

L.B. KUFFERT

'A SECRET UNDERSTANDING' PH.D. 2000

‘A SECRET UNDERSTANDING’:  
CRITICAL RESPONSES TO ‘MODERN LIFE’ AND MASS CULTURE  
IN ENGLISH CANADA, 1939-1963

By

LEONARD B. KUFFERT

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

McMaster University

© Leonard B. Kuffert, 2000

## **DESCRIPTIVE NOTE**

Doctor of Philosophy (2000)  
(History)

McMaster University  
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: “‘a secret understanding’: Critical Responses to ‘Modern Life’ and Mass Culture in English Canada, 1939-1963”.

AUTHOR: Leonard B. Kuffert B.Ed., B.A. (Hons.) (University of Saskatchewan), M.A. (University of British Columbia)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. J.M. Gauvreau

NUMBER OF PAGES: viii, 361

## ABSTRACT

During the Second World War and the generation or so after, a number of English-Canadian observers reported on the fundamental changes overtaking Canada as it became less isolated from a world figuratively shrinking its way towards becoming Marshall McLuhan's 'global village.' This loose affiliation of commentators spoke with certainty, but their opinions were in essence the often hastily-formed impressions of a surprisingly diverse group. Rapid changes to the pace and rhythms of contemporary life – though hardly peculiar to the mid twentieth century or to Canada – brought with them forms of culture thought detrimental to the individual's use of leisure time and even to Canada's coherence as a nation. This dissertation explores a critique of mass culture that was, for nationalists and taste monitors alike, inextricable from the environment of 'modern life.' Although wartime and post-war commentaries on modern life and mass culture in English Canada were often antimodernist, nationalist or elitist in tone, these were not *simply* attempts to recapture some bygone golden age, distinguish Canadians from other North Americans, or introduce 'Culture' to even the farthest-flung settlements. Contributors to this critique certainly worried that they might be sending such messages, and consistently emphasized their democratic intentions and credentials, especially when trying to unmask a commercial culture disguised as 'what the people wanted.' Critics of the mass society favoured self-improvement, self-awareness and lively engagement with one's surroundings, but over the course of a generation, many of these observers acknowledged the imprecision and permeability of cultural boundaries, widening their definition of acceptable leisure to include entertainments or works falling short of the lofty standards that had been bound up, during the earlier part of the twentieth century, with Shakespeare's plays or avant-garde art. Still, critical suspicions about the extraordinary power of modern life and mass culture to affect the individual and society can be read as indicative of a mid twentieth-century Canadian orientation towards cultural change.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank Michael Gauvreau very much for allowing me to follow my instincts and to define what I wanted to study, for providing timely and plentiful questions, and for lobbying to preserve much of the dissertation's original longer form. Thanks also to my committee: Ken Cruikshank, Ruth Frager, external examiner Brian McKillop, internal examiners Lee Brooks and Stefania Miller, and to McMaster graduate chair Wayne Thorpe.

All the archivists I encountered cheerfully filled requests for a fairly odd assortment of material. Among them, some deserve special thanks: Charles Armour, Linda Baier, Odile Bourbigot, Robert Fisher, Anne Goddard, George Henderson, Ken Puley and Pat Townsend.

The Richard Fuller Fund for Research Travel at McMaster University funded the bulk of the research. The John S. Ewart Memorial Fund at the University of Manitoba made a short archival visit possible during my final year.

For making this a better thesis via discussion and skepticism – and in some rare cases for not understanding what I was up to at all but doing so in a most salutary way – I acknowledge the input of: Nancy Christie, Mike Dawson, Russ Johnston, Ron Love, Marline Otte, David Plaxton, Till van Rahden, Brian Raychaba, David Russo, Geoff Spurr, Lisa Szeffel, Mary Vipond, Keith Walden and Donald Wright.

For general contributions to the research effort, friendship and project logistics I thank: Wendy Benedetti, Steve Billinton, Lori Brown, Anne Clendinning, Darin Currie, Gary Evans, Natalie Johnson, John Kendle, Giles Knox, Bob McDonald, Lisa McKendry, Kevin and Michelle Murison, Derek Neal, Susan Neylan, Diane Reilly, Dick Rempel, Doug Robertson, Sharon Rudy and Dermot Wilson. For financial and spiritual support I am grateful to my parents and my parents-in-law, Olive and Doug Cossar.

In the middle of research for this project, an infinitely more important and fulfilling thing happened. I met Roisin Cossar, whose patience and constant love, even while completing her own doctorate and beginning her teaching career, has sustained me.

I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Leo Oswald Kuffert and Ann Darlene Kuffert, whose love and respect for me has always been – as mine for them – complete and unabridged.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
ABBREVIATIONS USED	vi
Introduction	1
One – “unbearable superbity”: The Culture of Reconstruction	30
Two – “V stands for Vacuity”: Wartime	82
Three – “the object of our striving”: Scientism, Religion and Mass Culture	131
Four – “an empty life”: the 1950s	168
Five – “pleasures arranged by others”: the 1960s arrive	222
Conclusion	275
Notes	280
Bibliography	329

## ABBREVIATIONS USED

AO	Archives of Ontario, Toronto
AUA	Acadia University Archives, Wolfville
<i>CanF</i>	<i>Canadian Forum</i>
CAAE	Canadian Association for Adult Education
CBC	Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
CF	Citizens' Forum
DAL	Dalhousie University Archives, Halifax
<i>FFT</i>	<i>Food for Thought</i>
McG	McGill University Archives, Montreal
McM	McMaster University Archives, Hamilton
NAC	National Archives of Canada, Ottawa
QUA	Queen's University Archives, Kingston
RCALS	Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (1949-1951)
RCB	Royal Commission on Broadcasting (1956-1957)
<i>SN</i>	<i>Saturday Night</i>
TFRB	Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto
UBCSC	University of British Columbia Special Collections and Archives, Vancouver

UCA	United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto
UNB	University of New Brunswick Archives, Fredericton
USASK	University of Saskatchewan Archives, Saskatoon
UTA	University of Toronto Archives
WIB	War-time Information Board

## Introduction

In setting the stage for their account of life in a wealthy Toronto neighbourhood during the first half of the 1950s, sociologist John Seeley and his colleagues confessed: “Just as the therapist assumes that the patient will benefit by a clarification of what has actually happened in his life hitherto and is happening now, so we assumed that the community would benefit by a similar attempt at clarification.”<sup>1</sup> Depicting themselves as therapists, the authors of *Crestwood Heights* encapsulated the attitude of a number of English-Canadian observers and commentators who, during the Second World War and the generation or so after, wanted to show their compatriots what was “happening now” as Canada became less isolated from a world figuratively shrinking its way towards becoming Marshall McLuhan’s ‘global village.’ To many in this loose affiliation of self-appointed healers, what had happened “hitherto” seemed plain, and their diagnosis reflected the assumptions and often hastily-formed impressions of a surprisingly diverse group. Rapid changes to the pace and rhythms of contemporary existence – though these were hardly peculiar or new to the mid twentieth century or to Canada – had been accompanied by forms of culture thought detrimental to the individual’s use of leisure time and even to Canada’s coherence as a nation. This dissertation explores a critique of mass culture that was, for nationalists and taste monitors alike, inextricable from the turbulent environment of ‘modern life.’

Although wartime and post-war commentaries on modern life and mass culture in English Canada were often antimodernist, nationalist or elitist in tone, these were not *simply* attempts to recapture some bygone golden age, distinguish Canadians from other North Americans, or introduce ‘Culture’ to even the farthest-flung settlements. Contributors to this

critique certainly worried that they might be sending such messages, and consistently emphasized their democratic intentions and credentials, especially when trying to unmask a commercial culture disguised as 'what the people wanted.' The post-war years offered consumers abundance and convenience at the supermarket and on the airwaves. Improved living standards provided compelling reasons to think that science and technology would furnish all of life's necessities. Concerned onlookers warned that renewed prosperity and a blind faith in 'progress' might make Canadians a dangerously passive lot. A defence of the humanities, carried on via cautionary tales of a technocratic dystopia, was not an outright denial of modernity but a call for balance between antithetical spiritualist and materialist instincts. In academic journals, magazines, pamphlets or broadcasts, authors, editors or inspired citizens seldom missed remarking that aesthetic and interpersonal standards were changing while what they considered human needs remained the same. Over the course of a generation, however, many of these observers acknowledged the imprecision and permeability of cultural boundaries and widened their definition of acceptable leisure to include entertainments or works falling short of the lofty standards that had been bound up, during the earlier part of the twentieth century, with Shakespeare's plays or avant-garde art.

Concern about the potentially harmful effects of developments associated with modern life like new educational theories, television and automation profoundly affected the shape of post-war public discourse and cultural policy in Canada. Critics of the mass society favoured self-improvement, self-awareness and lively engagement with one's surroundings, and thought that without a creative sphere in which amorphous concepts like taste, nation, and tradition played prominent roles, a mature and independent Canadian culture could not be achieved. Increasing economic integration with the United States had long been cause for alarm, but in the years following the war, several commentators believed that their understanding of modernization and its dangers would allow them to preserve the sublime,

the genuine and the demanding against the convenience of new lifestyles and the abundance of a largely foreign mass culture. Their denunciations of pulp novels, 'science-worship' or conformity were often highly impressionistic assessments owing as much to each observer's own prejudices as to their experiences. Neither did they fully acknowledge the complexity or contingency of culture in ways that now seem perfunctory. Still, as I suggest in the pages that follow, suspicions about the extraordinary power of modern life and mass culture to affect the individual and society can be read as indicative of a peculiarly Canadian orientation towards cultural change, for the evidence shows that although such delusions were not widely held, much was done in their name.

### **Historiography**

If historians of Canada have all but abandoned the pre-Confederation period, as Allan Greer has suggested,<sup>2</sup> they have not done so with a vengeance by swarming to study the most recent half-century. As it has been written so far, the history of Canada from World War II through the 1960s has tended to be one of development, urbanization, dominion over new economic frontiers, a growing nationalism, and the continual updating of old party rivalries.<sup>3</sup> With the advent to Canada of social history during the 1970s, and a more recent interest in cultural history, generalists have on occasion nodded in the direction of 'everyday experience' or the 'arts community,' usually by including a chapter ill-matched to their interpretative strengths. That assessment is a simplified one, but it would be difficult to claim that a journalistic disposition towards the wartime and post-war years – towards reporting the political and economic events with which most newspaper readers would have been familiar – had not taken precedence over addressing more abstract questions of social or cultural change. Even the Second World War, one of the century's more cathartic moments now more than fifty years gone, has drawn few studies that look beyond paper

trails left by Ottawa's mandarins or battlefield memoirs to do more than account for a 'new maturity' abroad in the land after 1945.<sup>4</sup> The threats of fragmentation via Quebec nationalism or regionalism have combined to provide another powerful theme which, from the perspective of the cultural and intellectual historian, has been more satisfactorily approached. Historians, and more often others interested in prescribing remedies, have revisited the immediate post-war decades in order to unearth the roots of federal discord or an unfulfilled promise of harmonious multiculturalism, and have had to integrate social and cultural factors with the undeniable influence of high politics.<sup>5</sup> This historiographical note, however, aims primarily to acknowledge those works which attempt to interpret the wartime and post-war Canadian cultural landscape, and looks more specifically at how historians of Canada have (or have not) engaged the themes of modern life and mass culture.

In their tracings of the cultural contours of mid twentieth-century English Canada, a few observers have cited state involvement in that field as evidence of broader political trends or the search for an identity through cultural policy. Efforts to adjust to mass culture have become, in this formulation, functions of an awkward but devoutly-practised nationalism.<sup>6</sup> The idea of nation certainly has its place. Decades before the Second World War, members of an English-Canadian "elite" began their efforts to raise cultural standards and broaden access to what they considered worthy pursuits, frequently yoking such efforts to the task of cultivating nationhood. Some historical writing on Canadian culture during the early twentieth century is careful to maintain a distinction between these two projects.<sup>7</sup> Monographs on war remembrance, exhibitions, the interplay of religion and leisure, and shopkeeping have recently contributed to our understanding of popular culture and a public culture of commemoration between the late nineteenth century and the interwar period.<sup>8</sup> On occasion, Canadian historians have brought out works that set up compelling links between philosophy, belief, or ethics and action during those same years.<sup>9</sup> Such work,



however, is still in short supply for the post-World War II era.<sup>10</sup> Studies of individual 'thinkers' are a good start, in that they examine the lives and thought of some particularly observant Canadians with respect to more than purely economic or accompanying political development.<sup>11</sup>

There are, however, some studies that address the currents of post-war culture and bear further mention. Though her interest extends only to the early 1950s, Maria Tippet describes a process of continuity in which early twentieth century patterns of cultural activism extended through wartime and became state-sponsored. She sees

a gradually increasing concern with professional standards, on the one hand, and a 'national' culture, nationally organized, on the other. This concern sharpened during the Second World War and made an interest in fostering cultural life a principal objective of the cultural producers, politicians, and bureaucrats increasingly preoccupied with the task of post-war reconstruction. The cultural community particularly became convinced that it had a critical role to play in the lives of Canadians, and so began to lobby for government recognition, financial support, and administrative assistance.<sup>12</sup>

As advertised, Tippet's focus is on institutions – particularly museums and associations of artists – and she sees the Second World War as a watershed. She shows quite effectively how arts groups were able to lobby for recognition during the war, though her view of reconstruction as a *preoccupation* divorced from the effort of cultural development is a curious one. My study shows how the critique of mass culture and modern life drew upon the wartime energy surrounding the ideal of reconstruction, and how anticipation of a cultural and social 'great leap forward' hardened determination to establish identity by binding an idealized national character to high or folk culture; a resolve that eventually softened in time to allow Canada to be respectably marketed to itself during its Centennial year.

For historians, the chief legacy of this wartime awakening seems to have been the 1949-1951 Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences.

Paul Litt's book on the Massey Commission (as the commission is known) is a sensitive portrait of this institution, and includes a discussion of distaste for the type and quality of entertainments to which most Canadians had access.<sup>13</sup> His chapter on liberal humanism is an effective distillation of a particular kind of cultural ambition. However, he remains most concerned with the politics behind the promotion of particular kinds of culture, and seems to stretch the elitism of the commission's namesake over an 'elite' group whose attachment to cultural democracy was nonetheless evident. We are presented with a story of influential highbrows at a point where such categories were beginning to break down. More recently, Ian McKay has shown that culture has become a field in which there are no disinterested parties; a field in which governments, researchers and those in the tourism business construct and maintain visions of a folk culture that become accepted as authentic.<sup>14</sup>

It is now more than ten years since Brian McKillop called for "an historical scholarship that is not parochial – one that recognizes that other national experiences can at times provide insights into the structures, dynamics, and contexts of culture that we may find of use in understanding our own cultural circumstance."<sup>15</sup> A few studies which treat "other national experiences" may be profitably held up to Canada for comparison, or at least to supply useful metaphors which can characterize, not reduce, more complex processes. A few of these are introduced in the essay on method below, which takes up the balance of my introductory remarks and outlines the priorities and limits of this project. More are presented at relevant points within the dissertation's chapters.

Perhaps English-Canadian cultural life itself has largely been a process of borrowing from British and American models, and to a lesser extent from other national groups. Certainly the dynamism and wealth of the United States have played increasingly important material and cultural roles since the Second World War, but we must remember this was a presence that did not go uncontested. Doug Owsen discounts – prior to the 1960s – the

possibility of lively resistance to continental integration, arguing in his 1996 study of the baby boom generation that after the war, Canadian society followed in the wake of its even more prosperous American counterpart and underwent a re-orientation towards youth and freedom from tradition.<sup>16</sup> His careful attention to the accompanying trends in popular culture seem to concede that youth were easily led, even as they were working up to rebellion. Though his notions of a domesticated fifties and an angry sixties sketch the dominant social trends of these years, the present study explores the obverse side of the re-orientation he noted, not by following a generation through it, but by placing in context the thoughts of numerous men and women old enough to compare the post-war period to other times.

### **Essay on method**

This study is about maladjustment and complaint. During the period encompassing the Second World War and the generation or so following it, 'ordinary' English Canadians who were basically satisfied with their circumstances rarely generated the sort of documented discontent that historians can pick up years later and examine. As Keith Walden notes in his study of Toronto's Industrial Exhibition around the turn of the century: "country people were no more inclined than city residents to preserve emotional responses on paper."<sup>17</sup> This reminds us of one bias of documentary sources, which favour segments of the population like journalists and academics precisely because making public and sometimes emotional responses to their surroundings was expected of them. Soldiers, factory workers or farmers were no less affected by the conditions of modern life and, depending upon their tastes, no less joyfully transported or quickly repulsed by mass culture. They were, however, less likely to leave behind their views. Jonathan Vance's book on the memorialization of the First World War in Canada benefits greatly from its attention to

voices heard in the “less august fora of the small-town newspaper, the smoky Canadian Legion hall, and the IODE meeting[.]” and to the commemorative rituals “average Canadians” observed year after year.<sup>18</sup> When we look at wartime and post-Second World War commentary on modern life and mass culture, we see that commentators often had no quarrel with these “less august” local institutions. Their own roots and daily associations had shown them how vital an involvement in one’s own community could be in the face of a culture dominated by what became ‘popular.’

Though the discussion that follows is concerned with some articulate English-Canadians’ interpretations of their changing environment, it is not an attempt at collective biography. British author E.M. Forster – whose words supply the title for this dissertation because one of its subjects declared them part of his personal creed – also wrote about the amorphous and eclectic nature of ‘groups’ like the one whose fragmentary record forms my evidentiary base:

On they go – an invincible army yet not a victorious one.  
The aristocrats, the elect, the chosen, The Best People – all  
the words that describe them are false, and all attempts to  
organise them fail. Again and again, Authority, seeing their  
value, has tried to net them and to utilise them as the  
Egyptian Priesthood or the Christian Church or the Chinese  
Civil Service or the Group Movement, or some other worthy  
stunt. But they slip through the net and are gone; when the  
door is shut, they are no longer in the room; their temple, as  
one of them remarked, is the Holiness of the Heart’s  
Affection, and their kingdom, though they never possess it, is  
the wide-open world.<sup>19</sup>

For my present purposes, *concern* – rather than a shared set of credentials, affiliations or habits – brings together the main agents of a rather wide-ranging critique. The absence of an easily identifiable intellectual establishment in English Canada should not dissuade us from thinking and writing about how Canadians have approached complex themes. As one historian argued over twenty-five years ago, a conception of national identity that allows for

“contradiction, diversity and paradox” is more useful to us here than studying only the strands of thought that originated within Canada and refer only to Canadian experience: “The important activity is the assessment of how those ideas, whatever their origins, are handled within the Canadian context.”<sup>20</sup> Australian historian Nicholas Brown notes that one of his journalistic sources called the 1950s a “demoralising decade for those in the commenting business.” Regardless of whether the 1950s were as demoralizing or exhilarating for Canada, Brown’s identification of his sources as “a diverse grouping, including politicians, academics, advisers, bureaucrats, professionals, public intellectuals and commentators[.]”<sup>21</sup> serves as an apt characterization of those who populate this study. The more profound reflections upon contemporary society and its dominant culture were most likely to come from people living for – and earning a living by – voicing the discomfort others could or would not.<sup>22</sup>

Usually lacking formal frameworks over which they could drape their discontent and doomed to rail at forces largely beyond their control, critical observers nonetheless threw into sharper relief the anxieties that accompanied the interminable process of becoming modern. Northrop Frye wrote that “the habitually worried and anxious attitude of the more responsible citizen has a significance out of proportion to its frequency.”<sup>23</sup> Even though this type of citizen represented an extremely small proportion of the population, eavesdropping on their reactions to a rapidly-changing wartime and post-war environment provides us with a clearer sense of how such people – as American cultural historian Jackson Lears put it – “experienced and articulated moral and psychic dilemmas which later became common in the wider society.”<sup>24</sup> Listening to what this bunch had to say about some exceedingly slippery concepts is one of our best opportunities to learn how distinctive Canada’s post-war bout of modernization and cultural anxiety was. One historian of intellectuals and their experience in the realm of adjudicating culture contended that even histories of

popular/mass culture (and this distinction will be addressed):

cannot simply be a history of producers – artists, the culture industries, the impersonal narrative of technological “progress” – and/or a history of consumers – audiences, taste markets, subcultures. It must also be a history of intellectuals – in particular, those experts in culture whose traditional business is to define what is popular and legitimate taste, who supervise the passports, the temporary visas, the cultural identities, the threatening “alien” elements, and the deportation orders, and who occasionally make their own adventurist forays across the border.<sup>25</sup>

Classifying and evaluating contemporary life and culture is a calling few people pursue, and this does not make the results of such work any less complex or elusive. Daniel LeMahieu, whose work on interwar Britain has aided the conceptualization of this study, uses the term “cultivated élites” to denote a “deliberately ambiguous, fluid category embracing writers, artists, musicians, academics, and a variety of other educated individuals” whose response to the mass media was at best “an intricate mosaic of shifting opinions among complicated individuals who could not agree among themselves.”<sup>26</sup> Whether acting alone, or from within associations whose memberships and fortunes waxed and waned, the “worried and anxious” citizens’ approach to the social and cultural implications of modern life (especially mass culture) was decidedly *unpopular*. It was not derived from the will of ‘the people,’ but rather operated on the premise that the vast public was in need of guidance if it was ever to discern “what had happened hitherto” and act wisely. Though a number of commentators despaired of this guidance ever originating from within a deluded mass itself, the political temper of mid twentieth-century Canada suggested rather strongly that *democracy* was the only acceptable foundation upon which to build post-war society.

Despite their ability to bring culture to the attention of policymakers, cultural critics could not transform the state’s tacit approval of their tastes into immediate or effective authority over public behaviour. Antonio Gramsci spoke of intellectuals as “the dominant

group's 'deputies' exercising the subaltern functions of social hegemony and political government." While the vocal individuals and organizations that populate this study advocated the maintenance of certain cultural standards, they were hardly unthinking functionaries of the government or even a ruling class. If anything, their consistent exposure of the contradictions and difficulties imposed upon the general public by modern life and mass culture had the potential to undermine the very processes of social conformity and consumer hypnotism that built efficient nations and corporate fortunes.

Certainly they contributed to the more orderly conduct of the Second World War as writers and broadcasters nudging the public towards maintenance of the *status quo* at home, but critics of mass culture and the technocratic society stood for the most part outside what Gramsci referred to as the "prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production[.]"<sup>27</sup> and spoke in strident, but ineffectual tones of humanist indignation. They wanted an answer to the kind of fundamental questions about mass culture that historian Richard Pells first articulated and film scholar Anna Siomopoulos has since rendered more succinct: "whether this new American institution would promote self-government or a passive, conformist citizenry incapable of democracy; whether the aesthetics of mass production would provide a model for collective and cooperative action, or destroy the moral content of experience."<sup>28</sup> Morley Callaghan advised a panellist on the radio forum programme he hosted that the underlying purpose of debating public affairs over the radio was to register disappointment at a range of current conditions. "[W]e want to put the idea across," he wrote, "that men of the younger generation today won't be content to let the world drift aimlessly along on the worn-out wheels of the old liberal capitalist bandwagon."<sup>29</sup>

Our anxious Canadians were far from uniform in their opinions, and given my interest in their critical responses, it would be difficult to portray them as an elite in quite the

same way that Mary Vipond presented the Canadian intelligentsia of the 1920s, as a group containing “not so much social critics as aspiring social leaders and moulders of public opinion.”<sup>30</sup> Many came from privileged backgrounds in which opportunities to travel or spend time becoming educated were plentiful, so the term elite would certainly not be incorrect. However, they were equally likely to offer innovative responses to new cultural irritants, and to join or work with governmental commissions or volunteer organizations to provide the sort of unimpeded access to the arts and community life that most among them considered the unfulfilled promise of democracy. In some cases, the voices I present are those of ordinary citizens whose opinions on modern life and mass culture have survived for me to stumble across. One playwright and broadcaster maintained that the arts were not the preserve of one economic class or a group apart from the ‘common’ people, but served as the “sensitive antennae of the community, feeling toward the evolutionary path of historic change.”<sup>31</sup> If this image seems too abrupt a break from an elite model, we might also consider them a kind of *democratic clerisy* operating “above society’s normal activities.”<sup>32</sup> Paul Gorman notes that the subjects of his work on left-liberal critics of popular culture in the U.S. were such a clerisy, for they could be “concerned for the state of the lower classes and ... defend them actively while still maintaining the superiority and universality of their own standards for the arts.” In Canada during the war, a new kind of intellectual and cultural elite was emerging; one that, as Gorman put it: “justified its superior standing by its devotion to practicing democracy.”<sup>33</sup>

‘Sensitive antennae’ or ‘democratic clerisy’ are names too unwieldy for the people whose complaints I follow. In his study of advertising, Jackson Lears uses the term *cultural critics* to denote a group that “had a tendency to view the United States – and, indeed, the modern world – through the standardizing lens of ‘mass society’ theory.”<sup>34</sup> Ultimately, Lears urges his readers to look beyond such judgements to the connections between advertising



and an older vision of abundance, but his term of reference is nonetheless useful here. I have used *cultural critics* or simply *critics* with the understanding that this expression is not a job description but refers to a proclivity for putting some aspect of modern life or mass culture under analysis. It suggests a critique not only of cultural forms themselves, but of the very environment(s) that shaped those forms. Again, the idea that there existed new, complex and interdependent contexts in need of thoughtful interpretation was the stock-in-trade of that group of Canadians who, like their foreign counterparts, used terms like *mass society* quite comfortably.

With the 'linguistic turn' now a familiar departure for many researchers regardless of their discipline, it should be plain that language is always imperfect shorthand for often unfathomable structures and processes. That fact should not discourage us. The motley band of "artists, students, non-academic social scientists and workers" that formed the British research group Mass-Observation in 1937 were never accused of excessive orthodoxy, yet historians now view their notes and thoughts on a variety of social settings as articulate reflections on life in the years just preceding World War II. Certainly the group could, and did, draw its data into summaries and conclusions, but they did so in the belief that still more observation would yield a more subtly-shaded portrait of a complex cultural system. Wherever sociological, anthropological or literary theory seemed to be clearly applicable to the evidence presented here, I have endeavoured to make such connections. However, this dissertation takes no *overarching* theoretical framework as its guide, proceeding in much the same spirit as the anonymous 'Mass-Observer' who, in describing the crush of holiday-makers that travelled to Blackpool every year between June and October, noted:

The crowd has an automatic tendency towards release from the constraints of time. This is worthy of immediate study by all competent revolutionaries, but little has been done beyond the rubbish written by theorists like Le Bon – whose book is widely accepted as a standard. It is better to theorise no more

until much field work has been done.<sup>35</sup>

Relatively little ‘field work’ has been done in mid twentieth-century Canadian cultural history, and no single study will alter that picture drastically. Before proceeding, it would be best to offer concise working definitions for two frequently-used terms, bearing in mind that like the signs and often unconscious practices that inform culture, our understandings of the language involved in representing it are contingent and always contestable.

*modern life* – The title of this study advertises an examination of English-Canadian responses to ‘modern life’ during a given period. Here, that means conditions arising from the standardization, commodification and mechanization of work and leisure which began well in advance of World War II, as well as the attendant social and cultural norms and pressures these changes brought to bear. Historians and others have used ‘modernity’ as a way of referring to this state, and in his seminal work, *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air*, Marshall Berman draws attention to a paradox in what he calls the “experience of modernity,” noting that: “People who find themselves in the midst of this maelstrom are apt to feel that they are the first ones, maybe the only ones to be going through it ... however, great and ever increasing numbers of people have been going through it for close to five hundred years.”<sup>36</sup> I use *modern life* to represent this experience because that term addresses changes in lifestyle and culture in much the same way critics did. In 1938, educational activist E.A. Corbett spoke of the “swiftly changing panorama of modern life[,]” indicating a sense of motion or displacement that had long before become a common way of referring to everyday experience.<sup>37</sup> For men and women like Corbett, the possibility of autonomy from the rhythms of the city and factory dwindled as living seemed to become what one historian has called “a race against death for achievement.”<sup>38</sup>

For this examination of a cultural critique, it is important to reiterate that modern life connotes a set of conditions in which the social foundations of culture undergo

significant and accelerated changes, and culture itself becomes on the whole more uniform as people in widely-separated communities can listen to the same broadcasts or see the same movies. Warren Susman noted that early twentieth century critics could perceive this connection:

As if the full consequence of living in a machine age – an age of an industrial civilization in which new technology brought about changes in the material base of society that were altering patterns of social organization and structure – was not problem enough, there was also a growing awareness of subtle changes in the value structure as well, changes in part precipitated by the operations and needs of that very industrial civilization.<sup>39</sup>

I am primarily concerned with exactly that sort of awareness, and especially with mid-century English Canadian observers' bewilderment, anger or dismay at their shifting surroundings. Their approach to modern life as a prerequisite for mass culture is extremely important. For them, modern life was the state in which the individual suffered while "[t]he masses became recognized as the key constituency, imagined and figured as an often-undifferentiated grouping with putatively common desires and aspirations."<sup>40</sup> In the eyes of cultural critics, attempts to satisfy mass desires seemed particularly at odds with Canada's cultural and national destiny.

*mass culture* – An early-1950s attempt by two American anthropologists to classify the various definitions of *culture* and to trace the term's development yielded 164 variants, and since then neither formal nor working definitions have become any simpler.<sup>41</sup> Still, a good basic definition of mass culture comes from Canadian historian Paul Rutherford, who defines it as "products, services, and practices manufactured by the communications, advertising, education, sports, leisure and recreation industries to serve a huge market of consumers."<sup>42</sup> The key concepts here are manufacture and distribution, which carry rather strong industrial connotations. I qualify Rutherford's definition with a third element, namely

*commerce*. The perception that mass culture constituted a segment of the cultural spectrum in which considerations of profit consistently trumped aesthetic choices helped critics differentiate their hopeful visions for a refined Canada from the narrow gaze of the entertainment business. When they responded to what they considered the commercialization of contemporary culture by lending support to centrally-organized local arts initiatives or the mass distribution of ‘cultural’ programming, they did not do so as entrepreneurs.

Because critics’ assumptions about mass culture and the audience are central to defining the way mass culture operates here, I will address very briefly what I consider the main conceptual difference between *mass* and *popular* culture. Popular culture, according to one widely-accepted definition, consists of “beliefs and practices, and objects through which they are organized, that are widely shared among a population.”<sup>43</sup> When speaking about culture we often use the terms mass and popular interchangeably, and we do so in imitation of some distinguished mid-century minds.<sup>44</sup> In doing so, however, we acknowledge mass culture’s role as the now-dominant supplier of common points of reference. It is not, however, the only supplier that has ever existed. Mass-produced points of reference may have overwhelmed or transformed popular ones that developed prior to or independent of them – the department-store Santa Claus has conquered Saint Nicholas – but we need to preserve the distinction. It is true that what Rutherford called the “products, services and practices” that comprise mass culture very often *become* widely shared and thereby form part of popular culture – but I contend that they can only ever be a *subset* of it. Though mass-produced culture may be the source of much we share, observers have for some time suggested that it cannot be entirely synonymous with the broader range of possibilities that make up the popular – or as Raymond Williams more aptly calls it – the *common* culture.<sup>45</sup>

During the past two decades, researchers in the fields of cultural history and cultural

studies have expended considerable energy examining entertainments or practices which have become popular, and have often asked how much power or resistance cultural producers and consumers have exerted or indeed *can* exert in the creation or reception of films, novels, broadcasts or other manifestations of culture.<sup>46</sup> A less frequently-asked question is: What happens when well-meaning cultural ‘authorities’ intervene? I attempt to answer that question by examining the preconceptions English-Canadian cultural critics brought to their mid-century interventions – interventions which specifically addressed new modes of living and leisure. As it happened, critics had some means (political and social influence, access to a budding state cultural apparatus) to further their aims. These means ranged in their complexity from single articles in journals with small circulations, to briefs submitted to Royal Commissions by citizens’ groups, to a radio (later radio and television) forum series that would last for more than twenty years. We can study such efforts and the motivations behind them more easily than we can apprehend popular opinion on mass culture, which market researchers polled relatively infrequently and then only in the interest of making a narrow range of cultural products even narrower by making it less offensive.<sup>47</sup>

Historian Lawrence Levine disparages histories which view consumers of popular culture (his preferred term) as passive and powerless. He offers an alternative – the image of popular culture as ‘the folklore of industrial society’ – and conceives of it as an “interaction between complex texts that harbor more than monolithic meanings and audiences who embody more than monolithic assemblies of compliant people.”<sup>48</sup> While Levine’s focus is somewhat at odds with that employed here in that he studies popular culture instead of mass culture as a critical category, his central image is useful in that it indicates the impossibility of separating culture from its social context, and the folly of presenting audiences as automatons gladly consuming whatever is set in front of them. The empowered consumer can, and does, construct popular culture. Levine admits, however, that

critics rarely tried to understand this cultural 'give and take' in such sympathetic terms: "it was the critics and scholars who were often incapable of making distinctions, of comprehending that the culture they were examining or critiquing was not all formulaic pabulum with no substantive or stylistic distinctions."<sup>49</sup>

Levine's assessment applies reasonably well to Canada during and after World War II, even though critics began to adopt a more holistic and inclusive vision of culture. While literary scholar John Carey is wise to point out that "intellectual phobias about the mass are ... circular and self-deluding (for the mass is invented by the intellectual whom the invention gives pain to),"<sup>50</sup> such "delusions" nonetheless kept critics vigilant and thereby had considerable effect on the shape of Canada's cultural policy. However misguided or unsubtle their readings of a culture in which mass entertainments were becoming increasingly influential, we must pay closer attention to the way in which cultural critics represented the sort of culture they supported (lively local arts scenes, social activism, the creation of community/regional/national mythologies, the cultivation of one's own tastes) as integral to the realization of a Canadian identity. Critics believed that mass culture had become the folklore of industrial society *undeservedly*; that the passivity, simplicity, and conformity characterizing mass society were – to some extent – the by-products of a mentally-taxing modern life. The archetypal mass man may never have existed in Canada, but critics whose own traditional authority had been largely circumvented by the mass media still had need to invent him. ①

Even societies which colonial status or geography kept from developing rigidly hierarchical social structures of their own still accord their more literate and learned members a role in categorizing culture. Critics themselves may not have been successful at influencing tastes – in fact they may have been far less influential than the wealthy members of society whose lifestyles the middle and lower classes emulated – but it was rare to

encounter observers who did not subscribe to some variation on the high-low method of categorization, even outside the group whose social identities were served by maintaining it. There existed a sense that Canadians were being deprived of cultural forms either more refined or more relevant to their circumstances than most of the fare the U.S.-dominated cultural industries supplied. Convinced of the incompatibility of high and low, academic and sometime broadcaster J.M. Ewing declared: "If we are made familiar with bad art – and this is our unhappy plight – we can scarcely be expected to occupy our leisure with any other variety."<sup>51</sup> As I endeavour to show, however, the post-war period was one during which critics began to promote cultural uplift by blurring the distinction between 'highbrow' and 'middlebrow' and advocating regulation of the mass media to protect those cultural forms they classified as edifying or essential to Canadian cultural autonomy. They hoped to superimpose their own tastes and sense of identity upon the common culture, the range of activities and cultural works to which everyone has access. ()

Although mass culture became a more visible target for criticism, it is necessary to recall that critics' assumptions also reflected their dismay at the stresses, priorities and incongruities of modern life. Philosopher George Grant came to recognize the impossibility of ignoring the social conditions that favoured the development of a mass society, and to despair of overnight solutions:

Individuals are not in a position where they can accept and reject their culture in this simple way and shape history by such choices alone. We cannot choose to be independent of the forces that make our mass culture far too profound simply to be thought away. The belief that the forms of society can be easily changed by our choices is a relic of the faith in liberalism, and as limited as most of that liberal faith.<sup>52</sup>

Few others shared this profound distrust in a proactive cultural strategy, and even Grant had to work up to it. More pervasive was the conviction that the general public needed to be

made aware of its predicament, to be shown what it was missing at a time when technical expertise and a kind of blissful homogeneity appeared to have the upper hand. The promise of self-determination implicit in the Second World War's democratic faith seemed so much at odds with the realities of 1950s life that Canadian cultural critics began to conflate the respective plights of the individual within the mass society and the nation within the North American continent. 0

The concept of *democracy* is important to this study, but my work is not about the political uses of the democratic ideal, nor does it profess to advance our knowledge of Canadian politics. Given the variety of party affiliations (when we can discern them) among critics of modern life and mass culture, to ask whether Conservatives regarded the humanities with a greater degree of admiration than members of the CCF/NDP would be to subject a complex base of evidence to categories and judgements altogether too arbitrary. Describing critics as the heirs of a particular political tradition is difficult. They were conservative in that they opposed the ephemeral character of mass culture and the alienation from tradition that distinguished modern life. In some respects, they resembled what one historian called 'cultural conservatives' rather well, a group who "find that society really is not much interested in their ideas and that they are in a real sense superfluous to the basic concerns of their own culture."<sup>53</sup> Conversely, the perspective they were trying to defend also had much in common with nineteenth-century liberalism. We can identify the impulse to edify or improve society with a liberalism divorced from the perpetuation of traditional social structures, one that "looked forward to the gradual extension of democracy to all social classes and eventually to all nations."<sup>54</sup> Any search for a definitive way of attaching a political label to cultural criticism is not helped by the likes of historian W.L. Morton, who saw his political party of choice, the Conservatives, as the heirs of this liberal tradition.<sup>55</sup> Also, Louis Greenspan notes that the left has appropriated George Grant's anti-



imperialism, but ignores his attachment to religion. The right has adopted his religious thought, but largely ignores his critique of corporate greed.<sup>56</sup> Liberals brought the Massey Commission – for some the beginning of culture’s institutionalization in Canada – into being, but the conservative weekly *Saturday Night* had long before provided a standing forum for critics of mass culture and the complexities of modern life.

Both left and right saw their visions of the desirable society and its culture as victims of what had become, by the 1940s, the modern status quo. Cultural critics’ political leanings, or their divergent ideas about the role of the state, may have prevented them from openly lauding each other’s efforts, but they belonged to a critical community of thought whose borders were more permeable than those erected between the memberships of political parties. Much more important organizations than political parties in this regard were voluntary arts and educational associations, whose priorities were the protection and transmission of sometimes quite specific values and ideals. Characterized by one scholar as “umbrella organizations for mandarins,”<sup>57</sup> these organizations, especially the Canadian Association for Adult Education (CAAE), are more accurately viewed as drawing their members from populist rural social movements and urban elites.<sup>58</sup>

The themes explored in this study necessitated some difficult research choices, but I believe these have been sound ones. Most obvious is the focus on English Canada. There are too many generalizations here already, and extending these over what is certainly a distinct segment of Canada’s population would have turned this into a comparative study, half of which would then be based upon bad translations. While introducing his second season of ‘cultural’ broadcasts during the war, critic and playwright John Coulter promised that he would listen vigilantly for the “kindling of the spirit to speak of the things of today in terms of today.”<sup>59</sup> Historians cannot hope for such immediacy, but we can try to bring representative and often contradictory voices to the attention of the reader. I have

attempted to listen closely to English Canadians. Accordingly, the overwhelming majority of sources consulted for this dissertation were primary. They consist of both manuscript collections and published or broadcast works, more specifically: critics' personal or organizational papers, pamphlets, broadcast transcripts, articles, books and occasionally even advertising. I undertook complete reviews of three periodicals which ran through the entire period from 1939-1967: *Canadian Forum*, *Maclean's* and *Saturday Night*. While the first and last of these were limited in their circulation compared to *Maclean's*, all three consistently included more than descriptive reflections on contemporary issues. American and British periodicals like *Dissent*, *Partisan Review* or *Scrutiny* – hotbeds of cultural criticism – certainly had small and faithful readerships in Canada, but their Canadian imitators were generally short lived. Wherever possible, however, I have mined these smaller publications for commentary.

The voice of 'the people' may seem curiously absent here. Given the nature of this project, it was difficult to conceive of just where to look for popular reactions to modern life and mass culture. Did the Canadian Institute for Public Opinion take public opinion polls on a range of topics? Yes, but my purpose here is to assess in a *qualitative* way how Canadians responded to the proliferation of mass culture and the pressures of modern life. Did an auto worker in Windsor write to a friend about feeling useless at work after his area of the plant became automated? Possibly, and a series of such letters or an automation study group would have rated attention had they turned up. Beyond the issues of research expediency and richness of sources, the most salient reason for not pursuing the 'popular' perspective here is the position of the people as an *object* in the critique of mass culture. How can anyone have reflected upon the effects modern life had on the average person without professing some distance from that person? Critics were convinced that they could empower the public by helping it – often over the radio, yet one at a time – to recognize its

place within a troubling new order. People who could say, even in the most rudimentary manner, that some forms of culture existed for no other reason than easy reproduction and sale had thereby excused themselves from the modern mass, even though they still might choose to attend cowboy movies. Additionally, the reproduction and redistribution of canonical or 'authentic' works or practises (i.e. middlebrow culture) also became an acceptable way of transcending one's subjugation to prevailing trends. In plainer terms, reaching beyond the most convenient cultural option was more than half the battle. Certainly many of those who provided the observations and opinions I analyze here used a rather inclusive "we" when they offered a strategy for coping with consumerism or a remedy for the inanity of the soap opera, but it was nonetheless their benevolent and knowing tone of concern that marked them as possessors of a secret understanding.

Despite the lonely nature of a critique in which critics wrote and spoke as if they were at best a tiny coterie of the alert toiling in obscurity, it is probably most idiosyncratically Canadian that several of the trails pursued during the research phase of this project came to involve the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) in one way or another. Whether portrayed as the salvation of Canada or as a 'government monopoly,' this organization which grew by leaps and bounds from the 1940s through the 1960s was expected to do more than broadcast popular fare, essentially because it was not intended to be a creature of the commercial marketplace, having from its inception defied prevailing economic wisdom by attempting to serve the entire country.<sup>60</sup> Radio, and later television, overcame the time and space separating most Canadians from those centres in which artists and writers had settled. Historian Paddy Scannell notes that "[i]n modern societies radio and television are part of both the background and foreground of our everyday dealings with each other in a common world."<sup>61</sup> Broadcasts, perhaps even more than exhibitions arranged via university extension departments or drama festivals, represented the foundations of an

accessible national culture.<sup>62</sup> In the same way that organizations like the CAAE or the Canadian Institute of Public Affairs (CIPA) contained a significant proportion of those interested in broad social and cultural trends, the CBC served as an outlet for opinion on weightier questions, as policy and programme choices for the corporation often reflected the tastes and desires of critics who were employed by the CBC or appeared regularly on it.

The frustrations addressed here did not arise with the beginning of the Second World War, and they were not by any means exclusively Canadian. It would be useful, then, to set the scene for my treatment of the years 1939-1963. Historians of early twentieth-century European culture cite discomfort with the mechanization of life, the proliferation of cheap, salacious literature, and the standardization of leisure.<sup>63</sup> Though this refrain of cultural and moral decay aided by the march of science and industry had already been raised for generations by the early 1930s, that period emerges as a time in which some Europeans given to reflecting upon the state of culture urgently expressed their dismay at the prospect of the masses 'coming to power'. Among these alarmed voices, Spanish critic José Ortega y Gasset's probably became the best known, but the years after 1930 were most notable for English speakers in that several earlier works, stretching back to Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy* (1869), through Gustav Le Bon's *The Crowd* (1895), Oswald Spengler's *Decline of the West* (1918) and Sigmund Freud's *Civilization and its Discontents* (1930) were either quickly translated into English, as the Ortega and Freud works were, or came out in new editions.<sup>64</sup>

During the first part of this century, although Canadians had unprecedented contact with a range of international practitioners and works in the arts and literature, the American cultural presence in Canada dwarfed that of Great Britain and other nations. Still, the conviction remained that American culture "could be accepted because it posed no threat to Canada's British orientation and character: Canadians might be socially American ... but they continued to function within a British and imperial framework, a fact which would

prevent them from being absorbed by their southern neighbour.”<sup>65</sup> Late in the 1930s, even those who were aware of the many avenues along which American customs and enthusiasms had influenced Canadian daily life, and who were keen to see this reality acknowledged in Canadian literature, could not deny that the Empire tie remained strong. Authors Morley Callaghan and William Deacon noted with some disappointment that educators perpetuated the British attachment with the most vigour: “Every kind of pressure is brought to bear to keep up the Canadian tradition of having one foot in the European world, one foot in North America and the head up in the clouds.”<sup>66</sup>

Callaghan and Deacon found what they considered the pretence of Britishness frustrating, but it was the “Canadian tradition” they described – a tendency of looking to both the British and American scenes – that most influenced English-Canadian ideas about mass culture and modern life before World War II. This duality would continue to play a role in wartime and beyond. Though Britain’s penny press and other distractions could be as lurid as their American counterparts, English Canadians given to expressing their opinions on matters of culture continued to recollect and represent Old Country life as more genteel. Despairing of Canada’s cultural poverty in 1934, Arthur Lower extolled the richness of the European (especially the British) tradition and set forth a number of conditions remaining to be met before Canada acquired the rudiments of a worthwhile national culture. Since New York was already entrenched as the North American metropolis, it would be practically impossible for Toronto to take up the same role in a nation already operating under a continental pattern – another variation on the colonial theme – which catered to a mass taste defined in the United States. Sensing the literal and figurative oceans between the seats of high and ‘popular’ culture in the English-speaking world, Lower reckoned Canada’s position adrift somewhere in between, concluding that “Our popular culture is not our own, no more than our culture in the more technical sense.”<sup>67</sup>

American observers vexed by low and even middlebrow culture, and there were several of them,<sup>68</sup> could not perceive as threateningly alien much of the mass entertainment that became popular in the 1920s and 1930s in quite the same way as their counterparts in Canada. It was, at least, a phenomenon that had sprung from among themselves. Social scientists there began to recognize mass entertainments as an integral part of the American urban fabric relatively early in the interwar period, effectively dividing a waning conservative critique of mass culture from a rising left-liberal one.<sup>69</sup> Despite thriving pockets of ‘high’ culture in the US, from which touring companies frequently ventured north of the border, observers in Canada tended to identify newer forms of entertainment, leadership in technology and material pursuits with the Great Republic; and to see what Lower called “culture in the more technical sense” as having originated and continuing to flourish in Europe.<sup>70</sup> By the 1930s, sixty years after the introduction of universal education in Britain, a number of thinkers there believed that basic literacy, movies and radio had opened up a marketplace for culture in which the instincts and interests of the masses could be served without requiring them to dwell upon life’s more meaningful questions, and were hastening the advent of a culture too base to be endured.<sup>71</sup> A colonial link, a common language, and a shared position as consumers of American works that dominated the popular field made the British critique more accessible in Canada.

The situation in Britain seemed dire enough, but to British observers, North American culture had gone even further down the road in its adulation of the popular. Perhaps the richest period examples of this may be found in C.E.M. Joad’s 1926 monograph, *The Babbitt Warren*, an extended treatment of America’s decadence and Britons’ alarming capacity for emulating it, or Gamaliel Milner’s attempt to link the fall of Rome with modern British tendencies.<sup>72</sup> Being North Americans who nonetheless implicitly valued Old Country opinions, some Canadians concurred, though not without considerable helpings of

self-deprecation. In an unpublished short story written in the late 1930s, University of New Brunswick economist Burton Keirstead invented a wit called Philip Gerrard who personified an upper-class British abhorrence for mundane pursuits, sensational literature, and the irredeemable sameness of the masses. As Gerrard leaves England accompanied by the story's principal character John Forsey, a Canadian he met at Cambridge, he looks out over the throng of ship-goers at Southampton and wonders why he has been "so solemnly ambitious to waste my life trying to do something for people in the mass, because they always depress me so. I never feel so cynical as in a great crowd." During one of his subsequent trips to Canada, Forsey's wife Nora tells Gerrard: "There is nothing you can say in Canada which will make you smell worse to Canadians than to confuse them with Americans[.]" With that, she sets Gerrard ranting:

They're all the same, so far as I can see. All suffer from the same hoof and mouth diseases, all offend with B.O. all lose their jobs because they don't shave with the proper razors, all wear the same clothes, drive the same cars, suffer the same clichés to pass in lieu of thoughts, read the same drivel and send their young to schools that 'pay dividends in character when your boy gets into business'. Now mind you I don't pretend to have been in this country for more than thirty-six hours, but I have studied the popular magazines.<sup>73</sup>

This work contains five chapters which explore the dispositions and desires of some Canadians who professed to have studied the popular magazines and a good deal besides. The chapters emphasize particular themes, but remain chronological in their sequence. The first two chapters overlap in that they both treat events occurring during wartime, but they are not to be read as a narrative of consecutive highlights in the wartime critique of modern life and mass culture. In fact, Chapter One introduces the idea that there existed a 'culture of reconstruction' through which critics and their allies hoped to set the nation on a sound post-war cultural footing. The second chapter explores how critics were able to link

developments they despised at home with various enemy characteristics, and make their case for cultural democracy. The third examines the tension between science and religion through the eyes of critics, and features a case study dealing with scientific programming on the radio. The fourth and fifth chapters treat the 1950s and early 1960s by forming a tandem in much the same way as the opening pair of chapters did. Chapter Four looks behind the state's more overt involvement in cultural policy, and critics' deep pessimism about the efficient blandness of North American society. The fifth chapter outlines a shift toward recognizing a broader definition of culture during the late fifties and early sixties, as concern over national identity mounted. A short conclusion follows.

In 1948, one of *Saturday Night's* editorial staff, Willson Woodside, echoed American commentator Richard Weaver in denouncing the notion that progress in other areas of life meant cultural progress. Woodside reviewed Weaver's book *Ideas Have Consequences* most favourably, spending two and a half columns on its importance, and then interjecting breathlessly:

That is only his introduction. I have given it at some length to induce thoughtful people, who have been pondering on where the sensational press, the debased movies, the flood of crime fiction and "comics", the abandonment of the classical studies for more "useful" ones, mass living in the cities, the decline in religious belief, the loss of pride of work or craftsmanship, and other modern trends are carrying us, to get and read this book.<sup>74</sup>

This dissertation considers how cultural critics treated those same themes – and a few others – as critics spoke to a group Woodside called "thoughtful people." Noting critics' sense of detachment from the forces controlling modern life and mass culture is central to understanding Canadian society during the middle part of this century. As outsiders who could not stop asking difficult questions, the processes by which they had been rendered



outsiders fascinated them, and their sense of frustration was only exceeded by a desire to broadcast or inculcate their own perceptions and standards.

In patrolling the borderlands between high and low, looking to uphold all that seemed tasteful, edifying, educational or inspired and to dismiss the vulgar, vapid, anti-intellectual or derivative, the English Canadian cultural critic found ways to make distinguishing between these varieties of culture an expression of identity. By projecting the message that mass culture was producing Canadians who were somehow *less themselves*, critical observers who frequently had access to space in magazines and to the resources of the national broadcaster also made the vast middle ground between high and low effectively their own. Their critique helped ensure that when Canadians survey their cultural surroundings (domestic and foreign) they do so at least partially (and sometimes ironically) on the basis of how these might nourish starving intellects or erode national mythologies. This is not necessarily a bad thing. If English Canadians are today more familiar with the ways in which modern life and mass culture surround and define them, if they live in a nation where private citizens and cultural institutions view the media as avenues of entertainment, as businesses, or as the means to construct identity, they should be aware of the role of wartime and post-war cultural critics – however elitist or unbidden their contributions might have been – in struggling to balance the undeniable social benefits of democracy and modernization with their apparent cultural drawbacks. Studying critical disappointment at some outcomes of the subtle and symbiotic relationship between modern life and mass culture offers an opportunity – at least in the context of Canada's recent past – to understand a little more fully how life intimidates art.

## One – “unbearable superbity”: The Culture of Reconstruction

If we are to get and keep this new world of which we hear,  
we must be mentally well-nourished and mentally tough.<sup>1</sup>

B.K. Sandwell, 1941

Just as it would have been practically impossible to live in Canada during wartime and not gather that a war was on, so too was talk of the post-war world to which *Saturday Night* editor Sandwell referred almost unavoidable. By 1943, although millions were involved in the war effort overseas or on the homefront, it seemed plain that the “favorite indoor sport for thousands of Canadians, including government officials and professional politicians, university professors, welfare workers and just plain everyday citizens, is post-war planning.”<sup>2</sup> The term most commonly identified with the anticipation of peacetime, and with the variety of activities undertaken in preparation for it, was *reconstruction*. Employed by politicians to evoke images of a prosperous nation grateful to those who served it in war, and by businesses to market the same old products as somehow re-engineered for a new era, the general excitement over reconstruction also presented an opportunity for critics of the cultural status quo to insist upon rehabilitation. Although they agreed with the oft-repeated lines that wartime had allowed Canada to modernize and to achieve an unprecedented maturity – especially in the areas of industry and international relations – putative seekers after a new order hoped Canada could be re-invented following the war as a nation of citizens who heeded their responsibilities and obligations to the community and the democratic tradition Canadians had undertaken to protect. Informed by some powerful assumptions about the kind of culture an unguided populace would embrace following the

war – namely a culture that was formulaic and geared towards a passive audience – critics and their allies hoped to foster conditions in which ‘folk’ and ‘high’ culture could prove their worth by making post-war leisure time not only entertaining but edifying.

The concept of planning figured prominently during the late wartime and early post-war period and, despite its potential for divisiveness in politics, formulating plans for peacetime appeared to be a promising way to avoid the disillusionment of the 1930s. The dream of a post-war common culture drawing upon local or regional traditions and ‘civilized’ activities seemed almost attainable in a wartime environment which helped cast the preservation and pursuit of such traditions and activities as indistinguishable from “active local citizenship of a positive constructive sort.”<sup>3</sup> Within a few months after war’s end, however, it seemed that the public had largely turned its attention back to enjoying the material benefits of modern life. Still, among those convinced that Canadians could become a cultivated people if exposed to the right sort of influences, such a precipitous return to normalcy would not do. These cultural critics employed modern means of communication like radio to absorb, refashion, and retransmit the rhetoric of reconstruction, advancing their critique of modern life and mass culture through an endorsement of local alternatives. Without the seemingly boundless confidence that reconstruction encompassed, it is doubtful that efforts to impart a basic appreciation of the Canadian and Western traditions would have become quite the “search for identity”<sup>4</sup> that has fascinated and frustrated the few generations since.

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, the example of the dozen or so years following the American Civil War suggested rather powerfully that reconstruction was a task only properly undertaken once fighting had ceased. By the middle of the First World War, both Canada and Great Britain had recognized the value of preparing for the armistice,

inaugurating reconstruction programs early but paying them little notice until relatively late in the conflict. As a consequence, planning for reconstruction did not become an integral part of the First World War experience. Its position among the committees and bureaucracies dedicated to administering the war reflected an early twentieth-century zeal for social reform, but it suffered from underpromotion and the belief that agitation for peacetime utopias should rank behind more immediate wartime concerns.<sup>5</sup> Given the historical connotations and career of reconstruction, even several months into the Second World War it could still seem presumptuous or incongruous to “discuss demobilization during a Recruiting Drive.”<sup>6</sup> In general, historians of Canada have tended to treat reconstruction as an economic or governmental issue, and even Paul Litt’s and Maria Tippet’s accounts of Canadian culture and cultural policy at mid century do not explore the concept as much more than an administrative moment.<sup>7</sup>

Nonetheless, talk of the opportunities the nation and its citizens would have in a world at peace arose early and surfaced consistently during World War II in Canada, and such talk was often consonant with discussion of the eventual demobilization of Canada’s armed forces and their re-integration back into civilian life. Illustrative of this symbiotic relationship between news of the war and bustle over reconstruction was one magazine writer’s explanation for a “resurgence of energy” among Canadians in the fall of 1942:

Isn’t it because we realize that here, at last, is something bigger than ourselves, which not only must be done, but which is worth doing well and at whatever cost? If we can translate something of this spirit into the reconstruction period Canada once again will become a land of opportunity.

Although this journalist attributed the energy he sensed to the engaging task of fighting a war, and conceived of reconstruction as a period distinct from wartime and succeeding it, his further request for “a wide and healthy consideration of the spirit of reconstruction”<sup>8</sup>

indicated that such a spirit had entered public discourse well before war's end. An appeal to what was both a formally and informally acknowledged way of articulating material, social and cultural ambitions for peacetime, this call to action joined literally hundreds of similar expressions of anticipation. Reconstruction was, in the words of one cultural critic, "a time when changes are expected by everyone and can reasonably be looked for."<sup>9</sup> Hope may have been deferred, but it did not go undeclared.

Elected authorities spoke of "Reconstruction" proper as beginning with the end of hostilities, and the mandates of Canada's two government-appointed committees on reconstruction reflected that definition.<sup>10</sup> The King government's well-publicized plans for post-war economic reconstruction helped make homefront austerity seem bearable; a reliance on experts and an adherence to social scientific precepts, building since the early part of the century, lent those exercises in sanguine speculation still more authority.<sup>11</sup> Still, by so plainly preparing during wartime for the domestic and external problems of readjustment that would accompany peace, these officials contributed to an environment which privileged planning and encouraged the production of reassuring, if somewhat illusory, post-war visions. The prospect of continued cordial relations between business and labour – an odd team thrown in tandem by the war – beyond wartime was only one such vision.<sup>12</sup> However improbable they seem in retrospect, dreams of co-ordinated goodwill or an enlightened democracy pervaded the discourse surrounding reconstruction. This study uses the term 'the culture of reconstruction'<sup>13</sup> to denote that environment and the accompanying complex of attitudes, opinions and aspirations directed (especially during wartime) toward the achievement of a more satisfying post-war society. Satisfaction, however, is relative to one's aims. Officially, "Reconstruction" was about easing the economic and occupational transition to peacetime, but the culture of reconstruction that leapt up around these more pragmatic intentions brought to light questions about the kind

of society that Canadians could (or should) build once the war ended. Indeed, it gave the question of the state's role in planning for the post-war a distinctly cultural cast. This chapter's purpose is not to depreciate the importance of the economic, diplomatic and social welfare issues that defined reconstruction for most Canadians, but instead to focus on the underexplored perception that wartime presented an opportunity to begin the rehabilitation of a Canadian culture considered lost to modern lifestyles and mass entertainments.

Although its initial power depended upon there being a war from which to emerge, the culture of reconstruction, or more correctly, the will to exploit it, did not evaporate suddenly at war's end. F.C. (Cyril) James, chair of the Advisory Committee on Reconstruction, warned in 1943 that "we shall not, upon the morrow of victory, enter into a brave new world. If we are to attain the ideals for which we are fighting, everyone of us must continue during the post-war period to work with an energy and determination comparable to that which has been displayed during the last two years."<sup>14</sup> Such *broad-based* dedication would prove, like the culture of reconstruction itself, "illusory and short-lived."<sup>15</sup> Nonetheless, when the burden of war lifted and hosts of Canadians sauntered away from their noble intentions to reap the material benefits of a more industrialized and urbanized Canada cultural critics maintained the energy and determination to create a society serious about maintaining lofty standards of citizenship and culture. For them, the culture of reconstruction was a singular atmosphere in which 'civilization' and the conditions necessary for its perpetuation had at long last received some of the attention they deserved. The most visible part of its legacy – taken up before the decade was out – was the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences.

Following a treatment of the culture of reconstruction, including a discussion of planning as a powerful and malleable synonym for the exertion of authority, the remainder of this chapter examines some of the ways cultural critics attempted to graft their own

vision of a reconstructed nation – one populated with citizens who would be more at home with the classics than comic books – onto the general enthusiasm for more tangible things to come. In addition to surveying some aspects of Canadian experience peculiar to the anticipation of peacetime, this chapter features some of those outgrowths of the culture of reconstruction through which the critique of mass culture and modern life found expression during the war and in the years immediately following it. The most well-known of these, *Citizens' Forum*, was an ambitious national public affairs radio series conceived around neighbourhood discussion groups. Its creators expected democratic encounters over post-war plans to promote an awareness of the individual's role in the community and a sensitivity to traditions that would guide behaviour, despite the rapid changes sure to characterize the transition from war to peace.

*Citizens' Forum* is one of the richest sources we have for exploring the culture of reconstruction and its place in the development of post-war cultural and social criticism, but it is not an isolated example. Reconstruction's appeal as a theme brought a range of strategies for cultural rehabilitation to light. Though presented separately here, these strategies nonetheless existed concurrently and should be considered as parts of the larger culture of reconstruction. In 1944, a collection of arts groups presented a united front to the Parliamentary Committee on Reconstruction, calling for aid in the struggle to maintain and augment public participation in the nation's cultural life. A movement to increase the number of community centres cited the pressures of modern life in arguing for the establishment of a network of these local havens for personal creativity and wholesome recreation. An organization initially dedicated to familiarizing foreign servicemen with Canada re-invented itself as the Canada Foundation after the war, taking up the mission of promoting a vibrant Canadian culture.

A mass public equipped, as critics insisted, for little else but consuming goods,

services and the latest dances haunted advocates of a Canadian culture that was to be reconstructed upon the foundation of the responsible individual. The critical response was to suggest that suitably edifying and, if possible, homegrown material, presented locally or thoughtfully disseminated through the same media that commercial culture employed to reach its audience, would in time wean listeners, readers and movie-goers from the offerings to which they had become accustomed in pre-war years. Though this longing for the cultivation of the discriminating – not necessarily ‘highbrow’ – citizen through decidedly ‘middlebrow’ channels proved too idealistic, those wishing to cast English Canada in a particular mould during the 1940s did much to shape a reinvigorated cultural nationalism that would develop in the generation to follow. Theirs was a response to the modern condition and mass entertainment that helped establish mitigation of the perceived effects of a commercial culture and an industrial society as an integral part of Canadian cultural criticism.

Despite this chapter’s contention that the critique of modern life and mass culture resonated with the culture of reconstruction, it would be imprudent to pass over the basic political and economic motivations behind reconstruction or the official bodies devoted to reconstruction without a brief acknowledgement. For most Canadians, the economic and social welfare components of reconstruction justified all the effort. Only as a kind of side-effect did the interest they generated in the post-war allow the prospect of reconstruction to become a vehicle for cultural and social criticism.

Over twenty years had gone by since the Great War, but a determination to avoid the mistakes of 1919 did not take long to surface once war began. Even though the failure of eleventh-hour diplomatic efforts to contain Axis aggression dampened spirits at the war’s outset, it soon became plain that the overall tendency was to reckon in terms of victory; a



tendency which one columnist attributed to a defiant reaction against the “sense of disillusion, in fact almost of defeatism, that was bequeathed to us by the last war and its aftermath.”<sup>16</sup> Others, however, saw such grim determination as an advantage in itself:

To reconstruct the world in the 1920's men made assumptions which have since proven false. They were over-optimistic about the fundamental goodness and intelligence of men; as a result their dreams did not come true. They passed on to the succeeding generation, a world certainly no better, and probably more dangerous, than the one that they inherited. Today, the statesmen of the world are not as optimistic about the coming state of perfection as they were in 1918. This is probably a healthy sign.<sup>17</sup>

Whatever Canada's government may have lacked in rank optimism, it made up for in sober preparations for the post-war period, though these hardly seemed to be forthcoming at first. Early in the war, some observers condemned the “persistence with which our leaders avoid all genuine discussion of the ‘way of life which we value above life’ and sidestep most policies which would make the values of that way of life more actual to the masses of the people upon whom the burdens of the war are bound to fall most heavily.”<sup>18</sup> Once it began meeting, Canada's Parliamentary reconstruction committee spent the bulk of its time determining how to employ and house returning soldiers and their families after the war, and how to manage the transition from war to a peacetime economy. Far from being schemes laid aside until needed, some of the committee's objectives affected wartime policy directly. Indeed, one important motivation behind wartime controls on prices, supply and other normally fluctuating economic factors was the need to cushion the economy, once peacetime capitalism was reinstated, against the same strains that followed World War I. Reconstruction plans were not a rehearsal for the post-war overhaul of the economic system.<sup>19</sup>

Though the creation of an Advisory Committee on Reconstruction under McGill

Principal F.C. James was not authorized until early September 1941, James himself later traced official interest back to December 1939, when a special order-in-council called for a committee of the cabinet to gather information on rehabilitation and reconstruction.<sup>20</sup> Foresight, it was thought, would allow Canada to fulfil a new role as an increasingly important part of the world community, and to avoid obstacles to the maintenance of peace. More pragmatically, Canada could sustain its own prosperity in ways that the makeshift solutions of the interwar period had not afforded. A year into the war, expatriate academic Julia Grace Wales commented that mere criticism of the social order would not transform passive citizens into active ones, and advocated a positive program to combat a “profound distrust of all institutions.”<sup>21</sup> The fact that academics like Wales made up James’s Advisory Committee was an admission that experts from many disciplines would be necessary for the adjustment to, as the University of New Brunswick’s J.R. Petrie called them, the new “social, economic, and political folkways” that would emerge from the war. Petrie believed that the universities and the humanities in particular were to play a special role in maintaining a ‘civilized’ perspective during such an abrupt transition:

[O]ur sanity must be preserved. It is perhaps a pardonable prejudice to maintain that sanity will be provided by the universities, where at least an attempt is made to assess values and reach conclusions by methods that lie beyond the political hustings and market places of popular prejudices.<sup>22</sup>

The task of telling the story of Canada’s official efforts in the field of post-war reconstruction – a detailed account of the King government’s struggle to direct the process of demobilization both before and after victory – has yet to be attempted although the aforementioned Donaghy collection of articles is a promising beginning. However, some of the programs associated with rehabilitation and reconstruction, like technical and university education offered to veterans, have become familiar signposts through their appearance in

historical writing on post-war life, because the extension of such opportunities to individuals has influenced the entire nation's course since 1945.<sup>23</sup> Viewed in the context of the social programs inaugurated during and after the Second World War, 'official reconstruction' may not have generated the sort of tangible changes that Leonard Marsh's 1943 report on social security envisioned, but it nonetheless helped reinforce a framework of expectation in which Marsh and others could propose their remedies.<sup>24</sup> The Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship (CCEC) saw reconstruction as enough of a public issue to constitute itself upon a vow to "assist all Canadians in reaching an understanding of the problems which arise from time to time relating to post-war reconstruction."<sup>25</sup> The act of looking toward V-days became a part of wartime culture, and the official committees on reconstruction lent a name and some focus to the anxiety over what to do after the war. Academic and broadcaster Arthur Phelps, like a number of his contemporaries, recognized that "our insistent problems are those associated with change and growth[.]" and noted that such an environment had its cultural uses, for it was a kind of working out of the modern world to see where Canada fit:

the mind and power accumulating as a function of democracy in farm and labour groups, our sense of a total multiple dynamic experience with insufficient educational and cultural agencies for its interpretation and integration, all these are part of the excitement that is for us Canada in the making in these days. We are in search of a society, we Canadians.<sup>26</sup>

Though we may be able to identify significant milestones in the government's reconstruction program, it would be difficult, and of little practical use, to discern the specific hour at which a culture of reconstruction first emerged in Canada. It is of primary importance to note that references to the post-war as a node of public interest date from the earliest phases of the war. In January 1940, one observer remarked on the difference a few months made: "Just as it was the custom, a year ago, to visualize the conditions of a new

war, so it is now becoming popular to think about the time of peace.”<sup>27</sup> Certainly by 1941, reconstruction was a common enough subject of debate that some were comfortable noting differences in the way the Allied nations handled preparations for the post-war period. “[M]ore attention [is] given on this side of the Atlantic to what is going to happen after the war than there is in Great Britain,” one writer declared, but rightly recognized that “more seems to be happening in Great Britain which has a direct bearing on the kind of world we are going to live in when the war is over.”<sup>28</sup>

Canada was at a safe distance from the war, and this physical separation from the various fronts allowed, in a relative sense, for more leisurely reflection upon what sort of society would result if and when the war brought victory; and consequently for more time to invest in bringing that result about through an enhanced public awareness of reconstruction efforts. By recalling the opportunities squandered after World War I, ‘win the peace’ – an international motto entrenched in Canadian pamphlet literature by 1941 – reminded the public that it was not enough to win the war; plans must be in place for peacetime.<sup>29</sup> Likewise, if volume of publications is a reliable indication, U.S. officials and opinion leaders were doing their best to make Americans reconstruction-minded early in their war.<sup>30</sup> Claris Silcox wrote to a friend, telling of his travels to the United States during the first few months of 1942 as a participant in “a number of ‘Win the War - Win the Peace’ institutes on the Pacific Coast.”<sup>31</sup>

Perhaps the most important element to be identified with ‘winning the peace’ was *planning* which, within the culture of reconstruction, functioned as an implicit belief that existing flaws could be designed out of the system. Although the critique of modern life and mass culture held no prominent place in discussions of post-war planning, noting concerns about the desirability of allowing authorities to plan aspects of one’s life, or doubts about the general public’s ability to do much beyond electing those who could formulate plans can

help us to understand the context in which reconstruction-era strategies for cultural improvement were launched. Espousing goals that were largely superfluous to the government's plans for economic and social reconstruction, and without a mandate to create authoritative agencies for cultural rehabilitation, cultural critics nonetheless developed their own strategies for an enlightened post-war Canada.

"It has almost become an adage," one observer remarked in the CAAE's journal, "that after the war the 'old grey World won't be what it used to be.' A new world culture is being created; Science is developing it; the flux of peoples and nations is giving it periodic, temporary form."<sup>32</sup> Dynamic and unpredictable as this new world culture may have been, in Canada planning was deemed necessary to control the economic consequences of the transition to peace, and as an individual strategy to ensure domestic security. Constructing an appropriate post-war blueprint for the nation was a job for experts elected or authorized to act in the public interest, and engaging in the act of planning for one's own family or business became a sign of conscientious citizenship.<sup>33</sup> Planning on the part of science and industry would ensure the continuation of the material advances so important in convincing the public that conditions were changing for the better.

Preparation for a 'new order' based on the further modernization of Canadian society seemed to be a post-war goal that all could embrace, but it remained laden with some pre-war baggage. Opinion regarding how comprehensive plans were to be depended primarily upon political leanings, with conservatives favouring minimal controls and socialists eager to complete the installation of the welfare state. Some observers warned that any planning undertaken for the achievement of a new order would require a sensitivity to tradition and above all, an active, well-informed citizenry to keep it from devolving into communism or fascism. In declaring that "we must chart a clear and resolute course for our national life," one of Canada's premier anti-communists, Watson Kirkconnell, advocated

planning for the post-war based on what he called the “seven pillars”: religious faith, co-operation, education, justice, discipline, fraternity and loyalty. “If we are faithful to these,” Kirkconnell ventured, “we shall be able to preserve the best from the past and yet achieve such social and economic changes as may be necessary for human welfare.”<sup>34</sup>

Planned well-being was obviously desirable, but some insisted that it would come at a high price. Regimentation, so useful to the military and so necessary to the efficient distribution of scarce goods in wartime, was to be avoided in the post-war period. Politically conservative commentators and those representing business interests, quite predictably, placed considerable emphasis on this theme. Some vigorous denunciations of national planning – striving to identify such a state as unnatural and anti-democratic outside the exceptional context of war – carried on well into peacetime in the pages of *Saturday Night*.<sup>35</sup> It was not surprising to one contributor that opponents of free-enterprise had blamed it for the twentieth-century world’s economic ills, but he expressed considerable alarm at

the readiness of the masses to accept this charge as just and disregard the obvious fact that whatever faults the free enterprise system possesses, it is nevertheless a system which was born of the people themselves and grew with them, and certainly was not imposed upon them from above, as a post-war “New Order” would be imposed.<sup>36</sup>

Other opponents of planning proposed that planners and legislators simply let the government pass the budget and adjourn,<sup>37</sup> or suggested that what Canadians wanted more than a cradle-to-grave system was “security to make their own security.”<sup>38</sup> More imaginative commentators sought to equate rampant planning with the cruel machinery of war, the anonymity of troop life, or “a form of *escapism* which would entrust the whole organization of society to a number of worthy but fallible individuals who happen to constitute the state.”<sup>39</sup> Illustrators producing editorial cartoons for *Saturday Night’s* business section, ‘Gold & Dross,’ imported or emulated the work of conservative British cartoonist David Low,

ridiculing planning as the strategy of benighted socialists who would strip away the personality of the individual to impose an artificial uniformity of economic conditions.<sup>40</sup>

In spite of conservative efforts to portray the situation otherwise, the economic reality, C.A. Ashley contended, was that there had been “a large amount of governmental interference for many years; in fact it was largely the basis on which capitalism operated even before the depression, for what measure of interference, short of state ownership, could be greater than the institution of limited liability companies and of a protective tariff?”<sup>41</sup> Having only the spectre of regimentation and the fear of socialism to conjure with, supporters of what passed for “free-enterprise” faced a public which, able to recall with little effort the destitution of the 1930s, had largely warmed to plans for social security during the war.

As might be expected, further left along the political spectrum liberal and social democratic commentators were ambivalent, or well-disposed, toward planning.<sup>42</sup> The Liberal government had erected the official apparatus of reconstruction, and went ahead with its ambitious (for the times) scheme of state-administered social welfare measures.<sup>43</sup> Eminent CCF member F.R. Scott met conservative charges that national planning was regimentation by contending that planning for defence and reconstruction would not mean so many restrictions on thought and discussion, but might require some on property. Such necessary changes would meet with some resistance, he predicted sadly, because “most people will part with their freedom of thought before they will part with their investments[.]” Scott’s critique of the contemporary reluctance to participate in programmatic solutions to long-standing inequities was his way of calling attention to what he saw as the equally regimenting mythology of self-made wealth. Not one to back away from controversy, Scott went on to urge the adoption of comprehensive planning as one positive lesson that Canada could learn from the Nazis; a lesson England and France had already learned to their detriment.<sup>44</sup>

Even though discussions of the scope and scale of planning as a strategy for national efficiency and post-war recovery were politically divisive, the planning ethic benefited immensely from its association with the hopeful culture of reconstruction. Perhaps more than any other medium, print advertising reflected this connection as advertisers capitalized on planning's currency by conceiving campaigns that identified planning with security. Security was in effect commodified and made the consequence of a decision to take charge of the future through planning. This decision, quite significantly, could rest with individual consumers or with some band of scientists or planners at the service of society, but by buying the advertised product, consumers could assure themselves that they had played a role in hastening the glorious post-war period. One ad campaign which recognized the power of planning on a societal scale came, ironically, from a company forbidden to advertise the type of product it had become famous for producing. In 1944, Seagram's distilleries inaugurated a series of ads lauding the planners and researchers who had been invaluable to the war effort and would make the post-war years sublime: "No continent in the world is more fortunate in the tremendous improvements in everyday living which await it. That is because we are blessed with MEN WHO THINK OF TOMORROW!"<sup>45</sup> The implicit message was that the 'men who think of tomorrow' made the free-enterprise system as forward-looking as any other, with the added advantage that as the incumbent system it was committed – more than any other – to the maintenance of democracy.

Planning was, of course, appealing as an individual strategy, and advertisers invited consumers to manufacture their own security through foresight. A Royal Bank of Canada ad depicted a boy enjoying his stamp collection:

Young Bill is doing his own post-war planning. Every week he calls at the Royal bank, buys another War Savings Stamp and sticks it in his book. He has his own ideas of what he wants to do when the war is over - so he's saving for it now.



Young Bill typifies the spirit of all Canadian youth ... a quality of self-reliance and personal initiative that has made our country great. No one is going to plan his future for him. He's taking a hand himself.<sup>46</sup>

This copy was a brilliant bit of writing in that it made the rather common habit of keeping a savings account an intensely private act of 'personal' planning. "Taking a hand" oneself precluded identification with a mass public which ran the risk of having its future planned for it. This theme remained an important one for advertisers even beyond the immediate post-war period. A 1948 ad for Manufacturer's Life did not have to reach far back into the collective memory to tout insurance as personal planning through which the insured party "places - and keeps - his own financial future and that of his dependents beyond the hazards of mere circumstance. He becomes a 'Young Man with a Plan' ... a more substantial citizen and a happier man because of it."<sup>47</sup>

Especially during the last two years of the war, the image of shedding military garb and "falling out" of rank appealed to those left at home as well as men who had been or were still overseas. Again, advertisers picked up on these same themes, hoping that the happy prospect of the soldier's return would prime families for some post-war spending. In this way they were as keen as their American counterparts to instill a sense of belonging to a new model army of consumers whose reward would come with peacetime. In practical terms, though, it took some time before the troops returned home, and some economic controls remained in place as part of Ottawa's reconstruction program. In the meantime, advertisers honoured the awkward transitional period, reminding consumers that they must practice moderation to keep inflation in check, and that "the years of greater abundance, which are so surely ahead" would justify their patience.<sup>48</sup>

Wartime had done much to convince observers that the Canadian people were capable of taking on responsibilities beyond those of mere consumers, yet it seemed plain

that some aspects of post-war life would be complex and best left in the care of experts well-trained in their particular fields. Though it appeared somewhat anti-democratic to suggest that wartime decisions or important post-war plans should be made unilaterally by experts, even staunch opponents of state planning distrusted popular opinion. As Queen's economist John L. McDougall complained, the great majority of the people could not bring themselves to make the effort required in a democracy: "the people whose lives will be most deeply affected by it will not read the reports of the discussion in the newspaper, brief though they are. They will turn instead to 'Little Orphan Annie,' or will skip the paper altogether that night in order to see 'Tarzan' at the movies."<sup>49</sup>

More than two years after the war ended, Leonard Marsh could look back at the late wartime and early post-war period and note that planning belonged simultaneously among what he called "fog" words and "club" words, terms used to obfuscate and to silence opposition. "No issue," he said, "is in greater need of clarity of thought. And none is likely to get it, if we toss the words 'democracy' and 'national planning' around as if they were magic wands, or sticks of dynamite, according to taste. And if we use other words along with them, like 'regimentation,' for example - which are excellent for begging questions, but don't do much to answer them."<sup>50</sup> It was precisely because of these varying connotations that the idea of planning held a prominent place in the culture of reconstruction. It could mean taking complete charge of one's affairs or abdicating responsibility for them to some central agency. Planners could be villains or visionaries, depending upon one's conception of how instrumental governments were to be in bringing about what E.A. Corbett called that "far-off divine event towards which the whole creation moves."<sup>51</sup> Planning for the post-war, whether directed towards a return to rugged individualism or the achievement of collective security, was a part of the wartime cultural context and the culture of reconstruction because planning promised a level of control over an uncertain future. For cultural critics,

the opportunity to shape post-war culture depended upon their ability – during wartime – to articulate their plans for it.

The wartime compulsion to think deeply about the fundamental aspects of the civilization Canadians and their allies wished to preserve did not always create unabashed post-war planners. As one such dissenter, B.K. Sandwell saw war as a kind of nexus of past, present and future through which the nation would be reconstructed, but he found it impossible to ignore the war in favour of what still seemed to be a distant peace. Sensing more “intellectual activity” since the beginning of the war than in the quarter-century preceding it, he noted a concurrent desire to gaze beyond the conflict:

Canadians of both languages are earnestly and passionately, scanning their past and their present to discern their future which they now realize cannot be a mere continuation of the past and the present although it must nevertheless arise out of them.<sup>52</sup>

Despite what can only be described as his own reserved attitude regarding the expression of enthusiasm for reconstruction, Sandwell and his *Saturday Night* magazine capitulated in the summer of 1942, admitting that “discussion of the problems of the economic and social structure to be aimed at “after the war” is becoming so voluminous and engrossing that we have decided to open a regular department for that purpose.”<sup>53</sup> Even from the left, there came acknowledgement that reconstruction would not mean revolutionary change, but rather a chance to put hard-won wisdom into practice: “the social lessons which progressively minded people have been teaching this long while seem to have been more thoroughly absorbed than they realize and the problems of the next years are more likely to be those of working out the implications of principles already accepted, rather than of framing new blueprints.”<sup>54</sup> Often invoked as a generic reference to any sort of post-war

plan, the metaphor of the 'blueprint' recurred, and reconstruction items found a place in the *Canadian Forum*.<sup>55</sup>

By mid-war, Canadians were clearly aware of the idea of reconstruction, often using it as a pretext for expressing their views on subjects that were perhaps only tangentially related to the post-war era, and occasionally exploiting it for gain. As we have seen in connection with the ideal of planning, advertisers and their clients were especially keen to seize upon a theme they read as topical. In 1943 the Association of Canadian Advertisers, comprised of firms which advertised nationally, brought out a monthly publication designed to keep members up on the most salient reconstruction issues. As might be expected, individual firms, in the course of their quest to distinguish their message from competitors', found a natural fit between reconstruction's implicit message of service through preparation and the promotion of products such as insurance and home heating.<sup>56</sup> The International Order of Daughters of the Empire recognized discussion of the post-war as an opportunity to nominate the Dominion for a greater role within the Empire once the war ended, be this shepherding Old Country refugees or implementing members' suggestions for a healthier population.<sup>57</sup> Columnist Mary Lowrey Ross abandoned her usual conversational prose style, favouring verse in a satiric look at the widespread enthusiasm for reconstruction and the range of interested causes invoking it as the dawning of a new era. Although "A Reverent Ode to the Great Modern Goddess Panacea" poked fun at wartime readiness to plunder ideas from platforms all along the political spectrum – "Take some from each, and all from some / And usher in the Millennium" – Ross nonetheless noted a crucial feature of the culture of reconstruction: even the most reluctant souls could not help but be engaged to some degree by the bustle surrounding preparations for peacetime. Her poem ended with an exhortation to participate or suffer the consequences:

So turn from the ashes of yesterday.  
The fires of spring are on their way.

Leap to the fire, adventurous man,  
Nor trembling cling to the frying pan.  
Don't be jittery, don't be dawdle-y.  
Better to leap than be shoved in bodily.  
Here's to the future and all who contrive it.  
And the Post-war world. Let's hope we survive it.<sup>58</sup>

Whether or not it excited them to look toward peacetime with the rest of the nation, critics recognized as clearly as anyone how important it was to win the war before 'winning the peace' could be assured. However, as two examples from 1942 well illustrate, merely making the requisite acknowledgement of the war's paramount importance hardly guaranteed that one would be able to ignore and thereby subvert enthusiasm for reconstruction. B.K. Sandwell's views on the urgency of war have been noted above, and he stands as perhaps the best example of opposition to dividing the nation's attention between the war effort and post-war planning. In March 1942, he railed at those meddling liberals who would indulge too soon in the task of planning the post-war society, complaining that: "the calm assumption that the issue of the war is settled and that the time has come to consider details of Reconstruction is another instance of the unbearable superbitry of English-speaking people."<sup>59</sup> Such cautions against planning too far ahead only granted further notoriety to the culture of reconstruction, and emphasized its presumption that a society should be able to censure certain behaviours (in Sandwell's case, insufficient attention to the war) in order to effect the desired result (victory). In contrast, three months later, war artist Charles Comfort repudiated a narrow focus on the immediate, affirming that for those who truly cared about maintaining a civilized way of life, the war should be a war on two fronts: "There is almost a pathetic eagerness to put first things first. The danger is that in trying to do so, there is a tendency to treat the arts as non-essentials. We may, with the best will in the world, be destroying the very foundations of our civilization."<sup>60</sup>

The problem facing sensitive souls like Comfort was that government and public still

seemed to conceive of reconstruction in terms that were altogether too concrete. The widespread attention to topics such as post-war jobs, housing, foreign policy and social services reflected an entirely reasonable concern with those more mundane aspects of life, but ignored, as some noted, “the moral, spiritual and intellectual resources which alone can sustain the best of plans for a better order.”<sup>61</sup> Could a public so preoccupied be relied upon to seek such a balanced perspective on its own? What methods might be employed to raise awareness of citizens’ potential to shape not only their own material futures, but the culture that would emerge after the war?

