By Byron DeLear

The Association’s 49th Annual Meeting was held in Ottawa, Canada, on October 16–18, 2015, and was attended by more than 50 vexillologists and 9 companion attendees. Ken Reynolds, our Second Vice President and key local organizer, pulled out all the stops for NAVA 49 to present a gathering that delivered quality throughout the planned schedule. Ottawa, as the nation’s capital, was the perfect setting to experience Canada’s rich national traditions and history which were shared in presentations and on display throughout the weekend.

The official proceedings began Friday evening with the George Henry Preble Lecture which was established in 2013 as part of the Association’s continuing commitment to promote the scholarly study of flags by bringing Association members together with scholars of the annual meeting’s host community. Held in the auditorium of the Ottawa Public Library, this year’s Preble Lecture was given by Dr. Claire Boudreau, the Chief Herald of Canada. The Canadian Heraldic Authority is headed by His Excellency David Johnston, the 28th Governor General of Canada, and ultimately, official Canadian heraldry is under the authority of the Queen of Canada, Her Majesty Elizabeth II, also head of state for the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and the British Commonwealth. Joined by several colleagues, fellow heralds from the Authority, Boudreau gave a sterling presentation on the purpose, process, and mission of her organization.
This issue of NAVA News reports extensively on our recently concluded 49th Annual Meeting. It was an exceptional experience for all who attended. My only disappointment, as is always the case, is that all NAVA members were not able to be there. The Annual Meetings are a great benefit of membership. I understand that it is not an easy matter for all members to attend Annual Meetings; for me, it requires planning and a financial commitment. However, what I have received in return for each year's attendance has made it all worthwhile. When I just consider the meetings of the last five years—in Alexandria, Virginia (NAVA 45 & ICV 26); Columbus, Ohio (NAVA 46); Salt Lake City, Utah (NAVA 47); New Orleans, Louisiana ((NAVA 48) and Ottawa, Ontario (NAVA 49)—I discover a treasure trove of memories that have added so much meaning to my life. These are experiences that I simply can’t imagine having missed.

Our Annual Meetings are also critical to NAVA’s role as a scholarly organization, and its associated publications. Articles that appear in Raven and Flag Research Quarterly regularly appear first as scholarly papers delivered at NAVA’s Annual Meetings. Also, the Meetings provide a forum for discussions, both formal and informal, that chart the development of Vexillology and our Association. A great deal that NAVA has accomplished over the decades had its genesis at our Annual Meetings.

As noted at the beginning of this message, NAVA News plays a crucial role in reporting details of the Annual Meetings. I hope readers of this issue will appreciate the exceptional effort that Byron DeLear, the able NAVA News editor, has expended to produce a comprehensive report on NAVA 49 that will serve current members and also create a valuable asset for the historical record. Additionally, Ted Kaye has prepared a report that appears in this issue on the Twenty-Sixth International Congress of Vexillology recently held in Australia. This is definitely an issue of NAVA News not to be missed.

What lies ahead? We again travel west to San Jose, California for NAVA 50 where our arrangements in the suburb of Campbell provide an outstanding meeting site. Pete Loeser, our key organizer, ably assisted by Jim Ferrigan and Ted Kaye, has been planning for more than a year already. The NAVA 50 meeting hotel is located adjacent to the Pruneyard shopping complex, which offers dining and shopping opportunities to complement the time spent in meetings and associated flag activities. For those who can arrive a couple of days early or stay a few days late, the San Jose area offers many attractions. The Winchester Mystery House, for example, is well known; however, there will be no mystery about NAVA 50. It will surpass all expectation for an outstanding and memorable meeting. Plan early to attend.
The North American Vexillological Association / Association nord-américaine de vexillologie is a bi-national membership organization devoted to vexillology, the scholarly study of flags. Despite being a U.S. and Canadian group, our Association enjoys members who hail from all around the world, but our official jurisdiction ends at the borders of the United States and Canada. However, the international character and disposition of our Association is not limited by its geographic footprint because the nature of vexillology itself demands a transnational approach; and to understand with greater clarity what animates the most intense flag-based passions, in many instances, the scholarly study of flags involves an investigation of universal themes, characteristics, and social impacts.

On a basic level, flags are a form of universal, human communication. They are things people rally behind. They impart a sense of unity and purpose. This capacity to galvanize movements during war, strife, or duress—this ability to congeal a sense of belonging for any particular undertaking—is of course one of the reasons why people are so passionate about their flags. In this case, the role flags play is an age-old one and seemingly not going away anytime soon.

With regard to how flags help foster unity and collective purpose, there could not be a more palpable example than the relatively recent adoption of the 1965 Canadian flag. Several papers at this year’s Annual Meeting delve into the finer details of the history and provenance of the Maple Leaf flag, and its predecessor, the Canadian Red Ensign, and what is unambiguous is the fact that the new flag’s proponents had national unity on their minds and in their hearts. Hugh Brady, in this year’s Driver Award-winning paper, quotes Alistair Fraser, who said it took “Canada nearly a century to gain a national flag. What Canada lacked was a formal flag that represented Canadians themselves; a flag that individuals could fly to proclaim their Canadianness; a flag of Canada as a nation.”

The support, however, was not unanimous. Liberal MP Pierre Trudeau, future Prime Minister and father of current Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, said, “Quebec does not give a tinker’s damn about the new flag.” Despite these initial reactions, the new flag ushered in an era of progressive development and national cohesion for Canada. As vexillologists, it would be biased to presume there’s anything exceptionally unique about the documentable, socially unifying effects surrounding the adoption of a new national emblem, such as the Canadian Maple Leaf flag, now in its 50th year. This is because many flags around the world among many different peoples and cultures engender similar expressions of devotion, passion, and purpose—and even by flags considered extremely controversial. For example, why is it the ISIS flag is such a powerful tool of propaganda? Does it communicate a subtle sense of a viable and sovereign state? These are the kinds of questions asked by flag scholars—vexillologists. And because our Association since its founding has purposefully steered clear from nationalist or overly patriotic tendencies as they relate to the study of flags, a greater receptivity to universal themes is the natural result. This frame of mind allows us, as flag scholars and aficionados, and as a forward-thinking Association, to appreciate both the local devotion and excitement about any particular flag, but to also recognize the universal social and political themes that may be at play.

The collegial quality of NAVA 49 in Ottawa, Canada, carried on this tradition of maintaining an objective and scientific approach toward vexillology and will set the tone for future Association activities and publications. NAVA News #226 marks my sixth issue as editor of our Association’s news periodical, and as our year-end offering, reports in detail our recent 49th Annual Meeting, in addition to the 26th International Congress of Vexillology meeting held in Sydney, Australia, last September. If you couldn’t attend either of these events, I hope you get at least a small sense of the vexillological fellowship we enjoyed, and the love for the study of flags that knows no boundaries.

Byron DeLear
Editor-in-Chief
navanews@nava.org
visit and reconnect with old friends while drinks and light appetizers were served. Current and past presidents John Hartvigsen, Hugh Brady, Scot Guenter, Charles Spain, and Peter Ansoff, were in attendance this year. After the reception, several folks organized dinner at famed local pub D’Arcy McGee’s.

One of the weekend's serendipitous cultural delights was the coinciding “Poutine Fest” held on nearby Sparks Street. “Poutine” is a quintessentially Canadian dish made of French fries and cheese curds topped with gravy and various other ingredients. For three days, Sparks Street was lined with “potato shacks,” or cabanes à patates (what in the U.S. are known as food trucks), and this year, different offerings of this unique dish were enjoyed by more than a few vexillologists. Someone even suggested the creation of a Poutine flag in honor of this delicious fast food.

The opening ceremonies on Saturday morning featured a brief procession including the national colors of Canada, United States, the International Federation of Vexillological Associations (FIAV) and the Association—as President John Hartvigsen intoned, “it is, and will always be about flags.” Local host Ken Reynolds gave a brief description of the design of the NAVA 49 flag and then welcomed Association President John Hartvigsen to officially open the meeting.

She shared insights into both the British-based heraldic system and what differentiates Canada’s unique brand of heraldic symbolism and practice.

The Authority’s most important actions include: “granting of new armorial bearings (arms, flags and badges) and native symbols; registration of recognized existing arms, flags and badges; approval of military badges, flags and other insignia of the Canadian Forces; provision of information on heraldic artists who work in various media; and development of, and involvement in, national and regional heraldic ceremonies.” Because the Authority’s chief purpose is to make heraldry available to Canadians who desire access to it, much of their work centers on developing coats of arms, flags, and badges for different applicants. Boudreau shared numerous examples of different families’ armorial bearings and described the process of arriving at unique symbols and emblems for each applicant including native-based, First Nations-inspired symbolism. One interesting fact we learned is that various official titles held by the heralds are named for main rivers in Canada; for example, Saint-Laurent Herald, Fraser Herald, Saguenay Saint-Laurent Herald, Assiniboine Herald, and Miramichi Herald, to name a few. It was quite an honor to receive Canada’s Chief Herald for our Association’s 3rd Preble Lecture, and as NAVA President John Hartvigsen expressed, it sets a high bar for future opening presentations.

