
Copyright © 2021 Yoshie Takamitsu. All rights reserved. This work may be used, with this notice included, for noncommercial purposes. No copies of this work may be distributed, electronically or otherwise, in whole or in part, without permission from the author.

Interwar Transnational Network and the British Commonwealth: The Institute of Pacific Relations and Transformation of Relations among the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States, 1942–43

*Yoshie TAKAMITSU**

INTRODUCTION

In this article I will examine what role the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR), a network of nongovernmental transnational organizations, played in British Dominion Canada's search for its position in international politics in 1942–43. The Anglo-US-Canadian trilateral relationship has been described as the North Atlantic triangle, particularly in terms of Canada's international relations.¹ In the past few decades, however, the question of whether such a relationship actually existed in the 1940s has been reexamined by Hector Mackenzie.² The conclusion is that the relationship between Canada and the United Kingdom and the United States was an asymmetrical one in which Canada's presence was overestimated. Mackenzie does not deny, however, that Canada influenced both Britain and the United States in this relationship. While the United States and Britain did not perceive the relationship as a North Atlantic triangle, Mackenzie acknowledges the importance of Canada's influence on both countries. In this article I focus on the IPR conference at Mont Tremblant, near Montreal, in December 1942 and indicate how Canadian intellectuals from the nongovernmental

*Associate Professor, Chiba University

Canadian Institute of International Affairs (CIIA) along with the Canadian Department of External Affairs tried to influence the United States and the United Kingdom in the formation of the postwar international order.

The relationship among Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States gradually changed in a major way during the interwar years. The British Canadian colonies were granted responsible government in the 1840s. This move was prompted by Britain's change in imperial policy, the gradual withdrawal of British military forces from North America, and the adoption of free trade policies. This policy change led the Canadian colonies to pursue greater self-reliance and, as a result, to seek autonomy, including in foreign policy.³ Thus, by the time of confederation in 1867, in other words, by the time of the formation of the Dominion of Canada, Canada was self-governing and, to some extent, had also begun to assume responsibility for its foreign relations and foreign policy.⁴ In 1880, it appointed a high commissioner to London, and it established its Department of External Affairs in 1909.⁵

After the First World War, Canada's international position was enhanced by participation in the 1919–20 Paris Peace Conference and representation in the League of Nations. The prime ministers of the Dominions were invited to the Imperial War Conference held in 1917. As of that date, they gained access to the informational resources of the British Foreign Office. The 1917 Imperial War Conference resolved that a full recognition of the Dominions as autonomous nations within an imperial commonwealth should be readjusted after the First World War.⁶ Canadian representatives were subsequently granted recognition by the international community at the League of Nations.⁷ Shortly after his appointment as Canadian prime minister in late 1921, the Liberal Party's William Lyon Mackenzie King began to advocate for significant autonomy in the formation and administration of Canada's foreign policy.⁸ At the Imperial Conference of 1926, the radical demands of Ireland and South Africa established equality of status between Britain and the Dominion.⁹

For Canada, relations with the United States had been important long before it acquired foreign-policy autonomy. Therefore, Canada's first action after the Imperial Conference of 1926 was to establish a legation in Washington, DC. Vincent Massey became the first Canadian minister to the United States in 1926. The United States soon opened a legation in Ottawa and sent William Phillips as the first minister to Canada. Shortly after Canada established its mission in Washington, it opened diplomatic missions in France and Japan in 1928 and 1929, respectively.¹⁰ Furthermore, based on

discussions at the Imperial Conference in 1930, the British Parliament passed the Statute of Westminster on December 11, 1931, granting Canada full independence, including in diplomatic relations, if it so desired. Subsequently, Canada remained legally bound to Britain for a long time,¹¹ but in the early 1940s, it sought to play some role in the post–Second World War international order.

As Canada's international position was enhanced, the IPR was established as a transnational network for intellectuals interested in the international affairs of the Asia-Pacific region.¹² At the time, a rash of international nongovernmental organizations were being established focused on international politics.¹³ The first IPR conference in Honolulu in 1925 was attended mainly by Americans, Japanese, Chinese, Canadians, Australians, and New Zealanders. John Nelson, a Canadian journalist in Vancouver, was one of founding members of the IPR.¹⁴ In Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, the Institute of International Affairs was created from a merger between the London-based British Institute of International Affairs (BIIA) and the IPR. Therefore, the CIIA was founded as the Canadian branch of the BIIA, though the IPR members were deeply involved in its creation. The IPR was a US-led international nongovernmental organization, and the CIIA became involved in Canada-US relations through the IPR network.

