# THE ENGLISH CANADIAN LIBERAL ARTS CURRICULUM:

# AN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY, 1800-1950

by

Patricia Jane Jasen

a thesis submitted to the Department of History
in conformity with the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
February, 1987

copyright © Patricia Jane Jasen

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-37185-4

# THE ENGLISH CANADIAN LIBERAL ARTS CURRICULUM:

# AN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY,

# 1800-1950

BY

PATRICIA JANE JASEN

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

© 1987

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.

ABSTRACT

The liberal arts curriculum is the product of the intellectual, political, and social climate of its age. The "traditional" curriculum of the mid-nineteenth century derived from Victorian religious attitudes and beliefs about character development. As the century progressed and state power gradually displaced clerical power in the universities, the ideal of a balanced, unified arts program in which all students learned to place their knowledge in a Christian context gave way to a variety of specialized programs and an emphasis on job-training rather than character development. The scientific method became an accepted mode of inquiry, and arts disciplines multiplied as new methodologies (such as those used in the social sciences) were created and as society discovered a need for new kinds of expertise.

From the late nineteenth century onwards, there were a number of competing theories regarding the nature of the university and the proper content and structure of the arts course. The sciences and social sciences benefitted from the utilitarian emphasis in some respects, but professors in the humanities felt their prestige diminishing. Many of them embraced a theory about the importance of culture which was based pm the teachings of Matthew Arnold, and they also took the lead in campaigns to reintroduce the kind of order

and certainty which the traditional arts course had possessed by attempting to create a "common learning" or "core" of general education. This thesis analyses the development of the arts curriculum over a period of one hundred and fifty years, and examines the reasons why the quest for unifyiing principles in liberal education remained unfulfilled in the secular university of the twentieth century.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Several people have answered my letters and questions on the subject of higher education, and I would like to thank Paul Axelrod, Ronald Baker, E.G. Berry, Mario Creet, Judith Fingard, Frederick Gibson, Michiel Horn, Ed Hundert, Brian McKillop, Margaret Prang, and Gordon Rothney for sharing their knowledge and ideas. I would also like to acknowledge the assistance I have received from university archivists at Manitoba, Toronto, British Columbia, York and Queen's, and from the staff at the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, the Humanities Research Federation and the Social Sciences Research Federation. I am particularly indebted to the staff at the University of Manitoba Inter-library Loan department.

While writing this thesis, I have been grateful for the friendship of fellow students, support staff and faculty who offered commiseration and welcome diversion. John Kendle has been a most patient advisor and has guided me through this process with great efficiency. My family has been very helpful and understanding, and I especially thank my parents for their encouragement, my son, Paul, who cheered me on all these years, and my husband, Rick, for a host of insights and kindnesses which could never be enumerated.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS


Abbreviations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . p. 1

Introduction . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . p. 2

Ch. 1 The Origins and Philosophy of the Traditional Arts Curriculum . . . . . . . p. 8

Ch. 2 Honours and Options: a New Curricular Ideology . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . p. 59

Ch. 3 Science and Citizenship: The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Ideal of Citizenship . . . . . . . . . . . . . . p. 95

Ch. 4 Culture and Citizenship: Literature in the Arts Curriculum . . . . . . . . . p. 146

Ch. 5 The Social Sciences and the Utilitarian Ethic in the Interwar Years . . . . . . . p. 202

Ch. 6 Rhetoric and Reform: The Search for Curricular Order from the 1920s to the Cold War . . . . . . . . . . . . . . p. 262

Ch 7 Postscript . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . p. 317

Bibliography . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . p. 338

# Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| CF | Canadian Forum |
| CHA | Canadian Historical Association Annual Report |
| CHR | Canadian Historical Review |
| CJEPS | Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science |
| CJS | Canadian Journal of Sociology |
| DR | Dalhousie Review |
| JCS | Journal of Canadian Studies |
| NCCU | Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities |
| QQ | Queen's Quarterly |
| TRSC | Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada |
| UM | University Magazine |
| UTM | University of Toronto Monthly |
| UTQ | University of Toronto Quarterly |

# Introduction

"The curriculum," wrote George Grant in the 1960s, is the essence of any university."[1] Although that statement is logically true, the history of what universities actually teach is one of the least explored fields in the study of higher education in Canada. Scholarly histories of individual universities are now being produced by professional historians whose style is analytical rather than celebratory, but curricular development, which is highly complex and which draws its impetus from intellectual currents beyond the institution itself, is still given only sporadic attention. Robin Harris's A History of Higher Education in Canada (1976) looks at all of the universities together and contains several sections on curricular change, but, although his work provides a useful starting point, it remains for other historians to flesh out the story and to examine the arts curriculum in the context of Canadian intellectual life.

Valuable work has already been done. Recent studies of the thought of late nineteenth century Canadians, such as those by Brian McKillop, Carl Berger, and Ramsay Cook, have laid some of the necessary groundwork in the history of liberal education. The centrality of religion in the Victorian college and the far-reaching effects of secularization on intellectual life must be understood before the motives, goals and fears of

university educators can be appreciated. Also important is the contribution made by historians of science, and especially of the social sciences, such as Doug Owram, Barry Ferguson, and Marlene Shore. Their studies show how the scientific analysis of society developed in response to changing conceptions of knowledge inside the intellectual community and to society's increasing demands for various kinds of expertise. Useful as well are the histories of individual disciplines and departments, which are few in number as yet, but are to be welcomed whether they are produced by professional historians or by practitioners within the subject areas themselves.

Curricular history draws upon a diverse collection of primary sources, some of which must be used with caution. When reading either published materials or internal university documents, one is often faced with the task of trying to distinguish wishful thinking about the arts course from actual policy or practice. The recommendations of curricular reform committees, for example, are seldom acted upon in full, and in many cases have no effect at all on the course of study. University calendars are valuable sources of information on curricular structure and requirements, prescribed texts, and real or proposed course offerings, but they, too, reveal surprisingly little about what is actually taught and tell us nothing about the forces which

lie behind curricular change. For this dissertation I have collected and correlated information from as many kinds of sources as possible, including the academic press, memoirs of former students and faculty, presidents' reports, calendars, reports of committees and commissions, the writings of outside critics of the university, along with a variety of archival materials produced during periods of curricular innovation.

My primary goal has been to discover how the evolution of the content and structure of the arts course has reflected changing beliefs about what the curriculum should be able to accomplish. I have also been concerned with the interplay between intellectual ideals and the social, political, and economic pressures which limit and define what is taught in our universities. I have tried to explain why the arts course in the twentieth century seems to defy all attempts to re-establish the kind of curricular order which was possible in the mid-nineteenth century, before universities became immersed in conflicts between research and teaching, between job-training and general culture, between the inculcation of values and the quest for objective knowledge, and other issues.

This thesis draws upon the more advanced historiography of Great Britain and the United States in order to interpret some of these phenomena, and to determine

how trends in Canadian education compare with those in the rest of the English-speaking world. Much of Canada's curricular ideology has, of course, been imported from Britain, but the continuous flow of ideas and inspiration from abroad has generally been offset by the fact that our universities have developed in a distinctly North American social and economic context.

I have confined my research to English Canada, because the curricula of French Canadian universities were the product of a different intellectual tradition and the dictates of a different kind of religious and social structure. This thesis makes generalizations about the English Canadian curriculum which apply to all of the geographical regions; it also points, at times, to forces which were particularly strong in certain parts of the country, such as the role of utilitarianism in western Canadian universities. The University of Toronto is discussed most frequently because, with its superior financial resources, it so often took the lead in curricular developments and realized its goals more fully than did those institutions which were perpetually hampered by a lack of funds.

Instead of tracing changes in the structure and content of the arts course on a primarily chronological or institutional basis, I have focussed on exploring the basic concepts underlying liberal education and on discovering their origins and implications. What,

for example, was the "traditional" arts curriculum? What did the honours program symbolize? Why was Oxford idealized? Why was so much faith vested in the arts course, and what did people mean by such phrases as "the unity of knowledge," the "western tradition," the ideal of "citizenship" or of "public service," and "the best that has been thought and said"? This thesis is preoccupied with the language and ideas manifest in curricular history, and with finding out why, despite the transformation of higher learning which has occurred over the decades, the same problems keep resurfacing (or, to put it another way, why the same issues keep being perceived as problems). It concludes that curricular history repeats itself because the dilemmas faced by each generation of educators are fundamentally the same. Forty years ago, a philosophy professor at Dalhousie remarked upon the tendency for each age to embrace the same "plausible nonsense" about education by quoting Sir Thomas Browne:

> As though there were metempsychosis, and the soul of one man passed into another; opinions do find, after several revolutions, men and minds like those that first begat them.

# NOTES

1 George Grant, "The University Curriculum," The University Game, (eds.) Howard Adelman and Dennis Lee (Toronto, 1968), 47.

2 H.L. Stewart, "The Future of Universities," DR 24 (1944), 207.

# Chapter 1

## The Origins and Philosophy of the Traditional Arts Curriculum

The history of the liberal arts curriculum in English-Canada begins with the Loyalists' northward migration in the 1780s. After they had settled in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the Canadas, they turned their attention almost immediately to the creation of institutions of higher learning. They established fledgling King's Colleges at Windsor and Fredericton, and then later at York, in order to prevent their young men from attending universities in the new republic, where they would be exposed to an alien political ideology. The curricular philosophy imposed in British North America at that time may be called the "Oxford model," for it equated higher learning with the classics as they were taught at England's oldest university. The King's Colleges were intended to serve the governing classes, and they and their curricula soon became symbols of Anglican privilege and Family Compact rule in the colonies.

The King's Colleges' monopoly on higher education was challenged by new institutions created by other denominations, some of which had close links with political reform movements in the 1820s and 30s. The founders of these new colleges were motivated by sec-

tarian rivalries, but collectively they sought to broaden access to higher education and to broaden the curriculum as well. They considered the classics to be a good thing "in their place," but they maintained that meeting the practical educational needs of pioneer communities was more important than turning out polished gentlemen cast in the Oxbridge mould. In the opinion of such men as Egerton Ryerson and Thomas McCulloch, an ideal curriculum would balance the classics and pure mathematics with the sciences and modern languages, while assuring that all learning took place within a Christian framework.

It is this model which tends to be remembered as the traditional arts curriculum in English Canada. After responsible government was introduced in the late 1840s, several Church of England colleges were transformed into state supported universities which, along with the dissenting church colleges, offered a curriculum which was believed to encompass all of these branches of "useful" knowledge. Courses were carefully arranged in a three or four year sequence, and the whole structure was tied together by the doctrine of faculty psychology, which held that each subject had a part to play in "disciplining" the various faculties of the mind. The purpose of higher education at mid-century was to produce graduates of sound Christian character who would assume positions of responsibility,

leadership, and productivity in the community. Only in this era of the traditional arts curriculum does one encounter an educational philosophy in which religious, cultural, and vocational goals were considered genuinely compatible, and in that attribute lay the secret of its enduring appeal.

## THE OXFORD MODEL IN THE MARITIMES

In Windsor, Nova Scotia, a college was founded within a few years of the Loyalists' arrival. Its nearest antecedent was King's College, New York--an Anglican institution which was open for only twenty-two years before being transformed into a military hospital in 1776. The "loyal clergy" who mourned its passing (amongst them Charles Inglis--the future Bishop of Nova Scotia) were the first men to recommend that a new college be founded in the northern colony.[1] While the curriculum at King's, New York, had been intended to encompass a range of scientific and "useful" subjects such as navigation, surveying, and husbandry,[2] the tendency towards practical learning which was slowly gaining a foothold in the United States was not carried northward during the 1780s. When King's College was reincarnated in Nova Scotia during the following decade, its founders chose an older and narrower curricular pattern which was far less suited to the social and material circumstances of the colony.

The reasons behind this conservatism can be found in what historians have learned about "the Loyalist mentality" and especially in what is known of the men who formed the governing class in British North America at the end of the eighteenth century. Whatever their politics may have been prior to their flight, the colleges which they created at Windsor and Fredericton were the products of an intense conservatism nurtured by the spectacle of revolution in both America and France. Convinced that both upheavals had resulted from weaknesses in the connection between church and state, the colonies' leaders were determined to establish institutions which would be a force for conservatism in the Maritimes, just as Oxford and Cambridge were in England. They would not only train young men for the Anglican priesthood, but would disseminate both true religion and reverence for the authority of the British monarch throughout the region.[3] The sense of urgency was heightened by a fear that, in the absence of a local college, young Maritimers would be sent to the "Revolted Colonies," which would inevitably lead to the "corruption of their religious and political principles."[4]

From the outset, King's at Windsor was specifically intended to serve the members of the Church of England and to work towards increasing their numbers.[5] The act which founded the college in 1789 stipulated that

its president must always be an Anglican clergyman and later regulations embodied many more aspects of the Oxford model.[6] The Board of Governors determined that all King's professors must be Oxford or Cambridge men--or at least have been educated by such scholars at Windsor itself.[7] In 1802, the new Statutes went further, announcing that all those entering the college must sign the Thirty-Nine Articles and decreeing that no professor or student might attend any place of worship other than the Church of England or be present "at any seditious or rebellious meetings."[8] Oxford was to be the model for King's in matters large and small. The Statutes even required that, in this pioneer college with two professors and a handful of students, "the Academical habits shall be the same as those which are worn in the University of Oxford, consisting of gowns, caps, hoods and bands, as they are appropriated to each degree, faculty, standing, station, or situation, respectively."[9]

The curriculum was also patterned after that of Oxford. In Great Britain and the United States, the classics were still a primary component of a liberal arts education in the early twentieth century and were considered essential to the training of clergymen in most denominations. Windsor resembled Oxford in particular because of the almost exclusive concentration on classical works throughout its four year course.[10]

While it could be objected that a two-man faculty could not possibly introduce much lattitude into the arts curriculum, it appears that even when their efforts were supplemented by new staff members, the curriculum did not alter significantly for many years. Logic and rhetoric, studied through the use of the ancient languages, were the principle subjects in the traditional Oxford curriculum, and so they were at Windsor.[11]

The purpose of classical studies had not been unchanging over the centuries, however, and their emphasis at King's reflected a philosophy of higher education which had quite recently come into fashion in England. Sheldon Rothblatt has analysed the role of the classics in the late 1700s as the accepted means of passing on standards of "civilized" manners and speech. Cultural activity was concentrated in London, and, out of the multitude of regional dialects, the concept of a standard, polite English was emerging. Latin was widely held to be a "perfect" language, "precisely the model required to purge English of its many impurities." In the universities, the study of rhetoric became associated with "the cultivation of a pleasant or graceful style" of expression--a style suited to the quality of young man who could afford a liberal education and could expect a place in London society.[12]

At King's College, Judge Alexander Croke, an Oxonian and an especially influential member of the

Board, adhered to the notion that the college should be concerned with teaching correct manners and speech. He believed that a principle object of King's was to assimilate "the manners of the rising generation to those of the parent state," and he held that it was "of no small importance to this seminary to teach the genuine use, practice and pronunciation of the English language, which in distant colonies is too apt to degenerate."[13] According to Rothblatt, Quintillian and Cicero were read expressly for the purpose of improving style, and both received a generous portion of the students' time at Windsor.[14]

The Oxford-style curriculum at Windsor and at Fredericton (where a similar philosophy prevailed)[15] was intended to educate Anglican clergymen and English gentlemen. It betrayed the concerns and ambitions of the colonial elite in that it copied the training received by the English governing class. Through the initial exclusion of dissenters, the colleges reinforced the Tory grip on political power in the colonies. An early historian of King's at Windsor recalled that "the aristocratic and exclusive tone" of the establishment was accentuated by the lavish spending habits of its undergraduates and the ample salaries paid to its professors. The King's Colleges aimed to equip future leaders with the confidence and convictions needed to resist pressures towards reform, and to affirm

that some men are formed to rule, and others, to obey. In higher education, as in politics, religion, and social relations, the dictum was the same: "Fear thou the Lord and the King; and meddle not with them that are given to change."[16]

THE OXFORD MODEL IN UPPER CANADA

A college for Upper Canada was also planned during the 1790s, but was stalemated for several decades. Like Bishop Inglis, Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe was very eager to found a university, for he believed that such an institution would foster, "more than any other source or circumstance whatever, a grateful attachment to His Majesty, morality and religion."[17] A university which would train the governing elite was a key part of Simcoe's vision of Upper Canada as a ideal microcosm of English hierarchical society.[18] But because authorities in Britain thought that the college scheme was premature, the project lapsed after Simcoe's departure in 1796. He was indirectly responsible, however, for securing the land grant which would provide the endowment for a future King's College at Toronto. It was precisely this concentration of privilege in Anglican hands which created bitter denominational strife and delayed the building of any institution of higher learning in Upper Canada for fifty years.

The idea of a university for this frontier colony

was revived by John Strachan, a member of the Executive Council who would become Bishop of Toronto. Strachan was an extremely conservative man, who devoted his life to promoting what he termed "the Established Religion" of Upper Canada. During the 1820s and 30s he was certain that republicanism was rampant amongst the preachers of dissenting sects, and he took the view that "the most effectual method of supporting our Establishment is by getting the Education of the rising generation to be placed under the direction and control of the regular clergy."[19] While it was never his intention to exclude students from this new King's College on religious grounds (even Windsor relinquished that right by 1830), the institution was to be firmly under Anglican direction and influence.[20]

Strachan's religious conservatism was tempered by a more progressive approach in curricular matters, for he was deeply influenced by his Scottish background. In that country, the arts course was much broader in content, sacrificing some proficiency in classics and mathematics so that the sciences and philosophy could receive attention.[21] Strachan's belief that science had a part to play in the education of gentlemen was reinforced by the creation of the Church of England's new King's College in London, which attempted to compete with the utilitarian and "godless" University College on Gower Street by offering a broader curriculum.

Strachan may also have seen the wisdom of catering to the growing interest in practical subjects in Upper Canada, and have wanted to undermine one of the reformers' criticisms of Tory educational policy--namely, that it favoured an over-specialized, outmoded and elitist course of study which did little to advance the colony's prosperity. The curriculum he envisioned was to embrace "all useful knowledge," which he defined as "classical literature, Mathematical and Physical Sciences and Mental Philosophy," all "to be based on our Holy Religion, which ought to be the beginning and the end of an education in a Christian country."[22]

It was a commonplace of the mid-Victorian era that all secular instruction was to foster and defend the Christian faith, and Strachan spoke for the vast majority in Upper Canada when he placed religion at the centre of a liberal education. He assured the public that any religious teaching would be non-sectarian and entirely acceptable to any student who might choose to attend King's. It would be confined to "a thorough knowledge of the Holy Scriptures in their original languages, and to the study of such works as Butler's Analogy, Paley's Evidences, his Natural Theology," and no text would be read that was not "admired by all denominations of Christians." The public was aware, however, that overseeing all such instruction would be the Church of England. The college president,

Strachan himself, would teach "Moral and Intellectual Philosophy," a subject which included "Christian Ethics and Political Economy."[23] This was the course during which social and political opinions were most likely to be formed in the students' minds.

By the time that King's College, Toronto, finally commenced teaching, there could have been little doubt that its atmosphere would be as Tory and Anglican as its predecessors' at Windsor and Fredericton, and that, despite the presence of two professors of science, the classics were to retain their supremacy. At the stone-laying ceremony on St. George's Day, 1842, the comparison with Oxford was kept constantly to the fore. Some of the rhetoric may have been calculated to please the representative of the Crown, Sir Charles Bagot, who was Chancellor of the new college and an Oxford man himself. His Excellency delivered a speech extolling the contribution that King's would make to life in the colony, and he informed his audience that he had always imagined Oxford and Cambridge to be "the breasts of the mother country," adding, by way of explanation, that they had provided England with "that wholesome and invigorating nutriment which has led to her gigantic growth." The tone was sustained by a lad from the seventh form of Upper Canada College, who recited an "Ode" proclaiming that at King's "an infant Oxford springs ... Where once the Indian bow'd/

To idol-gods."[24]

The mood was the same at the opening ceremony in June of the following year. Mindful of the Reform party's intentions to sabotage the new college, President Strachan spoke in praise of religious exclusiveness in the administration of such institutions. In their inaugural addresses, he and Vice-president McCaul--former principal of Upper Canada College--both spoke of their hopes that King's would someday be the Oxford of the New World, an asylum of learned leisure "where men of retired habits may taste the sweets of society and yet converse with the illustrious dead."[25]

McCaul was to teach the classics, and he spoke lengthily of their singular educational value. He did not dwell on their content but stressed their worth as "the purest models of literary composition," through which one learned to express oneself with "perspicuity and grace." Besides fitting young men for the duties of an active life, the classics also offered gentlemen an opportunity for "profitable occupation in leisure--salutary recreation in ease." They suited men for both work and "noble recreation," and thus McCaul justified, on moral grounds, the supremacy of classical learning.[26]

Once teaching began in 1843, the atmosphere at King's was greatly influenced by the presence of Professor James Beaven, who taught philosophy and natural

theology and acted as Dean of Students. He instructed and governed his charges according to his own idealized memories of distant undergraduate days at Oxford. Beaven adhered to a very strict religious and social code; he had no use for dissenters and considered "democratical theories" to be incompatible with "an advanced condition of civilization."[27] Students coming to King's would have taken all this in stride, however, as virtually all were products of that other Tory stronghold, Upper Canada College.

King's was brought to life in an age preoccupied with reform, and it survived for only six years after instruction began. By mid-century, all of the Anglican colleges in British North America were to find their days of privilege numbered as governments fully elected by the people ousted the Church of England from its position of authority in higher education. Such colleges either retained their church connection but slipped from the mainstream of university development, as did King's at Windsor, or they became publicly supported institutions under secular control. A new curricular philosophy would dominate the University of Toronto, a secularized McGill, and the University of New Brunswick, but one must locate the origins of that philosophy in the colleges founded by the dissenting denominations during the first half of the nineteenth century.

THE REFORM MOVEMENT

By the 1840s, Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists and other Christian sects had reacted against the Anglican monopoly in higher education by creating colleges of their own. The establishment of such institutions as Dalhousie, Acadia, Mount Allison, Victoria and Queen's occurred not only because of denominational rivalry but because of differences in political outlook and educational philosophy. Just as the movement for political reform signified the growing confidence and power of the middle class in British North America, the campaign for curricular change expressed their need for training suited to middle class occupations and pursuits. Reformers in the first half of the nineteenth century had no wish to eliminate classical learning, but a number of them were determined to loosen its grip on the curriculum and, at the same time, break down the barriers of religion and class which the Oxford model symbolized.

One cannot, without undue digression, do justice to the fine points of sectarian conflict, and it will suffice to mention just a few of the colleges created during this era. The first institutional reaction to Anglican domination took place in rural Nova Scotia, where a group of Presbyterians, led by the Reverend Thomas McCulloch, founded Pictou Academy. College level instruction began in 1818 but the Academy did

not prosper, and Presbyterian efforts in higher education soon became focussed on Dalhousie College at Halifax.[28] During the 1830s the denominational colleges multiplied. Dalhousie gave offence to the Baptist community by hiring Presbyterians, which led to the birth of Acadia at Wolfville.[29] The exclusiveness of King's at Fredericton contributed to the founding of Methodist Mount Allison in Sackville.[30] In Upper Canada, the educational gap left by the delays in opening King's was partially filled by Upper Canada College, but because it was dominated by the Church of England and its curriculum was almost exclusively classical, Egerton Ryerson--a leading Methodist clergyman and educator--created Upper Canada Academy.[31] It was the fore-runner of Victoria College, which opened in 1842, along with Queen's College, whose founders at Kingston were motivated by a "strong repugnance" to the idea of committing their youth to "the charge of those likely to have rule at King's and McGill Colleges for some time to come."[32]

There were strong similarities between educational developments in the mother country and the colonies. New colleges were created in England during this period for virtually the same reasons, and the first was the University of London, founded in 1828 to meet the needs of middle class youth excluded from Oxford and Cambridge on religious (and financial) grounds.[33] In

Great Britain, expansion in higher education was part of a broader movement towards the emancipation of dissenters and the rising power of the English middle class.

In a parallel fashion, several of the men who helped found new colleges in Upper Canada and the Maritimes were associated with the campaign against oligarchical power. Thomas McCulloch has been called the intellectual leader of the reform movement in Nova Scotia in its earliest phase, and the "Pictou Scribblers" nurtured at his academy played a part in Joseph Howe's political awakening during the 1820s.[34] In Upper Canada, there were strong links between political reform and Methodism. Egerton Ryerson, founder of Victoria College, was a leader in both spheres. One aspect of his battle against the Anglicans' assumption of class superiority was his determination that all men be given access to education in keeping with their abilities. Knowledge, he pointed out, must be recognised as "the fruit of labour, and not the inheritance of descent."[35] Similarly, at Dalhousie, McCulloch observed that "the time has passed when men considered that rank and wealth entitled them to a monopoly of intelligence."[36]

One must take care, however, not to exaggerate the tie between new colleges and political reform.

The Methodists who founded Mount Allison were not associated with the movement in New Brunswick, nor were the Baptists who created Acadia in Nova Scotia involved in reform politics.[37] The subject is furthered complicated by the fact that reformers were themselves divided over the issue of higher education, and many --Joseph Howe and Robert Baldwin among them--favoured a provincial university over the proliferation of sectarian colleges. Hence the contest was not merely two-sided, not simply a matter of Tory versus reformer, or Anglican versus dissenter. Instead, the opposition to Tory privilege was split between those who sought an equal share in the revenue from crown lands which the King's Colleges enjoyed, but who had no quarrel with church sponsored higher learning, and those who looked forward to the establishment of secular institutions like the University of London. This difference could be downplayed as long as the Church of England remained the common enemy, but it became central when, for example, a secularized University of Toronto entered into competition with the denominational colleges of Ontario in the 1850s.[38]

Despite such mitigating factors, the interplay between political and educational reform cannot be overlooked, and the relationship can be better understood if one considers the influence that utilitarianism, or Benthamism, exerted in both spheres. Vir-

tually all reformers emphasized the links between useful knowledge and social equality. In Great Britain and in Canada, the dominantly classical curriculum was associated with the class discrimination meted out by the Church of England institutions and with the effete manners and cultivated idleness of their graduates. In the mother country, the reform campaign began when the Edinburgh Review attacked the way that Oxford and Cambridge linked the concept of utility with pursuits which were common or degrading. "What other measure is there of dignity in intellectual labour but usefulness?" demanded R.L. Edgeworth in 1809. Let that principle be recognised, and classical literature would be brought "within proper bounds"; the "puffed up pedant" would be reduced to size, and the "maker of verses" and the "remember of words" would be exposed for their true and limited worth.[39] It was in this spirit that the University of London was conceived by the disciples of Bentham to provide "persons of every religious persuasion" with "an enlightened education ... at a reasonable charge."[40]

For very similar reasons, the middle class in British North America sought a more practical education for ambitious sons not destined for the professions. They wanted a training equal in status to that offered by the King's Colleges, but one more suited to preparing young men for careers in business, commerce,

and agriculture. Both McCulloch and Ryerson spoke of practical utility as one of the great aims of a higher education. While they were far from being radicals, their arguments had a democratic flavour. Shortly after Victoria College opened, for example, Ryerson published a letter in the Christian Guardian (which he edited) expressing his own sentiments concern -ing the college:

> This institution is emphatically the college of the people ... a college adapted to the wants of the mass, affording that kind of education, and in that manner, best adapted to make sound, practical men, in every department of life--sound lawyers, sound divines, sound physicians, merchants, mechanics, agriculturalists, and to qualify them for filling the various offices in society with honour to themselves and benefit to the community.[41]

The reformers challenged the eighteenth century notion that fine manners and eloquent speech were, in themselves, proof of personal morality and worth. For them, virtue was associated with action and community service. McCulloch pointed out that the people of Nova Scotia did not "have the prospect of spending their days in literary retirement;" to their considerable credit, they had duties to perform, and "upon those duties, therefore, the system of education should be made to bear." Rather than provide a merely classical training, it would be more profitable--indeed, more virtuous--to provide them with

> an accurate acquaintance with the operations of their own minds, and to teach them to

> classify their knowledge and communicate their sentiments, and to furnish them with those just views of the various social relations and duties, and that knowledge of mathematical and phsyical science, which would be everyday useful to the community and honourable to themselves.

Dalhousie's success, he felt, depended upon how well it adapted its course of study to the present needs of the province of Nova Scotia. "If Dalhousie College acquires eminence and success," wrote McCulloch, "it will not be by an imitation of Oxford, but as an institution of science and practical intelligence." Even with respect to the professions, he believed that "the community will join me in affirming that to a lawyer or a clergyman a sound judgement is more valuable than a sackful of words."[42]

"A sackful of words": such a phrase was not the true measure of McCulloch's or Ryerson's estimation of the value of the classical inheritance. Both considered Latin and Greek to be essential to a good education. "Every scholar should possess a moderate knowledge of these languages," conceded McCulloch. "I am by no means an enemy to classical literature, but it ought to have its own place, and that only."[43] Ryerson objected to classical studies only when they were placed above all other forms of learning, and when they were "so taught and studied as to render the English language and the active industry of common life contemptible in the estimation and feelings of the student."[44] Above all, these men resented the class

advantage and snobbery that the classical languages symbolized in higher education.

They also had a fairly clear idea in their minds of the kind of learning for which the curriculum must be ready to make way. They were in favour of expanding the role of science in higher education, just as long as it accorded with Christian revelation and was accompanied by lectures in moral philosophy. These would remind the student of his humble place in God's universe, and would counteract any tendency towards intellectual pride that an intimacy with nature's secrets might induce. The King's Colleges had also introduced some scientific studies by the 1840s, but a principle difference between the Church of England curriculum and that planned for such institutions as Victoria and Dalhousie was that the latter was more varied and vocational, and offered, for example, early varieties of applied science and mathematics such as navigation and surveying.

Subjects such as these would identify these institutions as "colleges of the people," and so would the recognition that much of what an educated, cultured person should know could be acquired through the language which he already spoke. Many professed admirers of the classics, Ryerson pointed out, had affected "a sovereign contempt--a contempt very generally the offspring of ignorance--of the study and

beauties of the English language." Youth ought not to be excluded from "those invaluable mines of wisdom and knowledge which are contained in their own tongue."[45] Ryerson also advocated the study of French, for that subject would be required by "all Canadian youth who are likely to take a part in the public affairs of United Canada."[46]

The study of British history was another of Ryerson's enthusiasms. His curriculum was to include the History of England, "embracing a popular view of the rise and progress of the civilization, Learning, Science, Arts and Commerce of Great Britain, and especially her Constitution of Government, and its successive changes and its present state of perfection."[47] Ryerson undoubtedly felt that the curriculum at Victoria should acquaint young people with the history and culture of the Empire of which they were a part, and that, through the pride and affection thus engendered, these subjects would contribute more to the stability of the social order than could any amount of Latin and Greek.

Although the classics still loomed large at the new denominational colleges, these institutions championed, as a matter of educational policy, a less specialized, more utilitarian approach to higher learning than did the Anglican colleges. In the years leading up to the introduction of responsible government, it

was that philosophy which came to dominate public thinking about the function of universities. While Ryerson and other church college leaders would never sanction the secularization of higher education, their emphasis upon useful knowledge for the common man gave impetus to the movement to bring Church of England establishments under state control.

King's College, Toronto, for example, was a source of continuous controversy throughout the 1840s. While it was officially non-denominational, the Bishop of Toronto was president, almost all of its students and faculty were Anglicans, and compulsory chapel was conducted according to Church of England ritual.[48] There was, in addition, a very real link between the King's curriculum and the college's exclusiveness. The course of study had broadened somewhat, but the classics reigned supreme. The curriculum acted as a class barrier because the only students likely to matriculate at King's were those from Upper Canada College--an elite, Anglican institution where students devoted themselves to classics and mathematics after the old pattern. With Upper Canada College as its feeder school, King's could set its classical requirement at such a high level that Daniel Wilson would later refer to the King's matriculation examination as "the most solemn farce educated men ever attempted to perpetrate in a new country."[49]

Opposition to King's increasingly transcended divisions of party and sect, with many Anglicans and moderate conservatives finding the college's position difficult to support.[50] Robert Baldwin, himself an Anglican, introduced a bill during the same year King's opened which called for the establishment of a provincial University of Toronto. Although the bill was abandoned when Baldwin resigned in 1844, the assault upon the college continued. With Bagot gone, Strachan expected no help from his successor, Sir Charles Metcalfe, who was "never at a university" and was "disposed to rule through what is called a majority of the people."[51]

Pressure also came from within King's College itself. The high Tory philosophy which was paraded in the opening ceremonies represented only a portion of King's faculty. They found themselves opposed by the small scientific and medical contingent, who were attracted to the idea of removing the heavy hand of the church from college affairs and allowing it to move in a more practical and democratic direction.[52]

Typical of the "new men" who appeared at a number of colleges in the 1840s was Henry Holmes Croft, first professor of chemistry and experimental science at King's College. Trained in Germany, he came to Canada at the age of twenty-three and stayed for some time with reform leader Francis Hincks, under whose influence

he became, according to one historian, "a courageous opponent of the 'Family Compact' group in King's College."[53] Croft was a vigorous advocate of experimental science and of the application of chemistry to the problems of agriculture. He was a leading member of the agricultural and horticultural societies in the district of York and a founder of the Entomological Society of Ontario.[54] With such men as Croft began the long association in Canada between scientific research in the university and its practical use in the community, which has been a prominent aspect of the secularization process.[55]

When the Reform party returned to power in 1848, a bill was finally passed which stipulated that the King's endowment would be turned over to a new body and the old college would cease to exist. The University of Toronto would be completely under government control. At this point, the Oxford model of higher learning was not driven out of Upper Canada but took refuge in a new institution. John Strachan would play no part in watching King's be "destroyed by stolid ignorance and presumption, the voice of prayer and praise banished from its walls."[56] Now in his seventies, he recruited funds in England for Trinity College, where he would recreate as closely as possible the atmosphere of Oxford in what was, by that time, a bygone era.[57]

Trinity's curriculum was restricted to the classics,

mathematics, and Evidences of Christianity, and was not, as Robin Harris has suggested, a model for degree programs in English-speaking colleges.[58] Instead, it was a remnant of an earlier approach to higher education which the new governing class did not support. Trinity attracted the allegiance of what remained of the old oligarchy--men such as John Beverley Robinson, its first Chancellor and Strachan's former pupil. While Trinity was an anachronism in one sense, its founding was of a piece with the rising pride and self-consciousness of the old Loyalist elite at mid-century. It was fitting that the grand procession to the stone-laying ceremony in 1851 was marshalled by Major George Taylor Denison, whose more famous son would attend Trinity College later in the decade.[59]

The Oxford model had been shifted to the periphery of university development in Upper Canada, and it met the same fate in the other provinces. While King's at Windsor survived as a small church college,[60] its counterpart at Fredericton experienced a transformation similar to that which occurred at Toronto.

Once again, at Fredericton, the curricular issue was central. King's had begun teaching in the 1820s at the college level, and under the presidency of Dr. Edwin Jacob its curriculum had changed little during the course of many years. A graduate of Oxford and an Anglican divine, Jacob linked the survival of true

religion at King's to the preservation of the classical course, untainted by vocational studies.[61] The British scientist, Sir Charles Lyell, wrote of King's in 1852 that it had been "rendered useless and almost without scholars, owing to an old-fashioned Oxonian of Corpus Christi, Oxford, having been made head, and determining that lectures in Aristotle are all that the youth in a new colony ought to study, or other subjects on the strict plan which may get honours at Oxford."[62] Lyell exaggerated somewhat, for, while there was no science taught at King's for many years, chairs in chemistry and natural philosophy were created by 1840 and filled by Scots who would mix practical research with their college duties. Without the approval or the cooperation of the college authorities, they undertook series of public lectures intended to introduce the people of New Brunswick to the material benefits of scientific knowledge.[63]

This growing emphasis upon useful knowledge in the 1840s helped to push King's along the road to secularization. Pressures for reform from within joined forces with public agitation against the college as a Tory stronghold, which was said to provide an impractical form of education which could only serve as "a luxury confined to the aspirations of the few."[64] The campaign for curricular reform was led by the Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, Sir Edmund Head,

who appointed a reform commission modelled after the body which helped to guide Oxford into the modern world during the 1850s. Its members included Egerton Ryerson and J.W. Dawson, superintendant of education in Nova Scotia and a "protege and disciple" of Sir Charles Lyell.[65] The commission reported that the course of study ought to

> embrace those Branches of Learning which are usually taught in colleges both in Great Britain and the United States,--and Special Courses of Instruction adapted to the Agricultural, Mechanical, Manufacturing, and Commercial pursuits and interests of New Brunswick; and that the subjects and modes of Instruction in the Sciences and Modern Languages (including English, French and German) should have a practical reference to those pursuits and interests.[66]

Although some of these goals would not be met for many years, the University of New Brunswick Act of 1859 determined that King's would be replaced by a non-denominational teaching university whose destiny would be linked to the practical needs of the people of the province.[67]

Another college which underwent a secularization process and was moved in the direction of vocational and scientific studies during the 1850s was McGill. Despite an early interest in an English-speaking arts college for Montreal, McGill did not begin arts instruction until 1843. Stanley Frost writes that at this young college the "typical day consisted of two and one half hours of classical literature in the

morning, followed after a lunch break by one hour of mathematics and a further half hour of classics." Few students were attracted to McGill; enrolments during the 1840s were often less than ten; and the institution was in faltering financial health.[68]

In the following decade, McGill College was re-organized and made more responsive to the needs of its constituency.[69] A new principal was appointed in 1855, and William Dawson's credentials could hardly have been better. He was a scientist, a deeply religious man who nevertheless believed in the separation of church and college. He was a graduate of Pictou Academy and the University of Edinburgh, and had served on the commission which was to transform King's at Fredericton. In his inaugural address, Dawson declared that higher education must be tailored to the needs of the society it is to serve, and, in essence, that the more people who could go to university, the better. In the true spirit of utilitarianism, Dawson announced that at McGill "we should be content with nothing less than the best possible education of the greatest possible number."[70]

The Church of England colleges which became public institutions during the late 1840s and the 1850s adopted the basic ideals of the educational philosophy first championed by men such as McCulloch and Ryerson: namely, breadth and utility of subject matter. Because

the impetus for reform in the new universities was unfettered by denominational concerns, very little time would pass before they would go farther than such colleges as Victoria and Queen's in pursuing utilitarian goals. For just a brief period, however, before the new universities curricula became truly secularized, there was something close to a consensus amongst English-Canadian educators regarding the purpose and essential subject matter of the liberal arts course.

## THE TRADITIONAL ARTS CURRICULUM IN MID-VICTORIAN CANADA

By the 1850s, the course of study in use at most centres of higher learning in English-Canada was that which has come to be known as the "traditional" arts curriculum. The arts course was by no means identical from one college to another; nor was it static in content from year to year. But it can be said to have typically included Latin and Greek, both pure and applied mathematics, various branches of elementary science, courses in philosophy which went by a variety of names, and, finally, some university subjects of a modern cast, such as history, English literature, and other modern European languages.

It is in this period that one can locate the original meaning--in Canada, at least--of the term "general education." Constituting a definite reaction

against the narrow specialization of the Oxford model, the course at mid-century was, in Ryerson's words,

> not one to make a specialist, but to gain a broad outlook over the varied fields of human thought, and to give a sound mental training in the use of language, in exact reasoning, in the observation of nature, in the development of the intuitive convictions, especially in morals, and in the deduction of general truths from observed facts in the physical world and in history.[71]

The educational philosophy of this period had two unique features. Firstly, the arts course was genuinely regarded as being a survey of <u>all</u> of the branches of useful knowledge, and secondly, it was believed to be the most valuable form of training that a man could acquire. It was the breadth of subject matter in the traditional arts course, along with the certainty that all the important branches of human knowledge were represented in proper measure, that would make the memory of it so attractive to twentieth century educators.

The concept of utility was more important than is sometimes recognised, and was applied, in fact, to more than one process involved in the acquisition of a liberal education. It not only referred to the accumulation of useful knowledge, but to the training of the mind in a more fundamental sense. The factual knowledge provided by such courses as chemistry, French and navigation was certainly valued, but a primary objective of the curriculum was the enlargement of

mental capabilities or "faculties." As the utilitarian philosopher Henry Sidgewick explained:

> A liberal education has for its object to impart the highest culture, to lead youths to the most full, vigorous, and harmonious exercise, according to the best ideal attainable, of their active, cognitive, and aesthetic faculties.[72]

The utility of a liberal education thus referred to both the absorption of the content of the various courses <u>and</u> the development of skills which were believed to increase the efficiency of the student's mind.

Neither of these ideas is foreign to twentieth century educational thought, but words such as "faculties" and "mental training" had a particular philosophical meaning in the mid-nineteenth century, when the doctrines of faculty psychology held sway in both England and North America.[73] The notion that the mind is divided into compartments, each of which controls a certain ability or trait of personality, has a history stretching back to ancient Greece. But it reached its height of influence in English-speaking countries during the last century, both on a formal, philosophical level--in the work of Kant, for example— and on a popular level, in the rage for phrenology.[74] Its effect upon educational theory was profound.

Each subject in the arts curriculum was believed to have a special role to play in developing the mental faculties; in each, writes Frederick Rudolph, "inhered

a special promise."[75] In Canada, faculty psychology was used to justify the expansion of the curriculum during the 1840s and the move away from an over-specialized classical program. Once that goal was accomplished, the theory was then applied to conservative ends. The belief that every subject played a part in mental training helped to protect, for a while, the compulsory sequencing of courses, and the emphasis on balance further discouraged tampering. Many educators argued that the "fixed course" of the mid-nineteenth century arts college was structured to give just the right weight to each of the several disciplines. The link between curricular balance and the right development of the student's character was expressed with clarity by Egerton Ryerson when he described Victoria's course of study as being

> intended to maintain such a proportion between the different branches of literature and science, as to form a proper symmetry and balance of character. In laying the foundation of a thorough education, it is necessary that all the important faculties be brought into exercise. When certain mental endowments receive a much higher culture than others, there is a distortion in the intellectual character. The powers of the mind are not developed in the fairest proportion by studying languages alone, or mathematics alone, or natural or political science alone. The object of the Collegiate course is not to teach what is peculiar to any one of the professions; but to lay the foundation which is common to all.[76]

This belief in faculty psychology was supported by the overriding preoccupation with religion in the mid-Victorian college. A balanced character was an

essential prerequisite to personal morality, and, in Ryerson's view, the highest aspiration of every discipline was to help students to "discern the will of God."[77] In the curricula of all English-Canadian universities, whether they were under secular or clerical control, it was accepted that purely intellectual ambitions--arising from a lust for knowledge for its own sake--must be discouraged. Students should pursue "only that knowledge which it concerns us to know," and it should be balanced always by the guidance afforded by a proportionate development of the moral and spiritual faculties.[78] "Study without prayer is arrogance," warned Principal Nelles of Victoria, "prayer without study is fanaticism; and neither arrogance nor fanaticism will find true wisdom."[79]

It was commonly believed, as A.B. McKillop has shown, that God imparted true knowledge only to those who sought it reverentially and with moral ends in view. James George, Professor of Philosophy at Queen's, cautioned that "if the intellect be severed from God, and the heart in opposition to Him, the mind can give forth nothing but mere corruscations of light, which rather bewilder than guide." George darkly warned that both personal salvation and civilization itself depended upon the discipline of intellect by Christian morality. "The highest intellectual power without piety," he declared, is "but a Satanic light, leading

in the end to the darkness of the pit." Civilization is not defined by its wealth, achievements, or "polished manners," but by "the conscience and intellect of a people fully cultivated, and the intellect in all cases acting under the direction of an enlightened conscience."[80]

While all parts of the curriculum had an important role to play, philosophy was the subject specifically intended to teach the student how to discipline one part of his mind "through adherence to the dictates of another."[81] Moral philosophy was tied in with the prevailing curricular philosophy in two ways. For one thing, by far the most popular school of philosophy in English-speaking universities on both continents was the common sense philosophy of Thomas Reid, Dugald Stewart, and William Hamilton, which held that the mind is divided into "senses" and that the moral sense has the capacity--intuitively, or through common sense--to arrive at moral truth.[82] The actual undergraduate course in moral philosophy taught this theory to students, and, at the same time, attempted to ensure that it was vindicated in the character of the graduates who issued forth from the colleges. It was intended to imbue students with an understanding of their duties to God, society and themselves by teaching them, as Ryerson said, how to apply "the cardinal principles of the Scripture to the various relations and circum-

stances of human life."[83]

Moral philosophy was normally taught in the final year of the arts course, and another of its tasks was to synthesize all that had been learned and ensure that no branch of knowledge had the appearance of contradicting or challenging another. The student could then proceed into the wider world with a confident understanding of the universe and his place in it. As Rudolph writes of the senior course in moral philosophy at American universities: it "justified the curriculum; it rationalized it. It asserted the unity of knowledge, and sent the young graduates out into the world with a reassuring sense of their own fitness to play a role in upholding the moral order."[84]

The philosophy course also symbolized the moral authority of the faculty within the college and in society itself. The nineteenth century university exercised parental control over the student body, and the president, in particular, played the part of a patriarch. It was he, in the early years of Canadian universities, who normally taught the course in moral philosophy, and as it gradually became more common for arts faculties to create separate chairs of philosophy, the scholars who occupied them were distinguished by their social and moral conservatism. Such men as James Beaven, William Lyall and James George dedicated themselves to the task of blocking all avenues to

religious doubt, and convincing students that whatever they learned of the ways of nature or society, all events and relationships must be understood as fragments of one grand design.[85]

Just as the reformers who had fought for responsible government had moved towards the conservative side of the political spectrum by the 1850s, so the English Canadian university, generally speaking, had emerged as a bastion of mid-Victorian, middle-class mores and political opinions. The fixed curriculum taught--or was intended to teach--young men to revere authority and accept the decisions of those placed above them. The faculty decided what students should study and believe in; the students did not choose.

The balanced curriculum of the mid-nineteenth century was also designed to protect religious orthodoxy from the challenge posed by science. In philosophy, students were taught that the mysteries of nature would be revealed only to those who were in God's favour. James George taught that scientists who approach their subject reverentially would be the ones who would succeed. "The high priests whom God admits within the veil of nature to see its hidden laws, are those who approach the Holy of Holies with clean hands and a pure heart."[86] The urge to contain scientific thought was displayed at the most secular institutions and by professors--including scientists themselves--other-

wise progessive in their educational views. Principal William Dawson devoted his career to making McGill a centre of scientific research, yet his approach to his subject was self-limiting in the same sense as that of his mentor, Charles Lyell.[87] A lifelong opponent of Charles Darwin's theories, Dawson wrote not long before his death that "in so far as I have had any success as a teacher of Natural Science it has been due to my reverend regard for every material object, as the handiwork of the Divine Creator."[88] Scientific investigation in the mid-Victorian university was circumscribed, as Walter Meltzer has written, not merely by "the action of forces alien and antipathetic to science, but by the inhibitions present within science itself."[89]

A subject of study which invariably appeared in the arts curriculum of the 1850s and 1860s was "Evidences of Christianity." It involved a careful reading of William Paley's work of the same name, which was first published in 1794. Here was yet another aspect of the arts course which performed the function of reconciling scientific discovery and religious faith. *Evidences of Christianity* is a lengthy analysis of the various branches of science, which attempts to prove that all the evidence found in nature points to the accuracy of the Biblical account of creation. McKillop has considered "the prevalence of Paley" at some length

in A Disciplined Intelligence, and the purpose of the course is succinctly revealed in an examination question from 1882 which he has quoted. The examiners required students to "Shew how according to Paley (a) the unity (b) the goodness of God are evidenced by the works of nature."[90] In these few words one sees three fundamental tenets: that nature reveals God's design; that the design embodies a "unity;" and finally, that it is "good."

The classics remained central to the arts curriculum, although their position was being challenged by the growing emphasis upon useful learning. In an attempt to protect their disciplines from decline, classicists in the middle decades of the nineteenth century adopted the doctrine of faculty psychology and built a case for the supremacy of ancient languages which, in the long run, did them little good. Professor Kingsley at Yale (and others throughout the English-speaking world) argued that the study of the classics "forms the most effectual discipline of the mental faculties ... Every faculty of the mind is employed."[91] Their very difficulty and obscurity were held up as advantages, and the habit of studying mainly the structure and use of language rather than the content of the ancient texts was reinforced. This approach was increasingly unattractive to students, and it was true in Canada as well as in the United States that "what

favoured the modern languages was dislike of the ancient languages."[92] It could be said, furthermore, that all of the rising humanities subjects, namely, French, German, Spanish, Italian, "Oriental" languages (meaning Hebrew and other Semetic languages), English, and history, established themselves at the expense of the classics.

The modern languages first appeared in the arts curriculum during the 1840s, but were not taken very seriously at first. Their instructors were quite commonly adventurers from Europe with little experience as teachers. Toronto's first modern languages professor was described by auditor-general John Langton in 1856 as "a very worthy pudding-headed old Italian" hired upon the principle, "which seems to be accepted elsewhere as well as in Canada, that foreign languages are safe in the hands of a foreigner."[93] Such men were usually paid less and most did not have the prestige emjoyed by other faculty members.[94] Their status would improve towards the end of the century when all languages were placed on an equal footing, and it became possible for students to substitute modern languages for classics in the upper years of their course.

The subject of history also emerged as something of a challenge to the classical disciplines, although it did not play an important part in the traditional arts curriculum. Robin Harris counts only three pro-

fessors of history in Canada in 1860,[95] and one of these, Daniel Wilson at Toronto, has left a record of his frustration at trying to establish history as a subject distinct from the classics during the early part of his career. For several years Wilson had to contend with the conservative biases of both Beaven and McCaul, neither of whom were sympathetic to his goals. He wrote after his arrival in 1853 that McCaul "wants me to make it a Chair of Ancient History, being imbued with all the old exclusive preference for everything classical." Wilson was soon teaching some British history, but found himself constrained by "the dearth of books here" which he said was "something dreadful."[96]

Limited as it was, the teaching of history was closely linked to the subject of English, and at colleges where both were taught they sometimes combined into a patchy history of British political and intellectual life over the centuries. One should not lose sight of the fact that English was primarily studied in the form of rhetoric and was gradually replacing the classics as the vehicle for teaching language skills, but, at some universities, students also studied the history of English literature, although they seldom read the literary works themselves. William Spalding's text was most commonly used, and its table of contents reveals that the concept of literature was not confined to imaginative writings

but included philosophy, history, and essays on all manner of subjects which might "aid in the right guidance of youthful feeling."[97] The emphasis was not on aesthetic appreciation, but on the values embodied in literature and their interpretation in a historical context.