It may have been ‘unbearably superb’ to think about one task while completing another, but the aftermath of 1918 had taught ‘English-speaking people’ and many more besides that correcting the social displacement resulting from war was not a simple matter; it required consulting recognized authorities well in advance of an armistice. Meeting in 1942, the Canadian Association for Adult Education (CAAE) attributed the “failures of 1919” to a “lack of realistic preparatory planning and to the failure to guide public opinion to a critical examination of the social processes by which these popular aspirations for a better world might be fulfilled.” Yet, the Association’s members feared “the alternative danger of producing disillusionment and despair by pursuing a policy of offering facile promises of unrealizable immediate goals.”<sup>62</sup> Several commentators relished this aspect of reconstruction because it allowed them to position themselves as sober experts or authorities in the field of restoring a civilization lost to the ravages of modern life (of which war was a symptom), and its attendant mass culture.

One such authority was playwright John Coulter. On his radio programme devoted to cultural criticism, he cheered the BBC’s wartime ban on “songs of slushy sentiment, and all suggestive ones and those based on melodies lifted from the classics ... any form of debilitated vocal performances by male singers, and any insincere or over-sentimental style

of performance by women singers[.]” expressing profound relief that by banning such material “at last, democracy begins to silence its poltroons, and gird itself in sanity and dignity.”<sup>63</sup> Outside his radio criticism, his own work spoke of a deep commitment to reconstruction and to the ideal of engagement with one’s surroundings. Declaring that “Social inertia is henceforth a crime[.]” Coulter prefaced a pamphlet version of his opera, *Transit Through Fire*, with an implicit reminder of the banality of pre-war mass culture, and a dire prediction that if adults did not become involved in a thorough reconstruction effort, then

[e]very means will be used to help the next generation forget the fearful lessons of the recent past and set their feet once more on the good old beaten paths. If they should do that they will, in John Ruskin’s phrase, without doubt be everlastingly damned.<sup>64</sup>

The libretto of the opera itself pointed to modern life as complex, disheartening and disorienting, but rarely subtle. The protagonists, an idealistic young couple waylaid by the economic and spiritual stagnation of the 1930s, found purpose in wartime, and hope in the reconstruction credo of avoiding old mistakes. The hero, armed with an M.A., mocked an insular, monotonous and materialist commercial world that refused to acknowledge the community’s interests when he sang: “Only by spilling lagoons of blood / could again be stirred / the genius and generosity / of living democracy.”<sup>65</sup> The costly purchase of a new order – a transaction presumably still in its early stages in 1942 – saddened Coulter, but at the same time it provided an opportunity for what he considered the more worthy elements of the human personality to take on leadership roles.

*Transit Through Fire* was the first substantial ‘work’ (i.e. not an article or critical talk) to present the problem of what could be done during the war to improve what would come after. In venerating participation in a democratic, Christian community and disparaging the

homogeneity of a continental or world order, it prefigured Elizabeth Wyn Wood's later call to "put our aesthetic resources forward"<sup>66</sup> as a means of national improvement. Putting aesthetic resources forward also involved moving out from under the shadows of both the 'Old Country' and Canada's continental neighbour. Sandwell attributed a lingering, bifurcated provincialism to the perception that Canada was not "a mature and adequate society, and therefore cannot expect to gather many of the flowers of one." Britain and the United States were, it had been shown, societies deserving of their own great literatures, and Canada was not far from achieving this same distinction; all that remained was for Canada to develop its own "cultured public."<sup>67</sup> Coulter's vivid assessment of the need for cultural reconstruction withstands attempts at abridgement:

It's vision, or the darkness of death for us. And I am not confusing the business of art with the business of social or political reform. Though I do believe that if there is a stir in the arts today, there will be a stir in the rest of the social body tomorrow. I believe the arts to be the sensitive antennae of the community, feeling toward the evolutionary path of historic change. Though, of course, for the artist this change is manifest in the forms and terms of art. So I believe. But I am not simpleton enough to think this belief shared by any but a pitifully small minority of the people of Canada, or of anywhere else. The big majority of people everywhere, who of course like to regard themselves as the practical, solid, commonsense folk who make the wheels go round, but who in reality are and always have been dependent for every step of enlightenment and progress, on the vision, insight, imagination and invention of the unpractical and impossible minority, that big majority does regard us - with our books, our shows, our music - as at best the procurers of leisure relaxations, the cultural pastimes and graces which flower in times of peace.<sup>68</sup>

The problem of gaining a wider audience for the arts, and in effect expanding what Coulter called the "unpractical and impossible minority," was an integral component of the culture of reconstruction. During the summer of 1942, the University of Toronto's A.S.P.



Woodhouse noted one feature of wartime literature when he declared that: "To a far greater extent than was the case in the last war, this is a war of pamphlets." More importantly, he complained that the best and most plainspoken of the wartime pamphlets were virtually unknown, except possibly to a small group of people who would have made it their business to read such material regardless of how widely it was distributed. Even though he insisted that "the man with little money to spend for expensive books is as much concerned to understand the causes and issues of the struggle as is the scholar,"<sup>69</sup> Woodhouse believed that the organizations producing and distributing these pamphlets were unable to advertise their existence effectively, and this inability constituted a major obstacle to the sort of education for citizenship that the war effort and beyond required.

Others had sensed that more than pamphlet literature would be required if the reconstruction ideal was to affect a population more accustomed to entertaining spectacles than the sort of individual contemplation pamphlets demanded. Columnist John Baldwin declared: "the problem and its tentative solutions should be set out in churches, in farm and labour organizations, in Home and School groups, among undergraduates, and opened for discussion. By radio, by movies, by circulating exhibitions, a two-way stream of information, comment, and interest would be generated which would be invaluable."<sup>70</sup> Father M.M. Coady of St. Francis Xavier University acknowledged the importance of economic needs and desires, but emphasized the primacy of maintaining cultural priorities through reconstruction. "We shall not lose our souls in doing these material things," he wrote, "if we have a right philosophy." This right philosophy demanded, however, that Canadians be "mobilized for continuous enlightenment."<sup>71</sup> As it turned out, one organization had, even before the war had begun, taken steps that would place it at the centre of such a mobilizing effort, and thereby, at the centre of the culture of reconstruction.

The CAAE was only seven years old in 1942, but had already committed itself to emancipating the population from certain unpleasant symptoms of contemporary existence. The Association's first director, Edward Anand (Ned) Corbett, spoke in 1938 of a link between democracy and the basic goals of adult education:

The ambition of Democracy is to set men free. The ambition of Adult Education is the same, to set men free from government oppression, materialism, from bad taste in living, in music, drama, recreation, and most of all from the utter drabness of human life."<sup>72</sup>

The CAAE also committed relatively early in its career to discussion groups as a vehicle for adult learning. To many adults, the discussion group seemed less threatening than their memories of the school classroom or the college lecture theatre, and groups featured an added attraction: group leaders could conduct each lesson in a 'democratic' atmosphere.<sup>73</sup> The strategy of the small study group was hardly original, and remained a common one through the 1920s and 1930s, even among less conventional movements such as Social Credit and Technocracy, which relied on study groups as a means of recruitment.

By the later 1930s, Canadians hungry for edifying radio fare were also well aware of radio's potential as an educational tool. In Nova Scotia and Ontario, some educational organizations and extension departments had integrated listening groups with short broadcast series during the winter of 1938-39, including the Workers' Educational Association (WEA) programme "Labour Forum" in Ontario.<sup>74</sup> Director Corbett kept a close watch on the field of educational broadcasting, characterizing the contributions of American panel and orchestral programmes, and some of the CBC's talks on constitutional matters, as "definitely educational."<sup>75</sup> For some, the better foreign examples of educational programming, like the monumental 130-episode *Columbia School of the Air*, seemed to be all too fleeting, and frequently replaced by poor substitutes. One Canadian devotee of that

programme sighed, “Just about the time when we start to think about ordering the winter coal, Edgar Bergen comes back to the air, this time bringing with him not only his stooge Charlie McCarthy, but Bud Abbott and Lou Costello, Ray Noble’s orchestra and Judy Garland.”<sup>76</sup> By the end of 1939, the CAAE had made Manitoba and McGill graduate Neil Morrison its liaison with the CBC. Convinced that Canadian educators ignored radio at the peril of their objectives, his job was to organize – or perhaps more properly – to *evangelize* forum programmes.<sup>77</sup>

The first nationwide venture into applying the discussion group format via radio was a programme called *National Farm Radio Forum*. The show’s regional predecessors, *Inquiry into Co-operation*, *Community Clinic*, and *Canadian Farm Problems* met with some success in organizing listening groups early in wartime. *Farm Forum* itself began in the winter of 1941, and its initial appeal rested at least partly with the fact that it presented information farmers could use to operate within their means.<sup>78</sup> Whether similar principles could be adapted from the needs of agriculture and applied to the broader sphere of pressing social and cultural problems remained to be seen. As one historian of educational broadcasting in Canada has noted, the war meant that the organizations co-operating to produce *Farm Forum* (the CBC, CAAE, and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture) found themselves using “rhetoric charged with connotations of social action; even traditional voluntary association leaders used terms such as ‘postwar planning’ and ‘social reconstruction’ to describe their general aims.”<sup>79</sup>

By 1941, Neil Morrison had been hired as a member of the Talks Department at CBC. Although he outlined a scheme for a national affairs forum programme early in that year, it took some time to build commitment to such an undertaking, especially in the face of CBC General Manager Gladstone Murray’s reluctance to stir up controversy for the Corporation.<sup>80</sup> Not surprisingly, Morrison recommended in his 1941 proposal that any new

talks programmes be closely integrated with the adult education movement. However, most notable among Morrison's suggestions were a declaration that programmes using a forum model "should be planned to reach definite, large interest groups if they are to be most effective[,] and a plea that "[e]fforts and content should not be watered down by attempting to get universal appeal."<sup>81</sup> Murray resigned in mid-1942, and the Corporation's 'trial balloon' of that summer, *CBC Discussion Club*, was launched independently of the CAAE, treating reconstruction and its role in the establishment of a "full, happy, democratic way of life."<sup>82</sup> The Talks department, however, made no outstanding efforts to promote the show, and made no plans to repeat it, at least not without help from outside.

Close ties between the CAAE and the CBC, embodied most convincingly in the person of Murray's successor and CAAE member J.S. Thomson, meant that it would not be long before ideas for a new programme were floated. By November of 1942, those responsible for the successful *Farm Forum* displayed their eagerness to do more than preach to the converted about national affairs. Democracy remained the watchword, but CAAE executive member Watson Thomson made no apologies for declaring that "the best thinking on post-war reconstruction problems should be presented to the minds of the masses of the people concerned, in the kind of way that would make for vital change to those who are in the majority." Elevating society through a culture of reconstruction, however, required a certain amount of duplicity. According to Thomson, it was up to community leaders like the Association's members to face issues with "a certain moral earnestness," and to choose those capable of presenting the "best thinking." These capable people, he noted, were to ask "questions as to the kind of society that the people of Canada really want or think they want. But we must have implied answers to these questions ourselves."<sup>83</sup>

By mid-December 1942, J.S. Thomson set about trying to recruit a motivated coordinator for a national radio project, sensing somewhat apocalyptically that "out of the

present world conflict there are dynamic forces likely to be released and unless they are encountered by some kind of intelligent understanding[,] might lead us to results that have a shattering effect upon the whole of our political and social life.”<sup>84</sup> Members of the CAAE believed that the new venture should combine the appeal and reach of radio with the comfortable reinforcement of the local discussion group. In addition to the experience gained in putting *Farm Forum* and *CBC Discussion Club* on the air, the CAAE/CBC alliance could draw upon the examples set in such publications as the YMCA’s *We Discuss Canada*, in which the “tremendous task of winning the peace” featured prominently.<sup>85</sup> At the end of December 1942, members of the CAAE met and formally resolved to inaugurate the ambitious project, intending to draw upon and amplify a culture of reconstruction by “stimulating and giving guidance to a process of public enlightenment and awakening regarding the issues of the war and objectives in the post-war world.”<sup>86</sup> Those attending the meeting resolved that the present and the future could alternate as the focus of interest in the Association’s new strategy of education for reconstruction. Crucial to this strategy was acknowledging the power of planning, and the importance of public participation in making planning techniques “instruments of the achievement of a creative democratic society.”<sup>87</sup>

The CAAE and the CBC decided to concentrate, in the project’s execution, on realistic means of achieving post-war goals while avoiding “a repetition of the sentimental and escapist idealism of much of the Peace and League of Nations activity after the last war.”<sup>88</sup> Robert Boyer Inch became the first secretary of the project, having come to the CBC Talks department from a post with the League of Nations Society. While spending the early part of 1943 setting out the programme’s structure, Inch, in consultation with members of the Inquiry Committee on the Post-war World, which included three future members of the Massey Commission,<sup>89</sup> started casting about for an auspicious name. An early working title had been “The Inquiry” and, perhaps inspired by H.G. Wells’ 1933 novel

*The Shape of Things to Come*, Inch scrawled “The Things to Come” and “Shape of the Future” on a carbon copy. After some deliberation, the planning group settled on “Of Things To Come: An Inquiry into the Post-war World.”<sup>90</sup>

Keen to strike a balance between gravity and popular appeal, the programme’s organizers brought in writer Morley Callaghan to act as “Counsel for the People” during the first group of broadcasts in the spring of 1943. These were done without an apparatus of organized local listening groups, though such a structure was on the drawing board, to be implemented should the broadcasts evoke interest in forming a nationwide network of ‘inquirers’. A well-meaning supporter of the programme reminded organizers that Europe might be invaded in 1943 and that consequently, forum broadcasts would have to tread a fine line between enthusiasm and grave pragmatism:

- (a) the minds of the people may be distracted by the casualty lists, etc. and many will be impatient at considerations of a problematical future Utopia.
- (b) for the same reason, a realistic consideration of the hopes for a new world after the war may become a powerful contribution to national morale in dark days.<sup>91</sup>

Examining the topics presented in what was known as the “Of Things To Come” ‘spring series’ for 1943, it is clear that from the outset the series was intended, through the discussion of issues germane to the anticipated post-war lives and material interests of Canadians, to introduce abstract themes. Topics such as “The Last Peace and the Next One”; “Are Wartime Controls Here to Stay?”; “Social Security – Housing”<sup>92</sup> were chosen to draw in both the casual listener and the committed reconstructionist in search of post-war blueprints. The discussions were not so much about the inner workings of the League of Nations, price controls or subsidized housing, but were rather a means of bringing to public attention the principles that lay behind these.<sup>93</sup> The programmes were scripted, and a brief look at the process of setting up the first one provides evidence of how eagerly the

programme's producers wanted to present reconstruction as a fresh start, and how opinions were divided regarding how to 'pitch' the programmes.

In preparation for "The Last Peace and the Next One," Morley Callaghan wrote to Watson Thomson of the CAAE, explaining, in terms more reminiscent of a staged wrestling match than a public affairs programme, how veteran newspaper editor John Dafoe; a young adult educator, Robert McKenzie; and a third panelist, undetermined at that time but cast as a champion of the "old order", would square off in an entertaining, but nonetheless thought-provoking half-hour. In a letter to McKenzie, Callaghan emphasized Dafoe's credentials as at best a lukewarm supporter of a thoroughgoing reconstruction. "I gather that he has no blue-print at all, in fact I doubt very much if Mr. Dafoe believes in a blue-print." The goal, Callaghan suggested, was to make sure that the respective points of view each man brought to the discussion were clearly articulated, but that the progressive thinker – in this case McKenzie – would be seen to have carried the day.<sup>94</sup> McKenzie expressed his reluctance to engage Dafoe as a "Well Meaning if Out-dated Old Sage" while himself playing the role of the "Impetuous, Eager Youth." He trusted in the ability of the target audience to formulate conceptions of the panelists as "a by-product of our conflict of ideas not as a result of a conscious attempt to dramatize the conflict of Youth and Age."<sup>95</sup>

After the series had aired a handful of episodes, it was clear from the audience response that the program had been well-received.<sup>96</sup> Corbett worried, however, that the public might not be equipped to take the next step on its own. "The average man is full of a naive faith that officials are planning a new world and that as soon as hostilities cease these officials ... will pop up with blue-prints and all will be well[.]"<sup>97</sup> he wrote to the National Film Board's John Grierson. The depth of Corbett's concern was not justified, as listeners wrote urging the CBC/CAAE alliance to make the programme into a forum with organized listening groups, along the lines of *Farm Forum*. Comparing *Of Things To Come* to the fare

customarily identified with commercial sponsorship, one correspondent considered “Mr. Callaghan’s” programme to be the most important on radio and complained that: “We get too little of such programs and much too much soap [advertising]. I will admit there is a lot of good soap. I know it makes white clothes whiter, takes the dirt and grime out of overalls and works wonders with diapers, but soap will not remove that scale from the human brain.”<sup>98</sup>

The spring series had certainly succeeded in situating the programme in opposition to commercial programming, and had all but convinced the CAAE that listening groups could succeed. In July 1943, the National Selective Service called Robert Inch to active duty. He left the Talks department, and with it, the forum programme.<sup>99</sup> Before he departed, Inch reminded Corbett that the project had the potential to go beyond the territory already explored in public affairs radio, envisioning it as an instrument for revitalizing democratic citizenship, and noted that in Canada there was “a possibility of creating something more or less permanent along the lines of the *Chicago Round Table* or *Town Hall of the Air* but better because it is operated by an organization owned by the people.”<sup>100</sup> With Inch gone barely a month, the programme’s staff reaffirmed its desire to adopt techniques that would reach ordinary Canadians not normally given to seeking information on public affairs. Corbett noted a basic level of popular awareness regarding war aims and believed that Canadians were willing “accept sacrifices and submit to regimentation, for the purpose of winning the war,” but considered their grasp of the larger implications of the return to peace “confused and lacking direction[.]”<sup>101</sup>

Three weeks later, J.S. Thomson, having returned to his regular post as president of the University of Saskatchewan, but still involved with the forum project, spoke eloquently in support of the imperative need to draft cultural ‘blue-prints’ for Canada’s reconstruction. He compared reconstruction to the “intellectual and spiritual quickening” that characterized



Ancient Greek civilization, the Judeo-Christian tradition and the Renaissance. Plans to re-civilize the post-war world, Thomson contended, echoed all these honourable precedents, because “the new spirit is first the possession of a few, almost a secret doctrine, but it spreads abroad and like leaven hidden in the meal, it works until the whole lump is charged with a new life.”<sup>102</sup> The idea of using radio as a means to spur a “moral and intellectual revolution” among those making up ‘the whole lump’ was a pragmatic decision. However, it was a decision rooted in an acknowledgement of radio’s persuasive power, and more particularly, it reflected a desire to counteract the perceived effects of commercialized entertainments. Thomson explained:

To-day there is a culture that is very widely spread by modern technology, by the movies, by the radio, by cheap books, by music, dancing. What good thing do you see coming out of Hollywood? And yet Hollywood is the cultural centre of North American life. ... I think the whole question of artistic standards in music, in dancing, in literature, in pictures, in radio programmes, and in the religious life of the Churches is related to this venture we have in mind.<sup>103</sup>

Philosopher (and RCAF Squadron Leader) Gregory Vlastos admonished organizers not to mimic Hollywood, but to be unambiguous. “Sad experience has taught us the need for the simplest, most vigorous and most interesting type of presentation. You notice that I avoid the word ‘popular.’ We do not wish to bid for interest at the expense of content.”<sup>104</sup> Thanks to the work of provincial organizers, and in spite of some controversy about which political parties might reap the benefits of planning a more liveable post-war nation via the airwaves,<sup>105</sup> *Citizens’ Forum* debuted as a programme with listening groups attached in the fall of 1943. George Grant replaced Robert Inch as secretary. In addition to collaborating on the reading material that went out to the groups, Grant tended the central administration of the listening group network.<sup>106</sup>

It was not long before the programme had, in effect, established itself as the voice

of reconstruction.<sup>107</sup> Early in 1944, Mary Lowrey Ross began one verse of her satire on the vogue for reconstruction with a faux-Chaucerian flourish: "Sumer is icumen in/Lud sing rad-io,"<sup>108</sup> acknowledging the relationship between radio forums and longing gazes toward the post-war era. The Rev. F.W.L. Brailey saw *Citizens' Forum* as the "gymnasium and training ground for virile Christian citizenship[.]" while the editors of *Canadian Business* claimed that the first few programmes "stressed class distinction, they sowed discord, and their chief appeal was to the discontented."<sup>109</sup> A chemistry professor at the University of New Brunswick wrote to the programme's staff, congratulating them on extending the range of democratic participation.<sup>110</sup> Indeed, the forum concept found its way into other educational endeavours, one of which was the National Film Board's rural film circuit. The circuit adopted a forum-style discussion as part of its service, with projectionists often acting as itinerant group leaders. On the circuit, the critique of urban decadence met the myth of rural common sense, as one observer remarked upon how the circuit films were "rather different from the typical bill of a city movie, not only because the purpose is different, but because the audiences themselves like more solid fare than make-believe romance or custard pies."<sup>111</sup>

The group name, which each group was free to choose for itself, was further evidence of this earnest atmosphere and an inclination towards 'more solid fare.' Names occasionally reflected support for a particular branch of the service (The Corvette Group of Montreal), or pointed to some distinguishing characteristic of the individual group's membership (Toronto's Parkdale Young Married Couples). However, most common were names calling to mind the search for a new post-war order. For every group named to denote its meeting place or evoke a congenial atmosphere, like the School House Forum in Barrie, Ontario, or the Regina Friends Forum, there were a number named to celebrate the ideal of reconstruction. Names like the Phoenix Forum in Winnipeg, Toronto's Gropers,

Scott's Brain Trust in Vancouver or the Lachine Inquirers, the New Era Group, and the Higher Planes in Montreal<sup>112</sup> indicated an understanding among forum members of the importance of transcending their wartime surroundings and taking a role in shaping the post-war world, rather than waiting passively to be shaped by it.

The notion of 'activity' was another important component of the culture of reconstruction, calling upon individuals to maintain their end of the democratic bargain by taking time and expending effort to understand, and ultimately respond to, the challenge of modern citizenship. The challenge, as E.A. Corbett perceived it, was resisting the impulse to become part of the unresponsive mass. He wrote that apathy was to be disparaged by showing Canadians that "they can't escape responsibility by refusing to take a hand in correcting the evils they deplore[,]” and accordingly the job of those truly committed to a meaningful reconstruction was to “to present as vigorously as possible the need for active citizenship.”<sup>113</sup> An early *Citizens' Forum* pamphlet included the following prescription for the active citizen:

Democracy can be efficient -  
But first the people and their government must understand  
the difference between hopes and realities. If democracy  
means no more than getting out to vote once every four  
years then we've let our end down. Being an active citizen  
means more than reading the papers and listening to the  
news - it means finding out the facts, studying the problems  
and talking over proposed solutions with our neighbours,  
offering suggestions, making our views known and doing  
something about them in a constructive way.<sup>114</sup>

Columnist Violet Anderson wrote of the programme: “How significant for our time – that Canadians should hunger so to become active citizens, participating in the solution of problems vital to their country! How democratic that it should be wide open to anyone wishing to participate, and to participate by the democratic method of discussion!”<sup>115</sup> However, discussions were too contrived, too neatly packaged as a digest of moderate

reform sentiment for at least one member of the programme's staff. Early in the first season, George Grant told a trusted friend within the CAAE that the programme needed to embrace more than "middle of the way" or "mediocre" opinions, or else its group structure would accomplish little beyond its own survival.<sup>116</sup>

Grant's prescription would prove difficult to fill, and his warning would prove somewhat prophetic. *Citizens' Forum* reflected elements of the mass culture critique in that it did not intend to pander to mass tastes, or to prescribe courses of action to be followed slavishly. Yet, it set out from its inception to incorporate techniques and strategies, such as a panel format similar to that of the American programme *Invitation to Learning*, quizzes, and candid study materials that were visibly less 'dry' and more 'eye-catching' than wartime pamphlets.<sup>117</sup> It was a compromise between the high-flown rhetoric of an engineered post-war order and the acknowledged persuasive power of mainstream radio. It clearly supported a liberal-democratic system which appreciated popular input, but scorned the mob mentality that brought to mind Nazi "conditioning." By the end of the first season, CBC Programme Supervisor Ernest Bushnell praised the forum's at least partially-fulfilled potential to engage a "wide, continuous" audience comprised of "the best and most responsive type of listener."<sup>118</sup>

Often comprised of neighbours living on the same street, the local listening group came to symbolize a revitalized community ethic. Jean Hunter Morrison and George Grant wrote the reading material for these groups, and their work consistently praised communities in which people were able to participate meaningfully. It also mourned the passing of a simpler time. One week's material in 1944 cited revolutions in transportation, communication and production as causes of significant and disruptive changes to what had been the average Canadian's reassuring, if parochial, surroundings: "We no longer spend our days within the narrow bounds of a narrow community. In our sprawling cities and large

towns we hardly know our neighbours personally, let alone the people who represent us in Parliament.”<sup>119</sup> Such modern isolation demanded a rededication to the community ideal, and concerted action at the local level. The 1944-1945 season picked up where Grant and Morrison left off, with about half of its broadcasts devoted to citizenship and responsibility, and the second programme exploring “participating citizenship” and *Citizens’ Forum’s* contributions to that ideal.<sup>120</sup>

This rededication would, *Citizens’ Forum* organizers hoped, help listeners and forum members recognize their role within post-war reconstruction. However, although it tried to provide a lively discussion that would entertain while it educated, the programme’s tone still seemed too lofty for some, and may well have tempered enthusiasm for reconstruction among groups who were otherwise quite eager to educate themselves and advise the post-war planners.<sup>121</sup> The officer-organizer of an Armed Forces listening group noted that the “broadcasts tended to lull the gunners into an advanced state of somnolence, shared by myself. It was only after the broadcast was over and when the gunners were able to express themselves that the true spirit of discussion and free speech shone through.”<sup>122</sup> To the programme’s organizers, however, this self-expression was an indispensable attribute of the active citizen. Self-expression was the very purpose of the forums in urban communities where spectating had come to replace what was considered the almost lost art of social and cultural engagement. Within their own neighbourhoods, forum participants were to seek consensus actively rather than awaiting answers from on high, and the panel segment of the programme was intended to serve as a model of civilized debate. One of the early movers behind *Farm Forum* and *Citizens’ Forum*, W.H. Brittain, took a long term view of active citizenship and the forum programmes’ role in promoting it: “Progress is measured in centuries. The most we can do is give it direction. We can emphasize the importance of the twin-principles of responsibility and participation, for only with their full realization can any

democracy thrive.”<sup>123</sup>

Helping the public toward “full realization” of its role in shaping post-war society meant drawing a wide audience, and the programme’s organizers seemed unable to achieve this goal. Despite the programme’s appeals to democratic fundamentals, the impression that the majority were being ignored in planning *Citizens’ Forum* was well founded. The Lieutenant leading the aforementioned Armed Forces group asked, “is it necessary for the learned Joes, including Callaghan, to latch [sic] out with such phrases as “economic bourbons”, “Pan-Germanic”, and “financial oligarchy[?]”<sup>124</sup> In marked contrast to his initial reading of the programme’s reception, George Grant sensed a division in *Citizens’ Forum* membership when he reported on the state of the project at the end of 1943-44, the programme’s first season: “We have in fact drawn a line. People above that line have become part of the *Citizens’ Forum*, people below the line, the *Citizens’ Forum* has not gone down to reach.” Though he expressed dismay at the programme’s inability to attract a substantial membership for the listening groups, Grant consoled himself somewhat with the fact that it had at least caught on with a group thought to be unaccustomed to even a modest level of participation. “Among the middle class, the Forums have done a good job. Reading the reports and sitting in with the various Forums, one gets the sense that many people are studying citizenship for the first time.”<sup>125</sup>

Just as it aimed at recreating a community of communities, so *Citizens’ Forum* encountered some of the forces that observers saw dividing the larger society. While the war was still on, it was estimated that each *Citizens’ Forum* episode reached about 500,000 listeners, and the distribution of the study outlines accompanying both *Farm Forum* and *Citizens’ Forum* was over a million a year.<sup>126</sup> Given the recommended forum size of ten to twelve participants, probably about twelve to fifteen thousand people were full-fledged members of the 1200-plus local forums George Grant reported during the first full season.

Even at its height, membership did not even begin to represent a significant fraction of the population, but it included community leaders in influential positions – clergy, teachers, merchants and professionals – who were themselves eager to be seen at the forefront of cultural and social endeavours.<sup>127</sup> As long as the war and visions of its aftermath could sustain interest in the creation of a new democratic order, *Citizens' Forum* remained effective at defining participation in such projects as a requisite for active and meaningful citizenship.

As the war wound down and finally ended in 1945, the largely middle class composition of *Citizens' Forum's* core membership – and the middlebrow tone adopted to build that membership – became more readily apparent. Radio had the same potential to affect listeners, but many listeners no longer found themselves in circumstances where support for reconstruction could be presented as having crucial post-war implications. N.A.M. MacKenzie had predicted as much in 1944:

the incentive will disappear with the end of the war; ... many of us value our personal freedom and we are inclined to think of freedom in terms of freedom from regulation and regimentation and restrictions and from taxes and government intervention of all kinds. In brief, the conditions and attitudes which have made it possible for us to do what we have done during the war will tend to change or disappear and will be replaced by other conditions and attitudes.<sup>128</sup>

By 1946, E.A. Corbett could sense that the “old level of unity and urgency has disappeared since V-E and V-J days, and although there is evidence everywhere of interest in better education, and in social improvement, there has been a letdown and the average man is confused and frustrated in his desire to safeguard the principles for which the war was fought.”<sup>129</sup>

Without the atmosphere of urgency that characterized both wartime and preparations for the post-war period, *Citizens' Forum* became a public affairs programme much like any other, and its experts the target of Wayne and Shuster's good-natured

ribbing.<sup>130</sup> The programme had failed, as one historian of the adult education movement noted, to develop the momentum necessary for continued local action,<sup>131</sup> and the novelty of participating in reconstruction through radio was ultimately not enough to maintain an active membership large enough to make it meaningful outside the context of a collectively-anticipated regeneration. Queen's University professor and Forum activist Martyn Estall remarked near the end of the war that "radio knows nothing of good and evil. It has no social purpose of its own."<sup>132</sup>

Panelists continued to simplify complex issues for listeners and refrained from preaching any form of revolution, and as the candid Lieutenant said of the first season's programmes: "most of the series exuded a phony aroma of 'culture'."<sup>133</sup> Though membership was already on the wane in 1945, the first two years of peacetime saw the number of groups decline further. Robert T. McKenzie, the young man who had been cast as a foil for the old newspaperman Dafoe on the first *Citizens' Forum* broadcast, succeeded Grant as National Secretary and recognized an audience through which the programme might continue to have an effect:

no other country makes similar use of radio in this two-way process of informing and developing enlightened public opinion. While the number of participants remains regrettably small, it should be emphasized that the program is playing an important role in developing well informed community leaders whose influence far exceeds their numbers.<sup>134</sup>

After the war, such earnest determination to continue planning the better society through a rank of respectables seemed out of place. Even the programme's organizers acknowledged that on the whole, Canadians were most eager to resume "the unfinished business of personal living."<sup>135</sup> In a society learning how to consume again, *Citizens' Forum's* emphasis upon the democratic resolution of complex social problems over-estimated the



public's peacetime interest in such a project. One Nova Scotian educator complained to another in 1949 that *Citizens' Forum* had become, since the end of the war, a programme which tackled issues "about which the average citizen knows little, and possibly cares less." As that Cape Bretoner saw it, *Farm Forum* had maintained its public appeal, but for *Citizens' Forum*, only a re-orientation toward "homey, down to earth problems" could bring back the membership numbers of wartime.<sup>136</sup> Despite a rather rapid demobilization of its own, becoming less earnest and more popular in tone was not part of the programme's post-war agenda. Still, although deprived of the reconstruction-era hothouse in which it grew so quickly, *Citizens' Forum* ran for more than twenty years and served as one reliable indicator of the salient issues affecting the peacetime cultural and social climate.

Although *Citizens' Forum* was very much the product of a concerned and motivated group hoping to effect a transformation of Canadian society by democratic means, other reconstruction-era critics of mass culture recognized the ability of governments on all levels to create a cultural infrastructure through which the seeds of 'civilization' could be planted. Accordingly, their plans for the post-war cultural order assumed a rough equality among people, but not among those activities that people might choose to undertake. Three separate efforts to enhance the position of what could be considered 'high' or 'folk' culture reflected these assumptions, and a treatment of these efforts follows. The first, a movement to create a network of community centres, encouraged active participation in cultural and recreational pursuits as preferable to other forms of leisure. Second, an alliance of groups made a case for the arts as the basis of civilization by presenting their plans for a national cultural infrastructure to the Parliamentary Committee on Reconstruction. The third, an agency called the Canada Foundation, was formed at war's end to encourage private philanthropy as a means of cultural patronage.

The idea of a physical locale for cultural redemption in Canada developed before the Second World War. One forceful argument for establishing a place where community members could gather to enjoy their neighbours' company and to participate in creative leisure-time pursuits came in 1925 from publisher Lorne Pierce. In *The Beloved Community*, his essay outlining the constitution and sustenance of a community council programme, Pierce predicted that the rural areas, especially when organized through rural schools, would provide the most fertile ground. Presumably more patient than the city dweller, the farmer would respond to such a scheme for reform simply because

His long contact with the soil has made him impatient with anything but the fundamentals. He detests sham; and the brightest candidate for odium, the individual marked for the speediest excursion to limbo and emptiness, is that citizen who would substitute swank and camouflage for the real thing.<sup>137</sup>

Pierce would have to wait almost twenty years for disciples. Community centres existed, but early in wartime, much of the responsibility for instilling democratic values and an appreciation for the arts still rested with the schools.<sup>138</sup> New schools, however, were larger and tended to be built in urban settings.

Though suburbs would experience rapid growth in the post-war period, it was indeed difficult to determine during the war whether sprawl or the rebirth of existing neighbourhoods would result after the war. The average Canadian's post-war surroundings would need to be both a product of and a haven from modern pressures, which included more leisure: "Children are not made to take root in unyielding pavement, bleak tenements or impersonal suburban dwellings. Space and neighborliness for individual expression and community development will become more than ever necessary as applied science brings increasing leisure hours from the field, factory, office and transport."<sup>139</sup> The topic of urban planning's role in community development came to garner more attention, especially in the

context of an acute housing shortage, an issue to which *Citizens' Forum* devoted one of its first few shows in 1943. Hungarian-born architect Eugenio Faludi landed a job on Toronto's city planning board shortly after arriving in Canada in 1940, and achieved some celebrity during wartime as a prophet of prefabricated housing and new towns.<sup>140</sup> At bottom, his advice was: plan, but don't plan ugly, utilitarian housing tracts for the masses, for such monotonous surroundings have contributed to the degeneration of youth.<sup>141</sup>

Within most plans for the reconstruction of urban Canada there was ample room for the discussion of post-war recreational and cultural facilities. The tension between the initiative to 'win the peace' through planning and the desire to preserve an unstructured existence was central to this debate. F.C. James, speaking to a gathering of Canadian architects, argued for the primacy of traditional, and above all, *personal* avenues of learning from one's community:

If community planning is to satisfy the souls of men, as well as the dreams of aesthetes, it must take continuous account of these habits and traditions. It must recover for us the reality of home influences in moulding character, and of church and school in shaping the further development of human life. If the things which Mr. [H.G.] Wells discards as "stained glass" are not the fundamental verities of Western civilization, I do not know for what we are fighting.<sup>142</sup>

Predicting that the post-war period would be a time of increased leisure, Stuart Jaffary commented in 1943 on the crucial importance of guided recreation to the larger sphere of social services. "How eagerly this new arrival is to be welcomed and nurtured," he declared, "after our past decades of vacuous movies and the insidious passivity of 'spectating,' whether to the radio, sports, or politics!"<sup>143</sup>

By 1944, the community centre ideal, the rejuvenation and evangelization of which was viewed as part of the broader renewal of long-neglected urban areas, had come to shoulder hopes for more than the prevention of juvenile delinquency. Community centres

played an important part, as we shall see, in artists' lobbying efforts. Existing facilities were showing their age and were often ill-designed for the purposes they served. Although he relished his work as a part-time art curator in London, Ontario, librarian Richard Crouch noted that when libraries had taken over the function of Mechanics' Institutes in the early part of the twentieth century, organizing exhibits and debating societies, they were still chiefly engaged with "evolving and perfecting the means and methods for the democratic use and distribution of the book[.]" Only gradually did they learn how to accommodate the various other tasks they had since been called upon to perform; tasks that could include, as they did at Crouch's library, hosting such newly-evolved community events as *Citizens' Forum*.<sup>144</sup>

With few dedicated facilities, the desire to appreciate the arts in pleasant and purpose-built surroundings frequently lay behind calls to design, build and maintain a single focal point for each community's post-war cultural life. The success of well-subscribed itinerant events like the Dominion Drama Festival had convinced many, like one Maritime drama supporter, that "definite physical plans for artistic development are absolutely necessary to make us more closely knit and culturally lifted, if this present struggle for democratic privileges is to be worth fighting through."<sup>145</sup> Architects became involved early in suggesting model sites and plans,<sup>146</sup> and the most comprehensive statement of purpose for a network of community centres was a group of articles first published in the Royal Architecture Institute of Canada's *Journal*.

Most telling among these, and significant as a rich late wartime document of the reconstruction critique of modern life and mass culture, was musician Marcus Adeney's contribution. Expressing his reverence for Lorne Pierce as an unheeded visionary, Adeney recalled his own hometown of Paris, Ontario during the 1910s, where "church organ and choir allowed for self-expression," and visiting lecturers were rare. "We reflected all that we

had seen and known[.]” he noted, adding that the coming of the movies affected the town’s cultural and recreational facilities, which were still well-used but inadequate. Adeney admitted that some integration with other organizations like the YMCA, churches, or the CAAE would be necessary in many communities, so the organization of community centres would hardly be a grass-roots effort. It would, however, be the site of a brokered antimodernism. Foremost in his conception of the community centre movement’s tasks was its attention to and exploitation of “the deep impulse of every man toward a rounded life experience. Nothing is too rare and precious, no art too high-brow, no sport too simple or craft too humble, for the interests we must cater to.”<sup>147</sup>

The community centre Adeney envisioned was to be a “socially active” place, “with programmes and resources always a little ahead of the average citizen’s wishes and requirements[.]” Citizens should be allowed access to a range of arts and activities, but only those that developed taste, appreciation and skill should be endorsed. Amateur theatre, evening courses in art and handicrafts, folk dance, and sports programmes in which community members themselves participated – rather than spectating – were already top of the agenda in towns that had organized their own centres,<sup>148</sup> but Adeney and others wanted these activities to become the staples of a larger publicly-funded network. He recommended against the business community’s involvement in financing community centres, not because businesspeople would find a way to turn a profit from their association with such a noble cause, but because “business cannot take a long term view. Its agents must follow and not lead public opinion.”<sup>149</sup> The notion that a commercial presence could have a debilitating influence on community centres was rooted in the assumption that profit-seeking firms would favour the most popular activities, leaving the more difficult, the more esoteric ones to wither.

Inclined towards the public sector as its chief potential benefactor, the community

centre movement could play one particularly strong card. Though not of very long standing, a well-established tradition of war memorialization<sup>150</sup> allowed community centre boosters to tout their project as sacred to the memory of World War II's fallen, whose numbers were still mounting in 1945. Unlike the period following the First World War, it seemed that less acrimony existed over the question of ornamental versus utilitarian forms of commemoration, perhaps because rituals of remembrance had been developed by the later 1930s. Marcus Adeney cited a public opinion poll showing that 90 percent of Canadians favoured "useful" war memorials, and fused the motivations behind the community centre idea with a sentiment he knew would gather support:

But when we think of the arts and crafts, community planning, growth of mind and body for every citizen – all this nobly expressed in a building or group of buildings erected to the memory of the Fallen – we can draw no distinction between the useful and the monumental. Indeed, a Community Centre, designed by one equal to his task, would be the most splendid of cenotaphs.<sup>151</sup>

Community centre boosters continued to present plans after the war ended, and these embodied the same sense of mission that the movement's core supporters shared during wartime.<sup>152</sup> The belief persisted that Canadians needed instruction in matters of culture, so dissolute were their tendencies: "Many today do not know how to spend their leisure time constructively. They are attracted to the nearest or most advertised activity," Martyn Estall reported dryly in 1946.<sup>153</sup> In proposing, as Estall had during the previous year, that the whole idea be funded extensively by local, provincial, and federal governments, CAAE director Corbett produced a fascinating catalogue of hopes for community centres, most of which had been expressed piecemeal in earlier declarations of purpose. In 1947, Corbett was justified in noting that "Community Centres in which our people can spend their leisure time pleasantly and profitably are widely accepted as an appropriate form of

living war memorial.”<sup>154</sup>

As well as serving as a living war memorial, the community centre was to be the locus, Corbett insisted, where the “comradeship, unity and devotion to a common purpose which characterized our life during the war can be maintained and developed in peace.” Echoing his friend Estall’s assessment of popular tendencies, Corbett called for the promotion of “worthwhile recreation” in the same way as commercial entertainments (which he called “special interests”) were promoted. He contrasted “better leisure-time experiences ... increased participation ... wholesome patterns of activity ... an active enjoyment of the arts” with “monotonous and repetitive” work ... “an alarming number of persons rejected by our armed forces,” and the creation of “juvenile delinquents.”<sup>155</sup> Corbett did not want to replace other forms of leisure, but to expose people to new ones, trusting, as Marcus Adeney had, that people would “develop taste, appreciation and skill, according to their experience and contacts.”<sup>156</sup>

Community centres were an important element in the presentation a united front of arts groups, dominated by representatives from the visual arts, made to the Parliamentary Committee on Reconstruction and Rehabilitation in late June 1944. This presentation has drawn some scholarly attention as an important moment in the history of Canadian cultural policy.<sup>157</sup> It declared that cultural matters deserved the same consideration government had been giving the social programmes that for many Canadians defined the promise of post-war reconstruction. From the perspective of the mass culture critique, this was an ultimatum to the state, asking that it identify implicitly with the critics in the encouragement of those cultural forms which were not commercially-motivated.

Wartime, of course, did not bring about a sudden sense that certain arts were important repositories of civilization, but it presented an opportunity for cultural critics to relate the age-old theme of cultural decay to the neglect of both great works and new talent.

Reflecting during the war's early days upon artistic treasures and their value, Morley Callaghan noted that scientific and technical advances brought on by war were hailed as glad tidings, but that war's toll was considerable in human terms, "for the spirit needs beautiful and spiritual things to feed on, and not many of those things are around."<sup>158</sup> 'Those things' did not always need to be highbrow, and they did not need to be stored away until the war had ended. A sculptor and chair of the group taking its reconstruction cultural plan to Ottawa, Elizabeth Wyn Wood drew upon immediate wartime concerns to promote a more inclusive, but nonetheless active culture:

Artists and others of vision should act together to make our government understand that a nation's culture is an essential asset on its home front, before the world and before history. And by culture I do not mean literacy and gentility. I mean active, progressive, and creative achievement.<sup>159</sup>

An early draft of the 'Artists' Brief' to the Turgeon Committee listed a "capacity for intelligent and cultured living" as one of the goals of reconstruction.<sup>160</sup> Broadly similar in structure to many of the briefs that the Massey Commission would begin receiving just over five years later, the brief itself stands out not only because it prefigured such submissions, but because its signatories believed the nation's cultural development might best be served by petitioning a committee with no pretensions to the title of "cultural agency." Perhaps more than any single proposal contained in the brief itself, this alone was a remarkable testament to reconstruction's currency and the faith it inspired.

Examining the proposals, however, it is clear that the sixteen arts groups collaborating were aware that their audience would be more interested in the nation's 'bottom line' than in cultural prospects for the post-war. Accordingly, they emphasized the economic and social benefits of investing in culture, and the creative forces so instrumental in such fundamental sectors of the economy as construction, manufacturing, and even



radio.<sup>161</sup> The brief called upon the government to model Canada's cultural infrastructure upon European examples. Notable among these was pre-war France, a place where "[e]very original thinker, from dressmaker to building engineer, has found, not only opportunity, but promotion through public interest." Sweden and Denmark also received laurels for their integration of design and the manufacture of everyday objects. The final example, intended to be the most stirring, was Britain's generous support of music and the arts – some of the measures even undertaken during wartime – under the slogan: "The best for the most."<sup>162</sup>

The 'best' elements of culture, however, were not widely accessible in Canada, and the allied groups proposed that the state undertake a "distribution of opportunity" to bring "all hands ... into the service of the state, for the welfare of the people, in peace as they are in war." This was hardly a vision of a nationalized culture. Still, the brief went on to recommend that the state initiate "a way of thought among the Canadian people [that] would create a vast enlivening movement." This would require a governmental body for the supervision of culture and all its branches, including crafts and the "everyday aesthetic values pertaining to the consumer." In the artists' plan, community centres would play an important role as concrete expressions of national purpose and local gathering places for citizens seeking self-improvement.<sup>163</sup> One report on the brief made it plain that the sort of activities befitting the post-war community centre would be those requiring mental effort and careful attention:

Some day there will be a Community Centre at Mud Corners. It will be a spot where nearby folk will gather to hear good music and to see good pictures and shows. A spot where children and grown-ups will learn to make pottery, to act in plays, to blow saxophones and trumpets, to paint, to sing. It will be a spot for baseball games and picnics and concerts and discussions. There will be many of these centres throughout Canada, and all of them will be focal points where Canadians may find outlets for artistic urges and food for cultural hunger.<sup>164</sup>

The man who filed that report on the artists' presentation, Walter Herbert, was in a privileged position to assess it. As director of an agency called the Canadian Committee, he was responsible for a programme supplying educational material on Canada to American and British officers stationed here, and had been weighing the pros and cons of a national cultural ministry since earlier in the war.<sup>165</sup> He was well-connected in Ottawa, and advised staff preparing early "Of Things To Come" broadcasts.<sup>166</sup> Herbert lobbied for the sort of government involvement in cultural affairs that the artists' groups did in 1944, citing "colossal" indifference which "must be undermined and dissipated; because our nation cannot achieve the spiritual maturity which will eventually make us great if our cultural life continues cramped and runted."<sup>167</sup> In the way of technique, he was much enamoured of Stephen Tallents' 1932 essay, "The Projection of England," which issued the ultimatum: "If a nation would be truly known and understood in the world, it must set itself actively to master and employ the new, difficult and swiftly developing modes which science has provided for the projection of national personality."<sup>168</sup> He was not, however, convinced that the establishment of such an advanced state cultural apparatus would be simple. Writing to MP Paul Martin, he told the politician, as if speaking to a fellow member of some banned society: "Those of us who sincerely believe that artistic ferment has good-citizenship-building aspects will have to argue pretty vigorously against the cold-blooded realists."<sup>169</sup> When the war ended, so did the Canadian Committee's wartime mandate.

By October 1945, however, Herbert was head of a new organization, the Canada Foundation, which was to function as a cultural clearinghouse, publicizing Canadian artists, writers, and musicians until a proper ministry of cultural affairs could be set up. Without the lump sum of \$10 million that the artists' alliance had requested as seed money for the community centres and their operating expenses, Herbert's organization set out to secure private funds for its work, and to find champions for the culture crusade. Herbert even

wrote to Mrs. John Bracken, wife of the Conservative leader, again somewhat in the tone of a co-conspirator, about an upcoming CBC broadcast of a Willan-Coulter opera: "I suppose you have already planned to listen to 'Deirdre of the Sorrows' next Saturday afternoon. If you could induce Mr. Bracken to relax for three hours to listen with you, I think it would be good for his restless soul."<sup>170</sup> In the decade or so that followed, Herbert and his small staff were to serve as advocates for the restless souls pursuing the *fine arts* and preserving distinctly Canadian variations upon them. Typical of the work the organization undertook during the early post-war period was an index of cultural publications; a project that continued into the mid 1960s.<sup>171</sup> Arising out of the reconstruction-era concern with the nation's cultural diet, the Canada Foundation was a kind of privately-funded prototype of the Canada Council, which would not be endowed until 1957.

Thanks to the formal and informal attention it received, the ideal of reconstruction was difficult to dismiss as a series of hopeful daydreams untimely dreamt during the dark night of war. The culture of reconstruction formed a part of wartime experience indistinguishable from the war effort itself; an atmosphere in which those not fighting overseas could be confident that life at home would be substantially better when bombers were finally transformed into lounge chairs.<sup>172</sup> Perhaps assisted by acute memories of hardships during the Great Depression, the idea of planning for the post-war period gained credibility through more distant recollections of post-World War I disillusionment, as well as the more recent lessons of the New Deal, British efforts to construct a welfare state, and Canadian experience in that same field before and during the war. For the purposes of this study, however, it is most important to note that the culture of reconstruction, though filled with a variety of plans for Canada's emergence from the war as a modern nation, also accommodated criticisms of contemporary life and mass culture. Some opponents of planning seemed to believe that by resisting the extension of state planning into the post-

war era, they were preserving, even buttressing, the foundations of the democratic ideal. *Citizens' Forum*, an invitation to planning for reconstruction which employed the modern means of radio and mass mailings but featured a town-meeting style, also billed itself as a bastion of democracy. At best, Canadians' cautious acceptance of some aspects of a planned society indicated an ambivalence towards large-scale efforts to structure significant portions of their lives. Only the most optimistic supporters of a new order could imagine that the public had been utterly remade by the culture of reconstruction:

The common man today knows what profit he has; and he knows what he wants and what he does not want. He wants peace, and he wants the fruits of a nine-hundred-year struggle for freedom and dignity. He wants opportunities for self-improvement, control of his environment, and fruitful leisure. He wants friendly intercourse among the nations. He wants the dignity of man recognized not as an empty, sterile phrase, but as a basic, elementary, essential, and meaningful fact with all manner of civilized implications and outcomes. He does not want a world half slave and half free, no matter what delectable form the bondage may take.<sup>173</sup>

That was early in 1946. As forecast, war's end brought widespread prosperity.<sup>174</sup> Once economic controls were lifted, the delectable bondage of new houses and better jobs drew many. Convincing the public of the pressing need to scrutinize their cultural surroundings would not be a simple task.

Still, cultural critics considered the stakes high enough to model what they considered desirable behaviours. With its localized group structure and emphasis on participation, *Citizen's Forum* was the most prominent example of a will to embrace new technologies – in this case, radio – and counter the influence of mass culture by making virtuous citizenship somewhat more accessible. Community centre proposals were founded upon the perceived need to escape the passivity and uniformity of modern life. Though these efforts burned brightly for a short time, within two or three years it was clear that

post-war patterns of living and consumption, including the consumption of culture, favoured the mass society. Getting on with work, family, and personal security concerns was a reconstruction with more resonance for the ordinary Canadian than plans for community centres. However, for the extraordinary Canadians who envisioned wholesale changes to the way that the society would operate after the war, all was not lost. Their attempts to harness the culture of reconstruction had institutionalized the critique of mass culture by privileging what seemed like antidotes to mass culture – community centres, radio forums, active citizenship – and exploring the possibility of using the considerable resources of the national broadcaster and the state to promote examples of authentic or worthwhile entertainments. Though they did not succeed in cultivating a general vigilance towards some of the very diversions that buoyed spirits on the homefront or towards the compelling promises of modern life, cultural critics drafted their own set of blueprints for a ‘proper’ post-war Canadian culture against which English Canada would be measured well into the 1960s.

## Two – “V stands for Vacuity”: Wartime

While critics' blueprints for a cultural regeneration reflected their tenaciously-held beliefs about what post-war Canada *could* be, wartime life itself provided a more immediate challenge. In a nation entranced by the task of preserving democracy, how could critics promote an elevated vision of democratic civilization without abusing the various methods of exerting cultural influence? Referring to one such method, Watson Thomson of the University of Manitoba's extension department wrote: "The question of propaganda is really a much larger issue than the war itself or attitudes to the war. The nerve of the matter is its intimate connection with that profound crisis and transition in human affairs of which the war itself is an aspect and an episode." Crisis and transition accompanied the process of modernization, and they tugged civilization between "individualist anarchy" and a type of conformity (present elsewhere, Thomson contended, in fascism and communism) that was plainly "unacceptable to the liberal man of the west." Along with a number of his contemporaries, he sensed a middle path through this crisis, but also recognized how it might be difficult to convince the public to tread such a path, given that:

the total process of modernization has, in fact and in spite of all individualistic trends, collectivized life in a new and inescapable sense. The new technology came on the anarchic scene, playing into the hands of these strong men "of the baser sort" who were emerging as lords of the jungle and helping them to create lawless empires of industry or of political gangsterdom. Men with dying roots and dwindling faith were subjected to the mass-producing processes of assembly-line labor, stereotyped "culture," mechanized "pleasure." Individualism and collectivism, in other words, have not had an even chance against each other. The scales have become weighted in favor of collectivism, and

collectivism of a terrifyingly sub-personal, sub-rational quality.<sup>1</sup>

Several such recognitions populated the discourse about culture during the Second World War in English Canada. These critical insights were consonant with wartime and early post-war efforts to reinvigorate the democratic ideal by looking beyond its conventional political meanings and the often romantic notions surrounding it.<sup>2</sup> As leaders within their communities, critics often had to temper their concern over cultural matters with attention to their role as cheerleaders for the allied 'way of life.' The previous chapter showed how enthusiasm for reconstruction functioned to coax out critics' and activists' fondest wishes for what would be relatively tranquil peacetime circumstances. Using those aspirations for the cultivated society as a basis for comparison, this chapter examines the experience of being at war as a platform from which critics tried to impart their understanding of how modern life and mass culture affected Canadian society at an especially trying time. It provides a closer examination of some developments they considered destructive or deeply meaningful, exploring attitudes toward propaganda and the uses of scientific knowledge, and emphasizing the contentious issue of democracy.

As they wrote books and articles or made broadcasts, cultural critics were free to write as if the war did not exist. They could pan a film without commenting upon its consequences for wartime morale. Pieces with a war 'angle,' however, stood a better chance of reaching the broader audience – an audience long thought to be in need of intelligent guidance. In attempting to provide such guidance, critics forged links between their dispositions towards modern life and mass culture and the wartime circumstances most evident to the majority of Canadians. These links may be organized under three rubrics. First, critics associated tendencies in modern Canadian society (or the Western world at large) with documented or reputed enemy traits and modes of living. Advertising, for

example, became fascist propaganda's close relative. Second, while critics appreciated the roles that the scientific method, utilitarianism and mass production played in the war effort, they objected to the wholesale adoption of such principles, again associating these with totalitarianism and cultural decay. Third, while professing the requisite wartime reverence for democracy, critics hoped that its tendency to empower the mediocre could be overcome. Far from placing cultural matters on the shelf, the war brought some crucial aspects of the critique of modern life and mass culture into sharper focus. Among English Canada's more articulate citizens, the national concern with defeating an enemy more concrete than impoverished taste offered an opportunity to conflate the two struggles.

A war emergency could work to suspend or to blunt aesthetic sensibilities in favour of pragmatic attention to public morale. As Jonathan Vance has shown in his study of World War One's aftermath, even though "vacuous requiems for the dead" would not satisfy many Canadians bent on erecting more enduring monuments, mythical – often melodramatic – representations of the war nonetheless endured, and were reprised after 1939.<sup>3</sup> The Second World War had its own mythologies, which critics – even if they were so inclined – were reluctant to dismiss as appeals to sentiment. An example of this patriotic restraint comes from September 1943, when *The Canadian Author and Bookman* endorsed Ontario high school teacher Dorothy Dumbille's maudlin collection of wartime poetry, *Watch the Sun Rise*, even though her work did not resemble the sort of critically-acclaimed and clearly more modernist material then being turned out by established poets like E.J. Pratt or A.J.M. Smith.<sup>4</sup> To their general and polite praise for the work itself, the editors added the observation that the book's allegorical cover illustration of a woman facing purposefully eastward at dawn

happily epitomizes the position of Canada. Her sun is rising upon a new day of glorious opportunities and privileges. But that same day will be filled with vast responsibilities and obligations. Canadians must learn to assume the



responsibilities and fulfil the obligations, or they are likely to find the opportunities dwindle and the privileges vanish. It is part of a writer's task to carry such a message to the people. The writer who ignores this function, fails his great calling.<sup>5</sup>

As the editors' commentary indicated, accompanying an acute awareness of each citizen's wartime duties and potential rewards was a sense that writers had been handed an unprecedented opportunity to practise their craft in support of the war effort. Those concerned with maintaining morale promoted efforts like Dumbville's poetry because no matter how unoriginal or saccharine, such works served a noble and immediate purpose. Among Allied nations, that purpose was the successful diffusion of an ironic message: strict compliance with wartime regulations and prolonged personal sacrifice were essential to the maintenance of a democratic order.<sup>6</sup> There were some commentators who insisted that "the way to combat naziism is not by establishing it here 'for the duration', for if we surrender our freedom now it is doubtful we shall find it easy to regain once the war ends."<sup>7</sup> Yet, expert guidance, even the level of regimentation necessary to ensure the efficient prosecution of the war effort, became somewhat more justifiable when invoked in the defence of individual freedom. Even though a number of critics considered the brand of democracy mythologized in the wartime slogan only a half measure, it remained difficult to criticize forms of culture that had become popular under a democratic system.

Writers were not the only ones called upon to employ their talents in the cause of promoting wartime unity of purpose. Given the Nazi example of propaganda and perceiving the need to counteract it with propaganda supporting the allied democracies, broadcasters and filmmakers in Canada enjoyed enhanced status as a group which could decisively influence the prosecution of the war.<sup>8</sup> Columnist Raymond Davies considered every person involved in the diffusion of words and images as someone destined to make a difference, remarking: "[t]o those of us still outside the armed services, those of us who are

*opinion moulders*, history has given a central task, overshadowing all others."<sup>9</sup> Wartime did not provide the first convenient occasion for suggesting that the artist, writer or performer could also be an activist, but pre-war exhortations of this sort might be more easily characterized as items on a political agenda. As one commentator on the left vowed in 1936, "[t]here can be no full, free creative life for the individual except in harmonious association with his fellows ... so long as the good life is barred to the great masses of people by our social institutions and conditions this prerequisite is unattainable." Linking decadence and social inequality, he cited evidence of prior failures and suggested that catering to elite tastes had been the cause: "Past civilizations have crumbled because of such top-heaviness. The artist should be the first to recognize this, since any satisfying practise of his art demands responsiveness from as wide a body of his fellows as possible."<sup>10</sup>

In the midst of a war constructed as a choice between a strong attachment to democracy or oblivion, democracy became more than a political term for cultural critics. Considering the journal's acknowledged mandate and the attention traditionally devoted to party politics in Canada, it may seem incongruous to readers eager for news of wartime political bloodshed to note a *Canadian Forum* editorial's declaration that "we are all liberal democrats now."<sup>11</sup> The political contest surely went on during wartime, and its intricacies can be followed in several studies.<sup>12</sup> The *Canadian Forum's* editors, however, were not celebrating the achievement of a truce among political parties, but suggesting that few opinions could be expressed without at least implicitly honouring the ideals that characterized liberal democracy; ideals often cribbed as "The Four Freedoms" after a speech by U.S. President Roosevelt in January 1941.<sup>13</sup> This devotion both encouraged the denunciation of totalitarian nations' "brutal regimentation and overriding of the individual,"<sup>14</sup> and allowed critics to scold a domestic population "capable of enjoying the benefits of democracy without having either the invincible ignorance or the deep wisdom

necessary to fortify it against the perils which democracy brings."<sup>15</sup>

The war harboured a range of meanings. Early in the conflict, I.D. Willis, a self-employed writer living in Gananoque, Ontario, noted that during the 1930s it had become apparent Canada needed to grow up, and only adventure could grant it maturity. To Willis, war promised adventure because it represented nothing less than "the margin of a great wilderness of doubt and uncertainty, uncharted, unknown, into which the nation must go to find a new order."<sup>16</sup> Looking back on the war from close range, hardly a year after victory in Europe and mere months after the defeat of Japan, historian Arthur Lower saw both of the twentieth century's world wars as parts of a longer developmental cycle for Canada, maintaining that cumulatively, the wars had made

an impact on Canadian life almost as great as a revolution. We are far indeed from the simple old community of the nineteenth century, and while other forces were certainly moving us along in those directions, the wars have enormously accelerated our speed of departure from the old ways.<sup>17</sup>

Commenting some thirty years after the fact on the significance of the Second World War for the nation, historian Donald Creighton considered wartime a "fresh beginning in the Canadian experience" after a decade of dismal conditions. He cited the "immense and prolonged effects" of the war, and added that the "pace and direction" of the nation were greatly altered.<sup>18</sup>

Whether one considers World War II an adventure culminating in a new level of national 'maturity,' one episode in an extended process of modernization, or an unqualified departure from all that had gone before, it is plain that contemporary reports generally perceived war as typically modern, a mode of existence in which a person's circumstances could change quickly by coming into contact with previously unfamiliar cultures, or by having set patterns of life disturbed. Almost overnight, the anxiety wrought by

unemployment and economic uncertainty during most of the 1930s seemed much less acute as attention turned to international matters and to the question of whether the nation's established 'way of life' would survive the conflict. For the majority of Canadians, critiques of mass culture and modern life were not vital during wartime, and such concerns remained subjugated to a war effort that relied heavily upon mass communications to help inspire sacrifice and patience. Still, questions about what sort of culture Canadians would forge in the crucible of war occupied some observers to the extent that their thoughts on this and related subjects form a rich body of evidence from which we may draw some important conclusions.

The Second World War burst in upon a nation already in transition. Not yet fully free of the disappointments plaguing Canada during the 1930s, the war would take Canadians still further from Stephen Leacock's *Mariposa* towards a society in which everything seemed to move and change more quickly. During the calmer months of 1939, in an attempt to take "a measure of Canadian thought," journalist Peter Fraser spent some time perusing an Eaton's catalogue and a pair of large-circulation weekly magazines. The catalogue had long been a bridge between modern city goods and country customers. Comparing the Montreal-based *Family Herald* with the *Toronto Star Weekly*, he found the "earthy and rather pleasant smell of the one being balanced by the city-slicker aroma of the other," and gathered there was "a superior mentality obtaining in Canadian rural areas." As evidence, he cited the unashamedly agrarian *Family Herald's* ability to secure university professors as contributors, its sensible political commentary and the relative scarcity of ads for patent medicines. In Fraser's estimation, the *Herald's* song column, which reprinted old favourites such as the "Red River Shore," (suitable for accompaniment on the mouth-organ), ranked well above the *Star Weekly's* sentimental poetry and astrology features. As a testament to the storied

virtue of rural values, he identified *Family Herald* subscribers with the plain but canny backwoods types portrayed in movies and dime novels, concluding that it was "Little wonder that rural characters in all popular fiction and in all Hollywood productions ultimately always triumph." Fraser's commentary was a denunciation of the distance modern Canada had travelled from the principles of a long-departed rural independence already enshrined in the North American popular imagination. Appealing to a rural stereotype familiar to his predominantly urban audience, Fraser complained that fads and ephemeral concerns made it difficult for the modern city dweller to be much more than an easily-distracted bystander. Unable to confirm that rural Canadians lived up to the image of the wise rustic he had helped in his own small way to reinforce, Fraser nonetheless admonished town dwellers with that image, noting: "Canadians can thank heaven that their political bodies are still controlled by those on the back concessions."<sup>19</sup>

For more than a half-century leading up to the war, the proportion of Canadians occupying the setting Fraser romanticized shrank as the nation underwent an extended phase of urbanization and industrialization. So powerful were these changes that they now serve as points of departure for much historical writing about late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Canada, especially in the sub-disciplines of social and labour history. However, here it is most important to note that the processes bringing more Canadians into towns and cities and making wage employees of them had not run their course before World War I. Although the turn-of-the-century period boasted a more rapid rate of urbanization, it was only at some undetermined moment between the censuses of 1921 and 1931 that Canadians living in what the Dominion Bureau of Statistics defined as urban settings came to outnumber those living in rural areas.<sup>20</sup> Yet, the 'old ways,' or fond visions of them, seemed to remain part of the urban imagination even as rural areas obtained town amenities. One observer of rural life suggested that farm families had been isolated too long

and were ready to become 'up-to-date.' He remained certain, however, that city-dwellers would not alter their perception of life lived away from the crowds and factories, declaring that: "It is left to the urban orator to extol the blessings of rustic freedom. The agrarian knows the restrictions of his boasted liberty."<sup>21</sup>

Not only were people migrating from rural to urban environments during the first part of the twentieth century in North America, but the solitude supposedly conducive to freedom of thought and action was disappearing rapidly. More efficient methods of transportation and communication brought goods, people and information to what were previously isolated areas, breaking down local patterns and integrating the inhabitants of such areas into provincial or national frameworks.<sup>22</sup> More people became familiar with the bustle and the fleeting transactions – both social and economic – of urban life. The observant B.K. Sandwell noted that during the 1930s in Canada "in urban areas, and to some extent even in the country, the home has lost much of its importance as a social centre; motoring, the "movies", public dancing places and restaurants provide the occasions for people to meet their friends."<sup>23</sup> In 1939, American philosopher and educational theorist John Dewey saw independence and strength in the isolation of rural life: "Before we engage in too much pity for the inhabitants of our rural regions before the days of invention of modern devices for circulation and information, we should recall that they knew more about the things that affected their own lives than the city dweller of today is likely to know about the causes of his affairs."<sup>24</sup> A few months before the war, Trans-Canada Airlines' newly-inaugurated passenger service seemed like a potential boost for national unity and breadth of experience, but one commentator doubted air transport's ability to improve society in any profound way. He longed instead for an elevation of the national disposition:

[O]ur trust cannot be in streamlined fabrics, ingenious gearing, efficient engines, and unlimited miles per hour. It is conceivable that our bodies might reach the stratosphere and our spirits still be no higher than the dull levels of prejudice

and mediocrity along which it is sometimes easier to stumble  
than take flight from the ground.<sup>25</sup>

Within six months, all able spirits would be thrust into a partnership with the national war machine. Yet, as historian Chester Martin remarked at the time, Canadians went into the war with few illusions: "It requires almost an effort to recall the contrasts of twenty-five years ago – the ingenuous response of 1914, the bands playing, the haste to reach the scene in time to share in the adventure."<sup>26</sup> As it did elsewhere in the West, the coming of war further accelerated the pace of Canada's transformation into a modern nation. In their work on interwar Britain, Peter Miles and Malcolm Smith emphasize the importance of the year 1940 as a cultural, as well as military and political watershed. Following the tense months of waiting at the beginning of that year, (the 'phoney' war), the bombs began to fall. The task of preserving morale during the early days of the conflict fell largely to those working in branches of government that were geared toward controlling what the public heard on radio, saw in cinemas and on posters, or read in newspapers and pamphlets. An appreciable portion of Britain's writers, as George Orwell recalled, had been "sucked into the various Ministries or the BBC" regardless of their politics, because the British government understood the power of public information only too acutely.<sup>27</sup>

The pattern of state involvement in presenting the war to the British public that Miles and Smith identify also obtained in Canada, but to a lesser extent. A similar class or, more properly, a similarly literate group of Canadians commented on the nation at war. Most often, however, these observers volunteered their opinions, writing or broadcasting on what seemed to be a more freelance basis than their British counterparts. Canada's Bureau of Public Information (BPI) and its successor, the Wartime Information Board (WIB), lagged behind Britain's Ministry of Information (MoI) and the shorter-lived United States' Office of War Information (OWI) in relative size and sophistication. Despite their small size and

the opportunities for writers and broadcasters outside the public service, the BPI and WIB were where "[m]any members of the elite had gained experience in managing public opinion." For some, the techniques honed during wartime would later be recycled in aid of the "humanist cause of the Massey Commission."<sup>28</sup> Somewhat upset by wartime leanings towards the CCF, at least one representative of the business community saw even the moderate members of Canada's information corps as "shrewd propagandists who have wormed themselves into key organizations where they can more readily control and direct the thinking of thousands of people."<sup>29</sup> Inconveniently for the present study, browbeating the Canadian population about a perceived decline in cultural standards was not an officially sanctioned activity of any government agency during wartime.

Although the Canadian government had intended the BPI and WIB to oversee war news and commentary, to boost morale and to present Canada in a flattering light wherever possible, their mandates, and the Liberal government's reluctance to be seen engaging in propaganda, limited their ability to address domestic affairs not plainly connected with the war effort. While the BPI and WIB did not serve as the direct employer of an army of writers, broadcasters and film-makers in the same sense that Nazi Germany's propaganda bureau did, their methods were similar, and no doubt contributed in a modest way to national solidarity in wartime.<sup>30</sup> With the establishment of the National Film Board (NFB) in 1939 under the direction of John Grierson, Canada acquired another potential avenue of influence over public opinion. Grierson was a pioneer in the genre of the documentary film, and his wartime NFB efforts – which he did not hesitate to call "propaganda" – brought carefully-edited images of the war to countless Canadians.<sup>31</sup> Regardless of the profile or impact of government propaganda agencies, much of the measured reflection on homefront life and the state of culture in Canada still came from academics or journalists who worked under wartime secrecy guidelines, but were neither members of the



government information corps nor bound to follow their lead. Much of the wartime commentary we have on the topics of modern life and mass culture survives in articles, broadcasts and pamphlets that were certainly patriotic and probably served to boost wartime morale, but originated from the offices of voluntary associations or the desks of individuals concerned as much with the direction of Canada's cultural development as they were with winning the war.

The state of being at war threw into sharper relief some aspects of the connection between modern life and mass culture. Advertisers, as might be expected, did not miss the opportunity to be topical in wartime. Augmenting the themes of pre-war campaigns pushing futuristic goods with new ads emphasizing the nation's military obligation, they strove to place would-be consumers in the vanguard of modernity, and in the honourable company of Canada's armed forces. Advertisers associated their wares – often billed as the products "of tomorrow" – with the same qualities they had customarily trumpeted, such as reliability and efficiency.<sup>32</sup> These qualities took on a deeper significance in wartime because they had become essential for victory. Articles in Canadian magazines or topics featured on radio programmes paid at least some attention to the war, whether they devoted considerable space to war news, reported on some aspect of troop or homefront life or merely wished Allied forces well. Of course many articles or programmes failed to mention the war explicitly, but readers and listeners nonetheless felt its presence keenly. Business reports noted increased demand for commodities such as metals and rubber; sports leagues went on without many of their best players; and "women's" pages featured recipes adapted for rationing.

The overarching reason for these ancillary developments on the homefront did not need to be set out repeatedly for a public whose daily lives brimmed with these and other reminders of their nation's commitment. By no means did such an extensive awareness of

the war transform Canada into a nation motivated solely by war. Yet, war reached deeply into the lives of even those who might be expected to contemplate more sublime states. Art critic Robert Ayre reviewed a late 1940 exhibition of contemporary Canadian works, declaring that "the war is still too new, still not urgent enough, in Canada to be a valid influence in our art." But he quickly qualified that remark to account for the impact the war was having on the everyday lives of artist and non-artist alike:

This is not to say our painters aren't seriously disturbed by the war. They are to the extent that some have gone into active service, some are giving all their spare time and energy to military training, and others are too uneasy to work whole heartedly, as if painting doesn't matter in times like these. I think it does; it matters very much; and that is why a show like "Art of Our Day in Canada" is heartening.<sup>33</sup>

Clearly, culture of a certain sort had not been forgotten. However, given Canadian society's complete involvement in the war effort, particularly during its early stages when the very foundations of the Western achievement seemed in gravest danger, proposing some sort of order for peacetime culture without reference to the wartime task at hand would have seemed foolhardy.

War was a great agent of change, altering the life of nearly every citizen and, according to B.K. Sandwell, it was the one thing that "makes us willing to face risks and make experiments that we would not venture upon under any other circumstances."<sup>34</sup> Whatever their private motivations, ordinary Canadians joined the armed forces and filled jobs or managed households where daily routines were at the very least circumscribed by wartime needs. For members of the intellectual or cultural elites who had not already enlisted their bodies or – more appropriately – their minds and talents in the struggle, to appear unmoved by the war emergency was to invite public contempt. Literary critic J.R.

MacGillivray complained in 1941 that Canadian authors had not sufficiently engaged the war as a theme in their work and displayed "no apparent awareness of ideas and events, but a perfect isolation from place and time." He wondered what might remedy their insularity: "[D]id not somebody tell them last year to their gratification that in this war the front line ran right through their desks? Would that it did!" Despite a few exceptions, he noted that in 1940 "eighty per cent of our fiction has been devoted as usual to books for children, animal stories, and lurid tales of adventure on the frontier." The genre of the short story included some reflections on wartime and was therefore somewhat more successful in its "imaginative interpretation of the common experience of people in this country." But short stories could not command nearly the readership MacGillivray saw rushing to buy cheap novels that romanticized the opening of the west.<sup>35</sup> In a nation mobilized to fight its enemies abroad, figures like MacGillivray who thought about domestic cultural matters for a living, or those like Sandwell who noted the impact of various kinds of change upon the Canadian way of life, thought it prudent to express their opinions on such homefront subjects by linking them, directly or obliquely, to issues arising from the war.

For most Canadians, the Second World War was an uncomplicated struggle to join. Billed as a "War of Ideals" in which opposing ideals presented themselves unambiguously,

[i]t is a war between people who have no religion, on the one side, and people who have, on the other; between people who have officially thrown aside decency and morality, and people who still cherish these principles and give expression to them in their lives, however imperfectly.<sup>36</sup>

The assumption, by default, of proprietorship over decency and morality granted Canada and its allies plenty of latitude to dehumanize the enemy. Waging war certainly seemed justified, and one magazine writer contended that it would be extremely useful in wartime to cultivate a "constructive hatred towards the enemy, a hatred akin to the spirit of the

Crusaders."<sup>37</sup> Even peace-loving sorts, well-travelled and accustomed to seeking compromise in their daily lives and careers, found it easy to endorse the Second World War as a moral struggle. Editor and clergyman Claris Silcox was aware of the resistance some German church leaders offered their government and hence did not consider all Germans fully complicit. Yet he viewed the war as worth fighting because it was "not only a just war but a holy crusade against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."<sup>38</sup> For those convinced that Canadian society was itself prey to some of the same forces that had so perverted Nazi Germany and its Axis partners, the presence of features common to both enemy culture and modern Canadian life allowed them to practise their own brand of cultural stewardship while furthering the war effort.

Attempting to alert Canadians to disagreeable aspects of modern life and mass culture without hindering the war effort, critics helped perpetuate a view of the wartime world in which the Nazis spouted propaganda or indoctrinated their youth, while the Canadians, British and later the Americans managed information or engaged in "education for democracy."<sup>39</sup> These distinctions were subtle ones, but important. It was, ironically, German émigré sociologist Paul Lazarsfeld who identified the North American compulsion to resist too close a devotion to public opinion while also avoiding authoritarianism: "we look at radio and its effects upon public opinion as a possible means of steering safely between these two dangers. Has it made, or can it make, us more amenable to social change without making us thoughtless and intolerant victims of propaganda stereotypes?"<sup>40</sup> The additional irony of assigning sinister impulses to Germany or heroic motives to the Allies for what were broadly similar activities practised by each side in the struggle seemed lost on commentators who sought to maintain what little "decency and morality" they thought Canada could yet claim. To those concerned with the scourge of mass entertainments or the abandonment of cherished customs, Canadian society sat in grave danger of succumbing to

the same influences. As historian Frank Underhill noted: "The phenomenon of the masses as we see it in Nazi Germany is so sinister because Germany only reveals the ultimate stage of certain tendencies in our contemporary world which can be detected in all countries."<sup>41</sup> By linking domestic cultural trends with enemy techniques, and vice versa, critics dissatisfied with particular aspects of the emerging modern order could express their frustration with those trends *and* remain faithful to the war effort.

Portrayals of enemy culture served as potent object lessons for Canadians even before the Axis powers had officially become Canada's enemies on 10 September 1939. A month before war broke out, one columnist, still flushed with post-Royal Visit sentiment, expressed his belief that Canada's British and French heritage, as well as its friendship with the United States, outshone all its material riches and placed it in a distinguished company of nations. Conspicuously excluded from this group – "the peoples of whom we truly form part" – was Nazi Germany, which had earned a reputation since 1933 for its extensive propaganda machinery and its thinly-disguised use of crowd psychology as a political tool. The author of the piece, W.J. Healy, considered German threats of war as an example of the same sort of mass manipulation exercised on a larger scale and directed outside Germany's borders. Though he was certain Canadians possessed ample "spirit" to meet the challenge of war, should one erupt, Healy recommended that Canadians stand guard against Europe's propagandists, whose reliance on mass persuasion placed them foremost among "the darkeners of the sky of civilization, the war-mongers, who are most potentially dangerous in their planning to induce fear and nervous inaction[.]"<sup>42</sup>

Mere weeks before Canada entered the war, Watson Kirkconnell suggested that an state of enmity already existed when he contrasted fascist and communist practices with the ethic of freedom, an ethic he identified with Christianity and the democratic powers. Tying together the usually disparate realms of economics and religion, he blamed the modern

economic system for the discord of the late 1930s, when nations which could not produce all they needed threatened to take it by force from their weaker neighbours. Because they had abandoned their spiritual roots in favour of the rapid achievement of worldly objectives, Kirkconnell suggested that Canada's soon-to-be enemies had sacrificed too eagerly at the altar of modernity. "The fascist and Nazi systems of Germany and Italy seem to be efficient and moving forward," he wrote, "but this is at the price of Christian liberty."<sup>43</sup>

With such a buildup in the months before hostilities began, it should not be surprising that critics shifted easily to more pointed critiques of enemy culture in wartime. Once war was declared, with few exceptions, pre-war concern about the regrettable assaults on popular liberty in distant places like Germany and Italy<sup>44</sup> gave way to full-scale denunciations of reputed enemy characteristics which might threaten – or perhaps were already threatening – Canadian civilization from within. Much of the anti-enemy rhetoric to be found in wartime pamphlets, magazines, and radio broadcasts was homegrown propaganda, designed primarily to raise spirits and swell armed forces recruitment numbers. However, these sources contain more than the elementary hatred writers like Raymond Davies wished to incite. Among the patriotic calls for Victory Loan contributions and total commitment to the task at hand, a chorus used the example of enemy culture to demonize tendencies perceived to be at the root of either ongoing or potential cultural decay at home.

Identifying propaganda's least flattering features with the nation's enemies most commonly involved indicating the role such techniques played in the rise and perpetuation of the Nazi regime. Relative to Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Imperial Japan received less frequent attention from Canadian propagandists, though Prime Minister King vilified those nations often in his wartime speeches.<sup>45</sup> As for Germany, commentators found it difficult to hide dismay that this northern European nation with which the Anglo-American world enjoyed cultural and intellectual exchange as recently as the mid 1930s had strayed so far

from the fold. By 1942, Frank Underhill could echo, as if stating a mathematical axiom, British writer and broadcaster J.B. Priestley's declaration that "Hitler, the vindictive do-s-house dreamer, thinks and acts always in terms of the masses, and never for a moment in terms of the people."<sup>46</sup> Thanks to newsreel footage and frequent press coverage of party rallies during the 1930s and the war's early years, the Nazis had gained a reputation in the North American mind as masters of spectacle and manipulation. The distinction between masses and people to which Underhill alluded differentiated a uniformly corrupted or deceived enemy mind from the sort of self-control critics hoped Canadians still possessed: an independent will making each citizen capable of determining when to co-operate in an enterprise such as a 'just' war.

Identifying enemy propaganda with domestic advertising campaigns was an effective way of repudiating both forms of communication. When Northrop Frye wrote that "it is not Churchill or Roosevelt but Mussolini who must pose for cameras and kiss the shuddering babies and generally advertise himself like a toothpaste to retain public favor,"<sup>47</sup> he referred chiefly to the contrasts between democratic and totalitarian polities, but swung a double-edged sword. Frye hoped that the image of Il Duce advertising himself "like a toothpaste" would resonate for readers familiar with the sort of heavy-handed, unsubtle approach that selling such goods to the masses required. Correct or not, his implication that Allied leaders had secured popular support by simply doing their jobs also broadened the imagined distances between enemy and self, and between the world of advertising and virtuous resistance to it. Identifying forms of culture with an easily-maligned 'other' was hardly an original strategy, but it was particularly striking in wartime because the time for dialogue between opposing nations had passed. Pre-war memories and stereotypes substituted for direct interaction. As a tool for encouraging critical readings of even the most mundane aspects of one's own social and cultural surroundings, the enemy dictator

proved useful.

The ideal of an independent will resistant to demagogues and hucksters and supported by a tradition of self-determination appealed to critics as a beacon to lead Canadians through the dark years of war. Canada, according to Arthur Lower, featured an "easy-going, not unkindly populace resting on the laurels of religious teachings and the mores of its pioneer[s]," but its population needed informed direction because they were in danger of a grave fall:

The disappearance of fixed beliefs, the wearing out of the old traditions, the absence of a dynamic, all this has left a vacuum, a house swept and garnished into which seven devils may be moving, devils of intolerance, of harshness, of gregarious unanimity, of panic fear, the conventional characteristics of the crowd.<sup>48</sup>

Despite such candid admissions of dread, critics displayed a cautious fascination with the mass mind doomed to serve a succession of undeserving masters. In the spring of 1940, *Food For Thought* devoted an issue to a discussion of propaganda and its intended effects. A frequent contributor, British-born educator and broadcaster R.S. Lambert, noted that propaganda was best defined as a "*method of influencing people*" which, depending upon the motives of those employing it, could be used for good or ill. Far from rejecting propaganda out of hand, he even hoped that the Allies might "leave behind them their early amateurism" and become more expert in the field. This was especially important since the military outcome of the war remained uncertain, and the Allies would need to maintain goodwill among themselves, neutral nations and the conquered enemy. However, given the immediate example of the Second World War, it seemed plain to Lambert that enemy societies had succumbed to propaganda in a way that Britain and other English-speaking nations could (or should) not. In aid of establishing an historical basis for this distinction, he suggested a crude national hierarchy of resistance to mass persuasion:



Individuals are more rational than crowds; and therefore the art of propaganda is particularly effective in swaying the beliefs and actions of people in the mass. Highly individualistic peoples are least susceptible to propaganda, and so are those with well-established traditions or customs, which resist irrational, as well as rational, innovations of thought.<sup>49</sup>

In this instance, rational and irrational referred not to the logical rigor of the arguments put forward by propagandists, but to their format. Individualistic peoples tended to be difficult to persuade, through either protracted ("rational") argument or emotional ("irrational") appeal. To distance those in Britain and the Dominions yet further from what he called the "black art" of modern propaganda, Lambert added that although Britain's Lord Northcliffe pioneered in its study (but more so in its commercial exploitation) before and during the First World War, the British had all but abandoned such techniques during the interwar period. Hitler was thus free during the 1930s, Lambert suggested, to invest the term with the malevolent connotations it held throughout the English-speaking world.<sup>50</sup>

In wartime Canada, therefore, identifying with the British tradition meant affecting a degree of detachment from enemy-style propaganda and mass methods of maintaining popular solidarity, or at the very least advocating their controlled use. One observer wondered how Canada would "steer its way between the sterile purism which dreads the contamination of "propaganda" and the indiscriminate zeal of the flagwaggers."<sup>51</sup> To tread such a path, it would be necessary for an organization like the Wartime Information Board to represent its work as documentary of Canada's war effort, as a force for national unity, or as a corrective to the influence of enemy propaganda, which it essentially did.<sup>52</sup> In this sense, keeping the public informed of Canadian achievements on the battlefields of Europe or on the homefront suggested more of a concerted program of education than propaganda. In the field of education itself, fear of a Nazified generation was apparent.

