Introduction

Michael Oldfield was born on May 8, 1936. But he dates the real beginning of his life to ten years later, in September of 1946, when he entered a child welfare home called Folly House run by Barnardo's, Britain's largest children's charity at the time. Of course, he had lived through those earlier years, yet his memory of them is "more or less blank. I really just have very faint ideas that I was there, but nothing more. And it wasn't until I arrived in [Folly House] that I really sort of started to recollect my thoughts as I know them today."[1] Given these gaps in his memory, all that Oldfield knows about his early childhood comes from clues found in his official Barnardo's file, which he received in 1979 after he became curious about his missing years and asked the organization for a copy. He brought this thick manila folder with him when we met in Petersham on the outskirts of Sydney, Australia, on a sunny summer day in 2006. Our conversation began with a great shuffling of papers, as Oldfield sorted through medical reports, school records, and old photos, carefully piecing together his history from the time before it became his memory. As his narrative moved forward chronologically, he grew less dependent on the file, and by the time we reached the late 1940s he had largely placed it aside. Instead, he relied on his trove of memories of events long past but not forgotten, weaving these together to give me a sense of who he is today, and how he came to be that way.

Oldfield's story begins in the maternity ward of London's St. Pancras Hospital, where he and his twin sister Sheila were born during the later years of the Great Depression. His parents were never well off, and struggled to make ends meet. It was perhaps the promise of a steady paycheck that led his father to sign up for the army as soon as the Second World War began, leaving his mother to continue to care for the two children while working full time as a domestic servant. The work was exhausting, and when she received word in 1941 that her husband had been killed in action, it all became too much. On the advice of her employer as well as

[1] Author's interview with Michael Oldfield, February 23, 2006.

the local welfare authorities, she decided to place the by-now four-year-old twins with Barnardo's.

Judging by the stack of transfer reports in Oldfield's file, the next few years were a flurry of activity. He and his sister moved from one orphanage to the next to avoid Nazi air raids. In all the commotion, they lost touch with their mother, although the siblings stayed together throughout the war and eventually ended up in a group home in Scotland. Oldfield, though, had always been a sickly child, and, when he contracted an illness so severe that he needed hospitalization, the directors of the home decided that the northern weather was not agreeing with him. Barnardo's sent him south to England and to Folly House, but away from Sheila, who stayed up north. They would meet again several years later, but in a different continent, half a world away. The period in Scotland was the last time that the two were in regular contact with each other.

When Oldfield entered Folly House, it was a large, three-story country home surrounded by farmlands and filled with almost thirty little boys. He settled in easily, joining the local choir and succeeding in his classes. He was voted "boy of the year" three years in a row, an honor for which he won an elegant pinstriped suit that he wore until it was bursting at the seams. Oldfield probably would have continued along happily in Folly House had a man from Barnardo's head office not arrived one day in 1949 to talk to the boys about a unique opportunity available to them. The official told them that the organization often sent parties of children to live in a farm school in Australia. Would any boys from Folly House like to go? The talk struck a chord with Oldfield because he had recently studied the country in his geography class. His first thought was: "Australia, I've just drawn a map of that!" The rest of the discussion was a blur, but Oldfield notes that it must have been "persuasive," since after the meeting ended he asked for his name to be put on the list. A few weeks later, Oldfield received word that he was one of three boys from Folly House accepted for emigration that year. To Barnardo's, he was an ideal candidate: smart, well adjusted, and with no ties to his immediate family. His file indicates that the organization attempted to contact his mother for permission, but there is no record of her response. Perhaps, Oldfield muses, she had simply moved on with her life. There was another reason that he seemed particularly suited for the program. Although he would not know it until the eve of his departure, Barnardo's had already sent Sheila to Australia two years before. The siblings would meet again briefly on the quayside after his arrival in Sydney harbor, two awkward thirteen-year-olds who looked remarkably alike but found they had little to say to each other.

