

The University of Manitoba

The Massey Report and the Intellectuals:
Tory Cultural Nationalism in Ontario in the 1950s.

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts.

Department of History

by

Erna Buffie
Winnipeg, Manitoba

January 1982

THE MASSEY REPORT AND THE INTELLECTUALS:
TORY CULTURAL NATIONALISM IN ONTARIO IN THE 1950S.

BY

ERNA BUFFIE

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1982

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Table of Contents

Abstract	I
Acknowledgements	II
Introduction	1
I Things of the Spirit and Mind	17
II A Community of Concern	46
III "So Little for the Mind"	72
IV "A Temperate Dispute"	109
V "The Well of the Past"	149
VI The Search for a Canadian Idiom	189
Conclusion	233
Bibliography	

ABSTRACT

This thesis is about English-Canadian cultural-nationalism in the 1950s. The study deals with the intellectual content of cultural nationalism and not directly with its operation at a political or policy level. It includes an examination of the intellectual traditions out of which it grew, of the historical circumstances that nurtured its growth, and of the work of certain individuals for whom it was an issue of vital importance. The central purpose of the study is to provide an examination of the philosophical and ideological convictions of those who supported the cause of cultural nationalism. These convictions have been searched out in the books, essays and articles written by English-Canadian intellectuals who were articulate spokespeople on the need to promote the development of the national culture. These individuals included, amongst others: Vincent Massey, Hilda Neatby, George Grant, Arthur Lower, Harold Innis, Robertson Davies and Northrop Frye. Finally, the study attempts to explain why a certain segment of the Anglo-Canadian cultural elite, despite individual differences, supported the cause of cultural nationalism.

The thesis focuses on the tone and content of the debates surrounding the issue of cultural nationalism, not on the individuals per se. Consequently, it begins with an analysis of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. In many respects, this document best expresses the intellectual content of cultural nationalism. Indeed, the Canadian cultural traditions which the report represented and sought to promote provided the foundation for the defense of the national culture during the 1950s. The subsequent debates on the preservation and promotion of Canadian culture are examined in relation to the Massey Report. The study includes an analysis of two specific aspects of this general debate: the discussions on the possibility of a national philosophy of education and a Canadian idiom in literature. The thesis provides an exhaustive analysis of the work of a number of intellectuals associated with the cause of cultural nationalism in the 1950s. It is selective in approach, however, designed to highlight certain aspects of the philosophical and ideological foundations of cultural nationalism.

For Evelyn, my mother

Acknowledgements

Many people offered both their time and their moral support as I worked to complete this thesis. It is impossible to list them all but I would like to take this opportunity to thank a few.

First on my thank-you list is Jackie McIntyre, my typist, who always managed to smile when I brought in yet another page of corrections. I would also like to express my gratitude to Professor Mark Gabbert who made every effort to keep me honest and to John and Judy Kendle who took the time to read and comment on the early drafts. Thanks also to my advisor A.B. McKillop whose own work inspired this thesis.

A special note of gratitude to Margaret and Jim Macfarlane for always leaving their door open and to Sharon Babaian for taking time away from her own work to listen to me rant about mine. Thanks are also due to those friends who kept me sane by not discussing or reading any of the following chapters.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to my mother whose strength and will to survive have been and remain a constant source of inspiration.

INTRODUCTION

The 1950s has often been characterized as a period of relative quiet between two stormy decades. Around the world, and particularly in North America, this notion has been impressed upon the popular imagination through movies and television programs that take a nostalgic look at the decade. These media have chosen to emphasize the "happy days" of the 1950s, when teen-agers drove hot rods, danced to rock and roll and listened to their parents who always knew best. As always, the nostalgia is deceiving. In international affairs, the 1950s was the decade of the Cold War, "a period in which the Free World and the Communist Bloc glared at one another across Europe and Asia, even managing a small disagreement in Korea."¹ In the United States, Senator McCarthy terrorized the American population with the vision of a "Red menace" in their midst. It was a time in which people were forced to adjust to the possibility of a war of destruction more total than anything imagined before the invention of the Atomic bomb. Moreover, it was the decade in which the consumer society took root and blossomed forth in all its various splendor.

Stuart Ewen, author of The Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of Consumer Culture, has argued that the 1950s was "a period of monumental change when the patterns of conspicuous consumption became 'democratized' on a mass scale."² The creation of new and more sophisticated electronic media, such as television,

increased leisure time, and a constantly expanding system of production that opened new markets at every level of society conspired in the dissemination of a "dominant consumerist ideology."³ In the United States, the new society of the post war world was one that not only produced and distributed goods for mass consumption, but also distributed culture and social values on a mass scale.⁴

Canada, as much as the United States was being affected by "the project of ideological consumerization." A glance at any one of a number of popular magazines reveals the spread of the cultural values of consumer society. Pages of glossy photographs depicting a Donna Reed-like mother standing at the helm of a new washer-dryer unit, full page spreads of Chrysler Imperial's latest edition of the "dream car" attest to the fact that Canadians, like Americans, accepted the dreams and ambitions created for them by the new "Captains of Consciousness."⁵ The preference of Canadians for American television and radio programming that reinforced these values and attitudes also suggests that the general population willingly accepted the standardization of a North American culture.⁶ The idea that a different or distinct culture might be preserved north of the forty-ninth parallel did not seem relevant to the vast majority of Canadians. They appeared, at least on the surface, content to listen to Elvis Presley, to buy American automobiles and to watch "Ed Sullivan" and "The Honeymooners."

Ewen also argued, however, that in the United States

"the decade of the fifties was largely one of containment, a time of social and political petrification."⁷ Nevertheless, it was "within the robotized veneer of the fifties" that the heart of a resistance took form which was eventually expressed in the protest movements of the 1960s.⁸ The emergence of feminism, the civil rights movement, the growth of political activism on American campuses and the rise of the "New Left" were, Ewen maintained, the cultural and political manifestations of resistance to the standardization of culture.⁹ The "cultural apparatus of consumerism," had, in fact, provided "a rich soil for discontent."¹⁰ One might argue that the same was largely true in Canada: the conformism and complacency that characterized the mood of the decade in America was the same north of the border. Resistance, when it was expressed, came in the course of the next decade.

Yet generalizations such as these, while they might be useful, tend to ignore the significance of movements which did not conform to the dominant trends of social behaviour. There was, in fact, a concerted effort to counteract the rise of mass society and mass culture in English Canada during the 1950s. The resistance was not manifested in a broadly based social movement that expressed a radical or revolutionary ideology. It was, however, a significant expression of resistance. In many respects, it constituted a consistent, if rearguard attack on the changes occurring within Canadian society — a defensive response to the perceived threat of the Americanization of the Canadian

way of life. Moreover, it was a movement based in genuine concern for the future of Canadian society, as much as it was one based in the particular class interests of those involved. The heart of the movement took form within the middle class itself, inside the ranks of the intelligentsia.

The intellectuals examined in this thesis were all participants in this resistance. Their shared goal was the defense and preservation of traditions, social values and a conception of culture which they believed were being destroyed in the industrialized, consumer-oriented, modern world. Their common enemy was the United States, a nation that appeared to have completely embraced the social attitudes and cultural values of mass society, and which seemed intent upon spreading these across the American continent. The banner under which they rallied was cultural nationalism. Although the intensity and degree of nationalist sentiments expressed varied from individual to individual and from one intellectual discipline to another, these intellectuals shared a common belief. They agreed that the best form of defense against the commercialization of Canadian culture, was the preservation and promotion of a unique national culture — one grounded in the best traditions and values of Canada and of Western civilization as a whole.

Such attitudes were certainly not unique to the period under examination. As Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond and John English indicate in their survey Canada Since 1945, attempts to offset the impact of American culture had emerged before

1950. As early as the 1930s the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation had sought to develop programming which would "unify the country, displace American programming and improve the cultural and moral condition of the people."¹¹ Moreover, Mary Vipond has demonstrated that cultural nationalism was a vital force amongst the Canadian intelligentsia of the 1920s.¹² Nevertheless, in the light of significant economic and social changes in Canadian life, and given the advent of communications systems which appeared to undermine and indeed, destroy particular cultures by breaking down the barriers of space and time that separated them, the cause of cultural nationalism took on what might be described as a renewed importance.

In his article "The Post Second World War Canadian Society," S.D. Clark has attempted to describe the nature of the economic and social changes occurring in Canada after 1946. What he documents is a gradual transformation of the Canadian class structure, the result of changes wrought during and after World War II. From a nation with a relatively small, largely eastern-based middle class, Canada emerged in the twenty years after the war as a society in which the middle class was expanding and growing. He argues that

The massive shifts of population from the country to the city and from the city to the suburbs, and large scale immigration from Europe and from other overseas countries, increasing United States investment in Canada, the reversal of the trend of Canadians moving to the US to one of Americans moving to Canada, the emergence of new and expanding types of business enterprises such as household finance, construction and house building offering opportunities for rapid economic advancement to elements of the population hitherto under-

privileged, the increased intrusion of women into the labour force, and the enormous expansion of facilities of higher education were developments that did much more than simply reflect a growing state of economic expansion and prosperity. They brought about an enormous broadening of the base of the Canadian middle class.¹³

He goes on to state that for the vast majority of working class and lower middle class people the decade was one of promise. Warnings about foreign control of the economy or culture had little appeal for many Canadians.¹⁴ Yet if we accept his description of the process underway in Canada, it is easy to imagine the potential for dissent amongst the ranks of the eastern-based middle class.¹⁵ We can also add to his list of changes the growing dominance of the social sciences (as the handmaidens of the new technology and social engineers of the new consumer society), the dwindling importance of studies in the humanities and the subsequent loss of public influence and prestige of scholars trained in this area, as well as the diminishing appeal of the offerings of high culture in comparison to the easily accessible and cheaply reproduced offerings of popular culture. With these additions it becomes easier to see why some of the most vocal critics of the transformation were members of the traditional middle class intelligentsia — men and women who had dedicated their lives to the humanities and the arts.

On one level then, the call for the preservation or development of the national culture was a response to the demise of a traditional social order and, with it, the influence of areas of study (philosophy, theology, history

and literature) that had once held a dominant position in Canadian intellectual life. Nevertheless, to argue that cultural nationalism was solely an expression of the self-interest of those who promoted the cause would be a gross oversimplification. It was an expression of the genuine concern of intellectuals who feared for the future of Canada and its people. The intellectuals examined in the course of this study, whether historians, philosophers, literary critics, social critics or novelists, were committed to the promotion of culture in Canada and through this to the preservation of what they believed to be an alternate social order on the North American continent. This social order was one which they believed was founded and which would continue to be built upon the best traditions of the Canadian past.

During the 1950s, cultural nationalism rested upon a system of beliefs and a vision of Canada which despite significant individual differences, were profoundly conservative.¹⁶ Many cultural nationalists sought to preserve tradition — what they perceived to be the wisdom of the beliefs, customs and laws of the past — in the hope that these would promote meaningful intellectual, artistic and social development in Canada. They emphasized the social value of a respect for history and precedent, and the necessity of a sense of duty to both past and future generations. In varying degrees, all of them stressed the primacy of the community over the privileges of the individual, and some focused on the important role that

religion played in cultivating common beliefs, a sense of social duty and a conception of the moral community. Implicit in their views was a distrust of "modernity" insofar as modernity was synonymous with materialism, commercialism and the social and cultural values attached to both doctrines.

For many of these intellectuals the advance of modernity (in its most extreme form) entailed the disintegration of tradition, authority, and a social order wherein human beings were bound together by a sense of duty and moral purpose. Modernity was synonymous with the rise of the mass society, one in which individuals were primarily interested in the promotion of their own material interests and well-being. The mass society embraced the materialist faith in the power of science to guarantee human progress and emphasized that material growth and expansion was the highest expression of man's triumph over his environment. It was a society in which the traditional bonds of religion and social concern were sacrificed to the interests of business and commerce. The function of education in mass society was not to enlighten, edify or free the individual, but to insure social adjustment and to meet the market's insatiable need for specialists. They emphasized that in such a society man lost sight of the pursuit of the good and instead concentrated on achieving "the good life." Unaware of their loss of freedom, devoid of any sense of purpose or duty in relation to the community, individuals were reduced to members of a "Lonely

Crowd,"¹⁷ alienated from themselves and their fellows. Atomic bombs might drop, Senator McCarthy might conduct witch hunts, but the mass society ignored and endured. Pointing to the United States to illustrate the negative effects of these modern trends, Canadian intellectuals warned of the dangers of American cultural domination.

It is therefore easy to see why these intellectuals turned their attention to the development of culture and why they conceived of national independence primarily in cultural terms. Culture, in the sense that they utilized the word, entailed the training of the moral, intellectual and aesthetic sensibilities of Canadians. In order that an alternate social order be preserved in Canada, the promotion of culture in the traditional sense was seen to be an absolute necessity. In The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, and again in the work of Hilda Neatby, Arthur Lower, Harold Innis, B.K. Sandwell, Robertson Davies, Northrop Frye and others, the development of the spirit and mind was seen as the country's best route to a meaningful national independence. Furthermore, they argued that in order to combat the rise of the mass society and to insure that Canada took its place amongst other civilized nations of the Future World, Canadian culture had to develop in accordance with the established precedents and the historical experience of the nation, and had to be grounded in the best traditions of Western Civilization.

Many of these intellectuals were optimistic that a more humane, indeed more moral, social order might be preserved in

Canada. In references to the Canadian past they emphasized that the nation had been deeply influenced by the Loyalist and French Canadian traditions. Both had nurtured a political order that displayed a healthy respect for history, order and authority and a deep distrust of any political solution that involved a radical break with the past. The colonial experience was also alluded to as a central fact of Canadian life and was frequently seen to have been responsible for the stable evolution of Canada's independence. It had also nurtured the nation's attachment to the political, social and cultural traditions of the old world. Moreover, they repeatedly pointed out that Canada had been the product of rational argument and compromise, not revolution. As a result, they argued that Canadians had never cut themselves off from European, and in particular British, traditions to the extent that the revolutionary culture of the United States had done. They therefore maintained that the nation's political culture was established upon a conservative vision of society. The Canadian political order cherished freedom and promoted progress, but also maintained that moral and ethical considerations and the well-being of society as a whole was of central importance. Furthermore, they indicated that the Canadian definition of liberty, equality and fraternity was markedly different from the American conception.

The nation's political history was not the only area rifled for evidence to support their descriptions of the Canadian character and way of life. Social history and, in

particular, the social reality of two cultures, were also utilized to demonstrate another important feature of the national identity. In seeking to balance and meet the needs of French and English Canadians, they maintained that Canada had learned the value of compromise. Over the years the talent had grown to the point where Canadians had become the masters of the modus vivendi in every area of national life: political, social and economic. The continued existence of two cultures had also produced a pluralist society in Canada, one which allowed for the peaceful co-existence of many regions and ethnic groups within the parameters of one nation. The American social ideal of the "melting pot" had been abandoned in Canada and this had had far reaching implications for the Canadian political and social order. Moreover, many of these intellectuals sought in the Canadian landscape the source of the characteristic strengths of the Canadian people. Many implied that a harsh environment and climate had helped to mould the Canadian character, it had taught Canadians humility, modesty and tolerance.

In examinations of Canadian education, literature and culture in general these intellectuals drew upon all or one of these arguments to illustrate the Canadian difference. They sought to demonstrate that Canada need not embrace the political, social and cultural values of mass society. They believed that a unique Canadian culture, might be preserved and promoted. It had only to develop in accordance with the historical precedents and traditions of the nation, ones that were not only different

from the American but, also morally superior. Nevertheless, in the new era of interdependency, in the universe of "the global village," these intellectuals felt compelled to emphasize the universality of the cultural values and traditions to be promoted in Canada. Not wanting to appear chauvinistic or ethnocentric, they implied that it was the Canadian translation of the best traditions of Western civilization that were to be preserved. Canada was part of the world, yet unique within that world; and one could not be sacrificed for the other. Just as plurality was the strength of the nation's social and political order, diversity and not homogeneity or standardization was the strength of the universal world of culture and the international order.

Carl Berger has argued that the constituent elements of the nationalist tradition examined in his book, The Sense of Power, "survived long after the cause with which they had been allied lost its relevance."¹⁸ The preceding survey of the ideas and beliefs of Canadian intellectuals of the 1950s demonstrates the extent to which his assessment is accurate. Despite some significant individual differences, their conception of Canada was rooted in the assumptions of nationalists of an earlier era, who had sought to promote Canadian autonomy within the context of the British Empire. Moreover, while the formal political structure of imperial federation had been abandoned three decades earlier, many English-Canadian intellectuals of the 1950s argued that continued association with Great Britain (and thus association with the enduring cultural tradition of the West) was of the utmost importance. Although they

recognized that Britain's position as a world power had been radically undermined by events during and after World War II, many contended that the symbolic cultural connections between Canada and Great Britain had to be preserved to counteract American cultural domination. In so doing they did not imply that Canadian culture should remain derivative or colonially subservient to British cultural trends. They merely sought to emphasize that continued connection with the cultural traditions of the West, and in particular those of Great Britain, provided an important bulwark against the Americanization of culture in Canada.

The links between the cultural nationalists examined in this thesis and the Imperial Federationists examined in Berger's book were more than ideological and philosophical. Vincent Massey had himself, for example, been a member of the "Round Table Movement."¹⁹ The Canadian philosopher George Grant was the grandson of George Parkin and G.M. Grant, both of whom had been active in the movement for imperial federation.²⁰ Robertson Davies and Arthur Lower had both been educated at Upper Canada College and Queen's University, and these institutions had had long associations with men who had promoted Canadian nationalism and imperial union.²¹ Although educated in Western Canada, Hilda Neatby came from British stock, had served on the Massey Commission under Vincent Massey and had many connections with Ontario's cultural elite.²² The same was true of B.K. Sandwell, an individual who had long been associated with promoting Canadian culture.²³

Lorne Pierce, Desmond Pacey and Northrop Frye, to name only a few of the literary critics examined in this thesis, were all members of Ontario's intellectual establishment and were dedicated to the promotion of Canadian literature.²⁴

Nevertheless, even if these associations by birth, education and profession had not existed, it would have been easy enough to demonstrate that the intellectual links were not accidental, that they formulated the ties that bound a nationalist tradition that spanned many decades. An analysis of the Massey Report, the document which in many respects laid the foundation for the cultural nationalism of the 1950s will demonstrate the continued existence of that tradition. Furthermore, it will demonstrate how, in the face of a new threat to Canadian society and the Canadian way of life, the traditional intelligentsia of eastern Canada reformulated and expanded upon the arguments of an earlier generation to combat that threat.

Notes

Introduction:

1. J.M. Bumsted, "Canada and American Culture in the 1950s," Bulletin of Canadian Studies, IV, 1 (April 1980), p. 56.
2. Stuart Ewen, The Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of Consumer Culture, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976), p. 206.
3. Ibid., p. 206-214.
4. Ibid., p. 206.
5. For examples see any one of a number of Canadian periodicals published during the decade. In particular see: Maclean's and Saturday Night.
6. Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond and John English, Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics and Provincialism, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), p. 174.
7. Ewen, The Captains of Consciousness, p. 215.
8. Ibid., p. 218.
9. Ibid., pp. 216-218.
10. Ibid., p. 215.
11. Bothwell, Drummond and English, Canada Since 1945, p. 110.
12. Mary Vipond, "National Consciousness in English Speaking Canada in the 1920s: Seven Studies." An unpublished Doctoral Thesis completed at the University of Toronto, 1974.
13. S.D. Clark, "The post Second World War Canadian Society," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 12 (1975), p. 29.
14. Ibid., p. 29.
15. For an analysis of economic nationalism amongst the eastern-based middle class see:
Phillip Resnick, The Land of Cain: Class and Nationalism in Canada, 1945-1975, (Vancouver: New Star Books, 1977), Chapter 3.
16. These conservative views were not, however, given consistent expression in the political arena. Arthur Lower, for example, was a staunch supporter of the Liberal Party. George Grant supported the Progressive Conservatives, but later formed an association with the New Democratic Party.

17. This term is borrowed from a well-known study published in the 1950s. See:

David Reisman, The Lonely Crowd, (Chicago, 1950).

18. Carl Berger, A Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism 1867-1914, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), p. 265.

19. Ibid., p. 40.

20. Ibid., p. 40.

21. The Oxford Companion to Canadian History and Literature, ed. N. Story, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 202, 470-471.

22. The Canadian Who's Who, II, (Toronto: Canada Press, 1954), p. 794.

23. The Oxford Companion, p. 745.

24. The Oxford Companion, pp. 300, 620-621, 637-638.

CHAPTER I

Things of the Spirit and Mind

In 1951, after two years of public hearings and research, The Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences was published. This document, which came to be known simply as "The Massey Report," was much more than an exhaustive list of cultural agencies or a study of the state of post-war Canadian culture. It constituted both a defensive response to the perceived threat of cultural assimilation by the United States and a positive, if largely symbolic, assertion of Canada's national autonomy. Indeed, many contemporary journalists, academics and artists welcomed it as the long-awaited manifesto on the strategy for Canadian cultural survival.¹ As Bernard Ostry has pointed out, their enthusiasm was at least partially justified, as the report did lay "the cornerstone for much that followed in the development of Canadian cultural policy and institutions."²

Nevertheless, as important as the commission's recommendations were, they are not the central focus for this study. This is to be an examination of English-Canadian cultural nationalism in the 1950s, not an analysis of Canadian cultural policy. Consequently, after a brief examination of events leading up to the appointment of the Royal Commission, it is the cultural values and traditions which the commissioners proposals were designed to preserve

that will be examined. For it is the Canadian cultural tradition which the report represented and sought to protect, which provided the basis for Anglo-Canadian cultural nationalism in the decade of the fifties.

I

As early as 1945 at least one liberal cabinet minister and three upper level civil servants in Canada began to advocate the need for a government inquiry into the development of the arts, letters and sciences.³ These men, aware of the growing discontent within the artistic and academic communities, urged the government of Mackenzie King to investigate the possibility of developing a federal cultural policy.⁴ Their concern was precipitated in part by the Artists' March on Ottawa and the subsequent presentation of the Turgeon Committee Brief.⁵ In each case, however, it is likely that personal and professional experience had generated an interest in Canadian culture.

Vincent Massey and Lester Pearson, both members of the Department of External Affairs, would necessarily have been concerned with the kind of image which Canada projected abroad and as a result, when the issue arose, expressed interest in the development of the nation's cultural resources at home.⁶ Brooke Claxton, who in 1947 took over the portfolio of National Defence, and Jack Pickersgill, Special Assistant to the Prime Minister in 1945, had also expressed concern over the development of the country's cultural

resources.⁷ Pickersgill, a one-time professor of History at United College in Winnipeg, had first hand knowledge of the problems of higher education in Canada. (The complete absence of a national library was only one such problem). Nevertheless most of these men were probably more immediately concerned with the financial crisis being experienced on the campuses of Canadian universities.⁸ All of these factors, combined with the fears of journalists, artists and intellectuals over the growing dominance of American mass culture, resulted in the appointment of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences in 1949.⁹

In his study of Canadian policy on cultural affairs Bernard Ostry describes the total membership of the Commission as "representative of traditional culture."¹⁰ The phrase is apt in more ways than one. If we take it to mean that the commissioners represented the cultural, political and economic establishment of Canada then it is an accurate description. If we take it to denote individuals who represented an enduring English-Canadian cultural heritage then it is equally correct. Vincent Massey, a member of the Toronto Establishment, a businessman and a professional civil servant in the Department of External Affairs, had served as Canada's High Commissioner in London from 1936 to 1946, and in 1949 was appointed chairman of the Royal Commission.¹¹ The other commissioners included Hilda Neatby, a historian and later author of So Little For the Mind, an indictment of "progressive education;"¹² Arthur Surveyor, an engineer and

consultant by profession, and a member of the National Research Council and the Royal Commissions on the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Strait of Canso;¹³ N.A.M. MacKenzie, President of the University of British Columbia, a specialist in International Law, advisor for the Committee on University Training for Veterans and a Fellow of the Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufacturing and Commerce;¹⁴ and, finally, Father Georges Henri Levesque, critic of the Duplessis government, and the founder and Dean of the School of Social Sciences at Laval University.¹⁵ It is perhaps significant that the only sectors of Canadian society whose interests were not directly represented on the commission were the working class and the artistic community. All other classes and regions of the nation were represented.

Vincent Massey has been given credit for the actual writing of the report and it has been described as his "best literary monument."¹⁶ Certainly it must have required a monumental effort for the commissioners to synthesize 462 independent briefs and the testimony of 1200 witnesses, as well as to integrate data compiled by four advisory committees and a variety of experts commissioned to write special reports.¹⁷ The official document was written in two parts: Part One included a general survey, appraisal and forecast for the future of the arts, letters and sciences in Canada, while Part Two included specific policy recommendations. It is the tone and content of Part One, however, which provides the greatest insight into the cultural values and

traditions the commissioners believed Canada should uphold and protect. Ultimately, these were the values and traditions which provided the basis for the cultural nationalism of a certain segment of the English-Canadian intellectual community throughout the fifties. This cultural pattern was essentially British Canadian and elitist in its orientation. Moreover, it was dominated by a strong anti-American sentiment, rooted in a certain set of assumptions about the nature of the social values of the United States and the ways in which they differed from those in Canada.

II

However lavish the praise given to the United States for its generosity and support, Canada's dependence on private American funds for cultural development was seen by the commissioners as a real danger.¹⁸ Moreover, the "whole-sale importation" of American institutions, social theories and cultural values was seen as a direct threat to the development of indigenous cultural patterns.¹⁹ Indeed, things American were characterized as "alien" to Canada and their educational policies were described as not in keeping "with our own way of life;" a point of view elaborated and analyzed by Hilda Neatby in her study of Canadian education.²⁰ Whereas Quebec was protected by a language barrier, the report warned that English-Canada was in danger of being culturally assimilated into American society.²¹ Millions were being spent to maintain a national political independence which

"would be nothing but an empty shell without a vigorous and distinctive cultural life."²² It urged, therefore, that English-speaking Canadians resist absorption into the cultural patterns of the United States and "not be blind...to the very present danger of permanent dependence."²³

Defending Canadian independence in the face of an "American threat" was clearly not a new phenomenon. As the commissioners pointed out, Canada's unique position on the continent had always made her vulnerable to American influence and, one might add, domination. What was different, and what worried a certain segment of the Canadian population after World War II, were the social implications and the form of this new threat. By 1950 the impact of industrialization, urbanization and technological expansion, particularly in the area of mass media communication, placed whatever distinctive national character or culture that existed in Canada in danger of being totally and finally overwhelmed.

In The Writing of Canadian History, Carl Berger is at least partially correct when he points out that the anti-American sentiments of the Massey Report reflected a general anxiety "on the part of an intellectual elite over the pervasiveness of American mass culture."²⁴ The commissioners began their study of "Radio Broadcasting" by commending the federal government for acting upon the concerns of those Canadians who realized as early as the 1920s "that cultural annexation would follow our absorption in the American radio system just as surely as economic and even political annexation would have

followed absorption into the American railway system."²⁵ What was of present concern to the commissioners, however, was the fact that this national system, designed to "maintain a Canadian character" and "contribute to a sense of Canadian unity" was having only "tolerable success in combatting commercialization and excessive Americanization of Canadian programmes."²⁶

The concerns of the commissioners reflected those expressed by the members of numerous organizations from the Canadian Congress of Labour to the Canadian Authors' Association and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. These people urged that standards of artistic excellence on radio be maintained and that a distinctive Canadian character be preserved. In contrasting Canadian and American broadcasting many argued that programming should not continue to be subordinated to the needs of advertising to the excessive degree evident in the United States.²⁷ They expressed particular concern over the use of advertising on television, which in their opinion "[intensified] the methods of appeal to material instincts of various kinds...."²⁸ The report also pointed out that numerous national organizations believed that the CBC should exercise its jurisdiction to prevent private stations from catering to the lowest common denominator of taste within society.²⁹ Furthermore, they urged that programming on both radio and television, which sought only to titillate and not to enlighten or edify, should be curtailed.³⁰ Finally, in a specific reference to

television programming, they argued that "Recalling the two chief objectives of our national system of broadcasting, national unity and understanding, and education in the broad sense, we do not think that American programmes, with notable exceptions, will serve our national needs."³¹

Clearly, one of the chief concerns of the commissioners was to prevent American mass culture from totally overwhelming the national character or culture of Canada. If the concerns of the report as a whole are any indication, however, it is not simply an elitist preoccupation with the cultivation of "good taste" and "good manners" amongst the "swinish multitude" which motivated the commissioners.³² Their primary concern was the corroding effect of the social values which were being imported along with the cultural commodities produced in the United States, and the manner in which they undermined the Canadian way of life. Indeed, after reading the report one is left with the impression that it was not only the social values of the USSR which were coming under cold war scrutiny, as some authors have argued, but that the values most commonly identified with American society were also being questioned.³³ The underlying assumptions of the report seem to be that the traditional cultural and social values of Canada were somehow fundamentally different, and in some respects superior, to those of the United States, and so worth the time and effort to protect from the onslaught of American mass culture.³⁴ What, then were Canada's "national needs" -- the cultural values and way of life which

the commissioners sought to protect from "absorption into the general cultural patterns of the United States."?³⁵

The commissioners described at considerable length the values which they believed had guided and should continue to guide the community north of the forty-ninth parallel. They stressed the importance of the spiritual and intellectual dimension of human life and the dangers of subordinating these to the acquisition and consumption of material wealth.³⁶ Unlike nineteenth and twentieth century laissez-faire liberals, they did not believe that material growth or progress, in and of itself, would guarantee the development of moral man. In fact, one of the most quoted studies in the document—the article on philosophy prepared by George Grant—repeatedly warned of the price that would be paid by a society where "the rational contemplation of the good was exchanged for the triumphant contemplation of material progress."³⁷

The report emphasized the need to develop a social vision in Canada which viewed knowledge as the root of understanding and not only as the guarantor of power.³⁸ It implied, furthermore, that the quality of human existence was dependent upon more profound considerations than the pursuit of happiness and the acquisition of property. The social vision which emerged from the report appears to have been based upon a rejection of an eighteenth century faith in material growth and expansion as the route to social progress; values which were associated with the "alien" traditions of the United States.³⁹ Perhaps not surprisingly,

the commissioners began to hint at the failings of those very social values which American critics were beginning to expose. The American historian Richard Hofstadter had already launched his attack on The American Political Tradition in 1948, by stating that America, far from being a democracy of fraternity, was nothing but a democracy of cupidity.⁴⁰ The inability of American society to cultivate a broad moral vision, which Hofstadter noted, continued to come under attack by other opponents of so called "irrational Lockeanism."⁴¹ But whereas certain American social critics mourned the fact that America's past provided few answers to her modern dilemma, the authors of the Massey Commission seemed to be arguing just the opposite.⁴²

While admitting that the bonds of tradition in a new country like Canada were weak, they repeatedly emphasized that those which did exist could be strengthened and protected.⁴³ The Anglo-Canadian past, entwined with that of French Canada and based on the Loyalist tradition, appeared to provide the natural historical foundations for an alternate social vision.⁴⁴ In rejecting the American experiment the loyalists had brought to Canada traditions which were distinctly different from those of the United States. The report also seemed to imply that Canadians, as members of the Commonwealth and as subjects of the Queen, had more in common with the traditions of Great Britain than with those of the USA.⁴⁵ Finally, the commissioners emphasized that the Canadian way of life was one which they believed, rightly or wrongly, to be based upon the sound values and the basic good taste of ordinary citizens

who had been raised in a "smalltown Canada" which had all but disappeared.

These views corresponded to the central tenets of Canadian nationalists who had promoted the concept of Imperial Federation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁴⁶ Not surprisingly, Vincent Massey, the chairman of the commission, who had himself been a member of the Round Table Movement and Canada's High Commissioner to Great Britain, was promoting a vision of Canada consistent with his own political and intellectual background.⁴⁷ The emphasis on the loyalist tradition, Canada's place in the Commonwealth, and the implicit, but not lavish praise of British cultural traditions, demonstrated the extent to which the Massey Report was representative of a long-standing nationalist tradition in Canada. While the formal political concept of imperial federation had disappeared, it was evident that in the 1950s some of the central ideas and assumptions associated with the cause lived on. Nevertheless, it was in the report's celebration of the rural or agrarian ideal in Canadian life that the associations between the cultural nationalism of the Massey Report and that of an earlier generation were most eloquently expressed.

Four pages of the report are dedicated to a description of this "simple life" as it was—or at least as the commissioners imagined it had been—before the invasion of Mass Media. In it one feels the resentment and distrust of traditionalists confronted with yet another technological innovation of liberal industrial society, whose destructive potential had not yet

been adequately assessed.⁴⁸ Like many conservatives before them, they warned of the dangers of unbridled technological expansion and the rapid social change which followed it—change which was not necessarily for the better and was usually irrevocable. They took great pains to document the process whereby a way of life in which "communication was on a voluntary and personal basis" was gradually being destroyed and replaced by one which was "automatic easy and impersonal."⁴⁹ Above all they appeared to mourn the fact that "Culture, too, came to lean heavily on the machine."⁵⁰ Just as conservatives like Wordsworth had once condemned the factory system and its effect on the rural based family economy of Britain in the early nineteenth century,⁵¹ the authors of the Massey Commission mourned the automation of culture and its impact upon what they believed to be the rich cultural traditions and the tranquil way of life of rural Canada. In their opinion, the spread of mass culture entailed the demise of traditional values, and this meant that "Nowadays, opera has a rival in "soap opera," and perhaps a "pin-up girl" grins from the exact place on the wall where used to hang the portrait of a shy young woman of twenty, of whom they used to say: "Qui est-ce? Mais vous-savez bien que c'est le portrait de grand'mere."⁵²

This section of the report offers the best and the worst of tory paternalism, Canadian style. There is little doubt that this is a sentimentalized and idealized portrait of life in a Canadian small town at the turn of the century.

It is simply not true, as they seem to indicate, that everyone had the opportunity or the encouragement (personal or social) to visit the local library to pick up a copy of Jane Eyre. There is clearly a tendency on the part of the committee to universalize its own class experience, and to ignore the socio-economic and political realities of Canadian society in the first half of the twentieth century.⁵³ Nevertheless, it would be unfair to characterize this expression of concern as the prattling of wild-eyed reactionaries pushing back against the inevitable process of "modernization"—a term which tends to obscure more than it explains.⁵⁴ Furthermore, it would be wrong to denigrate the sentiments expressed here as merely nostalgic, or supercilious and patronizing. As the British historian E.P. Thompson has pointed out in his major study, The Making of the English Working Class, "The mistake today, is to assume that paternalistic feeling must be detached and condescending. It can be passionate and engaged."⁵⁵ Such was certainly the case for the members of the Massey Commission, as they witnessed the changes being effected in Canadian society.

Regardless of the balanced tone of the report, the commissioners noted the dissolution of traditional bonds and the rise of the mass society, not only with nostalgia but also with considerable alarm. The social vision outlined throughout the report was one which they believed to be rooted in "The Canadian Past;" it was therefore imperative that its essence be preserved. They were not disinterested observers of Canadian society but engaged advocates of a social vision.

It was a profoundly conservative view of society, one still strongly rooted in the British traditions of the Canadian past and a philosophical tradition which viewed the mind and spiritual values as fundamental to life as a whole.

This can be seen in the manner in which the commission defined its task and identified its real concern "with what might be called in a broad sense spiritual resources, which are less tangible than physical resources but whose importance needs no emphasis."⁵⁶ They maintained that these were the resources which had sustained and united the Canadian people through difficult times in the past and would guarantee the nation's survival in the future. The report asserted that the intangible resources, not the material ones, gave a nation "...not only its essential character but its vitality as well."⁵⁷ These intangibles—the things of the spirit and of the mind—formed the basis of the cultural traditions and conventional wisdom which bound diverse regional, ethnic or religious communities together into one nation.⁵⁸

The quotation from St. Augustine's The City of God, chosen by the commissioners to introduce their study and the nature of their task, defined the nation as "an association of reasonable beings united in a peaceful sharing of the things they cherish."⁵⁹ It went on to state that in order to determine the quality of the nation, one must examine what these things were. While the word "nation" is used here to denote something entirely different from the 19th and 20th century meaning of the word, the sentiment expressed in the epigram clearly suited the purposes of the members of the

Massey Commission. In their opinion, the nation was much more than the sum of its parts joined together by material self-interest as active partners in a social contract. The roots of unity and the guarantors of national survival were not solely to be found in material ties or physical bonds.⁶⁰ Unity was not to be achieved through enlightened self-interest, nor was it insured by the imposed homogeneity of a social "melting pot." True unity, in the words of the commissioners belonged "to the realm of ideas."⁶¹ It was "a matter for men's minds and hearts;"⁶² and they stated that "Canadians [realized] this and [were] conscious of the importance of a tradition in the making."⁶³

Unity was therefore established on the foundations of commonly held beliefs, values and shared traditions. Provincial, ethnic, or religious diversity was seen by the commissioners, not as antithetical to national unity, but in the Actonian sense, as a security for national freedom and as a healthy resistance to the modern peril of standardization.⁶⁴ They took for granted that whatever the separate economic or regional interests of individuals or "groups," a common cultivation of the things of the mind and spirit would produce a sense of community and a true "Canadianism."⁶⁵

It becomes more and more apparent as one reads the report that one of the major preoccupations of the commissioners, like that of many of their intellectual forbears in Canada, was to preserve the moral foundations of Canadian life. In a world where social change and technological growth

proceeded at an unprecedented rate, where science had apparently been pronounced the absolute ruler if not redeemer of the industrialized world, these intellectuals affirmed the need for a broad moral vision.⁶⁶ This is suggested in their concern with the development of "the spiritual strength of the nation" and their reaffirmation of those bonds of tradition and conventional wisdom which in some manner preserved the individual's relationship to the larger community.⁶⁷ For the commissioners, and for many intellectuals in Canada, however, this moral vision was not to be fostered at the expense of the intellectual freedom of the scholar, the scientist or the artist; nor could a broad ethical perception of human existence be sacrificed for mere efficiency, material gain or mechanical progress.⁶⁸

By the decade of the fifties the notion of critical inquiry founded on the idea of intellectual or artistic freedom had, at least in theory, been accepted. Nevertheless, the commissioners indicated that while critical inquiry could no longer be dominated by the dictates of moral authority, the moral implications of an act or a scientific investigation had still to be considered.⁶⁹ It was even more evident, perhaps, in the wake of the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, that intellectual inquiry had to be directed by more than material interests, the needs of the market or "the invisible hand," otherwise humanity was in danger of annihilating itself.⁷⁰ In a section of the report which in some respects anticipated the concerns expressed in the Snow-Leavis debates on the idea

of "Two Cultures,"⁷¹ the report not only explored the relationship between the humanities, the social sciences and the natural sciences but also the social responsibilities or duties of each.

Once again the commissioners warned that material interests and a dangerous preoccupation with the practical application of scientific knowledge for immediate tangible results had bred a lack of concern for the quality of human existence. This was clearly demonstrated, they argued, in the lack of funds available for studies in the humanities, that field whose task was "the exegesis and the preservation of all the elements which make of a man a civilized being."⁷² This tendency was also demonstrated in the opinions of social scientists who themselves warned of the impact of limited funds on the quality of research⁷³ and the dangers to society of men engrossed with "practical experimentalism," who had no means of assessing the social implications of their data.⁷⁴ Over and over again the report stressed the need for the restraining hand of the contemplative and critical traditions of philosophy on the social and the natural scientist and on "the man of action," presumably politicians, professionals and businessmen.⁷⁵

Behind the report's statements on the social value of philosophy stood the categorical views of George Grant. His article on "Philosophy" strongly advocated that belief in God, and more specifically a belief in the theological and human virtues promoted within the Christian tradition, should

be the starting point for philosophy and the basis upon which the philosopher assumed his social role as arbiter of the moral imperative.⁷⁶ These were the only elements which, in Grant's opinion, could save Canada as an independent nation, with a distinct spiritual tradition, from accepting the cultural values of "mass societies" of the more powerful Western States.⁷⁷ Without the aid of philosophy and of the great Classical and Christian traditions of the West the nation might well succumb to the nightmare of mass society, made from the stuff of eighteenth century dreams of unlimited human growth and progress, guided by omnipotent "Science." Grant did not advocate that investigation arbitrarily be limited by authority or that philosophy set up the new Indexes of modern society. He did, however, stress the value of a spiritual tradition which might act as a tempering influence on "reckless men of action" and as a balance to those who advocated rapid unchecked material and technological expansion.⁷⁸

Finally, the question of freedom of inquiry and expression was explored in the issue of state support. The commissioners repeatedly emphasized that in advocating state support they were not arguing for state censorship or control of the arts, letters and sciences.⁷⁹ Their main intention was to create an environment which would facilitate and not restrict the freedom of artist, scientist or scholar to investigate and create.⁸⁰ They also made it amply clear that they had no desire to usurp the powers of the provinces in the field of education in their attempt to formulate a

national policy for cultural affairs.⁸¹ They argued that if all civilizations strive towards the common good—not only the material but the intellectual and moral good of its citizens—then the Federal Government of Canada had a role to play in helping to realize that "Good." Indeed, they pointed out that, in their opinion,

If the Federal Government is to renounce its right to associate itself with other social groups, public and private, in the general education of the Canadian citizen, it denies its intellectual and moral purpose, the complete conception of the good is lost, and Canada, as such, becomes a materialistic society."⁸²

If nothing else, such noble words would have served to silence the accusations being levelled at the Federal Commission by Premier Maurice Duplessis.⁸³ More importantly, however, they served to underline the commissioners' preoccupation with the development of a moral vision and a sense of community, which would inform not only the private lives of men but the public actions of the government of Canada. Clearly, the moral imperative which seems to inform the authors of the Massey Report is representative of that which A.B. McKillop argues has threaded its way through the fabric of Anglo-Canadian thought from the Conquest.⁸⁴

Just as their intellectual forbears in Canada had felt the need to preserve the moral authority of the Church in the face of massive challenge posed by Darwin's theories and the empirical sciences, while at the same time promoting critical inquiry or "the pursuit of knowledge," so the Massey Commissioners sought to resolve the tension "between

intellectual inquiry and conventional wisdom, between individual autonomy and the social good, between the myth of freedom and the myth of concern."⁸⁵ In a social environment which presented the same sense of dissolution—in a world which had witnessed the death camps and the atomic bomb, where material consumption was becoming the yardstick by which to measure the quality of life, where absolutes had given way to relativism and mankind seemed perpetually poised on the brink of self-annihilation—Canadian intellectuals sought to restore a moral or spiritual vision to a decidedly secular society. In many respects this moral vision provided the cornerstone in the foundation of cultural nationalism in the decade of the fifties.

