The Halifax Memorial Tower (figs. 1-3), located in Sir Sandford Fleming Park in Halifax, was recently declared a National Historic Site of Canada. The Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada (HSMBC) recommended that the reasons for designation were the following: built at the instigation of Sir Sandford Fleming for the twin purposes of commemorating the achievement of representative government in the colony of Nova Scotia one hundred and fifty years earlier and celebrating Canada’s relationship within the British Empire, it reflects a transitional moment on the eve of the First World War, when the country was on the cusp of a change toward more independence. It is a rare structure whose design neatly mirrors its commemorative intent by means of the transitional qualities of its architecture, from the High Victorian character of its massive rusticated shaft to the later Edwardian classicism reflected in the tower’s more delicate classical superstructure. Its prominent site speaks forcefully to Halifax’s special relationship with the British Empire.1

Recent literature dealing with the meaning of the Tower has focused on its historical associations, especially Paul Williams’s thoughtful essays in Acadiensis and the International Journal of Heritage Studies, and Brian Cuthbertson’s meticulously researched study prepared for the HSMBC.2 For the purpose of determining national significance, the paper prepared by the author for the HSMBC subsequent to Brian Cuthbertson’s own, links the architectural design of the structure to its historical meaning, for such a link establishes the essential value of the Tower.

FIG. 1. HALIFAX MEMORIAL TOWER, SIR SANDFORD FLEMING PARK, HALIFAX. [JAY WHITE. 2006.]
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as a work of architecture, and sets it in the context of Canadian architecture and nationalism of its times. Indeed, the architectural style originally chosen for this monument was ideally suited to convey these nationalist and imperialist values, and reflects a program of architecture then being pursued nationwide. As well, the Memorial Tower also foreshadowed elements of the postwar world, Canada's relationship with the British Empire, and Canada's future directions historically and architecturally.

**PLANNING THE MEMORIAL TOWER**

The Memorial Tower was inspired by an imposing figure in Canadian history, Sir Sandford Fleming (1827-1915). His biography is well known and well documented elsewhere; relevant here are his attitudes toward Canada, the British Empire, and how they manifested themselves in stone. Fleming's contributions to Canada and the Empire were many, and aimed chiefly at placing Canada at the hub of a worldwide commercial, transportation, and communication network: the Canadian Pacific Railway; the all-Empire telegraphic line, laid from Australia and New Zealand to British Columbia, across Canada and across the Atlantic to Britain; and his development and promotion of the concept of time zones, which hugely facilitated transportation and communications for this globe-spanning empire. Nationalist and imperialist, Fleming saw Canada as the keystone of this great Empire.

Sir Sandford Fleming appreciated more than just the infrastructure of the Empire: he also admired the civil institutions that often arrived in its wake. In 1908, he turned his attention to the commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the granting of representative government in Nova Scotia (he and his family had property on the Northwest Arm, where they often spent their summers). The 1758 assembly was the earliest legislative assembly in the British Empire, and as such, a significant event in the spread of democratic principles in the Empire and the world. The province of Nova Scotia chose to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary with a memorial plaque, unveiled on August 19, 1908, and located in the provincial Legislative Building, but Fleming thought something more ambitious was in order. A persuasive man with a pen that never ran dry, he set about to enlist support for a significant architectural work, a tower specifically, to be erected in a prominent location, which would celebrate Canada and its relationship with the Empire, and inspire new generations of Canadians to adhere to the same values. After unsuccessful overtures to the City of Halifax, he found the ideal champion in the newly minted Canadian Club of Halifax (founded 1907), a branch of the national organization established to promote the understanding of, and loyalty to, the nation. This was a perfect undertaking for the club as it fit so well with its purpose, and the project was energetically undertaken by its president, Dougald Macgillivray. As the project had not been initiated very far in advance of the significant date of 1908, the committee was only able to organize the laying of a cornerstone by Lieutenant-Governor Duncan C. Fraser, on October 2 that year, the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the sitting of the first legislature. The tower itself would take several more years to come to fruition.

In the intervening years, the Canadian Club launched an ambitious fund-raising drive throughout Canada and the Empire. Pamphlets were published for wider public distribution as well. The response was heartening: indeed, the idea of celebrating the virtues of the British Empire struck a sympathetic note across Canada and around the globe. The
federal government donated five thousand dollars. Fleming generously made a gift to the City of Halifax of his summer property on the west side of the Arm as a suitably prominent site for the tower, and to serve as a suburban park for the benefit of Haligonians. City engineers laid out the grounds at the base—a terrace and a walkway in the immediate vicinity, and picturesque landscaping throughout the rest of the property, throughout 1911 (fig. 4).

