NEGO TATING ETHNICITY, REGIONALISM, AND HISTORIOGRAPHY: ARTHUR A. CHIEL AND THE JEWS OF MANITOBA: A SOCIAL HISTORY*

In 1949, the young American-born rabbi, Arthur A. Chiel, accepted the position of director of the B’nai Brith Hillel Foundation at the University of Manitoba. More than a few acquaintances raised their eyebrows at his decision. No one doubted that he was well-qualified to assume the role of chaplain to Jewish students, but they did wonder why Chiel chose Winnipeg over offers from Havana, Cuba and Berkeley, California. (“Are you sure that you know about those Winnipeg winters? Do you really want them?” 1) But Chiel made the move and remained in Canada’s third largest Jewish community for eight years, serving in a variety of communal positions and taking an active role in the Jewish life of the city. One of the enduring consequences of Chiel’s tenure in Winnipeg was in the undeveloped area of Canadian Jewish historiography. During his stay, the young rabbi turned his attention to the history of the Jews of Manitoba, and his research resulted in popular studies for different age groups,2 a modest volume on
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Jewish Experiences in Early Manitoba, and, most significantly, the 1961 study, The Jews of Manitoba: A Social History, which was published after he had left Winnipeg to take up a pulpit in the United States.

The Jews of Manitoba was one of the first monographs in Canadian Jewish history, and it stands out as the first detailed study of Jews in a specific region of the country. Chiel was also the first scholar of the Canadian Jewish experience to have strong and consistent backing from both academics and a non-Jewish historical society. As such, he and his History are worthy of attention not only in the area of Canadian Jewish historiography; the production of the work speaks to issues of note in Canadian historical writing in general. The historiography of Canada’s ethnic groups needs serious non-polemical investigation. Jack Granatstein’s recent Who Killed Canadian History has led to a heated debate on the practice of historical writing in Canada, especially the place of the narratives of minorities and under-represented groups (such as women). Rather than focus on ahistorical polemical arguments regarding inclusion or exclusion of certain narratives from Canadian historical writing, this paper proposes to analyze historically the creation of an early academic study of Canada’s Jews. After all, examining the author and his work in the light of his biography and intellectual context does seem to be the appropriate method for a historian to study the production of new narratives.

I

Arthur Chiel had no early connections with either Canada or its history, but his Jewish background was rich and varied. He was born and grew up in Taylor, Pennsylvania near Scranton, a coal-mining town where his father served as the spiritual leader of the small Jewish community. Raised in a household steeped in Judaism, Arthur was nevertheless exposed to the non-Jewish world by growing up in a small town. He began his post-secondary education at the Lutheran Thiel College in Greenville,
Pennsylvania, where he was the only Jew, but then re-immersed himself in the Jewish world. He attended Yeshiva College in New York City, the school which was set up, inter alia, to give those who came from traditional backgrounds an opportunity to continue their Judaic studies while engaging in the study of modern culture.\(^7\)

Not all students enrolled at Yeshiva were Orthodox Jews, and many who came from Orthodox backgrounds no longer adhered to the traditionalism of their parents. After graduating with his B.A. from Yeshiva College in 1943, Chiel registered at the Jewish Institute of Religion (JIR) in New York for his rabbinical training. As with so many other students drawn to JIR, the prime attraction was the founder of the Institute himself, Rabbi Stephen Samuel Wise (1874-1949).\(^8\) A fiercely independent figure, the Hungarian-born Wise was a Reform Jew in much of his theology, but he was also an avid Zionist and thus not accepted by the contemporary Reform mainstream. Instead of fitting into one of the existing denominations, Wise established the Jewish Institute of Religion in 1922. Now amalgamated with the Hebrew Union College, JIR began as a seminary where Wise could teach a Judaism that combined his Reform and Zionist outlooks.\(^9\) In many ways a larger-than-life figure (in the early 1940s he was meeting with Franklin Delano Roosevelt to discuss the fate of the Jews in Nazi occupied lands and addressing mass rallies), Wise could be quite harsh in his judgements of students. He could also be very personable, and the students were willing to forgive much to be with him.\(^10\) While at JIR, Chiel studied with some of the leading Jewish Studies scholars of the day including Salo Baron, the great Jewish historian who taught at Columbia University. But for the students at JIR, Wise remained the brightest star in the Jewish firmament.