These, then, were the cultural values and social vision of the nation which the Commissioners, and many of those who contributed to the report, sought to preserve and promote. It should be self-evident that their views were not limited to a specific space and time—that is, to Canada in 1951. As E.P. Thompson has pointed out, similar traditional values were reasserted by numerous Western intellectuals as a result of the profound disillusionment which came in response to the realities of World War II and the Cold War.⁸⁶ In many instances this had involved an explicit rejection of revolutionary or even reformist ideologies and marked a retreat into conservatism and Christian/idealist metaphysics. This reaction, Thompson argues, produced a breed of pessimistic, cynical and passive intellectuals who rationalized their

inactivity by pointing out that "...if evil is a necessary part of the human condition, there is not much point in bursting one's moral boiler about it."⁸⁷ As a result, many intellectuals closed the doors of their study and retired from the world asserting that they had "no greater duty to society than that of restraining themselves."⁸⁸

One might argue however, that at its best this attempt to re-articulate traditional values for a twentieth century world was accompanied by an active sense of duty and a passionate commitment to society. While the philosophical and ideological beliefs expressed in the Massey Report are both conservative and idealist in the most profound sense, they carry with them no sense of resignation or abdication of social responsibility. In fact there is a real notion that the Good can and should be promoted, and that society can be changed, or that, at least, what is good can be preserved.

The fact is, however, that regardless of the measure of commitment or feeling of shared responsibility expressed in the report, the practical applicability of this lament for Canadian culture was severely limited. It was limited by an unrealistic assessment of the nature of culture, and of its role in providing a national vision which would preserve the status quo, while altering the less appealing materialistic side of modern society. This was accompanied by the equally questionable assertion that a handful of artists and intellectuals who were, by their own definition,

over, above and separate from the greater part of society, could inform and direct that society. In addition to this, their concern over the philistinism of American commercialism and private enterprise in general and the inability of the free market system to support the arts recedes beside their resigned acceptance of the fundamental validity of its operation. Finally, their arguments attest to their inability to see the relationship between economics and cultural expression and illustrates the real limitations of their desire for social change. One cannot help but question the purpose of such a report during a period when the more pressing problems of the country, given the prediction of a post-war recession, were more economic than cultural.

The men and women who worked between 1949 and 1951 to produce the Massey Report were not, as we will see, alone in their concerns. The response to the Massey Report in contemporary journals and magazines indicates support not only for the proposals put forward by the commission but also for the philosophical or ideological assumptions upon which these recommendations were based. It was painfully obvious that a nation the size of Canada had embarrassingly few facilities for the cultivation and preservation of its culture. Not so obvious, and more difficult to determine, were those things which could and would distinguish the Canadian way of life, from that of other Western nations, in particular the United States. A number of Canadian journalists and scholars addressed this problem, and in their quest to define the

Canadian community—its past failures and future potential—
they themselves came to constitute what might be described
as a community of common concern.

Notes

Chapter 1

Introduction:

1. Articles which praised the Massey Report included, amongst many others:

B.K. Sandwell, "The Council for Culture," Saturday Night, 66 (June 12, 1951), p. 7.

"A Crew Cut View of the Massey Report," MacLean's Magazine, 64 (July 15, 1951), p. 2.

"The Massey Report," The Canadian Forum, 31 (July, 1951), p. 74.

"The Massey Report," Food for Thought, 12 (Oct., 1951), pp. 1-8.

There were also favorable assessments given by the presidents of the Canadian Historical Association and The Royal Society of Canada. See:

Abbe Arthur Maheux, "A Dilemma for Our Culture," C.H.A. Reps., (June 10 and 11, 1949-51).

Jean Bruchesi, "Culture in Canada," The Royal Society of Canada: Proceedings and Transactions, (1951).

2. Bernard Ostry, The Cultural Connection, (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart Ltd., 1978), p. 56.

Part I

3. Ostry, The Cultural Connection, pp. 54-55.

4. Ibid., pp. 54-55.

5. Ibid., p. 56.

6. Ibid., p. 58.

7. Donald Creighton, The Forked Road: Canada, 1939-1957, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976), pp. 180-181.

8. Ibid., pp. 180, 181, 184.

See also:

Ostry, The Cultural Connection, p. 59.

There are numerous references to the financial problems of Canadian Universities in the periodical press at this time.

9. Carl Berger, The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing: 1900 to 1970, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976), p. 180.

See also:

Ramsey Cook, The Maple Leaf Forever: Essays on Nationalism and Politics in Canada, (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1977), p. 203.

10. Ostry, The Cultural Connection, p. 61.
11. The MacMillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography, ed., W.S. Wallace (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1978).
12. The Canadian Who's Who, II (Toronto: Canada Press, 1954), p. 794.
13. Who's Who in Canada, ed., B.M. Greene (Toronto: International Press, 1953-54), p. 239.
14. Ibid., p. 977.
15. Ostry, The Cultural Connection, p. 60.

See also:

The MacMillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography.

16. The MacMillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography.
17. The Report of The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951), p. 8.

Part II

18. The Report of The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, pp. 16-17.
19. Ibid., pp. 13-18.
20. Ibid., p. 15.
21. Ibid., p. 16.
22. Ibid., p. 18.
23. Ibid., p. 18.
24. Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, pp. 179-180.
25. The Report of The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, p. 24.
26. Ibid., pp. 28, 29.

Precisely what the commissioners meant by Americanization is somewhat obscure. One gets the impression that it could be used to denote any society which had been transformed by mass production, consumption, commercialism and which had embraced purely materialistic values.

27. Ibid., pp. 28, 34.
28. Ibid., p. 47.
29. Ibid., pp. 28-29, 34-36.
30. Ibid., pp. 35, 39.
31. Ibid., p. 47.
32. Ibid., pp. 15-16.

They also urged that Canadian educators, academics and intellectuals be more selective in their use of the fruits of American "high culture" by taking into consideration their suitability in a Canadian context.

33. Ostry, The Cultural Connection, p. 63.
34. The Report of The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, p. 166.

See also:

George Grant, "Philosophy."

Royal Commission Studies Selected from the Special Studies Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951), pp. 119-135.

It is ironic to note that while the intelligentsia in English-Canada was busy rejecting American cultural and social values, the finance and business sectors were welcoming American dollars into Canada at a rate never before witnessed. Perhaps, as both Phillip Resnick and Bernard Ostry have pointed out the issue of culture was politically less dangerous and less costly than economics. It is certainly true that while continental economic integration, NATO and NORAD were becoming realities, no one in 1951, perhaps with the exception of Harold Innis, was yet prepared to link domination in the area of economics or national defense to the threat of cultural assimilation. By 1954, however, individuals such as Donald Creighton were making tentative connections between American dominance in foreign affairs with the role which the American mass media played in generating continental acceptance of that dominant role. It would take six years before the first murmurs of economic nationalism would be heard via the Gordon Report and almost two decades before

Canadian intellectuals would begin to analyze American domination in terms of a pervasive cultural, political and economic network.

35. Ibid., p. 41.
36. Ibid., p. 273.
37. Ibid., p. 161.
38. Ibid., p. 161.
39. Ibid., pp. 18, 272-73.
40. Richard Hofstadter, The American Political Tradition, (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), p. XXXVII.
41. N.J. Morton, The Terrors of Ideological Politics: Liberal Historians in a Conservative Mood, (Cleveland: Press of Case Western University, 1972), p. 16, pp. 58-59.
42. Ibid., pp. 58-60.
43. The Report of The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, pp. 4-5, 161, 272.
44. Ibid., pp. 4, 271.
45. Ibid., pp. 4, 47-49, 273-274.
46. Berger, The Sense of Power, Introduction.
47. Ibid., p. 40.
48. Ibid., pp. 19-20.
49. Ibid., p. 21.
50. Ibid., p. 21.
51. E.P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class, (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1963), pp. 377-378.
52. The Report of The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, p. 22.
53. One has only to consider studies of the 1919 General Strike in Winnipeg and other social histories of the period to appreciate just how romantic the picture painted by the Commissioner's was.
54. Ostry, The Cultural Connection, p. 60.

A perfect example of the confusion caused by the use of the word modernization is found in Bernard Ostry's book. Too often "modernization" is used as a euphemism which detracts from the often brutal and de-humanizing impact of industrialization.

55. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class, p. 378.
56. The Report of The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, p. 4.
57. Ibid., p. 4.
58. Ibid., pp. 11-12, 271.
59. Ibid., p. xxii.
60. Ibid., p. 4.
61. Ibid., p. 5.
62. Ibid., p. 5.
63. Ibid., p. 5.
64. Ibid., p. 271.
65. Ibid., p. 271.
66. Ibid., p. 158.
67. Ibid., pp. 4-5, 274.
68. Ibid., p. 161.
69. Ibid., pp. 166-167.
70. Ibid., p. 161, p. 165.
71. Roland N. Stromberg, After Everything: Western Intellectual History Since 1945, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975), pp. 44, 146.

This debate centered upon the relative merits of Science as opposed to the Humanities. Leavis, taking the side of the arts, rejected Snow's characterization of men of letters as reactionaries or politically "silly" and "wicked." Snow, who perceived men of science "to have the future in their bones" called for greater power for the scientific elite. Leavis was something of a traditionalist, and attacked Snow as a barbarian and a boor, whose naive faith in science was dangerous.

72. The Report of The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, p. 159.
73. Ibid., p. 165.
74. Ibid., p. 160.
75. Ibid., pp. 160-161, 166, 167.

76. Grant, "Philosophy," p. 119. See Chapter Four, for a more exhaustive analysis of this essay.
77. Ibid., p. 127.
78. Ibid., p. 119.
79. The Report of The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, pp. 5, 273.
80. Ibid., p. 273.
81. Ibid., p. 8.
82. Ibid., p. 8.
83. R. Bothwell, I. Drummond and J. English, Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics, and Provincialism, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), p. 166.
84. A.B. McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era, (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1979), p. 230.
85. Ibid., p. 231.
86. E.P. Thompson, "Outside the Whale," The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays, ed., E.P. Thompson (London: Monthly Review Press, 1978), pp. 217-219.
87. Ibid., p. 220.
88. Ibid., p. 220.

CHAPTER II

A Community of Concern

I

In 1951, Hans Zyla, a UNESCO fellow from Austria, left Canada after spending four months studying agricultural organization and rural adult education. Before leaving he prepared an article for Canada's adult education magazine Food for Thought in which he discussed the impact of his arrival in Canada:

I was prepared to meet circumstances different from those with which I was familiar but this thing was totally unexpected. It was more surprising to me than the life, the land, the people themselves. It was the Massey Report, and more important, the discussion it aroused. Wherever I stayed, wherever I went, whomever I met, always and everywhere, conversations came around to that subject. ¹

He went on to describe the Farm Forums where these discussions were organized and then launched into a more general discourse on culture and cultural values.

Whether or not Mr. Zyla was correct in ascribing such enthusiasm for the report to the general public is a point of debate. Frank Underhill argued that the Massey Commission produced an elitist minority report (albeit a valuable one) which did not demand the attention of the general public or even the majority of radio listeners "because they were not interested enough."² Clearly, any attempt to assess the interest of the man on the street, or the impact of the report on the public would be extremely difficult. We may speculate, however, that if the average Canadian had a radio or, more

importantly, subscribed to any one of a number of Canadian periodicals, he would at least have heard of the Commission and had some idea of the nature of its task.

The response of the periodical press to the publication of the Massey Report was substantial. In 1951, articles which discussed the report appeared in a variety of publications from the Labour Gazette to the Canadian Banker, from Maclean's to Saturday Night and the Canadian Forum. There were fifty articles on the Massey Report listed in the Canadian Periodical Index, 35 of which were printed in 1951.³ The reasons for this were twofold. On the one hand, magazine publishers had a vested interest in demonstrating their support for the report's findings. An official government document which overtly supported a policy of protection for the Canadian periodical press, from the power and influx of American mass publications, was a report which in this aspect at least was worthy of their support.⁴ On the other hand, interest expressed in the report was not merely expedient, nor was it based in self-interest alone. In numerous editorials, feature articles and reviews, the broader implications of the tone and content of the report found support, defense and re-articulation.

While a weekly journal such as the Financial Post kept its readers up to date on the Commission's progress during 1949, magazines geared to the arts, Saturday Night in particular, sought to comment on and summarize various aspects of the report for popular consumption once

it was published.⁵ In June and July of 1951, at least a dozen articles on the Massey Report, both editorials and features, appeared on the pages of Saturday Night alone. The topics ranged from a discussion of the ramifications of recommendations made in the field of education, to the potential dangers of state interference in the arts.⁶ Comments on the report were generally favorable and often gave writers an opportunity to pontificate on the important function of tradition in the modern age of progress and to defend the cultural values, both intellectual and spiritual, outlined in the report.

B.K. Sandwell, then editor of Saturday Night, agreed in particular with the report's assessment of the role which the Federal Government should have in cultural matters and in the area of education. In so doing he also took the opportunity to chastise the Duplessis government for its refusal to officially acknowledge the Commission.⁷ Sandwell, as much a representative of traditional culture as any of the commissioners, endorsed the report's sentiments and recommendations, echoing their concern over "the excessive amount of alien influence" on Canadian culture.⁸ These alien influences—primarily those of the United States—were all the more powerful in their effect on private ventures such as the fourth estate because they were not afforded the same protection as the CBC, NFB, or Crown Corporations.⁹ In Sandwell's opinion greater protection was necessary to preserve the Canadian cultural identity. Furthermore, he went

on to state that

The report alone, apart from any resultant government action will be of immense value to Canada if it awakens Canadians to the facts that the existence of Canada as a separate national entity has little significance unless it is accompanied by a specific national culture (even though it be a product, or a blending, of two cultures), and that the maintenance of a specific national culture requires the maintenance of certain mechanism for its development and diffusion.¹⁰

Sandwell himself had long been active in "the maintenance of a specific national culture." One of the organizers of the CAA in 1920, he was its first secretary and was later elected to the Royal Society of Canada.¹¹ He was the editor of Saturday Night from 1932 to 1951, during which time it became a periodical noted for journalistic excellence and for promoting new Canadian writers.¹² His interest in Canadian literature and culture in general would account for the generous space given over to special analyses of the Massey Report.

By way of contrast The Canadian Forum began its coverage of the Commission with an editorial in 1949 which argued that it had been established 50 years too late, and contended that the Liberals were not committed to cultural development because they had not yet taken a stand on the side of Federal planning in cultural affairs.¹³ In 1951 after the report's publication another editorial appeared, however, which applauded the commission's work. The Massey Report was not, it contended, "long hair," pro-British and unrelated to the man on the street, as some in the daily press had described

it.¹⁴ In their opinion the proposed Canada Council, far from being a blueprint for a ministry of culture, offered "the prospect of a democratic solution to the problem of state assistance..." In addition, Allan Sangster in his weekly feature "On the Air," virtually waxed poetic as he described the report's recommendations that the national broadcasting system have greater authority and control over private broadcasting. It was, he proclaimed,

...a clear cut victory for clear thinking
against muddleheadedness, for the great
good of the many against the self-interest
of the few, for right against wrong, and
for enlightenment against ignorance.¹⁶

Indeed, throughout June and July of 1951 favorable articles on the Massey Report seemed to dominate the pages of Canadian periodicals. The report had gained some support, and a community of common interest in the promotion of Canadian culture, and nationalism of a particular variety, had clearly emerged.¹⁷ It was dominated by the sentiments of a group which might be described as an eastern-Canadian, anglophone intelligentsia, which despite the often marked differences in approach, advocated the defense of tradition, the preservation of a community in Canada bound together by more elevated ideals than the pursuit of profit or even enlightened self-interest, and which exhibited a profound distrust, if not open hostility to things American.

An analysis of three individual responses to the report, those of Harold Innis, Arthur Lower, and Frank Underhill, will highlight those similarities and differences and provide an outline of the contemporary arguments for and

against cultural nationalism of the variety proposed in the report. It is no accident that these three individuals were Canadian historians. As William Christian and Colin Campbell have pointed out in their study of Canadian nationalism, "a sense of national identity is largely the result of an appreciation of national history, of the process through which the nation became what it is."¹⁸ Underhill, as we will see, was the only one who proved to be an exception to the rule.

II

In his book The Writing of Canadian History, Carl Berger has argued

...that Innis, Underhill and Lower, for all their idiosyncracies, responded to the upheavals of the forties and fifties by returning to the problems of Canadian culture, and by reasserting their common liberalism. Each of them, however, perceived the threat to individual freedom somewhat differently.¹⁹

Whether or not these three historians were "re-asserting their common liberalism" is open to debate. It is indisputable that during the fifties they did return to the problem of the nation's cultural development and the particular obstacles impeding its advance. Within the context of this problem, however, each was forced to examine the cultural values of the nation, the tradition that formed the basis for its sense of community, and the duties and privileges of the individual in relation to the rest of society. It is on the basis of these concerns that each formulated his own particular perception of the threat to individual freedom. What they saw developing in North American society, and the picture of Canadian culture as described in the Massey Report,

combined to produce the three responses which will be examined here.

Two of the three echo to a greater or lesser degree the cultural values, philosophical orientation and the implicit anti-Americanism expressed in the Massey Report. In many respects they represent what was to become a rear-guard action of the intelligentsia to resist what they perceived to be the Americanisation of Canadian culture—the transformation of a diverse nation into a mass society. Only one accepted as inevitable what was in fact the process already underway in Canada. That is, by 1951, Canadians were already living the American dream. They had nibbled on the fruits of technological expansion and unlimited growth. The "Captains of Consciousness" (or as Innis dubbed them "the jackals of communications systems") were already well on their way to creating the consumer society in the branch plant of Canada.²⁰

In The Strategy of Culture, Harold Innis wrote what he called "A Footnote to the Massey Report." It was in fact a severe warning as to the "pernicious influence" of American mass media and advertising, and the growing dangers of the constant barrage of the American print culture on the Canadian way of life.²¹ Throughout the article particular reference was made to the impact of these things on a nascent national literature; and, while he acknowledged that the slow development of English Canadian literature was, in part, the result of other mitigating circumstances—the serialization of literature in popular magazines and the existence of

two cultures in Canada—Innis placed the largest portion of the blame on the Canadian government.²² Government decisions, like the one which resulted in the maintenance of an open door policy towards foreign periodicals, had allowed the proliferation of a continental perspective and had created the conditions for the disappearance of the nation through cultural assimilation by the United States.²³

While Innis began his article by stressing the obvious dangers of nationalism, his fear of the culture of cupidity and commercialism to the South was great enough that he adopted a cultural nationalist stand as an absolute necessity if Canada was to be preserved as a separate entity on the continent. He argued that "Not to be British or American but Canadian is not necessarily to be parochial." Nevertheless, he also warned that to offset being overwhelmed by the one, connection to the other might be necessary, particularly given the rapid development of American media technology and the subsequent spread of "Made in America" propaganda.²⁴

As he pointed out:

The effects of these developments on Canadian culture have been disastrous. Indeed they threaten Canadian national life. The cultural life of English-speaking Canadians subjected to constant hammering from American commercialism is increasingly separated from the cultural life of French-speaking Canadians. The effects of American technological changes on Canadian cultural life have been finally evident in the numerous suggestions that Canada should join the United States.²⁵

Innis, with his penchant for dialectics, argued as did the Commissioners of the Massey Report, for the necessary balance of opposites. Continentalism, coupled with the power

of American commercialism, and accompanied by the steady erosion of the British connection, left Canada open to defeat on another front—that of the forty-ninth parallel. Therefore, vigilance at the border and cultivation of Canada's cultural roots in the British and European traditions was essential.²⁶ He warned that while Canada had had to break her colonial bonds to Britain by adopting a continental perspective, complete disassociation from Great Britain and total identification with the United States, posed an even greater threat than had colonial subserviance. In the final lines of his appeal, Innis wrote that

The[American] jackals of communication systems are constantly on the alert to destroy every vestige of sentiment toward Great Britain, holding it of no advantage if it threatens the omnipotence of American commercialism. This is to strike at the heart of cultural life in Canada. The pride taken in improving our status in the British Commonwealth of Nations has made it difficult for us to realize that our status in the North American continent is on the verge of disappearing. Continentalism assisted in the achievement of autonomy and has consequently become more dangerous. We can only survive by taking persistent action at strategic points against American imperialism in all its attractive guises.²⁷

Balance had to be found or Canada would continue to progress, as he had warned in 1948, "from colony to nation to colony!"²⁸ As soon as one power (the United States) threatened to overwhelm the nation's existence, its influence had to be offset by ties to another power—in this case, he argued, Great Britain and Europe.²⁹

The same considerations of balance were necessary in issues of individual autonomy as opposed to the broader social

good. While freedom, in particular freedom of the press, was a virtue to be upheld and preserved, it became a mockery, in Innis' opinion, when used to mask the existence of monopolies which promoted rapid change at the expense of social stability and which tended to cater to the lowest common social denominator rather than to educate the general public.³⁰ What was freedom of the press if it meant only the freedom of a few to create monopolies of communication which promoted social anarchy and "the unrestricted operation of commercial forces and an impact of technology on communication tempered only by commercialism itself?"³¹ Freedom was not an absolute good: nor was rapid unchecked technological expansion and development the sure route to progress. These considerations had to be tempered by regard for the well-being of the larger community.

The concerns evident in the Massey Report are also present in The Strategy of Culture but they are not cloaked in the cautious critical tones of the report. Innis' antipathy to the United States is explicit throughout the essay. Nowhere in the Massey Report is there any reference to American imperialist aspirations and one is left with the impression that the pressures being brought to bear on the fabric of Canadian society and culture by the American media were almost accidental—or occurring in spite of America's overwhelmingly good intentions.³² Innis was not so generous. He saw the American media as an arm of American commercial interests, reaching out to pull Canada within its orbit of influence: a machine for the spread of propaganda and ideological assumptions which could only drag Canada down the same perilous path

as the one chosen by Cold War America.³³

Clearly, Innis' preoccupation with the dangers of rapid social change, with the needs of the collectivity over the rights or privileges of the individual, and his emphasis, both as economic historian and social critic, on Canada's natural socio-economic and cultural ties to Europe and Great Britain, would tend to place him within the bounds of Canadian Toryism, as Christian and Campbell have suggested.³⁴ This is not to argue that Innis was an unalloyed conservative, philosophically or in practical politics. Nevertheless, the fundamental premises of his brand of cultural nationalism were both by design and necessity essentially conservative. For how else could nationalism have been expressed in Canada in the 1950s except in terms of conserving those traditions and cultural values which historically distinguished it from the United States? What did the new societies offer—these "Brave New Worlds" of the twentieth century? It appeared to Innis to be a choice between "the crude effrontery of American imperialism" or the Stalinist nightmare.³⁵ In despair it would seem that he embraced an essentially conservative outlook, one which Michael Oakshott has characterized as being "acutely aware of having something to lose."³⁶ That something was a nation which by its very nature might provide a balance or alternative to that of the consumer society of the United States.

In order to preserve Canada's autonomy, the cultural and political ties between Anglophones and Francophones, and those between Canada and Europe, had to be strengthened and

conserved. Furthermore, those moral and cultural values which had been the cornerstone of national growth had to be strengthened and protected from the disintegrating effects of crass commercialism, materialism and rampant consumerism. The operation of the "free market," the guidance provided by "the invisible hand," could not in Innis' opinion, always be trusted to act in the best interests of society. Therefore, the public, the government, had a right to control the often disastrous effects of the pursuit of the profit margin.

Contrasted to this are the generally optimistic comments of Arthur Lower. He echoes concerns similar to those of Innis, but provides a different emphasis because of the nature of his own brand of cultural nationalism. In a lengthy article which appeared in The Canadian Banker (Winter 1952), A.R.M. Lower elaborated on his conception of the nation. Canada, he argued, was a country of plan.³⁷ This did not imply, however, that national projects or public control had inhibited the initiatives of individuals. Lower asserted that, from the plan known as the BNA Act to the creation of the CBC,

The Canadian people have, in fact, virtually without knowing it worked out a way of life unique in the modern world; in their own practical, unvocal way, they have found a way of combining collectivism and individualism, the united effort of the community and the personal efforts of citizens...to provide a solution for...this stress between the general will as expressed in the state, and the multiplicity of individual wills, the laissez-faire society.³⁸

In Colony to Nation, Lower had earlier argued that Canada had had to seek a compromise between the two founding nations.

He now contended that it had also been compelled to reach a modus vivendi between two economic and social systems because of her position on the continent.³⁹

Canadians were willing to pay heavily for the privilege of remaining themselves. The reason for this, Lower suggested, was plain: "the one determining motive that runs through all Canadian history in both French and English Canada, is simply never to become part of the United States."⁴⁰ As Lower explained it, Canadians had never succumbed to the temptations of union with the United States because they refused to surrender "the nation's soul" for mere material wealth.⁴¹ Consequently, for the average Canadian, planning or socialization was the answer because

...individual enterprise, left to itself, leads in Canada, to the abyss. If you let things slide in a country like this there is no doubt about the direction they will slide—straight into Uncle Sam's ample arms. ⁴²

Considerations of individual liberty or freedom in Canada were not necessarily of the greatest concern. Like Innis, Lower seemed to indicate that freedom—in this case the individualistic, free market system—had to be limited by consideration for the welfare and survival of the total community.

Planning had prevented Canada's absorption into the United States and a national plan would assist in the prevention of Canada's cultural assimilation. The Massey Report, Lower argued, provided the first stage in the plan and came at the logical time in terms of the nation's

development "when the spirit of the Canadian community must find its voice."⁴³ This voice was, by implication, different from that of the United States. Lower intimated that the materialistic values which guided American society need not dominate the Canadian way of life. Canada, because of its geographical position and its unique historical experience, had the chance to develop a singular community and culture on the continent. This culture would never develop, however, in an environment where things were allowed to take their course. Just as internationalism was, in his opinion, a polite front for continentalism, so laissez-faire "would allow as it does allow, Canadians to get their English news and reports of the Commonwealth conferences...through American news agencies, cloaked in American phraseology."⁴⁴

Lower was very careful, however, to differentiate between popular culture and the culture of the few, accepting that it was largely the latter which would do the most to distinguish Canada as a nation among nations.⁴⁵ Stating that "the masses must have their representative figures too," he went on to point out that "a mature culture gets every type of expression from bottom to top."⁴⁶ Nevertheless, while he accepted the necessity of popular culture, it was seen as inferior to that represented on the pages of the Massey Report. Lower's attitude was unapologetically elitist, based in the belief that many may aspire but few attain true enlightenment or success.⁴⁷ In an article written one year later, his attitude was clarified: "One of the nasty aspects of civilization is that it involves the chosen few, who lead, and

the masses, who follow. It involves an elite...."⁴⁸

Lower defended the role of the intelligentsia, an intellectual vanguard which included the scholar. There was clearly a latent hostility on his part to the growing emphasis on "practical education" and the development of specialists, managers and administrators who usurped the place of these learned men.⁴⁹ As he pointed out in his article on the Massey Report, the Canadian scholar in the humanities was no longer accorded the social status or given adequate monetary rewards for his labor. The best minds, as a result, were being drawn into business, the government or the United States; a fact which meant that the educational apparatus in the country stood in great peril.⁵⁰

Canada, therefore, had to protect and nurture her human as well as her material resources. It would appear that in Lower's opinion, things of the spirit and mind were of equal or greater importance to mere efficiency or a high standard of living. A national policy or plan to protect Canadian culture was necessary if Canada was to remain independent of the United States in more significant ways than simply maintaining a separate apparatus of government.⁵¹

As Carl Berger has pointed out, Lower was nothing if not a Canadian nationalist. Throughout the 1950s, in articles, and in particular in his book Canadians in the Making, he sought to provide what he knew to be diverse individuals, ethnic groups and regions with a national consciousness—with a common past, a shared mythology.⁵² While he may have placed less emphasis on maintaining this national identity

through the British connection than others like John Farthing and Vincent Massey (and later, in the field of history, Donald Creighton and W.L. Morton),⁵³ he was not anti-British nor was he a continentalist. One would be hard pressed, however, to label Lower as having been strenuously anti-American. He usually shied away from that brand of Canadian nationalism which played upon Canada's moral superiority to the United States. Lower was one who sought a sense of identity defined in and of itself, not opposed to something else.⁵⁴ Furthermore, he looked to French Canada as an example of the coherence and spiritual strength which English Canada lacked.⁵⁵

Lower's cultural nationalism, like that of Innis, was based in a profoundly conservative and idealist conception of man and society. While an advocate of human rights and defender of the so-called liberal values of individual freedom and equality, and an outspoken critic of all forms of social injustice, Lower was also a man who openly accepted the existence and utility of social elites, who rejected a blind faith in material growth as the sure route to social progress, and who viewed man as primarily a spiritual being. These were the fundamental assumptions upon which his particular brand of cultural nationalism was constructed.

In sharp contrast to those replies previously examined, Frank Underhill's response to the Massey Report flatly rejected its anti-American sentiments as isolationist, unrealistic and paranoid. The commissioners' use of the word "alien" was singled out by Underhill as indicative of

a fallacy that runs through much of Canadian nationalist discussion. For we cannot escape the fact that we live on the same continent as the Americans, and that the longer we live here the more are we going to be affected by the same continental influences which affect them.⁵⁶

It was not the "wicked Americans" who made Maclean's second-rate, nor were they to blame for the fact that Canada had no daily to compare with The New York Times.⁵⁷ According to Underhill "it was mass consumption and the North American continental environment which produced these phenomena, not some sinister influence in the United States."⁵⁸

It is not that Underhill rejected the purpose, findings or recommendations of the report—many of these he supported.⁵⁹ He did, however, criticize the commission for failing to see the difference between popular culture or "mass culture" and "the culture of the few," and for not recognizing that "The root problems of our modern mass democracies is this relationship between mass culture, which is in danger of being debased with every new invention in mass communication, and the culture of the few."⁶⁰ For Canada to cut itself off from American culture and in particular "the finest expressions of the American mind" would have been, in Underhill's estimation, a double sin.⁶¹ Not only would it have meant losing touch with a group that had already begun to explore the features of mass culture but also, would simply have resulted in transforming Canada into a nation of Ulsterites. Indeed, he urged Canadians to realize

...that if we allow ourselves to be obsessed by the danger of American cultural annexation, so that the thought preys on us day and night, we shall only become a slightly bigger Ulster. The idea that by taking thought, and with the help of some government subventions, we can become another England—which, one suspects, is Mr. Massey's ultimate idea—is purely fantastic.⁶²

Other than editorials written in the daily press echoing some of Underhill's sentiments, his was the lone voice which spoke out against the implicit anti-Americanism of the report.⁶³ It was not that Underhill disagreed with the concern expressed by the commissioners over the secondary place which the humanities were assuming, nor was he against the concept of state support for the Arts.⁶⁴ He was, however, against the promotion of things Canadian if it meant the exclusion of things American. Like Goldwin Smith who had preceded him by almost a century, the Underhill of the 1950s saw Canada's national destiny as a continental one.

Moved by the upheavals of the Second World War and disillusioned with the socialist perspective which he had so ardently defended earlier, Underhill's allegiances throughout the fifties shifted back towards liberalism.⁶⁵ A.R.M. Lower described that shift in relation to himself as "doing a large detour and, from a firing position on my left, he began a skirmish on my right."⁶⁶ As Underhill became an ardent defender of liberalism, so too he came to view the United States as the great champion of liberal ideals in the modern world.⁶⁷ Canada, whose world status and power was at best limited, could do no better than to support America's

foreign policy. Indeed, he went so far as to suggest that Canada's survival—one would assume, like any competing force in the laissez-faire system—was insured only by the high quality of her way of life and her strength as a nation.⁶⁸ If it happened to come about that she was increasingly pulled within the American sphere of influence, both economic and cultural, then in Underhill's opinion this said more about Canada's intrinsic worth as a nation than it did about the American thirst for world domination.⁶⁹

If the purchase of American cars, the preference for American radio and television, Canadian participation in the Korean War, or the growth in the level of American equity investment in Canadian industry is any indication of Canada's determination to resist Americanization, then it would appear that Underhill was more in touch with his time than were either Innis or Lower. His argument that many of the new generation of Canadians were identifying with the values and culture of the United States without experiencing any great spiritual crisis would seem to be accurate.⁷⁰ This would, however, constitute a distortion of the facts. It was not that Innis and Lower ignored the influence of the United States or contended that all Canadians were experiencing a profound identity crisis or developing a severe case of schizophrenia from contact with American culture. Both men could see that Canadians were rapidly adapting themselves to the American way of life and because of this felt the need to expose what would be lost in doing so. Both, in varying

degrees, felt that Canada had the opportunity to develop a society founded on traditions that were different from, and in some respects more desirable than, those that gave rise to American mass society. For Innis and others like him the loss of traditions, and the abandonment of a sense of social duty or community, had to be prevented at all costs. It was only on the basis of tradition and through a sense of duty—and of belonging to a distinct community—that Canada could be preserved as a truly separate nation.

What many of them were unable to see (as Underhill did, perhaps because of his affiliation with the Left,) was the fact that capital is international. As money flows across the borders so does a particular form of production and social relations. These are accompanied by a certain set of assumptions about how society should operate, and the social and cultural values which insure its smooth operation. In spite of this, some Canadian intellectuals continued to maintain that an idea of community and a sense of nationality, which was being rapidly outmoded by the expanding forces of production could be maintained.

As a result, while it was clear that the Canada of the turn of the century no longer existed, numerous Canadian intellectuals, journalists, academics and artists believed that its most important elements—its moral fibre and social values—could be preserved or at least combined with a new vision of the nation. How far removed they were from the realities of the common Canadian and his times is questionable. It is important at this point, however, to examine

the ways in which other Canadian intellectuals attempted to reach the public to protect and promote a conception of Canadian society—its history and place—which would inspire allegiance and nurture a moral society.

Notes

Chapter II

1. H.J. Zyla, "Thoughts in a Journey to Canada," Food for Thought, 13 (Nov., 1952), p. 27.
2. F.H. Underhill, "Notes on the Massey Report," The Canadian Forum, 31 (Aug., 1951), p. 101.
3. The Canadian Periodical Index, does not contain an exhaustive list of all articles written on the Massey Report from every Canadian periodical. It does, however, provide a good cross-section of the available material.
4. The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951).

In a brief Chapter in Part I entitled "The Press and Periodical Literature" the commissioners gave their tacit support to the Canadian periodicals' request for tariff adjustments on paper import so that American periodicals in Canada were placed in a less advantageous position for competition.

5. "What's Needed for Canada's Culture?," The Financial Post, 43 (Nov. 12, 1949).

"Magazine Publishers of Canada Demand That They Get an Even Break in Their Own Land," The Financial Post, 43 (Nov. 26, 1949), p. 25.

6. In addition to Sandwell's articles a series on various topics related to the report appeared in each bi-weekly issue of Saturday Night from June 19 to July 31, 1951. A.W. Trueman, president of the University of New Brunswick wrote on the crisis in the universities. (Sat. Night. Vol. 66, June 1951, pp. 10, 14). Wilfred Eggleston novelist and journalist wrote on the dangers of state assistance (Sat. Night Vol. 66, July 3, 1951, p.3). L.A.C. Parton, principal of the Ontario College of Art wrote on the plastic arts (Sat. Night, Vol. 66, July 24, 1951, pp. 11, 26) while Ettore Mazzolini criticized the minimal space given in the report to music (Sat. Night, Vol. 66, July 17, 1951, pp. 12, 26). E.S. Robinson, head of the Vancouver Public Library, wrote on the potential of the proposed National Library (Sat. Night, Vol. 66, July 31, '51, pp. 62, 36) while Nathan Cohen, writer and radio critic echoed the report's concern over the potential dangers of a medium such as television. (Sat. Night, Vol. 66, June 26, 1951, pp. 11, 36).

7. B.K. Sandwell, "The Council for Culture," Saturday Night, 66 (June 12, 1951), p. 7.
8. B.K. Sandwell, "The Fourth Estate: Power or Pressure," Saturday Night, 66 (August, 28, 1951), p. 12.
9. Ibid., p. 12.
10. Ibid., p. 12.
11. The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature, ed., N. Story, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1967).
12. Ibid.
13. "Culture and the Cabinet," The Canadian Forum, 28 (March, 1949), p. 266.
14. "The Massey Report," The Canadian Forum, 31 (July, 1951), p. 73.
15. Ibid., p. 73.
16. Allen Sangster, "On The Air: Notes on the Massey Report," The Canadian Forum, 31 (July, 1951), pp. 109, 111.
17. Mary Vipond, "National Consciousness in English-Speaking Canada in the 1920s: Seven Studies." An unpublished Doctoral Thesis completed at the University of Toronto, 1974.
18. W. Christian and C. Campbell, Political Parties and Ideologies in Canada, (Toronto: McGraw-Hill-Ryerson, 1974), p. 177.

Part II

19. Carl Berger, The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 206-207.
20. Harold Innis, The Strategy of Culture: With Special Reference to Canadian Literature: A Footnote to the Massey Report, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952), p. 19.
21. Ibid., p. 19.
22. Ibid., pp. 15-17.

23. Ibid.
24. Ibid., pp. 2, 19-20.
25. Ibid., pp. 18-19.
26. Ibid., p. 2, 18-20.
27. Ibid., pp. 19-20.
28. Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, p. 192.
29. Innis, The Strategy of Culture, pp. 18-20.
30. Ibid., pp. 14-16.
31. Ibid., p. 15.
32. The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, pp. 16-17.
33. Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, pp. 191, 192.
34. Christian and Campbell, Political Parties and Ideologies in Canada, pp. 177-178.
35. Harold Innis, "Great Britain, the United States and Canada," Essays in Canadian Economic History, ed., M.O. Innis, (Toronto, 1956), pp. 394-412.
36. Michael Oakshott, "On Being Conservative" Rationalism in Politics (London: Methuen Press, 1962), p. 169.
37. A.R.M. Lower, "The Massey Report," The Canadian Banker, 59 (Winter, 1952), p. 22.
38. Ibid., pp. 22, 24.
39. Ibid., pp. 24-25.
40. Ibid., p. 24.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., p. 25.
43. Ibid.
44. Ibid., p. 28.
45. Ibid., pp. 26-27.
46. Ibid., p. 26.
47. Ibid.

48. A.R.M. Lower, "No Class in Canada," Saturday Night, (July 12, 1952), pp. 9, 18.
49. Ibid., pp. 9, 18.
See also"
Lower, "The Massey Report," pp. 29, 31.
50. Ibid., pp. 29, 31.
51. Lower, "The Massey Report," pp. 28, 29.
52. A.R.M. Lower, My First Seventy-Five Years, (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1967), pp. 305-306.
See also:
Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, pp. 112-136, 202-207.
53. W.L. Morton and Donald Creighton were representatives of the conservative cultural nationalism discussed in this thesis. Morton's, The Canadian Identity and Creighton's biography of John A. Macdonald, were two works that sought to establish the historical roots of the conservative social vision they promoted. At an early stage in the writing of this thesis, however, it was decided that a separate chapter on Canadian historians would merely constitute a repetition of information already made available in The Writing of Canadian History by Carl Berger. Therefore, while this study contains numerous references to the work of both men, particularly in the "Conclusion," it does not provide a detailed study of their work.
54. Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, pp. 124-125.
55. A.R.M. Lower, "Canada and the Future," Saturday Night, 70 (Jan. 2, 1956), pp. 9-10.
Lower, My First Seventy-Five Years, p. 196, pp. 243, 305.
A.R.M. Lower, "No Class in Canada," p. 18.
56. F.H. Underhill, "Notes on the Massey Report," The Canadian Forum, 31 (Aug., 1951), p. 102.
57. Ibid., p. 102.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid., p. 101.

60. Ibid., p. 102.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid.
63. There were certain newspaper editorials such as the one quoted in this article by Underhill which attacked the report and its anti-American tone. They did not appear to be particularly frequent. There was a series of articles done by the Winnipeg Free Press on the recommendations on broadcasting which were cautiously critical of the official document.

See: The Winnipeg Free Press, (July, 1951).
64. Ibid., p. 101.
65. Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, pp. 195-200.
66. Lower, My First Seventy-Five Years, p. 315.
67. Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, pp. 195-200.
68. Ibid., p. 200.
69. Underhill, "Notes on The Massey Report," p. 102.
70. Ibid., p. 102.

CHAPTER III
"So Little for the Mind"

I

On September 15, 1951, in a Financial Post cross-country poll, notable Canadians were asked whether their schools and colleges were doing enough to promote "Canadianism." Some of the responses expressed reservations about what was meant by "Canadianism," and rejected the notion that schools should promote "narrow nationalism" or "ballyhoo patriotism."¹ Most agreed, however, that a knowledge of and intelligent affection for the nation should be encouraged, and that the schools were doing an adequate job in this respect.² The Massey Report, published in the same year, assessed the situation somewhat differently. In a brief examination of the state of education in Canada, it expressed regret that

...our use of American institutions and our lazy, even abject imitation of them has caused our uncritical acceptance of ideas and assumptions which are alien to our traditions. But for American hospitality, we might in Canada, have been led to develop educational practices more in keeping with our own way of life.³

The commissioners argued that by importing American educational theories and by the use of American text-books in Canadian schools, the system of education had become "less Canadian, less suited to our conditions, less appreciative of our two cultures."⁴ Instead of promoting Canadian independence by devising a system of education consistent with the nation's cultural values and traditions, Canadian educators were, in fact, speeding up the process of Americanization.⁵

Given the scope of the Massey Report, the commissioners did not analyze the problem in great detail. Nevertheless, Hilda Neatby, one of the commissioners and a history professor at the University of Saskatchewan, spent the next two years examining the damaging results of Canada's uncritical acceptance of American authority in the field of education. The final product was the book, So Little for the Mind. It was addressed to other concerned Canadians who were not experts in education, but who were worried about the quality of education being offered their children.⁶ It was an open attack on the Americanization of Canadian education, and a call for a more traditional, a more "Canadian" approach to education. Whether or not Canadians who read the book were influenced by its nationalist intent is open to debate. That a substantial number of them were interested in education, however, was confirmed by the fact that the book entered its second edition in the first year of publication.