On a clear day in August 1912, a cheerful crowd of the mighty and the humble assembled to dedicate this memorial to the establishment of representative government in Nova Scotia, and to affirm their allegiance to Canada and the Empire. The keynote speaker was the Governor General, His Highness the Duke of Connaught. Prominent Canadian supporters of imperialism attended, including LCol George Taylor Denison and Dr. George R. Parkin. Numerous commemorative plaques and sculptures were installed in the interior of the tower, witness to the widespread adherence to the values that the tower represented. The thirty-nine plaques that were ultimately installed were gifts from other nations, all nine provinces, several Canadian universities, and various patriotic organizations.

Celebrations did not end with the dedicatory ceremony: commemorative publications followed to keep alive the spirit of the event, especially Joseph Andrew Chisholm’s The Halifax Memorial Tower. Subsequently, the Royal Colonial Society (later the Royal Commonwealth Society) presented two bronze lions, based upon Sir Edwin Landseer’s 1867 lions in Trafalgar Square, for the base of the monument (fig. 7). The lions were meant to “symbolize the vigilance and protection over the Empire which the Mother Country has exercised since she became a colonizing Power.” They were installed in 1914, a date significant in more ways than one.

**CANADA AND THE EMPIRE, 1880S TO 1914**

The Tower was completed in 1912, just as war in Europe was in the offing; the relationship between Canada and the Empire was a relationship on the cusp of change.

“Imperialism was a sentiment and an outlook before it became a policy,” as historian Carl Berger has pointed out. Imperialism meant many things to many people. Its detractors dismissed it as chiefly motivated by economics, specifically the opportunities it presented to a certain class of entrepreneurs to enrich themselves, and antithetical to Canada’s nascent nationalism. Certainly, self-interest played a role for those who did stand to benefit most directly; but the mechanics and sentiments of Canadians toward their sense of nationhood and where it stood vis-à-vis the Empire were more complex.

Imperialists valued the British Empire on several levels; imperialism fed many agendas. Imperialism was the engine that drove a global economy that benefited Canada directly. Construction of infrastructure such as canals, railways, ports, postal systems, and telegraph networks were undoubtedly beneficial to investors, labourers, communities, and the nation as a whole. So too was British investment in Canadian industries. But the Empire was, for many, much more than just a source of economic benefit. Anglo-Canadians regarded their cherished civic institutions and social values as a legacy of their British heritage, including an impartial judicial system, representative government, responsible government, a free press, and, ultimately, Confederation. The establishment of representative government was Nova Scotia’s special claim to the advancement of civil society within the Empire—achieved, Nova Scotians were always proud to point out, without force of arms. (It was a slightly selective definition of the first representative government in the British Empire; the earlier assemblies of the American colonies were considered precursors of a separate constitutional history; the assemblies held in the colonies of the West Indies were dismissed as “rather to be regarded as interesting historical survivals.”) Moreover, the British had in the past (and it was hoped, would again if necessary)
defended Canada against its occasionally aggressive neighbour. Britain for her part was uneasy about the growing economic and military strength of both the United States and Germany, and looked to its former colonies as reliable allies in the event of confrontation. In the Canadian imperialists’ version of the Empire’s history, this was an empire that extended democracy to its colonies (unlike other, absolutist empires); it was an empire that spread the benefits of commerce, communication, Christianity, democracy, and peace upon the seas, whilst stamping out piracy, slavery, and many other ills. French-Canadian nationalists felt a certain comfort in the Empire’s conservatism and hierarchical structure, reassuring in comparison to the startlingly excessive modernity of contemporary France. It was an Empire that protected and sheltered diverse races and religions under a canopy of tolerance and inclusiveness. This latter quality was, for Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier, always mindful to reconcile English and French Canadians, who held that what was good for Canada was good for the Empire and vice versa. Imperialism was not simply a purpose of the tower:

This building... will tend toward a symmetrical union of the far-flung members of the British Empire, and thus enhance a thousandfold the value of the memorial. In the Halifax Tower will centre memories, hopes, and ambitions that will gain significance and importance as the years roll on. It will take its place not as a merely local or provincial monument, or one whose appeal reaches only to the utmost boundaries of the Canadian Dominion, but as an embodiment of the spirit which animates the peoples of the Empire in both hemispheres, an attestation of the partnership of the sisterhood of nations all under one Crown.

such were the cultural underpinnings of the creation of the Memorial Tower, which extolled the British Empire as the spreader of democracy and civil institutions, beginning with the establishment of representative government in Halifax in 1758. Not just looking backward, the builders of the tower looked forward to a glorious future for the Empire, in which many nations spread across the globe were united in its common values. In the circular letter sent by the Canadian Club of Halifax in 1910 to New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, and all nine Canadian provinces, the Club stated the purpose of the tower:

In the Halifax Tower will centre memories, hopes, and ambitions that will gain significance and importance as the years roll on. It will take its place not as a merely local or provincial monument, or one whose appeal reaches only to the utmost boundaries of the Canadian Dominion, but as an embodiment of the spirit which animates the peoples of the Empire in both hemispheres, an attestation of the partnership of the sisterhood of nations all under one Crown.

