers. In January 1950 King selected F.A. McGregor, his personal secretary at the beginning of his political career at Canada's federal Department of Labour and during his stint with the RF, to work with him on his diaries. To King, his old secretary was simply "the best person to manage everything."⁴⁶ As James wrote Barnard "McGregor is one of the few people who has the entire confidence of Mr. King and I think that he will make an excellent chief of the small group which I hope we shall be able to build up in the course of the next two or three months."⁴⁷ Hired with RF funds at a salary of \$12,000 a year for a three year period, it was McGregor, and only McGregor, who would be entrusted to oversee the editing of King's personal diaries.

As the only person granted complete access to these documents during King's life, McGregor was able to use his influence to preserve the diaries after King's death. Despite Barnard's impassioned pleas that King mark text for destruction and that the rest of the diary be saved, as King's health deteriorated it became increasingly clear that he had not, and would not, make the selections. The written record seems to indicate that King planned to stick with his original plan of destroying all the material he had not personally selected for preservation, although given his wishes that anyone carrying on the work on the official biography be granted access to essential material, the case is certainly not without its ambiguities. A fascinating flurry

of correspondence between Ottawa and New York in late February and early March 1950 –a mere four months before King’s death in late July– sheds light on the mystery surrounding King’s intentions, though it does not provide a definitive answer. What the paper trail does indicate is that King’s advisors, including his future literary executors Lamb, McGregor, Norman Robertson, and J.W. Pickersgill, worked in concert with JDR Jr., and senior officials at the RF, in an effort to save King’s diaries from destruction.

In February 1950, Barnard received a memorandum from John Marshall of the RF’s Humanities Division concerning King’s failing health and the lack of progress made in the editing of his diaries. Concerned, Barnard wrote to JDR Jr. to ask if he would consider personally intervening in the matter. “[S]hocked to learn that it (Mackenzie King’s health) is so precarious...” Barnard asked Rockefeller “whether you could or would want to say anything to Mr. Mackenzie King about his diary.” Realizing that it was probably too late to follow his original plan to have King “delete passages that he would want forever withheld from public view...” he, nonetheless, felt that “the great bulk of this diary calls for no suppression from his point of view.” Barnard concluded his letter to Rockefeller by reiterating his assessment of the diaries’ historical value

It is distressing to think that what is probably the finest diary ever written by a statesman and covering such an exceptionally important period as 1912 to 1946 should be destroyed.⁴⁸

Rockefeller decided to intervene and on 1 March called King on the telephone at Laurier House. According to King’s record of the conversation, Rockefeller asked him if he would consider entrusting McGregor “and others with my diary.” The conversation, and a letter from Rockefeller which King received three days later, sent the former Prime Minister into a state of near-panic. Thrown into “profuse perspiration” by the letter, King felt betrayed by his friend. Convinced that Rockefeller was responding to correspondence “behind my back on the matter of

the diaries”⁴⁹ (which, of course, he was), King felt that the conversation and the letter “suggested an element of pressure...[and] that it seemed to signify some combination working without my knowledge in seeking to force a certain position.”⁵⁰ King was equally convinced that the source of the disturbance was a group of his Canadian advisors who had put Rockefeller up to intercede to save the diaries. “I felt pretty sure,” he noted in his diary, “that some communication had gone to New York in that direction.”⁵¹

In response Rockefeller urged his friend to make it a “codicil” to his will “allowing at least Mr. McGregor to go through my diaries and not have them destroyed.” According to King⁵² Rockefeller further suggested that he owed it to the RF not to destroy the diaries. Rehearsing his argument in the safe haven provided by his diary, King observed that at the time RF support for the project was negotiated, he stated clearly his intention to destroy the material, Barnard’s suggestion that he save some “extracts” was a mere personal preference and was never considered a condition of the grant.⁵³

Following his doctor’s advice that he “relieve” his “mind on the score of what I wished to do in regard to publishing any of my diary,” King called Rockefeller to discuss the issue. He felt sure, he told his doctor, that he was being pressured by those around him to “make public the diary as a whole but...[that he] did not wish to do that.”⁵⁴ King informed Rockefeller that publishing any part of the diary pertaining to Cabinet discussions would be a violation of his oath of confidentiality and thus he “could not think of giving to McGregor or anyone the right to make public what had taken place in the Cabinet.”⁵⁵ His diary, King expanded, “had been kept for my own guidance in writing but not for the eyes of others.”⁵⁶ As justification for his desire to destroy the diaries, King explained that the document contained “confidential things that I had recorded in my own way.”