Most research about the IPR has been published in Japan and has mainly focused on the prewar period, while most of the few studies in the United States have focused on whether or not the IPR was involved in Communist spying. Research has not flourished in the United States because the IPR was embroiled in the US "red scare," and it was forced to dissolve in 1960. Therefore, the number of studies about the Mont Tremblant Conference is limited, and the studies have been conducted primarily with reference to the summaries of the conference published by the IPR. There has been much focus on the American Council of the IPR and the International Secretariat and little focus on the role of the Canadian IPR.¹⁵ However, the IPR's influence on international politics increased commensurately with an increase in the participation of government officials. In this article, I draw on the historical documents of Edgar J. Tarr, a member of the CIIA and a leader of the Mont Tremblant Conference, and the Canadian Department of External Affairs to elucidate the details of the interactions among officials of various governments and nonofficial.¹⁶

The Anglo-US Conflict at the IPR Mont Tremblant Conference and Canada

The eighth IPR conference at Mont Tremblant was held December 4–14, 1942. (See table 1.) The IPR decided on the date of this conference on July 13, 1942.¹⁷ The conference was not initially to have been held in Canada.¹⁸ The CIIA, however, wanted the conference to be held in its own country. It had been actively attracting IPR conferences to increase its influence in international politics, and this was the third time it had hosted a conference, after Banff in 1933 and Victoria in 1939; in the case of 1939, the outbreak of the Second World War had caused the venue to be changed to Virginia Beach in the United States. Therefore, the CIIA worked hard to become the host the 1942 conference.¹⁹

Earlier studies emphasize that European countries, including Britain, were confronted at the Mont Tremblant Conference by the United States, Canada, and China over the colonial issue, especially the independence of India.

Table 1. list of the IPR Conference

	year	period	location
1	1925	from June 30 to July 15	Honolulu, U.S.A.
2	1927	from July 15 to 29	Honolulu, U.S.A.
3	1929	October 28 to November 9	Kyoto, Japan
4	1931	October 21 to November 2	Hangzhou and Shinghai, China
5	1933	August 14 to 26	Banff, Canada
6	1936	August 15 to 29	Yosemite, U.S.A.
7	1939	November 18 to December 2	Virginia Beach, U.S.A.
8	1942	December 4 to 14	Mont Tremblant, Canada
9	1945	January 6 to 17	Hot Springs, U.S.A.
10	1947	September 5 to 20	Stratford-upon-Avon, U.K.
11	1950	October 3 to 15	Lachnow, India
12	1954	September 27 to October 8	Kyoto, Japan
13	1958	February 3 to 12	Lahol, Pakistan

Michio Yamaoka, *Taiheiyo Mondai Chosakai Shiryo* (Tokyo: The Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies of Waseda University, 2010), 6.

Research had suggested that Canada backed the United States along with China, India, and Australia in denouncing European imperialism.²⁰ The Canadian position, however, was much more complicated, with Canada trying to play the role of mediator between the United States and the United Kingdom.

The Canadian Council of the IPR was the CIIA, which was established in 1928 and chaired by former prime minister Robert Borden. As mentioned earlier, the establishment of the CIIA resulted from the process of simultaneously establishing the Canadian branches of the BIIA and the IPR. This was because the formation of the BIIA network was not popular in Canada. Because the network was a transnational network centered on the United Kingdom, it did not receive much interest, especially from those who advocated Canadian autonomy, who were called “nationalists.” At the same time, the IPR network, which was based in the United States, was working diligently with John Nelson but failed to attract a prominent figure to install as chair. Moreover, Marle Davies, general secretary of the IPR from Hawaii, wanted the United Kingdom to join the IPR network, and the IPR’s willingness to connect with the BIIA through its Canadian branch was a key factor in the decision to join the CIIA by way of the Canadian group of the IPR.²¹

Throughout the 1930s, the IPR grew into the most comprehensive transnational network for Asia and the Pacific.²² The Canadian branch also expanded, and in 1932, with a monetary donation from Massey, Escott Reid was hired as national secretary, and the organization developed under his direction.²³ Massey served as the minister to the United States from 1926 to 1930 and as the high commissioner to the United Kingdom from 1935 to 1946. As a branch of the IPR, the CIIA was considerably more active than the Australian and New Zealand branches, and from an early stage it was actively seeking to participate in the IPR network. Canada’s geographic location in North America may have been a major factor in its closer relationship with the United States. The CIIA’s financial contributions to the IPR were about five times larger than those of the Australian and New Zealand branches, and they were even larger than those of the Japanese and British branches. The IPR was heavily reliant on private philanthropic funding from the United States. The size of the financial burden of the American Council of the IPR was orders of magnitude greater than that of the other branches, but the second-largest financial contribution was private funding from Canada.²⁴ (See table 2.)