Citing the example of German youth, for whom they believed "[c]onscience, civilized man's ethical guide, has been abolished," Ontario school officials resurrected a century-old debate by proposing the inclusion of a religious component in the provincial curriculum, ostensibly as a preventative measure.<sup>53</sup> N.A.M. MacKenzie, later an instrumental member of the Massey Commission, told conscientious Canadians that they could be safe from would-be dictators by making certain their educational system was not too focussed upon training youth for particular professions without grounding them in the humanities. Because it produced community leaders familiar with the wisdom of the ancients and moderns, he argued that a liberal university education gave a population access to the cultural background it needed to discriminate between right and wrong, forthrightly "meeting and defeating enemy propaganda."<sup>54</sup>

With conscience and a tradition of free inquiry upholding the Allied cause, it scarcely bothered those in charge of promoting the sale of Victory bonds that their Spring 1942 advertising campaign contained some powerful propaganda. The reader, addressed as "you" – an individual – saw a rank of blank-countenanced Germans saluting Hitler. These were the

faceless men, men without identity, who march with linked arms against machine guns if they are not ordered to stop, who beat old men in the streets, and send their own mothers to concentration camps because the Fuhrer says it should be so. They are not just vicious, bloodthirsty men ... they are automatons, without wills or desires[.]"<sup>55</sup>

The campaign acknowledged, and was probably to a degree inspired by the reported inability of Second World War era cartoonists to "produce anything recognizable as the typical German soldier" where World War I's "fat-necked barbarian, wearing a spiked helmet and decorated with the Iron Cross" had been ubiquitous.<sup>56</sup>

The image of ordinary Germans driven towards war with little control over their

fates did not go unexploited by those in Canada wary of mass culture and of the level of indoctrination presented in *Education for Death*, Gregor Zierner's account of his life as a teacher in Germany.<sup>57</sup> However, they could further their own cultural critiques and serve Canadian wartime morale simultaneously by arguing that Nazi success in deluding a mass following was at least partially attributable to a fundamental weakness among the German people. In that vein, R.S. Lambert noted what he considered some telling German traits, which included an:

admixture of sentimentality and brutality, which is alien to Anglo-Saxon hard-headedness ... cultivation of artificial in place of innate patriotism ... distrust of individualism, and cultivation of the herd instinct, leading, through the German power of organization and attention to detail, to regimentation.<sup>58</sup>

Lambert's early wartime vivisection of the enemy psyche led him to suggest that the "cultivation" of these tendencies could be blamed squarely on the Nazis, under whom such traits were "brought to the top," but that the tendencies themselves nonetheless resided in the group, and were easily coaxed out. He claimed that along with its allies, Canada remained a nation of individuals drawn together in a common cause, and its people would do well to defend British traditions in peacetime as well. Lambert added disapprovingly that Germany had tried to imitate some of Britain's characteristic institutions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, but had come up instead with "traditions created by artificial culture."<sup>59</sup> Hitler had merely augmented an already derivative pattern with a convenient assortment of theories of race and destiny. "There," intoned the Narrator in one of Mac Shoub's radio dramas, "is the cursed culture that slits the throat of life with a brutal edge."<sup>60</sup>

Working under such assumptions, it became relatively easy for critics in Canada to portray enemy culture as inauthentic and to use it as a model of what Canadians must take care to avoid at home. While examining the decline of religious affiliation at one of

Canada's oldest universities, B.K. Sandwell contended, as might be expected, that "[t]he true business of higher education is to keep alive, and to make continually stronger, the traditional culture of the community in which it functions." However, he drew upon a counter-example the enemy had provided in order to chastise contemporary Canadian society and advocate the ideal of a responsible populace:

The true meaning of that term "culture" is certainly not identical with the meaning ascribed by Germans between 1910 and 1941 to their own word "kultur"; but it contains more of the idea of discipline, and disciplined responsibility than we were willing to put into it during those same years.<sup>61</sup>

The enemy could exercise discipline over a mass public, but could hardly expect responsible behaviour from it. However well-deserved it was, the Nazi-era German reputation for thinking and acting *en masse* granted considerable license to those in Canada who wished to promote a responsible individualism at home. The war effort curtailed some domestic political freedoms, and although the regulations circumscribing wartime life were part of a regrettable state of regimentation for most Canadians, several commentators reminded the public that this plight was only temporary, and they had not been wrenched, at least not for the sake of conformity, from attachments or pastimes they were free to choose. By drawing attention to the enemy's dependence upon cultivating conformity, critics strove to condemn blind adherence to cultural forms that seemed popular, but which had nonetheless flourished at the expense of existing values or traditions. They hoped Canadians would learn, allegorically, that their society could only mature by building upon the traditions that had shaped it thus far.

In pointing out the errors to which entire societies were susceptible, observers were fortunate to have a convenient enemy to make the metaphorical divide between punishment and redemption more recognizable. In an address broadcast during the intermission of

Gounod's *Faust*, McGill Principal Cyril James spoke of Germany's Faustian bargain and its inevitable ruin. James considered Hitler "a modern embodiment of Faust" who showed complete disregard for "the code of laws and morals that has been carefully formulated and preserved by the untiring efforts of successive generations of mankind."<sup>62</sup> To James, the preservation of this code of laws and morals was synonymous with the Allied cause. Although enemy culture (or the conception of it that James and others shared) and the mass culture produced and consumed in North America were hardly identical, critics could draw parallels between the restricted nature of life in an Axis nation and the danger lurking behind the inanity and sameness of much of the contemporary fare they saw on this continent. The Canadian people could be trusted to elect reasonably harmless governments or to fill the jobs opening up in an increasingly mechanized world, but their fitness to choose wisely between the timeless and the ephemeral without some form of supervision remained suspect.

One final illustration of the identification of mass society with enemy culture comes from a 1943 radio play in which the protagonist was a young German pilot flying over France. The playwright, with a flourish of unsubtle symbolism, separates the pilot from his squadron. Liberated from the 'herd,' the young flyer begins to think about his indoctrination, which is presented as the antithesis of a Christian upbringing. Before long, he hears his superior officer's voice:

Remember ... you are no longer an individual. You are a  
cornice on the great edifice of the state. You must become a  
machine ... with eyes and ears and a voice. You must come  
and go like the hands of a clock, as though bidden by an  
unseen mainspring.<sup>63</sup>

Tormented by guilt over the innocent people he has killed and maimed, he thinks of the Lord's Prayer and dies horribly when his plane crashes. The playwright left the listener to

imagine that the pilot had been redeemed, either in the conventional religious sense or by rediscovering his individuality, but made it plain that the vast enemy crowd – of which he had been too long a member – could never be so fortunate.

What of the pilot's airplane and the breathtakingly efficient system that had created it? It would be misleading to argue that many Canadians regarded science, the technologies it brought in its wake, or the application of scientific principles to social problems with great suspicion during wartime. Regardless of the ways the enemy chose to apply knowledge, science itself would retain an exalted position as the engine of human advancement.<sup>64</sup> Such was the level of interest in the frontiers of scientific and technological knowledge that national magazines ran regular features offering declassified tales of war science. For its stirring lay-reader-oriented science pieces, *Maclean's* employed a number of freelance writers whose scientific credentials, if they possessed any, went unacknowledged. Most often relegated to the middle and back pages, these articles supplemented 'real' war news in that they were literally reports from another front.<sup>65</sup> An aptly-named feature, "The Science Front," ran in Sandwell's *Saturday Night* from late 1939 into 1943. The *National Home Monthly* geared its "Tuning Up For Tomorrow" series, inaugurated in 1945, toward heralding a post-war bounty of super-vitamins and household robots.<sup>66</sup> As the foregoing discussion of reconstruction showed, looking beyond the immediate conflict with confidence that scientific progress would be maintained was a component of wartime culture. Advertisers, media and government sources reminded the public that scientists and technicians would do their utmost to improve life on the homefront and to give Canada's military the equipment they needed. Recruits might have grumbled in their mess halls, but at least one branch of the armed forces revised its menu very early in the war to reflect new findings in nutritional science. Up-to-date military machinery demanded a well-nourished soldier operating at peak

efficiency.<sup>67</sup>

With very few exceptions, wartime observers rendered military technologies and the science behind them as neutral objects. Science retained its prewar prestige as one of modern life's most identifiable features, but as Sir Richard Gregory, editor of the British scientific journal *Nature*, argued in a pamphlet distributed widely in Canada, the enemy had 'chained' its scientific workers to party ideology, effectively polluting science itself.<sup>68</sup> At worst, science emerged as an accomplice rather than the author of human misery, a "tremendously enthusiastic butcher, sitting on God the Fuhrer's right hand."<sup>69</sup> Yet, such views – their rhetorical power turning upon the personification of science – were relatively rare in Canada. More numerous were discussions of new ways of waging war which either emphasized the malignant will behind enemy science or presented the Allied use and development of wartime technologies as an effort to keep pace with the enemy. Typical of this perspective was a 'phoney war'-era article describing the "eager" adoption of anti-blackout drugs by German pilots. A *Maclean's* correspondent emphasized national and ideological differences by asserting that it was "the instinct of a healthy young Briton to scorn the adventitious aids of science and to rely on his strong heart and clear brain." The author conceded that Allied pilots would soon have to adopt techniques similar to the enemy's if they hoped to repel the Luftwaffe, but intimated that these would be obligatory detours from Allied pilots' natural inclinations.<sup>70</sup>

Presenting each new enemy weapon as an aggressive use of otherwise benign scientific principles, journalists made Canadian and Allied attempts to counteract those weapons sound like entirely defensive measures. Yet, when these attempts were successful, newfound Allied superiority in defensive measures could be used as propaganda. One cartoon portrayed the RAF's successes in keeping enemy planes at bay by showing Germans reduced to firing handguns from biplanes.<sup>71</sup> Even the stories surrounding these defensive

measures could be prescriptive of appropriate wartime social conduct. When German U-boats began using acoustic torpedoes to home in on the sound of Allied ships' propellers, reporter Blair Fraser assured readers that the National Research Council's response was technically competent. In presenting what he could of Canadian scientists' still-classified solution to the problem, he related the story of how war had brought tinkerers of differing backgrounds together: "The Navy wired Research Council, "Can you do anything about [the torpedo]?" Research Council could. In the lab beside their little wharf a staff of college-trained physicists and shop-trained mechanics worked side by side for two days and two nights without rest."<sup>72</sup> The scientific expert and the craftsman were as much combatants as the paratrooper or the bomber pilot. More importantly, their respective expertise had been employed nobly against an enemy whose own technicians and scientists were compelled, contrary to the scientific spirit, to make ever more terrible engines of war.

During the war, critics strove to impart the lesson that on their own, advances in science did not pose a threat to mankind, but society should be vigilant of the motives behind their application. Physicist E.L. Harrington spoke of science as a servant of humanity, best used to save labour and provide "new pleasures," but noted that for all its marvels it could not save mankind from its own regrettable inclinations, or from those of the broadcaster. "They cannot build a radio which will give to us the best in music but will not receive jazz, or that will bring us messages of cheer and pleasurable programs, but neither the rantings of a Hitler nor soap advertisements."<sup>73</sup> His contrasting of *best music* with *jazz*, and *cheer* with *Hitler* reflected a conviction that even decisions about how to employ what otherwise seemed to be a dispassionate or even potentially beneficial piece of technology could have crucial implications within the realm of culture.

One could stand opposed, for example, to technological changes that made workers redundant, but the momentum of research and development remained largely unaffected by



such opposition because the fruits of science and the scientific worldview had long since become identified with modern life and with progress. As long as scientists and engineers continued to offer consumers increasingly comfortable lifestyles, their prestige grew and careers associated in some way with science became more desirable among youth casting about for secure employment. In an article written in the form of a letter to a generic 'bright young man,' William Hardy Alexander told his fictitious correspondent that if he is interested in academe, he should seek a post in natural or applied science, because such positions were distinguished, offered reasonably good incomes, and rarely involved serious political or moral choices. Alexander went on to qualify his initial statements by offering advice about potentially troublesome disciplines within the sciences, but maintained that these fields continue to flourish because society has not hesitated to invest any of its hope in them.<sup>74</sup> Investors had been pouring money into scientific research for decades, and defenders of the free enterprise system portrayed it and science as inseparable partners ensuring material and social progress.<sup>75</sup> Even though his foremost belief was that the sobering prospect of the war's first Christmas called for spiritual strength, journalist W.J. Healy admitted that "[m]ankind will go on living and developing and providing itself with improved appliances and better institutions."<sup>76</sup>

In such a climate, a 1940 editorial in *Canadian Forum* seemed merely to confirm what had long been obvious by declaring that the world's more advanced societies depended almost completely upon scientists and engineers to conduct their daily business. Although both of World War II's belligerent blocs were dependent in this same manner, the editors went on to raise an important point. Throwing Allied and enemy conceptions of the scientific method into sharp contrast, they saw – supporting the Allied order – a spirit of rationality which was "incompatible with the organization of mass emotion," and added that "societies based upon rational inquiry will survive their rivals in the long run, if civilization

survives at all."<sup>77</sup> The suggestion that an enormous advantage rested with the nations which did not rely upon mass persuasion as a weapon in the struggle helped to reinforce the message that, like the forthright practitioner of science, the liberal democracies were seekers after truth alone. They did not need to practise indoctrination which was in turn founded upon dubious science.

Given the associations developed during the 1930s between Nazi theories of race, national destiny, aggression and methods of propaganda, it was not difficult for interested commentators to suggest during wartime that enemy applications of science also lacked civilized restraint. In 1939, W.C. Keirstead reflected on the need for dissension in a democracy, identifying totalitarian culture with the absence of a genteel but rigorous scientific spirit:

Dictators may make use of scientists to provide means for their predetermined ends, but they use propaganda to secure mass responses. Music, ritual, ceremonial, regimentation, the cinema, the radio, the press, and emotional oratory are all used to arouse feeling, to produce uniformity of attitude, and to prevent critical thinking.<sup>78</sup>

This troubling relationship between science and culture in maladjusted enemy societies became a touchstone for those hoping to criticize more recent developments in Canadian life. Wartime critiques served a dual purpose, condemning the misuse of science for political ends and issuing warnings, like Keirstead's, about the power of mass persuasion to affect Canada as it had Germany and its allies.

Changes to educational curricula, which suggested a decline in the pre-eminence of a liberal arts course of study and a shift towards vocational training, caused some consternation in wartime. Such alarm was especially evident in the context of a perceived need to educate citizens who could serve as mediators between humanity's material and spiritual needs. As noted earlier, N.A.M. MacKenzie recognized the crucial role that science

played during the war but lamented, as others did, the tendency of universities to emphasize the technically-oriented professions. He claimed that "only incidentally do they serve the high sounding purposes" that they might. Though the depression and war were not attributable to the vocational bent of modern Canadian universities, MacKenzie nonetheless declared that such a narrow programme made "no provision for problems of [an ethical] kind and assumes little if any responsibility for their cause and cure. Our engineers, our doctors, our dentists and all the rest leave our universities with university degrees, presumably the hallmark of the educated man and woman." Scientists, doctors and engineers would, he argued, be expected to take on responsibilities within their communities for which a university career spent sneering at Arts electives had not prepared them.<sup>79</sup>

How a society decided to deploy its knowledge, and how it valued disciplines or pursuits other than those that were completely utilitarian made a substantial difference to wartime cultural critics. Reviewing a compendium of John Dewey's work a few months before war broke out, classicist Eric Havelock suggested that the deeds of European fascists were already prompting some North Americans to question their own readiness to employ science and rationality as sovereign methods. He claimed that the flavour of pragmatism associated with Dewey's philosophy appeared to be relatively harmless during America's age of economic expansion, where "the interaction of ends and means, of ideas and functions, seemed automatic." He added quickly, however, that "as man progressively extends scientific technique to the purpose of dominating his fellow men, the activities of totalitarian communities are going to force the thoughtful to turn with renewed attention to that old-fashioned question, What after all is the chief end of man?"<sup>80</sup>

Much had changed between the wars, and the question of ends did seem old-fashioned in a world brimming with means and strategies. Commenting on the recruitment campaign at home, one columnist believed that it lacked the sense of spectacle evident in

1914, adding that arousing enthusiasm for the present war was difficult because it had been

figured out in cold-blooded efficiency. In place of the recruiting depots and the bands, and the reviews which colored the last war, we have requests for enlistment of skilled mechanics, and training schools and secret sailings. In place of the munificence of Sir Sam Hughes, we even have scientific purchasing. It is a long time since British people were called upon to pay for anything without being given some kind of show for their money.<sup>81</sup>

The human price that a society paid for its preoccupation with technology and efficiency was also important to those seeking a balance between the pragmatic goals of winning the war and maintaining 'civilization.' Early in the conflict, as he pondered the rush to safeguard Europe's artistic treasures, Morley Callaghan noted that the First World War had taken a great toll among artists and writers. He cited an interwar drought in British literature as particularly compelling evidence of too great a fascination with science, and advocated going further than keeping brilliant physicists out of uniform. He asked if it had "occurred to our governments that the true key men of our civilization are the men who make beautiful things."<sup>82</sup>

Making beautiful things took on a greater significance for critics during a time when much of the nation's labour, if not devoted to using the materiel of war, had been given over to its efficient production. Early in 1940, architect and teacher Humphrey Carver reminded Canadians of what had become an abiding feature of modern existence, the decline of craftsmanship in the face of mass production. Invoking John Ruskin and William Morris, Carver set aside the socialist politics of those men to argue that Canada could lose what little authentic craft culture it had left if steps were not taken to imbue the relatively new field of industrial design with the essence of craft production: "the sensitivity of the hand." Carver recognized that the tide of industrialization would not abate. But he hoped, as others did, that handicraft could survive in Canada through some sort of integration with

industry, avoiding the fate of the British arts and crafts movement – a “reactionary and sentimental spinsterhood.”<sup>83</sup>

That handicrafts had become symbols of an artistic spirit indicated their currency as symbols of a world outside science, outside utilitarianism and outside the efficient production of conformity. Manufacturing and distributing goods or services according to an ill-informed notion of what the public might buy seemed somehow anti-democratic, but it had allowed consumers to have access to products and experiences formerly reserved only for those with more money or patience. Recognizing this as one of the keenest contradictions defining the modern age, Humphrey Carver repeated Morris’s observation that “as a condition of life, production by machinery is altogether an evil; as an instrument for forcing on us better conditions of life it has been indispensable.”<sup>84</sup>

Critics in wartime Canada had to grapple with the troubling paradox that important changes to the way Canadians earned their livings meant more leisure time, but the jobs they worked at seemed to leave them fit for little else than a culture someone else had made for them. Echoing European philosopher Paul Schrecker, Lawren Harris and a band of like-minded critics warned that: “if no systematic effort is made against the trend towards uniformity ... big business and mass production will efface all regional differences and smother the living creative effort of every individual.”<sup>85</sup> Asking her readers the rhetorical question: “Did you ever feel mass-produced?” Adeline Haddow agreed that mass production had come to stay, but intimated that it need not be the means by which creativity or individuality vanished. She prescribed a method for bestowing a sense of taste upon the consumer and the consumption of mass-produced goods: “Let her withdraw her watchful eye for a moment from the price ceilings and turn it upon the bad designs in cheap factory-made articles. Let her express her dissatisfaction and demand something better. Let her do her share in adapting the machine to a higher civilization.”<sup>86</sup>

In wartime, mass production, science and the rational deployment of resources aided the fight against enemies who were using the same tools, albeit in a manner consistently and unironically identified with aggression, the pursuit of irrational goals, and uniformity. In the absence of significant differences in technique, distinctions between the opposing powers depended upon the perception and communication of such cultural differences. That task fell to articulate Canadians in the journalistic, academic and artistic fields and, like their counterparts in Britain and the United States, they looked to simplify these distinctions further by pinning them upon one central principle, present among the Allied nations, but absent from the enemy camp. The dilemma for this group of 'perceivers and communicators' was that *democracy*, the principle that wartime necessity had placed at the core of Allied civilization, had also played an elemental part in the proliferation of mass culture.

Despite its inclusive, forgiving tone, Northrop Frye's declaration that "Democracy is in essence a cultural *laissez faire*, an encouragement of private enterprise in art, scholarship and science[.]"<sup>87</sup> was not meant to indicate unqualified support for the books, radio programs or films that had become most popular in an expanding cultural marketplace. Rather, he wished to remind his readers that a liberal democracy, even though it placed emphasis on the voice of the majority, made room for a considerable variety of expression which in turn made challenging, enduring works possible. "[T]here is more in life than democracy," one editor wrote, "though democracy may be the essential which sweetens the rest[.]"<sup>88</sup> More people could read, vote, and attend high school or university, but democracy's track record in the first part of the twentieth century held little promise of cultural regeneration in the second. Cultural critics had come to identify democracy in North America with an impatient mass audience unlikely to think critically or to appreciate any but

the most elementary historical, literary or biblical allusions. John Dewey noted that "[o]ne effect of literacy under existing conditions has been to create in a large number of persons an appetite for the momentary 'thrills' caused by impacts that stimulate nerve endings but whose connections with cerebral functions are broken."<sup>89</sup> Tabloid newspapers continued to run simplified, sensationalized stories ahead of, or in place of, war bulletins, public affairs articles or domestic items that seemed grey and lifeless by comparison. One incensed critic used verse to compare the hedonistic apathy of the tabloid reader to the alcoholic's preferred state: As men who seek oblivion in drink/ They dose their senses, dulling them with ink,/ Afraid to think, afraid to try to think.<sup>90</sup> However, because the liberal democratic ideal was for Frye and others "something rooted in the broader and deeper concepts of culture and civilization,"<sup>91</sup> it warranted their veneration not only as a worthwhile foundation upon which to differentiate the Allies from the Axis, but as a way to charge English-Canadian society with the responsibility of honouring the 'great tradition' of Anglo-American thought, and to redefine the practise of democracy itself so that it no longer implied the simple satisfaction of an unreflective mass.

Even if a full-fledged 'cult' of democracy did not exist during the war, a professed affiliation with the defence, evangelism or improvement of democratic life was almost mandatory for commentators seeking a sympathetic audience. Cultural critics added another dimension to patriotic calls for democracy's preservation. Author I.D. Willis was not alone in clinging to writer-diplomat John Buchan's idea that democracy existed as "an attitude of mind, of spiritual testament, and not an economic structure or a political machine[.]"<sup>92</sup> Research for this study uncovered in excess of sixty wartime pamphlets, books, articles or broadcasts of Canadian origin featuring *as a principal theme* the ideal of democracy or its application to some aspect of war or civilian existence. Not all these declarations of democratic faith were pointed critiques of modern life or mass culture, but many expressed

concern about the ways in which passive roles for the citizen/consumer had replaced the lively give and take that progressive thinkers associated with democracy in its ideal state. They could only manage, as E.M. Forster put it in 1939, "two cheers for democracy."<sup>93</sup> For example, the *Citizens All* series of broadcasts, begun in late 1940 and published almost concurrently as the *Democracy and Citizenship* series of pamphlets, aimed in a general sense to help listeners feel part of a democratic system that reached outside politics into their daily lives.<sup>94</sup> Most significantly, wartime commentaries harboured a critique of the 'hollow' democracy critics saw passing for a much richer set of values. Considering the volume of British and American output on the importance of maintaining a democratic society, it is clear that English Canadians had access to an arsenal of material in which democracy featured prominently.<sup>95</sup> Such publications were hardly bestsellers, but organizations like the Canadian Association for Adult Education, the Canadian Youth Commission and local libraries were able to distribute them in quantity to their members and to people who were inquisitive or motivated to explore public affairs.

For cultural critics during the war, this inquisitive segment of the population comprised the target audience, active citizens towards whom expressions of support for democracy or concern for its welfare could be directed. Offering this audience "mass education"<sup>96</sup> in democratic living provided critics with a suitable context for addressing troubling social and cultural developments. Just as in interwar Britain where "[w]hat culture was appropriate for a democracy became a question pitting the forces of the market-place against the influence of an articulate minority,"<sup>97</sup> those constituting this sort of articulate minority in Canada took care to situate their calls for cultural reform within the framework of a quest for liberal democracy, and took care to speak to those who owed their improved employment situations or social status to the democratization of educational opportunities. Critics could cite their concern that mass culture was unsuitable for a democratic people



because it distracted citizens from their vital wartime responsibilities, but they could also be confident that they were addressing an audience who 'knew better' or aspired to a more refined leisure than movies or pulp novels. The prosperity of wartime relative to the previous decade only seemed to make this unsuitability more evident, leading one pamphleteer to note: "Most of us have plenty money for the poor sort of stuff that many of our amusements dish up for us, for motor cars and gas, poor reading material, for all sorts of things that are not essential to comfortable and cultural living."<sup>98</sup> Even among organizations that were committed – like the Credit Union movement – to principles of direct democracy, the perception that certain popular pursuits lacked some unspecified quality that made others 'cultural' indicated fear of the direction an ostensibly democratic mass culture could lead.

Any observer of the wartime scene could discern the ideological gulf between fascism and the Allied attachment to political and social evolution. Such difference was essential to the construction of the war as the 'defence of democracy.' The widespread belief that the "ideal of democracy is at stake; this force which vitalizes all our institutions is in danger," lent further urgency to the need to halt the enemy's military progress,<sup>99</sup> and entreated the individual to take a part in maintaining democratic institutions at home. To meet the variety of threats facing it, commentators had democracy appear in a variety of guises, from militant to nurturing. In their pamphlet, *Dynamic Democracy*, Philip Child and John Holmes called for "an aggressive democracy on the march," ready to convince those not already suitably devoted to democracy that their hopes lay with its survival.<sup>100</sup> Even late in the war, the sense of struggle – of a torch passed from the English Civil War through the American, French, and Russian revolutions, and certainly on through the First World War – remained a vital mode of expressing the idea that "The Fight Isn't New."<sup>101</sup> At the other end of the scale, R.S. Lambert could not conceal his inclination towards a flexible, less martial

strategy: "As long as the enemy is inspired by the dynamic conception of a mission to change the world (even in a wrong direction), he must be countered by a similar dynamic conception of re-invigorated and improved democracy."<sup>102</sup>

Many Canadians were no doubt entirely satisfied with the rather practical argument that democracy must be preserved simply because the alternative was hateful totalitarianism. Staged spectacles like the "If" day held in Winnipeg in 1942 drove this point home by depicting what Canadians might expect if the war were lost. "German" troops arrested bus passengers, a priest, and the city's mayor. Others were interrogated at random and put in concentration camps. Worship was forbidden and, as a final humiliation, teaching democracy in the schools was banned.<sup>103</sup> This simple model which presented the public with a choice – confront democracy's enemies or face disaster – found its way into some of the wartime literature and commentary, despite otherwise forward-looking and comprehensive treatments of democracy as a system in need of continuous renewal, if not redefinition.<sup>104</sup> I.D. Willis's first wartime pamphlet opened rather tamely with the exhortation to "accept our personal responsibility for conditions in Canada, and to study those factors which have brought them about," but devolved towards slogans encouraging Canadians to put their 'shoulders to the wheel' so the enemy could be more speedily conquered.<sup>105</sup> More often, however, those who addressed democracy and its place in the war presented the image of a democratic culture which could, on the strength of its adaptable nature, rally citizens to its defence. Citing rigid enemy systems of thought and governance which tolerated no political or artistic opposition, Canadian commentators contrasted mass manipulation with the creative potential of a liberal democratic approach, or set democracy's practicality against the enemy's need to inhabit a "mystical nation-state."<sup>106</sup> Even in the midst of campaigning for more comprehensive social programs, one commentator identified the democratic ideal's greatest cultural advantage: "[D]emocracy, as a way of life, does offer the largest measure of

opportunity for the common man, both materially and spiritually; that as a result, it does permit of the fullest development of the human personality."<sup>107</sup>

In contrasting coercive totalitarian methods of instituting sweeping social reorganization with the gentler ways operating in North America, Father M.M. Coady, a pioneer in building Maritime co-operatives, also noted the difficulty – in democratic societies – of giving people what was considered good for them. "We want to attain our objectives," he wrote, "but we want also to do it in the free way. In our democratic way, the dynamics for social reconstruction must come from within."<sup>108</sup> Coady was referring to the difficulty of coercing Canadians into accepting social innovations imposed from above, but his caution indicated that it was unwise for those committed to elevating tastes to insist that they alone were equipped to serve as cultural arbiters. In a democratic society, freedom had to be the prize of total war, and despite an abundance of wartime ideas about what should be changed, critical observers could not object to much in contemporary culture without sounding like they wished to censor popular entertainments. For the liberal democrat hoping to counter the power of mass culture by enlisting government protection for less 'popular' pursuits, any cultural renaissance had to come through a broadening of the average person's experience, not through an abridgement of the consumer's freedom to choose: "[t]he enlightened state will, as far as is compatible with public order, avoid conflict with the awakened consciences of its citizens."<sup>109</sup>

While they condemned some domestic conditions by associating them with the enemy, critics also noted that the freedom to produce or appreciate cultural works was invaluable. "Cultural liberty," one observer remarked, would comfort and make more creative the artists, scientists and writers "who in a mysterious way lead the great mass of mankind."<sup>110</sup> This was the essence of Northrop Frye's approach when he wrote that:

the art which emerges under the cultural anarchy of  
democracy may be subtle, obscure, highbrow and

experimental, and if a good deal of art at any time is not so the cultural achievement of the country is on a Woolworth level. But art under a dictatorship seldom dares to be anything but mediocre and obvious.<sup>111</sup>

Relative to what was generally represented as the certainty of spiritual subjugation under a fascist regime, democracy held great promise for Allied nations – promise that few critical observers believed had been realized. Liberal democracy granted cultural producers the latitude to be subtle and highbrow, but it also granted them freedom to be mediocre and obvious, and critics perceived the tendency of newer media to serve mass tastes as a dictatorship of sorts. While they chose repeatedly to point out the unpleasant implications of such a dictatorship, critics remained mindful that preserving the right to criticize and to promote 'suitable' alternatives was more probable and desirable than overturning the complex and long-running historical process of modernization and the concomitant rise of mass culture. Instead of advocating measures that would mark them as cultural authoritarians, they proposed that the extensive democratization of culture – which had so far seemed to result mainly in troubling productions like radio soap operas – could also aid the cultivation of more discriminating minds. Few engaged the question of how many people were capable of becoming 'cultured,' even though democracy was helping to give more and more people the opportunity. B.K. Sandwell asserted rather bluntly that the majority would remain "uncultured," but could certainly escape ignorance and misery.<sup>112</sup>

In an atmosphere emphasizing the dramatic opposition between democracy and totalitarianism, inspirational works accenting the high stakes of the war and the moral rectitude of the Allied cause were part of the propaganda effort. More importantly for our examination of wartime cultural criticism, they also reflected a disdain for passivity. The idea that Allied nations shared a liberal democratic tradition came to the fore, and critics were for the most part eager to bind wartime resolve with the nineteenth century British liberal

tradition of Mechanics Institutes and voluntary societies, the erudite egalitarianism of American democratic heroes, or the faith of religious stalwarts. "The great tradition of political freedom which is Canada's heritage has been shaped in the brave struggles of men motivated by religion and conscience," read one pamphlet, "in the old world and on Canadian soil."<sup>113</sup> On Canadian soil, mass communications, greater rates of literacy, and advertising had operated to transform the public sphere, and as B.K. Sandwell remarked, the previous century's notion that "all ideas will be judged according to reason and only sound ideas will ultimately prevail, has been shown to be far too optimistic."<sup>114</sup> Acknowledging the foundations of democratic thought while soberly accounting for the reach and persuasive power of the contemporary mass media seemed a more proactive strategy. Beginning in February 1941, the CBC presented its *Theatre of Freedom* series, twelve radio plays featuring the talents of such renowned writers and actors as Raymond Massey, Merrill Denison, Norman Corwin, Elsa Lanchester and Charles Laughton, Douglas Fairbanks, Jr. and Orson Welles. Selected because "they have all of them some message to give to Democracy," the plays further admonished listeners by emphasizing particular democratic virtues:

*St. Joan* is a study of tolerance, *An Enemy of the People* preaches the sanctity of conscience. *Strife* warns against extremism and pleads for moderation. *Valley Forge*, *Abraham Lincoln*, and *Victoria the Great* describe the qualities of democratic leadership.

Here the producers hoped to represent the democratic tradition as an outgrowth of British, American and Canadian experience; an Anglo-American recipe for orderly progress. Though many of the productions featured historical themes, the CBC had Norman Corwin's *Seems Radio is Here to Stay* open the series in order to "bring home to us the vital power of radio to inform and unite our community in support of its ideals."<sup>115</sup>

Commentators and pamphleteers offering their advice to concerned Canadians

maintained that the community had to be united because its attachment to a concept of democracy based on personal responsibility and effort appeared to be in danger of extinction. John Grierson swam against this tide, expressing a desire to leave behind what he admitted was the compelling rhetoric of individualism in favour of democratic consensus and a planned society.<sup>116</sup> Yet, in their contributions to the larger stream of motivational messages and cautionary tales, they more often emphasized the idea of liberal democracy as a part of Canada's neglected heritage, a heritage that must ultimately shape the culture surrounding even the most rudimentarily-educated citizen. For example, Watson Kirkconnell's early wartime essays and speeches formed the basis for his short book *Twilight of Liberty*, which had the early working title of "Canadian Credo." Kirkconnell chastised complacent long-time residents by celebrating immigrants' quick integration and their willingness to fight for their adopted country. Presenting the contributions of immigrant groups in this manner, he implied that Canadians already steeped in a tradition of democracy must strive to better exemplify certain presumably Canadian qualities. In September 1941, he suggested "Canadian Affirmations" as a possible title, then subsequently leaned toward "Holy War" because he thought it "suggests something of the moral drive that we need in our thinking." The final title emphasized the enemy threat to freedom, and the urgency of democratic reconstruction from within.<sup>117</sup>

A dread of decay certainly pervaded efforts to inform the population about the wartime threat to those basic rights that had been linked with democracy most memorably through Franklin Roosevelt's 'Four Freedoms.'<sup>118</sup> Such dread was also, however, at the centre of wartime responses to mass culture. L.A. Mackay of the University of British Columbia noted the need to instil a sense of continuity in a democratic public: "If society were an organism, or if it were a machine, it would suffice that a small elite thought, learned and remembered; but in the world we live in, everyone, as far as possible, must remember the

important things, or society falls in ruin."<sup>119</sup> Like others among his contemporaries also sensitive to decay, Mackay saw Britain as the origin and conservatory of an admirable democratic tradition. The stability of a slowly evolving culture and *noblesse oblige* – the responsibility of the privileged to be public-spirited and to set an example for those less fortunate – recommended the Old Country as a model for the Dominion.<sup>120</sup> Charles Phillips drew the line at reinforcing patterns of deference and an "aristocratic" sensibility in the teaching of history, civics and literature.<sup>121</sup> One Member of Parliament, Duncan McArthur, spoke highly of the democratic tradition, but portrayed British democracy's trip across the Atlantic as a wasted effort. He contended that a vital sense of stewardship had failed to take root in a continental society whose social leaders had become wealthy and powerful too quickly. North American societies were hardly established before new inventions allowed them access to the continent's resources, which they "dissipated ... with prodigal wastefulness." Though the United States boasted a caste of millionaires, no invigorating sense of obligation could develop, McArthur suggested, where wealth and power were thought to be the products of individual skill rather than the natural outcome of a stable community and its roots.<sup>122</sup>

The appeal to a neglected democratic tradition, however, could only carry the critique of contemporary society and its cultural preferences so far. Canadians heard and read during wartime that it was democracy they were protecting, but democracy had become a rather nebulous concept. Wartime was an era of "super democracy, when Jack is as good as his Master, and youth is as good as age,"<sup>123</sup> a situation leading some critics to suggest that the idea's force had been stripped away. One editorial lamented this loss, and quoted T.S. Eliot's observation that "When a term has become so universally sanctified as 'democracy' now is, I begin to wonder whether it means anything, in meaning too many things[.]"<sup>124</sup> Another commentator found continuous invocation of the democratic ideal like a

"narcotic," but added that "now it seems stale, flat, and unprofitable, because it creates an illusion, out of which you emerge with a headache of disappointment and despair."<sup>125</sup> Northrop Frye offered a qualification to the idea of an entirely noble democratic tradition, noting that democracy served as a sort of charm absolving Britain and the United States of their historical "capitalist imperialisms." The perception that "the word 'democracy' wanders through books, magazines, newspapers and speeches undefined and untranslated" bothered him even more acutely during the war's early stages.<sup>126</sup> Two years later, Frank Underhill sensed no improvement, even among people he believed should have been more careful:

The most depressing feature of the war so far, and the thing which does most to make one feel defeatist, is not the battle news from across the Atlantic but the mass of stuff poured out by our editors, columnists, professors and best people generally on the subject of democracy and liberty. When one is in the habit of reading fairly widely in current periodicals and books, and when one has submitted himself for some time to a tasteless diet of all this rehashed rhetoric of the nineteenth century, he gets the feeling that V stands for Vacuity.<sup>127</sup>

Democracy's *potential* for getting things right recommended it, but its reputation did not. B.K. Sandwell complained that the only appreciable changes in democratic culture in a long while had been "extending the franchise over an ever-widening area of the population." He argued that faith in a vast public's ability to assess and respond to the complex issues facing a modern nation was misplaced, adding: "The accent has been too exclusively upon the quantity of the electorate and too little upon its quality."<sup>128</sup> Although critics were bound by wartime circumstances to express some form of support for democracy as an ideal, they nonetheless sought to distance themselves from a democracy that, given their experience, seemed no more likely to aid the achievement of that ideal than a recruiting poster. Even government-sponsored material on democracy offered some indication that without continuous attention, democracy would reflect the qualities of a mass public that was easily



satisfied and easily led. "Only the *best citizens* accept the duties as readily as they do the rights[.]" declared one pamphlet distributed to armed forces discussion groups.<sup>129</sup> Indeed, the uncomfortable sense that Allied nations had for some time been harbouring a rather ineffectual, delusional definition of democracy helped explain the drift of the 1930s. One playwright had a bold, progressive character declare: "Daddy went away to war in 1914 and saved the world for democracy. A depression wasn't big enough to undermine our self-confidence."<sup>130</sup> Ronald MacFarlane believed that majority rule was as prone to tyranny as a dictatorial system, but it was also much more likely to lead to a peaceful, ordered existence if guided by humanitarian principles and citizens who took responsibility for their own political and cultural fulfillment.<sup>131</sup> The unacceptable alternative to the ideal of the conscientious or active citizen was a mass without a sense of history, unable to reflect upon what sort of government – or what sort of culture – it was getting.

The messages that Canada could boast a rich democratic tradition and that the nation's enemies stood opposed to this tradition were simple enough to convey, and these received top billing from official and unofficial sources. Less evident, and less suited to a war effort demanding a united front, was the message that democracy must not be an instrument of its own downfall. "Man is not born a democrat[.]" declared one educator, identifying democracy as more than a political designation. It took on the gravity, during the Second World War, of a cultural choice or behaviour in need of "continuous creation and recreation[.]"<sup>132</sup> Although critics echoed wartime strains of praise for the personal freedoms and mutual protection possible under a democracy, they nonetheless worried that undue deference to it had contributed to a decadent mass culture and to the chaotic, materialistic modern whirl leading individuals, communities and the nation away from the principles, tastes and modes of living that comprised the national heritage. The wartime sanctification of democracy weakened a cultural elite's ability to insist that the supply of enervating

cultural forms be somehow curtailed, but also encouraged alternatives like the community centre.

Critical commentators, like their less outspoken neighbours, were unwilling to revisit a time when invincible ignorance had been the lot of many. "Fascism and ignorance go hand in hand[,]"<sup>133</sup> wrote Queen's philosopher Martyn Estall, and the material benefits attending improvements in literacy, the development of new media, and increased leisure time were too obvious to allow contemplation of anything but further democratization and development. These advances had certainly helped make mass culture possible, but they still lit one part of the path to cultural regeneration – the broadcast of a "deep wisdom" that would allow crucial elements of the Western tradition to be preserved. Underlying wartime commentary on democracy was a strategy for entrenching knowledge about how mass culture had operated to standardize tastes. By using the war's stark oppositions to expose the perils of democracy misapplied, critics could more forcefully argue that if the public looked to them as its able representatives, cultural democracy would function best.

This discussion has focussed on critics' portrayal of the war as sobering evidence that as modern life became more complex, mass culture seemed to render people less able to fend for themselves. Outside the well-worn critique of declining standards, there lay an awareness that war might also be a time of renewal during which Canadians could recognize the intangibles they wished to defend. As Cyril James noted: "This war is refining in the furnace some of the fundamental traditions and ideals of the human race, and those ideals are not utilitarian."<sup>134</sup> Neither did it seem that renewal would emerge from some example the enemy had set or from an unsupervised, unaltered democracy. On his programme *Books and Shows*, John Coulter suggested that despite all its horrors, war had some cultural uses. Younger poets had begun, he claimed, "to speak of the things of today in terms of today," a

development which contrasted sharply with the "inertia" of peacetime. He concluded that "if that inertia is proved to be an inherent characteristic of peace - then we should have to make the fearful admission, that the periodic recurrence of war is, after all, no evil, but a necessity, the essential instrument of regeneration which the Nazis and the Fascists claim that it is."<sup>135</sup>

While it is doubtful that Coulter or any other cultural critic considered such regeneration to be worth the price that war exacted, Coulter nonetheless welcomed the sort of cathartic therapy it brought on, as long as traditional modes of conduct or culture would not be summarily abandoned in the post-war era. He promoted the reaffirmation of – and experimentation with – forms and ideals like the opera and democracy that had proven themselves resilient and adaptable to new circumstances. His aforementioned libretto for *Transit Through Fire* testified to the wartime notion that behind the active citizen was an active culture aware of its origins but not constrained by them. To Coulter, new Canadian ventures in documentary film, like those undertaken by John Grierson's National Film Board were brave forays into hostile territory,

[a]nd Hollywood was the enemy. But in spite of base and flashy buffooneries, the deliberate triviality and trickery, the craven pandering, the cynical exploitation of what the mountebank commercarios of Hollywood believe to be the lowest common denominator of public sentimentality and lack of taste - in spite of this, there are films being made, especially documentaries, in which the canon of a true art of cinema is being laid down.<sup>136</sup>

The artistic innovations and rebellions embodied in modernism did not make it an enemy to critics, for these departures did not romanticize, commodify or make experience passive in the same ways mass culture did. The new Montreal train station met with approval in 1943 because travel remained an active venture, and the new terminal simply made travelling to or from this particular city a more comfortable and aesthetically-pleasing

experience than it had been. That the station was completed in wartime made it more impressive.<sup>137</sup> Of course, the grand scale and modern finish of the building could be counted upon to conjure bright visions of Canada's future, but the murals high on its walls lauded the doers and dreamers of the past as well as the present, prompting one journalist to declare that it was "more than a station. It is a monument to the progress of transportation in Canada[.]"<sup>138</sup>

Likewise, in the realm of the everyday, the war could deliver small rays of hope for Canadians exasperated with certain aspects of modern life. When C.D. Howe called an early wartime halt to cosmetic design changes in the automobile industry, he earned the admiration of an Ottawa columnist, who greeted the news with some relief, noting that "this business of getting up in the morning only to see a new shiny car before your neighbor's door, and it looking all the world like a new kind of U-boat or destroyer, made life too complicated."<sup>139</sup> Though satisfying to some, such victories seemed isolated, temporary and largely inconsequential, because dedicated critics of mass culture understood that war could only bring substantial cultural improvement if it assured the continuity of certain desirable traditions. Charles Comfort, head of Canada's band of war artists, cited with alarm the case of England in the crucible of war, where paintings were stowed away and where, reluctantly, evening concerts were "for a while abandoned." After making it plain that he considered the war effort Canada's top priority, Comfort warned that the single-minded pursuit of war aims without a parallel commitment to preserve art's place in the community would be disastrous:

There are few of us unawakened to the gravity of the war, and the importance of bending every energy to its rapid and victorious conclusion. There is almost a pathetic eagerness to put first things first. The danger is that in trying to do so, there is a tendency to treat the arts as non-essentials. We may, with the best will in the world, be destroying the very foundations of our civilization.<sup>140</sup>

Another Canadian stationed in Britain sounded a more optimistic note, reporting that Sir Kenneth Clark, the Director of Britain's National Gallery, had observed an increased propensity among ordinary citizens there to discard or at least discount what were considered rigid class barriers in their appreciation of art. "In wartime when the static social grouping is broken down," Sir Kenneth had said, "the tabu against art is broken down as well."<sup>141</sup> Although it is difficult to assess how willing average Britons or Canadians were to discuss matters pertaining to their nations' respective cultural scenes, the sense that war imparted an additional boost to the preservation of 'civilization' through continuity of activity or continuity of interest, was nonetheless apparent.

Part of that 'civilization' was a religious tradition organized around the tenets of Christianity, and support for it among critics remained strong throughout the war. One treatise on the importance of religious freedom declared that its "extra-ordinary power of self-recovery and revitalization makes Christianity the best companion of democracy."<sup>142</sup> Claris Silcox explained that much like an episode of upheaval in any individual's life, "war evokes both what is highest and what is lowest in human nature," suggesting that individual soldiers most often displayed what was best in Christian society. War might well work to put the serviceman back in touch with at least one aspect of his cultural heritage, but – like the technology that made it possible for war to be waged on an unprecedented scale – it could also erode confidence in traditional belief systems. Like Charles Comfort, Silcox was well aware of the possibility of giving too much attention to the war and putting too much faith in fighting men and machines, so he instructed his readers to remember Rudyard Kipling's dictum that "men in barracks don't grow into plaster saints."<sup>143</sup>

Critics found some uses for war, a harrowing experience from which they believed Canada would emerge to claim status as a mature nation. Expressing their dissatisfaction in terms of the bitter conflict itself, they used the potent example of enemy culture to warn

Canadians against the depths to which the masses could be driven or acclimatized. They sought a balance between utilitarian and aesthetic perspectives. They recognized the value of democracy, but worried that the cultural marketplace, as it had evolved, did not take into account the kinds of entertainment that were not immensely 'popular' and hence profitable. In 1946, one observer emphasized the need for a forthright declaration of the "inner conviction of the rightness of our way of life," having noticed during wartime that the stresses of modern existence would be best met with trusted weapons:

[I]n the course of the struggle many of us have been shocked into the realization of the clear evidence that we, and the society in which we live, are living upon inherited capital, upon the ideas, the customs and habits, the institutions left to us as a heritage by our fathers and forefathers.<sup>144</sup>

Determined to reconcile the wisdom of the ancients with that of the moderns, cultural critics were obliged to steer clear of simply disparaging the current technological order or mass communications. To denounce these forces outright was especially counter-productive in wartime, for science kept bombers aloft and even the most vacuous radio programs kept munitions workers entertained. Wartime convinced some 'opinion moulders' that Canadians would only emerge from the war a stronger people if they educated themselves and their children, not only about political matters, but about the humanist traditions underlying a liberal democracy.<sup>145</sup> As the war progressed, critics found uses for the very media by which mass culture prospered, having sensed that the much-discussed post-war period – whenever it arrived – would entail questions equally fundamental to the nation's social and cultural well-being. Most importantly for the nation's post-war culture, the experience of reflecting intensely on the wartime responsibilities and obligations of the citizen would reinforce their vision of a reconstructed democratic society that was more than the sum of its pastimes.

### Three – “the object of our striving”: Scientism, Religion and Mass Culture

In the months following the Second World War, victorious nations could begin devoting a greater measure of their energies to less momentous domestic issues. Mary Lowrey Ross knew her job was safe, however, because the planners, technocrats and engineers she loved to satirize would not be vanishing anytime soon.<sup>1</sup> War had accelerated the already well-advanced institutionalization of scientific research and its application, and these same activities would become even more instrumental to post-war economies. After victory in Europe, as the transition to peacetime started to put plans for reconstruction to the test, preparing for life in a technologically-oriented world became part of a new agenda, which was itself complicated by the use of the atomic bomb. Fears of nuclear war aside, solving what Charlotte Whitton called the “ghastly problem of our own genius” was intimately related to the citizen’s cultural destiny. As she suggested of the labour-saving inventions lightening the load at work and in the home, “each advance threatens to make him more dependent, dependent not only for subsistence but dependent in his unused powers of growth, of leisure, of achievement.”<sup>2</sup> Canadians also learned the strategic importance of keeping scientific secrets safe for the ‘free world’ when certain of their allies became enemies in a new ‘cold’ war.<sup>3</sup> Yet, in a post-war environment where trust appeared to be given over to the rational, conspicuously modern natural and social sciences, many found it difficult to let their religious attachments fall prey to *scientism*, the “apotheosis of science,”<sup>4</sup> the belief that “with the same techniques that have worked in the physical sciences we can eventually create an exact science of man.”<sup>5</sup> The broader “cultural dichotomy” of “Arts vs. Science” convinced defenders that the humanities would be

endangered with the "approaching reign of a sort of 'scientism'; all too frequently, even now, are the Arts and Letters emasculated to serve the imperious demands of utility."<sup>6</sup> For some, religion was mankind's haven from the modern storm, and was itself vulnerable because politics, society and culture no longer reflected

the essentially unchanging core of Christianity, but are based upon a new and radical re-orientation of the spirit which is no longer Christian in essence but wedded to strange new gods.<sup>7</sup>

This re-orientation of the spirit, an increasing dependence upon the scientific approach, did not necessarily mean the denial of the supernatural, and some of the nation's most articulate citizens argued for an harmonious accommodation between two forces that had otherwise been set at odds. Less than a week after the attack on Hiroshima, University of British Columbia president N.A.M. (Larry) MacKenzie could attribute the final victory "to the skill of our scientists who have produced our modern weapons including the atomic bomb[,] and to Almighty God who controls the destiny of all mankind."<sup>8</sup>

Science had been subject to criticism from religious people for a century or two before the Second World War, and likewise acknowledged as a symbol of modernity or progress for generations. Rather than generating the sort of bitter, intricate theological debates prevalent during the late nineteenth century, the discourse surrounding the respective roles of religion and science in mid-twentieth-century English Canada chiefly concerned what each mode of belief could do to alleviate society's ills. Using the reflections of journalists, academics, church leaders, broadcasters and others in English Canada during the late 1940s and early 1950s, this chapter examines the way observers perceived science or, more properly, *faith in science* as a troubling aspect of modern life. Historians have justifiably presented the immediate post-war years and the 1950s as a period during which the public put an increasing portion of its trust in experts,<sup>9</sup> but in 1951 when the Canadian



Broadcasting Corporation aired radio programmes featuring experts in cosmology, philosophy and psychology, listeners and critics did not hesitate to condemn the broadcasts as "Anti-Christian and Anti-Canadian."<sup>10</sup> While this chapter deals primarily with reactions to the seeming invincibility of science, that central episode or case study indicates that some observers viewed the dissemination of a scientific perspective via the mass media as not only unorthodox, but heretical. Cultural critics who saw religion as part of a civilized heritage sought some control over the ongoing secularization of Canadian society by holding religion up as a balanced and ultimately human activity centred on the individual, while ascribing to scientism the same disregard for the human personality they saw present in mass culture. In essence, they saw scientism itself as a *kind* of mass culture which was in the process of replacing a more intimate religious tradition.

Science had established itself as an integral component of material progress long before 1939, and research for this study uncovered no self-proclaimed pro-science lobby obliged to justify its growing authority. During the war, governments and industrial concerns embraced and underwrote the dramatic growth of research institutions and laboratories that heralded the post-war arrival of what some historians have called "big science."<sup>11</sup> Canada's 'Minister of Everything,' the former civil engineer C.D. Howe, perhaps the most famous member of the Canadian population not outwardly troubled by such developments, viewed the associated economic development as too good to pass up. Howe likened science to a relatively unexplored hinterland, and reminded his audience of the post-war convergence of scientific knowledge and economic power, claiming a kind of divine right for this most modern arrangement:

    this invasion by engineers of fields that are not strictly technical, is another proof of the great importance of science and technology in the industrial and economic life of modern days. This movement will continue, and in Canada, just as happened in Germany, the United States and England,

training in some phase of engineering or science will become more and more essential to high executive positions in industrial and business organizations.<sup>12</sup>

Atomic energy was, for Howe, the newest hinterland ready for exploitation. However, even at a time when jobs exploiting such brave new technologies helped fuel prosperity in Canada, the relationship between science and religion was much informed by a desire for stability and security. Though religionists<sup>13</sup> conceded that science provided the rapidly modernizing nation with its physical comforts, the sort of scientific outlook that had become identified with atomic terror did not inspire the confidence it seemed to in prewar years or during the war itself. Though it may be attributed to a number of factors, not least the fear of nuclear war and annihilation, a religious revival in post-war Canada indicated that faith in a higher power held considerable ground in a culture that had not yet fully accepted science as a part of its defining tradition. Cultural critics supporting a religious perspective did not attack the motivation for doing experiments or staffing laboratories, but rather warned against becoming infatuated with the fruits of technology or satisfied with the pat answers of the scientist in areas where a religious interpretation still claimed some influence.

In reminding Canadians that science could only do so much for them, religionists contrasted a limited science with an all-embracing religion, or constructed a picture of decay in which science offered no comforting answers to the vexing questions of human existence and purpose. Commenting upon the trend toward religious neutrality in Canadian universities, B.K. Sandwell noted that:

The Western World, save for a few aberrations like the Scopes Trial in Tennessee, is not in the least likely to set limits to scientific investigation in the name of any religion, for it has learned that the existence and nature of God are not a subject for scientific investigation, and that science can neither add to nor subtract from the content of faith.<sup>14</sup>

Sandwell underestimated the capacity of his fellow citizens to employ religion as a refuge from a rather threatening post-war world. Defenders of religion in Canada and elsewhere in the West had long sought to impose limits upon the scope of scientific inquiry.<sup>15</sup> He was, however, correct to suggest that religion could no longer command the legal authority it had a generation earlier in Tennessee. In the case of post World War II Canada, this sort of limiting still took place subtly within a society that otherwise privileged science.

Although religionists were easily the most vocal on the subject of science's value for humanity, some scientists were also keen to make peace between two cultures they treasured. The wartime emergency had mobilized the physical and spiritual resources of the nation, and it would not be easy for Canadians to abandon the idea that they fought to maintain a way of life informed by the western Christian tradition. The decade or so following the war was a time of transition in which some observers of science triumphant were still inclined to ask: toward what spiritual ends are we progressing? That such inquiries seemed to flare up during the early 1950s, becoming less vehement within the span of a few years, indicates that religion – at least with respect to any perceived assaults on its foundations from science – regained a measure of confidence in its ability to serve the spiritual needs of Canadians. Critics of scientism remained, but their attention was more likely to be focussed on technology and the mass society as forces harming individuals, families and communities, topics which fall under the larger mandate of this study and are explored in the chapters that follow.

Scholars such as Carl Berger, Patricia Jasen and Keith Walden have shown that the Second World War did not mark Canada's first exposure to the experience of modernity, nor to the sense of wonder and philosophical uncertainty generated by the advance of science.<sup>16</sup> However, a scientific outlook seemed to gain ground tremendously in the second quarter of

the twentieth century. On the eve of war, Sir Francis Peabody, a millionaire industrialist in one of economist Burton Keirstead's unpublished short stories, compared the rise of science during the interwar years to a religious conversion several orders of magnitude beyond a nineteenth century camp meeting: "It is the new religion, I tell you[,] and in America and I daresay in Europe today, whatever masquerades under the guise of science may be sure of commanding a degree of reverence and veneration which would move to envy a medieval saint."<sup>17</sup> Mocking the fascination with IQ testing and its ability to affect the social behaviour of parents concerned about their child's performance, Mary Lowrey Ross nonetheless sensed a profound generational shift: "Like most unscientific people they are profoundly impressed by Science and they accept its terms with the mixture of incomprehension and mystic faith that their parents reserved for articles of the Creed."<sup>18</sup>

Once hostilities began, and as the engines of war became more complex and more terrible, scientists' role in the war's prosecution brought them an even greater share of public approbation. An early wartime CBC broadcast celebrated engineer and polio victim Elsie MacGill, who heeded the noble calling of "hastening the peace to the world" by serving on the Hurricane fighter design team. It was a commonplace during the war to laud scientists and engineers for their tireless work, and they were quick to point out, as MacGill did, that their jobs were satisfying because "our goal extends beyond the war into the peace to follow."<sup>19</sup> Thus, scientific effort in war was geared, rhetorically at least, to the promise of peacetime. The war itself made heroes of the scientists who attended university year-round to hasten their training, enabling them to assume active duty sooner and to contribute to the efficiency and safety of the supposedly less intellectually-gifted troops at the front.<sup>20</sup>

Science journalists rendered science less mysterious for the larger reading public. The subjects of wartime research became the stuff of everyday discussion as weekly and monthly magazines began to run regular features offering declassified tales of war science,

along with tantalizing speculation about post-war goods made better in the laboratory and tested on the battlefield. In *Saturday Night*, "The Science Front" ran under the direction of controversial science writer Dyson Carter, and was probably the most engaging and critical of the science series. In several respects, Winnipeg's Carter did not resemble what we know of the typical American science writer, "a professional journalist or public relations expert whose job it became to write about science, technology, and medicine for both the mass public and for general scientific audiences."<sup>21</sup> His work did not resemble that of his Canadian counterparts, either. Many features played upon pent-up consumer demand for articles rationed during the war and helped create new demand for articles that were to come. Freelance science writers became especially enthused over new or dramatically improved materials like plastics and fibreglass emerging from wartime chemistry labs.<sup>22</sup> Leading the public to expect durable new materials and streamlined processes to accompany an overhauled world order was a vital part of the culture of reconstruction. When it began less than a month after V-E Day, *National Home Monthly's* "Tuning Up For Tomorrow" series portrayed science as the tireless servant of mankind by inviting readers to acquaint themselves with at least basic scientific principles and, more importantly, to become accustomed to an accelerated pace of scientific innovation. The series slogan suggested that at least a nodding acquaintance with the latest news from the world of science would be socially beneficial as well: "Science is making tremendous advances on many fronts that are full of promise for tomorrow. Here are highlights to excite your imagination and illuminate your conversation."<sup>23</sup>

Despite the rosy picture of science painted in magazines, some scientists feared that the public still might associate science exclusively with the destruction rampant in war, and sought to emphasize their benevolent aims and their commitment to peace. Some even tried to convince the Canadian public that it was indeed fortunate to be receiving the blessings of

science, given mankind's propensity for putting them to destructive uses. The themes of scarcity and war-weariness served University of Saskatchewan physicist E.L. Harrington well as he implored society to 'catch up' to science:

That many of us must for the present do without the cars, radios, and numerous other conveniences we sorely miss is not due to any breakdown in physics, but to a failure of our society to keep pace with scientific progress. ... It is not that we need less physics, as some have suggested, but rather that we do want [i.e. lack] a society worthy of the rich gifts physics has to offer.

Harrington went on to suggest how such a society might be created, mentioning the applicability of "certain social laws and principles that have become established and universally recognized," offering the examples of the Ten Commandments and Christ's teachings, and advocating their scientific (direct) application to modern problems.<sup>24</sup> In a wartime pamphlet written for troops still overseas, a CCF Member of Parliament from Nova Scotia used the metaphor of 'keeping pace' to urge the employment of science in the social realm: "Our task is to develop ourselves to catch up with the engines of science," wrote Clarie Gillis, "which have caught us all up and rushed past our understanding of how to use these powerful instruments for the good of humanity." For Gillis, religion remained in the larger picture, but as a feature "of the home and of the church," not possessing a 'society-wide' applicability to the problems of modern Canadian life.<sup>25</sup>

During wartime, science was too valuable a tool in the war effort to contrast it sharply with Christianity, the official faith of the allies. Though he would point less than five years later to the need to temper society's enthusiasm for science and materialism with a renewed religion, in his wartime book, *Seven Pillars of Freedom*, McMaster University's Watson Kirkconnell could not bring himself to name science as one cause of a weakening attachment to "religion as the motive force of civilization."<sup>26</sup> Others were only slightly more

forward, blaming "unhumanized science" or enemy perversions of nature's laws for the horrors of war. Some, like chemist William Hatcher, recommended that as a safety measure educational curricula should be more effectively balanced between sciences and humanities.<sup>27</sup> In *Saturday Night*, B.K. Sandwell condemned the practice of setting of one form of knowledge above others:

Now that the world is in the melting pot and everything is to be made over, it is interesting to conjecture whether a true higher education, directed to the maintenance, not of scientific industries, but of a true "culture", must not necessarily have a good deal more to do with religion than that higher education of the last forty years in North America has had.<sup>28</sup>

Though open hostility towards science was scarce during the war, some commentators addressed the gulf between the spiritual and the physical directly, advocating an acknowledgement of faith, even by secular governments. Sandwell wrote in support of a national Day of Prayer held in early September 1942, admitting that few Canadians expected divine intercession in a war of planes and tanks, but reminding readers that: "Prayer is not a force in that realm of the universe. But in the spiritual realm it is a force of tremendous importance. It need not change the mind of God, if it effectively changes the spirits of men through which God operates."<sup>29</sup> For one theologian, the "lag of moral, social and spiritual forces behind the mechanical force" became an even more important theme after the demonstration of brute science that ended the war in Japan.<sup>30</sup> Such tame approaches to the fundamental differences between spiritual and naturalistic perspectives suggest that although there was general optimism about what science could contribute to postwar life, the corollary that religion could do little was not often emphasized. Rather than speaking in terms of further human triumphs over ignorance and superstition, the prophets of post-war development assured Canadians that by 1950, they would see "Dame Nature still further

ironed out."<sup>31</sup> Canadian experience paralleled American in that the "spectacular achievements of wartime R & D ... encouraged the belief that conscious application of 'Manhattan Project' methods to problems of poverty, health, housing, education, transportation, and communication might eliminate material want."<sup>32</sup> In the light of such continent-wide optimism about the eventual alleviation of physical misery, even conservative religionists were quick to stress at war's end that the goal of religion was not to seek a return to an era before the age of science, but rather "to win man again for Christ, to win modern man as he exists here and now in his present social and political circumstances."<sup>33</sup>

As the prophets predicted, Canadian scientists and engineers continued 'ironing out' nature in the years following the war, while resources and intellects that had been committed to military operations changed into more comfortable civilian garb. However, humanity still faced essentially the same problems it faced before 1939, as well as the new threat of atomic conflict. A return to peacetime priorities – the pursuit of security for one's family, and a desire to put the cares of wartime to rest, only partially masked a new set of anxieties. Some of this anxiety must be attributed to the advent of atomic weapons and the ensuing doubt about humanity's future.<sup>34</sup> However, some of this concern arose in response to an increasingly complex society that a number of critics considered more oriented toward the acquisition of material goods, and toward the social sciences – psychology in particular – as all-purpose balm for human problems.<sup>35</sup>

Though historian Arthur Lower's prediction that "the magnitude of the issues we face will swing us back into our old mode of dealing with them, and that the second world war will see a renewal of our deep-seated Puritanism"<sup>36</sup> did not magically fulfil itself in the months following the end of the war, the wartime reluctance among religionists to challenge



the prestige of science began to break down. C.J. Eustace, a full-time executive in the Dent publishing house and a part-time Catholic intellectual, tried to restore a sense of mystery to the quest for a new order in the immediate post-war period by declaring that:

the period of transition through which we are now passing, described by various thinkers, both Christian and otherwise, as the "twilight age", is once again, under God, a time of trial and of faith, of obscurity and of prayer for those who believe and hope; while for those who have abandoned themselves to the formation of a brave new world in which nature alone and human efforts are to prevail, it is a time of blindness, wherein they will not see the work of the Holy Spirit, which is always prepared in secret within the souls of men.

Eustace also spoke of the difference between spiritual and "naturalistic" views of the universe, accusing proponents of the latter view of employing the glittering promise of a world transformed to persuade the pliant masses that "they, too, are creatures of nature only, and if obedient to her whims can by their own efforts conquer the restlessness of the human heart and bend the cosmos to their soul's desire."<sup>37</sup>

As the magnitude of the task of reconstruction sunk in after a war described as a millennial struggle between good and evil, religionists found that they could not mount a full scale attack on science because it had played such an important role in defeating fascism. Criticism of the scientific method came to portray it as a powerful but incomplete form of knowledge, or as a philosophy unable to deal with certain aspects of human life, emphasizing religion's potential to help the faithful cope with both the mind-boggling achievements and ethical problems science had wrought. Claris Silcox, a fixture in the United Church, addressed the topic of authority when he suggested that the scientists themselves had begun to ask questions that demanded a knowledge of the spirit:

in an age when the economists have become the idealists and the dreamers and are even unconscious of the laws of

arithmetic, and when the scientists, in the wake of the atomic bomb, have suddenly become moralists, sociologists, exponents of political theory and even theologians, it behooves a mere theologian like myself to inject some realism into the discussion.<sup>38</sup>

Bold challenges like Silcox's did not originate exclusively among the clergy or among self-proclaimed supporters of religion. Even when they took into account the triumphs of science in uncovering laws and processes only dimly understood just years before, journalists and commentators on science in the early post-war era incorporated new standards into their assessments of its intrinsic worth. One science writer marvelled at science's ability to gauge the infinitesimally small size of atoms, but betrayed a well-developed sense of spiritual symmetry when he estimated man's size at "about midway between a star and one of the three types of particles that form atoms," and concluded that "Science cannot tell you what your intelligence is made of, or your spirit, or your soul."<sup>39</sup> Though its application had ended the war, atomic fission had "added neither comfort nor convenience" to anyone's existence, claimed another writer, who also wondered: "Does anyone know any better now than 10 years ago why snow comes in crystals, no two alike?" Science had done much to reveal how the Universe operated, the author admitted, but asserted that it had done little – or could do little – to answer the question of *why* things behaved, reacted, or unfolded as they did.<sup>40</sup>

The question of purpose came more and more to characterize the discussion during the decade immediately following the Hiroshima and Nagasaki explosions. Science offered its opinions on the mechanics of matter, but no compelling 'story' to explain the universe. The scientifically-derived narratives of evolution or explanations of psychosis, for example, only reminded people that their time on earth was short, or trivialized their fears by attributing them to chemical imbalances in the brain. Reflecting on the place of religious belief and association in contemporary North America, Arthur Lower explained the

significant appeal of religion over a scientific perspective: "So natural and strong is humanity's desire to transcend its own fate that this still remains the church's greatest asset. The assaults of science have not prevailed against it." In this sense, he was providing a 'job description' for modern religion in an increasingly secular Canadian society. From Lower's vantage point, the post-war scene presented religion with a great opportunity by creating an unprecedented need for comforting counsel, and a need to acknowledge a realm beyond the physical:

Today the instability of life induced by the great wars and by the very accomplishments of science produce not faith in the intellectual solution – "scientific humanism" – but distrust in it and a marked return to dependence on the emotional or religious solution.<sup>41</sup>

Science could describe physical objects in nature and assemble systems of laws that explained how atoms collided, but it could not provide the means for identification with the infinite that was religion's stock in trade. Stella Keirstead found it odd that the question of immortality had become somehow "improper," and thought it was "strange if in a world where science has demonstrated daily the indestructibility of matter, the unanalysable quality called life should be the only thing capable of being reduced to nothing."<sup>42</sup>

Getting Canadians to recognize this distinction between the material and spiritual became an important goal for religionists trying to counteract the moral chaos some commentators attributed to a science-dominated world newly replenished with alluring consumer goods. One fairly obvious avenue for such a remedial campaign was radio. Before presenting a detailed analysis of a public debate over science and religion on the Canadian airwaves, a brief look at some of the late 1940s output of two reasonably prolific representatives of the religious perspective, C.J. Eustace and Watson Kirkconnell, should clarify some of the objections to science that would resonate through the early 1950s. Their

arguments, especially Eustace's, may seem alarmist or esoteric, but they address a common theme among post-war responses to modern life, an interest in finding some means of controlling the results of scientific advance or reminding the general population that life was not all about consumption and development. As one educator put it, "control of the bomb is not a scientific problem at all, – rather a social, ethical, and political one. Human energies, moreover, in contrast with natural ones, are headstrong and incalculable, and may not be depended upon to obey the laws. To deal with human energies you need people who have had the right training and experience, who are accustomed to dealing with people and irrational human values, who are able to see life as a whole, insofar as anyone may."<sup>43</sup> These defenders of religion most vigorously promoted the idea that although science had considerable power as an explanatory tool, it was unable to address the needs of the whole person. They resented the growing complexity of science as it less and less resembled applied common sense.

Considering his vocation as a vice-president at one of Canada's largest publishing firms, C.J. Eustace was prolific in the latter half of the 1940s, arguing consistently for the supremacy of the spiritual dimension in modern life. He wrote several articles and completed at least one book in the decade following the war, but it was an article entitled "Science, Materialism, and the Human Spirit" that best summarized his profound discontent with his surroundings. He began by exulting in the news from a conference at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology<sup>44</sup> involving various "world thinkers," where the participants concurred that "scientists have contributed to the moral confusion of the age," and took this as evidence that scientific progress in itself could never serve as the creed of a civilization. He denounced the proponents of scientism, which he defined as the transference of scientific utopianism "from the field of knowledge to the society at large," and for clouding the vision of the masses by suggesting that man was little more than "a

natural animal." He comforted his mostly Catholic readership by suggesting that scientism had more thoroughly deceived and gravely affected Protestants, for many of whom he believed the "preoccupation with social welfare has altogether superseded the spiritual ideal of knowing, loving, and serving God."<sup>45</sup>

Eustace's writings were a clear example of the quest to impose rather absolute limits upon the gaze of science in that he thought the time was ripe for a complete re-evaluation of the questions science could be expected to address. The idea of separate spheres for science and religion was not new. But the argument that such limits should be imposed, not because science challenged religious dogma, but because science was not equipped to answer abstract questions about the purpose of existence, was characteristic of the early post-war opposition to scientism. Eustace's article was also an acute reaction to relatively recent scientific developments. He assumed that Christianity existed, as did God, in the philosophical territory then being invaded by theoretical mathematics, and emphasized the folly of the move by scientists into this non-empirical "abstract" realm. Atomic science, riding a wave of post-war fame and fearful awe, had wandered where it could not claim to be true in the same way that religion could:

Just as empirical science cannot deal with supra-sensible reality, so scientific method cannot touch the apex of the human soul, or move man's will, or raise up his fallen nature. Scientific progress divorced from the laws of God, as they must be applied in the moral order, and independent of the healing grace of the Sacraments, cannot hope to influence man's behaviour; just as scientific knowledge cannot hope to reveal the innermost secrets of God's Being to man.

Eustace declared that these two different kinds of knowledge were incompatible, and that science must be subject to religion because although "it is not encroaching on Providence to work for an improvement of an order of things ... [and] the works of science and technology are good in themselves ... man is an infinitely nobler creature than the mere

object of scientific research."<sup>46</sup>

As the president of a small Canadian university from 1948 through 1964, Watson Kirkconnell could hardly discourage research in the sciences, which had brought considerable prestige and financial benefit to institutions like his across the country. However, he was full of practical suggestions as to how modern youth could cope in a rapidly changing environment by maintaining a vigorous faith which kept pace with science. Such a perspective seemed to echo wartime commentary that stressed the need to build a society worthy of science, but the similarity ended there. Kirkconnell wished to see a society in which faith maintained its role as conscience, and where religion did not represent the official creed of just another one of society's institutions. He considered knowledge of material and scientific factors important, but not totally adequate: "Only a profound religious awakening, transforming the very hearts and motives of men, can touch the core of the ulcer of our age. Intelligence is not enough."<sup>47</sup> In a commentary on the state of education, he claimed that growth in knowledge had outstripped growth in character. "The chief defect of our Western civilization today is not want of scientific skill," he cautioned, "but want of a fundamental set of moral values, anchored to religious faith."<sup>48</sup> The medieval universities, to Kirkconnell, had managed to synthesize an accommodation between science and faith, but he contended that this skill had been lost in modern times despite the stern lesson of the recent war, during which the spiritual ideals of the allies inspired the attainment of their military objectives.

By advancing the possibility of an accommodation, Kirkconnell – perhaps unwittingly – described a syncretic quality in Canadian culture around 1950. This was a culture in which science had established itself as a material benefactor, but where religion remained the force most able to render meaningful the lives of individuals otherwise indistinguishable from the modern mass.<sup>49</sup> In reflecting upon what a robust science meant to

Canada in these early post-war years, it was difficult for observers to symbolize a measure of control over the ethical questions science raised by appealing to anything but a religious tradition. Julia Grace Wales, a Canadian peace activist during World War I and professor of English at the University of Wisconsin, expressed her conception of the ultimate utility of religion in a utilitarian era when she wrote: "True religious creeds are much more than bald scientific statements. Vital symbol enters into them. All the great statements of faith have pregnant phrases which we cannot afford to forget."<sup>50</sup>

One Canadian was beginning to suspect, during the last few years of his life, that the *way* such vital symbols were delivered, no matter how pregnant with meaning they were, would play a significant role in getting them noticed. While his son Donald was away studying geography at the University of Chicago in early 1950, Harold Innis received a letter from the young man about a disturbing trend he had noted in American culture. *Newsweek* and *Harper's* had carried features on a Dr. Velikovsky, who posited scientific connections between biblical disasters and astronomical events.<sup>51</sup> Incensed at the uncritical way in which the public entertained these theories, Donald wrote:

    this neo-fundamentalism is presented by some of the country's leading publications as a serious challenge to modern theories. This is a sad commentary on the state of education in this country and the unscrupulousness of journalists. This Dr. Velikovsky is writing several large volumes on the subject and I have found that this fact is accepted by people as meaning that there must be something in it. Thus periodicals help the book trade and mass affects mind.<sup>52</sup>

Perhaps Donald was eager to demonstrate to his father, one of Canada's foremost academics, that he understood some of the processes the historian had been exploring for the work that would shortly be published as *The Bias of Communication and Empire and*

*Communications.* Clearly, Donald Innis believed that an insidious form of religion was using the instruments of mass persuasion to challenge the scientific worldview and to obscure truths science would eventually reveal. In Canada, however, the most striking incidence of a similar discontent with the manipulation of media would arise a year later, over the decision to broadcast three series of scientific programs on Canadian radio. The ensuing debate would reveal that Canada had not yet found a means to accept science culturally, and that the question of purpose remained the domain of religion.

To some Canadians, science stood not only as an alternative belief system, but it yielded radio, television and movies, and thereby served to perpetuate a breakdown in Christian belief via these instruments of mass culture. This perspective conveniently ignored the fact that some members of the ministry, the most famous of which was Alberta's William Aberhart, had been making broadcasts long before the CBC was created in 1936 to oversee broadcasting.<sup>53</sup> After 1938, a body called the National Religious Advisory Council existed solely to regulate religious broadcasting, but its role in influencing other aspects of broadcasting is unclear. From 1937 until the mid 1950s, the CBC banned programs by individuals claiming super-natural powers or those which dispensed personal advice. During those years, fortune-tellers, astrologers, handwriting analysts, dream interpreters and the like found themselves off the airwaves entirely. At the same time, this regulation could be interpreted as one designed to prevent the dissemination of 'pseudoscience.'<sup>54</sup>

Though the CBC's Talks and Public Affairs Department had been instrumental in bringing numerous controversial issues to the airwaves during wartime and into the post-war period, it had generally done so using the vehicle of the *Citizens' Forum* series, through programmes that were structured as debates. However, 1951, radio's last full year alone on the Canadian airwaves before the advent of television, featured a series of lectures by maverick Cambridge astronomer Fred Hoyle, a series including eminent Canadian



psychiatrist Brock Chisholm, and another by eminent philosopher Bertrand Russell.<sup>55</sup> Although only a small fraction of the lectures explicitly disparaged religion, the airing of these series stirred up a discussion that reveals much about the relationship between science and religion in the national culture. The negative respondents to these programmes considered such potentially controversial scientific material presented without a warning, or an opportunity for rebuttal from the churches, as a betrayal of the Corporation's commitment to defend the foundations of Canadian life. Respondents who wrote in support of 1951's lineup of scientific programming reflected upon how rare it was to hear scientists speak freely on Canadian radio.

The astronomer Hoyle's series went to air first, in early May of 1951. It consisted of eight talks, and set forth the fundamentals of his findings in cosmology. He presented his "New Cosmology" in a fairly straightforward manner in the early programmes of the series, and it was not until Hoyle's eighth and final broadcast that an appreciable degree of controversy emerged. Entitled "A Personal View," Hoyle's attempt to sum up, or to tie the other lectures together outlined his objections to criticism he had received when he broadcast an earlier collection of talks on the British Broadcasting Corporation's *Third Programme*. Hoyle spoke, he emphasized, "as a person, and not as a scientist" when he confessed that "the study of all these extraordinary facts has had an effect on me as a man." Perhaps listeners were expecting to hear how exploring the grandeur of the universe had reinvigorated Hoyle's faith. Instead, he asserted that working out *one's own* attitude toward such data was imperative, and not a task to "leave to the theologians and philosophers." He went on to cite a brief history of Christianity's retreat before the incisive arguments of Darwin and his followers, and to posit that the creation of the universe was something that could now be understood entirely in scientific terms. His most jarring assertion was, curiously, one that paralleled the distinction C.J. Eustace made about the respective roles of

science and religion. Hoyle said: "If the Christians are to find issues that lie beyond the purview of science, then they must look for them at a deeper level than the creation of the Universe."<sup>56</sup> Eustace, along with a number of other religionists, was convinced that there *were* no deeper issues than creation, and that a science too bold to leave what they viewed as philosophical questions alone demanded a response.

Hoyle's personal view of how the branch of science known as cosmology had evolved, and what it meant to his life was, of course, both broader in scope and more detailed than the foregoing sketch. However, public condemnation of the broadcast fastened upon the elements of the talk that cast Christian belief in a poor light, and attempted to do no more than argue that airing such shows on the national radio network undermined the very basis of an unspecified, but Christian, Canadian creed. One listener placed the Christian tradition at the very core of national life, declaring in an unequivocal and rambling fashion:

For the C.B.C. to permit such an anti-Christian and atheistic man as Mr. Hoyle to enjoy time on the national radio and trample on and misrepresent our basic and traditional Christian ideals and way of Life as we in Canada have always respected and lived up to since the early beginnings, is definitely disgusting and even outrageous.<sup>57</sup>

Despite such vehement expressions of outrage and the "scores of wires and telegrams from Roman Catholic organizations and other religious groups criticizing the use of publicly owned facilities to attack religion,"<sup>58</sup> the CBC received more letters in support of the broadcasts than in condemnation, although less than seventy in all.<sup>59</sup> The most likely reason for the overall dearth of letters on the protest side was that arrangements had been made for two academics to respond to Hoyle's final broadcast the week after it aired.

The men chosen to counteract Hoyle's intemperate words were Ralph Williamson, an astronomer at the University of Toronto, and Father J.M. Kelly of St. Michael's College.

Williamson opened his rebuttal with an attempt at character assassination, dredging up Hoyle's record as a wartime scientist, and portraying him as an iconoclast with little respect for the wisdom of his more experienced colleagues or the urgency of the war effort. In trying to mitigate Hoyle's influence on the minds of Canadians, Williamson pointed out a distinction between audiences: "It is one thing to try to sell a novel idea to a group of scientists, who are equipped with the experience and mathematical training necessary to determine whether the idea is worth considering further but it is very different when one talks to the non-scientific world." Presenting the public with a dollop of science via radio had been a grave mistake. Hoyle had been negligent, his fellow scientist declared, in not differentiating for the public between scientific fact and his own ideas. In noting this tendency to conflate fact and speculation, Williamson rather ironically placed Hoyle in the company of the notorious creationist who so enraged Donald Innis: "If we exclude Velikovsky's maunderings, Hoyle has committed the most glaring example of this kind of public flummoxing in modern times."<sup>60</sup>

Father Kelly, as might be expected, dealt with the religious implications of Hoyle's final broadcast, remarking that the cosmologist had "got into something beyond his depth" and that his "scientific strait-jacket" would never allow him to answer questions with which philosophers and theologians were more comfortable. Kelly even indulged in a bit of science fantasy, predicting that if Hoyle

could be transported into the future for a few hundred millions of years he would still find men unhappy with the answers science gives them. It's no use saying this is due to the perversity of men. I think the more normal and valid conclusion is that science alone is not big enough or deep enough for man.

Kelly lumped Hoyle's theory of continuous creation or "little bangs" with the Big Bang model, and dismissed them both by declaring that "the real question of creation is this:

Whence comes the thing that bangs?"<sup>61</sup> The objective of the scholar/priest's tirade was to place an aspect of human existence beyond the reach of scientists like Hoyle, who to him seemed bigoted and unable to understand why people might be most comfortable with an uplifting narrative of creation like Genesis, or an explanation of the afterlife that rewarded virtuous conduct. In providing an occasion for representatives of a religious perspective to respond to Hoyle, the national broadcaster was itself practicing a subtle form of censorship, placing a comforting mist of traditional belief between the public and some of the more disturbing implications of scientific license.

In September 1951, the Wednesday night slot that the Corporation's Talks Department had staked out in 1947, and which was by the early 1950s popularly known to be "intellectual"<sup>62</sup> in tone, hosted another controversial series. Dr. Brock Chisholm introduced the series *Man's Last Enemy – Himself!* on 5 September 1951. Structurally, this series differed from the Hoyle broadcasts in that the speakers were members of a group representing the psychiatric profession rather than a single presenter. No plans were made to include a response from any religious organizations. Though the group contained Sigmund Freud's daughter Anna, distinguished American scholar Carl Binger, and Ewen Cameron of Montreal's Allan Institute, Chisholm was clearly the main attraction in the eyes of Canadian critics. At the time of the broadcasts, he was Director-General of the United Nations World Health Organization, but in Canada he was still best known for his early post-war pronouncements on the psychological treatment of children.<sup>63</sup> In 1946, while he was still Deputy Minister of National Health, *Maclean's* published a digest of Chisholm's public statements which made plain his opposition to traditional standards of behaviour as guides for raising well-adjusted children. He encouraged parents to be truthful to their children at all times, and on the subject of religion, Chisholm suggested that parents should tell their children what they believed to be true, but to avoid presenting their belief as fact.<sup>64</sup> In his

1951 message, Chisholm stressed tolerance, compassion, and understanding among individuals, but remained firm in his insistence that the experts who helped people with their psychological problems were "modern experts, not hereditary or traditional ones, who would advise on the basis of obsolete concepts, on long past certainties which they had learned in their childhoods from their ancestors' ideas."<sup>65</sup>

Within days of Chisholm's address, an ultra-Catholic paper, *The Ensign*, responded angrily.<sup>66</sup> In subsequent weeks, Ewen Cameron's lecture, in which he advocated scientific knowledge over "the old rule of thumb moralizing," drew the wrath of the Jesuit paper *Relations*, which recalled his rebuke from the Anglican Bishop of Montreal for "denying the grace of God."<sup>67</sup> Others were more circumspect, and seemed to appreciate the more pastoral tone of the 1951 lectures compared to Chisholm's earlier work. The editors of *The Prairie Messenger*, a weekly published at St. Peter's Abbey in Muenster, Saskatchewan, commented on the series over the course of several issues. The editors found it "hard to imagine a man in Dr. Chisholm's high position opposing religion as such when the trend today is back to religion,"<sup>68</sup> and considered the title and general implications of the series inspiringly reminiscent of Matthew 16:24 – "If anyone wishes to come after Me, let him deny himself."<sup>69</sup> It was difficult for any but the extremists in Canada to make clear distinctions between the aims of psychology – as they were presented during the fall of 1951 – and religion.<sup>70</sup> Unlike the cosmology of Fred Hoyle, the psychological talks could not be so conveniently dismissed as atheistic. One listener wrote that the talks were:

full of recognition of the essential moralities by which we all strive to live our lives, and are in many ways a scientific examination, in terms suitable for an understanding of our world of today, of the eternal verities which were preached by Christ.<sup>71</sup>

On the heels of the psychiatrists came Lord Bertrand Russell. The aged philosopher

had turned his mind toward the problems and prospects of life at mid century, and had come up with a series entitled *Living in the Atomic Age*. As the series progressed, Russell made several concessions to the modern scene. His suggestion that a new system of virtues should be substituted for the old, which had burdened humankind with "the load of sin," and his insistence that science had liberated society from the "great parts of traditional religion and morality [which] were inspired by man's bondage to nature,"<sup>72</sup> cast considerable doubt on conventional religious belief. The final talk in the series stressed the peoples' quest to overcome conflicts with nature, with each other, and within themselves, and again urged listeners to renounce the idea of sin in favour of embracing the techniques by which science attempted to resolve these conflicts.<sup>73</sup>

In Russell's case, as in Hoyle's, the material was judged too controversial to broadcast alone. Following the six-part series, the CBC aired a panel programme featuring academics John A. Irving (Philosophy, Victoria College), D.R.G. Owen (Ethics, Trinity College), and Edmund Carpenter (Anthropology, University of Toronto).<sup>74</sup> Though Russell alluded to a religious tradition as only one part of a burden to be done away with, Owen responded to this endorsement of a scientific perspective by arguing that Russell had set about knocking down a straw man which was not Christianity, and that the disintegration and chaos threatening modern society was best countered by the sensitivity of religion. John Irving noted that even though Russell believed applied science had "outrun man's capacity for moral sensitivity and political control," Russell did not seriously consider advances in the social sciences. Carpenter concurred, but deemed more important Russell's idea that man must open his heart to joy and cannot remain in fear, "which can only lead him to escape into the past and into mysticism, and we know there's no solution there."<sup>75</sup> The group could not come out and indict Russell as anti-religious, but that was never the point of the exercise. However incisive the criticism of these three scholars, another drama was playing

itself out in a more public fashion.