Immediately following the Preble Lecture, the President’s Reception was held at the Sussex Room of the Ottawa Marriott Hotel, the main venue for NAVA 49. Located near Parliament Hill, the Marriott provided an elegant and great venue for our Annual Meeting. With a view overlooking downtown, the President’s Reception provided an opportunity to
As is the custom, the presentation conference room was generously adorned with the official flags, vertically displayed, of past Annual Meetings.

The opening day presentations gave an amazingly coherent overview of flags and flag culture in Canada. Each presenter gave an insightful paper that dovetailed perfectly with the other presentations. Carrying on a scheduling format change established at NAVA 48 in New Orleans, all of the papers eligible for the William Driver Award were presented on Saturday, which enabled the presentation of the award to occur at the Saturday night Whitney Smith Banquet. This year, Former President Hugh Brady earned the Driver Award, while Canadian Major David W. Grebstad received an Honorable Mention for his excellent presentation on the origins of the provincial flag of Manitoba. These papers and others will undoubtedly enrich NAVA’s forthcoming publications. A full description of NAVA 49 presentations appears on pages 9-19.

One highlight of the day came from meeting host and Second Vice President Ken Reynolds who, in between presentations, shared several Canadian military flags. These finely embroidered flags featured unit citations, battle honors, theatre honors, and honor titles. Some of the design artwork was done in collaboration with the Canadian Heraldic Authority. One particularly stellar example was the Nova Scotia Highlanders Regimental Colour replete with 21 different battle honours emblazoned (center image on page 1).

Saturday afternoon we toured the Canadian Museum of History where various flags and flag-related artifacts were graciously displayed exclusively for NAVA 49 attendees. In two sessions to accommodate our group’s size, we heard fascinating details from museum historian Forrest D. Pass, Ph.D., and textile conservator Caterina Florio, about the particular flags on display.

Pass described in a sequential manner the evolving vexillographic representations of Canadian symbols such as the fleur de lis, beaver, and different renderings of the iconic maple leaf. We were shown an early model for what would become the Flag of Quebec, known as the Carillon-Sacré-Coeur, which features a white cross on a blue field with four inward-facing, white fleur de lis symbols, and a flaming Sacred Heart surrounded by a laurel-shaped wreath of green maple leaves. In the 19th century, the Carillon-Sacré-Coeur was adopted by the Saint-Jean-Baptiste Society, a group dedicated to advancing Quebec francophone interests and was promoted as “the flag of French Canadian Catholics.” It is said to have inspired the design for the current Flag of Quebec.

Most fascinating perhaps were several historically significant artifacts loosely chronicling the progression of different vexillographic designs leading to the final, approved Flag of Canada. In the 1960s, Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson began advocating for the adoption of a new national flag that would be “exclusively Canadian” and give Canadians “a greater feeling of national unity” (see NAVA 49 Presentations on page 9). We had a chance to view one of the Maple Leaf prototypes in the form of the Prime Minister’s favorite design—the Pearson Pennant. The Pearson Pennant is a white flag framed by two vertical blue bars and features three more realistic looking red maple leaves—as compared to the current Flag of Canada—on a single stem.

Another design, evidently promoted by the nationalist leaning Native Sons of Canada, had an even more realistic green maple leaf centered on a diagonal bi-color of white by the hoist and red along the fly, (reverse view on right). The current Flag of Canada’s iconic eleven-point red maple leaf was included on what appears to be one of the final prototype renderings. The only difference between this design and the final form is a slight angled “cut” at the base of the maple leaf stem. In contrast, the Flag of Canada’s stem is horizontally cut and runs parallel to the flag’s bottom edge.
An added vexillological treat we all enjoyed was the fact that Ottawa’s streets and open-air markets had signs, vertical banners, and displays commemorating the 50th anniversary of the official adoption of the Canadian Maple Leaf flag. The Maple Leaf was inaugurated in a ceremony held on Parliament Hill on February 15, 1965, in which the Canadian Red Ensign was lowered and the new national Flag of Canada raised in its place. Maple Leaf flags adorned many downtown Ottawa shops and the pedestrian market walkway along Sparks Street.

Saturday night began with a group photograph in the Marriott lobby (see page 29), after which we all rode elevators to the revolving dining room high atop the hotel overlooking downtown Ottawa and Parliament Hill for the Whitney Smith Dinner. Located on the 29th floor, the “Merlot Rooftop Grill” is the only revolving restaurant in Ottawa, and throughout the night we most likely completed a few rotations.

Robert Labonté, of the Public Works and Government Services Canada / Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada, delivered the keynote address. Labonté held everyone spellbound as he explained his daily assignment of raising new Canadian flags atop the Canadian Parliament’s Peace Tower. These flags, each flown for one day on Canada’s “national flagpole,” are presented to Canadians without charge under a program so popular that the waiting list to receive a 7 ½ foot by 15 foot flag stretches out fifty-four years. The excellent cuisine and wonderful companionship made the Whitney Smith Dinner a high point of NAVA 49.

In addition to the aforementioned William Driver Award to Hugh Brady, J.D., FF, and Honorable Mention to David W. Grebstad, M.A., CD, Association President John Hartvigsen presented the following awards (see Awards and Honors on page 22):

- The Kevin Harrington Award to Forrest D. Pass, Ph.D., historian with the Canadian Museum of History, for the best article to appear in a non-vexillological publication during the preceding year. (‘Something occult in the science of flag-flying’: School Flags and Educational Authority in Early Twentieth-Century Canada, published in *The Canadian Historical Review* of September 2014);
- The Doreen Braverman Award to Randolph (Randy) Smith, Mary Ann Doktor-Smith and Advertising Flag Company in recognition of Randy's and Mary Ann's support of the Association’s mission through significant contributions to the vexillological community;
- Presidential Citation to Charles A. Spain, J.D., WSF, for his service to the Association in re-building the NAVA website;
- Steven A. Knowlton, M.L.I.S., accepted a certificate from FIAV as the co-author, with Anne M. Platoff, of the best paper presented at ICV 26.
Sunday morning’s annual business meeting was very thorough with presentations given by board members and various committee chairs. Congratulations are in order for the Association’s newly elected 2015-2016 executive board:

- John M. Hartvigsen, president;
- James Croft, first vice president;
- Kenneth W. Reynolds, second vice president;
- Cindy Williams, secretary; and
- Christopher P. Bedwell, treasurer.

Congratulations are also in order for the newly elected 2015-2016 nominating committee:

- Scot M. Guenter, chair;
- John M. Hartvigsen; and
- Hugh L. Brady

During the business meeting, there were some questions from the floor with regard to transparency and communications to members (see “Improving Communications” on page 25).

After a final session of presentations not eligible for the Driver Award (see Presentations on page 9), the local host of our next annual meeting, Pete Loeser, showed some slides of attractions and venues that will be a part of NAVA 50 in San Jose, California. Loeser also shared the results and methodology of the NAVA 50 Flag Design Contest which fielded over 50 entries. Head judge Peter Ansoff was joined by a panel of fellow vexillologists: Mark Hayden, Lee Herold, Dave Martucci, and Reid Reynolds. The winning design was based on a contest entry, submitted by Tony Burton, with two changes: the portion next to the hoist was changed from gold to white, and the star was reoriented with the point facing the hoist. The orientation of the star was a practical decision in view of the fact that the flag will most often be displayed vertically at future NAVA meetings.

NAVA 50 Annual Meeting Flag Design Concept by Tony Burton

The white portion with the red star and red chevron symbolize the state of California using elements of the state flag. The red and gold chevrons at the fly represent the Spanish heritage of San Jose. The blue/white/red combinations at the top and bottom recall the NAVA flag, and symbolize NAVA’s role in documenting the continuity between past and present as part of its vexillological mission.

The meeting concluded with comments from President Hartvigsen thanking the officers and committee members who spent many volunteer hours in planning and successfully bringing forth NAVA 49. Special recognition was given to local host Ken Reynolds who coordinated the entire logistics and schedule. A formal investiture of the new executive board was conducted and attendees enjoyed the rest of Sunday afternoon visiting and eating together, and further exploring Canada’s beautiful capital city.
The long discussions in the 1960s resulted in what is known today as the Canadian flag. Hotly contested, the debate divided Canadians between those who wanted a new flag to represent Canada, and those who wished to retain the old Canadian Red Ensign, and its connection to Great Britain. Many older Canadians, including veterans of both World Wars, felt a nostalgia in regard to the Red Ensign. Although in both wars, Canada had served under the British Union Flag, the Ensign held a place in their hearts. Younger Canadians tended to look upon the Ensign as a symbol of a colonial past, and most felt a need for Canada to stand apart from that past. Canada’s large Francophone population also had a tendency to view the Red Ensign as a symbol of British dominance. They too wished for a flag that represented all Canadians. Finally, in 1964, a design was selected. After many designs given by Canadians, the Maple Leaf Flag, bearing only the two official colors of Canada—red and white—was chosen. The Maple Leaf, long a symbol of Canada, was chosen as the central device. Royal assent by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, Sovereign of Canada was given and signed into law. On February 15, 1965, the new flag was raised over Canada in a ceremony held on Parliament Hill in Ottawa. Fifty years on, the Flag debate still occurs on occasion, but the Maple Leaf is here to stay.

