

W. L. Mackenzie King

He saw

a politic

nat these longer acceptable. The objective, onal compwever was not victory for one side umitmen ut the negotiation of a more satisface as differy partnership. Industrial harmony rum but epended upon the recognition that n as hamployers and workers were partners; ight. Hioth would be better off if they learned was to prespect each other and to co-operate." ld main Mackenzie King's prism reflected hip, which lights. On the page preceding the n if no gwe quotation, Neatby is at pains to oach to sent this proposition: "Europe's anısly des<mark>ir to co</mark>mmunism was fascism. Would Il party adians face a similar confrontation?" nt of the licit in the pages that follow is his wer. Mackenzie King would save us ional win both perils. Yet Neatby does not lier viewng to our attention this portion of knew tig's diary entry for June 29, 1937. ent and a part of King's record of his converd that on with Hitler:

and wat... I feel more and more how far reachcted the ng in the interest of the working classes ief that **re the** reforms being worked out in t in whitermany, and how completely they are oser. Helin the right lines. They are truly estabn. Induishing an industrial commonwealth, and to which ther nations would be wise to evolve ontribute apidly on similar lines of giving to efited. Pabour its place in the control of indusy dissolary; its leisure, its opportunities for s and education, recreation, sharing, in all f their particulars, the life which hitherto had lepender been preserved for the privileged classes mework only. Of all that I have seen on this trip times be been more impressed minded ind more heartened by what seems ould not to be working itself out in Germany in hese particulars than on almost anyship white thing else."

No doubt the Rockefellers also approved the methods through which industrial harmony was achieved in Nazi Germany!

One is often led to reflect, when reading these pages, that King's biographer must be possessed not only of hindsight but also of great determination to find acceptable reason and reasonable clarity where all others found obscurity. The author accepts as his guide to understanding the public actions and utterances of Mackenzie King a quite selective employment of King's private account of events as related to his diary. No doubt Neatby's problem was to find a balance between the terribly revealing and the equally self-serving. As indicated above, he occasionally fails. Moreover, at some points the diary (as representative of the private and inner man) and the official papers (as representative of the public and political man) become one and the same. Indeed, there is some evidence to suggest that there were occasions on which parts of the diary were written at least some days after the events in question. For example, on Page 281, Neatby cites the diary entry for May 13, 1938, on the subject of the British Commonwealth Air-Training Scheme. It is interesting that this same excerpt appears in the files of the Department of External Affairs in a memorandum describing a conversation with the British High Commissioner, Sir Francis Flood, on May 16, 1938. The only difference is that the diary employs the phrase "European war" whereas the memorandum substitutes "European conflict". There is, of course, the more fundamental consideration of whether, indeed, it is sound scholarship to use King to interpret King. The King diary is not a Rosetta Stone.

Magnitude of task

Still, these may be considered as relatively minor points when compared to the magnitude of Professor Neatby's task. He has taken 13 years between Volume II and III, sufficient time for mature and thorough consideration. Certainly, time enough to master things not obvious to those not equally immersed in the period of the 1930s: for example, how to differentiate between the Conservative "depression" of 1935 and the Liberal "recession" of 1937. That said, Neatby's portrait of R. B. Bennett seems fair, in its context. This is an important point, as Professor Neatby knows well. Since his work on King precedes any important biography of Bennett, Bennett's biographer, when he appears, will have in some measure to write his account according to Neatby's (King's) rules. It can be demon-