What historian Marc Raboy called "an attack on the CBC from the extreme right" hijacked part of the Parliamentary Committee on Broadcasting's agenda.<sup>76</sup> The pressure had been on since July 1951, when the more moderate B.K. Sandwell had judged Canadian radio an inappropriate place to question religion: "It may in the United States be the duty of radio to open its channels to any and every conceivable shade of opinion on religion and everything else. We have never felt that radio in Canada was under any such far-reaching obligation."<sup>77</sup> Despite the CBC's attempts to mollify or prevent protest through the airing of alternative viewpoints, the Russell series was the Corporation's 'third strike,' and some sort of discipline for presenting unvarnished science seemed inevitable.

Though some degree of protest or support for the previous Hoyle and Chisholm series had been evident from the time they were aired, the addition of Russell's presence on the Canadian stage, even rebroadcast, was weighty enough to ensure a more public debate. Both the Hoyle and Russell series were transcriptions – pre-recorded talks from the BBC – so CBC officials could 'read ahead' and deliberate on the matter of allowing responses to them. The deliberations within the CBC itself were quite illuminating. In the midst of the Russell series, Barry MacDonald, a CBC employee in Sydney, Nova Scotia, urged Supervisor of Talks and Public Affairs Neil Morrison to take further measures to counter the impression that:

the CBC has jumped on a particular ideological bandwagon. The bandwagon seems to be driven by people who have discarded the traditional morality of Western society and put their faith in some fairly recent discoveries (and hypotheses) in the field of science, especially in the social sciences.

MacDonald advocated a balanced perspective in that he did not wish to see a general ban on scientific talks that disparaged or could be taken to disparage religion. He nonetheless

maintained that in future, the CBC should make certain that "scholars and students of high calibre who are basically Christian, or at least spiritual (as opposed to strictly materialistic) in their outlook" preface or respond to such controversial talks. Christian scholars, he continued, should be allotted time and prominence comparable to the scientists.<sup>78</sup> Morrison decided it would be prudent to investigate the issue of relative time allowed for religious broadcasts and to the three scientific series. The results of his assistant's inquiry were clear. The three series in question ran for a total of ten and half hours. Nationally broadcast programs "of a religious character" accounted by themselves for 214 hours of airtime per year, every year.<sup>79</sup> Although the broadcast statistics did not reveal the pro-science bias at which MacDonald had hinted, another of his comments encapsulated the central paradox animating the relationship between science and religion in the early 1950s – the need to appear rational and objective while acknowledging that science had not done away with traditional beliefs regarding the nature of existence and moral conduct. MacDonald wrote: "the CBC can have no 'beliefs', except a general sympathy and accord with the basic ideas of our Canadian society. Certainly what we as individual members of CBC staff believes is irrelevant. So is the philosophic accuracy of either the 'traditional' or the 'new' school."<sup>80</sup>

By presenting talks on scientific subjects, the Corporation aimed to reflect what it perceived as a burgeoning part of the intellectual scene. During the war, science had been presented in such a way as to make it seem less complex, and more useful in the daily lives of Canadians. Returning veterans swelled the ranks of technical college and university students and were believed, if not expected, to be more familiar not only with the mechanics of science but, in view of the atomic threat, with its importance in the social and political arenas. Despite this democratization of science, one of the powerful "basic ideas" at the core of Canadian culture remained an attachment to the concept of a spiritual realm beyond the reach of physical forces. The dilemma for the CBC was that it seemed equally



democratic to respect such an attachment in any assessment of what the public wanted.<sup>81</sup> In her attempt to chronicle the acrimony over scientific programming in 1951, Miriam Chapin told her prospective American audience that Canada was still:

a deeply religious country, perhaps the most devout on earth. A Christian nation, it contains numerous minorities, Jews, Moslems, Buddhists, as well as deists and atheists. If nothing is to be heard on the air that offends any one of them, can any scientific truths be broadcast? Certainly Hoyle, Chisholm and the rest thought they were discussing science. Is Christianity so vulnerable an institution that none may presume to doubt its tenets?<sup>82</sup>

Journalists were divided on the question of allowing controversial science to be broadcast over the powerful medium of radio. In November, B.K. Sandwell added to his earlier commentary on the Hoyle program by arguing that "the questions whether there is a Creator and whether the life of the individual ceases at death are not scientific questions; these are not matters of knowledge, they are matters of faith; and the radio is not a suitable mechanism for disturbing the faith of anybody."<sup>83</sup> Wrapping up its coverage of the issue on New Year's Day 1952, *Maclean's* suggested that the "ancient struggle to root out heresy still goes on" and wondered how it was that some critics of the CBC could campaign to silence scientific programmes in a society that valued freedom of speech. In advocating an end to behind-the-scenes attempts to censor ideas which appeared to ridicule or diminish the relevance of religion in modern Canadian society, *Maclean's* held up as exemplary the views of a theology student from Toronto's Wycliffe College. The student welcomed the opportunity Russell's programs presented and shunned censorship, proclaiming: "Let not Christians hide behind artificial barriers but stand in the marketplace and declare Christ." Even in an era of prosperity and scientific marvels, the editor recognized the resilient nature of religious conviction. In his estimation, the result of declaring Christ in a materialistic world would not be the clear victory of one perspective over the other, but rather a

commendable modern compromise based upon a recognition of the limits of science and an appreciation of religion as a meaningful way of transcending them:

To wilfully or capriciously shake another man's faith without offering him a better faith in return is one of the most vicious and wasteful acts a human being can commit. But to seek the final alliance of faith and reason is a high and noble purpose; and the man who seeks that alliance is not an enemy to faith.<sup>84</sup>

Though it had played a useful part in transforming the economic lives of thousands of Canadians in the post-war period, science remained in an uneasy co-existence with religion because it still could not offer a 'better' faith in return. Some religionists, however, read this sort of stand-off during a period of religious revival in North America as a portent of difficult times ahead, or of creeping moral decay. During the year following the excitement over scientific programming, D.R.G. Owen, one of Russell's critics, published a slim volume entitled *Scientism, Man and Religion*, which he abridged and broadcast over the CBC as part of a series entitled *Christianity in an Age of Science*. In his essay "Science, Scientism and Religion," Owen opened by asking why the present age was considered scientific, and attempting to explain two important, and to him, intimately linked developments – "the decline of religious belief and the rise of the mass-society":

I ascribe these two related phenomena not to science, which is a certain method of investigation and control, but rather to scientism, a blind adulation of science which disregards or denies the limitations of the method.

Like C.J. Eustace, Owen used the term scientism to suggest an insidious ideology at work, and like Eustace, he saw great value in the technical achievements of science, but emphasized that science could not examine or resolve all the problems that humanity might encounter. Nor did the empirical principles upon which science operated address "other

methods of knowledge or the validity of other classes of belief." To Owen, science was much less versatile than religion, because "[t]he fact that spirit and values, for instance, are intangible and immeasurable means not that they are unreal but merely that they fall outside the scope of scientific investigation."<sup>85</sup> Most important, however, was Owen's insistence that both religion and science had served as pillars of Western society, but both had been ill-treated at the hands of scientism, a "prevailing tradition" or "set of presuppositions" that involved "the rejection of all apparently irreconcilable beliefs. The tradition of our age can be given the name 'scientific' in the sense that the assumptions of which it consists are distorted generalizations of the valid limiting principles of science."<sup>86</sup>

Owen drew a plain analogy between scientism and communism in his message. He saw an unfortunate paradox in the way that the West expended so much energy resisting enslavement to communist ideology, but paid little heed to the "internal threat" of scientism, which he claimed was just as destructive of freedom. "If this way of thinking wins the day," he continued, "the result will be a Western version of the mass-society in which man will be abolished as successfully as in the contemporary communist state."<sup>87</sup> Despite such a bleak prophecy for man under scientism, Owen took it as a "sign of hope" that "behind and beneath our modern culture are the insights of Ancient Greece and Palestine and of medieval Europe." If it did not forsake these insights, Owen suggested, contemporary Western society should be able to accommodate both religion and science, because "true religion does not dispute the well-authenticated theories of science," while "[s]cience proper, recognizing its limitations, passes no judgment on the reality or unreality of spirit, freedom, values and God."<sup>88</sup>

Despite the limitations of science, its power as a leveller and a force for the improvement of everyday living conditions also had to be acknowledged. Father Coady, who did much to improve the economic welfare of rural Maritimers because he believed that

poverty affected the soul as well as the body, admitted that religion or a right philosophy could only provide for part of humanity's need: "The formula for the good society of the future is not going to be taken out, like a rabbit, from some metaphysical hat; rather, it is going to be the manipulation of commonplace things, the re-patterning of the forces that determine the life of man on this earth." Coady included the basic physical necessities as well as economic security and freedom among the commonplace things that science could help provide. He had, however, anticipated objections that his audience might have to such a seemingly atheistic perspective:

I can hear some of you saying, "That is vile materialism. I thought he would come to that!" But I say to you that it is high spirituality – seeing the spiritual aspect of created material things. We should not be fooled by externals. Real spirituality goes deeper, sees God in material things, and recognizes that the laws of nature are His handwriting in the world He created.<sup>89</sup>

The principal of Queen's University from 1939 to 1951, Robert Charles Wallace was trained as a geologist but came to occupy, perhaps more convincingly than anyone else in Canada who pronounced upon the subject, the middle ground between a scientific and a religious faith. In a seminal lecture that staked out this territory, he granted that the scientist "has become an important person in the modern world, for our civilization has become geared to his discoveries, and awaits the new aids to living that he may give." However, he seized upon the fluid nature of scientific inquiry as evidence of science's status as an evolving perspective, not as truth. Wallace asserted that scientists could not embrace all forms of knowledge because they were not open to the possibility that the supernatural, as another "field of interest" had certain laws of its own: "One would like to feel that this objectivity is carried over into other fields of interest not connected with his scientific pursuits, but unfortunately this does not always prove to be the case."<sup>90</sup>

Science had drastically expanded the body of knowledge necessary for a dramatic taming of the forces of nature, but the empty prospect of material abundance without spiritual satisfaction differentiated a faith in science from religious faith enough to convince Wallace that both would be necessary components of the fullest possible life. He reasoned that atomic science, considered the most modern and the most dangerous branch had been – despite its potential for destruction – pushing mankind back in the direction of religious faith. Following an inventory of the contributions of science to a more abundant material life, he added: "Our lives are easier, we have more leisure: there is more entertainment: we should be happier. And yet there remains the question mark. Are we really happier? Have we found that peace of mind which is the object of our striving?"<sup>91</sup>

Wallace also applied quantum theory to the question of science's limited power to solve certain kinds of human problems. He appealed to extremely simplistic interpretations of Einstein's relativity and Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle to suggest that scientists were only just beginning to realize that some questions were insoluble via scientific methods.<sup>92</sup> Though he granted that some time in the distant future science might find a way to apply its methods to many of the questions that had been so far left to religion or philosophy, he returned to a familiar refrain:

There are imponderables in life, which science has not been in a position to analyse. True, much has been done by experiment in psychology to reduce to some measure of order and intelligibility our impulses and emotional reactions; and much more may yet be done by scientific analysis. For in many of our actions we are machine like. But in our credo, in the faith which inspires us to go forward, in the deeper strivings of the spirit - in a word, in the things that make life worthwhile, science has failed to penetrate. In these realms we seek other support.<sup>93</sup>

Such a search for other means of support was an essential part of the response to the pressures and pace of modern life, which Wallace believed had tended to "rush us off

our feet physically, mentally, and spiritually." The way in which science had transformed work and leisure made it an integral part of daily life for Canadians, but it could not address the restlessness of spirit that accompanied modernization. Wallace believed that a "greater need for a grip on the things that are eternal" was necessary in view of science's continual evolution from one hypothesis to the next. The explicit goals of science and religion, he noted, had led observers to perceive a significant gulf between the two. He attributed this tension to dogmatism on both sides, and to distinct ways of viewing the "great edifice of truth" – the scientists striving for ever newer representations of it, and the faithful "feasting their eyes on scenes that have become dear to them."<sup>94</sup> What contemporary people needed was a way to acknowledge the undiminished spiritual curiosity that one commentator called the "receptivity to the infinite which will not allow them to rest."<sup>95</sup> Wallace thought that an effort "to examine, in this very modern age, the faith by which we may live" was long overdue, and would lead to a greater understanding between the scientists and the faithful, two parties that had erroneously conceived of their respective goals as antagonistic.<sup>96</sup>

Wallace saw a certain order in the progress of humanity from age to age that revealed a divine purpose, and suggested that science and religion were equipped differently so that they might complement each other. The contentious issue of authority, he claimed, was set aside when religion was willing to admit, faced with hard scientific evidence about the physical world, that it spoke metaphorically on matters that were more properly the concern of science. Conversely, he warned scientists not to assume that they "had the complete vision." Wallace left his audience at Acadia with the message that the conditions were right for a truce when he proclaimed: "The world of science and the world of religion are one world. We are nearer to achieving that greatly desired unity than at any time in the days that have gone."<sup>97</sup> His plea for unity came near the end of a period marked by intense speculation on how religion could maintain its authority in the face of science.

Commentators perceived the promise of unity in unlikely places. Watson Kirkconnell saw it in the medieval university, and D.R.G. Owen saw it in the ancient Greek civilization, in the Holy Land, and in the Middle Ages. Lister Sinclair found it in early 1950s Canada. He wrote a radio piece on arctic survival, and reflected upon the effortless way an Inuit hunter remained open to material and spiritual stimuli: "Arvik is a mixture of technician and mystic - like most men. What observation can teach - he knows. What doing can prove - he accepts. ... Without books - he preserves the past. He seems to understand all the principles of science. And yet, he believes in spirits."<sup>98</sup> The question of religion's place in an unquestionably scientific world would pale next to a more general discontent with mass culture and the technological society in the years that followed. Religion and science could be said to address different concerns, but 'scientism,' reconceived as an over-reliance on technology by the likes of George Grant, would remain anathema to critics of the contemporary society and its culture.

The prestige of science during the war years owed much to its characterization as the right arm of democracy and to a growing trust in the scientific method as a rational way of addressing social problems. This transition certainly had implications for religion as a belief system and as a locus of social uplift. Religionists, like the scientific specialist, responded by claiming that their method was best suited to the task of helping people weather the pressures of modern life, some of which science had intensified. One of the most compelling episodes in this struggle involved questions about how relatively new methods of communication might be used, if at all, to present the quintessentially modern scientific worldview in a nation still conscious of the place of religion. By 1955, McGill zoologist N.J. Berrill wondered whether there was a "vital conflict" between science and religion. He answered in the negative, citing the common aims of the two perspectives and

an essential "unity in all things," remarking that it "is more a matter of convenience for the benefit of our own understanding that we seize upon these intangible qualities of the spirit and set them apart from the physical world."<sup>99</sup> Though several commentators spent a great deal of their energy setting spirit and body apart during the late 1940s and early 1950s, that activity only served to acknowledge, more acutely, the power of science in contemporary Canada. The success of science and technology in exploiting the riches of the physical world could not be denied, and much of the discomfort with science in the early post-war period was rooted in the search for a peace of mind less transitory than the physical comforts that boom-time brought to even the most remote corners of Canada.

Skirmishes along what B.K. Sandwell called the "science-faith borders" were less "vital" by the later 1950s, and at mid-decade even the least religious of observers began to view the religious revival of the post-war years as a rational coping strategy rather than fanaticism.<sup>100</sup> Even the most strident critics of the modern condition tended to identify not science itself, but the uses to which it was put as what troubled them. Berrill saw the complexity and pervasive nature of technology as a much more pressing problem:

To a great extent, then, the differences between science and religion are fictitious if what we mean by science is that passionate search of the religious soul for the ultimate reality which he calls God. Only when science is converted to technology and becomes materialistic and when religion ceases to be the search for truth and says it knows all the answers do difficulties arise. But this is not true science nor is it true religion, for between these there are language barriers but no others. There is but one quest and science, religion and art are all on the same road.<sup>101</sup>

This concern with technology rather than the work of pure science as a challenge to the role of religion in society began to reveal itself somewhat more vigorously by the late 1950s. The Toronto Conference of the United Church of Canada struck a committee to investigate automation, and in his section of the committee's report, Harold Toye saw grave



danger in the societal self-sufficiency that automation implied. Contemporary religion, he wrote, must "challenge the generally accepted authority of science, technology, industry, and military control which ignores God's Sovereignty and plays fast and loose with moral and spiritual values."<sup>102</sup> Despite his rather militant rhetoric, Toye's wrath was directed at the societal tendency to think in selfish material terms rather than putting the community's welfare and Christian conduct first.

In 1959, University of Toronto philosophy professor John Irving testified to the lopsided nature of the contest between science and religion when a British schoolchild asked him, via the magic of a transatlantic radio link, which faith he would embrace if Christianity did not exist. He quickly suggested Hinduism, but preferred Zen Buddhism even more "because no advance of science can bite into or destroy Zen-Buddhism."<sup>103</sup> Through the mid 1960s, philosopher George Grant complained of a widespread scientism under which human needs were no longer central to technocratic governments. Journalist Pierre Berton sat comfortably in church and found an inflexible religion that could not respond to modern conditions.<sup>104</sup> A year before Canada's Centennial, the historian W.L. Morton spoke of a monolithic culture in which little room remained for the spiritual or literary expressions that enriched life in bygone days. Science had come to determine the structure of daily and collective life to the extent that "[o]nly an Englishman such as Sir Charles Snow could speak of the existence of two cultures. To a North American there is only one, the scientific."<sup>105</sup> During that same year, Morton painted a bleak picture of contemporary life – of "perils unparalleled" – and added "[o]nly a faith such as Teilhard de Chardin's, that such things cannot be in the Providence of God, will enable a man to be at ease in these times."<sup>106</sup> Amid buildings crammed with advertisements of participating nations' scientific genius, Expo 67's Christian pavilion showed its visitors "man in contention with himself" via the most modern methods of audio-visual presentation.<sup>107</sup>

As North American society came to be populated with what William Whyte called 'organization men,' seemingly content to fit quietly into an order necessitated by technological advance and consolidated by bureaucracies, the post-war response to science as a trying facet of modern experience and an incomplete philosophy nonetheless bore eloquent witness to religion's enduring place in Canadian culture. Despite swelling church memberships in the post-war era, the task of claiming a prominent and honourable duty for religion in a scientific age distressed some observers greatly. For the most part, however, their fears were misplaced. Religion managed to "maintain its visionary authority"<sup>108</sup> among a people who were, their hopeful guardians believed, still inclined to seek explanations of life's purpose that were simple, familiar and reassuring. Movies and comic books proved more subtle enemies of religion. As an alluring alternative to traditional activities and community ties, mass culture brought Canada into ever more intimate contact with a modern world which offered much less spiritual guidance than psychiatrists on the radio. Yet, when those who thought about the gulf between science and religion were moved to speak, they tended to emphasize the fluid and contingent nature of science rather than the powerful mass culture diverting people entirely from questions regarding the universe and humanity's purpose in it.

Cyril James recalled the life of St. Paul and described how difficult it was to follow such an example amid threatening 1955 surroundings: "It was easier to walk with God, and work with Him, in simpler Eastern lands under Mediterranean skies than it is in a crowded bus on Sherbrooke Street in a world that is arguing about the atom bomb."<sup>109</sup> Though the wartime infatuation with the promise of science is perhaps easier to understand more than a half-century later, the post-war effort to make science responsible to tradition and popular beliefs, to adjust to the existential implications of nuclear weapons, and to retain religion as counsel and conscience were equally indicative of the times. In the early 1950s, the

combination of a religious revival and evidence that some scientists – like Fred Hoyle and Brock Chisholm – had abandoned the pious soul-searching of the immediate post-Hiroshima era spawned jeremiads like D.R.G. Owen's and hopeful calls for reconciliation like Robert Wallace's. Historians of science or of culture in Canada cannot ignore such attempts to safeguard religion's traditional place. Imploring their nation to leave room for the spiritual, supporters of religion in age of science did not yet realize that the implicit need to live in both worlds – to transcend the borders between science and faith – was both an axiom and a commandment of Canadian life at mid-century.

#### **Four – “an empty life”: the 1950s**

This study opened with an examination of the ‘culture of reconstruction’ in English Canada, a wartime climate in which the individual’s participation in local affairs was frequently equated with a contribution to the war and to the society that would emerge from it. A discussion of wartime itself followed, revealing that although democracy became a powerful rallying cry, fear of easily-distracted masses and of desolate utilitarianism – conditions that could be linked to modern life and to abuse of the opportunities democracy afforded – threatened the hopeful vision of an enlightened post-war nation. The foregoing chapter on the ambivalent reception ‘religionists’ gave the scientific worldview in the early 1950s showed that the longstanding contest between those two belief systems was far from decided and that their competition for space on the airwaves had only complicated matters. The 1950s were hardly a respite for cultural critics, who claimed that the problems attending modern existence and the banality of mass culture had only intensified. Having struggled during the 1930s and savouring what leisure they had in wartime, many Canadians were satisfied with peace and with the relative comfort they enjoyed once the troops returned home. Still, critical observers perceived a contemporary environment that, although more prosperous and ostensibly more carefree, accommodated a kind of emptiness or abandonment of the mental and spiritual engagement of wartime in favour of passive entertainment, material comfort and social status based on consumption. These were, critics reasoned, circumstances from which the ordinary citizen would be hard-pressed to extract himself, unless he chose “activities that will reveal his interests as a personality.”<sup>1</sup> This prospect seemed unlikely without some form of intervention, for as an exhilarating peace succumbed quickly to the uncertainty of the Cold War, the benchmark of individual

conduct was no longer the active citizen but the mass society.

Historians have not neglected the cultural dimensions of this environment, but tended until recently to portray North America during the 1950s as a place where simple values re-emerged and (particularly in the United States) an uneasy consensus reigned. Because the *American* 1950s experience represented the trajectory of the pre-eminent post-war commercial and cultural empire, it has become normative. In this version of events, although Cold War tensions dominated the international stage and affected domestic politics all over the world, post-war prosperity and a burgeoning youth-focussed culture operated to make the 1950s a relatively quiescent time for the average North American – a reward for the collective heroism of the 1940s. More general works on 1950s America cover political and diplomatic events assiduously and, with few exceptions, perpetuate the idea that the American public sought stability with an uncompromising passion.<sup>2</sup> Fortunately, some recent studies enrich our view of a time that had been somewhat sanitized by accounts conflating the excesses expressed in 1950s popular culture with the overall bias of the decade.<sup>3</sup>

While the historiography of the fifties in the United States has gone some distance toward recognizing the period's subtler hues, historical writing on Canada in the post-war years is still notable mainly for its fascination with the struggle for political power and influence. When surveys of this period address Canadian 'culture,' they list some of the more prominent artists, writers and musicians active at the time, or describe how governments proposed to support a small, under-appreciated and chronically underemployed community.<sup>4</sup> Admittedly, any account of 1950s Canada should acknowledge its broader political themes, but these may be exploited in more helpful ways. For example, a handful of historians have explored the difficult Cold War years. Though Canada did not have its own Senator McCarthy, foreign policy and national security were minefields and much was done to Canadians, ostensibly for their own protection.<sup>5</sup> Only recently have

students of the period come to appreciate that the history of social and cultural *policy* in post-war Canada is not the history of society and culture.<sup>6</sup> While Doug Owram's work on the 'baby boom' generation devotes long overdue attention to Canadian society and its culture in the 1950s, he nonetheless reinforces an interpretation of the decade as a comfortable nursery for those who would ultimately carry out more strident acts of dissent.<sup>7</sup> His rebellious young men and women of the later 1960s and early 1970s seemed to draw little of their anger from a sedate 1950s, absorbing only a sense of entitlement which enabled them to seek justice and self-knowledge more obtrusively as they reached adulthood.

As contemporary observers well appreciated, however, the 1950s were a time in which anxiety over the potential for atomic war, juvenile crime, and boredom often drove the public towards suburbs, censorship, and conformity to ready-made lifestyles. Despite clear evidence that overall, Canadians managed their anxieties by consuming cars and double features, cultural critics' commentary on such trends provides a perspective on the 1950s that empirical or anecdotal accounts of the trends themselves often cannot. Suffused with despair and clearly biased in the direction of autonomous thought, liberal education and the accumulated wisdom of the West, critical dismissals of mass culture and prescriptions for 're-humanizing' modern life were at least genuine. Given the often urgent tone of this critique, historians of 1950s Canada cannot justify merely gazing at a veneer of contentment with the abundant life or assuming that culture was an either/or proposition. Attention to the variety of ways in which modern life altered social patterns and values and a manifest will to help 'high' or 'folk' culture compete for public attention with mass entertainments each suggest that cultural critics saw the vast public as unwittingly subjugated but ultimately redeemable. Their success at selling this interpretation of how supply influenced demand during the later 1940s and early 1950s translated into unprecedented state support for the

arts. The immediate goal was not a highbrow renaissance, but an undoing of what Hollywood had wrought. By advocating a wider range of cultural options for Canadians, critical observers hoped to establish self-improvement and a degree of eclecticism as attractive social norms, and thus halt the common culture's perceived decline.

The end of World War II signalled a qualified return to the abundant life for Canadians, as many goods were still scarce and it would be some time before the armed forces pulled out of what had been the theatres of war. In this way the years 1947-1949 cohere more readily with the 1950s than they do with wartime. Accordingly, this chapter begins with that same transitional late 1940s period by setting out some broad themes that would continue to invite concern during the 1950s and beyond. These are: pressure to conform to new norms in work and home life; consumerism and the commercialization of culture; and the perceived abandonment of cultural effort in favour of 'empty' leisuretime pursuits. The remainder of the present chapter picks up those threads and discusses how cultural critics elaborated upon them in the period between 1949 and about 1956, although 1956 is by no means a firm terminal date. Most of the incidents or issues treated in the present chapter, for example historian Hilda Neatby's crusade against progressive education, arise before the later 1950s. The subsequent chapter will discuss themes having greater currency during the later 1950s and early 1960s (some remained lively points of contention through the middle of that decade), particularly fears about how mass culture affected personal and national identities, and assessments of technology's impact on society. This concession to chronology should not be read as an attempt to divide the period into distinct cells having entirely different characters, or to argue that criticism of a certain modern foible belonged to a particular year or month. Instead, these two chapters together explore the critique of modern life and mass culture in English Canada from about 1947 through about 1963 along broad thematic lines, and show how critics viewed some of the social and

cultural trends of the period as contributions to a subtle process of decay.

This first chapter of the pair encompasses, at least chronologically, one point of interest which scholars have long considered the birth of critical fascination with Canada's cultural well-being. Often cited as a kind of highbrow census or nationwide cultural inventory, the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (most commonly referred to as the Massey Commission, as it is hereafter) has become the central event in a "creationist myth" for cultural nationalists, despite the efforts of the 1920s, the wartime plans for cultural reconstruction, and the earnest pulse-taking embodied in the Canadian Youth Commission's relatively brief career.<sup>8</sup> Those seeking to understand the Canadian cultural 'elite' portray the commission as a watershed, or at least as the breakthrough acknowledgement of a desire to develop the nation's cultural infrastructure.<sup>9</sup> Though this chapter contains its share of evidence from the commission's short lifespan (1949-1951) it does not present that body's *Report* as the defining statement of an abiding 1950s mass culture critique. Instead, cultural criticism during this period ran wider, encompassing not only disappointment with cultural forms that had become popular, but with change affecting such areas as education, the business sector and the family unit. Well over 400 concerned community, provincial and national groups submitted briefs to the commission, and these are certainly valuable to the history of cultural policy. They are perhaps more worthy of attention because they constituted readings of the cultural landscape in particular locales or by representatives of groups interested in a variety of activities as pastimes or livelihoods.

It is somewhat unfortunate that part of the critical commentary on modern life and mass culture emerged during a relatively brief, but intense, nationalist re-evaluation of the Canadian arts milieu, broadcasting and higher education. It is unfortunate because we tend to see what Paul Litt called "The Donnish Inquisition"<sup>10</sup> as coterminous with interest in



rooting out cultural heresies. Without such a purpose-built institution, it is more difficult to follow the grumblings of a loose affiliation of cultural critics during the remainder of the decade. Yet, in the years following the Massey Commission, commentators on the Canadian scene recognized that neither the war nor the commission had ushered in an era of enlightenment. Grand visions of a post-war democracy filled with attentive, independent, active citizens likewise proved illusory, and post-Massey denunciations of the forces that made Canada appear a "soft nation"<sup>11</sup> round out this chapter.

For the present study, the Massey Commission exhibits two valuable characteristics. First, as a government-sanctioned examination of Canada's cultural life, it invited (intentionally and otherwise) more frequent commentary on a wide variety of cultural topics. By the time its *Report* came out in 1951, cultural critics had floated a raft of their own suggestions for coping with a gruelling modern environment whose ephemeral entertainments they believed did little to promote self-improvement or recreation, despite the increased leisure time available to the average person. Second, a host of policy recommendations emerged in the wake of the commission's hearings. However, many of the recommendations in that wide-ranging program took several years to implement, if they were implemented at all.<sup>12</sup> The vow to investigate broadcasting resulted in a Royal Commission in the mid-1950s, around which still more critical readings of Canadian cultural life huddled for heat and light. This second state-sponsored look at the dynamics of cultural change on the North American continent is explored more fully in Chapter Five.

For most Canadians, it was a simple matter to move into peacetime. With the war won, concern over issues such as the prospect of atomic war and the well-being of their own families came to occupy greater portions of their time and energy. For another much smaller group, cultural and social patterns established during the pre-war years remained

troubling, having been intensified by further industrialization and urbanization during the war. It is safe to say, however, that within two years after victory, much of the urgency and grim goodwill that characterized the relatively collectivist culture of reconstruction had ceased to matter to individuals occupied once again with their own affairs.<sup>13</sup> Curiosity and trepidation remained, but the war had equipped many Canadians with a sense of the world beyond their hometowns, and critics were generally inclined to see this as a positive sign. Even though he spoke three years before the decade officially arrived, Arthur Phelps delivered what seemed to be a characteristic declaration of 1950s hope and despair. He wanted his audience, a university group in New Brunswick, to ponder some of the irrevocable changes war had brought about:

Ideationally, we are at the very vortex of our contemporary human tension. We performed what we called our war effort. We have become a big business concern. Our young people have gone to the far places of the world and come home again. Lifted from their localities, they have also criss-crossed their own country and made discoveries. They have slipped back now to their home places and laid their uniforms aside and they wonder about themselves and the Canada they find.<sup>14</sup>

Phelps recognized that the war experience had been an education for many, and hoped that the post-war citizen's attention could be fixed upon the task of coping with profound change. Change, he noted, could frequently be attributed to the diffusion of dangerous goods or influences among populations unsure of how to assess their often concealed qualities. Disastrous change for North America's native population, Phelps remarked, came in the form of "whiskey and guns and syphilis." Change was a recognized condition of modern life. Yet modern life and its commercialized culture seemed all the more dangerous to critics in the post-war period because the changes these brought often made making a living and entertaining oneself seem such a harmless relief after years of wartime

concentration. The consequences of common leisuretime choices seemed removed from the choices themselves. "Work out techniques for the universal distribution of the funnies," Phelps added wryly, "and you have psychiatrists and mothers huddling in drawing-rooms at troubled little private meetings and even fathers and Brock Chisholm wondering what in the world is happening to us."<sup>15</sup> Critics believed that Canadians would seek help for the symptoms out of concern for their own well-being, but would they recognize the disease?

While they worried privately about what the future held in store for their families, Canadians also came out of the war with a heightened awareness that their nation had become a more important player on the world stage, and that it needed to remain one. Even literary types could cautiously admit that a vigorous internationalism might be affecting Canadian literature. Poet A.J.M. Smith suggested that "Canadian literature which formerly aimed to be 'national' is now, here and there at least, taking on a cosmopolitan maturity."<sup>16</sup> The advent of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) late in 1945 raised spirits among those in Canada who saw the new internationalism as a civilizing force committed to "the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind," even though the King government was either reluctant or simply ill-prepared to participate in it.<sup>17</sup>

Even as they sought a worldly sophistication, advocates of a civilized post-war Canada had to acknowledge the necessity of post-war economic development. That development, however, also re-emphasized troubling modern tendencies. B.K. Sandwell, a long-time supporter of free enterprise, noted that the drive to compete with one's neighbours had certainly survived the war, and remarked: "the world is so much with us that nobody can fail to realize that fact, except perhaps those that are dazzled by the false light of the goddess they worship. ... The diseases of the age are worry diseases; the twentieth century is the century of the duodenal ulcer."<sup>18</sup> A return to the genteel rat-race after six

years of war was hardly a reward for Canada's youth, and to Sandwell the quest for success, unlike the drive for achievement, seemed highly unnatural:

The 'shades of the prison house' which 'begin to close about the growing boy' are in the main the shadows, not of a struggle for existence, for we do not have to struggle much for existence today – not of a struggle for achievement, which is in accordance with our nature and a source of joy – but of a struggle for success, a struggle to keep up with the Joneses and ahead of the Smiths and not too far behind the Robinsons. I particularly want to stress that this struggle for success has nothing to do with the struggle for achievement. ... [The artist's] desire is to make the kind of music, the kind of picture, the kind of architecture, the kind of engine or machine even, which is the best he is capable of and the fullest expression of himself. That is the struggle for achievement, a great and noble and natural struggle; and in our time it gets sidetracked, before the youth is twenty-one, in favour of the struggle for success, and the result is a divided personality, a schism in the soul, which is fatal to happiness long before the inevitable tragedies of life arrive to darken it.<sup>19</sup>

While making it clear that he did not advocate the bland security of the socialist state, Sandwell also took pains to note that he considered the cult of success a perversion of the individualist ethic, and therein as dangerous as socialism. He held up the artist's highly subjective and personal sense of achievement as a model, one that offered access to a noble set of values while consumerism offered only temporary satisfaction and fleeting status. This was hardly a call for a new aesthetic elitism, but it was a warning that fitting into the mass society represented a denial of selfhood. If youth would only recognize – along with the rest of the population – that their daily work and leisure could be expressions of more than getting and spending, the nation as a whole could claim to have achieved its own culture.

One way of combining a desire for aesthetic maturity and cosmopolitanism with the ever-present need for employment and for practical items like furniture was the promotion of Canadian industrial design. Earlier in this study, we saw that even during wartime, the dull

mass production aesthetic and scant evidence of a design sensibility among Canada's manufacturers prompted some commentators to extol the virtues of a seemingly forgotten craftsmanship. Creativity and the opportunity to exhibit taste in daily living were not only for an artistically-inclined elite. Later in wartime, critics would argue for the adoption of new materials and production techniques by industrial concerns, so that "there might be some hope for beauty in daily life[.]"<sup>20</sup> By 1948, the "Design in Industry" exhibition had toured the country, and art and design critic Donald Buchanan, who had spent the previous few years advocating beauty in daily life, was praising the National Gallery for initiating a 'design index' – a compendium of international examples from which Canadian designers and manufacturers could draw ideas for new products. Buchanan's stances against unnecessary ornamentation, pointless streamlining, and the defining of design trends by the larger American manufacturers joined other clear calls for Canadians to reclaim this territory for themselves by establishing such facilities as an industrial design museum.<sup>21</sup> Good design was an antidote to the necessity of mass production, and the adoption of a design index was a move to emulate the seemingly less market-driven standards of European countries. A quiz administered to fairgoers at the 1948 Canadian National Exhibition showed them three floor lamps and asked them which they preferred. The experts and most of the respondents chose a functional and graceful lamp which happened to be unavailable in Canada. One observer wondered: "Must we regard it as an axiom that all lamps in Canadian stores are ornate? But then why should this be so?"<sup>22</sup>

Canada was still perceived, however, as a nation without the history or character – in essence without the culture – of its older allies. About a year after the war, social planner Leonard Marsh, virtually a household name after 1943 for his role in advising the Canadian government on social security policy, moved out of that particular spotlight to take a position at the University of British Columbia. To him, the choice was one between material

and spiritual sustenance. He wrote to a friend of the sacrifice he believed he was making:

I have always wanted to live – for a while, anyway – in this part of the Dominion. It has certain virtues; but you cannot believe how both Betty and I miss the realities and social maturity of Britain and Europe -- even if it is good to get some food and fuel for a while.<sup>23</sup>

Canada represented, as Marsh suggested, food and fuel. The sense that the post-war nation could trumpet its material blessings as an important middle-sized power hardly constituted a cultural awakening, but such blessings provided a compelling theme for advertisers in the later 1940s. Molson's kept its name in public view with a "Today we live in a Greater Canada" campaign, which highlighted new processes and industries – "New Additions to the Family!" – that had become part of Canada's industrial development since the war.<sup>24</sup> Not to be outdone, O'Keefe Breweries ran a series of ads celebrating "Canada Unlimited," and produced a book by the same name, pointing to material abundance as well as the abundant possibilities for Canadians and immigrants. The book provided a sketch of Canadian history, paid close attention to how great Canadians had conquered time, space and other obstacles, and proclaimed the vast – but now vastly more conquerable – wealth of its hinterlands.<sup>25</sup>

Cultural critics could not deny that life on successive and far-flung frontiers had shaped Canadian experience, and saw few indications that such an established economic pattern would stop shaping it during the late 1940s. Still, one optimist, geologist R.C. Wallace, whose thoughts on science and religion were featured in the previous chapter, predicted a cultural shift away from the exploitation of natural resources as a defining national characteristic. "Canada has been a pioneer," he declared,

and, like all pioneers, has turned her hand to carving out a home for herself from the resources that nature has provided. She has as yet not been too greatly concerned with the beauty and refinement of that home, if only she could live in reasonable comfort. That stage should now be over, and the main attention should now be given to the things that

endure.<sup>26</sup>

More common than Wallace's wish that Canadians would seek beauty and refinement on their own were new variations on an ancient theme: *things* had come to matter more than traditional values or standards of taste and morality. Though this refrain would echo through the 1950s and into our own time, it is worth noting here that critics began to comment on post-war society's materialistic tendencies even before many goods had returned to the shelves.<sup>27</sup> Among those who denounced an overly grasping culture in the early post-war period, Catholic publisher C.J. Eustace was unequivocal, calling the modern world "a chaotic and disordered place, in which men strive blindly for an abundance of life which they never seem to achieve."<sup>28</sup>

On the surface at least, post-war life was better, but its purpose seemed less apparent to critics who could easily recall the resolve of the war. The fact that most Canadians were achieving higher standards of living made the task of drawing attention to the dissolute nature of modern life more difficult. We will revisit the critique of consumerism in this and later chapters, but it is important to note here that critics found the act of identifying consumerism with fleeting reward an indispensable tactic. They employed it based upon the assumption that their post-war readers and audiences would be ashamed of acquisitive habits. What he saw as pointless consumption and hedonism alarmed Acadia's new President Watson Kirkconnell, who complained that the "masses of mankind in our age have been too preoccupied with the material wealth and industrial achievements of the day to have any philosophy of life at all." As the head of a Baptist institution, Kirkconnell could be expected to place spiritual integrity among the "things that endure," and to assure his audience that eventually, just as "Blomidon will be lost in the waters of Minas[,]"<sup>29</sup> man's earthly wealth would crumble.

In the later 1940s, cultural critics denigrated popular entertainments more directly

than they had during the war, when the task of maintaining morale made necessary the presentation of positive plans for reconstruction or the identification of mass culture with the enemy. Dr. J.M. Ewing, principal of Victoria College in Victoria, BC, commented on some of the more prominent post-war trends for his 1948 radio series *Our Changing Values*. Ewing professed nothing so forcefully as his belief that "we live today in a world whose social outlines are shadowy and insecure."<sup>30</sup> Dealing during the seven-week series with such topics as the demise of the 'kinship group' family, divorce, youth, education and leisure, Ewing urged his listeners to remember that the issues he raised had *histories* – that they did not originate in contemporary Canada. His analysis and prescriptions for a better society, however, were products of more recent, localized observations. Principal Ewing's remarks on the topic of leisure, made during the final programme in the series, are particularly valuable artifacts of critical concern. His approach also provides an example of the way in which critics began to broadcast their dismay, to make their analysis of the post-war cultural predicament more accessible to the public.

Admitting that he had "no hope of uncovering any profound truth" about leisure, Ewing nonetheless intended to "explore its possibilities," and in this spirit his talks only ran for fifteen minutes each. Beginning on an optimistic note, he claimed that the new leisure, no longer a privilege of the rich or even the moderately well-off professional, had become "leisure for all" thanks to labour-saving devices; devices which an increasing proportion of the population could afford, especially since the end of the war. After enumerating and classifying some of the uses to which wealthy people had put their leisure in the past, Ewing noted that the wise or constructive use of leisure was hardly the private preserve of an upper class. Historically, he contended, this group had subordinated intellectual and aesthetic pursuits to creature comforts and pleasure, always seeking parity with the "current stereotype" of their own class.<sup>31</sup>



In Ewing's estimation, everyone should have been paying attention to the way in which the contemporary middle and working classes sought to imitate their wealthier neighbours, who themselves had forsaken taste for status. He suggested that middle class leisure was especially derivative, replacing genuine experience and effort with sensation and consumption: "motor trips take the place of foreign travel; ... and the book-of-the-month is purchased instead of a rare first edition." In turn, working class leisure seemed a "respectable and rather harmless" imitation of middle class living standards, even though there had been "no lack of eloquence" on the prospect of the working class redeeming itself by turning to its own traditions. Working class leisure, Ewing noted, had done nothing of the sort. Lowbrow movies and radio programmes transcended social distinctions, dominating the common culture while the 'best' material remained hopelessly highbrow. He proposed a twofold solution which aimed at the growing middle classes, in effect admitting that the book-of-the-month was preferable to none at all. It entailed rejuvenating reconstruction-era reform sentiment by reaffirming the school and adult education missions, and secondly, bringing mass entertainments up to acceptable standards of taste:

So long as our motion pictures are shoddy and unconvincing,  
so long as there are radio stations that deluge their listeners  
with crudities and wise-cracks, so long as magazine  
illustrations lean more to eroticism than to art, just so long  
will our aesthetic level put us to shame.

The avuncular tone of Ewing's commentary on leisure was only made possible, he admitted, by peace and prosperity.<sup>32</sup> His simple arithmetic, in which bad culture drove out good and an enlightened middle stratum of society could serve as a new audience for 'better' works, appealed to others eager to take action against cultural decline.

The attention critics devoted to the scourge of the 'comics' illustrated another way they reacted to a post-war environment in which more time and money were available for

entertainment. Conservative MP Davie Fulton effectively targeted comics for censorship during 1948-1949 and comic magazines, especially those that portrayed criminal activity or gruesome death, brought out a variety of responses from experts and parents. Some reviled the magazines as vulgar, some saw them as just another form of reading material. Justice Minister Ilsley warned of the difficulty of framing a law that could discriminate between trashy and educational comics (of which a few series existed) and feared banning such potentially enlightening issues as a "pictorial representation of the murder of Thomas à Becket."<sup>33</sup> Though it arrived late to the scene, the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters found the comics a convenient foil for their argument that broadcast regulation should be taken out of the hands of the CBC. Rather than advocating censorship of crime comics, the Association's member stations began airing *Teen Age Book Parade* in 1952. Hosted by novelist Charles Clay, the programme claimed at least partial inspiration from such headlines as "Comic Books Help Saboteurs."<sup>34</sup> It also allowed the Association to appear as an eager champion of post-Massey Commission cultural uplift by promoting 'literature.'

Whatever the motivations of its participants, the furor over comic magazines indicated a shift towards a more comprehensive post-war critique of empty leisure and the decline of cultural effort because critics denounced both the form and the content of contemporary comics. Addressing the form, with tongue only partially in cheek, satirist Mary Lowrey Ross saw comics heralding an Age of Illiteracy, in which works of fiction would go straight to the movie studios, to be released in "one big overall form for one big overall audience, and no questions asked."<sup>35</sup> Commentators condemned the content of comic books as hyper-real, claiming the publications treated subjects that should be repulsive to any normal person and glorified swift and decisive vengeance against one's enemies. The Canadian Federation of Home and School drew a direct connection between

comics and youth crime, and urged the federal government to begin "encouraging the growth of literature that will exalt rather than debase."<sup>36</sup> One worried writer/parent imagined a conversation she might have with her children about the ways in which comics desensitized them to violence and effectively prevented them from reading 'better' literature.<sup>37</sup> The observant comedy duo of Wayne and Shuster, who consistently straddled the line between jester and conscience, broadcast a sketch in which one comics-addicted youngster spoke remorselessly of having killed his mother and, when later denied his daily dose of illustrated mayhem, suffered from "Disney spells."<sup>38</sup>

Everyday urban life was increasingly fast-paced and attention-grabbing, and an expanding mass culture had been offering compelling visual stimuli for decades. In the late 1940s, the post-war sense of wonder that Arthur Phelps spoke of in the spring of 1947 met the frustration of cultural critics who recognized that they did not have the power to control the production of those visual stimuli in the same ways that the commercial interests had done. The paradox of this period, however, was that the power to mount a resistance to pernicious cultural trends – if this could be accomplished – lay with the state. Even those whose late wartime and early post-war attempts to bring a critical agenda before government reconstruction agencies knew that simply dictating or imposing cultural standards was not likely to create a discriminating public. *Citizens' Forum* broadcast a programme on comics early in 1949 and, although participants agreed without reservation that comics were a low form of literature, a ban was out of the question. As one CAAE member noted early in 1949, "we will never become a mature people unless we learn to cope with our social problems as citizens and cease to depend at every turn on drastic government action."<sup>39</sup> It would, however, be only a matter of weeks before significant government attention would be lavished upon the arts, letters and sciences.

By 1949, Canada had become a nation with one of the world's highest standards of living, and continued economic growth seemed assured. With such fortunate prospects came an ease that would allow for introspection. The sense that an important phase of Canada's development had been too long neglected found support in political circles. In April 1949, thanks in large part to the efforts of a sympathetic and influential Liberal, Brooke Claxton, the federal government authorized a Royal Commission for the purpose of charting a distinctively Canadian cultural course. In convening the Massey Commission, the Liberal government of the day did not share T.S. Eliot's opinion, at the time quite recently expressed, that "culture is the one thing that we cannot deliberately aim at."<sup>40</sup> Just as critics of modern life and mass culture held a range of political views, they held differing estimations of the commission's approach. Some participated in its deliberations and even wrote learned reports for the commission on their particular areas of interest, while others kept their distance, complaining even before the *Report* had been issued that the body had gone too far, or not far enough.<sup>41</sup> At the outset, however, the commission had a clear mandate to travel the nation hearing submissions from individuals, local, provincial and national organizations; to report on the state of the arts, letters and sciences; and finally, to make recommendations to Parliament on virtually all aspects of culture except religion. This unprecedented attempt to plumb the depths of Canadian tradition and to shape the future brought the issue of cultural authority to the fore. Would it be consistent with liberal democracy for a commission to decide what sort of culture Canadians should have? If such a decision could be reached, how could this new national culture be made real?

Despite a profusion of "signs that we are passing out of pioneer and colonial conditions and becoming an independent, mature society," one group submitting a brief to the Massey Commission pointed out that the road towards complete independence and maturity would still be a long one given that many ordinary Canadians had been forced by

the fatigue and frustration of the modern environment to

seek escape in mass entertainment which also does nothing to satisfy creative instincts, stimulate the imagination, or cultivate the mind – escapist movies, commercialized radio, primitive music, spectator sports, reading which is anodyne rather than stimulus, and so on. The result is mental and spiritual lethargy, an empty life.<sup>42</sup>

These strong words exemplify a central pillar of the early 1950s critique of modern life and mass culture: the belief that most people had been drawn away from activities somehow representative of their identities. One group of concerned citizens expressed their shame that Canadian film-makers could not (or would not) interpret post-war reconstruction: "We feel that there is abundant material in Canada to make first rate moving pictures. But when we saw a screen portrayal of the problem of the homecoming soldier was it a soldier in Canadian uniform? No, it was *The Best Years of Our Lives* with Frederick [sic] March and Dana Andrews returning to an American city to start life in the postwar period."<sup>43</sup> Frustration at the difficulty of convincing Canadians that their daily lives no longer offered much room for creativity – that their inquisitive and imaginative talents had withered through no fault of their own – motivated a host of groups to suggest remedies via the Massey Commission. These remedies did not include banning mass-produced 'popular' entertainments, but rather stressed sustaining variety through the encouragement of artistic works and folk traditions outside the commercial mainstream.

Commission chair Vincent Massey and his colleagues received scores of submissions, over 470 in all. These constituted an inventory of the nation's tangible and intangible cultural resources, and aimed at improving the access residents of particular communities and regions had to 'authentic' experiences like live theatre, local arts and crafts, galleries and university education. To characterize those individuals and organizations who were interested enough in cultural matters to submit a statement as an entirely like-minded

elite group would be too simplistic. Taken together, the national, provincial or local arts associations, ethnic groups, unions, trade concerns or religious denominations offering their advice and experience represented much of the population. Amid the petitions for improvements to local or regional arts, educational, or broadcasting facilities, there were calls for decreased regulation and declarations that nothing should be forced upon a democratic people. Common to these widely-varying opinions about the role of the state or the authority of cultural 'experts,' however, was the notion that certain varieties of culture remained above the sort then dominating the mass market. In a cultural environment that favoured the factory worker who wanted or needed to forget the real world instead of celebrating its beauties or addressing the tribulations of being human, the "liberal humanist"<sup>44</sup> fought an uphill battle.

In general, the organizations itemizing their perceptions of Canada's cultural past and their recommendations for its future addressed particular areas of interest, but behind these more specialized requests for support and changes to policy there lay a dread of artificiality, of appearing to impose an alien set of norms or expectations on a nation that had not long ago submitted purposefully to wartime strictures. The Federation of Canadian Artists saw the arts as the "unfolding and evolving expression of the inner consciousness of the individual or society," and predicted grave consequences for the nation that would short-change the "natural development"<sup>45</sup> of its own culture. In answering its own question: "[H]ow can Manitoba people most effectively participate in a living and advancing Canadian culture?" one group's brief to the commission suggested that citizens' advisory councils be attached to the National Film Board and the CBC to recommend ways those agencies could better reflect the nation's history and diversity in future productions. Yet, the idea of 'natural development' was a fiction in that citizens who would step forward to serve on such councils tended to be people already involved in arts organizations and committed to at least

a rough hierarchy of cultural standards. This segment of 'joiners' appeared in front of the commission because they refused to let the process of setting priorities for national development in the arts, letters and sciences be anything less than the realization of a carefully-debated consensus. The above-mentioned Manitoba group typified cultural activism by being "interested primarily in the development of the national culture as participants therein, and not in the development of a cultural enclave in Manitoba or in assuming the role of camp-followers or beneficiaries of a cultural development whose real centres and life are considered to be external to our own activities and interests."<sup>46</sup> During one of the hearings, a member of a university women's group in Regina suggested that any advisory board set up to monitor broadcasting should include supporters of soap operas just as it should include people of different ages and religious backgrounds. This display of equanimity clearly caught Vincent Massey by surprise, and he remarked: "That is a very interesting suggestion – official defence of soap operas."<sup>47</sup>

Because an 'occasion' like the Massey Commission could draw greater-than-average community interest to the debate about cultural infrastructure it acquired an air of democracy, but the issues themselves remained, on the surface, rather peripheral to the average Canadian's concerns. Academics or artists made their presence felt through briefs and at public hearings because they could devote time and energy to fight for the preservation of what painter Charles Comfort called "those conditions which promote and support democratic 'spiritual' welfare." Comfort admitted that "[t]he individual and institutional liberties implied in western democracy are understood by nearly all of us[,] but cautioned his comrades in concern that the modern cultural system operated to restrict creative and 'active' leisure, and advised them: "[L]et us not forget that the welfare of the human spirit, and its freedom, is above all a supreme responsibility." With this supreme responsibility in mind, Comfort could see no real alternative to state involvement in cultural

affairs, involvement that would allow for a diversified common culture unrestricted by what commercial radio or the local movie house offered. He hoped that an "instrument for assisting and developing the arts may be set up in Canada" along the path Britain had followed, because he was certain that such an undertaking would have a "useful if not vital part in our spiritual regeneration."<sup>48</sup>

Commentators believed this regeneration would not be a matter of allowing Canadians to sit back and soak up 'culture.' It would have to involve, as the Saskatchewan Arts Board's brief suggested, an acknowledgement of the many activities competing for even the rural resident's attention:

There are in many small communities, and many a side-road, talents, sensibilities and imaginings that are, or may become, the stuff of a vigorous cultural life. There are in this country people of many backgrounds and traditions, and there are none of us in Canada who have not felt the force of new and varied experiences. Out of this complex of tradition and new experience Canadians will have to create their cultural expression.<sup>49</sup>

Under the rather ambitious heading of "means of improving the mind and increasing standards of social living," the Canadian Federation of Home and School included some of the demanding and clearly wide-ranging possibilities: "Lecture courses and classes in literature, languages, art, music, debating, dramatics, citizenship, the meaning and aims of democracy, growth of character, family and personal relationships, sex education, thrift, safety, handicrafts, etc."<sup>50</sup> The unfulfilled promise of the post-war community centre curriculum lived on as well in proposals to solidify the position of the local library as a cultural hub.<sup>51</sup> Without the germ of community that such venues offered, budding artists, writers, or musicians would be isolated, and this could have disastrous consequences for a national sense of cohesion. Without a self-sustaining community of writers, for example, observers believed that reaching a certain level of literary achievement would prove difficult,



and thereby catching up with the reputation of Canadian notables in other fields would be less likely. The Canadian Authors Association remarked flatly that "[t]he inarticulate nature of the average Canadian's patriotism results from the lack of a native literature commensurate with Canada's physical, industrial, scientific and academic stature, and with the proved character of its people."<sup>52</sup>

In the majority of briefs and memoranda to the commission, the broadcast media, and how to manage them, gained at least some mention. For many of these respondents, the CBC emerged as another foundation of cultural improvement; an especially necessary source of inspiration in communities too small or isolated to sustain much of an arts scene. Pointing to the anticipated advent of frequency modulation (FM) stations, one observer held up the prospect of "many more regional stations so that schools, universities, and even community centres may be granted operating rights."<sup>53</sup> In assessing broadcasting's potential for either providing or hindering access to a variety of perspectives and influences, critics tended to look to the CBC as a mitigating force. The corporation's policy of presenting programming of interest to the minority listener and to Canada's thinly-distributed population harmonized with their definition of cultural democracy. The American example of commercial radio, on the other hand, indicated an attenuation of options for listeners and led one group to ask the rhetorical question: "Where is the 'Great Plays' series that used to be heard on N.B.C. on Sundays; where is the 'Columbia Workshop' on C.B.S. that produced [Norman] Corwin and other creative writers and artists[?]"<sup>54</sup> The big networks had abandoned such shows, or moved them to times on the schedule for which they could not command the highest advertising rates. On private radio in Canada, too, the prime listening periods had (d)evolved to maximize revenue. Listeners took notice, ascribing more than crimes against good taste to programmes like "Gangbusters – Superman – The Fat Man – Counterspy etc. These latter types of program teach of a world where physical force and

brutality are the normal. They never admit desirable social forces, the fine arts, or normal human relations. This is destructive education. Thousands of dollars of school, social welfare and police effort must be used to neutralize the results."<sup>55</sup>

As well as representing the taxpayer, those who answered the commission's call for input also claimed to speak for a kind of silent army fed up with the lowbrow moneymakers crowding out less 'popular' fare. Critics saw this restless public as relatively powerless compared to the mass culture producer's image of the typical listener, reader or moviegoer. The neglected group comprised the "many many reticent and unassuming citizens who are not often heard from, [and] would, I am certain, not want fine music and drama lost to soap operas, degenerate crime stories and the commercial hucksters."<sup>56</sup> By imputing a latent distrust of mass culture to the average citizen, critics who were committed to helping that same average citizen steadily improve his cultural surroundings also expressed their belief that all people needed was variety. Some respondents to the commission, however, could claim to serve the public interest even as they served their own. Town Meeting Ltd. produced a radio programme called *Town Meeting*, which bore an uncanny resemblance to the American *Town Meeting of the Air* and preceded *Citizens' Forum* to air in Canada. In their brief, the programme's producers made no apologies for presenting their itinerant forum programme over commercial radio. They had identified a show format that could draw a profitable audience and advertisers, but they also saw this venture as lending their brief and its primary message – freedom for the private broadcaster – an aura of propriety. Without portraying their audience as an elite, they pointed to a pool of people willing to become involved in community affairs without a lot of official prodding: "democracy depends on an informed minority. The kind of people who listen to *Town Meeting* are people who want to know the facts. They listen partly because of entertainment and partly because they want to make up their minds on what is true and wise."<sup>57</sup> In that he possessed the ability and interest

to choose a stimulating programme, *Town Meeting's* model listener – like the “reticent and unassuming” citizens that arts groups invoked – was everyman, but he was not just anyone.

Many emissaries to the Massey Commission believed that it should be the state's role to represent minority tastes and thus guarantee some variation from the broader North American cultural pattern. Anthropologist Marius Barbeau sought preservation of Canada's folk heritage and saw fascination with Canadians' own stories as fundamental to the construction of a new identity. The continuous provision of opportunities to see and learn about other Canadians, their daily lives and distinctive qualities, he believed, “would lead, in a very few years, to progress beyond reckoning. It would also bring to Canadians a cultural unity which it lacks when its attainments are only derivative and reminiscent of other lands and past ages.”<sup>58</sup> Drama professor Emrys Jones issued a similar appeal for Canadian, rather than foreign, dramatic art. In his estimation, any re-invention of the Canadian cultural infrastructure should attempt to match the enthusiasm for amateur theatre, much of which he perceived to be at a novice level, with money to keep those who possessed the talent to be playwrights and actors in Canada. As it stood in 1949, Jones saw companies performing the “older classics, foreign experimental plays, and modern ‘hits’ from Broadway, Hollywood or the West End of London, while Canadian manuscripts find grudging performances only through special awards for their production.”<sup>59</sup> Such incentives to Canadian artists, however, were to become the legacy of the commission through the Canada Council after its formation in 1957.

Using cultural critics' written reflections, we see that developments in the cultural and educational spheres troubled them deeply during the early 1950s. The Massey Commission appeared as a step towards preserving what Raymond Williams has called the “great tradition,” a tradition that “is itself always in danger of being vulgarized when it is confined to a minority culture.”<sup>60</sup> Indeed, several commentators made this same distinction,

asking that the outcome of the commission not be a rigorous set of rules about culture because the great tradition was organic and able to subsume worthwhile works, regardless of their origins. Others noted the positive role immigrants could play in diversifying and enlivening Canada's cultural landscape if the principles of 'cultural democracy' were followed.<sup>61</sup> Keeping the field open to a broad range of influences was certainly an aim complementary to those principles, but given the way that the entertainment business worked, safeguarding variety and helping Canadian firms compete with their larger American counterparts would require some intervention.<sup>62</sup>

The sense that some form of guided regeneration was needed did not vanish when the commission disbanded. Champions of a homegrown spiritual rebirth, whether they worked within the commission or alongside it, would continue to see decay in every crooner and comic book, and to despair more vocally of the social patterns – the conditions of modern life – that reinforced what they saw as the numbing existence of the average person. As the patron of this formal bout of self-examination, the state assumed an unprecedented role in promoting the critics' understanding of what constituted worthwhile entertainment, along with an interpretation of cultural democracy that emphasized the protection of minority tastes and inculcated a sense of guilt for not living up to them. Having taken on the question of Canada's cultural structure and prospects, the Massey Commission drew additional critical attention to the exigencies of contemporary society and to mass culture's seeming inability to engage difficult themes. The high profile, even notoriety, of the commission meant that the early 1950s provided more frequent occasion for critics to dismiss much of their environment as oblivious to the age-old questions they believed must animate any culture worth having. In suggesting solutions to the problem of culture in a rapidly modernizing nation, critics acknowledged the accelerated rhythms of modern life as both context and cause for concern, and named mass culture as an obstacle to the

individual's fuller understanding of their responsibilities and opportunities in the social and cultural spheres.

The same month that the Massey Commission came into being, American critic Milton Klonsky published an article on mass culture in *Partisan Review*, the leftist journal especially notorious during the 1940s for its attacks on commercial or 'low' culture.<sup>63</sup> In arguing that "[c]omic strips, pulp fiction, movies, radio serials, commercial jazz and the rest are a direct result of modern technology and public education[.]" Klonsky could not conceal his disgust at the way in which presumably beneficial causes had had such regrettable effects. He went on to shudder at the momentum and appeal of these entertainments:

Whether we choose to dignify these products by the name of Art is a semantic problem – what is central is that they usurp the functions of traditional art in setting the styles, the manners, the images, the standards and the goals of life for millions, almost as though they were the organs of an unofficial state religion. And in its scope, this sub-culture is wide enough to include the millionaire and the dime-store clerk, the President of the United States and the Negro sharecropper, the old and the young, in a truly classless and democratic consonance of spirit.<sup>64</sup>

Like Klonsky, Canadian cultural critics were aware of the power and the subtlety of mass culture. They were aware, too, of how difficult it might be to achieve a "classless and democratic consonance of spirit" in Canada by merely asking an already motivated and interested segment of the population to report on the arts, letters and sciences. The Massey Commission's inventory of Canada's educational, artistic and scientific resources would be, the commissioners hoped, a spur to cultural nationalism in that it would help identify, reward and make examples of Canadians who were contributing to their particular fields of endeavour. But outside the confines of the commission and its quest to improve both infrastructure and attitude, cultural critics observed that most people did not know or did

not care about the ways post-war society and culture operated to marginalize alternatives to the mass taste. Though the effect may not have been intentional, conformity, consumerism and 'empty' leisuretime activities became a part of the larger discourse on public affairs thanks in some measure to the creation of a government organization for perceiving – and working to change – the texture of Canadian cultural life.

In 1949, another American critic reintroduced a way of classifying cultural activity that had been prevalent during the 1920s – highbrow, lowbrow and middlebrow.<sup>65</sup> Russell Lynes' post-war revival of 'brow' theory came not a moment too soon for Massey watchers, and a number of Canadian commentators adopted it. It was certainly possible to be too much of a highbrow in post-war Canada, and around the time the first Commission hearings were being held, one art enthusiast warned against the dismissal of amateur attempts at creativity. "The art life of a country is weak when there is only passive consumption of works of art[.]" wrote Harold King, adding that "the art life of a country is strongest when large numbers of people are active and producing, whether they give their whole time to it or not."<sup>66</sup> King's comments echoed the creed of the community centre movement, which emphasized full participation in the planning, operation and use of local facilities.

Of the reconstruction-era programs, community centres remained the most vital in the Massey years, and indeed benefited from something of a revival of interest in their potential as local headquarters for whatever cultural development projects might arise from the commission.<sup>67</sup> Those who despaired that Canada had become too centralized, too much an urban country to go back to the land considered improved rural access to cultural resources especially important. M.B. Mecredy sang the praises of the rural life, but realized that it must take on some of the 'better' attributes of town life if young people were to risk settling beyond suburbia. Even if local, provincial or federal authorities could improve

transportation facilities and take up his suggestions to improve cultural opportunities and education in rural areas, town youth were rarely game to leave urban comforts. This fact was for Mecredy all the more regrettable because "the hurly-burly of the fiercely competitive life of a business man, or the financial worries of a salaried man in the city has perhaps made him older physically than he would have become, living a country life[.]" However, recognizing that he had perhaps overestimated the physical effects of city life on the average person, Mecredy nonetheless remained firm in his belief that the urban grind "has at any rate robbed him early of the mental and spiritual zest which were once his."<sup>68</sup>

The urban dweller presented himself as an anxious, harried character to begin with, and tension over the new 'cold' war only subjected him to an additional worry. From the end of World War II, but especially after the Soviets' successful test detonation of an atomic bomb in 1949, anxiety over the destructive potential of this terrifying class of weapon had been an element of North American life. In Canada, initial reactions to the atomic age were mixed. The Montreal *Standard* ran an Atomic Age essay contest, and optimists dreamed of unlimited 'clean' power and great leaps forward in technology.<sup>69</sup> More pessimistic sorts, rural and urban, joined in worry over the consequences of misusing such power, and hoped to press their own agendas home. C.J. Eustace intoned gravely that "the smell of the final cataclysm is now in the air."<sup>70</sup> The topic also prompted some nervous satire, and some radio dramas with post-apocalyptic themes, though the mid-1950s would bring still more of this material.<sup>71</sup> The Atomic Age had brought with it a new kind of fear, and a new wariness of what the University of Alberta's C.R. Tracy called mankind's "doubtful blessing."<sup>72</sup> The milestone of reaching mid-century in one piece also meant that the mid-century retrospective became a convenient occasion for reflection for speakers and writers.<sup>73</sup> For cultural critics taking this opportunity, the first half of the twentieth century was hardly a story of unrelenting progress. For some, the contemporary scene represented an almost

irremediable loss of control. Owing to its particular emphasis on the inextricably intertwined problems presented by modern life and mass culture, one source is worth examining at greater length.

Broadcast on New Year's Day 1950 and based on a series of articles published concurrently in *Maclean's* magazine by such observers as Lister Sinclair and American media expert Gilbert Seldes, George Salverson's "In the Shadow of the Bomb" was a radio retrospective of the preceding fifty years, and a gem of cultural criticism geared towards a middlebrow audience considered receptive to digests and dramatizations of history and to intelligent, but above all, *intelligible* commentary. Featuring a cameo appearance from University of Chicago Chancellor Robert Hutchins with his list of the ten most important people of the twentieth century, the programme noted, as Sinclair's article had, the overarching role of science in shaping history since 1900. Along with whimsical and prophetic looks at Canada in 1990 – where almost minute-to-minute inflation would drive up the prices of all the fantastic inventions science had wrought – there were sombre reflections on the carnage of two world wars. As promised in the programme's title, the atomic threat did not go unacknowledged: "Now ... as science itself throws a shadow ... how well do we see? What are our moralities, our motives, our knowledge of ourselves and our time, as we are hurtled forward into the years of appalling climax and decision?"<sup>74</sup> In attempting to further "knowledge of ourselves and our time," one pivotal section of "In the Shadow of the Bomb" provided a biting critical account of the symbiotic rise of technology and mass culture.

Admitting that the past half century had seen marvellous advances in such fields as transportation, medicine and communications, the programme's Narrator (played by Lorne Greene) had to declare: "In this world of 1950 there is almost nothing which is not the work of science, and the prestige of science is so great that almost nothing can succeed without



it." The cultural impact of science, however, was best illustrated in what scientific progress had done to the rhythms of work life and to leisure. Earning six dollars a week for fifty-seven hours work, the labourer of 1900 could not approach the standard of living enjoyed by his 1950 counterpart, who took home \$44 after a forty-hour week. By extension, Henry Ford and his disciples were responsible for the process by which the "mass-produced Model T, rattling over the roads of the world, led us to the glittering fantastic world of mass-produced entertainment!" In making possible the reproduction and transmission of identical performances, science "swept away the vaudeville acrobats, [and] jazzed out of hearing the dreadfully polite English comedy ... It's a wild, mechanized dance of the arts that begins with a nickleodeon, and ends with a flourish in a television set!"<sup>75</sup>

Having made this initial connection between science and the mechanization of cultural production, the Narrator met a character called the Showman, who professed and demonstrated an intimate knowledge of the modern entertainment industry's inner workings:

SHOWMAN: Mechanized labor produced leisure.  
Mechanized entertainment was created to occupy that leisure.

NARRATOR: That's neat.

SHOWMAN: Perhaps too pat.

NARRATOR: But it explains many things.

‡ SHOWMAN: Yes it does. One thing it hasn't answered.

NARRATOR: Whether mass-produced entertainment means  
you must accept shoddy goods, along with the first rate?

SHOWMAN: Who can answer that? Who wants to? It gives  
us something pleasant to fight about, for a change.<sup>76</sup>

Though the formula mechanization = mechanized entertainment came from the pen of

Gilbert Seldes, by then a venerable media analyst and critic,<sup>77</sup> it was plain that Salverson, speaking through the Showman, had mixed feelings about mass culture and about efforts like the newly-embarked Massey Commission. The three final salvos of the above exchange (from ‡) were his, and indicate that he found the question of mass entertainment's right to exist not only moot, but impossible to resolve and prone to elitist bias. Still, it was clear that Salverson appreciated the opportunity to ask such questions, and approved of the fact that Canadians could discuss the nation's cultural life in a more formal way via the Royal Commission's hearings. In addition to fielding requests for performing arts facilities and university improvements, the commission would find itself in a position not unlike that of the 'great books' peddler, though much less likely to recoup its investment. By 1950, the problem of sponsoring access to – or *distributing* via the mass media – what Salverson called "first rate" goods no longer seemed to be a debasement of the classics, but one of the few options open to those committed to minority rights within a cultural democracy. Not surprisingly, the hearings dwelled upon the question of broadcasting, attempting to determine how to represent the cultural interests of Canadians who were not well served by fare in the commercial mainstream.

Mass distribution, the Showman concluded, was not entirely an evil thing. It had, after all, allowed such worthy productions as Laurence Olivier's *Hamlet* to be screened in places where stage productions of the play simply would not go, like the fictitious Tank Town, Saskatchewan, where the prompter had been the star of previous local theatrical efforts. The Showman lauded the ability of the newer media to bring the best to communities either poorly situated or unable to afford more traditional means of experiencing great art: "Quality ... that's what mass-produced entertainment gave to Joe Public." Mass-produced entertainment offered a multitude of entertaining options, but the majority of the fare available owed its familiarity, and hence its popularity, to what the

Showman called "the creation of an appetite." He confided that "[t]o be successful, the manufacturers of the entertainment have to go even further. They've got to create the appetite. By creating a habit."<sup>78</sup>

The Showman also suggested that the consequences of creating leisuretime habits could be more grave than a parade of worthless movies. "Give the people what they want[,]" he noted, "[a]nd make the people want whatever you give them" was the paradox upon which the entertainment industry turned. Though the Narrator agreed that some of the industry's output was excellent, he knew that giving the people what they wanted "must mean more to our peculiar age than merely the happy distribution of art forms and casual diversion." The more profound effects of mass-produced entertainment, the Showman replied, would eventually be demonstrated in "the kind of people we have in this world ... who will have to solve some mighty tricky problems." Cultural products that did not exercise the audience's critical faculties would not equip that audience for the demands and mounting responsibilities of a "peculiar age." The studios would continue to produce films geared to adolescents, even though audiences would go to more sophisticated productions like *Lost Weekend* or *Death of a Salesman* when such pieces were produced. As the Showman pointed out, "It isn't that people yearn for misery ... they want something true, and intelligent, said about their own lives." However keenly moviegoers might have longed to have entertainment provide answers to their personal crises, another observer complained that the movies nonetheless tended to standardize taste on a "vulgar level" and declared: "If Hollywood standards are low and false, so are those of the general public; and it is the latter, and not the former, which we should be concerned with changing."<sup>79</sup>

Though it would not arrive for another two years, journalists and potential critics certainly spotted television on the horizon.<sup>80</sup> The Showman's greatest hope for the new medium was that it could affect the general public's tastes in a salutary way, by combining

the artistic potential of film with the potential of radio to convey truth. He thought it more likely that each medium's less salutary qualities would emerge, mainly because precedents for their trivialization and commercialization had already been set: "while movies have been busy running away from reality, radio has had to be a salesman to keep going[.]"<sup>81</sup> The Narrator wondered what would happen if, like movies and radio, television's potential were restricted "to serving only the rudimentary appetites of the audience?" Salverson was arguing for a culture – and for cultural industries – that took a variety of tastes into account, including those of the minority. Catering to a notion of what the public wanted based on what they had been given in the past would not do. It seemed that the social and political stakes were a good deal higher in 1950, as the Narrator went on to inquire:

What will happen if they forget that, in a democratic society, there are not only many kinds of people, but that every human being has many interests and curiosities and desires ... and the function of a mass medium is to satisfy as many as possible? When this function is well-executed entertainment cuts across the lines of highbrow and lowbrow, it helps people to grow up, to become citizens in a world of conflict, and complete individuals[,] not mindless robots in a dense mass waiting for the next dictator.<sup>82</sup>

Owing partly to cold war anxiety and partly to memories of a war hardly five years over, the fear of an extended cultural adolescence moved critics to support the Massey Commission's overall motive, the development of "spiritual resources, which are less tangible but whose importance needs no emphasis."<sup>83</sup> In looking to an elevated common culture as essential to the achievement and maintenance of a national identity, critics had to determine which aspects of mass culture might affect that project. Approaches differed. Attempts like Salverson's to distil wisdom about the ways in which mass entertainment affected and even attenuated the citizen's ability to exercise the democratic franchise sought a broad audience. Preaching directly to those he identified as intellectuals, Albert Shea, who

would also eventually produce a layman's guide to the Massey *Report*, urged those "who would like more people to share their interest in certain ideas and principles" to put aside disdain for the canasta-playing masses and "go to them where they are." Shea insisted that there was a great need for "creative middlemen" who could translate or essentialize "the ideas we consider important," and described the chief function of the effective intellectual:

He must be constantly dramatizing the battle for freedom, equality, creative living and international understanding. He must spell out his lesson in terms of personalities, human drama, action, of battles fought and won with the pen, the test-tube and the tractor.<sup>84</sup>

Finding ways to interest the average person in such lofty subjects often seemed like an exercise in marketing. As Director of the Canada Foundation, identifying philanthropic individuals willing to finance the promotion of Canadian culture, Walter Herbert had indulged in a bit of marketing himself by the early 1950s. Despite his known connections to the incumbent Liberals, he was somewhat sceptical of the government's interest in cultural matters.<sup>85</sup> Part of his job, however, was keeping abreast of any new publications that emerged, especially if they could be used to raise awareness among Canadians of their own folkways and the nation's newfound international stature. By the time he crossed paths with Herbert in 1950, publisher Joseph Pollick had put out three issues of his *Canadian Life*, a project that Herbert assumed had folded, joining ill-starred and self-consciously literary periodicals of the post-war years like *Reading* and *Here and Now*. Even though he wrote to Herbert, figurative cap in hand, to drum up some publicity for the magazine or possibly secure the Canada Foundation's endorsement, Pollick attributed what limited success his magazine had achieved to a middlebrow strategy of discussing "Arts without being 'arty' and to present the Humanities without being a soap-box or a pulpit." To him, the arts and humanities were indispensable elements of a democratic society, but he recognized a need to

make these elements part of an entertaining package on the news-stand, i.e. part of leisuretime life. In an obviously ill-considered attempt to reassure Herbert that his publication's motives were pure, Pollick admitted: "to this end, when we do employ 'cheesecake', the fact that the woman is fully clothed only serves to enhance a man's thoughts; he might then conceivably read the Universal Declaration of Human Rights if it happens to be in the same issue."<sup>86</sup>

Like the wily publisher, critics knew what sold magazines. Harold Innis worked some of his communications theory into an essay he called a "footnote" to the *Massey Report*, arguing that newspaper and magazine monopolies were involved in "a continuous, systematic, ruthless destruction of elements of permanence essential to cultural activity. The emphasis on change is the only permanent characteristic."<sup>87</sup> The media and cultural industries, Innis suggested, prevented the citizen from forming enduring links with his community and its culture by not challenging his intellect. Again, much as Gilbert Seldes did, Innis believed technology and mass production had cultural consequences, one of which was the debasement of literature: "Cheap supplies of paper produce pulp and paper schools of writing, and literature is provided in series, sold by subscription, and used as an article of furniture."<sup>88</sup> The number of printed works in circulation had increased dramatically, but much of this output appeared to neglect the world's, the nation's, and the individual's problems, both chronic and newly-arrived.

The three themes mentioned at the outset of this chapter – conformity, consumerism, and emptiness – permeated the critique of modern life and mass culture by the middle fifties. In the midst of what appeared to be a stable domestic environment, critics justified their alarm by pointing to the presence of all three factors in contemporary Canadian society, and to the absence of leadership and excellence those defects seemed to

engender. As much as they might have hoped that Canadians would act as individuals, critics began to speak more frequently and disapprovingly of a mass society whose members lacked the self-awareness and confidence necessary for a realistic assessment of their surroundings. Modern education, mass communications, materialism and scientism had subverted the reconstruction-era dream of developing responsible citizens, and the apparent hedonism of the 1950s compounded fears of a generation ever more incapable of appreciating its rich heritage.