At the time, Oldfield never saw himself as a historical actor, as someone whose life was both shaped by, and was actively shaping, the wider forces of history around him. Yet in retrospect, his story of family separation, institutional care, and movement across continents has made his childhood seem atypical, at least in comparison to the majority of those in the modern West. This sense of historical disjuncture has meant that although Oldfield has defined himself in a variety of ways throughout his life – farmer, scholar, Anglican, freemason, world traveler – today others are more likely to think of him as a member of a distinct and historically specific group: British child migrants. Oldfield and his sister were two of the roughly 95,000 boys and girls selected between the years 1869 and 1967 by government-funded British charities for permanent relocation to the settler dominions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Southern Rhodesia.[2] Like Oldfield, the majority of these children were between the ages of five and thirteen. Most also came, as he did, from poor, primarily working-class households in Britain's major cities. Once overseas, they were groomed for a rural lifestyle and tended to remain in agricultural careers in the dominions throughout their lives. In more recent decades, however, large numbers of these former child migrants have returned to the United Kingdom as adults in search of lost relatives or to start life over in the land of their birth. Many have spoken openly about the feelings of pain and dislocation stemming from their removal from family and birth country, as well as of their experiences of abuse, neglect, or institutionalization in children's homes and orphanages in the dominions.[3] At the same time, activist groups in Britain and Australia

[2] The exact number of child migrants sent abroad in this period is impossible to tell given the inadequate nature of the records. The highest estimate cited is 150,000, although this figure includes "juvenile migrants" – those over the school-leaving age of fourteen – as well as those sent abroad before the modern child emigration movement began in the late Victorian period. Recent scholars agree that at least 80,000 went to Canada from the 1860s through the 1920s; in *Children of the Empire* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1982), 259, Gillian Wagner puts the figure at 88,000. Adding in the slightly more than 6,000 sent to Australia in the twentieth century, as well as the estimated 500 to New Zealand and 276 to Southern Rhodesia in the postwar period, the total number of child migrants amounts to around 95,000. For a full discussion, see Marjory Harper and Stephen Constantine, *Migration and Empire* (Oxford University Press, 2010), 248.

[3] These testimonies have appeared prominently in two government inquiries into the policy held in Britain and Australia, the reports of which can be found in: House of Commons, Health Committee, *The Welfare of Former British Child Migrants* (London: Stationery Office, 1998); Senate Community Affairs References Committee, *Lost Innocents: Righting the Record – Report on Child Migration* (Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, 2001). A number of popular histories have also highlighted the more abusive aspects of the policy. See in particular: Philip Bean and Joy Melville, *Lost Children of the Empire: The Untold Story of Britain's Child Migrants* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989); Margaret Humphreys, *Empty Cradles* (London: Doubleday, 1994); Alan Gill, *Orphans of the Empire: The Shocking Story of Child Migration to Australia* (Sydney: Millennium Books, 1997); David Hill, *The*

have done much to raise awareness about the long-term emotional consequences of the initiatives for former child migrants, and to push for compensation.[4] These efforts have not been in vain; in 2009 and 2010, both governments issued formal apologies for their previous sponsorship of the programs. Gordon Brown, the British Prime Minister at the time, called child emigration a "shameful episode of history" that represented Britain's "failure in the first duty of a nation, which is to protect its children."[5]

I spoke with Oldfield three years before these apologies made the history of child emigration international news, but he was already well aware that the general view of the policy was a negative one. He thus took pains to emphasize that his own experience was different. He had only fond memories of his time with Barnardo's, and never felt the trauma and loss that some other former migrants have known. He spoke of his resettlement to Australia as a wonderful adventure, stressing the thrill he felt when boarding an ocean liner in the port of Southampton, as well as his excitement at seeing the "vastness" of the country when he arrived, some six weeks later, at the Barnardo's farm school of Mowbray Park in Picton, New South Wales. Oldfield remembered Mowbray Park as a "beautiful place … grand," with more space to play in than he had ever seen in Britain, and he told me funny stories about adapting to Australian culture. To his horror, on his second night at the school he was served roasted pumpkin, a food that only animals ate back at Folly House. He managed to suffer it down, but never developed much of a taste for it. Even today, the only way he can bear it is baked in a scone. On the whole, though, his transition was smooth. He excelled at the local school, made friends quickly, and enjoyed the training he received in farming and dairying. When Oldfield talked about Mowbray Park, he switched from the first-person singular, "I," to the plural, "we." To him, this was not an isolated institution but a community, "a small village," where he counted as a valued member of the whole. He noted that this sense of connection and camaraderie helped him to become assimilated into the country that is now his home. He has remained in Australia to this day, and has no desire to return to Britain for more than the occasional holiday.

