

IS BIG MEDIA REALLY SO BAD?

LRC

Literary Review of Canada

Vol. 14, No. 10 December 2006 \$6.00

Tom Flanagan
Herding cats: Keeping the right together

John Roberts
Pierre Trudeau, public and private

Alma Lee
Noah Richler's literary map making

Tony Penikett
Why is Canada becoming more unequal?

Peter Desbarats
9/11 conspiracies hot off the presses

Holiday Special
The passionate and memorable reading of youth



PLUS: Erika Ritter and Vivian Rakoff on new memoirs + David Dunne on game theory and shopping + Maria Tippett on American philanthropists in Canada + Marina Jimenez on refugee tales + Martin Laflamme on Canada's high commissioners + Fiction reviews by Norman Ravvin and Esi Edugyan + Poetry by George Elliott Clarke, Joanne Page, Julie Roorda + Responses from Tim Inkster and Joel Lexchin



LRC

Literary Review of Canada

Vol. 14, No. 10 • December 2006

ADDRESS
Literary Review of Canada
581 Markham Street, Suite 3A
Toronto, Ontario M6G 2J7
e-mail: review@lrcreview.com
reviewcanada.ca
T: 416 531-1483
F: 416 531-1612

3 Solidifying Gains

A review of Hugh Segal's *The Long Road Back: The Conservative Journey, 1993–2006*
Tom Flanagan

5 The Nowhere Men and Women

A review of *Refugee Sandwich: Stories of Exile and Asylum*, by Peter Showler
Marina Jimenez

7 "Big Media Bad Thing"

An essay
Christopher Dornan

9 Loaded Assumptions

A review of *No One Makes You Shop at Wal-Mart: The Surprising Deceptions of Individual Choice*, by Tom Slee
David Dunne

10 A Rare Gift for Leadership and Friendship

A review of *Citizen of the World: The Life of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Volume One 1919–1968*, by John English, and *The Teeth of Time: Remembering Pierre Elliott Trudeau*, by Ramsay Cook
John Roberts

12 The Passionate Reading of Youth

A special section

14 Trudeau: Long March/Shining Path

An excerpt from a libretto
George Elliott Clarke

15 That's It in a Hazelnut Upstairs at the Dickinson's

Poems
Joanne Page

15 "Grey and Silver: Mist—Lifeboat"

A poem
Julie Roorda

16 Mort d'un vieux Québécois

A review of Gil Courtemanche's *A Good Death*
Norman Ravin

17 Sparring Cultures

A review of Randy Boyagoda's *Governor of the Northern Province*
Esi Edugyan

18 The Permeable Border

A review of *Rockefeller, Carnegie and Canada: American Philanthropy and the Arts and Letters in Canada*, by Jeffrey D. Brison
Maria Tippett

19 Who Really Destroyed The Twin Towers?

A review of Barrie Zwicker's *Towers of Deception: The Media Cover-Up of 9/11*
Peter Desbarats

21 Our Man in London

A review of *Commissions High: Canada in London, 1870–1971*, by Roy MacLaren
Martin Laflamme

23 A Sister's Sad Burden

A review of Marian Botsford Fraser's *Requiem for My Brother*
Erika Ritter

25 One City, Two Nations

A review of *Dimensions of Inequality in Canada*, edited by David A. Green and Jonathan R. Kesselman
Tony Penikett

27 Small Mirror, Large Landscape

A review of Eric Koch's *I Remember The Location Exactly*
Vivian Rakoff

28 A Cross-Country Canon

A review of Noah Richler's *This Is My Country, What's Yours? A Literary Atlas of Canada*
Alma Lee

30 Responses & Letters

Tim Inkster, Joel Lexchin

EDITOR

Bronwyn Drainie
editor@lrcreview.com

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Alastair Cheng

CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

Anthony Westell

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Robin Roger

POETRY EDITOR

Molly Peacock

ASSISTANT POETRY EDITOR

Moira MacDougall

COPY EDITOR

Madeline Koch

PROOFREADERS

Ted Brown, Alastair Cheng, Lauryn Drainie, Cassandra Drudi, Helene Gooderis, Madeline Koch, Claire Laville, Lorna MacPhee, Andrea Pivnsky

RESEARCH

Cassandra Drudi

PUBLICITY

Kevin Watt
publicity@lrcreview.com

DESIGN

James Harbeck

ADVERTISING/SALES

Michael Wile
Phone: 416-531-1483 • Cell: 416-806-6178
ad@lrcreview.com

PUBLISHERS

Mark Lovewell
lovewell@ryerson.ca
Helen Walsh
helen.walsh@vcmptc.ca

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Michael Adams
Ronald G. Atkey, P.C., Q.C.
Alan Bradbent, C.M.
James Gillies, C.M.
Carol Hansell
Donald Macdonald, P.C., C.C.
Trine McQueen
Susan Reisler
Grant Reuber, O.C.
Don Ruckard, C.M.
Reed Scowen
Anthony Westell

POETRY SUBMISSIONS

The Literary Review of Canada accepts poetry submissions by email from May 1 to October 1 each year, although it solicits poetry year-round. Send submissions to poetry@lrcreview.com in a single Word file as an attachment and include the poem in the body of the email as well. The LRC does not review queries.