Another individual, however, did successfully vie for Chiel’s attention in New York. Kinneret Dirnfeld, a young woman from Winnipeg, was there studying on a scholarship awarded by her Jewish community when she met Arthur Chiel.
In April 1944, they announced their engagement, and the following summer the young fiancé made his first trip to Winnipeg. In addition to meeting the family of the bride, he encountered the Jewish community and, according to his later testimony, he was immediately struck by its vibrancy:

[W]hen I came to visit here that summer, I liked very much what I saw, particularly what I saw of the Jewish community. It was a Yiddishe shott.... [At a meeting of Canadian Jewish Congress] I liked not only what I saw but I liked, also, what I heard. The atmosphere of that meeting was charged with a feeling of “Ahavat Yisroel”—a real concern for issues of world Jewry. I discerned a feeling of “Mesiras Nefesh.” These were people who were profoundly concerned....

Winnipeg became his annual summer destination for the next four years. During the rest of the year, he and his wife were residents of New York after his ordination in 1946, when he took on the non-denominational job of Religious Director at New York’s Young Men’s Hebrew Association, a job which encompassed counseling, teaching, and planning educational programmes. Chiel’s task was to instil a strong sense of Jewishness in the individuals drawn to the “Y.” It was quite a challenge. Soldiers were returning home from the war, and the full horror of the destruction of European Jewry was becoming fully known, if not yet assimilated.

Although many studies of Jewish reactions to the Holocaust emphasize American Jewish resistance to commemoration, they de-emphasize another response—how American Jews chose to combat despair (itself a response) by rebuilding an optimistic Jewish identity for the postwar period. This reconstruction was certainly a characteristic of Chiel’s years at the “Y”. As he later remembered, club leaders were not given theoretical Judaic materials, but rather concrete stories of Jews, such as the tales of Sholem Aleichem. These stories then served as easy springboards for discussion of the eastern-European
background of the club members, re-inventions of genealogies with the purpose of creating a feeling of Jews as part of a diaspora people. And, most important of all, club leaders had to have a positive attitude:

Why were [the clubs] successful? Because the initial attitude was a positive one—not one of yei-ush, of despair and resignation. There was a feeling of avodah, serving a living cause, a positive Jewish ideal. Negative club-leaders failed—positive club-leaders succeeded.\(^{17}\)

While working in New York, Chiel continued to draw from the rich academic environment of the east coast that he had already experienced as a student at JIR. In 1946, Rabbi Wise, who was also the founder and one-time president of the American Jewish Congress (a major national Jewish organization in the United States), awarded Chiel a fellowship to work with Kurt Lewin on Congress’s Commission on Community Interrelations.\(^{18}\) For two years, Chiel studied theories of group relations and leadership from one of the most important social psychologists of the generation, while still keeping up his busy schedule at the “Y.” He and his wife also had the occasion to deepen their understanding of the contemporary Jewish experience by visiting Palestine for several months in that tense time between the end of World War II and the creation of the State of Israel.\(^{19}\) So, when Arthur and Kinneret Chiel decided in 1949 to move to Winnipeg, the twenty-eight-year-old Chiel had behind him a rich and varied Jewish background both experientially and academically. He brought with him a strong commitment to religious life and Zionism, as well as exposure to the academic study of the Jewish experience and new trends in Jewish communal life.

II

In his first interview with the Winnipeg Jewish press, the new Hillel director acknowledged his imminent challenges. Chiel
believed that the Jewish student world was in “ferment.” He pointed out that a contemporary social survey of university students indicated that they had begun to “seriously question and criticize all their original religious and ethnic values.” What Chiel may not have realized was the degree to which the University of Manitoba and its Jewish students specifically were in “ferment” during this period of post-war adjustment.