Things, for example, that Roosevelt had spoken to me of to speak to Churchill about. Things that Churchill had spoken to me to speak to Roosevelt about. I had written in my

own way to remind myself later on to have available as to being accurate, etc. Another person might not read the language as I knew it. Also that I would wish it to die in my own breast. There were many secret confidences that I would not and could not afford to allow others to see.⁵⁷

Properly informed of the customs of Canadian governance and of King's purpose for keeping diary entries, Rockefeller still queried King about "other ways we could achieve the end of preserving material."⁵⁸ To this King reiterated that he was under no obligation to save any parts of the diary, that at the time of the preliminary discussions he had "told both Stevens and Barnard that I intended to destroy the whole diary if I did not have a chance to go through it myself."⁵⁹ Rockefeller responded by saying simply that he had not wished to suggest in his letter that King was legally or morally obliged to preserve the diaries –he was thinking, King proudly noted, "solely of my record and reputation."⁶⁰

To Rockefeller's repeated suggestions he should trust McGregor to make the necessary judgments, King said he would do so "absolutely," but, as he pointed out in his diary entry, "that was a different thing to a codicil which would give McGregor authority to disclose to the public what I had taken an oath I would never disclose."⁶¹ King tried to reassure his friend that he and McGregor "could work out a scheme whereby we would have most of the material that was worth preserving kept. That he, H. [Eduard Handy – King's secretary] and I were already shortly about to begin."⁶² To this, Rockefeller expressed his concern about the time any such scheme would take and how the effort could be detrimental to King's health. If it came to that, Rockefeller felt it would be better to forget the whole thing.⁶³

King was clearly annoyed that his diaries had already become the subject of clandestine international discussions.⁶⁴ Rockefeller, on the other hand, insisted he had written purely because of his concern for King's well-being. Nobody had influenced him in writing, he simply thought "that it would be a long business to go through the diary oneself and that the weight of it would be very heavy."⁶⁵ Repeating his advice of the previous year that King should not pressure

himself to work too aggressively on his memoirs, he said that he had every reason to believe that if King followed his doctor's order and "kept free of excitement and emotion, etc..." he could expect to live "another 8 or 10 years, and enjoy the latter part of ...[his] life very much."⁶⁶ Accepting King's assurances that he "got a certain pleasure out of the diary," and that his doctors "thought the diary a tonic," Rockefeller deferred to his friend's judgment. The old friends concluded their telephone conversation, King recorded, by agreeing to disagree about the extent of the former Prime Minister's greatness and, thus, the historical significance of the diary

I told him I thought he had been wrong in thinking that the diary amounted to much. He added that in that case, he must have been wrong in thinking I was a great man. I told him he certainly was. If anything I would be ashamed of the diary as an exhibit, of which there is nothing truer.⁶⁷

Rockefeller apparently was convinced by King's reassurances. Writing to Barnard in late March 1950, he maintained that the RF need not be concerned about King's health. King was only "feeling...the reaction that was to be expected resulting from a complete cessation of the public service which he rendered so uninterruptedly throughout his life." "While he has certain physical handicaps such as might overtake any man of his age," Rockefeller continued, "my own opinion is that with adequate rest and freedom from worry, personal and otherwise, Mr. King's health will improve and his life may easily be prolonged for some years to come." Apparently Rockefeller was also convinced that King would make progress on editing the diaries. Noting that the task was "very much on his mind," he observed how King was

with the strength as he can wisely devote to that purpose,...going over the diary with his trusted secretary [McGregor], indicating parts that, while important, are not confidential...[also marking passages] so highly confidential a nature that they could under no circumstances be used except by Mr. King personally.

Though he acknowledged that King had not advanced very far in work on his personal memoirs, Rockefeller felt that the RF's support was more than justified by the headway being made on King's public records. Recognizing that it was "difficult for anyone to predict with accuracy in

the case of a man of seventy-five,” Rockefeller had “every hope and expectation that although it will take longer than originally contemplated, the task to which Mr. King had planned to devote these later years of his life will ultimately be accomplished.”⁶⁸