The curriculum at mid-century was the product of both material circumstances and the intellectual climate in England and North America. A legacy of the Oxford model was the classics' lingering strength, for Latin and Greek were still considered essential components in the broadened curriculum of the 1850s. They were also less expensive to teach than the sciences or a more varied set of offerings. The extent to which arts programs embraced new areas of learning depended not only on their acceptance as useful subjects but also on the presence of professors at least minimally qualified to teach them. Arts faculties were very small, and if, for example, French or English were not taught at any given institution, it might only have meant that no one was available to teach these languages. Some subjects, including the sciences, were presented only at a very elementary level, and the arts curriculum in general offered but a superficial introduction to the expanding world of knowledge.

Despite its shortcomings, the arts course at mid-century embodied a sense of confidence that would never be recaptured. This confidence was based on the faith that the disciplines then taught represented the full extent of human learning, and that each subject constituted a part of the "unity" of knowledge. Intellectual, moral, material, and social benefits were all believed to proceed from the same educational pattern. A liberal education was valuable because it trained the mind to the full use of its powers, and developed the moral sense as it expanded the intellect. The arts course was also useful in a more worldly way, for the knowledge it offered was regarded as the basis for success in any occupation. Only during this period in curricular history were these two educational philosophies--mental training and vocational training--fully compatible, and on that compatibility rested the apparent stability of the traditional arts course.

NOTES

1 See F.W. Vroom, King's College: A Chronicle 1789-1939 (Halifax, 1941) 1-9.

2 Frederick Rudolph, Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study since 1636 (San Francisco, 1978) 47.

3 W.S. MacNutt, "The Universities of the Maritimes --a Glance Backward," DR 53 (1973-4) 431. For the clergy's response to revolution, see S.F. Wise, "Sermon Literature and Canadian Intellectual History," in Canadian History Before Confederation (ed.) J.M. Bumsted (Georgetown, 1979) 249-262.

4 Charles Inglis to Richard Cumberland (5 May 1790) quoted in M.H. Thomas, "The Memoirs of Thomas Cochran," New York Historial Society Quarterly 38 (1954) 76.

5 See Judith Fingard, The Anglican Design in Loyalist Nova Scotia 1783-1816 (London, 1972), 149-58. Some historians have maintained that the original design for King's was more liberal than the one which became law in 1802, when the college received its charter. See MacNutt, "The Universities of the Maritmes," 432-3; John G. Reid, Mount Allison University: A History to 1963, Vol I: 1843-1914 (Toronto, 1984), 13, Vroom, King's College, Ch. 4. Vroom portrays Judge Alexander Croke as "the evil genius" of the college, and his claim that Inglis protested the exclusion of dissenters has been generally accepted. Fingard's examination of the primary evidence refutes this notion, see The Anglican Design, 218. It is probable, though, that once Inglis realized how such an exclusive policy would affect enrolments, that he favoured the administering of religious texts at graduation rather than at matriculation, as instructed in 1806.

6 Gerald T. Rimmington, "The Founding of Universities in Nova Scotia," DR 46 (1966), 321.

7 Vroom, King's College, 37.

8 Book III, Of Moral Conduct and Behaviour, The Statues, Rules and Ordinances of the University of King's College at Windsor in the Province of Nova Scotia (1807), quoted in Vroom, King's College, 41.

9 Book IV, Of Habits, The Statutes ... of the University of King's College, Ibid.

10 See the course of study at King's in 1814 described in Robin Harris, A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663-1960 (Toronto, 1976), 30.

11 Sheldon Rothblatt, Tradition and Change in English Liberal Education (London, 1976), 78; Vroom, King's College, 50.

12 Rothblatt, Tradition and Change, 64-6.

13 Vroom, King's College, 37.

14 Rothblatt, Tradition and Change, 65. Cicero appears in each year of the program in 1814, and Quintilian was added "by order of the governors, to be read by Dr. Cochran ... as an introductory book on rhetoric." Thomas B. Akins, A Brief Account of the Origin, Endowment, and Progress of the University of King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia (Halifax, 1865), 73.

15 Alfred G. Bailey, "Early Foundations, 1783-1829," in The University of New Brunswick Memorial Volume (ed.) A.G. Bailey (Fredericton, 1950), 17-18; Desmond Pacey, "The Humanist Tradition," in The University of New Brunswick, (ed.) Bailey, 57-8.

16 Charles Inglis, "Steadfastness in Religion and Loyalty Recommended, in a Sermon Preached before the Legislature of His Majesty's Province of Nova Scotia, in the Parish of St. Paul, at Halifax on Sunday, April 7, 1793" (Halifax, 1793), 18, quoted in Wise, "Sermon Literature," 258.

17 G.G. McNab, The Development of Higher Education in Ontario (Toronto, 1925), 9.

18 For Simcoe's ambitions for Toronto society, see R.J. Burns, "God's Chosen People: The Origins of Toronto Society, 1793-1818," in Canadian History Before Confederation (ed.) Bumsted, 264-6.

19 George W. Spragge, "Introduction," The John Strachan Letter Book: 1812-1834 (ed.) Spragge (Toronto, 1946), xiii.

20 See McNab, The Development of Higher Education, 24-32; W. Stewart Wallace, A History of the University of Toronto, 1827-1927 (Toronto, 1927), Ch. 1.

21 Michael Sanderson, The Universities in the Nineteenth Century (ed.) Sanderson (London, 1975), 31-3.

22 "Proposed Curriculum of King's College University in 1842," in Historical and Other Papers and Documents Illustrative of the Educational System of Ontario, 1792-1853 (ed.) J. George Hodgins (Toronto, 1911), Vol. I, 215. Strachan had included science in his curriculum when he was a school master at Cornwall, see Gerald M. Craig, "John Strachan," in the Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol. 9. Later, he added his voice to those of reformers and radicals who criticized Upper Canada College, which was founded by Lieutenant-Governor Colborne in 1829, for being too restricted in its offerings after the fashion of an English public school. See Historical and Other Papers Vol I, 203. For the founding and nature of Upper Canada College, see McNab, The Development of Higher Education, 30-3. He also recommended a broad curriculum for McGill College, and cautioned against trying to pattern it after Oxford, a model--so he felt in 1815--which was "unfit for this country." See Strachan to Sam Sherwood (14 Feb. 1815) in The John Strachan Letter Book, 68. For Strachan's early involvement with McGill, see Stanley Bryce Frost, McGill University: For the Advancement of Learning, Vol. I, 1801-1895 (Montreal, 1980), Ch. 2. Despite his practical bent, a more conservative curricular outlook would triumph at his own colleges.

23 "Proposed Curriculum of King's College University in 1842," 215.

24 King's College, Toronto, Proceedings at the Ceremony of Laying the Foundation Stone, April 23, 1842, and at the Opening of the University, June 8, 1843 (1843), 21, 24.

25 Ibid., 48-9, 25.

26 Ibid., 56-7.

27 John Irving, "The Development of Philosophy in Central Canada from 1850 to 1900," CHR 31 (1950), 255, 258.

28 Harold L. Scammell, "The Rise and Fall of a College," DR 32 (1952), 35-44.

29 Reid, Mount Allison University, Vol. I, 16. When Dalhousie's Board of Governors decided that all faculty must be of the Presbyterian faith, a classicist of the Baptist persuasion was excluded from

his anticipated position.

30 Ibid., 16-17.

31 McNab, The Development of Higher Education, 34-5.

32 Gale to Norris (25 April 1839) quoted in Hilda Neatby, Queen's University, Vol. I 1841-1917 (Montreal, 1978), 23-4.

33 R.K. Webb writes that the appearance of "'the godless institution in Gower Street' led to the founding in London in 1831 of the Anglican King's College. In 1836, the original university, renamed University College, and King's were united in a new University of London, a purely examining and degree-granting institution to which many other colleges and schools have since been attached." Modern England from the 18th Century to the Present (New York, 1968), 182.

34 D.C. Harvey, An Introduction to the History of Dalhousie University (Halifax, 1938), 54. Also see John Irving, "The Achievement of Thomas McCulloch," in Thomas McCulloch, The Stepsure Letters (ed.) New Canadian Library (Toronto, 1960), 150-6. For radicalism at Pictou, see J.M. Beck, "Joseph Howe: Mild Tory to Reforming Assemlyman," in Canadian History Since Confederation, 470.

35 Alison Prentice, The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada (Toronto, 1977), 71, 90. Prentice is quoting Ryerson's Inaugural Address at Victoria College in 1842.

36 Harvey, An Introduction to the History of Dalhousie, 54-5.

37 Reid, Mount Allison University, Vol. I, 9-10; Richard Stewart Longley, Acadia University 1838-1938 (Wolfville, 1939), 32, 50-2.

38 See Douglas Owram, "Strachan and Ryerson: Guardians of the Future," Canadian Literature 83 (1979), 21-31, for these men's shared abhorrence of the idea of secular education.

39 Edinburgh Review (Oct. 1909), 50-1, in The Universities in the Nineteenth Century, 35-6.

40 Statement by the Council of the University of London Explanatory of the Nature and Objects of the Instruction (London, 1827) in The Universities in the Nineteenth Century, 60.

41 Quoted in D.C. Masters, *Protestant Church Colleges in Canada: a History* (1966), 3.

42 Quoted in Harvey, *An Introduction to the History of Dalhousie*, 50-4.

43 Ibid., 52-4.

44 Inaugural Address on the Nature and Advantages of an English and Liberal Education, delivered by the Rev. Egerton Ryerson (Toronto, 1942), 15, quoted in C.B. Sissons, *A History of Victoria University* (Toronto, 1952), 47.

45 Ryerson, Inaugural Address, quoted in Sissons, *Egerton Ryerson: His Life and Letters* (Toronto, 1947), 24.

46 Ryerson to the Provincial Secretary (20 Dec. 1842) quoted in Nathaniel Burwash, *A History of Victoria College* (1927), 105.

47 Ryerson to Bagot (10 Sept. 1842) in *Historical and Other Papers*, Vol. IV, 219.

48 Wallace, *A History of the University of Toronto*, 49-52.

49 Ibid., 48-9.

50 Ibid., 52.

51 Strachan to J. Harris (22 July 1846) in *John Strachan: Documents and Opinions* (ed.) J.L.H. Henderson (Toronto, 1969), 186.

52 J. King, *McCaul, Croft, Forneri: Personalities of Early University Days* (1914), 63-4.

53 Wallace, *A History of the University of Toronto*, 44.

54 King, *McCaul, Croft, Forneri*, 134-5.

55 See Carl Berger, *Science, God and Nature in Victorian Canada* (Toronto, 1983), Ch. 1.

56 Pastoral Letter (7 Feb. 1850) quoted in Masters, *Protestant Church Colleges*, 52.

57 T.C. Street, "The Arts Colleges--Trinity College" in *The University of Toronto and its Colleges, 1827-1906* (ed.) the Librarian (Toronto, 1906), 139.

58 T.A. Reed, *A History of the University of Trinity College* (Toronto, 1952), 53-4; Harris, *A History of Higher Education in Canada*, 40.

59 Reed, *A History of the University of Trinity College*, 43; Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power* (Toronto, 1970), 15. Young Denison was expelled from Trinity for "insolent and insubordinate" behaviour.

60 Vroom, *King's College*, Ch.9 and Ch. 10.

61 Francis Firth, "King's College, New Brunswick: 1829-1859," in *The University of New Brunswick*, 25-7.

62 Lyell to Horner (12 Sept. 1852) quoted in Richard A. Jarrell, "Science Education in the University of New Brunswick in the Nineteenth Century," *Acadiensis* 11 (1973), 57.

63 Jarrell, "Science Education," 58-61.

64 Firth, "King's College," 30.

65 See Frost, *McGill University*, Vol. I, 181; Reid, *Mount Allison University*, Vol. I, 75.

66 Quoted in *Documentary History of Higher Education In Upper Canada* (ed.) J. George Hodgins (1906) Vol. 16, 3.

67 Reid, *Mount Allison University*, Vol. I, 75-8.

68 Frost, *McGill University*, Vol. I, 115, 121.

69 Ibid., 173.

70 Ibid., 185, quoting Dawson's inaugural address.

71 Ryerson, Inaugural Address, quoted in Burwash, *A History of Victoria College*, 189-90.

72 Henry Sidgewick, in *Essays on a Liberal Education* (ed.) F.W. Farrar (London, 1967), 222, quoted in Rothblatt, *Tradition and Change*, 147.

73 Rothblatt, *Tradition and Change*, 126. Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum*, 68; Lawrence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago, 1965), 23.

74 Rothblatt, *Tradition and Change*, 126-31.

75 Rudolph, Curriculum, 68-9.

76 Ryerson, Inaugural Address, quoted in Sissons, Egerton Ryerson, 24.

77 A.B. McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era (Montreal, 1979),20.

78 Ibid., 19

79 Ibid., 6. McKillop is quoting Nelles' speech as paraphrased by Sissons in A History of Victoria College, 95.

80 James George, The Relation between Piety and Intellectual Labour. An Address Deli vered at the Opening of the 14th Session of Queen's College (Kingston, 1855), 9, quoted in McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence, 40; John Irving, "The Development of Philosophy in Central Canada."

81 McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence, 19.

82 Ibid., Ch. 2.

83 Ryerson, Inaugural Address, quoted in McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence, 19.

84 Rudolph, Curriculum, 90.

85 See McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence, 44-52, 72; F.H. Page, "William Lyle and his Setting," DR 60 (1980), 49-60; University of Toronto Archives, A83-0036/006 University Historian, File: Department of Philosophy, T.A. Goudge and John Slater, "Instruction and Research in Philosophy at the University of Toronto: a Historical Sketch."

86 George, The Relation between Piety and Intellectual Labour, in McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence, 62.

87 See Susan Gliserman, "Early Victorian Science Writers and Tennyson's In Memoriam: A Study in Cultural Exchange," Victorian Studies 18 (1975), 277-308, 437-459.

88 William Dawson, Fifty Years of Work in Canada, Scientific and Educational (London, 1901), viii; and see Mario Creet, "H.M. Tory and the Secularization of Canadian Universities," QQ 88 (1981), 720.

89 Walter P. Meltzer, Academic Freedom in the Age of the University (New York, 1955), 18.

90 McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence, 62-5.

91 Reports ... in Yale College (1828), quoted in Rudolph, Curriculum, 71; and see Rothblatt, Tradition and Change, 130.

92 Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, 24; Rudolph, Curriculum, 63.

93 "A Letter about University Affairs" (12 Nov. 1856), quoted in Early Days in Upper Canada (ed.) W.A. Langton (Toronto, 1926). James Forneri was the first professor of Modern Languages in University College, where he taught from 1853 to 1865. He had been a cavalry officer under Napoleon, it was said, and eventually became a refugee in London, where he taught Italian to earn a living. He emigrated to Nova Scotia in 1851.

94 See Harris, A History of Higher Education, 47; J. Audrey Lippincott, "Dalhousie College in the Sixties," DR 16 (1936-7), 288; Rudolph, Curriculum, 63-6 for similar attitudes in the U.S. Joseph Marshall at the University of New Brunswick (titled the second Baron d'Avray) was an exception; he was a professor on an equal footing with his colleagues. Masters, Protestant Church Colleges, 71-2.

95 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 50.

96 H.H. Langton, Sir Daniel Wilson: A Memoir (1929), 59, 63-4. He quotes a letter written by Wilson on 12 Nov. 1853.

97 William Spalding, The History of English Literature (London, 1875), 1.

# CHAPTER 2

# Chapter 2

## Honours and Options: a New Curricular Ideology

The traditional arts curriculum was never a discrete entity. It emerged out of the Oxford model, and its composition was constantly changing as the classics gradually made way for more science and modern languages. Its survival depended less on the sameness of its content from one year to the next than on the perpetuation of certain philosophical assumptions on which it was based. One of these was the concept of balance, which dictated that students must be exposed to a range of disciplines in order for their minds to develop properly. These different subjects were tied together by the overarching preoccupation with Christian faith and morality which suffused the entire course of study. It was also assumed that, if balance and unity were to be maintained, the authority of the institution to dictate what disciplines were studied --and in what order--could not be challenged.

But the stability of the traditional arts curriculum would not survive the secularization of higher learning during the last half of the nineteenth century. Even before the decade of the 1850s had ended, its precepts were already losing their influence in at least one institution in English-Canada and would do so elsewhere before long. The philosophy of general

education which informed the traditional curriculum was gradually overturned so that, by the end of the century, the principles of specialization and individual choice were not only accepted at the most prominent universities in English Canada, but had become closely associated with a new ideal of intellectual achievement.

The University of Toronto was the first institution to introduce options in the liberal arts course, and it also provided leadership to the rest of English Canada in the evolution of honours work. These innovations were opposed, at first, by the denominational colleges of Ontario, whose authorities recognised that the dismantling of the traditional curriculum was bound to be a secularizing force. But it soon became obvious that the new system was here to stay, and was just part of a much broader movement towards specialized learning in North America and Europe. What distinguished curricular reform in Canada from the more dramatic change to free election which occurred in the United States was the way the honours course preserved the idea of a structured course of study while abandoning the traditional emphasis on breadth in favour of high achievement in one discipline. Through this process, however, the old notion of general education was relegated to second-class status in the most prominent institution in English-Canada.

SPECIALIZATION VERSUS TRADITION

The introduction of specialization through honours work at Toronto opened a rift in the educational philosophy of Ontario's institutions of higher learning and played an important part in the acrimonious inquiry into the "University Question" which took place in 1860. During lengthy public hearings, the colleges accused the university of lowering educational standards by permitting specialization, and of wasting public funds by hiring professors to teach unnecessary optional courses. Even though the colleges genuinely disapproved of the university's curricular innovations on philosophical grounds, these objections were mixed with a more self-serving desire to discredit the provincial institution in order to secure an equal portioning of the university's endowment, which it had inherited from the financially privileged King's College. A particularly striking aspect of the proceedings was the fact that college authorities who had formerly espoused a curricular philosophy broad enough to meet the practical needs of "the people" now rallied against the democratizing tendencies of the state institution.

The concept of honours work was not, in itself, unique to the University of Toronto in the 1850s, nor did the term originally refer to a program which specialized in one or two disciplines. It had been a long-standing practice at some colleges to award

honours standing to students with superior examination results in all subjects. The term acquired a second meaning when colleges began to exact more work, in every discipline, from candidates for honours degrees, but still required that they study all of the subjects in the traditional curriculum. Victoria College's Calendar for 1863 advised that all honours students were "required to pursue the same course, and the estimate of merit will be based on an aggregate of all the subjects of the curriculum."[1] Slightly different again, however, were the regulations at Queen's and McGill, which permitted students to receive honours degrees in particular disciplines. This was achieved through the writing of extra examinations in the area of specialization, but did not involve the omission of pass work in other subjects.[2] None of these schemes posed an overt threat to the structure and unity of the arts curriculum, because no area of knowledge deemed essential to mental development was cast aside.

Meanwhile, at Toronto, a new concept of honours work had been conceived. Halfway through the university's first decade, new regulations were introduced which permitted options, specialization, and the elimination of portions of the pass course for honours students. Toronto's Calendar for 1859-60 advised that "Candidates for Honours in any department who have also in the first year obtained University first-class

Honours, either in Greek, or Latin, or Mathematics, or in both Modern Languages and Natural Sciences, are not required to take any branch in which they have passed the University Examinations the first year ...".[3] The opportunity for concentration appeared first at Toronto because the endowment enabled the university to hire additional staff members during the early 1850s, and also because the pressure for reform emanating from within the provincial university had the support of a large portion of the Ontario electorate. Vice-chancellor John Langton and his ally in the Senate, Professor Daniel Wilson, were leaders in the campaign for honours specialization, and they had the backing of Grit politician and Globe editor George Brown in the public realm.[4] The agricultural and business interests of Canada West, whom Brown represented, approved of curricular reforms which would permit liberal education to become specialized and therefore tailored to suit specific vocational goals, and they considered such practical aims to be the mandate of the provincial university.

The church colleges found this trend alarming. Their loud opposition, which culminated in the inquiry by a Select Committee of the House of Assembly in 1860, was motivated by a tangled collection of religious, philosophical, and financial considerations. Clearly, the university was in the process of secularizing its

course of study, for it had begun to place the material and social needs of its constituency above spiritual concerns. Such a development might have been tolerable if the colleges had been able to pursue their more traditional objectives on an equal footing with the provincial university, but that was not possible unless an equitable sharing of the endowment could be secured. As things stood, denominational college authorities felt they must oppose any move towards expansion on Toronto's part, for the government's policy seemed to be "to build up one College, and by its ample Endowments, its numerous Scholarships, and its magnificent buildings, to crush all others."[5]

The motives of the university's assailants were clearly mixed. Financial jealousy underlay the objections posed by Queen's and Victoria to the new system of options and honours work, but they were perfectly sincere in their accusations that Toronto had been caught in the act, as they saw it, of lowering academic standards and undermining the purpose of higher education. Egerton Ryerson was predictably critical of the way that the university had apparently abandoned its allegiance to balance and mental discipline in the arts curriculum and charged that a student might "not have studied a work of Greek or Latin or solved a problem in algebra or demonstrated a proposition in geometry after the first year of his

course of studies, and yet be a B.A. with honours."[6] The critics were further enflamed by the fact that the university had expanded its constituency beyond the classics-trained products of Upper Canada College by lowering its entrance requirements to coincide with the capacities of the ordinary secondary school graduate. This had been accomplished by removing certain Greek and Latin texts from the matriculation examination. The university course had then been lengthened to four years in order to compensate, but the church college officials charged that (for students who began to specialize in their second year) prescribed work in the classics no longer extended beyond the level formerly required for matriculation.[7]

The attempt to counteract the university's broadening curriculum and influence led the church college authorities into a position of retrenchment, favouring a classical emphasis and eschewing the concept of utility in higher education. They sought to prove that the university was squandering its funds by employing more than its original five professors, in order to teach subjects which had no place in a college education.[8] Egerton Ryerson, the former advocate of English literature, French, history, and all "useful" subjects, executed a startling about-face. When asked by the Committee if there should be a Professor of Agriculture in University College, Toronto, he replied:

"I certainly think not ... I do not think any practical instruction on such subjects can be given in University." Deprecating the chair of modern languages at Toronto, he proposed that "the period of attendance at a University is not the time for studying Modern Languages," and that "the student's attention should be exclusively devoted to the recognised subjects of a University Education." Nor did he feel that the subjects of history or English belonged in the curriculum, at least not in the manner in which they were taught by his enemy, Daniel Wilson.[9] Political circumstances which favoured the state institution had caused Ryerson to grasp at straws, and it was small wonder that his protests were not taken seriously by the Select Committee.

Ryerson had been forced into a corner through his realization that he must abandon his earlier emphasis on useful learning if he did not wish to find himself promoting the secularization process. It became obvious during this period that if vocational goals were to be seriously pursued, a student must be allowed to choose and specialize, even at the expense of curricular unity and balance. For the believers in faculty psychology, who were convinced that a balanced mental and moral development was the Christian raison d'être of higher learning, this trend had serious implications. Ryerson accused the

university of flying in the face of the best wisdom of the day, and informed the Committee that

> it is not the object of ... Education to minister to individual tastes and whims,--not to deal out snatches of knowledge on various subjects, but to develop and discipline the powers of the mind, by a common course of application and exercises, sanctioned by the experience of ages.[10]

He and his colleagues were distressed, as well, by the increasing emphasis upon intellectual achievement which accompanied specialization and had expertise as its goal. The Reverend Joseph Stinson, President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, had fears that moral culture was already being neglected. If so, learning could become "a curse instead of a blessing," and make students "conceited, selfish, cunning, and unprincipled as individuals."[11]

The colleges' position was weakened by the fact that the irresistible rhetoric of democracy was now monopolized by the provincial institution. In the language first employed by dissenters and reformers much earlier in the century, Langton and Wilson defended their actions as being in the best interests of "the people." Langton justified changes in matriculation requirements by explaining that university regulations must "harmonize with the education that can be obtained out of its doors ... the real standard for entering the University, whatever it may be in theory, must be based on the standard of the Grammar Schools of the Country."[12] Wilson simply and in-

gratiatingly explained the honours system as being designed "to prepare the youth of Canada for the practical duties of life." His statement reveals much about the perceived relations between honours courses and the vocations open to young men in the years before Confederation and is worth quoting at length. Each student, Wilson told the Committee, approached the university authorities and sought advice "as to what options he should take," and then

> The matter is very simply dealt with. He is asked what is your object in life? If you intend to be a Medical man drop your Greek and Latin and go on with the Natural Sciences and Modern Languages, for every educated man in the Country, and especially every Medical man, ought to know at least French,--which here is a spoken language,--and German also. If the young man intends to become a Theological Student, to qualify himself for entering the Ministry of any of our churches, then we say go on with your Classics, your Moral Sciences, your Mental Philosophy. If he proposes to become a Grammar School Teacher, we say--go on with your Classics and Mathematics. If a Land Surveyor,--devote your chief attention to your Mathematics, Geology, and Mineralogy. If a Farmer,--and I hope that is a class of Students which will be found to multiply every year, for I trust we are to educate not merely professional men, but the youth of Canada generally; and men will make all the better Farmers and Merchants and Tradesmen for having highly cultivated minds,--if a Farmer, we say, go on with Modern Languages, and still more with Natural Sciences, which will be of practical use to you in all the future duties of life. Is there not common sense in that? Is that not the most rational system for Canada?[13]

The student body actively supported Wilson and his allies, and their enmity towards Ryerson was apparently expressed "in a college song which contained a very uncomplimentary rhyme on his name."[14] Public

opinion was guided by the Globe, which declared that "Reform has begun in a wise direction, when it is no longer deemed indispensable to cram down our provincial throats a whole educational system for no other reason but because it has the time-hallowed sanction of Oxford and Dublin."[15]

The strong appeal of such rhetoric was part of the reason why Ryerson and other church officials in Ontario found that they were fighting a battle which they could not possibly win. They were not to secure a division of the endowment, nor could they halt the curricular reformation underway at Toronto. They had every right to be uneasy, for these changes were of great import: the university had announced through its actions that it no longer took seriously the notion that personal morality was dependent upon a carefully balanced cultivation of the mental faculties, or that a proper education must necessarily reflect "the unity of knowledge" as traditionally conceived.

Toronto had taken the lead in Canada in a reform movement which was proceeding simultaneously in Great Britain and the United States. Its essence was secularization: from now on, the wants of society, not the dictates of a metaphysical system, would openly determine the content and structure of higher education. As Oxford reformer Mark Pattison put it, "In drawing a curriculum for a university, or fixing the subjects

to be studied, we must not be guided by the philosophical chart of human knowledge, absolutely conceived, but by the bearings of knowledge upon life."[16]

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

A vital shift in curricular philosophy was underway, and the closing decades of the nineteenth century would find almost all English-Canadian colleges and universities accepting the principle of options and specialization through honours work.[17] This widespread adoption of a new curricular philosophy involved a complex set of factors, including the newly popular idea that universities should encourage students to select courses which suited their individual abilities and the equally innovative notion that higher education involved the pursuit of new knowledge through specialization. Both of these concepts, once incorporated as educational values, helped to erode the authority of the college over the students' mental life, and both had a secularizing effect on higher learning. To give students a degree of control over what they studied was, in essence, to transfer a portion of the colleges' authority over the curriculum to society itself. And to encourage students to pursue specialized fields of learning was to accept that some would progress farther in their chosen disciplines than their professors had done--and that their objective was not

merely the mastery of old truths, but the discovery of new ones.

This new philosophy was believed, by those who promoted it, to be in the best public interest. But there was nothing novel about the idea that young people should be trained to serve society, for both the old classical curriculum and the general course of studies which had developed in its place were intended to produce graduates equipped to strengthen and preserve the social and moral fabric. What diminished after mid-century was the notion that society was best served by educating all of its young people according to a particular pattern, which had been designed and perpetuated by clerical authorities. As industrialization progressed and the socio-economic structure became more complex, it became evident that the community could profit more fully if each individual devoted himself to increasing the efficiency of just one of its many branches or functions. As President Eliot maintained while he introduced a system of free election at Harvard, "For the State, it is variety, not uniformity, of intellectual product which is needful."[18]

A more diversified and individualized curriculum appealed strongly to Canadians who had a vested interest in the country's prosperity and growth after Confederation. Sandford Fleming became Chancellor of Queen's University in 1880, and he looked forward

to the day when the curriculum would be arranged

> so as to cramp and dwarf no man's powers by forcing them into grooves which they cannot possibly fit. On the contrary, the fullest opportunity should be afforded for expanding the individual intellectual facilities in the direction in which nature intended they should grow. Individuality is one of the wants of our time, and if not the sole, it should certainly be a chief, end of a true education.[19]

Allan Smith provides evidence of how the ideal of individual talents, the demand for specialized training, and the "myth of the self-made man" became closely associated after 1850.[20] In both Canada and the United States, the exploitation of personal intellectual potential became something of a moral crusade in which the society, the individual, and even the Lord would all be better served. Certainly President Eliot was an inspiration to his followers when he spoke of Harvard's mission to foster the growth of each student's mental powers in accordance with the special gifts with which God had endowed him.[21]

Faculty psychology had assumed that the minds of men were essentially the same, but that belief was no longer convincing, practical, or fashionable by the 1880s. In most institutions, some small church colleges excepted, the greatest obstacle to reform was now financial rather than philosophical. Reform was kept at a slow pace because of a lack of money for chairs in new disciplines and for the additional lecturers which would allow options to flourish within "departments" (which at this time typically consisted

of one man each). Chairs in English, history, modern languages, political economy, and the increasingly distinct branches of the natural and physical sciences were established only as institutions could afford them, and, in some cases, only as a result of generous private donations. By the 1880s, however, a limited number of optional courses were offered at most institutions in English-Canada.[22]

Even though the same educational ideas were influencing reform in both Canadian and American universities, in this country there was no academic "revolution" on the order of that which accompanied the introduction of free election south of the border.[23] Curricular reform took place more slowly and was less thorough-going than in the United States, where the change was so dramatic that a counter-revolution would set in before 1910. The poverty of Canadian institutions accounts for part of the contrast, and the way that the honours system absorbed much of the pressure for specialization without sacrificing the idea of structure was another important factor. Most arts programs in Canada remained tightly organized according to a year system, and there was nothing like the curricular "disarray" which enveloped American universities in the late nineteenth century.[24]

These differences, however, should not obscure the fact that even though the traditional structure

showed only cracks in English-Canada, its Christian rationale had collapsed. As Frederick Rudolph writes, the concept of curricular choice "did not destroy the unity of knowledge, but it made that ancient fiction more difficult to believe ... To the extent that election roamed beyond the borders of the old curriculum ... it became a measure of secular power."[25] That fact was tacitly recognised in a regulation governing the federation of the colleges of the University of Toronto in 1884 which advised that although the curriculum would still offer "Christian Ethics, Apologetics or the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion ... provisions shall be made by a system of options to prevent such subjects being made compulsory by the University upon any candidate for a degree."[26] The "prevalence of Paley" in Canadian universities would not survive the nineteenth century, for once the structure of the curriculum had loosened there could be no rationale for prescribing the cement which had held it together. As institutions of higher learning relinquished not only the authority to tell students what they must learn but how they must interpret that knowledge, their curricula became truly secularized.

## THE PURSUIT OF EXPERTISE

What was so attractive about the notion of cur-

ricular choice was the assumption that it would foster intellectual excellence. Lawrence Veysey has pointed out that the academic revolution which occurred in the United States (and reverberated throughout Canada) was exciting and invigorating not only because it freed students to design their own education, but because it "promoted serious study of every kind."[27] It openly recognised what the public had suspected for some time, which was that the old course had been "elementary, superficial, and unimaginative."[28] Chancellor Fleming's audience at Kingston would have taken his point when he assured them that "the people of Canada want no _superficial_ training."[29] Not just the structure but the purpose of education was changing throughout the English-speaking world, and the old curriculum, firm in moral principle but intellectually flaccid, no longer offered satisfaction. The American university was winning unprecedented public support by directing a new message to the nation: higher education now promised to stimulate--not merely discipline--the intelligence.[30] The mood in England was the same. Reformers at Oxford, among them, Mark Pattison, revealed that the old curriculum had not been "what it claimed to be," namely, "liberalizing. It was too often productive of a narrow self-complacency, a supercillious disdain of all that lay outside its own sphere" and "of the whole circle of _real knowledge_."[31] Pattison

contrasted "real knowledge" to the course that his opponents, including Cardinal Newman, still favoured, which he termed "disciplinal and formative" only. This shift in outlook amounted to a new definition of university instruction. Although Pattison did not downplay the importance of a foundation in general culture, he proclaimed that "the end and aim of the highest education must be the exclusive devotion of the mind" to one particular branch of knowledge in which the individual would gain expertise. "This division of labour," he wrote, "is the law of mental, no less than of manufacturing production."[32]

Such arguments not only suited the utilitarian mood of the Canadian public in the late nineteenth century, but were a boon to university administrators trying desperately to secure funding for curricular expansion. Principal Dawson of McGill, for example, campaigned for more staff and better facilities by insisting that true achievement could only be produced through intense specialization. "The highest excellence in Literature or in Science can only result from the life perseveringly devoted to one department. Such unity of purpose and concentration of power" he pronounced "wholly inconsistent" with the traditionalism still lingering, sheltered by poverty, at McGill.[33] Dawson, of course, was especially anxious to develop McGill's capacity for scientific specialization and

research, but it was true at many colleges that the promotion of experimental science helped to create the circumstances and atmosphere which permitted "serious study" in the liberal arts. The two went hand-in-hand, and at no university was this more true than at the University of Toronto.

## HONOURS AT TORONTO: GENERAL EDUCATION THROUGH "JUDICIOUS SPECIALIZATION"

A key figure in the further development of honours work at Toronto was James Loudon, a professor of natural philosophy (physics, after 1887) who would become the university's first Canadian-born president in 1892. Loudon was at the forefront of a movement which, in Alan Bowker's words, "captured control of the Senate" during the 1870s, and pursued a program of "Canadianizing, democratizing, and expanding" the university, introducing "new fields of study and new concepts of science and research." Like Dawson, he maintained that the highest function of the university was the extension of knowledge, and consistently pressed his colleagues to adopt a new attitude to learning. He called for an undergraduate course of study which would emphasize "that intellectual birth-right of independent thought which is the inheritance of every man," and for an end to the old style of teaching--based on passive absorption through memor-

ization and class recitation--which forced the student to "creep when he might walk upright and alone."[34] His supporters included other men of science at Toronto, and his ideas found favour with those in modern languages, as well. In keeping with his philosophy, he deplored the practice of forcing Greek "upon unwilling or indifferent students," and wished to see modern languages placed on an equal footing with the ancient ones.[35] He worked towards the establishment of scientific laboratories and the founding of a Ph.D. program, and would, during his presidency, look with approval upon professors engaged in research, feeling that only they could inspire students with a zeal for intellectual exploration.[36]

An integral part of his ambitions for Toronto was the development of the honours system. One of his earliest victories as a member of the Senate was the passage of a statute which created a complete distinction between honours and general programs. In 1877, the Calendar advised that "there are two ordinary modes of proceeding to the degree of B.A., vis.: (1) by taking a Pass Course; or (2) by taking an Honours Course." Five distinct honours departments were designated, namely, Classics, Mathematics, Modern Languages with History, Natural Sciences, Mental and Moral Science with Civil Polity.[37] These five would blossom into twelve by 1902, and increasing special-

ization would reinforce the distinction between Pass and Honour students. As specialized learning gained more and more prestige, the Pass course "became rather an indignity to which only the lazy or the dull willingly submitted."[38]

That the pass course was to become distinctly second-class was part of Loudon's design. The statute of 1877 provided that failures in the honours course might transfer to the pass course, thus clarifying its inferior status. H.H. Langton records that in 1880 Loudon "took a further step in the degradation of the pass course ... when he moved that Pass candidates be arranged alphabetically in the Class Lists and no longer ranked in order of merit"[39]--thus signifying that academic distinction and general education were to be considered mutually exclusive concepts. In 1891, finally, a dual system of admission examinations was introduced, whereby pass students would enter university by way of Pass Matriculation, and honours candidates would remain an extra year in high school to qualify for Honour Matriculation.[40]

The superior status of the honour student within the university was paralleled in the world of employment, especially in the teaching profession. The need to improve the quality of secondary education in Ontario was strongly felt in the late nineteenth century, and that goal was to be accomplished through

the hiring of qualified specialists in each subject --men and women who were products of the university honours system.[41] Once this policy was accepted, the specialist certificate awarded by Toronto was soon luring the majority of Ontario's best students to that institution.

Not only did honours graduates gain a monopoly on the secondary school teaching profession, but they acted as ambassadors for their alma mater and recruited the province's best matriculants for Toronto. These factors speeded the development of competing honours programs, particularly at Queen's, which during the 1880s felt an urgent need to increase its enrolments and improve its scholarly reputation in order to survive.[42] During this period, most colleges in Ontario, English-speaking Quebec and the Maritimes developed honours programs which entailed concentrated study in one or two disciplines and relief from some elements of the fixed course.[43] By the turn of the century, specialization and academic excellence had become broadly synonymous throughout the English-Canadian system of higher education.

To put it another way, by 1900, the most prestigious liberal arts course was the one which had most successfully inverted the philosophy of general education which had been dominant half a century earlier. Whereas the traditional course had assumed that all

students should be trained according to one pattern and that intellectual stimulation must be tempered by moral considerations, the honours system rested on the assumption that clever students should devote themselves to the disciplines in which they excelled and cast aside those subjects which were of less importance to them as individuals. But if the honours program represented such a radical departure from tradition, why were the more conservative members of Toronto's arts faculty--men such as Maurice Hutton, W.S. Milner and G.M. Wrong--amongst its strongest advocates?

Anyone familiar with these men's philosophies would answer that they had no intention of participating in a revolution, and that they did not see themselves as having discarded the traditional notion of liberal education. They believed, instead, that all of the benefits of general culture could be achieved through a complete immersion in a particular discipline, and that all of the qualities of an educated person could be fostered through the exploration of one "unified" field of human enterprise. This belief became increasingly important as the honours departments acquired new faculty members, during the 1890s and after, thus enabling the various programs to become more specialized and exclusive.

The scientists welcomed specialization without

misgivings, but the humanists felt the need to create an educational philosophy which would cloak their efforts in an atmosphere of moral purpose. The result was that certain elements of the traditional ideology of general education, namely, the emphasis on character, the cultivation of mental powers, and the unity of knowledge, were revived and incorporated into the intellectual goals of the honours course. In this process, honours classics took the lead, and, under Maurice Hutton, "established the philosophy and set the pace" for the other arts courses at Toronto. "Classics was the first course," as A.S.P. Woodhouse has noted, "to demonstrate in Canada the grand aim of the honour system, general education by means of judicious specialization."[44]

The emulation of Oxford was an important feature of the philosophy of honours work. After Hutton replaced McCaul in 1880, the old-fashioned preoccupation with rhetoric gave way to the more modern Oxford approach to the classics, which used Greek and Latin texts to explore the literary, political, philosophical, and scientific contribution of the ancient world. Hutton's early students recalled that "for the first time some of us realized that a great book was written for its contents."[45] The "Oxford mystique" was in its heyday in the early twentieth century,[46] and although one classicist claimed that "of conscious borrowing

there was none," Woodhouse described the course as a "Canadian adaptation of Oxford 'Greats'" (with allowance made for the inferior training in Latin and Greek with which the students "came up").[47] A similar force was at work through George Wrong in history, who adopted many features of the Oxford course as he laid the foundation for the study of his discipline at Toronto.[48] Arthur Lower remembered that, besides Wrong, there was George Smith, who had acquired such a good English accent while at Oxford "that I listened to his lectures for a year without suspecting that he was Canadian born." Hodder Williams' tutorials, added Lower, "were duplicates of his Oxford groups, in so far as he could make them ... His class-room methods, advice to students, and general attitudes were just Oxford transferred with no concessions to the Atlantic."[49]

Toronto had thus re-adopted the Oxford model (in an updated form) within the limited sphere of the honours program, complete with the emphasis on character, manners and "good form" which meant so much to Hutton and Wrong. In several of the honours departments students were taught in the Oxford style, by professors trained at Oxford; they were encouraged to proceed to Oxford after graduation, and were often financed in their missions by Rhodes or Flavelle scholarships.[50] (Joseph Flavelle, a very powerful

Canadian businessman, was W.S. Milner's brother-in-law, and had, with encouragement from his university associates, become "enchanted by the Oxford ideal" and what its products could do for Canadian public life).[51] F.H. Underhill, a classics graduate of 1911, recorded how great the pressure was to go on to Oxford, and how glad he later was that he had done so.[52]

The honours system must be viewed as a product of its times, which responded to the imperialistic fervour of the day by forging cultural ties within the British Empire and not with an alien culture to the south. If the demand for intense specialization emanated with brash insistence from the American university, at Toronto it could be satisfied in the British manner through a structured honours course, rather than through the chaos of complete free election which had been Harvard's way. Through this process, the university could expand its offerings but succeed in avoiding, at least temporarily, the kind of confusion which beset American institutions as they reacted against curricular laissez-faire at the beginning of the twentieth century.

The proponents of the honours system, in fact, may be said to have exuded confidence in their enterprise during this era before the Great War. With the full support of the provincial educational department behind it, the honours program could not run afoul

of the democratic spirit of the age; and if it was an elitist system, entry to it was allegedly based not on social class but on sheer ability. It provided, said Milner, "the means of fostering quality in a society whose note is equality."[53] Milner considered it the only program of study worth mentioning in his contribution to the many-volumed Canada and Its Provinces (1913) on "The Higher National Life." "In essence it makes a simple but great affirmation," professed Milner. "Immerse a student, when once the years of reflection have begun, in a great and worthy subject of his choice. Let him follow it as it ramifies, and ... He will slowly gather judgement, an energy of cautious inquiry, concentration, a sense of the unity of knowledge ...".[54] The term "unity of knowledge" was back in use, now shorn of its traditional association with mental faculties, but ensured of a long popularity as a conveniently vague rhetorical shield used to deflect accusations that honours programs were contributing to curricular fragmentation.

The confidence and prestige enjoyed by the honours system at Toronto was partly due to the fact that it accepted the principle of specialization while retaining full control over each student's course of study. In other words, it answered society's demands for expertise on its own terms. While entering students chose the discipline which they would pursue, that

was the last major choice they would make in their undergraduate careers. According to the philosophy of honours work, the students merely selected the particular avenues through which they would explore the unity of knowledge. That the content of each program increasingly excluded the content of every other honours course was considered unimportant.

In addition to the idea that all disciplines led to the same sense of "unity," another devise used in the defense of honours specialization was the old notion that "the end of a liberal education" is "the cultivation of power rather than the acquisition of knowledge." This "power" was said to be nurtured through the subjection of students to "the discipline of a carefully graduated and progressive course of studies," with virtually no options or omissions permitted.[55] Here lay a real source of strength for the honours course throughout its long history. Shielded from the chaos of curricular choice, confined to small classes and select students, it was carefully structured, very intimate, and truly "unified."

The great advantage of the honours system to the university was that it relegated to second-class status the whole issue of "real" general education: that is, the study of a full range of liberal arts subjects in a coherent and purposeful manner. Students at Toronto who wished to explore several disciplines in

their undergraduate years found that professors increasingly concentrated their time on the honours candidates who were the emerging specialists in their own fields of interest. Honours students in political economy were seen as the department's "own," says Ian Drummond,[56] and the same attitude prevailed in other disciplines. Not only did the honours courses serve the interests of professors and burgeoning arts departments, but Milner went so far as to tell the Canadian public that "any success which the university has attained is due to these 'special' courses." He assured them that there was "no feature more characteristic of the student body that its aversion to the 'general' course, which by the latest statistics contains in the graduating year but twenty-seven per cent of the students of that year."[57] It was destined for decades to be the reputed gathering place of those with too little time, too little application, or too few brains for the pursuit of a first class education.[58] The pass student, beyond doubt, was left with poorer educational resources, and that was no secret even as early as the 1880s. Numerous submissions to the Varsity begged the authorities to consider establishing a "general proficiency honor course" so that "a man who wishes his knowledge to be wider" might not automatically "be placed at a discount in the eyes of the world."[59]

To emphasize the superior status of the honours program is not, however, to suggest that general education had been eclipsed in the universities of English-Canada. At most institutions, arts faculty budgets were still meagre enough to prevent the degree of specialization that would permit the honours courses to flourish at the expense of the pass courses. A lack of money also meant that most colleges could not afford the rapid expansion in optional subjects which reduced the American system of higher education to a state of curricular confusion by 1900. Poverty has always acted as a conservative force in the history of the liberal arts course.

While the curricular structure had loosened and the traditional outlook had waned, certain subjects were still universally required. First year programs (generally a substitute for the final year in high school) were heavily prescribed, and in most cases English, Latin, mathematics, a science and some philosophy or history were standard subjects. The second year was also quite rigidly structured, but much more lattitude was introduced in the third and fourth years, depending on the resources of the institution. The emphasis throughout the course was on languages: Latin and English were standard requirements, but modern languages could be substituted for Greek, which was on its way out as a pass subject even

while it blossomed as the honours course *par excellence* at Toronto.

Mathematics and the sciences also flourished at the honours level, but were less important components of the general course than they had been before honours and options became established. The separation of the arts and sciences into two distinct streams had definitely commenced. On the other hand, the rise of experimental science had a dramatic influence on the curriculum through the newly fashionable application of the "scientific method" to the entire range of arts subjects, which was a distinguishing feature of the period. Most significant was its effect upon philosophy, a traditional subject which held its own in the church colleges, but elsewhere, was thrown into competition with its own offspring: psychology, political economy, and political science. Even though the humanities may be said to have maintained their primacy in the arts curriculum in the pre-war period, there were many academics who celebrated--and many who feared--the growing intrusion of the scientific method and the social sciences into the realm of the liberal arts.

NOTES

1 Burwash, A History of Victoria College, 230-1.

2 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 42; Neatby, Queen's University, 140.

3 University of Toronto Calendar (1859-60), quoted in "Proceedings of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly and Evidence Laid Before it on the University Question, 1860," in Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada (ed.) Hodgins, Vol. 15, 281.

4 Sissons, A History of Victoria College, 110.

5 "Statementof the Rev. John Cook, D.D., President of the University of Queen's College, Kingston," in "Proceedings of the Select Committee ...", 101.

6 Quoted in McNab, The Development of Higher Education, 230.

7 Sissons, A History of Victoria University, 113; "Proceedings of the Select Committee ...', 123.

8 Ian M. Drummond, Political Economy at the University of Toronto: A History of the Department, 1888-1982 (Toronto, 1983), 23.

9 "Proceedings of the Select Committee ...", 117-8.

10 Ibid., 123-4.

11 Ibid., 102.

12 Ibid., 179.

13 Ibid., 215.

14 W.H. Van der Smissen, "The People's College," UTM (Oct. 1915), 17-18.

15 W.H. Fraser, Pass French and German in the University of Toronto. Paper read before the Modern Languages Association of Toronto, April 20, 1892 (Toronto, 1892), 2.

16 Mark Pattison, Suggestions on Academical Reorganization (Edinburgh, 1868, Arno Press ed., New York, 1977), 267.

17 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 129-32.

18 Charles Williams Eliot, "A Turning Point in Higher Education: The Inaugural Address of Charles Eliot as President of Harvard College" (1869) quoted in Gilbert Allardyce, "The Rise and Fall of the Western Civilization Course," American Historical Review 87 (1982), 697.

19 Quoted in Lawrence J. Burpee, Sanford Fleming: Empire Builder (Oxford, 1915), 247.

20 Allan Smith, "The Myth of the Self-made Man in English-Canada, 1850-1914," CHR 59 (1978), 194-5.

21 Rudolph, Curriculum, 135-6. On individualism and university reform, also see Burton Bledstein, The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America (New York, 19760.

22 See Robert Falconer, "The Tradition of Liberal Education in Canada," CHR 8 (1927), 99-118; Frost, McGill University, Vol. I, 265; Neatby, Queen's University, 139-40, 182-3; Reid, Mount Allison University, 92-3; John Watson, "Thirty Years of Queen's University," QQ 10 (1902), 88-96.

23 Lawrence Veysey, "Stability and Experiment in the American Undergraduate Curriculum," in Content and Context: Essays in College Education (ed.) Carl Kaysen (Berkeley, 1978), 1.

24 Rudolph, Curriculum, Ch. 6.

25 Ibid., 93.

26 "Basis of Federation in 1884," in Report of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto (Toronto, 1906), 254.

27 Veysey, "Stability and Experiment," 3.

28 Rudolph, Curriculum, 135. He is referring, in this phrase, to Yale's curriculum.

29 Burpee, Sanford Fleming, 246.

30 See Bledstein, The Culture of Professionalism.

31 Pattison, Suggestions on Academical Reorganization, 259-61. And see The Universities in the Nineteenth Century (ed.) Sanderson, 118-20.

32 Pattison, Suggestions on Academical Reorganization, 262.

33 J.W. Dawson, A Plea for the Extension of University Education in Canada, and more especially in connection with McGill University (Montreal, 1870), 7.

34 Alan Bowker, "Truly Useful Men: Maurice Hutton, George Wrong, James Mavor and the University of Toronto, 1880-1927," unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto (1975), Ch. 1.Bowker cites J. Loudon, "The Universities in Relation to Research," UTM (June, 1902), 242-3; and "Dr. Field's Discoveries," UTM (May, 1907), 179.

35 H.H. Langton, James Loudon and the University of Toronto (Toronto, 1927), 6.

36 Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 10-11.

37 The University of Toronto and Its Colleges, (ed.) the Librarian, 84.

38 Langton, James Loudon, 5-6.

39 Ibid.

40 University of Toronto, A Group of Classical Graduates, Honour Classics in the University of Toronto (Toronto, 1929), 18-19.

41 W.L. Grant and Frederick Hamilton, Principal Grant (Toronto, 1904), 324. They also wrote that "The secondary schools of Ontario are virtually in the hands of teachers who are ranked as specially qualified in certain departments by virtue of having taken the university honour courses."

42 Ibid., 240-1; Neatby, Queen's University, 183-4.

43 Falconer, "The Tradition of Liberal Education," 101-6; Frost, McGill University, Vol. I, 266; Harvey, An Introduction to the History of Dalhousie, 91; Reid, Mount Allison, Vol. I, 179.

44 A.S.P. Woodhouse, "Staff, 1890-1953," in University College: A Portrait, 1853-1953 (ed.) C.T. Bissell (Toronto, 1953), 54-5.

45 A Group of Classical Graduates, Honour Classics, 14.

46 The Universities in the Nineteenth Century, 238-9.

47 W.S. Milner, "The Higher National Life," in Canada and Its Provinces, Vol. XII, The Dominion Mission; Arts and Letters, Part II (eds.) Adam Shortt and Arthur G. Doughty (Toronto, 1913), 416; Woodhouse, "Staff, 1890-1953," 54.