~Jim Brown, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
More than 60 people attended the Association’s annual meeting in Ottawa, Canada, and many excellent papers were presented covering the history of flags in Canada in addition to others which explored various aspects of flag design, ritual, and meaning.

This year’s Captain William Driver Award for best paper was given to Hugh Brady, J.D., FF, for “But It Was Ours”: The Red Ensign, Dominion Day, and the Effects of Patriotic Memory on the Canadian Flag Debate. Former Association President Brady tackled what might be considered by some a touchy topic for an American vexillologist hailing from Texas, namely, detailing the finer socio-political intricacies associated with the Canadian Great Flag Debate. Nevertheless, both Brady’s paper and presentation were excellent in drilling down into important distinctions between various forms of reverence for both the Canadian Red Ensign, and the officially sanctioned Flag of Canada, the Maple Leaf flag.

The Canadian Great Flag Debate took place in 1963-64 and culminated in the adoption of the current national Flag of Canada, the “Maple Leaf flag” which was inaugurated in a “simple and solemn” ceremony on February 15, 1965 on Ottawa’s Parliament Hill. Brady framed the two sides in the debate as the clashing of “two titans of 20th century Canadian politics”: Lester Pearson, the Liberal prime minister and proponent of a new flag, against John Diefenbaker, a former Conservative prime minister and defender of the old flag. Brady cited Pearson’s advocacy for the new standard as an advancement of Canada’s national progress while detailing the very real fact that the Canadian Red Ensign, in use since shortly after confederation in 1867, left an indelible mark on the hearts and minds of many Canadians as a form of “patriotic memory.” James McCook, of the Ottawa Journal, wrote, “the Red Ensign ‘was as Canadian as the Quebec Citadel or the Fort Garry gate when glimpsed by travellers beyond these shores.’ McCook viewed the Red Ensign as ‘an undemanding flag, easy to live with, undemanding’…But it was ours and around it developed many emotions, loyalties, and traditions.”

Brady juxtaposed the famous debate as “one party [being] seen as clinging to a flag that represented Britain and the other party as favoring a flag for Canada. The position of the latter is perhaps summed up best by author Alistair Fraser, who wrote: ‘[It] took Canada nearly a century to gain a national flag. During that time, it did have an official governmental flag that represented Canada as a state, this being the government’s original maritime flag. What Canada lacked was a formal flag that represented Canadians themselves; a flag that individuals could fly to proclaim their
Canadianness; a flag of Canada as a nation.”

Dominion Day celebrations—the official holiday commemorating Canadian confederation now known as “Canada Day”—were noted by Brady as indicative of a growing sense of patriotic pride and national identity, and in a decidedly unique, Canadian manner. In perhaps the most original thesis of Brady’s paper, he suggests that while most flags congeal and solidify as national symbols through war, the Canadian experience implies that adoption may also come through “conscious use of a conspicuous symbol coupled with appropriate patriotic exercises.” Dominion Day celebrations would qualify as such an exercise and were even more interesting because “for the most part, Dominion Day was not particularly favored or promoted by the Canadian government and political leaders until late in the 20th century.” These celebrations were driven by popular interest and featured widespread use of the Red Ensign.

However, Brady then pointed out that this Canadian brand of “patriotic memory” is distinct from Scot Guenter’s use of the term “civil religion” in which a national flag embodies a totem-like status as “a primary venerated object in public life.” Brady observed, “…there is little evidence that there is a Canadian civil religion or that Canadian flags have attained totem status thereunder; for that reason, ‘civil religion’ is unhelpful is describing parliamentarians’ view of the Red Ensign.” It is for this reason Brady prefers the term “patriotic memory” to describe both the lasting influence of the Red Ensign, and Dominion Day, on Canadian identity and vexillology.

In this 2015 Driver Award winner, Brady successfully applied unbiased principles of vexillology; and as an American vexillologist examining an intensely Canadian topic, may have also succeeded at injecting a scholarly, additional dose of objectivity with regard to his research and conclusions.

Bruce Patterson, the Saint-Laurent Herald and Registrar of the Canadian Heraldic Authority, offered a thorough vexillological history of two of the most important national symbols in Canada. *The Red Ensign and the Maple Leaf: Canada’s Two Flag Traditions* detailed the evolution of the Red Ensign, Maple Leaf, and various other proposals for national flags leading into the Great Flag Debate of 1964.

One influential prototype to the current Flag of Canada was a proposal in the early 1940s by the Native Sons of Canada, a nationalist-leaning group. The flag featured a diagonal split of red and white, with a green maple leaf in the center. Patterson states, “In many ways this was a precursor to the National Flag eventually adopted—in its simple construction, the predominance of the maple leaf, and the absence of historical elements.” We saw a contemporary example of this flag in a private showing at the Canadian Museum of History (see page 5).

Patterson explained, in the 1950s, flag proposals bereft of explicit British elements, in addition to ones that presented symbolic allusions to both Britain and France, began to appear. The popularity for a uniquely Canadian expression eventually outweighed adherence to English or French historical symbolism. As Patterson added, this was, “an attitude that would be shared by Liberal leader Lester B. Pearson and his allies in the development of the current flag.”

Patterson concluded that there can be no doubting the widespread adoption of the Maple Leaf flag—particularly in English Canada—and that there “are no serious alternatives championed as national flags...[However], for much of Canada’s first century, the country was represented by a
different flag, the Canadian Red Ensign in various forms, and even a succession of suggestions to replace this flag followed a similar pattern of including historical emblematic references to Canada’s British and French heritage, along with simpler allusions to Canada. In the years leading up to the 1964 Flag Debate, however, starker designs focusing on the latter began appearing as options, and this approach became the focus of the Liberal government at the time, which resulted in the flag we now have.”

The origins of the provincial flag of Manitoba and its background in reactionary politics were introduced by David W. Grebstad, M.A., CD, with his paper, The Flag of Our Fathers? The Manitoba Provincial Flag and British Cultural Hegemony in Manitoba, 1870-1966. In Grebstad’s lively talk, he described the history of Manitoba which eventually led to the province purposefully adopting a flag which incorporated the British Union Jack after the Canadian Red Ensign was replaced by the Maple Leaf flag in 1965: “The provincial flag of Manitoba is a banner symbolizing ninety-six years of the establishment and preservation of British cultural hegemony in Manitoba, and the result of an oppositional reaction to the evolving discourse of a bilingual and bicultural Canadian nationalism.”

Grebstad detailed various periods of immigration into Manitoba and how that has impacted the province’s cultural underpinning which forms the basis for its prevalent, traditional political views. He states, “This type of traditionalism naturally gravitates towards right-leaning political parties, therefore the ruling Progressive Conservative Party was loathe to acquiesce to anything that might unseat the British cultural hegemony in Manitoba.” Grebstad portrays a Canadian nationalism which identified with wider British synergies and favored Canada’s role as a charter member of the British Commonwealth over the independent, bilingual, and bicultural nation that was evolving in other provinces. From this oppositional, political dynamic, explained Grebstad, was born the Flag of Manitoba. The most apt description of the purpose of the retrograde, British-influenced design is an edgy quote offered in 2011 by blogger James Hope Howard: “So where most other Canadian provinces have unique, carefully considered designs that speak to their history and sense of identity, the entirety of the messages conveyed by our Manitoban [sic] flag are ‘we love England’ and ‘screw off, Pearson’ … you would be absolutely correct in charging that our flag paints us as an unremarkable province with no discernible identity except as vindictive naysayers who fear and resent change.”
Forrest Pass, Ph.D., shared the beginnings of flag tradition in Canada with his paper, “A ‘Red Rag’ to an Infuriated Bull”: American Flags, Canadian Vexilloclasts and the Origins of Canadian Flag Culture, 1880-1930. Pass, a historian with the Museum of Canada and former herald with the Canadian Heraldic Authority, was introduced by Annie Platoff as having an interest in flags since childhood but that interest developed further through academic and professional experience. Pass thanked everyone and quipped, perhaps in reference to his first name, “we could be saying that I’m branching out.”

Pass opened his talk with a report from 1892 concerning a flag controversy which caused a virulent popular reaction in the “sleepy village of Wiarton, Ontario” on Dominion Day. A United States Flag was hoisted over the Yeoman’s family hen house on the national holiday commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of Canadian Confederation. The mischievous unfurling of the Stars and Stripes led to, in some reports, up to sixty-five onlookers to surround the private residence. Clearly, the offending flag had to be taken down and local officials took to the task. After it was brought down by “special constables,” the flag was seized by the crowd and torn to ribbons. According to one report, the crowd “marched down the village’s main thoroughfare, Berford Street, ‘waving the pieces of the unfortunate flag singing and feeling as jubilant as if they had conquered the whole of the United States.’”

Pass laid out several other incidents in which Canadians were aghast at the presence of U.S. flags being flown in their country at various times in the late 1800s and early 1900s. The expanding proliferation, reverence, and ubiquitous presence of the Stars and Stripes was taken by some Canadians as an affront to their sovereignty and dignity. Pass explained, “‘A Yankee flag to them is like a ‘red rag’ to an infuriated bull,’ quipped the editor of the Newmarket, Ontario, Era, in describing his more nationalistic compatriots in 1911, and the infuriated bulls were more common than we might imagine.”