It is impossible to know whether Rockefeller was suffering from a severe case of wishful thinking or he was simply encouraging the RF president to continue supporting the project. In either case, Rockefeller’s optimism concerning both King’s health, and the progress King and McGregor were making on the diary, was completely unfounded. Within four months King was dead, the diary remained more or less untouched, and King had done nothing to clarify his wishes for the document’s future. In separate letters to Barnard and Rockefeller written shortly after King’s death, McGregor reflected on this situation. Writing Rockefeller, McGregor noted that King had “made very little headway in the writing of his memoirs.”⁶⁹ To Barnard he suggested that “unfinished is hardly the word, for the headway Mr. King made during the past twelve months as very slight indeed. The task of writing was too much for him.”⁷⁰

It is clear from correspondence between McGregor, James, and RF officials in the aftermath of King’s death, that the support of Rockefeller and the RF was critical in initiating an official biography and even more so in determining its shape and scope. Like King before them, the literary executors’ conception of what could be done was linked to what the RF could be convinced to do, or was willing to do, in the way of funding. King had made no provision in his will for funding the project except to instruct his literary executors to cooperate with the RF and McGill University. This instruction suggested to McGregor that King had assumed that the RF grant would continue and that it would be sufficient to fund the completion of an official biography. According to their legal council, the literary executors had no access to funds from King’s estate. As far as public financing was concerned, the federal state –acting through the National Archives– was already supporting work on the King record by compiling and indexing

the former Prime Minister's papers. It was felt that the sitting liberal government could not commit any further funding for an official biography of its recent leader. As McGregor put it in a memorandum to James written in late 1952

It is out of the question to hope for any grant from the Federal Government, having in mind the just criticism that would be directed against expenditure of public funds for the portrayal of the life of a man who has been so actively and so recently associated with one political party.⁷¹

Put in the simplest terms, King's literary executors –the men entrusted with King's legacy– were in the same position so many Canadian scholars in the humanities and social sciences found themselves in during the pre-Canada Council era. They had an important topic of study, a substantial research base, but no funding to support their work. Since no scholar would consider assuming the role of official biographer without guarantee of a long-term contract, the executors felt they could not even select a biographer without assurances that the RF grant would be transferred to fund a biography project.⁷² To McGregor at least, it was clear that the project could not continue without RF funding. Writing James in early September 1950, he noted that “so much depends, of course, on the attitude of the RF.”⁷³

Although the RF's interest had been, initially, to assist a former employee and JDR Jr.'s closest friend, and thus enable him to spend his final days working on a project close to his heart, the RF leadership saw, after King's death, sufficient value in the prospective biography project to entertain proposals from the executors. Yet again, although he was careful to deny interference in RF affairs, Rockefeller was deeply involved in the process. After receiving a letter from McGregor, Rockefeller wrote to Barnard. Observing that King's death was a great loss to him personally, and that the lack of “progress with his memoirs will...be an irreparable loss to posterity,” Rockefeller passed on McGregor's inquiry concerning RF interest in the King

biography. Rockefeller noted that he advised the Canadian that he had not been active in the RF for many years, and that he “had nothing personally to do with the matter of which he wrote and that [McGregor] should take it up with you.”⁷⁴ His influence and power was, of course, implicit in the communication.

For their part, RF officials were interested, to say the least. After consulting his colleagues about RF policy in such cases, Barnard authorized a twelve-month continuation of the original grant, thus allowing the Canadians to continue the archival work at full speed and providing them time and resources to find a biographer and to develop a comprehensive strategy for completion of the biography.⁷⁵ By December, with word that the RF was ready to approve a full transfer of funds from the original grant and to make those funds available to the executors for a period of three years, the decision was made to hire R. MacGregor Dawson, a political scientist from the University of Toronto, as King’s biographer.⁷⁶ Like McGregor’s position, Dawson’s appointment was funded exclusively from the RF grant.⁷⁷ The arrangement was formalized in early 1951 when Dawson agreed to terms and the RF Board of Trustees formally authorised the transformation of the grant.⁷⁸

The new grant meant that Dawson, McGregor and their team of assistants could forge ahead with their work on a full-time basis and with much-needed security. With funding assured and Dawson hired, McGregor turned his full attention to editing the diaries. Although clause ten of King’s will directed the literary executors to destroy the entire document, King had left the issue open to interpretation when he also accepted “those parts which I have indicated are and shall be available for publication or use.”⁷⁹ After contacting the Department of Justice, the executors concluded that this “escape clause” permitted them to show “very substantial portions

of the diaries...to the biographer, though all of these will not be available for publication.”⁸⁰ The fact that King had not actually marked text for use by a future biographer was an obstacle to the executors but, apparently, not an insurmountable one. According to the Deputy Minister of Justice, F.P. Varcoe, it was also permissible for the executors to preserve “parts of the diaries in accordance with verbal indications given by Mr. King before his death.”⁸¹ King’s secretary, Edouard Handy, and McGregor were adamant that King had wanted to select large sections of the diary available for use in his memoirs. Accordingly it was decided that they would select “extracts which are of the type Mr. King had indicated orally might be retained.”⁸²