FOUNDED IN 1993 BY P.A. DUFFIE
The Literary Review of Canada is published 10 times a year by the Literary Review of Canada Inc.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Canada \$30 (the rest of the world US\$50. Libraries in Canada \$65, in the rest of the world US\$84. Post includes postage.

©2006 The Literary Review of Canada. All rights, including translation and other languages, are reserved by the publisher in Canada, the United States, Latin America and all other countries participating in the International Copyright Clearance Center's International Copyright Licensing and the Pan American Copyright Licensing. Nothing in this publication may be reproduced without the written permission of the publisher.

ISSN: 1488-1444

Canadian Public Access Mail Product Sales Agreement No. 147081
Postmaster: Please send address changes to the above address.
The Literary Review of Canada is indexed in the Canadian Library Periodicals Index and the Canadian Index and is distributed by Dutton and the Canadian Magazine Publishers Association.

Cover art and pictures throughout the issue by Aino Antto.

Aino Antto is a Toronto-based freelance illustrator with interests in editorial illustration and children's books. Her first work, Len Gasparini's *A Christmas for Carol*, was published by Seraphim Editions in 2002. More examples of her work can be seen at <www.anttostudio.com>

FUNDING ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge the financial support of the Government of Canada through the Canada Magazine Fund towards our editorial and production costs.

We acknowledge the assistance of the OMDC Magazine Fund, an initiative of Ontario Media Development Corporation.



The Canadian Council of the Arts
Le Conseil canadien des arts
et des lettres
100, rue Wellington
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 6L7

Canada



Ontario
Film and Television
Tax Credits
Ontario Media Development Corporation



CANADIAN ARTS COUNCIL
CONSEIL DES ARTS DU CANADA

Solidifying Gains

Major strategists in the Conservative Party know that sticking together is the crucial thing.

TOM FLANAGAN

The Long Road Back: The Conservative Journey, 1993–2006
Hugh Segal
HarperCollins
253 pages, hardcover
ISBN 0002006138

Now that the Conservative Party of Canada has succeeded in winning an election, there is a spate of books on the disintegration and rebuilding of the party. William Johnson has brought out a second edition of *Stephen Harper and the Future of Canada*, and Bob Plamondon's *Full Circle: Death and Resurrection in Canadian Conservative Politics* is already for sale. These and other books still to come may be longer and more packed with information than Hugh Segal's *The Long Road Back: The Conservative Journey, 1993–2006*, but none is likely to convey so much wisdom.

The words "road" and "journey" in the title lead the reader to expect a narrative account. Indeed, the narrative is there, but it is not entirely reliable as history because it seems to be based mainly on Senator Segal's recollections and impressions. That's fine when he is writing about events in which he was a participant, but it is not so accurate when he was not personally involved. Sometimes the errors are minor (Stephen Harper is not a Straussian; the Canadian Alliance won only two seats in Ontario in 2000, not three), but sometimes they are more important.

For example, his account of the clash between Scott Reid and Peter MacKay at the 2005 Montreal convention is misleading in important respects. Reid did not propose going "back to a one-person, one-vote structure and away from the equal number of delegates per riding approach agreed to in the agreement signed between Harper and MacKay." He suggested only a modest change in the equality-of-ridings model, namely that a riding would not get its full quota of points or delegates unless at least a



hundred members showed up to vote—hardly an unreasonable requirement for a grassroots party. Stephen Harper did not direct Reid to make this proposal, but he was sympathetic to it because it represented a way of dealing with the "rotten borough" problem that the Conservative Party will have to address sooner or later. Harper was furious with MacKay for running to the media and labelling Reid's proposal a threat to party unity. John Reynolds did weigh in on MacKay's side, but on his own initiative, and actually against Harper's preference. So, *caveat lector* when using *The Long Road Back* as a source of information about events that happened when Senator Segal was not actually in the room.