In his research, Pass reports around sixty similar American “flag incidents” in Canada between 1880 and 1920. He stated that although there are examples of attempts to attenuate animosities between the U.S. and Canada, “in spite of a long history of cordial relations, anti-Americanism remained deeply engrained in Canadian culture,” much as a reflection of how each nation began. Pass quoted American political scientist, Seymour Martin Lipset, to succinctly describe the two tracks: “Americans do not know, but Canadians cannot forget, that two nations, not one, came out of the American Revolution,” and Canada has served for two centuries “as the United States’ counter-revolutionary foil, a model of what might have been had British arms prevailed at Ticonderoga and Yorktown.”

In the midst of the emergence of a very robust American flag culture post-Civil War, Canadians found themselves torn between “the relatively staid flag culture of Great Britain, in which the Union Jack remained first and foremost a state emblem, and the increasingly boisterous ‘flag worship’ of their American neighbors.”

Pass employed a rare term to describe the more destructive Canadian reaction to the effrontery of the Stars and Stripes. “Vexilloclasts”—a maniac who destroys flags—only appears twice in a Google search and one of the entries is from CRW flags’s article on “Humor in Vexillology.” This aptly describes Pass’s tone and delightful delivery during his presentation as he shared a number of riveting tales about “American flag incidents” in Canada. Pass stated, “As these episodes illustrate, civil authorities and the press dismissed the worst acts of vexillological vandalism as the excesses of youth, drunks and ‘hoodlums.’” But this very visible minority led to fuel another Canadian movement which, as Pass explained, contributed to the current national appreciation and pride surrounding the Maple Leaf flag. “Canadian flag culture is ubiquitous and unabashed, and when
contrasted with the relatively conservative use of the Union Jack and the Canadian Red Ensign at the beginning of the twentieth century, it appears strikingly similar to American practice. Exposure to late-nineteenth-century American flag culture played an important part in this process.” Pass also cited the expanding use of the Union Jack and Red Ensign at Dominion Day celebrations and concluded that “the most widely endorsed response to the proliferation of American flags was that Canadians should combat the phenomenon on its own terms…Canadian flag culture had evolved, and the stimulus to which it responded was the boisterous, unashamed, sometimes insensitive flag culture of the United States.”

Pass, as the winner of this year’s Kevin Harrington Award for the best article to appear in a non-vexillological publication (see Awards & Honors on page 22), has turned in another excellent example of vexillology as an unbiased social science. With these two works he has most assuredly made a significant contribution to the canon of Canadian vexillology.

Roger Eriksen, M.F.A., a professor of graphic design at Adams State University in Colorado, laid out numerous vexillographic principles in his paper, The Importance of Good Flag Design: Alternate Flag Proposals. Flag design, explained Eriksen, “is an area that goes relatively unnoticed by the general public.” Eriksen reprised principles from Ted Kaye’s Good Flag, Bad Flag: How to Design a Great Flag and suggested these principles to be equally valid for other design projects, such as corporate logo design. With regard to vexillography, Eriksen stated, “[flag design] must effectively represent an entire nation or region to the rest of the world...[and] that flags are living designs that come alive when hoisted and blown by the wind. They represent the living nation.”

Eriksen then shared alternate flag designs, some self-produced, as part of more than 10,000 proposals submitted for New Zealand’s new national flag. He concluded his presentation with numerous alternate designs for U.S. state flags incorporating the aforementioned principles of good graphic design. Some notable examples include: replacing the seal on the State of Washington’s flag with a stylized, but graphically simple and symmetrical, bicolor profile of Mount Rainier within a white circle; replacing Kansas’s seal and name in block letters with a simple, elegant sunflower symbol centered on a green and blue horizontal bicolor; and replacing Oregon’s name-seal-and-date design, with a yellow wagon wheel on green and blue stripes.”
In her paper *From Flying Flag to Museum Flag*, Canadian Museum of History conservator **Caterina Florio** described any “conservation strategy” with regard to flags as needing to involve the study of historical context and the “customs and relevance” of flags. While introducing Florio, Annie Platoff mentioned fellow flag conservator Gwen Spicer, an Association member who has presented a number of papers of artifact conservation at past meetings. Originally from Florence, Italy, Florio now lives in Ottawa, Canada, and began her talk by describing her focus “on the significance and relevance of museum artifacts and how they retain, diminish or change their meaning through time and context.”

Florio presented a brief history of flag-use over the centuries and held up a distinction unique to flags, namely their “essential quality” of moving in the wind. Interestingly, she also offered an etymological exploration into the origin of the word “flag,” and suggested the most persuasive explanation was from Professor Skeat “who derives it from the Middle English ‘flakken’ to fly, one of a number of similar onomatopoeic words suggestive of the sound of something flapping in the wind.” Florio then described the method of conservation as being accomplished through a process of “investigation, preservation, and interpretation,” primarily because the conservator’s job is not centered solely on conservation, but must also entail how an artifact is interpreted and understood.

Florio then presented a Canadian Museum of History case study she worked on of an election banner currently displayed in the temporary exhibition: “1867. Rebellion and Confederation.” After stabilizing the artifact, Florio collaborated with the curator to determine how best to display the piece to the public. The flag was painted on both sides with a center image of a crown surrounded by the inscription, “British rule and British institutions.” As Florio explained, “Below the inscription are the names of the two candidates, Dunn and Buchanan. At the top of the banner, between the words “British Rule”, there is a date, 1842, which may have been added later.”
Last year's Driver Award winner, flag scholar Scot Guenter, Ph.D., LF, FF, WSF, is one of the most published vexillologists in our Association, and perhaps the world. Guenter's offering this year is titled: Survey Results: College Students, the American Flag, and Other Powerful Patriotic Symbols, and is a fascinating study documenting changing attitudes driven by flag imagery and other patriotic notions. He explained that 27 years earlier at NAVA 22 he presented the results of a survey given to college students which "set out to be the first vexillological survey that combines questions on recognition, evocation, cultural values, and nationalism as it is demonstrated through flag ritual." In 2015, Guenter reprised the survey and, by comparison to his earlier work, discovered many useful things about evolving knowledge and perceptions of the U.S. flag, America, and levels of patriotism. He also emphasized the importance of replicating this methodology and stating, "it is crucial" for the world of vexillology to "promote the procedure of using surveys in an appropriately social scientific manner—as opposed to just gathering data from open internet survey posts, often anonymous or frequented by folks with a specialized agenda, and declaring it somehow magically valid or representative.”

To highlight this point, Guenter added that ad hoc, online surveys conducted by vexillologists do not provide “special dispensation” to tell people the “correct” or incorrect way to make flags. "As Whitney Smith pointed out many times," reminded Guenter, “vexillology is about gathering information and analyzing it to learn more, ultimately, about the human experience—it is not about prescribing a practice of flag design that others are scolded or persuaded to follow." Guenter then laid out more detail with regard to his methodological procedure, which was peer-reviewed, and then presented the 2015 survey data as contrasted with the results from 27 years ago.

The survey asked questions on the following categories:

- Demographics on Survey Participants
- Their Knowledge of U.S. Flag Meaning and Creation
- Their Evocation of Patriotism via the U.S. Flag
- Their Opinions on Appropriate U.S. Flag Usage
- Their Hierarchy of American Symbols

Guenter also found strong differences in party affiliation from his survey 27 years earlier. In the 1980s, during the Reagan era, 49% of respondents claimed to be Republicans; while in 2015, only 4.5% did. There were also wide swings toward “no affiliation” with 65% describing themselves that way in 2015. Questions about the U.S. flag were asked such as what the different elements of the flag represented. For example, when queried about what the colors of the U.S. flag signify, “the word that turned up the most, referencing all of them collectively or any one individually, was ‘freedom,’ occurring in 29% of the written responses.” Other questions dealt with the “evocation of patriotism,” such as, “Have you ever had a deep sense of pride when looking at the American flag?” Guenter reported only 57% said “yes,” and cautions, “That means 43% could not recall such an emotional response. If students are being honest, that is a noticeably low level of response, and one that should concern members of the society who believe patriotism and a strong, shared civil religion are integral to maintaining a healthy and much needed shared sense of community for the future good and ongoing cohesion of the society.” Guenter also provided a ranked list based on the students’ responses concerning the most popular, iconic symbols of America. The American Eagle, Statue of Liberty, and White House were the top three with interesting, albeit less popular, responses like the Dollar Sign, Guns, and McDonalds also mentioned as representative of the U.S.A.

Guenter concluded with the need for further study using surveys with peer-reviewed methodologies and how important it is for “tighter standards in vexillology when it comes to claiming surveys are valid or what their results indicate.” The findings of this survey, according to Guenter, seem to suggest patriotism is on the wane with young people in the United States, but that in military and sporting events, the “ongoing use of the flag in ritual activity does have a positive effect… [and can] increase a sense of patriotic commitment.”