It is interesting to note how this legal fiction, which was designed by the executors to save the diary from destruction, is portrayed in the records of the RF. In the record of the 1951 grant allowing for the transfer of funds remaining from the original grant to the executors, McGregor’s role was simply to undertake “the selection of materials [from the diary] for publication or use.”⁸³ It appears, that to the officers of the RF, McGregor had the power of selection which Rockefeller urged King to grant to him in. This despite the fact that less than a year earlier King specifically stated in a letter to Rockefeller (and, ironically, recorded in his diary) that he could not and would not empower McGregor in this manner. When a new grant was made to the King project in the spring of 1953, an even more substantial re-writing of history had taken place in the RF records. King’s will, according to the 1953 grant record, gave McGregor “full and final authority to determine which parts of his diary should be destroyed and which retained for scholarly use.”⁸⁴ Later, when the RF’s involvement in the project was drawing to a close, McGregor’s task had been transformed completely, to that of examining “and, where necessary...copying...Mr. King’s diaries to ascertain what if any portion thereof should be

destroyed under the terms of Mr. King's will."⁸⁵ What happened, in reality, was that after King's death the executors, spurred on by Rockefeller and by future Prime Minister (and former University of Toronto history professor) Lester Pearson, who was also determined that the diaries be saved,⁸⁶ simply decided that they were too valuable to destroy. By establishing the principal that excerpts from the diaries would be available to the official biographer, the executors also ensured that it be preserved for the use of other scholars. As Jean Dryden writes

There could be no half measures—once the diaries had been used by one historian, they could not then be destroyed without leaving the Executors open to justified accusations of distorting and crippling the history of the King era.⁸⁷

In the end then, Barnard, Rockefeller and King's literary executors had gotten their way.

RF officials were particularly proud of the role their organization played in preserving King's personal papers and diaries. They maintained the diaries were "saved intact for the use of future historians...[and that this] can probably be attributed to the opportunity for their deliberate examination by Mr. F. A. McGregor..., an operation which was made possible by The RF grant."⁸⁸ In some respects the confusion after King's death was a result of the man's unusual desire to conceal his true thoughts. But the ambiguity was not untypical. King, like many other diarists, was extremely conflicted when it came to thinking about and discussing the fate of his diaries. Discussing contributors to her anthology, *Ariadne's Thread: A Collection of Contemporary Women's Journals*, Lyn Lifshin observes

When it came to talking about whether thoughts of publishing occurred to them, the most common answer seemed to be some variation of 'no, but...' or 'no, not really,' blending with an almost unconscious, or not quite admitted, 'well, maybe sometime, when I'm famous or dead.'⁸⁹

The documentary evidence reveals that King, in life, never got beyond the "No, but...maybe" phase. After his death, however, Barnard, Rockefeller, Pearson, and the literary executors not

only decided to preserve the diaries but also dictated the precise manner and mechanism of the preservation and editorial process. In reality, there was never any question of “saving” the diaries “intact.” The executors entrusted McGregor, as King had refused to do, with transcribing and editing the diaries at the entry-to-entry level. Larger, far-reaching, editorial policy such as the long-delayed decision to destroy the special spiritualism diaries in 1974 were made by all the surviving executors.⁹⁰

Available to the general public since 1973, when the University of Toronto Press published them in microfilm, the resulting diaries are now easily accessible as part of a show-case King exhibit, “The Diary of William Lyon Mackenzie King: A Real Companion and Friend, 1893-1950,” on the Library and Archives Canada’s web site.⁹¹ While the significance of the diary as a historical document can be endlessly debated, it is clear that, after extensive work editing and transcribing the text, the literary executors concurred with Barnard’s and Rockefeller’s initial assessment of the diary’s value. Acknowledging that “[t]he state of much of the original text and the terms of Mr. King’s will made the task of making it available an immense job, and a most costly one,” the archivist Lamb noted, in 1955, that the more he saw of it, “the surer I am that it is one of the great political documents of our time.” As Canada’s head archivist, the federal official formally entrusted with caring for the record of Canadian history, Lamb was convinced “there can be no question as to the necessity and the value of the work that was done.”⁹² In making his assessment, Lamb also reflected the opinion of the man who knew the diary better than anyone, McGregor. Writing to Lamb to apprise him of the progress he had made on the diary, he also evaluated the enterprise