For many western Canadian Jews of the twenties and thirties, the University of Manitoba beckoned as an oasis of learning. Ernest Sirluck, who came from the community of Winkler, Manitoba, has described his arrival at the University as a kind of liberation from the stifling atmosphere of his small, largely Mennonite hometown and its economically struggling Jewish community. But he was also well aware of the shadowy side of the academic world of the time—the occasional antisemitic remark from a student, the German exchange teacher whom he suspected was a Nazi, the callous teacher who made vague nasty comments about Jews. The University of Manitoba replicated and perpetuated the prejudice rife in Canadian society as a whole. The hostility, in fact, was deeper-seated than Sirluck stated, especially at the medical school, where unspoken restrictions on Jews were in place. And, as was common for that time in English Canada, the arts curriculum canonized the culture that was considered worth teaching and excluded various non-Christian cultures and histories, including those of the Jews.

Some of the Jewish students at the University of Manitoba responded to these challenges. In 1942, the Zionist Avukah society began a sophisticated campaign of data collection and advocacy to counteract discrimination. Ultimately, the group presented to the Legislature of Manitoba irrefutable evidence of discriminatory practices at the medical school. Two years later, the Board of Governors of the University accepted the indictment and changed its practices. With communal support, Jewish students also challenged the subtle, implicit Anglo-Saxon Protestant culture on campus by creating informal
Judaic Studies courses at the University. In 1916, Jewish students had founded a local chapter of the Intercollegiate Menorah Association, a major interwar Jewish organization based in New York City that encouraged students to appreciate both the “interest and dignity of the Jewish past.” Students who affiliated with the University of Manitoba Menorah Association could attend lectures and plays and participate in debates and study groups that dealt with post-biblical Jewish topics. A Menorah report for the fall of 1920 listed discussions on Jewish culture, anti-Jewish propaganda, the judicial system of Palestine, the “International Jew,” and Yiddish writer Peretz Hirshbein, as well as a debate on the topic, “Resolved, that assimilation and not anti-Semitism ... constitutes the Jewish problem.”

The study of Jewish culture in the Menorah Association may have taken place on campus, but it was not part of the University. After the Second World War, however, the University of Manitoba decided not only to end the discrimination against Jewish students, but also to modify the assumptions of its curriculum. Shortly before Chiel’s arrival, the University had approved the creation of a department of Slavonic Studies, and within a few months of his taking on the position of Hillel director, the Hillel Advisory Board entered into negotiations with the University for the teaching of modern Hebrew and modern Jewish history with Chiel as instructor. By May 1950, the president of the University, A.H.S. Gillson, publicly announced the creation of a rather grandiosely titled “Department of Judaic Studies,” a department with only one instructor, Arthur A. Chiel.

Still, the University was showing its willingness to acknowledge cultural pluralism in the province. As the president said, “The ideal implied [in the development of courses in Ukrainian, Jewish, and later, Icelandic studies] is that the University of Manitoba shall give not only the standard courses of instruction, but that it shall also represent in its curricula the various cultures which go to make up the province itself....” With this move, the president looked to create momentum
towards a rapprochement between members of these groups on the one hand and the University and civic society as a whole on the other. The hope was that “the people of the province will feel closer to the university and realize the contribution which their respective cultures make to Canadian life is a valuable one.”

This discourse of the president is an example of what Richard Day has referred to as the “seductive incorporation” of minority groups into the state. But the minority groups themselves were not so easily seduced and had some specific aims of their own. The president of the University stressed the incorporation of Jews into the body politic of Manitoba, but Chiel emphasized how courses in Jewish Studies would help Jewish students integrate into the world Jewish community. As a Zionist, he stressed the recent creation of a Jewish state. He saw the new department as a potential participant in the renaissance of Israel and predicted that “[it] is through a Judaic department that Israel will come that much closer to Jewish youth.” While teaching at the University, Chiel confronted students who were indeed interested in Jewish Studies, and wanted to know more about their own community. Over the years, Chiel obliged his students, in part by assigning projects which traced their own family histories, thereby linking the students—who were largely Jewish—to the wider diaspora experience.

While the University was re-examining its cultural underpinnings, others sought to re-assess the social and cultural makeup of Manitoba. In 1944, several people committed to local history revived the Manitoba Historical Society, which had fallen victim to hard times during the Depression. These individuals included the historian, W.L. Morton, the public servant, author, and interwar feminist, Margaret McWilliams, the Legislature librarian, J.L. Johnston, and Minister of Health and Public Welfare Ivan Schultz. Although these founders envisioned a variety of objectives for the revitalized society, they set up as its first mandate the sponsorship of a series of works studying the ethnic groups of Manitoba. In doing so, they correctly noted that they were moving onto unexplored terrain,
or as McWilliams said, embarking upon “a type of project [that] has not been undertaken before by another of the provincial historical societies.”