Although, Guenter added, significant demographic differences between the two sets of respondents, including race, class, and immigrant status, must be taken into consideration.
**John Hartvigsen**, in his paper, *The Many Aspects of Vexillology*, shared a brief history of vexillology, and NAVA, which seeks to “promote a comprehensive study of flags and all things relating to them.” Hartvigsen then laid out several aspects of vexillology with the desire to bring these various tracks into “clearer focus.” Vexillology, Hartvigsen explained, was originally considered a subdivision of heraldry: “F. Edward Hulme, writing in *The Flags of the World: Their History, Blazon and Associations*, not surprisingly, declared matter of factly that, ‘Flag-devising is really a branch of heraldry, and should be in accordance with its laws, both in the forms and colours introduced.’”

A later, British view of good flag design came in the form of a one-sheet with seventeen guidelines. Written by Louis Loynes, it was distributed to NAVA members in 1969. Hartvigsen then relayed a story concerning the intersection between heraldry and vexillography, when during NAVA 7 in Valley Forge, PA., Walter Angst, a Swiss born conservator at the Smithsonian, had published in *Smithsonian Magazine* an article entitled ‘Heraldic Plan for redesign of the state flags,’ which—although the author was familiar with vexillology—included design guidance again closely tied to the rules of heraldry.” Again, simplicity of expression and contrasting colors were emphasized. Ted Kaye’s 2006 *Good Flag, Bad Flag* outlines the “principles of good flag design,” and according to Hartvigsen and others, “has had and continues to have a huge impact, and has definitely become part of the phenomena of flags.” Hartvigsen then spoke about the collaboration between the United Kingdom’s Flag Institute and the North American Vexillological Association in producing a joint report outlining the guiding principles of good flag design. The final report was published in *NAVA News* #223 and is posted on the Association’s website under Flag Information, Flag Design.

The history of these efforts to standardize or codify good flag design has not been without controversy, and even to this day there are differing opinions among vexillologists as to how far to go. What aspects of flag design are aesthetically subjective and artistic—and which flag design guidelines, if any, are objective, culturally neutral, and based on unbiased principles? These are important questions to ponder for vexillologists and the second half of Hartvigsen’s talk began exploring some exceptions to the design guidelines including numerous national and U.S. state flags.

Hartvigsen then launched into a fascinating analysis and history of one of the exceptions to the aforementioned flag design rules: the Flag of Mexico. In what may eventually develop into its own presentation or paper, the iconography of the eagle perched on a cactus while holding a snake in its beak and talon is explored in great detail including tracing the origins of the imagery back to 12th and 13th century Aztec mythology. Even more intriguing is Hartvigsen’s research into the lesser prominent accompaniments to the cactus/eagle/snake image which are abstract renderings of a rock resembling a pillow and water with “strange little tassels around its outer edge.” Hartvigsen concludes these symbols hearken back to ancient Aztec glyphs for water and stone, but, as Hartvigsen deduced, they also serve as phonograms for the Aztec name *Tenochtitlan*, the island capital of the Mexican Empire. In what may eventually develop into its own presentation or paper, the iconography of the eagle perched on a cactus while holding a snake in its beak and talon is explored in great detail including tracing the origins of the imagery back to 12th and 13th century Aztec mythology. Even more intriguing is Hartvigsen’s research into the lesser prominent accompaniments to the cactus/eagle/snake image which are abstract renderings of a rock resembling a pillow and water with “strange little tassels around its outer edge.” Hartvigsen concludes these symbols hearken back to ancient Aztec glyphs for water and stone, but, as Hartvigsen deduced, they also serve as phonograms for the Aztec name *Tenochtitlan*, the island capital of the Mexican Empire founded on 20 June 1325.

In closing, Hartvigsen stated, “Flag designing or vexillography, although it has some scholarly aspects, tends toward [the] artistic side of expression. While on the other hand, vexillology has artistic components, but trends toward scholarly pursuit.” Essentially, flags, their images, symbols, and meaning, in an artistic sense as well a function of human communication, go beyond coarse design principles in the way they are appreciated and understood. Both the scholarly study and the artistic design of flags are part of the same phenomena, and “perhaps the root of… [the] conflict between flag designing and vexillology.”
Flags for the Fallen by Steven Knowlton

Steven Knowlton, M.L.I.S., examined the funeral ritual of draping flags over coffins. Several recent examples were provided with significant differences. In New York, two slain police officers’ coffins were covered with the NYPD flag, while at funerals of public servants in Chicago the coffin is covered by the city flag, or in Los Angeles, police coffins are covered by a U.S. flag. Knowlton credits these differences as an expression of local tradition that may or may not be related to political developments such as tension between civilians and officers.

Knowlton then began to delve into the origin of using banners or flags on coffins by investigating Christian funeral ritual and tradition. He cited an early example of the burial of Charles the Eighth of France in 1498 in which “the ‘Banner of France’ served as the pall for his coffin.” Later historical examples of flag-based funeral rituals were provided. For instance, vexillologist Marc Leepson, “traces the use of national flags for funeral palms to the Napoleonic Wars, although it did not become widespread in the United States until the Civil War.”

Certain ceremonies and customs began to mature with regard to military rituals of U.S. flags being placed on coffins and then formally presented to the families of the deceased. The deeply symbolic funeral-flag is carefully folded, and according to Knowlton, “a body of folklore has arisen surrounded the ‘meaning’ of each of the 13 folds.” Knowlton then went even deeper by exploring the meaning and purpose of funeral rituals from as long as 400,000 years ago: “There is a deep human need to reflect on the role of the dead in the lives of those still living, as demonstrated by the hundreds of millennia that have witnessed funeral rites.” Knowlton considers it “uncoincidental” that the widespread use of U.S. flags in funeral services arose during the great national struggle of the Civil War, and offered a theory from authors Carolyn Marvin and David Ingle that “the American flag [is] a totem standing in for blood sacrifice—the offering of the lives of soldiers and police officers to the nation.” This totemic treatment of the U.S. flag is of course a part of Guenter’s “cult of the American flag” as a “civil religion.” Knowlton, in an excellent example of vexillology operating at the intersection of several academic disciplines, concludes: “The presence of an American flag at a funeral, then, neatly merges the theological, sociological, and anthropological uses of a burial rite. If a funeral brings together the community and valorizes the group’s ideals under which the deceased lived; and if the liturgy reminds the congregants that after death, the individual will be reunited with the larger communion of saints; so the ritual solemnizing the totem of blood sacrifice unites the corpse with the totem.”

In perhaps NAVA 49’s most delightful presentation, Vernón León offered research into a glyph-like symbol from a very popular video game series named, The Legend of Zelda. León’s, Legends of the Triforce: A Link to the Past, first examines the success, cultural impact, and origins of the The Legend of Zelda games series, and then focuses in on its iconic, triple triangle symbol known as the “Triforce.” Developed and published by Nintendo, León stated the series has sold some 75-80 million units and generated $4.7 billion dollars in sales. The Legend of Zelda’s branding and logos are seen on everything from tote bags, key chains, necklaces, a full range of toys, and
even musical instruments. One title in the series, named *The Legend of Zelda: Ocarina of Time*, features a flute-like instrument called an ocarina which has also been included in the franchise’s merchandising.

León then provided the biographical background of one of Zelda’s game designers, Shigeru Miyamoto, who also designed the famous *Donkey Kong* and *Super Mario* game platforms. Miyamoto is credited with the “revitalization of Nintendo.” Delving further into the mythology and background story of *The Legend of Zelda* universe, León revealed the origins of the Triforce and what it represents. Each golden triangle in the Triforce represents a goddess: “Din, the Goddess of Power, Nayru, the Goddess of Wisdom, and Farore, the Goddess of Courage.” The backdrop of the game is reminiscent of Japan’s Kyoto countryside, the city where Miyamoto grew up. In an interesting twist, Miyamoto was inspired to name the series after famous American author F. Scott Fitzgerald’s wife, Zelda Fitzgerald.

León told the story of why he began this research after spying the Triforce symbol on a miniature banner in a Japanese ceremonial display at the home of his friend and fellow NAVA member, Gus Tracchia. The Triforce turns out to be one ancient Japanese symbol in what is known as “Japanese Mon.” Mon are made up of 241 categories based on visual and structural resemblance. With a total of 5116 unique mon, each are used to denote either individuals or individual families. They are similar to coats of arms or crests in European heraldic tradition and the Triforce was likely inspired by the “Mitsu Uroko,” a mon representing the Hojo Clan. Hojo mythology describes founder “Hôjô Tokimasa receiving three dragon scales at Enoshima Island,” as evidently one basis for the three triangles of the Mitsu Uroko, or Triforce symbol. León also compares mythological themes in *Zelda* with similar ones within the Japanese Shinto religion, such as three goddesses of Shinto, Tagitsuhime, Ichikishimahime, and Tagirihime, mirroring the three Zelda goddesses which are symbolized by the Triforce glyph. Finally, the prevalence of the Mitsu Uroka, or Triforce symbolism, in Japanese society, and in multi-national corporate logos, was presented in addition to an appearance on Spock’s religious garments in *Star Trek III* and in the floor tiling of the Basilica de San Clemente. Evidently, Nintendo’s *The Legend of Zelda* video game series has expropriated a well-established, archetypal symbol that’s previously been utilized in major religions, corporations, and as the crest of a powerful Japanese family—who knew?
Annie Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF and Steve Knowlton, M.L.I.S., reprised their jointly authored work, *Old Flags, New Meanings*, which was presented this past September at the 26th Annual International Congress of Vexillology (ICV) in Sydney, Australia. *Old Flags, New Meanings* was recognized as the Best Paper at ICV 26 and provides a comprehensive analysis of several flags that over time have come to represent different meanings than their original ones. As they explained, “There are numerous examples, including the Confederate Battle Flag in the U.S., the Gadsden Flag used by the American ‘Tea Party’ movement, the Imperial Ethiopian flag as used by Rastafarians, the Eureka flag of Australia, and various flags used in the Ukraine conflict, where flags have been ‘recycled’ by groups who not only appropriate the symbol as their own, but also assign additional meanings to the symbol.”