48 Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 298-302; W.S. Wallace, "The Life and Work of George Wrong," CHR 29 (1948), 229-37.

49 A.R.M. Lower, My First Seventy-five Years (Toronto, 1967), 47.

50 Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 302-9. By 1911, 54 out of 172 members of the Faculty of Arts teaching staff were graduates of Oxford. Carl Berger, The Writing of Canadian History (Toronto, 1976), 10.

51 Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 20-3.

52 Douglas Francis discusses Underhill's reactions to Oxford in "Frank Underhill: Canadian Intellectual," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, York University (1975), 18-23. Other graduates of the same year who also went to Oxford were Carleton Stanley and C.N. Cochrane.

53 Woodhouse, "Staff, 1890-1953," 61.

54 Milner, "The Higher National Life," 420.

55 A Group of Classical Graduates, Honour Classics, 27.

56 Drummond, Political Economy, 24-5.

57 Milner, "The Higher National Life," 423.

58 A Group of Classical Graduates, Honour Classics, 19-20.

59 R.H., "Our Honor Courses," Varsity 1 (29 Jan. 1881) 143; "An Honor General Course," Varsity 2 (9 Dec. 1881), 86. A letter to the Editor from "Mod.," Varsity 3 (16 Dec. 1882), 105, observed that "It would seem that the desire of a great many of our undergraduates to see a general proficiency honor course established is to be quietly ignored by those in authority."

# Chapter 3

## Science and Citizenship: The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Ideal of Service

A new feature of the arts curriculum at the beginning of this century was the presence of the social science disciplines: the study of politics, economics, social relations, and human psychology. All had their roots in the subject of mental and moral philosophy, which was part of the traditional arts course, and all developed into separate fields as a result of a new approach to learning and research which may be termed the "scientific method."

In accordance with this new philosophy, instead of merely accepting ideas that were presented in text-books and sanctioned by clerical authorities as the final word, professors and students began to rely more on an inductive method of investigation which was based upon experience and the direct observation of "facts," both past and present. The sciences themselves led the way in this intellectual revolution, and, in the process, broke free from the religious inhibitions which had previously curtailed scientific inquiry. They were assisted by the fact that, during the late 1800s, society increasingly recognised the material benefits which would be derived from scientific research, and, as a result, the prestige of science as an aca-

demic subject blossomed. As Thomas Haskell observes, men of science were so successful in establishing a new, professional reputation for themselves that "by the end of the century the word "scientific" seemed to epitomize the very essence of well-founded authority."[1]

Once in vogue, the scientific method was applied (in varying degrees) in all of the liberal arts disciplines. The effect upon philosophy and history was especially profound. History moved away from its close ties to modern languages and developed new links with political economy, which was, at the same time, asserting its independence from moral philosophy. The new political economy encompassed the study of politics--often referred to as political science--along with the study of economics and social policy, and it tended to adopt a historical or "evolutionary" approach to the analysis of human institutions. The prestige of their empirical techniques helped to elevate these pursuits to a new professional status, and, in addition, the widely felt need for persons able to guide the development of a newly independent Canada, bogged down in political controversy over such issues as tariff protection, immigration, labour relations, and the imperial connection--created a position of authority for social scientists which they readily filled.[2] Many people believed, moreover, that Canada needed not only

experts but an informed general population, able to vote intelligently, resist the wiles of radical demagogues, and pursue their own goals in a spirit of "social citizenship." All of these aims the social sciences were expected to fulfil.

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD AND THE STATUS OF SCIENCE

In the traditional arts curriculum, the methods involved in the teaching of science did not differ very much from those used in other disciplines. There were lectures, a set text, and a reliance upon simple memorization of facts. Younger professors, such as Croft at Toronto, Dawson at McGill, and Brydone-Jack at the University of New Brunswick, tried to introduce their students to the concept of proof through observation and experiment, but there were no laboratories, and students did not perform experiments themselves.[3] The mid-nineteenth century college could not afford elaborate scientific apparatus, and, in any case, such an expenditure would have had a low priority amongst college authorities whose educational philosophy placed little value on the spirit of scientific inquiry. For most educators, the important truths were already known, and the idea of experimentation was acceptable only if its purpose was to confirm that God's design was manifest throughout the natural world. It was the era of what Walter Meltzer had referred to as

"doctrinal moralism:" the outlook on knowledge which assumed that "an idea was warranted and verified by proof of its moral advantages."[4] Much would have to change before the scientific method would become an accepted mode of inquiry in English-Canadian faculties of arts and science.

Religious restraints upon science were not its only handicap. Equally important was the fact that as a cultural pursuit it did not enjoy the same status as literary studies. Although reformers throughout the English-speaking world were frequently successful in their push for the creation of special science programs in the universities, such programs lacked prestige compared with the regular arts course. At Yale and Harvard, for example, the scientific courses were shorter, had lower admission standards, and graduates received a separate degree, thus protecting the B.A. from "violation."[5] Similarly, when an Honours School of Natural Science was introduced at Oxford, it was for some years considered subordinate to the classical course.[6]

In Canada, similar attempts were made at offering separate science programs within colleges and universities. Their common distinguishing feature was the absence of classical languages. Mount Allison did not conceal the inferior status of its course, which it described as being intended for "those of our

British North American youth who either do not appreciate the importance of classical learning or lack the time necessary for its acquisition."[7] Victoria College authorities, on the other hand, advertised that their program was equal to the regular arts course and claimed that it offered the best preparation for a variety of vocations and "at the same time a wide and liberal culture, such as will qualify the Graduate in Science for the highest social and political stations." Evidently the public was not persuaded, for, like other courses of its type, it attracted very few students.[8] The traditional association between a strong dose of classical learning and the prestige of a university degree had not yet disappeared.

A controversy over this very issue was already underway in Great Britain. Thomas Huxley and others were challenging the assumption that it was alright for a first-class university course to be dominated by literary studies but not by scientific ones. Men who favoured the more traditional approach, such as Arnold Newman, Benjamin Jowett, and Matthew Arnold, shrank from the notion of an educated man who had neglected culture in favour of science.[9] The scientist, in their eyes, could not be guaranteed to possess that refinement of character which should be the distinguishing mark of a university graduate. "Liberal education," wrote Newman, "makes the gentleman. It

is well to be a gentleman, it is well to have a cultivated intellect, a delicate taste, a candid, equitable, dispassionate mind, a noble and courteous bearing in the conduct of life ...".[10] Even though Matthew Arnold was willing to see science included in the curriculum, he did not see that it had much to do with the diffusion of "sweetness and light."

Huxley took the opposite position and did so with considerable effect. Huxley sprang from the same Nonconformist intellectual milieu which had generated the educational reforms of the first half of the century. He spent his life promoting scientific and technical education, and part of his reform strategy was to allow the literary subjects no special claims. "For the purpose of attaining real culture," he insisted, "an exclusively scientific education is at least as effectual as an exclusively literary education." Although Huxley agreed with Arnold that "a criticism of life is the essence of culture," he maintained that ancient and modern literatures no longer contained "the materials which suffice for the construction of such a criticism:"

> The distinctive character of our own times lies in the vast and constantly increasing part which is played by natural knowledge. Not only is our daily life shaped by it, not only does the prosperity of millions of men depend upon it, but our whole theory of life has been influenced ... by the general conceptions of the universe, which have been forced upon us by physical science.[11]

By arguing that the scientist was not only a man of practical worth but a man of culture, Huxley supplied a generation of educators with the rhetorical tools needed to forge a place of equal status for science in the university curriculum.

There was, of course, no absolute or final victor in the "two cultures" debate of the nineteenth century, but there was another major conflict, occurring simultaneously, from which science can be said to have emerged a clear winner. That was the struggle it waged against the churches' censorious influence over scientific inquiry. If science were to be freed from the shackles of doctrinal moralism one of two changes would have to occur: either it would have to be shown that science was no threat to religion; or the scientific community, and society in general, would have to decide that it did not matter if science did endanger faith. In the long run, the latter condition would prevail; but during the transitional, secularizing era of the late nineteenth century, most university men found the former view more to their taste.

The history of the contest between the religious and the scientific world-view is as much one of accomodation as conflict. A.B. McKillop has questioned the common understanding of the controversy which raged after Darwin's <u>Origin of Species</u> (1859) was published, and he has shown that it was not a clear-cut quarrel

between science and religion. "There can be no question of the fact that the debate took place or that it was acrimonious," says McKillop.

> Yet when the phenomenon is examined in minute detail, and the thought of individuals closely examined, the rigidity of the dichotomy begins to crumble. We see religious assumptions operating within the minds of certain scientists and shaping their science, the acceptance of Darwinian evolution by humanists altering their understanding of historical causation and change as it gradually blended with Christian and philosophical beliefs.[12]

It may be addded, however, that the undeniable trend was towards the freeing of science from religious constraints, either enforced or self-imposed, and that accomodation was increasingly a task left to the churches.

One trend which encouraged Christian intellectuals to take a more liberal stance was the new Biblical criticism which made its influence felt in theological circles after mid-century. If there was a possibility that portions of the Biblical account of the past could be considered metaphorically, then there was less danger that science would reveal unnerving contradictions in matters of faith, and the strictures against free inquiry could be relaxed. A youthful George Munro Grant, future principal of Queen's University, was outspoken in his belief that the Bible and nature should both be examined fearlessly. He pointed out that if the world is "of God" there could

be no danger, and asked that he might have "perfect freedom to search into it and announce what I find there."[13]

Daniel Wilson was another university leader who refused to go along with the clerical resistance to scientific exploration. Even though he rejected several of Darwin's conclusions he confidently predicted that they should cause no harm to Christian faith, for the truth would win out in the end.[14] As president of the University of Toronto he held that the church was wrong to inhibit science because, as Huxley was arguing in Darwin's defence, "some of the grandest revelations of science have not only been received with suspicion, but have been denounced as in conflict with religion."[15] After turning down a position at a denominational college in England in 1877, Wilson wrote in his diary that "Orthodox science is generally another name for shallow bigotry." And the next day: "Truth has nothing to fear in the long run from the researches of such men as Darwin and Huxley. I think it suffers far more from the shackles with which orthodox zeal would hamper inquiry with the most honest intentions."[16]

McKillop has demonstrated that religious liberalism and the growing acceptance of scientific investigation in the university owed much to a change in the philos-

ophical orientation of English-Canadian academics from the school known as Common sense philosophy to neo-Hegelian idealism.[17] Idealism was introduced at Queen's in 1872 by John Watson, newly arrived from the University of Edinburgh, where he had studied under Edward Caird. The new philosophy was quickly adopted by intellectuals in this country because it offered a fresh conception of design and purpose in the universe "that could encompass, rather than capitulate to, evolutionary science." In his inaugural lecture, entitled "The Relation of Philosophy to Science," Watson declared that "truth" is a complete unity, that no branch of knowledge can contradict another, and that scientists simply tended to mistake "the limited, phenomenal truths it examined for Truth itself." It was the philosopher's role, announced Watson, to reveal the "ultimate truth" and to discover "the true bond of connection between thought and nature."[18] Idealism exerted a powerful appeal as both an antidote to religious scepticism and as a reassurance to some that science was, after all, inherently subordinate as a form of knowledge to philosophy. It quelled religious anxieties and reassured those in the humanities who feared that their disciplines might lose their pre-eminence.

In addition, however, this new philosophy helped to ease the experimental sciences into a prominent

position in English-Canadian universities before the turn of the century by imbuing specialized, scientific research with a lofty moral purpose which served to camoflage its secularizing influence. John Reid offers the example of W.W. Andrews, a young science professor at Mount Allison, who imbibed the idealism of John Watson and George Paxton Young and felt reassured that the pursuit of his discipline would inspire, rather than threaten, piety. The scientific method, he now understood, was merely a technique which enabled one to comprehend "the hidden order of the world."[19] Principal Gordon of Queen's, George Grant's successor, dealt carefully with this issue in an address to the University Council in 1902, which was a time of scientific expansion and secularization at that institution. He assured his colleagues that "All scientific study of nature is, to use Kepler's devout expression, 'thinking God's thoughts after Him' and faith in the uniformity of law, which is the presumption of scientific inquiry, is really incipient faith in a moral order of the universe."[20]

Even though the truce between faith and science, which was facillitated by idealism, encouraged the acceptance of research as a primary function of the English-Canadian university, few advances would have occurred if public financial support for laboratories and new staff had not been forthcoming. In fact, one

must emphasize that government-funded scientific research did not await the intellectuals' solution to a metaphysical problem, but began outside the university milieu in areas of immediate utility, starting with the Geological Survey in 1841.[21] As the century progressed, state interest in practical science grew. In the 1870s funds were made available for the establishment of a School of Practical Science at Toronto in the belief that "the development of the provincial economy depended upon a regular supply of well-trained mechanics and technicians."[22] Once again the trend was international, and in the United States the Morill Acts--a response to the utilitarian attitudes to education encouraged by the Civil War--were providing large federal subsidies for new agricultural and technical colleges.[23]

The School of Practical Science was located on the University of Toronto campus, and its presence had a profound impact on the progress of science at that institution. Its several laboratories were open to university students' use, and it suddenly became possible to adopt an experimental approach to science teaching in the arts curriculum. In 1885, accordingly, "certificates of attendance on laboratory work" became a requirement for honours students in physics, biology, chemistry and geology.[24] The school affiliated with the university in 1887 and effectively became its

faculty of applied science and engineering. This union, along with an improved Canadian economy, helped to justify an expansion during the 1890s in the teaching staff of all the branches of science.[25]

The history of the School of Applied Science illustrates how important the government's vested interest in "useful knowledge" was to the development of pure and applied science at the University of Toronto. Across Canada, as well, the progress of scientific research was dependent upon the amount of funding which was available. Developments at McGill paralleled those at Toronto, and both institutions became noted as research centres in the early twentieth century. Many of the smaller church colleges did not take part in this kind of expansion, while the universities of New Brunswick and Manitoba--located in poorer provinces --occupied the middle rank, as did Dalhousie and Queen's, which benefitted from the creation of generously endowed chairs in several fields.[26]

The man most responsible for the promotion of the scientific spirit at Queen's University in the 1890s and early 1900s was Nathan Fellowes Dupuis. Dupuis was actually a mathematician who, early in his career, broke with the traditional reliance upon Euclid and wrote a modern, elementary geometry textbook which was widely used in schools.[27] Throughout his career at Queen's, he resisted the authority of tradition in

his own discipline and in the curriculum as a whole. He had a particular interest in applied mathematics and science and helped to establish the School of Mining, which was the forerunner of the Faculty of Engineering.

In his writings on education, one sees the way that the concern for the status of science and its relation to "culture" (which had been Huxley's preoccupation) came into play in the promotion of a more liberal attitude to pure and applied science. His contributions to the Queen's Quarterly displayed considerable sensitivity regarding the intellectual reputation of practical subjects. Clearly, Dupuis did not care to be considered a Philistine by his colleagues in the humanities, and his arguments revealed his debt to Huxley. In one article, for example, he professed not to grasp the point being made by critics who deplored that lack of culture possessed by scientists:

> It is not easy to understand what these men mean by culture. If it something which merely puts a polish upon the individual without increasing his usefulness in the world in which he is compelled to live, or assisting in the onward march of civilization, then the world has had a sufficiency of such culture, and the nature of progress during the last hundred years, in both civilization and the expansion of the experimental and practical side of education, is evidence that that the world has found something better.

If, on the other hand, said Dupuis, culture is taken to mean that knowledge which will "enable man to assist in the well-being of his fellow-creature, and to do

his part in lifting the world from a lower to a higher plane," then science must be regarded as a cultural subject of the first order.[28]

Dupuis had some sharp words for those who still insisted that the traditional subjects were superior to the sciences. In the same spirit in which he had helped to banish Euclid from the schools of Ontario, he vented his resentment against the dominance of the classics in the Queen's curriculum, and pronounced them "dead and fossilized, expressing the life of a world that has passed away, that marked a lower stage of development."[29] Like many scientists, he championed the equal rights of the modern languages, and he conceded that English should be a required subject in the curriculum.[30] But he had no patience with the claims of such men as John Watson, his colleague at Queen's, that philosophy was to be considered "the queen of the sciences." Instead, he saw it as dependent upon the intellectual progress made by physical science, in that, whenever "any great discovery is made in the scientific world, speculative philosophy seizes upon it and amoeba-like absorbs the softer and more easily assimilated parts."[31] Perhaps Dupuis was alluding to idealism's recycling of the theory of evolution by turning it into a philosophy of moral progress.[32]

Dupuis contended that there was no reason to force unwilling students to study the humanities while allow-

ing the sciences to remain neglected, because the two areas of learning were of equal cultural worth. "Just because a subject is useful," he chided, "does not necessarily mean that it is non-educational."[33] He explained that the sciences are no less intellectually stimulating than literary studies, and amplified his argument by declaring that applied science is really the study of "thought:"

> A man who studies a machine is studying not only a group of nature's physical principles, he is also studying the thought of the inventor or inventors who gave form to the machine, just as truly as the student of poetry is studying the thoughts of the poet whose work he is reading.[34]

Dupuis, Huxley and others who pressed for the equal status of science in education placed great emphasis upon the necessity of human progress and the role of specialized, experimental science in pursuing that goal. In that sense, their arguments blended well with the social Darwinist preoccupation with national efficiency and the race for supremacy amongst industrialized nations which was current at the time. Dupuis even admitted, at one point, that "specialization may be bad for the individual, but it is certainly profitable for the race."[35] Such a remark did not undermine his own case, however, because ideas concerning national and racial progress had such remarkable influence in the pre-war era. They were, in fact, instrumental in raising the status of science as a

profession and as a university subject.

That theme was central to the address given to the Royal Society of Canada in 1900 by President J.A. Grant entitled "The Universities in Relation to Research." Pointing out that"research in Canadian universities, as a definite system, can scarcely be said to exist as yet," he held up the example of Germany's accomplishments and directed attention to the way American universities were now following suit. "The fact is even dawning upon the British mind that some vital connection really does exist between national progress and scientific discovery," and the onus was on the Canadian university, Grant declared, to ensure that Canada kept up with the rest of the world. The nation's future would depend largely upon "the aggragate of intellectual effort of its population. "In this sense," said Grant, "...knowledge is power."[36]

By the turn of the century, the idea of original research and the development of new methodologies was not only permeating and transforming the study of science, it was also "infecting virtually all other disciplines with a new "spirit of inquiry." Grant made it clear at the outset of his address that the word "research" was to be given "its widest meaning, i.e., as indicating those efforts of the human mind which result in the extension of knowledge, whether such efforts are exerted in the fields of literature,

of science, or of art."[37] What Mark Pattison had argued in the 1860s had now become more widely understood: "It is not the matters known that make science, but the mode of knowing."[38] Philosophy professor A.G. Ferguson of Queen's observed (without pleasure) that the growth of science had brought about "a complete change in the mental atmosphere" and the diffusion throughout society "of a habit of mind which has learned to pay deference to science."[39]

The unease of traditionally-minded educators such as Ferguson arose, in part, from the fact that the new outlook challenged the kind of authority they had once enjoyed, and imparted new meaning to the very idea of truth itself. The scientific spirit which reached Canada by the end of the nineteenth century had brought with it a reaction against the passive acceptance of knowledge, whether in physics, political economy or the study of languages. Ideas which had once seemed immutable were now to be subjected to ever-lasting questioning and revision. Even the classics were now coming under the scrutiny of philologists, and archaeology was revolutionizing the scholar's ideas about the ancient world. Many academics, in varied fields, found the freer atmosphere to their liking, and the new attitude was well-exemplified in the words of Mount Allison's professor of English, W.M. Tweedie. He believed that there were no fixed laws in language

and that English must be studied, not as a subject cut and dried, but in its evolution from Anglo-Saxon times. Above all, he challenged his students, "Let us make sure that we are looking with our own eyes."[40]

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND THE AUTHORITY OF EXPERIENCE

The injunction to "look with our own eyes" appealed to many late Victorian intellectuals. It implied a declaration of freedom from doctrinal moralism and a declaration of faith that truth could be discerned through observation and experience. All disciplines were affected, but none more so than the several branches of philosophy, some of which began to congeal into separate social science disciplines in the late nineteenth century. During this period, psychology emerged from mental and moral philosophy, while political economy matured into a discipline in its own right and began to subdivide into political science and economics.

Initially, the social sciences were distinguished from their parent discipline by method more than by content. The method of the philosopher had been to "think hard" and reason his way towards truths which did not violate the religious sensibility,[41] while the early history of the social sciences, as Paul Buck notes, can "best be understood as the story of the implementation of the inductive ideal," which required

that one "confront a body of fact with no preconceptions about how these facts might form a pattern or generalization."[42] Whatever conclusions were reached through this empirical process would be based, it was assumed, on solid, objective "reality."

The change in outlook which occurred can be illustrated by considering the birth of psychology as a university subject in the late nineteenth century. First taught in the United States by William James,[43] its early history is linked with the decline of philosophical idealism in America and the rise of pragmatism--a philosophy which holds that truth is relative to time and place and which discovers truth through empirical and experimental techniques rather than through introspection or speculation. As George Ferguson says, "the earlier philosophers and psychologists did not differ on the nature of the questions asked about the mind, or the areas to explore. Both were concerned with sensation, perception, cognition, affection, and volition ... the difference was one of method."[44]

It was an American, James Mark Baldwin, who became Canada's first modern psychology professor in 1889. Baldwin had received training in Leipsig under Wilhelm Wundt, and, following in his mentor's footsteps, he erected the first psychological laboratory on British soil at the University of Toronto before departing for Princeton in 1893.[45] In his inaugural address he

acknowledged that "comparative and experimental psychology are the direct outgrowth of the modern scientific spirit, and it is to the merit of contemporary philosophy that the new work is receiving its hearty endorsement."[46] In fact, this new approach to the study of the mind met with some initial resistance from traditional philosophy, and Baldwin's appointment at Toronto had been complicated by the loyalty to idealism which was the legacy of George Paxton Young's tenure as resident philosopher.[47]

Young and many other English-Canadian intellectuals tended to regard psychologists as "materialists," an accusation which William Tait, who joined McGill's faculty in 1909, felt the need to refute. All Tait wished was that philosophy would became more empirical and adopt "an adherence to fact wherever it is found, in the mud, in the rocks, in the clouds, in the mind of man." He added that "the idealistic school ... can not take experience for what it really is."[48] Some examinations which were probably set by Tait shortly after his arrival at McGill reveal a concern to establish the basic premises of the new discipline in students' minds. A second year paper asked: "Why is psychology ranked as a science?" and "What are the methods of investigation used in psychology?" Another question read "We speak of mental processes and not of mental powers and capabilities. Comment on this."[49]

A similar process took place as philosophy gave birth to two other subjects, economics and political science.[50] In the traditional curriculum, political economy had been taught in a perfunctory manner and its purpose had been to introduce students to the principles of classical economics--that other major pillar of the mid-Victorian social order. O.D. Skelton recalled that until the late nineteenth century economic theory was regarded as a "complete and perfected achievement, based on a few fundamental deductions rooted in the niggardliness of nature (and human nature), something merely to be learned and accepted."[51] It did not take changing conditions into account; instead, it was believed, as the Reverend Hincks told the Canadian Institute in 1860, that "economical science is based upon what is common to man in all circumstances ... the more we study it the more thoroughly we believe that, as producers and exchangers of produce, there is one plan which suits us all."[52] As with psychology, the influence of a more modern and fluid approach was felt gradually, but by the late 1880s the desire to test political and economic theories against the evidence of direct observation was becoming a potent intellectual force. As John Bourinot advised the Royal Society of Canada in 1889, to know "what is wise and right in politics you must consult experience."[53]

The late nineteenth century was, in fact, a period of remarkable faith in the method of inductive reasoning as it was employed in the social sciences. Throughout the industrialized world, people were attracted to the idea that the scientific method could be applied to the problems of urbanized societies and cure them of their ills, simply by observing what had gone wrong and setting it right.[54]

It is a complicated matter to decide what factors in history account for this confidence, but it seems likely, as Buck has suggested, that the impact of Darwin's Origin of Species enhanced the prestige of the processes of inductive reasoning.[55] Darwin confirmed his principle of natural selection through the observation of natural phenomena, discovering, over a period of many years, that species adapt in accordance with the characteristics of their particular environments. According to McKillop, Darwin was criticized by reviewers for foresaking induction and reaching conclusions "that went beyond the scope of legitimate scientific inquiry."[56] But it is also clear that Darwin employed a combination of both methods (as is commonplace today) and that he was revered by social scientists because he based his theories on observable "facts" in nature, producing evidence that the most powerful clerical opposition was unable to refute.

The theory of evolution was itself a significant

influence in the development of the social sciences in the late nineteenth century. It loosened the grip of classical economics by directing attention towards changes in the human condition and towards the fact that social organizations are continually "evolving." Adam Shortt, who began to teach political science at Queen's in 1888, rejected the idea of universal economic principles and maintained that all aspects of society had to be studied in relation to their time and place. "Not only our knowledge of the facts," said Shortt, "but the facts themselves are constantly developing."[57] Shortt's counterpart at Toronto, William Ashley, agreed that classical economic doctrines had "only a relative truth." He felt that the "abstract deductive method" had had its day, and that fruitful inquiry would henceforth employ "the methods of direct observation from facts, whether past or present."[58]

The impact of Darwinism should not be considered in isolation. Ashley, Shortt, and other Canadian social scientists were influenced by German economic and historical thought which had, in fact, taken an evolutionary view of human history well before Darwin's work was published. One element which Darwin did contribute to nineteenth century thought was a much more mechanistic interpretation of change, and it helped to give rise to the idea that the objective study of historical facts would yield a scientific explanation of human

progress.[59] In place of the romantic or spiritual vision of the "unfolding" history of mankind which had been popular in Germany during the first part of the century, the new economics and political science would seek patterns in history and try to arrive at "explanatory generalizations about the past." They would concentrate on the objective study of institutions rather than the subjective study of people and events, coloured by personal notions of historical importance. As John Higham has written, evolution justified the abandonment of the "romantic concentration on great, representative moments of human experience," because it reduced "every moment to a link in the chain and imputed significance to the chain rather than the individual microcosm."[60]

The subject of history itself was thus drawn into the realm of the social sciences in the late 1800s. While history had first entered the curriculum as an adjunct of modern languages, joint chairs in history and English gave way by the 1890s to joint or independent chairs of history and political economy.[61] Through this process, history weaned itself from the tradition of the "literary amateur,"[62] and by the early twentieth century it was established as a discipline in its own right in English-Canada. Universities had become the home of another new academic breed, the professional historian, who claimed to possess the

expertise and the authority to interpret the past and, if required, to apply that knowledge to present-day experience--a role they shared with their fellow social scientists.

But it was equally true that the influence of scientific history, however pervasive, did not totally obliterate allegiances to the more literary or traditional approach still popular in English-speaking countries (though suffering a temporary eclipse in the United States). The perennial ambiguity of history's position--its dual role in the social sciences and the humanities--can, in fact, be said to date from this period. In Great Britain, for example, the romantic style of G.M. Trevelyan could co-exist with the scientific technique pursued by Stubbs and Freeman at Oxford. At Toronto, one sees both trends combined in George Wrong, one of Canada'a first professional historians and the man responsible for the creation of the history department at that university before World War I. Allan Bowker says that Wrong paid "lip service" to the notion of expertise, but had more genuine faith in the ideal of "character" in the traditional sense.[63] He wrote a great deal but did little original research, and he is said to have "deplored professionalism and specialization in history."[64] He valued scientific objectivity, yet he "emphasized that a historian had a duty to pass moral judgement," and, allying himself

with Acton, he wrote that "the historian is the guardian of truth, truth not merely as to specific fact, but truth as expressing constructive standards of conduct."[65]

Wrong's ideal of the scholar as moral exemplar was one he shared with others in the humanities, including Maurice Hutton, but it was an ideal which had an appeal for many social scientists as well. There tended to be a difference in their points of view, however. In the humanities, the notion of leadership was rooted in the idea that the scholar, through his immersion in "culture," possessed superior qualities of character, whereas the moral authority of the social scientist was based on the assertion of scientifically-grounded expertise in matters of political and economic importance which could be used to alleviate society's problems (hence political economist James Mavor's assertion that his discipline was "more humane than the humanities").[66] The ambition of both groups, nevertheless, were fundamentally the same: each saw itself as offering much-needed guidance in a world no longer anchored in Christian moral principle--one in which the rise of democratic institutions had vested power in what Wrong referred to as "the half-blind mass."[67]

One concept which informed the thinking of scholars in both the humanities and the social sciences was that of social citizenship, which was an ideal that developed during the last half of the nineteenth century

in response to the formation of a large, urban working-class and the movement for franchise reform. It was manifest, for example, in the idealist philosophy of T.H. Green at Oxford, in Matthew Arnold's essay on Culture and Anarchy, and in the social ideology of American progressivism.[68] The basic tenets included the belief that people must be taught to place the welfare of the community above selfish interests and that those who have gained an exceptional understanding of human society should employ that experience in the cause of good government and public leadership. Social citizenship had a wide-ranging appeal in the academic community in English-Canada, but none used it to better effect in establishing the authority of their disciplines than those in the social sciences.

## SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC SERVICE

The study of politics "is the science of citizenship," remarked the University of Toronto Varsity in 1884. "No state is safe from destruction by internal forces unless a large proportion of its citizens have learned to take an intelligent interest in government."[69]

These strong words were directed at certain university officials who successfully blocked, until the late 1880s, a persistent campaign conducted by students and other members of the academic community to have a chair of political economy established at Toronto.

The authorities' fear was that politics and economics could not be taught in the impartial manner befitting a provincial institution and that university life would become infected with the disease of political partisanship if issues under dispute in public life were discussed within its walls.[70] Their belief was that no man could "be a safe guide" to youth in such matters as tariffs, currency reform and labour relations betrayed, as well, a lingering assumption that students' minds simply absorbed without questioning the ideas passed on by their instructors.

In order to undermine the obstructionists' case, the advocates of political economy were determined to show that danger lay in ignorance of political issues, rather than in the pursuit of such knowledge, and that good government required an informed citizenry. One Varsity editorial suggested that

> Whether a student believe in the Ptolemaic or the Copernican theory of astronomy, the sun will rise in the East ...but whether he believes that government should provide subsistence for paupers, ...that abundance of imported goods is a calamity to be dreaded and suppressed by restrictive measures,... that a promise to pay gold is equivalent to the gold itself,... we say that whether a man believes in these things or not must make a vast difference in the government of the nation and the consequent condition of the citizens.[71]

A writer who styled himself "Publicist" pointed out that "men to whom politics have been a prohibited luxury" would have "no self-formed habits of thought," and would be too easily swayed by the wiles of poli-

ticians.[72] "X.Y.Z." reminded readers that before the last election "protection was regarded as a dangerous heresy by the people," but a vigorous Conservative campaign brought about a complete change of opinion. If protection is right for Canada now, he suggested, then it must have been so for some time, but if, on the other hand, "the National Policy is a mistake, and injurious to the interests of the people as a whole, more than half of the Canadian electors, from ignorance of economic principles, have been deceived."[73] Contributors to the Varsity repeatedly argued that Canadians would be greatly assisted in making intelligent decisions regarding all manner of disputed issues if they possessed "a knowledge of the fundamental principles of Representative Government, the laws of trade, and the political history of our own and other countries."[74]

Not only in the consideration of everyday matters, but also in dealing with the upsurge of radical ideologies, political science was presented as an indispensable intellectual tool. In Canada's growing industrial towns and cities, political movements such as "Socialism, Communism, and other social 'heresies'" were attracting followers. Advocates of political economy maintained that if people had an understanding of the "origin and development of private property" and a "thorough acquaintance with the principles on which society was based" they would recognise that

such theories were "injurious to man's interest and happiness."[75] Political writer and amateur scholar John Bourinot agreed that the teaching of political economy would serve as a vital weapon against the spread of subversive ideologies, and would help Canada to lay its political foundations carefully and avoid being "deluded by the glamour of republicanism or the social tendencies of purely democratic institutions."[76]

The claims made by the social sciences did not merely play on people's fears of disorder and disharmony. They appealed to their sense of the nobler side of democracy, as well, namely, that the welfare of all members of society should be taken into account by governments and other institutions. Political science, said Bourinot, "is inseparably connected with the vital interests of the whole community."[77] Not only during the 1880s, when the case for these disciplines was still being made, but even more as the new century approached, the proponents of the social sciences linked their importance to the needs of the ordinary man and woman--a concern which ranged well beyond the confines of the old liberal arts curriculum. Adam Shortt, in fact, credited the very existence of his discipline to the growth of modern democracy. "As a living branch of study," he wrote in 1893, "it implies this first condition, that the well-being of at least a considerable section of the community should be recognised as the

basis of government and law." No longer were the interests of the ruling class the only thing that mattered, for "the structure of the modern civilized world compels us to regard all social matters from the point of view of the people." Shortt foresaw that the social sciences would move beyond the study of political and economic policy to the examination of all of society:

> the social conditions, means and aims of civilization constitute the sphere of modern Political Science. We are compelled to go considerably beyond the science of wealth, on the one hand, and considerably beyond the science of government, on the other. We have to ask many previous questions with regard to the nature of man as a social being and the circumstances in which he is placed, and we have to ask many ultimate questions with regard to the final aims and objects of society.[78]

William Ashley, Shortt's counterpart at Toronto (hired after careful probing by Premier Mowat and Chancellor Blake to assess the soundness of his views),[79] was also in favour of opening his discipline to the study of grassroots problems. One of the treatises he published while at Toronto concerned "The Condition of Female Labour in Canada."[80] He recognised the class bias of classical economic doctrine and remarked in his inaugural address that in former times "the very term Political Economy stank in the nostrils of intelligent working men ... who had been fed upon it for half a century" to prove to them that "everything in the industrial world was for the best."[81] Ashley

was no radical, but he could see the flaws in laissez-faire when applied as a universal principle, and he acknowledged a wider role for the state in regulating human affairs than would have been acceptable a generation earlier.[82]

But opinions varied, and James Mavor, Ashley's successor in 1892, was more of a traditionalist in some respects. While a thorough-going empiricist himself, he did not encourage criticism of the orthodox economists, and students who studied under Ashley and Mavor must have noticed a sharp change in the classroom atmosphere after his arrival.[83] The unpopularity of his authoritarian manner contributed to the student strike at Toronto in 1895; at issue was his opposition to two proposed guest speakers at the Political Science Club: A.P. Jury, a Single Tax advocate, and socialist Phillips Thompson.[84] Mavor was more paternalistic than Ashley or Shortt, but their difference was one of educational philosophy more than political ideology, for no political scientist of the pre-war era ventured to criticize the basic institutions of Canadian society or to promote radical social change. This conservatism was shared by colleagues in the United States, and, as Paul Buck points out, one of the attractions of the scientific approach for political theorists of this period was that "its slow and careful method and its ability to evaluate all sides of a question tended

to serve as a break on hasty or radical theories of reform."[85]

It was this alleged ability to see all sides of an issue which helped the professional social scientists to extend their influence beyond the university and into direct participation in public life--a role for which they also aimed to prepare their students. Bourinot had argued that political science was needed "to give coherence, connexion, and system to the thinking of the nation," and, more specifically, to supply the expertise which would improve the quality and efficiency of the civil service.[86] The pre-war era was a reform-minded, efficiency-conscious age, receptive to the idea that the kind of knowledge which the social scientists possessed could make a lasting contribution to national prosperity and political stability.[87] Their personal disinterestedness and their dispassionate method of inquiry would, it was felt, make them qualified advisors on government policy and ideal as members of commissions and arbitration boards. Both Mavor and Shortt served in this fashion; Shortt left the university altogether for government work in 1908, while Mavor divided his time between teaching and other activities throughout his career.[88] This, too, was an international trend. In the United States, for instance, historian Frederick Jackson Turner promoted the use of social scientists as mediators, seeing them as men

"with the ideal of service to the State," who, in their role as experts, "possess the respect and confidence of all parties,"[89] and who would--it was understood--help to prevent any drastic upheavals in the relations between masters and men.

The early experiments in the teaching of sociology, which was a very minor discipline in English-Canada in this period, were probably the source of the only challenge which pre-war social science presented to the capitalist status quo. Although that discipline was, in part, an outgrowth of political science, it also derived directly from the moral philosophy courses offered at the colleges of theology where the social gospel was beginning to have an impact during the 1890s. As Marlene Shore explains, early sociology in North America was a reformist course of study, intended to provide students with the knowledge they would need to do community service work as either clergymen or social workers.[90] Darwin's impact was evident in this field as well, for sociology was based on the innovative idea that man was a creature shaped by an environment which had evolved over time. George Herbert Mead encouraged sociologists to recognise that morality itself "developed out of a social matrix."[91] The challenge to the traditional, religious conception of morality as an individual matter was strong in the more radical wing of the social gospel movement, which

sought to create the kind of society--through socialism, if necessary--where people could live in harmony and thus work towards bringing the Kingdom of Heaven to earth in the here and now. The Reverend S.D. Chown told students that only "a perfect sociology perfectly applied will result in the establishment of the Kingdom of God,"[92] and the new subject was frequently described as an exercise in "practical Christianity." Only in the post-war years would sociology mature into a secularized research discipline (under the leadership of C.A. Dawson at McGill), but, in the meantime, it lent something of the authority of the Christian social mission to the empirical and pragmatic concerns of the social sciences.

## THE UNIVERSITY AS PUBLIC SERVANT

During the late nineteenth century, the notion of the academic serving the community by providing expertise in a particular field laid the foundation for the rise of the experimental sciences and social sciences as university subjects. During the period before World War I, the university also assumed responsibility for training in a growing number of other useful professions, including engineering, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, accounting, agriculture, domestic science, and journalism. Dependent as they were, in varying degrees, upon state funding, the universities

encouraged the public to regard them as institutions eager to meet the material and social needs of their local communities and the nation. In fact, university administrators found that the concept of "service" could be very useful in their efforts to boost their institutions' claims to public respect and financial support, and it quickly became an umbrella-like rationale for all of the university's diverse activities.

In order to understand how the ideal of service functioned, one must consider the way it managed to combine two conflicting philosophies, namely, pragmatism and idealism. The debt to American pragmatism, particularly its concept of "social efficiency" as the yardstick of value in educational matters, is quite straightforward.[93] But it is more difficult to analyse the way that the idea of service managed to blend such a strongly utilitarian outlook with a philosophy that professed to reject immediate material gains in favour of a more elusive, universal "truth."

Once again, however, the idea of social citizenship provided the missing link between spiritual and material goals. In English-Canada, the notion of service drew much of its influence from the vague but inspiring social ethic of philosophical idealism in which "lives and careers," in McKillop's words, were "seen to be meaningful only when regarded from a universal perspective."[94] It was argued that society must be conceived

as an organism, a unified whole, in which all right-thinking people were engaged in different aspects of the same enterprise. Through this outlook, all kinds of utilitarian research and vocational training could be perceived as contributing to the universal good and could be awarded an equal place beside other academic activities. It also helped to revive and give new meaning to the old idea of the "unity of knowledge," for all members of the university community could be said to be striving after the same lofty goal of human betterment. Not only did the ideal of service provide a high-sounding rationale for funding the secular university, it papered over the widening cracks in the university's identity as an institution, caused by the great diversity of its pursuits, by relating all academic activities not only to one another but to the society which they were intended to serve.

The history of Queen's University provides an illustration of this concept in action. During the closing decades of the nineteenth century, Principal Grant faced the task of improving the reputation and financial standing of his institution so that it might compete successfully with the burgeoning provincial University of Toronto. Grant sought support for Queen's not as "a refuge for cloistered scholars," but "as one of the most vital and responsible influences in the concrete national life." Adam Shortt wrote that

Grant "preached a gospel of active social service," and he credited Grant with helping to inspire the fabled "Queen's spirit" in the 1890s. Realizing that his university must take a firmly utilitarian approach to the development of vocational programs, he clothed practical policies in the language of idealism and made a most effective appeal to his constituency. Shortt believed, in fact, that if Grant had taken a narrower view of Queen's role in the national life that he could not "have attracted to the support of the University increasing numbers of benefactors and students."[95]

The rhetoric of service was rewarding enough to appeal with equal force to Grant's successor, Principal Daniel Gordon. In an address in 1902 he stressed that the university "stands for service, service of the highest kind, service to the largest number and along the greatest possible number of lines." He strove to combine a utilitarian emphasis with a critique of materialism and a spirit of cultural uplift. "A man's life consists not in the abundance of that which he has," explained Gordon, "but rather in the abundance of that which he is ... Yet ... a man's life consists not merely in the abundance of that which he is, but also in the abundance of that which he can do." A key tactic is revealed in this passage: the vocations are discussed not so much in connection with personal

success and money-making, but rather as modes of public service. Seen in this light, university education was beneficial not only to those who received the degrees but to all of society, and Gordon could promise that the financial support the university received was "given back transmuted into intellectual and moral aid and multiplied a thousandfold."[96] There is no doubt that such arguments enhanced the university's reputation as an institution with a clear and worthy mandate, and that they helped to direct attention away from the fact that it now embraced many functions which could prove to be disharmonious.

The history of higher education in western Canada also illustrates the role played by the ideal of service in determining the atmosphere of higher learning. The universities of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia were all founded in the early twentieth century, and the University of Manitoba became a teaching institution (instead of a mere administrative entity uniting the denominational colleges) at that same time. The new universities began teaching a core of humanities subjects, yet within a very short time expanded into many other areas of instruction and research.[97] Such institutions promised that, in exchange for state support, they would supply the agricultural, technological, and professional training most needed in these young provinces into which were flowing millions of

immigrants whose social and material needs were many. The University of Saskatchewan was emphatically utilitarian, and, as Carlyle King suggests, "it is understandable, if regrettable, that the educational and political leaders of a pioneering farm economy would value good poultry more highly than philosophy and should prefer bridges to books."[98] President Murray's model was the state University of Wisconsin, and his vision was of "the University of Saskatchewan as scientist in service of the state."[99] Henry Marshall Tory was the University of Alberta's first president, and he, too, adopted the ideal of service from the outset. "The modern state university," said Tory, "has arisen out of a demand on the part of the democracy ... for a chance of self-realization. The modern state university is specifically a people's institution."[100] President Wesbrook of the University of British Columbia was of a similar mind. "The people's university," he affirmed in 1913, "must meet _all_ of the needs of _all_ of the people." His choice of a motto for the Coat of Arms was _Tuum Est_: "It is yours."[101]

The ideal of service had an impact at virtually all institutions of higher learning in English-Canada. For new universities, the exchange of services for funding was a basic premise of their existence. At some older institutions, such as Queen's, the necessity for a new ideology was made palatable through its

association with practical Christianity. At the wealthier University of Toronto, there was a comfortable sense, expressed officially, at least, that the increasingly diverse needs of the university's clientele could be accomodated without threatening the cultural identity of the institution. The Commission of 1906, chaired by industrialist Joseph Flavelle, observed that the university, "still cherishing the love of learning and intent upon the pursuit of knowledge, must adapt its courses of study to every phase of human progress. ... It must minister, in ways hitherto deemed to lie beyond its domain, to the practical as well as the intellectual and moral needs of the country."[102]

The universities of English-speaking North America had thus become hybrid institutions by the early twentieth century. The scientific method had transformed the traditional arts curriculum, and the ideal of the expert--first applied to the professional scientist and social scientist--had spurred the founding of new vocational faculties. The universities retained their role as protectors of the Western cultural heritage, but had added research and job-training to their range of responsibilities. Lawrence Veysey has aptly described the university in this era as going in several directions at once, becoming home to "a collection of divergent minds" and an array of conflicting ideals.[103]

The picture of what "a university was and ought to be," as Walter Meltzer says, had become blurred: "Like Hamlet's cloud, it appeared in the shape of a camel, or a weasel, or a whale. Some saw in that indistinct image a refuge for recondite thought; others perceived a public station, catering to all comers." There could no longer be "any sure definition of the university."[104]

Where funding was adequate, at Toronto, for example, the clamour for support for diverse goals could to some extent be met, and McKillop observes that "By 1906 a rough equilibrium had been established in the provincial university for culture and for science, for metaphysics and research."[105] But at poorer universities, especially in the west, culture and metaphysics did not necessarily fare so well.[106] In the English-speaking liberal arts community as a whole, moreover, those engaged in the speculative and literary disciplines, in which the scientific method played little part and public service was an uncertain by-product, saw their status decline and felt themselves pushed onto the defensive in the institutions they had once dominated. Their only solution was to formulate their own new rationale for the primacy of cultural subjects in the secular university.

NOTES

1 Thomas Haskell, The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth Century Crisis of Authority (Urbana, Ill., 1977), 65-6.

2 See Barry Ferguson, "The New Political Economy and Canadian Liberal Economic Thought: Queen's University 1890-1925," unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, York (1982), Ch. 1.

3 Jarrell, "Science Education," 56.

4 Meltzer, Academic Freedom, 14.

5 Rudolph, Curriculum, 103-4.

6 Pattison, Suggestions on Academical Reorganization, 259-60; The Universities in the Nineteenth Century, (ed.) Sanderson, 75-6.

7 Reid, Mount Allison University, Vol I, 93.

8 Victoria College Calendar (1875) quoted in Harris, A History of Higher Education, 127.

9 The Universities of the Nineteenth Century, 115-21.

10 Arnold Newman, Discourses on University Education, (Dublin, 1852), quoted in The Universities in the Nineteenth Century, 124.

11 T.H. Huxley, "Science and Culture, an Address Delivered at the Opening of Sir Josiah Mason's Science College, Birmingham, 1880," quoted in The Universities in the Nineteenth Century, 37-8.

12 A.B. McKillop, "Science and Humanism in Ontario's Universities," unpub. paper.

13 An 1862 address, quoted in J.R. Watts, "George Munro Grant," in Some Great Men of Queen's (Toronto, 1941), 7.

14 McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence, 108-9.

15 Berger, Science, God and Nature, 67.

16 Quoted in H.H. Langton, Sir Daniel Wilson: A Memoir (1929), 88-9.

17 See McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence, Ch. 6.

18 Ibid., 182-9.

19 Reid, Mount Allison University, Vol I, 189.

20 D.M. Gordon, The Functions of a Modern University," QQ 10 (1903), 491.

21 See A Curious Field-book; Science and Society in Canadian History (eds.) Trevor Levere and Richard Jarrell (Toronto, 1974), "General Introduction."

22 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 164.

23 See Lawrence Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, 70.

24 The University of Toronto and Its Colleges (ed.) the Librarian, 90.

25 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 145.

26 Jarrell, "Science Education," 75-6.

27 John Matheson, "Nathan Fellowes Dupuis," in Some Great Men of Queen's, 59-60. Matheson writes that "there is no doubt that this book helped a great deal to hasten the departure of Euclid from the Ontario schools."

28 N.F.D., "Some of the Factors of Modern Civilization," QQ 9 (1902), 168.

29 N.F. Dupuis, The Conservative and Liberal in Education," QQ 9 (1902), 168.

30 Ibid., 160.

31 Ibid., 169-70.

32 See McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence, 185-6.

33 Dupuis, "The Conservative and Liberal in Education," 169. See also the first part of this article published in QQ 9 (1901), 119-25.

34 Dupuis, "Some of the Factors of Modern Civilization," 54. See also the article by Dupuis' colleague, W.L. Goodwin, "Culture and Specialization," QQ 19 (1912) 348-58.

35 Dupuis, "Some of the Factors of Modern Civilization," 48.

36 J.A. Grant, "The Universities in Relation to Research," TRSC, Sec. 2 (1900), xlix-lix.

37 Ibid., xlix.

38 Pattison, Suggestions on Academical Reorganization, 266.

39 A.G. Ferguson, "Philosophy and Life," QQ 19 (1912), 182.

40 "Inaugural Address of Professor Tweedie," The Daily Sun (11 Sept. 1888), quoted in Reid, Mount Allison University, Vol. I, 187.

41 T.A. Goudge, "A Century of Philosophy in English-speaking Canada," DR 47 (1967-8), 539.

42 Social Sciences at Harvard, 1860-1920: From Inculcation to the Open Mind (ed.) Paul Buck (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), 3.

43 Rudolph, Curriculum, 139.

44 George A. Ferguson, "Psychology at McGill," in History of Academic Psychology in Canada (eds.) Mary J. Wright and C. Roger Myers (Toronto, 1982), 34.

45 C. Roger Myers, "Psychology at Toronto," in History of Academic Psychology, 73-6. And see James Mark Baldwin, "Psychology at the University of Toronto," American Journal of Psychology 3 (1890), 285-6.

46 Baldwin, Philosophy, Its Relation to Life and Education (Toronto, 1890), 13, quoted in Myers, "Psychology at Toronto," 73.

47 Myers, "Psychology At Toronto," 71. And see Goudge and Slater, "Instruction and Research at the University of Toronto."

48 William Tait, "Psychology and the Self," UM 7 (1908), 669, 675.

49 McGill University, Examination Papers, Session 1910-1911 (Montreal, 1911), 37-8.

50 For the emergence of political science from philosophy, see C.D.W. Goodwin, Canadian Economic Thought: the Political Economy of a Developing Nation (Durham, 1961). The term "economics" was not generally used to describe a university subject before World War I. At some universities,

notably Toronto, the term political economy encompassed both of the new subjects and would soon include sociology as well. On the other hand, Stephen Leacock at McGill saw political science as the study of government and political economy as the investigation of "man's activity in pursuit of wealth," but conceded that "Inasmuch as the production and distribution of material wealth is very largely conditioned by the existing form of government ... the study of political economy is brought into an intimate relation with that of political science." Leacock, Elements of Political Science (London, 1914), 8.

51 O.D. Skelton, "Fifty Years of Political and Economic Science in Canada," in Royal Society of Canada, Fifty Years Retrospect (1932), 88.

52 W. Hincks, "On the True Aims, Foundations and Claims to Attention of the Science of Political Economy," Canadian Journal of Industry, Science and Art 31 (1861), 26.

53 John George Bourniot, "The Study of Political Science in Canadian Universities," TRSC, Sec. 2, Vol. 7 (1889), 5.

54 See Buck, Social Sciences at Harvard, "Introduction," Meltzer, Academic Freedom, 42-4.

55 Buck, Social Sciences at Harvard, 6.

56 McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence, 101.

57 Adam Shortt, "The Nature and Sphere of Political Economy," QQ 1 (1893), 100. According to Goodwin, Shortt's "first action" at Queen's was the "liberalization of the syllabus, which involved less change of emphasis than broadening of scope. He continued to use the writings of Smith, Malthus, and Mill to provide training in theory but he prescribed intense and critical study of these works rather than a survey of them," 162. W.A. Macintosh says that Shortt introduced the recent publications of Francis Walker and Alfred Marshall, and adds that students read and discussed Marx's Capital. "Adam Shortt," in Great Men of Queen's, 118.