May I add one comment. No one could examine the fifty-eight years of diary as I have without coming to the conclusion that here is a record of and a commentary upon Canadian public affairs which is of unparalleled historical value. Without access to this

source-book, no historian could come to a fair appraisal of the complex nature of the man, the value of his contribution to Canada, and the forces that have acted and reacted in the determination of Canadian domestic and foreign policies...I find myself completely confirmed in the view that as Literary Executors we were completely right in our decision not to destroy the diaries.”⁹³

By the time the final RF grant in support of King’s official biography lapsed a fundamental shift was about to occur in the political economy of Canadian culture. In his Throne Speech to the House of Common in January 1957, King’s successor, Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent, announced the long-awaited formation of the Canada Council. As St. Laurent lectured members of the House of Commons, “the time has come for us to depend in future somewhat more upon ourselves.”⁹⁴ While American foundations continued to operate in Canada, it was the Canadian state through its new council which now provided the life-blood for Canadian cultural and intellectual endeavors. In this new era, in the new environment of public patronage, the Canada Council reigned supreme. In the short term the King project was sustained through revenues earned by the serialization of the biography in *Weekend Magazine*. After Dawson’s death in July 1958, the executors selected Professor H. Blair Neatby of the Department of History at the University of British Columbia to continue work on the biography. With the institutionalized federalization of support for scholarship which took place with the creation of the Canada Council –a body which was formally, at least, at “arm’s length” with respect to the sitting government– public funding was now available to support the project. Thus it was that Neatby’s work as official biographer was funded in what is now the “traditional” manner of Canadian scholarship. Support for research and publication of Neatby’s two volumes which treated King’s life up to the outbreak of World War II was provided by the Canada Council, the University of British Columbia, Carleton University, and the University of Toronto’s Press Publication Fund.⁹⁵

The case of the RF's support for the Mackenzie King project is an important piece of intellectual history and one that speaks volumes about the existence of networks of influence and support that spanned the border between the United States and Canada during the first half of the twentieth century. From 1951 to his death in 1958 –the years he was employed as biographer-- R. MacGregor Dawson, completed the first volume of the official biography, *William Lyon Mackenzie King: A Political Biography, 1874-1923*,⁹⁶ as well as a complementary monograph, *The Conscripted Crisis of 1944*.⁹⁷ Of greater significance, in the long-term, was the RF's partnership with King, his literary executors, and the National Archives of Canada in a project to preserve, organize and archive King's personal and public papers, including the diaries. This activity was crucial to establishing a research base on Mackenzie King. This base, in turn, facilitated the writing of not only Neatby's two volumes of the official biography,⁹⁸ F.A. McGregor's *The Fall and Rise of Mackenzie King, 1911-1919*,⁹⁹ J. W. Pickersgill's and D.F. Foster's edited collections of King papers,¹⁰⁰ but also all subsequent Mackenzie King historiography.

Rockefeller's personal interest and the support of the RF, inspired King and his advisors to think about his memoirs as an important project and one that necessarily was approached as a group venture. Rockefeller was one of the few individuals whose opinion really had the power to influence King on a personal level and his involvement did much to enhance King's sense of the importance of his own life. As empowering as Rockefeller's "stamp of approval" was the material support that came along with it. In a very real sense Rockefeller interest –personal, corporate, financial, intellectual, and emotional– was a pivotal component in what Marx and Engels referred to as the "material means of mental production" underpinning the enterprise to

create the official King “record.”¹⁰¹ The project may very well have developed in a similar manner under some other system of patronage but that is not what happened. By funding the biography, the RF involved itself in the circulation of “great” narratives of Canadian history.

Editor's Note: This research report is presented here with the author’s permission but should not be cited or quoted without the author’s consent.

Rockefeller Archive Center Research Reports Online is a periodic publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center. Edited by Erwin Levold, Research Reports Online is intended to foster the network of scholarship in the history of philanthropy and to highlight the diverse range of materials and subjects covered in the collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center. The reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, many of whom have received grants from the Archive Center to support their research.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and are not intended to represent the Rockefeller Archive Center.