Platoff and Knowlton provided before and after depictions of these flags’ meanings and then explained this process from an anthropological perspective. One example concerns a flag which has been the recent subject of immense controversy. The Confederate Battle Flag was first flown by the Army of Northern Virginia and by the end of the Civil War “had become a widely-accepted symbol of the entire Confederate cause.” As explained by Platoff and Knowlton, the seceding states had the most slaves within their borders “who had been transported to the New World in chains. To unfairly summarize a complex set of constitutional disputes, the southern states seceded to protect their ability to practice slavery as they saw fit.” During the war, “white southerners invested the Battle Flag with the same nationalistic totem power as northerners gave to the Stars and Stripes,” and the flag was even given respect at Civil War battlefields in the North. The new and more modern meaning assigned to this flag, begins to materialize during the civil rights movement, when challenges to continuing, rampant racism were opposed. White supremacist groups, such as the Ku Klux Klan, who advocated for the perpetuation of racism and racist policies rallied under the Confederate flag and “embraced the rebel flag in their iconography.” Because of its association with fringe groups like the Ku Klux Klan, the Confederate flag is now widely held in disregard. Platoff and Knowlton suggest the flag has “acquired a taint of disdain owing to [its] association with political groups whose views are considered unacceptable to the same bourgeois and elites who formed the core of the flag-reverencing communities of yore. […]” When a flag is used simultaneously by groups at various points along the political spectrum, it eventually becomes associated with the most extreme points of view and is disavowed by those who seek to maintain a position in the mainstream of a society. We humbly call this the ‘Platoff/Knowlton effect.’” The research in *Old Flags, New Meanings* is extensive; each flag is presented with a comprehensive and multi-disciplinary analysis which is what we’ve come to expect from both Platoff and Knowlton. NAVA 49’s presentations were greatly augmented by the inclusion of the Best Paper from ICV 26—a scholarly work in the finest traditions of vexillology.
NAVA 49 Presentations / Communications

“But It Was Ours”: The Red Ensign, Dominion Day, and the Effects of Patriotic Memory on the Canadian Flag Debate
Hugh L. Brady, J.D., FF, Texas and Virgina

The Importance of Good Flag Design: Alternate Flag Proposals
Roger Eriksen, M.F.A., Colorado

From Flying Flag to Museum Flag
Caterina Florio, Ontario

The Flag of Our Fathers? The Manitoba Provincial Flag and British Cultural Hegemony in Manitoba, 1870-1966
David W. Grebstad, M.A., CD, Ontario

Survey Results: College Students, the American Flag, and Other Powerful Patriotic Symbols
Scot M. Guenter, Ph.D., LF, FF, WSF, FVAST, California

The Many Aspects of Vexillology
John M. Hartvigsen, Utah

Flags of the Fallen
Steven A. Knowlton, M.L.I.S., Tennessee

Legends of the Triforce: A Link to the Past
Vernón León, New York

A ‘Red Rag’ to an Infuriated Bull: American Flags, Canadian Vexilloclasts and the Origins of Canadian Flag Culture, 1880-1930
Forrest D. Pass, Ph.D., Ontario

The Red Ensign and the Maple Leaf: Canada’s Two Flag Tradition
Bruce K. Patterson, HRHSC, Ontario

Old Flags, New Meanings
Anne M. Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF, California
Steven A. Knowlton, M.L.I.S., Tennessee


Peter Ansoff, “The Flag on Prospect Hill: A Response to Byron DeLear”

Scot Guenter, “The Phenomenon of Flag Homes: Musings on Meanings”

Kenneth Hartvigsen, “Kanye West, Brad Paisley, and the Contemporary Confederate Flag Discourse in Popular Music Iconography”

David Martucci, “Wayne’s World (of Flags)”

Robert Williamson, “Exploring the Genealogy of the President’s Flag of the United States of America, 1915-1959”
NAVA 49 montage

1 Treasurer Chris Bedwell opens the auction.
2 Meeting under flags of past Annual Meetings.
3 Posting the colors during opening ceremonies.
4 The Preble Lecture room for NAVA 49.
5 NAVA President John Hartvigsen gives proclamation of appreciation to Dr. Claire Boudreau, Chief Herald of Canada and speaker at the Preble Lecturer.
6 Heralds of the Canadian Heraldic Authority during the Preble Lecture with Ken Reynolds in rear on right.
7 Rich Monahan at Parliament's Centennial Flame.
8 Steve Knowlton receives FIAV honors from Charles Spain for co-written paper at ICV 26.
9 Ken Reynolds welcomes attendees to Ottawa and NAVA 49.
10 Canadian Museum of History, venue for exclusive display of Canadian flags and symbols for NAVA 49 attendees.
11 Forrest Pass, historian for Canadian Museum of History at center right explains museum's collection of Canadian flags and symbols.
12 Ted Kaye, (left) and Bob Harper sport national flag ties.
13 Luc Baronian toasts the president during the Whitney Smith Dinner.
14 Bruce Patterson speaks on Canada's two flag traditions during Saturday's presentations.
North American Vexillological Association / Association nord-américaine de vexillologie

2014–2015 Awards and Honors / Prix et honneurs

Vexillological accomplishments recognized at Whitney Smith Dinner
The Association’s annual gala event—the Whitney Smith Dinner—was held on Saturday night at the revolving Merlot Rooftop Grill located on the 29th floor of the Ottawa Marriott Hotel.

Captain William Driver Award / Prix Capitaine-William-Driver
Hugh L. Brady, Ph.D., J.D., FF, for “But It Was Ours”: The Red Ensign, Dominion Day, and the Effects of Patriotic Memory on the Canadian Flag Debate

Kevin Harrington Award / Prix Kevin-Harrington
Forrest D. Pass, Ph.D., for “Something occult in the science of flag-flying”: School Flags and Educational Authority in Early Twentieth-Century Canada, The Canadian Historical Review, September 2014

Doreen Braverman Award / Prix Doreen-Braverman
Randolph (Randy) Smith, Mary Ann Doktor-Smith, and Advertising Flag Company

Presidential Citation / Mention présidentielle
Charles A. Spain, J.D., WSF

2014–2015 Officers, Committees, and Boards / Officiers, conseils et comités

Executive Board / Conseil d’administration
President / Président
John M. Hartvigsen
First Vice President / Premier vice-président
Anne M. Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF
Second Vice President / Second vice-président
Kenneth W. Reynolds, Ph.D.
Secretary / Secrétaire
Steven A. Knowlton, M.L.I.S.
Treasurer / Trésorier
Christopher P. Bedwell
President Emeritus / Président émérite
Whitney Smith, Ph.D., LF, FF, WSF, FF, FVAST

Nominating Committee / Comité des mises en candidature
Scot M. Guenter, Ph.D., LF, FF, WSF, FVAST
Chair / Directeur
Hugh L. Brady, J.D., FF
H.P. (Pete) Van de Putte, Jr., FVAST

Appointed Officers / Les officiers désignés
Archivist / Archiviste
John A. Lowe, M.D., FF
Auditors / Vérificateurs
Gustavo Tracchia, FF
Parliamentarian / Parlementaire
Hugh L. Brady, J.D., FF
Registered Agent / Représentant légal
Ernest E. Aitchison, J.D.
Flag Research Quarterly Editor-in-Chief /
Rédacteur en chef
Kenneth J. Hartvigsen, Ph.D. (2013–2018 term) 7

Raven: A Journal of Vexillology Editor-in-Chief /
Rédacteur en chef

Appointed Officers / Les officiers désignés 8

Director of the Digital Library / Directrice de la bibliothèque numérique
Anne M. Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF

Information Technology Officer / Directeur des technologies des technologies de l’information
Michael Platoff

Media Relations Officer / Directeur des relations avec les médias
James J. Ferrigan III

NAVA News Editor-in-Chief / Rédacteur en chef
Byron DeLear

Protocol Officer / Agent du protocole
James J. Ferrigan III

Shopkeeper / Responsable des ventes
Al Cavalari

Flag Research Quarterly Editor-in-Chief /
Rédacteur en chef
Kenneth J. Hartvigsen, Ph.D. (2013–2018 term) 7