Like the Massey Report, Neatby assumed that Canada and the United States were essentially different. They differed because Canadians, unlike Americans, "did not date their national existence from a great eighteenth century revolution"⁷ Neatby implied that this fact had had far reaching implications. One of the most important was Canada's continued attachment to many of the traditions and values that the United States had rejected by way of revolution. These values, or "virtues" as Neatby called them, were ones that had been developed "during the whole period of western civilization," long before "the appearance of modern democracy in the eighteenth century."⁸ By promoting these values,

Canadians had created a substantially different social order from the one south of the border.

This argument was by no means a novel one. It has been utilized by numerous Canadian nationalists who hoped to demonstrate the inherent differences between Canada and the United States. As Carl Berger demonstrates in his book The Sense of Power, it appeared over and over again in the rhetoric of the imperial federationists.⁹ It can also be found in descriptions of the Canadian character formulated by Northrop Frye, Hugh Hood and George Grant.¹⁰ It was one of the central tenets of a national mythology built around "the loyalist tradition" that was passed down through generations of English-speaking Canadians.

According to the mythology, the character of English-Canada was largely determined by the loyalists. In "their reverence for law and order" and in their "desire to be peaceably and quietly governed," they brought to Canada the spirit of the British constitution.¹¹ Those in the nineteenth and early twentieth century who marshalled this as evidence of Canada's unique character as a nation, emphasized that this respect for order and authority was ingrained on the Canadian consciousness. As a result they argued that Canadians valued gradual, ordered, evolutionary change over any possible gains that might be derived from a radical break with the past.¹²

Berger points out that "behind this insistence upon authority rested a train of assumptions dear to the tory mind—the respect for history, the primacy of the community over

individual selfishness, society conceived as an organism of functionally related parts and structured to reflect different human aptitudes, religion as the mortar of the social order, and the distrust of materialism."¹³ An analysis of Neatby's treatises on education will clearly demonstrate that she was a latter day representative of this so-called "tory mind." Faced by the threat of cultural assimilation into American mass society, she made her tory preferences as explicit as those voiced by imperial federationists haunted by the spectre of political union with the United States. While she never referred directly to the loyalists, her statements on the differences between Canada and the United States demonstrated her attachment to the values of the "loyalist tradition." In Neatby's opinion it was no accident that Canada had not produced a theorist like John Dewey because his conception of society in general, and education in particular, was born of a "revolutionary tradition" alien to Canada.¹⁴ Of immediate concern to her, therefore, was the fact that Canadian educators, trained in the United States, were importing these alien theories into Canada.

According to Neatby, the importation of American ideas and values had eroded the traditional foundations of Canadian society. Rather than resisting this trend, educational experts enthusiastically adopted American theories. They even warned that teachers and administrators who ignored American authority in matters related to education, did so at their own peril.¹⁵ Incensed by this "colonial mentality" Neatby applauded

those who did resist. She defended them, arguing that "it was no narrow chauvinism which led Canadian teachers to resent this bland assumption on the part of the experts that Canada [was] and must remain a satellite state."¹⁶ Their resentment did not constitute an ethnocentric nationalism, but rather represented a desire to promote an approach to education consistent with Canadian traditions and values.¹⁷ Moreover, she implied that their stand represented a concerted effort to resist the spread of the social values inherent in American educational theory and practise.

Neatby seemed to agree with Harold Innis that Canada needed to develop a strategy for cultural survival. This strategy would include cultivating the roots of those values and traditions that had been transplanted to Canada from Britain and Europe.¹⁸ Like Innis, Neatby believed that such action would offset the "pernicious influence" of American social values. But whereas his critique was directed at the negative influence of social values imported through the use of American mass-media, Neatby's was aimed at the damaging effects of values imported along with American ideas on education. In more guarded language than Innis utilized, she argued that in order to preserve a unique (and, one would suspect, superior) culture, Canadians had to develop their own approach to education. They "had to respond by making a clear and precise statement of a Canadian philosophy of education based, not on an awkward synthesis of three or four mutually exclusive American schools of thought; but rather on a consideration of the essential values of western civilization."¹⁹

To establish such a philosophy of education Canadians had to be made aware of the specific problems created by the use of American theories; and the concomitant spread of social values implicit in them. It was a case of "know thine enemy."

The chief culprits Neatby singled out were American progressive theories of education and their chief exponents in Canada, the self-proclaimed "experts in education." Progressive educators, especially the American pragmatist philosopher John Dewey and his modern day disciples, had disregarded the original goal of education which was "to exercise, train and discipline the mind."²⁰ She argued that because Dewey and his followers had stressed the values of technique over content, indoctrination over freedom of inquiry, and self-realization over the traditional virtues of intellectual mastery and discipline, their doctrine was essentially anti-intellectual.²¹ She conceded that progressivists had done much to improve the physical comfort and general well-being of the student, but maintained that they had failed dismally in the training of his mind.²² By following the American lead, Canadian educators had therefore drastically reduced the standards of excellence in schools across the nation.

According to Neatby, however, progressivism was not only anti-intellectual, but also anti-cultural and amoral. Progressive educators ignored "the cultural inheritance of western civilization" in their preoccupation with the present²³ and failed to acknowledge the valuable guidance offered by the Christian church because of their distrust of religious dogma.²⁴

Therefore, instead of providing children with the historical facts that would lead children "to cherish appropriate democratic values by themselves," they chose to teach the democratic way.²⁵ Instead of demonstrating the validity of moral absolutes, they chose to inculcate the young with a vague, relativistic morality constructed on "pragmatic" considerations.²⁶ As a result, Neatby warned that "In their desire to teach democracy and morality ...[the progressivists had] forgotten that both must be founded on a true liberation of the mind."²⁷ This liberation of the mind could not be achieved through indoctrination, but only through rigorous intellectual training within the secure framework of established values. Although the progressivists were not entirely responsible for the "flabby morality" and confused thinking of the modern world, they had contributed to the general problems. In Neatby's opinion, they had also placed the Canadian social order in very grave danger.²⁸

Where had the well-intentioned progressivists gone wrong? In an attempt to answer this question for Canadians, Neatby analyzed progressivism in more detail. The result was a complex argument developed in three major publications: So Little for the Mind(1953), The Debt of Our Reason(1954), and A Temperate Dispute(1954). This argument was also presented in condensed form for a larger audience in popular journals such as MacLean's and Saturday Night. It was Neatby's intention to demonstrate that in rejecting the traditional or "aristocratic" approach to education, the progressivists had placed the very democracy they so ardently wanted to protect in grave danger. They ,

in fact, promoted values that would give rise to the mass society in Canada. Within her critique she also outlined the basis of an alternate approach to education. Not surprisingly, it was one that she believed to be rooted in Canada's history and cultural traditions.

II

In The Debt of Our Reason, a speech prepared for the Armstrong Lecture at Victoria University, Neatby emphasized that American progressivists had made a fundamental error in judgement when they set out to champion the cause of "the common man." They failed to recognize that the original advocates of universal education had not intended "that a new kind of education be devised for the common man, but that the essential values of the old aristocratic education be made available [to all]." ²⁹ Traditionalists like herself, who defended the virtues of an aristocratic education, did not presume to deny anyone the right to an education; they merely wished to promote the best system of learning for everyone. As she pointed out in So Little for the Mind, the progressivists, in their zeal to make education accessible to children from all backgrounds, betrayed a greater lack of faith in the abilities of the common man than their supposed enemies, the traditionalists. ³⁰ They themselves had watered down the curriculum because they did not believe that the common people had the ability to learn.

A further result of this "dark suspicion" of the aristocratic order—that is, one based on a notion of a hierarchical social structure—was the unbalanced emphasis

placed upon the "ideal" of equality.³¹ Rather than stressing equality of opportunity as a realistic goal for a democratic system of education, Dewey's followers insisted on the need to maintain the illusion that all children were equal. They urged that all children experience success because failure divided less-gifted children from their more successful peers.³² This notion of equality which ignored individual differences—or adherence to the doctrine of "equalitarianism"—was dangerous in Neatby's opinion. It encouraged mediocrity and catered to the needs of the lowest common denominator. As a result, bright children were often ignored or given insufficient praise for superior effort.³³ Therefore, in their attempts to eliminate differences for the sake of "group integration, progressive educators were, in fact, fostering uniformity, aimlessness and alienation.

Yet it was not just standards and behaviour in the classroom that concerned Neatby. The social implications of equalitarianism were even more objectionable. In a broader context she warned that no society would be satisfied with the bland porridge of equalitarianism for long. The faceless crowd of the "equalitarian" or "mass" democracy would not remain docile forever.³⁴ Recalling the recent experiences of Germany, she cautioned that desire for "more, please" might well lead to a reaction "seen clearly in dictatorships with their countless ranks and grades, their innumerable badges and uniforms."³⁵ Couched in the educational jargon of progressive educators Neatby found "the twentieth century vices of equalitarianism

and totalitarianism masquerading under the cloak of democracy."³⁶

Because the progressivists bowed only to the authority of the social sciences and ignored the teachings of history and philosophy, they were blind to the ramifications of the doctrines they preached. She wrote that as a result

...they have come to regard with patronizing contempt the little creatures with their varying I.Q.'s and their personality profiles, whom they type so neatly, treat so kindly and condition so complacently. The unconscious scorn engendered by Dewey for the Christian church and the aristocratic way of life, both of which nurtured a liberal humanist tradition, has cut them off from the living roots of democracy.³⁷

In this respect, she concluded, progressive educators were doing untold damage to Canadian society.

Neatby did not intend her criticism of modernity—specifically modern education—to be interpreted as merely an outburst of archaism, or as a desire to turn the clock back or "brood over a vanished and no doubt over-romanticized past."³⁸ She was, however, adamant in her belief that modern man should not forget the lessons of the past or ignore valuable intellectual and ethical traditions that had been developed over centuries. Like the Massey Report, hers was a profoundly conservative critique which argued that great civilizations had emerged "from faith expressed in creeds, translated into customs and enshrined in traditions."³⁹ These things could not be ignored or forgotten when considering the best form of education for the young.

In words which harkened back to those of that most celebrated conservative, Edmund Burke, she wrote of the need

to see man not only in relation to his present and his future but to his past. Moreover, she asserted that

Our Western society, it is often said, is the product of Judaic morality, of Christian love, of Greek philosophy, of Roman law, of modern humanism. But we are increasingly an unconscious product of these things. In the excitement of the modern age and the pursuit of rationalism, democracy and materialism we have forgotten where we came from and what we believed in. Ours has become a rootless and a faithless society.⁴⁰

The great danger was that a rootless and faithless society would create a false God and a synthetic faith, as she believed the Russians had done.⁴¹ She maintained that this was becoming an ever increasing possibility as a result of the impact of theories such as progressivism.

This was true, in her opinion, because progressivists ignored "the fervour of religious faith" and the "absolutism of moral principle" synonymous with the Christian religion. In this respect progressivism was representative of the ongoing process of secularization. At an earlier stage secularization had entailed an evolutionary transformation whereby

...certain attitudes in a somewhat different form were transferred from a consciously religious age, to an increasingly secular age.... These attitudes of worship (or reverence), of contemplation (or complete and devoted absorption), of fear (or the recognition of power to be respected and evil to be shunned) were central elements in the advance of Western society to knowledge and power, which have given us wealth and freedom.⁴³

In the United States, and increasingly in Canada, these central elements of progress were not given the prominence Neatby deemed they deserved. In fact, she argued that in the

secular, modern world, the tendencies to materialism and moral relativism had gone to a dangerous extreme.⁴⁴ In his pursuit of happiness and material success, modern man had forgotten the true foundations and essential meaning of what were once considered important attitudes, and so lacked appreciation of their intrinsic worth. The progressivists were no exception. By burying these attitudes in the philosophical quagmire of moral relativism and materialism, they had diluted the strength of those values essential to human progress—progress in the spiritual and moral sense and not just in the material sense.⁴⁵ Consequently, because of the expert's slavish imitation of American trends, the moral fibre of the nation was becoming lax and the moral vision which had guided past generations of Canadians had been misplaced.

This loss of moral vision was exemplified in the attempts made by Canadian educators to accommodate moral and religious traditions to the teachings of the social sciences (and contemporary attitudes in general).⁴⁶ What resulted was not a consistent reconciliation but a combination of attitudes and approaches that were often antithetical. "Individual satisfaction," regarded as an end in itself, was promoted as an important goal.⁴⁷ Pleas for "social adjustment," and "the fear of frustration and the mania for success" continued to be voiced by Canadian educators from British Columbia to Ontario.⁴⁸ Such attitudes, which Neatby argued "[ran] directly counter to Christian teaching of a firm and fixed moral law...", had not been eliminated. Consequently, no real reconciliation had been achieved.⁴⁹ It then often became a question as to whether these

educators had ever made a conscious choice to accommodate the views of the secular modern world to a religious world view, because they did not appear to have a precise definition of the attitudes of either.⁵⁰ The result was total confusion over the teaching of values and the real victims of this confusion were Canadian children.

It was not that Neatby favored the reinstitution of denominational education. The "transcendentalism" of a T.S. Eliot was not as appealing to her as were the views of those who advocated the restoration "not so much of a religion but religion...."⁵¹ In this context "religion" denoted an idea "of the final seriousness of life," and "an awareness that there [were] more important things than merely material ones."⁵² It was an element that would enhance intellectual inquiry not inhibit it, for Neatby maintained that "it[was] a question whether one achieves complete development of the intellect unless the powers were directed to something beyond the intellect."⁵³ It would seem that those things beyond the intellect included the greater good of the community and the spiritual or moral dimension of human existence. As was the case with the Massey Report, Neatby's critique of modern education was animated by the need to reassert a moral vision of society—one that would counteract the materialistic preoccupations of life in modern North American society.

In many respects, Neatby's notion of religion has much in common with Northrop Frye's concept of religio. For Frye, the function of religio (which goes beyond the dictates of religious doctrine and orthodoxy) is linked to that of social

concern.⁵⁴ Both provide a sense of community or social identity because they bind "together a society with acts and beliefs of a common concern."⁵⁵ Frye argues that, in the broadest sense, religion is the mortar that binds a community together; it is the foundation of a "society of neighbors."

Neatby was equally concerned with this function of religion and with the promotion of a "society of neighbors." Therefore, while she stressed the importance of freedom of inquiry, she emphasized that the free play of intellect had to be tempered by moral and ethical considerations and by concern for the well-being of society as a whole. In her opinion, the system of educating promoted by progressive educators advocated the importance of "self-realization," but did not provide the individual with the attitudes through which this might be achieved. She argued that in the progressivist's world the individual was under "no absolute obligation to anyone or any belief outside himself."⁵⁶ He was invited to no act of worship and found himself in the world, "sated with wonders but never called upon to wonder."⁵⁷

Without faith and a sense of wonder, and without the interest sustained by these attitudes, man's intellectual pursuits appeared meaningless because they lacked the spiritual base or sense of social concern that might have inspired them. Appreciation of knowledge for its own sake was lost. Emphasis on the purely practical and useful increased, and the pursuit of all other knowledge was reduced to mere diversions or entertainment.⁵⁸ It was clear to Neatby that the continued

proliferation of such attitudes would only compound the problems of existence in the world of television and the atomic bomb.

More dangerous still, however, was the loss of a sense of humility and selfless dedication that emerged from the contemplation of the vast store of human knowledge and from reverence for a power greater than man.⁵⁹ In Neatby's opinion the loss of such attitudes led man to assume that progress was inevitable "that with money and know-how everything could be achieved by short-cuts and accelerated programs."⁶⁰ Like George Grant, she warned that this naive belief in progress (guaranteed by science and technological development), combined with the increasing emphasis "on material comfort as the highest expression of well-being" was breeding a race of amoral, complacent, hedonistic individuals.⁶¹ Such attitudes caused the individual to lose sight of the spiritual and moral dimension of existence. As a result, many abandoned their duty to the larger community and concentrated on the solitary pursuit of personal happiness, security and wealth.⁶² The final result was the rise of the mass society and the decline of the society of neighbors.

Yet what solutions did the progressivists, and their "mentors" the social scientists offer to solve the problems which they themselves had helped to create? They offered only the universal panacea of "group integration" in an attempt to reinforce the idea of man as a social being who could only be fulfilled by "group interaction."⁶³ According to Neatby, an important distinction was blurred in this use

of jargon. In her essay "The Group and the Herd" she argued that their concept of group integration tended to overlook the fact that "human beings like animals may drift or be driven into herds," while groups or communities were formed only by individuals.⁶⁴ This distinction was vitally important because the difference between the group and the herd was "the measure of our humanity."⁶⁵

That this essential yardstick might be lost was made possible because the progressivists did not provide the intellectual training or spiritual and moral instruction necessary for the cultivation of an educated well-informed individual. In her opinion, their ideal of group integration was nothing more than a safety precaution designed to insure that the egocentric beings they educated were submerged in a faceless mass of humanity, a herd.⁶⁶ Their notion of community had very little if anything in common with the Christian or humanist conceptions of community, based on such antiquated notions as "freedom" coupled with a "sense of duty."⁶⁷ Consequently, the real foundations of individual freedom and a sense of community, "of a conception of one's place in the physical world and the world of men," were rapidly being lost.⁶⁸

Neatby conceded that the western world could never have remained "permanently dazzled by the individual emphasis of the American and French revolutions or of nineteenth century liberalism."⁶⁹ Moreover, she went on to observe that the atomization of society which resulted from adherence to extreme individualism was no more desirable than the "ideal" of community promoted by the progressivists.⁷⁰ Yet it was still

evident to her that the cultivation of the disciplined mind and spirit and the preservation of individual freedom were essential if democracy was to be maintained.⁷¹ It would seem that freedom, for Neatby, was meaningless without conscious individual choice and was artificial if the larger community was sacrificed at its altar. Her social vision was one which embraced an ethic of individual and social freedom. Such a community could only be realized through the preservation of its most precious component—the educated individual.

Neatby implied that because Canada had not been a product of an eighteenth century revolution, it had preserved the cultural traditions and social vision of an older notion of community.⁷² As a result Canadians had been given the opportunity to develop a system of education consistent with the very social values and traditions she defended. In her opinion, however, this opportunity had been lost because of the influence of American progressivism and the social values implicit in that philosophy.

Nevertheless, Neatby did not give in to total despondency. Her criticism of modern education in Canada did not form a lament for a culture already lost. She maintained that the process could be reversed. Canadian educators still had the opportunity to develop a system of education representative of the traditions upon which the nation had been built. What was needed in order to do so

...was a renewal of faith and a renunciation of the false rationalism which implicitly denies the power of faith for good or evil in human

society. What is needed is a redefinition of democracy in terms of freedom and a return to the habitual and deliberate contemplation of greatness. What is needed is a just appreciation at once of the uses and abuses of material comfort and well being, a constant awareness that although scarcity may ruin health and happiness, abundance is no guarantee of either.⁷³

She urged that Canadian educators play their part by establishing a philosophy of education that embraced these principles.

Like the Massey Report, Hilda Neatby noted the dissolution of traditional bonds and the rise of mass society, not only with nostalgia but also with considerable alarm. Hers was a profoundly conservative view of society, one still rooted in the British traditions of a Canadian past and a philosophical tradition which viewed intellectual and spiritual values as fundamental to life as a whole. Charles Taylor, in his book Six Journeys: A Canadian Pattern describes the intellectuals he examines as conservative "not in the narrow political sense, but in the deeper sense of trying to enact traditions which are rooted in faith, and which rebuke the corroding cynicism of recent decades."⁷⁴ Certainly, Neatby's critique of modern education was conservative in the sense that Taylor denotes. Moreover, her work was representative of a much broader intellectual response to a modern world that seemed devoid of any sense of certainty in the personal, social or political realm.

That tradition, the bridge between past and future, had grown thin, indeed had almost disappeared, was as evident to her as it was to other intellectuals such as Hannah Arendt. In examining the world after the second war, Arendt found that

the dissolution of tradition and authority was evident in every area of life, including education.⁷⁵ But whereas Arendt argued that the loss of tradition and authority was inevitable, the result of broader social and intellectual upheavals,⁷⁶ Neatby appeared to believe that it was the influence of the United States which was causing the gradual erosion of Canadian traditions. She implied that Canada, a country which had never experienced the upheaval of a revolution, still preserved elements of tradition and respect for authority in many areas of the public realm. In education it was therefore a matter of retrieving what had been lost by ridding Canadian education of American ideas and theories. This would not involve a return to a "vanished past"; she implied that such action would simply bring education back into line with the living traditions of Canadian society.

Finally, the questions implicit in Neatby's analysis of progressivism mirrored those that had preoccupied many who had contributed to and commented on the Massey Report. How could modern technological society in Canada find the correct solutions to social and political problems without the aid of men and women trained in the humanities or without a secure framework of social values within which to formulate those solutions? How could Canadians preserve a moral community without faith, serious reflection, respect for authority, and a consciousness of the "good" to be realized and "evil" to be shunned? How could these problems be solved without the selfless dedication of individuals who desired more than personal happiness, security and wealth? More important, perhaps,

how could Canadians nurture a moral vision of their society if they persisted in repeating the mistakes of the increasingly materialistic culture south of the border? It was clear to Neatby that Canadian progressive educators would not solve these problems because they were as much a cause as a result of the existing social trends in the Canada of the 1950s.

III

It is possible to argue that Neatby's analysis of education merely constituted the testimony of one who had dedicated her life to study of the humanities, resisting the growing dominance of science and the social sciences. Her constant reference to the central importance of history and philosophy, over the relative merits of sociology and psychology, could be interpreted as a defense based in self-interest and personal insecurity. The implicit message of this defense was a demand for more money for studies in the humanities and the utilization of the expertise of scholars trained in the humanities in all areas of public life, including education. This interpretation does not, however, fully explain the variety of her concerns. Similarly, her studies might be perceived as representative of a cold war mentality—as handbooks for the protection of the traditions of western civilization from the "red hordes." This too would be a drastic oversimplification. In fact what we find throughout her work is an assumption that the social values gaining ground in American mass society were no more admirable than those upheld by "the controllers of the Russian state."

Like many other intellectuals in Canada during the 1950s, Neatby's concerns were primarily those of a representative of "high culture" seeking to defend the traditions and ideals of that culture. Her call for the development of a Canadian philosophy of education was not simply born of a "Canada First" mentality. She appeared to be arguing that it was not only a unique Canadian culture that was at stake, but also the best traditions of western culture and civilization as found on the North American continent. She perceived culture to be, in the traditional sense, the training and refining of intellectual, moral and aesthetic sensibilities. In order to preserve Canadian culture, therefore, education had to concern itself with the cultivation of those sensibilities—ones which, she argued, a large number of American educators since Dewey had ignored.

In this respect, Neatby was perhaps more concerned with the preservation of culture in the broadest sense, than she was with the development of a Canadian culture as such. Canadian culture, if it was to be worthy of respect, had to be rooted in the correct values. Her attack on progressive education, an implicit attack on the social values of mass culture in America, did not advocate the development of an indigenous "popular culture" as the base for resistance. She argued instead for the preservation and promotion of the ideals and traditions of "high culture" at all levels of society. In order to defend this cultural tradition, she maintained that Canadians had to resist importing American social and cultural values in whatever form they arrived, whether as

movies, television, radio programs or educational theories. In addition to this they had to be educated in such a way that they knew what it was they defended.

It was Neatby's belief, given the historical development of the Canadian nation, that this was not as awesome a task as it first appeared. Culture in Canada, from an anthropological view (the historical preferences, predispositions, attitudes and goals of the Canadian people), provided a foundation for the preservation of culture as she defined it. This was hinted at in her tracts on education. Unfortunately she did not describe at any great length the distinguishing features of this Canadian experience in those studies. It is possible, however, to get at the assumptions that informed her conception of Canada through a brief perusal of other articles on related topics. Predictably, this conception did not differ greatly from the viewpoint put forward in the Massey Report.

Neatby argued that Canada's character as a nation had been largely determined by its founding people. Each of the nation's founding groups whether French-Canadian, Loyalist or Highland Scots, formed a community which by circumstance or by choice, had been cut off from some former loyalty.⁷⁷ In an article on Canada's cultural evolution prepared for the Westinghouse Conference called "Canada's Tomorrow" (1954). Neatby elaborated on this theme, stating that these groups,

...without having much in common beyond their rejection and their joint habitation of a vast, lonely land, have together created a national community with autonomous political institutions and an integrated economy. The different

communities may be geographically isolated or culturally distinct or both. With all their divisions, however, they have been thrown together by a common determination to survive.⁷⁸

She intimated that just as individuals maintained a sense of their individuality in order to contribute in a meaningful way to the co-operative life of the group, so too the various ethnic and regional communities of Canada had preserved their separate identities while appreciating their relationship to the greater whole: the nation.⁷⁹ Initially, the determination to survive had held these groups together. As time went on, however, it was their common history and shared traditions that insured their continued co-existence.⁸⁰ Here again we hear echoes of the sentiments expressed in the Massey Report. Unity in Canada was not synonymous with homogeneity. It was to be found in the preservation of diversity, through co-operation. For Neatby, the existence of a common history or shared traditions did not entail the elimination of cultural differences, but an honoring of those differences within a common framework.⁸¹

In Neatby's opinion, it was therefore necessary to begin any explanation of the national character by defining it in terms of two cultures—the French and the English. In an address delivered to the Canadian Historical Association in 1956, she argued that these two cultures, which inspired one another and added variety to Canadian life, preserved a fundamentally common heritage.⁸² Distinct and separated by a language barrier they were, in fact, inextricably connected. In her view Canada was "the product of French survival, of

its English by-product, and of their intimate and complex relationships."⁸³

In Canada it was therefore absurd to talk of "bi-culturalism as cultural co-operation."⁸⁴ What the nation needed, Neatby contended, was "better cultural circulation in what is and has for two centuries been one body."⁸⁵ For English-Canada this involved a recognition of its separate cultural roots as formed first in relation to French-Canada and second in relation to the whole of western civilization.⁸⁶ Only in this way could national unity be preserved. In order to do this, however, it was necessary for the State to take an active role in the education and cultural development of its citizens.

Neatby's conception of the State demonstrates the essential conservatism at the center of her nationalist outlook. In her opinion, the liberal view of the State, as defined by Adam Smith, was insufficient for a country like Canada.⁸⁷ She argued for the rejuvenation of an older tradition, "perhaps more French than English, which sees the State not merely as an organ of prohibition and police, but as a great social institution representing life in its wholeness."⁸⁸ It was not enough for the State to simply levy taxes for the military or to build railways or pipelines. Canadians had to present themselves to the world and to each other as a people with more than material progress on their minds. She might just as easily included that they had to cultivate an image substantially different from the one their neighbors to the south presented to the world.

In keeping with the sentiments expressed in the Massey Report, Neatby argued that national unity depended upon more than material growth and the flow of cash and goods. It depended upon the promotion of commonly held attitudes and values—those things of the spirit and mind that united Canadians. Therefore, the government had a larger role to play in preserving these things. It was her contention that the government could not separate the "political from the cultural and moral communitiy" for any attempt to do so constituted a denial of "the moral character of the State."⁸⁹ Consequently, Neatby agreed with Innis and Lower that the Canadian government had to protect the national culture. She too believed that a "laissez-faire" approach to culture would eventually mean cultural assimilation into the United States.⁹⁰ The fact that Canadians were already aware of the danger was demonstrated in the existence of an organization like the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.⁹¹ Nevertheless, she warned that further action was necessary and to this end argued that it would be admirable if Canada

...as a nation, would justify its existence by showing a little more direct concern for matters of the mind; by acknowledging some responsibility for preserving in Canada the great traditions of the arts, letters and sciences which belong neither to Canadians or Canadiens, but to human civilization.⁹²

One would suspect that, if pressed, Neatby would have argued that such a stance was not only admirable but necessary if English-Canada was to continue to exist as a separate cultural entity in the North American continent.

At this juncture Neatby returns to the central arguments on the role of education put forward in So Little for the Mind. Application of the conclusions she reached in her study of Canadian education, and the philosophical and ideological assumptions that led her to those conclusions, were not limited to this one institution. She systematically applied the same principles and outlook to every aspect of life in Canada. Her conceptions of democracy, of the individual's relation to society, of the nature of freedom and equality were consistently applied in other aspects of social criticism and in her writings on Canadian history. Neatby's social vision held together like a series of interlocking circles which expanded from the individual to the community, from the institution of education to the State as a whole. Moreover, she clearly believed that the conservative social vision that she promoted was rooted in the Canadian past—in the traditions and social values upon which the nation had been built.

There is no doubt that Neatby's attack on progressivism was hard hitting and to the point. She was ruthless in her assessment of modern education and demonstrated a remarkable facility for pinpointing the contradictions evident in her opponents reasoning. She was not, however, as adept at reconciling the contradictions evident in her own arguments.

As an idealist, Neatby concentrated on an analysis of those ideas (in this case progressivism) that shaped society in one form or another. As a result of this approach, progressivism was frequently characterized as an accidental

manifestation in the history of ideas. Neatby rarely examined this theory as a product of the social reality in which it took form and as one that served the needs of society once adopted to the practice of education. She was therefore unable to explain why progressivism had become the dominant theory of education across all of North America. She viewed progressivism as an aberration or accidental "wrong turn" in the development of educational theory in Canada, an assumption which was not only dubious but in the most extreme sense ahistorical.

Admittedly, Neatby did argue that progressivism was, in one respect, a product of the "revolutionary" traditions of the United States.⁹³ Moreover, she maintained that progressivism was as much a symptom as a cause of a widespread social malaise.⁹⁴ In her opinion, the genesis of this sickness was to be found in man's loss of faith in God and in the gradual rejection of Christian values.⁹⁵ She did not, however, attempt to link the demise of the religious world view and the rise of secularism, materialism and moral relativism to the continuing advance of liberal capitalist society. She did not fully explore whether or not the values of commerce were antithetical to Christian ethics and morality. While she attacked the modern preoccupation with material comforts, success-seeking, and social adjustment, she did not attack the operation of an economic system that promoted these attitudes. Consequently, she was unable to explain why progressivism had gained the currency it had not only in the United States, but also in Canada—a nation which was

rapidly assuming its place amongst the advanced capitalist states of the world.

It would be unfair to argue that Neatby completely ignored the social problems created by the liberal state and economic system. She attacked what she characterized as the outdated "laissez-faire liberalism of the nineteenth century" particularly as it had been applied to cultural exchange between the United States and Canada.⁹⁶ She defended the necessity of public ownership in certain areas of the economy and the importance of social welfare programs.⁹⁷ She attacked the liberal conception of the state and sought to redefine its jurisdiction in terms of the whole community of which it was an expression. Yet she did not challenge the central place of the market economy; she merely wished to alter its less attractive cultural, social and political by-products. In this respect, her social vision for Canada was not substantively different from the one she attacked.

Moreover, Neatby's views were as class-bound as those of the Massey Commissioners who maintained that, in the strictest sense, learning and intellectual cultivation were available to everyone. This was clearly demonstrated in her assessment of the factors that determined individual intelligence and in her distorted faith in the social justice guaranteed by equality of opportunity. In her attack on the progressivist's emphasis on equality she repeatedly stressed "the obvious irremediable fact that some children are brighter than others"⁹⁸ and maintained that "men are not equal and ... do not really desire equality."⁹⁹ There was little doubt that individual

differences did exist. Nevertheless, Neatby remained blind to the social factors that denied equality, and which made equality of opportunity a hollow promise.

Her flip dismissal of a passage taken from a British Columbian study guide on reading pinpoints this blind spot.¹⁰⁰ The guide emphasized that teachers consider the influence of personal background, physical condition, emotional drives and language ability on a child's ability to read. Neatby believed this to be a waste of time and defended the approach of "the old days when you could read or you couldn't."¹⁰¹ She refused to recognize that equality of opportunity meant nothing when children from impoverished families had the same opportunity for schooling but began that schooling on an unequal footing when compared with children from wealthier background. The absence of need, a stable home environment, English-speaking parents and the availability of books and other resources all influenced a child's ability to learn. It was not, as she argued, simply a matter of some children being "incurably stupid and lazy" and others being bright and ambitious.¹⁰² At least progressive educators attempted to face these problems, even if they used inappropriate methods to solve them. Allowing all children to sink or swim in her "traditional school" would have meant that the privileged would swim while the under-privileged sank. Giving the common man in Canada more than a common education was, therefore, a more complex process than she was willing to admit.

Finally, although Neatby despised the industrial and

technological metaphors utilized by the progressivists which reduced teachers to "social engineers," schools to "plants," and the process of teaching to mere "technique," she was not above utilizing similar metaphors.¹⁰³ She described education as a "key industry" and argued that if "the industrial challenge today is to tool up and increase production by all means," then education was not doing an adequate job.¹⁰⁴ Evidently, her concerns were not so far removed from those of the educational experts she attacked. Their means certainly differed, but their goals were often the same.¹⁰⁵

Neatby's attack on the methods of indoctrination utilized by progressive educators, and the totalitarian tendencies evident in progressivism was, perhaps, justified. Nevertheless, her own insistence on the need for deference to authority, her defense of a "natural" hierarchical social structure and her preoccupation with the preservation of social order betrayed an authoritarian tendency in her own work. There was a fine line between what she called a "loyal worker" and the "servile worker" she believed progressivism cultivated.¹⁰⁶

Her distress over the operation of prevailing systems that resulted in "The unhappy effects of the theoretical exclusion of dogmatic morality; of neglect and scorn for the intellect which results from pseudo-democratic equalitarianism; of the success-happiness fallacy; of the blind faith in scientific techniques and mass operations....,"¹⁰⁷ was genuine and in some respects well-founded. Yet her attack on progressivism as an "alien" American theory led her to imply

that these prevailing systems were somehow uniquely American and not Canadian. By fostering the development of a Canadian culture, rooted in Canadian traditions and values she hoped to offset the influence of what she believed to be American social values. By promoting the traditions and ideals of high culture she believed that the rise of mass consumer society might be halted. By instituting a Canadian philosophy of education that preserved an essentially conservative social vision she hoped to nurture the growth of a more moral and humane social order in Canada. Nevertheless, given the contradictions evident in her own system of thought, it is doubtful that, even if it had been applied, it would have achieved the desired results.

Despite these shortcomings and in some cases because of them, Neatby's nationalist critique of education in Canada solicited a widespread response. The articles on education and reviews of her work that appeared after the publication of So Little for the Mind bear examination. An analysis of these will demonstrate that Neatby was not entirely alone in her concerns. Other Canadian intellectuals were equally alarmed by current trends in education and the way in which these reflected the ongoing changes in Canadian society. A number of these agreed that Canadians had to devise their own system of education (one that was consistent with the traditions of the nation) if they wanted to protect and promote the national culture. Nevertheless, there were those whose opinions differed, and as a result the debate over Canadian education became something of "a temperate dispute."

Notes

Chapter III

1. "Teach more Canadianism in Schools?" The Financial Post, (Sept. 15, 1951), pp. 11, 14.
2. Ibid., p. 11.
3. The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, (Ottawa: The King's Printer, 1951), p. 15.
4. Ibid., pp. 15-17.
5. Ibid.
6. Hilda Neatby, So Little for the Mind, 2nd ed., (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Co., Ltd., 1953), p.v.
7. Ibid., pp. 38-39.
8. Ibid.
9. Carl Berger, The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism 1867-1914, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), Chapter 3.
10. See:
 Northrop Frye, "Conclusion," Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English, ed., Carl F. Klinck, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), p. 825.
 George Grant, Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1965), pp. 70-71.
 Hugh Hood, "Moral Imagination: Canadian Thing," The Governor's Bridge is Closed, ed., Hugh Hood, (Toronto: Oberon Press, 1973), p. 102.
11. Berger, The Sense of Power, p. 103.
12. Ibid., pp. 103, 115.
13. Ibid., p. 103.
14. Neatby, So Little for the Mind, pp. 38-39.
15. Ibid., p. 34.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid., pp. 34, 289.

18. Ibid., p. 34.
See: Chapter Two of this thesis for a detailed account of Harold Innis', The Strategy of Culture.
19. Ibid., p. 334.
20. Ibid., pp. 15-17.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid., pp. 8-9.
23. Ibid., pp. 26, 133-134.
24. Ibid., pp. 53-54.
25. Ibid., pp. 39, 45, 235-236.
26. Ibid., pp. 16-17, 59.
27. Ibid., p. 235.
28. Ibid., pp. 51-54, 235-236.
29. Hilda Neatby, The Debt of Our Reason, (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Co., 1954), pp. 10-11.
30. Neatby, So Little for the Mind, pp. 15, 45.
31. Ibid., pp. 39-42.
32. Ibid., pp. 15, 69, 258.
33. Ibid., pp. 15, 40, 317.
34. Ibid., p. 317.
35. Ibid., p. 317.
36. Ibid., p. 133.
37. Ibid., pp. 235-236.
38. Ibid., p. 319.
39. Ibid., p. 325.
40. Ibid., p. 326.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., pp. 239-241.

See also:

- Hilda Neatby, A Temperate Dispute, (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Co., 1954), p. 25.
43. Neatby, The Debt of Our Reason, pp. 18-19.
 44. Ibid., pp. 18-19.
 45. Ibid.
 46. Neatby, So Little for the Mind, pp. 48-49, 53-54.
 47. Ibid., p. 54.
 48. Ibid.
 49. Ibid.
 50. Ibid.
 51. Ibid., p. 247.
 52. Ibid.
 53. Ibid., p. 331.
 54. Northrop Frye, "The Knowledge of Good and Evil," The Morality of Scholarship, ed., Max Black, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967), p. 25.
 55. Ibid.
 56. Neatby, The Debt of Our Reason, p. 20.
 57. Ibid., pp. 20-21.
 58. Ibid., pp. 21-22.
 59. Ibid., p. 11.
 60. Ibid., p. 23.
 61. Ibid.
 62. Ibid., pp. 20-23.
 63. Ibid., p. 22.
 64. Hilda Neatby, "The Group and the Herd," A Temperate Dispute, (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Co., 1954), p. 32-33.
 65. Ibid., p. 33.
 66. Neatby, The Debt of Our Reason, p. 22.

67. Neatby, "The Group and the Herd," pp. 34-35.
68. Ibid., p. 35.
69. Ibid., p. 30.
70. Ibid., p. 31.
71. Neatby, The Debt of Our Reason, pp. 10-11, 22-23.
72. Ibid., pp. 8-11.
- See also:
- Neatby, So Little for the Mind, pp. 38-39.
73. Neatby, So Little for the Mind, pp. 324-325.
74. Ibid.
75. Hannah Arendt, Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought, (New York: Viking Press, 1961), pp. 14, 190-191, 194.
76. Ibid.
77. Hilda Neatby, "Cultural Evolution," Canada's Tomorrow, ed., G. Gilmour, (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada Ltd., 1954), p. 190-191.
78. Ibid., p. 191.
79. Ibid., pp. 190-192.
80. Ibid.
81. The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, pp. 5, 273.

W.L. Morton expanded upon this idea in his book, The Canadian Identity (1961). While Neatby did not provide a political explanation for the preservation of cultural diversity, Morton did. In an examination of Canada as a "constitutional monarchy" he explained how it was that the institution of the monarchy had contributed to a system of government that preserved diversity. He also compared this system to that of the United States. Whether or not Neatby fully agreed with Morton's explanation is open to debate. Nevertheless, both expressed essentially conservative views and both wished to promote an essentially conservative social vision for Canada and to preserve what they believed to be "the moral character" of the Canadian State.

82. Hilda Neatby, "Canadianism: A Symposium," Canadian Historical Association Repts., (1956), p. 75.
83. Ibid.
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid.
86. Ibid., pp. 75-76.
87. Ibid., p. 76.
88. Ibid.
89. Hilda Neatby, "The Massey Report: A Retrospect," Tamarack Review, Autumn, 1956, p. 39.
90. Ibid., pp. 40, 45-46.
91. Ibid., p. 40.
92. Neatby, "Canadianism," p. 76.
93. Neatby, So Little for the Mind, pp. 38-39.
94. Ibid., p. 17.
95. Ibid., pp. 235, 319-320, pp. 331-332.
96. Neatby, "The Massey Report," p. 45.
97. Ibid.
98. Neatby, So Little for the Mind, p. 69.
99. Ibid., p. 316.
100. Ibid., p. 30.
101. Ibid.
102. Ibid., p. 234.
103. Ibid., p. 5.
104. Hilda Neatby, "Progressive Education: A Challenge Missed," Saturday Night, 69 (Oct. 17, 1953), p. 7.
105. Neatby was, in many respects, a victim of the problems that many modern conservatives confronted. As George Grant describes it in Lament for a Nation (1965), "Conservatives who attempt to be practical face a dilemma. If they are not committed to a dynamic technology, they

cannot hope to make any popular appeal. If they are so committed they cannot hope to be conservatives." Neatby did not, however, fall victim to the most extreme pitfalls of conservatives who, according to Grant, had lost a conception of the "eternal order" and whose views were based on nothing more than "a defense of property rights and chauvinism, attractively packaged as an appeal to the past." Present day neo-conservatives would seem to fit into this category more comfortably. Nevertheless, as is the case with so much in conservative thought, the desire for social order and for maintenance of the status quo, helped to preserve the political, social and economic institutions that reproduce the very social values that both Neatby and Grant abhorred. This is the fault of modernity (as Grant would have us believe) and more the fault of conservatism itself as a system of thought.