Chiel was to benefit from these changes at the University and the Historical Society. He began teaching at the University in the fall of 1950, and already during his first term, he was approached about a new and exciting possibility. As he informed Louis Rosenberg, the research director of Canadian Jewish Congress:

> In unofficial fashion, a representative of the Manitoba Historical Society has proposed to me that I consider a history research project concerning the Jewry of Manitoba and Western Canada. The Society has had similar projects, on a fellowship basis, carried out concerning Mennonites and Ukrainians.

Rosenberg may well have marvelled at—or been a little envious of—the support for Chiel’s project. Less than two decades earlier, when he was working on his own pioneering study, *Canada’s Jews* (published in 1939), he received little moral or financial support. Now, some fifteen years after the publication of his work, a newcomer to Canada was receiving encouragement from both a university and a historical society.

Chiel did become a fellow at the Society but only in 1952. The contrast with Rosenberg’s situation is testimony to the postwar changes in the specific polyethnic milieu of Manitoba, as is the recognition given to ethnic studies at the University. It was in this context that Arthur Chiel produced his writings on the history of Manitoba’s Jews.

**III**

When writing about Manitoba’s Jewish history, Chiel assumed two narrative personae, each with a distinct voice. First, he was the raconteur, telling stories about Jews and Jewishness in the province with Jews as his intended audience. *Jewish*
Experiences in Early Manitoba, published in 1955 by the community-sponsored “Manitoba Jewish Publications,” codified that particular era and voice by reproducing a number of his early articles which had been written for popular Jewish publications. These stories highlighted, often in quirky ways, the extension and legitimization of the Jewish diaspora onto the physical and psychological landscapes of Manitoba. They were tales meant to inspire Jews to commitment to a world-wide Jewish community and to provide a sense of legitimacy in their Manitoba home.

To bring local Jews into the rich fabric of the Diaspora, Chiel wove together experiences of Winnipeg and Sholem Aleichem’s fictional Kasrilevke. His penchant for the works of Sholem Aleichem as pedagogic tools was well developed already during his stint at the “Y” in New York. Now it was extended to western Canada in his piece on Nissel Rabinowitch, aka Sholem Aleichem’s Fetter Nissel. In this lead chapter of Jewish Experiences, Chiel reprised the story of the great Yiddish writer’s favourite uncle, who spent the last fifteen years of his life in Winnipeg. Chiel also connected Manitoba’s Jews to the rest of the Diaspora through two of the iconic figures of nineteenth-century English Jewry, Moses Montefiore and Benjamin Disraeli, who were given Manitoba presences in Chiel’s uncritical examinations of how they were hailed by Winnipeg’s early Jews and the Manitoba press.39

In Early Experiences, Chiel also created dramatic links between Jews and Manitoba society. In an essay on the legal case of Regina v. Charles Wicks, Chiel started with a rough outline of the 1882 case in which the non-Jew, Wicks, attacked with an iron bar one Kieva Barsky who was working on the CPR tracks. Chiel’s narrative then moved into the fictional, as he “reproduced” Barsky’s internal debate whether to prosecute or to accept tamely that nothing could be done. The Jew ultimately decided to fight for justice, and the result was a very tolerant judgement by the Chief Justice (reproduced in extenso) which “established once and for all that Charles Wicks and his nasty
ilk could no longer get away with attacks upon Jews or, for that matter, on any other nationality.” Chiel also created a Jewish bond to one of the major figures of Manitoba’s history, Louis Riel, by emphasizing the latter’s early belief that he was really David Mordecai, a Jew. Chiel described how Riel advocated dividing the West among various nationalities, a proposal which included granting Vancouver Island to the Belgians and the Jews.