58 Drummond, Political Economy, 21; H.S. Ferns and Bernard Ostry, The Age of Mackenzie King: The Rise of the Leader (Toronto, 1955), 17-18. Both sources quote Ashley's inaugural lecture of Nov. 9, 1888 entitled "What is Political Economy?". For similar

definitions see Bourinot, "The Study of Political Science," 5-6; Leacock, Elements of Political Science, 6.

59 Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, 22; John Higham et al, History (Englewood Cliffs, 1965), 94-5.

60 Mary Furner, Advocacy and Objectivity: a Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905 (Lexington, 1975), xii; Higham et al, History, 95; and see Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, 6-7; Goodwin, Canadian Economic Thought, 160.

61 At Toronto, Daniel Wilson's chair of English and History was eliminated in 1892 when Wrong was hired to teach history and W.J. Alexander to teach English. At McGill, history was taught as an aspect of languages until the 1890s, see Frost Vol. I, 266 and Vol. II, 27. At Dalhousie, a chair in Rhetoric and History which included belles lettres was created in 1865, Harvey, An Introduction to the History of Dalhousie, 89. Separate chairs in History and Political Economy (1880) and in English Literature and Rhetoric (1882) were subsequently established.

62 Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, 7.

63 Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 267.

64 Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, 14-15; Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 296.

65 George Wrong, "The Historian and Society," CHR 14 (1933), 5-6, quoted in Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, 15.

66 Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 311-12.

67 Bowker, 294.

68 See Melvin Richter, The Politics of Conscience: T.H. Green and His Age (London, 1964), Ch. 11; Matthew Arnold, Culture and Anarchy (1869); Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York, 1962), Ch. 8.

69 William Houston, "The Place of Political Science in a Liberal Education," Varsity Holiday Number (Dec. 1884), 105-6.

70 See letter to the editor from J. McD. Duncan, Varsity 7 (20 Nov. 1886); Drummond, Political Economy, 18.

71 Editor, "Political Economy," Varsity 3 (13 Jan. 1883), 123.

72 "'Cloistered Scholarship' and Political Economy," Varsity 1 (11 Dec. 1880), 83.

73 "X.Y.Z.," "The Study of Sociology and Political Economy," Varsity 1 (25 Dec. 1880), 110.

74 Ibid., 111; and see Varsity 2 (27 Jan. 1882), 125; Varsity 3 ((28 Oct. 1882), 15; Varsity 3 (4 Nov. 1882), 27; Varsity 3 (23 Dec. 1882), 111; Varsity 5 (28 Feb. 1885), 196; Varsity 6 (20 Feb. 1886).

75 "X.Y.Z.," "The Study of Sociology and Political Economy," 111.

76 Bourinot, "The Study of Political Science," 15. Ashley agreed that political science is needed by the ordinary citizen, "given the perils of an ignorant democracy." Drummond, Political Economy, 21.

77 Bourinot, "The Study of Political Science," 4.

78 Shortt, "The Nature and Sphere of Political Science," 93-7.

79 Drummond, Political Economy, 19.

80 Ferns and Ostry, The Age of Mackenzie King, 18.

81 Ibid.

82 Goodwin, Canadian Economic Thought, 178-9.

83 Ferns and Ostry, The Age of Mackenzie King, 19-21

84 Ibid., 21-5; Drummond, Political Economy, 29.

85 Buck, Social Sciences at Harvard, 12; Goodwin, Canadian Economic Thought, 173; and Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, 25.

86 Bourinot, "The Study of Political Science," 3-4.

87 Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, 22-4.

88 S.E.D. Shortt, The Search for an Ideal: Six Canadian Intellectuals and their Convictions in an Age of Transition, 1890-1930 (Toronto, 1976), 99, 122-5.

89 F.J. Turner, "Pioneer Ideals and the State," address delivered in 1910, quoted in Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism, 220-1.

90 Marlene Shore, "The Research Ideal: Carl Dawson and the Origins of Sociology at McGill University," Historical Papers (1985), 47-50. For information on courses offered before World War I, see V.A. Tomovic, "Sociology in Canada: An Analysis of its Growth in English Language Universities, 1908-1972," unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Waterloo (1975), Ch. 3.

91 Ibid., 29.

92 McKillop, A Disciplined Intelligence, 226.

93 See Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, 113.

94 McKillop, "John Watson and the Idealist Legacy," Canadian Literature, 83 (1979), 74.

95 Adam Shortt, "Principal Grant," QQ 10 (1902), 1-4. And see Watt, "George Munro Grant," 14; Berger, A Sense of Power, 26.

96 Gordon, "The Functions of a Modern University," 487-97.

97 For early arts curricula in western Canada, see Falconer, "The Tradition of Liberal Education," 116-18; W.H. Alexander, "The University of Alberta," UTM 10 (1909), 16-20; A.S. Morton, Saskatchewan: The Making of a University (rev. ed. Toronto, 1959), 68; W.L. Morton, One University: A History of the University of Manitoba, 1877-1952 (Toronto, 1952) 36-7, 54.

98 Carlyle King, The First Fifty: Teaching, Research and Public Service at the University of Saskatchewan (Toronto, 1959).

99 Michael Hayden, Seeking a Balance: The University of Saskatchewan 1907-82 (Vancouver, 1983), 36-7, 65, and see Ch. 5.

100 Mario Creet, "H.M. Tory and the Secularization of Canadian Universities," QQ 88 (1981), 725.

101 Harry T. Logan, Tuum Est: A History of the University of British Columbia (Vancouver, 1958), 46. Logan was quoting a speech by Wesbrook given at the University of Manitoba in 1913.

102 *Report of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto*, xiii.

103 Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*, 58.

104 Meltzer, *Academic Freedom*, 108-9.

105 McKillop, "The Research Ideal and the University of Toronto, 1870-1906," *TRSC* 4th Ser. Vol. 20 Sec. 2 (1982), 273.

106 See Hayden, *Seeking a Balance*, 48-9.

# Chapter 4

## Culture and Citizenship: Literature in the Arts Curriculum

In an attempt to compete with the appeal of science and vocationalism, a number of professors of literature became involved in creating a new rationale for their disciplines. What they tried to do, in fact, was to show that literary studies belonged in a different category from vocational or scientific training, and that they constituted the most essential element of a higher education. The writings of Matthew Arnold supplied much of their inspiration and greatly influenced the way they expressed their hopes for literature. For Arnold, the classics embodied the highest expressions of culture, and his ideas had a strong appeal for classicists in English-Canada. Latin and Greek were not destined, however, to be the main vehicles of cultural influence in twentieth century Canada, because the difficulty of mastering the languages and their apparent lack of utility steadily diminished their role in the arts curriculum. Modern foreign languages, such as French and German, also had their limitations. The languages had to be learned before their literatures could act upon the students' minds, and most undergraduates did not progress beyond a very limited proficiency. English suffered from no such handicap and

was the subject which assumed the task of bringing culture to the masses in the English-Canadian university. English not only took over the classics' former role at the core of the liberal arts program, but in good part supplanted philosophy as the discipline concerned with morality and human conduct.

## SWEETNESS AND LIGHT: THE SPECIAL FUNCTION OF THE HUMANITIES

Matthew Arnold shared with other middle-class Victorian intellectuals the ideal of social citizenship--a condition which he believed to be nurtured by "culture" (especially literature) and to be guided by the authority of "the best that has been thought and said in the world."[1] Yet Arnold's faith in culture derived not only from recent trends in British thought but from the much older tradition of humanism which drew from classical antiquity, the Rennaissance, and the Romantic movement. Humanism was a creed which proclaimed "the dignity and central position of man in the universe,"[2] and Arnold employed it to defend humanistic studies against the aggressive claims of science and utility in education. Because culture is the expression of our highest nature, Arnold argued, the study of culture brings out the best in those that pursue it. The classic expression of his creed is his book *Culture and Anarchy* (1869) and his title

reflects his belief that, in a democracy, the diffusion of culture throughout the social classes is a necessary antidote to the anarchic and destructive modern habit of "doing what one likes."[3] Culture, he believed, would unify the classes by revealing the high ideals that people held in common, and would permit the democratic state to become an expression of humanity's "best self."[4]

In Arnold's scheme, culture was an even broader and more significant concept than religion. His famous critique of the excesses of middle class, Nonconformist, "Philistine" England was inspired by his belief that too much confidence had been placed in the religious sensibility, and too much emphasis had been put on morality for its own sake. This tendency he called Hebraism, a view of life which was obsessed with "conduct and obedience" and which on its own was "far removed from a true and satisfying ideal of human perfection."[5] Hellenism was his name for the opposite but complementary impulse of man to love beauty and truth, or "sweetness and light," for their own sakes, and to pursue the Socratic ideal of free thought which allows one to "see things as they really are."[6] The final aim of both Hebraism and Hellenism was "man's perfection or salvation," but neither alone was sufficient.[7] As Chris Baldick writes, "Arnold insisted in <u>Culture and Anarchy</u> that religion, important though it was, could not lay claim to the "totality" of human

affairs, and that it was one 'side' of human nature only. Instead, Culture itself came to stand for this totality."[8] In a secularizing and democratic society, Arnold proposed that culture be accepted as the most important source of correct values in morals, aesthetics, and politics. "If we look at the world outside us," he advised, "we find a disquieting absence of sure authority. We discover that only in right reason can we get a source of sure authority; and culture brings us towards right reason."[9]

Arnold's views on the singular importance of literary education had a considerable impact during his lifetime, and his influence did not diminish after his death in 1888. His was only one of many voices raised against the trends towards specialization, vocationalism, and too ardent a belief in science, but Arnold contributed to the humanist movement a remarkably appealing and enduring vision of the role of culture in modern society.

His influence extended beyond his own country. In the United States at the beginning of the new century, his ideas were adopted by administrators who feared that the revolution in higher learning which had begun in the 1870s had gone much too far. President Butler of Columbia was not alone in his lament that

> The specialization of knowledge ... has been carried so far that the phrase "a liberal education" has now hardly any meaning. Highly specialized knowledge is begetting on every side intolerance and narrowness of vision and of spirit.

> We are today surrounded by hosts of uneducated scholars. They are men who know almost everything about something, but little or nothing about the real significance of that something and its place in the scheme of things.[10]

Most critical of specialized learning were professors in the humanities, who adopted, in Veysey's terminology, an ideal of "liberal culture" with which to oppose the ideals of utility and research which were steadily gaining ground. "Most American men of letters were ardent Anglophiles," writes Veysey, "and an Englishman, Matthew Arnold, was often allowed to speak rather automatically for the concept of culture."[11]

Arnold visited Canada during a North American speaking tour in 1884. He drew large audiences, but his appeal was limited; as the Toronto Mail observed, in Canada, "the class that is prepared to follow Mr. ARNOLD is small--the professional and literary class."[12] Claude Bissell finds that after his visit Arnold became a favourite topic of discussion in the Week, but that its contributors "emphasized strongly the hebraic side of his teaching, and largely ignored the hellenic." Only Sara Jeannette Duncan would publicly discuss the full meaning of Arnold's attack on the middle class, and acknowledge that Ontario was "one great camp of the Philistines."[13]

But Arnold's popularity amongst intellectuals seems to have increased as the century drew to a close, and his full interpretation of the role of culture

came into greater favour. This change may be partially attributed to a more secular academic environment, and, more specifically, to the influence of philosophical idealism, which did much to temper the "hebraism" of orthodox Christianity in academic circles.[14] Also important was the fact that by the early twentieth century scholars in the humanities were in need of a new ideology with which to defend the status of literary education. As the Mail had predicted in 1884, "It has been Mr. ARNOLD'S good fortune to have impressed his contemporaries greatly, much more than he will be likely to learn during his lifetime."[15]

There were several professors of classical and modern literature in the pre-war, English-Canadian academic world who shared a common allegiance to the Arnoldian notion that culture was the "one thing needful" in a higher education. They undertook to spread this gospel through their writings and speeches, and helped to ensure the longevity of Arnold's influence in twentieth century Canada. Preoccupied with the fate of literary studies, they maligned utilitarian values and were frequently hostile towards science itself. They were conservative in outlook and distrustful of democracy in varying degrees, and they promoted the imperial connection as Canada's best protection against the encroachment of American materialism and social disorder. Their curricular philosophies were conser-

vative as well, and their influence acted as a break upon reforms which might reduce the literary content of the arts course.

For men of this frame of mind, the war between literary and scientific education was still escalating, even if it no longer engaged the attention of the majority of the members of the academic community. The survival of their subjects depended, in the words of English professor James Cappon, upon "a clear recognition of the fundamental difference which exists between the ideals of technological and humanistic or literary education." It was only a "confusion of thought," explained Cappon, that led educationalists "to think that they may easily and with advantage substitute the one for the other."[16] These men frequently emphasized the connection between a literary education, good character, and enlightened leadership, and pointed out the deficiencies of the scientist as a human being. Like Arnold, they believed that an accumulation of facts about the non-human world was incapable of "guiding our sense of conduct and beauty."[17] Maurice Hutton, for whom higher education and classical education were synonymous terms, argued that "science is apt to leave the character where it finds it, for better or for worse," and his colleague, W.S. Milner, conceded that "the highest type of man" when trained in science was "undoubtedly a cultured man, but he may be essentially

a stranger to the human family."[18] W.J. Alexander, a classicist who occupied the new chair of English at Toronto, agreed that the person who simply "comes in contact with facts" would not possess the breadth of human understanding, the "tolerance and coolness and judgement," which were among the rewards of a literary education and the requirements of public life.[19]

To an extent, these men were heirs to the mid-Victorian tradition of mental discipline in their concern over the effects of higher education upon spiritual health and public morality. What placed them beyond that tradition, however, was their greater faith in men's intellect--their "Hellenism," one might say. They expected themselves and their students to experience continuous moral improvement through the free-spirited study of secular culture. As Veysey puts it, men of letters, in this era, "made a religion out of civilization."[20]

There was still ambivalence, nonetheless, in their attitude toward intellectual achievement. It sprang from a deep-seated antagonism, felt by men who were not attracted to the world of research themselves, towards the pursuit of new and more specialized knowledge. They tended to feel that research fragmented knowledge, and that what man really needed was the unifying principles which only their subjects could provide. The special quality of the humanities was

that they were not obsessed with the search for new and ever more minute and contradictory facts, but with the pursuit of universal truths and with "seeing life steadily and seeing it whole."[21] Truth was held to be as much a product of inspiration as of research, something that, in Hutton's words, "cannot be sounded and plumbed by the intellect because it is not a matter of knowledge."[22]

These men were convinced, as was Arnold, that culture must provide the spiritual nourishment which religion had once supplied. James Cappon, for example, wrote that

> The essential conception of literary education as a whole is that it is the study of man's constant endeavour to keep alive his spiritual life by giving it a true and beautiful form of expression ... If that is the real meaning of literary education, is it necessary to insist on the fact that our new democracies are growing up under conditions (amongst others, an entire absence of fixed traditions and dogmatic belief) which makes this kind of culture one of their great needs and indeed quite indispensable? How else is reverence for the ideal that the history of humanity discloses to enter into their education? How else is their religious sense in our times to be developed?[23]

The antagonism that Cappon and others felt towards the growing status of research at the expense of teaching can be partially explained by the fact that they considered themselves, as purveyors of culture, to be performing a role analagous to that of the clergy and to be equally worthy of respect.[24] They believed that two processes were underway in their undergraduate

classrooms: the professor brought students into touch with culture--with "the literature which binds men together in a spiritual world" and, in addition, he offered students a model to emulate by "teaching traditional values and deportment through his own behaviour."[25] Because the authority they possessed in the twentieth century university would, it seemed, be exercised in the classroom, the growing tendency of research-minded scholars to downplay the importance of teaching was anathema to them. Academics in the sciences, social sciences, and professions all enjoyed increasing prestige outside the university because of the direct utility of their expertise. But the humanists' role in society now appeared to be undervalued, and their best defence was to proclaim that teaching was "the noblest of all professions."[26]

Notions of superiority, in fact, imbued much of these men's thought. They saw their disciplines as the embodiment of "the best that has been thought and said," and that phrase was now taken to mean the British as well as the classical literary tradition. While there was nothing unusual about scholars being convinced of the paramount value of their own disciplines, the Arnoldian link between culture and character gave rise to a strong belief in personal superiority as well. The Toronto World had testily remarked in 1884 that Arnold's faith in culture clearly implied that "the

poet and orator rank before the botanist, that Matthew Arnold is a better specimen of the species than Huxley or Darwin."[27] That jibe was not unwarranted, and the professors studied here shared a belief that their academic role consisted of training an intellectual and moral elite for which they themselves supplied the model of achievement. They strove, in good faith, to be paragons of "sweetness and light," and through their teaching to create a gentlemanly class of leaders--an aristocracy of manners, if not of birth, who would eventually civilize the rude democracy in which they lived.[28] Their mission was to establish "a source of sure authority," or, as Milner described the "burden" of the arts college in 1906:

> to carry our people through the vast material prosperity awaiting us, to foster our higher life, to furnish wealth with noble interests and ambitions, to kindle the spirit of citizenship, to rescue democracy from the spirit of the crowd, to check the hypnotic influence of the vagrant ideal, to hold out proper aims to government, to give grace to a raw civilization, to plead the beauty, the dignity and solemnity of life, in short to create "the soul of a people."[29]

The Arnoldian ideal was popular with professors of both classics and English, but was far less so with those in modern foreign languages. Honours classics at Toronto was recreated, by Maurice Hutton, in the very image of Arnold's Oxford, and despite the overall decline in classical learning from the turn of the century onwards, it remained a prestigious

cultural pursuit. Modern languages had much closer links to vocational training, and their professors were very much aware that a thirst for "culture" was not the motive to which most of their students would confess. English, on the other hand, enjoyed the best of both worlds, being an undeniably useful subject, yet pre-eminently associated, in the twentieth century university, with the cultivation of civilized values and refined habits of expression.

## THE DECLINE OF THE CLASSICS

By the turn of the century, English and Latin were the only subjects required in all four years of the arts course in English Canada.[30] Greek was not required at all, and its decline in Canada was paralleled by its virtual disappearance from the American curriculum. Schools and universities collaborated in its demise; Harvard led the way in making Greek optional for college entrance, thus freeing college-bound young people from the need to study Greek at any time. But the pressure of public opinion was what sealed its fate at all levels of education. As President Hadley of Yale explained in 1903, "colleges cannot teach a thing to a public which does not want to study it."[31] The same process occurred in Canada, for Greek was too difficult and its utility was too vague for it to remain part of the mainstream of higher education.

Yet in this same period the honours classics program prospered, especially at the University of Toronto. For Greek, more than any other discipline, the honours course provided a refuge from the changes caused by the modernization of higher learning. The great success of honours classics owed much to Maurice Hutton. He came from Oxford to Toronto in 1880 to take over from John McCaul (whose daughter he married) and he soon transformed the study of classical languages. Looking back after nearly fifty years, one of his first students retained "a very living impression of the sudden contrast between new and old."[32] Rather than confining his students, in the traditional manner, to "the dark and cold ante-chamber of parsing and grammar,"[33] he drew them into an exploration of the contents of the classical works and the minds of their authors. Under Hutton, the classics were studied in relation to the societies that produced them, and ancient history and philosophy soon became important components of the honours course.[34] Hutton's inspiration was the classical course at Oxford, which had risen to a new level of prestige in the late nineteenth century.[35] Matthew Arnold had contributed to the "Oxford mystique" by idealizing his university as a sublime place of "beauty and sweetness." In Culture and Anarchy and other writings, he portrayed Oxford as a "spiritual and intellectual 'centre' for English culture."[36] Hutton and his followers believed

in that centre, and they were determined to inject some of its beauty and sweetness into Canadian life through Toronto's classical course.[37]

The educational philosophy behind Hutton's vast confidence in the classics is worth a closer look, for the survival of Greek scholarship in twentieth century Canada must surely be indebted to his leadership. Hutton was head of the classics department for nearly fifty years, and between 1901 and 1929 he was principal of University College. His personal and academic influence extended across the country, for a majority of English-Canadian universities in the first half of this century employed classics professors who were graduates of Hutton's department.[38]

Hutton, in fact, used more than one educational philosophy to promote and defend the classics. Bowker has remarked on the fact that he held onto "the argument of mental discipline and the training of faculties" long after it was out of fashion.[39] He found it especially useful when discussing the need for classical learning at an early age. For example, he believed that young people "get a discipline for imagination, for effort, for patience, by puzzling out the meaning of classical languages," and he warned that English grammar was "not the best vehicle" for building character because it "is much too easy and has no discipline in it." Like many other classicists, his great concern

for the public schools was that they continue to require at least Latin, but at the level of higher education Hutton would not compromise his belief that Latin and Greek must be studied together. In that sphere he embraced a more modern argument. By constructing something of a parallel to Hellenism and Hebraism, he defined Greek as "the language of free thought" and Latin as "the language of order and discipline and law and obedience, and between the two," he continued, "they include the whole duty of man." Together they supplied not only the highest wisdom but the knowledge necessary for daily life, embodying "the best that has been thought and said on common subjects." Hutton would assent to no alternatives: "the world cannot do better than stick to the classics; there is no royal road to education, no democratic road, nor any Canadian road."[40]

But even though Latin remained secure for the time being, no amount of rhetoric could preserve Greek's traditional importance in the liberal arts curriculum. Latin benefitted from the popular belief that it laid the groundwork for the study of English, French, and other modern languages, and from the fact that, where Latin was concerned, a little learning was considered better than none at all. A writer in the University Magazine conceded that while "a smattering of Greek" was of little worth, "even the slightest and briefest study of Latin is of real practical value" because

of its application in other language studies.[41] Even if it was increasingly viewed as something of a handmaiden to newer literary disciplines, Latin retained its compulsory status before the war and was not yet forced to compete with other subjects in the general arts course.

But after World War I, the decline of the classics continued. In 1920, two years of Latin (after junior matriculation) was still required by arts students in central and Maritime Canada, but at most western universities another foreign language could be chosen instead.[42] Classicists fought the trend towards optional status for Latin by repeating old arguments about its "disciplinary value,"[43] and by attacking the growing emphasis on utility and the social sciences. Hutton recalled his early years at Toronto, when "there was more hard-thinking and less psycho-analysis," and when "the shibboleths of the present hour were not yet heard. There was no loud echoing of catch-words like 'service' and 'social service' and 'socialism.'"[44] J.M. Macdonnell of Queen's took a different tack and tried to persuade his readers that the classics were, in fact, of service in practical life, arguing that they provided a good practical training for business. Inspired by a post-war commission's report on classical learning in Great Britain, he ventured that "In the highest branches of industry and commerce what is demanded is character,

breadth of view, judgement, grasp of principle, and the power of clear thinking and clear expression."[45] His plea bore the mark of desperation, and brought an immediate rebuttal, in a subsequent issue of the Queen's Quarterly, from economist Clifford Clark.[46]

Throughout English-Canada in the interwar years, the numbers of students taking the classics in high school declined rapidly. The pace of change did vary across the country, but universities in general were pressured towards accepting other subjects than Latin at matriculation.[47] As a result, fewer classical graduates were needed as teachers, fewer students were drawn to the classics at university, and the level of university instruction in Latin had to be lowered to compensate for the lack of previous training, as had already occurred with Greek.[48] The public's declining regard for classical learning was turned into educational policy by provincial governments. C.B. Sissons, for example, remembered how certain "apostles of John Dewey" in Ontario's Department of Education mounted their offensive against the Latin requirement. Duncan McArthur, a historian who became Deputy Minister of Education in 1934, "at once became a missionary of French as opposed to Latin." Chief superintendant George Roger's policy was guided by his belief that "the schools must educate for life." There were professors such F.C.A. Jeanneret (who taught French at

University College) who opposed the government's goal to remove Latin as a matriculation requirement, but found it "unpleasant to be charged with biting the hand that feeds."[49]

Curiously enough, the provincial authorities found an ally of sorts in Ontario's most elitist educational institution, Upper Canada College. It was true that Principal W.L. Grant (son of George Grant, and an Oxonian, one time imperialist, and former professor of colonial history at Queen's) was a great advocate of classical learning as an avenue to culture in the Arnoldian sense. If the classics are ignored, he wrote in 1917, "we remain in ignorance of some of the most important spiritual forces which have shaped, and are still shaping, our race."[50] But Grant nevertheless objected to the Latin requirement and went so far as to call it "the sword in the hand of the Philistines."[51] Compulsory Latin, he argued in 1917, is not suited to democratic mass education. Modern needs cannot be met "by adherence to formulae designed for other ages and other systems. We must save Hellenism and the Classical spirit even at the cost of an appendectomy."[52]

What Grant wanted to see was the widespread teaching of the classics through English translations. "I think of the time spent upon the Ablative Absolute," wrote Grant, "and of the quickening insight into the early civilizations which could be given in even a part of

of that time ...".[53] He believed that, if classical cultures were to influence modern life, they would have to be made accessible to the majority, but he found that "to mention the possiblity of studying Greece and Rome in translation is almost invariably to provoke the sniff of superiority."[54] Hutton, for example, had no use for the idea, because the classics would then lose their all-important "brain-twisting" quality.[55] His colleague, John MacNaughten, professor of Latin at University College, was also opposed. "Greek literature in English translation," he scoffed. "Boned turkey in short. The least translatable of all tongues whose most valuable deposit by far is its poetry, that is to say its least translatable product and content, in translations? Homer through the medium of 'the language of the Book of Mormon'!"[56]

But despite the opposition (which was most vehement where the classics were strongest) the reading of ancient texts in English was the coming thing, and, to some extent, can be said to have breathed new life into classical studies in English-Canada. The pioneer in this field was a professor of classics in the province most hostile to Latin; in Alberta, high school students were not permitted to study any more than one language besides English.[57] William Hardy Alexander was a champion of classical learning but believed that "its content must be such as to justify it to the modern

world; a modern education must be a workshop, not a museum of antiquities."[58] By 1930, he had created the first university course in classical civilizations entirely based on translations. His inspiration for "Classics in English" had been his former teacher, President Benjamin Ida Wheeler of the University of California, who had taught him that "the whole future of classical studies is wrapped up in the vivid interpretation of them to the world of today in such languages as it can understand."[59] The idea spread across Canada, so that by World War II at least nine universities were offering such courses.[60] Toronto was one of the most resistant: it was not until 1953-4 that the Faculty of Arts created its own "Classics in English" and conceded that "it is possible that this will meet a modern need."[61]

The success of his pet project did not prevent Alexander from lamenting, later in his career, "the near disappearance of the classical tradition." Because the languages themselves attracted fewer and fewer devotees, classical scholars in the old sense were becoming "a thing of the past."[62] Perhaps, as had been hoped, the study of classics in translation might spur a few students to explore the languages of the original texts, but most were content with a brief dabble in Plato and Homer and Sophocles. By the 1950s, for that matter, although the classics were much praised as

the basis of the "Western Tradition," the majority of undergraduates were likely to experience their only brush with Greece and Rome through a historical survey of "Western Civ."

THE UTILITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES

Despite the fact that the modern foreign languages more or less displaced the classics in the twentieth century curriculum, they did not replace them in the sense of taking over their role as the bearers of a common or shared cultural experience. In the first place, not all students studied the same languages; honours students took several modern languages at once, but pass students chose from a gradually widening array of language options.[63] Furthermore, the teaching of modern languages necessarily emphasized the acquisition of language skills of a basic nature rather than a real familiarity with a foreign literary culture, and by the twentieth century its justification was based largely on utilitarian rather than moral or aesthetic arguments.

A survey of the history of modern language studies shows a definite improvement in their status in the arts curriculum from one century to the next. During much of the nineteenth century, the teaching of European languages was not one of the universities' most prestigious undertakings. Toronto recognised their sig-

nificance enough to create a Chair in Modern Languages in the 1850s to which Professor Forneri was appointed, but as one of his successors observed, "it was a fatal error to expect any one man ... to give adequate instruction in four different languages and literatures."[64] The quality and status of language study remained inferior to other parts of the curriculum for many years. In 1884, the Varsity complained that the department "has ever presented a sorry spectacle. In no other, perhaps, has the teaching been so wretched."[65]

The Varsity's editor argued for several changes. At that time, French and German were together considered equal to Greek, and four years of Latin were compulsory.[66] He insisted that the classics were not justified in maintaining their advantage over other languages; that German, for example, could impart just as high a degree of culture as Greek, and that the only reason it had not done so was "the slipshod way in which it has been studied." One prerequisite for better teaching was to make modern languages into disciplines in their own right, free from the burdensome ties not only with history but ethnology--the study of racial origins and characteristics.[67] (A reader agreed that it was "a remarkable system" that grouped "anthropology with French grammar").[68] The editor also proposed that it was time attention was paid to "the extraordinary developments in the science of languages."[69]

By the mid-1890s, a Department of Modern Languages had been created at Toronto with separate chairs in French and German and an expanded teaching staff which included John Squair, a graduate of the university who returned to teach in the mid-1880s and became involved in the reform of language teaching. In his memoirs, he recalled that, when he was a student at Toronto, the university was in the habit of "prescribing books on the History of Literature, containing descriptions and appreciations of books which the student had no chance of seeing for himself, and of asking him to reproduce these statements of fact and opinion at the Examinations." One of Squair's first actions was to see that the use of such books was eliminated. He attempted to concentrate the students' attention "on a few great things, and prevent frittering away time in trying to acquire knowledge at second hand."[70] Improvements were gradual, but by 1895 the study of honours French and German involved a progression through the literatures of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, combined with two years of Spanish, three of Italian, and some attention to linguistic analysis in the form of philology.[71]

One of the primary means used by modern language advocates to improve the academic reputation of their subjects was to invoke the scientific method. W.L. Fraser, who taught at Toronto and served as secretary

to the Modern Language Association of Ontario, was an early and enthusiastic advocate of the scientific approach to language.[72] He introduced a course in the "Elements of French Philology" in 1890 and taught it until his death in 1916.[73] W.H. Van der Smissen's application of philology to the study of German was, by his later admission, prompted by a desire to relieve the modern languages from "the reproach, at that time not unjustified, of being too light and thin to be considered worthy of a place alongside of the classic and other courses."[74] The suitablity of linguistics for undergraduate study was not unchallenged within departments,[75] but the emphasis on the scientific method remained a useful means of stressing the intellectual rigour that was to prevail in modern language study. Professor Milton Buchanan advised graduate students at Toronto in 1917 that the techniques used to study foreign languages were "to be as rigorously scientific and scholarly as those employed in laboratory sciences."[76]

Another means by which the status of modern languages was improved was through the emphasis that was placed, especially after World War I, on their usefulness in various walks of life. For this argument, Canadian educators had the support of a British government commission, apppointed in 1916, which inquired into the position of modern languages in the educational system. Its report, issued in 1918, decried their

low status and neglect in British schools and universities and emphasized the practical reasons why they should be taken more seriously. It pointed out that linguistic handicaps had hampered the war effort, and predicted that the future would require a more conscientious attempt to understand "the mental attitude and aspirations of foreign peoples." Members of the public service, the Foreign Office, and the military all would need such training, and languages would also be required by those engaged in international trade. Access to technological and scientific discoveries made by other nations would be facilitated as well. The report did not neglect the role of languages as a means to general education and culture, but it did not rely on that argument to press its case for improved teaching on the government and the public mind.[77] The report was well received by language professors in Canada, both because of its strong support for their subjects and its acceptance of the practical goals which were already predominant in this country. John Squair called it "the most important document which the present generation has seen on the question of the teaching of Modern Languages."[78]

During the interwar years, modern languages made steady gains over Latin and Greek and found themselves in competition with one another. French prospered because its usefulness was evident to virtually every-

one; not only was it of benefit in diplomacy, trade and science, but it was Canada's second language and an asset for anyone in public life. German had long been the second most important modern language in the curriculum, but its utility was less pronounced and it was not nearly as popular as a curricular option in the twentieth century. Before World War I, it could be argued that Germany's power and prestige as the most technologically advanced of non-English speaking nations made its language worth learning; in 1908, Professor MacGillivray of Queen's made the plea that German was "the language of the leaders, not only in the arts of war but also the arts of peace."[79] The war soon extinguished that notion, and the study of German was discouraged. Ontario's Minister of Education required the universities to make sufficient provision for Spanish and Italian so that "no undergraduate should be compelled to study German against his will."[80] German enrolments dropped by about one half, and the number of students choosing Spanish doubled.[81] There was a shortage of high school teachers of German after the war, but it recovered as a university subject, primarily because of its usefulness to those in science and medicine.[82]

Meanwhile, Spanish would continue to flourish as an option for pass students in arts. Much was made, at the time, of its use in commercial dealings with

South America; this trend was so noticeable that Milton Buchanan was prompted to ask whether "the study of Spanish may also serve other purposes than merely to barter for mutton in Buenos Aires?"[83] The head of Queen's Department of Spanish must have been one of the first language "experts" to be drawn temporarily into public service, for, in 1931, P.G.C. Campbell was despatched to South America to "publicize Canada" and promote Canadian exports.[84]

The study of modern languages did not neglect the literary classics at its more advanced levels, but the ability to read, write, and occasionally speak a foreign tongue was its primary goal as far as undergraduates were concerned. Language study in English-Canada was justified more by utilitarian than cultural ideals--a certain language did not attract more students because it possessed a richer literary heritage, but because it met the criterion of being "good for" something. The discipline of English, on the other hand, was seldom put to such a test. By 1940, English was the only subject still studied by almost all arts students, and there is no record of attempts being made to dislodge it from its privileged position. To ask what Shakespeare was "good for" would, during the first half of the twentieth century, have been to label oneself a Philistine.

THE CIVILIZING MISSION OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

At the end of the nineteenth century, the classics were embarked on their steady decline; the modern foreign languages were still searching for a rationale, be it scientific or utilitarian, to strengthen their position; but English studies had already assumed its place at the centre of the arts curriculum. This success was very recent. For decades, English had suffered the same low status as other modern languages. Earlier in the century, it had played the part of the "poor man's classics," injecting literary content into non-degree courses aimed at a lower class of citizen in England and Canada.[85] By the 1840s, a form of English studies had entered arts programs at the majority of English-speaking universities (excluding Oxbridge) where it supplemented the classics in the study of language skills. Literary works were consulted primarily to illustrate matters of usage and technique: Milner recalled his "undergraduate impression that university authorities conceived Shakespeare's plays as written with the far purpose of furnishing material for Fowler's figures of rhetoric."[86]

By the late 1850s or the 1860s, students in Britain and North America were also studying the history of English literature with the aid of manuals by such authors as C.G. Craik and William Spalding.[87] In the 1875 edition of his text, Spalding invited students

to reflect upon how "the world of letters ... is, in its effects, one of the highest and more powerful of those influences that have been appointed to rule and change the social and moral life of man." Yet his book consisted of a most uninspiring collection of literary trivia, surveying--in one volume--all aspects of writing from the year 449 to 1870.[88] The _Varsity_ complained that to expect students to learn English literature by studying Craik "or some other equally incapable individual" was as rational as to expect "students to learn swimming by reading works on hydrodynamics." The only way to arouse the student's interest, the editor advised, would be to place him "in close contact first with the living, throbbing literature of his own day."[89]

The students' desire to experience literature first hand instead of just reading about it seems unremarkable today. But the fact that a new generation of English professors (the first, in any real sense) was about to transform the study of English into an entirely different enterprise constituted yet another important aspect of the late nineteenth century academic revolution.

In one respect, there was a parallel between the new approach to literature and the strong faith in perception and experience which distinguished the new experimental and inductive approaches to the natural

and social sciences. Both depended on the intellectual participation of the students rather than just the memorization of textbooks and lectures. When W.M. Tweedie of Mount Allison enjoined students to "make sure that we are looking with our own eyes," he meant that literature must be approached directly and inquisitively. He championed linguistic analysis because he believed it brought students closer to the intended meaning of the writer. "When you sit down with the book," he instructed,

> be it a play of Shakespeare or a poem of Milton, let the poet first speak for himself and hold your mind impressive to his influence. Use every help to get at his true meaning--ascertain as far as you can the circumstances and time of writing the book, investigate difficulties of text, understand his words, compare parallel passages that occur to you--in all these things display the scholar's accuracy and care.[90]

But despite the fact that, like other modern languages, English initially sought prestige by advocating a "scientific approach," the rise of English owed more to a reaction on the part of humanists against the triumph of science. Advocates of literary culture, for the most part, rejected the utilitarianism and materialism which the scientific method had brought to higher learning. By the early twentieth century, English had become a discipline with a new mission: one which traced its origins back through Arnold to the Romantic conception of the poet as the guardian of a higher reality in a materialistic age.

Arnold's belief in the moral authority of culture was clearly a legacy of the Romantic movement in England. The Romantic poets such as Shelley, Wordsworth, and Coleridge did not invent the idea that literature serves a moral purpose; rather, their singular achievement was that they elevated imaginative literature to a status far above other kinds of writing, and, most importantly, they identified poetry as the highest literary art primarily because of the way its form, rather than its content, operated upon the imagination. Poetry, they believed, did not merely convey the author's meaning or message; it altered the mental and spiritual state of the receptive reader, and elevated him to the realm of a superior reality.[91] Arnold adapted this Romantic faith in "culture," as he called it, to his own need for a new philosophy of mass education, with which he hoped to oppose not only utilitarianism and anarchic liberalism, but the mounting religious scepticism which threatened to undermine all notions of right conduct.[92] "If one were asked to provide a single explanation for the growth of English studies in the later nineteenth century," writes Terry Eagleton, "one could do worse than reply: 'the failure of religion.'"[93] Arnold's essay on "The Study of Poetry" (1880) amply confirmed his own faith in the spiritual force of imaginative literature:

> The future of poetry is immense, because in poetry, where it is worthy of its high destinies,

> our race, as time goes on, will find an ever surer and surer stay. There is not a creed which is not shaken, not an accredited dogma which is not shown to be questionable, not a received tradition which does not threaten to dissolve ... We should conceive of poetry worthily, and more highly than it has been the custom to conceive of it ... More and more mankind will discover that we have to turn to poetry to interpret our life for us, to console us, to sustain us. Without poetry, our science will appear incomplete; and most of what now passes with us for religion and philosophy will be replaced by poetry.[94]

The Arnoldian creed had a profound effect upon Canadian professors of English, although the extent to which it helped to secure their discipline's place as the one universally recognised "core" subject in the arts course cannot be precisely measured. Robin Harris and W.L. Morton have both maintained (but without supporting evidence) that the prescription of English was mainly intended to improve composition skills, rather than to inject cultural content into the curriculum.[95] That justification must surely have been widely used, but it does not explain why English courses focussed on the study of great literatures of the past instead of on practical lessons in composition, as had the nineteenth century study of "rhetoric." What preoccupied English students from the 1890s onwards was their emotional, aesthetic, and moral appreciation of literary works, and the cultivation of their ability to analyse the force of those experiences in an acceptable written style. Amongst English professors, one finds a strong similarity of outlook regarding the

singular importance of English studies in the arts curriculum--an outlook which was based on an acceptance of Arnold's definition of the role of literary culture.

A look at the first occupants of new chairs of English at Toronto, Queen's, Dalhousie and Saskatchewan reveals the ideal they held in common. W.J. Alexander already possessed, at the time of his arrival at Toronto in 1889, a deep faith in the spiritual power of culture, and he fit in comfortably with other Anglophile humanists such as Hutton and Wrong. Queen's University was less preoccupied with the Empire and the Oxford mystique than Toronto, but James Cappon stood out from many of his colleagues as a man with, as W.E. MacNeill says, three articles to his creed: the British Empire, the Conservative party, and "humanistic studies, which alone make wise the mind of man."[96] Outside Ontario, Archibald MacMechan at Dalhousie cultivated a highly idealistic conception of the role of literature, and Reginald Bateman, first professor of English at Saskatchewan, was no less fervent in his belief that "Literature is the source ... of our highest development. It is the most potent factor in the slow progress of raising Humanity to a higher level; it is the true motive power of the world."[97]

For anyone graduating from Toronto between 1890 and 1925, says A.S.P. Woodhouse, "English and Alexander became almost interchangeable terms."[98] He devoted the

first part of his career at Toronto to transforming the English course into a serious and respected pursuit, introducing more organization and rigour into the program, and eliminating the use of "crammers" such as Craik.[99] Not only did his students read the "living and throbbing" texts for themselves, they were also taught that their pursuit differed from that of colleagues in other disciplines who were merely concerned with assessing and absorbing the information contained in books. The student of literature was distinguished by his greater interest in interpreting the writer's thoughts and feelings as expressed through "written symbols," and it was his task to "reproduce within himself the mental condition to which these symbols correspond." To do this required both training and an innate susceptibility to literary art, which few men possess in high degree but which is dormant, in some measure, in most. "To rouse this dormant capability, to guide it aright when roused, to teach the proper spirit in which to approach the masterpieces of literature, and to keep the mind in contact with them, this," said Alexander, "should form a main part of every course of literature."[100]

Alexander was confident that poetry was "literature in its purest form," and that, unlike other kinds of writing, such as history, it embodied lasting truths that "possessed validity everywhere for all time."

Quoting Arnold, he explained that "the highest poetry is at bottom a criticism of life, and the greatness of a poet lies in the beautiful and powerful application of ideas to life, to the question--how to live." Unlike philosophy, which is so intellectually complex that it remains "the sphere of the very few," poetry appeals to the many, and has the power to translate ideas "into living convictions grasped by the whole moral nature, which vibrates responsive to them." Alexander conceded that the study of poetry could not guarantee sound moral character, but was confident that "its general elevating tendency is none the less real."[101]

Reginald Bateman, professor of English at one of the most deliberately utilitarian universities in the country, possessed a philosophy very similar to that of Alexander. He too believed that "Poetry is the finest flower of the human mind," and that through it "one gains at second hand the highest spiritual experience." Other subjects, he explained, merely appealed to the intellect, but literature speaks to the heart, which is why it can raise man to a higher level of being:

> We know that a man may take a course in Science, or any purely intellectual subject, and come out at the end of it still uncultured and coarse-minded, with low ideals, with the higher instincts underdeveloped; he may go through a course of literature, too, it is true, and emerge in a similar condition, but not if the literature has been properly presented to him, and if he has really assimilated the best thoughts of the highest minds.

The teacher of English must therefore be a special kind of person, for "literature is the most difficult of all subjects to teach, since it requires in the individual certain qualifications beyond the merely intellectual. For the lack of these qualifications," warned Bateman, "no brilliancy of intellect can compensate."[102]

James Cappon arrived at Queen's in 1888, where he remained until his retirement in 1919. Recalled by one colleague as "the most dogmatic man of culture I have ever met,"[103] Cappon's belief in the superiority of his subject was unshakeable. Trained in idealist philosophy under Edward Caird, he retained little interest in formal philosophy, including that of his colleague, John Watson. According to MacNeill, he believed that "through literature he could teach all the Philosophy it was useful to know."[104] He was an active defender of classical learning but believed it to be of a piece with the study of the great English writers who were the intellectual leaders of the world's most advanced civilization--the British Empire. He had a strong interest in imperial affairs and in politics generally, but believed that the future of Canadian democracy depended on the leadership of a cultured elite _and_ the diffusion of the literary "gospel" throughout the working class.[105] The writings of Arnold pervaded his thinking: "From him," says MacNeill, "Cappon derived his fundamental critical principle: the study

of literature is the study of life and of the best that has been said and thought. He used those words very often."[106]

Archibald MacMechan began his forty year career at Dalhousie within a year of when Alexander arrived at Toronto and Cappon started teaching at Queen's. S.E.D. Shortt portrays MacMechan as a romantic, sentimental idealist, much influenced as an undergraduate by George Paxton Young, his professor at Toronto, and by Carlyle, Ruskin, Tennyson, and Arnold. From them, he derived his ideas about the mission of art and literature.[107] In an essay on Tennyson, he declared rather ambiguously that "the poet is a seer; he is an influence; through him truth is multiplied on truth until the world shows like one great garden."[108] Like Arnold, "MacMechan felt that it was the duty of the critic to point out ... distinctions between good and bad art for the multitude" because men turn to poets instinctively for guidance on matters of faith. In contrast to Cappon, he took little notice of practical affairs, believing that great literature precluded the need for "social thought" of a more conventional nature.[109]

The first group of English professors passed on its philosophy to the next generation of literary scholars. W.J. Alexander, in particular, had a devoted following; Millar Maclure would later write that his

influence was "probably the most important single factor in the development of English studies in Canada."[110] A.S.P. Woodhouse, the doyen of English studies from the 1930s through the 1950s, idolized Alexander and was full of praise for his ability to lead students "to the experience which was the full meaning of the poem."[111] E.K. Brown, who wrote a standard work on Matthew Arnold, was deeply influenced by Alexander as a student: "There was not a series of his lectures I did not hear at least twice, and the course on nineteenth century poets given to students in the final year of the Pass course I heard four times."[112] Pelham Edgar was to have a long career as teacher, critic, and promoter of Canadian literature, and he had absorbed from Alexander a belief in the genius of the poet and the social role of poetry. While still a student, Edgar wrote that "Perhaps only our poets will save us in the end, by the very quality of imagination, from the slough of materialism that with hideous maw threatens to engulf us."[113] Later, as a professor, Edgar assumed the role of Victorian scholar-gentleman, and one student recalled that "When Pelham Edgar read and talked about it, poetry and the practice of poetry seemed to become the noblest and most necessary occupation in the world. So we all tried to become poets!"[114]

Although Arnold was central to their beliefs about literature, the new generation developed some reserva-

tions about his writings on culture. In 1909, Edgar was content to analyse Canadian cultural life through Arnold's eyes (and find it wanting) but after the war he confessed that he found Arnold too prim and imprecise at times, and acknowledged that despite the worth of his arguments, "it is still the lily-fingered Arnold who speaks, and our weakness craves for robuster counsel."[115] E.K. Brown spent his career studying Arnold, but he introduced a collection of his essays in 1936 with the disclaimer that Arnold "is more often suggestive than exhaustive; his readiness to sit in judgement is at times a little pretentious and we regret with Mr. T.S. Eliot that he did not always appreciate 'that Heaven and Earth shall pass away, and Mr. Arnold with them.'"[116] Yet Brown and Edgar both conceded that his influence was far from spent; that "the figure of the critic who will supercede him ... has not yet appeared on the horizon."[117]

A document which helped to keep Arnold's belief in the civilizing mission of literature alive during the interwar period was a British government report, commissioned at the same time as those on the classics and modern languages, called The Teaching of English in England (1921). It was referred to as the Newbolt report after its principal author, the "minor jingoist poet," Sir Henry Newbolt, and it was a profoundly Arnoldean and deeply influential document.[118] The Newbolt

report proposed to counter the social disorder of post-war England by uniting the social classes in a shared pride in their literary heritage, and it even attributed that disorder to the failure of the educational system to effect such a unity thus far: "For if literature be, as we believe, an embodiment of the best thoughts of the best minds ... then the nation of which a considerable portion rejects this means of grace, and which despises this great spiritual influence, must assuredly be heading for disaster."[119] The teacher of English, said Newbolt, must see himself as a missionary

> in a more real and active sense than any of his colleagues. He has obligations not merely to the students who come to him to read for a degree, but still more towards the teeming population outside the University walls ... The fulfilment of these obligations means propaganda work, organization and building up of a staff of assistant missionaries. But first, and above all, it means a right attitude of mind, a conviction that literature and life are inseparable, that literature is not just a subject for academic study, but one of the chief temples of the human spirit, in which all should worship.[120]

Responses to the Newbolt Report were mixed. It definitely gave impetus to the development of English in the schools and universities, and helped to enhance the status of both the discipline and its professors.[121] It fit in with the mood at Cambridge, where at the beginning of the 1920s, as Eagleton says, "it was desperately unclear why English was worth studying at all," but "by the early 1930s it had become a question of why it was worth wasting your time on anything

else. English was not only a subject worth studying, but the supremely civilizing pursuit."[122] The report did not go over well everywhere, however; it was publicly burnt by a professor at University College, London,[123] and the new Merton professor at Oxford, George Gordon, found it too urgent and too full of the "religious jargon about literature and literary genius" which was then current. "We must be modest," he pointed out, "to be believed."[124]

Most professors of English must have read the report with ambivalent feelings. The praise might have been gratifying, but it was certainly excessive. As Professor Knox of University College, Toronto remarked, there were moments when "it may make the teacher of English blush at his imputed importance, his country's regenerator, the missionary to those who have not so much as heard whether there be a Holy Ghost." Yet in it he found his own faith in poetry as a source of wisdom and deep spiritual experience confirmed, and he agreed with Newbolt that we ignore poetry "at our peril." Knox had to admit, as well, that the report's "stern refusal to countenance the narrowly utilitarian theory of education and its bold and eloquent valuation of the study of literature" were "merely splendid."[125]

Professors of English were justified in their confidence, for, between the wars, theirs was the only humanistic discipline to really consolidate its position

at the centre of the arts curriculum. Its success depended not only upon the continuing strength of Arnoldian humanism, but owed something as well to new developments in criticism in the twenties and thirties. The "New Critics" in America, along with the Leavises and I.A. Richards at Cambridge, were intent on making English studies into a more serious and specialized pursuit, and on raising the status of the literary critic to a new level of professionalism. In the process, they revolted against the nineteenth century ideal of the poet as a spiritual leader and discounted his personal authority as a "Great Man" in literary history.[126] What mattered to these critics was not the genius of the individual poet and the interpretation and emulation of that genius, but the literary texts themselves. Literature was now seen as existing in a realm outside of history--as a separate system, a great tradition--with its own organizing principles.[127] It would be the business of the professional critic to interpret that tradition to the layman.