But I don't want to dwell on this too much, because sympathetic insight and strategic analysis are more important than facts, and Segal has those qualities in abundance. He is a master at describing situations, analyzing the realistic options that political leaders faced, and explaining why they did what they did. Most importantly, he has used his gifts for insight and analysis introspectively, training them upon the Tory side of the merger story. He shows, in pitiless detail, how the Progressive Conservatives lost their chance at recovery when Jean Charest decamped

to the Quebec Liberals after the 1997 election and Joe Clark became leader. Even though their own party was in deep trouble, Clark and other leading Tories, including Segal himself, rejected all attempts by the Reform Party and the Canadian Alliance to initiate cooperation. Their standard response was that Manning and the Reformers were extremists who did not understand Canada.

Segal has now come to a deeper understanding of the Reform phenomenon.

This deeply rooted suspicion of central government, of the eastern establishment, and of bureaucratic arrogance is an important part of our confederal political culture. While it is sometimes over the top, it is also often backed up with genuine reality... Many Tories, including me, focused on the more anti-Quebec, anti-refugee, Christian fundamentalist strains of the movement and not only dismissed them as un-Canadian, but sought to diminish their relevance to the political mainstream. What became apparent after

the second Manning election (and his last as leader) was that the movement was not a flash in the pan, but a legitimate and important expression of western anger and disengagement.

Segal now supports an inclusive model of "a national Conservative party that embraces its broad membership along the rational conservative spectrum," which includes paleo-conservatives like myself, Red Tories, social conservatives, historical conservatives, and even the more flinty-eyed neoconservatives. (Maybe that's me!)

To avoid the repetition of further disastrous splits in the Conservative coalition, it is important that Segal's Tory introspection be matched by rethinking among Reformers. What errors did we make on our side? Fundamentally, our mistake was the mirror image of that made by the Tories. Just as it took them a long time to understand crucial aspects of western political culture, we misperceived important aspects of political culture in other regions of Canada.

Preston Manning's original conception was that a national party could be built upon the tradition of prairie populism. He expected the new party to be based in the West but to attract support from resource-producing regions

Tom Flanagan is professor of political science at the University of Calgary. He managed Stephen Harper's two leadership campaigns as well as the Conservative Party's 2004 national election campaign. He worked in the war room during the 2005–06 Conservative campaign.

in northern and rural Ontario, Quebec and Atlantic Canada. He deliberately avoided calling himself and the Reform Party "conservative" or locating either on the right of the ideological spectrum. In the style of classical populism, he wanted a trans-ideological coalition, based on the "common sense of the common people" and organized against ruling elites in Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal.

Experience quickly showed that the populist model worked well in the West and to some extent in parts of rural Ontario, but had almost no appeal in Quebec and Atlantic Canada. That is not surprising retrospectively, and we should have foreseen it. Populism in Canada has multiple historical sources—evangelical Protestantism, the Clear Grit tradition of political reform, the populism of the

American Midwest, Anglo-Saxon Progressivism—all of which are stronger in the West and rural Ontario than elsewhere in Canada, and quite alien to the Catholic traditions of Quebec and Atlantic Canada, or of the immigrant communities of Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver.

In other words, the original conception of Reform was just too narrow for Canada. But by the time Manning and the rest of us realized this, the party was so deeply entrenched in the West, where it was an ideal match to the political culture, that it could not morph into something more acceptable in other parts of the country. Manning did his best with various campaigns to "broaden the circle" and create a "United Alternative." He succeeded in founding the Canadian Alliance, which was a significant step forward; but it was not enough of a break with Reform to bring over most of the federal Progressive Conservatives—or maybe they just were not ready.

Parallel to Manning's conception of Reform as a neo-populist revival, there was another conception of Reform, held by Stephen Harper (and me), as a Canadian version of Reaganism and Thatcherism—that is, a Conservative Party positioned further to the right and standing more consistently for small government, lower taxes, deregulation, privatization and free markets in general. That view coincided with Manning's in starting from a western base, but diverged somewhat in predicting where additional supporters would be found. Rather than target resource-producing areas in the periphery of Canada, we thought Reform would grow in the traditional bastions of the Progressive Conservative Party—small-town Canada and the outer suburbs of major metropolitan areas, the same type of terrain on which conservative parties thrive in all countries.

Harper's Thatcherite/Reaganite conservatism was not tied to a specific part of Canada in the same way as Manning's populism, but it suffered from another sort of miscalculation. It underestimated the loyalty of Progressive Conservatives to their traditional party. Millions of voters who agreed with Reform's policies could not give up their loyalty to the PC brand. I met many of these Tories in my Reform days. They were just as right-wing as I was, but Reform was

not their brand. It was as simple as that. And, although I was frustrated by their loyalty, I had to be impressed by it. They were the kind of people who are indispensable to any political party.