Chiel’s second voice was scholarly. Above all, it is recorded in *The Jews of Manitoba: A Social History*. Here the Jewish storyteller is muted and Fetter Nissel disappears from the stage; when *Regina v Wicks* is discussed, Barsky’s internal monologues are omitted. Early Experiences had been published by a small Jewish publisher. Intended for a wider and more scholarly audience, *The Jews of Manitoba* was published by the University of Toronto Press under the auspices of the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba. Most significantly, Chiel was working in a non-Jewish milieu. He had a close relationship with the Manitoba Historical Society. He was a recipient of their fellowship, presented his research findings to the Society, and served on its committees. During his time in Winnipeg, the Society was a site of conflicting visions of the significance and meaning of studying ethnicity which gave him various emphases and options to consider in writing his history. The architects of the fellowship program laid out its aims in the familiar language of incorporation. The Society’s fellows were to help

preserve the history of the ethnic groups in the settlement of Manitoba, to define the contribution made by the various groups to the life of the provincial community, and to analyze the interrelationships of the groups in that community.

Just as the University of Manitoba utilized the discourse of incorporation in justifying the creation of programmes for studying the various ethnic groups, so the Society used that language to emphasize the contributions of these groups to the general welfare.
But variations on this particular theme existed within the Society. Its president, Margaret McWilliams, who supported these studies, had an assimilatory model in mind, expecting the various ethnic groups to blend into the dominant Anglo-Celtic culture. More complex was the position of W.L. Morton. This Manitoba-born historian looked to broaden the study of Canadian history to acknowledge its regional factor. He had little patience for approaches that made the West irrelevant, like the Creighton school which emphasized the Saint Lawrence River and the Great Lakes, or others which turned the west into a hinterland under the influence of the large cities of the East. Instead, Morton found specific, indigenous forces for change in the various regions of Canada, particularly in the West. A close look at Morton shows him to have a broader, more inclusive vision than McWilliams. According to Chiel, in writing what would be his magnum opus for this period, his history of Manitoba, Morton was eager to factor in the role of the ethnic groups. This in turn served as a stimulus to Chiel to get on with his study of Manitoba Jews. But, as Carl Berger has correctly noted, Morton was not concerned with the lives of these groups on their own terms. Above all, he was interested in what they had in common and what they brought to the public square.

Morton was supportive, but he could not and did not offer a model of how to study an ethnic group. He and other shapers of the revitalized Manitoba Historical Society adumbrated certain expectations for the study of ethnicity, but the early historians of these groups did not allow themselves to be totally constrained by this framework. Those who published before Chiel offered possible models to the fledgling Jewish historian. The author of the monograph on the Mennonites, E.K. Francis (who was not himself a Mennonite), insisted on studying Mennonites as a group with a strong sense of community, and argued that this solidarity was beneficial both to the members of the group and to the province as a whole. His approach was social scientific, and he made extensive use of statistical data. He was the first of the Society’s fellows to
complete his manuscript. Ready in 1948, the work was not published until 1955, and not by the Society. Although there were many reasons for the delay, Francis was convinced—that a major cause was his refusal to accept McWilliams’ assimilationist standpoint.\textsuperscript{50}

Chiel, however, followed the example of another of the scholars. By the time he became a fellow, the Historical Society had appointed other fellows, including Paul Yuzyk, who was commissioned to study the province’s Ukrainians. Yuzyk’s \textit{The Ukrainians in Manitoba: A Social History} was the first monograph to appear in print under the auspices of the Historical Society. Although the manuscript was ready by the late 1940s, revisions, technical delays, and then necessary updating postponed its publication until 1953. By then, Yuzyk was a professor of History at the University of Manitoba (one of the positions in ethnic studies), and he and Chiel had met and become friendly.\textsuperscript{50} Yuzyk asked Chiel to look at the completed manuscript, and the experience moved the budding Jewish historian: “I confess that my reading of that pioneer study excited my admiration and ambition to do the same for the Manitoba Jewish community.”\textsuperscript{52}

In many ways, Chiel’s work and Yuzyk’s history are similar. Both offered portraits of the inner lives of their communities, and both included chapters on religion and parochial school systems. Chiel devoted a whole chapter to Zionism, a topic which is, by and large, related to the inner life of the Jewish community, and which reflected his own political passion. He also recognized and elaborated on the significance of the Yiddish theatre in the cultural life of Winnipeg’s Jews.