106. Neatby, So Little for the Mind, p. 18.

107. Ibid., pp. 319-320.

CHAPTER IV

"A Temperate Dispute"

I

Hilda Neatby's critique of modern education was intended to be much more than an attack on progressive educational theories. It was a call to Canadians to wake up and act to preserve what Neatby believed to be the nation's cultural heritage. It was a demand for the development of a Canadian philosophy of education which would express, in both theory and practise, the traditions and social values of all Canadians. Nevertheless, when the storm of controversy broke after the publication of So Little for the Mind, it was not the issue of a national education per se, but the relative merits of traditionalism and progressivism that were most frequently discussed.

Commenting on the book's reception, Frank Underhill noted that it had been "received with rapture by most teachers and by most parents of middle brow intellectual status or better."¹ Amongst the educational experts, those whom Underhill referred to deprecatingly as "the pompous pundits of education," the reception had been less than enthusiastic.² He noted that these progressive "swivel-chair educators" had "quickly [come] to regard Neatby as pious Catholic churchmen had once regarded Voltaire."³ A brief perusal of articles written in Manitoba journals geared towards this group demonstrates that Underhill's assessment was fairly accurate. In articles with titles such as "So Little from One Mind"

the educational experts that Neatby attacked struck back with a vengeance.⁴

These counter-attacks were generally formulated around a defense of the theory and practise of progressivism. Very few educators addressed the nationalist content of Neatby's study, and those who did generally failed to appreciate the relationship between Neatby's traditionalism and her particular brand of cultural nationalism.⁵ Some provided an adequate defense of progressivism,⁶ while others stood as embarrassing testimony to Neatby's most ardent criticisms of professional educators.⁷ These became easy targets for her penetrating wit. B.K. Sandwell, in a review of her book, A Temperate Dispute, described the fate of one such critic who had been "so neatly spitted on the point of her essay that he would probably never know what went through him."⁸

As one observer noted, the debate between Neatby and her detractors continued to be "waged violently and in strong language" throughout the winter of 1953-54.⁹ It reached a fever pitch on February 25, 1954, when Dr. Neatby and a Dr. E.C. Phillips (Professor at OCE) battled it out on the C.B.C. radio program "Citizen's Forum."¹⁰ Nevertheless, it was not only Neatby and the educational experts who took part in the debate, nor were educational journals and radio the only forums utilized. Articles and letters by members of the universities, the press and the "interested public" appeared in a large number of Canadian periodicals which included, amongst others, Saturday Night, Maclean's, Food for Thought and The University of Toronto Quarterly.¹¹ The Royal Society of Canada sponsored

a special symposium in 1954 entitled "So Little for the Mind," and the 23rd annual Couchiching Conference (Conferences sponsored by the Canadian Institute of Public Affairs and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) pitted traditionalists against progressivists in a discussion of Canadian education.

It should be noted, however, that a substantial number of those who took part in the debate refrained from taking sides. Some of these "moderate" spokespeople deplored the violent tone of the debate—the polemics and the name-calling. Many advocated what they believed to be a more reasonable approach. Kenneth Patrick Watson, in an article that appeared in The Canadian Forum (1954), was not the first or last to suggest that once the emotionalism had subsided "controlled thinking and discussion" would reveal that the chasm between the two camps was not as wide as either side believed.¹² He and others such as N.V. Scarfe (Dean of Education at The University of Manitoba), Andrew Moore (a Manitoba School Inspector), N.A.M. MacKenzie (President of the University of British Columbia) and Georges J.G. Laverre (Editorial writer for the Canadian periodical Culture) argued or implied that a compromise between the two camps could be reached.¹³

In an article written for a series on education printed in The University of Toronto Quarterly (1956), N.V. Scarfe suggested that the traditionalist and progressivist approaches were not "mutually exclusive."¹⁴ Another moderate even went so far as to claim that an application of the best principles of "the progressive system of traditional education" would provide many of the answers to the problems of modern education.¹⁵

Finally, Watson maintained that good teachers had always combined the best of both traditionalism and progressivism in school rooms across the nation.¹⁶ For these individuals, therefore, the two approaches were not, as Neatby claimed them to be, antithetical, but were in many respects complementary.

Ostensibly, the central task for many of those who participated in the debate was to find ways to improve the quality of education, and to solve the financial problems created by the increasing numbers of school age children.¹⁷ Neatby's brand of cultural nationalism, bound as it was to the preservation of traditions that she believed were undermined by the application of "alien" American theories like progressivism, did not generally demand much attention. For many, the development of a Canadian philosophy of education was not as important as the more pressing problems of overcrowded classrooms and the general quality of education. Nevertheless, there were those who believed that the nationalist content and anti-American slant of Neatby's treatises on education were important. Most of these critics and supporters came from the universities and what might be labelled the "high-brow" press; and, while their numbers may appear small, their appeal and influence were not insignificant.

II

Predictably, B.K. Sandwell was one of those who praised Neatby's work most enthusiastically. Born in England and educated at the University of Toronto, he became

a journalist in 1897 and ended his career as editor of Saturday Night.¹⁸ He strongly supported Canada's continued connection to Great Britain and the Commonwealth. Moreover, he was deeply concerned about the impact of continental influences on that relationship and on the Canadian way of life. In a special study prepared for the Massey Commission he traced the impact of these present day influences, and warned that if Canada wished to maintain a separate cultural identity she must be aware of the ever-increasing-influence and power of American mass culture.¹⁹

Arguing that the "mechanical devices" of the new forms of mass media were reducing personal contact between family members and others, he pointed out that the school was "now almost the only person-to-person cultural contact which is left in full operation."²⁰ Yet even this was reduced by the influence of radio and cinema, whose impact was "of a far more alluring quality than anything even the most Deweyite school curriculum could offer."²¹ Nevertheless, he was not advocating that the schools should even try to compete on the basis of groundrules laid down by advanced communication technology. It would seem that in his opinion, the so-called Deweyite schools were doing more harm than good in their attempts to accommodate the education of the young to the presentation, style and content of mass culture and the social values of mass society.²² On the basis of this special study it was clear that when Neatby's first critique of "Deweyite" progressive education appeared Sandwell would give it his full support.

In a review of So Little for the Mind, Sandwell began by describing himself as a nineteenth century man—a fact which he noted disqualified him as a credible critic in the eyes of most progressive educators. Nevertheless, he went on to explain that his agreement with Neatby was based "on a long standing conviction that the current conception of democratic education [was] radically false and unsound."²³ In addition to this, however, one of the book's greatest values was the fact that it was a Canadian study that dealt with Canadian needs and conditions. It was significant because it made

...one of its chief charges against Canadian educational progressivism on the ground that it [was] not Canadian, that it was based upon an alien philosophy, invented in and chiefly held by a nation which early in its history cut itself off not only from the political but also from the social and cultural traditions of Europe in a way which Canada had never dreamed of following.²⁴

The value of tradition and the preservation of Canadian cultural autonomy preoccupied Sandwell as much as it had the members of the Massey Commission and Neatby herself. Moreover, it was clear to him that the most obvious place for the maintenance of those traditions was the school room, where person-to-person contact was still possible. Nevertheless, with the infiltration of progressive theories into Canadian education this had become a much more difficult task. Therefore, in order to counteract the apparent uniformity, aimlessness and alienation that seemed to characterize modern American society, Canada had to resist adopting American theories, and preserve the cultural traditions upon which the nation had

been built.²⁵ Thus Sandwell's tacit anti-Americanism and explicit nationalism in regards to education was an integral part of a world view that placed the greatest emphasis on the preservation of "tradition" as a means by which to offset the influence of the cultural values of the mass society to the south.

Another product of a nineteenth century inheritance was George Grant, head of the Department of Philosophy at Dalhousie University. The grandson of two of Canada's leading Imperialist's, George Parkin and G.M. Grant, his own brand of conservatism had much in common with their ideas and attitudes.²⁶ As Carl Berger noted, Grant's book, Lament for a Nation (1965) was something of "a depressing footnote" to the imperialist thought of an earlier generation.²⁷ Like his forbears, however, Grant was committed to the task of promoting Canadian independence during the 1950s. Perhaps partly because of family connections (he was Vincent Massey's nephew) but mainly because of his growing reputation as a scholar in his own right, Grant was invited to prepare a special report on philosophy for the Massey Commission. In this study, he addressed some of the same concerns that later preoccupied Neatby in her expose of modern education.

In his essay simply entitled "Philosophy," Grant expressed his own misgivings about the development of mass society in Canada. It was his opinion that the only way to arrest its growth and resist its final triumph was through the promotion and preservation of "the traditional faith of the west."²⁸ Grounded in the structure of the classical and

Christian traditions, this faith was based upon two conceptions of reality—the contemplative and the active.²⁹ It was Grant's belief that any society that emphasized action over contemplation risked ill health, because the contemplative tradition, (the rational form of which was philosophy) acted as a balance to the life of action. It provided a forum wherein it was possible to assess the possible ramifications of any given act in its social context. Moreover, it helped men "to relate their particular functions to the general ends which society, [desired] ,"³⁰ and acted as a brake on their often wreckless actions. In his opinion, Canadian society risked very poor health indeed, because so little time and money were being spent on the development of the contemplative arts.³¹

According to Grant there were two reasons for this state of affairs. In Canada, a country which had long been preoccupied with material survival, "the active rather than the contemplative life" continued to be viewed as the ideal long after it was necessary for survival.³² Consequently, the bonds of tradition were weaker here than in other countries. Moreover, Canada had come of age in a world that had experienced an almost "incalculable spiritual change," the result of the growing dominance of ideas associated with "mass industrialization."³³ In the west, this spiritual change had led man away from contemplation and away from the rational pursuit of the Good. In "the amazing light of science" man had come to believe that society could be perfected and that "knowledge for power" was the only

knowledge of worth.³⁴ As a result, in the field of education "there arose the egalitarian slogans with their contempt for the impractical and the academic."³⁵ That this had further weakened the bonds of tradition was evident to Grant. It was evident in the purely "materialist preoccupations of many Canadian universities," the excessive degree of specialization in higher education, and in the attempts to reduce philosophy to a mere "technique" by which students might hope to "earn a living."³⁶

Yet Grant seemed to imply that the damage done was not irreparable because a contemplative tradition continued to exist in Canada. Not all Canadian universities had followed the modern trend. For French and English-speaking Catholics a religious faith and contemplative tradition that stressed the unity of human knowledge and the central role of philosophy had been kept alive in Roman Catholic colleges and universities.³⁷ The situation for Protestant Canadians was somewhat different, however, partly because within the Protestant tradition the relationship between theology and philosophy had always been somewhat ambiguous.³⁸ Indeed, the study of philosophy in Protestant universities had often helped to destroy faith, instead of creating a "rational groundwork" for it.³⁹ Within the last century, therefore, many of the universities founded on the Protestant tradition had broken formal ties with the church and become "secularized."⁴⁰ Nevertheless, Grant maintained that even in Protestant Canada there was a tradition to build upon. The influence of men such as John Watson of Queen's University, who had been bred

in Scotland and "trained in European philosophy with its faith in human reason's pursuit of the Good," had helped to preserve a conception of the contemplative arts that future generations could build upon.⁴¹

Grant was cautious to point out, however, that this would not be done unless those teaching recognized that the vital issues of philosophy had to be translated into "sufficiently Canadian terms to make them of burning interest to young Canadians."⁴² Such an attitude he argued, was not "to stand upon the dogmas of a narrow Canadian nationalism, or to imply that Canadians [had] not important things to learn from men trained in Great Britain."⁴³ It merely meant that the work of philosophy in Canada should "be carried on within the context of Canadian teaching impregnated with our history and the form of our institutions and ideals."⁴⁴ He implied, therefore, that in order for philosophy to be relevant and meaningful to those studying it, it had to have its roots in the particular culture it served.

In 1951, Grant was still optimistic about the future of Canadian culture. He maintained the belief "that Canadians were no longer willing to accept from the more important nations of the Western world [in particular, the United States] their assumptions about human life."⁴⁵ Moreover, he noted that Canadian scholars like C.N. Cochrane, Northrop Frye and Harold Innis recognized that our traditions would not remain alive automatically. They understood that Canadian intellectuals had a vital role to play in preserving and enlivening the western tradition, as he defined it.⁴⁶ This recognition,

combined with an awareness of how much of the wisdom of those traditions "had been trodden underfoot in our concentration in developing the mass society," was the first step towards real cultural growth in Canada.⁴⁷

Nevertheless, Grant stressed that "any great flowering of our culture in general and our philosophy in particular" depended on a prior condition, "namely the intensity and concentration of our faith in God."⁴⁸ The sceptic lacked the courage that alone buttressed "the tiring discipline of being rational" necessary for the study of philosophy. Moreover, he agreed with A.N. Whitehead that "it is in ages of faith that men pursue truth and beauty."⁴⁹ Therefore, he implied that only in a renewed "age of faith" would a valid and vital Canadian culture flourish.

That Grant and Neatby shared the same mistrust of "modernity" should be self-evident. For both, the possibility of Canada and a Canadian culture was contingent upon the preservation of a way of life that they associated with the best traditions of Western civilization. It was also contingent upon a rejection of modernity, in so far as modernity was synonymous with materialism, a rejection of the contemplative tradition, loss of faith in a transcendent order and a naive belief in the power of science and technology to guarantee human progress. That education and, in particular, a liberal arts education had a central role to play in helping to determine the future choice for Canada was as obvious to Grant as it had been to Neatby.

In an address delivered to the National Conference on Adult Education, on May 27, 1954, Grant explored the nature and purpose of education in the "expanding economy." He began his speech with the assertion that one could not speak of education without first taking into account the reality of the expanding economy, "the inescapable situation within which we work and have our being."⁵⁰ Essentially, this economic order had produced "a society which [held] that the control of nature by technology [was] the chief purpose of human existence and from that belief a community [was] formed where all else was subordinated to that goal."⁵¹ While control of nature had always been "a crucial end of man's existence," Grant maintained that it had not, until very recently, been set up as the primary goal of existence.⁵² As a result of this new emphasis, social institutions, particularly education, were being unified around a new religion, "the religion of the manipulation of nature for short term economic gains."⁵³

In the process, modern man had lost sight of the "infinite goal" of human existence. In his preoccupation with the achievement of "limited finite goals" man had lost sight of the very tradition that preserved human freedom.⁵⁴ In Grant's view this was as true in Washington as it was in Leningrad, for both of these competing modern empires had embraced the religion of materialism, and the ideal "of a vast adjusted suburban world."⁵⁵ Indeed, Grant argued that "in our concentration on finite ends, the knowledge of the infinite—that is the world of freedom— [had] disappeared

in North America to a degree most of us [could not] even guess."⁵⁶ This loss of the "idea of spirit or freedom" was expressed in the predominant theory of education in North America. Modern education, in its preoccupation with "realizing a multitude of practical purposes" and "the achievement of immediate finite goals," reflected the very soul of the expanding economy.⁵⁷

Whereas historically education was defined as the process by which men became free—freed from the myths and shadows of everyday life into the realm of light and truth—the end of education in the modern world was social adjustment.⁵⁸ Whereas the process of learning had once been synonymous with struggle and rebellion, it was now associated with making people comfortable and adjusted.⁵⁹ Instead of life serving education, progressive educators like E.C. Phillips declared that education should serve life.⁶⁰ As a result, it was Grant's opinion that education was now viewed primarily as the means by which a variety of desirable ends might be achieved, including "good citizenship," "a proper sexual life" and "economic prosperity."⁶¹ In light of this, Grant wrote with devastating sarcasm that the primary goal of modern education appeared to be "to make men the most successful of apes."⁶²

The results were disastrous. In his opinion this view of education not only perverted the true purpose of learning, but killed the possibility of real art. More dangerous still, it helped to destroy man's relation to God. Art in the "adjusted society" became a sugar coating for worldly existence, a commodity added on the "the basic

business of the expanding economy."⁶³ Similarly, religion became a useful tool in the preservation of social order and the infinite was made "a tame confederate in our petty adventuring."⁶⁴ Eternity, according to "the religion of the American Senate," was merely the reward for socially adjusted and materially productive behavior."⁶⁵

Grant therefore admonished Canadian educators to get back to the business of "making men free." For Grant, however, freedom was not merely the capacity to act without inhibition—to do what one liked—but the capacity to focus our attention on the infinite so that we might do what was right.⁶⁶ The idea of "attention" was borrowed from the work of the French philosopher and mystic, Simone Weil, a woman whom Grant would later refer to as a "modern saint."⁶⁷ By her definition the faculty of attention was utilized in any process of learning. It was generally cultivated in one of two ways: by hard physical labor or through the rigorous discipline of study.⁶⁸ To learn to perform any task or master any operation correctly, attention to the work at hand was necessary; and the cultivation of the faculty of attention was crucially important because it eventually led the individual to pay attention to others and to the infinite.⁶⁹ It developed man's capacity for concern and aided him in the pursuit of truth and the "Good." It was, therefore, the single most powerful of man's abilities for it guaranteed human freedom—the capacity to do what is right. In the modern world where technology reduced the instance of hard

physical labor, disciplined thought and a system of education that insisted upon disciplined study was therefore of vital importance.⁷⁰

Yet when a book such as the one written by Hilda Neatby appeared, which attacked the anti-intellectual and oppressive system of modern education, the Canadian public failed to understand its purpose. Through discussions with wealthy middle class parents in Halifax, Grant discovered that their support for Neatby was not based upon a recognition that the training of the intellect "was necessary for the liberation of their children's souls."⁷¹ Their support was grounded in a fear "that if the anti-intellectual tendency in the schools continued their children would not be smart enough to be prosperous technicians."⁷² In light of this discovery Grant asserted that he probably had more in common with the "good-hearted enthusiasts" of progressive education, "because however vacuous and foolish progressive education [was] , the motive of egalitarian kindness behind it [gave] it at least more of the spirit than [did] middle class success-seeking."⁷³

Nevertheless, throughout the essay Grant appeared to imply that a system of education that preserved "the traditional faith" of the west could be conserved in Canada. The country still paid "a small half-hearted token to the tradition of freedom—that is the tradition of the infinite."⁷⁴ He maintained, however, that if Canadians embraced the religion of the American Senate and followed the already established pattern of the American "expanding economy" these remnants

of a traditional education would be destroyed. He warned that if the nation continued to concentrate on the development of mass society, following the dictates of the ideal of social adjustment, and if it persisted to feed Canadian children myths that turned reality into "a rosy dream" where "the horror of Dien Bien Phu and Senator McCarthy" could not touch them, it was lost.⁷⁵

Grant's explicit anti-Americanism, and his belief in the possibility of a Canadian culture that preserved its historical association with the "traditional faith of the West," formulated a brand of cultural nationalism that had much in common with that expressed in the Massey Report and in Neatby's treatises on education. Grant appeared to believe that if Canadians nurtured the development of the spirit and mind within the framework of this "traditional faith" then a truly worthy Canadian culture might emerge. Like Neatby, he was concerned over the diminishing influence of the humanities. He therefore sought to promote their social value in a modern world that appeared infatuated with the power of science and of the social sciences. He too embraced an elitist conception of culture. For Grant, culture was something that affected the lives of all men, but its formulation and dissemination was the responsibility of an elite, the intelligentsia. Moreover, he believed that while culture was grounded in the particular, it had to develop out of universal traditions. Canadian culture, while it would develop its own unique form and content, was still a part of the universal world of western culture.

Nevertheless, there were contradictions evident in Grant's views similar to those in Neatby's work. On the one hand he appeared to support a system of education that promoted intellectual struggle and even rebellion. On the other hand he lavished praise upon a Catholic system of education which, historically, had been associated with the repression of this type of behavior. His oversimplified view of industrial capitalist society as "an expanding economy" dedicated only to "short term economic gain" tended to obscure what was in fact an enormously complex set of economic and social relationships, the growth of which would not be halted merely by altering man's consciousness alone.

A programme of action that sought to preserve tradition and man's relation to the infinite —the realm of freedom as he defined it—was not a powerful enough weapon to arrest the growth of the consumer society. While he was extremely sensitive to the social changes occurring around him, his "Tory mind," his attachment to order and authority, prevented him from suggesting more strenuous political action. Moreover, his conception of Canada as a nation that was in some respects fundamentally different from the United States, provided him with the hope that Canadian society might escape the excesses of modernity. By 1965, however, he recognized, that the roots of this social order had been torn up in Canada's advance as a liberal capitalist society.

III

There were others who shared Grant's hope for the future of Canadian society and the Canadian system of education. Two of these were scholars who had already commented at length upon the implications of the Massey Report. Both A.R.M. Lower and Frank Underhill examined the problems facing modern educators in Canada. Underhill's comments developed from a direct response to Neatby's work, while Lower, who had already written a number of articles on education himself, examined the issue without directly commenting on Neatby's books and articles. Needless to say, however, the optimism of each was based upon very different points of view. In fact, the opinions which they expressed on the question of a Canadian approach to education did not differ substantially from the ones they had voiced on the general issue of the national culture.

As early as 1949 Arthur Lower began writing articles on education. After the publication of So Little for the Mind three more appeared. These were not the only ones he wrote,⁷⁶ but they were representative of his central concerns and overall approach. It was perhaps no coincidence that the first of these essays entitled, "The Survival Value of a Soft Nation," appeared in the same issue of Saturday Night as Neatby's article, "Progressive Education: A Challenge Missed."

The second, written as the Presidential Address to the Royal Society of Canada, explored the function of "The Canadian University," while the third, "Education in a Growing Canada," provided the introduction to a 1956 collection of essays on Canadian Education Today. Although these essays did not refer to Neatby or to her studies on education, all three provide evidence of Lower's support and demonstrate areas where his opinion differed from Neatby's.

Lower began his essay, "The Survival Value of a Soft Nation," by examining the product of the secondary school system—those students who walked through the doors of the universities in which he taught. It was the immaturity of these students which concerned him and he attacked the system of education which functioned to prolong adolescence.⁷⁷ People in Canada and in North America in general, he argued, existed in "a dream world of comfort and easy living." This was clearly reflected in the school system where children were not challenged or forced to face the problems of modern existence. While Canadian educators were fond of talking about "education for life," they were actually promoting doctrines which were "in large part a mis-education for life."⁷⁸ Like Neatby, he maintained that these experts were intent upon the promotion of

...a nicey-nice version of existence, where there are no nasty people and no nasty problems; it is one wherein we are all "socially adjusted" to each other, where everybody fits in, no one makes himself objectionable.... It is a prolongation of childhood.⁷⁹

In Lower's estimation, however, the root of the problem was the pervasive sentimentalism of North American society and

"particularly that of our American cousins."⁸⁰ Canadian "educationists," as much representatives of "ordinary men" with their "mediocre abilities" and inadequate education, took over "American practices without fundamental examination, so that American sentimentality gets into our schools, just as into American schools."⁸¹ As a result of this all pervading sentimentalism—which began with the assumption that man was basically good and which accepted the ultimate value of creature comforts and easy success for all—intellectual and moral discipline were suffering.⁸² In Lower's opinion this boded ill for the young people who were the victims of such a system. He argued that "Progressivism" as it was practiced in Canadian schools provided inadequate preparation for "the rough rude world."⁸³ He cautioned Canadians "to remember that there is a limit to the free play of individual impulse, that men are just as likely to be naturally bad, as naturally good, and that they therefore may need the firm hand, both to restrain their anti-social tendencies and to teach them to spell."⁸⁴

Throughout the essay, echoes of Neatby's and Grant's warnings are heard and amplified. Here again we find the belief that Canada could no longer afford to imitate American trends and that a traditional and rigorous approach to learning could not be abandoned or the nation that abandoned it would not long survive.⁸⁵ While the call for a national approach to education was not directly addressed in this essay, it seemed to be implied. Three years later, in an essay entitled "The Canadian University," it was given full voice but within a somewhat different framework from that of Neatby.

In his presidential address to the Royal Society of Canada, Lower focussed on the role and function of the university, not secondary education. He argued that the university was first and foremost a national institution that should have the national culture as its primary focus.⁸⁶ Those in Canada who tried to convince themselves that it was or should be international and cosmopolitan were usually seeing through colonial spectacles, their eyes fixed on London, Washington or New York as the true centers of culture. In his opinion, such attitudes represented the most distasteful form of provincialism and parochialism; and he argued that for Canada, "the best escape from parochialism in culture" could only come "from a more complete understanding of the local scene, a more complete, more sympathetic identification with it."⁸⁸ As far as Lower was concerned, it was only through the study and definition of the immediate and particular environment of Canada that Canadians could begin to participate in a meaningful way within the larger community of nations.

The university, therefore, had to provide the foundation for the consolidation of this national culture in a world which was "increasingly chaotic [and] nomadic,"⁸⁹ To do this it had to help in the creation of a new culture, or, as he put it,

...a native culture, built upon the remains of the old, and let us hope incorporating a good deal of it.... A valid, vital culture will have to come out of the current scene, despite its crudities. In its formation, the academic must play a lead, not titter nervously as he hears the harsh strains coming out of the rough and tumble dance hall....⁹⁰

While one could hardly describe Neatby as tittering nervously on the sidelines of "real life," it is possible to argue that she would have questioned Lower's emphasis on the value of the "current scene." Nevertheless, she would probably have wholeheartedly agreed with his nationalist view of the role of the University.

Lower was not advocating chauvinism or a "tribalist" nationalism. Nevertheless, in "Education in a Growing Canada" he did argue that, even in the modern world, education was not unlike initiation into the tribe. It continued to involve instruction in the three areas basic to human existence: belief, behavior and self preservation. In the modern world these were translated respectively into religion, morals and occupation.⁹¹ Focusing on the area of religion, and in particular the relationship between the church and the school, he came to the conclusion that training in Christian values had so far prevailed, even in Canadian public schools.⁹² But whereas in Roman Catholic Quebec the relationship between church and school was intimate and the two remained closely tied, the situation in English-Canada was substantially different. For the protestant or public school there was "no snug doctrinal harbour" and the variety of views stimulated an experimental approach to education which often gave the appearance of instability.⁹³

In spite of this, he argued that "the Protestant world [was] saved from chaos by such doctrine as remains." Nevertheless, he observed that "...the weaker the hold of tradition on a Protestant society...the greater its tendency

to anarchy."⁹⁴ According to Lower, salvation for the English-speaking world "has lain in its traditional institutions, which so far have proved strong enough for every crisis: representative government, the common law, fair trial and open debate."⁹⁵

In the modern world of technology, rapid change and high mobility, however, the tendency towards anarchy was greater than it had ever been and, in his opinion, this was clearly reflected in trends within the school system.⁹⁶

According to Lower, the United States, with its revolutionary history, its emphasis on extreme individualism and the general absence of a sense of "social freedom" or social restraint, found itself in an even more precarious position than did the rest of the English-speaking world.⁹⁷ English-speaking Canadians were not to be confused with their American neighbors because they "had never cut [themselves] off from tradition to the same degree as [their] American friends."⁹⁸ Canada had always been marked in contrast to the United States by its "conservatism" and by an ethic of social freedom⁹⁹ which Lower asserted was derived from the colonial experience, whose merit was the provision of a "fairly stable framework of social attitudes."¹⁰⁰ Canadians had never been as willing as Americans to experiment, to tinker with that framework as it was expressed in an institution such as education. Furthermore, while they confronted modern dilemmas similar to those of a highly industrialized nation like the United States, they had never completely allowed "the commercial way of life . . . to overpower traditional codes."¹⁰¹

They had not yet come to equate—as the American historian Charles Beard argued of the United States—"the good" with "that which is successful."¹⁰²

The pressure to conform to this attitude was enormous, however, and Lower believed that the debates over education in Canada attested to this. These debates were not simply arguments between traditionalists and experimentalists, but signalled a struggle for control between two opposing structures of values.¹⁰³ His greatest concern arose from a recognition that those who advocated the values of commerce were gaining control, and might well effect the final demise of those attitudes which had traditionally guided the nation in the education of its children.

In this struggle for control he maintained that it was the representatives of what he labelled "the third estate" or working class who would probably promote the preservation of a traditional framework of social values. While others argued that the working class would use its influence to promote "practical" education rather than traditional or intellectual education, Lower maintained the opposite to be true. He expressed his belief that

The working man is likely to prove just as respectful of the old-fashioned education as is the class at present in control: he is not as likely to feel that the traditional material should be superseded as is the self-made man who is creating his own new world and is impatient with values that do not conform to it. He may not be quite as anxious to have his son study plumbing as are some of the vocational reflectors of the world of business to be found in our schools today.¹⁰⁵

From this point of view democracy in the schools was certainly not to be feared merely because of the increased influence of the working class. On the other hand, a democratic vision based upon the presupposition that all could achieve the same level of success was, in Lower's opinion, not only far-fetched but undesirable. In an argument that harkened back to that of Neatby he stated that the greatest goal of education was "to contrive systems that in a new sense would give equal opportunities for all—large opportunities for those who could make the best of them and lesser ones for those who not so well-endowed by nature."¹⁰⁶ He went on to assert that "if something of this sort can be worked out without generating the arrogance and condescension which have usually accompanied a hierarchical organization of society, something very great will have been done."¹⁰⁷

To achieve such a system of education compromise was necessary and, as Lower pointed out, hope lay in the fact that Canadians had never been blind to the virtues of compromise. One had only to look at the political and economic compromise which had been reached between what he described as "a hybrid socialism" and "clipped-wings capitalism" in Canada to know that a similar compromise could be reached in the field of education.¹⁰⁸ To this end, experimentation would be necessary; but he maintained that "whatever modern or quasi-modern experimentalism [could] do, it [could] never substitute itself for the accumulated experience of the race."¹⁰⁹ The preservation and conveyance of this accumulated experience or "corpus of knowledge" from one generation to the next was in his view the

most important task of education.

There is no doubt that Neatby and Lower differed in their approaches. It is unlikely that she would have wholly agreed with his views on the nature of the struggle within the institution of education. The increasing political strength of what Lower called the "third estate" and its growing influence on matters related to education was never addressed by Neatby. Hers was largely a conservative and paternalistic attitude to the lower class. Her judgements appeared to rest upon the assumption that these were the people who had to be provided for and protected by their intellectual superiors. Moreover, she perceived mass culture in much the same way as did the Massey Report—with concern and suspicion. It was the lower classes for whom the glossy magazines, Hollywood movies and sub-standard radio programs were produced. Hence, her faith in their ability to judge what constituted the best system of education would not necessarily have matched Lower's optimism. Nor would Neatby have given her vote of confidence to the commercial class; their grasping, materialistic outlook could not be trusted. Rather, she appeared to place her entire trust in the intelligentsia as the group that would provide the guidance necessary in the struggle to establish a traditional, intellectual and truly Canadian system of education.

Nevertheless, Lower's assumptions about the cultural differences between Canada and the United States, his emphasis on the central role of tradition, his suspicion of extreme individualism and egalitarianism, as well as the importance he

placed on the community as a whole and the notion of social freedom, all paralleled Neatby's views. Finally, his belief that the best approach to education at the secondary and the post-secondary level was a national approach certainly corresponded to Neatby's demand for a Canadian philosophy of education. Both agreed that those involved in education should gear their programs and design their reforms to suit the specific needs of the national community they served.

Frank Underhill's attitude, on the other hand, differed substantially. At a Royal Society symposium entitled "So Little for the Mind," four scholars and educators commented on Neatby's critique of progressive education. In addition to such noted speakers as N.A.M. MacKenzie and F.E.L. Priestly, Frank Underhill presented his views on Neatby's analysis. After first expressing his pleasure at having read the work of so witty and vivacious a debunker of progressivism, and after admitting agreement with certain of her views, he went on to outline where his differed from those of Neatby.¹¹⁰

In an approach not unlike the one he utilized in his critique of the Massey Report he argued that the problems of education in Canada were not the outcome of a conspiracy to Americanize Canadian culture, but had arisen as a result of the "anti-intellectual atmosphere of our twentieth century."¹¹¹ The real enemy was not John Dewey or educational progressivism but the "Philistine spirit of our bustling, materially successful, middle class society."¹¹² This, he argued, was characteristic of the Western world and the North American continent as a whole. As a result, he went on to assert

that "Miss Neatby has found Dewey too attractive as a personal devil. She is still too much taken up with the task of saving Canadian culture from those baneful American influences which were discovered by the Massey Commission."¹¹³

Moreover, he pointed out that Americans themselves had already begun to do battle against the middle class philistinism of certain progressive educationists and Miss Neatby "only [helped] to reproduce in Canada the pattern which had already been traced out in the United States."¹¹⁴ Canada was part of the continent, and, like the United States, was a liberal, democratic and capitalist society confronting virtually the same social problems as did the society to the south. He did not accept the view that Canada was somehow fundamentally different from the United States. In "Canada and the Canadian Question, 1954," he admitted that its historical development was somewhat different from the American, but he maintained the view that the product was essentially the same.¹¹⁵ In opposition to Neatby he argued that the fundamental problem plaguing the Canadian school system "...was not its domination by imported American ideas but its domination by a native interlocking directorate of orthodox bureaucrats in the provincial departments of education, and expounders of orthodox doctrine in the colleges of education."¹¹⁶

As far as he was concerned, the variety of orthodox doctrine did not matter as much as the fact "that it [was] laid down from above as the authoritarian party line."¹¹⁷ The central focus for the attack against progressivism was not the philosophy as such, but the power of the men and women who promoted it.¹¹⁸ The real solution to the problem was the

decentralization of power. He argued that teachers, who were closest to the immediate problems of education and so best equipped to solve them, "had to achieve the same mature responsibility of educational policy which [was] enjoyed by the university professors."¹¹⁹

Clearly, Neatby's conservatism and her anti-Americanism most rankled Underhill. The promotion of Canadian cultural nationalism in the area of education, built as it was upon anti-American sentiment, was repugnant to him. Furthermore, in the case of Neatby's study it was also misplaced and unrealistic in that it took the focus away from the real problem grounded in the structure of bureaucratic power.¹²⁰ According to Underhill the problem was not created by the importation of American theories and American cultural values as expressed in those theories; the problem lay within the operation of a purely Canadian system which allowed a handful of bureaucrats the power to dictate an orthodox, doctrinaire approach to the real experts who taught children on a day to day basis.¹²¹ In his opinion Neatby's covert nationalism and her anti-American approach was unrealistic because they maintained that problems of modern education would be solved by "purging" Canadian schools of alien American ideas and by replacing them with an equally doctrinaire, orthodox but "purely Canadian" philosophy of education.

Once again, Underhill was one of the few who consistently argued that the anti-American cultural nationalism of individuals like Neatby and Lower was unrealistic. From his vantage point

Canadians could not have their cake and eat it too. Promoting Canada's cultural identity by excluding American cultural influence was as impossible a task as maintaining Canada's standard of living while shouting "no truck nor trade with the Yankees."¹²² As long as Canada continued in her chosen historical path as a liberal, democratic and capitalist society, she could not hope to alter her direction or escape from American influence.

It was not that Underhill refused to acknowledge certain political differences between Canada and the United States. In his essay "Canada and the Canadian Question, 1954," he stated those differences and acknowledged that "the oldest and most tenacious tradition in our communal memory centers around our determination not to become Americans."¹²³ Yet for all these apparent differences and anti-American sentiments Canada was not, in his opinion, fundamentally different from the United States.¹²⁴ As far as he was concerned existing anti-American feelings were generated more from what Merrill Denison termed Canada's "malevolently informed" and America's "benevolently ignorant" attitudes towards one another than they were based upon any real cultural, social or political differences.¹²⁵ Furthermore, he argued that cultural nationalists who believed that Canada was fundamentally different and who argued that the nation should shun the valuable contributions which the best of American culture might offer were deluding themselves.¹²⁶

In this respect he seemed to imply that individuals like Neatby and Lower were advocating the complete disallowance

of any American cultural trends in Canada. It was clear, however, that neither promoted such an approach. They did argue however, that Canada's historical experience had created the foundation for substantially different political and social attitudes which might foster the creation of a unique, and in some respects more ordered, if not more moral, culture in the country north of the forty-ninth parallel. Neatby argued, as had the Massey Report, that such a culture would not be promoted if Canadians relied exclusively on imported American theories and institutions.

Underhill rejected this point of view entirely, arguing that "we have no native inherent sense of higher standards which might preserve our Canadian purity if we could shut out the American [cultural] invasion."¹²⁷ In his opinion, Canada was, by virtue of its political institutions and economic structures a "mass democracy," basically the same as the United States. What was good in one nation was the potential or realized good of the other, and the problems of one were shared by both. Underhill seemed to be arguing that unless Canada was prepared to take a radically different approach to the organization of society this would continue to be the case.

These were realities which would eventually confront the Diefenbaker administration as it attempted, through a variety of policies, to diminish the power of American influence. Nevertheless, they were observations that would not begin to alter the political approach and content of Canadian nationalism until the next decade. In actual fact Underhill's arguments did

little to diminish the spirit and the enthusiasm of the cultural nationalists of the 1950s. Yet it is equally true that the arguments of individuals such as B.K. Sandwell, George Grant, Arthur Lower and Hilda Neatby reached a limited audience and that their advice was not generally heeded by the people to whom it was directed. During the 1950s and the following decades, Canada did not produce a noted theorist whose central intention was to develop a Canadian philosophy of education. Furthermore, it would appear that the work of American theorists continued to dominate the field of education in Canada throughout the 1960s and 1970s. Finally, a perusal of the evidence compiled by the Report of the Royal Commission on Canadian Studies (1975) (also known as The Symons Report) and A.B. Hodgett's analysis of the state of civic education in Canada, What Culture? What Heritage? (1968) substantiates the view that in terms of content, Canadian education did not concentrate on providing children with a knowledge of Canada, its history and traditions.

Nevertheless, Neatby's work was not insignificant or devoid of influence. It was partially due to the pressures brought to bear on the government by individuals such as Neatby that the Canada Council was established in 1957. In more general terms, her work was significant in that it was representative of considerations that engaged the interest of many intellectuals and artists during the post-war period, when they sought to define the Canadian experience and give form to the elusive identity of the nation. The concern expressed by Neatby about Canada's status as a subordinate and subservient satellite of the United States mirrored the concern of other Canadian intellectuals. Moreover, Neatby's critique of

modernity and her fear of mass society and the values spread through mass culture, were shared by many intellectuals who had been trained in the humanities. Nevertheless, it was not only scholars and academics who feared the social transformation underway in Canadian society. Some of the nation's writers also viewed the rise of the mass society with a critical eye and expressed their belief that the development of culture, in the traditional sense, would facilitate the growth of a unique Canadian culture and halt the process of cultural assimilation into the United States. The following chapter will examine the work of one such author, Robertson Davies. It will demonstrate the extent to which the assumptions, ideas and beliefs of cultural nationalists such as Neatby, Grant and Lower were reflected in his work.

Notes

Chapter IV

1. Frank Underhill, "So Little for the Mind: Comments and Queries," Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, XLVIII, III (June, 1954), p. 15.
 2. Ibid., pp. 15-16.
 3. Ibid., p. 15.
 4. A.L. Doucette, "So Little from One Mind," The Manitoba Teacher, 32, 5 (March-April, 1954).
- See also:
- Hilda Neatby, "My Small War with the Educators," MacLean's, 67 (July 15, 1954), p. 17.
5. N.V. Scarfe, "Are Teachers Slaves?" The Manitoba Teacher, 33, 12 (Sept.-Oct., 1954), p. 60.
 6. Jessie MacPherson, "Ends of Education," Food for Thought, (Feb., 1954), pp. 3-7.
 7. Doucette, "So Little from One Mind."
 8. B.K. Sandwell, "Brunhilde Neatby Rides Again," Saturday Night, Sept., 1954, p. 10.
 9. K.P. Watson, "How Much for the Mind?" The Canadian Forum, 34 (April, 1954), pp. 7-9.
 10. Ibid., p. 9.
 11. The letters and articles appearing in these periodicals are too numerous to list in full. Some of the more important included:
- S.M. Katz, "Crisis in Education," MacLean's, 66 (March 1, March 15, April 1, 1953).
- R.C. Wallace, "Education for Living," Dalhousie Review, 33 (Sept., 1953), pp. 1-9.
- Jon Wheatley, "What does Education Mean for Business," and "Business, Culture and Education," Western Business, 28, 7, 9 (July and Sept., 1954).
- A.W. Trueman, "The Problems of Education," University of Toronto Quarterly, 24 (Oct., 1954), pp. 97-102.
- Robertson Davies, "Dr. Neatby Punches the Pedagogues," Saturday Night, 69 (Nov. 14, 1953), pp. 22-23.

- Jacques Barzun, "Battle over Brains in Democratic Education," University of Toronto Quarterly, 23 (Jan., 1954), pp. 109-121.
12. Watson, "How Much for the Mind?" p. 9.
 13. G.J. Lavere, "Education," Culture, 14 (Dec., 1953), pp. 443-448.
- N.A.M. MacKenzie, "First Principles," Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, XLVIII, III (June, 1954), pp. 36-38.
- Andrew Moore, "An Attempt to Clarify Some Issues," Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, XLVIII, III (June, 1954), p. 31.
- N.V. Scarfe, "Matter and Method in Education," University of Toronto Quarterly, 25 (Jan., 1956), pp. 242-248.
14. Scarfe, "Matter and Method," pp. 242-243.
 15. G.M.A. Grube, In a talk given at the 23rd annual Conchiching Conference, as quoted in "Three Educationists Tell Where Schools Fail," The Manitoba School Trustee, 10, 4 (Nov., 1954), p. 14.
 16. Watson, "How Much for the Mind?" p. 9.
 17. The problems created by the growing numbers of school age children were frequently discussed and the financial crisis in education was viewed as a serious problem. For examples see:

John Andrew Hope, Where Knowledge is Free, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1954), pp. 1-10.

S.M. Katz, "Crisis in Education," MacLean's, 66 (April, 1953), p. 58.

G.J. Lavere, "Education," pp. 443-444.

Part II

18. The Oxford Companion to Canadian History and Literature, ed., Norah Story, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 745.
19. B.K. Sandwell, "Present Day Influences on Canadian Society," Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951), pp. 1-11.
20. Ibid., p. 4.
21. Ibid., p. 4.