The chair of the CIIA at the time of the Mont Tremblant Conference was

Table 2. Contributions of National Councils to the International IPR finance

	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	total of 1931–36
U.S.A.	\$65,000	\$22,000	\$27,500	\$37,000	\$35,917	\$17,500	\$204,917
Hawaii	\$10,000	\$5,525	\$6,575	\$5,700	\$10,000	\$2,000	\$39,800
Canada	\$7,500	\$4,778	\$4,950	\$3,960	\$3,223	\$3,246	\$27,657
U.K.	\$5,000	\$3,550	\$2,625	\$3,026	\$2,934	\$2,455	\$19,590
Japan	\$5,000	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$859	\$843	\$1,425	\$13,127
China	\$2,000	\$1,202	\$2,677	\$2,000	\$1,770	\$1,794	\$11,443
Soviet Union					\$2,000	\$2,000	\$4,000
Australia	\$625	\$600	\$600	\$600	\$588	\$460	\$3,473
Netherland East Indies			\$480	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$2,580
New Zealand	\$500	\$42	\$624	\$300		\$300	\$1,766
Philippine		\$500	\$500	\$500			\$1,500

Agenda, 52nd Meeting, 1936/02/28 for 1932–34 and Agenda, 56th Meeting, 1937/5/26 for 1935–36, RIIA 6/1/4, Royal Institute of International Affairs. Hawaii is tabulated separately from the United States. Also, the U.S. share for 1936 does not include the Rockefeller Foundation's \$180,000. The Rockefeller Foundation's contribution was included in the U.S. contribution until 1935, but was reclassified to seemingly correct the imbalance among the branches.

Edgar J. Tarr, who took over as chair in fall 1937 and tried to change the direction of the CIIA, advocating that it more directly inform public opinion rather than serve as an academic institution as Reid had intended.²⁵ Tarr was a wealthy businessman in Winnipeg. Meanwhile, Reid retired from the CIIA at the end of October 1938, and in 1939 he was appointed second secretary of the Canadian legation in Washington.²⁶ Until the outbreak of the Second World War, the CIIA and the Canadian Department of External Affairs took opposing views about war and did not cooperate closely.²⁷ After the outbreak of the war, however, the relationship between the two sides became closer, and there was close correspondence between Tarr and Hugh L. Keenleyside, assistant undersecretary of the Department of External Affairs, regarding the organization of the Mont Tremblant Conference.²⁸ Keenleyside served the Canadian legation in Tokyo from 1929 to 1936. He was Prime Minister King's adviser in early 1936 and first secretary of the Department of External Affairs from 1937 until 1941, when he was appointed assistant

undersecretary of the US and Far Eastern Division.²⁹

Tarr believed that the IPR conference had an important role to play in Canada's foreign relations, and from the preparatory stages of the 1942 conference, he encouraged departmental officials to become involved.³⁰ Initially, the Canadian government did not attach much importance to the IPR as a forum. However, when it heard that the United Kingdom was sending a delegation, including senior government officials, it began to think seriously about participating.³¹ In setting the agenda of the 1942 conference, Tarr consulted with Keenleyside, and they had a frank exchange of ideas. Keenleyside was opposed to the IPR's stance of proposing policy to the government, as it was important for him that officials reach their conclusions informally.³² Canada's Department of External Affairs had come to emphasize the IPR as a forum, but it recognized that the main actor for setting foreign policy was the government. Tarr also believed that the government had to take center stage during the war, and soon after the end of the war, a venue would become available for private organizations to contribute.³³ Tarr noted, however, that more emphasis had been placed on the IPR outside Canada and expressed concern that the Canadian Department of External Affairs was downplaying the importance of the IPR.³⁴

The Anglo-US conflict over the agenda was already evident during the preparation for the Mont Tremblant Conference. The United Kingdom, for example, was dissatisfied with the conference's agenda and requested an unsolicited change, for which Tarr tried to play a mediating role.³⁵ Keenleyside shared this concern about the Anglo-US conflict. He was worried about Britain's complete rejection of Indian independence. He questioned why the Indian delegation was composed only of those who agreed with the British position.³⁶ In Keenleyside's opinion, the British and Indian delegations faced a formidable front in maintaining colonialism. Such an attitude was considered to have the worst impact on the United States and China. The RIIA (the BIIA received a royal charter in 1926 and became known as the RIIA) was worried that it would have the opposite consequences, in an attempt to help promote US and British understanding.³⁷