Forgotten Children: Fairbridge Farm School and Its Betrayal of Britain's Child Migrants to Australia (Sydney: Random House, 2007).

[4] The most prominent advocacy group is the Child Migrants Trust, based in Nottingham, with an additional office in Melbourne. For a description of its work, see the book authored by its founder: Humphreys, *Empty Cradles*.

[5] Great Britain, House of Commons, *Debates* 506, no. 44, 6th series, February 24, 2010, col. 301. For the Australian apology, see Commonwealth of Australia, House of Representatives, *Debates* 17, 1st session, 6th period, November 16, 2009, 11,647–11,650.

As Oldfield told it, his was a tale of successful integration, of crossing oceans to find a place where he belonged. Even so, when I asked how he identified himself – did he feel more British or Australian? – his feelings lay somewhere in between. "I've always associated myself as half English," he said. Noting that his accent had changed little over the years, he told me that, when people asked where he was from, he usually replied that he was an "English gentleman or English fellow. Even though I know – I've been here for fifty years – that I'm Australian. But people still accept me as being English." He joked that he even dressed the part, having kept his penchant for pinstriped suits ever since receiving that first one back at Folly House. He certainly looked smart on the day of our interview, his dark blue suit, Windsor knotted tie, and pocket handkerchief considerably outshining my own graduate-student attire.

Michael Oldfield's migration story, and his comments about feeling simultaneously "Australian" and "half English" provide a helpful reminder, in this era of passport controls and visa restrictions, that the boundaries between nations and national identities have not always been as fixed as they might now appear. On the contrary, it has long been possible for people to imagine themselves as members of multiple and overlapping communities, a fluidity of belonging that was especially prominent among those who lived in the context of empire. As Linda Colley has shown, the notion that individuals could ascribe to several different identities at once lay at the heart of Britain's imperial project from the eighteenth century onward. It was central to the development of a new, overarching sense of "Britishness" that served to unify the disparate inhabitants of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales into a coherent nation without destroying their preexisting loyalties.[6] In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as this small island nation came to rule one-quarter of the world's population, this ethic of Britishness was transformed into a truly global identity. It was carried overseas by the roughly 25 million souls who left the United Kingdom for foreign shores between the end of the Napoleonic wars through the 1920s, a massive transfer of people that still stands as one of the largest world migrations in the modern era.[7] The great majority of these Britons chose to live among their "brethren" in the United States and the settler empire. There, like Oldfield, they forged unique local identities but also retained a firm connection to their natal heritage. This complex sense of self became the

[6] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).
[7] James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Angloworld, 1783–1939* (Oxford University Press, 2009), 126.

hallmark of the territories that made up what recent scholars have termed the "British world" but that contemporaries at the time were more likely to call, simply, "Greater Britain."[8]

Both at home and abroad, Britishness was often viewed as an exceptional spirit, the core part of a person's being that encompassed her "British soul."[9] For Oldfield, this inner nature still found expression in the most basic and unconscious aspects of his personality: how he spoke and carried himself, how he dressed. This notion that all people contain a deep-seated essence reflecting their origins is an old one, dating back in British culture to at least the Enlightenment. In the eighteenth century, writers described it as the natural "bent" or "inclination" that distinguished each individual and that, writ large, tended to separate society into discrete social classes.[10] In the nineteenth century, the idea was reworked in two different yet complementary ways. The first was a growing emphasis on childhood as the most formative stage of life, the time in which every person interacted with their environment to develop an identity that determined how they would think, feel, and behave in adulthood.[11] The second was an argument about the power of heredity, which underwrote a view of the world divided by blood and culture into separate nations, races, and ethnicities.[12] In late Victorian Britain, as the nation rapidly expanded its imperial reach, these ideas combined into the jingoistic ideal that the British people