22. Ibid., pp. 4-6.
23. B.K. Sandwell, "Teaching Without Knowledge," Saturday Night, October, 1953), p. 9.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. Carl Berger, The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1970)
27. Ibid., p. 265.
28. George Grant, "Philosophy," Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951), p. 119.
29. Ibid., p. 119.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid., pp. 120-121.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid., p. 121.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid., pp. 121-123.
37. Ibid., pp. 123-124.
38. Ibid., p. 124.
39. Ibid., p. 125.
40. Ibid., p. 125.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., pp. 125-126.
43. Ibid., p. 126.
44. Ibid., p. 126.
45. Ibid., p. 127.
46. Ibid., pp. 126-128.

47. Ibid., p. 128.
48. Ibid., p. 132-133.
49. Ibid., p. 133.
50. George Grant, "Adult Education in the Expanding Economy," Food for Thought, 15 (Sept. - Oct., 1954), p. 4.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., pp. 4-5.
53. Ibid., p. 4.
54. Ibid.
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid., p. 5.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid., pp. 5-6.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid., p. 8.
61. Ibid., p. 7.
62. Ibid., p. 6.
63. Ibid., p. 6.
64. Ibid., p. 7.
65. Ibid., p. 7.
66. Ibid., p. 10.
67. E.B. Heaven and D.R. Heaven, "Some Influences of Simone Weil on George Grant's Silence," George Grant in Process: Essays and Conversations, ed., Larry Schmidt (Toronto: House of Anansi, 1978), p. 68.
68. Grant, "Education in the Expanding Economy," p. 10.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid., p. 10.
71. Ibid., p. 6.
72. Ibid., p. 6.

73. Ibid., p. 5.

74. Ibid.

75. Ibid., p. 8.

Part III

76. See also:

A.R.M. Lower, "The Canadian University—Time for a New Deal," Queen's Quarterly, 62 (Summer, 1955), pp. 24-256.

_____, "Our Elderly Adolescents," Saturday Night, 70 (May 28, 1955), pp. 31-32.

77. A.R.M. Lower, "The Survival Value of a Soft Nation," Saturday Night, 69 (Oct. 31, 1953), p. 7.

78. Ibid., p. 7.

79. Ibid.

80. Ibid.

81. Ibid.

82. Ibid.

83. Ibid., p. 8.

84. Ibid.

85. Ibid., pp. 7-8.

86. A.R.M. Lower, "The Canadian University," Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada, XLVIII, III (1953), pp. 5, 7.

87. Ibid., p. 11.

88. Ibid., p. 14.

89. Ibid., p. 16.

90. Ibid.

91. A.R.M. Lower, "Education in a Growing Canada," Canadian Education Today: A Symposium, ed., Joseph Katz (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Co., 1950), p. 3.

92. Ibid.

93. Ibid.

- 94. Ibid., p. 4.
- 95. Ibid.
- 96. Ibid., p. 5.
- 97. Ibid., pp. 6-7.
- 98. Ibid., p. 7.
- 99. Ibid., pp. 7-8.

For Lower, this ethic of social freedom or restraint was demonstrated in the Canadian government's willingness to participate in the economic, social and cultural life of the country through such publicly owned facilities as the Canadian National Railway, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and others.

- 100. Ibid., p. 7.
- 101. Ibid., p. 8.
- 102. Ibid., pp. 8-9.
- 103. Ibid., p. 9.
- 104. Ibid., pp. 9-10.
- 105. Ibid., p. 10.
- 106. Ibid., p. 11.
- 107. Ibid.
- 108. Ibid., pp. 12-13.
- 109. Ibid., p. 13.
- 110. Frank Underhill, "So Little for the Mind," pp. 16-23.
- 111. Ibid., p. 22.
- 112. Ibid., p.
- 113. Ibid., p. 20.
- 114. Ibid.
- 115. Underhill, "Canada and the Canadian Question, 1954," Queen's Quarterly, 60 (Winter, 1953-1954), pp. 462-475.
- 116. Frank Underhill, "So Little for the Mind," p. 20.
- 117. Ibid.
- 118. Ibid.

119. Ibid., p. 21.
120. Ibid., pp. 20-21.
121. Ibid., p. 21.
122. Underhill, "Canadian and the Canadian Question," pp. 470-471.
123. Ibid., pp. 473-474.
124. Ibid., p. 472.
125. Ibid., p. 472.
126. Ibid., p. 473.
127. Ibid., p. 474.

Chapter V

"The Well of the Past"

I

The arts, and in particular literature, have produced some of Canada's most vocal cultural nationalists and certainly some of the nation's most perspicacious social critics. Since the nineteenth century many novelists, poets and critics alike, have viewed themselves as self-conscious inventors of the national identity, and as guardians of high standards of cultural excellence.¹ In the 1950s this tradition continued and for some writers it took on a heightened sense of importance and immediacy given the forces conspiring against the growth of Canadian culture and the development of a Canadian idiom in literature. The trend towards the standardization of culture, and the debasement of culture and social values and standards of taste, which had alarmed both the Massey Commissioners and the critics of modern education, also preoccupied Canadian authors.² Robertson Davies was one of these.

It would be difficult to describe Davies as an artist who lived for the cause of Canadian nationalism. As a novelist, dramatist and critic his nationalism was of a more covert variety than that of Hugh MacLennan. In much that Davies has written and said, however, one gains the impression of an artist who has always been motivated, in part, by the desire to formulate and to express the national character and experience and to promote the nation's cultural growth. Given his background, education, work and general experience, his interest in the development of

Canadian culture was not unusual.

The son of a successful newspaper entrepreneur who was later appointed to the Canadian Senate, Davies was educated at Upper Canada College, Queen's University and Balliol College, Oxford.³ His connections with the cultural elite in Ontario were firmly established by birth and education and strengthened by his activities as book editor for Saturday Night, as editorial writer for the Peterborough Examiner, and as Governor of the Board of Directors for the new Stratford Festival Theatre.⁴ During the late 1940s and throughout the next decade, Davies was nothing short of prolific. He wrote numerous plays, published the first two of his Samuel Marchbanks books, produced book reviews and editorials on a weekly basis, co-authored three books on the Stratford Festivals and wrote three novels.⁵ Nevertheless, a great deal of his time during this period was spent on activities related to the theatre: writing, directing and producing plays. His social standing and established reputation as a writer of no small talent, and his commitment to the development of the dramatic arts in Canada meant that he was the logical choice to prepare a special study on the theatre for the Massey Commission.

True to his reputation as a humorist, Davies approached his task with an irreverence uncommon to those given the weighty task of producing a brief for a Royal Commission. Arguing that "the language of official documents" was alien to an artist and a form that he did not dare touch "for fear that some of it would stick, like pitch, and ruin him," Davies chose to write about the condition of the Canadian

theatre in a form more compatible with his role as a playwright.⁶ The subtitle of his study was "A Dialogue on the State of the Theatre in Canada" and he resurrected two characters that had been utilized in Great Britain by a seventeenth century drama critic.⁷ Through the characters of Lovewit and Trueman, two "experts" on Canadian theatre, Davies set out to discuss the state of the art with the proper degree of sobriety, but not to the exclusion of wit and humour.

He began his study with the assumption that the theatre did indeed exist in Canada, and that there was a willing audience for first-rate productions. What was needed, in his judgement, if the theatre was to flourish in Canada, was better financial support for professional actors and playwrights, the establishment of a Theatre Center for study in the dramatic arts and an informed criticism.⁸ Davies was adamant in his belief that a National Theatre could not be force-fed by government grants; nor could it be created by building an impressive playhouse. It could only be nurtured by encouraging "experience, craftsmanship, and a noble idea of what the theatre should be."⁹ There were steps that the government could take to encourage the theatre—patronage of the sort which was negative and unobtrusive such as a tax system that viewed royalties as capital gains or a more direct form of financial support from a council that operated at arm's length from the government.¹⁰ Nevertheless, any form of direct support had its dangers and Davies argued that excessive grants could reduce a growing theatre into "a pension scheme for the

artistically worn out, the incompetent and the faddists."¹¹

It was the references which Davies made to the role of education and the function of a living theatrical tradition, however, which were most revealing. In commenting on Canadian audiences and the condition of the theatre in Canada he examined the function of education and tradition in nurturing the development of the dramatic arts. He noted that while Canadians appreciated good productions, their appreciation of the theatre was limited by a system of education that was "so poor in quality that virtually no Canadian who [was] not a university graduate in English" was familiar with the great body of classic plays available to the theatre-goer."¹² Canadians were drawn only to plays with which they were familiar, and this he blamed upon "a fear of the unknown" characteristic of "an illiterate, ignorant and intellectually lazy people."¹³ He implied, therefore, that it was the duty of the authorities and of the intellectual elite to see that this situation was changed—that the common man in Canada received an education designed to refine his tastes in dramatic fare. Moreover, he went on to argue that this "slighting of the classics" was not only due to a poor system of education, but also the result of the absence of a theatrical tradition in Canada.¹⁴

While admitting that the "weight of tradition may be as great a handicap as none at all," Davies maintained that "a living tradition" that was constantly "renewing itself" was as vital a feature of the theatre as any of the other arts. He contended that "the theatre's past [was] a living and potent force" that helped to nurture "a noble ideal of what the theatre

should be."¹⁵ It gave to performing artists "a sense of wonder and nearness of the great past" that encouraged them to give their best in honour of a continuing tradition of theatrical excellence.¹⁶ Davies pointed out that while the tradition of the theatre spanned national boundaries, the establishment of a "native" tradition was of crucial importance. He implied that it was through the development of and participation in a national tradition, one that incorporated the best of the universal and translated it into Canadian terms, that Canadian audiences and professionals in the dramatic arts would create a truly worthy national theatre.¹⁷

Nevertheless, Davies pointed out that there were strong forces working against the establishment of a national theatre in Canada, foremost amongst these were the limited opportunities available to professional actors. Still, he remained confident that the cultivation of "a living tradition" was possible because there was a group of Canadian professionals good enough "to give us a theatre if they could live by it."¹⁸ Regardless of the fact that a few of these might be lost to greener pastures in the United States, Davies maintained that most would remain in Canada given sufficient encouragement, because "patriotism in the arts [was] no less common than it [was] in other spheres."¹⁹ The desire to create a national theatre and a living dramatic tradition existed in Canada; what was needed beyond artistic commitment was sound financial management and support.²⁰

Davies' ideas on the value of "tradition" in the arts was connected to a notion of the value of the past and a vision of human society that can only be described as conservative in the most profound sense. In A Voice from the Attic (1960), a book which Davies described as "a commentary on the world of books today,"²¹ he explored the value of a sense of kinship with the past in a chapter appropriately entitled "The Well of the Past." It was his opinion that in reading the best and the worst of the literature of an earlier generation (in this case Victorian literature) the reader was provided with something more than a pleasant escape from the prison of "contemporaneity."²² Such reading encouraged the reader "to feel in the mode of that age"²³ and had the potential to bring "a change of vision that was deeply revealing."²⁴ To illustrate his point, he told the story of an old friend who had been held on the knee of a godmother "who had been, in her infancy, held on the knee of yet another godmother who had been held on the knee of Queen Anne, who died in 1714."²⁵ He wrote that

Viewed unsympathetically, this was nothing, a chance association by knees; yet if we cherish life, and are not mere creatures of death and sepulcher, deluded by the notion that our experience is real and our demise the end of the world, we see in it a reminder that we are all beads on a string—separate yet part of a unity. The past is only partly irrecoverable.²⁶

Implicit in his comments were certain revealing assumptions about the nature of human existence and the individual's place within history. It would appear that for Davies, in life as in art, an awareness of tradition and a

feeling of kinship with the past provided a sense of belonging and purpose for those of the present and future. He implied that a knowledge of oneself as part of the "great chain of being" instilled a sense of community that might begin with the particular and immediate past, but which expanded to embrace the universal in space and time. It also instilled, as he implied in his discussion on the function of "a living tradition" of the theatre, the desire to honour the past by offering the best to the present and future. The recovery of the past, the existence of a tradition that was constantly renewing itself was therefore of vital importance in the larger scheme of life. It helped man to preserve his relationship to others and his commitment to the promise of future generations.

The fact that Davies felt it necessary to reassert the value of the past and of tradition—the link between the future and past—indicates the extent to which he believed its value was being undermined in modern society. Indeed, in various sections of A Voice from the Attic Davies explored the manner in which it was being undermined and suggested a number of ways in which the process might be reversed. To this extent Davies was as committed to the task of maintaining some sense of order and certainty in a period of upheaval, uncertainty and change as were the authors of the Massey Report and individuals such as Hilda Neatby and George Grant. While A Voice from the Attic concentrated primarily on international as opposed to national literary trends, and was

less concerned with the promotion of a national literature than it was with the world of books as a whole, an analysis of this book will provide some insight into those cultural values and social attitudes which Davies believed had to be promoted in Canada if a vital national culture was to develop. Moreover, a later examination of Davies plays and novels set in Canada will demonstrate that the views which he expressed in 1960 were ones that he had formulated and promoted throughout the previous decade.

A Voice from the Attic contains a variety of essays on subjects ranging from current trends in self-help books to the nature and function of Pornography. In the introduction Davies asserted that his views might possess some novelty for American readers, written as they were by a Canadian. The book was, as he put it, a voice from what Patrick Anderson called "America's Attic."²⁷ As such, it was neither British nor American, but written from the vantage point of one who could observe both without prejudice. The views of a Canadian, Davies assured his readers, were rarely committed to either side and were for this reason somewhat unique.²⁸ The implication was, of course, that the attic was not empty; indeed, that it might even contain treasures from some remote past that the family downstairs might do well to examine.

The book began significantly with a call to the "Clerisy," a label utilized in the nineteenth century to denote the informed reading public; one that read for both pleasure and edification.²⁹ Having abdicated their function to promote good books and leaven popular taste to the reviewer

and academic critic (the professional intelligentsia), the clerisy, Davies argued, had to reclaim their rightful place in the world of the arts and letters.³⁰ The intelligentsia had once again to be expanded beyond a small group of professionals to include the nonprofessionals, the intelligent reading public.³¹ Literary taste, he maintained, could not continue to be directed, as it was, solely by a handful of "experts;" it had to be cultivated by the influence of a relatively large group of sensitive and informed readers capable of asserting their individual taste. The professional intelligentsia had once again to become sensitive to the Clerisy; and the Clerisy, which by its very nature was capable of rendering judgements on the quality of literature, had to make their views known, not to impose their taste on others but to provide balance and variety.³²

According to the views put forward in the book, Davies was an unapologetic elitist. He maintained that it was only when a democracy was "in the grip of reversed peristalsis that it feared that an elite would rob the Common Man of his presumably God Ordained right in matters relating to art and literature."³³ According to Davies there was no "democracy of taste" in art and there was no such thing as "democracy in the world of intellect."³⁴ A literary elite existed and would continue to exist regardless of how many people were taught to read, because an ability to read was no guarantee that people would read what was best, if they read at all.³⁵ Nevertheless, he implied that the greater the numbers included in that elite—one that encompassed both

professional critics and the nonprofessional Clerisy—the greater their influence on the general public who could be taught to read, but who could not be "taught" to love books or what might be learned from them.³⁶ Moreover, Davies maintained that the "Common Man," was no fool and generally recognized that the spread of intellect was not a bad thing, and that it "[could not] do a country anything but good."³⁷ Unfortunately, it was clear to Davies that contemporary North American values and attitudes were breeding an unbalanced distrust of elites and were, therefore, interfering in the spread of intellect.

Davies blamed this state of affairs on the poor quality of education, the anti-intellectualism and the pervasive sentimentality of modern North American society. Increasingly over the years, in modern society success had come to be identified with happiness and mental health (or social adjustment), and the great traditions of philosophy, psychology and religion had been reduced to "a watery draught" doled out in self-help books to those who "[clamoured] for reassurance and wisdom" but who were unable to realize that these things were not easily achieved.³⁸ It was a society in which the very word "intellectual" had taken on "both a sinister and comic connotation;" one in which millions were being robbed "of the simplicity of ignorance" but had as yet failed to be lifted to "the simplicity of wisdom."³⁹ It was a society obsessed with "end-gaining," with immediate gratification and quickly achieved success and this, in Davies opinion, was the

final curse of a "nervously tense and intellectually flabby society."⁴⁰ Modern man, preoccupied with ends over means, ultimately failed to recognize that there was no short-cut to wisdom and maturity. Nevertheless, Davies refused to give in to "the luxury of despair" and argued that these trends might be reversed if the Clerisy

Acting simply as individuals...chose to assert itself in the rebellion already well begun by a number of serious American thinkers, against the lumpishness, the dowdy triviality, the shoddy expertise, and the lack of foundation which bedevils so much of North American education. 41

Clearly, his call to the Clerisy to wake up and take note of the problems evident in modern society, and in particular modern education, was not at all unlike Neatby's attack on progressivism and her campaign for the reinstitution of a traditional education.

Moreover, Davies, like Arthur Lower, attacked the "Romantic" attitude which on the North American continent had been debased to mere sentimentalism. Romanticism, as he defined it, "asserted the supremacy of individual feeling over discipline, learning and thought."⁴² As an attitude, or mode of thought it was no more inherently evil than Classicism.⁴³ Yet in the form in which it had enveloped the North American continent, it had distorted "all ideas which were uncongenial to it, with the result that discipline is confused with harshness, learning is confused with personality development, and thought, if it inclines towards scepticism, is confused with cynicism."⁴⁴ As a result of this debased romantic attitude, this preoccupation with feeling, North

American society, in Davies opinion, had isolated itself in "a warm, caressing bath of ill-examined sensation."⁴⁵

Modern American literature, like the society in which it took form, was plagued by the same disease. Preoccupied with "the hot pulsings of emotion and unreason" many modern writers were unwilling or unable "to make a synthesis of this material or to relate it to a background of reason or intelligence."⁴⁶ To do so, he argued, "would be to make their work, not moralistic, but moral."⁴⁷ Clearly, the distinction was an important one for Davies. What he referred to was not a narrow, pious moralizing, but a clear notion of Good and Evil and a knowledge of the presence and operation of both in human society, as ascertained by an author through the application of intellect and emotion. This was all too frequently absent in the work of modern writers, particularly American writers, who tended to have "an unexamined, trivial and lopsided concept of the moral order."⁴⁸ As a result, they had a base conception of life. Davies argued that while "...they bring enormous gusto to their portrayals of what is perverse, shabby and sordid...they have no very clear notion of what is Evil; the idea of Good is unattractive to them, and when they have to deal with it, they do so merely in terms of the sentimental, or the merely pathetic."⁴⁹

Unfortunately, Davies argued, their work was just the sort that appealed to "the products of our modern universal literacy," to people whose values and thoughts had been confused and muddled by poor education.⁵⁰ Both they and the authors whom they read had "intellectual and spiritual rickets."⁵¹

Regardless of the fact that many of these modern writers had potentially powerful intellects, he argued that these intellects had been given nothing to feed on in the society in which they had been nurtured.⁵² As artists, they thought and wrote sentimentally, representing demonstrably evil characters as somehow worthy of admiration or exaltation.⁵³ Both they and their readers had been desperately badly educated and this was reflected in literature as much as it was demonstrated in modern life in general.

Yet according to Davies, utter doom and gloom or complete despair in the face of these problems would have been a reaction born of the sentimental attitude he most abhorred. There was no doubt to him that political, social and moral chaos was everywhere evident, and that this was and should be reflected in modern literature.⁵⁴ Nevertheless those artists who merely represented or celebrated the present uncertainties were merely being self-indulgent. They asserted "the despair and disintegration of man as dogmatically as the doctrine of Pollyanna was ever asserted by the Glad Girl."⁵⁵ Clear-eyed disillusion on the part of the modern artist was not irrelevant; but Davies argued that there had to be some way of discerning "ignorant romanticism" from real disillusion, and some way of distinguishing between those who merely feared the chaos and those who faced it and found within it "some new aspect of order" or some hope for the future.⁵⁶

Davies was clearly not in favor of a Pollyanna optimism but neither was he in favor of a world view expressed in

literature which denigrated the human spirit and which sought to promote despair without promising some hope for redemption.⁵⁷ The writers of greatest talent were ones who attempted to see in the present the form and direction of the future. There was no guarantee that their prophecies would be either welcome or familiar. Nevertheless, he argued that it was the duty of the Clerisy to be alert and courageous in their judgement of literature "so that when the first shafts of dawn [appeared] in our present night, they would know them for what they [were]."⁵⁸

Davies therefore ended his book as he began it, with a call to the Clerisy to make their views known. He noted that this was particularly difficult in North America because it did not have as strong a "tradition of a clerisy" as the one which still existed in Great Britain.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, individuals who advocated "curiosity, the free mind, belief in good taste and belief in the human race" did exist across the continent.⁶⁰ It was their duty to spread their beliefs and their knowledge. Yet Davies was adamant that this would not be achieved through concerted group action; the banding together of the Clerisy to change society was not the answer, for "their strength lay in their disunion" and the influence which they might have as individuals.⁶¹ In a world in which the individual had all but lost significance "an informed, rational and intellectually adventurous individuality" had to take precedence over all else.⁶² The Clerisy could not go out in the world as zealots or leaders to spread the knowledge they had gained through hours of literary solitude; they had to leaven the groups to which they belonged in the spirit of sharing, as an act of communion.

Despite the wit and humour which Davies brought to his study of the world of books, and despite the fact that the greater part of A Voice from the Attic was concerned with a study of literature, Davies was clearly motivated by the desire to expose what was wrong with modern literature by examining what was wrong with modern society, and to this extent he was as committed to social criticism as he was to literary criticism. Indeed, he argued that it was absurd "to divorce literature from the world in which it was produced,"⁶³ and in comments on modern literature he demonstrated his own dissatisfaction with the society in which it had been written. It was the success-oriented, "end-gaining" society which came under fire—the commercial and materialist ethics and the pervasive sentimentality of mass society which disregarded the important function of the intellectual and the humanist—and against which he formulated his own views. These views were both conservative and idealist in the most profound sense. Like Neatby, he was a conservative "not in the narrow political sense but in the deeper sense of trying to enact traditions which were rooted in faith, and which [rebuked] the corroding cynicism of recent decades."⁶⁴ He was an idealist in that he viewed ideas and spiritual values as fundamental to life as a whole. For Davies it was the world of ideas that had the greatest influence over the lives of men and the quality of their existence. He was clearly committed to the notion of the moral community and to the spread of humanist values and he placed his faith in the power of the few, an elite, to alter the consciousness, the attitudes and values of the many.

By implication, these were the values and attitudes which Davies believed had to be spread in Canada if a vital national culture was to emerge. For him, as for other conservative cultural nationalists of the 1950s, the promotion of a unique Canadian culture was not an end in itself, but the means by which to develop in Canada universal standards of culture and to translate into Canadian terms the best that Western civilization had to offer. Nevertheless, Davies acknowledged that in a country like Canada the development of the spirit and mind and a sense of kinship with the past or the creation of a living tradition would be difficult things to achieve. Nevertheless, throughout the 1950s and beyond them, Davies was committed to these tasks. Through his work as a playwright and novelist he set out to recover the Canadian past and to promote cultural traditions which would nurture the growth of a national culture.

II

In a statement about Stephen Leacock, Lister Sinclair once wrote that his genius "was the incarnation of insularity."⁶⁵ Leacock, he argued, was "dreadfully unarmed and defenseless unless protected by the Canadian Shield" and was therefore "so honestly and candidly parochial that the idea of there being such a thing as a non-Ontario outlook never even occurred to him."⁶⁶ A superficial reading of Robertson Davies' early fiction might yield a similar appraisal. Most of his early plays and his first three novels were set in southern Ontario, and his view of Canada and Canadians was formed in relation

to that environment. In this respect Davies might be categorized as a regional novelist. Yet the problems impeding cultural development in Canada and the cultural traditions that he explored in his work applied to areas beyond the Laurentian Shield. They were common to many areas of English-speaking Canada, and the struggle to create a vital culture in Canada affected them as much as it did the inhabitants of Kingston, Ontario.

Written in 1949 and set in Kingston, the play Fortune My Foe explored some of the problems confronted by the artist and scholar in post-war Canada. The play centered on the dilemmas of Nicholas Hayward, a young professor of literature who, because of his love for a woman and his desire for recognition and success, has decided to seek his fortune in the United States. Through the challenge delivered by his older colleague, Idris Rowlands, through his contact with the old world artist Szabo, a man displaced by war and through the insight of his lover Vanessa, Nicholas eventually realizes that his place is in Canada. This is where his duty lies and this is the country that requires what he has to offer, even if its people do not recognize that fact.

Many of the contemporary problems affecting Canada's cultural development are explored in the play. The most astute and the most bitter observers of Canada's cultural environment are the derelict, Buckety Murphey, and the Welsh-born literary scholar, Idris Rowlands. Both feel that they have been betrayed by Canada and each one warns the newly-arrived puppeteer/artist Franz Szabo that Canada is "no country for dreamers."⁶⁷ It is, in their opinion, a

cultural wasteland populated with pioneer "blockheads" who have no appreciation for art. In an impassioned speech Rowland's exclaims to Szabo:

God how I tried to love this country! How I tried to forget the paradise of Wales, and the quick wits of Oxford. I have given all I have to Canada—my love, then my hate, and now my bitter indifference. This raw frost-bitten country has worn me out, and its raw frost-bitten people have numbed my heart.⁶⁸

Yet as Szabo observes, Rowland's indifference is not complete.⁶⁹ Idris' appeals to Nicholas to stay in Canada are rooted in the belief that things might change. Where he has failed he believes Nicholas might succeed. In an exchange with Hayward, he tries to demonstrate that going to the United States or yearning after a romanticized version of England will not ultimately satisfy him.⁷⁰ The American tendency to commercialize or trivialize culture appalls Rowlands and he condemns Hayward for believing that commercial success and public acclaim can be equated with happiness, contentment, or real artistic achievement.⁷¹ He implies that if Canada is a cultural wasteland it is such because of the failure of its artists. Drawn to the United States by the lure of money and success, or to Great Britain by an "ideal of civilization" which does not, in the final sense, exist anywhere except in the heart of the artist and scholar, they take with them those things that might enrich their country.

The contradictions evident in Nicholas' intention to leave and his suggestion that Szabo stay in Canada is pointed out to him by both Idris and Vanessa.⁷² In a discussion with

Vanessa, Nicholas argues that it is not merely for her sake that he wants to leave Canada. He wants the money and recognition available in the United States. As far as he is concerned scholarship and the arts in Canada "still exist in the nineteenth century," and by going to the United States he intends to make the leap into the twentieth.⁷³ When Vanessa challenges him, arguing that he would rather stay in Canada and change the situation because of his love for his country, Nicholas responds vehemently, condemning those who say they love Canada as "neurotics" or "rascals." He maintains that "This is not yet a country that a man loves; it is a country that he respects and worries about. The mainspring of a Canadian's patriotism is not love but duty."⁷⁴

In the end, it is precisely Nicholas' sense of duty that wins. He decides to stay and do battle with the Canadian philistines represented in the play by Ursula Simonds, the closet socialist who believes that art should serve the Cause,⁷⁵ and Mattie Philpott and Orville Topscott, the progressive recreational experts who believe that in Canada "art is proud and happy to consider itself the handmaiden of education."⁷⁶ For him, there is no escaping Canada and the things of the spirit and mind that bind him to his country. Yet his decision to stay is not made rashly, without awareness of the possible consequences of his sacrifice. In the final scene he turns to Szabo and says

Yes. If you can stay in Canada, I can too. Everybody says Canada is a hard country to govern, but nobody says that for some it is also a hard country to live in. So let the geniuses of easy virtue go southward; I know

what they feel too well to blame them.
 But for some of us there is no choice;
 let Canada do what she will with us, we
 must stay.⁷⁷

Davies has written that one of the major threats to cultural development "is, and has always been, the bleak indifference of the great part of the Canadian people towards any culture whatever."⁷⁸ In Fortune My Foe he blames the nation's slow cultural development on the "raw frost bitten people" whom Idris Rowlands condemns. Nevertheless, he implies that nothing will change if potential artists and scholars continue to escape to the greener pastures of Great Britain and the United States, leaving the future of Canadian culture in the hands of badly educated enthusiasts such as Mattie Phillpot and Orville Topscott. The responsibility for change rests heavily, it would seem, on the shoulders of the intellectual and artistic elite. In their work lies the hope for the future of Canadian culture.

Yet this was not a simple task, as Davies well knew. Many of the other intellectuals of the 1950s, would have agreed with Nicholas Hayward that Canada was indeed a difficult country to live in. Throughout the play many of the concerns later expressed in the Massey Report and by individuals such as Hilda Neatby, Harold Innis and Arthur Lower were given voice. Lower's lament for the plight of the humanities and the scholar in Canada,⁷⁹ Neatby's tirades against the cultural philistines in control of education, and Innis' warnings about the influence of American commercialism and materialism were all incorporated into Davies' play. Indeed, many

of the contemporary issues represented in the drama such as the "brain drain" to the United States continued to be noted with alarm throughout the 1950s.⁸⁰ Even Davies' portrayal of Franz Szabo as a symbol of hope for the future of Canadian art reflects the belief held by some that immigrants arriving in Canada after World War II would bring with them cultural values and standards of taste that would revitalize Canadian culture.⁸¹

But it was in his major project of the 1950s, the writing of the three satirical romances known as the Salterton novels, Tempest Tost, Leaven of Malice and A Mixture of Frailties, that Davies attempted his most 'comprehensive overview' of the contemporary scene in Canada. Each of the three novels explores aspects of life in a small town in southern Ontario. From architecture to religion, household menus to reading habits, Davies details the environment and the community of people who constitute Salterton, Ontario. Each book expands the reader's perception of the community, shading in areas of the town and its inhabitants until it comes alive as a social unit. Yet it is the thematic structure of the three novels that binds them together as a trilogy. Each, in varying degrees, examines the relationship between art and society, between the individual artist and his or her community in a Canadian context. In the particular locale of a small Canadian town, cultural traditions and standards of taste which Davies implies are universal, struggle against pettiness, ignorance and parochialism to create a vital culture within the community itself—a culture

moulded by the particular but partaking of the universal.

In some ways it is almost possible to envisage Davies sitting down with a copy of the Massey Report, opening it at page nineteen, and deciding it was time that someone satirized the romanticized version of rural and small town life found there. It was not that Davies was hostile to the point of view expressed in the report, nor was he at odds with what the commissioners deemed to be essential cultural values.⁸² Rather, it would seem that he believed it was time for Canadians to see things as they were and not simply as they imagined or wished them to be. He was determined to show the too cozy, too parochial and too falsely genteel side of Canadian culture, while demonstrating the value of tradition, developed over centuries, that endured in new forms. Yet, as Northrop Frye found in Stephen Leacock's Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town, there is "a spirit of criticism, even of satire that is the complementary half of a strong attachment to the mores that provoke satire."⁸³ Such was the case in Davies, and we find that in *Salterton*, as in *Mariposa*, "a good deal of what goes on may look ridiculous, but the norms against which it looks ridiculous are provided by [the town] itself."⁸⁴

The second novel, Leaven of Malice (1954), offers a wealth of information on Canada's cultural aspirations and the people who expressed them. These aspirations and the cultural values that supported them are ones which cut across the class lines drawn by Davies, and he demonstrates that good values and standards of taste are not the exclusive preserve of *Salterton*'s wealthy class. More important, however, he

explores the remnants of colonialism in Canadian culture, and the predicaments of those dedicated to creating a unique national culture. He exposes the ludicrous aspects of both to ridicule, demonstrating that while the fossilized culture of the Saltertonian establishment is rife with pretense and a false sense of propriety, the "new" is often characterized by naive enthusiasms, misplaced priorities and a questionable sense of what is and is not of enduring cultural value.

On the one hand we have the world of Mrs. Soloman Bridgetower's Thursday afternoon "At Homes." This is the seat of the congregation of "those forces in Salterton which sought to resist social change."⁸⁵ Into this world struts Bevill Higgin, teacher of singing and elocution, who is anxious to impart his knowledge to the "colonials." Higgin is not only second rate, but malicious as well. After being snubbed by a librarian and rejected by both Soloman Bridgetower, a professor of English literature at Waverly University, and by Gloster Ridley, the editor of the local newspaper, he plays a practical joke on all three that spreads to embrace the lives of a substantial part of the community.

Prior to being exposed as a prankster, Higgin is welcomed into Mrs. Bridgetower's circle with enthusiasm. To them he represents propriety and gentility. He is immediately accepted, first because he is British and second because he affirms their values of truth and beauty against what they believe to be the nastiness and vulgarity of the modern world.⁸⁶ The Bridgetower's, Shillitos and Pottingers of Salterton live in a "nice" world, graced with "nice" things and they judge

art and culture within this framework. As a result they are easily duped by a second-rate flim flam man who is in the business of selling flowery language and drawing-room ditties.⁸⁷ In many respects Mrs. Bridgetower and her friends embody the parochialism and intellectual comfort against which so many Canadian literary critics of the 1950s raged.

At the other extreme we have Henry Rumball, an enthusiast of contemporary American literature who dreams of writing "the Great Canadian Novel," and the dons of literature at Waverly University, the proselytes of "AmCan." Rumball is a man looking for an angle. To him the writing of a great novel involves finding a new gimmick, for contemporary literature is, in his opinion, a constant search for novelty.⁸⁸ Thus he tells his boss, Gloster Ridley, about his new concept for a novel set in western Canada. He describes the central theme as "the prairies conquest of man. See? A big concept. A huge panorama."⁸⁹ With a twist of what he believes to be subtle irony, he has chosen the title "The Plain that Broke the Plough," an inversion of an American film title "The Plough that Broke the Plain."⁹⁰ While Henry's enthusiasm is engaging, Davies indicates that it is both misplaced and misdirected. In many respects Henry Rumball represents everything that is worst about contemporary North American literature, things that Davies would later write about in A Voice from the Attic.

The "cultural vultures" at Waverly University are not much better. One such vulture accosts Solly Bridgetower in the halls of Waverly University and advises him to jump right into "AmCan"—the anagram used to denote the study of American

Canadian literature.⁹¹ He suggests to Solly that in the publish or perish world of the scholar, Canadian literature provides a virtually untapped source of material. In a magnanimous mood he offers to "give" Solly the Canadian dramatist-poet Charles Heavysege.⁹² In Solly's opinion and, he suspects, in the opinion of most literate men (with the notable exception of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow) Heavysege is not a great dramatist.⁹³ But he is Canadian. In the realm of the students of AmCan this fact alone is enough to warrant at least one pithy article on his work.

Cultural nationalists who seized upon anything Canadian as an object worthy of study were ludicrous in Davies opinion. In discussing his reasons for writing about such individuals Davies has stated that he did so because cultural nationalism "was in the minds of so many people at the time that I prepared the Salterton novels, but I wrote about it because I thought that it was funny rather than because I had violent opinions about it."⁹⁴ Yet even though cultural nationalism is satirized in Leaven of Malice and even though Davies claimed that he did not have violent opinions about it, he was clearly sympathetic with the cultural aspirations of Canadians. Moreover, he did have violent opinions about the enemies of Canada's cultural development, and these came under ruthless examination in his novels.

Amongst these were the progressive social scientists and educators; the stuff of which Hilda Neatby's nightmares were made. Norm and Dutchy Yarrow, social engineers, defenders

of "normality" and in the vanguard of the recreation field, are portrayed as the I'm O.K., You're O.K. set of the 1950s.⁹⁵ Crude reductionist Freudianism is Norman's strong point. His method of psychoanalysis is based upon "jollyng" a person into a normal attitude and a belief in the Norman Vincent Peale version of a "sincere but modern and scientific faith."⁹⁶ In an exchange in which he attempts to tell a Classics professor that he is suffering from an Oedipal Complex, the poverty of his intellect and his overwhelming ignorance are put on display.⁹⁷ Also included in this segment of Salterton's population are the champions of "pedagogical method." These are generally school teachers eager to explain to novices like Solly Bridgetower that the content of the classics of English literature is nothing compared to the method by which they are taught.⁹⁸

There are, however, those in Salterton who recognize that all is not well in the world of Salteronian culture. Amongst these are Gloster Ridley, Solly Bridgetower and Humphrey Cobbler. Solly rejects the "nicey-nice" version of culture peculiar to his mother's circle, yet finds that his role as scholarly "werewolf" of AmCan is no more acceptable to him.⁹⁹ Bemoaning his fate, he finds himself wondering why a country like Canada feels that it must have "the cultural trappings of older countries—music of its own, pictures of its own, books of its own."¹⁰⁰ Yet he realizes that he, like so many others, is "caught up in the strong, close mesh of his country's cultural ambition." However silly Henry Rumball might appear, Solly admires him, for here at last

is a man trying to create something.¹⁰¹ Solly, on the other hand, an Oxford-educated Mama's boy hijacked into critical work on a second-rate dramatist and the victim of a practical joke that has him engaged to a woman he hardly knows, is as yet unable to determine how he intends to realize his own and his country's cultural ambitions.

He seeks advice from his friend and confidant Humphrey Cobbler, Davies' archetypical artist.¹⁰² Living in surroundings that are far from impressive, Cobbler has dedicated his life to art, to his work as a musician. He is a complete eccentric, who flouts social convention by playing Dean Knapp's organ in the local church in the dead of night with complete abandon for the pleasure of his music students.¹⁰³ In purviewing Solly's predicament Cobbler's advice is succinct and to the point. He advises the young English professor to get rid of his mother and Charles Heavyside, to marry and to begin work on a novel.¹⁰⁴ Even though Solly immediately rejects his advice, the final resolution of the novel comes with his acceptance.¹⁰⁵ Not only does he decide to marry and to stay and work in the community of his birth, but in deciding to pursue a writing career he has also made the first step towards realizing his own and his country's cultural ambitions. Both decisions are tempered by uncertainty, but they are not made without hope for the future.

Like other characters in the novel, Solly is a prisoner of the past—a personal and a social or historical past. On a personal level, Solly's relationship with his mother is a larger than life portrait of the unhealthy bonds that can tie the sibling to the parent. On another level, his

mother symbolizes the bonds of social and cultural attitudes from which Solly seeks to escape. Held to both by loyalty, guilt and a sense of duty he is unable to completely destroy their hold because he is a part or product of them. Solly is his mother's son in every sense of the word and from this there can be no final or ultimate escape. Nevertheless, Davies intimates that Solly is able to reject the strangling hold of relationships and cultural values and attitudes that impede his progress as a writer, while cleaving to those things of enduring value from his past. It is a long-process, and as we find in A Mixture of Frailties, it is not complete—the dead hand of the past continues to weigh heavily on lives in the present. But both personal and cultural progress are made for Solly and for his country; it might be slow and uneven, but it is progress nonetheless.

In A Mixture of Frailties, (1958) this theme is explored in more explicit terms. In the novel a young secretary from a working class district of Salterton is offered the opportunity to pursue a singing career on money bequeathed to her through the "Bridgetower Trust." In her death and in her desire to avenge herself on her son's betrayal, Mrs. Solomon Bridgetower's legacy launches the career and personal quest of Monica Gall. Symbolically, the death of the fossilized culture of colonial Canada inadvertently gives birth to the new. Monica's odyssey takes her to Great Britain where she is tutored by three men, three mentors who guide her development as an artist. This development includes ridding herself of those influences from her past which threaten to repress her artistic growth.

Throughout the novel, her sense of duty and allegiance to the community of her birth is therefore tempered by a greater understanding.

Monica is able to throw off the narrow religious and moral beliefs of the "Thirteeners," the evangelical group in which her family were members.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, she does not reject the value of religion in the broadest sense. She cleaves to a notion of religion which affirms her sense of belonging within the community of man. It is one that stresses a sense of wonder in response to the unknown, and she celebrates through her music the mystery and awesome power of life.¹⁰⁷ While she is eventually able to escape the petty, small-minded vision of her mother's world, she is also able to acknowledge her debt to the woman. Although she rejects her mother's ideas of right and wrong, she recognizes in her mother's coarse humor and exuberance a similarity in temperament. In the end, she sings a tribute to Ma Gall that expresses "the spirit which might have been her mother's if circumstances had been otherwise."¹⁰⁸

Monica is therefore able to separate duty and loyalty to her community from her personal and artistic development. The blind loyalty to family and values which she expressed at the beginning of the novel have been tempered by insight, but not eliminated.¹⁰⁹ She knows that Humphrey Cobbler is right when he argues that Salterton cannot be the measure of her success. As he says, the cultural standards of Salterton "are just the standards of childhood and provincialism."¹¹⁰

Yet Monica recognizes that she remains to some extent tied to this community; she acknowledges her duty and loyalty to those things of value which it has offered her. The voice from the past that speaks to her is not just that of Giles Revelstoke, the British composer, but the voice of her Canadian mother.¹¹¹

In many respects Davies seems to paint a very harsh picture of the small town Canada whose cultural values and traditions the Massey Commissioners celebrated in their report. Yet when one takes a closer look at Salterton, when one peers through the pretense and the naive enthusiasms, hope for the nation's cultural development is found. It is a hope made possible by the presence of individuals like Humphrey Cobbler, Gloster Ridley, Dean Knapp and by the new generation of Solly Bridgetower and Monica Gall. It is a hope which finds its genesis in the preservation of cultural values and standards of taste which rise beyond the petty provincialism and false gentility everywhere evident in Salterton. Even in small town Canada artists and members of the Clerisy are to be found doing their work and "leavening" the groups to which they belong. While the environment is less than ideal, culture still manages to flourish. In spite of poorly educated people and in spite of individuals like Norm Yarrow, the values of high culture and standards of taste are maintained.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that in Davies' fiction these cultural values are often associated with the traditions of Great Britain. Although Davies maintained that to be Canadian was to be neither British nor American but an objective observer of both, it is evident that he believed British cultural influence to be of some importance.

While he took aim and fired upon the Canadian colonial mentality that indiscriminantly embraced all things British as superior, he clearly valued the cultural connection.¹¹² It is in the cultural environment of London that many of the artists and scholars of Davies' books are nurtured. It is through contact with the long-lived cultural traditions of Britain, or through association with their representatives in Canada (Humphrey Cobbler and Idris Rowlands being two of these), that Nicholas Hayward, Solly Bridgetower and Monica Gall find their creative voices.