ENDNOTES:

1. RF 49060, Rockefeller Foundation Grant Record, 6 April 1949, p. 1, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, Papers of the Rockefeller Foundation (hereafter RF), Rockefeller Archive Center (hereafter RAC).
2. "Rockefeller Foundation and McGill University to Assist in Making Memoirs by Mr. King Available to Public. Statement by Rt. Hon. W.L. Mackenzie King," (For release after 12.00 noon, April 7th, 1949), p. 2, file 10: "Rockefeller Foundation Clippings and Press Releases, 1949," volume 4, MG 26 J 17, Library and Archives Canada (hereafter LAC).
5. RF 49060, p. 3.
6. Raymond B. Fosdick, *John D. Rockefeller, Jr.: A Portrait*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956, p. 421.
7. John Marshall to F. Cyril James, 3 February 1953, file 4: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence Re: Memoirs Project, 1953," volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC.
8. For analysis of Rockefeller Foundation for support for the social sciences and humanities in Canada see Jeffrey D. Brison, *Rockefeller, Carnegie, And Canada: American Philanthropy And The Arts And Letters In Canada*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005.
9. <http://king.archives.ca>.
10. For a comprehensive examination of American philanthropy and support for the arts and letters in Canada during the first half of the twentieth century see Brison, *Rockefeller, Carnegie, And Canada*.
11. See "A Brief Presented by the Humanities Research Council of Canada to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences," 15 July 1949, pp. 2-3, sent to Stephen H. Stackpole by J.E. Robbins, 10 October 1949, file: HRCC, 1944-1962, Carnegie Corporation of New York Archives (hereafter CCNYA). For an excellent study of the early years of the Social Science Research Council of Canada see Fisher, *The Social Sciences in Canada: 50 Years of National Activity by the Social Science Federation of Canada*. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier Press, in collaboration with the Social Sciences Federation of Canada, 1993.
14. "Memorandum to Rockefeller," 31 December 1948, unnamed author to Rockefeller, copy sent to Barnard, 3 January 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC. Rockefeller forwarded the letter to the newly-appointed President of the Foundation, Chester Barnard, without naming its author. Rockefeller later revealed to King that it was Kenneth Chorley who suggested the project. See 19 May 1949, p. 2, Diaries of William Lyon Mackenzie King, MG 26 J13, <http://king.archives.ca>, LAC.
15. King to Ferris Greenslet, 26 November 1948, file 9: "Memoirs Project: Correspondence from Interested Publishers, 1944-1954," volume 5, MG 26 J17, LAC.
16. "Memorandum to Rockefeller." King and Chorley had met a number of times in both Ottawa and Williamsburg and had, most recently, corresponded about arranging the transfer of paintings of colonial Virginia from the British crown to the historic site at Williamsburg, "with a view," as King put it in his diary, "to developing Anglo-American friendship." See 27 May 1947, p. 1, Diaries of William Lyon Mackenzie King, MG 26 J13, <http://king.archives.ca>, LAC.
17. "Memorandum to Rockefeller."
18. Barnard to Rockefeller, 2 February 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427R, RG 1.2 RF, RAC.
19. Officer's Conference, 4 February 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
20. Rockefeller to King, 10 February 1949, "Rockefeller Foundation - Extracts Re Funds," file 1: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence Re: Memoirs Project 1950," pp. 1-2, volume 4, MG 26 J 17, LAC.
21. Barnard to King, 10 February 1949, pp. 1-2, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
22. King to Barnard, 12 February 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
23. King to Barnard, 7 March 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
24. 20 February, 1949, p. 1, Diaries of William Lyon Mackenzie King, MG 26 J13, <http://king.archives.ca>, LAC.
25. Norman McLeod Rogers, *Mackenzie King* (Toronto: G. N. Morang, 1935).
26. 20 February 1949, p. 1, Diaries of William Lyon Mackenzie King, MG 26 J13, <http://king.archives.ca>, LAC.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid., p. 2.
29. Interoffice Correspondence, Willits to Bernard, 11 Feb. 1949 RAC. Curiously, three months after the grant was awarded, William Chenery wrote to the Rockefeller Foundation requesting a copy of a 1915 foundation report written by King on the Colorado Fuel and Iron strike. Chenery, who was thinking of writing a book about the strike, was told that the report was confidential and could not be released. Chenery to Alan Gregg 12 August 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.