The effects of the new criticism on teaching were several, though they would not reach Canada with full force until after World War II. In English studies, attention shifted away from the historical survey approach, thus severing the last links between the disciplines of English and history.[128] As Rudolph says of American universities in the 1930s, "In English

departments, the 'New Criticism' no longer talked to history."[129] There was also a tendency to downplay the importance of both the student's intuitive or "uncritical" responses to literature and the search for the poet's own intentions in writing. Each work was part of a unified literary canon, and the critic-professor was its legitimate interpreter.[130] And lastly, there developed a more rigid attitude concerning the question of which works merited intensive study or "close reading" and which were excluded from the great tradition. That made it difficult for Canadian literature to gain entry to the arts curriculum; as Woodhouse would say, "it is not easy to have first-class criticism of a literature which is, with a few honourable exceptions, unmistakably second-rate."[131]

Although the new critical theory rejected the Romantic ideal of poetic genius, it did not by any means abandon everything that Arnold stood for. In his faith in the mission of literary education, for example, "Leavis was the true inheritor of Matthew Arnold."[132] Generally speaking, the idea of the social function of literature, or the authority of culture as a sort of secular religion, was not diminished but enhanced by the new approach, and no less in Canada than elsewhere. Canada's most influential post-war teacher and critic, Northrop Frye, would teach that works of literature embody the "myths" which give meaning

to life. Frye's literary and social criticism (the two are really inseparable) constantly affirm his belief that culture is the force behind social reform, that without culture one is trapped by one's ego and by the social environment, and that the organized study of our cultural heritage brings students into touch with "the bureau of standards where real time and space are kept."[133]

The civilizing mission of culture was primarily the responsibility of English, the one discipline which virtually all students were required to study. Its prescription had few critics. Humanists were generally grateful for any guarantee that students would have some exposure to culture. Scholars in social sciences, sciences and the professions were willing to concede that some kind of cultural influence was beneficial, and they could always hope that an English course would teach their students how to write, if nothing else. Compulsory English would not survive indefinitely, but, during the interwar years, which were arguably the most utilitarian of all eras in the history of the arts curriculum, English was universally accepted as the "one thing needful" in a liberal education. The prescription of English, in fact, was the principal means, outside of convocation addresses and other purely rhetorical exercises, by which service-oriented

universities acknowledged the importance of the ideal of culture while pursuing other goals with far greater vigour.

## NOTES

1 Matthew Arnold, Culture and Anarchy (ed.) Dover Wilson (Cambridge, 1971), 6.

2 M.H. Abrams, A Glossary of Literary Terms (4th ed.) (New York, 1981), 76-7.

3 See Arnold, Culture and Anarchy, Ch. 2.

4 See Chris Baldick, The Social Mission of English Criticism (Oxford, 1983), 34-5.

5 Arnold, Culture and Anarchy, 131, 58.

6 Ibid., 131.

7 Ibid., 130.

8 Baldick, The Social Mission, 53.

9 Arnold, Culture and Anarchy, 162.

10 Nicholas Butler, Review of Reviews 30 (1904), 134, quoted in G. Haines and F.A. Jackson, "A Neglected Landmark in the History of Ideas," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 34 (1947-8), 205.

11 Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, 196.

12 Editorial, Toronto Mail (13 Feb. 1884) quoted in B.B. Opala, "Matthew Arnold in Canada," unpub. M.A. thesis, McGill University (1968), 41.

13 C.T. Bissell, "Literary Taste in Central Canada during the Late Nineteenth Century," in B. Hodgins and R. Page, Canadian History Since Confederation (Georgetown, 1972), 165. Bissell is quoting Duncan, "Saunterings," Week 3 (30 Sept. 1886), 707.

14 Veysey has studied the relation between faith in liberal culture and adherence to philosophical idealism in the American university. See The Emergence of the American University, 190-3.

15 Mail (13 Feb. 1884) quoted in Opala, 40.

16 James Cappon, "Is Ontario to Abandon Classical Education?" QQ 12 (1904) 206. Cappon was writing specifically to oppose a new Education Bill that made Latin optional in the training of public school teachers in Ontario, which he viewed as "part of a general movement against literary or humanistic

education as a whole," 193.

17 See Baldick, 40-1. In his report on Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) Arnold explained that "the study of letters is the study of the operation of human force, of human freedom and activity, the study of nature is the study of the operation of non-human forces, of human limitations and passivity ... Therefore the men who have had the humanistic training have played, and yet play, so prominent a part in human affairs, in spite of their prodigious ignorance of the universe; because their training has powerfully fomented the human force in them." Quoted from Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold (ed.) R.H. Super (Ann Arbor), Vol. IV, Schools and Universities on the Continent (1964) in Baldick, The Social Mission, 40.

18 Maurice Hutton, "The Classics," in The Sisters Jest and Earnest (Toronto, 1930), 280; W.S. Milner, "the Arts College," in Report of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto, 173. On Hutton and leadership, see Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 266.

19 W.J. Alexander, The Study of Literature, Inaugural lecture delivered 12 October 1889 (Toronto, 1889), 10-11.

20 Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, 202.

21 The aim of humanism, "as Matthew Arnold has said in the most admirable of his critical phrases, is to see life steadily and see it whole," wrote Irving Babbitt in Literature and the American College (Boston and New York, 1908), 23. The quotation comes from an early poem of Arnold's, first published in 1849, called "To a Friend," in which he wrote of Sophocles, "Who saw life steadily, and saw it whole;/ The mellow glory of the Attic stage." Alexander quotes these lines without identifying their course in The Study of Literature; he could be sure that they would be recognised by his readers.

22 Hutton, quoted in Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 166.

23 Cappon, "Is Ontario to Abandon Classical Education?" 195.

24 According to S.E.D. Shortt, Cappon, and Hutton shared the conviction of Archibald MacMechan,

professor of English at Dalhousie, that their role was "essentially a religious one." See *The Search for an Ideal*, 45, 61, 88. Veysey discusses the same attitude among literary scholars at American universities, in *The Emergence of the American University*, 221.

25 James Cappon, quoted in Shortt, *The Search for an Ideal*, 66; Hutton, quoted in Shortt, 88.

26 Hutton, ibid., 79-80.

27 *Toronto World* (13 Feb. 1884), quoted in Opala, 38.

28 As Berger says in *The Writing of Canadian History*, 10, "Like other university intellectuals of his and the previous generation, Wrong almost ritualistically condemned Canadian public life as disfigured by excessive political partisanship, materialism, rawness, and a lack of intellectual leadership." Bowker, in "Truly Useful Men," 72, writes that Wrong took it as his mission to "civilize his crude countrymen, to inculcate in their leaders the ideals and manners he so admired in the older civilization of the motherland."

29 Milner, "The Arts College," 177.

30 Harris, *The History of Higher Education*, 135. On Greek's decline, see 135-8.

31 See Rudolph, *Curriculum*, 180-6.

32 Group of Classical Graduates, *Honour Classics*, 13.

33 A.L. Fraser's description of the teaching of Professor John Johnson at Dalhousie in "At Dalhousie, Fifty Years Ago," *DR* 26 (1947), 465-70.

34 Group of Classical Graduates, *Honour Classics*, 45-6. For a description of the new spirit in classical education, see R.A. Falconer, "A Hundred Years in the Humanities and Social Sciences," in *Queen's University: a Centenary Volume*, 35-6.

35 See M.L. Clarke, *Classical Education in Britain, 1500-1900* (Cambridge, 1959), 116-27.

36 Baldick, *The Social Mission*, 46.

37 One should note that other influences were present, but were not as strong. H.R. Fairclough, a lecturer

in ancient history at Toronto from 1887 to 1893, was a Canadian who graduated from Toronto and Johns Hopkins. At the latter university, he was immersed in a different atmosphere from that at Toronto --one of informality and greater equality between professor and student--and he also acquired there an enthusiasm for philology and research. Stanford University, where he taught from 1893, probably suited his inclinations better than Hutton's department. See Warming Both Hands, the Autobiography of Henry Rushton Fairclough (Stanford, 1941), 78-83.

38 See Group of Classical Graduates, Honour Classics, Appendix, "Graduates in Honours Classics, 1881-1928."

39 Bowker, "Truly Useful Men," 279.

40 Hutton, "The Classics," 278-83. See also "A Professor's Valedictory," in The Sisters Jest and Earnest, 105-6.

41 R.E. Macnaghten, "The Future of Latin," UM 7 (1908), 93. For the further decline of Greek, see H. Bonis, "Greek vs. German in our Educational System," UTM (April, 1916), 327-300.

42 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 233-5.

43 W.D. Woodhead, "The Decline in the Study of the Classics and Its Consequences," NCCU (1927), 97-103. The classics' declining importance had a parallel in the reduced emphasis on mathematics in the twentieth century. At the same conference, A.S. Eve, also of McGill, spoke critically "On the Present Standards of Mathematics in Canada," 104-8.

44 Hutton, "The Changes of Forty Years," UTM 22 (May, 1922), 344-5.

45 J.M. Macdonnell, "The Decline of the Arts Faculty," QQ 30 (1922-3), 316-18.

46 W.C. Clark, "University Training for Business-A Reply," QQ 30 (1922-3), 321-34.

47 See J.F. Leddy, "The Place of the Humanities in Secondary Education," in The Humanities in Canada, (eds.) Watson Kirkconnell and A.S.P. Woodhouse (Ottawa, 1947), 36-7. After World War II, McGill University and those in the Maritimes still required Latin at Matriculation; those in Ontario and the west did not.

48 Group of Classical Graduates, Honour Classics, 16.

49 C.B. Sissons, Nil Alienum: The Memoirs of C.B. Sissons (Toronto, 1954), 130-2.

50 W.L. Grant, "A Plea for the Wider Study of Classical Life and History," QQ 24 (1917), 478.

51 W.L. Grant, "Defects in Our Teaching of English," UTM 26 (1926), 222.

52 W.L. Grant, "More about Compulsory Latin," UTM 26 (1926), 322.

53 Grant, "Defects," 222. For Grant's opposition, see B.K. Sandwell, "Is our English Teaching Defective? Perhaps: But the Trouble is the Democracy Dissolute not the Ablative Absolute," UTM 22 (1926), 269-71; Carleton Stanley, "More Latin and Not Less is the Remedy," UTM 26 (1926), 271-2; "Professor Stanley's Retort Courteous," UTM 26 (1926), 324-6. Sandwell and Stanley were both University of Toronto classics graduates. Sandwell was at that time editor of the Montreal Financial Times and Stanley was Professor of Latin at McGill.

54 Grant, "A Plea," 479.

55 Hutton, "Language Study--the Classics," UTM 19 (1919), 297-300.

56 John MacNaughton, "How about the Humanities?" UTM 19 (June, 1919), 302. For a more balanced look at the pro's and cons, see H.L. Tracy and L.E. Law, "The Classics at Bay: a Discussion," QQ 43 (1936), 182-7.

57 Leddy, "The Place of the Humanities," 36. Alberta was the province most influenced by the American philosophy of progressive education.

58 W.H. Alexander, "The Classics in a Liberal Education: Per Se and Per Alia," NCCU (1930), 49.

59 Ibid., 51-3. He told the conference that "We have in the University of Alberta a synoptic course which we call 'Classics in English.' It is a survey of Greek thought mainly, and also of the material expression of Greek art; it is required of all classical students, but is also available to all upper-year students in the Faculty of Arts." Was

Alexander's desire to share classical culture with a broader constituency related to his lack of political conservatism? Alexander was very active in socialist politics in the 1930s, as were classicsts G.M.A. Grube and E.A. Havelock.

60 See Watson Kirkconnell, "New Provinces," in The Humanities in Canada, for descriptions of such courses at British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Western, Queen's, McGill, and Mount Allison. Toronto offered four series of lectures, but no credit courses. See also Maurice Lebel, "The Humanities Two Years After the Report," Humanities Research Council Report 2 (1947-9), 10-11.

61 Dean Woodside, "Report of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts," University of Toronto President's Report (1953-4), 49.

62 W.H. Alexander, "The Religion of Classicism," TRSC 3rd ser. Vol. 45 (1951), 139-40. Alexander observed: "the whole structure of the West seems very shaky; it has been endangered by the enfeeblement of Christianity, to be sure, but also, and by no means negligibly, through the near disappearance of the classical tradition." For other expressions of alarm, see Gilbert Norwood, "Latin and Education," UTQ 9 (1940), 491-9; L.A. MacKay, "On Not Studying the Classics," QQ 53 (1948), 262-9; G.M.A. Grube, "Why Study the Classics in this Busy World?" UTQ 19 (1949-50), 81-92; E.A. Havelock, "The Ontario Classical Association: Its Aims and Membership," The Phoenix, 1 (1946). On the post-war decline of classics see Lebel, "The Humanities Two Years After," 10-11.

63 Apart from Semetic languages, non-European languages did not appear in the arts curriculum until World War II, but some European languages which met regional needs, such as Icelandic in Manitoba, began to make an appearance early in the century.

64 W.H. Van der Smissen, review of "McCaul, Croft, Forneri," UTM (Dec. 1915), 138.

65 "The Modern Language Department," Varsity 4 (8 March 1884), 233.

66 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 138.

67 "The Revised Curriculum," Varsity 5 (22 Nov. 1884), 55-6; "Modern Languages and their Narrowness,"

Varsity 5 (13 Dec. 1884), 92-3.

68 Varsity 5 (22 Nov. 1884), 61.

69 "The Revised Curriculum," 55-6; "Modern Languages," 92-3.

70 John Squair, The Autobiography of a Teacher of French (Toronto, 1928), 72-3, 109-19.

71 The University of Toronto and Its Colleges, 87.

72 Obituary for W.L. Fraser UTM (Feb. 1917), 183-4. The Modern Language Association of Ontario was founded in 1886. Its goal was to improve the status of modern languages in schools and universities. Through it, Fraser campaigned (against Hutton) for the equal status of modern and ancient languages. See Fraser, Pass French and German.

73 Modern Language Instruction in Canada, Vol. II, (ed.) I. Goldstick (Toronto, 1928), 258-9.

74 "Letter to the Editor," UTM 5 ( (Feb. 1914), 215.

75 See A.F.B. Clark, "The Rehabilitation of Modern Languages," UTM 15 (Nov. 1913), 20-33. Clark felt that modern languages ought to be concerned with "'the best that has been thought and said' in the modern world" rather than with a "hodge-podge of philology, bibliography, commercial correspondence and neurotic French fiction."

76 Milton A. Buchanan, "The Scientific Study of Language and Literature," UTM (Dec. 1917), 100.

77 The recommendations of the commission were discussed by John Squair in "Modern Languages in Great Britain," UTM (Nov. 1918), 22-8.

78 Ibid., 23. UTM 19 (June 1919) was a "Language Study Number" and was probably inspired by the British report. There is also reference to the report in Modern Language Instruction in Canada, 352. That volume consisted of the findings of a North American committee on modern languages, funded by the Carnegie Corporation.

79 John MacGillivray, "German in the Schools and Colleges," QQ 15 (Jan. 1908), 212.

80 Modern Language Instruction in Canada, 297.

81 University of Toronto Archives, University Historian, A83-0036/001, File: Manu. R.S. Harris 1983 V.2, Liberal Education at the University of Toronto, 7-8.

82 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 385.

83 Buchanan, "A Revival of Interest in Italian and the New Position of Spanish," UTM 19 (June, 1919), 309.

84 David A. Dewar, Queen's Profiles (Kingston, 1951), 24.

85 Terry Eagleton writes: "English as an academic discipline was first institutionalized not in the Universities, but in the Mechanics' Institutes, working men's colleges and extension lecturing circuit. English was literally the poor man's Classics--a way of providing a cheapish liberal education for those beyond the charmed circle of public school and Oxbridge." Literary Theory: An Introudction (Minneapolis, 1983), 27. In Canada, English replaced classics in the early science programs which were discussed above (Ch. 3).

86 Group of Classical Graduates, Honour Classics, 14.

87 For a description of the texts and their use, see D.J. Palmer, The Rise of English Studies (London, 1965), 48-9.

88 William Spalding, The History of English Literature (Edinburgh, 1875), 1. The first part of Ch. XVII, for example, requires only nine pages to cover the following: "FICTION PROPER. 1. Classification of Novels--Statistics of Novel-writing. 2. Leading Novelists of the Period. 3. Minor Novelists. 4. Contemporary American Novelists."

89 "The Study of English Literature," Varsity 5 (21 FEb. 1885), 184.

90 "Inaugural Address of Professor Tweedie," The Daily Sun (11 Sept 1888).

91 See Eagleton, Literary Theory, 18; Palmer, The Rise of English Studies, 41-2; and Raymond Williams, Culture and Society: 1780-1950 (Penguin ed. 1977) Ch. 2.

92 See Eagleton, Literary Theory, Williams, Culture and Society, Ch. 6.

93 Eagleton, Literary Theory, 22.

94 Anrold, "The Study of Poetry," in The Complete Prose (ed.) Super, Vol. 9, 161-2, quoted in Baldick, The Social Mission, 18-19.

95 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 385; Morton, One University, 129-30

96 W.E. MacNeill, "James Cappon," in Some Great Men of Queen's, 80.

97 Reginald Bateman, "The Teaching of English," in Reginald Bateman: Teacher and Scholar (London, 1922), 40.

98 Woodhouse, "Staff, 1890-1953," in University College (ed.) Bissell, 76.

99 The University of Toronto and Its Colleges, 86-7.

100 W.J. Alexander, The Study of Literature, 6-7, 16. On the Romantic poets' semi-mystical doctrine of the symbol, see Eagleton, Literary Theory, 21-2.

101 Ibid., 17-24.

102 Bateman, "The Teaching of English," 37-42.

103 P.G.C., " A University Fifty Years Ago," QQ 48 (1941), 251.

104 MacNeill, "James Cappon," 77.

105 Shortt, The Search for an Ideal, 68-75.

106 MacNeill, "James Cappon," 74.

107 Shortt, The Search for an Ideal, 51-2.

108 Archibald MacMechan, "Tennyson as Artist," in The Life of a Little College (Cambridge, Mass. 1914), 93.

109 Shortt, The Search for an Ideal, 52.

110 Millar Maclure, "Literary Scholarship," in The Culture of Contemporary Canada (ed.) Julian Park (New York, 1957), 231.

111 Claude Bissell, Halfway Up Parnassus: A Personal Account of the University of Toronto: 1932-1971 (Toronto, 1974), 81-2.

112 E.K. Brown, Rhythm in the Novel (Toronto, 1950), ix-x, quoted in Marjorie Fee, "English-Canadian Literary Criticism, 1890-1950: Defining and Establishing a National Literature," unpub. Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto (1981), 337. His book was Matthew Arnold: A Study in Conflict (Toronto, 1948).

113 Pelham Edgar, "Walt Whitman," Toronto Mail (9 April 1892), 12, quoted in Fee, "English-Canadian Literary Criticism," 240.

114 David G. Pitt, E.J. Pratt: The Truant Years 1882-1927 (Toronto, 1984), 131. For Pratt's reminiscences of Edgar as a teacher, see 99-101.

115 Edgar, "A Confession of Faith and and a Protest," UM 8 (1909), 305-15; Fee, "English-Canadian Literary Criticism," 244-5; Edgar, "Matthew Arnold as a Writer of Prose," DR 1 (1921), 262.

116 Representative Essays of Matthew Arnold (ed.) E.K. Brown (Toronto, 1936), ix.

117 Ibid., xxxvi.

118 Eagleton reports that Newbolt was the "perpetrator of the immortal line 'Play up! Play up! and play the game!'" Other committee members included J. Dover Wilson, who edited the Cambridge edition of Culture and Anarchy and wrote Milestones on the Dover Road (1969), and George Sampson, author of English for the English (1921). See Baldick, The Social Mission, 98-103.

119 Quoted in Baldick, 96, who cites Wilson, Milestones, 252-3, as his source.

120 Ibid., 97.

121 Ibid., 94.

122 Eagleton, Literary Theory, 131.

123 Baldick, The Social Mission, 94.

124 Ibid., 105-6, quoting G.S. Gordon, The Discipline Of Letters (1923), 13.

125 R.S. Knox, "The Educational Value of the Study of Literature," NCCU (1930), 56-64.

126 See Eagleton, Literary Theory, 39-53; Baldick, The Social Mission, Ch. 6 and Ch. 7; David Daiches, English Literature (Princeton, 1964), 94-110.

127 Like the Books of the Bible, literary works were seen as parts of a larger, unified whole, and the intentions of the individual writers were seen as relatively insignificant.

128 Daiches, English Literature, 95.

129 Rudolph, Curriculum, 250.

130 See Daiches, English Literature, 97-8.

131 Woodhouse, "Research in the Humanities," Humanities Research Council Report 2 (1947-9), 20.

132 Eagleton, Literary Theory, 34.

133 See Frye, "A Liberal Education," CF (Sept. 1945), 135; "The Critical Discipline," in Canadian Universities Today: Symposium (eds.) George Stanley and Guy Sylvestre (Toronto, 1961), 35; "The Ethics of Change: the Role of the University," in The Ethics of Change: A Symposium, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (Toronto, 1969), 54. For Arnold's influence, see Frye, "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," UTQ 19 (1949-50), 1-16; The Critical Path: An Essay in the Social Context of Literary Criticism (Bloomington, 1973). Frye's myths of freedom and concern are virtually parallel to Arnold's Hellenism and Hebraism, though Frye does not really acknowledge the similarity. Instead, he defines Arnold's theory of culture as a myth of concern, implying that Arnold's critical theory is more authoritarian than his own.

# Chapter 5

## The Social Sciences and the Utilitarian Ethic in the Interwar Years

The ideal of public service, first invoked in English-Canadian universities in the late Victorian era, became a standard theme as higher education grew more and more dependent on public funding during the early twentieth century. The universities responded to demands for vocational training by creating new programs, secure in the knowledge that such activities enhanced their service image, guaranteed them continued support, and added to their revenue by attracting larger enrolments. The notion of service also prompted the the universities to become involved in a growing range of practical research activities, and to encourage faculty members to act as ambassadors for their institutions by lending their expertise to community and government projects.

Many professors, especially those in the humanities, were unhappy about the growing emphasis on useful knowledge, but for academics in the social sciences, the 1920s and 1930s offered many opportunities to prove the utility of their subjects. This was, in fact, an era of applied social science: political economists devoted much of their time to the immediate problems of business and government; sociology had not yet shed

its reformist image; and psychological research was both inspired and funded by the mental hygiene movement. The disciplines themselves remained immature in the sense that they were more concerned with practical applications than with theory, but growing numbers of undergraduates were attracted to the social sciences because they seemed to address the pressing problems of the age.

## THE CITADEL OF CITIZENSHIP

By the interwar period, presidents and principals of most universities in English-Canada had developed a common style of speech and policy-making which emphasized the service function of their institutions. Their practical bent is sometimes played down by historians; Blair Neatby, for example, comments that Canadian universities were "committed to the ivory tower" and "still shuddered at the idea that universities should stress vocational training."[1] But, in reality, most university leaders favoured expansion in vocational fields and based much of their educational policy on the needs or wishes of provincial legislatures, professional associations, and farm and business groups. Such conditions were in keeping with trends which began before World War I, and the ideal of service became even more prominent during the Depression, when provincial authorities made sure that society got good value

from dollars spent on higher learning.

In part, the constant emphasis on service was a rhetorical device, used by university presidents who needed to convince politicians and voters than their institutions were worthy of support. During the period when the University of Manitoba was most destitute, for example, President Maclean in his annual reports described that institution as "a citadel of citizenship," and reassured readers that "It means a great deal to the University worker to be enabled to feel that his service is not only educational and humanitarian but a form of state service and a medium of patriotism."[2] His successor, President Sidney Smith, continued the theme by declaring that, quite apart from what it stood to gain from public support, "the University owes a duty to its shareholders, the tax-payers of Manitoba, to minister directly to their needs."[3]

But such rhetoric did not merely reflect a desire to please or impress, though that urge was certainly present. There is amply evidence to show that it was the expression, as well, of an educational philosophy, which, like that of President Grant of Queen's in an earlier era, combined a pragmatic recognition of the needs of the hour with a genuinely idealistic outlook. University presidents did not need to be metaphysicians in order to think and speak in idealist terms; the concepts and the phraseology were in the air, and were

readily adopted because they provided a means of explaining and justifying the way that universities were developing.[4]

With its emphasis on state service and social citizenship, and its confidence that all real knowledge leads to the same goal of human betterment, idealism was extremely useful in rationalizing the proliferation of university courses and programs. This phenomenon was not confined to Canada; for example, Frederick Rudolph marvels at the ability of Josiah Royce, who was America's leading idealist philosopher, to confront the "materialistic, practical, progressive, popular tendencies of the course of study" at late nineteenth century Harvard and to see them all playing their parts as "learned servants of the ideal."[5] Even though idealism gradually lost influence among philosophers themselves after the war, its application as a philosophy of education remained pervasive. This fact was recognised by Rupert C. Lodge, a professor of philosophy at Manitoba, who published a study of educational philosophies in 1937. Lodge explained that from "the idealist standpoint, <u>all</u> education which proceeds by spiritual interactivity, by the mingling of personalities so as to stimulate to further personal development, to further insights into the laws and ideals which can make experience a finer and more beautiful thing, is 'liberal' education." He pointed out that the idealist possessed

the ability to see the promise of good in all kinds of educational pursuits, so that "What to realists look like geese, look to him like potential swans."[6]

In the utilitarian atmosphere of western Canadian universities, the link between idealism and service was especially strong. Walter Murray's presidency at Saskatchewan of nearly thirty years provides a striking illustration. Murray was actually trained in idealist philosophy at Edinburgh in the late nineteenth century and taught for a while at Dalhousie after his return to Canada. Like many others of his generation, including H.M. Tory, he found in idealism a means of reconciling faith and modern scientific knowledge, and, as Michael Hayden suggests, his philosophy performed a similar function in his later career as an administrator by reducing the conflict between cultural or spiritual values, on the one hand, and vocational or "materialistic" goals, on the other.[7] His belief in the ethic of service and the unity of knowledge enabled him to rationalize the direction taken by the university throughout a period of several decades, during which the arts subjects suffered, by default, from serious neglect. Murray's vision of the university as encompassing all useful learning is illuminated in the following passage, written in the late 1920s:

> The large university is the state in miniature. All the interests of the larger world without are reflected within the university. Within it

> the young men preparing for the most diverse callings come to understand and appreciate each other, and learn how to co-operate. From the narrower sphere they transfer this understanding, this co-operation, to the larger, with immense benefit to the state which educated them and which they will serve.[8]

Walter Murray's approach was not untypical. Across western Canada, skeletal arts faculties were encircled by growing numbers of professional schools and other service-oriented programs and activities, and a successful university president would have to be skilled at reconciling diverse educational aims. Very often, this meant praising the liberal arts and even acknowledging their pre-eminence as university subjects, while directing funds towards more utilitarian programs in order to meet the demands of the legislature and the expectations of the public. W.J. Waines recalled that when Sidney Smith became president at Manitoba, "he made a strong plea for liberal education but in fact, during his regime, the University established and developed several professional areas and starved the Arts Faculty."[9] Arts professors in the west did without adequate offices, classrooms, libraries and research opportunities, and arts faculties were chronically under-staffed, but probably no president would have denied that the arts formed the very "hub"--to use Smith's favourite expression--of the university.[10]

Even at older and better-heeled institutions in central Canada, the administrative tone was essentially

the same. Sir Arthur Currie's background was very different from Murray's--he did not possess a university degree of any kind and was drawn into the presidency of McGill after a business and military career.[11] Yet he adopted a similarly idealistic approach to the university's policy of public service. At the National Conference of Canadian Universities in 1927 he urged greater cooperation between the university and society so that "step by step, mile by mile, shall we advance until we realise that life is one great unity." Currie spoke with pride of his own institution's efforts to take practical steps towards "unity in education and life" by "trying the experiment of asking committees of business men, of engineers, of farmers to help us with their aid and advice. We are doing everything we can to fill the requests for research which the manufacturer makes upon us."[12] This kind of idealism did not impress everyone in the academic community, and after Currie's death, the conservative man of culture at McGill, Sir Andrew Macphail, publicly regretted that Currie did not think beyond the rhetoric of visions and service to consider that "visions are frequently illusions," and that "service may be misapplied."[13]

Yet Currie had simply adopted the style of the successful university leader in English-Canada. Sir Robert Falconer, who wrote a series of articles on the relationship between idealism and citizenship, was a

practical-minded president who steered the University of Toronto through a period of expanding commitments to vocationalism and industrial research while preserving his cherished faith that the "spirit of the truth-seeker is one."[14] The ambiguities of R.C. Wallace's idealist rhetoric and his firm achievements as principal of Queen's have both been analysed by Frederick Gibson.[15] According to Wallace, if there was a problem in education it was that "we are not sufficiently concerned with a wise synthesis ... the parts have meaning only with relation to the whole ... To this work the modern educationalist must set himself. It is for him to achieve unity out of the diversity of modern culture."[16] These men and others like them were conciliators and "peace-makers," as Hayden says of Murray, and their success was measured in part by their knack for juggling the claims of liberal culture, scientific research, and public service.

Those few administrators who were openly repelled by the constant compromising involved in running a university in English-Canada provided, through their administrative failures, a salutary contrast to the dominant approach. There was Carleton Stanley at Dalhousie, whose disdain for the ideal of service and lack of interest in professional education combined with an ineffectiveness which finally brought his leadership to an end.[17] There was the muddling R.B. Taylor at Queen's,

who proclaimed, perhaps rightly, that a policy of state service posed a threat to intellectual freedom,[18] but whose administration was so unsuccessful that his resignation was requested. His successor, the very British Hamilton Fyfe, had little respect for the way Canadian universities were run, but was soon disappointed in his efforts to transform Queen's (where education, in his view, was "only a rumour") into a more academically-oriented institution. The administration of R.C. Wallace, who succeeded Fyfe after a stint at the University of Alberta, was for many at Queen's a very welcome return to "the method and spirit of Grant."[19]

The atmosphere in arts faculties and the nature of their teaching in this period needs to be understood not only in the context of hard times caused by the Depression, but in relation to the dominant, service-oriented philosophy of higher education which was well-entrenched by this time in English-Canadian universities. In particular, the extent and the direction of the social sciences' development was very largely determined by the test of utility that was applied to each new venture. This emphasis on what was useful in the "here and now" skewed the growth of the social sciences away from the theoretical and towards the practical, and affected the nature of these disciplines in Canada for decades to come.

FROM PHILOSOPHY TO PSYCHOLOGY

The story of psychology's rise as an arts subject during this period is also the story of philosophy's decline. All of the social sciences had their origins in philosophy, but by the end of World War I, psychology was the only one which remained in the same department as the parent discipline. Both philosophy and psychology were concerned with the study of the mind and with human perceptions of reality, but the experimental techniques and the practical application of knowledge which characterized the latter subject steadily increased its prestige during the interwar period. Meanwhile, at many universities, philosophy attracted a diminishing share of funding and enrolments, and became just one of many optional studies which a student might choose or ignore. In the nineteenth century, it had occupied a central role in the arts curriculum because it placed all knowledge within a Christian framework and helped to arm students against religious scepticism. In the early twentieth century, philosophy became a secular discipline, and, as T.A. Goudge points out, its significance diminished "in the eyes of the community, of university administrators, and of the students."[20] After World War I, philosophy was no longer a required subject at most universities,[21] because the grounds for its prescription had disappeared. During the 1920s and after, it suffered heavy competition from the social sciences,

especially psychology, and was forced to search for a new role in the secular university.

The weakness of philosophy in the decades following World War I may have some relation to Canadian philosophers' longstanding devotion to idealism. Under the guidance of John Watson, who was head of philosophy at Queen's for fifty-one years, idealism remained prominent here much longer than in the United States or Great Britain, and its decline was not sudden but gradual. John Irving looked back, in 1950, at a century of philosophy in English-Canada and recorded that after fifty years "of noon-day brilliance, followed by a long twilight, Idealism now faces its eclipse."[22] But as its popularity faded, little in the way of new systematic approachs arose to replace it. The new movements which developed in the United States such as pragmatism, varieties of realism, and logical positivism, "found scant support in Canada."[23] American philosopher Charles Hendel suggested the reason might be that "Canadians simply will not travel in shoals,"[24] but something beyond mere individualism must account for their refusal to investigate or embrace new theories. A combination of idealism's lingering influence and the small and geographically fragmented nature of the philosophical community in Canada probably explains at least some of this resistance.

Another factor which affected the development

of philosophy in twentieth century Canada was the belief (not incompatible with idealism) that it was better to structure the teaching of the discipline around a historical approach rather than to try to analyse and evaluate a host of new philosophical systems. "Faced with a multitude of American and European 'isms,'" wrote John Irving, "Canadians have emphasized anew the importance of the history of philosophy: the thing most worth while is the famous philosophical literature of the past."[25] George Sidney Brett, who was second in influence only to John Watson in the first half of this century, made his primary contribution to philosophical writing through his historical studies and organized the curriculum at Toronto along historical lines. He believed that students of philosophy must have a solid grounding in the development of their subject, which would be gained from the "close study of texts, viewed in their historical setting."[26]

His method was mirrored at other universities. At McGill, R.D. MacLennan emphasized the study of "the thought of the great masters" and argued that the future of philosophy was secure if its goals were "cultural" and if it offered an alternative to the utilitarianism of most university departments.[27] This approach was exemplified in the Maritimes by H.L. Stewart, head of philosophy at Dalhousie. Stewart was an idealist, an opponent of vocationalism, who believed that

"explorations of 'the best said or done' by the great thinkers and artists of the past" should fully occupy "the ingenious undergraduate mind."[28] He taught philosophy according to a "history of ideas" approach and had "little or no patience with the technical controversies of the philosophical schools."[29] This concentration on thinkers of the past shifted attention conveniently away from the clamour of competing "isms," and it also enabled philosophers to share some of the confidence enjoyed by professors of literature that their subject, which involved reading the "best" books and thinking "the thoughts of great minds,"[30] played a vital part in the transmission of the western cultural heritage to modern youth.

This approach gave philosophy a clear mandate, but left it vulnerable in at least two respects. In the first place, the history of philosophy was not the monopoly of one department, for as the social sciences sought to establish their intelletual foundations, they created their own "history of thought" courses. In the late 1930s, for example, a member of Toronto's department of philosophy complained to Brett that political economy was trying to "steal its content," having brought "philosophical texts from Hobbes to Bosanquet within its ever-expanding orbit, and just now," he continued, "it has decided to bring Plato, Aristotle, and Augustine under its utilitarian rubric."[31] The emphasis on a textual

rather than a critical or systematic approach thus made it easier for other disciplines to raid its territory. And secondly, the historical approach played down the importance in the undergraduate curriculum of "learning how to philosophize," and left the discipline open to the criticism that it lacked a distintive methodology. Brett's successor, H.H. Anderson, carried on this tradition at Toronto for many years, and Goudge records that one well-known philosopher went so far as to describe the department's activities as "philosophical archeology." Non-historical courses gradually became more numerous, though an equilibrium was not achieved until the early 1960s.[32]

A concentration on the history of philosophy was the discipline's main organizing principle during the interwar period, but it was not the only approach in use. At Manitoba, Rupert Lodge tried to confront the plethora of new movements by combining them all into a "balanced" philosophy which comprised three major categories of thought. As Irving says, "Lodge maintains that a philosopher must be either an idealist, a realist, or a pragmatist, and he has exhibited great ingenuity in the classification of various 'isms' that seem to fall outside the three main movements."[33] Instead of introducing students to philosophy through "great thinkers," Lodge devised a course which seems to have had a definite utilitarian thrust, for it showed students how to apply

the various philosophies to practical everyday problems:

> We begin teaching undergraduate students in their second year of Arts, introducing them to critical self-reflection by having them write a large number of essays upon the moral and intellectual problems arising out of their own development to maturity. These essays are discussed in class, and in connection with these discussions an outline of systematic thinking on ethics, logic, theory of knowledge, and metaphysics is presented in such a way as to show the students how to make practical application (both to life-problems and to their problems as students of arts and science) of the standpoints of "realism," "idealism," and "pragmatism." The aim of this introductory course is to stimulate the maximal development of our students' critical self-consciousness with the idea that it will help them, not only in solving their biosocial problems, but also in their university studies.[34]

Lodge himself wrote the text for this course, and during his career he published other works of an "applied" nature such as <u>Philosophy of Business</u> (1945) and <u>Applied Philosophy</u> (1950).

Another way in which philosophers tried to assert the usefulness of their discipline was by attempting to revive its former ties with science and the social sciences. Much was made after World War I of the impact of the theory of relativity and other discoveries on the relations between physics and metaphysics, or on science and philosophy, broadly speaking. J.M. MacEachran, a philosophy professor at Alberta, wrote that "Physics has experienced a change of heart as remarkable as it is sudden, and it is strange to witness some of our more distinguished scientists like Whitehead,

Eddington and Jeans turning into speculative philosophers."[35] One of G.S. Brett's secondary interests was the complementary nature of philosophy and science, and W.C. Keirstead at the University of New Brunswick was convinced that his discipline would be able to provide science with a set of unifying, fundamental concepts. "Philosophy," said Keirstead, evoking a familiar phrase, "aims to see life steadily and see it whole."[36] But even if a community of interest did exist amongst some scientists and philosophers at the highest level of inquiry, that fact had little impact on the status of philosophy in universities in this country or on its position in the arts curriculum. World War II would bring new setbacks, for when education became linked to national survival, the sciences flourished while the status of philosophy plummetted.

Once peace returned and the Cold War began, however, the terrifying impact of science on modern warfare gave rise to an intense interest in the preservation and promotion of "human values" through education. Academics in the humanities as a whole saw opportunities to promote their disciplines in this context, and some philosophers were attracted to the idea that the social sciences and philosophy could play a combined role in creating a new standard of ethics. John Macdonald of Alberta and John Irving of Toronto both believed that their discipline could combine with--and,

in fact, preside over--the social sciences in the creation of a new "social philosophy" which would guide mankind towards lasting peace.[37] Irving was philosophy's most ardent spokesman in the post-war years, and he maintained that

> Education for world understanding is not only a great ideal but also a practical necessity; its realization depends upon the integration of philosophy and the social sciences in our future program of study ... only in terms of a synthesis of philosophy and the social sciences can reason wage a successful battle against the force of unreason in the world.[38]

Irving helped to shift the emphasis at Toronto away from "philosophical archeology" and towards modern issues, but he could do little to alter the relationship between philosophy and the social sciences. Canadian political scientists, psychologists and sociologists were still in the process of defining their disciplines and promoting their separate, professional status, and did not seek cooperation with a discipline whose mode of inquiry was alien to them. It was during these post-war years, for that matter, that psychology strove successfully for full independence and separate departmental status in many universities in English-Canada,[39] while philosophy remained uncertain of its strength and the directions it should pursue. Ironically, Irving himself favoured the separation; his ambitions for his own discipline's growth led him to regret in 1946 that at most institutions philosophy was "still gravely hampered"

by its "union with psychology."[40]

Philosophy, one might say, sought greatness in the modern university, but psychology had greatness thrust upon it. The latter was already established as a sub-discipline at Toronto and McGill before 1914, and after the war it grew rapidly due to its capacity to meet a wide range of social needs. There was a shift in emphasis, in fact, from the research orientation of the German-inspired psychology laboratories created at the end of the nineteenth century to a concentration on clinical or applied research. The Canadian public was most interested in seeing how the application of science to behaviour could improve society in immediate, tangible ways, and the universities responded to its desire for practical results.[41]

Psychology grew so rapidly at Toronto and McGill that separate departments were created at those two institutions during the 1920s. Well before the war ended, Professor E.A. Bott at Toronto turned the psychology laboratory which Baldwin had founded into a rehabilitation clinic for wounded veterans. This work was widely acclaimed and drew attention to the practical nature of the discipline.[42] In 1922, Brett remarked on the steadily growing demand for undergraduate offerings in psychology (he even mentioned a "Farmers' Course") and on the increasing number of other services the depart-

ment was performing for the public, including work for the National Committee for Mental Hygiene and the Juvenile Courts.[43] An honours course was created, and the enrolments in psychology courses during the early twenties reflected both the discipline's popularity among arts students and the status it had achieved as a component of professional courses such as medicine and education. In 1926, a separate department was established with Bott as head, and in the years that followed an expanding faculty pursued research in such areas as childhood behaviour and delinquency. This work was funded largely by the Committee for Mental Hygiene, which was the forerunner of the Canadian Mental Health Association.[44]

With William Tait at the helm, psychology developed along similar lines at McGill. Tait's vision, says George Ferguson, "was that of the applied scientist. He saw flourishing application for psychology in education, medicine, business, social work, physical education and human relations."[45] His department was headed during the early 1920s by William Caldwell, a moral philosopher and a man of very different temperament and beliefs, who eventually pleaded with President Currie to free Tait to create his own department. "The Psychologists resent the interference of the philosophers as they would resent priestly or scholarly interference," wrote Caldwell. "Neither set of men wholly approves of the other. The separation has come about

at many places through a life-long quarrel ... Step in, sir, in your fine strong way and free us all, and make us all friends for the sake of the University."[46] The fact that psychology students outnumbered those in philosophy by a ratio of two to one gave further justifcation to the separation which was achieved in 1924. Tait then expanded into new areas of public service, and as Ferguson points out, this move "was characteristic of the period and was related to the break with philosophy. Philosophy was the antithesis of the utilitarian. Having separated from it, psychology must now show that it could serve society in many practical ways." One of the department's first ventures was the School Service Bureau, which assisted the schools in intelligence testing, remedial programs, and the like.[47] During the Depression, psychologists at McGill participated in the Social Science Research Project, investigating such topics as the "qualitative character and industrial aptitude of unemployed as compared with employed groups."[48]

At many other universities, psychology also made rapid headway in the interwar years, even though separate departments were still a generation away. In 1924, upon Watson's retirement, Dean Skelton requested that George Humphrey, a psychologist who had studied at Leipsig and Harvard, be hired to act as head and to "build up the psychological side of the department"

at Queen's. James Inglis writes that "there was a sharp and dramatic change in course content just as soon as Humphrey took over. From a heavy concentration on the Greek and German philosophers, the Department changed to a broad offering of courses in psychology as well as in philosophy."[49] Similar appointments were made at other universities. At some, relations remained congenial enough, although there is evidence that the psychologists grew restless in the role of junior partner, for most such departments were headed by philosophers. At Manitoba, Rupert Lodge and Henry Wright took turns acting as head, and the latter's son records that "when Henry was Chairman, it was the Department of Philosophy and Psychology, when Rupert was writing the annual report, it was just Philosophy." Wright's hopes for a separate department were not fulfilled until after his retirement, even though psychology enrolments far exceeded those in philosophy from the 1920s onwards.[50] Queen's seem to have been exceptional in avoiding internal tensions--a blessing which Humphrey attributed to the fact that "the philosophers were such nice people."[51]

Undergraduate offerings in psychology reflected its utilitarian emphasis and stressed clinical above purely "scientific" areas of study, although one experimental course was included in most curricula. Universities created courses in various kinds of applied psychology geared to the professions (such as educational

and legal psychology) along with such offerings as Social, Child, and Abnormal Pyschology which could be applied to clinical work.[52] There was a strong interest in the use of tests for determining differences amongst individuals. At British Columbia, for instance, the descriptions of courses in both Personality and Clinical Psychology reveal a preoccupation with measuring intelligence and personality traits.[53]

Generally speaking, the public recognition of the uses of psychology made that subject an asset to the university in its public service role, but there were times when the psychologists' "objectivity" regarding moral issues caused embarassment. Ferguson mentions that Tait and his colleagues at McGill gave offence on a number of occasions. Tait was rebuked for having had "the audacity to conduct an enquiry into attitudes towards prohibition" at one point in his career.[54] A more serious episode occurred at Dalhousie, where the first occupant of the chair of psychology, Norman Jellinger, was asked to resign in 1929 as a result of his classroom forays into the field of psychoanalysis:

> When he began to solicit accounts of their dreams from his students and then provide them with full-blown Freudian interpretations, carefully written out and suitable for displaying to their parents, the university authorities were seized with alarm ...Dalhousie may have been ready, at last, for psychology taught by a psychologist,... It was not yet ready for Freud.[55]

Just as the economists were not free, during this period,

to discuss the merits of socialism in their classrooms because they might alienate the university's supporters,[56] so psychologists were expected to steer away from theories that could challenge current standards of personal morality.

Overall, however, psychology was a respected subject which prospered because of its many practical uses, and, unlike philosophy, enjoyed an even greater prestige after war broke out again in 1939. From the start, psychologists were anxious to show what they could contribute to the war effort, and they organized the Canadian Psychological Association to promote that image and to recruit funding for wartime research projects. A number of psychologists devoted their efforts to the development of psychological testing and placement techniques which were widely used by the armed Services, and their work on "Revised Examination M" soon attracted support from the National Research Council.[57] In addition to defence-related work, which continued after 1945, the early 1940s also presented opportunities in other areas, for the government became interested in developing public health and welfare schemes. This ever-expanding field of government activity provided research funding for academics and employment for graduates in psychology.[58]

If psychology as a discipline suffered a handicap during the period from the 1920s to the early 1950s,

it was not its lack of utility, but rather its abundance of recognised uses. A survey of psychology teaching and research in Canadian universities during the early fifties confirmed that the discipline's development had been lop-sided; that experimental or "pure" research had been sacrificed to applied or clinical psychology. Robert McLeod, who conducted the study, "decried what he called the 'premature professionalism' of psychology in Canada and made a plea for a return to science." From the 1950s onwards, increased funding allowed psychology to make rapid progress, though at some universities bitter rivalries developed between the "professional" (or clinical) and the "scientific" conceptions of the pyschologist's role.[59] But it was clear that the academic who was both philosopher and psychologist (as some men, like Brett, were at the beginning of this period) was now a creature of the past. Experimental psychology, in fact, moved one step further from its roots after World War II by becoming identified as much with the biological sciences as with the social sciences.

## THE TRIUMPH OF ECONOMICS

Despite the complete difference in subject matter, the fortunes of psychology and economics were linked. In an age preoccupied with efficiency, both disciplines aroused public confidence because their practitioners showed a readiness to use their expertise to improve

society through immediate action, and both attracted the funding which encouraged advances in research and teaching.

During the 1920s, the Department of Political Economy and Political Science became the largest in the arts faculty at Queen's, and, at Toronto, one fifth of the students in arts were enrolled in the Department of Political Economy.[60] In both cases, the creation of a vocational program, namely commerce, accounted for a large portion of the departments' enrolments. Another reason for growth in the field of economics was the government's increasing dependence, during the 1920s and especially the 1930s, on the advice of professionals in matters involving the economy. It might be said that during the interwar years economists as a group undertook the task of trying to increase the efficiency of the capitalist system in Canada, and, during the Depression, came into prominence as the experts most trusted to guide the country through its greatest economic and social crisis.

Commerce programs were the product of the close cooperation between universities and the business community which began before World War I. Pressure from the Toronto Board of Trade and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association prompted Toronto's Department of Political Economy to create a two year diploma course in 1901, and, by the early twenties, Toronto, Dalhousie, and

Queen's were among the institutions which now offered four year, B. Comm. Degree programs.[61] While such programs required students to take a number of arts subjects, they were clearly vocational and their content was guided by the needs of the business world. At Toronto, the Department of Political Economy was assisted by a "committee on the commerce course" composed of both businessmen and academics which, says Ian Drummond, provided advise on the course and tried to find jobs for its graduates.[62]

As one might expect, commerce programs were passionately opposed by the enemies of vocationalism in faculties of arts, and the diatribes of such men reveal a deep fear that the arts faculties themselves, like the rest of the university environment, were to be overtaken by the utilitarian ethic. At Queen's, James Cappon insisted that no arts subject should be primarily intended to train people to make money,[63] and J.M. Macdonnell blamed the new course for introducing the vocational spirit into arts, encouraging the preoccupation with material things and dampening the intellectual enthusiasm of other arts students whose cultural subjects tended to take on "an air of unreality" by contrast.[64]

Opponents of the commerce courses at Toronto carried their crusade to the National Conference of Canadian Universities (N.C.C.U.) in 1930 and 1932. They voiced

their fears that the program's popularity posed a serious threat to the rest of the arts disciplines. Principal Malcolm Wallace of University College found the numbers in commerce "very disturbing."[65] Classical historian Charles Cochrane charged that the intellectual claims made by commerce were a fraud; that in their modern language courses, for example, students were "busy with potting up technical words and learning to write business letters. They are not studying literature, nor is there anything liberal in any of their studies."[66] Frank Underhill, in his customary flamboyant style, declared that this "cancerous growth of commerce in the Arts body" would prove a threat to the effective maintenance of "the whole spirit of a liberal education."[67] Underhill wanted commerce out of arts--so that, like engineering, it could produce its "barbarians" openly and stop "doing so under false pretenses."[68]

Those who rose to the defense of commerce had practical arguments to support their views, but, as was common at that time, utilitarian logic was mixed with idealist rhetoric to produce a stronger case. R.C. Wallace, while still president of the University of Alberta, published a book called <u>A Liberal Education in a Modern World</u>, which seems to have been inspired in part by the controversy over commerce and the issues it raised. Throughout his book, Wallace stressed that the unity of knowledge was not threatened by the

vocational spirit but indeed encompassed it, and that such subjects were fit for university study as long as they possessed "underlying systems' that could be illuminated.[69] Clifford Clark, who ran the commerce program at Queen's, responded to criticism by maintaining that the Queen's program was not to be considered an inferior intellectual pursuit. The specialist in commerce, according to Clark, had the same opportunity as any other student to taste "the pleasures of intellectual life" and glimpse the "sublime mystery of the universe, its oneness, the unity of knowledge," because "one part of the universe yields the same teaching as any other if only it is mastered."[70]

The development of commerce courses was just one of several ways in which the discipline of economics was able to contribute to the university's practical role in society. Another area in which social scientists, especially economists, became deeply involved was government service. What occurred in the twenties and thirties was a dramatic expansion of a public service role already established before World War I. Some academics left the universities for full-time careers in government, as Adam Shortt had done earlier. Among them were O.D. Skelton, who joined the Department of External Affairs, and his former student, Clifford Clark, who became deputy minister of finance in R.B. Bennett's government. It was more common, however, as Michiel

Horn explains, for an academic to accept a temporary post in the public service or a "stint on an advisory body or Royal Commission."[71] For some, outside contracts provided welcome additional income in an era when professorial salaries were beginning a long process of decline,[72] and all such work added to the prestige of being an expert in economic or social matters. With the deepening Depression, many areas of national importance came under scrutiny, and the Commissions on Banking, Price Spreads, and Employment were just a few of the bodies which reflected the "amazing influx of social scientists into advisory roles on policy problems."[73] Most impressive of all was the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations which, in the Depression's closing years, drew upon the knowledge and research abilities of scholars from all over the country, and can be considered a milestone in the professionalization of the social sciences in Canada.