Canada's relationship with the United States is portrayed in much more ambiguous terms. In Fortune My Foe, the United States is seen alternately as enemy, crass commercializer of culture or as a paradise for Canadians seeking fame, recognition or money. In the Salterton novels, however, the United States has little or no presence. It is true that one of the central characters from Tempest Tost has been trained and found fame in the United States, but for the most part Americans are either non-existent or appear only briefly as shrewd buyers and sellers of culture.¹¹³ The valuable association for Canada and Canadians is clearly the one with Great Britain.

It is not that Davies wished to see Canada transformed into a little bit of England on the North American continent. Rather, it would appear that he believed that cultural traditions which had been developed over centuries in the Western world could not be ignored or forgotten in Canada's struggle to find its own cultural voice. The coarseness and vulgarity of the new world (which is a part of its

vitality, as Monica Gall discovers when reflecting on her mother's life) had to be tempered and strengthened by the rich and varied traditions of established cultures. Moreover, Davies intimated that without these influences, Canadian culture might well be overwhelmed by the materialistic and commercial values that appeared to have dominated life in pioneer Canada, and which seemed to continue to gain strength across the North American continent.¹¹⁴ For Davies, the development of culture in Canada did not merely involve the promotion of what was different or novel; nor did it entail celebrating Canadian art or scholarship simply because it was Canadian. Like Hilda Neatby, George Grant, Vincent Massey and others, Davies was interested in the preservation of culture in the universal and traditional sense, the training of the artistic, intellectual and aesthetic sensibilities of Canadians. The promotion of a living tradition of culture that began with the particular but which finally spanned national boundaries was necessary if Canada was to find its own cultural voice.

III

Almost ten years after he wrote his article on the theatre Davies became involved in another project launched by Vincent Massey, one that was more than a symbolic attempt to preserve a traditional conception of culture in Canada. At the end of the 1950s Vincent Massey announced his intention to build a graduate college for students studying in both the Humanities and the Sciences, and chose Robertson Davies as the first principal of what was to be called Massey College.

In an article written after the building's completion Davies explained why it was that the college housed scholars from both the Arts and the Sciences. He wrote that in choosing a "heterogeneous group we [hoped] to stress the unity rather than the diversity of knowledge, and to show that the things uniting educated people were more numerous and important than the differences of professional interest which divided them."¹¹⁵ The college was designed to counteract the modern tendency towards the specialization and compartmentalization of knowledge and learning. It was to be a bulwark against the destruction of a traditional and universal conception of culture and of the cultural man, a haven for the protection of humanist ideals.

Rejecting the "elegant cubes of steel, aluminum and glass" common to modern architecture in the technological society, the building was constructed of brick, wood, cast stone and concrete.¹¹⁶ The final structure, described with stylistic labels ranging from Oriental to Gothic,¹¹⁷ recalled an earlier era, one which, Davies maintained, stressed permanence, comfort and beauty.¹¹⁸ In choosing a quotation to adorn the central hall of the college, he captured the essence of the ideal upon which it had been founded. The quote, from the work of George Santayana, reads that

Happiness is impossible, and even inconceivable, to a mind without scope and without pause, a mind driven by craving, pleasure or fear. To be happy, you must be reasonable or you must be tamed. You must have taken the measure of your powers, tasted the fruit of your passion, and learned your place in the world and what things in it really serve you. To be happy you must be wise.¹¹⁹

The quest for a disciplined intelligence, which preoccupied so many nineteenth century Canadian intellectuals, continued in the halls of Massey College.¹²⁰ In a modern world, which Davies described as preoccupied with end-gaining and success-seeking, the cultivation of a disciplined mind was clearly of utmost importance. Massey College was designed to combat the excesses of modernity and to preserve in English Canada a conception of culture and of the cultured man that would inspire future generations. It was, perhaps, the most graphic illustration of the struggle being waged by a group of Canadian intellectuals intent upon preserving a social and cultural order in Canada that would be the nation's best defense against the vices of commercialism, materialism and the mass society.

Notes

Chapter V

1. Carl Ballstadt, The Search for English-Canadian Literature, An Anthology of Critical Articles from the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), pp. xi-xiii.
2. Amongst these was the Canadian novelist and essayist Hugh MacLennan. Throughout the 1950s, in essays written for periodicals such as Saturday Night and MacLean's, MacLennan attacked the commercial and materialist values gaining ground in Canada. In articles that compared the United States and Canada he noted what he saw as the significant differences between the two societies and encouraged Canadians to protect these differences. Nevertheless, MacLennan's creative output during the 1950s was somewhat limited when compared to that of Davies. Moreover, he lived and worked in Montreal, a city somewhat removed from the cultural centres of southern Ontario.
3. Gordon Roper, "A Davies Log," The Journal of Canadian Studies, XII, I (February, 1977), p. 4.
4. Ibid., pp. 6-8.
5. Ibid.
6. Robertson Davies, "The Theatre: A Dialogue on the State of the Theatre in Canada," Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951), p. 369.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., pp. 369-392.
9. Ibid., p. 392.
10. Ibid., p. 390.
11. Ibid., p. 384.
12. Ibid., p. 373.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid., p. 374.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.

17. Ibid., pp. 374-375.
18. Ibid., p. 375.
19. Ibid., p. 376.
20. Ibid., p. 381.
21. Robertson Davies, A Voice from the Attic, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1972), p. 3.
22. Ibid., pp. 111-112.
23. Ibid., p. 112.
24. Ibid., p. 154.
25. Ibid., p. 114.
26. Ibid., p. 115.
27. Ibid., p. 3.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid., pp. 5-7.
30. Ibid., pp. 34-35.
31. Ibid., p. 294.
32. Ibid., pp. 34-35.
33. Ibid., p. 294.
34. Ibid., p. 24.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid., pp. 294-295.
37. Ibid., p. 294.
38. Ibid., p. 53.
39. Ibid., p. 54.
40. Ibid., p. 9.
41. Ibid., p. 289.
42. Ibid., p. 341.
43. Ibid., p. 342.

44. Ibid., p. 341.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid., p. 104.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid., p. 105.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid., p. 344.
52. Ibid.
53. Ibid.
54. Ibid., p. 347.
55. Ibid., pp. 345-346.
56. Ibid., p. 351.
57. Ibid., pp. 289, 351.
58. Ibid., p. 351.
59. Ibid., pp. 27-28.
60. Ibid., pp. 27-28, 351.
61. Ibid., p. 351.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid.
64. Charles Taylor, Six Journeys: A Canadian Pattern, (Toronto: Anansi, 1977), p. vi.

Part II

65. Lister Sinclair, "A Canadian Idiom," Our Sense of Identity, ed., Malcolm Ross (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1954), p. 237.
66. Ibid., pp. 237-238.
67. Robertson Davies, Fortune My Foe, (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Co., 1949), p. 42.

68. Ibid., p. 48.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid., p. 51.
71. Ibid.
72. Ibid., pp. 48-52, 81-82.
73. Ibid., p. 81.
74. Ibid., p. 82.
75. Ibid., pp. 54-58.
76. Ibid., pp. 63-70.
77. Ibid., p. 98.
78. Robertson Davies, personal letter to me (April 1, 1981).
79. Arthur Lower, "Gods Canadians Worship," MacLean's, October 25, 1954, pp. 22-23.
- _____, "No Class in Canada," Saturday Night, July 12, 1952, pp. 9, 18.
80. See:

G.M. Morrison, "The Lost Canadians," Saturday Night, July 26, 1952, p. 1.
81. See:

"An Editorial," The Financial Post, March 12, 1956, p.6.

"Is Immigration Changing Canada's Character?," The Financial Post, January 30, 1954, p. 9.

Sheila Patterson, "These Newcomers Different," Saturday Night, January 25, 1953.
82. In a review of Hilda Neatby's book, So Little for the Mind, Davies stated that the Massey Report was one of the most important reports to be published in recent years and urged all Canadians to read it.
83. Northrop Frye, "Conclusion," Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English, ed., Carl F. Klinck (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), p. 839.

84. Ibid., p. 839.
85. Ibid.
86. Robertson Davies, Leaven of Malice, (Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1980), p. 153.
87. Ibid., pp. 146-154.
88. Ibid., p. 18.
89. Ibid., p. 19.
90. Ibid., pp. 17-19.
91. Ibid., p. 163.
92. Ibid.
93. Ibid., pp. 162-163.
94. Robertson Davies, in a personal letter to me, April 1, 1981.
95. Davies, Leaven of Malice, pp. 110-111, 182.
96. Ibid., pp. 110, 128-129.
97. Ibid., pp. 197-199.
98. Ibid., p. 198.
- In Tempest Tost, Davies' attack on modern educational and teacher training is explored in more depth and the attack is even more ruthless.
99. Ibid., pp. 163-164.
100. Ibid., p. 164.
101. Ibid., p. 165.
102. Ibid., pp. 173-183.
103. Ibid., pp. 60-63.
104. Ibid., pp. 173-183.
105. Ibid., p. 216.
106. Robertson Davies, A Mixture of Frailties, (Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1980), p. 44.
107. Ibid., pp. 310-311.

- 108. Ibid., p. 303.
- 109. Ibid., pp. 56-60.
- 110. Ibid., p. 301.
- 111. Ibid., p. 372.
- 112. Ibid., pp. 191-195.

In a scene in which Monica Gall lies and brags to a British family about her loyalist ancestors the pretense of this colonial tradition is exposed. Nevertheless, as foolish as Monica appears in relating her story, Davies manages to convey the feeling that this tradition is something which is and should be valued by Canadians. It is something that is part of a national mythology and not something that the British can really appreciate or understand.

- 113. Robertson Davies, Tempest Tost, (Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1980).
- 114. Robertson Davies, "Dr. Neatby Punches the Pedagogues," Saturday Night, 69 (Nov. 14, 1953), p. 22.

Part III

- 115. Robertson Davies, "Massey College," The Canadian Architect, October 8, 1963, p. 48.
- 116. James H. Acland, "Massey College, Critique," The Canadian Architect, October 8, 1963, p. 60.
- 117. Ron Thom, "Massey College," The Canadian Architect, October 8, 1963, p. 48.
- 118. Davies, "Massey College," p. 48.
- 119. Acland, "Massey College, Critique," p. 60.
- 120. A.B. McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence.

Chapter VI

The Search for a Canadian Idiom

I

Numerous Canadian literary critics, like the authors whose work they assessed, were vocal cultural nationalists. Many of them viewed the evaluation, defense and promotion of the national literature as important aspects of their work as Canadian critics. They too viewed themselves as inventors of the national identity and as guardians of high standards of literary excellence. This was particularly true in the 1950s, a decade in which the trend towards cultural standardization and commercialization seemed to threaten the emergence of a Canadian idiom in literature. As a result, critics such as Desmond Pacey, George Woodcock and Northrop Frye were intent upon describing the unique features of Canadian literature and the historical, political and social factors which helped to shape them. In so doing they too were involved in promoting a social vision for modern Canada—one based on Canadian traditions and reflected in the national literature.

Nevertheless, in a world which stressed interdependence and the international community of interests (particularly in cultural matters) this search for a Canadian idiom was a difficult one. It embodied a series of seemingly contradictory—indeed, at times apparently antithetical—notions: universalism and particularism, nationalism and internationalism, unity and diversity. Few critics were willing to choose one side at the expense of totally excluding the others. Concerned

that Canadian literature would never find its mature voice in the modern world, they defended the importance of the particular and the national. Afraid that undue emphasis on the particular would lead to cultural isolationism or charges of parochialism, they stressed the importance of universal traditions and the international world of literature. Anxious that the emerging literature not be wholly dominated by international and, in particular, American trends they sought to elucidate the traditions of the extant national literature. Conscious of the cultural and regional variations within the nation itself, they sought unity in diversity.

At the beginning of the decade, however, one of the most pressing problems examined was the relatively slow growth of the national literature. Many of the individuals and associations that contributed briefs to the Massey Commission lamented the lack of a substantial body of novels, plays and poetry that formulated and expressed the Canadian character and experience.¹ Needless to say these were not the first lamentations of their kind. Since the nineteenth century Canadian authors and critics had expressed concern over the low standards and slow development of Canadian literature.² As Roy Daniells noted as late as 1957, it had become a national pastime for critics to preface any survey of Canadian literature "by a kind of ceremonial lament" over the "cultural misfortunes" that had limited its growth.³

At the top of the list of these cultural misfortunes was Canada's status as a pioneer society. According to the early critics, literature and the arts in pioneer Canada had

generally been ignored in the struggle for material survival.⁴ "Canadian philistinism" and "literary apathy" were frequently noted, and the critics mourned the fact that in Canada, materialist and utilitarian values had largely triumphed over aesthetic ones.⁵ They maintained, moreover, that these problems were compounded by a small and scattered population.⁶ As a result of these demographic and geographic realities, Canada lacked a cultural centre, a substantial readership and the sheer numbers from which literary genius might emerge.⁷

Others maintained that Canada's role as a cultural colony of Great Britain had also inhibited the growth of a national literature.⁸ Too often, Canadian writers had accepted the styles and forms of the mother country as superior to any possible indigenous trends.⁹ Finally, the country's close proximity to the United States was also identified as having a negative influence on the emerging literature of Canada.¹⁰ On the whole, these early critics agreed that attempts to diminish the cultural influence of these two countries had not been very successful.

By 1950, however, many argued that while these explanations might have excused the failures of the past, they could not all be used to apologize for the present and future development of Canadian literature. In a presentation to the Massey Commission, The Canadian Writers Committee stated that

As an agricultural and industrial nation Canada ranks high in the world. But as a cultured nation exploring the human mind and soul she ranks low. She has excused herself because of

the size of her population, her youth and the battle she has had to wage wresting the country from nature. These last two excuses are valid no longer, the first one never was.¹¹

According to the Committee, and the Massey Report itself, the time had arrived for the development of a mature literature that expressed what Lister Sinclair referred to as "the Canadian idiom."¹²

Critics of Canadian literature did not, however, stop trying to find reasons for what they perceived to be the slow growth of Canadian literature since World War II. The old excuses simply took new forms and the emphasis shifted to other cultural misfortunes. The special reports prepared for the commission by E.A. McCourt and René Garneau both included the usual list of factors that had influenced the past development of literature in Canada.¹³ In regard to its present and future development, however, these two authors and the commissioners stressed the importance of three major issues: the presence in Canada of two languages, the influence of American culture, and the attitude of the Canadian public.¹⁴

McCourt and Garneau agreed that the presence of two languages in Canada continued to have a retarding effect on the growth of a national literature.¹⁵ Both maintained, however, that this did not constitute an insurmountable barrier to future development. In special reference to the briefs and reports presented to them by authors and by writers associations, the commissioners demonstrated that many had already expressed a desire for cultural exchange. Writers

from both backgrounds were eager to draw from "the sources of intellectual and artistic wealth" in two languages.¹⁶

Nevertheless, they noted that these same authors had less control over the influence exerted by the flow of American books into Canada than they had over the possibility of cultural exchange.¹⁷ These books, the report argued, filled the gap left by the absence of Canadian ones, but did not provide the nation's readers with an accurate reflection of their own life and experience. Garneau even went so far as to say that this had led to a "crisis of orientation" in Canadian letters that could only be resolved by strengthening ties with the literary traditions of Great Britain and France.¹⁸ Nevertheless the commissioners hastened to add that Garneau's solution was not universally accepted, especially by those who viewed it as evidence of the "survivals of the spirit of colonialism."¹⁹

There was no suggestion that the flow of American literature should be completely stopped, but there was general agreement that it should be balanced with a comparable volume of Canadian books. It was also suggested that the "deluge of less worthy American publications" be seriously curtailed.²⁰ One would assume that these unworthy publications included certain magazines and mass-produced paperbacks. It was the opinion of the commissioners that limiting the influx of this printed matter, which "[threatened] our national values, [corrupted] our literary taste and [endangered] the livelihood of Canadian writers" would create an environment more conducive to the development of the national literature.²¹

The attitudes of the Canadian public were also noted as a factor that continued to influence the growth of a national literature. Canadians were described as uninterested in literature and as lacking in sympathy for the plight of the native writer.²² As a result, the commissioners argued, Canadian authors experienced a profound loneliness in their own land. According to one source quoted in the report, the only writers able to gain a large audience in Canada were those who did not compel their readers to think too seriously about "contemporary values," or those who did not disturb the "intellectual comfort" of their readers.²³ While no longer a pioneer people, Canadians (in the opinion of the commissioners) still adhered to "pioneer" attitudes to literature and culture in general.

The commissioners pointed out that a lack of public interest meant that Canadian writers also lacked financial support.²⁴ The general absence of artistic patronage, coupled with a limited publishing market at home, left the writer in a desperate financial position. The commissioners maintained that if the country wanted a literature commensurate with its status as a nation, it would have to pay for it.²⁵ They therefore recommended that the central government encourage and protect the publishing industry in Canada by establishing a national council to provide financial support for the artist.²⁶

Underlying these concerns was the belief expressed by the Canadian Authors' Association that "The inarticulate nature of the average Canadian patriotism results from the

lack of a native literature commensurate with Canada's physical, scientific and academic stature, and with the proved character of its people."²⁷ While this statement included a rather dubious proposition about the correlation between an established literature and the growth of patriotic sentiment, the concern expressed over the lack of a national literature was shared by many. For the Massey Commission, preoccupied with those things of the spirit and mind which would unite Canadians, a national literature that mirrored the Canadian way of life was of vital importance. It would promote a sense of national identity that transcended regional and linguistic boundaries, and would cultivate those values, traditions and standards of taste essential to the nation's development. It would also provide an important defense against cultural domination by the United States.

Six years after the publication of the Massey Report, its demands were at least partially met when Prime Minister St. Laurent announced the inauguration of the Canada Council on March 28, 1957. During 1956 and 1957 numerous articles appeared in the periodical press praising the establishment of the Council. Earlier there had been some misgivings expressed over "state control" of culture,²⁸ but once the autonomy of the Council had been established in Bill No. 47, it was generally conceded that direct control by government would be impossible. Criticism, when it was voiced, centered on the government's appointments to the Council.²⁹ Articles in Maclean's and The Canadian Forum questioned the omissions

evident in its make-up. Editorials in both magazines lamented the absence of artists on the governing body. They maintained that such appointments would have done much to balance the "conservative" and "establishment" character of the existing Council.

Inspite of specific criticisms, however, it was generally agreed that while the Council might promote cultural development, its existence could not by itself guarantee that art would flourish.³⁰ As Robertson Davies observed: "if a writer has little or nothing in him, the voluptuous patronage of the most self-indulgent prince of the most book eager state could not add a cubit to his stature."³¹ In the opinion of most, the best that the Council could do with its money was provide a "hothouse atmosphere for all the arts" and promote the growth of an indigenous culture by supporting the nation's artists.³² Nevertheless, the Council began to operate only in 1957, and its influence would not become evident for at least a decade.

II

The presence of the Canada Council could not guarantee the growth of Canadian literature; neither could it guarantee that this literature would be intelligently assessed by a body of Canadian critics. It had been noted by Canadian writers that the national literature had often been either uncritically received or generally ignored by the native critic.³³ Indeed, in his submission to the Massey Commission, E.A. McCourt bitterly acknowledged that literary criticism in Canada was

"beneath contempt." By mid-decade, however, accusations that the critics gave only immoderate or uncritical praise to Canadian books was being strenuously denied by the critics themselves.

In a response to comments made on this subject in The Times Literary Supplement on Nov. 5, 1954, Robertson Davies argued that, although few in number, Canadian critics were actively engaged in promoting the national literature.³⁵ He and others maintained that individuals such as E.K. Brown, A.J.M. Smith and Desmond Pacey, and periodicals like The University of Toronto Quarterly, with its yearly review, "Letters in Canada," had done much to make Canadian writers known.³⁶ Davies went on to argue that while these reviewers did not lend themselves to "chauvinistic enthusiasm" they did enthusiastically promote Canadian literature.³⁷ Moreover, it was his opinion that Canadian critics "understood some things in Canadian books better than did foreign critics." As a result "their praise or blame took a direction of its own."³⁸ Claude Bissell agreed and maintained that it was not just a "mark of chauvinistic prejudice" that compelled Canadian critics to be chiefly concerned with novels that were set in Canada,³⁹ and written by native authors. Bissell implied that the critic, like the novelist, was not necessarily indulging in literary nationalism if he chose to cultivate his own garden or "illuminate that area that he must, by the very nature of things, know most intimately."⁴⁰

The notion that a Canadian criticism was an important

compliment to the national literature was therefore becoming increasingly popular. Perhaps the most definitive statement on the function of criticism was written in 1955 by George Woodcock. In "Views on Canadian Criticism" Woodcock explored the intimate relationship between literature and criticism in the Canadian context. Quoting D.S. Savage, the British critic, he argued that the function of criticism was "to interpret, elucidate and evaluate our literature, and in so doing to define, defend and expound the tradition."⁴¹ Savage had used the word "tradition" cautiously and had noted that the reference was not simply to "the literary tradition solely, but the whole cultural complex from which literature is one specific outgrowth, and which includes the tradition of thought and belief."⁴² The literary critic was, therefore, something of a cultural historian who, in the interpretation and evaluation of literature, helped to define and defend the broader social, intellectual and artistic traditions of a particular culture. Woodcock agreed with this assessment and set out to examine the extent to which Canadian criticism had performed its central function—that of defining the Canadian tradition.

Like Harold Innis, Woodcock insisted that an exploration of the Canadian literary tradition was not necessarily connected to chauvinistic nationalist sentiment. In fact he emphasized that nationalism and nationalist movements often frustrated and paralyzed cultural traditions.⁴³ Nevertheless, he went on to conclude

that "peoples and regions have their own distinctive literary and cultural traditions and attitudes conditioned by shared language, habitat and historical experience."⁴⁴ Although great literature had a broad universal appeal, this appeal was usually achieved when the writer delved "most deeply into the life of his own place and time, and [found] the universal where his roots [plunged] into their native soil."⁴⁵ This was as true for Canadian writers as it was for those of Ancient Greece or modern England. He therefore noted that while cultural exchange was valuable and necessary, the ideal of the cosmopolitan artist was a chimera; writers were dependent not only on "their immediate and temporary environment," but most importantly "on their origins."⁴⁶

Woodcock maintained that there existed in Canada a literature in an "emergent state" that was qualitatively different from both British and American literature. Canadian writers had only recently recognized that they were no longer "colonial dependents of English or American traditions"; yet they were still aware that there was "no community of Canadian writing, no evident unity in all the apparently scattered paths which they and their fellow writers were taking."⁴⁷ These writers, who were moving towards a self-conscious identity, lacked a defined literary tradition that would provide this sense of community. Woodcock argued that, for this reason, the time was ripe for a Canadian criticism. It was only through the development of the "critical spirit" that Canadian writing would be led "out of the hesitations of adolescence and into the self-consciousness

of maturity."⁴⁸

Woodcock indicated that in a country like Canada the development of a "critical spirit" would be a complex process. Criticism would have to evolve an approach based on Canadian experience, and in this respect the native critic would, at least initially, have to be something of a psychologist, a sociologist, a philosopher, a mythologist and an historian. The critic would be less concerned with "close textual analysis" than with "the peculiar nature of the Canadian experience."⁴⁹ Each would have to search out those things which made "the temper of our life—despite so many superficial resemblances—essentially different from the American or British."⁵⁰ The critic had to be aware of the ways in which the Canadian tradition (and life in general) related to international trends and "the world continuum."⁵¹ Most important, perhaps, he would have to "delve into the past for the unifying threads and probe into the future for the sense of direction," always keeping in mind that "within the culture, each writer is inalienably an individual, with his own psychology and his own reaction to experience."⁵²

In many respects, Woodcock's article was prophetic. It was not that Canadian critics prior to 1955 had ignored the development of the national literature and the search for a Canadian tradition; it was simply that these tasks were taken up with a renewed sense of enthusiasm during the 1950s. This was in part, the result of the interest generated by the Massey Report, the first official government-sponsored study which had examined the development and future of the national literature.

It might also be argued that after the war, in a period of relative peace and prosperity and in an environment of economic expansion, rapid social change and uncertainty, the search for identity took on a new sense of urgency.⁵³ Canada's rapid economic growth, the decline of British power and the rise of American influence after World War II, and the mass-media revolution spearheaded in the United States and spreading out to embrace the Canadian market stimulated activity in all areas of high culture in Canada. It was a period of assessment, a time in which many intellectuals, literary critics included, sought to define Canada's relationship to the rest of the world by exploring the Canadian tradition.

Whatever the reasons for the renewed enthusiasm of the literary critics, the numbers of books, articles, anthologies and periodicals concerned with the promotion and definition of the Canadian literature which appeared during the 1950s was impressive. By 1952 Desmond Pacey had already written his first study on Creative Writing in Canada and by 1957 Wilfrid Eggleston had completed his volume The Frontier in Canadian Letters. Anthologies such as Julian Park's Culture in Contemporary Canada (1957) and Malcolm Ross's Our Sense of Identity (1954) and The Arts in Canada: A Stock Taking at Mid Century (1958) all contained critical articles on the development of the novel, poetry and drama. Collections of creative writing continued to be published throughout the 1950s, many of which attempted to provide a sense of the historical development of Canadian literature. Included

amongst these were Irving Layton's and Louis Dudek's joint effort Canadian Poems 1850-1952 (1953), Carl F. Klinck's Canadian Anthology (1955), A.J.M. Smith's second and extended version of The Books of Canadian Poetry (1957), and Northrop Frye's E.J. Pratt: Collected Poems (1958). In the winter of 1953-54 Queen's Quarterly began a regular section on "Our Lively Arts" which featured articles on Canadian literature, and in 1956 The Royal Society of Canada held its first symposium on the national literature, featuring Desmond Pacey and Northrop Frye as the keynote speakers.

Furthermore, while the first half of the decade had witnessed the demise of Alan Crawley's Contemporary Verse and John Sutherland's Northern Writing, by mid-decade Robert Weaver and others had established Tamarack Review and Louis Dudek published the first issue of Delta. Finally, in 1959 Jan de Bruyn began the publication of Prism and George Woodcock himself brought out the first issue of Canadian Literature. These magazines, whether devoted to literary journalism, to the publication of fiction, drama and poetry or to literary criticism in the broadest sense, demonstrated a renewed commitment to the promotion of Canadian literature. Regardless of differences in editorial policy (the most humorous and audacious of which can be found in Delta, October 1957), each one of these periodicals sought to provide a forum for new and established writers and literary critics.

For a number of Canadian critics, however, the most pressing problem was the question of whether or not a distinctly Canadian idiom could be identified and developed in the

national literature. If the task of the critic was to defend and define the Canadian tradition, then a number of questions about the nature of literature and the artist's relationship to society and to the world of literature as a whole had to be explored. In the search for a Canadian idiom the critics therefore turned their attention to the literature itself.

III

Prior to 1959 it was the general consensus of the critics that even though Canadian literature showed promise, it was not yet time for self-congratulation.⁵⁴ Desmond Pacey observed that while Canadian poetry had experienced a kind of renaissance during the 1940s, good novels were still few and far between.⁵⁵ In 1958, Claude Bissell wrote that only since the Second World War had "the Canadian novel aroused anything like the attention that had been given to Canadian poetry."⁵⁶ He went on to note, however, that regardless of the high quality of established authors like MacLennan, Wilson, Lemelin and Roy, and the promise of the new generation of Buckler, Wiseman, Richler and Marlyn, it was still true that Canadian critics could not yet speak of "a major achievement in fiction."⁵⁷

Such a major achievement would only come with time and with the development of a national literature which, while universal in its appeal, grew out of the particular Canadian experience. Claude Bissell and others emphasized that this did not entail the continuation of a nationalist school of Canadian literature which had insisted on singing the praises of the "true north strong and free."⁵⁸ This school

of Canadian literature, which persisted in painting maple leaves and beavers on every page of prose, and in drenching poetry in maple syrup, was merely the product of minds dominated by an immature and provincial nationalism.

Canadian literature, if it was to make a major contribution to the international world of letters, had to be consciously Canadian, but not consciously nationalistic, in its intentions. Like other intellectuals preoccupied with the development of Canadian culture, numerous literary critics argued that Canadian literature had to grow out of the particular and unique roots of the Canadian experience—the history and traditions of Canadian culture and society—in order that it might branch out and embrace themes with a universal appeal.

This attitude to the development of the national literature was certainly not peculiar to the 1950s. It had been discussed, expounded and refined over at least four decades by individuals like Lorne Pierce, the Methodist minister who had functioned as the editor of Ryerson Press from 1920 to 1960.⁵⁹ In A Canadian Nation, Pierce made his final comment on Canadian culture. He argued that in order for the nation to make a substantial contribution to the world of letters, its authors and artists would have to become more "consciously Canadian."⁶⁰ This did not imply an indulgence in either "shoddy sentiment" or "strident patriotism,"⁶¹ but a sophisticated appreciation of "our own land and its traditions."⁶² Only through a knowledge of the particular could one appreciate and finally enrich the universal, and he noted that because of this "One may have international interests, one may even

be regarded as cosmopolitan, but fundamentally, that is down deep at the foundations of things, one is always a native son, a birth-right child of time and place, and that is the secret of our strength and our infinite variety and endless interest as a people."⁶³

For Pierce, variety or diversity was the key to Canada's distinct culture. In his opinion this culture would arise from the blending of the best of the French and English Canadian cultural traditions and that of other ethnic groups in Canada.⁶⁴ While the process had to a limited extent already begun, it could only be reinforced by conscious choice. Association and not assimilation was the foundation of Canadian culture, but a greater unity in diversity had to be achieved if the "Canadian people" were to be forged together as a race.⁶⁵ Pierce implied that Canadian literature, like all aspects of Canadian culture, would emerge from the best traditions derived from the various ethnic, regional and linguistic groups of the nation as a whole.

The tension between diversity and unity, another aspect of the general concern over the relationship between the particular and the universal, preoccupied Canadian literary critics of the 1950s as much as it did others interested in the development of Canadian education and culture in general. Claude Bissell noted that, in a country like Canada, cultivating one's own form of literary expression meant the creation of a national literature characterized by diversity not uniformity. Like Pierce, he noted that Canada was a country of two languages and many ethnic groups and

regions, and, its literature would necessarily reflect these facts.⁶⁶ Other critics like Robertson Davies and Malcolm Ross noted that regionalism in Canadian literature was not necessarily the result of immature provincialism, but represented an attractive feature of contemporary life in Canada.⁶⁷ Moreover, they implied that despite this diversity a unity did exist which made it possible to identify a national literature distinct in its totality from American, British or French literature. Like the Massey Commissioners, Ross argued that this diversity was something to be maintained and implied that it offered a healthy defense against standardization, conformity and uniformity. He enthusiastically argued that, in Canada, there was "no reason at all why the spectrum should shrink to grey, why in the end, our varied cultures should turn flat and single. We are learning a new idiom. We shall come to talk it with our own accent, our several accents."⁶⁸

Ross was not alone in his assessment. Nor was he alone in his observation that the search for a Canadian idiom was a difficult one because the nation's literature was coming of age in a world that was becoming more international in its orientation. He remarked that "If no man is an island, no culture is an island in the day of Sputnik and the ICBM."⁶⁹ Still, he went on to observe that cultural exchange, or adaptation of the international idiom, did not eliminate the possibility, indeed the necessity, of preserving a national culture. Like Pierce, he maintained that literature and culture in general could not be expressed in terms of someone else's experience. Canadians, like other peoples, had to advance "over their own

cobblestones" in order to make a vital and unique contribution to the literary cultures of the world.⁷⁰

Following a similar train of thought, Northrop Frye, in an article that traced the development of Canadian literature from 1929 to 1954, noted the influence of international trends on Canadian writers and acknowledged their value. He also noted, however, that while participating in the international world of letters Canadian intellectuals had always been "cultural nationalists" and never more so than in 1954 when he was writing.⁷¹ Frye defended their position, arguing that "Canada's possessive attitude to its literature is frankly provincial, but the assumption that provincialism is always and everywhere wrong, is merely an assumption based on a different kind of provincialism."⁷² In his opinion Canadian literature was and would continue to be "Canadian by one definition or another of that word" and international, or part of "a recognizable type of English literature...steadily growing in articulateness and power."⁷³

Placed within a social and political context, as well as a cultural one, the preoccupation with the relationship between the particular and the universal was, at least in part, the result of a more widespread fear of American domination of Canadian affairs. It was probably clear, even to the most "ivory tower" members of the literary elite that in the cultural as well as in the political and economic realm the word "international" was rapidly becoming synonymous with things American. The fact that Canadian authors and

critics saw themselves as members of an international community, dealing with themes of universal appeal but emphasized that they did so from a uniquely Canadian perspective, demonstrated this awareness. Clearly, they did not wish to advocate cultural isolationism or appear too parochial in their outlook, but neither did they wish to be overwhelmed by the culture of any other nation, least of all that of the United States.

It was therefore no accident that when the critics sought to define what was unique about Canadian literature and culture in general, the nation they most frequently utilized as the basis for comparison was the United States. Like the Massey Commissioners and individuals such as Harold Innis, Hilda Neatby and George Grant, members of the Canadian literary elite sought to define the nation's identity in opposition to that of the United States. In fact during the 1950s any mention of the literature and culture of the United States was likely to be followed by the assertion that Canadian culture was and would remain separate from the American. For some, this resistance was motivated by the belief that Canadian literature (in all its various expressions, fiction, non-fiction, creative and scholarly) had something to offer the world, not simply because it was different but because it offered a cultural outlook that was in some respects more humane, more "moral," than that of the United States.

Throughout the 1950s this theme emerged in the work of numerous literary critics and authors. Writers such as

Hugh MacLennan, and critics like Desmond Pacey, Malcolm Ross and Northrop Frye argued that Canadian literature, born as it was out of different environmental, historical, political and social experience and preserving alternate cultural traditions from the United States, would continue to reflect these differences. Invariably, these comparisons led to a discussion of the higher moral purpose of the nation, to references to Canadian humility, tolerance, and to the national talent of compromise or to the ability to hold "opposites in tension."⁷⁴ Canada, which Hugh MacLennan once described as the "good wife" on the continent—a personification which seemed to encompass all of the above virtues—would produce a literature that mirrored the spiritual and moral values of the country.⁷⁵

In the concluding chapter of his book Creative Writing in Canada (1952), Desmond Pacey was even more specific. In his opinion there were two features that distinguished Canadian literature from the literature of other countries. The first of these was its "dominant pattern of social response." In his opinion the vast majority of Canadian authors since confederation had "almost constantly attacked in various ways the excesses and the false values of a commercial and industrial society."⁷⁶ In the midst of the industrial revolution, late nineteenth and early twentieth century novelists and poets had rebelled against the displacement of the agricultural and rural way of life and "yearned for an earlier pre-industrial day."⁷⁷ More recent writers

recognized that industrialism was here to stay and "advocated a new social order in which its adverse effects would be mitigated."⁷⁸ He implied that Canadian literature was somehow unique because of the overwhelming negative response of most of its individual authors to the continuing process of industrialization and commercialization.

According to Pacey, the second feature of Canadian literature which made it unique was the response of individual artists to the physical environment. Like Canadian painters, most Canadian writers had responded to the realities of a harsh climate and a huge expanse of inhospitable wilderness with a mixture of terror and reverence, fear and exultation.⁷⁹ Without ever delving into what these responses implied within the literature (symbolically and metaphorically) Pacey went on to note that the Canadian climate and geography had had important consequences for the "writers' attitude to his fellow-men."⁸⁰ Canadian authors were optimistic but their optimism was more restrained than their fellow American writers, because they lived "in a physical environment which [was] more forbidding and more humbling."⁸¹ They were, therefore, "less inclined to boast" than American authors and displayed a more restrained sensibility and a "greater sense of humility."⁸² The progress of Canadian literature, he concluded, had consequently been "more stable if less spectacular" because of the influence of a "stern environment."⁸³

The weaknesses of Pacey's conclusions on the unique features of Canadian literature were obvious. The worst of

these was the assertion that the attack on commercialism had been more frequent and intense in the work of Canadian authors than in the work of writers from other countries. Yet regardless of these weaknesses, his analysis was significant for other reasons. Once again we find a member of the Canadian intelligentsia summoning evidence for a vision of Canada as the moral community—the ordered and humane society that existed in contrast to the somewhat anarchic and dehumanizing social structure of the United States. Throughout, he directly or indirectly identified the United States with commercialism, arrogance, instability and intemperance. Canada, while it might appear drab and unspectacular, was associated throughout his analysis with anti-commercial attitudes, modesty, stability and humility. He argued that Canada shared in the "vigour, range and optimism" characteristic of life in pioneer North America, but implied that it had preserved a more humane social order.⁸⁴ This was reflected in the national literature and he observed that even though its development had been slow (the culmination of a gradual process of evolution) the final product would constitute a more enduring contribution to the world of letters.

In 1957 another group, which counted Pacey among its members, joined together to produce the definitive account of the unique features of Canadian literature—those elements which constituted its literary tradition. Carl Klinck, A.G. Bailey, Claude Bissell, Roy Daniells and Northrop Frye set about compiling a series of essays on various aspects of the

literary history of Canada. Their central aim was to produce a "comprehensive reference book" for students and scholars engaged in the study of the national literature."⁸⁵ In the concluding chapter, however, Northrop Frye intimated that what the editors and contributors had achieved went far beyond their original aims. He concluded that "The writers featured in this book have identified the habits and attitudes of the country as Fraser and MacKenzie have identified its rivers. They have also left an imaginative legacy of dignity and high courage."⁸⁶ In a sense, he implied that a study of these writers had entailed a retrieval of the past: a comprehensive statement on the Canadian literary tradition. This was a task in which many literary critics of the 1950s had been engaged; hence, although the volume was published in 1965 it represented the culmination of the work of the previous decade.

As the general editor of the University of Toronto Quarterly's yearly feature, "Letters in Canada," from 1950 to 1960, Northrop Frye had been directly involved in the process of defining and promoting Canadian literature.⁸⁷ Indeed, Frye was one Canadian critic of the 1950s who had already gained an international reputation as a scholar, and who had influenced the careers of numerous Canadian authors.⁸⁸ Educated at Oxford and the University of Toronto, he had originally been ordained as a United Church minister, but quickly turned his attention to literary criticism, editing and teaching.⁸⁹ In his conclusion to Literary History of Canada, Frye noted that during the previous decade much of

his critical work on Canadian literature had been based on intuition and guesswork. He had hoped, therefore, that a volume on the nation's literary history would broaden the inductive basis upon which he and other critics had made generalizations about the nature of Canadian literature. What he discovered once the book was assembled, however, was that it confirmed rather than refuted his own intuitions on the subject.⁹⁰ As a result, he admitted that his "attempt at conclusion and summary" had involved "some self-plagiarism."⁹¹ It was true in fact that Frye's "Conclusion" formulated a repetition and expansion of the observations made in essays like "Preface to an Uncollected Anthology" (1957) "English Canadian Literature, 1929-1954" (1956) and "Culture and the National Will" (1957).

In Frye's view, Canadian literature, "in its orthodox form of fiction and poetry," had first to be understood within the context of the nation's cultural history, of which it was but one expression.⁹² Orthodox Canadian literature had not yet produced an artist whose work had sufficiently transcended the Canadian context in such a way as to pull the reader "toward the centre of the literary experience itself."⁹³ As a result, the editors of Literary History of Canada had recognized that a critical evaluation of the literature produced to date was inappropriate. Most important was the examination of the full range of verbal expression—literary and non-literary—and of the social and historical experience of which it was both a "force and function."⁹⁴ Like Woodcock,

Frye appeared to accept the fact that the definition and defense of a cultural tradition was an important function of criticism in Canada. He therefore proceeded to summarize the features of this tradition, or "imaginative continuum" as it had been described in the volume as a whole.

Frye's summary was not simply an analysis of Canadian cultural history and the distinct features of Canadian literature, as they had been expressed in the essays preceding his own. It included his own views on the nature and function of history, myth and literature and his ideas on the operation of what he described as "the garrison mentality." He explored each of these in relation to Canadian literature in order to explain the various stages of its growth and to indicate the emerging pattern of its future development. In describing the distinct features of Canadian culture, he cautiously noted that the tendencies identified were unique only in intensity and degree, not in substance.⁹⁵ Often, in order to demonstrate these differences, Frye resorted to comparison. The culture against which he most frequently compared Canadian culture was that of the United States.