By the time the Massey Commission disbanded, the state's strategy for the arts, broadcasting, research and post-secondary education included unprecedented plans for funding academics, for exposing Canadians to 'higher' cultural forms and preserving local and regional folkways wherever possible. One early success, though aided immeasurably by the expertise and prestige of noted British director Tyrone Guthrie, was the inauguration of a permanent Shakespeare stage at Stratford, Ontario.<sup>89</sup> For many cultural critics, triumphs such as the Stratford Festival were welcome developments, but hardly meant that they could – or that they wished to – abdicate their role as interpreters and consciences. Some believed that the state's more overt involvement in culture, via the Massey Commission, brought about what writer Hugh Garner called a "planted misconception" that the life of the mind in Canada had suddenly fallen under eminently capable stewardship.<sup>90</sup> Far better, some said, to continue local efforts with "lecturers and teachers who are well trained, interesting and enthusiastic"<sup>91</sup> than to expect too much of an unwieldy national plan pitched too high, too soon. Defining its needs in terms of its largely female constituency, the Canadian Association of Consumers declared that "[c]ulture includes education for citizenship, and education in modern economics as it affects the home is very necessary now." Holding the audience's attention while helping them cope more effectively with a fast-paced post-war world seemed more important here than helping them become film scholars: "Women want

films depicting various aspects of consumer education, presented in informative, practical, interest-holding (entertaining if possible) ways, such as up-to-date information on good buying habits for textiles, clothing, meats, fruits and vegetables, household appliances, etc.”<sup>92</sup>

Whatever their opinion of the federal government’s visible hand, critics still behaved as though the vast public would not sense its own enslavement to modern rhythms and a commodified culture. Indeed, one well-researched aspect of Canadian thought in the 1950s has been economic historian Harold Innis’s interest in communications technologies, particularly their subtly transformative social and cultural implications. Before his death in 1952, the final pieces of work that Innis produced were not revisions of his early ideas on the cod fisheries or the fur trade, but ponderous explanations of how culture was intertwined with the ways information and abstract ideas reached or did not reach the public. Though Marshall McLuhan’s notoriety as an outspoken observer of such phenomena would peak in the mid-1960s, Innis’s probings influenced his work during the 1950s.<sup>93</sup>

During the half-dozen years following the Massey Commission, critical attention to modern life – especially to more recent developments like television and their capacity to act as aids or as obstacles to self-improvement – became more pronounced. In drafting a document calling for broader access to the arts, artist Lawren Harris seized upon the words of American author Alan Valentine, who perceived a great gap between the sort of culture democracies had spawned and the sort they might achieve. Valentine wrote: “Until the common man personally confronts the magnitude of the duties he has assumed; until he insists upon quality in cultural as well as political leadership and therefore [in] himself, the practise of democracy will belie his promise.” Littering his own declaration of faith, “Democracy and the Arts,” with such exhortations to assume responsibility for elevating cultural standards, Harris expressed his belief that the masses could and should somehow be rescued, one at a time if necessary, from the grip of an “inexhaustible” supply of “pin-up



girls, coca-cola virgins [and] boogie-woogie."<sup>94</sup> With the introduction of television in 1952, as Paul Rutherford has observed, Canadian commentators looked south to Americans' early experience with the new medium and tended to magnify the most alarming trends they saw, even as they recognized TV's educational potential.<sup>95</sup>

Because such man-made improvements to the material world and an advancing standard of living could have positive cultural effects, advocates of cultural improvement wanted to take advantage of the technological benefits of rapid change without becoming complacent about moral and aesthetic standards. Speaking to a group gathered for the purpose of gazing into "Canada's Tomorrow," McMaster University President G.P. Gilmour believed that it was possible to accept new comforts while at the same time staying in touch with proven values:

Between the rosy optimism of those who foresee constant improvement of living standards and leisure and the pessimism of those who fear that man will become the slave of his own inventions, there is certainly some middle path, which cannot be anticipated as inevitable but can be strenuously sought after as a duty and a possibility. Not leisured morons, living by push-button techniques while starving in mind and soul, but citizens of a free state, living by great ideals and exemplifying sturdy virtues should be our hope.<sup>96</sup>

Those ideals were certainly part of the original *Citizens' Forum* mandate late in wartime, but by 1953 the programme's organizers had made some decisions about the sort of citizen that could reasonably be expected to follow the show. Responding to suggestions that their weekly offering was "too difficult and demands a degree of concentration and attention that the average listener is unwilling or unable to give[.]" Isabel Wilson noted that there had been little demand for change from active participants, and that "any attempt at 'mass' appeal would involve not only a different range of topics, but a drastic change in their presentation, both on the air and in the discussion material." She indicated that the whole

apparatus was geared toward at least middlebrow abilities and interests when she acknowledged that there had been "no effort to plan for listeners with perhaps no more than an elementary school education."<sup>97</sup> Certainly there were no obstacles set in front of anyone wishing to organize or join a local forum, but Wilson made no apologies for asking listeners to expect a certain level of competence and dedication from themselves and their fellow forum members. Weightier questions, like "Has Canada a cultural future of her own?"; "What do we want from the CBC?"; "Is the city destroying our pioneer virtues?"; "What do we want from Canadian Television?" and "The Church, Social Centre or Spiritual Community?" continued to dominate the programme's agenda.<sup>98</sup>

In view of the population bulge just hitting the elementary schools around 1952-53, one of the earliest and most illustrative examples of cultural criticism arising in the wake of the Massey Commission had to do, quite appropriately, with how children were being educated, and how their education could be expected to serve them as adults. Liberated from her duties with the commission, Professor Hilda Neatby took on the rather inexact sciences of pedagogy and child psychology, arguing as she had in previous years that 'progressive' education as it was practised in Canada did not challenge children in the ways they needed to be challenged.<sup>99</sup> Published in 1953, her indictment of Canada's educational system, *So Little for the Mind*, brought few new complaints to the table. Its chief villain seemed at first to be John Dewey, whose thought had been a profound influence upon the field of education and upon experts in the field especially during the generation preceding the time Neatby wrote her self-described exposé.<sup>100</sup>

*So Little for the Mind* did not blame Dewey for the degraded state of education, but rather cast stones at the vogue of his teachings and variations upon them.<sup>101</sup> Neither Neatby nor the progressive educators she considered Dewey's disciples fully understood his educational philosophy, which James Kloppenberg argues had been "so distorted by

generations of well-meaning but ill-equipped educational administrators that its original significance has been almost entirely lost." Indeed, in describing Dewey's assessment of the effects of modern life, Kloppenberg reveals a philosophy not far from that of cultural critics interested in allowing Canadians to exercise a latent curiosity:

Before the urban and industrial revolutions flattened children's experience at home, Dewey wrote, every day raised a multitude of questions about man's relation to nature and the individual's relation to those around him, questions that grew from children's experiences and could often be answered by their own independent investigations and encounters.<sup>102</sup>

Regardless of Dewey's original intentions, Neatby despaired that putting the student first, as was the progressive educators' accepted practice, had been a dangerous concession to modern psychological theories. Without some challenging standards and difficult tests at which children risked failure, she reasoned, "self-centred little automatons" would emerge from schools by the thousand. The desire to channel pupils only toward those subjects that they could master without much effort – and those that would translate directly into careers – infuriated Neatby. "Who is so bored and boring as a self-centred person?" she asked, and supplied an answer to her own question with another: "Who is so happy and so free as the one whose pleasures and interests reach outward?"<sup>103</sup>

Neatby's complaints were hardly tentative responses to brand new problems, and she was hardly alone in her advocacy of liberal education as a way of equipping children for an adult world that, unlike the school experience, had seemed to become less forgiving. In 1941, Edward McCourt's satire of the educational system featured a utopian schoolhouse which offered fantastic solutions to keenly felt problems like the tendency to conform. This ideal school would pay dividends for the student "because he must now rely upon himself and not upon the herd for entertainment, he is able to develop a quality which our

generation has almost completely lost – that of Self-sufficiency.”<sup>104</sup> Despairing that Canadian youth would never become culturally self-sufficient, Professor Neatby ‘reached outward’ to link arms with foreigners like Sir Richard Livingstone, Sir Walter Moberly, T.S. Eliot and Robert Hutchins, all of whom she believed resented the untempered pragmatism of the Deweyites.<sup>105</sup> She also enlisted the views of like-minded Canadians, some of whom, like McCourt, had been vocal on the subject even during wartime. These others had condemned educators for cheating students by allowing “the edge to be taken off their naturally keen minds with radio and movies,”<sup>106</sup> or prefigured Neatby’s tirade by complaining that progressive education ignored common sense and produced “shallow, unindustrious, pleasure-seeking, aggressive, and undisciplined people.”<sup>107</sup> Arthur Lower’s dismissal of the contemporary North American educational system as “highly utilitarian,” and seemingly more so in Canada than in the United States, led him to conclude in 1948 that unless the gap between the truly ‘educated’ – i.e. the beneficiaries of a liberal education – and the mass could be eliminated, Canadian schools would “always turn out a good many brilliant misfits and countless dull people who fit in all too well.”<sup>108</sup> Business writer J.J. Brown warned that materialism had made the educational system an empty vocational exercise for many and had all but banished the idea of a “trained mind” attuned to such lofty ideals as “‘truth for its own sake’, ‘work for the fun of it’, ‘the instinct of craftsmanship’, ‘pride of accomplishment’, and so on.”<sup>109</sup> There were pockets of support for the newer methods. These recognized the stiff competition offered by radio, television and movies, and parental pressure on children to be socially successful. “That the latter pressure is translated by most children into an injunction to be popular with their peers rather than to make high grades” wrote one moderate, “is not surprising in a world where adult desires for status have often taken the place of pleasures and achievement, as goals to be aimed at.”<sup>110</sup>

Though her own opinions did not define a critical consensus or chart a new course

for Canadian educators, the significance of Neatby's work lies chiefly in her conviction that she was exposing a misguided group of experts who had only managed, despite their democratic rhetoric, to make the various provincial educational systems training grounds for a dull acquiescence to the social status quo. Her critique of progressivist education was at bottom a critique of modern life, especially of such factors as its "theoretical exclusion of dogmatic morality; of the neglect and scorn of the intellect which results from pseudo-democratic equalitarianism; of the success-happiness fallacy; of the blind faith in scientific techniques and mass operations[.]" Her proposed remedy included, along with a renewal of faith, nothing less than the "re-definition of democracy in terms of freedom and a return to the habitual and deliberate contemplation of greatness." Greatness and achievement were, for Neatby, the very qualities that the modern educational establishment had jettisoned in favour of social adjustment and success. The final aspect of her plan for reconstructing civilization seemed tailor-made for the flush 1950s; it was not the "futile" restoration of some bygone age but "a just appreciation at once of the uses and abuses of material comfort and well-being, a constant awareness that although scarcity may ruin health and happiness, abundance is no guarantee of either."<sup>11</sup>

Of course, the depth of Neatby's conviction was no guarantee that her contemporaries would agree with her assessments of education or of the larger society. In fact, one observer who advocated a middle way portrayed the historian and her antagonists as uncompromising partisans in what had become an intense debate during the winter of 1953-54.<sup>12</sup> Though somewhat alarmed at her conservatism, Neatby's former teacher Frank Underhill defended her on the grounds that

there must be something in the complaints which one hears on all sides, from parents, from employers, from university teachers, about the intellectual quality of the products of our high schools – their inability to read or to express themselves in writing, their boredom, their vulgarity, their

purposelessness, their lack of curiosity or understanding about any kind of life except what is comprised in the experience of their own group, their failure to reach the position where they are on the way to become inner-directed rather than other-directed. The ultimate purpose of the school is not to make children happy in solving children's problems but to prepare them to solve the problems of the men and women they are to become.<sup>113</sup>

By "inner-directed," Underhill meant self-directed – a quality that contrasted glaringly with the mass society, and more particularly with its reputation as a homogenizing force. Adding his support to Neatby's post-Massey project, Robertson Davies laid the blame for mediocrity at the feet of materialism. For decades, he argued, there seemed little need for liberal education in a nation of frontiers. "[M]aterial success could be made to serve as a cloak for a great deal of provinciality and downright stupidity. We still think of ourselves in pioneer terms, though we are now a wealthy nation of townspeople. ... Why should we bother with education beyond the standard which appears to serve us well?"<sup>114</sup> Ultimately downcast at the unlikelihood of reversing such a trend, during the winter of her discontent Neatby held faint hope that educators would uphold the long and honourable Western tradition, complaining that "they continue blandly to socialize for a society which threatens every moment to cease to exist."<sup>115</sup>

A collection of essays Neatby published once spring returned in 1954 was less notorious than *So Little for the Mind*, but equally illustrative of one direction 1950s cultural criticism had taken. Entitled *A Temperate Dispute*, the collection extended her critique of educational expertise, and included two essays with broader applications.<sup>116</sup> One of these, "The Debt of Our Reason," accused educational progressivists of hiding behind two vaguely-defined, and therefore almost infinitely useful concepts: a democratic philosophy and the scientific method.<sup>117</sup> Even more relevant to the mid 1950s Canadian scene was the historian's stab at the mass society, "The Group and the Herd," in which she worried that

individuality had been lost and that a “herd instinct” had become prevalent. The ability to live in solitude and to enjoy leisure as an opportunity for achievement or understanding was, for Neatby, the mark of an educated person and a goal for any society’s educational system. A society would flourish only by hallowing the idea that “all we have learned, all we have achieved, derives from the individual who is in the group but who remains an individual; who co-operates and even submits, but who can, if he must, stand off from his fellows and tell them they are wrong.” Her example of the herd instinct, somewhat predictably, was the Nazi youth camps in which individuality and the spirit of healthy dissent had been repressed in the interest of uniformity.<sup>118</sup>

If the mass society was so ephemeral and so detrimental to the individual, how did critics characterize those people who seemed to thrive upon the culture it housed? In his satirical novel *The Chartered Libertine*, author and journalist Ralph Allen made them the unwitting victims of commercial culture, fed mostly “movies about cowboys, plays about private detectives, programmes of recorded love songs, funny sayings by comedians, and serials about unhappy ladies.” Critics like Neatby appeared as principled but powerless crusaders who longed to make room for “a piece of music that isn’t a love song, some of it very old music that hasn’t any words and takes nearly a hundred instruments to play; talks and lectures about science and books and about our own history; plays in which, sometimes, nobody gets murdered or even falls in love.”<sup>119</sup> All over North America, living standards rose after the war, yet, except for the introduction of the new medium of television, the range of cultural and social options – the variety of pastimes and lifestyles – did not seem to be expanding at the same pace. Identifying the sort of personality that could both define and perpetuate such an environment became something of a cottage industry during the 1950s. Acknowledging a debt to the more ambitious of the community studies completed during the interwar period,<sup>120</sup> some of the most influential work in North American social

science after the Second World War gathered data and anecdotal evidence to construct portraits of post-war society, paying particular attention to the psychological effects of living in a mass society. American congressional hearings on the problem of juvenile delinquency reached the conclusion that the mass media "stood between parent and child."<sup>121</sup> In Canada, these reports of conformity and anonymity within the mass society and the corporate world found an attentive audience among cultural critics.

Sociologist David Riesman headed what was probably the most influential such project, a nearly decade-long survey completed during the "great Toqueville revival of the late 1940s to the mid-1960s" which brought concerns about democracy's capacity for engendering homogeneity into the foreground of critical discourse.<sup>122</sup> The result of his team's work was *The Lonely Crowd*, which introduced the very concepts of "inner-directed" and "other-directed" that Frank Underhill used to distinguish between mature and immature members of society.<sup>123</sup> Riesman's concern was not so much maturity as explaining, through identification of causes and symptoms, the replacement of the inner-directed type of "social character" by the other-directed.<sup>124</sup> The question of how this replacement had come about – how experience inside and outside the social and cultural fields shaped social character – was important to Canadian observers as well. Sociologist Murray Ross, an advocate of community centres after the war, echoed Riesman's findings, reporting that in mid-1950s Canada the "average man in the urban centre finds his life has little meaning, his human relationships little depth or significance, his voice little importance in the affairs of his work or his community." This sense of feeling disconnected from one's local society drove the average person irretrievably into the arms of the advertiser and the cunning businessman, as Ross explained:

In reaction, he turns to all kinds of escape devices which "hucksters" and other manipulators of mass advertising have convinced him are the fruits of the good life to which he is entitled. Thus, he becomes a heavy consumer of tobacco,



liquor, slick magazines, television, movies, and two-tone automobiles which cover up, in part at least, his loneliness and feeling of insignificance.<sup>125</sup>

In 1956, the same year Ross pointed squarely at what amounted to the consumer's complicity in his own exploitation, a team of social scientists presumably much influenced by *The Lonely Crowd* published the results of their five-year dissection of a modern Canadian suburb. John Seeley, Alex Sim and Elizabeth Loosley collaborated on *Crestwood Heights*, a thinly-veiled study of Toronto's prosperous Forest Hill area. Sim had been closely involved with the *Citizens' Forum* project from its earliest stages, and Loosley had participated to a lesser extent. The team saw its Forest Hill project as an exercise in community psychotherapy; although admittedly as a diagnostic or descriptive – rather than a curative – phase of treatment. They noted that the community had “come to us for help,” assuming that what residents said and did could reveal deep-seated anxieties, but not assuming that “the patient knew what his problem was.”<sup>126</sup> Residents spoke of problems largely related to adjustment to conditions which were not exclusive to the post-war period, but were nonetheless considered characteristically modern in nature. One example was the corporate or professional career paths that many of the men in the neighbourhood followed, paths leading through a range of occupations, but sharing the characteristics of hard work, “prudent boldness” and “ever-widening circles of decreasing intimacy.” Conversely, many young women would “drift into school and into marriage taking things as a matter of course.”<sup>127</sup>

Owing to Crestwood Heights/Forest Hill's wealth and reputation as a ‘desirable’ area, that particular community was hardly typical of others in Canada or the United States, and it was not presented as typical. The authors did, however, structure their work using such categories as Shelter, Time and Career to show how even in a privileged neighbourhood with higher-than-average levels of education and income, modern life had

functioned to establish values through stages of socialization over which community institutions presided. The suburb in question was a factory for fitting people to norms which had little to do with personal achievement or self-improvement except where those served as pathways to wealth and status. The authors documented, in abundant detail, what B.K. Sandwell had described eight years earlier as the "terrible over-concentration on the struggle for self-advancement, the pursuit of the bitch-goddess Success."<sup>128</sup>

The anxieties surrounding this struggle for success were, for the authors of *Crestwood Heights*, the most prominent features of suburban life. Although the study was supposed to present these features objectively, its rendering of the neighbourhood as a hive of neuroses places the book among works that were plainly critical of modern conditions, particularly those conditions affecting families and gender roles. Despite its origins as an academic project, initially under the direction of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene,<sup>129</sup> *Crestwood Heights*, as David Riesman noted with some disappointment, "was not dense and allusive; everything is painstakingly spelled out[,]" and therefore it could be read by the "educated non-professional reader."<sup>130</sup> Yet, this accessibility was an important addition to the critical arsenal during the 1950s. Even an extensive research project like *Crestwood Heights* would not suffer for being directed at a motivated general audience. Communities might display a range of different attitudes towards the dream of material success, but all of them needed to be advised of the ways in which such a relatively homogeneous dream had been propagated. As Alex Sim told an audience in 1957:

while one locality may vary with another in the intensity with which the dream is sought, believed, or realized, its universality extends as far as the message of the mass media is effectively extended. There is much more than dreams in Crestwood Heights that belongs to all North America. There is the material culture, the literature, jokes, beliefs, styles, psychological theories, and fads, medical practices, political ideas, house furnishings, fables, fears, and hopes, all these are universal to North America yet caught and mingled in a given

point in space and time in a special way.<sup>131</sup>

Neighbourhood culture was certainly susceptible to a multitude of forces and constituted a rich field of inquiry for social scientists, but by the mid-1950s, cultural critics had also devoted nearly a decade's worth of close attention to the ivory tower. Indeed, hopeful commentary on achieving a kind of equilibrium – between the natural and social sciences on one side and the humanities on the other – had been a feature of criticism well before the war. In the mid-1930s, J.L. Synge remarked wistfully upon the ability of the great scientists of the early modern period, like Newton, to combine their scientific curiosity with an acute literary sensibility. “In the eighteenth century,” he explained, “Science was a playful girl who whispered of conic sections, putrefaction, and refraction in the ears of bishops and marchionesses. Now she is a stern matron who stands beside the chair in every council of war or industry.”<sup>132</sup> Especially after World War II, under the threat of the atom bomb, critics remarked often that the speed with which the sciences seemed to be displacing the humanities in higher education reflected deeper and rather distressing currents in society.<sup>133</sup>

However, as was noted in the previous chapter, scientific research maintained significant authority in the early post-war period. Its credentials as a prime mover behind victory in war and as a source of increasing leisure could not be denied, but cultural critics exercised themselves over more than science's implications for religious belief. Especially during the time the Massey Commission was meeting to address – among its other concerns – the question of how to make Canada's universities institutions that ‘kept up’ with the sciences while preserving the tradition of the West, a number of observers anticipated British author C.P. Snow's late-1950s work *The Two Cultures* by calling for improved communications between the dominant scientific and the beleaguered humanistic communities.<sup>134</sup> Among these peacemakers, Malcolm Wallace argued in a submission to the commission that such an entente could be reached, but not without some cultural

breakthrough in which a "pendulum swing of popular interest once more restores to us an active faith in the Humanities[.]" With guarded confidence in that breakthrough, Wallace identified an eventual return to the humanities with the modern Canadian economic and diplomatic goals of "enabling us to take our place in the world community of the future." He warned, however, that genuine respect for the "civilizing power" of the humanities was an absolute precondition to the sort of maturity the nation sought, declaring: "Our own people cannot grow to mature stature until they turn their interest to the moral, aesthetic and philosophic aspects of life; they will need the humanities to teach them to understand the history, the tastes and the thinking of other peoples."<sup>135</sup>

The Massey Commission ultimately recommended that considerable public money be spent improving universities, and even establishing new ones, to equip Canadian youth for life in the modern world. For critics, the problem with such a goal was that it seemed to privilege the task of fitting graduates for specific kinds of employment rather than moulding their characters. The university had become, in the course of a generation, a training ground for technical pursuits, venerating the "[n]arrow concepts of usefulness" which Arthur Lower suggested "proceed from the drive for the efficient society, the society 'on its toes', girding itself against its enemies within and without. If our energies are to be consumed in the fight against the enemy, what remains over for making ourselves better human beings, for building what we call 'civilization'?"<sup>136</sup>

Delivering an address dense with implicit disdain for the technocratic takeover of higher education, Lower's fellow historian Donald Creighton thought it impossible to overstate the case for the humanities "in an age characterized by the enormous prestige of the physical and social sciences and by the adulation accorded to technical training and what is reverently described as "know-how[.]" Arguing at first for the applicability of the humanities to the function of government, Creighton quickly donned his critic's hat to

praise the world which "vanished irrevocably in 1939, ... [and whose] intellectual foundations seem, in comparison with those of modern times, so solid and shapely." The new dominance of the sciences and social sciences troubled Creighton, who spoke as though the appeasement of mass opinion meant that the humanities had been utterly banished from the contemporary scene:

Nazi-ism may be said to have reposed on bogus anthropology; communism reposes on bogus economics; and there are times when the contemporary English-speaking world seems to place its total trust upon a bogus political science which has converted democracy into a vaporous pervasive incense, floating in a supposedly edifying fashion over nearly everything, and yet, oddly enough, arousing its devoted worshippers to truculence abroad and illiberality at home. One sometimes wonders whether the humanities would have lent themselves to such monstrous perversions.<sup>137</sup>

In the mid-1950s, the modern university also had its defenders. E.W.R. Steacie, head of the National Research Council, thought it unrealistic to adopt the humanistic biases of a cultural elite as a practical model of civilization for modern Canada. He also condemned science popularizers of the "ain't science wonderful" school, who seemed to focus only upon new "gadgets" for mass consumption instead of stressing science's role as the method that helped create still more leisure time for humanistic pursuits. The cries of anguish over science and technology's eminence in the post-war university or the world outside it, Steacie claimed, did not reflect the opinion of the average Canadian, because technology enveloped "what everyone, or almost everyone, does for a living[.]" Indeed, he insisted that technology was the way a society determined what uses would be made of hard-won scientific truths, and there was no advance in the arts that could not also be used for objectionable purposes. "If writing had never developed, there would be no yellow journalism and no comic books," the chemist surmised, "but I doubt if my humanist friends would agree that the development of writing was unfortunate."<sup>138</sup>

Unfortunately for the humanists, and for that element of the Canadian population committed to 'reconstructing' a nation populated by inner-directed individuals, the technocratic society remained the engine of prosperity in North America. Its culture of newer, bigger houses and cars, of television and comic books, seemed to be the very thing the people wanted – a product of democratic ingenuity. A.R.C. Duncan, chair of Philosophy at Queen's University, expressed some frustration that the humanities were frequently viewed as "a kind of top-dressing of ornamental culture on the solid foundations of science and technology[.]" In doing so, he pointed to a problem critics did not know how to get around: cultural improvement required a kind of dedication or effort that seemed to many like a replication of the work environment. Standing in opposition to pleasure and the plainly recreational effects of more passive pursuits, seeking culture outside of what was readily available seemed like asking for an extra helping of wartime austerity, like donning sackcloth and ashes for no good reason. Attention to cultural matters during the 1950s carried this connotation to the extent that Duncan confessed:

The plain fact is that for many people the word 'culture' conjures up dreary images of long haired youths listening to Bach and Vivaldi instead of red-bloodedly jiving and skiffing, attending revivals of obscure Elizabethan plays instead of rioting with Elvis Presley, and wandering tight-lipped and white-faced around galleries of paintings instead of enjoying throbbing emotional dramas in glorious technicolour like *Peyton Place*.<sup>139</sup>

For cultural critics upset with the prodigality of 1950s culture and its subjugation to a manufactured mass taste, the social implications of modernity were a frequent target. Educating, rather than merely lecturing individuals about their vulnerability to a vapid commercial culture and the ease of suburban sameness came to be something of a mission. Critics paid close attention to the work of social scientists like David Riesman, whose

dispatches from an alienated America provided a powerful framework for understanding Canada's trip down a similar path. To some, signs like the pre-eminence of the sciences in higher education were adequate indications of wholesale capitulation to a technocratic modern order. In essence, the ideal of active citizenship most forcefully articulated during the reconstruction period remained important to cultural critics, who saw local or individual engagement with approved folk and high culture traditions as central to a vigorous nationhood, to social harmony, and to gradual emancipation from the too-easy yoke of mass entertainments. The term 'reconstruction' could no longer be applied so readily, but several of the same assumptions and goals remained in place. The state's interest in the cultural sphere, documented more extensively elsewhere, only added a political dimension to the critics' existing struggle to make edifying activities and resistance to materialistic, homogenizing impulses indispensable components of a desirable common culture. In this sense, the 1950s were a time of considerable anxiety – not comfort – for observers who made it their business to point out troubling symptoms of the mass society and its culture, and yet attempted to treat their Canadian patients in ways that did not seem patronizing or anti-democratic.

The Royal Commission on Broadcasting began in 1956 under R.M. Fowler, but it was unlike its predecessor the Massey Commission in that more of its energy seemed to go towards assessing the business and the politics of broadcasting than towards programming content or its social impact. Few Canadians seemed worried, as Arthur Lower was, that "Television will repeat the story of the movie, but on a far more intimate scale, for it is carrying ideas, from pie-throwing upward, into every hearth and home." Lower's outrage at the prospects for Canadian cultural development was a blend of nationalist invective and conspiracy theory. The United States produced much of the objectionable fare inundating the Canadian market, but in his estimation Americans themselves were not part of the plot.

American popular culture was not 'popular' at all, but had been forced upon the audience: "No doubt any society can be persuaded without too much difficulty to accept large helpings of sex in its daily diet, but that is different from asserting that these are "what the public wants." Nonetheless, Lower argued, the Canadian public distinguished itself from the American by being inherently more conservative, a further and more distressing indication that "[m]uch of what is served up to them in the way of 'popular culture' is, for them, an acquired taste."<sup>140</sup>

If cultural critics are to be believed, few Canadians were terribly bothered about where or how they acquired their tastes and social habits. As they fit into lives that seemed straight out of William H. Whyte's *The Organization Man* – another influential mid-fifties study of the mass society – it did not occur to many of them that their cultural choices were less frequently their own. In describing how the public had come to want what it had been given, George Salverson's 'Showman' claimed to encapsulate cultural producers' low estimation of the mass audience. During the 1950s, the ease of being able to turn to an ever-increasing number of diversions, however simple or derivative those might have been, seemed to drive the act of 'getting culture' even further upmarket, further from legitimacy as a democratic process. The mass society itself had come to represent the fruits of an injudicious democracy. To J.B. Priestley, whose Toquevillian moment came as he toured the United States in 1957, this new society based on higher rates of productivity, inflation and higher standards of living also featured "high pressure advertising and salesmanship," mass communications, and a majority-oriented "cultural democracy" which contributed to the sense that "You think everything is opening out when in fact it is narrowing and closing in on you ... You have to be half-witted or half-drunk all the time to endure it."<sup>141</sup>

When 'getting culture' was linked with the search for a Canadian identity, as it often was during the 1950s and into the early 1960s, insisting upon an identity which included an



appreciation of the Western humanist tradition could seem unnatural and contrived. Sensing the difficulty of enforcing a hierarchy of tastes, critics began to favour a middlebrow ethic of self-improvement through which citizens could acquire a rudimentary understanding of the basis for their nation's being and have access to cultural forms that explored the human condition. Around 1950, observers considered radio and travelling exhibits valuable for providing stimulation to audiences without lively arts communities close by, but reliance on such methods of cultural uplift remained suspect. One group's contribution to the Massey Commission read: "The blight of passivity is the curse of our modern civilization, and we shall make a most disastrous mistake if we imagine that turning a radio button or watching a touring drama group is any substitute for singing in a glee club or putting on a play."<sup>142</sup> Reviewing Carl Jung's *The Undiscovered Self*, Robertson Davies concluded sadly that most of his fellow citizens preferred the anonymity of the crowd and a numbing presentism, noting that "Our North American feeling that mass good-doing, corporate worship, and concurrence in a body of accepted opinion is "modern" and "efficient" conceals a dread of that loneliness which a soul must encounter when it turns inward toward itself."<sup>143</sup> To the cultural critic, the fleeting satisfactions of mass culture and the false conviviality of the mass society signified nothing more clearly than the convenience of empty lives.

## Five – “pleasures arranged by others”: the 1960s arrive

By the middle 1950s, critics of modern life and mass culture had begun to worry more publicly about what English Canadians might find if they turned inward to examine their individual or collective personalities. While the broader educational aims of the mass culture critique continued to enjoy state sympathy, the critique's proponents were becoming less categorical about the space between high and low. In light of the assimilation of Canadian lifestyles to a more generic North American model during the 1950s, social and cultural self-determination seemed more important to critics than the maintenance of hierarchies. Since the Second World War, and especially as more formal agencies for cultural development were being established in Canada during the fifties, outspoken monitors of contemporary society feared acquiring reputations as dogmatic arbiters of taste. As Morley Callaghan reported rather matter-of-factly in 1957, it was “no longer respectable to be highbrow.” He wrote, however, of the abiding need for a homegrown group that could set inspiring examples of engagement with art and with everyday life; “some kind of an aristocratic class formed of colorful men with minds of their own. I know that aristocracy is a dirty word in our time, but I call Thomas Jefferson a democratic aristocrat.” Callaghan wondered if such a democratic aristocracy could come into being in time to save Canadians from an unpleasant fate:

Where is this new class of men respecting leisure and reflective idleness to come from? I'm not sure. But I have enough faith in the human spirit to know it must come if Canada is not to become a big railroad station with a soap opera on a giant television screen to divert those who are waiting to catch a train.<sup>1</sup>

This chapter examines how cultural critics responded to their waning power to influence tastes or define (descriptively or prescriptively) a Canadian character impervious to 'other-direction.' During the later 1950s and early 1960s, critics did not tire of pointing out how they saw modern life and mass culture favouring structures that effaced distinctive individual and collective qualities. They contended that work and leisure were increasingly mediated and systematized, arranged by those who cared little about the autonomous person, family ties or national distinctions. By exploring three inter-related topics – critical objections to the state of the cultural 'market,' the embrace of a middlebrow cultural nationalism, and responses to the social implications of an automated workplace – we see that their own remedies were no less meddlesome. Advocating a self-awareness that encompassed personal and national identities, many in English Canada's academic, arts and journalistic communities became mediators too, attempting to cultivate an audience perpetually sensitive to the dire consequences of allowing alien, foreign, unfamiliar forces to determine the sort of society Canada would be in the 1960s and beyond.

The later 1950s and early 1960s saw an escalation of the Cold War, and this contest of ideologies was certainly a pervasive part of modern life. In Canada, the domestic scene was more sedate. The political shift towards John Diefenbaker's Progressive Conservatives during 1957-1958 was notable, but it seemed to have few direct or immediate implications for those interested in cultural matters. The 1957 creation of the Canada Council as a central agency through which the arts and academic research would be funded, and the advent of an independent Board of Broadcast Governors in 1958 were each in the works before the political changeover.<sup>2</sup> These bodies were evidence of the state's interest in the cultural field, but they are worthy of mention here because the more practical tasks of governing *media* and shepherding *culture* guaranteed some public philosophizing about the relationship between those very things. Indeed, the 1956 Royal Commission on Broadcasting was a

prime occasion for such debate, and reflected critics' acquiescence to the television age.

Sensitive to the immediacy and rapid proliferation of mass communications, critics recognized the need to treat the electronic media, especially television, as fundamental to a new wider public sphere; one that held the promise of an enlightened democracy but seemed to deliver less. They supposed that, as was the case in the business world, the pattern in the cultural field was for large firms to take over production, and for the output of these cultural industries to display the "adolescent" tendencies of which George Salverson's 'Showman' character spoke with such familiarity in 1950.<sup>3</sup> The continental market for culture seemed to glorify image and sensation over substance and decorous behaviour. If these tendencies were to be corrected, the mass audience needed exposure to material intended for more mature minds, and to material that would excite further interest in uncovering a latent Canadian identity.

Thanks to the post-war entanglement of Canada's economic and foreign policies with those of the United States and the basic similarities between the two nations, the search for a national identity apart from the American juggernaut has become a fixture in Canadian historical writing, as well as in the larger field of Canadian studies. Portrayals of that search as either a worthwhile goal or a futile errand have been emerging consistently for over forty years.<sup>4</sup> We have not examined the extent to which this search may also have been informed during the late fifties and early sixties by what some of the nation's more articulate citizens saw as a crisis of selfhood stemming from contemporary social and cultural trends. Cultural nationalism displayed an antimodern sensibility in that continental integration had accelerated as North America became a mass society, but this was not a nationalism biased against the electronic media. It was a qualified retreat from an "unconscious moulding by book culture,"<sup>5</sup> and some critics suggested that exposing the public to Canadiana through works only marginally more 'refined' than those that had been spilling across the border for

at least two generations would speed the day when Canadians could assemble the constituent parts of their own mythology. However elusive that goal may have proven since, the imperative of defining or inducing the formation of a vigorous and distinctive national identity affected the way in which opponents of mass culture conducted their campaign. In little more than ten years, the desire for a thoroughgoing reconstruction in which active citizens set the tone had largely given way to a middlebrow approach that did not seek to disturb or harangue, but to facilitate any sort of activity outside the American-dominated commercial culture. O

Although observers inside and outside Canada had been pointing for years to the humanities' decline in influence as compared to the growing authority of a scientific worldview, it was 1959 when Britain's C.P. Snow showed that these camps within the academy constituted separate worlds of their own outside it as well.<sup>6</sup> The late 1950s and early 1960s featured a revival of critical interest in the topic, a revival that most often included discussion of the cold, homogenizing qualities of the technological society Snow had set in opposition to the very pursuits which critics believed gave life its warmth and variety. Running through and beyond the revival of interest in the science-humanities dichotomy, the discussion of automation and its ramifications for life outside the workplace helped resurrect and emphasize, among some interested parties in Canada, an older opposition between humanity and the rhythm of the machine.

Though hardly native to late 1950s - early 1960s Canada, the image of a fickle or crooked cultural marketplace was one of the most compelling in the critic's arsenal during those years. Not only did this image equate mass culture with the financial interests of its producers, it intimated that the contemporary cultural marketplace had inverted one of the fundamental laws of commerce in that demand adjusted itself to suit the low quality of

what was being supplied. The oft-noted fact that a relatively large and self-sustaining market full of consumers who were not so different from the average Canadian existed close by – and was possessed of hundreds of canny mass media enterprises – only complicated matters. The mass media brought more new sounds and images into a greater number of Canadian households each day. By the later 1950s, critics who owed their livings to exercising skill with language and literature had to grapple with the amalgamation of new media, and ultimately with the death of the old truism that the home, a place where one could structure one's own life, was a refuge from the public arena. Producer and critic Mavor Moore expressed the temper of the times in this way:

The audience, meanwhile, is trying to become accustomed to a break-down of old familiar categories: "talking pictures", a radio program called "Stage '57", a television program called "Producers' Playhouse", recordings of "literature", magazines enclosing records, teachers who clown and clowns who preach, orchestras who act, dancers who sing, "live" television shows partly filmed, music to read by or (for hens) to lay eggs by. The world now comes into his home, and he "gets away from it all" not by retreating to his hearth but by "going out" into the world.

Moore recommended that anyone who wanted to understand the modern world learn more about the new "co-operative arts," and contended that the manipulative power of advertising and applied psychology had made the relative positions of artist and audience ambiguous. "The mass media become more and more massive," he wrote, and complained that "private or coterie art becomes either a mass fad or a total loss, and the maverick artist cannot gain access to any of the few power stations that control this Niagara."<sup>7</sup> Though he did not contend that public tastes should always emulate those of a cultural elite, he nonetheless believed that altering one's work to suit a "mass fad" afforded the artist little creative freedom, and deprived audiences of much they might appreciate. The phenomena that Marshall McLuhan spent much of his working life explaining – transformations of the

ways in which we communicated – were hardly fads, and by the later 1950s critics recognized that, in the name of the maverick artist and the ordinary Canadian viewer, these newer avenues of influence could not be avoided.

Into the 1960s, attitudes towards the mass entertainments on offer remained unforgiving. Rock and roll, castigated first in the United States as a corrupting influence, primarily on the white teenager, had become a worldwide phenomenon by the later 1950s. It met with the wrath of Watson Kirkconnell because he considered it bad music to begin with, and all the more harmful to responsible Christian citizenship when "rock 'n' roll exploiters" began to market sacred and semi-sacred music arranged in their own style. Even though its supporters might represent it as "the proletarian music of the new democracy," he could not appreciate such ventures as "a vocal rendering of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm ... in which the Lord became a rip-ranting, banjo-whanging cowboy and reverence was lost in the tinny vulgarity of it all."<sup>8</sup> Late 1950s youth, however, appeared to be genuinely enthused by the music, and could not see the contradiction in listening to it, even as an increasing proportion of them entered universities staffed by those who had acquired their tastes in times dominated to a lesser extent by canned culture. Frank Underhill left McMaster University after a visit, disappointed at the assortment of movie magazines his wife found in a residence hall, and dismissive of students who would buy sheet music for songs like *Gonna Get Along Without Ya Now*, *The Little Drummer Boy*, *Only the Lonely Know the Way I Feel*, *Harbor Lights*, *Starbright*, and *Welcome New Lovers*. Such songs, Underhill suggested, trivialized important human relationships or emotions, and had tapped into a lucrative youth market which consumed these songs

'as recorded by' individuals of whom I had never heard but who were, I presume, heroes of the disk jockeys; and the dreary sentimental slush of their words must have surpassed anything even in the screen magazines.

Underhill was probably right about the lyrics' sentimentality, but he neglected to give the students credit for at least playing these songs on the piano rather than merely buying the readily available recorded versions. He held these students up as evidence that Canadian higher education seemed to be infested by clients and patrons whose inclinations were towards personal popularity and lax standards "at the very moment when what is most needed is an austere and difficult struggle towards excellence."<sup>9</sup>

The belief that this difficult struggle towards excellence could be orchestrated by a small cultural elite had become less tenable by the time the Canada Council was formed in 1957. The cultivation of excellence in a broad range of endeavours remained an admirable goal, but the idea that such results could be enforced was antithetical to the ideal of cultural democracy. However, so too was abandoning minority tastes or aspirations in favour of the most popular fare. The Canadian Arts Council declared in a submission to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting that "[t]o impose the preferences of a supposed majority upon all groups in the community is surely undemocratic. In a national broadcasting system there should be programmes for all classes of citizens, and for all tastes and interests."<sup>10</sup> The Canada Council and other organizations would reward excellence where it was to be found, and would also attempt to sow the seeds of non-commercial culture, sometimes in places where these might not take root. The most popular radio and television shows would continue to be available, whether on CBC-affiliated stations, through the American networks, or via private channels. Neither were comic books and movies in any danger. Where critics of mass culture had some input, they represented their position as non-coercive in that any attempt to offer the public a more diverse selection of cultural opportunities sounded less threatening and more democratic than preaching to it about the *intrinsic evils of ubiquitous lowbrow entertainments*.

Experienced observers and student journalists alike recognized that either the fact or



the appearance of meddling with culture would cause an anti-intellectual backlash, or would simply fail because any campaign to transform the public taste was too ambitious.<sup>11</sup> They had listened for long enough to the likes of Don Jamieson, a television executive who had a direct interest in agitating for a free market in broadcasting and predicted that the curtailment of lowbrow programming would meet with little success. He claimed that: "[a]n audience raised on hill-billy music won't appreciate a Mozart octette overnight." In assuming that "hill-billy" music and Mozart existed on opposite ends of the cultural totem pole, Jamieson misjudged an important component of the mass culture critique. To critics, what he called hill-billy music would probably have been acceptable if it truly was the music on which the audience had been raised, or if it gave the audience a sense of an authentic milieu. Nonetheless, Jamieson saw highbrow material (or that which had been labelled highbrow) as unimpeachable in its quality, but bearing no guarantee of morality or propriety, noting that "[i]n much of Europe, as cultural levels advanced, moral values declined. History records that the Gestapo played classical music to stifle the sounds from the gas chambers!" He was arguing for a vision of Canadian culture derived not from some arbitrary conception of wisdom or beauty, but through a reading of 'what ordinary Canadians want':

I do not suggest that we must remain in ignorance of finer things in order to save our souls. Obviously, however, cultural development alone is not enough. The moral fibre of the nation must be strengthened at the same time. I believe it legitimate to complain that some of the dramas, on the national service, do no such thing. The Canadian culture we seek must stem from all the people of Canada. It must not be the synthetic product of a handful of so-called free thinkers, as much as these people are entitled to a place in the overall scheme of things."<sup>12</sup>

It was difficult, then, in a Cold War environment that equated North American popular culture with democracy and a kind of 'people's morality,' to speak of the imposition of cultural standards from on high as a practical policy. Even the critics themselves

recognized how Olympian, and therefore remote, these heights must have seemed to the average Canadian. In 1957, historian W.L. Morton broadcast a review of colleague Donald Creighton's *Dominion of the North*. Creighton wrote to Morton to apologize, claiming he had missed the broadcast

because I had no idea that you would be the speaker and because, quite frankly, I am a little tired of the very familiar voices of that extremely small and almost unchanging group of literary and political critics who have been performing on C.B.C.'s "Critically Speaking" for the past ten or fifteen years.<sup>13</sup>

As much as the abandonment of cultural standards might leave the door open to an irresponsible 'lowest common denominator,' avoiding the appearance of regimentation or snobbery was paramount. A period of intense speculation about the desirability of controls, largely directed at broadcasting, yielded a number of revealing articles in a new monthly called the *Canadian Commentator*. Opinion among the journal's contributors ranged somewhat, but none would back quotas or embargoes as sound cultural policy. Mavor Moore was particularly sensitive to this issue, and wrote in favour of such works as the Agatha Christie novels.<sup>14</sup> The prominence accorded cultural topics in a publication that otherwise featured articles on domestic (occasionally American) party politics and foreign policy made plain the political sensitivity of the culture debate in late-1950s Canada.<sup>15</sup>

In his aforementioned condemnation of rock and roll, Watson Kirkconnell spoke of the "exploiters" eager to get into the "religious music racket" as simply the latest in a long line of Tin Pan Alley confidence men.<sup>16</sup> The United States had a fully-developed and lucrative system of cultural industries which employed mass distribution techniques similar to those in place in other commercial fields. In commenting upon the nature of this market, legal scholar Ernest van den Haag grieved that there was no telling how many talented

people had been lured into writing or performing for the bulk of the population, and suggested that long ago, Dante was able to accomplish what he had because "there were no alternatives to being as good a writer as his talent permitted."<sup>17</sup> Academics, too, perceived the Canadian university orbit as relatively serene or, as Claude Bissell at the University of Toronto did, less businesslike than the American one: "We have, for instance, neither the energy nor the resources to establish the specialized periodicals that flourish so abundantly in the United States, and that make the writing and publication of a learned article an exercise in marketing."<sup>18</sup>

Perceptions of such a transformation towards the cultural marketplace made a case for the intentional protection of Canadian arts, letters and folkways on nationalist grounds more tenable. Broadcasting became a central part of this vision, and extending such protection meant extending the broadcast network.<sup>19</sup> Donald Creighton proposed a new national policy in which a closely-regulated electronic media would play the leading role, promoting an elevated common culture by controlling and augmenting the supply of programming. "A national broadcasting system can do for us, in the realm of the mind and the spirit, precisely what these old and tested national policies have done in the political and economic sphere," he declared. His scheme for aiding home manufacture and consumption was not based on the exclusion or replacement of foreign material with Canadian, but on the belief that "[a] steady flow of live programmes along the east-west life line will express Canadian ideas and ideals, employ Canadian talent, and help unite our people from sea to sea and from the river unto the ends of the earth."<sup>20</sup>

Not all observers could be counted upon to favour such relatively direct methods as those Creighton had proposed but, as was the case with the democratic ideal, they rarely questioned the need to battle the forces of continentalism. Though Alan Thomas of UBC's extension department recognized television's power as "the great stabilizer" and saw the act

of carving out a Canadian space on the airwaves as an uphill struggle given the tremendous competition from programmes that existed purely to entertain, he was more concerned with the method than with the nature of the goal, remarking that "the whole issue surrounding the "Canadian content" of broadcasting hinges on the fact that the audience must be "canadianized" or constantly reminded of the quality of its nationality. The question is whether this is the way to do it."<sup>21</sup> Again, the idea of making prohibitive laws or regulations to attain a rather abstract cultural end was a difficult proposition in a democratic society, but the end itself – a heightening of Canadian self-awareness – enjoyed the approval of most commentators. They cited the need to avoid the fate of becoming "nobodies, shabbily dressed in bits of borrowed material," the need to correct an ever-deepening dependence on the United States, or to seek more than the "derivative and commonplace[.]"<sup>22</sup>

Critics knew that "culture" still threatened much of the population, regardless of how much joy and pride it might generate. After the Canada Council was set up, the educational and cultural sectors got in line to receive their separate windfalls. Philosopher John A. Irving perceived, however, that there existed little public will to justify the outlay on culture, largely because of its intangible qualities:

Education is accepted as a means of improving our skills and techniques in order to increase our comfort and material prosperity. Culture is suspect because it aims at improving among other things, our tastes in art, literature, drama, architecture and entertainment. Education is valued because with it we are enabled to enjoy more of the pleasures which we share with the uneducated. Culture provokes resistance because in changing our tastes it seems to aim essentially at changing our natures.<sup>23</sup>

For a few others, the very notion of trying to change someone's tastes, assembling a heritage through such projects as McClelland and Stewart's Centenary Series in Canadian history or the construction of a stately national capital was itself artificial. Writer Hugh

Garner dismissed this bandwagon atmosphere as inauthentic, as "patriotism by persuasion, an attempt by misguided zealots to transfer love of country from one person to another by means of the written and spoken word."<sup>24</sup> Perplexed by what seemed to him to be a sudden upturn in attention to the health and welfare of a national culture, John McDade presented a typology of cultural hypochondriacs which included the "Logical Lamentor," "Anti-American Snarler," "Perfervid Anti-puritan," and the "Short-haired Breast-beater," a devotee of *Reader's Digest Condensed Books* who, convinced that "we tend to overdo all this culture stuff,"<sup>25</sup> represented an angry element in the middlebrow audience only distinguishable from the masses in that he had a voice of his own. At bottom, however, the idea that Canadians needed and wanted an identity aroused less controversy than the possibility or the method of achieving one.<sup>26</sup> Whether they emerged through a laissez-faire approach or a concerted campaign, the process of discovering the characteristics that would grant Canada an individuality among nations had become an almost legendary activity. One satirist couldn't wait for the process to exhaust itself: "[W]e've survived the Oxford group, Social Credit, hula-hoops, several wars and any number of isms – I imagine sanity will return, we'll forget the whole thing, and just be ourselves again."<sup>27</sup>

The desire to make new national distinctions was strong. Mass culture in the later 1950s and early 1960s was nothing if not convenient, and critics still contrasted this convenience with the determination required to access and appreciate 'highbrow' works. The extremely popular output of American studios, publishers, and networks had been especially convenient to the bulk of Canada's population for most of the century, so it was hardly surprising that by the mid-1950s critics had come to identify mass entertainments almost automatically with the United States. By the later 1950s in that country, cultural critics like Dwight Macdonald had already spent large parts of their careers approaching mass culture

as a kind of pollutant and wondering what they could do to expose and eliminate its sources within their own affluent society. To Canadian critics these sources were external, and so doubly worrisome. By the early 1960s, their critique rested upon the image of a cultural commodities exchange dominated by Americans since well before World War II. Though improved communications technology had provided one means by which English Canada could be gathered into an ostensibly lowbrow American fold, it also provided another avenue for the assertion of what some historians have labelled cultural nationalism.<sup>28</sup>

The tradition of identifying mass culture with an American influence helped reinforce the corollary notion that works of Canadian (and other non-American) origin possessed some greater merit. Despite decades of innovative and thoughtful American contributions to the arts and scholarship, many critics in Canada still looked to Europe for their literary and artistic models.<sup>29</sup> This bias was at least partially attributable to the extremely visible mass culture 'machine' in the U.S. Still, nationalism played an important role in creating a narrative of Canada's misfortune; a view in which high, folk, and now Canadian works were to be valued all the more because they had to contend with a neighbouring culture whose capacity for producing garish trivialities had only seemed to increase during the television age. After completing his survey of contemporary French culture in 1954, University of Buffalo historian Julian Park embarked on a new project. He assembled a group of knowledgeable contributors for the purpose of taking a snapshot of Canadian cultural life. Somewhat predictably, the group addressed Canada's progress in disciplines such as literature, music, art, the social sciences, philosophy, science and education. These were all supposed to indicate the presence of a distinctive national culture, which Park defined simply as the Canadian's "recorded reflection of his way of life and his attitude toward it." An inventory of activity in these academic and conventionally 'artistic' fields might have sufficed as a "reflection" of the tastes of educated or especially creative

Canadians, but Park also admitted that "obviously radio and television reach more people than perhaps all the arts combined[,]" noting:

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is performing both its cultural and national duty. It has three objectives – adequate coverage of the entire population, opportunities for Canadian self-expression, and resistance to absorption of Canada into the general cultural pattern of radio in the United States, supposed, rightly or wrongly, to be geared to a lower intellectual level. The Canadian who captures the attention of his fellow citizens in the realm of the lively arts has to be different from, and frequently better than, his competitor in America. He must stand more criticism, and this he gets in large measure from his fellows.<sup>30</sup>

Even an outsider like Park could sense the ambivalence his team of Canadian correspondents harboured towards the new 'lively arts' of radio and television. It was not surprising, given the potential of these media to reach across the distances that separated town from town and region from region, that by the later 1950s communications had assumed a central position in the Canadian discourse about how cultures develop, change and relate to others. Harold Innis, embracing the topic in the early 1950s, had linked the survival of a distinct Canadian culture with a distinctly Canadian presence in print media and broadcasting. "[T]aking persistent action at strategic points against American imperialism in all its attractive guises" and "attempting constructive efforts to explore the cultural possibilities of various media of communication and to develop them along lines free from commercialism,"<sup>31</sup> were for Innis crucial to preventing the further erosion of cultural choices. An order of magnitude more compelling than print, the electronic media presented both a terrible challenge and a significant opportunity to those convinced that the mass society need not define the Canadian character. Providing credible opposition to mass culture, which Frank Underhill called a "dynamic form of American diplomacy,"<sup>32</sup> required direct competition for listeners' and viewers' attention, not merely the disapproval that

critics had employed in the past to denigrate salacious literature. Like Innis, critics had to develop a strategy for culture which accounted for the new ways the world communicated.

One prominent figure concerned with understanding – and conveying an understanding of – mass communications during the later 1950s and early 1960s was Marshall McLuhan. The scope and applicability of McLuhan's work to more than the Canadian scene marked it as an extension of Innis's later writings. McLuhan, however, placed greater emphasis on the psychological mechanisms behind media influence and – over time – exhibited less dread of the potential death of a Canadian culture.<sup>33</sup> McLuhan is chiefly notable here because his views were *exceptional*, tending to run counter to a more prevalent alarm about how the values of the past were being transformed or rendered irrelevant via newer methods of communication. Critical of the under-utilization of new media (particularly television) in the field of education, McLuhan clearly did not subscribe to the belief that these media were creating a passive public. Rather, he drew attention to the "great enlargement of reading interests which has resulted from movie, radio and television[.]"<sup>34</sup> and saw newer methods of communication as a way to make the student an active learner:

is it not this very shift in our society which makes the young so resentful of an educational establishment in which they are consumers only? They live with a technology which insists that they be co-producers in the very act of learning. They experience only a negative motivation with regard to a curriculum which ignores the undeveloped countries of our minds and which looks on the new media as the source not of culture but of trash.<sup>35</sup>

By taking what amounted to a more objective stance on the question of what the media were doing to people – by not assuming that mass communication automatically begot the mass mind – he placed himself outside the convivial confines of the mass culture critique, especially after his 1951 work *The Mechanical Bride*.<sup>36</sup> He rejected the frantic search for a



glorious identity, suggesting that Canadians should be better satisfied with "simply becoming very much more aware of those tendencies and situations which have so long postponed the development of this dubious egotism."<sup>37</sup> He did not look so suspiciously at the connections between modern media, culture and national identity as the critics whose thought, action and influence form the basis of the present study. Those connections, however, would affect the way in which the critique of modern life and mass culture proceeded, and they would find expression in the debate over how to control broadcasting in Canada.

Late in 1955, the Canadian government acted upon one of the recommendations of the Massey Commission and appointed businessman Robert MacLaren Fowler<sup>38</sup> to chair a Royal Commission on Broadcasting. The Fowler Commission's primary purpose, and its eventual result, was the alteration of Canada's broadcasting policy. To this end, much of the commission's work involved discussing and hearing presentations on the rather technical matters of allocating frequencies, station licensing, broadcast financing and regulation. The commission employed Dallas Smythe, a Canadian-born researcher who was then a member of the communications department at the University of Illinois, to study and classify a week of television programming by content. The commission stirred up the most revealing commentary on mass culture, however, by inviting individuals and organizations to appear before it. Some respondents portrayed themselves as objective observers, and others made no secret of their frustration with either the cruel television marketplace or with the officious bureaucrats who aimed to tame it. The standard-bearers for each of these camps were the CBC and the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters (CARTB). These two 'stakeholders' opened the discussion with voluminous submissions and lengthy oral presentations. Although some of the more patently cultural (as opposed to technical/financial) issues only came to the fore after these two organizations had presented

their cases, a short summary of their positions will aid in understanding how supporters of both public and private broadcasting models could purport to serve the public interest.

The commission's first 'guest,' CBC chairman Davidson Dunton, wasted little time before absolving his own network of greed. As an implicit condemnation of latter-day broadcasters whose stations were more investment than public service, he looked back to praise sainted pioneers in the field, declaring: "to them the country owes a big debt, to those people who did something to get it going in the twenties when the returns were not sure or enormous[.]" The CBC, he assured the commissioners, was not a business, nor did it intend to let broadcasting in Canada come under the sway of advertisers and ratings. It would not fill its schedule with material imported from the US, even though such material was considerably cheaper to run than producing original programming. The CBC had shown, Dunton claimed, that "it is possible for a system to run counter to the usual pressures of economy and to deliberately produce Canadian programmes, deliberately distribute service right across the country." This defiant act, costly but deemed necessary for the sake of providing an alternative to American stations, had historically defined the public broadcaster's mission. The use of public funding to produce and schedule programmes for a broader range of listeners and viewers put this mission under close scrutiny. "It is easier to operate a straight business," Dunton noted, for because it ran on licence fees and then came to rely more on tax revenue, the CBC found itself constantly "weighing this elusive norm of public interest[.]" As for varieties of culture, he emphasized that it was "not necessarily our job to see that just the highbrow things are circulated, or just popular things, or just the things the larger groups may want. I would suggest it is our job to see, on the whole, there is a comprehensive service containing in reasonable proportion a number of elements that broadcasting can communicate so well."<sup>39</sup>

T.J. Allard, the executive vice-president of the CARTB, hoped that the Fowler

Commission would help his organization get out from under the thumb of the CBC, which still regulated the industry. The association's brief called for a separation of powers in broadcasting much like the separation of the executive, judicial and legislative branches in government.<sup>40</sup> Despite CARTB's insistence that freedom to broadcast was analogous to freedom of the press,<sup>41</sup> and despite the litany of legal opinion it cited to support this claim, the association's preoccupation with the business end of broadcasting shone through. Simply put, the private station owners conflated the freedom to broadcast as they liked with the public interest. Asked about programming that was violent or served no discernible educational purpose, Allard replied that "good taste is something which can almost invariably be provided for by law," and cited the fact that comics were not banned, but rules of content had been set out and publishers who wanted to stay in business would obey these rules. Allard's fellow board members struck a less puritan note in coming forward with some examples of how they had policed their own programming. New Brunswick's representative on the board mentioned that his station carried the *Mount Allison Forum*, "a discussion sometimes of professors which can be quite dull[.]" He humbly suggested that as a citizen of his community, he was well-equipped to judge how much "dull" was too much. "I am trying to run my station so that my community will be a little bit better because my station is operating there, and I do not think there is a regulation under the sun that can do it an better than that."<sup>42</sup>

Beyond the heated contest over the expansion of television and the question of an independent regulatory body for broadcasting in Canada, a number of submissions addressed the cultural tone of programme fare and the issue of whether broadcasting was a business or a higher calling. Indeed, at times the Fowler Commission became a forum for debating the commerce-culture nexus. Organizations normally more occupied with the state of higher education or planning the next concert season demonstrated a knowledge of how

the public's experience with the mass media had been shaped by business imperatives. The Canadian Association of University Teachers, for example, noted that sponsors in imperfectly competitive markets (where name-brand recognition was as important as product quality or price) tended to spend the most on radio and television sponsorship. "[I]t is a strange cross-section of the nation's business which assumes final control of our entertainment," the association's brief reported, "producers of soap, gasoline, cosmetics, stomach powders, automobiles, branded foods and household equipment."<sup>43</sup> The ads were memorable, but the sponsorship game certainly affected the sorts of programming the public could expect. The Humanities Association of Canada, Fredericton Branch, agitated for a higher power CBC signal in central New Brunswick because the branch's members believed that audiences were not 'getting what they want' from a local private station which nonetheless had high ratings: "It may be that CFNB, as it claims, is, on the whole supplying the majority of its listeners with what they want, but we must suspect surveys conducted among listeners most of whom can listen to only one station. And do surveys take into account that many people seldom listen at all because the programmes are so bad?"<sup>44</sup>

Representing the other side of the debate, civic politicians attended the commission's Winnipeg hearings in order to beat the local development drum, and this pattern prevailed in most other cities. By 1956, most Canadian 'regional metropolises' had CBC television stations, if not some production facilities as well. Local boosters came to the Fowler Commission to aid groups of investors looking for second and third stations, reasoning that if the city were granted another station or stations, business *and* culture could be served. Winnipeg lawyer C.I. Keith, Q.C. represented the local symphony orchestra, yet worried about the sort of message that increased regulation of the airwaves would send: "I would hate to see some kind of a ... board made up of professors and musicians to devise programmes that the public will be forced to look at, heaven preserve us from that sort of

thing.<sup>45</sup> The business potential of private television appeared, to boosters, still relatively unexploited, and they claimed that local talent would thrive on local stations. Chairman Fowler subsequently dismissed this claim by pointing out that much of the material broadcast locally was 'canned,' i.e. pre-recorded, most likely in the United States.<sup>46</sup> In Winnipeg, Alderman Douglas Chisholm estimated that the previous evening's CBC broadcast of Franz Kafka's *The Trial* "may suit ten or twenty percent of the public, but the other eighty percent may not like it at all." He went on to advocate an alternative source for television in the city, so "the CBC could possibly find by surveys what the people actually want instead of as at present, what is felt is good for them." Alderman Albert Bennett later added to his colleague's implied charge of snobbery by praising what he saw as one of the national network's rare concessions to popular taste: "The only people who told me they did like a programme on CBC were two men who said they wanted to get home and see the wrestling on Saturday night."<sup>47</sup>

In the same city, others regarded Saturday wrestling telecasts as an abdication of the CBC's responsibility. A delegation from United College, which included Principal W.C. Lockhart, and historians Stewart Reid and Kenneth McNaught, presented themselves as "teachers," not interested parties. They did not dissemble. A national broadcasting system must be not only national, they suggested, but look beyond the nation's boundaries, preferably to UNESCO and to other Commonwealth countries. They saved their sharpest words for the state of the broadcasting industry in Canada:

[R]adio broadcasting and television have acquired three fairly distinct functions: they are at one and the same time agencies to influence, agencies to entertain and agencies to sell goods. In the public interest first consideration should be given to the educative function of broadcasting and last consideration to its use as an advertising medium. Increasingly, it seems to us, the tendency has been to follow the reverse order.

These academics had nothing against entertainment, endorsing music hall and modern music broadcasts as examples of light entertainment suitable for the public airwaves. More importantly, however, they saw the overall picture as troubling. McNaught summed up this concern by remarking that J.B. Priestley's comment about Canada having "slipped one cultural stage" was spot on, suggesting television "should be parasitic upon a lively theatre, but that we had T.V. and no lively theatre[.]"<sup>48</sup>

It was fitting that those educators were among the first groups to address the commissioners, for some of the more revealing reflections on broadcasting offered to the commission had to do with the electronic media's capacity to educate as well as entertain. Critics of commercial broadcasting found it frustrating that the lightest of light entertainment seemed to dominate during the hours when most people would watch or listen to broadcasts. They did not advocate banning this light entertainment, but were convinced that its producers had not given anything more edifying a try in the same time slots. In response to a commissioner's question about financing only educational and informative programmes publicly, and having entertainment finance itself, the Canadian Federation of University Women's Marion Gilroy replied: "I do not know where you could draw the line. One person's entertainment is another person's education[.]"<sup>49</sup> Determining how much to expect of an audience or how it might react against a steady diet of educational programming remained a difficult task.

Still, the allure of television as an educational medium remained strong, even though its supporters harboured some reservations. One group expressed caution about putting too much stock in television because even though it suited the field of adult education in which "motivation is assumed, not developed[,]" it might not be as suited to all levels because "the very ease of approach encourages passivity of mind."<sup>50</sup> Approached through television, the passive mind was then susceptible to dangerous influences. A Catholic group looked

forward to seeing and hearing more "men of intellect" on the air in Canada, but added – almost certainly referring to the notorious scientific broadcasts of 1951 on CBC – "we can do without those whose faculty is to shock or affront the conscience of the nation." This same group believed that the potential benefits of using television as an educational tool outweighed the risks, for the self-interested false populism of the private broadcasters appeared to them the least attractive option of all: "any encouraged or tolerated policy of anti-intellectualism will dwarf the growth of this great land of ours, sap its heritage, endanger its stability and democratic institutions and mock that spiritual faculty by which men most nearly reflect the image of God."<sup>51</sup>

Aside from the moral implications of catering to the lowest common denominator, several of the groups filing briefs with the commission dismissed the private broadcasters' tactic of lumping the electronic media and the press together as democratic institutions. The press catered to readers of a certain political stripe or recreational interest, and readers looked to other publications if they were no longer satisfied. Some critics resented that the electronic media carried on "as though the listener or the viewer directly controlled the nature and quality of programs." Programme ratings resembled newspaper or magazine circulation figures in that they measured how many people had tuned in, but critics perceived and spoke of a diffused and distant horde of specialists at maximizing ratings, none of whom took responsibility for the final product in the same way that the editor of a local paper had traditionally done:

the connection between the audience and the show is extremely complex. Often it involves the following: business firm, advertising agency, show business agency, network, program producer, performers and audience. The ultimate decision rests with the source of the money – the sponsor.<sup>52</sup>

Although the CBC sold advertising time as well, one of its advantages in the eyes of critics

was its policy of producing or buying broadcast rights to shows that could not command high advertising rates. Groups that appreciated the variety in programming that this arrangement offered threw their support behind granting the public broadcaster adequate funding to operate as a "public service free from undue pressures[.]"<sup>53</sup>

Though it too had to compete for advertisers, the press was easier to ignore regardless of whether it was selling or editorializing. The intrusive and persuasive world of radio and television advertising, however, required "constant supervision so that it does not constitute an invasion of human privacy."<sup>54</sup> Privacy in the home seemed especially rare as both radio and television became familiar household fixtures. At one time radio listening had been a family event for which battery power had to be conserved, but by the mid 1950s, individuals could spend hours a day looking at television, drifting in and out of the room while the set remained on. Having entered the physical space where the family lived, its convenience helped it penetrate family routines:

Different from the theatre and the cinema, which limit their plays to those who attend of their own free choice, television is directed especially to family groups, made up of persons of every age, of both sexes, of differing education and moral training. Into that circle it brings the newspaper the chronicle of events, the drama. Like the radio it can enter at any time, any home and any place, bringing not only sounds and words but the detailed vividness and action of pictures; which makes it more capable of moving the emotions, especially of youth."<sup>55</sup>

Canada had some distance to go before every single home had a television set, but Fowler et al. fielded plenty of concern about this new domestic appliance and its effects on children. On one occasion, a story of 'good kids' out of control found its way into what were supposed to be more solemn proceedings. A visitor to the commission reported that the mother of two young boys had recently been able to observe them with and without television in the house. Deprived of their favourite programmes, the boys slept soundly and



were well behaved, but with TV, "the bed was always a tangle at night." To this tale, Fowler replied: "I am afraid that [television] is a fact [of] modern life and children will have to adapt."<sup>56</sup> As much as this sounded like a vote of confidence in the resiliency of the baby-boom generation, parents worried that their children were seeing too many "scenes of aggression and mental torment" to cope intelligently. In addition to the mental disturbance that some of the more highly-rated shows could engender, young viewers came in contact with other programmes that might not have been violent, but could still "convey false standards and ridicule authority."<sup>57</sup>

In that "lynch laws, war and spy stories" loomed large in respondents' recollections of what they saw, the "social responsibility"<sup>58</sup> associated with respect for authority seemed to be missing from just about everything broadcast on the commercial airwaves. Paul Rutherford supplied a corrective to this notion in his study of television in Canada during the 1950s and 1960s. Even American stations, supposedly the source of much material of dubious value, broadcast a decent amount of "culture on the small screen."<sup>59</sup> Still, the perception that for-profit broadcasting entailed a fairly unadventurous adherence to formula persisted. "Humour for children on private stations is 90% little animals mangling bigger ones, and the other 10% consists of stammering, puns, and custard-pie throwing[.]" complained an agitated group of Regina housewives. While they certainly entertained strong opinions about the direction that most television programming had taken, the prospect of setting their children down in front of the television if certain standards were met seemed to occasion little fear. In contrast, their confidence in the CBC's lineup of children's fare, which included such material as *Jubilee Road*, *Kindergarten of the Air*, the school broadcasts, *Camp Wilderness*, *CBC Stamp Club*, and *Folk Song Time*, reflected their approval of an equally wholesome adult schedule, which consistently offered "something of a challenging nature. It gives us good music, fair and objective political and international comment, drama, help

with consumer and household problems, and discussions by well-informed observers."<sup>60</sup>

The recognition that television could provide "something of a challenging nature" through which the ordinary person could connect to the wider world outside the home – and to other Canadians – represented one facet of a distinctly altered cultural landscape. High culture remained high, but the obvious utility of introducing it to audiences via broadcast could no longer be dismissed in the hope that the millions would pawn their televisions to buy symphony passes. Lobbying for a healthy CBC was one thing, but it was quite another to see respondents to the Fowler Commission looking to the cultivation of spare-time intellectuals as part of the solution to an identity crisis. This was not an overnight transformation, but as critics came to terms with how television had already assured itself of a place in the home, the critique of modern life and mass culture adopted an increasingly middlebrow sensibility.

Using the new medium to bridge the "gap between the increasing complexity of our society and the understanding of the average citizen"<sup>61</sup> seemed to be a direct method of equipping Canadians for their roles in a democratic country. One presentation predicted that the future would be bright for adult education, claiming: "the tastes, interests and capacities of the public are greatly underrated, both in the United States and in our own country."<sup>62</sup> Signs that increased literacy appeared to be delivering some long-awaited results boded well for an expansion of that segment of the population which pursued its own answers to some of life's more difficult issues:

The people of a growing democracy must be kept informed of developments in the world at large. The increasing sales, all over the Western World, of paper-backed books on politics, economic, science, art, philosophy, etc., seem to indicate that there is a growing demand for information on these and other subjects.

In Cold War-era Canada, posterity also mattered. The same group told the

commission that it would be "tragic if some Gibbon of the future, reflecting on the decline of North American civilization, could say of our use of television: 'They used it only to watch wrestling and to sell soap.'" <sup>63</sup> Again, to those presenting briefs on broadcasting, the CBC appeared as the antithesis of this lowbrow sideshow. Programmes on the public network like *Exploring Minds*, which began its run in 1953 and was an introduction to the world of the university, *Anthology* and the satirical but sophisticated *Rawhide* represented accessibility, the ideal of movement from one interesting subject to another and movement away from entertainment calculated to appeal to base curiosities and instincts but to leave the individual with little of value. As a network deliberately dedicated to culture outside the mainstream, the BBC's Third Programme inspired some reverence among critics of mass culture, <sup>64</sup> but on the North American continent it had become difficult to ignore mainstream entertainers and experiences or to abdicate knowledge of them if one hoped to reach the public. Additionally, in Canada, where highbrows had come to owe more of their pleasures to state assistance, justifying the expense on a small segment of the population was a near impossible exercise in public relations.

To several observers and participants in broadcasting, much in mainstream experience seemed vigorous, personal and evocative of Canadian archetypes – therefore preferable to the sort of entertainment private stations customarily carried. The radio and television employees union went further, declaring: "Our people are developing their own folk art, and are making themselves known to each other across the land. And we know of no better folk art anywhere than 'La Famille Plouffe' and 'Jake and the Kid'." <sup>65</sup> These were series about ordinary people, but they explored regional contexts that helped them to become folk art in a way that satisfied the contemporary sense of the term. <sup>66</sup> Other aspects of Canadian life in the mid twentieth century could stand as representations of folk experience, and critics recognized that "omitting the accomplishments of industry, the

settlement of the north, or sports and recreation, would indeed mean that a projection of Canadian culture was a service to a minority by a minority[.]” Alternatively, more visibly employing radio and TV to inform people about such immediate concerns as the technological revolution and its implications<sup>67</sup> would demonstrate that the CBC was fulfilling its public service mandate. Perhaps to show solidarity with the national broadcaster’s declared policy of providing a “comprehensive service,” suggestions for programming tended to include plenty of opportunities to encounter high culture, but also a rather mixed bag of other fare. A Labour-Progressive Party representative outlined the consensus of his provincial wing: “We would like to see a local ‘pick of the stars’ programme, more use of the local ballet groups, the development of a local T.V. drama programme,” and added that party members would welcome a series introducing Manitobans to their own history.<sup>68</sup> The British Columbia Parent-Teacher Federation exemplified the mid twentieth-century bourgeois-middlebrow more convincingly, asking for more programmes on subjects like “hobbies, manual dexterity, instruction and development an sports, dramatization of children’s stories, adventures and animal stories, science and natural phenomena and field trips.”<sup>69</sup>

The incompleteness of middlebrow culture made it an ideal vehicle for the acts of public service and community-building that many cultural critics hoped to perform. That is, introductory approaches to any subject assumed no prior knowledge of it and could concentrate on conveying one or two rather simple ideas at a time. The Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA) saw television as powerful and potentially troublesome if not approached correctly, but told the Fowler Commission that both radio and television could do much to help combat misunderstandings about mental health or even “to help people understand themselves and their emotional make-up,” just by passing on a couple of elementary ideas.<sup>70</sup> In the organization’s experience with programmes in its field of interest,

the CMHA noted that of the "good" and "bad" programmes on mental health, all the "good" ones were essentially reverent introductory shows. A comedian appearing on the *Ed Sullivan* show in the fall of 1955 exemplified the "bad" by doing a song called 'I'm a Schizy Phreny.' The CMHA called this "a burlesque on the behaviour of psychotic patients which was in poor taste[.]"<sup>71</sup> It also lacked the earnest quality defining middlebrow culture.

In his brief to the commission, historian Arthur Lower outlined a strong nationalist position by equating "American Programs and American Control" with cultural imperialism. He insisted that "The Canadian people, as those who have spent their lives trying to understand them know, are conservative, they do not crave much excitement: in a dozen different ways their psychology is different from that of the great city populations to the south."<sup>72</sup> Though the USA was home to pioneers in the field of middlebrow culture, the two nations were different on that score as well. In the US, it served an entrepreneurial function – culture could be bought. In Canada, although opportunities like book-of-the-month clubs existed, the middlebrow also became a strategy for instilling a sense of national cohesion. Defining an ideal Canada against the example of commercial culture they found operating (though not as unrestrictedly as its partisans might have liked) within the Canadian broadcasting system, cultural critics saw television as a potentially effective way of passing on a set of simple ideas about how that commercial culture operated to the detriment of a Canadian identity. A group of scholars at Queen's University wrote their own brief, and wanted the electronic media to "please and inform us and move us as civilized human beings, not simply as potential customers whose sales-resistance can be undermined right in our living rooms." They advocated an eclectic list of experiences brought closer – but still mediated – by broadcasting. Like Marshal McLuhan who saw the new technologies as extensions of the human nervous system,<sup>73</sup> they saw radio and TV as ways of "heightening and extending our enjoyment" of all those vital affirmations of humanity:

We can attend the Coronation and the Olympic Games and the Stratford Festival; we can go to church or to school or to Parliament or to the ballet or to the ball-park as well as, but not necessarily on the way, to market.<sup>74</sup>

▲

The critique of private broadcasting heard at the Fowler Commission hearings was not anti-American, although it resented control by this larger and distinct market, an 'artificial' monopoly like the one supporters of private broadcasting in Canada saw hindering their plans for expansion. Neither situation could be represented as democratic. As one observer prudently noted, the commission was "insistent that Canada find itself[,] yet she acknowledged one of the primary obstacles to this process of discovery by quoting from its *Report*: "The problem of influence on Canada from the United States is not ... mainly that American programmes are too bad, but many of them are, in a special sense, too good."<sup>75</sup> This 'special sense' – the knack American producers seemed to have for turning out unsophisticated but popular programmes, books or films – worried critics and prompted them to conflate more easily the issues of nation and taste.

The problem of a public broadcasting system in competition with the commercial media caught the attention of commentators again around 1958, when private broadcasters finally succeeded in obtaining a regulatory board independent of the CBC. For its first twenty-two years, the CBC had regulated the very trade it plied, and some who had been on hand to lobby for the adoption of that system in the 1930s were again wary of the implications of meddling with the existing structure in the late 1950s.<sup>76</sup> However, with the uncoupling of the roles of regulator and broadcaster came some relief for commentators weary of hearing how the national broadcaster was remote or less responsive to popular tastes than it might have been. In terms of the board's influence over the CBC's own programming, the new regulatory structure meant little because assumptions about the

relative value of highbrow and lowbrow programmes survived. Some critics revisited the arguments raised two years earlier in front of the Fowler Commission. They advocated a system whereby the most vacuous popular material could not simply drive out the rest as not only indicative of a complex and diverse modern society, but essential to democracy. "If we can provide audiences with the programmes they want while keeping available to them programmes they ought to want," one observer of the rather inexact science of broadcast planning noted, "we can preserve freedom and cultural opportunity."<sup>77</sup> According to Mary Lowrey Ross, the audience for the CBC public affairs programme *Fighting Words* consisted of a "small though volatile minority" to whom the programme's panelists all seemed to be inveterate eggheads, and a larger group "prepared to follow a program with interest and curiosity even when its subject matter is considerably over their heads[.]"<sup>78</sup>

This determined middlebrow audience gathered a disproportionate share of attention from the hopeful band interested in bringing about cultural improvement through a broadened awareness of contemporary social issues and participation in public affairs. Self-improvement became a less arduous task when all it took was turning on the television. In 1957, the CAAE represented its long-running *Citizens' Forum* programme as "an idea as old as the Greeks ... as modern as television ... and more essential than ever."<sup>79</sup> Even though it billed itself as democratic, in tune with the latest technology and a repository of sane perspective on the stresses of modern life, the number of memberships – and consequently the number of groups participating formally – had begun to decline drastically within two years after the war, much diminishing *Citizens' Forum's* status as a movement. Despite the drop in memberships, the programme's organizers were still concerned mightily about its tone. It tended through the 1950s to feature fewer international topics and more family issues, and by the early 1960s this inclination toward the domestic was well established.<sup>80</sup> Participants were still being asked to consider some weighty subjects, but,

armed with the pamphlets from headquarters, an alert parent was about as well-equipped to follow the average week's discussion as was the better-educated viewer. With fewer operating groups and faithful members on the mailing list, however, it was more likely that those watching or listening without the prepared text were in the majority. Long-time staffer Isabel Wilson could wonder, with much greater justification than she had even five years earlier, if *Citizens' Forum* was not "now sacrificing the interests of the continuing groups to those of the wider listening audience."<sup>81</sup>

The originators of *Citizens' Forum* had not envisioned these programmes as discrete experiences to be sampled or quickly forgotten, but rather as part of a nationwide endeavour whose members assembled each week to form hundreds of neighbourhood *salons* and, organizers hoped, to put what they learned into practise immediately. For some of those who kept the faith through the 1950s, the suggestion that they had to tailor their noble ambitions to a less committed audience clearly struck a nerve. But could they simply abandon the field to situation comedies? Organizers worked to make the forum programmes more entertaining for the casual viewer and less reliant on the group discussion model by relating current social questions to the audience's own experiences. This was a response to the post-war challenge of a larger pool of competing programmes, and seemed necessary given a public that was relatively self-involved by comparison to the wartime listeners who had tuned in each week scarcely more than a decade earlier. In the universities, noted one concerned educator, developing "more intelligent producers and consumers of radio and TV" depended upon a "long and arduous" vigil, during which "[w]e must be on the alert lest our products delude our past, present and future constituencies with their insidious brand of Kitsch."<sup>82</sup>

Suggesting that his corporation was undertaking a project to reflect Canadian culture rather than dictate it, CBC president Alphonse Ouimet declared in 1959 that the public



broadcaster must concern itself with bringing the public programmes on a variety of subjects, but he defined that variety in a telling way. "Canadian culture," he said, "embraces everything from sled-dog races to symphony orchestras, from comedy to opera, from good talks to jazz." The activities he named seemed to cover a fairly wide range, but behind this inclusive picture lurked the old assumption that the CBC should champion interests or inclinations that had not been represented adequately by commercial broadcasters.<sup>83</sup> Ouimet, however, was intent upon presenting the corporation's mission as non-discriminatory:

Any narrower view of a national broadcasting service would destroy the purpose of the CBC as a unifying force in Canada. If CBC were to direct its programs only to arbitrarily selected social and economic groups, excluding others, we would no longer be a unifying force, but a divisive force – a force dividing the nation and doing irreparable harm to our aspirations as a people and as a nation.

A socio-economic definition of the ideal listener or viewer would hardly have suited the times, and the president did not need to call attention to the fact that the CBC had always offered fare with which better-educated Canadians and those with the money to attend live performances were at least broadly familiar. "I do not believe Canadians want cultural segregation[,]”<sup>84</sup> Ouimet said, adding that the CBC had never considered itself anything but an agent of integration. The intent behind offering a wide array of programming was not to cater to a highbrow audience, but to expose the casual listener-viewer to something unavailable in the mass culture marketplace; something requiring a bit of effort. The CBC conducted its operations over two mass media, but did not view itself as a purveyor of mass culture. Indeed, although its policy of variety in programming had customarily entailed carrying some shows that were popular on commercial networks in the US, the bulk of its own productions were still oriented towards information, self-improvement and cultivating a broader knowledge of Canada.

Perhaps consciously broadening Ouimet's already inclusive-sounding embrace of sled-dog racing and opera, the CBC announced rather baldly in a 1961 print advertisement: "The culture of a nation is the sum total of what everybody does." Through the intercession of a public network that interpreted its mission as "reflecting" the nation's increasing diversity, the CBC promised its audiences personal introductions to "a thousand and one Canadians whom we will never otherwise meet[.]"<sup>85</sup> Getting out and seeing the countryside for oneself, a strategy Bruce Hutchison advocated in his book *Canada: Tomorrow's Giant*, a 1957 sequel to the successful wartime volume *The Unknown Country*,<sup>86</sup> was not practical for many Canadians locked in to industrial work schedules. The CBC offered encounters with interesting people, 'better' minds, and a tradition that critics believed mass culture producers had only acknowledged through insensitive plunder.

This effort at persuasion had a target, the large audience containing people Robertson Davies described as those "who have no interest in literature as such, and who regard reading simply as one, and by no means the best, of the means by which they achieve the sensation which is the only form of entertainment they know." This audience, by Davies' estimation, was worthy of attention. Although it was not littered with specialists in the field of literature, it appeared to him to "have taste and standards."<sup>87</sup> There were some reservations about middlebrow culture. Robert Fulford concurred with Davies' hopeful assessment of the audience, but followed the American critical tradition by denouncing the practise of simplifying or abridging the classics in order to market them.<sup>88</sup> Indeed, counter to the prevailing wartime and post-war model in which small-scale cultural efforts were praised, Fulford reckoned that the adult education movement had exercised a troublesome influence in creating an appetite for localized culture and a little learning. He weighed in on the side of the purists, contending that "to destroy or dilute Mark Twain is surely more harmful than letting a thousand sheriffs mow down a thousand bad guys." He considered it

a graver problem, however, that television had become less interesting since the mid-1950s, when an "aversion to "problem plays," dislike of unglamorous acting, disgust for plays which modestly fitted themselves to the intimacy of TV" had inclined much American fare towards an unchallenging and mediocre "Hollywood" style.<sup>89</sup> Television had followed a recognizably lowbrow path, Fulford argued, as it abandoned life's more difficult themes in order to boost ratings.

The problem of evangelizing a critical sensibility – with its emphasis on self-improvement – had become one of marketing that sensibility, of convincing Canadians that adopting a skeptical attitude towards commercial popular culture would be beneficial to them collectively and individually. Although there were certainly pitfalls to trying to induce a widespread interest in decidedly 'cultural' pursuits, the ethic of popular participation and accessibility often overshadowed that of reverent appreciation. Money and support existed for what were clearly middlebrow projects.<sup>90</sup> This had been building through the mid-1950s with the publication of such items as the proceedings of a Canadian Westinghouse-sponsored conference on Canada's future and the suggestion that large cash prizes for achievement in the arts, letters and sciences should be established and awarded at a Grey Cup style festival.<sup>91</sup> The adult educators' manual for Shakespeare workshops condoned the adaptation of plays to local circumstances in order to draw wider audiences.<sup>92</sup> The publishing house that put out the *Canadian Commentator* also introduced its own encyclopedia, as well as the *Baxter Dictionary of Dates and Events* and a book it called the *Hexicon*, a six-language dictionary for businessmen, scholars and travellers.<sup>93</sup>

By the later 1950s, critics had for the most part welcomed or at least developed a tolerance towards compromise alternatives to the romance novel or the western movie, whether these flew the banner of quick edification or conscious Canadianism. Indeed, this general acceptance of middlebrow works as compatible with the struggle against a mass

culture that seemed to have no educational value, and compatible also with the cultural nationalist position favouring a Canadian idiom distinct from the larger North American one was a defining aspect of the field of cultural criticism in Canada during the later 1950s and early 1960s. John D. Robins' venture, the *Encyclopedia Canadiana*, debuted in 1957. It assembled, as one booster noted, "most of the essential information about our nation and our people."<sup>94</sup> It could be, at the same time, a product, a pathway to personal development, and an act of patriotic scholarship.

Whether a particular work or genre had 'blazed its own trail' or simply resorted to a convenient and profitable formula was an important consideration in distinguishing between art and kitsch.<sup>95</sup> In valuing works which purported to educate Canadians in an entertaining manner alongside those that were innovative or artistic in a more traditional sense, Canadian critics acknowledged this principle but also subverted it by seeking what were essentially nationalist ends. Supporting the popularization of folk and high cultures as an affirmation of selfhood and nationhood, they reflected a new conception of the cultural marketplace as corrupted, but redeemable. By 1963, courting the middlebrow aesthetic had matured as a strategy for binding together idealized personal and national identities. This was especially the case at the CBC where the goal had always been to provide more than entertainment, and where critics retained a heaping measure of direct and indirect influence.<sup>96</sup> One young public affairs host, Patrick Watson, summarized this spirit of compromise rather well, declaring: "we should arouse interest rather than just feed interests that have already been aroused."<sup>97</sup> When plans for a new nature television series were being discussed, its creative team worked at finding a way to present genuine scientific knowledge in an accessible manner. The group planning the series hoped to affect a higher tone by avoiding the formulaic treatment of animals, exemplified in "contrived story situations; anthropomorphism; meaningless music; fiction; characters; travelogue; human involvement

for its own sake." Still, the medium of television demanded that the programmes appeal to the viewer for whom they might be an initiation to the world of science, and that the treatment be a digest of the most important principles. One member of the group insisted that the "over-riding flavor will be utterly scientific, with complete reliance on subject matter and film quality to maintain entertainment values at a high pitch. (Need I remark that one can be utterly scientific and still be attractively colloquial and easy in style!)"<sup>98</sup> In undertaking to serve an audience whose own familiarity with a particular subject was limited, the producers of this programme nonetheless incorporated altered conceptions of high and low, of education and entertainment, that resembled those of the contemporary cultural critic.

Though the Cold War was rooted in ideological differences, the existential anxiety building since the end of World War II owed part of its menace to the image of scientific knowledge used in a destructive fashion. In the late 1950s, the "space race" and fears that the communist bloc was educating its scientists more efficiently than the Western nations further worried those already willing to side with U.S. President Eisenhower when he warned of a 'military-industrial complex', an alliance that he contended was interested primarily in keeping an uneasy peace.<sup>99</sup> It was a world in which a devastating war loomed. Large corporations controlled a larger portion of the economy, and had taken an unprecedented measure of control over the ways employees did their jobs or related to their co-workers. People seemed to while away greater proportions of their leisure time than ever.

American journalist and cultural critic Bernard Rosenberg was well aware of how the rest of the world viewed his homeland's dominant forms of entertainment in 1957, when he warned his readers not to blame capitalism, America or democracy for mass culture. "If one can hazard a single positive formulation," Rosenberg declared, "it would be that modern technology is the necessary and sufficient cause of mass culture." Claiming "[a]ll that really

matters is the most recent industrial revolution[.]” he described the trickling down of technology from advanced to less-advanced countries and their co-operative cultural great leap backward. For Rosenberg, it was clearly a bad time for any nation to be as technically competent as virtually the whole world had become, and he mused that “Maybe at a higher stage of development, society will be “ready” for industrialization, with consequences very different from those we see around us in the here and now. Meanwhile, change followed by barbarous accommodation proceeds at an accelerated tempo.”<sup>100</sup>

Although Canadian critics kept a close watch over a cultural arena charged with nationalist sentiment and were reluctant to appear uncompromisingly highbrow, their attention – like Rosenberg’s – sometimes turned to the larger economic and social forces that defined modern life; forces contributing to the milieu in which mass culture thrived. Since the Industrial Revolution, speculation about and concern over the effects of labour-saving or labour-reducing technology had accompanied such innovations. During the Second World War in Canada, opinion on the intrinsic value of increasing mechanization varied. Supporters of this process saw it as contributing to what would be only temporary bouts of unemployment or displacement, while detractors might link it with an excess of leisure time or the enervation of an entire generation of women.<sup>101</sup> Near the end of the war, artist Lawren Harris foresaw a society where “big business and mass production will efface all regional differences and smother the living creative effort of every individual[.]” and despaired that art and artists would suffer most.<sup>102</sup> Once peace returned, youth and the factory labourer were also at peril, not because they stood to inherit an increasingly comfortable – if monotonous – workplace, but because the ease of everyday life made ‘honest’ work less attractive and because keeping up with better and faster machines at work often proved debilitating.<sup>103</sup>

Just as the neighbourhood – even the wealthy neighbourhood exemplified in

*Crestwood Heights* – was a site of acculturation to modern social patterns, the modern workplace also came under fire as a hive of conformity. In 1956, the former editor of *Fortune* magazine, William H. Whyte, brought out his book on corporate culture, *The Organization Man*. For more than a decade, it remained an influential reading of the sort of work environment in which a growing number of Canadians found themselves. Along with the organization of people, the prospect of substantive changes to the nature of industrial employment in Canada alarmed several observers during the later 1950s and early 1960s. The one word likely to bring out fears of a bleak working future with further-attenuated avenues for creative input from the individual worker was *automation*.