But what was the effect of this outside activity on university departments and undergraduate teaching? The answer depended on whether a particular department was able to expand its staff in proportion to its new activities, or whether outside commitments merely depleted the faculty already on hand. At Toronto, nineteen new economists were appointed to the staff between 1922 and 1937,[74] and, according to Vincent Bladen, the thirties were a time of "intellectual ferment" in a

department which comprised a circle of young, able, excited scholars in almost continuous controversy." He recalled that those "were the exciting days of the Keynesian Revolution, the years of 'high theory'... we had much to learn, much to adopt and much to adapt in our continuing study of the peculiar features of the Canadian economy."[75] The influx of new staff members with their own areas of interest resulted in the creation of new undergraduate courses. There were offerings which focussed on income and social welfare, the "diagnosis of business conditions," economic geography, "agriculture and the Wheat Pool," the role of the state in economic life, and others that explored the changing conditions of agriculture and business and the growing sphere of government activity.[76]

There were other universities, however, where a definite conflict arose between the public service role of the institution and the faculty's teaching duties. At the University of Manitoba, for example, the Depression prevented the hiring of new faculty, and yet all of Manitoba's small staff of economists and political scientists were drawn into public service at various times. Department head Robert McQueen remarked that although it was flattering that "the members of the Department were sought for such posts ... it seems clear that the students are the first consideration of the Department and if governments require assistance it should not be at the cost of the students.[77] He

complained that his own absence had been caused by his membership on the Board of the new Bank of Canada--a role which did not accord with his own sense of propriety but had been urged upon him by university authorities because it would bring "the University into contact with the public life of the country."[78]

If the public service role of the economist was a mixed blessing, the real triumph of economics, as far as the arts curriculum was concerned, may have been that the importance of economic conditions in both the past and the present was given much greater recognition than ever before. Not only did the discipline of economics itself grow rapidly, but the way historians interpreted the past shifted from an emphasis on political history to the study of economic development. In R.O. Macfarlane's history classes at the University of Manitoba, H.S. Ferns found that Harold Innis's "great and difficult" book, _The Fur Trade in Canada: An Introduction to Canadian Economic History_ (1930), was indispensable for "anyone wishing to understand what Macfarlane had to say." Innis steered him, Ferns recalled, in the direction of "an economic interpretation of history" and an understanding that "political entities like empires could be dissolved by economic forces." While not neglecting the "old staples of Canadian historical study--the evolution of constitutional arrangements and political tensions"--Macfarlane's teaching

drew directly on the current work of Canadian, especially Torontonian, political economists.[79]

Historians of Canada were influenced by the work of their colleagues in political economy and by the reaction against constitutional history already underway in Europe and America. F.H. Underhill's views on history were affected by social scientists at Toronto (a few of whom were fellow socialists in the League for Social Reconstruction) but also by the progressive history of Frederick Jackson Turner, Charles Beard, and others, who emphasized the significance of economic conflicts in American history.[80] By the 1930s, the young Donald Creighton had recoiled from the tedium of constitutional history, and, inspired by Innis, was creating his own new interpretation of Canadian economic and social development.[81] Although the fascination with economic history would pass,[82] the writings of this period constituted an important turning point for Canadian historical research, and, according to one contemporary historian, "the results of recent scholarship entered into university teaching with gratifying speed."[83]

There can be no doubt that Canadian economics "came of age" in the interwar period, but some academics would later maintain that society's ever-increasing appetite for expert economic advise affected the discipline adversely by directing attention away from scholarly activity. During the period of post-war

reconstruction, the government found many new uses for economists and drew them, in growing numbers, away from the universities. K.W. Taylor calculated that "in the late forties and early fifties, the publication of books on Canadian economics dropped by about half from the levels of the thirties and early forties."[84] The discipline of economics suffered from its utilitarian role in that theoretical studies were discouraged or were more likely to be conducted, for specific purposes, by economists in the government's employ, "with all the limitations on fundamental thinking that that implies." As C.B. MacPherson wrote in the mid-fifties, "If there were enough Canadian economists to go around this would be no problem, but there are not ... It seems at times as if the problem of Canadian economics is a problem of survival of creative thinking in face of governmental demands."[85]

## ECONOMICS' POOR RELATIONS: POLITICAL SCIENCE AND SOCIOLOGY

Of the twenty-four new faculty appointed to the Department of Political Economy at Toronto between 1922 and 1937, only two were political scientists.[86] In joint departments across the country, economics was the dominant discipline by far. O.D. Skelton remarked in 1932 that the study of politics "receives far less consideration from faculty and students than the study of economics," and one explanation he offered was that it was harder

to make a living as a political scientist because that discipline had fewer practical uses than economics.[87] Sociology--the "Cinderella of the social sciences," as Innis called it--lagged even further behind, and was well-established as a discipline at only one university in English-Canada before World War II.[88] Both political science and sociology made advances during this period, but neither could match the utilitarian appeal of economics. As a result, they enjoyed less prestige in the university and the community, and learned to get by, as two social scientists would report to the Massey Commission, "on such financial crumbs as have been left over after the needs of economics--or in some cases history--have been taken care of."[89]

Political science was handicapped during the early twentieth century by the way it merged with, or failed to emerge completely from, other disciplines. At many universities the term "political economy" remained in use to describe the activities of both economics and political science, thus implying that the latter was a mere branch of the former. Political science also shared its territory with history for some time, for during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries historians devoted their attention to political and constitutional history. Only gradually, says MacPherson, did it become evident that "the systematic analysis of the functioning body politic and its component parts"

was the task of political science.[90] MacPherson also points out that the discipline's early ties to the professional study of law tended to limit its scope and retard its growth as an independent field of study.[91]

By the 1930s, however, political science had developed a distinct if somewhat narrow mandate of its own. Law had become established as a separate, professional pursuit,[92] and the historians' new preoccupation with economic history left the refinement of constitutional history to the political scientists. "For a decade or more," says MacPherson, "the handful of academic political scientists struggled with detailed investigations of different aspects of Canadian government."[93] R. MacGregor Dawson was a leader in this field and published several important works, including <u>Constitutional Issues in Canada</u> (1933) and <u>The Development of Dominion Status, 1900 to 1936</u> (1937). Such painstaking analysis of the evolution and structure of Canadian government was a necessary prelude to more sophisticated studies of how democracy actually worked in Canada, for, as MacPherson explained, the "usual pattern of development of political science in any country ... is to turn first to study the flow of power <u>from</u> government and only later to consider the flow of power <u>to</u> government."[94]

The preoccupation with constitutional history was reflected in the way that political science was taught. A concentration on the political and legal systems of

the British Empire and the reliance on such texts as Dicey's Law of the Constitution and Kennedy's The Constitution of Canada was typical of political science instruction across Canada.[95] The subject matter of the discipline was restricted partly by the state of Canadian research, but the development of both teaching and research was retarded by a shortage of faculty whose main interest was political science. In a period when practical needs were paramount, universities preferred to hire economists and generally neglected to encourage political science as a specialized discipline.[96] It was therefore taught, in some departments, by economists or historians, and offerings might consist of as little as one course.[97] One new area which did appear, probably inspired by the uneasy peace of the interwar period, was international relations. Dalhousie introduced a course which dealt with the League of Nations and problems in Europe, and British Columbia listed a course on "Problems of the Pacific."[98] But university calendars suggest that students' attention was seldom directed towards current political issues in their own country, such as the rise of third parties or the range of political ideologies which flourished in the 1930s.[99]

Across Canada during the late 1930s and the 1940s, the small community of political scientists grew increasingly impatient with the neglect of their subject and the narrowness of its scope.[100] Some progress was

being made; J.A. Corry, who joined the Queen's faculty in 1936, published his Democratic Government and Politics ten years later, and in that work he explored the relation "of democratic ideology to democratic practice."[101] But even after the war, the study of political ideas and the forces which "motivate government action such as political parties, pressure groups and public opinion" had barely touched the curriculum.[102] An expansion in the subject's content was not likely to occur until the number of political scientists in the country increased, and in the seventeen universities of English-Canada in 1950 there were only "the equivalent of thirty full-time teachers of political science, a bare two per cent of the total academic staff in arts and science faculties."[103] Three separate organizations--the Social Science Research Council, UNESCO, and the International Political Science Association--investigated the position of political science in post-war Canada, and all three reported on its "subservient state ... in relation to economics."[104] This situation was perpetuated partly by the longstanding bias towards the demonstrably more "useful" subject of economics (the two were still housed in one department in most universities) and partly by the curricular conservatism bred by the poverty of Canadian universities which had carried over from the Depression years. By the 1950s, universities were ready to recognise the significance and range of

political science as an academic discipline, but it would remain a "poor relation" until university funding and staffing increased later in the decade, after which its growth would be dramatic.[105]

The discipline of sociology grew even more slowly in Canada than did political science. The two subjects shared certain handicaps: they had difficulty establishing clear definitions of their intellectual territory; they were not considered as useful, or as scientific in their methodology, as economics; and both had to struggle for recognition as independent disciplines. But in another sense, the plight of sociology was unique. It began in Canada as a practical, reform-oriented subject before World War I, and then during the interwar period struggled to free itself from that past and become a discipline distinct from social work. Sociologists (what few there were) thus engaged in the frustrating task of dissociating their subject from its utilitarian aspects during an age when the more successful social sciences, namely economics and psychology, were moving in the opposite direction.

Sociology began in English-Canada during a period preoccupied with social problems. The first two decades of the twentieth century are noted for the number of inter-connected reform movements which gained large followings. Among them were urban reform campaigns,

the women's suffrage movement (which was based, in this country, on the notion that if women had political power they would move to alleviate social distress) and the temperance movement. Most such movements owed something to the social gospel ideology and were of a piece with the idealistic passion for social and moral regeneration that affected many English-Canadians during the first world war.[106] It was in this context that the first sociology courses were created by the denominational colleges with the aim of equipping young people, especially clergymen, with an understanding of social problems and a sense of urgency regarding the search for their solution.[107] Shortly after, sociology also gained a foothold in some secular universities as a reformist discipline. At the beginning of the war, Toronto founded a Department of Social Service, which R.M. MacIver would later describe as encompassing "the sphere of Applied Social Science, the study of the conditions on which social welfare depends."[108] Similarly, at McGill, the spirit of social reform and a particular awareness of the social problems affecting Montreal led to the creation of a Department of Social Service in 1918.[109]

At Montreal, progress towards a more research-oriented, less reformist discipline was rapid. Carl Dawson, who had been trained in theology and sociology at Chicago, became head of what was called the Department of Social Science by 1922. Marlene Shore has studied

Dawson's work in depth, and explains that in his early years at McGill he spent much of his time championing the idea that a truly scientific understanding of Canadian community life would benefit society in the long run. Dawson believed that reformers tended to apply mere patchwork solutions while encouraging Utopian dreams of social regeneration, and he was convinced that sociologists should confine their attention to empirical research.[110] Soon after his arrival at McGill, social work and sociology began to move in different directions, and the original department gave way to a School of Social Work (1923) and a Department of Sociology (1925).[111]

Dawson thus became head of the only sociology department in Canada. He would devote his career to the accumulation of a body of "factual" data about Canadian society, and would at least partially succeed in imparting "to Canadian sociology the flavour of empirical research."[112] His main area of interest was the settlement and urbanization of the west, and he published several studies on the immigration and assimilation of ethnic groups in that setting. He shared his interest in the west with other social scientists such as economist W.A. MacIntosh and historians Chester M rt n and A.S. Morton, who all contributed to the "Canadian Frontiers of Settlement" series published between 1934 and 1940. Carl Berger points out the similarities between American sociologist Robert Park's use of the

city as a social laboratory and the Canadian social scientists' interest in the Prairies as "a kind of social clinic." Because many ethnic groups created block settlements which then experienced rapid social change, the processes of assimilation could be studied first-hand over a relatively short period of time.[113]

Both the theme of Carl Dawson's work and the continuing association of the discipline with social reform (which he opposed) were reflected in undergraduate teaching during the 1930s. At McGill, Dawson developed courses on immigration and the assimilation of "alien" groups which may have represented the first serious attention paid to non-English and non-French speaking Canadians in the arts curriculum. Other courses offered at McGill included criminology, social disorganization, and the family. Some universities, by contrast, offered no sociology, and at others offerings were more sparse. They tended to stress social pathology, social control, and reform policy, and to rely on American textbooks, though Dawson's and W.E. Getty's _Introduction to Sociology_ (1929, 1935) appeared as the required text for some introductory courses.[114]

Sociology made some progress at Toronto, but in an atmosphere less receptive than that at McGill. During the early 1920s, R.M. MacIver (who became head of Political Economy in 1922) attempted to introduce sociology to the arts curriculum, but, according to

his memoirs, his efforts were not encouraged.[115] Under his successor, H.J. Urwick, the subject made some headway as an area of specialization within political economy; an honours program was created in 1932, and in the mid-thirties the department introduced new courses in the methods of sociological research, "industry and human welfare," and several other areas.[116] There were, however, obstacles to its achieving the status of an independent discipline at Toronto. Although Urwick had been heavily involved in the early development of sociology in England, its attempts to adopt a more scientific approach in the interwar period seem to have left him cold.[117] Urwick maintained that scientific objectivity was all but impossible when dealing with matters concerning human behaviour, and in 1935 he wrote that "Sociology is not yet a fit discipline for intelligence. If it has any relation to the social process, it is because it is a glorious and fascinating speculation about what is unlikely to happen."[118] Along with such prejudice, sociology had to contend with the resistance of the political economy tradition at Toronto to the breaking down of the established discipline into separate social sciences.[119] Drummond points out that sociology "really began as an interdepartmental project under Urwick's sponsorship," and that it was taught by social scientists from other fields, including psychology. A "real"

sociologist was not appointed until 1937, but within the next two years a "semi-autonomous sociology section" was established under S.D. Clark. Sociologists were then invited to attend department meetings but were not listed as department members until 1942-3.[120]

Clark has argued that the difficulty experienced by sociologists in gaining respect for their discipline was due to its lingering reformist image, which was not, in his view, likely to be eradicated by Dawson's approach.[121] Clark devoted his career to the development of a historical approach to sociology, because he felt that the kind of research typified by Dawson's studies of the west was too preoccupied with the observable present. It depended on such techniques as interviews and questionnaires, and Clark suspected that some research topics were actually chosen because they lent themselves to this methodology. He believed that in order to study major problems and formulate comprehensive social theories, a historical method--comparable to that used by the economists--was required.[122] Clark's writings would have lasting importance as early ventures into combining the techniques of sociology and history, and as pioneering works in Canadian social history--an area which historians themselves would ignore until the 1960s.[123]

Meanwhile, other Canadian sociologists devised their own arguments to defend the legitimacy of sociology as a distinct and respectable discipline with

scientific traditions of its own. In a collection of Essays in Sociology, published in 1940 by the editors of the Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, some of the contributors chose to identify themselves with their European progenitors rather than their North American origins. Carl Dawson tried to answer the criticism that sociology lacked a precise definition of its territory and function by explaining that the father of the discipline, Auguste Comte, believed that his new science would "wipe out the traditional distinction between history, philosophy, and the natural sciences. Social life was conceived as an organic whole, changing according to ascertainable laws, knowledge of which promised predictability and orderly adjustment to human affairs."[124] Toronto sociologist C.W.M. Hart agreed that the basic principles of sociology had been established by Comte and Durkheim and could hardly be improved upon. Sociology must model its techniques on those of the physical sciences. "It is, I fear," said Hart, "a case of social science or no social knowledge at all."[125]

Despite such efforts to raise its status, sociology continued to play a minor part in the arts curriculum and was not introduced at some universities, including Queen's, until the 1950s.[126] Sociology entered the curriculum in Saskatchewan in 1958 in response to public demand, though President Thompson admitted that he did not "care for" the discipline himself.[127] Separate

sociology departments were the product of the late 1950s and early 1960s, after which the subject became suddenly fashionable amongst a generation of "socially conscious" undergraduates. Burgeoning enrolments throughout the sixties allowed courses to multiply, but the long neglect of sociology followed by such rapid growth meant that Canadian universities could not staff these departments with professors trained in Canada.[128] Sociology, along with political science, would be massively--and inappropriately--dominated by American influences, a fact which helps to explain why these departments became fertile seed-beds for radical Canadian nationalism.

The manpower shortage, suffered not only by the social sciences but by all disciplines, is quite well understood, but the problem of foreign influence in Canadian social science teaching also owes something to the fact that these disciplines developed in Canada in an academic setting which stressed public service and applied research and placed less value on theoretical work. In the United States, there were similar pressures, but the social science community was larger and mature enough to develop in both intellectual and practical directions at once. In Canada, the emphasis on utility played down the need for theories to explain social and political phenomena and to give the social sciences coherent structure as disciplines.

Into this vacuum would step a large body of non-Canadian academics who, quite naturally, brought their own theoretical baggage with them.

The problem of the neglect of theory was recognised early in the post-war period. Critics within the disciplines themselves were aware that Canadian scholars had focussed on descriptive rather than analytical studies; were preoccupied with devising topics that would "sell;" and lagged behind their American counterparts in the realm of social and political theory. In an essay written for the Massey Commission, B.S. Keirstead and S.D. Clark criticized sociologists for tending "to make much of whatever would attract public attention," instead of building up the theoretical side of their discipline through disinterested research. But they acknowledged that the temptations which social scientists faced were great. Government and business could easily distract social scientists from creative scholarship and lure them towards practical research, for they "have the money to induce scholars to undertake this work. Moreover, where they have not seduced the scholars themselves, they have seduced the university authorities."[129] Even in the comparatively healthier field of economics, the loss of highly trained people into government and business work meant that theory was being neglected. "It is not that we need 'Canadian' theory—the concept is absurd," wrote J.H. Dales of the University of

Toronto in the 1960s, "but that we badly need theorists working in Canada who can adapt theory to the requirements of Canadian problems."[130]

The disadvantages inherent in an ethic of public service had been predicted by many academics in the 1920s and 1930s, but among social scientists Harold Innis was the most empassioned critic. He insisted that the social scientists' willingness to work directly towards practical ends was a betrayal of their disciplines and of "the university tradition." Scholars, he argued, were necessarily engaged in a perpetual struggle against personal and social bias, and that fight became a lost cause (and the results of their work hopelessly distorted) if government or industry was allowed to establish research priorities. The highest public service, in Innis's view, consisted of preserving the university as a counter-balance to state power rather than becoming an accessory to it.[131]

Innis's opponents, who included members of the League for Social Reconstruction as well as colleagues who sat on government boards and commissions, argued with equal conviction and logic that social scientists had a duty to put their expertise to work wherever it might improve the human condition.[132] During the 1940s, however, when the war drove universities, government and industry into much closer cooperation, Innis gained more allies. In an introduction to Arthur Lower's

discussion concerning the role of the social scientist in the modern world, the editor of the Canadian Historical Review presented the dilemma: "Shall they retire into an ivory tower and let the social consequences of their work take care of themselves, or shall they become mere technicians for the society in which they live?"[133] MacPherson agreed that the problem was very real, and that there was a danger that social scientists might find themselves being used "to give a respectable academic front to whatever institutions the new forces and new leaders in the state might propose to set up."[134]

In the post-war world, it was widely acknowledged that a heavy emphasis on applied research had distorted developments in the social sciences. Rapid growth in these disciplines during the 1960s along with the increased funding for "pure" research provided by the Canada Council would alleviate the problem to some degree. The inevitable tensions between scholarly and service-oriented research would persist, however, just as they did in other disciplines and in other countries, and, in Canada, a strong tradition of servicing the "Establishment" and the newer problem of "Americanization" paved the way for a real crisis of self-definition in the social sciences in the years to come.[135]

NOTES

1 Blair Neatby, The Politics of Chaos: Canada in the Thirties (Toronto, 1972), 15-16.

2 James A. Mclean, University of Manitoba Annual Report (1933-4), 1.

3 Sidney Smith, in University of Manitoba President's Report (1936-7); ibid., (1938-9), 1.

4 It seems likely that they imitated one another's way of dealing with educational problems, but also that a majority of them had some exposure to idealist philosophy and would have understood its language. For example, H.M. Tory did not study at Queen's, but of Watson he said, "When I was young everyone swore by him." See E.A. Corbett, Henry Marshall Tory: Beloved Canadian (Toronto, 1954). Elsewhere, Tory suggested that training under Watson was one of the accepted attributes of a university president. See J.R. Kidd, "A Study of the Influence of Dr. H.M. Tory on Educational Policy in Canada," unpub. M.A. thesis, McGill (1944), 148.

5 Rudolph, Curriculum, 166-7.

6 Rupert C. Lodge, Philosophy of Education, (New York, 1937), 297.

7 Hayden, Seeking a Balance, 30-1.

8 Walter Murray, "University Development Since Confederation," DR (1927-8), 482.

9 University of Manitoba Archives, MSS SC 58 Folder 1, W.J. Waines, "University Presidents I have Known: Recollections and Impressions," 5.

10 The annual reports of deans of arts to their university presidents during this period provide a detailed account of their financial woes. These reports are included in the President's Reports.

11 Frost, McGill University, Vol II, Ch. 5.

12 Arthur Currie, "Is Canadian Education Fulfilling its Purpose?" NCCU (1927), 25-31.

13 Andrew Macphail, "Sir Arthur Currie," QQ 41 (1934) 13-14.

14 Robert Falconer, Idealism in National Character (Toronto, 1920; Malcolm Wallace, "Sir Robert Falconer

the Man and his Interests," UTQ 13 (1944).

15 Frederick Gibson, Queen's University, Vol. II: To Serve and Yet be Free (Kingston and Montreal, 1983), Ch. 6 and Ch. 9.

16 R.C. Wallace, A Liberal Education in a Modern World (Toronto, 1932), 133-4.

17 See Paul Axelrod, "Moulding the Middle Class: Student Life at Dalhousie in the 1930s," Acadiensis (1975), 96-8; Ronald Hayes, "Two Presidents, Two Cultures, and Two Wars: a Portrait of Dalhousie as a Microcosm of Twentieth Century Canada," DR 54 (1974), 405.

18 R. Bruce Taylor, "Academic Freedom," QQ 27 (1919), 1-11.

19 Gibson, Ch. 3 for Taylor, Ch. 5 for Fyfe, and for comparison of Wallace to Grant, see 144, 152.

20 University of Toronto, A83-0036/006 University Historian, File: Department of Philosophy, T.A. Goudge, "Instruction and Research in Philosophy at the University of Toronto: a Historical Sketch of the Department of Philosophy, Part I, 1827-1969," 16.

21 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 246. Philosophy was not required at Dalhousie, McGill, Toronto, or the four western universities, but was still prescribed at Queen's and Acadia in 1940, Harris, 386.

22 John Irving, "One Hundred Years of Canadian Philosophy," in Philosophy in Canada: A Symposium (Toronto, 1952), 23. The symposium was held at Toronto on 29 December 1950 on the occasion of the forty-seventh annual meeting of the American Philosophical Association.

23 Irving, "Philosophy," in The Culture of Contemporary Canada (ed.) Park, 251-2.

24 Charles W. Hendel, "The Character of Philosophy in Canada," in Philosophy in Canada, 32.

25 Irving, "Philosophy," in The Culture of Contemporary Canada, 252.

26 Ibid., and see 252-8 for a discussion of Brett's philosophy and published works.

27 R.D. MacLennan, "Philosophy and Liberal Education," in Culture 2 (1941), 422-4.

28 H.L.S. "Current Magazines," DR 24 (1945), 481. Stewart was an Arnoldian who spread the gospel of culture through newspaper and journal articles, books and radio talks, and through the Dalhousie Review which he founded and edited for twenty-six years. Irving said of Stewart that "He was a master of the art of popular exposition of the best that has been thought and said in the world." "Philosophy," in The Culture of Contemporary Canada, 259.

29 Ibid., 259-60.

30 Goudge, "A Century of Philosophy," 542-3.

31 Goudge, "Instruction and Research in Philosophy," 2-3.

32 Ibid., 2-4.

33 Irving, "Philosophy," in The Culture of Contemporary Canada, 262-3. And see R.C. Lodge, "The Comparative Method in Philosophy," Manitoba Essays (Toronto, 1937). Irving says that Lodge was the "leading advocate" of this approach but does not name its other adherents.

34 Lodge, "Philosophy as Taught at the University of Manitoba," Culture 2 (1941), 430-4.

35 J.M. MacEachran, "Twenty-five Years of Philosophical Speculation," in W.H. Alexander et al, These Twenty-five years: a Symposium (Toronto, 1933), 106. And see G.S. Brett, "The Philosopher's Stone," CF 6/72 (1926), 370-2. Stewart Basterfield, in "Physics and Metaphysics" CF 9/108 (1929), 421--2, wrote that "One thing seems certain, the scientist is beginning to think that the philosopher is not quite the fool he seems to be." The notion that science and philosophy (or the humanities as a whole) were coming together again greatly appealed to the idealism of administrators such as R.C. Wallace and H.M. Tory. See Wallace, "The Humanism of Science," NCCU (1930), 33-6; and Tory, "A Study of the Organization and Work of the Royal Society of Canada," TRSC sec. 3 Vol. 34 (1940), 72.

36 W.C. Keirstead, "Philosophy, Its Data and Its Aims," Culture 2 (1941), 436-7.

37 Irving, "Philosophy," in The Culture of Contemporary Canada, 267-8. Macdonald may have been less optimistic about the possiblity of such a union than Irving. See "Review of New Books," QQ (1952--3), 540-2, where he reviews Irving's Science and Values: Explorations in Philosophy and the Social Sciences (Toronto, 1952).

38 Irving, a review of Morris Guinsburg, Reason and Unreason in Society, CF 29 (Jan. 1950), 234. See also: Science and Values which is an exposition of his scheme; "The Sciences and Philosophy in Modern Culture," in The Heritage of Modern Culture (ed.) R. Chalmers (Toronto, 1952), a book produced by the United Church Commission on Culture appointed in 1946.

39 McGill and Toronto had separate departments in the 1920s, but a number of others, including Dalhousie (1948), Queen's (1949), and Manitoba and Saskatchewan (1947) delayed the creation of separate psychology departments until a new generation of faculty took over.

40 Irving, "The Future of Philosophy," UTQ 16 (1946-7), 198.

41 See "Introduction," in History of Academic Psychology (eds.) Wright and Myers, 15-16.

42 Myers, "Psychology at Toronto," 81-3; William Line, "Psychology," in Royal Commission Studies: a Selection of Essays prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (Ottawa, 1951), 152.

43 G.S. Brett, "Psychology in the University," UTM 22 (April, 1922), 298-300. And see "Psychology Department undergoes Important Change" UTM 21 (Nov. 1920) 56-7.

44 Myers, "Psychology at Toronto," 83-5; and "Introduction, in Academic Psychology in Canada, 16-17. Hincks was inspired by the mental health movement that flourished in the United States after the publication of Clifford Beer's The Mind that Found Itself (1908). The Committee subsidized research related to mental health. Money was available for studies on childhood and family life from the early twenties onward, for "Early intervention and parent education were viewed as essential elements in any mental health promotion program."

45 George Ferguson, "Psychology at McGill," in Academic Psychology in Canada, 46.

46 Ibid., 44-5

47 Ibid., 43-6.

48 Ibid., 50. The Social Science Research Project was first suggested by Hincks, but the research it sponsored involved all the social science disciplines. It began in 1930 and was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, and its director was Leonard Marsh, an economist trained at the London School of Economics who was author of the Marsh Report in World War II. Industrial and commercial representatives were included on its committee. Frost, McGill University, Vol. I, 151-3, 195.

49 James Inglis, "Psychology at Queen's," in Academic Psychology in Canada, 105-6. The courses devised by Humphrey by 1930 are described by Inglis.

50 Morgan W. Wright, "Psychology at Manitoba," in Academic Psychology in Canada, 171-2. Enrolment figures are given in the University of Manitoba President's Reports. In 1924-5, for example, total enrolment in the Department of Philosophy was 217, of which 165 were in Psychology.

51 Julian M. Blackburn, "George Humphrey," Canadian Journal of Psychology 11 (1957), 141-50.

52 A survey of university calendars of the mid-1930s reveals a similarity in offerings. Also see the various chapters of Academic Psychology in Canada.

53 University of British Columbia Calendar (1936-7), 134-6. For "Psychology of Personality," the text was Schaffer, The Psychology of Adjustment, and for "Clinical Psychology," the text was Measurement of Intelligence.

54 Ferguson, "Psychology at McGill," 51. He writes that "this is a common experience of chairmen of psychology departments."

55 F. H. Page and J.W. Clark, "Psychology at Dalhousie," in Academic Psychology in Canada.

56 See Michiel Horn's chapter on "Professors in the Public Eye" in The League for Social Reconstruction (Toronto, 1980).

57 Ferguson, "Psychology at McGill," 56-7; and see

Line, "Psychology," 153-4.

58 See <u>Academic Psychology in Canada</u>, "Introduction," 17; Myers, "Psychology at Toronto," 89.

59 Ibid., "Introduction," 18-19. And see Robert MacLeod, <u>Psychology in Canadian Universities and Colleges</u> (Ottawa, 1955); Myers, "Professional Psychology in Canada," <u>The Canadian Psychologist</u> 7 (1958), 27-36.

60 Gibson, <u>Queen's University</u>, 39; Drummond, <u>Political Economy</u>, 8.

61 Harris, <u>A History of Higher Education</u>, 242-3. Skelton wrote that these courses "show a wide divergence in the amount of economics and general arts work required as a basis, the length and breadth of the course, the extent to which the faculty is distinct from the economics staff, and the degree of business technique included. This development has met a success that has brought its share of embarassments, but the trend towards higher standards and emphasis on training in fundamentals rather than in specialized techniques is marked." "Fifty Years of Political and Economic Science," 88-9.

62 Drummond, <u>Political Economy</u>, 55.

63 For Cappon's reaction, see Gibson, <u>Queen's University</u>, 36-7. Skelton soothed Cappon's fears by reassuring him that not very many students would be attracted to the new course.

64 J.M. Macdonnell, "The Decline of the Arts Faculty," <u>QQ</u> (1922-23), 315.

65 M.W. Wallace, <u>NCCU</u> (1930), 21.

66 C.N. Cochrane, ibid., 20-1. See also "The Question of Commerce Courses in Universities," <u>NCCU</u> (1932), 61-9.

67 F.H. Underhill, "Commerce Courses and the Arts Faculty," <u>NCCU</u> (1930), 78.

68 Underhill, <u>NCCU</u> (1930), 20.

69 Wallace, <u>A Liberal Education</u>, 17, 44.

70 Clark, "University Training for Business," 329-31.

71 Michiel Horn, "Academics and Canadian Social and Economic Policy in the Depression and War Years," JCS 13 (1978), 6. See also Skelton, "Fifty Years," 89.

72 Barry Ferguson and Douglas Owram, "Social Scientists and Public Policy from the 1920s through World War II," JCS 19 (1984-5), 6-7.

73 Ibid., 11.

74 Drummond, Political Economy, 61.

75 V.W. Bladen, Bladen on Bladen (Toronto, 1978), 68-9, quoted in Drummond, Political Economy, 77-8.

76 Drummond, Political Economy, 66-7.

77 University of Manitoba President's Report (1938-9), 42-3.

78 Ibid. (1936-7), 41.

79 H.S. Ferns, Reading from Left to Right: One Man's Political History (Toronto, 1983), 39-40.

80 Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, 61-2.

81 Ibid., 210-12.

82 Ibid., 195-6, 261-2.

83 Reginald Trotter, "Aims in the Study and Teaching of History in Canadian Universities Today," CHAAR (1943), 55.

84 K.W. Taylor, "Economic Scholarship in Canada," CJEPS 26 (1960), 10-11, quoted in J.H. Dales, "Canadian Scholarship in Economics," in Scholarship in Canada, 1967: Achievement and Outlook (ed.) R.H. Hubbard (Toronto, 1968), 88-9.

85 C.B. MacPherson, "The Social Sciences," in The Culture of Contemporary Canada, 207-8.

86 Drummond, Political Economy, 61.

87 Skelton, "Fifty Years."

88 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 388.

89 B.S. Keirstead and S.D. Clark, Social Sciences, in Royal Commission Studies, 179.

90 MacPherson, "The Social Sciences," 208-9.

91 MacPherson, "On the Study of Politics in Canada," in Essays in Political Economy (ed.) H.A. Innis (Toronto, 1938), 158.

92 Law became a separate department at Toronto in 1930. Drummond, Political Economy, 73.

93 For the major publications of this period, see MacPherson, "The Social Sciences," 208-11.

94 Ibid., 211.

95 Axelrod, "Moulding the Middle Class," 25. And see Skelton, "Fifty Years."

96 H. McD. Clokie, "Canadian Contribution to Political Science," Culture 3 (1942), 471-2.

97 At Manitoba in 1938-9, there were nine courses listed in economics and one in political science.

98 Dalhousie University Calendar (1938-9), 82. U.B.C. Calendar (1936-7), 109.

99 A complete survey and analysis of course offerings, which cannot be conducted solely through the use of calendars, still needs to be done. For example, Dalhousie in 1936-7 listed an economics course called "Programmes of Social Reconstruction" but did not describe its content or list the required readings.

100 See Clokie, "Canadian Contribution," 467-74; MacPherson, "On the Study of Politics," 159-64; MacPherson, "The Position of Political Science," Culture (1942), 452-9; Herbert Quinn, "Political Science at McGill University," Culture 8 (1947), 92-3; Quinn, "Political Science Instruction in Canadian Universities," Culture 9 (1948), 247-54. For an example of resistance to the idea that the study of politics could be established as a legitimate social "science," see E.J. Urwick, "The Role of Intelligence in the Social Process," CJEPS 1 (1935), 69. Urwick was head of Toronto's Department of Political Economy from 1922-37. His successor, H.A. Innis, is on record as saying that political science had already received too much attention. See Dales, "Canadian Scholarship in Economics," 92.

101 MacPherson, "The Social Sciences," 212.

102 Quinn, "Political Science Instruction," 251.

103 J.E. Hodgetts, "Canadian Political Science: A Hybrid with a Future?" in Scholarship in Canada, 100.

104 Ibid., 99. For the results of the SSRC survey conducted by R. MacGregor Dawson, see PAC SSRC MG 28 I 81 Vol. 86 File: Political Science Teaching in Canada, 1950-1.

105 MacPherson, "After Strange Gods: Canadian Political Science in 1973," in Perspectives on the Social Sciences in Canada (eds.) T.N. Guinsburg and G.L. Reuber (Toronto, 1974), 56. In the SSRC survey results, there is evidence that some universities wanted to or planned to add political scientists to their staffs for some time before the necessary funding materialized. For growth in the discipline, also see Hodgetts, "Canadian Political Science," 100-3.

106 See R.D. Francis and D.B. Smith, Readings in Canadian History: Post-Confederation (Toronto, 1982), Topic 8, Social Reform Movements.

107 Shore, "The Research Ideal," 19-21.

108 R.M. MacIver, "The Department of Social Service as a Branch of the University," UTM 19 (Feb. 1919), 100.

109 Shore, "The Research Ideal," 2-4.

110 Ibid., 41-3.

111 Frost, McGill University, Vol. II, 148-50. The School of Social Work closed in 1930.

112 Ibid.

113 The Writing of Canadian History, 162, and MacPherson, "The Social Sciences," 216. Dawson's work included The Settlement of the Peace River Country (1934), Group Settlement: Ethnic Communities in Western Canada (1936), and Pioneering in the Prairie Provinces: The Social Side of the Settlement Process (1940).

114 For an analysis of courses taught and texts used at Canadian universities, see Tomovic, "Sociology in Canada."

115 MacIver, As a Tale that is Told (Chicago, 1968) 96. MacIver was an Oxford classics graduate who lectured in political science and sociology at Aberdeen before World War I. His main interest was sociology. He described himself as being "saddled for a time with the direction of a struggling School of Social Work," 89, and explains that a principal motive for his departure for Barnard College was that there he could teach sociology which "I had not been able to introduce at Toronto," 96. See also Drummond, Political Economy, 46.

116 Drummond, Political Economy, 65.

117 Urwick worked under Canon Barnett in the social settlement movement in East London, was director of the London School of Sociology from 1902-10, and was Professor of Social Philosophy in the University of London from 1912-22.

118 Urwick, "The Role of Intelligence in the Social Process," 73. See also Urwick, "Is there a Scientific Sociology?" CJEPS 4 (1938), 231-40. Urwick reviewed MacIver's Society: A Text-book of Sociology (New York, 1937) and criticized him for failing to illuminate what the subject matter of sociology is and explaining why it can be studied scientifically.

119 The political economy department did not give way to separate departments of political science and sociology until 1963. Innis was very critical of the processes of specialization and departmentalization in the social sciences.

120 See Drummond, Political Economy, 73, 99-100; Tomovic, "Sociology in Canada," 248-9.

121 J. Paul Grayson and Dennis William Magill, One Step Forward, Two Steps Sideways: Sociology and Anthropology in Canada (1981), 155-6.

122 S.D. Clark, "Sociology and Canadian History," CJEPS 5 (1939), 348-57.

123 For a discussion of Clark's contribution to Canadian history, see Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, 163-9. Clark had intended to be a historian but became bored with the preoccupation with constitutional history which was still dominant at Toronto in 1931, and he pursued his further studies at the L.S.E. under such notables as Laski, Power and Tawney. His works include: The Social Development of Canada (1942), Church and Sect in Canada

(1948), and Movements of Political Protest in Canada (1959).

124 C.A. Dawson, "Sociology as a Specialized Discipline," in Essays in Sociology (ed.) C.W.M. Hart (Toronto, 1940), 19-20. Innis introduced the collection and conceded that "The position of sociology ... suggests the established vested interests of older disciplines." Although he remarked on its potential, he also stressed its problems as a young discipline. Its practitioners argued with one another over method and content, he said, because they bring "a quantity of baggage from other disciplines." He also criticized sociology for trying to be all-inclusive, and said that it lacked a clear sense of its function, v-vii.

125 Hart, "Some Obstacles to a Scientific Sociology," in Essays in Sociology, 51-2.

126 Gibson, Queen's University, 345.

127 Hayden, Seeking a Balance, 211.

128 For evidence of the shortage of instructors becoming more and more serious during the 1950s, see Keirstead and Clark, "Social Science," in Royal Commission Studies, 181-2; Keirstead, "The Social Sciences," in Canada's Crisis in Higher Education (Toronto, 1957), 157; David Corbett, "The Social Sciences in Canada: an Appraisal and a Program," QQ 66 (1959), 65-73. Keirstead and Clark (1951) pointed out that not only were academic salaries higher in the U.S. than in Canada, but that in the U.S. social scientists on average made more in the universities than in the civil service, whereas in Canada the opposite was true. Keirstead (1957) reported that in 1955 there were twenty-nine doctoral students in economics and political science, and five in sociology and anthropology.

129 Keirstead and Clark, "Social Sciences," 184-9. Also see S.D. Clark, "The Support of Social Science Research in Canada," CJEPS 24 (May, 1958); John F. Graham, "The Social Sciences: Specific Needs," in Scholarship in Canada, 20-1; Desmond Connor and James Curtis, Sociology and Anthropology in Canada (Montreal, 1970), 8.

130 Dales, "Canadian Scholarship in Economics," in Scholarship in Canada, 90-1.

131 See Leslie A. Pal, "Scholarship and the Later Innis," _JCS_ (1977), 39; Horn, "Academics and Canadian Social and Economic Policy," 198. For a sampling of his views, see Innis, "The Role of Intelligence: Some Further Notes," _CJEPS_ 1 (1935), 280-7; "A Plea foe the University Tradition," _DR_ 24 (1944-5).

132 Ferguson and Owram discuss the various points of view in "Social Scientists and Public Policy," 7-10.

133 Editor's note prefacing "The Social Sciences in the Post-war World," _CHR_ 22 (1941), 1.

134 MacPherson, "The Social Scientist in the Modern World," _CHAAR_ (1941), 86. See also "The Social Sciences in the Post-war World," a symposium, _CHR_ 22 (1941).

135 See H. Winthrop, "Does Sociology have to be Polarized into 'Pure' and 'Applied'?" _Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology_ 6 (1969), 54-7; M. Gurstein, "Towards the Nationalization of Canadian Sociology," _JCS_ 7 (1972), 50-8; M. Mackie, "Sociology, Academics and the Community: Maligned Within, Invisible Without?" _Canadian Journal of Sociology_ 1 (1975), 203-221; J. Stolzman and H. Gamberg, "The National Question and Canadian Sociology," _CJS_ 1 (1975), 91-106; D.E. Smith, "What it Might Mean to do a Canadian Sociology," _CJS_ 1 (1975), 363-76; "Must Canadian Political Science be a Miniature Replica?" _JCS_ 9 (1974), 31-42; F. Felt, "Nationalism and the Possibility of a Relevant Canadian Sociology," _CJS_ 1 (1975), 377-385; Danny Drache, "Rediscovering Canadian Political Economy," _JCS_ 11 (1976), 3-18; S.D. Clark, "The Changing Image of Sociology in English-speaking Canada," _CJS_ 4 (1979), 393-403; H.H. Hiller, "The Canadian Sociology Movement," _CJS_ 4 (1979), 125-50; R. Whitaker, "Confused Alarms of Struggle and Flight: English-Canadian Political Science in the 1970s," _CHR_ 60 (1979), 1-18.

# Chapter 6

## Rhetoric and Reform: The Search for Curricular Order from the 1920s to the Cold War

The utilitarianism which spurred the development of the social sciences in the first half of the twentieth century challenged the central place of the arts course, and especially of the humanities, in the English-Canadian university. As administrators continued to stress their institutions' public service role, the universities' centre of gravity shifted more towards vocational studies and, within the arts faculties, more towards the social sciences and away from the "cultural subjects." Many academics raised their voices against this process, and, to some extent, the arguments they used to defend the liberal arts echoed those put forward by conservative academics before World War I. Some of those individuals were still professionally active in the 1920s, but a new generation had matured who represented a wider range of social attitudes: no longer was the defence of cultural education identified primarily with the pro-Britishness and unapolegetic elitism typical of the pre-war humanist. Liberal-nationalist Arthur Lower and socialist-cum-liberal Frank Underhill both concerned themselves with the fate of the liberal arts course in English-Canada, and there were other academics on the political left who were convinced that

university education should be aimed, above all, at nurturing the spiritual health of the nation.[1]

The language used to promote and defend the arts course during these decades has significance because it illuminates several aspects of the academic atmosphere of the period. It reveals the ongoing tension between vocationalism and the ideal of "knowledge for its own sake;" the arts professors' deep concern over their status in the modern university; and the continuing importance of the Arnoldian notion that cultural subjects possess a moral authority lacking in all other fields of study. It shows, as well, that fears about the future of the arts course drew from broader concerns about Canadian society itself, including the alleged neglect of spiritual matters and the rise of "materialism;" the intrusion of technology and scientific methodology into more and more areas of life; and the alternating threat and reality of war. Many arts advocates promoted liberal education as an antidote to the ills of modern humanity, believing that it imparted to the young the values on which the survival of civilization would depend. But running through their analysis was a pervading fear that the realities of arts education fell far short of the ideal.

Those academics with the greatest stake in the well-being of the arts course were often its greatest critics. They deplored the proliferation of specialized

disciplines and sub-disciplines which had fragmented the arts curriculum. They believed that the sense of aimlessness which seemed to typify the general arts student was a testimony to the arts faculties' inability to instil a sense of purpose and direction comparable to that of the professional schools. In response, a number of scholars--and administrators who shared their alarm--attempted to rally a curricular reform movement which would tackle these problems. Their concern was focussed almost exclusively on the pass or general arts course; the honours program still retained its structure, purpose, and self-confidence, and its reputation as the natural home of the bright student flourished as faith in the pass course waned.

## THE HONOURS CURRICULUM

The easiest approach to the problem of the arts course was to sidestep the whole issue of course proliferation and free election by emphasizing specialized honours work as the only route to a good Bachelor's Degree. Most English-Canadian universities had honours programs by the interwar period, although they were still less specialized than Toronto's and could not match its high enrolments or academic reputation. That reputation depended on the careful segregation of honours from pass candidates and almost complete control over the students' choice of courses.

Toronto, in fact, had led North America in the development of honours work, having created programs in the late nineteenth century which concentrated on just one or two disciplines. American universities did not enter the field until well into the twentieth century; only after the elective system had come under severe and sustained criticism did they turn to the idea of structured, specialized programs as an alternative to the cafeteria-style general course. Interest in the honours system grew rapidly during the 1920s,[2] but, according to Robin Harris, a report produced by W.S. Learned for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1927 singled out only three institutions, Harvard, Swarthmore College and Toronto, as having real success in "attracting able students" into an honours program and "effectively guiding their intellectual development over the next four years." Of these, only Toronto had an honours system that encompassed the entire four years of the undergraduate program.[3]

Growing doubts about the quality of the general arts course reinforced the belief that the honours course was a valuable academic tradition which must be cherished and preserved. Its advocates still maintained, as they had in previous decades, that by dedicating oneself to a particular liberal arts discipline one could attain the best possible undergraduate education. Instead of achieving the "superficial omniscience" of

the general student, those in honours delved deeply into all aspects of their fields and came to an understanding, it was said, of the "universal principles" which underlie all human knowledge. "More and more you will find that knowledge is one, and you may hope, before you leave, for something at least of that synoptic vision which will make you free of the human household," wrote some graduates of the classical course in the late 1920s.[4]

The University of Toronto protected the integrity and reputation of the honours programs through several concrete policies. These served to maintain a maximum amount of control over the quality of student admitted, the content of each degree program, and the standard of its graduates. Students matriculated after Grade 13 and were required to meet the criteria set out by the honours department they wished to enter. From that point onwards, they were segregated as fully as possible from the pass student population in separate honours course offerings. Each program was heavily prescribed, permitting only a few carefully restricted options.[5] As some of its graduates pointed out, "there is none of the piecemeal accumulation of credits towards a degree, or of the haphazard choice of subjects to be taken each year, that mark the system of so many universities on this continent."[6] Academic standards were protected, according to A.S.P. Woodhouse, by preserving the old

system of grading honours graduates into three classes, and ranking the candidates within the first two classes in order of merit. Failure in one subject required a student to transfer to the pass course. "It is thus possible," he wrote, "to keep the standard for first class very high, and to determine with precision the standing of all candidates in relation to it." The whole program was reputedly designed for superior students--or at least the kind of student most likely to flourish in a highly structured and demanding academic environment. Its elitism was a matter of open pride. Woodhouse pronounced the honours program "the best means for educating the intellectual elite of this country," and remarked that "obviously in judging of honours courses one must have the best student in view, just as in judging the pass course one must have the average student."[7]

Provisions for honours work and the percentage of students enrolled in such courses varied greatly from one university to the next. Honours students predominated at Toronto but did not do so elsewhere in Canada. During the interwar period, slightly over half of Toronto's arts students were enrolled in honours, whereas at other institutions the great majority (Harris estimates between eighty and ninety-five percent) were working towards pass degrees.[8] Queen's probably emulatd Toronto most closely, for, although its course enrolled

fewer students, it too involved four years of study after admission from Grade 13.[9] Twelve courses were taken in the major subject and four in the minor. Students also took introductory courses in English, Latin or mathematics, a language, philosophy or psychology, and a science, thus making this program somewhat broader in content than Toronto's. At a majority of other universities the programs were shorter, in many cases requiring (as did the pass course) only four years after junior matriculation, which was Grade 11 in most provinces. McGill provided a common first year for honours which required English, Latin or Greek, and mathematics, and began specialized work in second year. It was usual for Maritime universities not to begin honours work until the third year, and the smaller (or poorer) the institution, the less likely it was that a full set of separate courses for upper year honours students would be offered.[10]

Honours courses also developed in the western provinces. Despite the egalitarian and service-oriented nature of higher education in the west, arts faculties at Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia began providing for honours work shortly after the institutions were founded. Initially, however, these programs resembled those of the Maritimes in merely adding extra work in areas of specialization rather than an extra year to the course of study,[11] and honours work as a prep-

aration for teaching careers did not receive the encouragement that was provided by the specialist's certificate awarded by the Department of Education in Ontario. Woodhouse recorded that

> In more than one province it would appear that there was an active discouragement of honours as a preparation for teaching, the reason alleged being the need for teachers of varied, if limited competence, such as the pass course is thought to produce, rather than for more highly qualified specialists.[12]

In the west, Manitoba led the way in adding a fifth year (with entrance after Grade 11) to its honours program in 1923, and in pursuing a policy more similar to that of the University of Toronto. During the last two years of the program at Manitoba, students confined their studies to two disciplines, although for some time there was little differentiation between honours and pass offerings. By the 1930s, however, at least some departments had managed to create a set of special honours courses.[13] In history, for example, department head H.N. Fieldhouse made a point of furthering the separation of honours and pass work as a method of improving the quality of instruction, at least for superior students. He disliked the atmosphere of the provincial university, where he believed that the obligation to provide mass education had produced very low academic standards. (A former student recalled that the young Fieldhouse, who had only recently arrived from Britain, "despised students, most of his colleagues,

and the Manitoba community").[14] In order to counteract the overly democratic nature of the educational system, he was willing to sacrifice the quality of teaching given to pass students so that the department's small staff could offer "Honours courses of outstanding value." As he confided to readers of his annual report in 1934, the problem to be confronted in Manitoba was how "to combine a degree factory and a University under one roof without making the fact prematurely public."[15]

Whether at Toronto or Manitoba, the philosophy of honours work was that promising students should receive something better than the smorgasbord of general courses which was the fate of most Canadian university students. That meant not only smaller classes and more demanding courses, but more or less intense specialization in one or two chosen fields. Specialized learning was thus viewed as one antidote to the disorder of the elective system, but it was a solution which ignored the ongoing problem of what should be done to improve the pass course. Some academics believed that this evasion must be exposed and the real issues tackled. As F.H. Underhill wrote in the Canadian Forum:

> These institutions, such as Toronto, who separate honours men from pass men, are allowing words to blind them to realities if they imagine that this has automatically relieved them of self-examination. It may be doubted, indeed, if any institution west of McGill turns out a higher proportion of young Babbitts among its B.A.'s than does the University of Toronto.[16]

At Dalhousie, George Wilson complained of "the all too

general contempt for the ordinary student." He suggested that if "there is little culture" in Canada and "if we are continually bemoaning the fact that our civilization is Philistine and materialistic," the universities must take the lead in setting new standards and values. That could not be accomplished, he pointed out, by being concerned with just a few gifted students: "If we are to have a real civilization," Wilson advised, "the whole atmosphere must change."[17]

THE PASS COURSE

Despite the tendency of present day critics to harken back to this era as one of a far more rigorous arts course,[18] the structure of the general program at most English-Canadian universities in the interwar period was already fairly loose. The first year was heavily prescribed, but most institutions still admitted students after junior matriculation. First year programs typically included English, mathematics, a second language (and, in the Maritimes, a classical language), and were basically the equivalent of a final year in high school except that a few more options were available. Several institutions also prescribed English in second year, continuation in the foreign language for another year, a science, a social science or philosophy, and perhaps history. Third and fourth year courses were usually electives.[19] At most institutions,

a system of courses and credits had replaced the traditional year system, for it seemed the only way to accommodate new disciplines and the diverse needs and aptitudes of a more democratically selected student body.[20] Dalhousie was one institution which found the new arrangement too chaotic, and, during the 1930s, restored some of its former sequence requirements.[21] The fact remained, however, that the piecemeal process of assembling credits towards a degree which prevailed at most institutions was unduplicated in the professional faculties. One critic said that the arts program now resembled the accumulation of "coupons ... to be exchanged at the end for a prize."[22]

A feature common today which barely affected the interwar arts course is the system of majors and minors. In American universities, the major had been introduced in the late nineteenth century as a means of curtailing complete free election, but it did not involve any strong degree of concentration in any one subject. Students might have as many as three major subjects, each requiring only two or three courses.[23] Majors were prescribed in some Canadian universities in the interwar period, but again, the amount of specialization could be minimal. At British Columbia, for instance, students had to declare two majors and take at least three courses in one and two in the other, along with a minimum of two courses in a minor subject.[24]

Most curricula were designed to prevent rather than encourage specialization. The idea was still current that the general arts graduate should have some acquaintance with all fields of knowledge, and distribution or "breadth" requirements were intended to ensure that no area of learning was entirely neglected. At Manitoba, for example, there were no major subjects, and the principle governing course selection in the third and fourth years was that a certain number be chosen from Group A, the humanities, and Group B, the social sciences. Apart from that, the University merely stated that the authorities "expect that a reasonable degree of sequence will be observed."[25] What observers increasingly suspected, however, was that as the number of optional courses increased, such a provision could not guarantee that a student's program had any real coherence. Universities had, in effect, lost their authority over the structure of the pass course. As a writer in the Canadian Forum put it, if a student "can get his 50% in his twenty assorted credits, he can drone gaily on until he gets his degree and no power under heaven will stop him."[26]

The University of Toronto's pass course was the subject of recurring complaint, for at that institution the contrast between the two classes of arts student was especially striking and presented a problem to reformers which seemed to defy solution. How could

the low status of the pass student be improved in an institution dominated by honours work? Back in 1895, the university had tried to emphasize the legitimate function of the non-specialist course by changing its name from "pass" to "general"--a revision intended to describe "the character of the course without branding it as inferior," says C.B. Sissons. The name reverted to "pass" once again in 1919 when authorities acknowledged that it had never achieved equality with the specialized courses and was unlikely to do so now that it was becoming a vehicle of mass education.[27] During the 1920s, however, there was pressure once again to improve the status of the pass course. W.B. Kerr, who sometimes wrote on educational matters in the _Canadian Forum_, outlined some of the charges against the old system. He pointed out how anomalous it was to take pride in the university's reputation for honours work when half the arts student body received an education no better than any other in North America. "If Toronto University has a skeleton in its closet, the shape of the skull bears a distinct resemblance to that of the pass student," Kerr accused. He maintained that classes were too large, with enrolments sometimes exceeding one hundred, and that professors allowed pass students to take as little of their time as possible. "Everyone around the university cannot but be aware of the small esteem accorded to the pass course; how it is spoken

of with contempt as the haunt of the frivolous, the refuge of the intellectually inferior, and the graveyard where lie buried the dead of the honours course." Kerr wanted to see "the pass course transformed into a really good general course, comparable in its way to the honours courses."[28]

A new system was introduced in 1931, prompted partly by the desire for a better non-specialist program, and partly by the absorption (which occurred at the same time) of the old first year of the pass course into the high schools as Grade 13.[29] The straight substitution of a general program equivalent in length to the honours course was discussed by the University Council but not approved, and instead the university began offering a three year pass course and a four year general program.[30] The latter was intended to be as good as the honours course, but in fact lacked the structure and quality needed to make it comparable. Harris points out that, like the pass course, "it required the taking of a specified number of courses in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences, but no single course, not even a single subject--not even English--was prescribed."[31] It was open to students who completed their second year of the pass course with a C average, but it was taken mainly by those who dropped out of honours after second year, and it never succeeded in enrolling many students.[32] In the following decade, Woodhouse would pronounce it

a failure because it "inherited the disabilities of the pass course, instead of rising securely to the standard and prestige of the honours course."[33] That goal, however, had never been realistic, because the general course possessed none of the attributes of the honours course except its four year duration.