Harper realized this about the same time as Manning started working toward expanding the Reform Party. Harper laid out his new view at the Winds of Change conference held in Calgary in May 1996 to discuss possible cooperation between Reform and the PCs. What Harper said then now seems like common sense, but it

It is important that Segal's Tory introspection be matched by rethinking among Reformers. What errors did we make on our side?

was novel at a time when political analysts were still struggling to make sense of the 1993 election, after the Progressive Conservatives had been reduced to two seats, and two new parties—Reform and the Bloc Québécois—had taken over their seats in the House of Commons. Harper marshalled historical evidence to show that all winning Conservative coalitions in 20th-century Canadian history had consisted of three factions: a populist element, strongest in the West but also present in rural Ontario; traditional Tories, strong in Ontario and Atlantic Canada; and francophone nationalists in Quebec. The disaster of 1993 was not a random event: it represented the splintering of Brian Mulroney's grand coalition along ancient fault lines. Conservatives, according to Harper, would never win another national government until they brought these factions back together. The speech made a deep impression on me. I called Harper's wife that afternoon and said, "Stephen sounded like a prime minister today."

Afterward, when I helped Harper write up his theory for publication, I dubbed it "The Three Sisters," after a prominent mountain lying between Banff and Canmore. Initially, it seemed impossible to bring the three sisters back into a single party, so we speculated about various ways of forming a coalition among sister parties, but that turned out to be even harder to achieve than simple unification.

In 2001, Harper started the active implementation of his plan by running for the leadership of the Canadian Alliance. His victory in that race won him the western populist sister. Political junkies will remember that his first act after becoming leader of the Alliance was to seek a meeting with Joe Clark to discuss cooperation with the Progressive Conservatives, but again that party's leadership was not interested.

For Harper, however, it was only a detour on his roadmap. He successfully wooed the second sister, the traditional Tories, in the fall of 2003, when he and Peter MacKay negotiated a merger of the Alliance and the PCs. The results in the 2004 election confirmed the theory of the three sisters. The new Conservative Party did better than the sum of the Alliance and PCs, but, unable to win any seats in Quebec, it could not yet beat

the Liberals. Harper continued to work hard at wooing Quebec and, with a little help from Sheila Fraser, John Gomery and a few Montreal PR firms, made a breakthrough on January 23 2006, when the Conservatives won ten seats in that province. Those new seats, plus 16 additional seats in Ontario, propelled the Conservatives into a minority government and made Harper prime minister.

Along the way, Harper has had to soften his conservative philosophy considerably to take account of the Canadian situation. In Britain and the United States, there are left and right factions within the Conservative and Republican parties ("wets" and "dries" in Britain, eastern establishment liberals and sun-belt conservatives in the United States). They are always jockeying for position: sometimes one is in control, sometimes the other. They fight with each other, and they complain and posture, but they long ago learned the importance of coexistence and taking turns. The situation is more complicated in Canada because there are three major factions, not two. In addition to the western populists, who tend to be more conservative in practice, and the traditional Tories of Ontario and the Atlantic provinces, are the *bleus* of Quebec—more nationalist than conservative, and using the Conservative Party as a vehicle of provincial autonomy. Doctrinaire Thatcherism is too rigid to hold this tripartite coalition together. Harper figured this out ten years ago, and the rest of us are catching up with him.

Believe me, the contemporary mood among western conservatives and populists is for reconciliation with other strands of conservatism. I spent a recent weekend at the Calgary Congress, organized by Link Byfield's Citizens Centre for Freedom and Democracy. Four hundred of exactly the same sort of people who were the most

Believe me, the contemporary mood among western conservatives and populists is for reconciliation with other strands of conservatism.

loyal supporters of the Reform Party debated the "renewal of the federation." Preston Manning spoke about the need to build alliances. Every proposal was subjected to the same line of scrutiny—how will people in other parts of the country react to it? The atmosphere was political in the best

sense of the term—not just venting frustration, but putting forward policies in an attempt to find coalition partners.

With influential Tories like Senator Segal re-examining their earlier beliefs and western activists turning away from hard-edged positions that work regionally but not nationally, prospects seem bright for turning the new Conservative Party of Canada into a long-lasting coalition. Various types of conservatives can live together if they emphasize not what divides them but what unites them. For now, while the coalition is successful and Conservatives control the government, everyone seems to have learned their lesson. The test will come when the tide runs out on the Conservatives, as it inevitably will, and they are voted out of office. At that point, any party undergoes a round of mutual recrimination. If we can survive that, we will indeed have learned the lessons of the past. ☐