Automation's pedigree as the offspring of modern life was impeccable, in that it entailed an entirely new degree of mechanical control over already highly-mechanized production processes. In purely practical terms, it represented a leap in what had been a gradual or predictably incremental process of technological change. Where the assembly line had broken down manufacturing into a series of repetitive tasks that were still performed by human operatives, automation proposed to take over even those tasks, leaving the responsibilities of overseeing and occasional maintenance to a much smaller workforce. Well before the Second World War began, a few concerned parties projected how increased mechanization would affect the number of jobs available in Canada's industrial sector. Opinion varied, usually according to the opinion holder's relation to the means of production, and the issue of displaced labour continued to crop up well after the term automation came into more frequent use by the mid 1950s.<sup>104</sup> The immense economic significance of this new way of producing both simple and complex goods remains notable, but our chief interest here is in automation's power to incite commentary from those critics for whom it conjured vivid images of social and cultural decay.

A term unheard of before 1948, automation was initially the target of satirists like

Mary Lowrey Ross and Eric Nicol, probably because it seemed to occupy far and fanciful horizons.<sup>105</sup> It was not until the mid-1950s that Canadian observers, along with their American and British counterparts, paid an appreciable amount of attention to automation or its implications. Within a decade, a number of monographs had been published on the subject, although none were of Canadian origin.<sup>106</sup> In 1956, poet and essayist Kildare Dobbs delivered one of the earliest blows against the automated society, identifying the difference between industry as it had developed and the coming age of automated industry in which the "only job left for men is watching the machines that watch the machines." Industrialists, according to Dobbs, had lately "convinced themselves that automation is going to set the mass of men free from drudgery and so free for higher things." Boredom, however, seemed more likely than a spontaneous rush to contemplate the nature of existence or create sublime works of literature. He cited the inadequacy of 'do-it-yourself' hobbies for filling the idle hours created by automation and portrayed the "problem of leisure" as one of the gravest threatening society. Finally, he charged his fellow artists with the task of leading the resistance:

Automation is the latest refinement in the relentless social machine and it is the artist's job to assert in his own person through his art that man is not just a blemish on his inventions. He is not just a spanner in the beautiful works, a nuisance, an inconvenient item of statistics, but ultimately and absolutely valuable, the master and not the slave of the automats.<sup>107</sup>

A few weeks earlier, the organization that brought intellectual heavyweights to the shores of Lake Couchiching every summer made automation the focus of its winter conference.<sup>108</sup> Participants discussed unemployment, education and the very question of how automated Canada was, or could become. In his contribution, Eugene Forsey responded to another participant's proposal that American and British corporations



automate some of their Canadian branch plants by likening such an experiment to "trying it on the dog in Canada[.]"<sup>109</sup> This sort of overt nationalism, however, was not as common in late 1950s and early 1960s discourse surrounding automation. Equipping workers for such fundamental change, even in their time away from the job, became a cultural concern. One group presenting to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting noted: "Automation points up the increased leisure we shall all have as our lives become increasingly mechanized. That this leisure can be enriched is obvious if we have a national radio and television network which part time at least will provide an adult education program geared to our interests and needs."<sup>110</sup> As J.R. Kidd of the CAAE suggested, North Americans were remarkably uniform in being ill-prepared for this latest industrial revolution, and a number of commentators agreed that the most urgent need was not distributing blame, but anticipating automation's latent consequences for the individual and the community.<sup>111</sup>

One leader in this regard, and probably most representative of a 'middle of the road' perspective was John A. Irving. He participated in the United Church of Canada's first approach to the issue during 1956-1957, lending another dimension to the Toronto Committee that was primarily concerned, not surprisingly, with how automation might affect the church and its mission. In addition to its affirmation of the Church's potential as a stabilizing force, the committee's report included part of an article Irving had contributed to *Saturday Night*.<sup>112</sup> In the unabridged version, "Can Machines Replace Minds?" Irving expended considerable effort familiarizing his readers with exactly what automation was by providing examples of its application and carefully defining the differences between it and more familiar forms of mechanization. His purpose, however, was to reassure readers that the machines themselves were only able to accomplish intricate tasks because humans had successfully designed them to do so. Improvements to manufacturing technology had not created a new independent will to rival the human mind.<sup>113</sup>

In spite of such reassurances, critics also viewed automation as a force that could undermine those aspects of the social order owing their stability to limited leisure or to a previously more gradual pace of change.<sup>114</sup> Some thought that under a new regime in which leisure time was more plentiful, peace of mind would be first to depart. "As automation carries him to opulence," Bruce Hutchison wrote half-satirically of the average modern, "he cannot suffer ease without a tranquilizer pill." He also reckoned that despite the nation's long tradition of harrowing work on various frontiers, "only a small minority" of Canadians possessed the fortitude to cope with "true leisure," an ideal state which might well include working at activities that gave one pleasure. Hutchison predicted that faced with utter boredom, the worker displaced by automation would rise up, throw off the bonds of idleness and discover his own mind, "a machine as surprising and novel to him, on first inspection, as a Russian rocket and much faster, with a wider orbit." What he called a revolt against leisure looked suspiciously like a rededication to cultural effort, a project that commentators like himself took rather more seriously than he let on here. "With our new machinery," Hutchison proclaimed, echoing a better-known emancipator, "the real question is not whether we can have more leisure – for we certainly can and will – but whether a civilization so conceived and so dedicated to leisure can long endure."<sup>115</sup>

Like Irving, Hutchison was, in a rather elliptical fashion, praising a moderate course of action where automation was concerned. He was also doing so for a middlebrow audience, an audience he believed would appreciate the paradox of automation and – more importantly – be mindful of the consumerist impulses that would accompany the further cheapening of mass-produced goods. Though examples of good design could conceivably find their way into more and more homes if their production was given over to the automated factory,<sup>116</sup> one of Julian Park's correspondents, Roy Daniells, had earlier portrayed the appliances and gadgets symbolic of material success as equally symbolic of a

different kind of servitude: “Our domestic machines may be labour saving, but they conduce, not to leisure, detachment and contemplation, but to involvement, manipulation, and pride of cumulative possession. They do not free their possessors.”<sup>117</sup>

Commentary from those who supported automation, though evocative of a new era of leisure, did little to dispel the critical notion that days spent “watching the machines that watched the machines” would be a blow to humanity. From the management side, columnist William Westley applauded the trend towards pliable and team-oriented workers, ready for shifting around in automated enterprises. Far from ignoring critical perspectives, he chose to see as a boon the shift from “the ‘compulsive man’ of industrial expansion to the ‘adjustive man’ of over-production” – a shift David Riesman described in *The Lonely Crowd*. Automation, Westley enthused, tended to promote the “development of character types who ‘can get along with others’, who can compromise and be good fellows even while being unpleasant.” He also noted William Whyte’s concern over “compulsive attention to the demands of the group, to the demands of the corporate family and our conformity to them,” but ultimately dismissed it by putting the onus on the modern executive to guide industry through what would be an inevitable series of changes:

All this could contain the seeds of our own destruction. Yet I am inclined to view the future optimistically. As the compelling effects of automation spread through industry, changing the jobs, changing the workers, altering the whole pattern of our society, today’s executive will need new skills to deal with a new challenge.<sup>118</sup>

The challenge for workers would be one of maintaining individuality as they moved still further from the craft ideal. However, if technology was to take over some of the industrial worker’s most distasteful tasks, more time and energy would be available for hobbies and one’s family. Despite the potential for more time at home, the perceived effects on family life of work in an automated plant were not all beneficial. Alastair MacLeod of

Montreal's Mental Hygiene Institute blamed the application of "machine values to living man" for removing healthy forms of stress from the industrial environment. Traditionally, the organization of the human family had allowed men to function as "aggressive, competitive, purposeful" providers and women to fill correspondingly deferential feminine roles. MacLeod explained how he saw the up-to-date working world defacing this delicate domestic picture:

Father no longer has opportunities for pursuing aggressive competitive goals openly at work. Some of his basic masculine needs remain unmet. Mother no longer feels she has a real man for a husband and becomes openly aggressive and competitive herself, even moving out of the home into industry in her efforts to restore the biological balance.<sup>119</sup>

The forty hour week had been achieved, and it looked as though father's time would be trimmed again in years to come. Having become somewhat more expendable at work, expendability threatened at home. Social worker R.S. Hosking, a prominent member of the United Church of Canada's Commission on Christian Marriage and Divorce, held out some hope, urging men to make the most of time at home by becoming reacquainted with their own families.<sup>120</sup> Though it did so diplomatically, the Commission presented automation, along with the trend towards women seeking work outside the home, as generally negative influences on family unity. Ultimately, these were only two of a host of pressures confronting Canadians, pressures that made marriage a much more difficult state to maintain:

Many things threaten marital fidelity and family integrity in our society. Desire for sexual gratification is over-stimulated by much of our mass advertising, popular entertainment and printed matter. Rapid urbanization, industrialization, and the increased mobility of population have transformed long established patterns of family relationships. Pre-occupation with material ambitions and personal enjoyment threaten more durable values in human relationships.<sup>121</sup>

This was certainly a familiar refrain for critics who saw the transformative, impersonal forces of economic 'progress' as the villain in family dramas, in the alienation of the individual, and in the automated workplace. Indeed, from the mid-fifties, an austere future symbolized most powerfully by automation and unbridled scientism gave rise to a number of dystopian visions broadcast on the CBC's more 'serious' radio and television drama series.<sup>122</sup> One of these, William Paluk's "Let the Machines Do It," was a comedy based upon the premise that humans would eventually take on some characteristics of the computers they had come to trust implicitly. It was only through a mechanical malfunction that the "molecular chain of efficiency" embodied in the world's vast computer network was broken, and the play's characters lapsed into what would seem, for early 1960s listeners, to be familiar human patterns of interaction.<sup>123</sup>

As a departure from the familiar and sometimes pleasurable rhythms of work, automation was certainly notable among the processes that constituted Canada's post-war modernization. Keeping pace with a creeping tide of automation in offices and plants throughout Canada, concern for the impact of these technological changes reached new heights during the early 1960s.<sup>124</sup> Having demonstrated its interest through the Toronto Committee in 1957, the United Church of Canada entered what had become a more developed discourse in 1964 when it resolved to create a full-scale Commission on Automation. The Commission's mandate was to encourage the just distribution of automation's fruits and promote the benevolent uses of leisure. With those ambitious goals in mind, it ran magazine ads declaring that "[t]he Christian task in these days of increasing automation is to bear active witness to these Christian principles, and so help to make sure that the onrushing robots mean a better life for all."<sup>125</sup> By the mid-1960s, cautionary voices inside and outside this intrepid band admitted that rapid technological change would

proceed with or without the approval of Canadian society's self-appointed guardians.<sup>126</sup> They could only hope, as historian W.L. Morton did, that the young adults of the 1960s would recognize themselves among the "first generation of humanity who will be fully mechanized, automated and electronicized." The direst cultural implication of this shift was that with the exception of the professional artist's work, the new generation's leisuretime pursuits might soon represent Canadian society's principal opportunity to define itself in full public view. Critics came to recognize that the working out of personal and collective identities would have to acknowledge the impact of automation upon the working lives of many Canadians. They did not, however, concede the struggle to mechanized and standardized cultural experiences, and hoped that presenting alternatives to those experiences would appeal to a basic sense of individuality, probably best identified as a middlebrow grasp of one's own place within a developing nation. Urging his audience to be mindful of the immense differences between man and machine, Morton alluded to a task that both he and they must undertake as individuals:

machines are not persons, and persons are not machines.  
Man was not made for the machine, but the machine for  
man. Sensibility, thought, love, these only men may possess,  
and never the most intricate computer. I do know the world  
has moved an enormous distance since I worked at Brandon  
College, and I also know that I still have a little work to do.<sup>127</sup>

Late in the summer of 1957, the same summer Diefenbaker's Progressive Conservatives managed a narrow victory over a flat-footed Liberal machine, *Macleans*' printed a translated excerpt from Gabrielle Roy's most recent novel, *Rue Deschambault*. Roy based the story loosely on her own childhood, and in one scene she recalled her mother's ability to remain in good spirits, regardless of the family's circumstances. One line read: "A hundred times a day Maman got a lift of joy from the world around us, sometimes it was

nothing more than the wind or the flight of a bird that delighted her." Roy's cheering memory, though fictionalized and set plainly in a bygone period, thoroughly vexed one reader. He wrote to the magazine's editors, asking:

How can Miss Roy write that tosh in this sixth decade of the twentieth century? ... The world around us is not the wind or the flight of a bird. It is the fearful energy of an atomic universe, it is hydrogen bombs, rockets, guided missiles, it is international tension and the threat of war, it is the danger of financial collapse and bankruptcy, it is the mechanization of life, it is the degradation of all spiritual values through the commercialism and popular entertainments of our time. It is the kind of environment that produces the angry man and the existentialist, characters so lamentably absent from Canadian writing. ... How could any intelligent person get a "lift of joy" from it?<sup>128</sup>

The brooding sense of doom present in this household encompassed several facets of life that had changed drastically for Canadians since the Second World War. The correspondent's disappointment at the state of the modern world – and Canadian literature's apparent inability to acknowledge it – existed side by side with hopes that the nation would soon manifest its own distinctive character. Unveiling that character, however, could no longer be a project managed without paying close attention to the changing face of modern life, or without employing the obviously persuasive media to engage the public anew each week by reconstructing Canada in an entertaining – but always uplifting – fashion.

Unsure themselves of what Canada had come to mean to its inhabitants, critics equated the fragmentation of experience at home and at work with an overall decline in cultural standards and social cohesion. One of the chief drawbacks of this fragmentation was that no new personal responsibilities seemed to be necessary for the maintenance of order. Nothing like a repressive bourgeois sensibility existed to check a hedonism made public through rites of consumption, or to oppose an empty leisure which appeared to exact little personal effort and promote little spiritual growth. The inner-directed society had

become other-directed, and critics believed that too much was going on for the average person to retain a measure of individuality without some benevolent guidance. Earlier in the 1950s, it seemed that cultural improvement was on the agenda to stay, and that a strategy of intervention in the matter of declining public tastes might meet with success. Faced with the task of learning what anthropologist Edmund Carpenter approvingly called the "new languages"<sup>129</sup> of the mass media, most critical observers were less sanguine as the 1950s continued.

They sensed a twofold loss. First, they feared that given the pressures they frequently defined as external to Canada, or at least external to an idealized Canadian sensibility which had not been allowed to develop, it would be difficult to maintain the drive for cultural improvement. In the climate of the Cold War, establishing an elevated common culture by allowing the public to choose freely from among a number of competing alternatives was advisable as a sound public relations tactic, but seemed unlikely given the strong competition such an ambition faced from the American cultural industries. With a shared language, and a host of other similarities linking the two countries, lowbrow cultural products became popular in English Canada for the same reason they were popular in the United States – because they appealed well enough to the average North American's tastes. The problem, as critics saw it, was that the only people with the power to improve tastes by offering a broader range of entertainments were the producers, advertisers and media corporations already complicit in the decline.

Second, the pattern of increasing anxiety critics saw accompanying further Canadian integration into a technocratic continental orbit worried those who were still hoping that the individual could take comfort in new leisure opportunities rather than looking "to corporate sources for the advancement of his interests, the satisfaction of his needs and the definition of his beliefs."<sup>130</sup> The convenors of 1963's Couchiching conference opened one session by



asking: "Have we, the children of the twentieth century, become enmeshed in the seaweed and algae of an ocean of doubt and perplexity?"<sup>131</sup> The specialization already required of workers who were newly threatened by automation was only one element contributing to critics' conviction that Canadians were already 'at sea.' It had become more difficult for individuals to establish values and tastes that were their own. Though observers had identified the pace of contemporary life as a source of anxiety before the turn of the century, this long familiarity had done little to diminish modernity's pernicious influence on the average person's psychological well-being and on fundamental social structures like the family. Maintaining their fascination with the broader context in which cultures existed and changed, several commentators (with the notable exception of Marshall McLuhan) contended during the later 1950s and into the 1960s that the complementary relationship between technology and mass distraction could lead only to weakened national and personal cultures consisting largely of the numbing selections available in the cultural marketplace.

Where reconstruction-era commentators welcomed highly-structured community-focused attempts to wean citizens away from passive leisure, and supporters of the Massey mission greeted localized aspirations towards a humanist high culture with approval, many in the band of critics active during the late 1950s and early 1960s recognized a kind of accessible exceptionalism as a reasonably reliable path – though admittedly more roundabout than blind patriotism – towards a Canadian identity. Those concerned about how modern Canadians coped with new pressures, social trends and cultural developments had been refining their own understandings of what it took to maintain a healthy self-concept since well before the Second World War. They began to recognize during the later 1950s that it was pragmatic to engage in nationalist or middlebrow strategies, which seemed more democratic or inclusive than conformity to highbrow standards. A melding of the assumptions surrounding nationalism and democracy characterized the later 1950s and early

1960s. These assumptions – first that Canada was a nation whose exposure to American mass culture had kept it from some important date with self-discovery, and second that the remedy for this situation could only come through widespread acknowledgement of the undemocratic nature of that process – complemented each other. Within reasonably edifying cultural productions, critics found elements of the active individual type and linked these with an emerging identity-focused nationalism. In addition to maintaining their praise for high or folk cultural forms, a number of critics came to recognize that supporting self-consciously Canadian efforts at popular enlightenment would seem less authoritarian than ‘shoving Culture down people’s throats’ and might draw the moderately-educated, middle-income middle manager disenchanted with his anonymity into the struggle for a nation impervious to low cultural influences.

As national secretary for *Citizens’ Forum* near the end of World War II, a hopeful George Grant saw an opportunity to model meaningful participation in community affairs through radio listening groups – a promising marriage of old ends and new means. By the early 1960s, Grant could point to what he considered a disturbing relationship between technology and Canada’s contemporary scene, observing that “as we move to greater technological mastery (a movement that can only be stopped by war) the most pressing social questions will call forth judgments as to which activities realize our full humanity and which inhibit it.” To Grant, and to others eager for the nation to become an example of “full humanity,” conformity, alienation and the disintegration of community and family were dark clouds behind the more visible silver lining of Canada’s post-war economic growth, and activities that built the good society still had to be separated from those that threatened it. In addition to proclaiming his determination to humanize urban life, to restore a creative element to the world of work, and to balance individualism and order, Grant asked:

How can we stimulate education (in its broadest sense) so that the new leisure will be more than a new boredom of passive acquiescence in pleasures arranged by others? How can we see that in rightfully cultivating the fullest equality we do not produce a society of mediocrity and sameness rather than of quality and individuality?<sup>132</sup>

In a period that featured the arrival and entrenchment on the Canadian scene of such significant agents of change as automation and television, the problems of authority and influence remained central for critics. Just as industrial automation was part of an inexorable process of modernization with which labour and social activists would have to cope, cultural critics found their own options limited. Though they professed to be democrats, some clung to the assumption that given more leisure and no guidance, the Canadian public would choose unwittingly from among the worst of the alternatives open to them. Even given the unprecedented state interest in culture beginning earlier in the decade, critics could not assert any right or privilege to police entertainments or lifestyles without appearing reactionary and anti-progressive. The trap of bland, secure employment and a limited culture was well-constructed, and very much resembled the one reputed to house so many of our American cousins. Indeed, one of the editors of a well-known American collection of contemporary essays on mass culture suggested that instead of effecting a democratization of cultural opportunity, mass culture had severely limited the range of human activity. He noted that: "A genuine esthetic (or religious or love) experience becomes difficult, if not impossible, whenever *kitsch* pervades the atmosphere." He went on to proclaim, more artfully than any Canadian critic of those years, that "only the genuine experience, as Flaubert realized, can satisfy us. It presupposes effortful participation."<sup>133</sup> Though not reduced to such a convenient epigram in this country, devotion to the idea of *effort* as a foundation of worthy experience remained as strong or perhaps even stronger among Canadian commentators. By the early 1960s, several of them had been longstanding

supporters of cultural forms which required at least some effort of the audience, and continued to identify these as antidotes to commercial culture.<sup>134</sup> Such thought-provoking works could also provide an antidote to the whirl of modern life, and would help to determine more fairly than box-office receipts what sort of culture best characterized or suited Canadians.

The concluding section of Chapter Three suggested rather briefly that, compared to the decade or so immediately following the Second World War, the later part of the 1950s in Canada housed more profound concern about technology's social and cultural implications. Though it was only coined in the late 1940s, *automation*, a term most properly defined as "the automatic control of the manufacture of a product through its successive stages,"<sup>135</sup> had acquired a greater currency and a broader meaning by the mid-1950s. In addition to the speculation arising about its consequences for the labour market, the spectre of automation prompted questions about its potential to alter roles within the family, and about what further leisure time might mean for those people already believed to be using their time off unproductively. Automation, as interpreted by a group more favourably disposed towards the craft ideal, meant not only a loss of control over even the simplest elements in the production process, but a transformation of work and working culture that would leave only consumers and machine-minders in its wake.

Founded upon an aversion to the notions of advertising or marketing culture in what was considered the American style, critics' own preferences for leisuretime listening, viewing or reading – make it complex or educational, make it about ourselves as Canadians or about the human condition – outlined a bill of goods that would hardly sell itself. These preferences were of long standing by the late 1950s and early 1960s, so the most notable aspect of critics' approach to the threat of mass culture at the time was that they did not dismiss ways of making the fruits of art, literature and scholarship more convenient and

entertaining. A willingness to link self-improvement with a decorous patriotism, and most importantly to do so in magazines, on radio, and on television spoke to a softening of old prejudices. Journalist Blair Fraser wrote of *Maclean's* editorial strategy: "We think of a *Maclean's* reader as an intelligent person in a relaxed mood, and a great deal of what we offer is intended only for his entertainment and not for his improvement. However, we have serious purposes. We want to report Canada and the world to Canadians through Canadian eyes."<sup>136</sup> Of course, endeavours like the Stratford Festival remained laudable as institutions requiring the individual to pay close attention, but, relative to the mass media, these drew small audiences. Given a public unable to afford tickets to events such as live theatre on a regular basis, making the critique of mass culture part of the discourses of nationalism and self-respect, and making it more accessible via convenient means of communication marked a notable transition from what seemed the relative elitism of the Massey era only a few years earlier.

Cultural interchange between nations, for good or ill, had been present long before mass communication was practicable. Canada in the late 1950s, as a member of the United Nations, NATO and the Commonwealth, could not afford to cut itself off from a culturally rich and diverse, but increasingly troubled world. As Malcolm Ross put it:

If no man is an island, no culture is an island in the day of Sputnik and the ICBM. But long before these dreadful signs of our littleness and our oneness had appeared in the heavens, the intermesh of the national cultures was far advanced. Communication does not always beget communion. But at least now under the same dark sky, we can huddle together in a jiffy and, from Rome to New York, Toronto to Tokyo, trade our terrors and forge our hope.<sup>137</sup>

Observers like Ross saw value in looking outside Canada for spiritual as well as artistic reasons, while at the same time making certain that our own cultural credentials were displayed to their best advantage.<sup>138</sup> Julian Park's observation about the CBC and its "duty"

only hinted at the environment Canadian entertainers inhabited; an environment at least partially of the critics' creation. Holding acts which were Canadian in origin in special esteem, they were also adamant that these be aimed at an audience with relatively mature tastes. If performers, writers or artists sought a measure of critical approval at home, their work had to exhibit something of a cerebral quality, employing themes that were somewhat complex, illustrating some aspect of the Western tradition or presenting some episode of Canadian history. Even Canadian television comedians, remarked Mary Lowrey Ross, did not "sit down on freshly painted benches, or involve themselves with wild loops of pizza dough[.]"<sup>139</sup> Whether this was a folkway – as she argued – or the result of a perceived need to provide entertainment clearly divergent in character from an American model, critics' identification of intrinsic cultural value with the rejection of slapstick and formulaic sentiment did not mean that only the 'best' or most 'authentic' books, films or dances would do. It took until the early 1960s, however, for a pattern of compromise – today more familiar and institutionalized in CBC production values, Canadian content regulations and numerous other aspects of cultural policy and practice – to emerge. While nationalist sentiment undoubtedly played a part in prompting some Canadian observers to portray American cowboy films and teen music idols as the uninvited Other, so too did disdain for the perceived vacuity of mass culture reinforce the will to produce or encourage more meaningful – and homegrown – alternatives. The question of whether critics were nationalists first or highbrows all along is moot when we consider that both these points of view ultimately influenced their critique.

## Conclusion

When he looked back upon a life spent encouraging continuous learning and determined self-improvement, adult educator Ned Corbett thought it fitting to close his memoir with a statement of what he called “my own belief.”<sup>1</sup> Instead of a time-worn maxim reminiscent of his Nova Scotia birthplace or of the raw Northern Alberta homestead country where he spent much of his early career, Corbett selected a short passage from one of E.M. Forster’s essays written at the beginning of the Second World War. There Forster – and by association Corbett – described the sort of exclusive group with which he would gladly identify, even in an age known for its attachment to democratic rhetoric:

I believe in aristocracy – not an aristocracy of power, based upon rank and influence, but an aristocracy of the sensitive, the considerate and the plucky. Its members are found in all nations and classes and through all ages, and there is a secret understanding between them when they meet. They represent the true human tradition, the one permanent victory of our queer race over cruelty and chaos.<sup>2</sup>

As a title for the collection in which the same essay would appear twelve years later, Forster chose *Two Cheers for Democracy*. This choice reflected both enthusiasm for the potential bounty of modern life and dissatisfaction with its unpleasant outcomes, two sentiments also present in the circumspect attitude of the English-Canadian cultural critic at mid-century. Convinced of the desirability of social equality, critical observers nonetheless bemoaned the proliferation of a culture based on amusing a mass public. They cited a shortage of eccentric citizens – a shortage that some thought might be overcome by cultivating audiences who would “respect leisure and reflective idleness[.]”<sup>3</sup> This was not merely an

admonition to leave Dad alone once he lit his pipe and settled down with the evening newspaper. It was part of a more complex critique of post-war Canadian society; a society in which most people seemed to demand little of themselves culturally, even though the technological changes characterizing their contemporary environment afforded them the leisure to engage in a variety of pastimes even their parents had found too expensive or distant a generation earlier. In the wartime and post-war years, Canada was becoming a modern nation, but placing all one's trust in scientists and rejecting old ties seemed foolish to many commentators. To be appropriately modern was to "look at things in their relations" just as women's columnist Adeline Haddow suggested her wartime readership do when choosing furniture. "Lovely to have heirlooms," she declared, "but terrible to have nothing but heirlooms!"<sup>4</sup>

Much as early twentieth-century social reformers feared the effects of industrial "trusts," by the time World War II began English-Canadian cultural critics were well-placed to recognize the economies of scale present in broadcasting, film distribution, and publishing on the North American continent. Considerations of national self-determination aside, they were acutely sensitive to how changes in communications technology had helped create an alternative reality against which artistic triumphs, pressing issues in a community (locality, region or nation), or even the routines of daily life seemed unable to compete. As one irate journalist complained: "Sales clerks ignore one while practising quiz answers to themselves."<sup>5</sup> Especially after the war ended, modern life offered comforts and diversions – bread and circuses – that worked to pull the public away from an ethic of production set both implicitly and explicitly against a newer consumerist paradigm. Faced daily with the gulf between producer and consumer, between individual and mass, between culture and entertainment, critics' efforts likewise reflected the evolution of a twofold strategy.

First, in an era marked by the state's further incursion into the field of social welfare,



it was not terribly incongruous to see the state as a force in the realm of culture, and cultural critics played an instrumental role as advisors to what has customarily been portrayed as a largely nationalist project. The CBC, with its potential to counteract the market by offering deliberately educational or Canadian content became – and remains – an important vehicle for reminding Canadians of the world outside the entertainment ‘industry,’ even though the corporation itself has had to compete in this same field. Second, while the prospect of bringing high culture to every small town appeared to be expensive and rather artificial in light of the mass audience’s attachment to being given ‘what it wanted,’ critics looked to an elevated common culture not as a consolation prize but as a corollary of unmasking the conformity and false democracy of the cultural marketplace. Reconciled to the fact that a nation’s cultural landscape could not be remade by *fiat*, critics urged Canadians to become selective and intelligent consumers of culture. This middlebrow sensibility took a firmer hold late in the 1950s and had become firmly entrenched by the time the nation celebrated its Centennial in 1967.

The optimism of late wartime led critics and social activists to envision conditions in which an idealized public sphere<sup>6</sup> could counteract the community-destroying forces of modern life. One enthusiastic observer made no secret of his hopes: “New channels of personal and social expression are desperately needed; trickles have already appeared for these channels. Dare we hope that the flood will follow, and that a mild renaissance of social and cultural expression is in the offing?”<sup>7</sup> We have tended to think of figures like Matthew Arnold as the heroes of a Canadian elite, the sort of group for whom the Massey Commission represented great progress along the path towards cultural maturity.<sup>8</sup> Yet, inside and outside such undertakings as the commission or the community centre movement during wartime, the act of drawing attention to the effects of modern life and mass culture constituted an implicit questioning of progress itself. Critics were slow to notice the

symptoms and often reluctant to alter their courses of treatment, but ‘culture fatigue’ was a common ailment. Helping the public discover its own history and literature via television or to ask difficult questions about modern life effectively replaced the drive to bring about a highbrow revival – a project that remained perpetually difficult to present as democratic. One newspaper writer surveying the early 1960s scene preferred to let matters resolve themselves, damning the venerable Couchiching Conference and beat poetry by conflating them, and embracing the television Western by default: “Away, away with the lot of you, and take your berets and sandals with you. Better Paladin with his black hat than Stanley Knowles with no tie.”<sup>9</sup>

Doug Owram has written that “No phrase had more power or meaning in the 1960s than ‘participatory democracy.’”<sup>10</sup> While the generation he studied was one that dressed for dissent and set its rebellion to a soundtrack, we should not conclude that the 1940s or 1950s were somehow without their agitators. Cultural critics were democrats, committed to democratic instincts and institutions, but they could hardly trust the system – as it had unfolded – to serve what they believed were the intangible best interests of the people. They recognized by the mid 1950s that their mission was to oversee a common culture into which traditions and fads alike must be incorporated. Northrop Frye outlined the problem of cultural criticism as one of brokering an uneasy accommodation between taste and authority:

Democracy is a mixture of majority rule and minority right, and the minority which most clearly has a right is the minority of those who try to resist a passive response, and thereby risk the resentment of those who regard them as trying to be undemocratically superior. I am speaking however not so much of two groups of people as of two mental attitudes, both of which may exist in the same mind.<sup>11</sup>

To possess the impulse to be oneself and yet strive for improvement is likewise a

contradiction that can nonetheless drive a person or an entire nation to “face risks and make experiments that we would not venture upon under any other circumstances.”<sup>12</sup> Studying the way cultural critics tried to reconcile their conflicting instincts is to take part in mapping the allusions and memories that defined Canada’s self-concept in the generation or so during and after the Second World War. As for English Canada as we have known it since the 1960s, its common culture remains informed by those frustrated observers who professed to have a profound understanding of the way modern life and mass culture reinforced one another and who sought to impart that perspective via radio and other mass means. They articulated their immediate impressions of this process in ways the larger society – having reduced these impressions to convenient formulae like those in which 1967 becomes the ‘last good year’<sup>13</sup> – can now only clumsily imitate.

## Notes

### Introduction

<sup>1</sup> John R. Seeley, R. Alexander Sim and E.W. Loosley, *Crestwood Heights: A Study of the Culture of Suburban Life* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press [hereafter UTP], 1956), 14.

<sup>2</sup> Allan Greer, "Canadian History: Ancient And Modern," *Canadian Historical Review* 77 (December 1996): 575-590.

<sup>3</sup> Stephen Azzi, *Walter Gordon and the Rise of Canadian Nationalism* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999); Morris Zaslow, *The Northward Expansion of Canada, 1914-1967* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, [hereafter M&S] 1988); John Richards and Larry Pratt, *Prairie Capitalism: Power and Influence in the New West* (Toronto: M&S, 1979). Surveys include: Alvin Finkel, *Our Lives: Canada after 1945* (Toronto: J. Lorimer, 1997); Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond, and John English, *Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics and Provincialism*, rev. ed. (Toronto: UTP, 1989); J.L. Granatstein, *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation* (Toronto: M&S, 1986); John English, *Years of Growth, 1948-1967* (Toronto: Grolier, 1986); Donald Grant Creighton, *The Forked Road: Canada, 1939-1957* (Toronto: M&S, 1976).

<sup>4</sup> There are many regimental chronicles and soldier recollections, of which George Blackburn, *Where the Hell Are the Guns?: A Soldier's View of the Anxious Years, 1939-44* (Toronto: M&S, 1997) is probably one of the more well-written. More recent academic treatments include: Desmond Morton, *Victory 1945: Canadians From War To Peace* (Toronto: HarperCollins, 1995); W.A.B. Douglas, *Out of the Shadows: Canada in the Second World War* (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1995); J.L. Granatstein and Peter Neary, eds., *The good fight: Canadians and World War II* (Mississauga, ON: Copp Clark, 1995); David Bercuson, *Maple Leaf Against the Axis: Canada's Second World War* (Toronto: Stoddart, 1995); Granatstein, *Canada's War: The Politics of the Mackenzie King Government, 1939-1945* (Toronto: UTP, 1990 [1975]) and *A Nation Forged in Fire: Canadians and the Second World War, 1939-1945* (Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1989). Two accounts that present less 'official' sides of war are: Terry Copp, *Battle Exhaustion: Soldiers and Psychiatrists in the Canadian Army, 1939-1945* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990); Ruth Roach Pierson, *They're Still Women After All: The Second World War and Canadian Womanhood* (Toronto: M&S, 1986).

<sup>5</sup> Eva Mackey, *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999); Kenneth McRoberts, *Misconceiving Canada: The Struggle for National Unity* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1997) and *Beyond Quebec: Taking Stock of Canada* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995); Stephen G. Tomblin, *Ottawa and the Outer Provinces: the Challenge of Regional Integration in Canada* (Toronto: Lorimer, 1995); William D. Gairdner, *Constitutional Crack-up: Canada and the Coming Showdown With Quebec* (Toronto: Stoddart, 1994); Robert Chodos, *The Unmaking of Canada: The Hidden Theme in Canadian History since 1945* (Toronto: Lorimer, 1991); Michael Oliver, *The Passionate Debate: the Social and Political Ideas of Quebec Nationalism, 1920-1945* (Montreal: Véhicule Press, 1991); Peter Brimelow, *The Patriot Game: Canada and the Canadian Question Revisited* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1986); George Melnyk, *Radical Regionalism* (Edmonton: NeWest Press, 1981).

<sup>6</sup> J.L. Granatstein is perhaps most representative of historians concerned primarily with the distribution of money and power via state cultural agencies. See his: "Culture and Scholarship: The First Ten Years of the Canada Council," *Canadian Historical Review* 65(4) (September 1984): 441-474, and George

Woodcock, *Strange Bedfellows: The State and The Arts in Canada* (Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1985); Bernard Ostry, *The Cultural Connection: An Essay on Culture and Government Policy in Canada* (Toronto: M&S, 1978)

<sup>7</sup> Mary Vipond identifies this elite as a force binding literary and artistic nationalists together during the 1920s. Vipond, "The Nationalist Network: English Canada's Intellectuals and Artists in the 1920s," *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* V (Spring 1980): 32-52. See also her 1974 PhD dissertation from the University of Toronto: "National Consciousness in English-speaking Canada in the 1920's: Seven Studies." Thus far, the only monograph on the multi-faceted activity in this field is Maria Tippett, *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts before the Massey Commission* (Toronto: UTP, 1990)

<sup>8</sup> Jonathan Vance, *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning, and the First World War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997); Keith Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture* (Toronto: UTP, 1997); Lynne Marks, *Revivals and Roller Rinks: Religion, Leisure, and Identity in Late-Nineteenth-Century Small Town Ontario* (Toronto: UTP, 1996); David Monod, *Store Wars: Shopkeepers and The Culture of Mass Marketing, 1890-1939* (Toronto: UTP, 1996)

<sup>9</sup> Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, *A Full-orbed Christianity: the Protestant Churches and Social Welfare in Canada, 1900-1940* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996); Doug Owram, *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945* (Toronto: UTP, 1986); Ramsay Cook, *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada* (Toronto: UTP, 1985); James Struthers, *No Fault of Their Own: Unemployment and the Canadian Welfare State, 1914-1941* (Toronto: UTP, 1983)

<sup>10</sup> Notable exceptions are two works by sociologists: Mary Louise Adams, *The Trouble With Normal: Postwar Youth and the Making of Heterosexuality* (Toronto: UTP, 1997) and Peter Li, *The Making of Post-war Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1996). Other helpful studies include Reg Whitaker and Gary Marcuse, *Cold War Canada: The Making of a National Insecurity State, 1945-1957* (Toronto: UTP, 1994); Paul Rutherford, *When Television Was Young: Primetime Canada, 1952-1967* (Toronto: UTP, 1990).

<sup>11</sup> William Christian's *George Grant: A Biography* (Toronto: UTP, 1993) is the central work. Graeme Patterson, *History and Communications: Harold Innis, Marshall McLuhan, the Interpretation of History* (Toronto: UTP, 1990); Philip Marchand, *Marshall McLuhan: The Medium and the Messenger* (New York, Ticknor and Fields, 1989); Arthur Kroker, *Technology and the Canadian Mind: Innis/McLuhan/Grant* (Montreal: New World Perspectives, 1984)

<sup>12</sup> Maria Tippett, *Making Culture*, see especially Chapter Six. In her *Art at the Service of War: Canada, Art, and the Great War* (Toronto: UTP, 1984) Tippett portrays WWI as an earlier catalyst in Canadian cultural development.

<sup>13</sup> Paul Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission* (Toronto: UTP, 1992)

<sup>14</sup> Ian McKay, *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), on construction of the Folk ideal, see pp. 301-302.

<sup>15</sup> A.B. McKillop, "Culture, Intellect, and Context," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 24(3) (Fall 1989): 12.

<sup>16</sup> Doug Owram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby Boom Generation* (Toronto: UTP, 1996). See also John Kettle, *The Big Generation* (Toronto: M&S, 1980); Robert Collins, *You Had To Be There: An Intimate Portrait of the Generation That Survived the Depression, Won the War, and Re-invented Canada* (Toronto: M&S, 1997)

<sup>17</sup> Keith Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture* (Toronto: UTP, 1997): 191.

<sup>18</sup> Jonathan Vance, *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning, and the First World War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997), 6.

<sup>19</sup> E.M. Forster, "What I Believe," (1939) in *Two Cheers For Democracy* (London: Edward Arnold, 1951), 82-83.

<sup>20</sup> A.B. McKillop, "Nationalism, Identity and Canadian Intellectual History," in McKillop, *Contours of*

*Canadian Thought* (Toronto: UTP, 1987), 6. This essay was originally published in 1974.

<sup>21</sup> Nicholas Brown, *Governing Prosperity: Social change and social analysis in Australia in the 1950s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

<sup>22</sup> One wartime writer referred to a group outside the political power base: "not so much those upon whom rests the responsibility of conducting the present war, but those individuals whose position entitles them to public hearing and public respect, and whose prominence enables them to be powerful factors in the shaping of public opinion. This tendency is showing itself not only among political figures, but among people eminent in education, in literature, in business and in religion." J.S.B. Macpherson, "Where Does Canada Stand in the World of Future?" *Saturday Night* [hereafter *SN*] (13 February 1943): 6.

<sup>23</sup> Northrop Frye, *The Modern Century: The Whidden Lectures 1967* (Toronto: UTP, 1967), 29.

<sup>24</sup> T.J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture 1880-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994) [originally published 1983], xvii.

<sup>25</sup> Andrew Ross, *No Respect: Intellectuals and Popular Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 5.

<sup>26</sup> D.L. LeMahieu, *A Culture for Democracy: Mass Communication and the Cultural Mind in Britain Between the Wars* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 103.

<sup>27</sup> Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), 12.

<sup>28</sup> Quotation from: Anna Siomopoulous, "Entertaining ethics: Technology, mass culture and American intellectuals of the 1930s," *Film History* 11(1) (1999): 48. Richard Pells, *Radical Visions and American Dreams: Culture and Social Thought in the Depression Years* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1984).

<sup>29</sup> Callaghan to Robert T. McKenzie, 12 February 1943. NAC, CBC, RG 41 Vol. 187, file 11-18-5, part 5, CBC broadcasts on Citizens' Forum: "Of Things To Come".

<sup>30</sup> Vipond, "The Nationalist Network," 34.

<sup>31</sup> John Coulter, "Books and Shows," Talk number seven, Second series, 5 January 1943. McM, John Coulter Papers, Box 36, f. 2.

<sup>32</sup> Barry Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism: The Intellectual Legacy of Adam Shortt, O.D. Skelton, W.C. Clark, and W.A. Mackintosh, 1890-1925* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993), 233.

<sup>33</sup> Paul R. Gorman, *Left Intellectuals and Popular Culture in Twentieth-century America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 10.

<sup>34</sup> Jackson Lears, *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 126.

<sup>35</sup> Gary Cross, ed., *Worktowners at Blackpool: Mass-Observation and popular leisure in the 1930s* (London: Routledge, 1990), 1, 161.

<sup>36</sup> Marshall Berman, *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982). Likewise, Charles Taylor notes how modernity can be seen with equal validity in two ways, as more intense in the years since World War II or as a process operating since the seventeenth century. Charles Taylor, *The Malaise of Modernity* (Toronto: CBC/Anansi, 1991), 1.

<sup>37</sup> E.A. Corbett, "Adult Education," typescript, (1938), 3. NAC, Robert Alexander Sim Papers, MG 30 D 260, Vol. 11, file 11, Canadian Association for Adult Education [hereafter CAAE], correspondence, minutes, pamphlets. The late-nineteenth century understanding of modern life seemed ambivalent and self-serving in prompting such uses of the term as: "in these remote districts the rush of modern life and thought had not as yet induced that feverish restlessness, which is the bane of our nineteenth century life." Maud Ogilvy, *The Keeper of the Bic Light House: A Canadian Story of To-day* (Montreal: E.M. Renouf, 1891), 64; "a mass of little luxuries – trifles too light and various to be describable, all the nameless inelegancies of modern life, with its superfluities, its pretence of intellect, its discriminating taste." G.M. Robins, *The Tree of Knowledge* (Montreal: John Lovell and Son, [1890]), 317; "how much less does the habitual drinker care for pictures, music, books, lectures, and a

hundred similar features of the best modern life than the man who abstains from alcoholic poison?" Lilian M. Heath, comp., *Platform Pearls for Temperance workers and Other Reformers* (Toronto, 1896), 125.

<sup>38</sup> Richard D. Brown, *Modernization: The Transformation of American Life, 1600-1865* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1976), 12-14. Leo Charney and Vanessa R. Schwartz, "Introduction," in Charney and Schwartz, eds., *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995): 1-12.

<sup>39</sup> Warren I. Susman, "Culture and Commitment," in *Culture As History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 187. Matei Calinescu wrote of "bourgeois modernity," which included: "The doctrine of progress, the confidence in the beneficial possibilities of science and technology, the concern with time (a measurable time, a time that can be bought and sold and therefore has, like any other commodity, a calculable equivalent in money), the cult of reason, and the ideal of freedom defined within the framework of abstract humanism, but also the orientation toward pragmatism and the cult of action and success[.]" Matei Calinescu, *Faces of Modernity: Avant-Garde, Decadence and Kitsch* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1977): 41-42.

<sup>40</sup> Charney and Schwartz, *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life*, 5. Salvador Giner, *Mass Society* (London: Martin Robertson, 1976), 166ff.

<sup>41</sup> A. L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions* (New York: Vantage, 1952), 291. Raymond Williams calls culture "one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language. Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (London: Fontana/Croom Helm, 1976), 76. Julian Park offered: "The culture of the English-speaking Canadian is simply the recorded reflection of his way of life and his attitude toward it." Julian Park, ed., *The Culture of Contemporary Canada* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1957), v. The Canada Council saw culture as "activities and interests that go beyond supplying the basic requirements of existence and give to it beauty, pleasure and meaning, and so interwoven with everyday life as to be inseparable." Canada Council, *The Canada Council and the Arts* (Ottawa, 1959).

<sup>42</sup> Rutherford applies this definition regardless of "whether the creator and/or distributor is a private company (Canada's Wonderland), a public corporation, (the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation), or even a voluntary association (a parent-teacher association). He also *implicitly* contrasts 'high' culture with a mass culture "accessible to very large numbers of people, unlike opera, much scholarship, and even folk art." Paul Rutherford, "Made in America: The Problem of Mass Culture in Canada," in David H. Flaherty and Frank E. Manning, eds., *The Beaver Bites Back?: American Popular Culture in Canada* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University, 1993), 260-261. In his defence of popular culture, sociologist Herbert Gans bemoaned the power of the traditional definition of mass culture as the "symbolic products used by the 'uncultured' majority." Gans, *Popular Culture and High Culture* (New York: Basic Books, 1974), 10.

<sup>43</sup> Chandra Mukerji and Michael Schudson, *Rethinking Popular Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 3. Ray Browne defined popular culture rather broadly, as that which "embraces all levels of our society and culture other than the Elite – the 'popular,' 'mass' and 'folk.' It includes most of the bewildering aspects of life which hammer us daily." Ray B. Browne, "Popular Culture: Notes Toward a Definition," in George H. Lewis, ed. *Side-Saddle on the Golden Calf: Social Structure and Popular Culture in America* (Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear, 1972), 10.

<sup>44</sup> Some of the best-known critics and students of culture in the US "alternately" used the terms *mass culture*, *popular culture*, and *kitsch* to refer to "television, radio, Hollywood movies, mass-market paperback books, most advertising, and other mass-produced goods and art." Neil Jumonville, *Critical Crossings: The New York Intellectuals in Postwar America* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991), 151.

<sup>45</sup> In 1960, Irving Kristol presented popular culture as a class-specific entity that had recently vanished, and mass culture as a pervasive and often invasive environment in which all of us live. Irving Kristol, "Democracy and Mass Culture: High, low, and modern," *Manchester Guardian* (8 June 1960). Raymond Williams wrote that one "cannot describe the bulk of this material produced by the new means of communication as

'working-class culture'. For neither is it by any means produced exclusively for this class, nor, in any important degree, is it produced by them." Williams, *Culture and Society 1780-1950* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1958), 319-320.

<sup>46</sup> Among the better works addressing these themes are: Leon Hunt, *British Low Culture: from Safari Suits to Sexploitation* (London: Routledge, 1998); Jackson Lears, *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1994); Arthur Marwick, *Culture in Britain since 1945* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991); John Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991 [1989]); Michael Denning, *Mechanic Accents: Dime Novels and Working-Class Culture in America* (New York: Verso, 1987); Kathy Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working-Class Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the Century New York* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986); James Gilbert, *A Cycle of Outrage: America's Reaction to the Juvenile Delinquent in the 1950s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Janice Radway, *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1984); Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours For What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City 1870-1920* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: the Meaning of Style* (London: Methuen, 1979). For articles, see Dominic Strinati and Stephen Wagg, eds., *Come On Down?: the Politics of Popular Media Culture in Post-war Britain* (London: Routledge, 1992); 'Forum' on popular culture in *American Historical Review* 97(5) (December 1992); and Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, eds. *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain* (London: Hutchinson, 1976).

<sup>47</sup> David Paul Nord, "An Economic Perspective on Formula in Popular Culture," *Journal of American Culture* 3 (Spring 1980): 25-27.

<sup>48</sup> Lawrence W. Levine, "The Folklore of Industrial Society: Popular Culture and Its Audiences," *American Historical Review* 97(5) (December 1992): 1380-1381. [I believe one of the first uses of the phrase "folklore of industrial society" is in Marshall McLuhan's *The Mechanical Bride*.] Levine's *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1988) presents the 'sacralization' of culture and the imposition of hierarchies upon it around the beginning of the previous century. Michael Kammen's *American Culture, American Tastes: Social Change and the 20<sup>th</sup> Century* (New York: Knopf, 1999) addresses a more recent critical embrace of popular culture. Andrew Ross emphasizes the oppositional power of popular culture. This perspective, he argues, improves upon the "more well-known, conspiratorial view of "mass culture" as imposed upon a passive populace like so much standardized fodder, doled out to quell unrest and to fuel massive profits." Andrew Ross, *No Respect*, 4.

<sup>49</sup> Levine, "Folklore of Industrial Society," 1381.

<sup>50</sup> John Carey, *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1880-1939* (London: Faber and Faber, 1992), 210. Daniel LeMahieu notes that cultivated elites in early twentieth-century Britain shared a "fundamental allegiance to the notion of cultural hierarchy," and that "few intellectuals challenged the centrality of this concept." LeMahieu, *A Culture for Democracy*, 103.

<sup>51</sup> Dr. J.M. Ewing, "Our New Leisure," Seventh in the series *Our Changing Values*, broadcast 22 September 1948, CBC Trans-Canada Network, 5-6. Neil M. Morrison Papers, NAC, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 28, Public Affairs Scripts Broadcast 1943-51.

<sup>52</sup> George Grant, *Philosophy in the Mass Age*, ed. William Christian (Toronto: UTP, 1995 [originally published 1959]), 6.

<sup>53</sup> "The early-twentieth-century conservatives said no to modern painting, or to stream-of-consciousness fiction, or to Coolidge prosperity, or to the New Deal so often that they seemed unable to say yes to anything. ... In fact, the conservatives valued many things, ... religion, the classics, church architecture, useless knowledge, beauty, and the land, and they desperately wanted the world to stop wasting time, money, and energy on destructive diversions and to get on with the really important things in life." Robert M. Crunden, "Introduction," in Robert M. Crunden, ed., *The Superfluous Men: Conservative Critics of American Culture, 1900-1945* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1977): xi-xx.



<sup>54</sup> As Patrick Brantlinger notes: "Democratization was to be made effective through universal education and an extension of industrial prosperity to all classes and nations. But the change would occur through the elevation of the 'the lower orders' or 'masses' toward the standard of living of the upper classes rather than through the 'leveling' of those upper classes. ... 'culture' became a key term in nineteenth century liberal theory, for it was by diffusion of culture partly through state-supported schools that 'the masses' could gradually be pacified and brought into the fold. To cite Matthew Arnold's title again, 'culture' was to supplant 'anarchy.'" Patrick Brantlinger, *Bread and Circuses: Theories of Mass Culture as Social Decay* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983): 31. On liberalism in Canada during the early part of the twentieth century, see Barry Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism*, especially the final chapter on the "new liberalism."

<sup>55</sup> W.L. Morton, "Canadian Conservatism Now," paper given 30 January 1959. McM, W.L. Morton Papers, Box 47, Articles, A-Ge, also annotated for *Conservative Concepts*.

<sup>56</sup> Louis Greenspan, "The Unravelling of Liberalism," in Arthur Davis, ed., *George Grant and the Subversion of Modernity: Art, Philosophy, Politics, Religion and Education* (Toronto: UTP, 1996): 201-202.

<sup>57</sup> William R. Young, "Making the Truth Graphic: The Canadian Government's Home Front Information Structure and Programmes." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1978, 91-92.

<sup>58</sup> Raboy, *Missed Opportunities: The Story of Canada's Broadcasting Policy* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990), 75. Ron Faris, *The Passionate Educators: Voluntary Associations and the Struggle for Control of Adult Educational Broadcasting in Canada 1919-1952* (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1975)

<sup>59</sup> John Coulter, "Books and Shows," Talk number one, Second series, 24 November 1942. John Coulter Papers, McM, Box 36, f. 2.

<sup>60</sup> Historians have been attentive to the documentary record. On Canada, see Mary Vipond's recent articles: "The Beginnings of Public Broadcasting in Canada: The CRBC, 1932-36," *Canadian Journal of Communication* 19(2) (1994): 151-171; "Financing Canadian Public Broadcasting: licence fees and the 'culture of caution'," *Historical Journal of Film, Radio, and Television* 15(2) (June 1995): 285-300; and her previous volume *Listening In: The First Decade of Canadian Broadcasting, 1922-1932* (Montreal and Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992); David Skinner, "A System Divided: A Political Economy of Canadian Broadcasting," unpublished PhD dissertation, Simon Fraser University, 1997; and Marc Raboy, *Missed Opportunities*. For a still more politically-focused narrative, see Frank Peers, *The Politics of Canadian Broadcasting, 1920-1951* (Toronto: UTP, 1969) or E. Austin Weir, *The Struggle for National Broadcasting in Canada* (Toronto: M&S, 1965). On Britain, see Paddy Scannell, *A Social History of British Broadcasting, 1922-1939: Serving the Nation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991) and Asa Briggs, *A History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979). On the American alternative to the state-influenced model, see Michelle Hilmes, *Radio Voices: American Broadcasting, 1922-1952* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); Susan Smulyan, *Selling Radio: The Commercialization of American Broadcasting, 1920-1934* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994)

<sup>61</sup> Paddy Scannell, *Radio, Television and Modern Life: A Phenomenological Approach* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996)

<sup>62</sup> Frank Chamberlain, "Radio Is Our National Theatre," *SN* (27 December 1941): 22.

<sup>63</sup> Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, *In 1926: Living at the Edge of Time* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997); Leo Charney and Vanessa R. Schwartz, eds., *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995); Modris Eksteins, *The Rites of Spring: the Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age* (Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1989); Carl E. Schorske, *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1981). For primary material, see Anton Kaes, Martin Jay, and Edward Dimendberg, eds., *The Weimar Republic Sourcebook* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995).

<sup>64</sup> Ortega y Gasset's *The Revolt of the Masses* appeared in 1930, and was out in English by 1932. Peter Goodall, *High Culture, Popular Culture: The Long Debate* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1995): 23 ff. *Civilization and its*

*Discontents* was translated almost immediately.

<sup>65</sup> See chapter five – “Leaning ‘On a Foreign Walking Stick’” – in Maria Tippet, *Making Culture*, 127, 142-145. See also Tippet, “The Making of English-Canadian Culture, 1900-1939: The External Influences,” paper delivered 28 April 1987, York University (Toronto: ECW Press, 1988)

<sup>66</sup> Morley Callaghan and William Deacon, “The National Forum: Can Canadian Literature Be Distinctively National?” radio address, CBC, 13 November 1938, 7.

<sup>67</sup> A.R.M. Lower, “Colonialism and Culture,” *Canadian Forum* [hereafter *CanF*] XIV No. 163 (April 1934): 264-265.

<sup>68</sup> Joan Shelley Rubin sees critics during the 1920s through the 1940s as more engaged or threatened by ‘middlebrow’ forms, like the Book-of-the-Month Club or literary programs on radio, than by works without any pretence to edification. Further, this critique of the middlebrow did not seem to develop in earnest until the 1940s. Joan Shelley Rubin, *The Making of Middlebrow Culture* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1992) xii-xv. See also Robert Crunden, ed., *The Superfluous Men*, introduction.

<sup>69</sup> On this phenomenon of acceptance, see Chapter 4, “Social Scientists and “Deviant Entertainments,” in Paul R. Gorman, *Left Intellectuals and Popular Culture in Twentieth-century America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996). See also Michael Kammen, *The Lively Arts: Gilbert Seldes and the Transformation of Cultural Criticism in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 327.

<sup>70</sup> See Chapter 5 of Tippet’s *Making Culture* presents a sample of American arts groups travelling in Canada or available for appearances. On the way that Europeans came to identify dominance in certain cultural forms with American productions and production values, see Richard Pells, *Not Like Us: How Europeans Have Loved, Hated, and Transformed American Culture Since World War II* (New York: Basic Books, 1997)

<sup>71</sup> The British conception of the ‘problem’ of mass culture is well covered in John Carey’s *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1880-1939* (London: Faber and Faber, 1992) In his aforementioned *A Culture for Democracy*, Daniel LeMahieu more directly addresses the struggle to present ‘high’ culture within a democratic, as opposed to an exclusive, context.

<sup>72</sup> C.E.M. Joad, *The Babbitt Warren* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Trubner, 1926); Gamaliel Milner, *The Problem of Decadence* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1931)

<sup>73</sup> B.S. Keirstead, “The Boundaries,” unpublished MS, n.d. [1938], 19, 122. UNB, Burton Seely Keirstead Papers, UA RG 81, MS 3.1.1.

<sup>74</sup> Willson Woodside, ““Insolence of Material Success” What It’s Doing to Modern Man,” *SN* (25 December 1948): 10. A recent treatment of Weaver is Joseph Scotchie, *Barbarians in the Saddle: an Intellectual Biography of Richard M. Weaver* (New Brunswick, NJ, Transaction, 1997).

## Chapter One

<sup>1</sup> “Begin Now?” *SN* (27 December 1941): 3.

<sup>2</sup> Leonard L. Knott, “Post-War Preview,” *Montreal Standard* (magazine section) 30 October 1943.

<sup>3</sup> John Grierson, “Education and the New Order,” Address at the closing banquet of the CAAE annual convention, Winnipeg, 31 May 1941, 11. McG, John Grierson Collection, MG 2067, Container 4, file 110.

<sup>4</sup> This is Blair Fraser’s term, and the title of his popular history of the post-war period, *The Search for Identity: Canada Postwar to Present* (Toronto: Doubleday, 1967)

<sup>5</sup> Desmond Morton and Glenn Wright, *Winning the Second Battle: Canadian Veterans and the Return to Civilian Life, 1915-1930* (Toronto: UTP, 1987), 98-99, 106; Craig Brown and Ramsay Cook, *Canada 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed* (Toronto: M&S, 1974) especially Chapter 15: "O Brave New World...". Brown and Cook note wartime activity by social gospellers and a surge in nationalism, but little excitement surrounding the post-war as distinct from immediate reforms. Barry Ferguson chronicles some academic interest in reconstruction among Queen's political economists, but this interest only flickers to life very near the end of World War I, gathering strength in 1919. See especially Chapter 9 of Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism: The Intellectual Legacy of Adam Shortt, O.D. Skelton, W.C. Clark, and W.A. Mackintosh, 1890-1925* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993). Maria Tippet's *Art at the Service of War: Canada, Art, and the Great War* (Toronto: UTP, 1984) contains a chapter ('Lest we forget') on interwar efforts to memorialize the war via art exhibitions and the sense that war had – in an indirect way – contributed to a welling up of nationalist sentiment during the 1920s. On Britain, see Paul Johnson, *Land Fit for Heroes: The Planning of British Reconstruction, 1916-1919* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1968) 1-9; and Kenneth O. Morgan, *Consensus and Disunity: The Lloyd George Coalition Government, 1918-1922* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979) especially Chapter 4 on social reform.

<sup>6</sup> Albert Shea, "Blueprint for Demobilizing," *SN* (14 June 1941): 11.

<sup>7</sup> Peter Neary and J.L. Granatstein, eds., *The Veteran's Charter and Post-World War II Canada* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998). Another recently-published collection of articles – Greg Donaghy, ed. *Uncertain Horizons: Canadians and Their World in 1945* (Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, 1997) – contains a handful on reconstruction. These include: Francine McKenzie, "Canada and the Reconstruction of Postwar Trade, 1943-1945,"; Hector Mackenzie, "The White Paper on Reconstruction and Canada's Postwar Trade Policy,"; David Slater, "Colour the Future Bright: The *White Paper*, the Green Book and the 1945-1946 Dominion-Provincial Conference on Reconstruction,"; Peter S. McInnis, "Planning Prosperity: Canadians Debate Postwar Reconstruction,"; and Dominique Marshall, "Reconstruction Politics, the Canadian Welfare State and the Ambiguity of Children's Rights, 1940-1950". Though informative on Canadian reconstruction policy, they take little interest (with the possible exception of McInnis and to a lesser extent Marshall) in reconstruction as a public experience or in its cultural dimensions. For more on the official side of reconstruction, see: David Slater, *War, Finance and Reconstruction: The Role of Canada's Department of Finance 1939-1946* (Ottawa: Department of Finance, 1995). Paul Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission* (Toronto: UTP, 1992); Maria Tippet, *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts Before the Massey Commission* (Toronto: UTP, 1990).

<sup>8</sup> John Baldwin, "Approach to Reconstruction," *SN* (24 October 1942): 28.

<sup>9</sup> Marcus Adeney, "Community Centres in Canada," *Journal of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada* 22(2) (February 1945): 21-23, 39.

<sup>10</sup> Charged with advising and overseeing plans for the transition from war to peace were, respectively: the Dominion Advisory Committee on Reconstruction under McGill University Principal F.C. James, and the House of Commons Special Committee on Reconstruction and Re-establishment chaired by James Gray Turgeon, MP. The Advisory Committee advocated the creation of a Department of Reconstruction. When that Department was formed in 1944 under C.D. Howe, the Advisory Committee disbanded.

<sup>11</sup> In *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945* (Toronto: UTP, 1986), Doug Owram viewed the reconstruction period as a logical place to end his account of the transformation of the Canadian civil service. Not only did those years teem with evidence that intellectuals had found a place within government, but also economic reconstruction was chiefly about engineering the speedy removal of wartime controls. See also Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism*, 230.

<sup>12</sup> James Allen's cartoon depiction of figures personifying Labour and Industry united behind a co-ordinated plan to tackle post-war problems, while the steam shovel of Wartime Unity moves into action, illustrated the 'strike while the iron's hot' mentality of reconstruction. "Let's Break Ground Now," *SN* (8 March

1941): 33.

<sup>13</sup> As of this writing, I am not aware of any other studies using this term.

<sup>14</sup> F. Cyril James, Address during the radio intermission of Gounod's *Faust*, CBC, 30 January 1943. McG, F. Cyril James Papers, MG 1017, Addresses and Other Papers, 1943.

<sup>15</sup> Ron Faris, *The Passionate Educators: voluntary associations and the struggle for control of adult educational broadcasting in Canada, 1919-52* (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1975), 153.

<sup>16</sup> Albert C. Wakeman, "New Year Thoughts on the War - and After," *SN* (6 January 1940): 7.

<sup>17</sup> Ronald Oliver MacFarlane, "Canada Tomorrow: Canada and the Post-war World, Part One," *Behind the Headlines Series*, Vol. 2, no. 3 (January 1942) (Toronto: CILA/CAAE, 1942)

<sup>18</sup> "Winning the War," *CanF* XX No. 237 (October 1940): 199. Ardent democrat I.D. Willis warned business interests that returning veterans would demand "real improvements in all phases of our national life which must go deeper than mere social insurance." I.D. Willis, memorandum to J.T. Thorson, [1940]: 13. NAC, Canadian Authors Association Papers, MG 28 I 2, Vol. 1, Ontario.

<sup>19</sup> Maxwell Cohen, *Governmental Machinery of Wartime Controls and its Relation to Postwar Problems*. Report to the Advisory Committee on Reconstruction (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1942), 28.

<sup>20</sup> Advisory Committee on Reconstruction, *Report* (issued 24 September 1943) (Ottawa, King's Printer, 1944), 1.

<sup>21</sup> Julia Grace Wales, "Pro, Not Anti: A Principle of Integration," *The New Age* 2(31) (8 August 1940): 9-10.

<sup>22</sup> J. Richards Petrie, "The Universities and the War," *The Brunswickan*, Vol. 60, no. 7, (8 November 1940): 3, 6. For examples of similar confidence in the university during the the 1920s, see Barry Ferguson, *Remaking Liberalism*, 211; Paul Axelrod, *Making a Middle Class: Student Life in English Canada During the Thirties* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990), 12-15.

<sup>23</sup> Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond and John English, *Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics and Provincialism*, rev. ed. (Toronto: UTP, 1989), 82, 109-111; Doug Owram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby Boom Generation* (Toronto: UTP, 1996), 24-25.

<sup>24</sup> Other important wartime remedies, appearing in a flurry in 1943, close on the heels of Britain's Beveridge Report of December 1942 were Harry Cassidy's *Social Security and Reconstruction in Canada*, Marsh's *Social Security for Canada*, then Charlotte Whitton's *The Dawn of an Ampler Life*, 'commissioned' by federal Conservative leader John Bracken. Whitton's work "was both a direct attack on Marsh's proposals and an alternative vision of Canada's social welfare future." Brigitte Kitchen, "The Marsh Report Revisited," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 21(2) (Summer 1986): 38-40.

<sup>25</sup> Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship, "Constitution," [1941]. Canadian Citizenship Council Papers, NAC, MG 28 I85, Vol. 54, Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship.

<sup>26</sup> Arthur L. Phelps, "The Canadian Pattern: Problems and Convictions of a Canadian Part 1," CBC, 19 December 1943. NAC, Wartime Information Board [hereafter WIB], RG 36/31, Vol. 10, file 4-3, Canadian Committee.

<sup>27</sup> Albert C. Wakeman, "New Year Thoughts on the War - and After," *SN* (6 January 1940): 7. W.D. Black, "Industrial Development in Canada to Meet the War Emergency," Broadcast on CBC, 13 November 1940. NAC, Clarence Decatur Howe Papers, MG 27 III B20, Vol. 140, series 89, Articles, Speeches, Books; G.W. Brown to A.R.M. Lower, 31 July 1940. QUA, A.R.M. Lower Papers, Correspondence re: "Social Sciences in Post-war World," Box 13, B 142.

<sup>28</sup> "A New Approach," *CanF* XXI No. 248 (September 1941): 166-167.

<sup>29</sup> Claris Silcox, *The War and Religion* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1941), 10; Young Men's Christian Associations of Canada, National Council, *We Discuss Canada* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1942), 57; Bruce Hutchison, "Win the Peace NOW!" *Macleans* (15 April 1943): 18, 44-46.

<sup>30</sup> Along with dozens of pamphlets, some of the most prominent books produced on reconstruction themes in the United States were: George B. Galloway, *Post-war Planning in the United States* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1942); Fawn M. Brodie, *Peace Aims and Post-war Planning* (Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1942) and Brodie, *Peace Aims and Post-war Reconstruction* (Princeton: American Committee for International Studies, 1941); Office of War Information, *Toward New Horizons: The World Beyond the War* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1942); Raoul de Roussy de Sales, *The Making of Tomorrow* (Toronto: M&S, 1942) [a reprint]; Lewis Corey, *The Unfinished Task: Economic Reconstruction for Democracy* (New York: Viking, 1942) For a more comprehensive listing of reconstruction publications from the United States, Canada and Great Britain up to 1943, see Ralph Flenley, *Post-war Problems – A Reading List* (Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1943)

<sup>31</sup> C.E. Silcox to Abbé Arthur Maheux, 8 July 1942. United Church of Canada Archives, [hereafter UCA] Claris Edwin Silcox Papers, Box 11, file 5, Correspondence 1940-1945.

<sup>32</sup> John P. Kidd, "Planning the Community," *Food for Thought* [hereafter FFT] 6(3) (November 1945): 24.

<sup>33</sup> Print advertising is a rich source on the culture of reconstruction and reflected, as well as helped perpetuate, public awareness of issues like planning. Magazine readers could be simultaneously heartened and chastised by ads such as: "The men who are planning the world of tomorrow," (1945); "'Caught Short' Through Lack of Planning," (1945); "Are You a Post-war Planner?" (1945).

<sup>34</sup> Watson Kirkconnell, *Seven Pillars of Freedom* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1944), vii.

<sup>35</sup> These few articles constitute a sampling of the *Saturday Night* treatment of planning: P.M. Richards, "Free Enterprise Must Plan Now," *SN* (30 January 1943): 34. Stanley McConnell, "The State: In Theory, Practice, Prospect," *SN* (11 November 1944): 20; C.E. Silcox, "Look Out, Leviathan's On the Horizon Again!" *SN* (30 September 1944): 16-17; C. Monte Roberts, "Saturday Night Presents Its Own Dictionary for Socialists," *SN* (28 April 1945): 41; Wilfrid Eggleston, "Do Most Canadians Really Want More Government Intervention?" *SN* (12 April 1947): 8.

<sup>36</sup> P.M. Richards, "Principles for the Post-War," *SN* (7 November 1942): 26.

<sup>37</sup> William R. Yendall, *The Common Problem* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1942)

<sup>38</sup> I.D. Willis to A.D. Dunton, 15 April 1943. NAC, Canadian Authors Association Papers, MG 28 I 2, Vol. 1, Ontario.

<sup>39</sup> Stanley McConnell, "The Menace of Collectivism," *SN* (19 September 1942): 34. My italics.

<sup>40</sup> Examples are: "Better Get Ready to Turn Those Theories Into Blueprints, Mister," *SN* (18 September 1943): 33. "Not So Nice For Him To Come Home To," *SN* (18 March 1944): 33.

<sup>41</sup> C.A. Ashley, "Introduction," in C.A. Ashley, ed., *Reconstruction in Canada*. (Toronto: UTP, 1943), xiii.

<sup>42</sup> Bruce Hutchison, "Where Now, Canada?" *Maclean's* (1 July 1942): 7, 38, 50-51. "Planning Our Civilization," *CanF* XX No. 234 (July 1940): 100-101; Fergus Glenn, "Anatomy of the Little Man," *CanF* XXV No. 295 (August 1945): 109-111.

<sup>43</sup> For a discussion of the politics of planning during World War II, see Chapter 5, "The Coming of the Planners", in Donald Creighton, *The Forked Road: Canada 1939-1957* (Toronto: M&S, 1976)

<sup>44</sup> F.R. Scott, "Social Planning and the War," *CanF* XX No. 235 (August 1940): 138-139. For a denunciation of the fear and hope keeping the ordinary Canadian a part of the harried mass, see the aforementioned "Anatomy of the Little Man."

<sup>45</sup> The advertising copy is from "Next! Movies that 'live and breathe'... the work of men who think of tomorrow!" (June 1944), but Seagram's ran several others in the 'Men Who Think of Tomorrow' series.

<sup>46</sup> "Post-war Planner," (1943). This advertisement also included a short section entitled "What is Private Enterprise?" which ran: "It is the natural desire to make your own way, as far as your ability will take you; an instinct that has brought to this continent the highest standard of life enjoyed by any people on earth."

It is the spirit of democracy on the march..."

<sup>47</sup> "Young Man With a Plan," (1948)

<sup>48</sup> "Moderation promises a glorious future," (1946) featured a new slogan for Seagram's: "Men who Think of Tomorrow ... Practice Moderation Today!"; "We Walk the Middle Road," (1946)

<sup>49</sup> John L. McDougall, *The Foundations of National Well-Being – Post-war* (Kingston: 1944), 10.

<sup>50</sup> L.C. Marsh, "Is National Planning a Threat to Democracy?" prepared for *Citizens' Forum*, 3 December 1947. UBCSC, Leonard C. Marsh Papers, Box 6, Broadcasts.

<sup>51</sup> E.A. Corbett "Director's Report," (1946), 7. NAC, WIB, RG 36/31, Vol. 14, file 8-20-1, CAAE.

<sup>52</sup> "Thinking About Canada," *SN* (2 May 1942): 3.

<sup>53</sup> Editorial notice, "After the War," *SN* (15 August 1942): 3.

<sup>54</sup> "A New Approach," *CanF* XXI No. 248 (September 1941): 166.

<sup>55</sup> "Planning Post-war Canada" began its run as a regular section in *Canadian Forum* in April 1943.

<sup>56</sup> Association of Canadian Advertisers, *Continuing Study of Trends in Post-war Planning*. Each issue contained a packet of reprints from various sources and an editorial on some aspect of post-war planning. Among the numerous advertising campaigns making use of the idea of reconstruction were: "Two shoulders to the same wheel," (1941); "Canadian Nickel: Serving Today ... Preparing for Tomorrow," (1943); "Post-war Planner," (1943); "What's coming is ... PLENTY" (1943); "Think Big..." (1944); "Postwarithmetic," (1944); "The Challenge," (1945).

<sup>57</sup> "Canada's Future Possibilities in Post-War Reconstruction As Suggested by an Englishwoman," *Echoes* 161 (Christmas 1940): 8; Velyien E. Henderson, comp., "Reconstruction: Resolutions of National Empire Study Committee," *Echoes* 166 (Spring 1942): 24, 167; (Summer 1942): 9, 45.

<sup>58</sup> Mary Lowrey Ross, "A Reverent Ode to the Great Modern Goddess Panacea," *SN* (29 January 1944): 29.

<sup>59</sup> "Hasty Reformers," *SN* (21 March 1942): 3.

<sup>60</sup> Charles Fraser Comfort, "Art and the Community," Speech at the Opening Ceremonies of the John Gordon McIntosh and Wilhelmina Morris McIntosh Memorial Building, University of Western Ontario, 26 June 1942: 22. NAC, Charles Fraser Comfort Papers, MG30 D81, Vol. 35, file 1.

<sup>61</sup> R.D. MacLennan, "The Continuing Aims of Higher Education," *Culture* 4 (1943): 495.

<sup>62</sup> CAAE, "Report of the Proceedings of a Special Programme Committee of the Canadian Association for Adult Education," 27-31 December 1942: 4. AO, CAAE Papers, Series B-I, Box 3, CF, administrative, 1943-1960.

<sup>63</sup> Coulter, "Books and Shows," Talk number seven, First series. Broadcast 28 July 1942: 6. McM, John Coulter Papers, Box 36, f. 1.

<sup>64</sup> *Transit Through Fire*, words by John Coulter and music by Healey Willan, (Toronto: Macmillan, 1942), 1. The opera was published in this form, Coulter claimed, "so that they may get into the hands of the young men and women, fighters, workers, students, who may have few pennies in their pockets, but in their hearts and minds have intelligence and will and moral passion to join resolutely in the task which shall await them when the war is won."

<sup>65</sup> *Transit Through Fire*, 6. Coulter borrowed heavily from the libretto in later critical broadcasts, contending: "In war, we act at last like, or something nearly like, a true community. A Christian community. There's a paradox!" Coulter, "Books and Shows," Talk number one, Second series, broadcast 24 November 1942, 3-4. McM, John Coulter Papers, Box 36, f. 2: 4-5.

<sup>66</sup> "The alternative being/a world-community/ruled by a hierarchy/for whom the State and the Sword/are the avatars of God." *Transit Through Fire*, 8; Elizabeth Wyn Wood, "A National Program for the Arts in Canada," *Canadian Art* 1(3) (February-March 1944): 93-94.

<sup>67</sup> "Canadian Criticism," *SN* (27 November 1943): 3.

<sup>68</sup> John Coulter, "Books and Shows," Talk number seven, Second series, broadcast 5 January 1943, 2-3. McM, John Coulter Papers, Box 36, f. 2.

<sup>69</sup> A.S.P. Woodhouse et al., "Remaining Material," *University of Toronto Quarterly*, ('Letters in Canada' 1941 Number) 11(3 and 4) (April and July 1942): 347. The series that Woodhouse enjoyed were the "Food for Thought" series from the CAAE, and the "Behind the Headlines" series from the Canadian Institute of International Affairs.

<sup>70</sup> Baldwin, "Approach to Reconstruction," 28.

<sup>71</sup> Father M.M. Coady, "Blueprinting Post-War Canada," *Culture* 4 (1943): 161-171.

<sup>72</sup> E.A. Corbett, "Adult Education," typescript, (1938), 5. NAC, Robert Alexander Sim Papers, MG 30 D 260, Vol. 11, file 11, CAAE, correspondence, minutes, pamphlets.

<sup>73</sup> See for instance, Number 6 in the CAAE's "Live and Learn" series: John Macdonald, *The Corner Stone of Democracy: The Discussion Group* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1939)

<sup>74</sup> David P. Armstrong, "Corbett's House: The Origins of the Canadian Association for Adult Education and its Development during the Directorship of E.A. Corbett, 1936-1951," (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Toronto, 1968), 110-112; "W.E.A. Radio Forum," *Adult Learning* IV (November 1939): 23-24. See Michael Welton, "An Authentic Instrument of the Democratic Process": the intellectual origins of the Canadian Citizens' Forum," *Studies in the Education of Adults* 18(1) (April 1986): 35-49; chapters II-V of Ronald L. Faris, "Adult Education for Social Action or Enlightenment?: An Assessment of the Development of the Canadian Association for Adult Education and its Radio Forums from 1935-1952," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1971); Gordon Selman, *Adult Education in Canada: Historical Essays* (Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing, 1995); Gerald Friesen, "Adult Education and Union Education: Aspects of English-Canadian Cultural History in the 20th Century," *Labour/Le Travail* 34 (Fall 1994): 163-188.

<sup>75</sup> E.A. Corbett, "Education by Radio," *CanF* XVIII no. 218 (March 1939): 374-377.

<sup>76</sup> Frank Chamberlain, "The School of the Air," *SN* (20 September 1941): 16.

<sup>77</sup> Neil M. Morrison, "Community Problems," Broadcast on CKUA and CFCN, 20 November 1939. Neil M. Morrison Papers, NAC, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 28, Public Affairs Scripts Broadcast 1943-51; Armstrong, "Corbett's House," 112. See also: "The Common Man in the Post-war World," *The New Trail* 1(2) (January 1943): 20-22.

<sup>78</sup> John Nicol, Albert Shea and G.J.P. Simmins, *Canada's Farm Radio Forum* (Paris: UNESCO, 1954), 40-46. Marc Raboy, *Missed Opportunities: The Story of Canada's Broadcasting Policy* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990), 75.

<sup>79</sup> Ron Fans, *The Passionate Educators*, 99, 153.

<sup>80</sup> Philippe J. Baillargeon, "The CBC and the Cold War Mentality, 1946-1952," (unpublished M.A. Thesis, Carleton University, 1987) 18-24.

<sup>81</sup> Neil Morrison to General Supervisor of Programmes, 22 February 1941. NAC, CBC CF, MG 28 I 400, Vol. 1, file 2, CAAE - CBC co-operation.

<sup>82</sup> Program description, "CBC Discussion Club," broadcast 28 August 1942. CBC Radio Archives, Toronto.

<sup>83</sup> CAAE Council meeting, Toronto, 16 November 1942. NAC, CBC CF, MG 28 I 400, Vol. 1, file 2, CAAE - CBC co-operation.

<sup>84</sup> James S. Thomson to Inch, 16 December 1942. NAC, Robert Boyer Inch Papers, MG 30 C 187, Vol. 8, file 370, CBC Program, "Of Things To Come".

<sup>85</sup> Young Men's Christian Associations of Canada, National Council, "We Discuss Canada." (Toronto: Ryerson, 1942), 57.

<sup>86</sup> "Report of the Proceedings of a Special Programme Committee of the Canadian Association for Adult Education," Meeting at Macdonald College, December 27-31, 1942. NAC, CBC CF, MG 28 I 400, Vol.

1, file 3, Report of the Special Programme Committee.

<sup>87</sup> "Report of the Proceedings of a Special Programme Committee of the Canadian Association for Adult Education," 15, 28.

<sup>88</sup> CAAE, "Report of the Proceedings of a Special Programme Committee of the Canadian Association for Adult Education," 27-31 December 1942: 27. AO, CAAE Papers, Series B-I, Box 3, CF, administrative, 1943-1960.

<sup>89</sup> These were N.A.M. Mackenzie, Father G-H. Levesque and Arthur Surveyer. Other members of the Committee were, R.E.G. Davis of the Canadian Youth Commission, Mrs. G.V. Ferguson, Charles Fraser of the *Halifax Chronicle*, the Hon. Lomer Gouin, and Robert T. McKenzie of the University of British Columbia's Extension Department.

<sup>90</sup> Wells' novel had predicted a world war arising over tension between Germany and Poland by about 1940. Morley Callaghan to Watson Thomson, 5 February 1943; Inch to Hugh Morrison, 11 February 1943; all at: NAC, CBC, RG 41, Vol. 187, file 11-18-5, part 4, CBC broadcasts on CF: "Of Things To Come." Wells was active in writing on the theme of reconstruction early in the war, putting out: *The Commonsense of War and Peace* (London: Penguin, 1940); *The New World Order* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1941); *Guide to the New World* (London: Gollancz, 1941).

<sup>91</sup> Claris Silcox to Robert Inch, 23 March 1943. NAC, CBC, RG 41 Vol. 187, file 11-18-5, part 6, CBC broadcasts on CF: "Of Things To Come".

<sup>92</sup> "List of Participants in "Of Things To Come" Spring Series 1943. NAC, CBC CF, MG 28 I 400, Vol. 1, file 9, "Of Things To Come", February - June 1943.

<sup>93</sup> "Of Things To Come": Inquiry on the Post-war World (Toronto: CBC, 1943)

<sup>94</sup> Morley Callaghan to Watson Thomson, 5 February 1943; Callaghan to Robert T. McKenzie, 12 February 1943. NAC, CBC, RG 41 Vol. 187, file 11-18-5, part 5.

<sup>95</sup> Robert T. McKenzie to Inch, 22 February 1943. NAC, CBC, RG 41 Vol. 187, file 11-18-5, part 5, CBC broadcasts on CF: "Of Things To Come".

<sup>96</sup> Responses to Spring series, "OTTC", 1943. NAC, CBC, RG 41 Vol. 186, file 11-18-5, part 1, CBC broadcasts on CF: "Of Things To Come". Kathleen Strange, "Report No. 2," 8 March 1943. NAC, Canadian Authors Association Papers, MG 28 I 2, Vol. 1, Manitoba.

<sup>97</sup> E.A. Corbett to John Grierson, 22 April 1943. NAC, WIB, RG 36/31, Vol. 14, file 8-20-1, CAAE.

<sup>98</sup> H. McDonald, Crossfield, Alberta, to CBC, NAC, CBC, RG 41 Vol. 186, file 11-18-5, part 1, CBC broadcasts on CF: "Of Things To Come".

<sup>99</sup> R.B. Inch to Members of the CBC Post-War Committee, 14 July 1943. NAC, Canada Foundation, MG 28, I179, Vol. 25, file 4a, CBC, 1942-1951.

<sup>100</sup> R.B. Inch to E.A. Corbett, 28 July 1943. NAC, Robert Boyer Inch Papers, MG 30 C 187, Vol. 8, file 370:1, CBC Program, "Of Things To Come". *The Chicago Round Table and Town Meeting of the Air* were American radio programmes geared toward the discussion of public affairs, but did not feature the localized listening groups planned for *Citizens' Forum*. Harry A. and Bonaro W. Overstreet, *Town Meeting Comes to Town* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1938), 57-60.

<sup>101</sup> E.A. Corbett, "Director's Report," delivered at the CAAE Annual Meeting, 19-22 August 1943. NAC, H.R.C. Avison Papers, MG 30 D 102, Vol. 5, file 25, C.A.A.E. London Conference, 1943.

<sup>102</sup> James S. Thomson, "The New Phase of Adult Education," address delivered at the Macdonald College Conference, 10 September 1943: 12. NAC, CBC CF, MG 28 I 400, Vol. 1, file 8, Macdonald College Conference, Proceedings, Commentary.

<sup>103</sup> Thomson, "The New Phase of Adult Education," 14-19.

<sup>104</sup> Gregory Vlastos to N.A.M. MacKenzie, 25 September 1943. UBCSC, N.A.M. MacKenzie Papers, Box 210, folder 4.