Canadian imperialism was not just for the moneymakers, for Union Jacks and portraits of the Queen hung on many a modest kitchen or parlour wall. Massive immigration from Britain after 1815 brought generations of new Canadians nostalgic for what they left behind, proud of their homeland’s power and achievements, and determined to perpetuate her institutions and values in Canada. Scots and Irish who had no particular attachment to Britain while “at home” became more British than the British once installed in Canada. The Empire was extolled in the school system, at county fairs and public entertainments, with every anniversary and royal or vice-regal visit. It simply made sense to build Canadian nationalism upon the solid foundations of an existing loyalty. The Empire was, as historian Robert Bothwell put it, part of the fabric of daily life.

Nationalist sentiment was inextricable from imperialist sentiment for many Canadians, and more specifically Anglo-Canadians, who held that what was good for Canada was good for the Empire and vice versa. Imperialism was not simply a product of Great Britain exported to its current and former colonies, but rather a dialogue between the metropolitan and her satellite states. In Canada, promoting nationalism and its travelling companion imperialism practically became an industry during these decades. Thoughtful and prolific writers such as Dr. George Parkin (1846-1922), LCol George Taylor Denison (1839-1925), and George Munro Grant (1835-1902) promoted these values at every opportunity. Patriotic organizations came into existence both in Canada and elsewhere in the Empire, such as the Royal Society of Canada (1882), the Champlain Society (1905), the Canadian Club (1897), and the Boy Scouts (1909), among others. This was the era of the founding of many local historical societies, and those in Anglo-Canada were dedicated to the nationalist/imperialist ethos. The veneration of the United Empire Loyalists was especially strong in Ontario. Events that cemented imperial connections were held, such as the 1884 celebrations marking the centennial of the arrival of the United Empire Loyalists; and the Colonial Conference of 1897, called for by Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain. Toronto invented Victoria Day. Tercentenary celebrations in Quebec, marking the arrival of Champlain and the implantation of French culture in the New World, were embraced by imperialists as a celebration of the Canada that was to come, an inclusive dominion that accommodated duality, thus reflecting the tolerance of the Empire.

Canada’s and Great Britain’s past shared glories were honoured, for which the erection of monuments commemorating the War of 1812 battles at Lundy’s Lane, Crysler’s Farm, and Chateauguay (in 1896) testified. The popular press covered Britain’s adventures abroad, and Canadians either participated in them or enjoyed reading about them. Canadians avidly read British imperialist literature (Scott, Kipling, and others) and much of Canada’s literature of the era was modelled upon it. Tours by royalty and titled governors general provided the pomp and circumstance so beloved by imperialists.

This building... will tend toward a sympathetic union of the far-flung members of the British Empire, and thus enhance a thousandfold the value of the memorial. In the Halifax Tower will centre memories, hopes, and ambitions that will gain significance and importance as the years roll on. It will take its place not as a merely local or provincial monument, or one whose appeal reaches only to the utmost boundaries of the Canadian Dominion, but as an embodiment of the spirit which animates the peoples of the Empire in both hemispheres, an attestation of the partnership of the sisterhood of nations all under one Crown.
Fleming exemplified the nationalist and imperialist ethos of the times (he was a man who understood the power of symbols, being the first person to think to put the iconic beaver on a postage stamp). No better summary of Fleming’s attitude toward the Empire can be found than in his own speech, given at the dedication ceremony for the tower on August 12, 1912:

We may rest assured that the British Empire, built upon the principles of freedom, justice, equal rights, and the self-government of all its autonomous parts, is not destined to pass away like the empires of history. The new empire is inspired by a spirit unknown to the empires founded on absolutism. It is a union of free and enlightened communities, dedicated to the cause of commerce, of civilization, and of peace; and who can doubt that such a great political organization is destined to endure? Every improvement in transportation, in postal arrangements, and in telegraphy by land and sea, is calculated to facilitate intercommunications and to foster friendships among kindred people, and thus to perpetuate their attachment to the cradle of the British race, and the source of that unequalled constitution which is their highest inheritance.27

Fleming and the Canadian Club of Halifax conceived of the Memorial Tower as a companion piece to the highly successful tercentenary celebrations held in Quebec in July 1908.28 For several weeks of that very hot month, historical recreations, in which upward of four thousand costumed re-enactors participated, thrilled visitors from around the world. The tercentenary celebrated the arrival of Samuel de Champlain in 1608, and the ensuing implantation of French culture in the New World.29 At the unveiling of the plaque in the Nova Scotia Legislature celebrating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the granting of representative government, Lieutenant-Governor Duncan C. Fraser had this to say about the events in Quebec: “It was empire-making in its conception, and unrivalled at least on this continent in its success. Here two great races celebrated the glory of their forefathers, the success of Great Britain and the freedom and peace that connection with our Kingdom has brought both.”30 The attempt to co-opt the founding of Quebec by descendants of people who clearly had not been there, and the patronizing attitude may annoy us now, but the sentiments were, like it or not, entirely sincere.