Despite the scope of Chiel’s work, much of the apologetic, look-how-we-fit-in perspective persists. He carried his fascination with pioneers of the community from \textit{Early Experiences} into the \textit{The Jews of Manitoba}, and devoted an extraordinary amount of space to showing how the early Jewish settlers established a foothold in Manitoba and participated in the expansion of the Manitoba economy, especially in agricul-
ture. But the fact is that most Jewish farmers did not succeed. Although Chiel is elaborate in his portrayal of the valiant efforts at farming made by some Jews, he minimizes the failures. As Royden Loewen has shown, this was a common feature in the historiography of Mennonites and Ukrainians, as well. Many historians continued to exhibit the sensitivities of their ethnic ancestors, who knew how immigration quotas were contingent on proving that immigrants were farmers. These scholars were also aware of a historiography which focused on the significance of agricultural expansion in the development of the West. Thus historians continued to address the contributions of these communities to Manitoba’s agriculture, a somewhat atavistic response given the postwar urbanization of Canada and the changes in immigration policy.53

Chiel’s personal interests and integrationist perspective also merge in subtle ways in his portrayal of intra-communal conflicts. When discussing religious developments, he writes more of the English-speaking congregations in Winnipeg than of the small Yiddish-speaking shuls which dotted the city’s North End. And when it came to his own times, Chiel had his personal Whig interpretation of religious history. Although he had been ordained at JIR, and mentored by Rabbi Stephen Wise, in Winnipeg he was involved in the establishment of Rosh Pina Congregation, a Conservative synagogue in North Winnipeg, and he joined the Rabbinical Assembly of the Conservative movement. Chiel ended his chapter on religion with a paean to the power of Conservative Judaism:

Today an increasing number of young people, among them children of Orthodox Jews, of radicals, of non-conformists, of affirmants, and dissidents of all kinds, seek affiliation with Conservative synagogues to help them define the source and the nature of their Jewish identity and to reinforce it.”54

An apologetic mode is apparent in Chiel’s treatment of the radical elements in the community. He and Yuzyk both
rejected the communist politics that had been so much a part of their respective communities. In his book on Ukrainians in Manitoba, Yuzyk included a chapter called, “Ukrainian Communist delusion,” in which he tries to establish that Communism had made far fewer inroads into the Ukrainian community than was commonly assumed. He concludes the chapter with the reassurance that, despite the subversive activities of Moscow-trained agitators, “the large majority of patriotic Ukrainian Canadians are highly conscious of the possible threat of a fifth column in their midst, and will not allow the situation to run out of control. But the cooperation of all Canadians is essential. Vigilance is the price of the preservation of our democratic institutions.” As Myron Momryk has shown in an unpublished article, Ukrainian Canadians played out the Cold War in their communities and in their narratives, and Yuzyk was clearly a Cold Warrior.

Chiel’s treatment of the communists is, in some ways, still more heavy-handed. He simply ignores most of the radical elements in the Jewish community, with the exception of some remarks on the Yiddishist schools in Winnipeg. The resulting distortions seriously compromise his portrayal of the community, as Joe Zuken, the long-standing Communist alderman in Winnipeg, pointed out in a review of the book. Zuken certainly had personal reasons to protest the erasure of the radical elements of the community from *The Jews of Manitoba*. In the 1950s, the Canadian Jewish Congress (which Chiel regarded highly) invested much effort in keeping the communist United Jewish People’s Order (UJPO) out of community activities. Zuken was himself a member of UJPO and believed that his UJPO-sponsored lectures in 1950 on German disarmament had led to the Order’s expulsion from Congress. But beyond these personal reasons, Zuken was absolutely correct to point out the distortions in Chiel’s *History*. The historian did not even include a discussion of Jewish involvement in the Winnipeg General Strike; the volume listed with care Jewish manufacturers but paid no attention to unions. By expunging them from
his narrative, Chiel reproduces the expulsion of the radical elements from the community.