Raven: A Journal of Vexillology Editor-in-Chief /
Rédacteur en chef

Standing Committees / Comités permanents 9

Budget Committee / Comité du budget
Christopher P. Bedwell
   Chair / Directeur
   Hugh L. Brady, J.D., FF (ex officio)
   Lee L. Herold
   Steven A. Knowlton, M.L.I.S.
   John M. Hartvigsen (ex officio)

Flag Design Committee / Comité de vexillographie
Christopher P. Bedwell
   Chair / Directeur
   Edward B. Kaye
   Anne M. Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF
   John M. Hartvigsen (ex officio)

Membership Committee / Comité d’adhésion
Steven A. Knowlton, M.L.I.S.
   Chair / Directeur
   Anne M. Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF
   Vanessa Van de Putte
   Catherine Wright
   John M. Hartvigsen (ex officio)
   Edward B. Kaye (adviser / conseiller)

Program Committee / Comité de programme
Anne M. Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF
   Chair / Directeur
   Peter A. Loeser
   Kenneth W. Reynolds, Ph.D.
   Charles A. Spain, J.D., WSF
   John M. Hartvigsen (ex officio)

Publications Committee / Comité des publications
Charles A. Spain, J.D., WSF 10
   Chair / Directeur
   Kenneth J. Hartvigsen, Ph.D.
   Anne M. Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF
   Kenneth W. Reynolds, Ph.D.
   John M. Hartvigsen (ex officio)
   Luc V. Baronian, Ph.D. (adviser / conseiller)

Special Committees / Comités spéciaux

Awards & Honors Committee / Comité des prix et honneurs 11
Scot M. Guenter, Ph.D., LF, FF, WSF, FVAST
   Chair / Directeur
   Kevin Harrington, M.A. (T.), FF
   Steven A. Knowlton, M.L.I.S.
   Charles A. Spain, J.D., WSF
   H.P. (Pete) Van de Putte Jr., FVAST
   John M. Hartvigsen (ex officio)

Award Judges / Juges des prix 12
Christopher P. Bedwell
   Scot M. Guenter, Ph.D., LF, FF, WSF, FVAST
   John M. Hartvigsen
   Steven A. Knowlton, M.L.I.S.
   Anne M. Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF
   Kenneth W. Reynolds, Ph.D.
   Dean C. Thomas

Grants Committee / Comité des bourses 13
Anne M. Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF
   Chair / Directrice
   Perry Dane, J.D.
   Scot M. Guenter, Ph.D., LF, FF, WSF, FVAST
   Kenneth W. Reynolds, Ph.D.
   John Hartvigsen (ex officio)

Flag Conservation Committee / Comité de conservation des drapeaux 13
Laura K. Kidd, Ph.D.
   Chair / Directrice
   James J. Ferrigan III
   Kenneth J. Hartvigsen, Ph.D.
   Gwen Spicer, M.S.
   John Hartvigsen (ex officio)

Organizational Members Advisory Committee / Comité consultatif des membres de l’organisation 20
H.P. (Pete) Van de Putte Jr., FVAST
   Chair / Directeur
   Paul B. Swenson, M.A.
   John Hartvigsen (ex officio)
Editorial Boards / Comités de rédaction

Raven: A Journal of Vexillology Editorial Board / Comité de rédaction
Scot M. Guenter, Ph.D., LF, FF, WSF, FVAST
Chair / Directeur (2013–2016 term)
Perry Dane J.D. (2013–2016 term)
Anne M. Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF (2013–2016 term)
John M. Hartvigsen (ex officio)

Flag Research Quarterly Editorial Board / Comité de rédaction
Charles A. Spain, J.D., WSF
Chair / Directeur (2013–2016 term)
David B. Martucci (2013–2016 term)
John M. Hartvigsen (ex officio)

NAVA News Editorial Board / Comité de rédaction
Charles A. Spain, J.D., WSF
Chair / Directeur (2013–2016 term)
Anne M. Platoff, M.S., M.A., FF (2013–2016 term)
John M. Hartvigsen (ex officio)

Joint Commission on Common Vexillographic Principles / Commission mixte sur les principes vexillographiques communs

Graham M.P. Bartram, FFI
Chair / Directeur
Edward B. Kaye
Jason Saber
Charles A. Spain, J.D., WSF
Philip S. Tibbetts

NAVA 49 Flag Design Concept

The NAVA 49 flag was designed by Reid Reynolds and her father, Ken Reynolds, Ph.D., with input from John Hartvigsen, Pete Loeser, and Jeremy Hammond.

Although a simple and minimal design, the flag covers a lot of contextual ground. First, the flag is restricted to red and white—the national colours of Canada. In this instance, the white field also signifies snow and winter, the latter being the predominant season for most of the country (and the reason why NAVA 49 could not be held in Ottawa in February 2015 for fear of freezing most of the attendees—it was -32 degrees Fahrenheit on February 15, the fiftieth anniversary of the Canadian flag). The silhouette next to the hoist depicts the Peace Tower on Parliament Hill, the well-known building that most represents Ottawa to the country and the world. The maple leaf in the upper fly represents the nation as a whole and Canada’s most well-known symbol. The flag’s proportions are 1:2.
Dear Fellow NAVA Members,

One of the challenges for NAVA’s leadership is communicating with members. *NAVA News* and *Semaphore* are vehicles used along with emails and a lot of phone calls, but it seems that despite best intentions, some information is not shared as the Board would wish to do. Below are efforts to improve this.

NAVA’s Bylaws require that Association officers prepare “reports of their activities” for the Annual Business Meeting, which is held in conjunction with the Annual Meeting; see § 6.05 (b) of the Bylaws. Often in the past these reports have been verbal and have, therefore, not been part of the historical record. I asked the Executive Board Members to prepare written reports to be available at NAVA 49’s Business Meeting in Ottawa, and they complied. However, it was pointed out that these reports were not available for members who were not able to attend the Business Meeting. Important among these reports is the Annual Budget Report, which reports on NAVA’s financial status; see § 6.10 (5) of the Bylaws. To insure that reports are available to all members, the reports have been placed in the members section of our website.

NAVA’s Bylaws also provide that Board Meetings be open for member who desire to attend; see § 5.07(d) of the Bylaws. Routine Board Meetings are sometimes held immediately after the Annual Meeting’s conclusion, but members attending the Annual Meeting have not been specifically invited. Recognizing that some members were waiting to talk to me at the conclusion of a short Board Meeting held after NAVA 48 in New Orleans, I realized that I could have invited them to attend the Board Meeting if they wished to do so. Accordingly, at NAVA 49 in Ottawa, I invited members to attend the short Board Meeting following the formal part of NAVA 49’s programs. Only a couple of members chose to do so, but they asked about members wanting to attend the regular Board Meetings.

Since the regularly scheduled Board Meetings are held by telephone conference calls, only Board Members and specifically invited guests have attended in the past. Others may attend, but there are some considerations caused by the conference call setting. When a conference call is scheduled, the number of attendees must be requested to insure a sufficient number of slots are reserved. Also, since a conference call already has multiple participants, active discussion must be limited to Board Members. Other members attend as observers who enter the discussion only if invited to do so. Comments about the meetings or Board actions are always welcome, and can be made to me or other Board members either before or after any meeting. I welcome, as I know the other officers do, comments and questions from NAVA members. I can be contacted at the email address pres@nava.org and will be happy to respond either by email or phone.

Board Meetings are scheduled on the second Thursday of December, February, April, June and August at 7:00 p.m. Eastern Time. The first of these Board Meetings is scheduled for Thursday, 10 December at 7:00 EST. Any member who desire to be included in this conference call should notify NAVA’s Secretary by email (sec@nava.org) by Monday, 7 December. To be included in the conference call for any of the remainder of the meetings, please notify the Secretary two weeks prior to a scheduled meeting.

Transparency is a goal of the Executive Board as we transact NAVA business. When I talk with one NAVA member, I am often asked to take an action that is opposite to what another member has advised me to do. As a Board, therefore, we cannot fully satisfy everyone. I can only promise that we will do the best we can, while realizing that every member has genuine concerns for NAVA’s success.

Sharing wishes of continued NAVA success,

John

John M. Hartvigsen
President | Président
North American Vexillological Association | Association nord-américaine de vexillologie
Every two years the global vexilligentsia convenes somewhere in the world to talk about flags. Thus in September, the 26th International Congress of Vexillology (ICV 26) met in Australia’s largest city for a week celebrating flag-studies.

Over 100 vexillologists and companions from 22 countries enjoyed the hospitality of the Flag Society of Australia (FSA), whose tireless organizers delivered a tremendously successful event. More than 20 of those congress attendees belong to NAVA (though many of those live in countries other than the US and Canada).

An international congress resembles a NAVA meeting, only with more of everything spanning six days (NAVA members will recall NAVA 45, held concurrently with ICV 24 in 2011 in Washington, D.C.). It has a flag, a series of presentations on flag topics, a field trip, a business meeting, and a final banquet, suffused with the camaraderie of vexi-friendship. Sydney followed this model with rewarding additions.

Veteran vexillographer Tony Burton designed the congress flag (he also designed the flags of ICV 19, ICV 24, and NAVA 50, among others). The editor of the FSA’s journal, Crux Australis, he also organized the lecture program at the congress. In all, 33 speakers delivered papers on a wide range of topics—spanning flag history, flag design, flag usage, and flag analysis. The 30-minute lecture segments used PowerPoint slides and sometimes actual flags—in some cases very large flags.