But British imperialism was, in the years just before the outbreak of the First World War, something of a house of cards. Just as imperial sentiment grew, so did Canada’s sense that it should have more of a say in future imperial economic and military policy, including the option not to sign on for all of Britain’s military adventures. Clearly, lapses by Britain such as the Washington Treaty of 1871 demonstrated that Canada ought to have a say in imperial policy. While Canada sought preferential imperial trade tariffs, Britain had no intention of abandoning free trade any time soon. Britain would
never cede control over policies that it considered her own, while it chaffed at Canada’s reluctance to rearm. Indeed, the British military presence in Canada had been haemorrhaging for decades. The British Army pulled out in 1871. The Royal Navy left Halifax and Esquimalt in 1905-1906, and while Canada (and especially Nova Scotians) felt vulnerable by the British military’s departure, it didn’t look like the Canadian federal government was quite prepared to fill such very large shoes unless pressed by extreme circumstances. Colonial conferences aimed at encouraging Britain to maintain its support of its daughter states were countered by Britain’s attempts to get said daughters to buy into Britain’s foreign policy; these conferences achieved little beyond the expression of fine sentiments.31

Aside from the geopolitical pitfalls of British imperialism, its social ethos was on shaky ground. As author Donald A. Wright illustrates, the antimonodermism of imperial sentiment was not going to survive the modern world, try as one might to dress up the present in the historical romanticism of Sir Walter Scott, Rudyard Kipling, and John Ruskin. In Canada, imperialism was hamstrung by a patronizing attitude toward French Canadians and was sometimes dismissive of non-Anglo-Canadians; by an imagined past that didn’t bear too close scrutiny in every instance; and by an unsustainable imposition of the imagined, superior values of a past society that was rural, pre-industrial, militaristic, and manly.32 If it had not been for the First World War, the relationship would have eventually collapsed on its own of its inherent contradictions.

Were the dignitaries in attendance at that dedication ceremony in Halifax on that hot August day in 1912 aware of what would come to pass two years hence? All of the fine speeches made at the dedication ceremony of the tower in praise of the past glories of the Empire and fervent hope for its future solidarity belied the uneasiness of the times. For Disquiet padded the corridors of power of the Western world, rattled the door handles and whispered in the keyholes. Change was upon them, for that rough beast, its hour come round at last, was slouching toward the future battlefields of Europe to be born.33

A NATIONAL ARCHITECTURE FOR CANADA, 1867 TO 1914

The architectural design of the Memorial Tower marks the transition from the exuberant tastes of the High Victorian, which had so dominated Canadian architecture from the 1850s onward, to the more urbane tastes of Edwardian classicism in the early twentieth century. In so doing, it marks the end of several decades of Canada’s age of nationalist architecture, while embracing newly-emerging trends. The transitional qualities of the building reflect in a striking way the transitional nature of Canada’s relationship with the British Empire at that time. The treatment of the stone and the use of historical details, such as the Palladian windows, root this building stylistically in the architecture of the prewar era, speaking still to the surviving rich, Victorian traditions inspired by Ruskin, but also suggesting in the handling of the surfaces and details, something of the Edwardian classicism of the years just before the war. The architectural design and its execution are very effective. Overall, the massive building, its dramatic site, its plain and sober interior featuring plaques which catalogue Canada’s relationship with her sister colonies and states of the time are a powerful evocation of profoundly held sentiments.

An outstanding monument that dominates the Halifax skyline from all vantage points in the Northwest Arm, the Memorial Tower (figs. 1-5) is handsomely and solidly built. It is a straight shaft of some one hundred and twelve feet high on a thirty-five-foot-square base, perched upon the levelled crest of the rise of land, approached by a monumental flight of stairs framed at the top by two bronze lions (fig. 7). The main portion of the shaft is composed of rusticated local ironstone with smoother granite above. The shaft tapers gently, culminating in an open loggia at the top, where four Palladian windows frame views in all directions. Finely finished granite frames these windows, whereas lower windows have plain copper flashings. A simple hipped roof with a shallow pitch covers all. Its site on a rise of land on a peninsula jutting out into the water accentuates its prominence from all perspectives in the area, right down to Halifax’s outer harbour.

Inside (fig. 5), the tower is as plain and massive in design as the exterior would have one anticipate. There are four floors connected by central cast-iron staircases. Each floor is lined with the same ironstone that makes up the exterior, few windows puncture the walls to light one’s way, and commemorative plaques adorn the interior surfaces. The plaques are mostly made of the stone of the country, province, or city of origin. Each one is an individual design, and most feature icons such as crests, shields, or other imagery characteristic of the nation, province, or city of origin. There is a truly fine bronze bas-relief, the gift of the City of Bristol (fig. 6), a recreation of a painting by Ernest Board presented at the Royal Academy in 1909, depicting the departure of John Cabot from Bristol to the New World in 1497. From the lookout on the fourth floor, one can see across the Arm toward downtown Halifax, a residential neighbourhood along the shore and, rising behind the houses, Dalhousie University (fig. 8).
Other views give over the community to the east, north up the Arm to Dead Man’s Island and south toward the passing ship traffic of Halifax’s outer harbour.