According to Frye, the formative features of Canadian culture included: the existence of two cultural groups in Canada, the harsh environment and the influence of two larger and more powerful nations, namely Great Britain and the United States.⁹⁶ In focusing on the latter influence, Frye began with an assumption that had been repeatedly utilized by other Canadian intellectuals in order to compare and contrast Canada

and the United States. He argued that the revolutionary experience and the creation of a written constitution had introduced "a deductive or a priori pattern in American culture."⁹⁷ It had produced a tendency to define an American way of life and "[marked] it off from anti-American heresies." Canada, a colony and sideline observer of the American experience, adhered to "the inductive and expedient" and to a more conservative approach to political affairs.⁹⁸ This, in turn had influenced its cultural life. He implied that as a "genius of compromise" Canada maintained cultural and political attitudes that were inclusive rather than exclusive.⁹⁹ These attitudes emphasized the value of tradition and continuity over any possible benefits derived from a radical break with the past. It was therefore no accident that Canada's attachment to Great Britain was based upon its existence as a "symbol of tradition" rather than its role as a "fellow-nation."¹⁰⁰

This need for continuity over time was paralleled by a need to transcend the divisions imposed by space. The physical environment of Canada was one that was both vast and essentially terrifying. In such an enormous and overwhelmingly inhospitable place, where centers of population were both small and scattered, the need to establish some sense of continuity was of paramount importance.¹⁰¹ In Canadian literature, therefore, the preoccupation with transportation and communication (real and symbolic) could be interpreted as a response to this ever present need to "probe into the distance" in both the literal and metaphorical

sense.¹⁰² Frye argued that as a result, the Burkean notion of "society as a continuum" was a strong feature of the Canadian imagination which had emerged at an early stage of our cultural history.¹⁰³ Moreover, this feature was "consistent with the pragmatic and conservative outlook of Canadians" and was reflected in the nation's "preoccupation with its own history and in its relentless cultural stock-taking and self-inventories."¹⁰⁴

According to Frye, the theme of conquest in Canadian literature also demonstrated the tremendous influence of the natural environment on the Canadian consciousness. Whereas in the United States conquest of the frontier was synonymous with "the wild west" and with an "another redskin bit the dust feeling," in Canada it was synonymous with the gradual expansion of order and authority—two things dear to the conservative mind.¹⁰⁵ Conquest, when portrayed in Canadian literature, "had been mainly of the unconscious forces of nature."¹⁰⁶ Human and moral values were frequently depicted in combat with "the vast unconsciousness of nature" which seemed to be "the unanswerable denial of those values."¹⁰⁷ Moreover, the conquest of nature was usually portrayed as limited and temporary, as an endless and ongoing process rather than a final achievement or victory.¹⁰⁸

What then did this mean for the human community and for the cultural history of that community? Frye argued that the two apparent results expressed in life and literature was the creation of the "garrison mentality" and the corresponding development of a rhetorical tradition in Canadian fiction and

non fiction.¹⁰⁹ The garrison society (a social group constantly under siege) developed language as another tool for combat. The desire to assert or defend society against its enemies, whether human or natural, encouraged the development of rhetoric, the language of contest.¹¹⁰ Frye implied, that this had resulted in the assertive moral tone evident in so much Canadian literature. Whether defending the conventional standards of society as a whole, or attacking those standards from within, the work of Canadian authors was frequently rhetorical, "an illustration or allegory of certain social attitudes."¹¹¹ Frye also implied that this had inhibited the development of the poetic imagination which sought to construct rather than assert, to explore the theme of self-conflict rather than conflict with the external world.¹¹²

Asserting that this trend could be identified in the literary cultures of other countries, Frye once again emphasized that the difference in Canada was one of degree. It was, in part, a function of the fact that the Canadian literary imagination had come of age at a relatively late stage in "the cultural history of the West."¹¹³ It had been rooted not in myth but in history, and even this basis was somewhat tenuous because of the mass media revolution which, in Canada, had resulted in the "foreshortening of Canadian history."¹¹⁴ As a result, a literary tradition (in the orthodox sense) had been slow in emerging, because in Frye's judgement "Literature was conscious mythology: as society develops, its mythical stories become structural principles of story telling, its mythical concepts, sun gods and the like,

become habits of metaphorical thought."¹¹⁵ In the absence of a "structure of traditional stories and images" the writer in Canada had had to voluntarily attach himself to a literary tradition and thus tended towards descriptive rather than metaphoric thought—to rhetoric not poetry.¹¹⁶

On one level, the result was the predominance of a "social and conceptual approach to literature" in Canada. In some instances this resulted in an attachment to, rather than a detachment from, the prevailing social mythologies. Instead of creating an "autonomous world," that of literature, which gave the reader "an imaginative perspective on the actual one," much of Canadian literature remained tied to a description and defense of the real world and its social myths.¹¹⁷ Yet Frye noted that as Canadian society developed, the autonomous world of literature began to emerge. As this occurred it became possible for the writer to find his identity in the world of literature and thus attain a more detached approach to society.¹¹⁸

As a literary critic, Frye acknowledged that this world of literature was international or universal. Nevertheless, he argued that the writer had to find its particular roots in the immediate, the particular environment in which he wrote.¹¹⁹ His own point of view was juxtaposed with that of another Canadian author, John Coulter, who wrote that "The art of a Canadian remains...the art of the country of his Forbears and the old world heritage of myth and legend remains his heritage... though the desk on which he writes be Canadian."¹²⁰ In

contrast, Frye pointed out that the process of finding an artistic identity in Canada "may not be a simple matter of forsaking the Canadian for the international, the province for the capital. It may be that when the writer attaches himself to the world of literature, he discovers, or rediscovers, by doing so, something in his Canadian environment more vital and articulate than a desk."¹²¹ The search for a Canadian idiom, therefore, depended upon the artist's ability to enter the world of imagination, the universal literary tradition as a whole, finding within it the distinctive emphasis or mythological structures of the literature of the land of his birth. This would be the surest sign that both the artist and the literature were maturing. At this stage, he implied, Canadian literature would fully exist within the realm of "literary experience itself" and could then be evaluated within that context, and not merely as one aspect of the nation's cultural history.

Once again, in Frye, the tension between the universal and the particular, nationalism and internationalism, was explored but no final resolution achieved. For Frye it was not a matter of choosing one side or the other but of maintaining the two in balance and harmony. Yet he was willing to explore the tradition of the particular, not only to define it but also to defend it. To this extent he was perhaps more concerned with the national and the particular. The reasons for this were made plain. His emphasis on the particular was based in a recognition that in the modern world, the universal was becoming predominant and the trend towards uniformity was gaining

in strength.¹²² The world was becoming "Americanized" and the creative writer appeared to be writing in a world that was "post-Canadian, post-American, post-British and post-everything except the world itself."¹²³ In the "empire of the aeroplane and television" provinces disappeared and the distance, both spatial and temporal, between cultural centres were eliminated. Yet Frye, with his penchant for dialectics, argued that these very conditions "[gave] the old ones new importance, as what vanishes in one form appears in another."¹²⁴ He implied that in the homogenizing world of mass media and high technology, the traditions of the particular or national took on a new importance. They acted as the necessary balance to the powerful trend towards standardization. At the end of his summary, he therefore attempted to demonstrate what it was in Canadian literature that was "more vital than a desk"—the Canadian imaginative tradition.

Frye argued that "everything that [was] central to Canadian writing [seemed] to be marked by the imminence of the natural world" and by the desire to reconcile it with the human world.¹²⁵ Celebration of the "technological will to power," the desire to conquer, assimilate and standardize characteristic of the American revolutionary traditions and culture, was generally absent in Canadian literature.¹²⁶ Although Canada and Canadians had participated in a modern world dominated by "the will to power," they had produced an imaginative tradition that expressed "deep reservations to this world as an end in itself."¹²⁷

Frye argued that this tradition had been nurtured and reinforced by Canada's political separation from the United States. Its roots were firmly planted in "loyalist toryism" and a conservative vision of society and continued to be expressed even in the current radical critique of that conservatism.¹²⁸ In fact, Frye maintained that Canadian radicalism bore a greater resemblance to the Toryism which it opposed than it did to American radicalism, borne of the revolutionary tradition.¹²⁹ Whether conservative or radical it betrayed a strong attachment to order and history, to compromise and reconciliation and to a conception of freedom which was not synonymous with the triumph of laissez-faire or national independence.¹³⁰ The imaginative forms of these social myths were expressed by the nation's poets and novelists either in social criticism of the will to power—the "oligarchic tendencies" of American society and its commercial values—or in a vision of society which stood in opposition to the ideal of the "American republic."¹³¹

Frye utilized a painting by the American artist Edward Hincks to illustrate the distinctive emphasis of the Canadian literary tradition and its imaginative perspective on the world. It was, he argued, a pictorial representation of the "reconciliation of man with man and of man with nature," a theme which lay beneath the surface of both American and Canadian literature.¹³² Yet Frye indicated that because of the particular Canadian experience—the impact of the environment and the nation's political and social development—it was a central and not an

incidental part of the Canadian imagination.¹³³ The distinctive emphasis of the Canadian tradition was "the quest for the peaceable kingdom."¹³⁴ He implied that this quest, given the preeminent modern will to power, was of vital importance for it sought harmony, reconciliation and, one would assume, the necessary and peaceable co-existence of opposites.

One cannot help but see in Frye's work an implicit assumption that this tradition was, in some respects, superior to that of the United States, not only because it was different but because it was more humane. Although he was careful to point out that the quest for the peaceable kingdom was present in the American literary tradition and while he expressed a grudging admiration for "so huge and so productive" a nation as the United States, he appeared to believe that something had been preserved in Canada which was largely absent from American society and culture.¹³⁵ While Canada appeared to have made "the American way of life its own" in the material sense, it had preserved an essential moral dimension in the realm of the imagination—a suspicion of the will to power and a quest for a moral community.

While Frye's analysis was somewhat more sophisticated than that of Desmond Pacey, their conclusions were not radically different. Nor were Frye's views radically different from those of George Woodcock, even though the latter seemed to place greater stress on the particular than on the universal. Both Frye and Woodcock appeared to agree that at this stage in the country's development the identification of a literary

tradition that would provide a sense of continuity and community for Canadian writers was of central importance. Both seemed to indicate that isolationism and fervent nationalism were not the catalysts that would create the best conditions for the development of Canadian literature. Yet each one indicates that for the critic, as for the Canadian author, a knowledge of the particular was of crucial importance in the promotion and growth of a national literature. Finally, in the arguments utilized by Frye we find mirrored many of the assumptions that operated in the work of others previously examined earlier in this thesis. His discussion of the influence of the loyalist tradition, his analysis of the revolutionary tradition in American society, his view of the essential conservatism of the Canadian social vision, his notion of the "technological will to power" and its negative impact in the modern world echo similar concerns found in the work of Hilda Neatby, George Grant, Arthur Lower, Robertson Davies and others. Moreover, his emphasis on the quest for the peaceable kingdom in literature and life demonstrates his own particular concern about the direction and future of Canadian society in a world which seemed to have all but abandoned the quest.

What we find in the work of the literary critics previously examined, beyond a desire to establish a sense of the traditions or distinctive features of Canadian literature, is a response to a world in upheaval. The challenge posed to literature by the mass media revolution was complex and awesome. It was, perhaps, clear to many Canadian critics in the 1950s that the threat to the future production and

consumption of "great literature," inherent in the rise of mass media communications, was something that could not be ignored. Implicit in their discussions of the relationship between the universal and particular, the national and international, was a fear that the modern tendency towards uniformity, reinforced by the extension of electronic media, would affect the development of literature.

Literature, which most of these critics argued developed from a knowledge of the particular, and which derived its infinite variety and interest from this fact, risked becoming flat and uniform in the homogenized universe of "high technology." Moreover, good literary fare was in danger of being swamped by second-rate writing that was mass produced and easily accessible. Finally, movies and the new medium of television appeared to have the power to erode whatever small audience existed for the consumption of "good" Canadian literature. These media also seemed to debase those values and standards of taste necessary for the appreciation of that literature. At least one Canadian scholar, Marshall McLuhan, was intent upon studying the nature and possible effects of mass communications. His first book The Mechanical Bride: Folklore of Industrial Man (1951) attempted to anticipate the influence of the new electronic media on print culture. As has been illustrated there were others who were equally concerned. Indeed, for many literary critics, cultural nationalism in the 1950s was as much an attempt to cope with changing social conditions and economics, as it was an expression of patriotism,

moral principle or the search for identity.

Nevertheless, it was the search for a cultural identity and not the future development of print culture which was the central focus for most of the critics examined. Moreover, there was a sense that not only the future of Canadian literature was at stake, but also the future of Canadian society. Frye's concern over the modern will to power and Pacey's observations on the anti-commercial attitudes evident in Canadian literature and the general emphasis placed on the differences between Canada and the United States were more than critical musings. Beneath these observations, and the widespread preoccupation with the nature of the Canadian idiom, rested a belief that culture, and particularly literature, had a role to play in determining the choice for Canada's future. The general sense of urgency was precipitated by more than a simple desire for a literature that Canada could show off to the rest of the world. To a large extent the urgency given voice by the critics was born of a desire to define a literary tradition that would inspire future generations in Canada. It was a tradition that would preserve and promote a more humane social order than the one which Canadian literary critics saw being constructed around them.

Notes

Chapter VI

1. Some of the literary associations and journals which submitted briefs to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences included:
 The Canadian Authors Association,
 The Canadian Writer's Committee,
 The Canadian Writer's Foundation,
 Composers, Authors and Publishers Association of Canada,
Contemporary Verse, A Canadian Quarterly,
Culture, A Quarterly Review,
 The Fiction Writers of Saskatchewan,
 Fiddlehead Poetry Society,
First Statement Press,
 Societe des Ecrivains Canadiens,
 Vancouver Poets.
2. Carl Ballstadt, The Search for an English Canadian Literature: An Anthology of Critical Articles from the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), p. xxv.
3. Roy Daniells, "Literature," The Culture of Contemporary Canada, ed., Julian Park (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957), p. 2.
4. Ballstadt, The Search for an English Canadian Literature, pp. xiii, xxii-xxiv.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., p. xxviii.
7. The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951), pp. 11-13.
8. Ballstadt, The Search for an English Canadian Literature, pp. xxi, xxviii, xxx.
9. Ibid., p. xxi.
10. Ibid., pp. xxv, xxx, xxix.
11. The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, p. 244.
12. Lister Sinclair, "A Canadian Idiom," Our Sense of Identity, ed., Malcolm Ross, (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1954), p. 234.
13. Edward McCourt, "Canadian Letters," Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951), pp. 67-82.

René Garneau, "La Litterature," Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951), pp. 83-98.

14. The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, pp. 222-225.
 15. Ibid., p. 223.
 16. Ibid.
 17. Ibid., pp. 225-226.
 18. Ibid., p. 225.
 19. Ibid.
 20. Ibid.
 21. Ibid., pp. 225-226.
 22. Ibid., pp. 226-227.
 23. Ibid., p. 227.
 24. Ibid., pp. 226-227.
 25. Ibid., p. 227.
 26. Ibid.
 27. Ibid., p. 224.
 28. Wilfrid Eggleston, "The State and Cultural Life," Saturday Night, 6 6 (July 13, 1951), p. 3.
 29. See: "Fear of Culture," Canadian Forum, 37 (1957-1958), p. 26.
- Morley Callaghan, "We're on the Wrong Track in Our Culture Quest," Maclean's, May 25, 1957, pp. 8, 86-87.
- "Why They Appointed Taylor and Bronfman to the Canada Council," Maclean's, May 25, 1957.
- "Why Aren't there Any Crackpots on the Canada Council?" Maclean's, May 25, 1957.
30. See: Robertson Davies, "Writer in the Attic," Saturday Night, 70 (April 30, 1955), pp. 11-12.
- Bruce Hutchison, "The Demon's Lover," Saturday Night, November 24, 1956, p. 13.

Robert Weaver, "Literature: Some Promise," Saturday Night, 75 (August 29, 1959), p. 34.

31. Davies, "Writer in the Attic," p. 11.

32. Weaver, "Literature: Some Promise," p. 34.

Part III

33. Ballstadt, The Search for English Canadian Literature, pp. xxv-xxvii.

See also:

McCourt, "Canadian Letters," p. 74.

34. McCourt, "Canadian Letters," p. 74.

35. Robertson Davies, "Writer in the Attic," p. 11-12.

36. Ibid.

See also:

Desmond Pacey, "The Canadian Writer and His Public, 1882-1952," Studies Varia: The Royal Society of Canada, Literary and Scientific Papers, ed., E.G.D. Murray (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), pp. 19-20.

Northrop Frye, "English Canadian Literature, 1929-1954" Canadian Librarian's Association Bulletin, 13 (December, 1956), p. 108.

37. Robertson Davies, "Writer in the Attic," p. 12.

38. Ibid., p. 12.

39. Claude Bissell, "Letters in Canada, Fiction," The University of Toronto Quarterly, July, 1958, p. 454.

40. Ibid.

41. George Woodcock, "Views of Canadian Criticism, 1955," Odysseus Ever Returning, Essays on Canadian Writers and Writing, ed., Malcolm Ross (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1970), p. 130.

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid., p. 131.

45. Ibid.

- 46. Ibid.
- 47. Ibid., pp. 135-136.
- 48. Ibid., p. 137.
- 49. Ibid., p. 136.
- 50. Ibid.
- 51. Ibid.
- 52. Ibid.

Part III

- 54. See:
 Frye, "English Canadian Literature, 1929-1954," p. 112.
 Pacey, "Canadian Writer and His Public, 1882-1952," pp. 10-20.
 Weaver, "Literature: Some Promis," p. 24.
- 55. Pacey, "Canadian Writer and His Public, 1882-1952," p. 17.
- 56. Claude Bissell, "The Novel," The Arts in Canada: A Stock Taking at Mid-Century, ed., Malcolm Ross (Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1958), p. 92.
- 57. Ibid., p. 96.
- 58. Ibid.
 This type of Canadian literature, which was also portrayed as colonial or derivative, was criticized by Roy Daniells, George Woodcock, Lister Sinclair and others.
- 59. The Oxford Companion to Canadian History and Literature, ed., Norah Story (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 636-637.
- 60. Lorne Pierce, A Canadian Nation (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1960), p. 42.
- 61. Ibid., p. 29.
- 62. Ibid., p. 42.
- 63. Ibid.
- 64. Ibid., pp. 2-9.

65. Ibid., p. 3.
66. Bissell, "Fiction," p. 454.
67. Davis, "Writer in the Attic," pp. 11-12.
68. Malcolm Ross, "Editor's Introduction," The Arts in Canada: A Stock Taking at Mid-Century, ed., M. Ross, (Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1958), p. 5.
69. Ibid., p. 4.
70. Ibid., p. 5.
71. Frye, "English Canadian Literature, 1929-1954," p. 108.
72. Ibid., p. 112.

This other variety of provincialism was likely the type that Arthur Lower attacked. Frye seems to refer here to those who agued for a more "cosmopolitan" outlook, one which Lower argued was just a polite front for a colonial mentality that viewed London or New York as the only real centres of culture.

73. Ibid., p. 112.

74. See:

Northrop Frye, "Preface to an Uncollected Anthology," Studia Varia: Royal Society of Canada Literary and Scientific Papers, ed., E.G.D. Murray (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), pp. 21-24.

Desmond Pacey, Creative Writing in Canada, A Short History of English Canadian Literature, (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1952), pp. 191-202.

Malcolm Ross, "Introduction," Our Sense of Identity, ed., M. Ross (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1954).

75. MacLennan, Hugh, "The Tyranny of the Sunday Suit." Cross Country, ed. Dorothy Dunear (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, Ltd., 1949), pp. 157-160.
76. Pacey, Creative Writing in Canada, p. 197.
77. Ibid., p. 198.
78. Ibid.
79. Ibid., pp. 199-201.
80. Ibid., p. 202.
81. Ibid., p. 202.

82. Ibid., p. 202.
83. Ibid.
84. Ibid.
85. Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English, ed., Carl F. Klinck, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), p. ix.
86. Northrop Frye, "Conclusion," Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English, ed., Carl F. Klinck, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), p. 849.
87. The Oxford Companion to Canadian History and Literature, p. 300.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid.
90. Northrop Frye, "Conclusion," p. 821.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid., pp. 821-822.
93. Ibid., p. 822.
94. Ibid.
95. Ibid., p. 835.
96. Ibid., pp. 823-825.
97. Ibid., p. 825.
98. Ibid.
99. Ibid., pp. 825, 829.
100. Ibid., p. 825.
101. Ibid., pp. 828-829.
102. Ibid., P. 828.
103. Ibid., p. 829.
104. Ibid.
105. Ibid.
106. Ibid., p. 830.
107. Ibid.

108. Ibid., pp. 830-831.
109. Ibid., pp. 830-831.
110. Ibid., pp. 831-832.
111. Ibid., p. 834.
112. Ibid., p. 832.
113. Ibid., pp. 835-836.
114. Ibid., p. 836.
115. Ibid.
116. Ibid.
117. Ibid., pp. 836-839.
118. Ibid., p. 839.
119. Ibid., pp. 839-840.
120. Ibid., p. 840.
121. Ibid.
122. Ibid., pp. 846-847.
123. Ibid., p. 848.
124. Ibid.
125. Ibid., p. 846.
126. Ibid., p. 846-847.
127. Ibid., p. 847.
128. Ibid.
129. Ibid.
130. Ibid.
131. Ibid., pp. 847-848.
132. Ibid., p. 848.
133. Ibid., pp. 846-848.
134. Ibid., p. 848.
135. Ibid., pp. 841-842, 847, 848.

CONCLUSION

Contrary to popular belief the decade of the fifties was not a period of complete political and cultural petrification. Canadian intellectuals and artists did not all sit quietly removed in their studies, content to enjoy the apparent prosperity and stability of their times. They were not all detached observers of the "current scene." In fact, many were engaged social critics and committed cultural nationalists. Alarmed by the combined effects of rapid technological change and American cultural influence, intellectuals such as Hilda Neatby, George Grant and others warned Canadians that the future of their country and its traditions was not certain.

The Massey commissioners were amongst the first to voice the concern. They warned that the steady erosion of tradition, the declining importance of the humanities, and domination by American commercial culture jeopardized Canada's cultural development. Harold Innis and others agreed and argued that for culture to flourish in Canada, these trends had to be reversed or at least controlled. In observations on current trends in education, Hilda Neatby, Arthur Lower and George Grant called upon Canadians to recognize the value of tradition and the importance of studies in the arts and letters. They urged their compatriots to preserve what Northrop Frye and others later defined as the essentially conservative social vision of Canada—those things of the spirit and mind that formed the foundation of a distinctly Canadian mode of thought. Canadians, in their view, had to resist what Robertson Davies and Arthur Lower referred to as the pervasive sentimentalism

of North American mass society and culture, and instead promote values associated with a more disciplined form of intelligence and a moral community.

Almost without exception, these intellectuals maintained that the Canadian way of life could be preserved if Canadian culture developed in accordance with the historical experience and traditions of the nation. Whether historians, philosophers, novelists or literary critics, they stressed a vision of Canada as a society with a healthy respect for tradition, continuity and compromise. They emphasized the essential conservatism of Canadian political and social traditions, the nation's peaceful development as a bi-cultural nation and its valuable connections with the enduring cultural values of Great Britain. They implied that only if Canadians were educated properly, if they continued to respect and to preserve their traditions and values, would the future of Canada as a "society of neighbors" be assured. Canada might escape the excesses of the new consumer-oriented mass society.

As the decade of the 1950s wore on, however, it began to appear as though their appeals were falling on deaf ears. Canadians seemed increasingly content to settle for the dreams and goods created for them by Americans. Some Canadian intellectuals began to recognize that rational arguments alone were not powerful enough to convince Canadians of the need for action. Canadians had to be offered a practical political program that captured their imaginations, if their ideal of Canadian society and culture was to be made a reality.

II

Towards the end of the decade George Grant, Donald Creighton, W.L. Morton and others began to rally support for a renewed Canadian conservatism. Incensed by what they perceived to be the continentalist policies of the federal Liberal party and outraged by the abuse of parliamentary tradition during the 1956 pipeline debate, they sought an alternative in the Conservative party of Canada.¹ Their differences were marked and, as Carl Berger notes in The Writing of Canadian History, their differing outlooks became even more pronounced over the next decade.² Nevertheless, they agreed that the preservation of the Canadian way of life could only be achieved through a philosophical conservatism translated into practical political action. The cornerstones of conservative belief—respect for tradition and authority, recognition of the values of loyalty and duty, and belief in the organic unity of society—were for them the only foundations for a meaningful Canadian independence.³

The external enemy was the United States and the enemy within was the Liberal party of Canada. The influence of American policies and social values, coupled with the Liberal party's disrespect for Canadian traditions and constitutional principles, was gradually eroding the character of the Canadian nation state. Donald Creighton attacked the Liberal government's tendency "to perpetrate colonialism at the behest of the United States, by following the dictates of American foreign policy."⁴ He warned that direct and

indirect control of Canadian news services was doing much to facilitate the widespread acceptance of American "diplomatic gangsterism."⁵ W.L. Morton's outline of the political principles of a "Canadian Conservatism Now," was formulated as an attack of the materialism and moral relativism of modern Canadian liberalism. In it, he attempted to establish how Canadian conservatives, through adherence to the principles of constitutional monarchy, might preserve the essentially moral character of the Canadian state.⁶ In The Canadian Identity(1961) he examined the historical roots of Canadian conservatism and the Canadian system of government and compared them to the principles of American republicanism.⁷ He implied that excessive American influence might result in the gradual erosion of the foundations of the Canadian system of constitutional monarchy and the moral character of the Canadian state.

The Anglican bishop, John Farthing, perhaps the most extreme defender of the British and conservative foundations of the Canadian polity, also attacked the spiritual poverty and materialist preoccupations of modern liberalism in his book, Freedom Wears a Crown. He warned of the modern tendency to ignore the past, and urged Canadians to look to their conservative traditions and heritage to preserve the Canadian way of life.⁹

The authors of Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics and Provincialism observe that these "attempts to uncover the [unique Canadian] tradition in the British constitution (as

in John Farthing's book Freedom Wears a Crown) or in a new conservatism were unconvincing when not simply hackneyed."¹⁰ It might indeed be argued that Morton's book was unconvincing, for there is some doubt whether the political tradition he described had ever existed in the past, let alone in the present. It might also be argued that Creighton's warnings were ineffective because they fell on deaf ears. Nevertheless, this does not mean that their work can be summarily dismissed as "hackneyed." Bothwell, Drummond and English overlook the fact that this "new conservatism" was in some small way an expression of the sentiments that led to the defeat of the Liberals in 1957, and again in 1958. While it is true that John Diefenbaker reduced the nationalist sentiments and social vision of conservative intellectuals to the trite and commonplace—to a vague notion of a new national policy and dream visions of a "Canada of the North"—they were more than an interesting sideline of his winning campaigns.¹¹

Indeed, contemporary journalists like J.B. McGeachy and Michael Barkway maintained that the Conservative victory represented the triumph of a new Canadian nationalism.¹² They argued that Diefenbaker had won the election because Canadians had decided they no longer wanted their domestic and foreign affairs controlled by the United States. Nevertheless, their point of view was somewhat distorted. John Meisel's study of The Canadian Election of 1957 has demonstrated there were more significant reasons for the liberal defeat.¹³ Moreover, as George Grant later observed, Diefenbaker himself was

"mistaken . . . when he imagined that [nationalist] rhetoric was central to his victory."¹⁴

Yet even if the electoral victory of the Conservatives did not necessarily signal the triumph of conservative nationalism, the defeat of the party in 1963 did, in many respects, signal its final demise. The Conservative party's attempts to counter American influence and to sustain the British connection through the Commonwealth were ineffective. Problems created by hollow free trade promises to the British, the immediate decision to join NORAD, the Bomarc missile fiasco and the demise of the Avro Arrow were graphic illustrations that conservative nationalism could not be translated into practical political policies.¹⁵

By 1963 conservative nationalists recognized that the vision of the Diefenbaker years would remain unfulfilled. Within two years, George Grant and W.L. Morton both admitted that the world view they had nurtured and defended had been defeated. "The impossibility of conservatism," Grant wrote, was the "impossibility of Canada."¹⁶ Canadians had sold their birthright for membership in the American empire, and had traded the hope of the moral community for the promise of unlimited growth. In an address to the Canadian Union of Students, W.L. Morton wrote of the despair he had experienced when he realized,

. . . with the rush of an avalanche, and with all the clarity of loss, that the world in which I had been reared, the world by whose standards I had fitfully but not disloyally lived, the world I had bothered with and had

tried to keep in modest repair, that world no longer existed. It was no longer there—it had vanished. I was like a man alone in the arctic waste, in twilight, and with no landmark.¹⁷

This world, "the world of an English Canadian" with its roots plunged deep in British traditions, had disappeared in the spring election of 1963.¹⁸ Morton mourned its loss but began to see some promise in the world that had replaced it. George Grant was somewhat less optimistic.

In 1965 George Grant proclaimed that Canadian conservatism had met its final defeat. As the title of his book, Lament for a Nation, demonstrates, however, the defeat of conservatism entailed much more than the electoral loss of a political party. In Grant's view, Canadian conservatism had given the nation state its meaning and significance.¹⁹ Consequently, the loss of a conservative social vision, signalled the imminent demise of Canada as a sovereign state. An analysis of Grant's arguments and observations therefore serves as a fitting conclusion to a study of conservative cultural nationalism in the 1950s. It also provides a glimpse of the shifts occurring in nationalist thought—shifts that would take Canadian nationalism in a new direction over the next two decades.

In Grant's opinion Canadian conservatism had been much more than "covert liberalism."²⁰ At its best, the Canadian conservative tradition had preserved a moral vision of the human community. This moral vision, which stood in opposition to liberal materialism, had "never stood upon an abstract appeal to free enterprise."²¹ It promoted the

common good over the rights and privileges of the individual and had willingly restrained "the individual's freedom in the interests of the community."²² It was the one respect, perhaps the most crucial one, in which Canada differed from the United States.²³

Nevertheless, Grant observed that since 1945 Canadians and their political representatives had willingly abandoned this tradition. Under Mackenzie King, C.D. Howe, and later under St. Laurent and Pearson, the nation had embraced the dominant liberal vision of progress espoused by its dynamic neighbor to the south.²⁴ Canada had taken its place within an empire, moulded together by the homogenizing power of modern technology and the international network of corporate capitalism. Simply put, Canada had become a satellite state in the American empire.

Grant maintained that Diefenbaker's inadequacies as a leader were not solely to blame for Canada's present position.²⁵ The defeat of conservatism in the "Age of Progress" was inevitable; it was not a powerful enough ideological force to fight liberalism. Indeed, in its struggle with dominant liberal attitudes it came to resemble the very ideology it opposed.²⁶ The contradictions that emerged when conservatives attempted to translate philosophy into policy demonstrated its weaknesses. Conservatives were doomed:

If they are not committed to a dynamic technology, they cannot hope to make a popular appeal. If they are so committed they cannot hope to be conservative. . . . The impossibility of conservatism

in our epoch is seen in the fact that those who adopt the title can be no more than defenders of whatever structure of power is at any moment necessary to technological change They are not conservatives in the sense of being the custodians of something that is not subject to change. They are conservatives. . . in the sense of advocating a sufficient amount of order so the demands of technology will not carry the society into chaos.²⁷

Liberalism and the philosophy of progress were creating a universal and homogeneous world order with the power of modern technology. Grant maintained that this universal order bore little resemblance to the ideal of world-wide brotherhood, or to the "moral community" his ancestors had sought in the unifying structure of imperial federation.²⁸ Yet he intimated that some greater political good might still emerge from the death of conservative nationalism. In fact, when Lament for a Nation is read in tandem with Grant's essay "An Ethic of Community"(1961), the prognosis for Canada's future does not seem so bleak.

In "An Ethic of Community," Grant attempted to demonstrate that a political and social morality was still possible. Socialism, although a philosophy of the "Age of Progress," provided a comprehensive critique of capitalism.²⁹ If combined with "a profound vision of human well-being"—a moral ethic of community—then it might provide a viable alternative to liberalism and capitalism.³⁰ Socialism's continued attachment to a naive determinism that made "questions of morality easy since their solution depended on economic circumstance alone" was inadequate.³¹ Socialists had to recognize this and develop a notion of justice and

equality based upon a christian and moral conception of human existence.³² To achieve the "good society" moral effort was required and a notion of man as a free moral agent with a propensity for Good or Evil was necessary.

Grant seemed to imply that socialism had to incorporate what he believed to be the most valuable ideals of conservatism. In light of this, Lament for a Nation reads more like a challenge than a keen. Even though by 1965 Grant was certainly more skeptical about the possibility of combining socialism and nationalism, or socialism and an "ethic of community" he was not totally without hope. Indeed, in his observation that Canadian socialism had as yet failed "to recognize itself as an essentially conservative force" he set forth the challenge.³³ In the modern world an ethic of community had to be combined with a comprehensive critique of capitalism. As he pointed out, the Conservative party had failed partly because it offered no such critique.³⁴ While the future of Canada was increasingly uncertain, Grant still maintained that the need for considered action was important. If Canadian socialism recognized its proper function, a choice for Canada might still be possible.

III

It was evident to a number of Canadian intellectuals by the late 1950s that laments and rearguard attacks were not enough to preserve Canadian independence and the Canadian way of life. One of the final acts of the St. Laurent administration was the appointment of the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects. Published in 1957, Walter

Gordon's report came out in the first flushes of the Diefenbaker triumph. For the first time an official government document warned of the possible dangers of American equity investment in the Canadian economy. American ownership of Canadian resources was seen as a threat not only to Canada's economic independence but also to its political autonomy.³⁵ Furthermore, the report implied that the problem was aggravated by cultural factors.

The commissioners observed that Canadians, many of whom travelled, studied and did business in the United States "brought back with them American tastes, standards, customs and ideas."³⁶ In addition, these ideas and standards were "spread with particular thoroughness by American radio, television, periodicals and film," made available to Canadians.³⁷ Gordon and his associates tentatively implied that economic penetration and cultural influence were related; the latter did, in fact, have "wide economic significance." American cultural influence reinforced American economic control because it created a situation whereby "no other two countries in the world . . . [had] such a close identity of consumer preference and business psychology."³⁸

The issue of the preservation of a "Canadian way of life" became a moot point when it was evident that Canadian resources and industries were in large part foreign controlled. During the 1960s and 1970s nationalists in Canada turned their attention to economic affairs. In 1960, Hugh Aitken

and others published a collection of essays which cautiously explored the dangers of foreign control in The American Economic Impact on Canada.³⁹ More explicit still was Walter Gordon's, A Choice for Canada (1966) in which he openly attacked American economic domination of the Canadian economy.⁴⁰ Others such as journalist Michael Barkway and political economists Mel Watkins and Abe Rotstein joined the fray.⁴¹

Still, economics did not completely dominate the minds of those concerned for the future of the Canadian state. James Minifie criticized Canada's subservience to American foreign policy and challenged Canadians to decide whether they intended to be independent peacemakers or subordinate powder-monkeys for the United States.⁴² Furthermore, forms of cultural and political domination by the United States were examined as aspects of the larger problem of economic control. A number of Canadian intellectuals examined how American domination affected all areas of the nation's existence, and like cultural nationalists of the 1950s attempted to explain and defend the Canadian difference. In a collection of essays edited by Peter Russell for one such group (The University League for Social Reform), many of the arguments of the cultural nationalists of the 1950s were repeated.⁴³ Notable amongst these is Carl Berger's "true north strong and free," an essay which explored "the myths, legends and symbols" of the Canadian nationalist tradition. Berger's essay was no mere "objective" examination; it entailed a defense of the "nationalist

mythology" utilized by cultural nationalists of the previous decade.⁴⁴

It could also be argued that attempts to develop a political ideology—like the one described by George Grant—which fused conservatism and socialism were evident. Canadian nationalists such as Abraham Rotstein took Grant's advice seriously. In 1978 Rotstein noted that the essence of nationalism in Canada (and elsewhere) was its thrust as "a countermovement against the diverse forces of modernization—those that tend to homogenize and erode the enduring fabric of society."⁴⁵ He went on to say that

If there are generalizations to be drawn about nationalism in the modern world—while recognizing the very different life experiences and circumstances of every society—it is that nationalism is a conservative movement—with a small "c". It seeks to contain and control the forces of erosion in modern society—particularly industrial society. Not that these forces can or indeed should be stopped. But nationalism throws the emphasis on the rate of change, on the question of who bears the burdens and how the benefits are distributed. In each case, the central issue is the network of power in modern society: where the decisions are made, for whose benefit and with what safeguards.⁴⁶

Understood in the context of his study, it is far less likely that Rotstein's claim was sui generis than that he was consciously responding to Grant's challenge, thereby formulating a brand of nationalism that attempted to combine a radical critique of capitalism, with a conservative "ethic of community."

The decades after the 1950s marked a shift from cultural to economic nationalism in Canada. Yet this reorientation may well have been more apparent than it was real. Nationalists

of the 1960s and 1970s generally recognized that Canadian independence could not be guaranteed solely by the promotion of Canadian high culture, yet they continued to build upon the quest for identity that was given sustained expression in the decade of the 1950s. A number of Canadian intellectuals now attempted to combine the traditional vision of the Canadian way of life with a critique of Canada's economic relationship with the United States. The definition of the Canadian tradition formulated by intellectuals of the 1950s—their emphasis on the essential conservatism of the Canadian people and on the moral character of the Canadian community—did indeed influence a new generation of Canadian scholars. Just as intellectuals of the 1950s had been influenced by the work of their forbears, so too they bequeathed a legacy to a future generation.

Footnotes

1. Carl Berger, The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing, 1900-1970 (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 229-232. It should be noted that Arthur Lower was not amongst this group. In an article entitled "The Beginning of a New Political Era," (Canadian Commentator (May 3, 1958), p. 3) he wrote that the "old Conservatism rooted in Loyalism, Orangism, Imperialism and vested interests was rapidly ceasing to have a reason for existence." The "old Liberalism" was "equally an anachronism." He argued that first and foremost, Liberals had to go back to the "classical concern with freedom and human rights or perish."
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
For examples of the work of conservative intellectuals during this period see:
Donald Creighton, "Canada and the Cold War," Towards the Discovery of Canada, (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1972).
George Grant, Lament for a Nation, The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1965).
John Farthing, Freedom Wears a Crown, (Toronto: Kingwood House, 1957).
W.L. Morton, The Canadian Identity, (_____, "A Canadian Conservatism Now," Contexts of Canada's Past, ed., A.B. McKillop, (Toronto: MacMillan Co., of Canada, 1980).
4. Donald Creighton, "Canada and the Cold War," Towards the Discovery of Canada, (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1972), p. 245.
5. Ibid., pp. 252-253.
6. W.L. Morton, "A Canadian Conservatism Now," Contexts of Canada's Past, ed., A.B. McKillop, (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1980).
7. W.L. Morton, The Canadian Identity, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), pp. 104-106, 111-113.
8. Ibid., pp. 111-114.
9. John Farthing, Freedom Wears a Crown, (Toronto: Kingwood House, 1957), pp. 29-39.

10. Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond and John English, Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics and Provincialism, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), p. 172.
11. Ibid., pp. 200-201.
12. Michael Barkway, "Can Canada Remain Independent?," The Financial Post, September 14, 1957, p. 3.

J.B. McGeachy, "Nationalism Sparked Tory Win," The Financial Post, April 12, 1958, p. 7.
13. John Meisel, The Canadian General Election of 1957, (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1962), pp. 267-277. Amongst other things, Meisel notes that the Liberal party's lack of talent, its lack of contact with public opinion, its complacency and arrogance and its position in Quebec all contributed to its defeat. The Conservatives presented a political program with a broad appeal, professed to be the "champion of the Underdog" and capitalized on an ineffective Liberal campaign and a turid, aging government party.
14. George Grant, Lament for a Nation, The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1965), p. 11.
15. For a discussion of the policies of the Conservative party from 1957-1963 see:

Bothwell, Drummond and English, Canada Since 1945, pp. 197-253.
16. G. Grant, Lament for a Nation, p. 68.
17. W.L. Morton, "The Dualism of Culture and the Federalism of Power," Contexts of Canada's Past, ed., A.B. McKillop, (Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada, 1980), p. 255.
18. Ibid., p. 256.
19. G. Grant, Lament for a Nation, pp. 68-71.
20. Ibid., p. 65.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid., pp. 8-10; pp. 37-41.

25. Ibid., pp. 13-24; pp. 66-67.
 26. Ibid., pp. 66-67.
 27. Ibid., p. 67.
 28. Ibid., pp. 69-72.
 29. George Grant, "An Ethic of Community," Social Purpose for Canada, ed., M. Oliver, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), pp. 12-14.
 30. Ibid., p. 17.
 31. Ibid., p. 16.
 32. Ibid., pp. 16-21.
 33. G. Grant, Lament for a Nation, p. 15, p. 59, p. 74.
 34. Ibid., p. 17.
 35. The Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1957), pp. 35-37.
 36. Ibid., p. 36.
 37. Ibid.
 38. Ibid.
 39. Hugh G.J. Aitken, John J. Deutsch, W.A. Mackintosh and others, The American Economic Impact on Canada, (Toronto: Burns and MacEachern, 1960).
 40. Walter Gordon, A Choice for Canada, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1966).
 41. Abe Rotstein, The Precarious Homestead, (Toronto: New Press, 1973).
- Melville Watkins, Gordon to Watkins to You, (Toronto: New Press, 1970).
42. James Minifie, Peacemaker of Powdermonkey, Canada's Role in a Revolutionary World (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1960).
 43. Peter Russell, ed., Nationalism in Canada (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1966).

See in particular:

Cole Harris, "The Myth of the Land in Canadian Nationalism," pp. 27-47.

George Heiman, "The 19th Century Legacy: Nationalism or Patriotism," pp. 323-341.

Abraham Rotstein, "The 20th Century Prospect: Nationalism in a Technological Society," pp. 341-363.

Frank Watt, "Nationalism in Canadian Literature," pp. 235-251.

Melville Watkins, "Technology and Nationalism," pp. 284-302.

44. Carl Berger, "The True North Strong and Free," Nationalism in Canada, ed., P. Russell (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1966), p. 4.
45. Abraham Rotstein, "Is There an English-Canadian Nationalism?," Journal of Canadian Studies, 13 (Summer, 1978), p. 111.
46. Ibid., p. 111.

Primary Sources: A Select Bibliography by Topic

I On Culture, Canada and National Independence

Books:

Bissell, Claude. Our Living Tradition: Seven Canadians.
Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.

Brown, George, W. (ed.). Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950.

Chalmers, R.C. and Irving, John (eds.). The Heritage of Western Culture. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1952.

_____. The Light and the Flame. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1956.

_____. Challenge and Response: Modern Ideas and Religion. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1959.

Gilmour, Gary (ed.). Canada's Tomorrow, Papers Presented to Westinghouse's Canada's Tomorrow Conference, Quebec City, November, 1953. Toronto: MacMillan and Company of Canada Ltd., 1954.

Farthing, John. Freedom Wears a Crown. Toronto: Kingswood House, 1957.

Innis, Harold. Changing Concepts of Time. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1952.

Lower, A.R.M. Canadians in the Making; A Social History of Canada. Toronto: Longmans, Green, 1958.

Massey, Vincent. On Being Canadian. Toronto: J.M. Dent and Co., 1948.

_____. Speaking of Canada: Addresses by the Governor General, 1952-1959. Toronto: MacMillan and Co., 1959.

Park, Julian. The Culture of Contemporary Canada. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957.

Pierce, Lorne. A Canadian Nation. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1960.

_____. A Canadian People. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1945.

_____. Christianity and Culture in Our Time. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1949.

_____. (ed.). Our Sense of Identity. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1954.

Ross, Malcolm (ed.). The Arts in Canada: A Stock Taking at Mid Century, 1958.