Among the lectures: “Vexillology and Social Media”, Paul Lindsay, Australia; “Flag Display in Traditional Chinese Architecture”, Xing Fei, China; “Expression of Regional Identity in the Netherlands through Flags”, Marcel van Westerhoven, Netherlands; “Zero to Hero–Change in Attitude to South Africa’s National Flag”, Bruce Berry, South Africa; and “Ten Years of the Dictionary of Vexillology”, Željko Heimer, Croatia.

The meetings took place in the corporate auditorium of Telstra, Australia’s largest telecommunications firm, with high-tech projection and a 2-story LCD screen…definitely the most advanced venue ever for a flag congress. Ralph Kelly, the FSA’s treasurer and webmaster, chaired the organizing committee.

The field trips ranked among the high points of the congress. In the course of the week the group enjoyed a sunset dinner cruise on Sydney Harbor, a jaunt up to Observatory Hill to see the 2008 flag mast with about 40 flags flying, a
parade in downtown Sydney to the national flag day celebration, and a tour to Canberra—the nation's capital (led by Gerald Naughton). There participants saw Parliament (and its massive flag), the War Memorial, and the flag collections at the Australian War Memorial Annex. A special bonus was the kangaroo hopping alongside the bus on the motorway en route.

The 30+ companions—those who came with their vexi-partners—had a fun and interesting program organized especially for them by Suzanne Kelly. They saw the Sydney Opera House, the zoo, Manly and many other beaches, and museums, with excellent almost-spring weather.

The International Federation of Vexillological Associations (known by its French acronym, FIAV), held the 24th session of its general assembly during the congress. In it, the next two congresses were outlined (London in 2017 and San Antonio in 2019), proposals for future congresses were heard from the Irish and Slovenian delegations, and the FIAV board was re-elected. Delegates from more than 40 of the 50+ member associations attended. However, this was the first year that the “miss three meetings and you’re out” rule took effect, purging some inactive groups from the FIAV membership roll.

Members of Flags of the World (FOTW), at all other times a virtual community dedicated to maintaining and expanding the largest on-line flag information resource, met for their biennial in-person session.

With excellent timing, on the congress’s second full day, New Zealand announced the four finalist designs for its new national flag, narrowed down from 40 semi-finalists. The media in Australia and New Zealand found the world’s flag experts on hand to comment on the process and the designs, bringing public attention to the field of vexillology. A member of the New Zealand flag committee and a Wellington graphic designer both delivered presentations on the Kiwi flag-selection process.

Ralph Bartlett, president of the FSA, served as congress treasurer—he and several other volunteers had organized ICV 19 in Melbourne in 1987. Their experience showed in the glitch-free, feature-rich program enjoyed by the participants.

At the closing dinner, held in the elegant dining room of the Royal Automobile Club of Australia, the flag ties came out in droves. There the FIAV board presented awards, including Laureates of the Federation and Fellows of the Federation. The best paper award went to Annie Platoff & Steve Knowlton—both NAVA officers—for their “Old Flags, New Meanings” (Steve could not attend). The FIAV flag passed ceremonially to the organizers of the next congress.

Participants parted saying “See you in London!”.
ICV 26 montage

1. On Observatory Hill, chief instigator John Vaughn explains the flag mast and its multitude of flags.
2. Recipients of the “Fellow of the Federation” show their certificates.
3. The 21x42-foot national flag flies atop the 265-foot flag pole over Parliament in Canberra.
4. Nozomi Kariyasu (Japan) finds his country’s flag on the tie of Ralph Bartlett (Australia).
5. Attendees enjoy the closing dinner at the Royal Automobile Club of Australia.
6. Delegates hoist their flags during the Australian national flag day celebration.
7. Poppies decorate the memorial to WWI dead in Canberra for the 100th anniversary of Gallipoli.
8. The FIAV flag passes to the organizers of the next congress, ICV 27 in London in 2017.

All photos by Ted Kaye

NAVA Welcomes 2015 New Members

John Abrams
Jonathan Abramson
Diego Aguiar
Anwarul Alam
Grant Appell
Amber Altheberry
Thomas Bicsak
Barry Blediger
Andrew Bland
Benjamin Carneh
Douglas Carnival
Brad Carter
Michael Cotrell
Jason Currie
Meghan DeRoma
Matthew Drwenski
Roger Eriksen
Connor Davis Freeman
Joseph Gaddoibis
A. L. Garrison
Walter K. Gaylor (Timeless Colors)
Winston Gould
Andrew Guexes
Robert Harper
Jamie Harrison
Steven Hartvigsen

Scott Helings
Brian Howard
David Hughart
Philip Jordan
Brian S. King
Eila Krumm
Tom Laidlaw
George Leaman
Jesus Licon, Jr.
James Lyons
Gary MacDonald
Laura McCoy
Ted McNabb
Tracey Mee

David Millar
Carlos Alberto Morales-Ramirez
Nigel Morris
Michael Mortimer
McQuillen Murphy
Carver Murphy
Desmond O’Neill
Gabe Osterhout
Gary Picou
Chris Pinette

Moose Jaw, SK
Southold, NY
Seattle, WA
Santarmo, CA
San Jose, CA
Helena, MT
Vancouver, WA
Charlottesville, VA
El Paso, TX
New York, NY
Chilliwack, BC
Scappoose, OR
Ottawa, ON
Barrack Heights,
NSW, Australia
Ashville, NC
Bridgeport, PA
Gunnedah,
NSW, Australia
Bristol, CT
Bermuda, PA
Bermuda, PA
Voorhees, NJ
Caldwell, ID
Knoxville, TN
Caribou, ME

Richard Tadd Pinkston
Nicholas Pinto
Donald B. Porter
Daniel Purdorm
Manuel Quiroa
Rosemary Reder
Paul Revis (Sensoria, LLC)
Reid Reynolds
Nicholas Rindman
Tom Rohrer
Andy Russell
Diego Sanchez
Blaine Shaffer
Hugh Sloan III
Elijah Snow-Rackley
Conor Sullivan
Madison Taylor
Elaine Tranpanier
Denis Vermeire
Christina Victor
Matthew Ward
Scott Warren
Rolan White
Douglas Williams
Ian Williams
Zacary Wilson

Cleveland Heights, OH
Fairfax, VA
Toledo, OH
Liberty, MO
Mississauga, ON
Palm Beach, FL
Astoria, NY
Ottawa, ON
Fort Collins, CO
Lancaster, PA
Novato, CA
Shaker Heights, OH
Omaha, NE
Oxford, MS
Cleveland Heights,
OH
Minneapolis, MN
Logan, UT
Ottawa, ON
Ottawa, ON
Oakland, CA
Gahanna, OH
Summer, SC
Sherman, TX
Oakland, CA
Marina Del Rey, CA
San Jose, CA
49th Annual Meeting / 49e Réunion annuelle
Ottawa, Canada • 16–18 October 2015

Above: NAVA 49 group photograph taken in the lobby of the Ottawa Marriott Hotel, 17 October 2015.

Not pictured: Mary Ansoff, Barbara Dundas, David-Roger Gagnon, David Grebstad, Edward Murphy, Reid Reynolds

Nonattending meeting supporters: Zach Harden, Jamie Harrison, Marlene Little, Gary Randall, James Ritchie, Pete & Vanessa Van de Putte, Rick Wyatt

1 Edward B. (Ted) Kaye
2 Anne M. (Annie) Platoff, First Vice President
3 Steve A. Knowlton, Secretary
4 Peter A. Ansoff
5 Leon Fitzjarrell
6 Graeme Jagger
7 Bruce Patterson
8 Scot M. Guenter
9 Amber Atteberry
10 Rob Raeside
11 Karen Lowe

12 John M. Hartvigsen, President
13 Christopher P. (Chris) Bedwell, Treasurer
14 Jack Lowe
15 Hank Gigandet
16 Rich Monahan
17 Caterina Florio
18 Gwen Spicer
19 Roger Eriksen
20 Gustavo (Gus) Tracchia
21 Susan Harper
22 Robert Harper
23 David E. Ott
24 Marianne Loeuser
25 Edward McNabb
26 Janene Eller-Smith
27 Cindy Williams
28 Richard Hobart
29 Collin Simpson
30 Christopher D. Smith
31 Eric Durish
32 Michael Halleran
33 Wm. Jefferson (Jeff) Spain
34 Michael S. Platoff
35 John S. Adcock
36 Al Cavalari
37 Lee Herold
38 Luc Baronian
39 Diego Sanchez
40 Charles A. Spain
41 James Croft
42 Frederico (Fred) Drews
43 Forrest Pass
44 David Fitzjarrell
45 Jim Brown
46 Larry Soucier
47 Hugh L. Brady
48 Peter A. (Pete) Loeuser
49 Kenneth W. (Ken) Reynolds, Second Vice President
50 Carlos Morales-Ramirez
51 Byron DeLear
52 Vernón M. León
53 Clyde Simpson

BARBARA DUNDAS