<sup>105</sup> Callaghan's instructions to Robert McKenzie seem to confirm the contemporary suspicions that the programme exhibited a noticeable CCF slant. For a detailed description of the Liberal government's objections to the programme's early format and some of its panelists, see Baillargeon, "The CBC and the Cold War Mentality," 28-32; Ron Faris, *The Passionate Educators*, 104-108. See also: "The Job Ahead," *Canadian Business* 17(1) (January 1944): 17-18; and "Radio News and C.C.F.," *Ottawa Citizen* 28 February 1944, 3.

<sup>106</sup> Grant's involvement in the project is best covered in William Christian's *George Grant: A Biography* (Toronto: UTP, 1993), 96-102.

<sup>107</sup> Canadian Teachers' Federation, "Brief to the House of Commons Special Committee on Reconstruction and Re-establishment." January 1944. NAC, RG 14, 1987-88/146 (39) Reconstruction, W-2; Violet Anderson, "Citizens' Forums Breed Democracy in Canada," *SN* (20 May 1944): 16-17; Toronto's Public Library system issued a reading list to compliment forum materials: "Books for Citizens' Forum, Part II." NAC, CBC CF, MG 28 I 400, Vol. 1, file 22, Reading List, 1943-44.

<sup>108</sup> Ross, "A Reverent Ode to the Great Modern Goddess Panacea," 29. Ross might also have adapted her line from the early seventeenth-century Cornish "Hal-an-Tow". The song's chorus was a particularly optimistic one, and told of the excitement building before May Day: "Hal-an-Tow, jolly rumbalo/We were up long before the day-o/To welcome in the summer time/To welcome in the May-o/Summer is a'comin in/And winter's gone away-o."

<sup>109</sup> Rev. F.W.L. Brailey, "Citizens' Forum in the Churches," [1944]: 2. AO, CAAE Papers, Series B-I, Box 3, CF, administrative, 1943-1960; "The Job Ahead," *Canadian Business* 17(1) (January 1944): 17.

<sup>110</sup> R.H. Wright to CF, 1 April 1944. NAC, CBC, RG 41 Vol. 188, file 11-18-5, part 9, CBC broadcasts on CF: "Of Things To Come".

<sup>111</sup> Anne Fromer, "Canada's Rural Movies Building Citizenship," *SN* (11 March 1944): 19a.

<sup>112</sup> Names of forums gleaned from group reports and correspondence in NAC, CBC CF, MG 28 I 400.

<sup>113</sup> E.A. Corbett to Col. G.G.D. Kilpatrick, 18 January 1944. NAC, CBC, RG 41 Vol. 187, file 11-18-5, part 3, CBC broadcasts on CF: "Of Things To Come". Kilpatrick was Director of Education for the Department of National Defence (Army).

<sup>114</sup> "He's Ready For the Job Ahead," CF pamphlet, 1944. NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 11, Brochures 1943-61.

<sup>115</sup> Violet Anderson, "Citizens' Forums Breed Democracy in Canada," 16.

<sup>116</sup> George Grant to Harry Avison, 18 January 1944: 3. AO, CAAE Papers, Series B-I, Box 3, CF, administrative, 1943-1960.

<sup>117</sup> "Report of the Proceedings of a Special Programme Committee of the Canadian Association for Adult Education," 30. *Invitation to Learning* featured American intellectuals Huntington Cairns, Allen Tate, and Mark Van Doren, along with occasional guests, and was a series of debates which incorporated the elements of a Western civilization canon. For transcripts of these programmes, see Huntington Cairns, Allen Tate and Mark Van Doren, *Invitation to Learning* (New York: Random House, 1941)

<sup>118</sup> Memorandum from the General Supervisor of Programmes to the Board of Governors, 8 May 1944. Cited in Faris, "Adult Education for Social Action or Enlightenment?", 293.

<sup>119</sup> Jean Hunter Morrison and George Grant, "Who Shapes the Future?" *Citizens' Forum Bulletin* No. 19, 25 April 1944: 2.

<sup>120</sup> Jean Hunter Morrison and George Grant, "Action Now," *Citizens' Forum Bulletin* No. 20, 2 May 1944: 4.; "Of Things To Come - A Citizens' Forum" Topics for Discussion - Season 1944-1945," [leaflet] (1944), 1-2.

<sup>121</sup> [Martyn Estall], "The War Has Changed Things," [1945]: 2, 5. AO, CAAE Papers, Series B-I, Box 3, CF, administrative, 1943-1960.

<sup>122</sup> "Comments about "Of Things To Come" from former McGill student, now Lieutenant in the Artillery." [1944] NAC, CBC CF, MG 28 I 400, Vol. 1, file 10, Broadcasts, 1943-44.

<sup>123</sup> W.H. Brittain, "The Role of the Canadian Association for Adult Education," (1944), 2-3, 8-9. NAC, H.R.C. Avison Papers, MG 30 D 102, Vol. 5, file 26, C.A.A.E. 1944.

<sup>124</sup> "Comments about "Of Things To Come" from former McGill student, now Lieutenant in the Artillery," [1944].

<sup>125</sup> George Grant, "Citizens' Forum --- So Far," FFT 4(3) (November 1943): 20; "Report to the Executive of the C.A.A.E. on the Progress of Citizens' Forum," (1944), 2. AO, CAAE Papers, Series B-I, Box 3, CF, administrative, 1943-1960.

<sup>126</sup> "Submission by the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship." 16 November 1945. NAC, WIB, RG 36/31, Vol. 14, file 8-20-3, Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship. Rev. F.W.L. Brailey estimated the number of organized listening groups at 1450 "among civilians" during the first season. "Citizens' Forum in the Churches," [1944], 1.

<sup>127</sup> One report listed as members of a British Columbia group: a doctor, a principal, a minister, a priest, a postmaster, a rancher, merchants, clerks, housewives. An Ituna, Saskatchewan, group included three teachers, two druggists, a municipal secretary, an implement dealer, and two housewives. Anderson, "Citizens' Forums Breed Democracy in Canada," 16-17.

<sup>128</sup> N.A.M. MacKenzie, "Canada and the Post War World," address before the Vancouver Canadian Club, 15 September 1944, 3-4. UBCSC, N.A.M. MacKenzie Papers, Box 97, folder 1.

<sup>129</sup> E.A. Corbett "Director's Report," (1946), 7. NAC, WIB, RG 36/31, Vol. 14, file 8-20-1, CAAE.

<sup>130</sup> Wayne and Shuster's R.C.A. Victor Show, "Story of the CBC," CBC Trans-Canada Network, 24 October 1946. NAC, Frank Shuster Papers, MG 31 D 251, Vol. 2.

<sup>131</sup> J.R. Kidd, "Foreword," in Isabel Wilson, *Citizens' Forum: "Canada's National Platform"* (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980); Faris, "Adult Education for Social Action or Enlightenment?", 336.

<sup>132</sup> [Martyn Estall], "The War Has Changed Things," [1945]: 4.

<sup>133</sup> "Comments about "Of Things To Come" from former McGill student, now Lieutenant in the Artillery." [1944]

<sup>134</sup> R.T. McKenzie, "Report on Citizens' Forum 1946-47," NAC, CBC CF, MG 28 I 400, Vol. 1, file 58, National Secretary's Report, 1946-47.

<sup>135</sup> R.T. McKenzie, "Report on Citizens' Forum 1946-47." McKenzie was quoting from the local reports his office received.

<sup>136</sup> E.L. Fortune to Guy Henson, 11 May 1949. AO, CAAE Papers, Series B-I, Box 1, CF, administrative, 1943-1960.

<sup>137</sup> Lorne Pierce, *The Beloved Community* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1925), 20.

<sup>138</sup> "You and Me and Reconstruction," *CBC Discussion Club*, broadcast 28 August 1942. NAC, CAVA/AVCA: 1984-0164, reference copy at: 1982-0043/63.

<sup>139</sup> *Letter From Home! From a Soldier of 1914-19 To A Soldier of 1939-194?* (1943). USASK, Pamphlet LX-23.

<sup>140</sup> "A Town-Planning Expert," *SN* (12 July 1941): 1. This piece kicked off a series of articles by Faludi, who also wrote for *Canadian Forum*, *Food for Thought* and *Maclean's* between 1941 and 1950.

<sup>141</sup> Dr. E.G. Faludi, "Housing Is Science," *SN* (15 August 1942): 8.

<sup>142</sup> James was responding to an article in which Wells disparaged British architects for mourning the loss of some of Britain's historic buildings. F. Cyril James, "Stained Glass," Address before the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, 20 February 1943, 5. McG, F. Cyril James Papers, MG 1017, Addresses and Other Papers, 1943.

<sup>143</sup> S.K. Jaffary, "The Social Services," in C.A. Ashley, ed., *Reconstruction in Canada* (Toronto: UTP, 1943), 111.

<sup>144</sup> Richard E. Crouch, "A Community Art Centre in Action," *Canadian Art* 2(1) (October-November 1944): 22.

<sup>145</sup> George E. Buckley to Reconstruction Committee, 20 June 1944. NAC, RG 14, 1987-88/146 (39) Reconstruction, W-4. Buckley was President of the Theatre Guild of Saint John, NB.

<sup>146</sup> Eric R. Arthur, "Town Planning and Tomorrow," *FFT* 3(8) (April 1943): 6-7; Campbell Merrett, "Planning with the People," *Canadian Art* 3(1) (October-November 1945): 18-21.

<sup>147</sup> Marcus Adeney, "Community Centres in Canada," *Journal of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada* 22(2) (February 1945): 22. The power of an antimodern perspective in a postmodern society (capitalist modernity + globalization, cybernetics and fragmentation of traditional systems of meaning) is well discussed in Ian McKay's essay on the packaging of history in mid twentieth-century Nova Scotia. See McKay, "History and the Tourist Gaze: The Politics of Commemoration in Nova Scotia, 1935-1964," *Acadiensis* 22(2) (Spring 1993): 102-138.

<sup>148</sup> Richard E. Crouch, "A Community Art Centre in Action." *Canadian Art* 2(1) (October-November 1944): 22-28.; Paul Duval, "Arthur Lismer, Canadian Artist, Led World in Art Education," *SN* (13 October 1945): 24-25.

<sup>149</sup> Adeney, "Community Centres in Canada," 23.

<sup>150</sup> See especially Chapter 7 of Jonathan Vance's *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning and the First World War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997). Vance notes on pp. 204-205 that the impulses to build purely "aesthetic" or utilitarian monuments each had vocal support; a difference of opinions that could, in some cases, be overcome.

<sup>151</sup> Adeney, "Community Centres in Canada," 23. See also Fred Lasserre and Gordon Lunan, "Community Centres," *Canadian Affairs* 2(17) (1945): 3-5. A detailed bibliography of reconstruction-era material on community centres in Canada, the United States, and Britain is: James Dahir, comp., *Community Centers as Living War Memorials: A Selected Bibliography with Interpretive Comments* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1946). George Mosse has written on attempts to extract positive motivations from World War experiences in *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990). On commemoration, see John E. Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992); Michael Kammen, *Mythic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of American Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1991).

<sup>152</sup> Librarian Elizabeth Loosley, among others, was still promoting the community centre after the Massey Commission began its hearings in 1949. She recommended the films "After Six O'Clock" and "When All the People Play" to groups that were planning centres. Loosley, "Solving Community Problems," *FFT* 10(3) (December 1949): 17-21.

<sup>153</sup> Martyn Estall, "Proposals for Government Action," (1946) NAC, H.R.C. Avison Papers, MG 30 D 102, Vol. 5, file 28, C.A.A.E. 1946.

<sup>154</sup> E.A. Corbett, "Proposals for Government Action to Assist Community Centres and Leisure-Time Programs in Canada," (1947), 7-8. NAC, WIB, RG 36/31, Vol. 14, file 8-20-1, CAAE. Lawren Harris et al., "Community Art Centres," *Canadian Art* 2(2) (December 1944-January 1945): 62-63, 77, 85; Anthony Walsh, "Rehabilitation Through Art and Handicrafts," *Canadian Art* 2(3) (Summer 1945): 3-5, 38; Murray G. Ross, "The Community Centre Movement," *FFT* 6(4) (January 1946): 10-17; Canadian Youth Commission, *Youth & Recreation: New Plans for New Times* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1946); David Murray, "Planned Recreation in Canada," *CanF* XXVI No. 306 (July 1946): 84-85; [H.R.C. Avison], "Memorandum re: Proposed Action by National Organizations in Recreation, Adult Education and the Arts towards a Federal Government Program on Community Centres and Community Leisure-Time Programs," (1946) NAC, H.R.C. Avison Papers, MG 30 D

102, Vol. 6, file 30, C.A.A.E. 1946; Lionel Scott, "A Community Centre Plan That Works," *FFT* 7(7) (April 1947): 9-13.

<sup>155</sup> Corbett, "Proposals for Government Action to Assist Community Centres and Leisure-Time Programs in Canada," (1947), 1-2, 7-8. On the topic of recapturing the spirit of fraternity that the Canadian soldier "knew overseas," see the issue on "Community Centres," *Canadian Affairs* 2(17) (1945): 2.

<sup>156</sup> Adeney, "Community Centres in Canada," 21.

<sup>157</sup> Paul Litt and Maria Tippet both cite the 1944 brief as a prominent wartime declaration of cultural activism. Litt, *The Muses, the Masses and The Massey Commission*, 23-24; Tippet, *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts before the Massey Commission*, 171-172.

<sup>158</sup> Morley Callaghan, "If Civilization Must Be Saved," *SN* (16 December 1939): 6.

<sup>159</sup> Elizabeth Wyn Wood, "A National Program for the Arts in Canada," *Canadian Art* 1(3) (February-March 1944): 93-94.

<sup>160</sup> The draft document was entitled: "Suggestions for Increased Government Support of the Arts in Canada," (1944) NAC, Canada Foundation, MG 28 I179, Vol. 20, file 3b, Arts and Letters Club, Toronto, 1944-1966.

<sup>161</sup> [Associated Arts Groups], "Brief Concerning the Cultural Aspects of Canadian Reconstruction," 3. NAC, RG 14, 1987-88/146 (39) Reconstruction, W-2.; "Canadians Ask Cultural Freedom," *The Canadian Author and Bookman* 20(4) (December 1944): 10. Reprinted from *Free World*, (1944, issue unknown)

<sup>162</sup> "Brief Concerning the Cultural Aspects of Canadian Reconstruction," 3.

<sup>163</sup> "Brief Concerning the Cultural Aspects of Canadian Reconstruction," 4-5.

<sup>164</sup> Walter B. Herbert, "An Acorn of Culture Is Planted On the Hill," *Ottawa Journal* 29 June 1944, 4.

<sup>165</sup> According to Herbert, £10,000 was made available in 1942 by a Michael Huxley for what became the Canadian Committee, and noted that "there has been a great deal of discussion and talk among people of a certain type in Canada during the past ten years - all related to a visionary proposal that we should have in our country some organization modelled more or less after the British Council and performing functions more or less similar to those of the British Council. But nothing has ever been done about it." Herbert to Thomas A. Stone, 21 October 1942. NAC, Walter B. Herbert Papers, MG 30 D 205, Vol. 1, Correspondence, 1942/44.

<sup>166</sup> W.B. Herbert to R.B. Inch, 25 March 1943. NAC, Canada Foundation, MG 28 I179, Vol. 25, file 4c, CBC, 1942-1951. Paul Litt reports that Herbert had been a Liberal party organizer. Litt, *The Muses, the Masses and the Massey Commission*, 282 n.18,

<sup>167</sup> Walter B. Herbert, "A Ministry of Fine Arts: A Contrary View," [1944], 4. NAC, Walter B. Herbert Papers, MG 30 D 205, Vol. 1, Addresses, Articles and Lectures.

<sup>168</sup> Stephen Tallents, "The Projection of England." During 1944, Herbert sent a copy of this to A.D. Dunton, then General Manager of the WIB, later to head the CBC. NAC, WIB, RG 36/31, Vol. 10, file 4-3, Canadian Committee.

<sup>169</sup> Walter B. Herbert to Paul Martin, 20 May 1944. NAC, Canada Foundation, MG 28 I179, Vol. 20, file 3b, Arts and Letters Club, Toronto, 1944-1966.

<sup>170</sup> Herbert to Mrs. John Bracken, 17 April 1946. NAC, Canada Foundation, MG 28 I179, Vol. 25, file 4b, CBC, 1942-1951.

<sup>171</sup> "Project. Publication of a Canadian Cultural Index," NAC, Canada Foundation, MG 28 I179, Vol. 33, file 3, Cultural Index, 1947-1948. *Canadian Cultural Publications* ran to thirteen editions, ceasing publication in 1965.

<sup>172</sup> John B. Collins, "'Design in Industry' Exhibition, National Gallery of Canada, 1946: Turning Bombers into Lounge Chairs," *Material History Bulletin* 27 (Spring 1988)

<sup>173</sup> F.M. Salter, "On the Other Hand," *The New Trail* 4(2) (April 1946): 79.

<sup>174</sup> The fact of post-war prosperity in Canada has been well-acknowledged, drawn upon by a number

of scholars in several disciplines. For further details and helpful statistics on post-war growth, the best source remains Kenneth Norrie and Doug Owsram, *A History of the Canadian Economy*. Second edition (Toronto: Harcourt Brace, 1996), 408-409 ff.

## Chapter Two

<sup>1</sup> Watson Thomson, "Education and Propaganda," *CanF* XXI No. 253 (February 1942): 328.

<sup>2</sup> The sort of power that the term *democracy* could (and does) wield illustrates a phenomenon which critics certainly sensed, but which historians, especially in the field of culture, now view as a commonplace: "experience is mediated by language, that our access to experience in the past as in the present is decisively shaped by its encoding in particular rhetorical conventions." Richard Wightman Fox and T.J. Jackson Lears, "Introduction," in Lears and Fox, eds., *The Power of Culture: Critical Essays in American History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 5.

<sup>3</sup> Jonathan F. Vance, *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning, and the First World War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997), see especially Chapters 6 and 7, quotation from p. 219. The National Film Board's *On Guard for Thee*, released during 1940, traced the growth of Canada's self-confidence from WWI to the end of 1939. Battle footage from the first war moves into interwar industrialization, and the 1930s depression gets rather less attention than the prelude to it. The Royal Visit of 1939 is also a highlight. Another example was the radio presentation of a letter, supposedly from a Canadian airman named "Jimmy" who had written to his parents before he died. Jimmy has abundant faith in democracy and reminds the audience of their duty to bring about peace. [Posthumous Letter from 'Jimmy'], broadcast 27 December 1942, NAC, CAVA/AVCA: 1988-0167.

<sup>4</sup> The modernist reaction to sentimental Victorianism was well under way by the 1920s. Ken Norris, "The Beginnings of Canadian Modernism," *Canadian Poetry* 11 (Fall-Winter 1982).

<sup>5</sup> *The Canadian Author and Bookman* 19(3) (September 1943): front cover.

<sup>6</sup> The American government and advertisers managed to equate tasks that defined the national war effort – enlisting, saving and producing – with the defence or potential improvement of the individual family's life. Robert B. Westbrook, "Fighting for the American Family: Private Interests and Political Obligation in World War II," in Fox and Lears, eds., *The Power of Culture*, 195-221.

<sup>7</sup> Leslie Roberts, *We Must Be Free: Reflections of a Democrat* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1939), 248.

<sup>8</sup> An associate told broadcaster Norman Creighton not to worry about getting pulled away from the his wartime serial *The Gillans* by Selective Service because he was working in radio. Allan Dill to Norman Creighton, 8 March 1943. DAL, Norman Creighton Papers, MS-2, 689, B4.

<sup>9</sup> Raymond A. Davies, "Writers and Artists Must Work for Offensive," *JN* (19 September 1942): 19.

<sup>10</sup> John Fairfax, "Art For Man's Sake," *CanF* XVI No. 187 (August 1936): 24.

<sup>11</sup> "Winning the War," *CanF* XX No. 237 (October 1940): 198-199.

<sup>12</sup> J.L. Granatstein, *Canada's War: The Politics of the Mackenzie King Government* (Toronto: UTP, 1990); Brian Nolan, *King's War: Mackenzie King and the Politics of War, 1939-1945* (Toronto: Random House, 1988); Robert Bothwell and William Kilbourn, *C.D. Howe: a biography* (Toronto: M&S, 1979); Reginald Whitaker, *The Government Party: Organizing and Financing the Liberal Party of Canada, 1930-1958* (Toronto: UTP, 1977); Walter Young, *Anatomy of a Party: The National CCF, 1932-1961* (Toronto: UTP, 1969); Granatstein, *The Politics of Survival: The Conservative Party of Canada, 1939-1945* (Toronto: UTP, 1967).

<sup>13</sup> The four were freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear.

For a good example of how pervasive and resonant Roosevelt's speech was in Canada, see George W. Brown, *Canadian Democracy in Action* (Toronto: Ontario Department of Education, 1945).

<sup>14</sup> Thomson, "Education and Propaganda," 328.

<sup>15</sup> "Begin Now?" *JN* (27 December 1941): 3.

<sup>16</sup> I.D. Willis, memorandum to Justice J.T. Thorson, [1940]: 12. NAC, Canadian Authors Association Papers, MG 28 I 2, Vol. 1, Ontario.

<sup>17</sup> A.R.M. Lower, "Canada, the Second Great War, and the Future," *International Journal* 1(2) (April 1946): 99-100.

<sup>18</sup> Donald Creighton, *The Forked Road: Canada 1939-1957* (Toronto: M&S, 1976), 37.

<sup>19</sup> Peter Fraser, "What Our Thinking Canadians Really Think About," *JN* (18 March 1939): 2.

<sup>20</sup> *Historical Statistics of Canada*. 2nd edition (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1983), series A67-A69.

<sup>21</sup> H.M. Cavers, "Progress and the Farmer," *CanF* XIX No. 224 (September 1939): 189.

<sup>22</sup> Harold Innis was deeply concerned with the economic and cultural effects of communications and transportation technology, especially in his later works. For a more recent intellectual history along these lines, see Stephen Kern, *The Culture of Time and Space, 1880-1918* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983). Jeremy Wilson presents one Canadian example of this standardization process in his study of changes to the scale and substance of political campaign issues in the interior of British Columbia in Wilson, "The Impact of Communications Developments on British Columbia Electoral Patterns, 1903-1975," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 13(3) (September 1980): 530.

<sup>23</sup> B.K. Sandwell, *The Canadian Peoples* (London and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1941), 116-117. Sandwell also named these factors as rivals of the church as a social hub.

<sup>24</sup> John Dewey, *Freedom and Culture* (New York: Putnam, 1939), 44-45.

<sup>25</sup> Leslie Gordon Barnard, "Postscript to a Letter," *The Canadian Author* 16(2) (April 1939): 7.

<sup>26</sup> Chester Martin, "Trends in Canadian Nationhood," in Chester Martin, ed., *Canada in Peace and War* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1941), 26.

<sup>27</sup> Peter Miles and Malcolm Smith, *Cinema, Literature and Society: Elite and Mass Culture in Interwar Britain* (London: Croom Helm, 1987), 232-233, 239. See also Robert Hewison, *Under Siege: Literary Life in London, 1939-1945* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977), especially Chapter One, "Barbarians at the Gate."

<sup>28</sup> The WIB was the successor of the Bureau of Public Information, a body established in 1939 to coordinate information about George VI's Royal Visit. Though small, it included several members of other Canadian cultural and social reform organizations. William R. Young, "Making the Truth Graphic: The Canadian Government's Home Front Information Structure and Programmes During World War II," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1978, see especially pp. 74-80 for a listing of staff. Paul Litt, *The Muses, The Masses, and the Massey Commission* (Toronto: UTP, 1992), 40. The MoI's interests were broader than those of the WIB, and the Ministry was also influenced in the direction of cultural study, during the early stages of the war at least, by the presence of some dynamic members of the unorthodox British social research group Mass-Observation. Gary Cross, "Introduction," in Gary Cross, ed., *Worktowners at Blackpool: Mass-Observation and popular leisure in the 1930s* (London: Routledge, 1990), 2-3.

<sup>29</sup> "The Job Ahead," *Canadian Business* 17(1) (January 1944): 18.

<sup>30</sup> Young, "Making the Truth Graphic," ii, 1-6, 17.

<sup>31</sup> H. Forsyth Hardy, "Democracy as a Fighting Faith," in *John Grierson and the NFB* (Toronto: ECW, 1984), 90. See also Gary Evans, *John Grierson and the National Film Board: The Politics of Wartime Propaganda* (Toronto: UTP, 1985).

<sup>32</sup> Particularly around the time of the New York World's Fair of 1939, a rash of ads emerged touting the futuristic qualities of certain products. Firestone Tires ran "As Modern As the World of Tomorrow"; General Electric reminded consumers of the benefits of research with "Test-tube Babies," a campaign

emphasizing the economic spin-offs of a forward-looking society. Some examples of war-related print ad campaigns were: "Two shoulders to the same wheel," (1941); "Canadian Nickel: Serving Today ... Preparing for Tomorrow," (1943); "Westinghouse Wartime Precision" (1943).

<sup>33</sup> Robert Ayre, "Art of Our Day in Canada," *SN* (28 December 1940): 25.

<sup>34</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "War Gets Things Done," *SN* (22 March 1941): 14.

<sup>35</sup> J.R. MacGillivray, "Fiction," *University of Toronto Quarterly* ("Letters in Canada" issue, 1940) 10(3) (April 1941): 292-293, 299.

<sup>36</sup> A.W. Trueman, "Our Present and Future Problems, With Suggestions for Their Solution," *Echoes* 160 (Autumn 1940): 11.

<sup>37</sup> Raymond A. Davies, "Canadian Workers Must Learn To Hate the Axis," *SN* (1 August 1942): 10. See also Davies, "Management Too Must Learn To Hate Fascism," *SN* (15 August 1942): 14.

<sup>38</sup> Claris Edwin Silcox, *The War and Religion* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1941), 3. Les Callan drew a cartoon for the *Toronto Star* in April 1941 featuring a "free democracy" rifle pointed at a swastika and a "Hitler's axis" rifle pointed at a cross. "War Aims," Original at NAC, accession number 1990-608-208.

<sup>39</sup> A number of pamphlets and articles published during the war used this phrase or variations on it to emphasize the need to inculcate the fundamentals of the democratic tradition. See the later section of this chapter which deals with democracy.

<sup>40</sup> Paul Lazarsfeld, "The Effects of Radio on Public Opinion," in Douglas Waples, ed., *Print, Radio and Film in a Democracy: ten papers on the administration of mass communications in the public interest* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), 66.

<sup>41</sup> Frank H. Underhill, "The People Versus the Masses," *CanF XXI* No. 252 (January 1942): 311.

<sup>42</sup> W.J. Healy, "Canada," *National Home Monthly* 40(8) (August 1939): 1.

<sup>43</sup> Watson Kirkconnell, "The Price of Christian Liberty," (1939), Presidential address delivered in Winnipeg before the Baptist Union of Western Canada, reprinted in *The Canadian Baptist* (10 August 1939 and 24 August 1939): 5.

<sup>44</sup> One observer suggested that significant confusion existed in England and Canada regarding the important distinction between democracy and liberalism, and that Nazi and Fascist regimes were at least nominally democratic in that they were 'popular.' H.N. Fieldhouse, "Dictatorship and Democracy," *Queen's Quarterly* 47(2) (Summer 1940): 161-164.

<sup>45</sup> Young, "Making the Truth Graphic," 128-140.

<sup>46</sup> Underhill, "The People Versus the Masses," 312.

<sup>47</sup> Northrop Frye, "War on the Cultural Front," *CanF XX* No. 235 (August 1940): 146. In this case, Mussolini merely met Frye's need to name an Axis leader.

<sup>48</sup> A.R.M. Lower, "Look On This Picture and On This - A View of Canada in 1941," unpublished MS, dated 27 October 1941, 1. QUA, A.R.M. Lower Papers, Box 19, B 430.48.

<sup>49</sup> R.S. Lambert, "Mind Under Fire," *FFT* 1(5) (May 1940): 3, 17.

<sup>50</sup> "Mind Under Fire," 4-7. In a review of Canadian wartime efforts in the field of propaganda, the author portrayed these efforts as informational, with 'hate' propaganda conspicuously absent. See especially pp. 14-15. Looking back on the 1930s, National Film Board director John Grierson noted that resistance to activities resembling propaganda was high, in his estimation because "it was not generally allowed that information services were proper to democratic government." John Grierson, "The Changing Face of Propaganda," MS [1944]. NAC, Canada Foundation, MG 28 I179, Vol. 37, file 6, Grierson, John, National Film Board. This piece was eventually published as "Democracy's Propaganda," in *Free World* IX(1) (January 1945): 37-40. On Northcliffe of Fleet Street, see D.L. LeMahieu, *A Culture for Democracy*, 111 and passim.

<sup>51</sup> Watson Thomson, "Education and Propaganda," *CanF XXI* No. 253 (February 1942): 328-331.

<sup>52</sup> Young, "Making the Truth Graphic," iii.

<sup>53</sup> F.D.L. Smith, "Religion, at Long Last, Gets Into Education," *SN* (4 July 1942): 36.

<sup>54</sup> N.A.M. MacKenzie, "The Universities in a World at War," speech at Sir George Williams College, [1944], 12. UBCSC, N.A.M. MacKenzie Papers, Box 96, folder 2.

<sup>55</sup> "YOU Against the Faceless Men!" (1942).

<sup>56</sup> "Talk of the Town," *The New Yorker* (7 February 1942): 7.

<sup>57</sup> Gregor Ziemer, *Education for Death: The Making of a Nazi* (London: Oxford University Press, 1941). W.H. Brittain saw "conditioning" as the reason behind some of the remarkable results the Nazis achieved, but was certain that Canadians could not be conditioned in the same way. "The Role of the Canadian Association for Adult Education," (1944), 2-3. NAC, H.R.C. Avison Papers, MG 30 D 102, Vol. 5, file 26, C.A.A.E. 1944. See also R.S. Lambert, "Youth, War and Idealism," *FFT* 1(8) (October 1940): 3-13.

<sup>58</sup> R.S. Lambert, "Why Germany Is Like That," *FFT* 1(3) (March 1940): 3; See also G.M.A. Grube, "Hitlerism Is the Enemy," *CanF* XIX No. 228 (January 1940): 320-322. Sir Robert Falconer characterized the German nation under Nazi rule: "They are impelled by an arrogance of race, a hubris of ethnic complacency, a sense of the incarnation in them of a divine naturalistic force, which has degraded their youth into an immoral, indeed, I should say, a sub-moral state of mind." Robert A. Falconer, "Foreword," in Philip Child and John W. Holmes, *Dynamic Democracy: Problem of Strategy in the World War of Morale, Behind the Headlines Series*, Vol. 1, no. 9. May 1941 (Toronto: CILA/CAAE, 1941), 1.

<sup>59</sup> Lambert, "Why Germany Is Like That," 9-10. Chronicling ways in which Germany had "parodied" Britain, Lambert listed Bismarck's attempts to instill a devotion to the monarchy, the fostering of commercialism and industrial capitalism, and Wilhelm II's desire for a colonial empire.

<sup>60</sup> Mac Shoub, "Thunder On, Democracy!" broadcast 8 July 1942, as the *CBC Play of the Week*. Concordia Centre for Broadcast Studies, CBC Radio Drama Archive, M007813.

<sup>61</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "Religion and Education," *SN* (16 August 1941): 7.

<sup>62</sup> F. Cyril James, Address during the radio intermission of Gounod's *Faust*, CBC Trans-Canada Network, 30 January 1943. McG, F. Cyril James Papers, MG 1017, Addresses and Other Papers, 1943.

<sup>63</sup> Anon., "Thine is the kingdom," broadcast 21 January 1943, CBC Trans-Canada Network, 10. McM, CBC Scripts Collection, Reel 19.

<sup>64</sup> Donald Avery, *The Science of War: Canadian Scientists and Allied Military Technology During the Second World War* (Toronto: UTP, 1998); George R. Lindsey, ed., *No Day Long Enough: Canadian Science in World War II* (Toronto: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 1997).

<sup>65</sup> Typical of the *Maclean's* pieces were: Creighton Peet, "Your House of Tomorrow," (15 September 1943): 12-13, 43-45; Leonard L. Knott, "Chemistry Fights," (15 May 1942): 24-25, 46-47, 49-51; Wallace Rayburn, "Medicine Goes To War," (1 September 1943): 18-19, 32, 34-35, 37.

<sup>66</sup> Lawrence N. Galton compiled the "Tuning Up for Tomorrow" series, which began in the July 1945 issue of *National Home Monthly*. It fits best under John Burnham's category of "Gee Whiz!" science. John C. Burnham, *How Superstition Won and Science Lost: Popularizing Science and Health in the United States* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987), 5-6.

<sup>67</sup> Kenneth Johnstone, "New Army's Food Is Streamlined," *SN* (18 November 1939): 22.

<sup>68</sup> Sir Richard Arman Gregory, *Science in Chains*, No. 12 in the Macmillan War Pamphlets series (London: Macmillan, 1941). In the same series, Julian Huxley contributed a pamphlet entitled "Argument of Blood," which dealt primarily with Nazi race thought. Both sources were recommended in the CAAE's "Pamphlet List" for 1945.

<sup>69</sup> In a stunning departure from his usual cheerleading role, science writer and communist Dyson Carter reminded critics of Russian science what Hitler had been doing with the fruits of German scientific labour. "When Science Kneels to Pray," *SN* (25 October 1941): 10.

<sup>70</sup> Beverly Baxter, "London Letter - Science At War," *Maclean's* (1 February 1940): 9, 35. Baxter



developed this idea of misused science further in "The Mind of The German Soldier," *Maclean's* (15 December 1941): 9, 44-45. See also Rolfe Williams, "Jap Using Drugs to Enslave Conquered Peoples," *SN* (2 May 1942): 6.

<sup>71</sup> "The enemy are starting..." *SN* (4 January 1941): 23.

<sup>72</sup> Blair Fraser, "Hush-Hush Science War," *Maclean's* (15 January 1945): 5-6, 41-43. C.D. Howe considered the scientist an unsung hero whose contribution would be acknowledged properly once the war had ended. "Address to Rotary Club of Montreal," 11 February 1941, 3. NAC, Clarence Decatur Howe Papers, MG 27 III B20, Vol. 140, series 89, Articles, Speeches, Books.

<sup>73</sup> E.L. Harrington, "Physics and Society," *Culture* 5 (1944): 285.

<sup>74</sup> William Hardy Alexander, "Noli Episcopari (Letter to a young man contemplating an academic career)," *CanF* XIX No. 225 (October 1939): 220-223.

<sup>75</sup> P.M. Richards, "Democracy Worth Fighting For," *SN* (9 August 1941): 26.

<sup>76</sup> W.J. Healy, "Christmases in Years to Come," *National Home Monthly* 40(12) (December 1939): 1.

<sup>77</sup> "End of an Era?" *CanF* XX No. 234 (July 1940): 101.

<sup>78</sup> W.C. Keirstead, "Discussion in Democracy," *CanF* XVIII no. 218 (March 1939): 378.

<sup>79</sup> N.A.M. MacKenzie, "The Universities in a World at War," speech at Sir George Williams College, [1944], 12. UBCSC, N.A.M. MacKenzie Papers, Box 96, folder 2. Quoted passage from: MacKenzie, "The Future of the Arts Course," speech to Universities Conference, [1942], 6-7. UBCSC, MacKenzie Papers, Box 96, folder 2. W.C. Graham to Gordon Sisco, 7 July 1943. UCA, Commission on Church, Nation and World Order, Box 1, f.8 - Correspondence; For a more consciously religious interpretation of the same issue, see R.D. MacLennan, "The Continuing Aims of Higher Education," *Culture* 4 (1943): 495-503.

<sup>80</sup> E.A. Havelock, "The Philosophy of John Dewey," *CanF* XIX No. 222 (July 1939): 123.

<sup>81</sup> Albert C. Wakeman, "New Year Thoughts on the War - and After," *SN* (6 January 1940): 7.

<sup>82</sup> Morley Callaghan, "If Civilization Must Be Saved," *SN* (16 December 1939): 6.

<sup>83</sup> Humphrey Carver, "Home-Made Thoughts on Handicrafts," *CanF* XIX No. 230 (March 1940): 386-387. A Hamilton businessman took Carver's notion of integration one step further, arguing that handicrafts were neither "interests of the dilettante [or] hobbies of the intelligentsia. In these days of increasing leisure time, and in view of the ever-widening demand for entertainment, amusement, and pleasure, these gifts have a definite and growing market." Joseph M. Pigott, "Youth and a Trade," *Maclean's* (15 May 1940): 18, 51. Even an advocate of modern architecture admitted that the Industrial Revolution had spawned "ugly factories and products which disturbed artistic people" before efficiency and economy were accepted as components of good design. George Laidler, "Modern Building," *CanF* XIX No. 223 (August 1939): 154-156.

<sup>84</sup> Carver, "Home-Made Thoughts on Handicrafts," 386.

<sup>85</sup> Lawren Harris et al., "Community Art Centres," *Canadian Art* 2(2) (December 1944-January 1945): 62. Schrecker's Toqueville-style diary had just been published in the United States by Harper's.

<sup>86</sup> Adeline Haddow, "Individuality and the Machine," *SN* (20 June 1942): 21. Joy Parr presents the empowered post-war housewife in *Domestic Goods: The Material, the Moral and the Economic in the Postwar Years* (Toronto: UTP, 1999), a study exploring the design and consumption of household fixtures and furnishings.

<sup>87</sup> Frye, "War on the Cultural Front," 144.

<sup>88</sup> "Education For What?" *CanF* XXI No. 250 (November 1941): 229.

<sup>89</sup> John Dewey, *Freedom and Culture* (New York: Putnam, 1939)

<sup>90</sup> May Richstone, "Tabloid," *SN* (7 December 1940): 15.

<sup>91</sup> Frye, "War on the Cultural Front," 144.

<sup>92</sup> Buchan was perhaps better known in Canada as the first Baron Tweedsmuir, Governor-General from 1935-1940. Willis began one of his pamphlets, *Democracy: A Tripod* (Port Hope, ON: 1940), with this quotation from Buchan's autobiographical *Memory Hold-the-Door* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1940), 220.

<sup>93</sup> "So two cheers for Democracy: one because it admits variety and two because it permits criticism. Two cheers are quite enough: there is no occasion to give three. Only Love the Beloved Republic deserves that." E.M. Forster, "What I Believe," in *Two Cheers For Democracy* (London: Edward Arnold, 1951), 79.

<sup>94</sup> One of the more comprehensive broadcasts in this series was: Terence William Leighton MacDermot, *Can We Make Good?* Fourth Broadcast in the *Citizens All* series on CBC, broadcast 15 November 1940. Published as No. 4 in the *Democracy and Citizenship* series (Toronto: CAAE/CILA, 1940).

<sup>95</sup> On the American side, Thomas Vernor Smith, Glenn Negley and Robert Bush produced *Democracy vs. Dictatorship* (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1942), a resource package for the teaching of democracy, which noted such publications as: F.L. Bacon and E.A. Krug, *Our Life Today* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1939); Ryllis and Omar Goslin, *Democracy* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1940); L.J. O'Rourke, *Our Democracy and its Problems* (Boston: Heath, 1942); Lewis Mumford, *Faith for Living* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1940). Not listed as teaching material was Smith's own *The Democratic Tradition in America* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1941). In Britain, support for and invocation of the concept was no less vigorous or wide-ranging. See Harold J. Laski et. al., *Where stands democracy?: A collection of essays by members of the Fabian Society* (London: Macmillan, 1940); David Thomson, *The Democratic Ideal in France and England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940); Julian Huxley, *Democracy Marches* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941); J.B. Priestley, *Out of the People* (New York: Harper, 1941); Godfrey Elton, *St. George or the Dragon: Towards a Christian Democracy* (London: Collins, 1942); Josiah C. Wedgwood, *Testament to Democracy* (London: Hutchinson, [1942]).

<sup>96</sup> Martyn Estall, "Learning for Living," *Canadian Affairs* 2(16) (October 1945), 3.

<sup>97</sup> D.L. LeMahieu, *A Culture for Democracy: Mass Communication and the Cultural Mind in Britain Between the Wars* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 3.

<sup>98</sup> Nova Scotia Credit Union League, "Is Ignorance Bliss?" [1940], 2.

<sup>99</sup> Prior to the dissolution of the German-Soviet entente, writers and broadcasters also noted the differences between communism and liberal democracy, but seemed to find it easier to demonize the Nazi, Italian fascist, and Japanese regimes as enemies of democracy. See, for an example from the pamphlet literature, the quoted piece by the phlegmatic, but committed I.D. Willis, entitled *Democracy: A Tripod* (Port Hope: 1940), 1-2.

<sup>100</sup> Philip Child and John W. Holmes, *Dynamic Democracy: Problem of Strategy in the World War of Morale*, Behind the Headlines Series, Vol. 1, no. 9. May 1941 (Toronto: CILA/CAAE, 1941), 5. On radio, "You Are Democracy" (broadcast 2 December 1944) was a good example of such direct appeals. NAC, CAVA/AVCA: 1976-0066.

<sup>101</sup> *Government By the People* Canadian Post-war Affairs: Discussion Manual No. 5, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1945, 6.

<sup>102</sup> R.S. Lambert, "Youth, War and Idealism," *FFT* 1(8) (October 1940): 11.

<sup>103</sup> Winnipeg "If" Day, Fox Movietone Newsreel, 1942. NAC, CAVA/AVCA: 1978-0203.

<sup>104</sup> H.N. Fieldhouse did not subscribe to the notion that democracy and dictatorship were mutually exclusive, and cautioned his readers to avoid using democracy as a synonym for liberalism. Fieldhouse, "Dictatorship and Democracy," 162-163. D.G. Davis, *Parents and Democracy* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1941); Julia Grace Wales, *Democracy Needs Education* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1942); Charles E. Phillips, *New Schools for Democracy* Behind the Headlines Series, Vol. 4, no. 6 (Toronto: CILA/CAAE, 1944); George W. Brown, *Canadian Democracy in Action* (Toronto: Ontario Department of Education, 1945)

<sup>105</sup> I.D. Willis, *What Do Canada and Democracy Really Mean to You?* (Port Hope: 1940): front cover.

<sup>106</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "You Take Out What You Put In," Third broadcast in the 'Citizens All' series on CBC, 1 November 1940, published as Number 3 in the *Democracy and Citizenship Series* (Toronto: CAAE/CILA, 1940), 6; T.W.L. MacDermot, *Can We Make Good?*, 6; Canadian Teachers' Federation, "I'm Free to Choose," No. 3 in the *Democratic Way* series, (July 1943), 8-10.

<sup>107</sup> S.K. Jaffary, "The Social Services," in C.A. Ashley, ed., *Reconstruction in Canada* (Toronto: UTP, 1943), 119.

<sup>108</sup> M.M. Coady, "Blueprinting Post-War Canada," *Culture* 4 (1943): 161. University of Wisconsin English professor J.G. Wales, a Canadian, wrote during the war that institutions in democratic nations deserved space to adapt to rapidly changing conditions because these institutions were "of long and organic growth." Julia Grace Wales, "Pro, Not Anti: A Principle of Integration," *The New Age* 2(31) (8 August 1940): 9-10.

<sup>109</sup> Canadian Teachers' Federation, "Freedom of Conscience," No. 4 in the Democratic Way series, (January 1944), 20.

<sup>110</sup> T.W.L. MacDermot, *Can We Make Good?*, 16-19.

<sup>111</sup> Writing at a time when Germany and the Soviet Union were not yet at war, Frye condemned both ends of the political spectrum, adding that: "This something broader and deeper neither nazism or communism possesses." Frye "War on the Cultural Front," 144-146.

<sup>112</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "Who Are Culture's Custodians?" *SN* (7 June 1941): 11.

<sup>113</sup> "I'm Free to Choose," (July 1943), 6. Quotation from: "Freedom of Conscience," (January 1944), 4.

<sup>114</sup> Sandwell, "You Take Out What You Put In," 18.

<sup>115</sup> The remaining plays, in order of presentation, were: *This Precious Freedom*, *The Flying Yorkshireman*, *Hellas*, *A British Subject I Was Born*, and *The Fall of the City*. "Radio Hits the Mark!" *FFT* 2(2) (February 1941): 15. At the conclusion of Norman Corwin's play, actor Phillips Holmes enumerated radio's contributions to "keeping democracy alive." *Seems Radio is Here to Stay*, broadcast 2 February 1941. NAC, CAVA/AVCA: 1981-0100.

<sup>116</sup> John Grierson, "Education and the New Order," Address at the closing banquet of the CAAE annual convention, Winnipeg, 31 May 1941, 9. McG, John Grierson Collection, MG 2067, Container 4, file 110.

<sup>117</sup> Kirkconnell to William Clarke of Oxford University Press, Toronto, 5 November 1940, 30 April 1941, 29 June 1941, 6 September 1941; Clarke to Kirkconnell, 22 May 1941. AUA, Watson Kirkconnell Papers, Material on *Twilight of Liberty*, P1/11.2.

<sup>118</sup> Young Men's Committee, National Council, YMCA, *Canada and the Four Freedoms* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1944); "Freedom and Scientific Dogmatism," *FFT* 3(3) (November 1942): 5-6; J.E. Middleton, "Roosevelt," (poem) *SN* (21 April 1945): 3; "You and Me and Reconstruction," CBC Discussion Club, 28 August 1942. NAC, CAVA/AVCA: 1984-0164, reference copy at: 1982-0043/63.

<sup>119</sup> L.A. Mackay, "About Tradition and Modern Education," *SN* (26 July 1941): 14-15.

<sup>120</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "Liberty and Commitments," *SN* (20 September 1941): 3.

<sup>121</sup> Charles E. Phillips, *New Schools for Democracy* (Toronto: CIIA/CAAE, 1944), 15-16.

<sup>122</sup> Hon. D. [Duncan] McArthur, "Education for Democracy," *SN* (7 December 1940): 45. Creighton, *The Forked Road*, 20.

<sup>123</sup> W.P. Percival, "Freedom of Educational Opportunity," *Canadian Geographical Journal* 26(12) (June 1943): 289.

<sup>124</sup> "Winning the War," *CanF* XX No. 237 (October 1940): 199.

<sup>125</sup> T.W.L. MacDermot, *Can We Make Good?*, 7.

<sup>126</sup> Frye, "War on the Cultural Front," 144.

<sup>127</sup> Frank H. Underhill, "The People Versus the Masses," 311.

<sup>128</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "You Take Out What You Put In," 19. Sandwell had written along similar lines prior to the war. See "Totalitarian Democracy," *SN* (29 April 1939): 1.

<sup>129</sup> "Canadian Hurdles," Canadian Post-war Affairs: Discussion Manual No. 4 (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1945), 82. My italics.

<sup>130</sup> John Chastey, "Bridge to To-morrow," broadcast 1 January 1943, 18. McM, CBC Scripts Collection,

Reel 9.

<sup>131</sup> Ronald Oliver MacFarlane, "Canada Tomorrow: Canada and the Post-war World, Part One," *Behind the Headlines* 2(3) (January 1942) (Toronto: CILA/CAAE, 1942)

<sup>132</sup> D.G. Davis, *Parents and Democracy* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1941), 3.

<sup>133</sup> Martyn Estall, "Learning for Living," 5.

<sup>134</sup> F. Cyril James, "Stained Glass," Address before the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, 20 February 1943. McG, F. Cyril James Papers, MG 1017, Addresses and Other Papers, 1943.

<sup>135</sup> John Coulter, "Books and Shows," Second series, Talk number one, broadcast 24 November 1942, 5. McM, John Coulter Papers, Box 36, f. 2.

<sup>136</sup> John Coulter, "Books and Shows," Talk number three, First series, 30 June 1942. McM, John Coulter Papers, Box 36, f. 1.

<sup>137</sup> "Montreal Central Station Opening," script, 14 July 1943. NAC, CBC, RG 41, Vol. 252, file 11-39-8, Montreal Station Opening.

<sup>138</sup> Gerald Clark, "First Stop To Tomorrow," *Maclean's* (1 September 1943): 20, 45.

<sup>139</sup> "Frozen Streamlines," *Ottawa Journal* (22 November 1940).

<sup>140</sup> Charles Fraser Comfort, "Art and the Community," Speech at the Opening Ceremonies of the John Gordon McIntosh and Wilhelmina Morris McIntosh Memorial Building, University of Western Ontario, 26 June 1942. NAC, Charles Fraser Comfort Papers, MG30 D81, Vol. 35, file 1.

<sup>141</sup> Douglas Le Pan, "The Arts in Great Britain in Wartime," *Canadian Art* 1(1) (October-November 1943): 13.

<sup>142</sup> "Freedom of Conscience," (January 1944), 6.

<sup>143</sup> Claris Edwin Silcox, *The War and Religion* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1941), 6.

<sup>144</sup> Richard M. Saunders, "Introduction," in Richard M. Saunders, ed., *Education for Tomorrow* (Toronto: UTP, 1946), ix-x.

<sup>145</sup> John Macdonald, "The Corner Stone of Democracy: The Discussion Group," (Toronto: Ryerson, 1939); C. Cecil Lingard, "Why National Leadership in Education Is Vital," *SN* (21 December 1940): 6; "Education For What?" *CanF* XXI No. 250 (November 1941): 229-230; Canadian Teachers' Federation, "I'm Free to Choose," No. 3 in the Democratic Way series, (July 1943), 5; L.A. MacKay, "Liberal Education Needed for Healthy Democracy," *SN* (27 May 1944): 11. "Government By the People," Canadian Post-war Affairs: Discussion Manual No. 5 (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1945), 60.

## Chapter Three

<sup>1</sup> Mary Lowrey Ross, "At Least We'll Still Have With Us the Men Who Dream-Up Tomorrow," *SN* (26 January 1946): 9.

<sup>2</sup> Charlotte Whitton, "What Splendour Men Have the Power to Shape," address to the Illinois Welfare Association Convention, Peoria, IL, 3 December 1945, 6. NAC, Charlotte Elizabeth Whitton Papers, Vol. 83, Manuscripts.

<sup>3</sup> John Grierson, "Education in a Technological Society," address to the National Conference on Adult Education, Winnipeg, 28 May 1945. McG, John Grierson Collection, MG 2067, Container 4, file 110; "Genie Out of the Bottle," *SN* (11 August 1945): 1; "We'd Better Keep Our Scientists," *Maclean's* (1 October 1945): 1; John J. O'Neill, "Freedom in Scientific Research Not Likely For Long Time Yet," *SN* (20 October 1945): 11.

<sup>4</sup> D.R.G. Owen, *Scientism, Man and Religion* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1952), 13.

<sup>5</sup> William H. Whyte Jr., *The Organization Man* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956), 23.

<sup>6</sup> University of Montreal Institute of Medieval Studies, "Memorandum to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences," November 1949, 4. NAC, RCALS, RG 33/28, Vol. 20.

<sup>7</sup> C.J. Eustace, "The Role of Religion in Canadian Life, Being an Attempt to Essay the Place of the Church in our New Changing Society," *Culture* 6 (1945): 147-148.

<sup>8</sup> N.A.M. MacKenzie, "V-J Day," Radio broadcast, 12 August 1945, 1. UBCSC, N.A.M. MacKenzie Papers, Box 103, folder 11.

<sup>9</sup> CF, "Who Should Go To University?" 3 March 1948. CBC Radio Archives, Toronto. tc on 820219-9(1); Lister Sinclair, "Mankind in the Age of Science," *Maclean's* (1 January 1950): 5-7, 47-48; Doug Owsram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby Boom Generation* (Toronto: UTP, 1996). See also T.J. Jackson Lears, "A Matter of Taste," in Lary May, ed., *Recasting America: Culture and Politics in the Age of the Cold War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 38-57; Owsram, *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1910-1945* (Toronto: UTP, 1986).

<sup>10</sup> "T.M.F." to CBC Talks Department, compiled letters re: "Living in an Atomic Age," (1951). NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 6, CBC, Censorship Attempts by Pressure Groups.

<sup>11</sup> On "big science" and its cultural impacts, see Jon Agar, *Science and Spectacle: The Work of Jodrell Bank in Post-war British Culture* (Amsterdam: Harwood, 1998); Charles E. Rosenberg has recently revised and expanded his 1976 work *No Other Gods: On Science and American Social Thought* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997); Christopher P. Tournay, *Conjuring Science: Scientific Symbols and Cultural Meanings in American Life* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1996); the articles in Peter Galison and Bruce Hevly, eds., *Big Science: the Growth of Large-scale Research* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992). On the contingency of the power relationships surrounding research, see Chandra Mukerji, *A Fragile Power: Scientists and the State* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989).

<sup>12</sup> C.D. Howe, "Opportunities for the Young Engineer," Address to the graduates of the University of British Columbia, 11 May 1950. NAC, Clarence Decatur Howe Papers, MG 27 III B20, Vol. 141, series 89, Articles, Speeches, Books, 4. In June 1946, Toronto *Star* cartoonist Les Callan depicted Howe as a waiter serving diners their "atomic age." "Chee! And We Only Ordered Apple Pie!" Original at NAC, 1990-608-420.

<sup>13</sup> I have borrowed this term from James Gilbert. He used it to denote supporters of a religious perspective, in his work on two distinctly different contexts: *A Cycle of Outrage: America's Reaction to the Juvenile Delinquent in the 1950s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986) and *Redeeming Culture: American Religion in Age of Science* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

<sup>14</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "The Science-Faith Borders," *JN* (28 June 1952): 4.

<sup>15</sup> On Canada's late nineteenth and early twentieth-century struggles over this question, see: David Marshall, *Secularizing the Faith: Canadian Protestant Clergy and the Crisis of Belief, 1850-1940* (Toronto: UTP, 1992); Michael Gauvreau, *The Evangelical Century: College and Creed in English Canada from the Great Revival to the Great Depression* (Montreal and Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991); Ramsay Cook, *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late-Victorian English Canada* (Toronto: UTP, 1985). Julie A. Reuben's *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996) deals with nineteenth century developments in the United States. For a longer view of the controversy, see John Hedley Brooke, *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

<sup>16</sup> Carl Berger, *Science, God, and Nature in Victorian Canada* (Toronto: UTP, 1983); Patricia Jasen, "Romanticism, Modernity, and the Evolution of Tourism on the Niagara Frontier, 1790-1850," *Canadian Historical Review* 72(3) (September 1991): 283-318.; Keith Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture* (Toronto: UTP, 1997). For a compelling introduction to the cultural implications of modernity in the Canadian context, see Ian McKay, "Introduction: All That Is Solid

Melts into Air," in Ian McKay, ed., *The Challenge of Modernity: A Reader on Post-Confederation History* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1992): ix-xxvi.

<sup>17</sup> B.S. Keirstead, "The Boundaries," unpublished MS, [1938]. University of New Brunswick Archives, Burton Seely Keirstead Papers, UA RG 81, MS 3.1.1., 129.

<sup>18</sup> Mary Lowrey Ross, "The Human Equation," *SN* (13 May 1939): 24.

<sup>19</sup> "Design for Canadian Wings," or "Elsie MacGill," n.d. [1941]. McM, CBC Scripts Collection, Reel 21.

<sup>20</sup> A product of the later 1920s, the National Research Council began to pay dividends early in the war. Charles Clay, "Our Headache Headquarters," *SN* (7 December 1940): 22-23. Blair Fraser, "Hush-Hush Science War," *Maclean's* (15 January 1945): 41-43.

<sup>21</sup> George R. Ehrhardt, "Descendants of Prometheus: Popular Science Writing in the United States, 1915-1948," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1993, iii. Carter was a geologist who wrote science columns for the *Winnipeg Free Press*. He was also a communist, and wrote throughout his career for communist periodicals, mostly about Russian scientific research. When that sort of material began creeping into his national columns, especially following Russia's alignment with the Allied powers during World War II, he found it more difficult to get work.

<sup>22</sup> Most often relegated to the middle and back pages, these freelance science articles served as commentary on activity behind the lines of battle, and did not displace "real" war news from the front pages. Typical of these were: Creighton Peet, "Your House of Tomorrow," (15 September 1943): 12-13, 43-45; Leonard L. Knott, "Chemistry Fights," (15 May 1942): 24-25, 46-47, 49-51; Wallace Rayburn, "Medicine Goes To War," (1 September 1943): 18-19, 32, 34-35, 37.

<sup>23</sup> Lawrence N. Galton compiled the "Tuning Up for Tomorrow" series beginning in the July 1945 issue of *National Home Monthly*. It is probably best put under John Burnham's category of "Gee Whiz!" science, a pursuit not particularly designed to "disturb one's mysticisms." John C. Burnham, *How Superstition Won and Science Lost: Popularizing Science and Health in the United States* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987), 5-6.

<sup>24</sup> E.L. Harrington, "Physics and Society," *Culture* 5 (1944): 285.

<sup>25</sup> Clarie Gillis, M.P. "Letter From Home! From a Soldier of 1914-19 To A Soldier of 1939-194?" [1943]: 18. (Published by *Canadian Forum*.) An early wartime expression of the idea that ideals must keep pace with material progress may be found in: F. Cyril James, "Science and Society," address to the Royal Society of Canada, London, Ontario, 21 May 1940. McG, F. Cyril James Papers, MG 1017, Addresses and Other Papers, 1940. C.E. Silcox, "The Consecration of Power and Intelligence," Commencement Address, Andover-Newton Theological School, 19 September 1945. UCA, Claris Edwin Silcox Papers, Box 11, file 6, Correspondence, 1946-1949.

<sup>26</sup> Watson Kirkconnell, *Seven Pillars of Freedom* MS (1943). AUA, Watson Kirkconnell Papers, P1/12.2; 1. Kirkconnell's vague reference to religious decay in 1943 became the following indictment by 1948: "Modern science, a sorcerer's apprentice who has summoned up evil powers that he cannot control, exposes our cities to the threat of annihilation by gas, bacteria, and atomic bomb." Kirkconnell, "The Dykes of Civilization," inaugural address on the occasion of his installation as President of Acadia University, 22 October 1948, 3. AUA, Watson Kirkconnell Papers, P1/18/1.

<sup>27</sup> L.A. MacKay, "Functions of a High School," *SN* (2 August 1941): 15; "Personnel Selection," *SN* (23 January 1943): 1, 3; William H. Hatcher, "The future of chemistry," *Culture* 5 (1944): 258-264. R.C. Wallace, "The Function of Science in the Field of Education," *Culture* 5 (1944): 3-5.

<sup>28</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "Religion and Education," *SN* (16 August 1941): 7.

<sup>29</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "Day of Prayer," *SN* (5 September 1942): 2-3.

<sup>30</sup> C.E. Silcox, "The Consecration of Power and Intelligence."

<sup>31</sup> Harold A. Albert, "Knocking the World About," *National Home Monthly* 46(1) (January 1945): 16.

<sup>32</sup> Walter A. McDougall, ...*The Heavens and the Earth: A Political History of the Space Age* (New York: Basic Books, 1985), 6.

<sup>33</sup> C.J. Eustace, "The Role of Religion in Canadian Life, Being an Attempt to Essay the Place of the Church in our New Changing Society," *Culture* 6 (1945): 151.

<sup>34</sup> N.A.M. MacKenzie, "V-J Day," broadcast, 12 August 1945. Lister Sinclair, "You Can't Stop Now," broadcast 11 November 1945. NAC, Lister Shedden Sinclair Papers, MG 31 D44, Vol. 2, Radio Scripts. A sea-change was apparent in popular periodicals as well. See Max Werner, "We Can't Risk War Now," *Macleans* (1 October 1945): 7, 59-60. John Grierson, "The Political, Economic, and Educational Implications of the Atomic Bomb," address delivered to the International Conference of the Junior League, Québec, 14 May 1946. McG, John Grierson Collection, MG 2067, Container 4, file 108. J.R. Stirrett, "Atomic Admonition," *CanF* XXVII No. 325 (February 1948): 252-253. The sustained influence of atomic weapons on American culture is examined in Margot A. Henriksen, *Dr. Strangelove's America: Society and Culture in the Atomic Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), of which Part 3, "Is God Dead?" deals more specifically with the question of religion. For a look at the bomb as a 'psychic event,' see Paul Boyer, *By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age* (New York: Pantheon, 1985) and his more recent look at nuclear culture, *Fallout: A Historian Reflects on America's Half-Century Encounter with Nuclear Weapons* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1998). On public and journalistic interest in atomic science at war's end, see Peter B. Hales, "The Atomic Sublime," *American Studies* 32(1) (1991): 5-31; Alice Kimball Smith, *A Peril and a Hope: The Scientists' Movement in America, 1945-1947* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

<sup>35</sup> Miriam Chapin, "Psychoanalysis Brings Clearer Understanding of the Child," *SN* (5 May 1945): 38. The radio series "What's On Your Mind?" featured dramas based on actual case histories from the files of the Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene. It debuted with such programme titles as "The Crying Wren," broadcast 4 March 1946, and "The Exasperating Electrician," broadcast 11 March 1946. NAC, Lister Shedden Sinclair Papers, MG 31 D44, Vol. 2, Radio Scripts; Gerald Zoffer, "Psychological Factors In Juvenile Crime," *SN* (26 January 1946): 18; CF, "Psychology Versus the Hairbrush," (1947). NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 11, Brochures 1943-61; Northrop Frye, "Dr. Kinsey and the Dream Censor," *CanF* XXVIII No. 330 (July 1948): 85-86; W.E. Blatz, "Psychology's No Parlour Game," *SN* (12 April 1952): 11, 19; John Porter, "Two Cheers for Mental Health," *CanF* XXXIV No. 405 (October 1954): 145, 152-153.

<sup>36</sup> A.R.M. Lower, "Canada, the Second Great War, and the Future," *International Journal* 1(2) (April 1946): 97-111.

<sup>37</sup> C.J. Eustace, "The Future of Religion in the Secular or Neutral Society," *Culture* 7 (1946): 422-423. A similar transition had taken place in the United States, as American Association for the Advancement of Science president Kirtley Mather noted in 1951: "Science discloses the imperative need; something that transcends science must assist man to respond to the challenge of our time." Gilbert, *Redeeming Culture*, 38.

<sup>38</sup> C.E. Silcox, "Which Way, Canada?" speech to Bathurst Sunday Evening Forum, 20 January, 1946, 5. UCA, Claris Edwin Silcox Papers, Box 6, file 52.

<sup>39</sup> Howard W. Blakeslee, "Atomic World," *Macleans* (1 January 1947): 18.

<sup>40</sup> J.E. Middleton, "Can Science Ever Find the Core of Truth?" *SN* (18 January 1947): 9. John H. Yocom, "Mankind's Ceaseless Pondering On What Life Is All About," *SN* (21 August 1948): 19.

<sup>41</sup> A.R.M. Lower, "Is the Church Doomed?" MS, [1949-1950]. QUA, A.R.M. Lower Papers, Box 18, B 430.33.6., 15. One observer in the post-war period believed that a link with the infinite was all the church – especially the Protestant church which held no confession – had to offer. J. Donald L. Howson, "Psychiatry Assumes a Role of the Church," *SN* (24 August 1946): 14.

<sup>42</sup> Marjorie Stella Keirstead, "Skeleton for longer philosophical poem," unpublished MS, n.d. [1946], 2. UNB, Burton Seely Keirstead Papers, UA RG 81, MS 3.4.1q.

<sup>43</sup> C.R. Tracy, "Education in the Atomic Age," *The New Trail* 4(2) (April 1946): 64.

<sup>44</sup> "The Mid-Century Appraisal of Man" conference took place in Boston early in 1949, and featured such noted speakers as Winston Churchill and one of Eustace's Catholic heroes, Jacques Maritain.

<sup>45</sup> C.J. Eustace, "Science, Materialism, and the Human Spirit: The Religious Implications of Scientific Progress," *Culture* 10 (1949): 120, 124; see also his *An Infinity of Questions: A Study of the Religion of Art, and of the Art of Religion in the Lives of Five Women* (New York: Longmans, 1946) 12-18.

<sup>46</sup> "Science, Materialism, and the Human Spirit," 125-128.

<sup>47</sup> Watson Kirkconnell, "The Dykes of Civilization," 7.

<sup>48</sup> Watson Kirkconnell, "Faith and Education," address given on the CBC "Religious Hour" programme, 23 September 1951. Reprinted in *The Maritime Baptist* (3 October 1951): 1. Kirkconnell subscribed to the views of Sir Richard Livingstone, whose *Education for a World Adrift* (1943) spoke of an "age without standards" in need of a "science of good and evil."

<sup>49</sup> Kirkconnell emphasized the central place of the spirit in making one's way in the modern world: "Do we accept the fact of God as a supreme reality in human experience? Then at once all values in our philosophy undergo a kaleidoscopic change. Man is no longer a meaningless atom in a universal anarchy. His spiritual destiny becomes a major issue." Kirkconnell, "Faith and Education," 1-4.

<sup>50</sup> Julia Grace Wales, "Formula and Faith," *United Church Observer* 13(13) (1 September 1951): 7.

<sup>51</sup> On Velikovsky, see Chapter 8 of James Gilbert, *Redeeming Culture*.

<sup>52</sup> Donald Innis to Harold A. Innis, 27 January 1950, 2. UTA, H.A. Innis Papers, B72-0003, Box 5, file 14, Correspondence, 1950.

<sup>53</sup> Russell Johnston, "The Early Trials of Protestant Radio," *Canadian Historical Review* 75(3) (September 1994): 376-402. Most of the early broadcasts originated from small evangelical denominations.

<sup>54</sup> Regulations 7(j)(i) and (ii) read in part: "No one shall broadcast: (j)(i) programs presenting a person who claims supernatural or psychic powers, or a fortune teller, character analyst, crystal-gazer or the like, ...; (ii) programs in which a person answers or solves or purports to answer or solve questions or problems submitted by listeners or members of the public ...;" Parliament of Canada, "Regulations for Broadcasting Stations made under the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936 (as revised and amended to 24 March 1941)"; CBC Regulations for Broadcasting Stations, revised 1948 edition.

<sup>55</sup> These series were broadcast on the following dates and under the following titles: 2 May - 20 June 1951 - Fred Hoyle, "The Nature of the Universe"; 5 September - 26 September 1951 - Brock Chisholm et al., "Man's Last Enemy - Himself"; 28 September - 2 November 1951 - Bertrand Russell, "Living in an Atomic Age."

<sup>56</sup> Dr. Fred Hoyle, "A Personal View," Eighth in the series, *The Nature of the Universe*, broadcast on the CBC, 20 June 1951: 2-6. Neil M. Morrison Papers, NAC, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 28, Scripts Reviewed By Parliamentary Committee.

<sup>57</sup> "H.K." (Regina, Sask.) to CBC, 1951, compiled letters re: "The Nature of the Universe," NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 6, CBC, Censorship Attempts by Pressure Groups.

<sup>58</sup> "Report from Ottawa," *Winnipeg Free Press*, 20 June 1951.

<sup>59</sup> CBC Talks and Public Affairs, Report on "The Nature of the Universe" (1951). NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 6, CBC, Censorship Attempts by Pressure Groups.

<sup>60</sup> Dr. Ralph Williamson, "Reply to Hoyle," broadcast 27 June 1951. Neil M. Morrison Papers, NAC, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 28, Scripts Reviewed By Parliamentary Committee: 1-3.

<sup>61</sup> Rev. J.M. Kelly, "Reply to Hoyle," broadcast 27 June 1951. Neil M. Morrison Papers, NAC, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 28, Scripts Reviewed By Parliamentary Committee: 4-6.

<sup>62</sup> N. Alice Frick, *Image in the Mind: CBC Radio Drama 1944 to 1954* (Toronto: Canadian Stage and Arts Publications, 1987), 26. "W.H." (Weston, Ont.) to CBC, 1951, compiled letters re: "The Nature of the



Universe," NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 6, CBC, Censorship Attempts by Pressure Groups.

<sup>63</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "Certain Uncertainties in the Speech of Dr. Chisholm," *SN* (1 December 1945): 10-11; B.K. Sandwell, "In Chisholm vs. Santa Claus We Are For the Prosecution," *SN* (22 December 1945): 10; J.E. Middleton, "Wrong Tools," *SN* (9 February 1946): 3; "See Here Dr. Chisholm!" *Maclean's* (1 March 1946): 62-64.

<sup>64</sup> G. Brock Chisholm, M.D., "Tell Them the Truth," *Maclean's* (15 January 1946): 9, 42-44. See also E.T. Mitchell, Ph.D., "You Need a Conscience," *Maclean's* (15 April 1946): 20, 30-32; Major General G.B. Chisholm, "The Reestablishment of Peacetime Society," *Psychiatry* 9(1) (February 1946): 3-20.

<sup>65</sup> Brock Chisholm, "The Origins of Hostility," in G. Brock Chisholm et al., *Man's Last Enemy – Himself!* (Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1951)

<sup>66</sup> "CBC Books Anti-Religious Speakers," *The Ensign*, 8 September 1951.

<sup>67</sup> Ewen Cameron, "The Nature of Hostility," in G. Brock Chisholm et al., *Man's Last Enemy – Himself!* (Toronto: CBC, 1951): 37. *Relations* piece cited in: Miriam Chapin, "Freedom of the Air – For Whom?" unpublished MS, 1951: 3. NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 6, CBC, Censorship Attempts by Pressure Groups. Another account of Cameron's upbraiding appeared in "Church and Psychiatrist," *SN* (8 May 1951): 5.

<sup>68</sup> "The Good in Dr. Chisholm," *The Prairie Messenger*, 13 September 1951.

<sup>69</sup> "Where Science Stops," *The Prairie Messenger*, 27 September 1951.

<sup>70</sup> In his 1952 book, D.R.G. Owen was careful to differentiate between the 'psyche' which was the subject of psychological study, and the 'spirit', which was the domain of religion. *Scientism, Man and Religion* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1952): 14.

<sup>71</sup> Marjory Whitelaw to F.P. Whitman, MP, 6 December 1951, 3. NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 26, Mass Communications and Freedom, 1950-52.

<sup>72</sup> Bertrand Russell, "Perplexities of This Atomic Age," broadcast 28 September 1951, 3; "The Modern Mastery of Nature," broadcast 12 October 1951, 3. Neil M. Morrison Papers, NAC, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 28, Scripts Reviewed By Parliamentary Committee.

<sup>73</sup> "The Achievement of Harmony," broadcast 2 November 1951, 1-3.

<sup>74</sup> The United Church of Canada supported the choice of top-flight experts for the psychiatric talks and approved of Bertrand Russell as a suitably well-known figure, but urged all the same that air time be allotted for immediate rebuttal. "The CBC Under Fire," *United Church Observer* 13(19), 1 December 1951, 4.

<sup>75</sup> "Postscript" to Russell's "Living in an Atomic Age" series, broadcast 16 November 1951. CBC Archives, Toronto. Tape copy at 820413-9(4).

<sup>76</sup> Marc Raboy, *Missed Opportunities: The Story of Canada's Broadcasting Policy* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990), 109. The Parliamentary Committee on Broadcasting was often active, but was not a standing committee.

<sup>77</sup> Editorial, "Radio and Christianity," *SN* (10 July 1951): 5-6.

<sup>78</sup> Barry MacDonald to Morrison, 11 October 1951, 1. NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 6, CBC, Censorship Attempts by Pressure Groups.

<sup>79</sup> *Morning Devotions* and other local programs augmented this total. Counting regional and local broadcasts, the CBC carried some 1220 hours of religious programming during the year ending April 1951. Marjorie McEnaney to Morrison, internal CBC memo, "Recent protests by religious bodies," 23 October 1951. NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 6, CBC, Censorship Attempts by Pressure Groups.

<sup>80</sup> MacDonald to Morrison, 11 October 1951, 1.

<sup>81</sup> Robert W. Keyserlingk, "No Whitewash, Please," *The Ensign* (1 December 1951): 1.

<sup>82</sup> Miriam Chapin, "Freedom of the Air – For Whom?" unpublished MS, 1951, 5. NAC, Neil M.

Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 6, CBC, Censorship Attempts by Pressure Groups.

<sup>83</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "Freedom of Speech By Radio," *SN* (17 November 1951): 5. Sandwell returned to the topic of freedom of speech in the new year arguing that the small number of radio stations available meant that not everyone had the right to be heard over it. "The Pitches Are Limited," *SN* (19 January 1952): 4-5.

<sup>84</sup> "Religious Censorship and the CBC," *Maclean's* (1 January 1952): 2.

<sup>85</sup> D.R.G. Owen, "Science, Scientism and Religion," in *Christianity in an Age of Science* (Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1952): 5-6.

<sup>86</sup> Owen, "Science, Scientism and Religion," 7-8.

<sup>87</sup> Owen did not claim to be the first to connect faith in science with Communism, and was aware of works of fiction making the same connection: "The shape of possible things to come has already been described for us in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-four* and Virgil Gheorghiu's *The Twenty-fifth Hour*." Owen, "Science, Scientism and Religion," 9-10.

<sup>88</sup> Owen, "Science, Scientism and Religion," 11.

<sup>89</sup> Dr. M.M. Coady, "Through the Visible to the Invisible," address to the Rural and Industrial Conference and Convocation celebrating the 25th Anniversary of the founding of the Extension Department, St. Francis Xavier University, 7 July 1953, 1. AO, CAAE Papers, Series A-I, Box 1, Director's Files, 1935-1943.

<sup>90</sup> R.C. Wallace, "Science and Faith," 5-7.

<sup>91</sup> He continued: "Have the scientists themselves been satisfied with the mechanistic interpretation of the universe? There have been signs in recent years that they are not, and that the newer outlook in science does not bear out the rigid determinism that was prevalent in the last generation. The doubts have come from the investigations into the inner motions of the constituent parts of the atom." Wallace, "Science and Faith," 7-8.

<sup>92</sup> "[T]he physicist is prepared to admit today that he has not yet found a complete statement of the laws by which nature operates, more particularly in the sub-atomic realm. Altogether apart from this element of uncertainty, he realizes that there are aspects of life which science has not the tools to deal with; or to be less dogmatic, science has not yet found the tools to deal with them." "Science and Faith," 9-10.

<sup>93</sup> "Science and Faith," 10-11.

<sup>94</sup> "Science and Faith," 13.

<sup>95</sup> Education, religion and philosophy were all considered contributors to the tradition of looking beyond material life. "Milestone," *FFT* 15(1) (September-October 1954): 1.

<sup>96</sup> "Science and Faith," 15.

<sup>97</sup> Wallace clearly subscribed to the idea that the narrative of human history was more than the story of a species muddling through chaos: "It was asked of old: 'What is man that thou art mindful of him?' Weak though he is, and prone to err, he has got a story behind him that shows that a divine power has indeed been mindful all the way." "Science and Faith," 15, 18-21, 27.

<sup>98</sup> Lister Sinclair, "Survival: A Study in Technology," [1952], 19. NAC, Lister Shedden Sinclair Papers, MG 31 D44, Vol. 10, Radio Scripts.

<sup>99</sup> N.J. Berrill, "Is There Vital Conflict in Science, Religion?" *SN* (30 April 1955): 8.

<sup>100</sup> Emil L. Fackenheim, "The Current 'Religious Revival': Is It Genuine?" *CanF* XXXV No. 422 (March 1956): 269-270; "Moderation in Suburbia," *SN* (3 March 1956): 3-4; Alfred Harris, "Religious Revival: Faith or Fear?" *SN* (10 May 1958): 10-11, 51. Earlier reports of a revival cited changing community structures and indifference, not rejection, as contributing factors in the revival or abandonment of religion. A.C. Forrest, "Religious Revival in Canadian Suburbia," *SN* (13 December 1952): 11, 20.; Fred Bodsworth, "Christianity - Revival or Decline?" *Maclean's* (15 December 1953): 9-12, 57, 59-61, 63-65.

<sup>101</sup> Berrill, "Is There Vital Conflict in Science, Religion?": 8.

<sup>102</sup> Rev. E. Harold Toye, "The Effect of Automation on Religion," in "Report of the Toronto

Committee on Automation," (1957), 8-9. TFRB, J.A. Irving Papers, MS. col. 132, Box 45.

<sup>103</sup> "Asking the World," BBC broadcast, 8 November 1959. TFRB, J.A. Irving Papers, MS. col. 132, Box 48, file 2.

<sup>104</sup> Grant would explore this theme in *Philosophy in the Mass Age* (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1959) and *Lament For a Nation* (Toronto: Gage, 1965); Pierre Berton, *The Comfortable Pew* (Toronto: M&S, 1965), 101, 129.

<sup>105</sup> W.L. Morton, "The University As It Is And Is Becoming," address "to University gathering," May 1966. McM, W.L. Morton Papers, Box 55, Lectures, No-W. Snow's 1959 book (initially a lecture series) *The Two Cultures* approached the divide between the scientific and the literary 'communities' as one of the most important problems affecting developed societies.

<sup>106</sup> W.L. Morton, "Address to Senior Graduates, University of Manitoba, 26 May 1967," McM, W.L. Morton Papers, Box 55, Lectures, No-W. 1-2.

<sup>107</sup> "The Christian Pavilion," (1967). NAC, Canadian Corporation for the World Exhibition, RG 71, Vol. 15, ARC 71/15/37. The Christian Pavilion's publication, "The Eighth Day of the Week" suggested that man's day of creation is the eighth, and emphasized the inability of modern technology to cope with human problems in a climate not informed by true Christian belief and charity. Christian Pavilion, "The Eighth Day of the Week," (1967). NAC, Canadian Corporation for the World Exhibition, RG 71, Vol. 406, Christian Pavilion.

<sup>108</sup> James Gilbert uses this phrase to frame one of the crucial questions in his study of this question from the American point of view. Gilbert, *Redeeming Culture*, 4.

<sup>109</sup> F. Cyril James, "The Renewal of Your Mind," Baccalaureate Sermon, McGill University, 22 May 1955. McG, F. Cyril James Papers, MG 1017, Addresses and Other Papers, 1955, 6.

## Chapter Four

<sup>1</sup> Blodwen Davies, *Youth Speaks Its Mind* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1948), 152.

<sup>2</sup> Promisingly titled, Gary Donaldson's *Abundance and Anxiety: America, 1945-1960* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997) is a recent survey in which the only chapter on culture and society alludes only briefly to anxiety. Better examples of generalist work are: Loren Baritz, *The Good Life: The Meaning of Success for the American Middle Class* (New York: Knopf, 1989); William L. O'Neill, *American High: The Years of Confidence, 1945-1960* (New York: Free Press, 1986). The best survey treatment of 1950s culture, John Patrick Diggins, *The Proud Decades: America in War and Peace, 1941-1960* (New York: Norton, 1988), explicitly questions the interpretation of the decade as "placid." See especially Chapters 6 (society and popular culture) and 7 (high culture) which address complexity and anxiety.

<sup>3</sup> Recent counterpoints to the representation of a placid fifties include Margot A. Henriksen, *Dr. Strangelove's America: Society and Culture in the Atomic Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997) and James Gilbert, *Redeeming Culture: American Religion in an Age of Science* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997). In Joel Foreman, ed., *The Other Fifties: Interrogating Midcentury American Icons* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1997) contributors use difference and nonconformity as alternative ways to see American society and culture. Tom Engelhardt notes the "triumphalist despair" of the post-war period in *The End of Victory Culture: Cold War America and the Disillusioning of a Generation* (New York: Basic Books, 1995), 9. In *The Culture of the Cold War* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), Stephen J. Whitfield cites fear of Communism as a profound influence on American popular culture. Elaine Tyler May's *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1988) employed the metaphor of 'containment' to explore family life during the 1950s, and laid the groundwork for studies both 'popular' and academic:

Stephanie Coontz, *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap* (New York: Basic Books, 1993); Joanne Meyerowitz, ed., *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1994).

<sup>4</sup> Alvin Finkel, *Our Lives: Canada after 1945* (Toronto: J. Lorimer, 1997); Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond and John English, *Canada Since 1945* revised edition, (Toronto: UTP, 1989) and Donald Creighton, *The Forked Road: Canada 1939-1957* (Toronto: M&S, 1976).

<sup>5</sup> Larry Hannant, *The Infernal Machine: Investigating the Loyalty of Canada's Citizens* (Toronto: UTP, 1995); Reg Whitaker and Gary Marcuse, *Cold War Canada: The Making of a National Insecurity State, 1945-1957* (Toronto: UTP, 1994). See also Daniel Robinson and David Kimmel, "The Queer Career of Homosexual Security Vetting in Cold War Canada," *Canadian Historical Review* 75 September 1994): 319-345.

<sup>6</sup> In her *Domestic Goods: The Material, the Moral and the Economic in the Postwar Years* (Toronto: UTP, 1999) Joy Parr addresses the design and consumption of furniture and appliances in Canada, portraying the complexity of these acts and their ties to political and ethical choices. Valerie Joyce Korinek's "Roughing It In Suburbia: Reading *Chatelaine* Magazine, 1950-1969," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1996) examines a magazine's readership as a coherent "community" which was nonetheless fragmented by class, religious and other divisions. Though more specifically concerned with television as a new medium of communication and with its content, Paul Rutherford's *When Television Was Young: Primetime Canada, 1952-1967* (Toronto: UTP, 1989) contributes to our understanding of the early 1950s cultural scene.

<sup>7</sup> Owram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby Boom Generation* (Toronto: UTP, 1996). For more of a psychohistorical and literary approach to the this same generation, see François Ricard, *The Lyric Generation: The Life and Times of the Baby Boomers* trans. Donald Winkler (Toronto: Stoddart, 1994), first published as *La génération lyrique: essai sur la vie et l'oeuvre des premiers-nés du baby-boom* (Montreal: Boreal, 1992) in which Ricard also marvels at the extraordinary luck of the "cosseted children of transition." (p. 68). A clearly visible orientation towards family life also played an important part in characterizing the 1950s as a sedate period. See Veronica Strong-Boag, "'Their Side of the Story': Women's Voices from Ontario Suburbs, 1945-60," in Joy Parr, ed., *A Diversity of Women: Ontario, 1945-1980* (Toronto: UTP, 1995).

<sup>8</sup> On the commission from 1943-1948 see Linda McGuire Ambrose, "The Canadian Youth Commission: Planning for Youth and Social Welfare in the Postwar Era," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Waterloo, 1992.

<sup>9</sup> Vincent Massey headed the commission, and Father Georges-Henri Lévesque took on a leadership role in French-speaking Canada. Paul Litt's aforementioned work on the commission is the definitive study, and the term "creationist myth" first appears on page 5 of his book. Though Paul Rutherford was not attempting a history of the Massey Commission, he portrays it as a "culture probe." Rutherford, *When Television Was Young*, 13-16. George Woodcock wrote of the arts before Massey Commission: "Canada was a country still emerging from an age of practically minded pioneers; the arts were considered unnecessary luxuries in a life devoted to the conquest of a hostile land." Woodcock, *Strange Bedfellows: The State and the Arts in Canada* (Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre, 1985), 50; see also pp. 12-16 on the need for the state to serve as the agent of the community. Maria Tippett, in *Making Culture*, uses the commission as a terminus. While it is an obvious place to end a work dealing with the first half of the twentieth century, her overall argument also suggests that in creating the commission, Canada's policymakers heralded a new era of cultural awareness. In the same way, Bothwell et al. in the 'cultural' chapter of *Canada Since 1945* view the commission as a consolidation of cultural policy.

<sup>10</sup> "The Donnish Inquisition: The Massey Commission and the Campaign for State-Sponsored Cultural Nationalism in Canada, 1949-1951" is the title of Litt's doctoral dissertation, completed at the University of Toronto in 1990.

<sup>11</sup> Arthur Lower, "The Survival Value of a Soft Nation," *SN* (31 October 1953): 7-8.

<sup>12</sup> See Paul Litt, *The Muses, The Masses, and the Massey Commission*, Chapter 11 and Conclusion, for a

catalogue of these recommendations and their fates.