At the heart of the problem was the interpretation of the Atlantic Charter. The Charter was a statement of principle of the postwar order agreed on by the leaders of the United Kingdom and the United States in August 1941, but immediately after the agreement was reached, there was a disagreement in interpretation of paragraph 3 of the Charter, which said that "they respect the

right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.”³⁸ This was because of British prime minister Winston Churchill’s public statements that the principles of decolonialization and self-determination did not apply to the British Empire.³⁹ When he was preparing for the IPR Mont Tremblant Conference, Tarr was very concerned that Churchill’s speech had outraged public opinion in the United States, as he believed that the March 1942 mission of Sir Stafford Cripps to India had broadened the understanding of the difficulties of the Indian problem in the United States. He believed it was necessary for Britain to be clear about its commitment to think about and discuss the change in the status of India. He, therefore, warned the British members of the IPR indirectly via Keenleyside that this situation was an extremely dangerous element of postwar Anglo-US cooperation and that without Anglo-US cooperation, there could be no lasting peace.⁴⁰

It is worth noting that Tarr did not attempt to prevent anyone who had a different opinion from the mainstream of the IPR from participating. He argued that it was important to start discussions to challenge the criticism by some IPR members that Britain, the United States, and China were unable to discuss together India’s independence at a conference. He believed that by setting up a common forum for discussion among the three countries, the threat to stability of international relations or order would be removed.⁴¹ This skill of Tarr’s may have been cultivated from experience in responding to Canadian diversity. There was a non-negligible minority in Canada: the French Canadians. Anglo-Canadians were also divided over important policy issues, but the CHIA encompassed a diverse range of political positions. Tarr was also keen to accurately reflect the diverse opinions within Canada when selecting Canadian representatives. For example, although he did not wish to select F. H. Soward, professor of history at the University of British Columbia, because too many academic researchers would have seats at the IPR conference, Tarr believed that British Columbia’s perspective had to be represented. He did not like the opinion of R. G. Trotter, professor of Canadian and Colonial History and head of the Department of History at Queen’s University, but he accepted him because his views were shared by some Canadians.⁴²

The British-Canadian Informal Meeting in Ottawa and the Postwar International Order

Canada—that is, Tarr and the Department of External Affairs—was concerned about the stubbornness of the British delegation at the Mont Tremblant Conference and the unbalanced makeup of the Indian delegation because they knew that British attitudes were diverse and that not everyone thought like Prime Minister Churchill. From spring 1942, consultations on the draft Joint Declaration on the Colonies were underway in the United Kingdom, with opinions ranging from those that were relatively for independence such as C. R. Attlee, deputy prime minister and Dominion secretary, to the more anti-independence Prime Minister Churchill and Gladwin Jebb of the British Foreign Office.⁴³ In that respect, the fact that the British Council of the IPR was the RIIA made matters somewhat more difficult: the RIIA intended to keep the British Empire from changing, and it was more concerned with the preservation of the British Empire than was a politician like Attlee, although not as much so as Prime Minister Churchill.⁴⁴

In February 1943, members of the RIIA (British Council of the IPR) and Canadian government officials met informally in Ottawa. This meeting was arranged by Keenleyside and Tarr. Keenleyside told Tarr at the end of December 1942 that members of the RIIA, such as Sir Frederick Whyte, H. B. Butler, Sir George Sansom, and W. J. Hinton, and Canadian government officials should take this opportunity to exchange ideas. At the same time, he said that the IPR could be a catalyst for good relations between Britain and the United States by drafting a colonial charter as part of the IPR's activities.⁴⁵ In response, Tarr proposed a meeting with Whyte.⁴⁶ According to Tarr, the British side was willing to have this meeting.⁴⁷ Therefore, Tarr told N. A. Robertson, the undersecretary of the Canadian Department of External Affairs, that he was concerned about British-US relations at the IPR Mont Tremblant Conference and that he was organizing a meeting between Whyte and Canadian officials to ease this conflict.⁴⁸ Robertson agreed to the proposal, arguing that the role played by the United States in the postwar international order was in a state of flux and that the United Kingdom could use its powerful influence to direct US policy in the desired direction.⁴⁹

Once the date for the meeting was set, Tarr prepared a draft agenda in consultation with Canadian officials.⁵⁰ He summarized the general approach to the problem in eleven points. Among these, he counted “a feeling of superiority on the part of many Americans vis-à-vis the United Kingdom, and on the part of many English, a partly submerged but constantly

reappearing dislike for Americans.” He also pointed out “the shift of relative world power and prestige as between the UK and US.” Then he asked, “Can American attitude and action be adjusted to make it easier for the UK and its citizens to refrain from irritable reactions to the US, and if so, how?” Furthermore, he believed in a greater willingness on the part of the UK to make concessions because it was a more pressing need for the UK.⁵¹