Because the Memorial Tower was created to commemorate the establishment of representative government in the British Empire, it represents the virtues of that Empire and Canada’s role in it, whilst anticipating a future of continued, harmonious development. The tower has a strong philosophical foundation for its architectural design. As an essay in nationalistic architecture, it belongs to the body of public, institutional, and commercial buildings erected in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that provided the new nation of Canada with a recognizable national style of architecture. This was a style of architecture that purposefully blended motifs from different cultures and historical periods, which was in design and materials considered suitable to a northern people, their climate and geography, to their varied pasts married into a shared heritage and based upon common values.

Fleming had spent his career engaged in the nation-building ethos of his time, a mindset which would have included the great monuments of nationalistic architecture, many of which were inspired by British architectural critic John Ruskin (1819-1900). Ruskin’s first two major works on architecture, The Seven Lamps of Architecture (1849) and the even more influential The Stones of Venice (three volumes published between 1851 and 1853), profoundly shaped architecture in the second half of the nineteenth century and well into the early twentieth century. His influence in Canada was first manifested at University College in Toronto, built in 1856-1860 by architects Frederick Cumberland and William G. Storm. The College building was in turn based upon the Oxford Museum (1852-1857) by architects Benjamin Woodward and T.N. Deane, who developed their design in close consultation with Ruskin himself. But the style rose to national prominence—and almost national policy—in Canada with the construction in 1857-1866 of the Parliament Buildings in Ottawa (fig. 9), the Centre Block of which was designed by architects Thomas Fuller and Augustus Laver. As the legislature of the United Canadas and then the Dominion of Canada, it is appropriate that the style was Ruskinian High Victorian: a new style that was a hybrid of many historical styles, suitable for a new nation with many historical roots. It blended the pointed arch of northern Gothic, considered appropriate to northern peoples; the mansard roofs and pavilions of the French Second Empire; the guildhall of Ypres, a solid model of medieval design for secular structures; all composed in the rich polychromy and intricately carved and textured surfaces advocated by Ruskin. Its bold, craggy outline and its situation on the edge of a dramatic cliff spoke to rightness to place, rightness to climate, rightness to a people.

The Parliament Buildings in Ottawa heralded a remarkable episode in Canadian architecture that saw the emergence of a national style of architecture, which has been well explored in Canadian historiography by authors like Harold Kalman, Janet Wright, Christopher Thomas, and others. Soon after Confederation, the federal government launched an ambitious building program across the country to house the various federal services that citizens of the new country needed, structures that would be emblems of the new federal state. These works included post offices, drill halls, and other prominent structures, produced by the Department of Public Works under chief architects Thomas Fuller (1881-1897) and David Horwood and Taylor.
Ewart (1897-1914), and these were splendid works in High Victorian design, meant to embody the heritage and values of Canadian peoples, in the mixture of architectural styles from various periods and countries, in the use of local stone, and in a bold and energetic design suggestive of the power of the place and the people who rightfully belonged there. Structures large and small bore the characteristic features of this remarkably consistent body of architecture, and they were erected in great cities and small (fig. 10).

The federal government was not the only organization in Canada to embrace the idea of a national style, for the appeal of an architecture that suggested a broad range of inherited cultures, that was suitable to a difficult northern climate, and that revelled in the richness of surface and colour so to the tastes of the times, was irresistible. We find echoed again and again in institutions, schools, city halls, and other public buildings across the country the outline, composition, and historicist details of the Centre Block.36

The commercial world, also looking for a national and a corporate image, seized upon High Victorian as well, the best examples of which are the railway stations and railway hotels erected by the Canadian Pacific Railway, which persisted with its French chateaux/Scottish baronial confections well after the war. It was only in the last few years before the war that an equally rich, but more consistently classical, school of architecture emerged, the Edwardian Classical, which began to be favoured by the Department of Public Works, and by institutional, and commercial designs. Nevertheless, a whiff of Ruskin persists even in these later, bombastic designs.37

Inspired by Ruskin’s highly poetic writings, architecture of the second half of
the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth century was associative and often meant to be understood literally, as though its forms and motifs were text upon a page. A building’s architectural style therefore was to be demonstrative of its very purpose. In the case of the Tower, Fleming had a clear idea of what he had in mind and he had the Toronto architectural firm of Horwood and Taylor prepare a sketch to guide the competition (fig. 11). Fleming envisaged a tower whose design illustrated the stages toward attainment of the full suite of national civil liberties. The foundations represented the granting of representative government (“one of the most important events that ever occurred in Canada in respect to its veering on the whole future of the Empire”), and the tall shaft upon it led up to the next significant achievement, responsible government. The next stage stood for Confederation, and the richly decorated upper storey suggested the glories yet to come. In a public address given in June 1908, Fleming demonstrated how fully he embraced Ruskin’s literalism:

The monumental edifice contemplated should in some distinct manner indicate the purpose of its erection. It should commend itself by the extreme simplicity, massive-ness, and grandeur of its general outline; at the same time every course of masonry should have its distinct meaning. The whole structure might most fittingly, I think, take the general form of an Italian tower. The foundation course would testify to the beginning of representative government in the outer empire.