Many of those who were concerned about the quality of the arts course in English-Canada as a whole realized that something more than a reshuffling of existing courses or a resurrection of old rules of distribution was needed to give such programs new life. W.S. Learned, who spent many years surveying the system of higher learning in North America for the Carnegie Foundation, told the N.C.C.U. in 1934 that "our notion of general education, if not void, is wholly without form; it lacks any rational aim that can be trusted to arouse an inquiring student mind and it has no organized arrangements for its total appraisal."[34] How could the arts course compete with vocational programs, he asked, when it alone allowed students to assemble their own programs with no clear end in view? The attention paid to the problem of the arts course at meetings of the N.C.C.U. during the inter-war and war years is one indication of the pervading sense of dissatisfaction. Even among administrators who had devoted themselves to promoting expansion into vocational programs there was widespread agreement (at least on the level of conference rhetoric) that the

arts course must somehow be taken in hand--that its goals must be clarified and its methods revised to meet those goals. Some of them looked to the United States, where the problem had been tackled somewhat earlier, as a source of new ideas. Much of the impetus for curricular reform in Canada would be inspired, in fact, by the writings of American educators and by the experiments in general education which were already underway in the United States.

## THE GENERAL EDUCATION MOVEMENT

One might hesitate to extend the word "movement" to describe the activities of Canadian reformers during this period, because their efforts resulted in so little actual change. They did produce, however, a body of writings and speeches which testify to their concern for the arts course and to their conviction that its mission was a vitally important one. The few curricular experiments which did occur during this period, along with the several aborted attempts at reform, not only illustrate the ideals of general education but demonstrate the difficulty of putting them into practice.

Both Canadian and American reformers were drawn to the idea that the arts course should provide students with a shared body of knowledge that would help them to make sense of their world, to preserve the values upon which western civilization rested, and to provide

wise leadership in troubled times. Their rhetoric seems extreme a good deal of the time, but one needs to remember that the disorder of the arts curriculum became a topic of widespread concern during a period when world wars and economic collapse seemed to threaten the survival of "our way of life." Educational reformers hoped, with evangelical furvour and Arnoldian optimism, to substitute culture for the anarchy of modern times by exposing all college-bound youth to a comprehensive system of general education. That term was used to describe an amphorous philosophy which opposed early specialization and affirmed that one could define the essential components of the arts curriculum if the aim of "education for citizenship" were kept constantly in view. Its hallmarks were the prescription of "core" courses, a tendency to override departmental boundaries to create an interdisciplinary approach, and a basic assumption that the mission of the arts course was to imbue students with the civilized moral and intellectual values of western culture. Rudolph describes the general education movement as an attempt "to keep alive the romantic image of an educated person."[35] It tried to preserve the idea that arts graduates would share a set of values--that there could still be a gentlemanly consensus on questions of truth, morality, and taste. Specialization and vocationalism, as Gilbert Allardyce says, "taught individuals to be different, general

education taught them what they should know in common."[36]

Professors in the humanities, including history, tended to be in the forefront of this movement. Lacking the professional ties with the outside world that academics in the vocational fields and the social sciences enjoyed, their own status and incomes depended on the well-being of the arts course. Although many were unhappy with the growing number of professional programs in the university, they did not usually disparage the social sciences as disciplines in their own right. Nonetheless, they disliked seeing the qualities by which these subjects prospered, such as their scientific methodologies, their immediate utility, and their interest in the present over the past, constantly eating away at the more traditional notion of the arts course as a cultural enterprise. They also linked the declining prestige of the arts course to the proliferation of electives and the blurring of educational goals which accompanied the expansion of social science teaching after World War I. Throughout the period in question, professors in the humanities pleaded for a reordering of educational priorities and for recognition of the arts faculties as the guardians of the accumulated wisdom of mankind.

What they sought was a resurrection of the traditional notion of a structured, balanced arts program, dominated by the humanities, but now imbued with the authority of culture rather than Christianity. Pre-

dictably, the influence of Matthew Arnold was present in both the ideas and the language of the reform movement. In many writings, the cultural heritage was treated as revealed truth, almost like Holy Scripture, and was believed to contain answers concerning the meaning of life and to provide infallible guidance on matters of "conduct." W.R. Wright, head of Oriental languages and Principal of University College at Toronto in the late 1940s, wrote that "the model for human greatness and goodness is to be derived from the revelation of human nature at its best, that is, from the revelation in poetry, religion, and history."[37] A liberal education, according to historian George Wilson, ought to make the student say, "Once I was blind, but now I see."[38] English professor Desmond Pacey insisted that the "one thing needful" was "a recognition that the values peculiar to the humanities are moral values," and that it "is still not too late to hold with Matthew Arnold that the designs of the Eternal are really with the humanities."[39] Like Arnold, they believed that culture "leads us towards right reason," and right reason was the authority which the liberally educated person would naturally and willingly accept.

The idea that a liberal education put one in touch with an alternative and superior source of authority often found expression in the notion that the liberal arts "freed" the human spirit from the grip of the

present and its many problems. In part, such rhetoric was directed against the preoccupation with material success which was dominant in vocational programs, where students were trained to make a living but were not educated "for life." As Northrop Frye explained:

> The word "liberal" implies a disinterested pursuit of truth as its own end, in contrast to the attempt to manipulate or press it into the service of an immediate social aim ... the draft that draws the fire of freedom is liberal education, the pursuit of truth for its own sake by free men. This pursuit of truth is an act of faith, a kind of potential or tentative vision of an end in human life.[40]

The appeal of such a philosophy during the Depression, the war, and the early Cold War years is not hard to understand. Its proponents offered "to free us from the tyranny of the present," to counteract the power of propaganda and bureaucratic control, and "to leave on the individual a mark of unassailable dignity."[41] W.H. Alexander ventured that "a liberal education ... makes and keeps a man free ... free at least in his own soul whatever external conditions might be." Fascist and communist rulers supressed liberal studies, said Alexander, because the power of such regimes depended on the destruction of spiritual freedom.[42]

This faith in the potential of liberal education to improve the human condition, when combined with a keen dissatisfaction with the arts course as it stood, produced the motivation behind the general education movement. In the United States, the "failure of the

arts course to educate," as Underhill put it, had already prompted several experiments in general education by the 1930s.[43] These aroused the interest of Canadian educators who wondered if they, too, might venture into the stormy waters of radical curricular change. The American movement provided several experimental models to choose from, although none was to gain wholesale approval amongst reformers in Canadian universities.

John Dewey was a pioneer in general education who had few admirers in Canadian arts faculties. His philosophy was peculiarly American and highly pragmatic in its goals. After World War I, Dewey was instrumental in the creation of a course at New York's Columbia University which is considered to be the ancestor of the "Western Civ." style of course. It dealt with "the intellectual traditions and institutional development of Western society," and its purpose was to provide students (including a large number of first generation Americans in need of "assimilation") with a shared appreciation of their nation's singular role as heir to the Western democratic tradition.[44] Dewey's ideas did not appeal to Canadian reformers because, although he embraced the ideal of a common learning and was a strong critic of early specialization, his emphasis was on social adjustment and education for "life needs." He sought to break down further the barriers between vocational and liberal education and tended to evaluate

all learning according to its value in solving contemporary problems. There was an element of anti-intellectualism in his thought, and his preoccupation with service, democracy, and the merits of technology and science allied him with forces to which many reformers, both American and Canadian, were passionately opposed.

President Robert Hutchins major curricular experiment at Chicago, on the other hand, attracted a mixed but more favourable reaction in this country. Quite a number of professors in Canada sympathized with his analysis of the problem of the arts course, even if they did not agree entirely with his solution. Hutchins deplored the elective system, for which he blamed President Eliot ("the great criminal") of nineteenth century Harvard. In his view, the educational crisis had become so severe that "Today the young American comprehends only by accident the intellectual tradition of which he is part and which he must live, for its scattered and disjointed fragments are strewn from one end of the campus to the other." His principal ambition was to reintegrate the arts curriculum around a common core. "Civilization is the deliberate pursuit of a common ideal," wrote Hutchins, and

> Education is the deliberate attempt to form human character in terms of an ideal. The chaos in education with which we are familiar is an infallible sign of the disintegration of civilization; for it shows that ideals are no longer commonly held, clearly understood, or deliberately pursued. To formulate, to clarify, to vitalize the ideals

> which should animate mankind--this is the incredibly heavy burden which rests ... upon the universities.[45]

At Chicago, in 1931, Hutchins created a junior college in which all students spent their first two years studying a core curriculum encompassing three fields of study: the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. "Ideally," explains Allardyce, "instruction in the three broad areas was intended not to transmit factual knowledge but to develop critical understanding of their distinctive organizing ideas and systems of logic."[46] Hutchins was sure that order could be imposed upon (or revealed within) the arts curriculum "by removing from it the elements which disorder it today," namely, "vocationalism and unqualified empiricism." He advocated a system of junior colleges in which students would all have the same basic education, providing them with "a commmon stock of fundamental ideas." As for the problem that students might not care for this regime, he declared that such an objection would be "irrelevant. But even if it were relevant," he added confidently, "it is not true."[47]

Hutchins' scheme was avidly discussed but not adopted by educators in this country, although many found the idea of a one or two year common course attractive.[48] University leaders, including such traditionalists as Carleton Stanley who had little sympathy with vocationalism, tended to feel that Hutchins' attack

on the modern university was too sweeping to be useful. Stanley advocated a more modest approach to curricular reform: "We must start with the world as it is and give individual answers, apply them here and there and see how they work out," he advised. Practical men like R.C. Wallace of Queen's recognised that the Chicago plan could not be imposed at Canadian universities, which placed a premium on public service and had no choice but to meet their students' vocational needs. "In the first place," he pointed out during a discussion of Hutchins' experiment in 1937, "the community does not want it and will have nothing to do with it."[49]

The caution of university administrators is not hard to understand, for it was their job to seek harmony amongst a multitude of opposing interests. But Hutchins had few real followers even among humanities professors in Canada. Although they shared his dislike of the elective system and the vocational emphasis, his "Aristotelian" theory of general education, on which he collaborated with philosopher Mortimer Adler, had little appeal. Part of the problem with Hutchins' method was that it ran counter to the fundamentally historical approach to knowledge which was characteristic of humanities teaching in Canada at that time. At Chicago, students read the "great books" of the Western trad-ition, including the classics in translation, but studied them not in their historical setting but according to

"conceptual categories" or the methods of inquiry which they represented. This method of general education shared its rejection of history with the Chicago school of literary criticism, in which great books were studied "within genres, forms or topics that were deemed timeless or recurring in human creative production."[50] The great books method was carried even further by two Chicago professors, Stringfellow Barr and Scott Buchanan, who migrated to St. John's College in Maryland and created a four year compulsory curriculum consisting of one hundred and twenty chosen works.[51] Its principles were laid out in Adler's How to Read a Book (a volume much read and much criticized, reported Manitoba classicist E.G. Berry, "... it is said that the next volume will be entitled How to Read Another Book").[52] Such gentle mockery typified the Canadian response to the great books idea.

One American reformer who received respectful attention from some academics in Canada was Alexander Meiklejohn. One-time president of Amherst College and author of The Liberal College, a work widely read during the 1920s, he was asked by the University of Wisconsin to create an experimental "college within a college" which would begin teaching in 1927. Veysey sees Meiklejohn as "an altogether remarkable figure," quite ahead of his time in his efforts to bridge "the enormous gap between traditional and progressive versions of liberal education"

and to devise a program less authoritarian and rigid than some general education schemes.[53] J.M. Macdonnell at Queen's admired the way that Meiklejohn defined the issue of general education as not representing a choice "between practical and intellectual aims but between the immediate and the remote aim, between the hasty and the measured procedure, between the demand for results at once and the willingness to wait for the best results."[54] Meiklejohn's curriculum at Wisconsin was organized around the study of a selected civilization (ancient Greece in the first year, America in the second year) in all its aspects, not through the usual paraphernalia of lectures and courses, but through reading and discussion. Such a destructuring of the arts curriculum was truly radical. G.G. Sedgewick of British Columbia praised the Wisconsin experiment to his colleagues at the first Conference of Professors of English in Canada in 1934, but, although he admired it, he concluded that "the best we can do at present is wait and see" whether it would be a success.[55] By that point, in fact, Meiklejohn's unconventional college had already, as Veysey says, run "squarely into the most vicious forms of Midwestern philistinism" and been "hounded to death" by a hostile public and university community.[56]

Canadian caution in the field of general education can be partially understood, therefore, as a function of both the tensions within and the antipathy of outsiders

towards the curricular reform movement in the United States. There was, during the 1920s and 1930s, no widespread interest in duplicating American experiments, and, if there had been, the funding required by such projects would have been hard to come by. A few Canadian universities did look into the possiblity of adding a general education component to the arts course in the form of interdisciplinary, survey-style courses, which would be intended for first year students or for inclusion in each year of the course. At British Columbia, Sedgewick remarked that "our Faculty as a whole is looking into what the Americans love to call courses of Orientation. I think there is a good deal of hope in these ... but just now we tend to brood over our first year with an all-covering but barren sympathy like a hen over a china egg."[57] As it happened, just three English-speaking universities went so far as to devise such experimental courses: these were Sir George Williams College in Montreal, the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Manitoba.

Sir George Williams appears to have been the only centre of higher learning in Canada to adopt Dewey's philosophy of progressive education. Although Henry Hall, the college's historian, mentions Hutchins as an influence, he also quotes a statement made by the principal in 1938 to the effect that "For many years, Sir George Williams College has sought to ally itself,

in spirit and in practice, with that phase of modern education known as the 'progressive movement.'" He included in its tenets the attempt "to establish the person rather than the subject-matter as the center of reference," and the adoption of a "philosophy of culture which refuses to assign to any traditional subject matter" a set of "mystical values which modern experiment indicates they do not possess."[58] The college's three compulsory "pandemic" courses, as they were called, were surveys of the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. The course descriptions reveal an ambition to cover as much territory as possible, and, in the latter two surveys, to relate the content to practical life. Humanities 101 brought students "into contact with as many as possible of the masterpieces of thought and art of our ancestors," while the social science offering surveyed the fields of "Anthropology, Psychology, Sociology, Human Geography, History, Economics and Political Science," while acquainting the student with "contemporary society and the problems which confront it." The aim of Natural Sciences 101 was to present science as "a unity," and to teach students to accept the authority of science in their lives:

> The aim is to help the individual to see himself in relation to the universe, to free himself from superstition and prejudice, to gain criteria for the estimation of truth and to rely upon established truth for the ordering of his own life, to appreciate the leadership of the specialist in particular and scientific method in general

> for solving individual and world problems;--in short to guide constructively the beliefs and attitudes of the student.[59]

The general education movement requirements introduced at Saskatchewan at the beginning of World War II were the product of long dissatisfaction with the arts course. By the 1930s, said Dean Thompson, the general program had come to represent no very definite type of knowledge or training:

> It is true that here we had retained one compulsory class, English, and three semi-compulsory--one of several foreign languages, one of several social subjects, and one of several sciences. But those requirements did not nearly meet the situation. Large areas of knowledge might remain completely untouched by the average student.[60]

Two men of quite different outlooks collaborated to reform the arts course. Dean Thompson of the Faculty of Arts and Science was a very pragmatic man, a scientist interested in promoting Saskatchewan as a research centre, while the university's president, the Rev. J.S. Thomson, was trained in philosophy and was a traditionalist who strongly resented "the spell which science has thrown over the minds of youth today." He distrusted research and specialization and believed that the arts course must reach out "to a unified philosophy of life" and do its part to alleviate "the present crisis in civilization."[61]

The revised program at Saskatchewan accomodated the goals of both men by combining a more focussed system of specialization with the ideal of a common core

of general learning. As the president wrote:

> Our aim is to combine the objective of giving students an opportunity to pursue special interests with that of making them men of wide general education. The Faculty of Arts and Science has become persuaded that every man who aspires to the kind of culture that should be represented by the granting of a Bachelor's degree ought to have an opportunity to become so educated that he is equipped to take an intelligent interest in the world--physical, social, and intellectual, in which he to play a part.[62]

Three separate streams were created from which students would choose when they entered university: Language and Literature, Social Science, and Natural Science. First year English and a foreign language remained compulsory in all three, but otherwise, the student specialized in one group of subjects and within that group took four courses in one discipline. The provision of three electives allowed for some flexibility. The most innovative part of this scheme was that students were required to take "General Introductory Classes" in fields outside their own group of subjects. These four courses were intended to acquaint students "with a body of knowledge which is generally recognised" as "essential," and which "includes the fundamental principles and important ideas for every main subject."[63]

Although the faculty emphasized that these were not "survey" courses (that term was already becoming associated with superficiality and pre-packaged learning) all four offerings were ambitiously broad in content. Philosophy and History A, for example, which was taught

by President Thomson and Professor Hilda Neatby, attempted to deal with "contemporary civilization in light of its history," and to introduce various philosophical approaches to "the fundamental problems of human life, individual and social."[64] This undertaking was later described by Thompson (the scientist) as less than a success.[65] This system survived at Saskatchewan until well into the post-war period, but there was one rather dramatic and unexpected result of its provisions for specialization: the science category attracted over half the students, another third enrolled in the social sciences, but, in 1951, only two and a half percent of the faculty's students were choosing to concentrate on languages and literature.[66]

President Sidney Smith of the University of Manitoba kept a close eye on Saskatchewan's reform plans during the late 1930s. He was impressed, as well, by his colleagues fears, aired at the meeting of the N.C.C.U. in 1937, that the arts course was "losing ground," and during the years that followed Smith made frequent pleas for its rejuvination. Clearly influenced by American reformers, he advocated the breaking down of departmental barriers and "the offering of courses by much larger groups, such as divisions," which would be able to "bring about a better unity" in undergraduate education.[67] A committee was formed in 1941 which was composed of a few members of the Faculty of Arts, including H.N.

Fieldhouse, who later recalled (perhaps with his own, earlier scorn for the general course in mind) that he and the other members "construed the President's remarks as an invitation to consider our ways and, possibly, to repent while there is still time."[68] Their concerns were the usual ones: they felt that the arts course was "not coherent," that it represented "only an undi-gested pot-pourri of segmented studies," and that the elective system and vocational specialization were to blame.[69] They feared that good students were avoiding arts because it had so little to offer, and that society had fallen under the control of "the maimed products of a too early specialism and ... the victims of a higher illiteracy."[70] As the crisis of war deepened, the need to reform Manitoba's arts curriculum was associated more and more closely with the survival of western civilization. As Smith wrote in 1943, "Today we know that if our free democratic world is saved, it will be saved not just by machines and guns, but by our capacity to produce a higher type of human being."[71]

The plan which was eventually approved at Manitoba involved a reduction of free choice in the first two years and the addition of four new courses in "Western Civilization," dealing with the sciences, social sciences, literature and the visual arts. One of these would be included in each year of the arts program. Anxious to avoid "the mushy and soporific effects" of survey

courses, the reformers stressed student participation and stipulated that "batteries of tutors" were to provide small group discussion and careful supervision.[72] But, as at least one of the reformers had feared, there was no money available to hire these tutors, either during or after the war. Committee member W.J. Waines wryly commented some years later that he had

> had little expectation that the courses would ever get off the ground because of the cost of providing competent tutors. The courses were listed in the calendar for a few years and then were quietly dropped. The President made use of the proposal as the basis of a number of speeches in various parts of the country. So, the work of the committee was not lost. It became one of the means by which the President established his prestige as a leader in educational philosophy.[73]

After the war, Smith left Manitoba for the University of Toronto, where he would renew his pleas on behalf of general education, and the "Manitoba Experiment" was abandoned.

In most universities in Canada, wartime produced few changes in the arts curriculum, but greatly increased the anxiety which people felt over its status and quality. In the first place, arts enrolments plunged soon after the war began. The war effort depended on scientific and industrial research, and a great many young people were drawn into engineering and science rather than arts. This was initially due to both a voluntary sense of duty and to moral pressure (arts students tended to be looked upon as shirkers), but by 1943 arts enrolments had been officially restricted by the National

Selective Service.[74] Many academics felt that the government, backed by public opinion, was using the excuse of war to persecute the liberal arts. C.R. Tracy wrote that "the low estate of the Arts course is not the result of war, but of a steady decline which has taken place during the past few decades. The war has brought out the public attitude more clearly than anything else could, but it has not created it."[75] Academics made much of the fact that after years of declining prestige, liberal arts teaching was not even considered to be "in the national interest" and university facilities were therefore being given over to more urgent pursuits. As H.L. Stewart of Dalhousie mournfully quipped, "in the academic field we have not only lost our way, we have now lost also our address."[76]

The "non-essential" status of the arts course in wartime seemed to verify, as had been feared for some time, that it was simply not good enough to command respect. "If the arts course is suffering," said George Wilson flatly, "it deserves to suffer," because it had failed to convey any clear sense of its purpose and value to society at large.[77] Again, the elective system and over-specialization were seen as the main culprits. "Our uncomfortably bloated and formless academic programs" show "that we know not where we are going, nor why," complained University of Toronto historian Richard Saunders.[78] Tracy defined the curriculum as "a series

of compromises between rival departments:"

> When the scheme is completed and printed in the university calendar it is usually remarkable for its incomprehensiblity. The clue has been mislaid somewhere. The faculty which boasts that it alone is capable of interpreting all knowledge seems incapable of explaining even itself.[79]

While some recognised that the source of the problem was a proliferation of subject areas which was beyond the university's control, there was a very strong tendency to blame the whole problem on some sort of moral failing on the part of academics, who were accused of being too eager to pursue their own special interests, or on adminstrators, who equated success with constant expansion and public service. Through its own negligence, said the critics, the university had "lost its old sense of the oneness of its mission."[80] It did not help very much, said H.L. Stewart, that the central importance of cultural studies to human welfare had become a standard topic for inspirational addresses at conferences and convocations, because most of these were empty rhetoric. Chiding university leaders for their "readiness to ignore in action all that these lofty aspirations would enjoin," he remarked that the "real value we set upon anything appears in the strength of our refusal to part with it for something else."[81]

Would-be reformers of the arts course in the 1940s were convinced that its weakness was both cause and effect of the much broader malaise. During and after the war,

their demands for reform were justified by renewed and more emphatic claims that the decline in the quality of liberal education had helped to cause the recent crisis in civilization, and they insisted that the university must now rise to the task of guiding the world to lasting peace. Writing in the Queen's Quarterly in 1950, Heinrich Henel was sure that "if we of this age are threatened by both degeneracy and barbarism it is because we neglect the humanistic tradition to which we have fallen heir."[82] Saunders attributed the strength of fascism to the fact that the west as a whole had become spiritually "soft." When he introduced a series of lectures on Education for Tomorrow in 1946, he warned that "We have lost touch with the spiritual sources of our way of life. We do not know what we believe. We drift in a sea of chaos."[83] Some feared that specialized and technical learning had produced a generation unfit to govern human affairs. There "are left but few who can see life steadily and see it whole," said R.S.K. Seeley in his book, The Function of the University (1948), and Malcolm Wallace told the N.C.C.U. in 1942 that

> We have concentrated upon the law of things rather than upon the law of man ... Too much emphasis is put on achieving the technique necessary for one's job. The result is that the technicians who are ruling the world are the least qualified to lead it ... Prejudice has taken the place of thinking; the achieving of skills has shown the way to power. If culture, not power, is held up as an ideal in the new system, the Arts college will not go out.[84]

Not only were students taught the wrong things; graduates also lacked "the civilizing core of general culture" that had formerly enabled leaders to speak to one another on common ground.[85] C.J. Vincent wrote in the Queen's Quarterly in 1943 that because higher learning had been fragmented, "educated people ...do not speak a common language: they have ceased to agree upon the significance and value of certain signs--signs which make communication and understanding possible."[86] Throughout the western world, there was an outpouring of literature, which met an avid readership, predicting that the survival of civilization depended on a revolution in educational policy. Few could have expressed this belief more urgently than did Howard Lee Nostrand, who, in his introduction to Jose Ortega y Gasset's Mission of the University (1944), solemnly announced that "If we could solve the problem of general education, we could confidently strike any third world war off the calendar."[87]

The post-war work which influenced Canadian educators most profoundly and breathed new life into the curricular reform movement was the Harvard Committee's Education in a Free Society, produced under President Conant's leadership and published in 1945. The Harvard "Redbook," as it came to be called, was a blueprint for reform which attempted to establish a balance between the traditionalist and progressivist outlooks-- between the

belief in the authority of the past and the recognition that contemporary "relevance" must have a strong influence on the curriculum. It appeared less dogmatic or radical than some such tracts, and yet, like other reform schemes, it recommended that students be required to take a core of general courses which would include such offerings as "Great Texts of Literature" and "Western Thought and Institutions."[88] As Allardyce says, the Redbook "annointed general education with the fair name of Harvard, giving it a legitimacy that convinced college faculties across the country of the value of a common learning."[89] Canadians who had shyed away from other American experiments could find little to criticize in the Harvard Report. University presidents of quite different philosophies agreed with Principal Wallace of Queen's that the report "bids fair to be the tract for our time."[90] J.S. Thomson declared that Harvard was providing "the sanest leadership in education" in North America. I wish with all my heart," he added, that the Report of the Harvard Committee ... might become the prescribed textbook for every College of Education in this country."[91] Leaders at both the University of Saskatchewan and Sir George Williams College were reassured that their own core requirements were a step in the right direction,[92] and Harvard inspired other universities to take a fresh look at the question of general education.

They were encouraged to do so, as well, by two very influential Canadian reports on the condition of the liberal arts in the post-war period: J.B. Brebner's _Scholarship for Canada_ and a volume entitled _The Humanities in Canada_ written by Kirkconnell and Woodhouse. These studies were produced for the Social Sciences Research Council and the Humanities Research Council (precursors of the Canada Council) which had been created during the war and were funded by American sources. Brebner's concerns clearly sprang from the mood of the times, and he urged Canadians to take a wider view of higher education. Early specialization, he said, must be recognised as "a menace to a healthy society," and he warned that "Only if Canadians want to be subordinated to the leadership of other peoples or to domination by Canadian or foreign experts in political control can they afford to neglect the broad cultivation of those whose brains could lead Canada towards a better fate." Brebner advocated a system of general education while cautioning against the accompanying danger of the professor who sees himself "as a high priest of culture."[93] Influenced by the Harvard Report and other such works, Woodhouse joined with Brebner in recommending that all universities formulate a "basic minimum of general education ... that ought to be required of every student." He did not favour a mere distribution requirement, however, because he recognised that these had little value

in fostering a unified approach to learning. "For a young student to be compelled to attend a class in English literature from 9 to 10, followed by one in Latin from 10 to 11, is not necessarily in itself a particularly illuminating experience," explained Woodhouse. "Nor will much be necessarily gained from the combination of subjects by the student's going on to philosophy or history from 11 to 12 and spending the afternoon dissecting a dead frog." Instead, he recommended "courses in orientation" which would occupy from a third to one half of the student's time and which, along with other required courses, would supply "a genuine and solid core for a liberal education."[94]

Leaders at several Canadian universities took such advice to heart and, during the late forties and early fifties, struck committees, produced reports, debated at length, and devised new curricula which they hoped would improve the quality of the general arts degree. But if there is one conclusion which historians of higher education have shared it is that the results of the post-war curricular reform movement were disappointingly meagre. At McGill, for example, a long period of debate resulted in little but the removal of the classical requirement and the introduction of an experimental course in "The Great Writings of Europe" which was soon discontinued.[95] Some institutions made gestures towards tightening the structure of their courses through pre-

requisites, distribution requirements, or provisions for concentration. At Queen's, after 1945, students were required to take at least three courses in each of three subjects, and in 1952 were permitted to take five courses in one field and four in another.[96] Such revisions may have improved the coherence of the arts course to some extent, but they did not change the fundamental nature of undergraduate education in the way that reformers had initially hoped.

Renewed reform efforts at the University of Manitoba met a similar fate. Principal Graham of United College (who had cooperated with Smith on the Manitoba experiment) headed a new committee whose goal was to revise the arts curriculum according to the ideals of the post-war general education movement. Drawing from the Harvard Report and numerous other such works, Graham's recommendations were based on his conviction that the survival of Western civilization depended on its ability to re-establish a "common culture," without which the west would continue "tearing itself to pieces." Graham believed that the arts course must be organized around a core curriculum, for it did not make sense to insist "that while everyone must be educated ... there is nothing in particular that an educated man should know." And yet his own proposals involved no interdisciplinary core courses of the kind which Harvard recommended or like those worked out under Smith. Graham's scheme

would merely require that all students take "tool courses" in English and mathematics and adhere to certain rules of distribution. He also proposed a two-tiered system of the kind that Toronto was in the process of discarding: a General Degree with Distinction which would permit some specialization for bright students, and an ordinary program for "those whose mental processes move more slowly." The latter would teach students to "discriminate between values" and become good citizens, but would prevent them from pursuing any subject in depth.[97] This plan was rejected by the Faculty of Arts and Science and only a few minor changes to the curriculum were finally made.[98] English, a foreign language and a social science became compulsory in second year (the equivalent of first year after Grade 12). Third and fourth year courses remained freely elected except that students had to take a sequence of two courses in each of two different disciplines.[99]

Renewed reform activity at Toronto began with the same sense of urgency and high expectations. Sidney Smith was now president of the university, and, in his installation address, he posed "one stark question" for the universities of Canada. "What are they doing to secure the peace bought at such cruel price?" asked Smith. "Will the universities avail themselves of the chance to save the republic of the mind and our very civilization?" The solution he offered was curricular

reform. Supporting his arguments with quotations from the Harvard Report, he once again attacked the specialization and departmentalization of knowledge which distracted the universities from "their major mission of developing students who will be defenders of human freedom, examples of human dignity, and apostles of human values."[100]

In his report for the 1946-7, Smith announced that a committee had been formed to survey the Pass and General Courses. Its goal was to reshape and strengthen all non-honours work, in order to "give it a recognisable identity and make it comparable to any of the honours courses as an instrument of liberal education." There would be higher standards, some specialization, and a carefully integrated system of distribution which would provide a "core of unity" so that "all who receive a degree would be sharers in a common cultural heritage."[101] But although the committee members (which included Edgar McInnes, T.A. Goudge, and M. St. A. Woodside) discussed the idea of a common first year, they rejected it as too difficult to design or prescribe.[102] What they eventually devised was a new General program which involved no compulsory courses and no survey or orientation courses. Their main recommendation was that first year students be required to study a language, a social science, a natural science and one of the humanities disciplines, and that a distribution over three of these areas be continued into the upper years. Some special-

ization would also be required--students would take two courses in both their second and third years in a subject of concentration.[103]

Just as the Graham Report had betrayed a certain ambivalence towards general education by continuing to associate specialization with intellectual ability, so too would a longstanding allegiance to the honours course undercut reform efforts at Toronto. When the new and not very innovative general course came into effect in 1951-2 Smith remained enthusiastic, acknowledging no dilution of the original ideal and declaring that he "craved" for the new program the same respect as the honours courses enjoyed.[104] But once again that goal would prove unreachable. Department heads were slow to provide advanced offerings for general students, continued to promote their complete segregation from honours candidates, and were on the alert for any sign that honours work might be "sacrificed" to the general course.[105] Even Smith himself, when he found that enrolments in the general course had risen slightly in comparison with honours (to fifty-one percent in 1953-4), interpreted this trend as a sign of possible decline in the quality of honours work. "It would be unfortunate if the General Course became a threat to the honours courses which have been the particular glory of the University of Toronto," he warned, "the honours course should be attracting the vast majority of the students of out-

standing ability."[106]

But the failure of the general education movement to produce exciting changes in the liberal arts course could not be blamed on the strength of the honours course. The problem was far more basic. General education was intended to produce a cultural consensus and yet, time after time, reformers found that such a consensus within the university community itself was a necessary but unattainable pre-condition of a successful core curriculum. With the continuous proliferation of disciplines and specialties within disciplines, the possibility of arriving at an agreed-upon set of core requirements grew slimmer as each year went by. The dictates of professionalism also worked against general education and in favour of specialization. What few Canadians realized was that even the Harvard Report encountered powerful opposition from faculty and that its ideal of "a common learning" had to be sacrificed. As Allardyce explains,

> The Redbook plan for compulsory core courses in the social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences gave way in debate to a "temporary" experiment permitting two to four optional courses in each of these areas. With time, what was temporary became permanent, and two to four options became more, and more. The elective system, thrown out the door, came back in through the window.[107]

Principal Mackintosh of Queen's acknowledged in his address to the N.C.C.U. in the spring of 1953 that "the integration of knowledge has collapsed. We are all engaged

in a search for some kind of integration and none of us can profess to have found it."[108] The search for order in the arts curriculum was not, as W.L. Morton said in 1952, a mere problem of administration but was instead "a problem of knowledge."[109]

# NOTES

1 See Arthur Lower, "The Social Sciences in Canada," Culture (1942), 433; F.H.U., "O Canada," CF 9/105 (1929), 304; W.H. Alexander, "The Higher Learning: Twenty-five Years of Conflict," in These Twenty-five Years," Grube, "Why Study the Classics," E.A. Havelock, The Crucifixion of Intellectual Man (Boston, 1950). The last four men were all members of the League for Social Reconstruction in the 1930s, whose educational philosophy was more Christian than Marxist.

2 For the development of honours courses in the U.S., see Rudolph, Curriculum, 230-1, and Veysey, "Stability and Experiment," 11-12.

3 University of Toronto Archives, University Historian, File: Manuscript R.S. Harris 1983 V 2, "Liberal Education at the University of Toronto: Developments: 1919-32."

4 Group of Classical Graduates, Honour Classics, 24, 15.

5 Woodhouse, in The Humanities in Canada, 58-60.

6 Honour Classics, 21.

7 Woodhouse, in The Humanities in Canada, 60, 81, 76.

8 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 106.

9 Queen's took the same attitude as Toronto towards the separation of pass and honours students as a means of guarding against lowering standards. As Principal Taylor wrote, "Education is an aristocratic business, and no theories of democracy will alter that wholesome if unpalatable fact." See R.B. Taylor, "The Function of a University," QQ 25 (1928), 495-6.

10 For regulations concerning honours at Queen's and other universities, see Woodhouse, The Humanities in Canada, 66-9.

11 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 241.

12 Woodhouse, The Humanities in Canada, 69.

13 The University of Manitoba calendars for the period show the gradual addition in some disciplines of

upper year courses which are designated for honours students. This occurred in history and English, for example, but not in philosophy, where Lodge remained the only instructor aside from Wright in psychology. For a former student's memories of how the system worked, see Ferns, Reading from Left to Right, 32.

14 Ferns, 35-6.

15 "Report of the Department of History," University of Manitoba Annual Report (1933-4), 34.

16 F.H.U., "O Canada," 304.

17 George Wilson, "Why Teach History?" QQ 40 (1933) 407.

18 For example, see D.J. Bercuson et al, The Great Brain Robbery: Canada's Universities on the Road to Ruin (Toronto, 1984); H. Blair Neatby, "The Gospel of Research: The Transformation of English-Canadian Universities," TRSC ser. 4 Vol. 20 Sec.II (1982), 275-84.

19 These provisions are spelled out in university calendars of the 1930s.

20 For the advantages of this system at a western university, see Morton, One University, 129; Ferns, 31-2.

21 Carleton Stanley, "Dalhousie Today," DR 18 (1938-9), 216-28.

22 Report of the Student Commission of the University of Manitoba (1932-3), 13-19.

23 Veysey, "Stability and Experiment," 35-7.

24 University of British Columbia Calendar (1936-7), 64.

25 University of Manitoba Calendar (1951-2 ), 25.

26 Jean Burton, "Western Canadian Universities," CF 10/120 (1930), 440.

27 University of Toronto Archives, University Historian, Box 4, File: Faculty of Arts 1945-51, C.B. Sissons, "A Memorandum on the History of the Honours, General and Pass Courses," Appendix to the "Report of the Committee to Investigate the Pass and General Courses." 40.

28 W.B. Kerr, "The Pass Student," <u>CF</u> 8/86 (1927), 446-7. Kerr also criticized the lecture system used to teach pass courses in "Methods of Teaching in our Universities," <u>CF</u> 8/85 (1927), 414-17.

29 Sissons, "A Memorandum," 41.

30 Sissons, <u>A History of Victoria University</u>, 308.

31 University of Toronto Archives, Harris manuscript, "Developments 1919-32," n.p.

32 In 1946-7, for example, it enrolled 123 students out of a total of 6441 in arts. <u>University of Toronto President's Report</u>, (1947-8), 4.

33 Woodhouse, <u>The Humanities in Canada</u>, 60.

34 W.S. Learned, "Junior Colleges," <u>NCCU</u> (1934), 56-7.

35 Rudolph, <u>Curriculum</u>, 256.

36 Gilbert Allardyce, "The Rise and Fall of the Western Civilization Course," <u>American Historical Review</u> 87 (1982), 697-8.

37 W.R. Taylor, "The Philosophy of Higher Education," <u>UTQ</u> 16 (1946-7), 423-4.

38 George Wilson, "The Problem of the Arts Course," <u>DR</u> 27 (1947), 77.

39 Desmond Pacey, "The Humanities in Canada," <u>QQ</u> 53 (1943), 354-7. And see C.J. Vincent, "Science and the Humanities," <u>QQ</u> 50 (1943), 261; Kirkconnell, <u>Liberal Education in the Canadian Democracy</u> (Hamilton, 1948), 8-11.

40 Northrop Frye, Trends in Modern Culture," in <u>The Heritage of Western Culture</u> (ed.) Chalmers, 113.

41 See Wilson, "Why Teach History?", 411; E.W. Nichols, "The Arts Course: Its Purpose and Essential Elements," <u>NCCU</u> (1925), 21; Robert England, <u>The Threat to Disinterested Education: A Challenge</u> (1937), 18.

42 Alexander, "The Classics in a Liberal Education," 48. And see Alexander, "The Higher Learning," 13-14; and Robert Falconer, "The Humanities in the Wartime University," <u>UTQ</u> 13 (1943), 3-4.

43 F.H.U., "O Canada," 303.

44 The course originated as a "War Issues" course which was added, at the government's request, to the Student Army Training Corps program in 1917. It stressed "the enduring achievements of the mother country," and was intended to play a part in the legitimization of Wilson's entry into the war with Germany. The idea that America was heir to the Western tradition persisted into peace time and the goal of "education for citizenship" became widespread. At Columbia, the course was also seen as a way of assimilating East European and Jewish immigrants whose backgrounds had exclusded them, so it was believed, from that tradition. Daniel Bell, The Reforming of General Education, (New York, 1966). And see Allardyce, "The Rise and Fall," 703-9. For an assessment of Dewey's influence on the American curriculum, see Willis Rudy, The Evolving Liberal Arts Curriculum, 131-3; Veysey, "Stability and Experiment," 11.

45 Robert Hutchins, Education for Freedom (Baton Rouge, 1944), 25.

47 Hutchins' writings formed the basis of Malcolm Wallace's address to the NCCU on the topic, "Is the Arts Course Losing Ground?" NCCU (1937), 12-17. And see Robert Hutchins, The Higher Learning in America (New Haven, 1936).

46 Allardyce, "The Rise and Fall," 710-11.

48 See N.A.M. MacKenzie, "The Future of the Arts Course," NCCU (1942), 137; R.C. Wallace, "The Arts Faculty and Humane Studies," NCCU (1942), 56; C.R. Tracy, "The Future of the Faculty of Arts," QQ 50 (1943), 186.

49 For the opinions of Stanley, Wallace, and others, see NCCU (1942), 19-22. For other comments on Hutchins, see Report of the NCCU on Post-war Problems (ottawa, 1944), 24; H.L. Stewart, "The Future of Universities, DR (1944), 214-5.

50 Allardyce, "The Rise and Fall," 710-11.

51 Rudolph, Curriculum, 280.

52 Edmund G. Berry, "An Experiment in Liberal Education," QQ 48 (1941), 129-33.

53 Veysey, "Stability and Experiment," 54-7.

54 Macdonnell, "The Decline of the Arts Faculty," 313-4.

55 G.G. Sedgewick, "The Unity of the Humanities," DR 8 (1928-9), 363.

56 Veysey, "Stability and Experiment," 56.

57 Sedgewick, "The Unity of the Humanities," 366.

58 Henry Hall, The Georgian Spirit (1967), 91-4. Hall was quoting the annual report for 1937-8.

59 These course descriptions remained unchanged for many years.

60 University of Manitoba Archives, President Smith's Papers, Box 51 Folder 8, W.P. Thompson, "Excerpt from Annual Report of the President of the University of Saskatchewan, 1940-1, the New Curriculum," mimeo.

61 Thomson, "Universities and Democracy," NCCU (1939), 111. See also "The Conflict of Values in Education," NCCU (1946), 43-6. Here Thomson attacks the social sciences for claiming to be scientific. In Seeking a Balance, 193, Hayden says that Thomson "had no understanding of science, no regard for the Ph.D. and little understanding of research."

62 University of Saskatchewan Annual Report of the President (1939-40), 8.

63 See "The New Course for the B.A. degree, University of Saskatchewan" and "Excerpt from Annual Report" in University of Manitoba Archives, President Smith's Papers, Box 51, Folder 8.

64 For descriptions of the introductory courses, see The Humanities in Canada, 47-8. And see J.S. Thomson, Yesteryears at the University of Saskatchewan: 1937-49 (Saskatoon, 1969), 40-2.

65 W.P. Thompson, The University of Saskatchewan: A Personal History (Toronto, 1970), 157.

66 Ibid.

67 University of Manitoba President's Report (1939-40), 6.

68 H.N. Fieldhouse, "The Liberal Arts Course--the Manitoba Experiment," NCCU (1944), 58.

69 Daniells to Wheeler (13 Nov. 1943), University

of Manitoba Archives, Smith Papers, Box 51, Folder 8; University of Manitoba President's Report (1943-4), 26; Smith, "The Liberal Arts Course--An Experiment," QQ 51 (1944), 7.

70 University of Manitoba President's Report (1939-40), 7; "Memorandum on the Work of the Principal's Committee on the Arts Course," 2-3 in University of Manitoba ARchives, Smith Papers, Box 51, Folder 9.

71 University of Manitoba President's Report (1942-3). Smith was quoting Lewis Mumford. Also see Fieldhouse,"The Liberal Arts Course," 56, on the dangers of over-emphasizing science.

72 For details on the proposed curriculum see Fieldhouse, "The Liberal Arts Course," 59-60; The Humanities In Canada, 50-1.

73 Waines, "University Presidents I have Known," 5-6.

74 For attitudes to arts students, see Gibson, Queen's University, ali L.G. Thomas, The University of Alberta in the War of 1939-45 (Edmonton, 1948), 15-16; A.G. Bedford, The University of Winnipeg: a History of the Founding Colleges (Toronto, 1976), 238. Gibson provides the most accurate acccount of wartime policies regarding the arts course, see Ch. 8. While there had been rumours during 1942 that the government, in cooperation with the service-minded presidents of Queen's and McGill, was planning to shut down arts faculties entirely, the policy which came into effect allowed one year of arts for new matriculants and further arts studies only for those who remained in the upper half of their year.

75 Tracy, "The Future of the Arts Faculty," 175.

76 H.L. Stewart, "University Life in Canada," Culture 6 (1945), 344. And see H.L.S., "Universities and the War Effort," DR 23 (1943), 495-503; Lower, "The Social Sciences in Canada," 433; Innis, "A Plea for the University Tradition."

77 Wilson, "The Problem of the Arts Course," 81.

78 Richard Saunders, "Introduction," in Education for Tomorrow A Series of Lectures Organized by the Committee Representing the Teaching Staff of the University of Toronto (ed.) Saunders (Toronto

1946), x.

79 Tracy, "The Future of the Faculty of Arts," 180.

80 Ibid., 183. And see Taylor, "The Philosophy of Higher Education," 421; W.R. Taylor, "The University and Education," in _Education for Tomorrow_ (ed.) Saunders, 51.

81 H.L.S., "The Universities and the War Front," _DR_ 23 (1943), 119. And see Tracy, "The Future of the Faculty of Arts," 179-80.

82 Heinrich Henel, Humanistic Scholarship," _QQ_ 57 (1950), 45.

83 Saunders, "Introduction," ix-xi.

84 R.S.K. Seeley, _The Function of the University_ (Toronto, 1948), 20. Wallace, discussion, _NCCU_ (1942), 138. And see N.A.M. Mackenzie, "The Future of the Arts Course," _NCCU_ (1942), 128-40; R.C. Wallace, "The Arts Faculty," _NCCU_ (1942), 118-20.

85 Kirkconnell, "Education in Canada," _Culture_ 6 (1945), 431-2.

86 Vincent, "Science and the Humanities," 257-8.

87 Howard Lee Nostrand, "Introduction," to Jose Ortega y Gasset, _Mission of the University_ (1944), 1. And see Hutchins, _Education for Freedom_ (1944); _The Humanities After the War_ (ed.) Norman Foerster (Princeton, 1944); _Liberal Education Re-examined_ (ed.) T.M. Greene (New York, 1943); J.B. Conant, _Education in a Divided World_ (1948); Sir Richard Livinstone, _Education in a World Adrift_; Sidney Hook, _Education for Modern Man_ (New York, 1946).

88 Harvard Committee, _General Education in a Free Society_ (Cambridge, Mass. 1945). For the proposed courses, see 204-20.

89 Allardyce, "The Rise and Fall," 716-7.

90 R.C. Wallace, "Education in a Democracy," _QQ_ 53 (1946), 430.

91 J.S. Thomson, "Matriculation," _NCCU_ (1947), 45.

92 _University of Saskatchewan Annual Report_ (1946-7), 32; Hall, _The Georgian Spirit_, 92.

93 J. Bartlett Brebner, Scholarship for Canada (Ottawa, 1945), 7, 20-31. Brebner mentions Ortega y Gasset, Mission of the University; Mark van Doren, Liberal Education; and Jacques Barzun, Teacher in America, as influential works.

94 Woodhouse in The Humanities in Canada, 203, 45-7.

95 Frost, McGill University, Vol. II, 274. Frost tells how a committee produced a report in 1950 which offered the usual platitudes about the 'broad aims of the humanities," but little in the way of reform.

96 Gibson, Queen's University, 233-4; Queen's University Principal's Report (1952-3).

97 Report of the Sub-Committee on the Curriculum for the General Degree in the University of Manitoba, submitted to the Senate's Committee on Arts and Science, University of Manitoba Archives, UPC GEN 19, 4-21, 40-57.

98 University of Manitoba Archives, President's Papers, UA 20 Box 122 Folder 6: General Degree--Dr. Graham's Committee.

99 Morton, One University, 182; University of Manitoba President's Report (1950-1), 8.

100 Smith, "Let Knowledge to Wisdom Grow," reprinted in Education for Tomorrow, 123-8.

101 University of Toronto President's Report (1946-7), 10; ibid. (1947-8), 4-5.

102 University of Toronto Archives, University Historian, Box 4, File Faculty of Arts 1945-51, "Report of the Committee to Investigate the Pass and General Courses."

103 University of Toronto Calendar, Faculty of Arts (1952-3), 64-7.

104 University of Toronto President's Report (1951-2), 8-9. And see Smith, "Unity of Knowledge: the Sciences and the Humanities," address before the Royal Canadian Institute (Toronto, 1952), 12.