In another review of Chiel’s book, the famous Winnipeg-born medievalist, Norman Cantor, developed points similar to those of Joe Zuken. Cantor praised much of the research, and recognized it as a pioneering effort in Canadian Jewish historiography. But he also found _Jews of Manitoba_ unsatisfying because it reflected the lives and interests of the Jewish establishment (who sponsored the publication of the work) and did not recognize the turbulent life below the upper middle class. The class vision bias in the work was especially obvious to Cantor in the discussion of community politics, and he was dismayed that Chiel did not attempt to analyze the social bases of power, not to mention the growing plutocratization of the community in the period after World War II.\(^59\)

Another remarkable—and ultimately distorting—feature of _The Jews of Manitoba_ is the minimal role assigned to anti-semitism in the province’s history. Prejudice hovers offstage but hardly makes an appearance. Chiel notes the increase in Jewish physicians in the late 1940s and 1950s, which, he states, is “undoubtedly...due to the fair admissions policy at the University of Manitoba medical school in effect now for more than a decade, as well as the liberal policies that prevail on the medical staffs of Winnipeg’s hospitals.”\(^60\) But this is liberalization without illiberalism, since there is no discussion of the discriminatory practices that had existed before 1945.\(^61\)

According to Chiel, the Jewish newspaper, the _Canadian Israelite_, combatted antisemitism in its pages on every occasion. To judge from his description of the _Israelite’s_ battles, however, Winnipeg was not one of the fronts.\(^62\) Although Chiel provides no indication of a rise in antisemitism, somehow Manitoba’s Jews needed a revitalized Canadian Jewish Congress in 1933 in order to combat it.\(^63\) Marcus Hyman helped draft an amendment to Manitoba’s Libel Act to prevent the distribution of hate propaganda, but a reader of _The Jews of Manitoba_ could well ask: “Was this a problem? What hate propaganda?”\(^64\)
Chiel’s treatment of antisemitism reflected his aversion to ye’ush, to despair within Jewish life. He was an optimist, as we know from his description of his activities in New York. In a speech delivered in Winnipeg in 1953, Chiel came close to articulating a philosophy of Jewish history that explained his emphasis on the positive. Along with some of his contemporaries (including Salo Baron, who strongly denounced the lachrymose conception of Jewish history), Chiel rejected

the notion that Jews survived in the past because of the outside anti-semitic forces....Jewish history points to the fact that it was for inner and positive reasons that Jews survived extraordinary hardships.....Jews survived because they had something to live for: the development and propagation of their national-religious-cultural ideal.65

Salo Baron, however, did not ignore antisemitism in his own historical work, whereas Chiel does. By minimizing antisemitism, Chiel’s work also fit in well with the sunny framework of ethnic-groups-as-contributors established by the Manitoba Historical Society. In this and many other ways, personal ideological commitments and context came together in the creation and character of the work.

We should not undervalue Arthur Chiel’s achievement. He conducted original research into the early history of the community, examining newspaper accounts and the minute books and records of the English-speaking synagogues, and interviewing the older members of the community. His work was significant, especially because so little previous research in the area had been done. Still, even on his own terms—his wish to investigate the religious, economic, and political lives of the Jews—Chiel’s argument is underdeveloped. It dwells on certain topics and studiously avoids others, and these emphases affect his conclusions. Chiel argues that two major forces shaped the dynamic and rich Jewish experience in Manitoba. One was the predominant wave of eastern European Jews who came to the
province beginning in 1882. The second was that the Jews of Manitoba benefited from the polyethnic milieu of Manitoba where groups could preserve their distinctiveness, and thus “[f]lanked by such clear examples of ethnic loyalties the Jews of Manitoba were encouraged to preserve their own heritage. This they did, retaining as much of it as they believed to be compatible with life in a modern day.”

These are excellent conclusions. Unfortunately, Chiel does not adequately prove them. For reasons suggested above, he does not examine sufficiently the Yiddish-speaking world of the eastern European immigrants and focuses disproportionately on the English speakers. And he certainly does not show the impact of the polyethnic milieu on the Jewish community. If anything, the fact of Chiel’s book proves more in this regard than the information in the book itself. His own enthusiasm for Jewish topics became focused on the Jewish community of Manitoba with the support of an outside agency, the Historical Society of Manitoba. This agency (as well as the University) was interested in the experiences of Jews as one of a number of ethnic groups populating Manitoba. As noted above, much of Chiel’s inspiration derived from the work of the Ukrainian historian, Paul Yuzyk. Yuzyk’s *The Ukrainians in Manitoba: A Social History* and Chiel’s *The Jews of Manitoba: A Social History* have much in common beyond the almost identical titles, including a somewhat parochial view of their respective communities during the Cold War.