From a modern perspective, the literalism seems forced and even a little ridiculous, but associationism was an essential element of nineteenth-century architecture. Fleming made clear his expectation that the appropriate design of a commemorative tower would be one of Italian inspiration, such as advocated by Ruskin. For the most part, Ruskin’s guidance on the design of towers is fairly pedestrian: start with a wide base and taper upward, which is indeed the logical limitation of masonry construction. He recommends towers for their seriousness and sobriety, set upon bold and massy foundations, with no buttresses to sustain them and few windows to lighten their appearance:

There must be no light-headedness in your noble tower: impregnable foundation, wrathful crest, with the visor down, and the dark vigilance seen through the clefts of it […] Its office may be to withstand war, look forth for tidings, or to point to heaven: but it must have in its own walls the strength to do this.

Ruskin refers to several Italian campanile, but undoubtedly the one that drew his most heart-felt praise was the campanile of St. Mark’s, in Venice (fig. 12). Originally built in the late tenth century, it achieved its current design in the sixteenth century. What drew Ruskin’s praise with respect to the tower specifically, and Venetian architecture generally (and that inspired him to consider Venetian architecture as a suitable model for the British Empire), was that it successfully blended architectural motifs and cultural values from several eras and societies to create something original and fresh and entirely appropriate to Venice. At the height of its glory, Venice was at the crossroads of the central Mediterranean, a seafaring, mercantile empire linking the peoples of the Mediterranean basin through common commercial interests. The architecture resulting from this tolerant mercantilist empire was, in Ruskin’s estimation, a successful integration of Lombard, Roman, and Arab influences; that is, the Gothic
of Lombardy, the Classic of Roman, with
the colour and spirituality of Islam. He
admired the inclusiveness of Venice’s cul-
ture and architecture, and believed that
the modern British Empire at its best
embodied these very qualities. It was
a highly romantic and conjectural view
of history, driven as much by fear of the
abrupt changes that the modern world
was foisting upon society as by love of the
past. Clothe a railway station or a drill hall
or a national legislature for a new country
in medieval styles, and it might look com-
fortingly familiar, it might acquire a sense
of belonging in its borrowed clothes. Such
were the philosophical underpinnings of
much of High Victorian architecture as
it was practised throughout the British
Empire, including Canada.

Working with Fleming’s instructions, the
Royal Architectural Institute of Canada
offered to sponsor a national competition
and to award medals to the designs that
placed first, second, and third. The com-
petition was published in the August 1910
issue of Construction. The winners of the
contest were N.S. Sharp, W.M. Brown, and
John Lyle. All of these designs are very
fine (figs. 13-15), and worthy of analysis in
their own right, but in the context of this
study, what is pertinent is that they were
rather more classical than Fleming had
in mind. None of the first three designs
was awarded the commission, which went
instead to the Halifax firm of Dumaresq
and Cobb. Contractor S.M. Brookfield,
Ltd. was awarded the construction project
for twenty-three thousand nine hundred
and sixty dollars, and construction began
in October 1910. It may be that Fleming
did not have a hand in the final decision
concerning the design of the tower, for
by this time the decision-making had
passed from Fleming to the president of
the Canadian Club of Halifax, Dougald
Macgillivray. Macgillivray also proposed the Sir
Hector Macdonald Memorial Tower, a
Scottish baronial confection erected in
1907 in Dingwall, Scotland; this was met
with silence. (Other prominent towers of
the Empire did not figure into the discus-
sion; no mention is made of the Tower
of the Houses of Parliament in London
(1859), nor the towers of Tower Bridge
(1886-1894).) In the end, the award for
the design of the tower was given to the
local architectural firm of Dumaresq and
Cobb.