105 See Woodhouse, "The Humanities--Sixty Years," QQ 60 (1953), 545; John Irving, "One Hundred Years of Canadian Philosophy," in Philosophy in Canada: a Symposium (Toronto, 1952), 21; Drummond, Political Economy, 90-1, 118.

106 *University of Toronto President's Report* (1953-4), 13-14.

107 Allardyce, "The Rise and Fall," 716-7. And see Rudolph, *Curriculum*, 259-60.

108 W.A. Macintosh, "Presidential Address," *NCCU* (1953), 5.

109 Morton, *One University*, 183.

# Chapter 7

## Postscript

The general education movement had attempted to restore the kind of order and certainty to higher learning which, a century earlier, had been characteristic of the traditional arts curriculum. It failed because there were now too many courses and disciplines competing for prominence in the arts program, and because none of the conditions which had once accomodated a highly structured curriculum still prevailed. People no longer believed, for example, that the brain was divided into "faculties," which had to be stimulated in order to develop, nor was the arts course still dedicated to the protection and encouragement of religious piety and to the suppression of "intellectual pride." The authority of religion had waned during the late nineteenth century and freed the arts course from its strictures, and no other organizing principle or philosophy had arisen which was powerful enough to create a consensus on what the purpose and structure of the curriculum should be. But if curricular reform was a discouraging process in 1950, ten or twenty years later the task would be even more confusing and divisive.

The post-war decades would bring a multitude of changes in the content, scope and status of the arts

course. Immediately after World War II, Canadian arts curricula were still underdeveloped and fairly restricted in content in comparison with their American counterparts. Social science disciplines which were well established in the United States were still neglected here, and, in the humanities, most teaching still concentrated on European history, culture and thought. Throughout the first half of the century, the poverty of Canadian institutions had acted as a break upon curricular reform, but the prosperity which they finally began to enjoy towards the end of the fifties transformed the arts course dramatically, and made it even more difficult to contain or control.

The most important developments during the 1950s, as far as the liberal arts were concerned, were the creation of a new cultural policy prompted by the Report on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, the government's realization that vast increases in grants to universiites were necesseary if they were to accomodate the baby boom generation in the 1960s, and the emergence of an economic theory which linked education with economic productivity. These were the conditions underlying the post-war revolution in arts teaching.

The Massey Report recommended a system of federal operating grants to universities and the creation of a Canada Council. In arguing their case for ongoing

support to scholarship, the commissioners drew upon a legacy of ideas and rhetoric devised by earlier arts advocates and kept the links between culture, values and citizenship constantly in view.[1] In their efforts to persuade the government that spending money on the liberal arts was anything but frivolous, they treated the preservation of the "Western tradition" as if it were an element of defence policy.[2] The St. Laurent government conceded that the universities as a whole needed support and instituted annual operating grants in 1951, but the creation of a Canada Council, which was seen as a politically risky venture, was delayed until 1957.[3] Once its grants became available, it raised morale and spurred activity in the humanities and social sciences by funding research, subsidizing the publication of books and scholarly journals, paying for conferences, and, in general, fostering the kind of atmosphere which would bring scholarship (and therefore teaching) in this country closer to the mainstream of intellectual life in the English-speaking world.[4] While surveying Maritime universities in the early 1960s for the Humanities Research Council, Gordon Rothney encountered a growing acceptance of the idea that "productive scholarship is something in which university people should indulge." He found that "Almost everywhere, now, there is less of the old high school type of attitude, which regarded a subject as

a traditional body of knowledge to be taught year after year."[5]

A series of increases in university funding, of which the initial federal grants were merely a foretaste, also contributed to expanded research activity and the development of new courses. During the fifties, the universities sustained an organized and well-publicized campaign aimed at pressuring the federal government, the provincial governments, and the private sector to pay for the hiring of more professors and the building of new classrooms, laboratories, offices and libraries. Enrolment projections provided by the Dominion Statistician in the mid-fifties justified the universities' claim that their financial plight had attained the status of a "national emergency."[6] By the closing years of the decade, money had begun to flow into the system of higher education, vast programs of expansion were underway, and arts faculties were rapidly doubling and redoubling in size. Whereas, before the war, in many departments across the country, two or three professors had handled the entire teaching load (with all of the restrictions on research and curricular innovation which that implied), faculty members in virtually all disciplines were steadily increasing in number and were carving out specialized areas of teaching and research.

But why were government authorities, with the

enthusiastic support of the business community, so responsive to the campaign for university expansion? Why did they rally in support of both professional and liberal education, when the latter tended towards a non-utilitarian attitude towards the educative process? Historians have already shown that the prospering economy of the 1950s created a need for more university graduates than were being produced, and that, at the same time, the demand for graduates was increasing because of the belief that higher education of all kinds was directly related to economic growth. The fifties and sixties were the era of the "human capital theory," which meant that a high monetary value was placed on the skills and knowledge possessed by well-educated persons.[7] Economists, governments, and the private sector became convinced that the Gross National Product would expand in proportion to the country's investment in higher learning, and this theory by no means excluded the contribution to be made by liberal education. Encouraged by arts advocates who eschewed the pre-war critique of materialism and leapt upon the band wagon of economic growth, business and government leaders began to see graduates trained in the humanities and social sciences as being especially suited for careers in the civil service and for life in the corporate world.[8] They reasoned that young people who were trained to "think," to solve problems imagin-

atively, to communicate well and who possessed a broad understanding of society would make intelligent and adaptable employees. Universities could therefore be sure that the pressure of growing enrolments upon the faculties of arts would be at least as great as that experienced by the professional schools.

The curricular historian of the post-war period will be faced with the task of analysing the rapid and complex process of diversification which occurred in the arts curriculum, which was brought about by the speed at which the universities grew and also by the sudden influx of foreign academics who introduced new specialties and techniques to Canadian scholarship. All disciplines were affected, and perhaps each must chronicle its own post-war development before the historian can fully understand the academic revolution which took place. A few of the major trends, however, may be tentatively suggested here.

The social sciences experienced the most impressive growth, not only in the absolute numbers of professors and students but in the position they occupied within the arts curriculum. This was especially true in those disciplines which had been severely limited by lack of staff. Geography was not even taught at many universities before the war, but became established as both an undergraduate and graduate discipline at most

institutions by 1960.[9] Sociology and political science entered the post-war period with a strong sense of their inferior status compared with economics, but they gradually rejected their role as junior partners and expanded their subject matter as the number of practitioners grew. There were only thirty political scientists employed in Canadian universities in 1950, but by 1964-5 there were two hundred, and by 1970 the number had exceeded five hundred.[10] The teaching of sociology expanded even more quickly. Although several universities did not hire anyone specifically to teach sociology until the late 1950s, all offered a range of courses in such areas as the sociology of the family, religion, communications, social problems, criminology, and so on, within a few years. Alberta, for example, hired its first sociologist in 1958 and had a staff of twenty-two by the mid-sixties.[11] Anthropology, as well, was mainly a post-war development, although it had its start in the interwar period as the study of native Canadian cultures in Canada at a couple of institutions. The University of British Columbia, Toronto and McGill had well-established departments by 1960, and the discipline grew rapidly during that decade, often in conjunction with sociology.[12]

As a general rule, the later a discipline developed, the more thorough was the process of Americanization. Canadian universities could train some of their own

economists and psychologists to fill the vast numbers of positions which were opening up (although the influx of foreign-born faculty in these subjects was considerable), but in anthropology, sociology, and to some extent political science, universities had no choice but to look abroad. S.D. Clark believes that the Canada Council's policy (unlike that of the National Research Council) of making its fellowships tenable at foreign universities inhibited the immediate growth of an indigenous system of graduate studies in the social sciences and encouraged the "brain drain" to continue into the sixties.[13] Bernard Ostry has calculated that Canada produced only nineteen Ph.D.'s in sociology during the entire decade of the 1960s, but that by 1970 the discipline had developed to the point where two hundred and twenty-five doctoral students were enrolled.[14] The effect on the curriculum was, of course, profound. Because a majority of American-born professors had, at that time, no intention of remaining in Canada or becoming Canadian citizens, their choice of research topics was guided by the American market.[15] The content of their lectures was similarly foreign in emphasis, and the use of American texts and other materials was taken for granted. In his recent study of sociology and nationalism, Donald Whyte confirms that as "academic departments were established or expanded, the character of undergraduate programs came to resemble the

standard American package."[16]

However minor by comparison, a process of Canadianization was also underway during the 1950s and 1960s. Before World War II, Arthur Lower's plea that Canadians should study their own culture instead of always looking to Britain or Europe attracted little attention.[17] But at the beginning of the 1950s, the Massey commissioners gave official sanction to the idea that Canada must foster an indigenous culture before it could rank as a mature nation. "Squarely representative of traditional culture"[18] as they were, they showed greater concern over Canada's dependence on the United States than on the old country, and would not have wished Canadian culture to displace the British heritage. Nevertheless, their recommendation of a Canada Council was a major turning point in the early history of "Canadian studies." It provided the means whereby English and French Canadian writers could work and gain a public following, and it supported the literary journals, such as Canadian Literature, which began to produce the body of criticism which had to exist before Canadian writing could be taken seriously as an academic subject.[19] Canadian historians also drew upon the Council's support, and, in general, the principle was established that those academics who wanted to study Canada could at least obtain the funding to do so. In departments dominated by foreign-born aca-

demics, or by Canadians still convinced of their cultural inferiority, a stigma continued to cling to the idea of Canadian content in the curriculum, even though students "voted with their feet" in favour of courses which dealt with their own culture and national life.[20] Ironically, this lingering prejudice against Canadian courses and the controversy it engendered throughout the late sixties and seventies helped to fuel the fervent nationalism which eventually changed hiring policies and diverted funds towards the creation of Canadian Studies programs.

The history of cultural attitudes in faculties of arts helps to explain why so many professors believed that Canadian civilization as a whole did not greatly matter and was not a suitable subject for undergraduate study. At the beginning of the 1950s, the arts curriculum, at least in the humanities, was still dominated by the idea that its mission was to expose students to "the best that has been thought and said," and Canadian works seldom gained admission to that canon. Before Canadian courses could be accepted on equal terms in faculties of arts, the prevailing hierarchy of values in liberal education had to undergo some adjustment. This process is central to Canadian cultural evolution after World War II and needs to be better understood. It would seem, for example, that help came from some unexpected sources. The nation's fore-

most literary critic, who found no place for Canadian works in his Anatomy of Criticism, gave legitimacy to a critical approach which would encourage other scholars to concentrate on indigenous literature. Northrop Frye conceded (contrary to his own system) that Canadian literature "is more significantly studied as a part of Canadian life than as part of an autonomous world of literature."[21] Unfashionable as this was in the world of literary theory, it excused Canadian scholars from the unrewarding task of assessing each work in relation to the "Great Tradition."

As the monolithic concentration on a unified cultural heritage gradually diminished, the arts course began to accomodate a range of subjects which fell outside the boundaries of the western heritage. This process needs to be examined in the context of Canada's growing role in world affairs after World War II, the declining importance of Europe on the world stage, and the erosion of the west's longstanding confidence in its own cultural supremacy. Apart from isolated experiments such as the introduction of Chinese at Toronto in the 1930s, this area of curricular expansion got underway in the Cold War atmosphere of the late 1940s. At that time, Slavic Studies programs received massive outside funding because it was widely believed that a knowledge of Russian society would help to preserve peace, to combat the spread of communism, and

prepare us for the possibility of war.[22] Other non-western cultures made their way into the arts curriculum during the late fifties and sixties, spurred by problems in international relations and by the arrival of new specialists to Canadian universities from the United States and abroad.[23] The introduction of courses in the languages, politics, religions, history, geography, anthropology, and economics of Asia, Africa, South America and the Middle East extended the range of liberal education so that, as Allardyce says, by the 1960s "Europe was no longer the world."[24] Although lack of interest among a majority of faculty and students meant that "non-western" studies would remain on the periphery of the arts course for years to come, their presence in the curriculum had established the point, made by one Asian studies pioneer, that "There is a good deal of arrogance in our imagining that we are the prototype of universal man."[25]

The burgeoning arts curriculum of the 1950s and 1960s prompted a revival of the general education movement which may prove to have been the last phase in its less than triumphant history. Although most academics (George Grant was one exception)[26] did not question the benefits of their unversities' new found prosperity, some did concern themselves with the effect of course proliferation upon the quality of undergraduate edu-

cation and recognised an element of self-indulgence in the creation of ever more specialized offerings. John Deutsch criticized this tendency in an address to the Royal Society in 1960 and borrowed from Sir Richard Livingstone the cryptic observation that "a great teacher 'is known by the number of valuable subjects which he declines to teach.'"[27] H.N. Fieldhouse, then Dean of Arts and Science at McGill, remarked in the same year that "it is easy to pass from the position that a member of staff has an unrestricted right to pursue research in a matter of choice, to the practice of adding courses to the undergraduate curriculum simply because they reflect that choice."[28]

Several institutions tried, once again, to bring the arts course under control by introducing some form of general education requirements, but their efforts differed little from previous such attempts and experienced no greater success. Some universities, including Western and Carleton, devised so-called "core curricula" which stipulated that first-year students must distribute their efforts over several prescribed areas.[29] Fieldhouse doubted the wisdom of confining such schemes to the first year of arts, and created instead an ambitious synoptic course (called "the Faculty Course") which was taken by all third and fourth year students. Its goal was to provide liberal education with "a common core and synthesis," and it was not

unlike the general education courses devised some twenty years earlier.[30] At the University of British Columbia, a Faculty of Arts committee proposed to eliminate all exposure to separate disciplines during the first year and institute a compulsory program which would strive to illuminate "the interdependency of all areas of human experience." This reform campaign failed to bring about any major changes to the arts course, but the controversy it aroused engulfed the faculty in bitter and longlasting strife.[31]

New universities had the advantage of being able to build their curricula from scratch, and the best-known experiment in general education to occur in Canada at any time was the program devised at York. Murray Ross, York's first president, was impressed by what he had read about the general education movement in the United States, and he and his colleagues were determined to create an alternative to the curriculum at Toronto, with its specialized honours courses and the second class status of its general students.[32] Sociologist John Seeley announced at the beginning of the sixties that "Against this evasion of the problem of establishing a common core culture for all, York has resolutely turned its face."[33] But York was to experience the same problems which Harvard and other institutions had already encountered. Although it created a set of required general education courses which were broad

in scope, as planned, the cohesion of the program began to break down almost immediately. The difficulty of finding people who could devise and teach such wide-ranging courses tempted York to allow a gradual proliferation of offerings, and, since students were allowed to choose amongst them, there was no longer any "core" to which all were exposed.[34] By 1968, a curriculum committee had conceded that "there is, we believe, no single core of human knowledge demanding collective absorption."[35]

It seems to have been relatively commonplace for universities which tried to impose some sort of core curriculum in the early sixties to abandon such schemes a few years later. McGill's Faculty Course survived only until 1968; York's last core requirement, called "Modes of Reasoning," was dropped that same year. A Senate commission at Carleton had to admit that its first year program did little to hold the curriculum together, and that "If integration, some overview of the wholeness of things, is one of the functions of general education, it is unlikely to be accomplished in five separate gulps."[36] Curriculum committees were under pressure from student activists who loudly challenged the reasoning behind all prescribed courses, but who also effectively pointed out that, in a mass learning situation, the herding of hundreds of students into classrooms to hear televised lectures on some

"essential" subject was poor educational policy. But quite apart from the overwhelming problems of student numbers and student protest, the basic philosophy of general education was ready to be laid to rest. A professor who argued against the common first year program at Carleton captured the prevailing sense that a "core of general culture" perhaps did not exist, or that the search for it was no longer worth the trouble. "I believe in education," he wrote, "though I do not believe that education, secularly and institutionally conceived, can 'save' us--as Arnold thought that 'culture' might save the middle class of his day ... The cry for general education seems to me to come from somewhere East of Eden, in the Land of Nod, to suggest a Paradise Lost which must be at least partially regained."[37]

Curricular expansion has continued throughout the seventies and eighties, despite financial restraints and the sharp decrease in the hiring of new staff. New offerings continue to emerge because a majority of academics have tacitly accepted the notion that virtually any area of human life that can be studied is eligible for inclusion in the arts course. Would-be reformers still incline towards a "back-to-the-basics" approach, often with little understanding of the way that the history of curricular reform has tended to repeat itself. No new solutions have sur-

faced, and perhaps the arts course can only be restored to order if its bias against vocationalism is abandoned and it is organized into programs (as have already appeared on a small scale at some universities) which are designed to educate students towards specific kinds of employment. Until that time, the problem of the arts course will remain much the same, in essence, as it was several decades ago. Despite all that has occurred in the history of liberal education, Mark Pattison's dryly-worded definition of its fundamental dilemma is still most apt. "Everyone of us is," he wrote in 1868, "consciously or unconsciously, working out this double problem: to combine speciality of function with generality of culture."[38]

NOTES

1 Canada, Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 1949-51 (Ottawa, 1951). See especially Ch. 14, "The Scholar and the Scientist." Also see the accompanying volume of Special Studies, especially Malcolm Wallace on "The Humanities," and George Grant on "Philosophy." Parts of the Report rely on earlier documents such as The Humanities in Canada.

2 Report of the Royal Commission on National Development, Introduction to Part II, p. 274. Other post-war material which linked culture and defence policy included Saunders, "Introduction," Education for Tomorrow; Kirkconnell, Liberal Education in the Canadian Democracy; P.J. Nicholson, "The Universities as the Custodians of Western Civilization," NCCU (1951), 10-13; Hilda Neatby, So Little for the Mind (1953), 326.

3 See Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond, John English, Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics, and Provincialism (Toronto, 1981), 165-7; Bernard Ostry, The Cultural Connection (Toronto, 1978), 63-6.

4 For the Council's impact, see George Woodcock, "When the Past Becomes History," and Northrop Frye, "Across the River and Out of the Trees," in UTQ 50 (1980-1).

5 G.O. Rothney, "1961-2: The Humanities in the Atlantic Universities," PAC HRCC MG28/I82 Vol. 2 File: Humanities in Canada: Revision.

6 See Canada's Tomorrow: Papers and Discussion (ed.) G.P. Gilmour (Toronto, 1954); Maurice Lebel, National Conference on the Humanities," Culture 6 (1955), 162-88; N.A.M. MacKenzie, "The Work of the Universities," in Canadian Education Today (ed.) Joseph Katz (Toronto, 1956); Canada's Crisis in Higher Education (Toronto, 1957); The Challenge to our Universities (ed.) L.A. Duchemin (Mount Allison University, 1958).

7 See Cyril Levitt, Children of Privilege: Student Protest in the Sixties (Toronto, 1984), 20-1; and Paul Axelrod, Scholars and Dollars: Economics and the Universities of Ontario, 1945-1980 (Toronto, 1982), 23-33.

8 Ibid., 106-10. And see H.J. Somers, "Private and

V.W. Bladen, "The Role of the University," UTQ 26 (1956-7), 483-95; M. St. A. Woodside, "The Value of the Humanities," UTQ 26 (1956-7), 508-19.

9 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 519-20.

10 MacPherson, "After Strange Gods," 56. He explains that the American influence, which emphasized the distinctive subject matter and scientific methodology of political science, played a part in separating it from the political economy tradition.

11 S.D. Clark, "The American Take Over of Sociology: Myth or Reality," DR 53 (1973), 205-6.

12 Harris, A History of Higher Education, 519-20. See also T.F. McIlraith, "The Progress of Anthropology in Canada," CHR 11 (1930), 132-50; Connor and Curtis, Sociology and Anthropology in Canada.

13 Clark, "The American Take Over, 208-10. For statistics on PhD's awarded in the social sciences compared with the sciences and humanities, see Mabel Timlin, "The Social Sciences in Canada: Retrospect and Potential," in The Social Sciences in Canada: Two Studies (eds.) Mabel Timlin and Albert Faucher (Ottawa, 1968).

14 Bernard Ostry, Canadian Higher Education in the Seventies (Ottawa, 1972), quoted in N. Keyfitz, "Sociology and Canadian Society," in Perspectives on the Social Sciences, 79-80.

15 "A Look at the Universities," Canadian Dimension 7 (Oct.-Nov. 1970), 44.

16 Donald Whyte, "Sociology and the Nationalist Challenge in Canada," JCS 19 (1984-5), 113. For statistics and other evidence see The Struggle for Canadian Universities: a Dossier (eds.) Robin Mathews and James Steele (Toronto, 1969).

17 For example, see Arthur Lower, "The Social Sciences in the Post-war World," CHR 22 (1941), 12-13.

18 Ostry, The Cultural Connection, 61.

19 Woodcock, "When the Past Becomes History," 100.

20 J.A.S. Evans, "For if Canadian academics are inferior ... it is because our universities have made them that way," University Affairs (July, 1976), 17.

21 Fee, "English-Canadian Literary Criticism," 372. And see Woodcock, 96.

22 J.B. Rudnyckyi, "A Birthday for Slavic Studies," University of Manitoba Alumni Journal 19 (July, 1959), 121. At some universities, eastern European language studies were funded (at least initially) by citizens' groups in order to foster a knowledge of these cultures in areas with large Slavic populations. But Russian remained dominant, partly because of defence considerations. Watson Kirkconnell, "Address to the Canadian Association of Slavists," Slavistica 31 (1957), 6.

23 For a history of developments in these areas, see D.L.B. Hamlin, International Studies in Canadian Universities (Ottawa, 1964).

24 Allardyce, "The Rise and Fall," 717.

25 W.A.C.H. Dobson, "New Frontiers in the Humanities," HRC Annual Report (1963-4), 37.

26 George Grant, "The Minds of Men in the Atomic Age," in Texts and Addresses delivered at the 24th Annual Couchiching Conference (1955), 39-45.

27 J.L. Deutsch, "The University and its Finances," in Canadian Universities Today (eds.) George Stanley and Guy Sylvestre (Toronto, 1961), 84.

28 McGill University Principal's Report (1959-60), 34.

29 Axelrod, Scholars and Dollars, 104-5.

30 McGill University Principal's Report (1959-60), 34.

31 Faculty of Arts Committee, Discipline and Discovery (Vancouver, 1965), Ch. 1. This reform movement did eventually lead to the creation of the Arts I Program, inpsired partly by Alexander Meiklejohn and Joseph Tussman (of Berkeley). It was an optional, interdisciplinary first year program which began in 1967 and enrolled about 200 students each year.

32 See Murray Ross, The New University (Toronto, 1961).

33 "Report of the Interim Curriculum Committee" (April, 1961), 3. York University Archives.

34 For the original plan see York University, These Five Years (Toronto, 1965).

35 Quoted by Theodore W. Olson, _The Future of the Faculty of Arts: a Report to the Dean_ (York University, 1972), 13.

36 Carleton University Senate, Commission on Undergraduate Teaching and Learning in the Faculty of Arts, _Preliminary Report_ (Carleton University, 1969), 41.

37 Ibid., Working Paper #1, "The General-Specialist Dichotomy with Special Reference to the Common First Year," 2, 7-8.

38 Pattison, _Suggestions on Academical Reorganization_, 258.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I PRIMARY SOURCES

### A Unpublished

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada Library

Misc. unpublished university reports and documents

Public Archives of Canada

Humanities Federation of Canada, Papers
Social Sciences Federation of Canada, Papers

Queen's University Archives

Faculty of Arts, misc. papers and reports

University of British Columbia Archives

Faculty of Arts, misc. papers and reports

University of Manitoba Archives

Faculty of Arts, misc. papers and reports
President's Papers
Vice-president's Papers

University of Toronto Archives

Faculty of Arts, misc. papers and reports
University Historian, notes and manuscripts

York University

Faculty of Arts, misc. papers and reports

### B Published

#### i Books and Pamphlets

Adelman, Howard, and Dennis Lee. The University Game. Toronto, 1968.

Alexander, W.H. et al. These Twenty-five Years: a Symposium. Toronto, 1933.

Alexander, W.J. The Study of Literature. Toronto, 1899.

Arnold, Matthew. Culture and Anarchy ed. Dover Wilson. Cambridge, 1971.

Akins, T.B. A Brief Account of the Origin, Endowment, and Progress of the University of King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia. Halifax, 1865.

Babbitt, Irving. Literature and the American College Boston, 1908.

Bercuson, D.J. et al. The Great Brain Robbery: Canada's Universities on the Road to Ruin. Toronto, 1984.

Bissell, C.T. ed. Canada's Crisis in Higher Education. Toronto, 1957.

__________. The Strength of the University. Toronto, 1968.

Brebner, J.B. Scholarship for Canada. Ottawa, 1945.

Broadus, E.K. The Story of English Literature. New York, 1934.

Brown, E.K. ed. Representative Essays of Matthew Arnold Toronto, 1936.

Canada. Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences. Report. Ottawa, 1951.

Canada. Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. Ottawa, 1951.

Carleton University Senate. Commission on Undergraduate Teaching and Learning in the Faculty of Arts. Preliminary Report. 1969.

Chalmers, R.C. and John Irving. eds. Challenge and Response Toronto, 1959.

__________. The Heritage of Western Culture. Toronto, 1952.

Connor, D. and J.E. Curtis. Sociology and Anthropology in Canada. Montreal, 1970.

Corry, J.A. My Life and Work: A Happy Partnership. Kingston, 1981.

Cottam, K.J. Canadian Universities: American Takeover of the Mind?. Toronto, 1974.

Dawson, William. Fifty Years of Work in Canada. London, 1901.

_______________. A Plea for the Extension of University Education in Canada. Montreal, 1870.

Dewey, John et al. The Authoritarian Attempt to Capture Education. New York, 1945.

Duchemin, L. The Challenge to our Universities. Mount Allison University, 1958.

Dunton, D. and D. Patterson. eds. Canada's Universities in a New Age. Ottawa, 1961.

Edgar, Pelham. Across My Path. Toronto, 1952.

England, R. The Threat to Disinterested Education, A Challenge. Toronto, 1937.

Fairclough, H.R. Warming both Hands: the Autobiography of Henry Rushton Fairclough Stanford, 1941.

Falconer, Robert. Idealism in National Character. Toronto, 1920.

Ferns, H.S. Reading from Left to Right: One Man's Political History Toronto, 1983.

Flexner, A. Universities: American, English and German Oxford, 1931.

Foerster, Norman. The Humanities and the Common Man. Chapel Hill, 1946.

Fox, W.S. Sherwood Fox of Western: Reminiscences Toronto, 1964.

Fraser, W.H. Pass French and German in the University of Toronto. Toronto, 1892.

Gilmour, G.P. ed. Canada's Tomorrow. 1954.

Goldstick, I. ed. Modern Language Instruction in Canada. Toronto, 1928.

Graham, W.C. Education in the New Age. 1947.

Grant, W.L. and F. Hamilton. Principal Grant. Toronto, 1904.

Grayson, J.P. and D.W. Magill. One Step Forward, Two Steps Sideways: Sociology and Anthropology in Canada. 1981.

Greene, T.M. Liberal Education Re-examined: Its Role in a Democracy. New York, 1943.

Hamlin, D.L.B. International Studies in Canadian Universities. Ottawa, 1964.

Harrison, W.E.C. The Universities are Dangerous Toronto, 1941.

Hart, C.W.M. ed. Essays in Sociology. Toronto, 1940.

Harvard University Committee. General Education in a Free Society. Harvard, 1945.

Havelock, E.A. The Crucifixion of Intellectual Man. Boston, 1950.

Henderson, J.L.H. ed. John Strachan: Documents and Opinions. Toronto, 1969.

Hodgins, J. George ed. Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada. Toronto, 1894-1910.

________________. Historical and Other Papers and Documents Illustrative of the Educational System of Ontario 1792-1876. Toronto, 1911.

Hubbard, R.H. ed. Scholarship in Canada: 1967: Achievement and Outlook. Toronto, 1968.

Hutchins, Robert. Education for Freedom. Baton Rouge, 1944.

________________. No Friendly Voice. Chicago, 1936.

Hutton, Maurice. The Sisters Jest and Earnest. Toronto, 1930.

Innis, H.A. ed. Essays in Political Economy in Honour of E.W. Urwick. Toronto, 1938.

Irving, John A. Science and Values: Explorations in Philosophy and Social Sciences. Toronto, 1952.

Katz, Joseph. ed. Canadian Education Today. Toronto, 1956.

Kirconnell, W. and A.S.P. Woodhouse. The Humanities in Canada. Ottawa, 1947.

Kirkconnell, W. Liberal Education in the Canadian Democracy. Hamilton, 1948.

________________. A Slice of Canada: Memoirs. Toronto, 1967.

Langton, John. Early Days in Upper Canada. Toronto, 1926.

Leacock, Stephen. Elements of Political Science rev. ed. London, 1914.

Lodge, R.C. Philosophy of Education. New York, 1937.

Lower, A.R.M. My First Seventy-five Years. Toronto, 1967.

McCulloch, Thomas. The Stepsure Letters. New Canadian Library ed. Toronto, 1960.

MacIver, M.M. As a Tale that is Told. Chicago, 1968.

McLean, R. Canada and Asia. Ottawa, 1959.

MacMechan, A.M. Headwaters of Canadian Literature. 1924.

________________. The Life of a Little College Cambridge, 1914.

McGill University. Examination Papers, Session 1910-11. Montreal, 1911.

Mathews, R. and J. Steele. eds. The Struggle for Canadian Universities: A Dossier. Toronto, 1969.

____________. ed. Some of the Materials concerning the Struggle for Canadian Universities. Ottawa, 1971.

Nash, A.S. The Universities and the Modern World. New York, 1944.

N.C.C.U. Report of the National Conference on Post-war Problems. Ottawa, 1944.

Neatby, Hilda. So Little for the Mind. Toronto, 1953.

Neilson, W.A. and C.F. Wittke. The Function of Higher Education. Evanston, Ill. 1943.

Olson, Theodore. The Future of the Faculty of Arts: A Report to the Dean. York University, 1972.

Park, Julian. ed. The Culture of Contemporary Canada.

New York, 1957.

Pattison, Mark. Suggestions on Academical Reorganization Edinburgh, 1868.

Priestley, F.E.L. The Humanities in Canada. Toronto, 1964.

Ross, Murray G. The New University. Toronto, 1961.

Ryal Society of Canada. ed. Fifty Years Retrospect: Anniversary Volume, 1882-1932. 1932.

Saunders, Richard. ed. Education for Tomorrow. Toronto, 1946.

Saunderson, Hugh H. The Saunderson Years. Winnipeg, 1981.

Seeley, R.S.K. The Functions of the University. Toronto, 1948.

Sheffield, E. ed. Curriculum Innovation in Arts and Science. Toronto, 1970.

Sissons, C.B. Nil Alienum: the Memoirs of C.B. Sissons. Toronto, 1954.

Smith, Sidney. Unity of Knowledge: The Sciences and the Humanities. Toronto, 1952.

Spalding, William. The History of English Literature. 13th ed. London, 1875.

Spragge, G.W. ed. The John Strachan Letter Book: 1812-1834. Toronto, 1946.

Squair, John. The Autobiography of a Teacher of French. Toronto, 1928.

Stanley, G. and G. Sylvestre. eds. Canadian Universities Today: Symposium. Toronto, 1961.

Symons, T.H.B. To Know Ourselves: The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies. Ottawa, 1975.

University of British Columbia. Faculty of Arts Committee. Discipline and Discovery. Vancouver, 1965.

University of King's College, Toronto. Proceedings of the Ceremony of Laying the Foundation Stone, April 23, 1842, and at the Opening of the University, June 8, 1843. Toronto, 1843.

University of Manitoba. Report of the Royal Commission on the University of Manitoba (1907). Winnipeg, 1910.

____________________. Students Union. Report of the Student Commission of the University of Manitoba. Winnipeg, 1933.

University of Toronto. A Group of Classical Graduates. Honour Classics in the University of Toronto. Toronto, 1929.

____________________. Philosophy in Canada: A Symposium. Toronto, 1952.

____________________. Report of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto (1906). Toronto, 1906.

Wallace, Robert C. A Liberal Education in a Modern World. Toronto, 1932.

Wittenberg, A.J. General Education as a Challenge for Creative Scholarship. Toronto, 1964.

York University. These Five Years: 1960-65. Toronto, 1965.

ii. Calendars, Journals, Reports

The following periodical publications have been used extensively:

University Calendars for the English-speaking universities of Canada.

Canadian Forum

Canadian Historical Review

Canadian Historical Association Annual Report

Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science

Canadian Journal of Sociology

Culture

Dalhousie Review

Journal of Canadian Studies

Proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities

Queen's Quarterly

Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada

University Affairs

University Magazine

University of Toronto Monthly

University of Toronto Quarterly

Varsity (University of Toronto)

Humanities Research Council Annual Reports

Social Sciences Research Council Annual Reports

Annual Reports of Presidents and Principals of English-speaking universities in Canada.

iii Other Articles

Baldwin, James Mark. "Psychology at the University of Toronto." American Journal of Psychology 3 (1890), 285-6.

Bateman, Reginald. "The Teaching of English." Reginald Bateman: Teacher and Scholar. London, 1922.

Blackburn, J.M. "George Humphrey." Canadian Journal of Pscyhology 11 (1957), 141-50.

Fieldhouse, H.N. "What Subject or Subjects Today are Best Fitted to Fulfil the Role Played Previously in the University Curriculum by the Classics." 7th Congress of the Universities of the Commonwealth, 1953. Cambridge, 1954.

Frye, Northrop. "Humanities in a New World," in University of Toronto Installation Lectures. ed. Murray Ross. Toronto, 1958, 9-13.

Grant, George. "The Minds of Men in the Atomic Age." Texts of Addresses delivered at the 24th Annual Couchiching Conference. (1955), 39-45.

Hincks, W. "On the True Aims, Foundations, and Claims of the Science of Poltical Economy." Canadian Journal of Literature, Science and Arts. 31 (1861), 20-8.

Kirkconnell, Watson. "The Place of Slavic Studies in Canada." Slavistica 31 (1957), 14.

Milner, W.S. "The Higher National Life." Canada and Its Provinces. Vol. 12 The Dominion Mission; Arts and Letters, part 2. eds. Adam Shortt and Arthur Doughty. Toronto, 1913.

Norwood, Gilbert. "Are We on our Way to Being White Zulus?" Saturday Night 2 (Feb. 1946), 9.

W.J. Rose. "Cradle Days of Slavic Studies." Slavistica 23 (1955), 9-13.

Savage, D.C. "African Studies in Canada." Canadian Journal of African Studies 1 (1967), 5-11.

Rudnyckyi, J.B. "A Birthday for Slavic Studies." University of Manitoba Alumni Journal 19 (July, 1959), 21.

Stanley, Carleton. "Spriritual Conditions in Canada." Hibbert Journal 21 (1923).

Thomas, M.E. ed. "The Memoirs of William Cochrane, sometime Professor of Columbia College, New York, and at King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia." New York Historical Society Quarterly 38 (1954), 55-83.

## II SECONDARY SOURCES

### B Unpublished

#### i. Article

McKillop, A.B. "Science and Humanism in Canadian Universities.'

#### ii. Theses

Bowker, Alan F. "Truly Useful Men: Maurice Hutton, George Wrong, James Mavor and the University of Toronto, 1880-1927." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Toronto, 1975.

Fee, Marjorie. "English-Canadian Literary Criticism, 1890-1950: Defining and Establishing a National Literature." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Toronto, 1981.

Ferguson, Barry. "The New Political Economy and Canadian Liberal Democratic Thought: Queen's University 1890-1925." Ph.D. dissertation. York University, 1982.

Francis, Douglas. "Frank Underhill--Canadian Intellectual." Ph.D. dissertation. York University, 1975.

Kidd, J.R. "A Study of the Influence of Dr. H.M. Tory on Educational Thought in Canada." M.A. thesis. McGill University, 1944.

Neill, R.F. "The World of Harold Adams Innis: Content and Context." Ph.D. dissertation. Duke University, 1967.

Opala, Beatrice. "Matthew Arnold in Canada." M.A. thesis. McGill University, 1968.

Pilkington, G. "A History of the Association of Universities and colleges of Canada, 1911-1961." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Toronto, 1974.

Tomovic, V.A. "Sociology in Canada: An Analysis of its Growth in English Language Universities, 1908-1972." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Waterloo, 1975.

ii Books

Axelrod, Paul. Scholars and Dollars: Economics and the Universities of Ontario, 1945-1980. Toronto, 1982.

Bailey A.G. ed. The University of New Brunswick Memorial Volume. Fredericton, 1950.

Baldick, Chris. The Social Mission of English Criticism. London, 1983.

Bedford, A.G. The University of Winnipeg: a History of the Founding Colleges. Toronto, 1976.

Beesley, Patricia. The Revival of the Humanities in American Education. New York, 1940.

Bell, Daniel. The Reforming of General Education. New York, 1966.

Berger, Carl. Science, God, and Nature in Victorian Canada. Toronto, 1983.

__________. The Writing of Canadian History. Toronto, 1976.

Bissell, C.T. Halfway Up Parnassus: A Personal Account of the University of Toronto, 1932-1971. Toronto, 1974.

__________. ed. University College: a Portrait, 1853-1953. Toronto, 1953.

Bledstein, Burton. The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America. New York, 1976.

Buck, Paul. ed. Social Sciences at Harvard, 1860-1920: From Inculcation to the Open Mind. Cambridge, Mass. 1965.

Burwash, N. A History of Victoria College. 1927.

Clark, A.L. The First Fifty Years: A History of the Science Faculty at Queen's, 1893-1943. Kingston, 1944.

Clarke, M.L. Classical Education in Britain, 1500-1900. Cambridge, 1959.

Corbett, E.A. Henry Marshall Tory: Beloved Canadian. Toronto, 1954.

____________. Sidney Earle Smith. Toronto, 1961.

Creighton, Donald. Harold Adams Innis: Portrait of a Scholar. Toronto, 1957.

Daiches, David. English Literature. Princeton, 1964.

Dewar, David. Queen's Profiles. Kingston, 1951.

Drummond, Ian. Political Economy at the University of Toronto: a History of the Department, 1888-1982. Toronto, 1983.

Eagleton, Terry. Literary Theory: an Introduction. Minneapolis, 1983.

Ferns, H.S. and B. Ostry. The Age of Mackenzie King: The Rise of the Leader. Toronto, 1955.

Fingard, Judith. The Anglican Design in Loyalist Nova Scotia, 1783-1816. London, 1972.

Frost, Stanley B. McGill University: Vol. I. 1801-1895. Montreal, 1980. Vol. II. 1895-1971. Montreal, 1984.

Garson, Marjorie. ACUTE: The First Twenty-five Years, 1957 to 1982. 1983.

Gibson, Frederick. Queen's University: Vol.II. 1917-1961. Kingston and Montreal, 1983.

Goodwin, C.D.W. Canadian Economic Thought: the Political Economy of a Developing Nation. Durham, 1961.

Gregor, A. and K. Wilson. eds. Monographs in Education II. Higher Education in Canada: Historical Perspectives. Winnipeg, 1979.

Gruber, Carol S. Mars and Minerva: World War I and the uses of the Higher Learning in America. Baton Rouge, 1976.

Guinsburg, T.N. and G.L. Reuber. eds. Perspectives on the Social Sciences in Canada. Toronto, 1974.

Gwynne-Timothy, J.R. Western's First Century. London, 1978.

Hall, Henry. The Georgian Spirit: the Story of Sir George Williams University. Montreal, 1967.

Harris, Robin. A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663-1960. Toronto, 1976.

Harvey, D.C. An Introduction to the History of Dalhousie University. Halifax, 1938.

Haskell, Thomas. The Emergence of Professional Social Science: the American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-century Crisis of Authority Urbana, Ill., 1977.

Hayden, Michael. Seeking a Balance: The University of Saskatchewan 1907-82. Vancouver, 1983.

Higham, John et al. History: the Development of Historical Studies in the United States. 1965.

Hind, Henry Youle. King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia, 1790-1890. New York, 1890.

Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-intellectualism in American Life. New York, 1962.

Horn, Michiel. The League for Social Reconstruction: Origins of the Democratic left in Canada 1930-42. Toronto, 1982.

Jarrell, R.A. and N.R. Ball. Science, Technology and Canadian History. Waterloo, 1980.

Johns, Walter. A History of the University of Alberta 1908-1969. Edmonton, 1981.

Johnston, C.M. McMaster University: Vol. I. The Toronto Years. Toronto, 1976. Vol. II. The Early Years in Hamilton, 1930-1957. Toronto, 1981.

King, Carlyle. The First Fifty: Teaching, Research and Public Service at the University of Saskatchewan, 1909-1959. Toronto, 1959.

King, J. McCaul, Croft, Forneri: Personalities of Early Universities Days. 1914.

Langton, H.H. Sir Daniel Wilson: a Memoir. 1929.

___________. James Loudon and the University of Toronto. Toronto, 1927.

Levere, T.H. and R.A. Jarrell. eds. A Curious Field-book: Science and Society in Canadaian History. Toronto, 1974.

Levitt, Cyril. Children of Privilege: Student Protest in the Sixties. Toronto, 1984.

Logan, Harry T. Tuum Est: a History of the University of British Columbia. Vancouver, 1958.

Longley, R.S. Acadia University, 1838-1938. Kentville, 1938.

McKillop, A.B. A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era. Montreal, 1979.

MacLennan, Hugh. McGill: the Story of a University. London, 1960.

McMillan, Cyrus. McGill and Its Story, 1821-1921. London and Toronto, 1921.

McNab, G.G. The Development of Higher Education in Ontario. Toronto, 1925.

Masters, Donald C. Bishop's University: the First Hundred Years. Toronto, 1950.

___________. Protestant Church Colleges in Canada: a History. 1966.

Meltzer, Walter. Academic Freedom in the Age of the University. New York, 1961.

Morton, A.S. Saskatchewan: The Making of a University. Toronto, 1959.

Morton, W.L. One University: A History of the University of Manitoba 1877-1952. Toronto, 1957.

Neatby, Hilda. Queen's University: Vol. I. 1841-1917. Montreal, 1978.

Niblett, W.R. ed. Higher Education: Demand and Response. London, 1969.

O'Brien, Charles F. Sir William Dawson: a Life in Science and Religion. Philadelphia, 1971.

Ostry, Bernard. The Cultural Connection. Toronto, 1978.

Palmer, David J. The Rise of English Studies: An Account of the Study of English Language and Literature from Its Origins to the Making of the Oxford English School. London, 1965.

Patterson, R.S. et al. eds. Profiles of Canadian Educators 1974.

Pitt, David G. E.J. Pratt: The Truant Years 1882-1927. Toronto, 1984.

Prentice, Alison. The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada. Toronto, 1977.

Queen's University at Kingston. A Centenary Volume. Toronto, 1941.

Reed, T.A. ed. A History of the University of Trinity College 1852-1952. Toronto, 1952.

Reid, John G. Mount Allison University: A History to 1963. 2 vols. Toronto, 1984.

Richter, Melvin. The Politics of Conscience: T.H. Green and His Age. London, 1964.

Ross, Murray G. The University: the Anatomy of Academe. New York, 1976.

Rothblatt, Sheldon. Tradition and Change in English Liberal Education. London, 1976.

Rudolph, Frederick. Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636. San Francisco, 1978.

Rudy, Willis. The Evolving Liberal Arts Curriculum. New York, 1960.

Saunderson, Michael. ed. The Universities in the Nineteenth Century. London, 1975.

Schlesinger, A.M. and M. White. eds. Paths of American Thought. Boston, 1963.

Scott, D.C. John Graves Simcoe. Toronto, 1909.

Shook, L. Catholic Post-secondary Education in English-speaking Canada. Toronto, 1971.

Shortt, S.E.D. The Search for an Ideal: Six Canadian Intellectuals and their Convictions in an Age of Transition, 1890-1930. Toronto, 1976.

Sissons, C.B. Egerton Ryerson: His Life and Letters. 2 vols. Toronto, 1947.

___________. A History of Victoria University. Toronto, 1952.

Slattery, T.P. Loyola and Montreal: a History. Montreal, 1962.

Spinks, J.W.T. Decade of Change: the Unversity of Saskatchewan 1959-1970. Saskatoon, 1972.

Talman, J.J. and R.D. Western, 1878-1953. London, 1953.

Thomas, L.G. The University of Alberta in the War of 1939-45. Edmonton, 1948.

Thompson, W.P. The University of Saskatchewan: a Personal History. Toronto, 1970.

Thomson, J.S. Yesteryears at the University of Saskatchewan, 1937-49. Saskatoon, 1969.

Timlin, M. and A. Faucher. The Social Sciences in Canada: Two Studies. Ottawa, 1968.

Tory, H.M. ed. The History of Science in Canada. Toronto, 1939.

Veysey, Lawrence R. The Emergence of the American University Chicago, 1965.

Vroom, F.W. A Chronicle of King's College 1789-1939. Halifax, 1941.

Wallace, R.C. ed. Some Great Men of Queen's. Toronto, 1941.

Ward, W.R. Victorian Oxford. London, 1965.

Williams, R. Culture and Society: 1780-1950. Penguin ed. 1977.

Wilson, J.D. and R.M. Stamp. Canadian Education: a History. Scarborough, 1970.

Wright, M.J. and C.R. Myers. eds. History of Academic Psychology in Canada. Toronto, 1982.

iii. Articles

Allardyce, Gilbert. "The Rise and Fall of the Western Civilization Course." American Historical Review 87 (1982), 495-725.

Angrave, J. "John Strachan and Scottish Influence on the Character of King's College, York, 1927." JCS 11 (1976), 60-8.

Axelrod, Paul. "Historical Writing and Canadian Universities: the State of the Art." QQ 89 (1982), 137-44.

_____________. "Moulding the Middle Class: Student Life at Dalhousie University in the 1930s." Acadiensis (1985), 84-122.

Baird, F. "A Missionary Educator: Dr. Thomas McCulloch." DR 52 (1972-3), 611-17.

Bissell, C.T. "Literary Taste in Central Canada during the Late Nineteenth Century." Canadian History Since Confederation. eds. Bruce Hodgins and Robert Page. Georgetown, 1972. 157-70.

Burns, R.J. "God's Chosen People: The Origins of Toronto Society, 1793-1818." Canadian History Before Confederation. ed. J.M. Bumsted. Georgetown, 1979. 263-76.

Creet, Mario. "H.M. Tory and the Secularization of Canadian Universities." QQ 88 (1981), 718-36.

Ferguson, Barry. "Political Economists and Queen's Quarterly, 1893-1939." QQ 90 (1983), 623-43.

_______________ and Doug Owram. "Social Scientists and Public Policy from the 1920s through World War II." JCS 19 (1984-5), 3-17.

Frye, Northrop. "Across the River and Out of the Trees." UTQ 50 (1980-1), 1-14.

Gliserman, Susan. "Early Victorian Science Writers and Tennyson's In Memoriam: A Study in Cultural Exchange." Victorian Studies 18 (1975), 277-308, 437-459.

Goudge, T.A. "A Century of Philosophy in English-speaking Canada." DR 47 (1967-8), 537-49.

Greenlee, J.G. "The Song of a People: Sir Robert Falconer on Empire." JCS 15 (1980), 80-92.

Haines, G. and F.Jackson. "A Neglected Landmark in the History of Ideas." Mississippi Valley Historical Review. 34 (1947-8), 201-20.

Hayes, F.R. "Two Presidents, Two Cultures, and Two Wars: A Portrait of Dalhousie as a Microcosm of Twentieth Century Canada." DR 54 (1974), 405-17.

Horn, Michiel. "Academics and Canadian Social and Economic Policy in the Depression and War Years." JCS 13 (1978), 3-9.

Irving, A. "Social Science Research in the University: an Examination of the Views of Harry Cassidy and Harold Innis." Canadian Journal of Higher Education 10 (1980), 95-110.

Irving, John. "The Development of Philosophy in Central Canada from 1850 to 1900." CHR 31 (1950), 252-87.

Jarrell, R.A. "Science Education at the University of New Brunswick in the Nineteenth Century." Acadiensis 11 (1973), 55-79.

Lawr, Douglas. "Agricultural Education in Nineteenth Century Ontario: An Idea in Search of an Institution." Education and Social Change: Themes from Ontario's Past. eds. M. Katz and P. Mattingly. New York, 1975.

Lippincott, A. "Dalhousie College in the Sixties." DR 16 (1936-7), 285-90.

McKillop, A.B. "John Watson and the Idealist Legacy." Canadian Literature 83 (1979), 72-88.

______________. "The Research Ideal and the University of Toronto, 1870-1906." TRSC 4th ser. Vol. 20 sec. II (1982), 253-74.

______________. "Science, Values and the American Empire: the Canadian Forum in the 1920s." Journal of American Culture (1980), 699-718.

MacKinnon, I.F. "Sir William Dawson: the Church and Science." DR 28 (1948), 246-56.

MacNutt, W.S. "The Universities of the Maritimes: a Glance Backwards." DR 53 (1973-4), 431-8.

Neatby, H. Blair. "The Gospel of Research: the Transformation of English-Canadian Universities." TRSC 4th ser. Vol. 20 sec. II (1982), 275-84.

Owram, Doug. "Economic Thought in the 1930s: The Prelude to Keynesianism," CHR 66 (1985), 344-77.

____________. "Strachan and Ryerson: Guardians of the Future." Canadian Literature 83 (1979), 21-31.

Page, R.H. "William Lyall in his Setting." DR 60 (1980), 49-66.

Purdy, J.D. "John Strachan's Educational Policies, 1815-1841." Ontario History 64 (1972), 45-64.

Rimmington, Gerald. "The Founding of Universities in Nova Scotia." DR 46 (1966), 319-37.

Scammell, Harold. "The Rise and Fall of a College." DR 32 (1952), 35-44.

Shore, Marlene. "Carl Dawson and the Research Ideal: The Evolution of a Canadian Sociologist." Historical Papers (1985), 45-73.

Stager, D.A. "Federal Government Grants to Canadian Universities, 1951-66." CHR 54 (1973), 287-97.

Stamp. R.M. "Canadian High Schools in the 1920s and 1930s--the Social Challenge to the Academic Tradition." Historical Papers 1978), 76-93.

Thomas, C.E. "The Early Days of King's College, Windsor, N.S." J. of the Canadian Church Historical Society 6 (1964), 30-35.

Veysey, Lawrence. "Stability and Experiment in the American Undergraduate Curriculum." Content and Context: Essays in College Education. ed. Karl Kaysen. New York, 1973. 22-62.

Wallace, W.S. "The Life and Work of George M. Wrong." CHR 29 (1948), 229-39.

Whyte, Donald. "Sociology and the Nationalist Challenge in Canada." JCS 19 (1984-5).

Wise, S.F. "Sermon Literature and Canadian Intellectual History." Canadian History Before Confederation. ed. Bumsted. 249-62.

Woodcock, George. "When the Past Becomes History." _UTQ_ 50 (1980-1), 90-101.