In attendance at the meeting were Sir George Sansom, Sir Frederick Whyte, W. J. Hinton, and Redvers Opie on the British side and Tarr, Dr. W. C. Clark, G. F. Towers, Louis Rasminsky, W. A. Mackintosh, O. D. Skelton, N. A. Robertson, H. L. Keenleyside, Hume Wrong, H. F. Angus, and Escott Reid on the Canadian side. The minutes were to be prepared independently by Hinton on the British side and by Reid on the Canadian side.⁵² (See table 3 for list of all participants.) According to the minutes by Reid, the British participants shared the perception that there was an anti-British atmosphere in the United States. As a result, if the United States were to withdraw from Europe after the war, it would be very alarming for Britain because Britain would have to consider its European policy alongside the Soviet Union. It was expected that Europe would then be divided into two camps, East and West. The presidential election of 1944 was a major factor in determining the course of events in the United States. It was recognized that the outcome would determine the future of world peace to some extent. The key to the presidential election, it was said, was for US public opinion to understand that Britain was pursuing an enlightened policy in its colonies, such as India.⁵³

The Canadians made two proposals, which were generally accepted by the British side. The first was that negotiations with the United States should be conducted as multilateral negotiations, along with the other Allies. The second suggestion was that it was important to have a “forward-looking” policy. The first proposal was especially significant. The proposal was based on the idea that multilateral negotiations would be effective in reducing the pressure on the United States to take a stronger position in bilateral negotiations. This was something that Canada was aware of in its negotiations with the United States. The Canadian government had behaved similarly in the Northwest Canada issue, which involved the virtual US occupation of the Canadian Northwest in 1943. By the Ogdensburg agreement, the United States embarked on a proliferation of military projects through the Canadian Northwest. The influx of US military personnel and civilian workers resulted in the presence of over 33,000 US citizens in the Canadian Northwest as of June 1943, which far exceeded the local

Table 3. list of participants of the informal meeting on February 6 to 7

the British side

*Sir George Sansom	Minister advising on Far Eastern Affairs, British Embassy, Washington
*Sir Frederick Whyte	Chair of Far Eastern Group at the RIIA
*W. J. Hinton	Director of Speakers and Exhibitions Division, British Information Services
*Redvers Opie	Economic Adviser, British Embassy, Washington 1939–42

the Canadian side

*Edgar J. Tarr	President, Monarch Life Assurance Company. Honorary President, CIIA
Dr. W. C. Clark	Deputy Minister, the Department of Finance
G. F. Towers	Governor, Bank of Canada
*Louis Rasminsky	Assistant Chair, Foreign Exchange Control Board
W. A. Mackintosh	Special Assistant to Deputy Minister, the Department of Finance
*D. A. Skelton	Director of Research, Bank of Canada
N. A. Robertson	Under Secretary, the Department of External Affairs
*H. L. Keenleyside	Assistant Under-Secretary, the Department of External Affairs
Hume Wrong	Minister-Counsellor, Canadian Legation in the United States
H. F. Angus	Professor, the University of British Columbia
Escott Reid	the Department of External Affairs

Minutes by Reid, 1943/2/10, box 3177, RG25 G-2, Library and Archives Canada.

*Participants of the IPR Conference in 1942

population.⁵⁴

As of the late 1930s, Canada needed to strengthen its relations with the United States, and wartime cooperation between the two countries was noticeably strengthened in the early 1940s. In the process, however, Canada had become concerned that its relations with the United States jeopardized its own sovereignty.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, the relationship with the United States was vitally important to Canada, and it considered how to deal with the United States in a multilateral framework.⁵⁶ There was also a consensus at the informal meeting that conflicts between Britain and the United States

were more likely to arise in bilateral negotiations than in multilateral negotiations. Concerning the IPR Mont Tremblant Conference, multilateral negotiations were effective because a third party was able to play a buffer role between Britain and the United States.⁵⁷

Robertson, however, later wrote a note to the effect that the meeting was of little consequence: on March 10, 1943, the Department of External Affairs sent the minutes prepared by Reid to the diplomatic missions in the United States, Britain, Australia, Argentina, and other countries. At the time, Robertson recalled that he did not even sign the letter to make it clear that it was not an official meeting. He also referred to the tensions between Britain and the United States, which Tarr claimed were exaggerated, and opposed third-party mediation.⁵⁸ This was clearly a subsequent change in the positions taken at this meeting. What happened in between? In spring 1943, talks between Britain and the United States on the plan of the “United Nations” were just beginning to make progress.⁵⁹ The Canadian view was reflected in the Anglo-US talks. As we will see, the meeting was significant in that regard, but at the same time, the informal meeting may have been regarded as having already completed its role.