The Church and the Secular World: The Report of the United Church Commission on Culture. Toronto, 1950.

Articles and Essays:

"Action Coming on Culture." The Financial Post, Dec. 3, 1955, p. 31.

Andrew, G.C. "The Canada Council: A National Necessity." Queen's Quarterly, 61 (Autumn, 1954).

"Are Canadians Too Quiet?" An opinion poll in The Financial Post, June 6, 1953, p. 7.

Ayre, R.H. "A Country in Search of Itself." Culture, 9 (Dec., 1948), 371-377.

"Backstage With Culture." An editorial in Maclean's, 70 (May 25, 1957), p. 1.

Brady, Alexander. "The New Canada." Conchiching Conference Publication, August, 1956, 1-10.

"Brains Make Independence." An editorial in The Financial Post, May, 1958, p. 6.

Bronner, F.J.L. "What is a Canadian?" Culture, 15 (Dec., 1954), 391-394.

Callaghan, Morley. "We're on the Wrong Track in our Culture Quest." Maclean's, 70 (May 25, 1957), p. 8, 86-87.

"Canadianism — A Symposium." Canadian Historical Association Annual Reports, 37 (June 6-8, 1956), 74-82.

Careless, J.M.S.. "History and Canadian Unity." Culture, 12 (June, 1951), 117-124.

Dansereau, P.. "Culture Is What We Are Concerned With." Canadian Commentator, 1 (August, 1957), p. 6.

de Tonnancour, Jacques. "Our Image of Ourselves." Queen's Quarterly, 66 (Autumn, 1959).

Fraser, Blair. "How Much will Ottawa Help the Arts?" Maclean's, 69 (April 14, 1956), 6-7.

Garner, Hugh. "Spoon-fed Patriotism Won't Work in Canada." Saturday Night, 73 (March 29, 1958), 8-9, 35.

Herbert, Walter. "The Cultural Pattern." Canada, ed. G.W. Brown. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950.

- "How the Canada Council Will Work." The Financial Post,
February 16, 1957, p. 27.
- "How Can We Become More Canadian?" An opinion poll in
The Financial Post, Dec. 2, 1950, p. 10.
- Hutchison, Bruce. "A Window on the Nation." The Financial Post, Nov. 5, 1955, p. 7.
- _____. "Business and Culture." The Financial Post,
March 17, 1956, p. 7.
- _____. "Can Canada Stay Alive In Spite of Canadians?"
The Financial Post, Sept. 12, 1959, p. 17.
- _____. "Give People the Facts for Canada to Survive."
The Financial Post, Sept. 5, 1959, p. 16.
- _____. "Second-Rate Canada?" The Financial Post,
Aug. 9, 1958, p. 10.
- _____. "The Search for An Idea." The Financial Post,
April 23, 1955, p. 7.
- _____. "The Demon Lover." The Financial Post,
Nov. 24, 1956, p. 13.
- _____. "The Small Town Boy." The Financial Post,
October 27, 1956, p. 13.
- _____. "What is this Creature the Canadian?"
The Financial Post, March 21, 1953, p. 68.
- _____. "War With Beastly Priestly." The Financial Post,
May 12, 1956, p. 7.
- _____. "What's Wrong With Canada?" The Financial Post,
May 21, 1955, p. 7.
- Kirkconnell, Watson. "What, When, Where, Why and How of
the Canadian Conference of the Arts." Canadian
Author and Bookman, 34 (Summer, 1958), 29-30.
- Lavere, G.J.. "The State of Canadian Culture: A General
View." Culture, 15 (March, 1954), 83-90.
- Le Bourdais, D.M.. "Culture on Metal." The Canadian Author
and Bookman, (Autumn, 1954), 12-15.
- Lower, Arthur. "Canada and the Future." Saturday Night,
70 (Jan. 21, 1956), 9-10.
- Lower, Arthur. "Are There Canadians." Saturday Night,
67 (June 28, 1952), 1, 17.

- _____. "Gods Canadians Worship." Maclean's, 71
(Oct. 25, 1958), 22-23, 66-67.
- _____. "No Class in Canada." Saturday Night,
67 (July 12, 1952), 9, 18-19.
- _____. "Seeing the Pacific from Winnipeg." Saturday Night, 67 (July 5, 1952), 11, 20.
- MacLean, John P.. "Subsidy for the Arts Nothing New,
But National Patterns Varied." The Financial Post,
March 2, 1957, p. 26.
- MacLennan, Hugh. "Culture Canadian Style." Saturday Review
of Literature, 28 (March, 1942).
- _____. "The Canadian, 1955 Model." Saturday Night,
70 (Jan. 7, 1956), 7-8.
- _____. "The Years Ahead ... What Kind of People We'll
Become." Maclean's, 68 (Oct. 5, 1955), 14-15, 106-108.
- McGeachy, J.B.. "Are We Starved for Culture." The Financial
Post, Feb. 15, 1958, p. 7.
- _____. "The Arts in Darkest Canada." The Financial
Post, Jan. 17, 1959, p. 7.
- _____. "Bloody but Unbowed the CBC will Live." The Financial Post, July 25, 1959, p. 7.
- _____. "No Ivory Tower for Long Hairs." The Financial
Post, Feb. 22, 1958, p. 7.
- _____. "Our Culture Blooms Abroad." The Financial
Post, Sept. 20, 1958, p. 7.
- _____. "There's Little Gore in Our Lore." The Financial
Post, June 28, 1958, p. 7.
- _____. "There's Pleasure and Profit in Our Art." The Financial Post, Sept. 5, 1959, p. 7.
- _____. "What Price Culture?" The Financial Post,
Feb. 9, 1957, p. 7.
- Moore, Mavor. "What Will the Council Counsel?" Canadian
Commentator, 1 (Jan. 1957), 8-9.
- _____. "What Sputnik Has Done to the Arts." Canadian
Commentator, 2 (Jan., 1958), p. 2.
- Nicol, E.P.. "Aid for the Arts." Food for Thought, 15 (Feb.
1955), 28-31.

Patterson, Sheila. "This New Canada: Study of a Changing People." Queen's Quarterly, 62 (Spring, 1955), 80-88.

Payzant, G.B.. "Victory of the Philistines." Canadian Commentator, 2 (April, 1958), 1-2.

Phillips, A. "Are We Getting Our Money's Worth from Canada Council?" Maclean's, 72 (Dec. 5, 1959), 26, 72-75.

Pierce, Lorne. "The Arts and Letters in Canada and Our Emerging Culture." Canadian Author and Bookman, 34 (Summer, 1958), 29-30.

Rayski-Kietlicz, K.. "Canadian Cultural Pattern." Dalhousie Review, 30 (July, 1950), 169-178.

Sandwell, B.K.. "A Bold Lot We Canadians." The Financial Post, Nov. 21, 1953, p. 9.

———. "An Old Canadian Custom." The Financial Post, Jan. 24, 1953, p. 9.

———. "Canada: Prudent and Wary." The Financial Post, March 6, 1954, p. 9.

———. "Hard Times Coming for the Humanities." The Financial Post, Feb. 27, 1954, p. 9.

———. "This Will Help Us Catch Up." The Financial Post, Nov. 17, 1956, p. 1.

Weaver, R.L. and MacLure, M.. "Canada Council: An Editorial View." Tamarack Review, 4 (Summer, 1957), 32-42.

"What Shapes National Character." An editorial in The Financial Post, March 12, 1955, p. 6.

"Where to Invest \$50 Million? Arts Council Answer Soon." The Financial Post, Dec. 1, 1956, pp. 1-3.

II On The Massey Report

Government Publications:

Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951.

Royal Commission Studies Selected from the Special Studies Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951.

Books:

Innis, Harold. The Strategy of Culture, With Special Reference to Canadian Literature: A Footnote to the Massey Report. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952.

Articles:

"All Important Factor." An editorial in Canadian Business, 24 (July, 1957), 11-12.

Bruchesi, Jean. "Culture in Canada." Royal Society of Canada Proceedings and Transactions, 45 (1951), 141-157.

Cohen, Nathan. "Television and the Massey Report." Saturday Night, 66 (June 26, 1951), 11, 36.

"Crew-Cut View of the Massey Report." An editorial in Maclean's, 64 (July 15, 1951), 2.

"Cultural Timetable." An editorial in Food for Thought, 12 (Dec., 1951), 1-2.

"Culture and Cabinet." An editorial in The Canadian Forum, 28 (March, 1949), 265-266.

Eggleston, Wilfred. "Canadian Geography and National Culture." Canadian Geographical Journal, 43 (Dec., 1951), 254-273.

———. "State and Cultural Life." Saturday Night, 66 (July 3, 1951), 3.

"Film Board Monopoly Facing Major Test?" The Financial Post, Aug. 8, 1959, pp. 17-18.

"For and Agin." Saturday Night, 65 (Nov. 15, 1949), 28.

Fraser, C.F.. "Crisis in the Arts, Letters and Sciences." Dalhousie Review, 30 (April, 1950), 35-45.

Lower, A.R.M.. "The Massey Report." Canadian Banker, 59 (Winter, 1952), 22-32.

"Magazine Publishers of Canada Demand that They Get an Even Break in Their Own Land." The Financial Post, November 26, 1950, p. 10.

Maheux, Abbe Arthur.. "A Dilemma for Our Culture." Canadian Historical Association Reports, (June, 1949-1951), 1-6.

"Massey Report." An editorial in The Canadian Forum, 31 (July, 1951), 74.

"Massey Report: Second Anniversary." An editorial in The Canadian Forum, 33 (June, 1953), 51-52.

"Massey Report." An editorial in Food for Thought, 12 (Oct. 1951), 1-8.

- Mazzoleni, Ettore.. "Music and the Massey Report."
Saturday Night, 66 (July 17, 1951), 12, 26.
- Neatby, Hilda.. "Massey Report: A Retrospect." Tamarack Review, No. 1 (Autumn, 1956), 37-47.
- Panton, L.A.C.. "Art and the Massey Commission." Saturday Night, 11 (July 24, 1951), 11, 26.
- "Recommendations of Labour to the Royal Commission." Labour Gazette, 50 (July, 1950), 100-104.
- Robinson, E.S.. "National Library and the Massey Report."
Saturday Night, 66 (July 31, 1951), 12, 36.
- Sandwell, B.K.. "1952: Canada Joins the Human Race."
Saturday Night, 67 (Dec. 8, 1951), 31, 39.
- . "Council for Culture." Saturday Night,
66 (June 12, 1951), 7.
- . "Minority Culture Report." Saturday Night,
66 (June 26, 1951), 7.
- . "The Periodical Press and the Massey Report."
Saturday Night, 66 (Aug. 28, 1951), 12.
- Sangster, Allan. "On The Air - The Massey Report." The Canadian Forum, 31 (July and August, 1951), 82-83, 109-111.
- Symington, D.F.. "Business Has a Stake in Culture."
Canadian Business, 23 (Feb., 1950), 34-36, 72.
- "The State of the Nation." An editorial in Food for Thought,
9 (May, 1950), 61.
- Trueman, A.W.. "Education and the Massey Report."
Saturday Night, 66 (June 19, 1951), 10, 14.
- Underhill, F.H.. "Notes on the Massey Report." The Canadian Forum, 31 (Aug., 1951), 100-112.
- "What's Needed for Canada's Culture?" The Financial Post,
Nov. 12, 1949, p. 18.
- Byla, A.J.. "Thoughts on a Journey to Canada." Food for Thought, 13 (Nov. 1952), 27-29.

III On Canadian Education

Books:

Arendt, Hannah. Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought. New York: Viking Press, 1954.

Bissell, Claude. National Conference of Canadian Universities: Canada's Crisis in Higher Education. Toronto: University, 1957.

Croskery, G.C. and Nason, G. (eds.). Addresses and Proceedings of the Canadian Conference on Education. Ottawa: Mutual Press, 1958.

Hope, John Andrew. Where Knowledge Is Free. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1954.

Katz, Joseph. Canadian Education Today: A Symposium. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Co., 1956.

Neatby, Hilda. So Little for the Mind. Toronto: Clark, Irwin and Co., 1953.

_____. The Debt of Our Reason. Toronto: Clark, Irwin and Co., 1954.

_____. A Temperate Dispute. Toronto: Clark, Irwin and Co., 1954.

Phillips, C.E.. The Development of Education in Canada. Toronto: W.J. Gage Co. Ltd., 1957.

St. John, Bascom. Spotlight on Canadian Education. Toronto: W.J. Gage Ltd., 1958.

Articles and Essays:

Allen, A.R.. "Teachers Try to do too Much." The Financial Post, April 2, 1955, p. 13.

Baker, H.S.. "Education Leadership and Philosophical Consensus." Canadian Education, 11 (Sept., 1956), 72-86.

Barzun, Jacques. "Battle Over Brains in Democratic Education." The University of Toronto Quarterly, 23 (Jan., 1954), 109-121.

Berrill, N.J.. "Education for What?" Saturday Night, 70 (Oct. 9, 1954), 14-15.

Davies, Robertson. "Dr. Neatby Punches the Pedagogues." Saturday Night, 69 (Nov. 4, 1953), 22-23.

Doucette, A.L.. "So Little from One Mind." The Manitoba Teacher, 32 (March-April, 1954), 22.

"Education: Everybody's Business." An editorial in Trades and Labour Congress Journal, 35 (Jan., 1956), 5-6.

Freedman, Max. "Letter from Washington: Education in American." Saturday Night, 70 (Oct. 19, 1955), 14-15.

Grant, G.P.. "Education in the Expanding Economy." Food for Thought, 15 (Sept.-Oct., 1954), 4-10.

_____. "Philosophy." Royal Commission Studies Selected from the Special Studies Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951.

_____. "Philosophy and Adult Education." Food for Thought, 14, (Sept.-Oct., 1953), 3-8.

Katz, Joseph (ed.). "Canadian Education Today." Canadian Education Today: A Symposium, Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Co., 1956, pp. 230-250.

Katz, S.M.. "Crisis in Education." Maclean's, 66 (March 1, 1953), 7-9, 54-59.

_____. "Crisis in Education, Pt. II." Maclean's, 66 (March 15, 1953), 20-21, 47-49.

_____. "Crisis in Education, Pt. III." Maclean's, 66 (April 1, 1953), 20-21, 68.

Kirkconnell, Watson. "The Humanities." Canadian Education Today, ed. J. Katz. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Co., 1956.

Lavere, G.J.. "Education." Culture, 14 (Dec., 1953), 443-448.

Lawson, J.I.. "What is Education." Saturday Night, 69 (April 17, 1954), 30.

Lower, A.R.M.. "Education in a Growing Canada." Canadian Education Today: A Symposium, ed. J. Katz. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson and Co., 1956, pp. 1-14.

_____. "Canadian University." Royal Society of Canada Proceedings and Transactions, 47 (1953), 1-16.

_____. "Canadian University, Time for a New Deal." Queen's Quarterly, 62 (Summer, 1955), 243-256.

_____. "Does Our Education Educate?" Maclean's, 61 (Nov. 15, 1948), 9, 72-76.

_____. "High School Weak Link in Educational System." Saturday Night, 69 (Sept. 11, 1954), 7-8.

- _____. "Survival Value of a Soft Nation." Saturday Night, 69 (Oct. 31, 1953), 7-8.
- MacKenzie, N.A.M.. "First Principles." The Royal Society of Canada Proceedings and Transactions, 48 (June, 1954), 36.
- _____. "The Work of the Universities." Canadian Education Today: A Symposium ed. Joseph Katz, Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1956, pp. 179-191.
- MacPherson, Jessie. "Ends of Education." Food for Thought, 14 (Feb., 1954), 3-7.
- Moore, Andrew. "An Attempt to Clarify Some Issues." The Royal Society of Canada Proceedings and Transactions, 48 (June, 1954), 25-34.
- Mowat, A.S.. "How Progressive are Progressives?" University of Toronto Quarterly, 24 (Oct., 1954), 26-33.
- Neatby, Hilda. "Cultural Evolution." Canada's Tomorrow, ed. Gary Gilmour. Toronto: MacMillan and Company of Canada Ltd., 1954.
- _____. "Progressive Education: A Challenge Missed." Saturday Night, 69 (October 17, 1953), 7-8.
- _____. "There's Too Much Democracy in Our Schools." Maclean's, 69 (April 28, 1956), 4, 71-73.
- _____. "On Education." The University of Toronto Quarterly, 25 (Jan., 1956), 183-258.
- Priestly, F.E.L.. "Problems of Three Dimensional Education." The Royal Society of Canada Transactions and Proceedings, XLVIII (June, 1954).
- _____. "Present Day Influences on Canadian Society." Royal Commission Studies Selected from the Special Studies Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951.
- _____. "Teaching Without Knowledge." Saturday Night, (Oct. 31, 1953), 9.
- Sanderson, H.H.. "Next Ten Years in Education." Canadian Education, 12 (Dec., 1956), 37-43.
- Scarfe, N.V.. "Are Teachers Slaves?" The Manitoba Teacher, 33 (Sept.-Oct., 1954), 59-60.
- _____. "Matter and Method in Education." The University of Toronto Quarterly, 25 (Jan., 1956), 242-248.
- _____. "Stupidity of the Grade System." Saturday Night, 71 (Aug. 18, 1956), 7-8.

- Smith, C.E.. "Education and Social Change," Canadian Education Today: A Symposium, ed. Joseph Katz, Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson and Co., 1956, pp. 26-37.
- Smith, H.E.. "Methodologies in Education-Administration for What?" Canadian Education, 10 (Sept., 1955), 68-79.
- Stevenson, J.A.. "Policies and Tactics." Saturday Night, 68 (Feb., 14, 1953), 4, 8.
- "Teach More Canadianism in Schools?" An Opinion poll in The Financial Post, Sept. 15, 1951, 11-14.
- Tracey, Clarence. "Subsistence Education." Queen's Quarterly, 61 (Winter, 1954), 234-239.
- Trueman, A.W.. "The Problems of Education." The University of Toronto Quarterly, 24 (Oct., 1954), 97-102.
- Underhill, F.H.. "So Little for the Mind: Comments and Queries." The Royal Society of Canada Transactions and Proceedings, XLVIII (June, 1954), 15-23.
- Wallace, R.C.. "Education for Living." Dalhousie Review, 33 (Sept., 1953), 1-9.
- Watson, K.P.. "How Much for the Mind?" Canadian Forum, 34 (April, 1954), 7-9.
- Wheatley, Jon. "Business, Culture and Education." Western Business, 28 (Sept. 1954), 30-31, 34.
- . "Traditional vs Progressive." Western Business, 28 (Aug., 1954), 27-28.
- . "What Does Education Mean for Business?" Western Business, 28 (July, 1954), 29, 52.
- Wilson, D.J.. "Education: Academic, Vocational or Well-Rounded?" Canadian Business, 26 (March, 1953), 22-23.

IV On Canadian Literature

Books:

- Davies, Robertson. A Jig for the Gypsy. Toronto: Clark, Irwin Pub., 1954.
- . A Masque of Aesop. Toronto: Clark, Irwin Pub., 1952.
- . At My Heart's Core. Toronto: Clark, Irwin Pub., 1950.

- _____. A Mixture of Frailties. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1980.
- _____. A Voice from the Attic. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1960.
- _____. Eros at Breakfast and Other Plays. Toronto: Clark, Irwin Pub., 1949.
- _____. Fortune My Foe. Toronto: Clark, Irwin Pub., 1949.
- _____. Leaven of Malice. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1980.
- _____. Tempest-Tost. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1980.
- _____. The Diary of Samuel Marchbanks. Toronto: Clark, Irwin Pub., 1947.
- _____. The Tabletalk of Samuel Marchbanks. Toronto: Clark, Irwin Pub., 1949.
- Dudek, Louis and Layton, Irving (eds.). Canadian Poems, 1850-1952. Toronto: Contact Press, 1953.
- Edgar, Pelham. Across My Path, ed. Northrop Frye. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1952.
- Eggleston, Wilfred. The Frontier and Canadian Letters. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1957.
- Klinck, Carl F. (ed.). A Canadian Anthology. Toronto: Gage Publishers, 1955.
- _____. (ed.). A Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- MacLennan, Hugh. Thirty and Three, ed. Dorothy Duncan. Toronto: MacMillan Co., of Canada, Ltd., 1954.
- _____. Cross Country, ed. Dorothy Duncan. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1949.
- Pacey, Desmond. Creative Writing in Canada; A Short History of English Canadian Literature. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1952.
- _____. Ten Canadian Poets. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1958.
- Park, Julian (ed.). The Culture of Contemporary Canada. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957.
- Pratt, E.J.. Collected Poems. ed. Northrop Frye. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1958.

Ross, Malcolm. Our Sense of Identity. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1954.

Scott, F.R. and Smith, A.J.M. (eds.) The Blasted Pine: An Anthology of Satire, Invective and Disrespectful Verse Chiefly by Canadian Writers. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1957.

Whalley, George. Writing in Canada. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1956.

Articles:

Bailey, A.G.. "Literature and Nationalism After Confederation." University of Toronto Quarterly, 25 (June, 1956), 409-424.

Beattie, Munro. "Poetry, 1950-1960." Literary History of Canada, ed. Karl Klinck et.al. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965, pp. 785-821.

Birney, Earl. "On Being a Canadian Author." Canadian Librarian Association, 9 (Nov., 1952), 77-79.

Bissell, Claude. "The Novel." The Arts in Canada: A Stock-Taking at Mid Century, ed. M. Ross. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1958, pp. 92-96.

———. "Fiction." Letters in Canada, The University of Toronto Quarterly, 4 (July, 1958), pp. 72-75.

Daniels, Roy. "Poetry and the Novel." The Culture of Contemporary Canada, ed. Julian Park. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957, pp. 81-95.

Davies, Robertson. "A Writer in the Attic." Saturday Night, 70 (April 30, 1955), 11-12.

Davies, Robertson. "The Theatre." Royal Commission Studies Selected from Special Studies Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951, pp. 369-392.

Duchamel, Roger. "A National Literature." Canadian Author and Bookman, XXVI (Autum, 1950), 4, 28.

Frye, Northrop. "English Canadian Literature, 1929-1954." C.L.A. Bulletin, 13 (Dec., 1956), 107-112.

———. "Preface to an Uncollected Anthology." Studia Varia: Royal Society of Canada Literary and Scientific Papers, ed. E.G.D. Murray. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957, pp. 21-36.

———. "Study of English in Canada." Dalhousie Review, 38 (Sept. 1958), 1-7.

- _____. "Towards a Theory of Cultural History." The University of Toronto Quarterly, 22 (July, 1953), 325-341.
- Garneau, Rene. "La Litterature." Royal Commission Studies Selected from Special Studies Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951, pp. 83-98.
- Hicks, Granville. "Novelists in the Fifties." Saturday Review, 42 (Oct. 24, 1959), 18-20.
- MacLennan, Hugh. "Canadian, 1955 Model." Saturday Night, 70 (Jan. 7, 1956), 7-8.
- MacPherson, Hugo. "Fiction, 1940-1960." Literary History of Canada, ed. Karl F. Klinck et.al... Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965, pp. 694-722.
- McCourt, Edward. "Canadian Letters." Royal Commission Special Studies Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951, pp. 67-82.
- Pacey, Desmond. "Areas of Research in Canadian Literature." The University of Toronto Quarterly, 23 (Oct., 1953), 58-63.
- _____. "The Canadian Writer and his Public, 1882-1952." Studia Varia: Royal Society of Canada Literary and Scientific Papers, ed. E.G.D. Murray. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.
- _____. "The Novel in Canada." Queen's Quarterly, 52 (Autumn, 1945), 322-331.
- Pierce, Lorne. "The Arts and Letters in Canada and Our Emerging Culture." Canadian Author and Bookman, 35 (Summer, 1959), 8-9.
- Priestly, F.E.L.. "Creative Scholarship in Canada." The Arts in Canada: A Stock-Taking at Mid Century, ed. Malcolm Ross. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1958, 98-101.
- Sandwell, B.K.. "Canadian Writing in 1952." Saturday Night, 68 (Nov. 29, 1952), 1, 21.
- Sinclair, Lewis. "A Canadian Idiom." Here and Now, 2 (June, 1949), 16-18.
- Shapiro, Lionel. "The Myth That's Muffling Canada's Voice." Maclean's, 68 (Oct., 29, 1955), 12-13, 43-45.
- Snethurst, S.E.. "Towards a Canadian Literature." Queen's Quarterly, 59 (Winter,), 455-463.
- Strange, K.M.. "On the Record for 1950." Saturday Night, 66 (Oct. 31, 1950), 12, 20-21.

Thompson, D.W.. "Search for a Canadian Author's Association Constitution." Canadian Author and Bookman, 35 (Summer 1959), 14-15.

Waters, R.E.. "An Unknown Literature." Saturday Night, 70 (Sept. 17, 1955), 30-33, 35-36.

Weaver, R.L.. "Literature: Some Promise." Saturday Night, 75 (Aug. 29, 1959), 34.

_____. "The Economics of Our Literature." Queen's Quarterly, 60 (Winter, 1953-54), 476-485.

"Who's Canada's Best Known Author?" The Financial Post, March 18, 1958, 8.

Whalley, George. "The Great Canadian Novel." Queen's Quarterly, 55 (Autumn, 1948), 318-326.

Woodcock, George. "A View of Canadian Criticism." Dalhousie Review, 35 (1955), 216-223.

Young, Scott. "What's Wrong with the Canadian Novel?" Saturday Night, 69 (May 29, 1954), 16-17.

V Canada, The United States and Great Britain

Articles:

"A Chance to Help." The Financial Post, June 5, 1954, p. 6.

Adelphi. "Fear of Canada Going to the U.S." The Financial Post, April 21, 1956, p. 10.

Barkway, Michael. "Canadians Own More of Canada." Saturday Night, 67 (July 12, 1952), 12, 20.

Barkway, Michael. "Can Canada Remain Independent." The Financial Post, Sept. 14, 1957, p. 3.

Barkway, Michael. "No Anti-Americanism Theme of Canadian Talk." The Financial Post, Nov. 22, 1958, p. 3.

Bissell, Claude. "American Studies in Canadian Universities." Queen's Quarterly, 66 (Autumn, 1959), 384-387.

"Canadians, Yanks: How Different?" The Financial Post, June 12, 1954, p. 13.

Francis, Anne. "Americans Don't Know What All the Fuss is About." Canadian Commentator, 1 (March, 1958), 4.

"How to Show the Duke the Real Canada." The Financial Post, October 24, 1953, pp. 7, 9.

"How Can We Kill the Idea We're a U.S. Satellite?" The Financial Post, May 5, 1951, p. 13.

- Hutchison, Bruce. "An Englishman's Tears." The Financial Post, October 29, 1955, p.7.
- _____. "Canada-U.S. Relations." The Financial Post, Dec. 3, 1955, p. 7.
- _____. "This Basic Ignorance is Dangerous." The Financial Post, August 31, 1957, p. 7.
- _____. "Union With the Yanks." The Financial Post, May 7, 1955, p. 7.
- _____. "U.S. Sound Barrier." The Financial Post, Dec. 17, 1955, p. 7.
- _____. "We Have Begun to Debate How, Where Canada Stands." The Financial Post, May 15, p. 14.
- _____. "What Price Canada?" The Financial Post, June 14, 1958, p. 13.
- _____. "Why Americans Can't Hear Canada's Hopes and Fears." The Financial Post, Sept. 26, 1959, p. 19.
- "Is There Much Anti-Americanism in Canada?" The Financial Post, May 30, 1953, p. 10.
- "Is the United States a Bad Neighbor?" The Financial Post, Jan. 4, 1958, p. 9.
- "Let's Hear Canada's Voice." The Financial Post, Aug. 21, 1954, p. 6.
- Livesay, Dorothy. "Letter From London." The Canadian Forum, 38 (April, 1958-March, 1959), 10.
- McGeachy, J.B.. "Do Americans Patronize Us?" The Financial Post, May 10, 1958, p. 10.
- _____. "How Many Canadians Want a Republic?" The Financial Post, July 18, 1959, p. 7.
- _____. "New Light on U.S. - U.K. Alliance." The Financial Post, March 30, 1957, p. 7.
- _____. "No Dues in this Club." The Financial Post, July 14, 1956, p. 7.
- _____. "'Papa Knows Best,' Ike Says." The Financial Post, Oct. 27, 1956, p. 7.
- Minifie, J.M.. "Congress and Nationalism." Canadian Commentator, 1 (Sept., 1957), 6.
- _____. "Firmer Line Towards the United States." Canadian Commentator, 1 (June, 1957), 4.
- Moore, Mavor. "United We Fall." Canadian Commentator, 1 (Sept. 1957), 4, 5.

- Nash, Knowlton. "Canada: Name or Nation in U.S. View?" The Financial Post, Sept. 21, 1957, p. 3.
- "National Survival is the Problem." The Financial Post, Sept. 14, 1957, p. 1.
- "Nationhood Not Just Accidental." The Financial Post, July, 2, 1955, p. 1.
- "Price of Sovereignty." The Financial Post, Sept. 15, 1951, pp. 24-25.
- "Put Canada First." The Financial Post, March 6, 1954, p. 6.
- Safarian, A.E.. "The Dilemma of Foreign Investment." Canadian Forum, 35 (April 1955-March 1956), 246.
- Sandwell, B.K.. "Striking Differences." The Financial Post, Jan. 2, 1953, p. 9.
- _____. "The Difference." The Financial Post, March, 13, 1954, p. 9.
- _____. "The Problems With American Ignorance of Canada." The Financial Post, Jan. 30, 1954, p. 9.
- _____. "U.S. Today, Britain Then - A Parallel." The Financial Post, Jan. 17, 1953, p. 7.
- Sparham, Desmond. "On Becoming Canadian." The Canadian Forum, 35 (April 1955-March 1956), 218.
- "Tomorrow's Canada: An Issue on the Gordon Report." The Financial Post, Jan. 19, 1956.
- "The United States: Canada's Problem." The Canadian Forum, 31 (May, 1951), 1-2.
- "The United States Pushes Culture Here." The Financial Post, Nov. 22, 1958, p. 6.
- "The Superman Theory of Politics Not for Canada." The Financial Post, July 10, 1954, p. 1.
- Underhill, F.H.. "Canadian and American Ties With Europe." Queen's Quarterly, 66 (Autumn, 1959), 10.
- Wade, Mason. "Canada from the South: An American View." Queen's Quarterly, 62 (Autumn, 1955), 339-348.
- _____. "The Place of Canadian Studies in American Universities." Queen's Quarterly, 66 (Autumn, 1959), 337-383.
- Weaver, Robert. "What Canada Needs." Canadian Commentator, 1 (Sept. 9, 1957).

"What Does Canada Count in World Affairs." The Financial Post,
7.

"What Meant Most for Canada in 1953?" The Financial Post,
Jan. 23, 1954, pp. 10, 11, 23.

"What's Behind Weaking U.K. Ties?" The Financial Post,
March 26, 1955, pp. 26, 27.

Wrong, Dennis. "Dullesphobia." The Canadian Forum,
37 (April 1955-March 1958), 266.

VI Other

Lower Arthur. Canada, Nation and Neighbor. Toronto:
Ryerson Press, 1952.

_____. Colony to Nation; A History of Canada. Toronto:
Longmans, Green, 1946.

_____. This Most Famous Stream; The Liberal Democratic
Way of Life. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1954.

Innis, Harold. The Bias of Communication. Toronto: University
of Toronto Press, 1951.

_____. Changing Concepts of Time. Toronto: University of
Toronto Press, 1952.

_____. Empire and Communications. Oxford: Clarendon Press,
1950.

_____. The Strategy of Culture. Toronto: University of
Toronto Press, 1952.

Underhill, Frank. Canadian Political Parties. Ottawa: CHA, 1956.

_____. The British Commonwealth; An experiment in Co-operation
Among Nations. Durham: Duke University Press, 1956.

Secondary Sources

Books:

- Atwood, Margaret. Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature. Toronto: Anansi, 1972.
- Ballstadt, Carl. The Search for English Canadian Literature. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.
- Bell, Daniel. Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- Bell, David and Tepperman, Lorne. The Roots of Disunity: A Look at Canadian Political Culture. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979.
- Berger, Carl. The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.
- . The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English Canadian Historical Writing, 1900-1970. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Bothwell, Robert, Drummond, Ian and English, John. Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics and Provincialism. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.
- Buitenhuis, Elspeth. Robertson Davies. Toronto: Forum House, 1972.
- Cameron, Donald. Conversations with Canadian Novelists. Toronto: MacMillan and Co., 1973.
- Cook, Ramsay. The Maple Leaf Forever: Essays on Nationalism. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Christian, William and Campbell, Colin. Political Parties and Ideologies in Canada: liberals, conservatives, socialists, nationalists. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1974.
- Crean, S.M.. Who's Afraid of Canadian Culture? Don Mills: General Publishing Company, 1976.
- Creighton, Donald. Canada's First Century. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1970.
- . The Forked Road, 1937-1957. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.
- . Towards the Discovery of Canada. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1972.

- Dooley, D.J. Moral Vision in the Canadian Novel. Toronto: Clark, Irwin and Co., Ltd., 1979.
- Ewen, Stuart. Captains of Consciousness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Fetherling, Doug. (ed.). A George Woodcock Reader. Deneau and Greenbey Publishers, 1980.
- Fraser, Blair. The Search for Identity: Canada 1945-1967. Toronto: Doubleday, 1967.
- Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- _____. The Bush Garden: Essays on the Canadian Imagination. Toronto: Anansi, 1973.
- _____. The Critical Path: An Essay in the Social Context of Literary Criticism. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.
- _____. The Educated Imagination. Toronto: C.B.C. Publications, 1963.
- _____. The Well-Tempered Critic. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963.
- Fulford, Robert. Crisis at the Victory Burlesque: Culture, Politics and Other Diversions. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Gagne, Wallace. Nationalism, Technology and the Future of Canada. MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1976.
- Grant, George. Lament for a Nation. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965.
- _____. Technology and Empire. Toronto: Anansi, 1969.
- Hardin, Herschel. A Nation Unaware: The Canadian Economic Culture. Vancouver: J.J. Douglas Ltd., 1974.
- Heick, W.H. (ed.). History and Myth: A.R.M. Lower and the Making of Canadian Nationalism. Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1975.
- Hodgetts, A.B. What Culture? What Heritage? Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968.
- Jones, Douglas. Butterfly on Rock, A Study of Themes and Images in Canadian Literature. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.
- Kedourie, Elie. Nationalism. New York: Praeger Press, 1960.

- Laxer, James and Robert. The Liberal Idea of Canada. Toronto: James Lorimer and Co., 1977.
- Lower, A.R.M. My First Seventy-Five Years. Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1967.
- Mandel, Eli. Contexts of Canadian Criticism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Matthews, Robin. Canadian Literature: Surrender or Revolt? Toronto: Steel Rail Press, 1978.
- McKillop, A.B. A Disciplined Intelligence. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1979.
- . Contexts of Canada's Past: Selected Essays of W.L. Morton. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1980.
- Meisel, John. The Canadian General Election of 1957. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.
- Minifie, James M. Peacemaker or Powder Monkey: Canada's Role in a Revolutionary World. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1960.
- Minihan, Janet. The Nationalization of Culture. New York: New York University Press, 1977.
- Morton, N.J. The Terrors of Ideological Politics: Liberal Historians in a Conservative Mood. Cleveland: Press Case of Western University, 1972.
- Morton, W.L. The Canadian Identity. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1961.
- . The Shield of Achilles. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968.
- Moss, John. Patterns of Isolation. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.
- New, William. Among Worlds. Erin, Ontario: Press Porcepic, 1975.
- Newman, Peter C. Renegade in Power: The Diefenbaker Years. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1963.
- . The Distemper of Our Times: Canadian Politics in Transition, 1963-1968. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968.
- Oakshott, Michael. Rationalism and Politics. London: Methuen Press, 1962.
- Ostry, Bernard. The Cultural Connection: An Essay on Culture and Government Policy in Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.

- Pacey, Desmond. Essays in Canadian Criticism, 1938-1968. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1969.
- Parker, George L. (ed.). The Evolution of Canadian Literature in English, 1914-1945. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada, 1973.
- Porter, John. The Vertical Mosaic. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- Rotstein, Abraham (ed.). The Prospect of Change: Proposals for Canada's Future. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Resnick, Phillip. The Land of Cain, Class and Nationalism in English Canada, 1945-1975. Vancouver: New Steel Books, 1977.
- Russell, Peter (ed.). Nationalism in Canada. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1966.
- Schmidt, Larry (ed.). George Grant in Process: Essays and Conversations. Toronto: Anansi, 1978.
- Schwartz, Mildred A. Public Opinion and Canadian Identity. Berkley: University of California Press, 1967.
- Shortt, S.E.D. The Search for an Ideal: Six Canadian Intellectuals and their Convictions in an Age of Transition, 1890-1930. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.
- Smith, A.J.M. (ed.). Masks of Fiction: Canadian Critics on Canadian Prose. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1961.
- . The Canadian Century. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishers Ltd., 1973.
- Smith, D. Gentle Patriot. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 1973.
- Stromberg, Roland N. After Everything, Western Intellectual History Since 1945. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.
- Stursberg, D. Diefenbaker: Leadership Gained. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1975.
- . Diefenbaker: Leadership Lost. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.
- Symonds, T.H.D. To Know Ourselves: The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies. Ottawa: Association of University and Colleges of Canada, 1975, 2 vols.
- Taylor, Charles. Six Journeys: A Canadian Pattern. Toronto: Anansi, 1977.
- Thomas, Clara. Our Nature, Our Voice. Toronto: New Press, 1966.
- Thompson, E.P. The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays. London: Monthly Review Press, 1978.

Underhill, F.H. In Search of Canadian Liberalism. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1961.

_____. The Image of Confederation. Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Publications, 1967.

Viereck, Peter. Conservatism from John Adams to Churchill. Princeton: D. Jan Nostrand Company Inc., 1956.

Wilson, Edmund. O Canada: An American's Notes on Canadian Culture. New York: Farrar Strauss, 1964.

Woodcock, George. A Choice of Critics. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1966.

_____. Odysseus Ever Returning. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1970.

_____. The Canadian Novel in the Twentieth Century. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1970.

Articles:

Astor, Howard. "Nationalism and Communitarianism." Nationalism, Technology and the Future of Canada, ed. Wallace Gagne. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1976, pp. 52-74.

Bonnycastle, Stephen. "Robertson Davies and the Ethics of Monologue." Journal of Canadian Studies, XII (February, 1977), 20-40.

Berger, Carl. "The True North Strong and Free." Nationalism in Canada, ed. Peter Russell. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1966, pp. 3-26.

Bumsted, Jack. "Canada and American Culture in the 1950s." Bulletin of Canadian Studies, IV (April, 1980), 54-74.

Carey, J.W.. "Harold Innis and Marshall McLuhan." Antwisch Review, XXVII (1967), 5-39.

Cook, Terry. "The Canadian Conservative Tradition." The Journal of Canadian Studies, VIII (November, 1973), 46-55.

Cooper, Tom. "The Unknown Innis." The Journal of Canadian Studies, 12 (Winter, 1977), III-III7.

Davies, Robertson. "Fifty Years of Theatre in Canada." University of Toronto Quarterly, 50 (Fall, 1980), 69-80.

Frye, Northrop. "Across the River and Out of the Trees." University of Toronto Quarterly, 50 (Fall, 1980), 1-14.

Harris, Cole. "The Myth of the Land in Canadian Nationalism." Nationalism in Canada, ed. Peter Russell. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1966, pp. 27-46.

- Heiman, George. "The 19th Century Legacy: Nationalism or Patriotism." Nationalism in Canada, ed. Peter Russell. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1966, pp. 323-340.
- Kilbourn, William. "The 1950s." The Canadians 1867-1967, ed. J.M.S. Careless and R. Craig Brown. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1967, pp. 309-343.
- MacLennan, Hugh. "Fiction in Canada - 1930 to 1950." University of Toronto Quarterly, 50 (Fall, 1980), 29-42.
- McKillop, A.B.. "Moralists and Moderns." Journal of Canadian Studies, 14 (Winter, 1979-80), 144-150.
- . "Nationalism, Identity and Canadian Intellectual History." Queen's Quarterly, LXXXI (1974), 533-550.
- Rotstein, Abraham. "Is There an English Canadian Nationalism?" Journal of Canadian Studies, (Summer, 1978), 109-118.
- Thomas, Clara. "Two Voices in a Mixture of Frailties." Journal of Canadian Studies, XII (February, 1977), 82-91.
- Watt, Frank. "Nationalism in Canadian Literature." Nationalism in Canada, ed. Peter Russell. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, Ryerson, 1966, 235-251.
- Woodcock, George. "When Past Becomes History: The Half-Century in Non-Fiction Prose." University of Toronto Quarterly, 50 (Fall, 1980), 90-101.
- Woods, John T. "A Cultural Approach to Canadian Independence." Nationalism, Technology and the Future of Canada, ed. Wallace Gagne. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1976, pp. 75-103.
- Unpublished Thesis:
- Vipond, Mary. "National Consciousness in English-Speaking Canada in the 1920s: Seven Studies." A Doctoral Thesis presented to the University of Toronto, 1974.

NOTICE

THE QUALITY OF THIS MICROFICHE DEPENDS UPON
THE QUALITY OF THE PRINT OF THE THESIS
SUBMITTED FOR FILMING. THIS THESIS HAS BEEN
MICROREPRODUCED AS RECEIVED. ANY OMISSIONS IN
THE TEXT (E.G., COLOURED PLATES) ARE NOTED IN
THE APPROPRIATE PLACE IN THE FILM.

REPRODUCTION IN FULL OR IN PART OF THIS FILM IS
GOVERNED BY THE CANADIAN COPYRIGHT ACT, R.S.C. 1970,
C. C-30. PLEASE READ THE AUTHORIZATION FORM WHICH
ACCOMPANIES THIS THESIS.

THIS THESIS WAS FILMED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES
AND SPECIAL COLLECTIONS, ELIZABETH DAFOE LIBRARY,
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA, WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, CANADA.