[8] Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich, eds., *The British World: Diaspora, Culture, and Identity* (London: Frank Cass, 2003); Philip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, eds., *Rediscovering the British World* (University of Calgary Press, 2005); Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of the World Order, 1860–1900* (Princeton University Press, 2007); Kate Darian-Smith, Patricia Grimshaw, and Stuart Macintyre, eds., *Britishness Abroad: Transnational Movements and Imperial Cultures* (Melbourne University Press, 2008); John Darwin, *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World-System, 1830–1970* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[9] This quote comes from the original version of "Advance Australia Fair," by the Scottish composer Peter Dodds McCormick (1878), cited in Neville Meaney, "Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 31, no. 2 (May 2003): 121–135, 121.

[10] Jenny Davidson, *Breeding: A Partial History of the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009).

[11] Carolyn Steedman, *Strange Dislocations: Childhood and the Idea of Human Interiority, 1780–1930* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995).

[12] This hardening of racial attitudes has been most apparent in studies of missionaries, which have traced the waning of an earlier, evangelical faith in the universal brotherhood of man during the middle decades of the nineteenth century and the rise of newer tendencies to essentialize the differences between colonizer and colonized. See especially Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830–1867* (University of Chicago Press, 2002); Richard Price, *Making Empire: Colonial Encounters and the Making of Imperial Rule in Nineteenth-Century Africa* (Cambridge University Press, 2008).

formed a distinct master race, gifted in the art of liberty and destined to spread the benefits of their civilization around the globe.[13] Britons, it seemed, were born with a kernel of this superiority lodged deep within them. Yet it was the experiences of childhood that determined whether it would bloom or remain dormant, as well as the particular expression it would take in adulthood.

Child emigration was a product of this tendency to understand Britishness as an ethnic and spiritual core that required careful cultivation to achieve its full potential. While Poor Law authorities and private charities had sporadically resettled child apprentices in the colonies since the seventeenth century, child emigration first emerged as a coherent movement in 1869, when the philanthropist Maria Rye began sending regular parties of what she called her "gutter children" to Canada.[14] Like other "child savers" of her time, Rye was eager to pluck poor children from the streets of British slums before their malleable constitutions were corrupted through the forces of want, disease, and immorality. Transferred overseas to the underpopulated yet bountiful dominions, they would live among those who were, as she assured readers of *The Times*, "bone of your bone and flesh of your flesh."[15] There, as the children grew fit and strong from the hearty, outdoor lifestyle, they would also help extend the reach of British settlement, bringing thousands of new acres of Greater Britain's dark, rich soil under plow.

This was a vision of mutual development: of needy children made whole and the settler empire fulfilled. Its effects were significant. In Britain, it served to justify a more intensive intrusion into the private realm of the family. At the time, it was not uncommon for social reformers to seek the removal of children from destitute households in an effort to improve their life chances and to protect the future stability of the nation. Thomas Barnardo, the founder of the organization that still bears his name, called this form of intervention "philanthropic abduction," and he touted it as

[13] The concept found its clearest expression in two extremely popular works of Victorian literature, Charles Dilke's travelogue, *Greater Britain: A Record of Travel in the English-Speaking Countries during 1866 and 1867*, 2 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1868), and J. R. Seeley's bestselling *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures* (London: Macmillan, 1883).

[14] On the earlier history of child emigration, see Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, 1–35; Elaine Hadley, "Natives in a Strange Land: The Philanthropic Discourse of Juvenile Emigration in Mid-Nineteenth-Century England," *Victorian Studies* 33, no. 3 (Spring 1990): 411–439; Barry Coldrey, "'A Thriving and Ugly Trade': The First Phase of Child Migration, 1617–1757," *History of Education Society Bulletin* 58 (Autumn 1996): 4–14;. On Rye's life and work, see Marion Diamond, *Emigration and Empire: The Life of Maria S. Rye* (New York: Garland, 1999); Lisa Chilton, *Agents of Empire: British Female Migration to Canada and Australia, 1860s–1930* (University of Toronto Press, 2007).