The design of the tower can likely be
credited to architect Andrew Cobb. The
Memorial Tower was among the first
commissions undertaken by a partner-
ship of young Halifax architects. Sydney
Perry Dumaresq (1875-1943) was the son
of distinguished Halifax architect James
Charles Dumaresq. Sydney studied at
Acadia College, and immediately upon
graduation went to work for his father. Father and son designed numerous buildings throughout Atlantic Canada, including a number of banks.53 Young Sydney was always the junior partner in his relationship with his father, and seems also to have been so in his brief partnership (1909-1910) with the rather better-educated and more sophisticated Andrew Randall Cobb (1876-1943). Cobb was born in Brooklyn, New York, the son of an American father and Canadian mother. Upon his father's death, he moved to Halifax with his mother, where he studied at Acadia College. He pursued further education at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), and later (1907) at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris.54 At both institutions he would have received a rigorous education in construction and craftsmanship, and in both institutions the stylistic bias would have been toward the classical styles, rather than any of the medieval revival styles. Cobb returned to Halifax in 1909 and set up his partnership with Dumaresq straight away.18 The Tower was the only significant work to emerge from their brief partnership. Cobb was better trained and better equipped to address the requirements of the competition: while studying in France, he had spent as much as six months travelling in Italy, including Venice,56 where he would have seen St. Mark’s Square, minus its famous campanile, which had fallen down in 1902 (not to be reconstructed until 1912). The tower was, nevertheless, well illustrated in academic texts (Ruskin included an illustration of it in The Stones of Venice) and tourist literature (Cobb possessed a postcard of St. Mark’s Square, with the missing tower inserted in the image).57 Did Fleming and the Canadian Club get what they had hoped for? If we examine this great bombastic monument, we can smell change in the air. The dedication ceremony of August 1912 might have been in some ways prescient of events to come, for all those earnest speeches about the continued loyalty of the members of the Empire to each other smacked of desperation. One may read into the design of the tower a desperate clinging to an imagined past, or some whisper of the future of Canadian nationalism, imperialism and its very architecture as well.

We can readily identify the Ruskinian qualities in the solid, rusticated shaft, which corresponds precisely to his guidance for the building of towers, rising up from more roughly finished surfaces and tapering toward more delicate superstructures and finishes. Yet, the lack of polychromy, the consistently delicate grey surfaces, the slightly smoother treatment of those surfaces, and the prominence of those very classical features—the Palladian arches—on the topmost floor speak as much to contemporary Edwardian classicism58 as they do to an architectural philosophy launched more than fifty years previously, and which even the retardataire federal Department of Public Works was then trying to shrug off.

Tellingly, Sir Sandford Fleming, that most consummate of imperialists, hated the final design of the Memorial Tower, and...
herein lies a curious tale. He objected to the design because of the overly large windows on the upper floor, and because of the lack of weightiness of the stone walls below. He felt very strongly that these features deprived the tower of the sense of durability advocated by Ruskin for monuments meant to last the ages. The elements to which Fleming objected—the very classical Palladian window and the slightly smoother monochromatic stonework below—owe as much to Cobb’s training at the École des Beaux-Arts as to any lingering High Victorian tastes. Even more ironically, Ruskin himself had found the campanile of St. Mark’s less than ideal, exactly because of its Renaissance upper storey; how Fleming expected the architect to improve upon a model that Ruskin himself found wanting is unclear. In fact, Cobb did rather a good job capturing the lugubriousness of Ruskin’s own drawing (fig. 12) in the main shaft, while opting for a lighter, classical upper storey, as had the Renaissance rebuilders of St. Mark’s campanile. A transitional model for transitional times: the tower itself was, architecturally, already the bridge to postwar architecture, which eschewed the dated polychromy and muscularity of Ruskinian High Victorian in favour of the even more bombastically imperial garb of Edwardian classicism (fig. 17). Fleming was an older generation raised on other tastes; Cobb was the harbinger of things to come in the postwar era.

It is worth considering the tower also as a building type, that is, as a memorial. As such, it demonstrates vividly how veneration of the past serves modern agendas. As a structure with a memorializing purpose, the tower was perfectly symptomatic of the rising tide of nationalism asserting itself in the Western nations of this prewar era. Nations felt compelled to cement the fealty of their citizens by celebrating their histories and their cultures. It was the era of the creation of icons and symbols, those powerful leitmotifs for which citizens lay down their lives. Musicians explored national folk music in search of the characteristic, the indigenous. Romantic novels celebrated real and imagined pasts. Historical painting enjoyed a popular appeal that it has never enjoyed since. Major portions of cities were rearranged to create processional ways, so that cities became stage sets for nationalist and imperialistic processions of operatic dimensions. A few of the outstanding monuments of the era were: the Lincoln Memorial (begun 1914) in Washington; the International Exposition in Chicago in 1892; the Mall, Admiralty Arch, and the refaced Buckingham Palace in London (1906-1913). In Canada, painters, poets, musicians, ethnologists, writers, and architects all searched their respective art forms to find the meaning of Canadian nationalism. Considered as both a work of national architecture, and as a memorial, the tower marks a pivotal point in Canada’s national architecture, born of its imperial roots, adapted to circumstances, and now ready for change.