-
30. Barnard to James, 10 March 1949, p. 2, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC. In fact, when news of the grant first leaked to the press in early April, some Canadian newspapers reported that King was selling his papers to the RF for between \$200,000 and \$1 million. See F. C. Mears, "Mackenzie King Private Papers Said Going to Rockefeller Files," *Montreal Gazette*, 2 April 1949; and "Former PM Disposes of Papers: Mr. King's Files Go to the Rockefeller Foundation," *Ottawa Evening Journal*, 2 April 1949. Both articles in file 10: "Rockefeller Foundation - Clippings and Press Releases," volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC. King was so worried by the reports that he wrote to Barnard to apologise for any embarrassment the incident might cause the RF and to assure the officer that he would understand if the RF wanted to reverse its decision and rescind its support for the project. For his part, Barnard wrote King that although "the articles to which you refer very naturally are disturbing to you," they were "not at all to us." See King to Barnard, 3 April 1949, and Barnard to King, 5 April, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
31. Inter-Office Correspondence, Willits to Barnard, 11 February 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
32. Marshall memorandum to Stevens, 20 December 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
33. Barnard to King, 3 March 1949, p. 2, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
34. James to King, 14 March 1949, file 9: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence with C.I. Barnard, F.C. James, 1949-50," volume 4, MG 26 J 17, LAC.
35. James to Barnard, 14 March 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
36. Barnard to King, 3 March 1949, pp. 2-3.
37. King to Barnard, 7 March 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
38. See James to Willits, 20 April 1949; Barnard to James, 2 June 1949; Inter-Office Correspondence, Stevens to Barnard, 17 June 1949; and Interview between Stevens and Barnard, 22 August 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
39. Barnard to James, 2 June 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
40. 23 May 1949, p. 1, Diaries of William Lyon Mackenzie King, MG 26 J13, <http://king.archives.ca>, LAC.
41. King to James, 31 Aug. 1949, file 9: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence with C.I. Barnard, F.C. James, 1949-50", volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC.
42. "Interviews: DHS (David H. Stevens), Mackenzie King project," 1 December 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
43. James to John Marshall, 27 December 1950, p. 1, file 1: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence Re: Memoirs Project 1950," volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC.
44. W. Kaye Lamb to James, 16 June 1949, file 9: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence with C.I. Barnard, F.C. James, 1949-50", volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC; "McGill University Rockefeller Foundation Grant for Mackenzie King Memoirs: Statement of Receipts and Disbursements to December 31, 1949," file 9: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence with C.I. Barnard, F.C. James, 1949-50," volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC; and Lamb, "Progress Report on Calendaring of the Papers of the Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King," 29 November 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
45. Summary of interview, David H. Stevens and Lamb, 22 August 1949, p. 1, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
46. 7 April 1949, p. 1, Diaries of William Lyon Mackenzie King, MG 26 J13, <http://king.archives.ca>, LAC.
47. James to Barnard, 7 November 1949, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
48. Barnard to Rockefeller, 28 February 1950, Folder 86, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
49. 4 March 1950, p. 1, Diaries of William Lyon Mackenzie King, MG 26 J13, <http://king.archives.ca>, LAC.
50. Ibid., p. 2.
51. 1 March 1950, p. 1, Diaries of William Lyon Mackenzie King, MG 26 J13, <http://king.archives.ca>, LAC.
52. The letter from Rockefeller to King does not exist in King's papers. In his diary entry of 7 March (p. 3) King states that both men agreed to destroy their copies of the letter. Although the RF normally kept copies of correspondence related to its active projects, no copy of the 4 March letter from Rockefeller to King exists in the RF's grant files.
53. 7 March, 1950, p. 3, Diaries of William Lyon Mackenzie King, MG 26 J13, <http://king.archives.ca>, LAC. Ibid.
54. Ibid, pp.1-2.
55. Ibid., p. 2.
56. Ibid.
57. Ibid., p. 3.