IV

Arthur Chiel created the *The Jews of Manitoba: A Social History* at a specific moment in the history of the Jews and the history of Manitoba. He was a member of the cohort of post-war North American Jews looking to develop new cultural, social, political, and psychological strategies for Jewish life. As such, his work focused on religion (of a certain accommodationist sort—Conservative Judaism) and a political agenda
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which legitimized Zionism and viewed communism with suspicion or worse. Psychologically, he counselled a positive, optimistic attitude. In Manitoba, the ruling elites and others with cultural authority began to look for new ways to manage the polyethnic reality. Many Canadians only began to understand that they would have to face up to a multicultural Canada sooner or later after the widening of immigration categories in 1947. In Manitoba, many sensed the new reality even earlier. The University of Manitoba and the Manitoba Historical Society were two sites of discussion about the relationship between the old established ethnic groups, especially the Anglo-Celts, and the newer groups. The story behind the emergence of Manitoba’s histories of the Ukrainians, Mennonites, and Jews (as well as subsequent studies of other ethnic groups) helps us to understand shifts in Canadian historiography.

Critical analysis of these early studies of Manitoba’s ethnic communities also informs our understanding of the broader Canadian approach to multiculturalism in the postwar era. The optimistic tone of Chiel’s work, its emphasis on the Jews as “positive” contributors, and its de-emphasis of communism accorded well with changes taking place in certain federal government circles. Shortly after the appearance of The Jews of Manitoba, a brief review appeared in the Citizen, a journal that was published five times a year by the Citizenship Branch of the Government. This agency played a significant role in the official re-imagining of a Canada with many ethnic groups. It was also involved in surveillance, with particular interest in monitoring the political left. Chiel’s type of historical writing clearly resonated with those looking to invent a Canada with minorities who abided by the rules of the Cold War, and who wanted to focus on the positive rather than the negative history of prejudice in Canada. Thus, the anonymous reviewer in the Citizen began by quoting Chiel: “The Jews of Manitoba have been positive and loyal Canadians at the same time that they have been positive and loyal Jews,” and he noted approvingly the ways in which Jews made “contributions” to Manitoba society.
The events at the Manitoba Historical Society also served as a rehearsal for some of the actors who would reappear on the national stage. John Diefenbaker appointed Paul Yuzyk to the Senate, and in his maiden speech delivered on March 3, 1963, Yuzyk made clear his opinions on questions of ethnicity in Canadian society. At a time when the discussion of bilingualism and biculturalism was about to be fully opened up, he believed that an exclusive focus on the relations between French and English Canadians was misguided and denied the ethnic makeup of Canada. He articulated his own image of a multicultural Canada, which recognized the non-French and non-English ethnic groups as a “Third Element.” According to Yuzyk, the problem was that more people did not know about these groups:

The contributions and place of the Third Element ethnic groups are very little known to the Canadian public and to the leaders of our country. To my knowledge, only the province of Manitoba has made an effort to learn objectively about the predominant groups in that province. The Manitoba Government has been subsidizing these studies through the Manitoba Historical Society since 1946, which to date has received manuscripts on the Mennonites, Ukrainians, Poles, Jews, early French and Hutterites, of which the social histories of the Ukrainians, Mennonites and Jews have been published. We sorely lack authentic studies of these groups on a Canada-wide basis.\(^70\)

Although the “third element” has been viewed, with good reason, by some historians as a ploy of ethnic politicians to create a new balance of domestic power (and subsidization), one matter is certain: Yuzyk came armed for this particular struggle\(^71\) with his experience of the precocious Manitoba scene.

Arthur Chiel and his *The Jews of Manitoba: A Social History* were part of that scene. The book was a notable achievement in Canadian Jewish historiography and accord-
ingly won the first H.M. Caiserman Award of the Canadian Jewish Congress. But Chiel, his book, and his milieu are themselves historical phenomena. A close analysis of this book has allowed us to re-investigate how ethnicity and culture came together in Manitoba at a certain point in time. The story of the book allows us a sense of the early shaping of Canadian Jewish historiography; it also helps us to analyze the manifold implications of the emergence of new discourses and policies of pluralism within postwar Canada.
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