Towers were all the rage in Victorian Canada, although most of them were...
Monuments and memorials erected in Canada during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were typical of their genre in purpose and design as found elsewhere in the Western world. Most of the significant memorials took the shape of columns, piers or obelisks of classical design, or statuary, also of classical inspiration, such as (Major General Isaac) Brock’s Monument, Queenston Heights (fig. 19; first built 1824 and rebuilt in 1853 by architects Howard and Thomas); (Horatio) Nelson’s Column, Montréal (1805); and Eugène-Étienne Taché’s monuments to the War of 1812 at Lundy’s Lane, Cryslers Farm (fig. 20), and Chateauguay (built in 1896). These classically-styled monuments purposefully evoked the positive aspects of the Roman Empire, as a bringer of peace and uniter of peoples, a borrowed glory for the makers of the British Empire’s image who sought to evoke benevolence, magnanimity, and justice. Other monuments engaged the Ruskinian aesthetic and imperialism, such as the Welsford Parker Monument (fig. 21) in Halifax, and the Stoney Creek Monument (fig. 22) at Battle of Stoney Creek National Historic Site in Ontario, designed by E. Rastrick and unveiled on June 6, 1913.

A few commemorative towers were built after the war, but either in purpose or in design, or both, they are quite different. Several memorials commemorating the war might be classified as towers, such as the memorial at Vimy Ridge National Historic Site in Ontario, but the purpose of a war memorial sets it aside as a separate category of memorial; in a similar vein is the Woodbridge Memorial Tower in Woodbridge, Ontario (built 1924), also commemorating the fallen of the First World War, and the very fine Soldiers’ Tower attached to Hart House, University of Toronto (fig. 23, 1919-1924; Sproat and Rolph, architects). The mood of the post-1918 war memorials is grief and loss, not the celebratory tone of the Halifax Tower, harkening back to more optimistic times. The finest tower of the postwar era is undoubtedly the Peace Tower, also attached rather than freestanding, created as part of the reconstructed Centre Block (fig. 24; built 1916-1927, Pearson and Marchand, architects). Its location, its blend of classical and medieval styles, and its dedicatory spirit bring us back full circle to the tower that set the standard for the type in Canada, the tower of the original Centre Block.

SITE AND SETTING

The site, which was donated by Sir Sandford Fleming, also speaks to the imperialist ethos. The elevated peninsula made the tower clearly visible from many vantage points on both sides of the Arm, and from ships far out in Halifax’s outer harbour. Fleming had made many improvements to the property over the years, laying out lawns and paths, as he had always permitted public access. The site was also well frequented, as the Arm was a popular destination for boaters and picnickers from the city. Moreover, the site had profound historical associations intended to support the didactic qualities of the tower. Fleming wrote eloquently about the Arm’s association with many historic personages, including Joseph Howe and Sir Charles Tupper. He foresaw a park that was a locus for significant cultural institutions, although that never came to pass.

While museums and other cultural institutions did not come to occupy Sir Sandford Fleming Park, the nature of this park is integral to the meaning of the tower. It was never meant to have the kind of prominence that the rather more declarative Statue of Liberty (New York Harbour, 1886) has, situated as it is at the mouth of the port, or as a monument in a formal landscape such as the Americans pursued in their memorials along the Mall in Washington. Rather, the tower was meant to be a picturesque element in the great British landscape design tradition; one need only think of the Albert Memorial (1872) in Kensington Gardens, London, or any number of statues of Queen Victoria standing or sitting in public parks across the globe. Fleming specifically cited the suburban parks of Ottawa and Toronto as the type of picturesque, recreational space that he had in mind. The Plains of Abraham (fig. 25), the site of the tercentenary celebrations in 1908, similarly were laid out (by landscape architect Frederick G. Todd) in a naturalistic manner, without formality, and purposefully...
not evoking its character (however brief) as a battlefield.22

Fleming’s gift of a park (fig. 26) reflects the contemporary Fresh Air and City Beautiful movements then currently influential in European and North American cities alike. The park itself speaks to the culture of physicality characteristic of the Empire, a valuation of physical fitness manifest through public parks, sports clubs and leagues, gardening clubs, fresh air societies, and associations such as the Boy Scouts, for whom physical fitness was a patriotic duty.23 The ideal imperialist possessed a sound mind in a sound body: however else to serve nation and Empire?

CONCLUSION

The Memorial Tower is one of those rare buildings whose design fulfills and indeed exceeds the purpose for which it was built. Sir Sandford Fleming envisaged a didactic monument reflecting the best qualities of Canada and the British Empire; what he got was something rather more telling. Its surviving High Victorian qualities mark the endpoint of a dynamic period in which Canada’s national style of architecture came into being, flourished, and finished gracefully in the early twentieth century. The Tower’s handling of its historicist details and its materials and surfaces speak to the emergent trends of the early twentieth century. The transitional qualities of its architecture reflect Canada’s changing nationalism, in particular how its nationalism was defined with respect to British imperialism on the eve of the First World War. Few cities were so intimately linked to these themes as was Halifax. Rising so prominently in Halifax’s cityscape and seascape, the tower stands at one of those critical moments in history, a monument that extols the past, whilst inadvertently foreseeing a future none at the time could have imagined.
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