[15] Maria S. Rye, "Our Gutter Children," *The Times*, March 29, 1869, 8.

one of the most laudable aspects of his work.[16] In this respect, child emigration was no different from a host of late nineteenth-century initiatives that placed the collective interests of society over the claims of poor parents. Its ideology was mirrored in the "orphan trains" that trundled some 250,000 boys and girls across the United States from the 1850s to the 1920s, most of whom were foundlings from New York City sent to live with farming families in the American West.[17] This vision also appeared in the public and charitable institutions that sprang up across Europe to take in the children of paupers.[18]

Setting child emigration apart from these other schemes was its emphasis on the settler empire as a redemptive space for the British race. Like many in the dominions, emigration proponents defined these territories not as mere replicas of the mother country but as "Better Britains," egalitarian regions that lacked the entrenched class hierarchies and social problems that plagued the homeland.[19] This concept underlay their insistence that resettlement would allow destitute children to attain a higher degree of social mobility than if they remained in Britain. While most metropolitan reformers aimed to promote their wards into the ranks of the respectable working class, emigration enthusiasts aimed higher, imagining that even the lowest "gutter child" could become an independent property owner or a member of the professions. This promise of future advancement provided a powerful justification for a program that often severed the children's links to the people and places they had formerly known. In Britain, as Lydia Murdoch has shown, many struggling parents placed their young in charitable homes and Poor Law institutions only temporarily. They often maintained contact with their children and exercised a degree of control over their fate.[20] Emigration, on the other hand, was intended to be permanent. It understood children

[16] Thomas Barnardo, "Is Philanthropic Abduction Ever Justifiable?" *Night and Day* (November 1885): 149–150.

[17] Stephen O'Connor, *Orphan Trains: The Story of Charles Loring Brace and the Children He Saved and Failed* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2001), xvii. See also Marilyn Holt, *The Orphan Trains: Placing Out in America* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992); Jeanne F. Cook, "A History of Placing-Out: The Orphan Trains," *Child Welfare* 74, no. 1 (January–February 1995): 181–197; Linda Gordon, *The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

[18] Rachel Fuchs, *Abandoned Children: Foundlings and Child Welfare in Nineteenth Century France* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984); Lydia Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans: Poor Families, Child Welfare, and Contested Citizenship in London* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006).

[19] Buckner and Francis, "Introduction," *Rediscovering the British World*, 15. On the concept of the dominions as "Better Britains," see also James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001).

[20] Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans*, 92–119.

to be less the product of their biological families than the embodiment of an imperial race destined for greatness.

In articulating this expanded and seemingly classless vision of British children's potential in the empire, and by employing it to reconfigure the conventional boundaries of parental rights, child emigration left a significant imprint on late Victorian culture, even though the actual number of children resettled during these years was a fraction of the total in care.[21] As such, the policy stands as another example of how the growth of British imperialism shaped the ideologies, practices, and institutions of metropolitan life during the final decades of the nineteenth century. In this instance, Britain's status as an imperial nation inspired reformers to think in fresh ways about the social value of poor children, and offered new possibilities for their care.[22] In recent years, the task of illuminating the influence of empire "at home" in Britain has become a major concern of historians and literary scholars, with the majority of their scholarship focusing on the networks of power and authority that connected the nation to its colonies in Africa and Asia.[23] Yet the case of child emigration suggests that, within the emerging realm of child welfare, it was not the formal empire, marked by clear notions of racial and cultural difference, that dominated the minds of British social reformers. Rather, it was the "kith and kin" territories, defined through the bonds of spiritual and ethnic "sameness," that had the most effect. Expanding the analysis to take this other imperial terrain into account is important, for it provides a new perspective on the role imperialism played in determining what it meant to be "British" in the late nineteenth century. For many Victorians, the idea of a pan-Britannic race freely occupying a larger British world resonated more strongly and more personally in their lives than the less

[21] As Murdoch points out, the proportion of child migrants sent overseas in the Victorian era was always much lower than the number of children receiving indoor relief in Britain. In just one year, 1884–1885, for example, over 54,000 boys and girls under the age of sixteen were living in Poor Law institutions in England and Wales. Ibid, 170, note 24.