At the informal meeting between Britain and Canada in February, issues of wartime cooperation between the Allies and the postwar international order were discussed. With regard to politics among the Allies, Canada was dissatisfied. It believed that the organizational framework of the Allies should ensure that their contributions to the war should be commensurate with their influence on common policy. Only within such a framework, they believed, could they increase their effective contributions to the war effort. Canada saw that the UN Relief Administration would be led by seven countries: the four major powers, plus Canada, Brazil, and Sweden. Canada was unhappy with the division of twenty-six countries of the UN Relief Administration between the major powers and the rest of the world because it would have lumped Canada and Costa Rica together. Canada took pride in being the third most important country in the United Nations.⁶⁰

Gladwin Jebb of the British Foreign Office prepared a memorandum in March 1943 in preparation for revision of the Cabinet Memorandum for the United Nations plan. The memorandum drew on criticism from Attlee, the deputy prime minister and Dominion secretary, as well as the views of representatives of the Dominions and the British Embassy in Washington. As a result, a reference was added to the importance of general consent for decisions in UN beyond the four major powers to gain the understanding of the Dominions. This was on the advice of Charles Webster, a member of the

RIIA.⁶¹ In addition to the government-level exchange of ideas in Washington, informal meetings between RIIA members and CIIA and Canadian government officials in Ottawa were likely another source of information about the Canadian position toward the UN plan.

The Canadian members of the IPR sought to improve Canada's position in the postwar international order. They acknowledged, furthermore, that seeking to expand the role of Canada in the United Nations mechanism would increase Canada's responsibility. Meanwhile, the Canadian members recognized that the fundamental problem was that the Canadian Parliament and citizens had not come to feel responsible in matters of international policy if their own national interests were not directly involved.⁶² The Canadian government had opposed taking on a position of responsibility in the past. The government believed it was a time for Canada to realize its responsibility to the international community.

CONCLUSION

In this article I have examined the role that the IPR, a network of nongovernmental transnational organizations, played in Canada's search for its position in international politics in 1942–43. The CIIA was created as a response to both the British-led and British Empire-based BIIA network and the US-led IPR network. In Australia and New Zealand, as well as in Canada, Institutes of International Affairs were the result of a merging of these two networks. However, Canada was uniquely positioned between these two transnational networks, because Canada was politically equidistant from both the United Kingdom and the United States. In Canada, a British-dominated transnational network was not so popular, and establishing a Canadian branch of the BIIA was a difficult task. The difficulty was resolved when Canada joined the IPR through establishing a Canadian chapter. The IPR network welcomed the confluence of the BIIA network, as it had sought the UK's participation. Canada had been the link between the United Kingdom and the United States since the early days of the IPR.

Originally, the British considered the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) to be the US counterpart to the BIIA network. As far as European issues are concerned, the coordination of the BIIA and the CFR appears to have worked well.⁶³ However, on Asia-Pacific issues, the CFR did not function well because the number of Asian experts is limited, and the focus of their activities has shifted to the IPR, and the IPR became the main venue. As a

more US-centered forum, the IPR was less than desirable for discussing Asian issues for the United Kingdom, and there were some strained moments in Anglo-US relations. In such an arena, Canada had elected themselves to catalyze improvement in these relations. Anglo-US cooperation was necessary for the stability of the postwar international order, not only for Canada but for the world. By involving itself in Anglo-US relations, Canada was gradually consolidating its readiness to increase its international standing and to assume commensurate responsibilities.

This article has focused on the IPR conference at Mont Tremblant and the informal Anglo-Canadian meeting immediately after the IPR conference. Contrary to claims in earlier studies by Thorne, Yui, Akami, and Anderson,⁶⁴ Canada did not blame the British for keeping the colony intact or side with the US position on the colonial issue. Canada tried to be a mediator between Britain and the United States. This skill may have been cultivated by previous experience in responding to Canadian diversity in national background and political positions. Canada did not merely change its dependency from the United Kingdom to the United States. It was also concerned with maintaining good Anglo-US relations and felt the need to protect Canadian sovereignty from the United States. Canada tried to convey that the important thing in relations with the United States was to position the United States in a multilateral framework. Pressures from the United States on countries that needed close relations with US for their survival could be better resolved at the multilateral level than at the bilateral level.