-
58. Ibid., p. 2.
 59. Ibid.
 60. Ibid., p. 3.
 61. Ibid.
 62. Ibid.
 63. Ibid.
 64. Ibid., p. 4
 65. Ibid.
 66. Ibid.
 67. Ibid.
 68. Rockefeller to Barnard, 30 March 1950, p. 1, Folder 86, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
 69. From an excerpt of a letter sent from McGregor to Rockefeller (date unknown), reproduced in Rockefeller to Barnard, 16 August 1950, Folder 86, Box 9, 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
 70. McGregor to Barnard, 29 August 1950, p. 1, Folder 86, Box 9, 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
 71. McGregor, "Memorandum to Dr. F. Cyril James, Re: Rockefeller Grant For Mackenzie King Biography," 17 November 1952, p. 3, file 3: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence Re: Memoirs Project, 1952," volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC.
 72. McGregor to James (copy to Barnard), 26 September 1950, excerpt in "Rockefeller Foundation - Extracts Re: Funds," file 1: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence Re: Memoirs Project, 1950," volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC.
 73. McGregor to James, 12 September 1950, file 1: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence, Re: Memoirs Project, 1950," volume 4, MG 26 J 17, LAC.
 74. Rockefeller to Barnard, 16 August 1950, Folder 83, Box 9, Series 427R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
 75. Inter-office Correspondence, Charles B. Fahs to Joseph Willits, LFK, and Chester Barnard, "Subject: Mackenzie King Project," 5 September 1950, Folder 86, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
 76. McGregor to Fahs, 5 December 1950, file 1: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence, Re: Memoirs Project, 1950," volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC.
 77. James to Fahs, 15 December 1950, file 1: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence, Re: Memoirs Project, 1950," volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC.
 78. Expenditures from the original grant amounted to \$21,0001.88 at the end of 1950, leaving an unexpended balance of \$78,998.12. See McGregor to James, 22 December 1950, "Rockefeller Foundation - Extracts Re Funds," p. 10, file 1: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence Re: Memoirs project, 1950," volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC.
 79. McGregor, "Memorandum to Dr. F. Cyril James, Principal of McGill University," p. 3, file 1: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence Re: Memoirs Project 1950," volume 4, MG 26 J17, LAC.
 80. Ibid., p. 4.
 81. F.P. Varcoe to J.W. Pickersgill, 14 December 1950, file: Literary Executors Correspondence, MG 26 J17, cited in Dryden, p. 52.
 82. Memo from Chairman, Board of Literary Executors to James, 22 December 1950, p. 4, File: Rockefeller Foundation Correspondence, 1950-55, cited in Dryden, p. 53.
 83. RF 49060, "McGill University - Amendment," p. 2, 19 January 1951, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427R, RF, RAC.
 84. RF 53058, "McGill University - Mackenzie King Papers," p. 1, 1 April 1953, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RF, RAC.
 85. RF 55191, "McGill University - Mackenzie King Papers," p.2, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RF, RAC.
 86. J. Bartlett Brebner to Joseph Willits, 31 October 1950, Folder 86, Box 9, Series 427R, RG1.2, RF, RAC.
 87. Jean E. Dryden, "The Mackenzie King Papers: An Archival Odyssey," *Archivaria* 6 (Summer 1978), p. 57.
 88. RF 55191, "McGill University - Mackenzie King Papers," 6-7 December 1955, p. 2, Folder 85, Box 9, Series 427 R, RG 1.2, RF, RAC.
 89. New York: Harper and Row, 1982, pp.15-16, cited in Elizabeth Podnieks, *Daily Modernism: The Literary Diaries of Virginia Woolf, Antonia White, Elizabeth Smart, and Anaïs Nin*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000, p. 28.
 90. Dryden.
 91. <http://king.archives.ca>
 92. Lamb to James, 14 July 1955, file 6: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence Re: Memoirs Project, 1955," volume 4, MG 26, J 17, LAC.

-
93. McGregor to Lamb, 17 June 1955, p. 2, file 6: "Rockefeller Foundation - Correspondence Re: Memoirs Project, 1955," volume 4, MG 26, J 17, LAC.
 94. House of Commons, *Debates*, 18 January 1957, p. 393.
 95. Neatby, *William Lyon Mackenzie King (Volume 3): The Prism of Unity, 1932-1939*, p. viii.
 96. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.
 97. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961.
 98. *William Lyon Mackenzie King (Volume 2): The Lonely Heights, 1924-1932* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1963; and *William Lyon Mackenzie King (Volume 3): The Prism of Unity, 1932-1939*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1976.
 99. Toronto: Macmillan, 1962.
 100. J.W. Pickersgill, *The Mackenzie King Record: Volume 1, 1939-1944*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1960; Pickersgill and D.F. Foster, *The Mackenzie King Record: Volume 2, 1944-1945*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1968; Pickersgill and Foster, *The Mackenzie King Record: Volume 3, 1945-1946*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1970; and Pickersgill and Foster, *The Mackenzie King Record: Volume 4, 1947-1948* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1970.
 101. Cited in Clyde W. Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990, p. 12.