[22] On the impact of imperialism on the development of British child welfare more generally, see Anna Davin, "Imperialism and Motherhood," in *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, ed. Frederick Cooper and Ann Stoler (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 87–151.

[23] Essential introductions to this now considerable literature include: Catherine Hall, ed., *Cultures of Empire, a Reader: Colonizers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Manchester University Press, 2000); Antoinette Burton, ed., *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking With and Through the Nation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003); Kathleen Wilson, ed., *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660–1840* (Cambridge University Press, 2004); Andrew Thompson, *The Empire Strikes Back? The Impact of Imperialism on Britain from the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (New York: Pearson Longman, 2005); Catherine Hall and Sonya Rose, eds., *At Home with the Empire: Metropolitan Culture and the Imperial World* (Cambridge University Press, 2006).

familiar and sometimes alarming visions that were associated with the empire of domination.[24]

While more work is needed to explore just how deeply the concept of Greater Britain permeated British society and culture, its effect overseas is clearer. The decades surrounding the turn of the twentieth century were a period of tremendous growth in local patriotisms across the settler empire, as nationalists in each of the dominions sought to define the qualities and characteristics that they felt were unique to their countrymen.[25] The rise of these local identities did little to challenge the central place of Britishness within the settler imagination, however.[26] On the contrary, the notion of a global community of Britons arguably meant more in the settler territories during these years than it did in Britain itself, for it invested these emerging nations with the potent notions of White racial superiority and civilizational pride that underpinned the wider imperial mission. Such sentiments were clearly on display in the popular enthusiasm at the turn of the twentieth century for the South African War, a conflict that was much less controversial in Australia or New Zealand than it was in the mother country.[27] And they received another boost from the movement toward self-government across the settler empire, a trend that was effectively completed by 1931 when the Statute of Westminster recognized the dominions' legislative autonomy and equal status to Britain. Instead of weakening the bonds of imperial belonging throughout the British world, these constitutional changes

[24] Stuart Ward, "Echoes of Empire," *History Workshop Journal* 62, no. 1 (October 2006): 264–278.

[25] John Eddy and Deryck Schreuder, eds., *The Rise of Colonial Nationalism: Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and South Africa First Assert Their Nationalities, 1880–1914* (Sydney and Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1988). The use of the gendered term "countrymen" is intentional, for this was in many ways a masculine enterprise. In Australia, for instance, as the male-centric notions of "mateship" and the frontier became central to the national imagination, they served to conscribe women's role in society. The fact that these ideals were equally defined in terms of a restrictive brand of "Whiteness" also allowed for the continued subordination of Indigenous peoples and exclusion of non-British immigrants. Patricia Grimshaw, Marilyn Lake, Ann McGrath, and Marian Quartly, *Creating a Nation* (Ringwood: McPhee Gribble, 1994).

[26] Douglas Cole, "The Problem of 'Nationalism' and 'Imperialism' in British Settlement Colonies," *Journal of British Studies* 10, no. 2 (May 1971): 160–182.

[27] Craig Wilcox, *Australia's Boer War: The War in South Africa, 1899–1902* (Oxford University Press, 2002); John Crawford and Ian McGibbon, eds., *One Flag, One Queen, One Tongue: New Zealand and the South African War, 1899–1902* (Auckland University Press, 2003). The Canadian response was more muted on account of Francophone opposition to the country's involvement in a British imperial war. Here too, however, the government contributed a military contingent, and the war served as a focal point for affirming Anglo-Canadian race patriotism. Jacques Monet, "Canadians, Canadiens, and Colonial Nationalism, 1896–1914: The Thorn in the Lion's Paw," in *The Rise of Colonial Nationalism*, 160–191.