The Anglo-Canadian informal conference led by the CIIA with Keenleyside after the IPR conference also provided an excellent opportunity for the United Kingdom to consider the demands of the British Dominions when considering the United Nations plan. Canadians also tried to be a buffer in Anglo-US relations and to use the relationship as a way to enhance Canada's position in the postwar international order. The meeting was, in addition, an opportunity for Canada to convey its dissatisfaction with the postwar international order, which was being envisioned as a great power-centered mechanism. As the Cold War progressed, the US government compromised on British colonial policy, while the British compromised less, resulting in an underestimation of Canada's role as a successful mediator of differences between the two major powers.

NOTES

This work was supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of

Science, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (KAKENHI) number 19H04510.

¹ J. B. Brebner, *North Atlantic Triangle: The Interplay of Canada, the United States and Great Britain* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1945); John Holmes, *The Shaping of Peace: Canada and the Search for World Order, 1943–1957*, 2 vols. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979/1982).

² Hector Mackenzie, “Delineating the North Atlantic Triangle: The Second World War and Its Aftermath,” *Round Table* 95, no. 383 (January 2006): 101–12.

³ John Hilliker, *Canada’s Department of External Affairs*, vol. 1, *The Early Years, 1909–1946* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1990), 3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 5–7.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 30–56.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 70.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 80.

⁸ Kazuo Kimura, Phillip A. Buckner, and Norman Hillmer, *Kanada no Rekishi: Daiei Teikoku no Chusei na Chojo 1713–1982* [Elder Daughter of the Empire: A History of Canadian-British Relations, 1713–1982] (Tokyo: Tosui Shobo, 1997), 175.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 181.

¹⁰ Hilliker, *Early Years*, 111–12.

¹¹ Until Canada’s constitution was “patriated” in 1982, approval of the British Parliament was required for changes to that constitution. <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/patriation-of-the-constitution>.

¹² Although much of the early research on the IPR focused on its association with McCarthyism, empirical research on the founding of the IPR and its interwar activities began in the 1980s. Beginning with Paul F. Hooper’s first reference to early IPR activities using IPR documents from the University of Hawai‘i’s collection in *Elusive Destiny* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1980), he published a series of articles. In collaboration with William Holland, the former international executive director of the IPR, he started a new trend in IPR research. Although interest in the IPR is high in Japan, it shares with Hooper a focus on the private-sector interaction aspect of the IPR. In the 1980s, Nobuo Katagiri started work on the Japanese Council of the IPR, based on research in the Diplomatic Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, resulting in a book compiling previously published papers, *Taiheiyo Mondai Chosakai no Kenkyu* [The Institute of Pacific Relations] (Tokyo: Keio Gijuku Daigaku Shuppankai, 2003). However, Tomoko Akami’s *Internationalizing the Pacific* (New York: Routledge, 2002) changed the conventional image of the IPR dramatically. Taking a long-term view of the entire interwar period, Akami argues that the essence of the IPR’s activities was the search for the formation of a world order by the United States, led by East Coast American intellectuals.

¹³ Thomas Davies, *NGOs: A New History of Transnational Civil Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 90–105.

¹⁴ T. B. Millar, “Commonwealth Institutes of International Affairs,” *International Journal* 33, no. 1 (Winter 1977–8): 10–11.

¹⁵ International Secretariat of IPR, ed., *War and Peace in the Pacific: A Preliminary Report of the Eighth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations on Wartime and Post-war Co-operation of the United Nations in the Pacific and the Far East, Mont Tremblant, Quebec, December 4–14, 1942* (New York: ISIPR, 1943). Christopher Thorne, *Allies of a Kind: The United States, Britain, and the War against Japan, 1941–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 212–14. Daizaburo Yui, *Mikan no Senryo Kaikaku: Amerika Chishikijin to*

Suterareta Nihon Minshuka Koso [The Unfinished Reform under the Occupation] (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1989), 71–107. Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, 257–69.

¹⁶ Tarr's work in CIIA is discussed by Pricilla Roberts, "Tweaking the Lion's Tail: Edgar J. Tarr, the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, and the British Empire, 1931–1950," *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 23, no. 4 (November 2012): 636–59. The author argues that the CIIA has become influential in Canadian foreign policy largely due to Tarr's contributions. She mentions the Mont Tremblant Conference but not the informal meeting that immediately followed.

¹⁷ International Secretariat of IPR, *War and Peace*, v.

¹⁸ Tarr to Carter, 1943/6/9 and Carter to Tarr, 1942/6/11, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, Library and Archives Canada (hereafter cited as LAC).

¹⁹ Tarr to Angus, Keenleyside, Mackintosh, Pearson, Rasminsky, and Skelton, 1942/8/19, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

²⁰ Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 213; Yui, *Mikan no Senryo Kaikaku*, 100; Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, 268.

²¹ Edward Greathed, "Antecedents and Origins of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs," in Harvey L. Dyck and H. Peter Crosby, eds., *Empire and Nations* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967). This article is the most basic work on the creation of the CIIA. The *International Journal* that featured "Opinion and Policy" is useful for understanding the relations among the university, the CIIA, and the Department of External Affairs. *International Journal* 33, no. 1 (Winter 1977–8).

²² Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, 167–239.

²³ Carter Manny, "The Canadian Institute of International Affairs 1928 to 1939: An Attempt to 'Enlighten' Canada's Foreign Policy" (bachelor's thesis, Harvard College, 1971), 22–61.

²⁴ Yoshie Takamitsu, "The Democratization of International Politics and Second Track Diplomacy between the World Wars," *Rekishu Hyoron* 789 (January 2016): 62.

²⁵ Manny, *Canadian Institute of International Affairs*, 62–69.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 73. Tarr was president of Monarch Life Assurance Company and director of the Bank of Canada.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 79–97.

²⁸ External to Tarr, 1942/8/23, box 2, Edgar J. Tarr Series, MG28-1250, LAC.

²⁹ John D. Meehan, *The Dominion and the Rising Sun: Canada Encounters Japan, 1929–41* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004), 15–16, 154. Hilliker, *Early Years*, 243.

³⁰ Tarr to Keenleyside, 1942/7/13, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

³¹ Robertson to Pearson, 1942/8/5, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

³² Keenleyside to Tarr, 1942/10/6, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

³³ Tarr to Keenleyside, 1942/6/15, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

³⁴ Tarr to Keenleyside, 1942/10/10, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

³⁵ Tarr to Angus, Keenleyside, Mackintosh, Pearson, Rasminsky, Skelton, 1942/8/25, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

³⁶ Keenleyside to Tarr, 1942/10/23, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

³⁷ Tarr to Keenleyside, 1942/11/12, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

³⁸ Official text of Atlantic Charter, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_16912.htm.

³⁹ Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 61.

⁴⁰ Memo to Members of Canadian Group at Mont Tremblant Conference, undated, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

⁴¹ Tarr to Keenleyside, 1942/11/27, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

⁴² Tarr to Macdonell, 1942/9/2 and Tarr to Keenleyside, 1942/11/14, box 2837-40, RG25-2929, LAC.

- ⁴³ Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 223–24.
- ⁴⁴ Inderjeet Parmar, *Think Tanks and Power in Foreign Policy: A Comparative Study of the Role and Influence of the Council on Foreign Relations and Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1939–1945* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 24–36.
- ⁴⁵ Keenleyside to Tarr, 1942/12/31, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁴⁶ Tarr to Whyte, 1943/1/4, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁴⁷ Tarr to Keenleyside, 1943/1/7, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁴⁸ Tarr to Robertson, 1943/1/9, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁴⁹ Robertson to Tarr, 1943/1/26, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁵⁰ Tarr to Robertson; Tarr to Keenleyside, 1943/2/3, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁵¹ “Anglo-American Relations” by Whyte and Tarr, 1943/2/3, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁵² Robertson to Pearson, 1943/2/24, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁵³ Minutes by Reid, pp.1–3, 1943/2/10, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁵⁴ Shelagh Grant, “Search for a Northern Policy 1940–1950: Impact of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs” (honors thesis, Trent University, 1981), 37–39.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 41.
- ⁵⁶ Minutes by Reid, p. 3, 1943/2/10, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4
- ⁵⁸ External Affairs to Massey, 1943/3/10; External Affairs to Robertson, 1943/3/10; and Robertson to External Affairs, 1943/8/16, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁵⁹ Yuichi Hosoya, “Designing the ‘United Nations’: Charles Webster and the Planning of World Order, 1942–43,” *Journal of Law, Politics, and Sociology* 84, no.1 (January 2011): 102.
- ⁶⁰ Minutes by Reid, pp. 5–6, 1943/2/10, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁶¹ Hosoya, “Designing the ‘United Nations,’” 102–3.
- ⁶² Minutes by Reid, p. 13, 1943/2/10, box 3177, RG25 G-2, LAC.
- ⁶³ Parmar, *Think Tanks and Power*, 96–97.
- ⁶⁴ Thorne, 212–14; Yui, 71–107; Akami, 257–69. Michael Richard Anderson, “Pacific Dreams: The Institute of Pacific Relations and the Struggle for the Mind of Asia” (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2009), 74–78, 99–101.