<sup>13</sup> Nicholas Brown suggests that in Australia the quick turn from a society characterized during the war by voluntarism and duty towards the "milk bar economy" of the 1950s was particularly jarring for some commentators. Brown, *Governing Prosperity: Social change and social analysis in Australia in the 1950s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 99.

<sup>14</sup> Arthur L. Phelps, "Community and Culture," Founder's Day Address at the University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, 18 February 1947.

<sup>15</sup> Phelps, "Community and Culture," 8.

<sup>16</sup> A.J.M. Smith, "Canadian Renaissance," *The Canadian Author and Bookman* 22(2) (June 1946): 32.

<sup>17</sup> Quotation from: United Nations, Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, adopted in London on 16 November 1945, preamble. Walter B. Herbert, "'UNESCO' [sic] Puts Canada in Humiliating Position," *JN* (27 October 1945): 22; Walter B. Herbert, "Let's Pull Our Cultural Threads Together," MS submitted to *Saturday Night*, 9 November 1945. NAC, Walter B. Herbert Papers, MG 30 D 205, Vol. 1, Addresses, Articles and Lectures; Blodwen Davies, "The Significance of UNESCO," *CanF* XXVI No. 307 (August 1946): 107-109. Chapter Three of J.R. Kidd's study of citizenship addresses this new internationalism. Kidd, "A study to formulate a plan for the work of the Canadian Citizenship Council," unpublished Ed.D. project, Columbia University, 1947.

<sup>18</sup> B.K. Sandwell, *The Gods in Twilight*, First Hewitt Bostock Memorial Lecture in Canadian Citizenship, Vancouver, 30 October 1947. (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1948), 17.

<sup>19</sup> Sandwell, *The Gods in Twilight*, 17.

<sup>20</sup> The *Canadian Forum* certainly took the lead in publishing articles on design early in wartime. Humphrey Carver, "Home-Made Thoughts on Handicrafts," *CanF* XIX No. 230 (March 1940): 386-387; Douglas MacAgy, "Designers for Living," *CanF* XX No. 236 (September 1940): 178-180. Helen Frye, "Design in Industry," *CanF* XXVII No. 315 (April 1947): 12-13. Quotation from: Donald W. Buchanan, "Design in Industry – A Misnomer," *Canadian Art* 2(3) (Summer 1945): 194-197.

<sup>21</sup> Buchanan wrote a rash of articles on design, including, "The Design of Household Goods," *Canadian Art* 4(2) (February-March 1947): 74-77; "Design Index," *Canadian Art* 5(2) (Christmas - New Year 1947-1948): 86-89; "Take Another Look at Your Kitchen Range," *Canadian Art* 5(4) (Spring-Summer 1948): 182-183; "Completing the Pattern of Modern Living," *Canadian Art* 6(3) (Spring 1949): 111-116. Charles Fraser Comfort, "Living With Design," round-table discussion, during the Ontario Education Association Conference, 8 April 1947. NAC, Charles Fraser Comfort Papers, MG30 D81, Vol. 35, file 5; H.A. Nieboer, "History and Industrial Design," *Here and Now* 1(3) (January 1949): 79-86. Art Gallery of Toronto, "Submission to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences," 21 October 1949, 5. NAC, RCALS, RG33/28, Vol. 2. For a much more detailed look at design in this period, see Joy Parr's recent *Domestic Goods*, especially Chapter 6, "Inter/national Style."

<sup>22</sup> D.B. Cruikshank, "Industrial Design – What Are Canadians Doing About It?" *Industrial Canada* 50(3) (July 1949): 216-219.

<sup>23</sup> L.C. Marsh to John Grierson, 25 February 1947, his emphasis. Marsh had taken the job at UBC to hedge his bets, and wrote to another famous friend, seeking a job at UNESCO in Paris. Marsh to Julian Huxley, 31 March 1947. UBCSC, Leonard C. Marsh Papers, Box 28-26, Correspondence, 1936-1978.

<sup>24</sup> This set of Molson's ads ran in national magazines beginning in summer 1947, "to promote a fuller realization by Canadians of Canada's present greatness."

<sup>25</sup> Gerald Anglin, *Canada Unlimited* (Toronto: O'Keefe Foundation, 1948) The book was apparently an adaptation of Eric Johnston's *America Unlimited*, which was produced in 1944. O'Keefe's had been using the slogan "Canada Unlimited" as early as March 1944. (*Canadian Business* 17(3) (March 1944): inside front cover.) Carling's countered with its "Nature Unspoiled" series in 1948. For more on Johnston, see Lary May, "Making

the American Consensus: The Narrative of Conversion and Subversion in World War II Films," in Lewis A. Erenberg and Susan E. Hirsch, eds., *The War in American Culture: Society and Consciousness During World War II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 71-102.

<sup>26</sup> R.C. Wallace, "Education in Canada," in R.H. Coats, ed., *Features of Present-Day Canada in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1947), 180.

<sup>27</sup> 'A Canadian', "Christmas - or Paganism?" *Maclean's* (15 December 1945): 5, 45; A. Vibert Douglas, "Growing Materialism Needs Spiritual Aid," *SN* (24 November 1945): 16. C.E. Silcox, "The Menace of Modernity to Christian Marriage," 1946. UCA, Claris Edwin Silcox Papers, Box 9, file 38.

<sup>28</sup> C.J. Eustace, "What Is Materialism?" *Culture* 9 (1948): 152. For an example of his early post-war thoughts on materialism, see Eustace, "The Future of Religion in the Secular or Neutral Society," *Culture* 7 (1946): 421-428.

<sup>29</sup> Watson Kirkconnell, "Things That Endure," address to the United Baptist Convention of the Maritime Provinces, 28 August 1948. Reprinted in *Acadia Bulletin* 34(6) (September 1948): 15-16. Blomidon is the name of the cape near the Minas Basin to the north of Wolfville, Nova Scotia.

<sup>30</sup> Dr. J.M. Ewing, "Our Changing Society," First in the series *Our Changing Values*, broadcast 11 August 1948. Neil M. Morrison Papers, NAC, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 28, Public Affairs Scripts Broadcast 1943-51.

<sup>31</sup> Dr. J.M. Ewing, "Our Changing Society," 1-2.

<sup>32</sup> Dr. J.M. Ewing, "Our New Leisure," Seventh in the series *Our Changing Values*, broadcast 22 September 1948, 2-5, quotation from page 5. NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 28, Public Affairs Scripts Broadcast 1943-51.

<sup>33</sup> Sidney Katz, "What About the Comics?" *Maclean's* (1 December 1948): 7, 71-73, 75. Programmes on comics and advertising were the most listened to of *CF*'s 1948-49 season. Summary of *CF* Questionnaires, 1948-49. AO, CAAE Papers, Series B-I, Box 1, *CF*, administrative, 1943-1960.

<sup>34</sup> CARTB provides a short history of the programme as an addendum to its brief to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting in 1956. NAC, RCB, RG33/36, Vol. 25, reel C-7019.

<sup>35</sup> Mary Lowrey Ross, "The Coming Comic-Strip Age," *SN* (27 March 1948): 10. Ross later predicted that children would probably grow out of their fascination with them. Ross, "Comics and the Elsie Books," *SN* (21 August 1948): 9.

<sup>36</sup> Canadian Federation of Home and School, brief to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 29 August 1949, 2. NAC, RCALS, RG33/28, Vol. 13.

<sup>37</sup> Dora Carney, "What's Wrong with the So-Called Comics?" *SN* (13 November 1948): 32-33. Americans were aware of the comics "problem" at around the same time. See "School for Sadism," *Art Digest* 23(15) (1 May 1949). In response to American psychiatrist Fredric Wertham's long-gestating book on comics, *Seduction of the Innocent*, which was published about five years after the Canadian controversy, Robertson Davies warned of the dangers of censorship, but admitted comics were proof that "widespread literacy was not inevitably a key to widespread knowledge or improvement; it may equally well be a key to intellectual anarchy and degradation." Robertson Davies, "Greetings, Humanoids! Drag Over a Cyclotron," *SN* (5 June 1954): 17.

<sup>38</sup> "Wayne and Shuster's Toni Show," CBC Trans-Canada Network, 10 February 1949. NAC, Frank Shuster Papers, MG 31 D 251, Vol. 4.

<sup>39</sup> "No Laughing Matter," *FFT* 9(6) (March 1949): 28.

<sup>40</sup> T.S. Eliot, *Notes towards the Definition of Culture* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1948), 18.

<sup>41</sup> See *Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences* (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951). "Frustrated Artists," *The Printed Word* 183 (December 1949): 4; Commission on Culture of The United Church of Canada, "Brief," presented to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 16 November 1949; *CF*,

"Should the Federal Government Support Cultural Activities?" study material to accompany broadcast for 24 November 1949; Walter Herbert, "Who Supports the Arts?" *FFT* 10(8) (May 1950): 49-51; Frank H. Underhill, "Notes on the Massey Report," *CanF* XXXI No. 367 (August 1951): 100-102; John Stewart, "The Massey Report: Ideological Preparation For War," *National Affairs Monthly* 8(1) (September 1951): 34-53; Anne Francis, "Capital Report," broadcast 3 June 1951. NAC, CBC, RG 41, Vol. 303, file 14-2-2, pt. 2, Massey Commission, Editorial Comment; "Can We Be 'Scared' Into Culture?" *Montreal Gazette* 14 September 1951.

<sup>42</sup> Discussion Group of Hamilton, "Brief submitted by the Discussion Group of Hamilton to the Royal Commission on Arts and Science Development," (1949). NAC, CBC, Vol. 304, file 14-2-2, part 11. Paul Litt also found this brief particularly exemplary of reactions against the mass media. Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 88.

<sup>43</sup> Public Affairs Institute [of Vancouver], "Brief," 7.

<sup>44</sup> This term, or at least its application to the early 1950s Canadian cultural and intellectual context, is Paul Litt's. See Chapter 4 of *The Muses, the Masses and the Massey Commission* for a fuller discussion.

<sup>45</sup> Federation of Canadian Artists, "Brief submitted in 1949 to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences," reprinted April 1951.

<sup>46</sup> [Manitoba Citizens], "To the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences," [1949], ii, 10.

<sup>47</sup> Transcript of hearing, University Women's Club, Regina, 3 November 1949, 210. NAC, RCALS, RG33/28, Vol. 32, reel C-2016.

<sup>48</sup> "Draft and notes for brief on the Visual Arts in Canada," [1950]. NAC, Charles Fraser Comfort Papers, MG30 D81, Vol. 42, files 8-10, Massey Commission, 1949-1950. Though the draft is not dated, Comfort's notes are dated 19 January 1950. Alternate versions exist in the same volume, files 42-14 and 42-15. Some of this material found its way into Comfort's essay, "Painting," in *Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences* (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951), 407-418.

<sup>49</sup> Saskatchewan Arts Board, "Brief to Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences," October 1949, 3. NAC, RCALS, RG 33/28, Vol. 29, reel C-2014. The Board had been established earlier in 1949.

<sup>50</sup> Canadian Federation of Home and School, brief to RCALS, 3. NAC, RCALS, RG33/28, Vol. 13. One of the Saskatchewan Arts Board's stated objectives was "to make available to the people of Saskatchewan opportunities to engage in any one or more of the following activities: drama, the visual arts, music, literature, handicrafts and the other arts[.]" 1. NAC, RCALS, RG33/28, Vol. 29.

<sup>51</sup> Alberta Library Association, "Brief to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences," 13 September 1949, 6. NAC, RCALS, RG33/28, Vol. 1.

<sup>52</sup> Canadian Authors' Association, "Brief," submitted to Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 31 October 1949, 3. NAC, RCALS, RG 33/28, Vol. 9.

<sup>53</sup> Blodwen Davies, *Youth Speaks Its Mind*, 165.

<sup>54</sup> Public Affairs Institute, "Brief," presented to the RCALS, Vancouver, 30 September 1949, 3. NAC, RCALS, RG33/28, Vol. 28, reel C-2014.

<sup>55</sup> Arts Centre of Greater Victoria, "Supplement to brief to Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 29 October 1949, 3. NAC, RCALS, Vol. 3.

<sup>56</sup> Arts Centre of Greater Victoria, 2-3.

<sup>57</sup> Town Meeting Ltd., "Brief to be presented to the Royal Commission on Arts, Sciences, and Cultural Activities," 1949, 5. NAC, RCALS, Vol. 31, Reel C-2015.

<sup>58</sup> Marius Barbeau, "The Fountain-heads of Canadian Culture," addendum to the brief presented by the National Museum of Canada, 20 July 1949, 3. NAC, RCALS, RG 33/28, Vol. 25, reel C-2012.

<sup>59</sup> Western Stage Society, "A Submission by the Western Stage Society to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences," 1949. Vol. 32, reel C-2016.

<sup>60</sup> The 'great tradition' was great and enduring for Williams "[j]ust because it is a mixed inheritance, from many societies and many times as well as from many kinds of men, it cannot easily be contained within one limited social form." Williams, *Communications* 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (London: Penguin, 1976), 114-115.

<sup>61</sup> Frank H. Underhill, "Notes on the Massey Report," 100-102; Robert Ayre, "The Press Debates the Massey Report," *Canadian Art* 9(1) (October 1951): 25-30, 36-38; George Robertson, "A Broader Base of Patronage," *Canadian Art* 9(3) (Spring 1952): 107; Gratton O'Leary, "Canada's Political Philosophy," in *Canada: Nation on the March* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1953), 189; W.M. Haugan, "Cultural Democracy," *FFT* 10(1) (October 1949): 13-16, 50. Haugan conceived of cultural democracy as a state midway between cultural assimilation and cultural pluralism, where the boundaries between ethnic groups were not so rigid.

<sup>62</sup> The Periodical Press Association of Canada made one of the clearest cases for such intervention when it showed that under the R.B. Bennett government of the early 1930s, import tariffs on American magazines had been beneficial to the Canadian magazine industry. "Brief presented on behalf of Periodical Press Association of Canada," 27 October 1949, 6-7. NAC, RCALS, RG 33/28, Vol. 27, reel C-2014.

<sup>63</sup> On the climate at *Partisan Review*, see Chapter 6 of Paul Gorman, *Left Intellectuals and Popular Culture in Twentieth-Century America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Neil Jumonville, *Critical Crossings: The New York Intellectuals in Postwar America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).

<sup>64</sup> Milton Klonsky, "Along the Midway of Mass Culture," *Partisan Review* 16(4) (April 1949): 349.

<sup>65</sup> Russell Lynes, "Highbrow, Lowbrow, Middlebrow," *Harper's* (February 1949): 19-28. For an etymology of these terms, see Joan Shelley Rubin, *The Making of Middlebrow Culture*, xi-xiv. On the subtlety of such classifications, see Michael Kammen, *The Lively Arts*, 89-94.

<sup>66</sup> Harold King, "Some Notes for Amateur Artists," *Canadian Art* 7(1) (October 1949): 10-11. Among the passive habits, King placed "possession of pictures for prestige; refined, intellectual hedonism; or the enjoyment of only choice masterpieces in galleries by a respectful, adoring audience." 10.

<sup>67</sup> Beatrix Graham, "Planning for Community Welfare," *FFT* 10(3) (December 1949): 12-16. Elizabeth Loosley, "Solving Community Problems," *FFT* 10(3) (December 1949): 17-21; "Community Centers," *New Frontiers* 1(2) (Spring 1952): 8.

<sup>68</sup> M.B. McCredy, "Canada's Cultural and Agricultural Outlook," *Culture* 10 (1949): 138.

<sup>69</sup> The winning entries, and the *Standard's* own columns on the subject, originally published during February and March 1946, were eventually put out as a booklet entitled *Into the Atomic Age*. Will F. Jenkins, "Your Great-Great-Grandmother and the Atom Bomb," *National Home Monthly* 47(2) (February 1946): 12, 22-23. E.F. Burton, "Atomic Energy Can Be Power Without Tears," *SN* (24 August 1946): 6-7. Charles Clay, "Atoms or Bacon - It's All In The Day's Work At N.R.C." *SN* (11 December 1948): 3, 26; Ralph Staples, "Salute to an Atomic Future," *FFT* 10(3) (December 1949): 34-37.

<sup>70</sup> C.J. Eustace, "The Price of Time," *Culture* 11 (1950): 369. Lister Sinclair, "You Can't Stop Now," 11 November 1945. NAC, Lister Shedden Sinclair Papers, MG 31 D44, Vol. 2, Radio Scripts. Max Werner, "We Can't Risk War Now," *Mackay's* (1 October 1945): 7, 59-60. Larry Smith, "We CAN Prepare For Atom-Bombs," *SN* (26 September 1950): 8, 43.

<sup>71</sup> Mary Lowrey Ross, "Miss A. Meets the Atomic World and Puts It in Its Place," *SN* (1 September 1945): 10. L.E.G. Upper [A.R.M. Lower], "Let's Move Our Mountains," *SN* (27 December 1949): 25; Anon., "Death by Atom Light," n.d. [post-1945] McM, CBC Scripts Collection, Reel 8.

<sup>72</sup> C.R. Tracy, "Education in the Atomic Age," *The New Trail* 4(2) (April 1946): 64; J.R. Stirrett, "Atomic Admonition," *CanF* XXVII No. 325 (February 1948): 252-253; The best historical analysis of 'the bomb' as a social and cultural phenomenon is Paul Boyer, *By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age* (New York: Pantheon, 1985).



<sup>73</sup> Dr. Aileen Dunham, "A Survey of the First Half of the Twentieth Century," *The New Trail* 8(1) (Spring 1950): 23-29; C.F. Comfort, "The Artist in Modern Society," address to School of Social Work, University of Toronto, 22 February 1950. NAC, Charles Fraser Comfort Papers, MG30 D81, Vol. 35, file 11; A.R.M. Lower, "Canada, 1925-1950," *United Church Observer* 1 June 1950, 9, 33; Fred Bodsworth, "1900 - How Wrong Can You Be?" *Macleans* (1 January 1950): 8, 42-43; John Largo, "1950 - Brave New Wacky World," *Macleans* (1 January 1950): 9, 40-41.

<sup>74</sup> George Salverson, "In the Shadow of the Bomb," 1 January 1950. McM, CBC Scripts Collection, Reel 98.

<sup>75</sup> "In the Shadow of the Bomb," 19. In dramatizing this sequence, Salverson borrowed liberally from Gilbert Seldes article, "Nickleodeon to Television," *Macleans* (1 January 1950): 12-13, 44.

<sup>76</sup> "In the Shadow of the Bomb," 20-21.

<sup>77</sup> Seldes, "Nickleodeon to Television," 13. Seldes' first influential book, *The Seven Lively Arts*, was published in 1924. *The Great Audience* came out later in 1950, though Seldes may have drawn upon its arguments in preparing his piece for *Macleans*.

<sup>78</sup> "In the Shadow of the Bomb," 23-24.

<sup>79</sup> "In the Shadow of the Bomb," 24-26. Doris Mosdell, "Adults and the Commercial Film," *FFT* 10(6) (March 1950): 15-17.

<sup>80</sup> "Television," *FFT* 9(4) (January 1949): 1-3; Blair Fraser, "Why They Won't Let You Have Television," *Macleans* (15 January 1949): 12-13, 38-39; Morley Callaghan, "Television - the New Monster," *National Home Monthly* 50(3) (March 1949): 16, 38-39; "Warning to Televisionaries," *JN* (4 July 1950): 6-7; Don Magill, "What TV Will Do To You," *Macleans* (1 March 1951): 22-24; Nathan Cohen, "TV Will Creep in on Soft-Soled Shoes," *JN* (26 June 1951): 11, 36; Mavor Moore, "What We'll Do With TV," *JN* (24 May 1952): 9, 19-20.

<sup>81</sup> Still addressing the inadequacies of movies and the radio, Salverson had the Showman continue: "and a salesman's job is to lull the critical faculties of whoever's being sold. So, on one side you get mythology. On the other ... flabby minds. Deliberately encouraged. No sir ... you couldn't permit anything to be disturbed, or anything that required hard thinking. The movies make their play frankly for the adolescent, and, except for its factual programs, radio goes ahead promoting immaturity into old age." "In the Shadow of the Bomb," 26.

<sup>82</sup> "In the Shadow of the Bomb," 27.

<sup>83</sup> *Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences 1949-1951* (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951), 4.

<sup>84</sup> Albert A. Shea, "The High Cost of Intellectual Snobbery," *FFT* 11(8) (May 1951): 20-21. Albert A. Shea, *Culture in Canada: A Study of The Findings of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (1949-1951)* (Toronto: Core Press, 1952). Shea had served in the Royal Canadian Air Force, worked for the Wartime Information Board, taught Political Science at the Universities of Toronto and Manitoba, and worked for UNESCO on a survey of mass communications.

<sup>85</sup> Walter Herbert, "Who Supports the Arts?" *FFT* 10(8) (May 1950): 49-51.

<sup>86</sup> Joseph Pollick to W.B. Herbert, 12 January 1950. NAC, Canada Foundation, MG 28 I179, Vol. 33, file 4b, Cultural Publications, 1948-1952.

<sup>87</sup> Harold A. Innis, *The Strategy of Culture* (Toronto: UTP, 1952), 15.

<sup>88</sup> Innis, *The Strategy of Culture*, 14.

<sup>89</sup> See Margaret Groome, "Canada's Stratford Festival, 1953-1967: Hegemony, Commodity, Institution," unpublished PhD dissertation, McGill University, 1988. More general accounts include: Tom Patterson with Allan Gould, *First Stage: the Making of the Stratford Festival* (Toronto: M&S, 1987); John Pettigrew and Jamie Portman, *Stratford: The First Thirty Years* (Toronto: MacMillan, 1985).

<sup>90</sup> Hugh Garner, "Culture and the Privy Purse," *SN* (6 March 1954): 9. Though the bulk of his commentary is on matters of church and state, W.L. Smith argued that the state had taken on a greater role as an arbiter of values. "Morals for the Masses," *CanF* XXXI No. 372 (January 1952): 218.

<sup>91</sup> Canadian Federation of Home and School, brief to Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 3. NAC, RCALS, RG 33/28, Vol. 13,

<sup>92</sup> Canadian Association of Consumers, brief to Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 7 November 1949, 2. NAC, RCALS, Vol. 9.

<sup>93</sup> Innis's major works during this period, aside from *The Strategy of Culture*, were *Empire and Communications* (Toronto: UTP, 1950) and *The Bias of Communication* (Toronto: UTP, 1951). Around the same time, McLuhan published *The Mechanical Bride: Folklore of Industrial Man* (New York: Vanguard, 1951) and began in 1953, with Edmund Carpenter, to edit the journal *Explorations*. Sandra Campbell, "From Romantic History to Communications Theory: Lorne Pierce as Publisher of C.W. Jefferys and Harold Innis," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 30(3) (Fall 1995): 91-116; Arthur Kroker, *Technology and the Canadian Mind: Innis, Grant, McLuhan* (New York: St. Martin's, 1985); Joel Persky, "The Media Writings of Harold Adams Innis," *Journal of Canadian Culture* 2(1) (Spring 1985): 79-87; and Persky "The Innescence of Marshall McLuhan," *Journal of Canadian Culture* 1(2) (Fall 1984): 3-14.

<sup>94</sup> Lawren Harris noted this epigram from Alan Valentine's *The Age of Conformity* in a draft of "Democracy and the Arts," [1954]. NAC, Lawren Stewart Harris Papers, MG 30 D 208, file 5-15.

<sup>95</sup> Rutherford, *When Television Was Young*, 21-25.

<sup>96</sup> G.P. Gilmour, "Chairman's Message," Canada's Tomorrow Conference, 1953. UBCSC, N.A.M. MacKenzie Papers, Box 99, folder 6.

<sup>97</sup> Isabel Wilson, "A Report on Citizens' Forum, Canada's National Platform," (1953). AO, CAAE Papers, Series B-I, Box 1, CF, administrative, 1943-1960.

<sup>98</sup> Programmes broadcast 17 January 1952, 13 March 1952, 5 November 1953, 7 January 1954 and 21 October 1954 respectively. On these programming decisions and their background, see Isabel Wilson, *Citizens' Forum: "Canada's National Platform"* (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980).

<sup>99</sup> Hilda Neatby, "Education For Democracy," *Dalhousie Review* 24(1) (April 1944): 43-50.

<sup>100</sup> Hilda Neatby, *So Little For the Mind* (Toronto: Clarke Irwin, 1953), vi.

<sup>101</sup> See, for a concise example, Vernon S. Stevens, "Preface to a Philosophy of Education," *CanF* XXXII No. 376 (May 1952): 33-34.

<sup>102</sup> James T. Kloppenberg, *Uncertain Victory: Social Democracy and Progressivism in European and American Thought, 1870-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 374.

<sup>103</sup> Neatby, *So Little for the Mind*, 232.

<sup>104</sup> Edward A. McCourt, "Schoolhouse in Utopia," *SN* (12 July 1941): 25.

<sup>105</sup> Neatby, *So Little for the Mind*. See especially the opening section of Chapter Seven, "Comment and Criticism."

<sup>106</sup> Catherine Stephen, "Schools Across the Sea," *SN* (23 November 1940): 25.

<sup>107</sup> Dr. J.M. Ewing, "Our Progressivist Education," Sixth in the series: *Our Changing Values*, broadcast 15 September 1948. NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 28, Public Affairs Scripts Broadcast 1943-51. Neatby herself offered some wartime advice in "Education For Democracy," *Dalhousie Review* 24(1) (April 1944): 43-50. See also William E. Hume, "Are the Schools Ruining Your Child?" *Maclean's* (1 March 1952): 12-13, 37-39.

<sup>108</sup> A.R.M. Lower, "Does Our Education Educate?" *Maclean's* (15 November 1948): 9, 72-76.

<sup>109</sup> J.J. Brown, "Mr. Brown Looks at Education," *Canadian Business* (November 1951): 48. Neatby also quoted extensively from Toronto sociology professor J.R. Seeley's contribution to the University of London's *Year Book of Education* for 1951. Neatby, *So Little for the Mind*, 264-268.

- <sup>110</sup> See the above-mentioned article by Vernon Stevens, "Preface to a Philosophy of Education." Quotation from Jessie Macpherson, "The Ends of Education," *FFT* 14(5) (February 1954): 3-7.
- <sup>111</sup> Neatby, *So Little for the Mind*, 315, 324-325.
- <sup>112</sup> Kenneth Patrick Watson, "How Much For the Mind?" *CanF* XXXIV No. 399 (April 1954): 7-9.
- <sup>113</sup> Frank H. Underhill, "So Little for the Mind: Comments and Queries," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* Vol. 46, Series III (June 1954): 16-17.
- <sup>114</sup> Robertson Davies, "Dr. Neatby Punches the Pedagogues," *JN* (14 November 1953): 22-23.
- <sup>115</sup> Hilda Neatby, "Progressive Education: A Challenge Missed," *JN* (17 October 1953): 8.
- <sup>116</sup> Hilda Neatby, *A Temperate Dispute* (Toronto: Clarke Irwin, 1954) The essays "A Temperate Dispute" and "Is Teaching a Learned Profession?" took up directly the educational theme addressed in *So Little for the Mind*.
- <sup>117</sup> Neatby, "The Debt of Our Reason," in *A Temperate Dispute*, 78-85.
- <sup>118</sup> Neatby, "The Group and the Herd," in *A Temperate Dispute*, 30-36, 45-49.
- <sup>119</sup> Ralph Allen, *The Chartered Libertine* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1954). Allen patterned his character Hilary Bonnisteel upon Neatby.
- <sup>120</sup> The most influential of these early community studies were R.S. Lynd and H.M. Lynd, *Middletown: A Study in Contemporary American Culture* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929) and their follow-up study *Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937). W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt produced the Yankee City series beginning in 1941. The series began with *The Social Life of a Modern Community* and *The Status System of a Modern Community* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941 and 1942).
- <sup>121</sup> James Gilbert, *A Cycle of Outrage: America's Reaction to the Juvenile Delinquent in the 1950s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 3.
- <sup>122</sup> On Riesman, along with other American intellectual notables of the 1950s William Whyte and C. Wright Mills, see Chapter Four of Richard Pells, *The Liberal Mind in a Conservative Age: American Intellectuals in the 1940s and 1950s* (2nd ed., Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1989) or Neil J. Munro, *Critical Crossings: The New York Intellectuals in Postwar America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991). On the "Toqueville revival," see Michael Kammen, *The Lively Arts*, 336.
- <sup>123</sup> David Riesman, with Reuel Denney and Nathan Glazer, *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1950). The study also introduced a third category, "tradition-directed," which probably best described intellectuals discontented with the mass society. The same team published a companion volume, *Faces in the Crowd* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1953) which focused on the interviews done for the *Lonely Crowd* project.
- <sup>124</sup> Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd*, 4. Riesman defined social character as a "product of experience," lending the concept an applicable historical dimension.
- <sup>125</sup> Murray G. Ross, "Man and His Lack of Community," in R.C. Chalmers and John A. Irving, eds., *The Light and the Flame: Modern Knowledge and Religion* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1956), 66.
- <sup>126</sup> John R. Seeley, R. Alexander Sim and E.W. Loosley, *Crestwood Heights: A Study of the Culture of Suburban Life* (Toronto: UTP, 1956), 14, 17, 145-146. David Riesman wrote the introduction to *Crestwood Heights*, in which he criticized the authors for their lack of a comparative perspective, but praised them for their sensitivity to the "anxiety and other forms of mental suffering among the well-to-do." viii.
- <sup>127</sup> *Crestwood Heights*, 134.
- <sup>128</sup> Sandwell, *The Gods in Twilight* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1948), 16.
- <sup>129</sup> Seeley et al., *Crestwood Heights*, 13. The National Committee for Mental Hygiene was a subsidiary of the Canadian Mental Health Association. Under the direction of Dr. J.D.M. Griffin, the Committee ran a radio series on the CBC during 1950. Entitled "In Search of Ourselves," the series simplified psychological terms

and attempted to remind the average listener of her individuality. "In Search of Ourselves," pamphlet, [1950]. NAC, Canada Foundation, MG 28 I179, Vol. 25, file 4a, CBC, 1942-1951. See also Harriet Carr, "'In Search of Ourselves,'" *FFT* 10(4) (January 1950): 10-12.

<sup>130</sup> David Riesman, "Introduction," *Crestwood Heights*, viii.

<sup>131</sup> R. Alex Sim, "Crestwood Heights: An Exploration," address given before the National Council of Jewish Women, Montreal, 16 January 1957, 5-6. NAC, Robert Alexander Sim Papers, MG 30 D 260, Vol. 5, file 16, Crestwood Heights, An Exploration.

<sup>132</sup> J.L. Synge, "Science and Culture," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 5(3) (April 1936): 349.

<sup>133</sup> C.R. Tracy, "Education in the Atomic Age," *The New Trail* 4(2) (April 1946): 64-66; J.E. Middleton, "Old Knowledge and New," (poem) *SN* (1 February 1947): 5; Dennis Healy, letter to the editor, "Overspecialized College Education Promoting a Dangerous Trend," *SN* (22 November 1947): 4; Watson Kirkconnell, *Liberal Education in the Canadian Democracy* Address at McMaster University, February 1948.

<sup>134</sup> A.S.P. Woodhouse, "Research in the Humanities," Paper read at the Regional Conference on the Humanities in the Maritime Provinces, 9-10 June 1949. NAC, RCALS, 1946-1951, RG 33/28 Vol. 45, file 3.9; C.E. Dolman, "Science and the Humanities," address to the British Columbia Academy of Science, University of British Columbia, 14 April 1950; Anne Francis, "Capital Report," CBC broadcast, 3 June 1951. NAC, CBC, RG 41, Vol. 303, file 14-2-2, pt. 2, Massey Commission, Editorial Comment; F.M. Salter, "The Problem of the Humanities," *The New Trail* 9(2) (Summer 1951): 79-85.

<sup>135</sup> Malcolm W. Wallace, "The Present Status of the Humanities in Canada," Submission to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 1950, 22. NAC, RCALS, 1946-1951, RG 33/28, Vol. 54, Special Studies files.

<sup>136</sup> A.R.M. Lower, "Uses and Abuses of Universities," *SN* (25 April 1953): 8.

<sup>137</sup> Donald Creighton, "What Can the Humanities Do for Government?" National Conference on the Humanities, 19-20 November 1954, 1. NAC, Donald Grant Creighton Papers, MG 31, D77, Vol. 10, Humanities Research Council of Canada, 1954-55.

<sup>138</sup> E.W.R. Steacie, "The Impact of Society on Science," Purvis Memorial Lecture, Society of Chemical Industry, Montreal, 27 November 1957, in J.D. Babbitt, ed., *Science in Canada: Selections from the Speeches of E.W.R. Steacie* (Toronto: UTP, 1965), 97-99. C.D. Howe echoed Steacie's call for a greater scientific awareness among humanists: Howe, "Afternoon Convocation," Address to Convocation of Dalhousie University, (1958). NAC, Clarence Decatur Howe Papers, MG 27 III B20, Vol. 148, series 89-2, Speeches, part 15.

<sup>139</sup> A.R.C. Duncan, "An Ideal Programme for the Humanities," speech to Humanities Association of Canada, June 1958. Reprinted in *Humanities Association Bulletin* 25 (January 1959): 11-17.

<sup>140</sup> "A Summary of the Brief Submitted to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting by Professor A.R.M. Lower of Queen's University," [1956]. TFRB, J.A. Irving Papers, MS. col. 132, Box 61, CBC 1951-1955.

<sup>141</sup> J.B. Priestley and J. Hawkes, *Journey Down a Rainbow* (London: Readers Union, 1957), 43-44, cited in Nick Tiratsoo, "Limits of Americanisation: The United States Productivity Gospel in Britain," in Becky Conekin, Frank Mort and Chris Waters, eds., *Moments of Modernity: Reconstructing Britain, 1945-1964* (London and New York: Rivers Oram Press, 1999), 96.

<sup>142</sup> Saskatchewan Arts Board, "Brief to Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences," October 1949, 3. NAC, RCALS, RG 33/28, Vol. 29, reel C-2014.

<sup>143</sup> Robertson Davies, "The Individual and the Mass," *SN* (10 May 1958): 26.

## Chapter Five

<sup>1</sup> Morley Callaghan, "Canada's Creeping 'Me Too' Sickness," *JN* (13 April 1957): 18, 38. Callaghan's urge to champion a democratic aristocracy may have been informed by American critic Russell Lynes's *A Surfeit of Honey* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953 [and reprinted yearly through at least 1957]), see especially Chapter II, "What Became of the Upper Class?"

<sup>2</sup> Paul Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission* (Toronto: UTP, 1992); Andrew Stewart and William Hull, *Canadian Television Policy and the Board of Broadcast Governors* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1994); Marc Raboy, *Missed Opportunities: The Story of Canada's Broadcasting Policy* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990); J.L. Granatstein, "Culture and Scholarship: The First Ten Years of the Canada Council," *Canadian Historical Review* 65(4) (September 1984): 441-474; Frank Peers, *The Public Eye: Television and the Politics of Canadian Broadcasting, 1952-1968* (Toronto: UTP, 1979).

<sup>3</sup> George Salverson, "In the Shadow of the Bomb," 1 January 1950. McM, CBC Scripts Collection, Reel 98.

<sup>4</sup> Malcolm Ross, *Our Sense of Identity* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1954); W.L. Morton, *The Canadian Identity* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961); Blair Fraser, *The Search for Identity: Canada 1945-1967* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967); Robin Mathews, *Canadian Identity: major forces shaping the life of a people* (Ottawa: Steel Rail, 1988); Allan Smith, *Canada: An American Nation?: Essays on Continentalism, Identity and the Canadian Frame of Mind* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994).

<sup>5</sup> Marshall McLuhan, "Why the CBC Must Be Dull," *JN* (16 February 1957): 14.

<sup>6</sup> C.P. Snow, *The Two Cultures* ed. Stefan Collini (Cambridge: Canto, 1993).

<sup>7</sup> Mavor Moore, "What Sputnik has done to the Arts," *Canadian Commentator* 2(1) (January 1958): 1-2.

<sup>8</sup> Watson Kirkconnell, notes on rock 'n' roll, MS, [1957]. AUA, Watson Kirkconnell Papers, P4/36/2. This material appears to have been delivered as a speech to an Acadia University Student Christian Movement group.

<sup>9</sup> F.H. Underhill, "How Good Are Our Universities?" *CanF* XLII No. 503 (December 1962): 199-201.

<sup>10</sup> Canadian Arts Council, "Brief to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting," 22 August 1956, 5. NAC, Canadian Conference of the Arts, MG 28 I189, Vol. 34, file 20, RCB. An earlier draft of this brief (18 May 1956) quoted writer/broadcaster Lister Sinclair: "this is a democracy and one of the principles of a democracy is that everyone should be allowed what they want. Not that everybody should have what most people want."

<sup>11</sup> Morley Callaghan, "We're on the wrong track in our culture quest," *Macleans* (25 May 1957): 8, 86-87; Kenneth Forbes, "Don't fall for the modern art hoax," *Macleans* (5 July 1958): 8, 50-52; J. Barry Toole, "That Culture Business," *The Brunswickan*, vol. 90, no. 26, 31 January 1958, 3; Thelma H. McCormack, "Canada's Royal Commission on Broadcasting," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 23(1) (Spring 1959): 92-100.

<sup>12</sup> Don Jamieson, Address to the Western Association of Broadcasters, June 1957, 6-7. AO, CAAE Papers, Series E-I-4, Library, miscellaneous, Box 6. Jamieson was VP and General Manager of CJON-TV in St. John's, and later became President of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters. See especially the chapter entitled "What the Public Wants" of his book on the broadcasting industry in Canada, *The Troubled Air* (Fredericton: Brunswick, 1962).

<sup>13</sup> Donald Creighton to W.L. Morton, 29 October 1957. McM, W.L. Morton Papers, Box 6, f.39, Creighton, Donald, 1955-1961.

<sup>14</sup> Mavor Moore, "Critic on the Hearth," *Canadian Commentator* 1(3) (March 1957): 13-14; "Snobs at Stratford," *Canadian Commentator* 1(9) (September 1957): 7-8; "Who Killed Agatha Christie?: The Snobbery of the Critics," *Canadian Commentator* 1(10) (October 1957): 6-7.

<sup>15</sup> The first two years of *Canadian Commentator's* run coincided roughly with the period that saw the

formation of the Canada Council and the advent of the Board of Broadcast Governors. Mavor Moore, "What Will the Council Counsel?" *Canadian Commentator* 1(1) (January 1957): 8; Marcus Long, "A Dangerous Proposal," *Canadian Commentator* 1(4) (April 1957): 1-2; Pierre Dansereau, "Culture Is What We Are Concerned With," *Canadian Commentator* 1(8) (August 1957): 6; Robert Weaver, "What Canada Needs," *Canadian Commentator* 1(9) (September 1957): 9; "Bring on the Broadcast Commission," *Canadian Commentator* 2(6) (June 1958): 16; Raymond Varela, "Television and the majority rule," *Canadian Commentator* 2(11) (November 1958): 9-10.

<sup>16</sup> Watson Kirkconnell, notes on rock 'n' roll, MS, [1957].

<sup>17</sup> Ernest van den Haag, "Of Happiness and Despair We Have No Measure," in Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White, eds., *Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America* (New York: Macmillan, 1957), 512.

<sup>18</sup> Claude T. Bissell, "Sputnik and the Humanities," speech to Humanities Association of Canada, 10 June 1958, Edmonton. Reprinted in *Humanities Association Bulletin* 25 (October 1958): 10-16.

<sup>19</sup> Humanities Association of Canada, Fredericton Branch, brief submitted to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting, 1956, 1. NAC, Royal Commission on Broadcasting [hereafter RCB], RG 33/36, Vol. 33, reel C-7020,

<sup>20</sup> Donald Creighton's presentation to Diefenbaker, 18 July 1958. McM, W.L. Morton Papers, Box 3, f.11, Canadian Broadcasting League.

<sup>21</sup> Alan M. Thomas, "Audience, Market and Public - An Evaluation of Canadian Broadcasting," *Canadian Communications Canadiennes* 1(1) (Summer 1960): 27.

<sup>22</sup> "Forgotten History," *SN* (29 March 1958): 42; Miriam Chapin, *Contemporary Canada* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), 3; Lorne Pierce, *A Canadian Nation* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1960), 36, 38-39.

<sup>23</sup> J.A. Irving, "Culture and Society," n.d. [1960?] (typescript), 2-3. TFRB, J.A. Irving Papers, MS. col. 132, Box 45.

<sup>24</sup> Hugh Garner, "Spoon-Fed Patriotism Won't Work in Canada," *SN* (29 March 1958): 8. Two years later, Garner recycled the same article in another magazine: "The phony cult of canned Canadianism," *Macleans* (21 May 1960): 8, 58, 60.

<sup>25</sup> John McDade, "So B---y Grim About Culture," *Canadian Commentator* 4(4) (April 1960): 15-16.

<sup>26</sup> CF, "Have We A National Identity?" (1963).

<sup>27</sup> James R. Edgett, "The United Search of Canada," *SN* (1 August 1959): 44.

<sup>28</sup> Ramsay Cook, "Cultural Nationalism in Canada: An Historical Perspective," in Janice L. Murray, ed., *Canadian Cultural Nationalism: The Fourth Lester B. Pearson Conference on the Canada-U.S. Relationship* (New York: New York University Press, 1977), 15-44. Litt, *The Muses, The Masses and the Massey Commission*, 4-6.

<sup>29</sup> Robert Weaver, "What Canada Needs," *Canadian Commentator* 1(9) (September 1957): 9.

<sup>30</sup> Julian Park, ed., *The Culture of Contemporary Canada* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1957), v, ix.

<sup>31</sup> Harold A. Innis, *The Strategy of Culture* (Toronto: UTP, 1952), 18-20.

<sup>32</sup> Frank H. Underhill, "Canadian and American Ties with Europe," *Queen's Quarterly* 66(3) (Autumn 1959): 376.

<sup>33</sup> Philip Marchand, *Marshall McLuhan: The Medium and the Messenger* (New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1989), especially Chapter 7; Lawrence Grossberg, ed., "On postmodernism and articulation: an interview with Stuart Hall," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10(2) (1986): 45-60; Arthur Kroker, *Technology and the Canadian Mind: Innis, Grant, McLuhan* (New York: St. Martin's, 1985); Joel Persky, "The Innescence of Marshall McLuhan," *Journal of Canadian Culture* 1(2) (Fall 1984): 3-14.

<sup>34</sup> Marshall McLuhan, address delivered at the 26th Annual Couchiching Conference, 3-10 August 1957, reprinted in *National Values in a Changing World* (Toronto: CIPA/CAAE, 1957), 31.

<sup>35</sup> McLuhan, "Our New Electronic Culture - The Role of Mass Communications in Meeting Today's Problems," *NAEB Journal* (October 1958)

<sup>36</sup> "He was soon to discover the automatism portrayed in *The Mechanical Bride* was yielding to a new tribalism. The study of this new tribalism would strip the last traces of moral earnestness from his prose and immerse him completely in the role of explorer, the relentless seeker of insights unhindered by the striking of moral attitudes." Marchand, *Marshall McLuhan: The Medium and the Messenger*, 110.

<sup>37</sup> McLuhan, "What Canadians Value in Their Reading," 32.

<sup>38</sup> Fowler was president of Canadian Pulp and Paper Association. He had served on Rowell-Sirois (Dominion-Provincial Relations) Commission and on the Wartime Prices and Trade Board. He was a member of the Canadian Institute for International Affairs, and presented that organization's brief to Massey Commission.

<sup>39</sup> A.D. Dunton, presentation to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting, Ottawa, 30 April 1956, 22-50. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7013.

<sup>40</sup> Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, [hereafter CARTB], "Brief of the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters," 15 March 1956, 14. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 25, reel C-7019.

<sup>41</sup> CARTB, "Brief of the CARTB," 6-8.

<sup>42</sup> CARTB, presentation to the RCB, Hearings, Ottawa, 3 May 1956, 543-610. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7013. The CARTB made it clear that its membership opposed regulating the time devoted to certain types of programmes, but yet Clause 1 in the 1943 Canadian Association Broadcasters (the Association's original name) *Code of Ethics* committed the Association to a kind of proportional representation in programming. The 1943 code was included with the CARTB presentation, having undergone no substantial revisions. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 25, reel C-7019. Like the CARTB, the directors of the Canadian Marconi Company, which owned CFCF in Montreal, saw broadcasting as little different from publishing, and found any scheme for assessing the cultural value of a broadcast silly. Canadian Marconi Company, brief to the RCB, Montreal, 15 April 1956, 7-10. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 34, reel C-7020.

<sup>43</sup> Canadian Association of University Teachers, "Broadcasting in Canada," a brief presented to the RCB by the Canadian Association of University Teachers, 30 April 1956, 4. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 34, reel C-7020.

<sup>44</sup> Humanities Association of Canada, Fredericton Branch, "Brief to Royal Commission on Broadcasting," 1956, 4. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 33, reel C-7020.

<sup>45</sup> RCB, Hearings, Winnipeg, 7 May 1956, 1025. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7013.

<sup>46</sup> RCB, Hearings, Regina, 11 May 1956, 1417. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7013.

<sup>47</sup> RCB Hearings, Winnipeg, 7 May 1956, 885-886, 897. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7013.

<sup>48</sup> RCB, Hearings, Winnipeg, 7 May 1956, 973-1000. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7013. The longer quotation comes from p. 979. McNaught does not attribute a source to the Priestley comment. The Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) shared United College's opinion of the private stations, pointing out that minority tastes were likely to be ignored, especially in peak hours. CAUT, "Broadcasting in Canada," 5.

<sup>49</sup> RCB, Hearings, Regina, 11 May 1956, 1400-1401. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7013.

<sup>50</sup> University of Toronto Television Committee, "Educational Television in Canada: The University's Role," brief to RCB, 10 April 1956, 1. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 32, reel C-7019.

<sup>51</sup> Canadian Federation of Newman Clubs, brief presented to the RCB, Halifax, 1956, 2. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7020.

<sup>52</sup> Canadian Association of University Teachers, "Broadcasting in Canada," 4. Another organization warned: "The advertising industry itself must take cognizance of the fact that the Canadian public wants quality and variety in its television programming and not meaningless and degrading forms of entertainment." Saskatchewan Arts Board, "Brief to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting, 1956," 3. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7019.

<sup>53</sup> Canadian Federation of University Women, "Brief to the Fowler Commission on the C.B.C.," Regina, 11 May 1956, 3. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 30, reel C-7019.

<sup>54</sup> Humanities Association of Canada, Fredericton Branch, brief to Royal Commission on Broadcasting, 1956, 6. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 33, reel C-7020.

<sup>55</sup> Canadian Federation of Newman Clubs, brief presented to the RCB, Halifax, 1956, 2-3. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7020.

<sup>56</sup> RCB, Hearings, Regina, 11 May 1956, 1436. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7013.

<sup>57</sup> RCB, Hearings, Vancouver, 14 May 1956, 1627. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 30, reel C-7014.

<sup>58</sup> RCB, Hearings, Regina, 11 May 1956, 1502. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7013.

<sup>59</sup> Paul Rutherford, *When Television Was Young: Primetime Canada 1952-1967* (Toronto: UTP, 1990). See especially Chapter 8, "Culture on the Small Screen."

<sup>60</sup> "Brief of a Group of Regina Housewives," RCB, Hearings, 11 May 1956, 1502-1503. Phyllis Levin, Juliet Shapiro, and June Mitchell represented the larger group. The Newman Club Alumni of the University of Manitoba advocated a fairly narrow range of topics for TV: "wholesome matters of scientific, artistic or sporting activities or reporting occasions of State." RCB, Hearings, 7 May 1956, 1009. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7013.

<sup>61</sup> Humanities Association of Canada, Fredericton Branch, brief to RCB, 1956, 3.

<sup>62</sup> Saskatchewan Arts Board, "Brief to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting, 1956," 2. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7019.

<sup>63</sup> Humanities Association of Canada, Fredericton Branch, brief to Royal Commission on Broadcasting, 1956, 3-4.

<sup>64</sup> Canadian Federation of University Women, "Brief to the Fowler Commission on the C.B.C.," Regina, 11 May 1956, 1. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 30, reel C-7019.

<sup>65</sup> Association of Radio and Television Employees of Canada (NABET-CLC), "Submission to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting, 29 June 1956, 3. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 35, reel C-7021.

<sup>66</sup> On the ambiguity and contention surrounding the idea of the folk, see Ian McKay, *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994).

<sup>67</sup> RCB, Hearings, Vancouver, 14 May 1956, 1597-1598. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 30, reel C-7014.

<sup>68</sup> RCB, Hearings, Winnipeg, 8 May 1956, 1113. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7013.

<sup>69</sup> RCB, Hearings, Vancouver, 14 May 1956, 1626-1627. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7014.

<sup>70</sup> Canadian Mental Health Association [CMHA], "Brief to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting," April 1956, 2. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 32, reel C-7019.

<sup>71</sup> CMHA, "Brief to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting," 4-5.

<sup>72</sup> A.R.M. Lower, "Brief on the Question of Radio and Television Broadcasting for Submission to the Royal Commission of Inquiry on these Subjects," 1956, 16. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Exhibit 207, reel C-7020.

<sup>73</sup> Marchand, *The Medium and the Messenger*, 148.

<sup>74</sup> A Brief submitted to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting by a number of citizens of Kingston, Ontario, 1956, 5-6. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 35, reel C-7021.

<sup>75</sup> Thelma H. McCormack, "Canada's Royal Commission on Broadcasting," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 23(1) (Spring 1959): 96. During the Royal Commission on Broadcasting's Hearings in Vancouver, Geoffrey Andrew drew the distinction between anti-Americanism and developing "an alert self-consciousness[.]" Brief presented by the University of British Columbia Television Committee, Vancouver, 14 May 1956, Royal Commission on Broadcasting, Hearings, 1588. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, reel C-7014.

<sup>76</sup> "Memorandum on Broadcasting in Canada," 8 April 1958. NAC, Donald Grant Creighton Papers, MG 31 D77, Vol. 8, Canadian Broadcasting League, Correspondence and Memoranda.



<sup>77</sup> "Bring on the Broadcast Commission," *Canadian Commentator* 2(6) (June 1958): 16.

<sup>78</sup> Mary Lowrey Ross, "The Fringe Audiences," *SN* (3 January 1959): 25.

<sup>79</sup> CF promotional pamphlet/schedule, 1957. NAC, Neil M. Morrison Papers, MG 30 E 273, Vol. 11, Brochures 1943-61.

<sup>80</sup> Season schedules and individual study bulletins for CF, 1949-1963, located in Robarts Library, University of Toronto (late 1950s-early 1960s) and in various archival collections – AO: CAAE Papers; CBC Radio Archives; NAC: Canadian Citizenship Council Papers; Canada Foundation, CBC *Citizens' Forum*.

<sup>81</sup> CAAE, National Council Meeting, 20 May 1958, Winnipeg. Canadian Citizenship Council Papers, NAC, MG 28 I85, Vol. 21, CAAE.

<sup>82</sup> Peter Siegle, "Kitsch and U," *FFT* 20(3) (December 1959): 107.

<sup>83</sup> Representing the UBC Television Committee, Geoff Andrew noted while appearing in front of the Fowler Commission in 1956: "Our national culture, even if not highly developed as yet, is a distinctive culture, and it embraces everything from hockey and lacrosse to the Group of Seven and Andrew Allan's radio drama. It further embraces everything from the Ballads of Newfoundland to the Salmon Derbies of the Pacific Coast." RCB, Hearings, Vancouver, 14 May 1956, 1596. NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 30, reel C-7014.

<sup>84</sup> Alphonse Ouimet, "Broadcasting – a greater challenge than ever," address to the Canadian Club of Toronto, 7 December 1959, 3-4. AO, CAAE Papers, Series A-II-2, Box 1, Director's Files, 1960.

<sup>85</sup> "This too is Canadian Culture!" CBC magazine advertisement, (1961).

<sup>86</sup> Bruce Hutchison, *Canada: Tomorrow's Giant* (Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company, 1957); Hutchison, *The Unknown Country: Canada and her People* (Toronto: Longmans, Green, 1943)

<sup>87</sup> Robertson Davies, "Moderate and Middlebrow," *SN* (14 April 1956): 26.

<sup>88</sup> One submission to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting thought very highly of American child expert Frank C. Baxter's assessment of television and its function as an educative medium, quoting him: "Your television set is not a vending machine for higher learning. It can, at best, be an invitation to knowledge. That in itself is very much. God bless TV if it opens our eyes to the hidden treasures that await, for example, the reading of Robinson Crusoe. But God help us too, if the dramatized smattering on TV is all we ever get." Children's Section, Ontario Library Association, "Brief," NAC, RCB, RG 33/36, Vol. 32, reel C-7019.

<sup>89</sup> Robert Fulford, "Television Notebook," *CanFXL* No. 474 (July 1960): 90.

<sup>90</sup> See Joan Shelley Rubin, "Self, Culture, and Self Culture in Modern America: The Early History of the Book-of-the-Month Club," *Journal of American History* 71(4) (March 1985): 782-806; and Janice Radway, "The Scandal of the Middlebrow: The Book-of-the-Month Club, Class Fracture, and Cultural Authority," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 89(4) (Fall 1990): 703-736.

<sup>91</sup> G.P. Gilmour, ed., *Canada's Tomorrow* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1954); K.R. Swinton, "The Rehabilitation of the Egghead," *Canadian Commentator* 2(5) (May 1958): 9.

<sup>92</sup> F. David Hoeniger, "Shakespeare and his Theatre," (CAAE, 1958)

<sup>93</sup> Advertisement, "Gems of Wisdom in the Words of the World's Greatest Thinkers," *Canadian Commentator* 3(11) (November 1959): 9-10.

<sup>94</sup> "A Bookshelf of Canada," *Citizenship Items* 10(6) (November 1957). Robins was the author of *The Incomplete Anglers* and the editor of the early post-war anthology *A Pocketful of Canada*.

<sup>95</sup> Roy Little, "The Untutored Audience," *FFT* 19(6) (March 1959): 270-280.

<sup>96</sup> Paul Rutherford, *When Television Was Young*, 84.

<sup>97</sup> Robert Fulford, "What's Behind the New Wave of TV Think Shows," *Maclean's* (5 October 1963): 25-27, 61.

<sup>98</sup> Livingston to members of the CBC Science Unit, 27 June 1963. NAC, CBC, Vol. 203, file 11-18-11-43, Science Programs.

<sup>99</sup> See, for example, George Steele and Paul Kircher, *The Crisis We Face: Automation and the Cold War*

(New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960)

<sup>100</sup> Bernard Rosenberg, "Mass Culture in America," in Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White, eds., *Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America* (New York: The Free Press, 1957), 11-12.

<sup>101</sup> P.M. Richards, "Technology and Jobs," *SN* (4 May 1940): 11; M.M. Kirkwood, *Women and the Machine Age* Number 7 in The Machine Age Series (Toronto: Social Service Council of Canada, [1940])

<sup>102</sup> Lawren Harris et al., "Community Art Centres," *Canadian Art* 2(2) (December 1944-January 1945): 62.

<sup>103</sup> J.E. Middleton, "Are Machines Making Young Canada Soft?" *SN* (25 January 1947): 11; Dyson Carter, "Speed-Up Brings Killing Diseases," *Canadian Tribune* (7 December 1946): 11.

<sup>104</sup> A.W. Blue, "The Machine - Is It Man's Enemy? Technological Unemployment Seen As Society's Most Serious Problem - A Study of Effects and Possible Remedies," *SN* (11 July 1931): 21, 28; Eugene A. Forsey, *Unemployment in the Machine Age: Its Causes* Number Five in the Machine Age Series (Toronto: Social Service Council of Canada, 1940); "Brave New Machine World," *SN* (20 September 1952): 32; Norman DePoe, "Will a machine ever take your job?" *Macleans* (1 October 1955): 20-21, 62-67; Fred Bodsworth, "What science will do to us," *Macleans* (15 October 1955): 16, 102-103, 105; British Columbia Federation of Labour, *What's Happening to Jobs?: The Effects of Automation and Related Problems* (Vancouver: 1960).

<sup>105</sup> *Oxford English Dictionary*, Second Edition, J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, eds., (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), Vol. I, 805-806. The OED lists 1948 as the term's earliest known appearance. Mary Lowrey Ross, "Miss A. and the Cybernetic Age," *SN* (11 January 1949): 11; Eric Nicol, "The Machine," January 1953. McM, CBC Scripts Collection, Reel 82.

<sup>106</sup> See, for example: George Soule, *What Automation Does to Human Beings* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1956); Howard B. Jacobson and Joseph S. Roucek, *Automation and Society* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959); Walter Buckingham, *Automation: Its Impact Business and People* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1961); Donald and Eleanor Laird, *How To Get Along With Automation* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964); Ben Seligman, *A Most Notorious Victory: Man in an Age of Automation* (New York: Free Press/Macmillan, 1966) and George Terborgh, *Automation Hysteria* (New York: Norton, 1966).

<sup>107</sup> Kildare R.E. Dobbs, "Automation and Art," *CanF* XXXVI No. 423 (April 1956): 8-9.

<sup>108</sup> The Canadian Institute on Public Affairs Winter Week-End Conference on "Automation - What It Means To You" was held at Upper Canada College in Toronto on 25-26 February 1956.

<sup>109</sup> Panel Presentation: "Automation for Canada: Today and To-morrow," 26. Canadian Institute on Public Affairs Winter Week-End Conference on "Automation - What It Means To You" Upper Canada College, 25 February 1956. NAC, CBC, RG 41, Vol. 895, file PG8-1-4-2, pt. 1, Couchiching Conference.

<sup>110</sup> Canadian Federation of University Women, "Brief to the Fowler Commission on the C.B.C.," Regina, 11 May 1956, 2. RG 33/36, Vol. 30, reel C-7019. Adult education became especially important since the "intellectual demands" on workers increased apace. University of Toronto Television Committee, "Educational Television in Canada: The University's Role," 1.

<sup>111</sup> J.R. Kidd, "The Challenge of Automation," *FFT* 18(5) (February 1958): 214; E.G.D. Murray, ed., Royal Society of Canada, *Our Debt to the Future*. Symposium Presented on the Seventy-fifth Anniversary, 1957 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1958).

<sup>112</sup> United Church of Canada, "Report of the Toronto Committee on Automation," (1957). TFRB, J.A. Irving Papers, MS. col. 132, Box 45.

<sup>113</sup> John A. Irving, "Can Machines Replace Minds?" *SN* (8 June 1957): 10-11, 38-39.

<sup>114</sup> Geoffrey Vickers, *The Undirected Society: Essays on the Human Implications of Industrialization in Canada* (Toronto: UTP, 1959), 39.

<sup>115</sup> Bruce Hutchison, "The Coming Revolt Against Leisure," *Macleans* (15 March 1958): 19, 52.

<sup>116</sup> Ian Vorres, "Beauty in the Machine Age," *SN* (1 August 1959): 10-11.

<sup>117</sup> Roy Daniells, "Poetry and the Novel," in Julian Park, ed., *The Culture of Contemporary Canada* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957), 25.

<sup>118</sup> William A. Westley, "The workers automation wants," *Executive Decision* (February 1959): 56-57.

<sup>119</sup> Alastair W. MacLeod, "Personal Satisfaction," in *Round Table on Man and Industry* University of Toronto, 1958), 15-16.

<sup>120</sup> R.S. Hosking, "What's the matter with Father?" *Toronto Star Weekly Magazine* (21 November 1959): 40-41, 58; Nancy Christie notes that Hosking "blamed the changing status of men upon the changing role of women." Nancy Christie, "Sacred Sex: The United Church and the Privatization of the Family in Post-war Canada," in Christie, ed., *Households of Faith: Family, Religion and Social Change in Canada* (Toronto: UTP, forthcoming)

<sup>121</sup> "Toward a Christian Understanding of Sex, Love, Marriage," First Report of the Commission on Christian Marriage and Divorce, (1960), 3. UCA, Commission on Christian Marriage and Divorce, 82.084C, Box 1, f. 14; Crossley W. Krug, "The Causes of Divorce," (August 1961). UCCA, Commission on Christian Marriage and Divorce, 82.084C, Box 3, f. 28, Briefs 1961.

<sup>122</sup> Alf Harris, "The Wonderful Robot," broadcast 8 March 1956. Donald Jack, "The Proof Machine," broadcast 14 April 1956; anon., "Your World on a Plastic Platter," broadcast 19 April 1956; Alf Harris, "The Future of the Past," broadcast on Prairie Playhouse, broadcast 14 July 1961; Hugh R. Oldham, "The Day the Bomb Went Off," broadcast 29 November 1956; Robert Sherman Townes, "Who Destroyed the Earth?" adapted by George Salverson, broadcast 19 April 1957; Lister Sinclair, "The View From Here Is Yes! - A Nativity Play From the Modern Point of View," broadcast 13 December 1961; Donald Jack, "The Looking Glass World," TV drama, 11 October 1962. McM, CBC Script Collection, various reels.

<sup>123</sup> William Paluk, "Let the Machines Do It," 7 April 1961. McM, CBC Scripts Collection, Reel 85.

<sup>124</sup> "Action to Offset Automation Urged," *Toronto Daily Star*, 19 August 1960, 14; "The Friendly Monster," *Toronto Telegram*, 3 May 1961, 3; "Some Human Consequences of Our Increasing Industrialization," *The Royal Bank of Canada Monthly Letter* (October 1961); Sir Geoffrey Vickers, "The Impact of Automation on Society," in *Automation and Social Change* (Toronto: Government of Ontario, 1963), 41-54.

<sup>125</sup> "The United Church and the Onrushing Robots," *Maclean's* (19 September 1964): 32.

<sup>126</sup> John MacLure, "Are People Obsolete Already?" *Maclean's* (3 October 1964): 20, 36-39; June Callwood, "Tomorrow's here and we're all set for yesterday," *Maclean's* (23 January 1965): 7, 24-28; Harry Bruce, "Can We Stand Life Without Work?" *SN* (April 1965): 22-24.

<sup>127</sup> W.L. Morton, "Convocation Address, Brandon College, 1964," McM, W.L. Morton Papers, Box 52, Lectures, A-Confederation.

<sup>128</sup> J. Franklin Reed, Galt, Ontario, letter to the editor, *Maclean's* (28 September 1957): 4.

<sup>129</sup> Edmund Carpenter, "The New Languages," *Explorations* 7 (March 1957): 4-21.

<sup>130</sup> James S. Thomson, "The Challenge of Existentialism," in Ralph C. Chalmers and John A. Irving, eds., *Challenge and Response: Modern Ideas and Religion* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1959), 73-74.

<sup>131</sup> Session: "Values in the Making," at the 32nd Annual Couchiching Conference, "Values in Conflict," 28 July-1 Aug 1963. NAC, reference copy at: R2818-2821, 2822.

<sup>132</sup> George Grant, "An Ethic of Community," in Michael Oliver, ed., *Social Purpose For Canada* (Toronto: UTP, 1961), 13. The appearance of this collection of essays coincided with the transformation of the CCF into the NDP and with the last years of Grant's affiliation with social democratic politics.

<sup>133</sup> Bernard Rosenberg, "Mass Culture in America," 9.

<sup>134</sup> "It's The Striving That Matters," *Citizenship Items* 12(1) (January-February 1959): 8.

<sup>135</sup> *OED*, Second Edition, Vol. I, 805-806.

<sup>136</sup> Cited in Valerie Joyce Korinek, "'Roughing It In Suburbia': Reading *Chatelaine Magazine*, 1950-1969," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1996, 43.

<sup>137</sup> Malcolm Ross, "Introduction," in Ross, ed., *The Arts in Canada: A Stocktaking at Mid-century* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1958), 4.

<sup>138</sup> "Forgotten History," *SN* (29 March 1958): 42.

<sup>139</sup> Mary Lowrey Ross, "Folk Ways of Television," *SN* (10 May 1958): 24.

## Conclusion

<sup>1</sup> E.A. Corbett, *We Have With Us Tonight...*, 222.

<sup>2</sup> E.M. Forster, "What I Believe," in *Two Cheers for Democracy* (London: Edward Arnold, 1951), 82. Italics mine.

<sup>3</sup> Morley Callaghan, "Canada's Creeping 'Me Too' Sickness," *SN* (13 April 1957): 38.

<sup>4</sup> Adeline Haddow, "A Modern Background for Today's Woman," *SN* (12 September 1942): 26-28.

<sup>5</sup> "The Little King," *The Printed Word* 183 (December 1949): 3.

<sup>6</sup> An oft-noted articulation of this concept comes in Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991)

<sup>7</sup> S.K. Jaffary, "The Social Services," in C.A. Ashley, ed., *Reconstruction in Canada* (Toronto: UTP, 1943), 111-112.

<sup>8</sup> Paul Litt, *The Muses, The Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 18, and 83-120.

<sup>9</sup> Editorial from the *Orillia Daily Packet*, n.d. [August 1964?], cited in "Order and Good Government: A report on the 33rd Annual Couchiching Conference - July 25-31, 1964." NAC, RG 41 Vol. 895, file PG 8-1-4-2, pt. 2, Couchiching Conference.

<sup>10</sup> Owsram, *Born at the Right Time*, 229-230.

<sup>11</sup> Northrop Frye, *The Modern Century: The Whidden Lectures 1967* (Toronto: UTP, 1967), 28-29.

<sup>12</sup> B.K. Sandwell, "War Gets Things Done," *SN* (22 March 1941): 14.

<sup>13</sup> Pierre Berton, *1967: The Last Good Year* (Toronto: Doubleday, 1997)

## **Bibliography**

### ***PRIMARY SOURCES***

#### **Manuscript Collections**

##### **National Archives Of Canada – Manuscript Groups**

H.R.C. Avison, MG 30 D102  
Morley Callaghan, MG 30 D365  
Canada Foundation, MG 28 I179  
Canadian Citizenship Council Papers, MG 28 I85  
Canadian Conference of the Arts, MG 28 I189  
Canadian Institute on Public Affairs, MG 28 I144  
Charles Fraser Comfort, MG30 D81  
Donald Creighton MG 31 D77  
Clarence Decatur Howe, MG 27 III B20  
Arthur Lismer, MG 30 D184  
Neil Morrison, MG 28 I400  
Jean Hunter Morrison MG 30 D265  
Lister Sinclair MG 31 D44  
Lawren Harris MG MG 30 D208  
Walter Herbert MG 30 D205  
Marshall McLuhan MG 31 D156  
George Raleigh Parkin, MG 30 D77  
Frank Shuster, MG 31 D251  
Robert Alexander Sim, MG 30 D260  
Julia Grace Wales MG 30 D238  
Charlotte Elizabeth Whitton, MG 30 E256

##### **National Archives Of Canada – Government Record Groups**

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, RG 41  
Canadian Corporation for the World Exhibition (Expo '67), RG 71  
Centennial Commission, RG 69  
National Film Board, RG 53, Part II, 2.1.2 McGill Study of Expo '67, 1967-69

Records of Parliament, RG 14, 1987-88/146 (39), Reconstruction.  
Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and  
Sciences, RG 33/28  
Royal Commission on Broadcasting, RG 33/36  
Wartime Information Board, RG 36/31

**Acadia University Archives**

Watson Kirkconnell Papers

**Archives of Ontario**

Canadian Association for Adult Education

**Dalhousie University Archives**

Norman Creighton Papers, MS-2 689  
Herbert Leslie Stewart Papers, MS-2 45  
W. Graham Allen Papers, MS-2 96

**McGill University Archives**

F. Cyril James Papers, MG 1017  
John Grierson Collection, MG 2067

**McMaster University Archives**

John Coulter Papers  
CBC Script Collection

**Queen's University Archives**

Robert Charles Wallace Papers, coll. 1024  
A.R.M. Lower Papers, coll. no. 5072  
Joseph Alexander Gray Papers

**United Church of Canada Archives**

Board of Information and Stewardship Fonds, 83.001C  
Broadcasting Department, 98.030C  
Commission on Automation, Fonds 501, 82.131C

Commission on Christian Marriage and Divorce, 82.084C  
Commission on Church, Nation and World Order  
Ashley W. Lindsay Papers, 86. 304C  
Claris Edwin Silcox Papers, 86.208C

**University of British Columbia Special Collections and Archives**

N.A.M. MacKenzie Papers  
Leonard C. Marsh Papers

**University of New Brunswick Archives**

Alfred Goldsworthy Bailey, UA RG 80  
Burton S. Keirstead Papers, UA RG 81  
*The Brunswickan*

**University of Saskatchewan Archives and Special Collections**

George E. Britnell Papers  
Vernon C. Fowke Papers

**University of Toronto Archives**

Harold Adams Innis Papers, Accessions B72-0003, B72-0025  
John A. Irving Papers, MS. col. 132

**Periodicals**

NOTE: Periodicals listed here are those:

- a) for which 1939-1967 runs exist and were reviewed in their entirety (*Canadian Forum*, *Maclean's*, *Saturday Night*)
- b) reviewed over a shorter run, or not reviewed in their entirety (e.g. *Canadian Commentator*, *Here and Now*, *New Frontiers*)
- c) of varying publication histories, containing articles retrieved specifically because of topical relevance rather than as the result of an issue-by-issue review (e.g. *Queen's Quarterly*, *The New Trail*)

Individual articles drawn from the listed periodicals are not cited below, but are fully cited in footnotes.

*Canadian Art*

*Canadian Forum*

*Culture (Revue Trimestrielle des Sciences Religieuses et Profanes)*

*Echoes*

*Food For Thought*

*Here and Now*

*Maclean's*

*National Home Monthly*

*New Frontiers*

*Queen's Quarterly*

*Reading*

*Saturday Night*

*The Canadian Author (and Bookman)*

*The New Trail*

*The United Church Observer*

*University of Toronto Quarterly*



**Books and Pamphlets**

- Advisory Committee on Reconstruction, *Report*. Ottawa, King's Printer, 1944.
- Allen, Ralph. *The Chartered Libertine*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1954.
- Anglin, Gerald. *Canada Unlimited*. Toronto: O'Keefe Foundation, 1948.
- Ashley, C.A., ed. *Reconstruction in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1943.
- Bacon, F.L., and E.A. Krug. *Our Life Today*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1939.
- Berton, Pierre, *The Comfortable Pew A critical look at the Church in the New Age*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965.
- British Columbia Federation of Labour, *What's Happening to Jobs?: The Effects of Automation and Related Problems*. Vancouver: 1960.
- Brodie, Fawn M. *Peace Aims and Post-war Planning*. Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1942.
- Brodie, Fawn M. *Peace Aims and Post-war Reconstruction*. Princeton: American Committee for International Studies, 1941.
- Brown, George W. *Canadian Democracy in Action*. Toronto: Ontario Department of Education, 1945.
- Buchan, John. *Memory Hold-the-Door*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1940.
- Buckingham, Walter. *Automation: Its Impact Business and People*. New York: Harper Brothers, 1961.
- Cairns, Huntington. Allen Tate and Mark Van Doren, *Invitation to Learning*. New York: Random House, 1941.
- Canada, Centennial Commission. *Centennial Facts 2: Confederation Train and Caravans*. Ottawa: 1967.
- Canada, Centennial Commission. *Centennial Symbol/Graphics Manual*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1965.
- Canada, Centennial Commission. "Progress Report on Projects of National Significance For the Celebration of Canada's Centennial of Confederation." Ottawa: 15 November 1965.

Canada, Centennial Commission. *The Centennial and Canadians: a Report of Centennial Activities, 1966-1967*. Ottawa: Centennial Commission, 1967.

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

Canada, Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. *Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences*. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951.

Canada Council. *The Canada Council and the Arts*. Ottawa, 1959.

Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. *General Report on the 1967 World Exhibition*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969.

Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. *Terre des Hommes – Man and His World*. Ottawa: Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition, 1967.

Canadian Teachers' Federation. *Freedom of Conscience*. No. 4 in the Democratic Way series, January 1944.

Canadian Teachers' Federation. *I'm Free to Choose*. No. 3 in the Democratic Way series, July 1943.

*Canadian Hurdles*. Canadian Post-war Affairs Discussion Manual No. 4, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1945.

Canadian Youth Commission. *Youth and Jobs in Canada*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1945.

Canadian Youth Commission. *Youth & Recreation: New Plans for New Times*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1946.

Child, Philip, and John W. Holmes. *Dynamic Democracy: Problem of Strategy in the World War of Morale*. *Behind the Headlines Series*, Vol. 1, no. 9. May 1941, Toronto: CIIA/CAAE, 1941.

Cohen, Maxwell. *Governmental Machinery of Wartime Controls and its Relation to Postwar Problems*. Report to the Advisory Committee on Reconstruction. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1942.

Corbett, E.A. *We Have With Us Tonight...* Toronto: Ryerson, 1957.

Corey, Lewis. *The Unfinished Task: Economic Reconstruction for Democracy*. New York: Viking, 1942.

- Coulter, John, and Healey Willan. *Transit Through Fire*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1942.
- Dahir, James, comp. *Community Centers as Living War Memorials: A Selected Bibliography with Interpretive Comments*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1946.
- Davies, Blodwen. *Youth Speaks Its Mind*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1948.
- Davis, D.G., *Parents and Democracy*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1941.
- Dewey, John. *Freedom and Culture*. New York: Putnam, 1939.
- Eliot, T.S. *Notes towards the Definition of Culture*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1948.
- Ellul, Jacques. *The Technological Society*. New York: Vintage, 1964.
- Elton, Godfrey. *St. George or the Dragon: Towards a Christian Democracy*. London: Collins, 1942.
- Eustace, C.J. *An Infinity of Questions: A Study of the Religion of Art, and of the Art of Religion in the Lives of Five Women*. New York: Longmans, 1946.
- Fisher, John. *John Fisher Reports: An Anthology of Radio Scripts*. Hamilton: Niagara Editorial Bureau, 1949.
- Flenley, Ralph. *Post-war Problems – A Reading List*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1943.
- Forsey, Eugene A. *Unemployment in the Machine Age: Its Causes*. Number Five in the Machine Age Series, Toronto: Social Service Council of Canada, 1940.
- Fraser, Blair. *The Search for Identity: Canada 1945-1967*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967.
- Frye, Northrop. *The Modern Century: The Whidden Lectures 1967*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.
- Galloway, George B. *Post-war Planning in the United States*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1942.
- Gillis, Clarie, M.P. *Letter From Home! From a Soldier of 1914-19 To A Soldier of 1939-194? (1943)*
- Goslin, Ryllis and Omar. *Democracy*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1940.
- Grant, George. *Lament For a Nation*. Toronto: Gage, 1965.

- Grant, George. *Philosophy in the Mass Age*. ed. William Christian, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995 [originally published 1959].
- Grant, George. *Technology and Empire: Perspectives on North America*. Toronto: House of Anansi, 1969.
- Gregory, Sir Richard Arman. *Science in Chains*. No. 12 in the Macmillan War Pamphlets series, London: Macmillan, 1941.
- Government By the People*. Canadian Post-war Affairs: Discussion Manual No. 5, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1945.
- Heath, Lilian M., comp. *Platform Pearls for Temperance Workers and Other Reformers*. Toronto, 1896.
- Howard, Eileen. *Expo Summer*. Toronto: Doubleday Canada, 1969.
- Hutchison, Bruce. *Canada: Tomorrow's Giant*. Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company, 1957.
- Hutchison, Bruce. *The Unknown Country: Canada and her People*. Toronto: Longmans, Green, 1943.
- Huxley, Julian. *Democracy Marches*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941.
- Innis, Harold A. *The Bias of Communication*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1951.
- Innis, Harold A. *Empire and Communications*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950.
- Innis, Harold A., *The Strategy of Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952.
- Jacobson, Howard B., and Joseph S. Roucek. *Automation and Society*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.
- Jamieson, Don. *The Troubled Air*. Fredericton: Brunswick Press, 1966.
- Joad, C.E.M. *The Babbitt Warren*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Trubner, 1926.
- Kirkconnell, Watson. *Seven Pillars of Freedom*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1944.
- Kirkconnell, Watson. *Twilight of Liberty*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- Kirkwood, M.M. *Women and the Machine Age*. Number 7 in The Machine Age Series, Toronto: Social Service Council of Canada, [1940].

- Laird, Donald and Eleanor. *How To Get Along With Automation*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Laski, Harold J. et. al. *Where stands democracy?: A collection of essays by members of the Fabian Society*. London: Macmillan, 1940.
- Lynd, R.S., and H.M. *Middletown: A Study in Contemporary American Culture* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929
- Lynd, R.S., and H.M. *Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937.
- Lynes, Russell. *A Surfeit of Honey*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.
- Macdonald, John. *The Corner Stone of Democracy: The Discussion Group*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1939.
- MacDermot, Terence William Leighton. *Can We Make Good?*. No. 4 in the *Democracy and Citizenship* series, Toronto: CAAE/CILA, 1940.
- MacFarlane, Ronald Oliver. "Canada Tomorrow: Canada and the Post-war World, Part One," *Behind the Headlines* Series, Vol. 2, no. 3 (January 1942) Toronto: CILA/CAAE, 1942.
- Man and His World – Terre des Hommes: The Noranda Lectures, Expo 67*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.
- McDougall, John L. *The Foundations of National Well-Being – Post-war*. Kingston: 1944.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *The Mechanical Bride: Folklore of Industrial Man*. New York: Vanguard, 1951.
- Milner, Gamaliel. *The Problem of Decadence*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1931.
- Morton, W.L. *The Canadian Identity*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.
- Mumford, Lewis. *Faith for Living*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1940.
- Neatby, Hilda. *A Temperate Dispute*. Toronto: Clarke Irwin, 1954.
- Neatby, Hilda. *So Little For the Mind*. Toronto: Clarke Irwin, 1953.
- Nicol, John, Albert Shea and G.J.P Simmins. *Canada's Farm Radio Forum*. Paris: UNESCO, 1954.

- Ogilvy, Maud. *The Keeper of the Bic Light House: A Canadian Story of To-day*. Montreal: E.M. Renouf, 1891.
- O'Rourke, L.J. *Our Democracy and its Problems*. Boston: Heath, 1942.
- Overstreet, Harry A. and Bonaro W. *Town Meeting Comes to Town*. New York: Harper Brothers, 1938.
- Owen, D.R.G. *Scientism, Man and Religion*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1952.
- Phillips, Charles E. *New Schools for Democracy*. Behind the Headlines Series, Vol. 4, no. 6, Toronto: CIIA/CAAE, 1944.
- Pierce, Lorne. *A Canadian Nation*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1960.
- Pierce, Lorne. *The Beloved Community*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1925.
- Priestley, J.B. *Out of the People*. New York: Harper, 1941.
- Riesman, David, Reuel Denney and Nathan Glazer. *Faces in the Crowd*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Riesman, David, Reuel Denney and Nathan Glazer. *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1950.
- Roberts, Leslie. *We Must Be Free: Reflections of a Democrat*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1939.
- Robins, G.M. *The Tree of Knowledge*. Montreal: John Lovell and Son, [1890].
- Ross, Malcolm. *Our Sense of Identity*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1954.
- Roussy de Sales, Raoul de. *The Making of Tomorrow*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1942.
- Sandwell, B.K. *The Canadian Peoples*. London and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- Sandwell, B.K. *You Take Out What You Put In*. Number 3 in the Democracy and Citizenship Series, Toronto: CAAE/CIIA, 1940.
- Seeley, John R., R. Alexander Sim and E.W. Loosley. *Crestwood Heights: A Study of the Culture of Suburban Life*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956.
- Seligman, Ben. *A Most Notorious Victory: Man in an Age of Automation*. New York: Free Press/Macmillan, 1966.

- Shea, Albert A. *Culture in Canada: A Study of The Findings of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (1949-1951)*. Toronto: Core Press, 1952.
- Silcox, Claris. *The War and Religion*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1941.
- Smith, Thomas Vernor, Glenn Negley and Robert Bush. *Democracy vs. Dictatorship*. Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1942.
- Smith, Thomas Vernor. *The Democratic Tradition in America*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1941.
- Snow, C.P. *The Two Cultures*. ed. Stefan Collini (Cambridge: Canto, 1993) [originally published 1959].
- Soule, George. *What Automation Does to Human Beings*. London: Sidgewick and Jackson, 1956.
- Steele, George, and Paul Kircher. *The Crisis We Face: Automation and the Cold War*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Terborgh, George. *Automation Hysteria*. New York: Norton, 1966.
- Thomson, David. *The Democratic Ideal in France and England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.
- United States, Office of War Information. *Toward New Horizons: The World Beyond the War*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1942.
- Valentine, Alan. *The Age of Conformity*. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1954.
- Vickers, Geoffrey. *The Undirected Society: Essays on the Human Implications of Industrialization in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959.
- Wales, Julia Grace. *Democracy Needs Education*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1942.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, and Paul S. Lunt. *The Social Life of a Modern Community*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, and Paul S. Lunt. *The Status System of a Modern Community*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942.
- Wedgwood, Josiah C. *Testament to Democracy*. London: Hutchinson, [1942].
- Wells, H.G. *Guide to the New World*. London: Gollancz, 1941.
- Wells, H.G. *The Commonsense of War and Peace*. London: Penguin, 1940.

Wells, H.G. *The New World Order*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1941.

Whyte, William H, Jr. *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

Willis, I.D. *Democracy: A Tripod*. Port Hope: 1940.

Willis, I.D. *What Do Canada and Democracy Really Mean to You?* Port Hope: 1940.

Yendall, William R. *The Common Problem*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1942.

Young Men's Christian Associations of Canada, National Council, *We Discuss Canada*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1942.

Ziemer, Gregor. *Education for Death: The Making of a Nazi*. London: Oxford University Press, 1941.



**Articles, Essays and Articles in Books**

- Brown, J.J. "Mr. Brown Looks at Education," *Canadian Business* (November 1951): 48.
- Chisholm, Major General G.B. "The Reestablishment of Peacetime Society," *Psychiatry* 9(1) (February 1946): 3-20.
- Cox, Harvey. "McLuhanite Christianity at Expo 67," *Commonweal* 86(10) (26 May 1967): 277-279.
- Cruikshank, D.B. "Industrial Design – What Are Canadians Doing About It?" *Industrial Canada* 50(3) (July 1949): 216-219.
- Daniells, Roy. "Poetry and the Novel," in Julian Park, ed., *The Culture of Contemporary Canada*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957.
- Estall, Martyn. "Learning for Living," *Canadian Affairs* 2(16) (October 1945).
- Forster, E.M. "What I Believe," (1939) in *Two Cheers For Democracy*. London: Edward Arnold, 1951, 67-76.
- Grant, George. "An Ethic of Community," in Michael Oliver, ed., *Social Purpose For Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961, 3-26.
- Keyserlingk, Robert W. "No Whitewash, Please," *The Ensign* (1 December 1951): 1.
- Klonsky, Milton. "Along the Midway of Mass Culture," *Partisan Review* 16(4) (April 1949): 348-365.
- Kristol, Irving. "Democracy and Mass Culture: High, low, and modern," *Manchester Guardian* (8 June 1960).
- Lazarsfeld, Paul. "The Effects of Radio on Public Opinion," in Douglas Waples, ed., *Print, Radio and Film in a Democracy: ten papers on the administration of mass communications in the public interest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942, 66-78.
- Lynes, Russell. "Highbrow, Lowbrow, Middlebrow," *Harper's* (February 1949): 19-28.
- MacLeod, Alastair W. "Personal Satisfaction," in *Round Table on Man and Industry*. University of Toronto, 1958, 12-19.
- Martin, Chester. "Trends in Canadian Nationhood," in Chester Martin, ed., *Canada in Peace and War*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1941.

- Neatby, Hilda. "Education For Democracy," *Dalhousie Review* 24(1) (April 1944): 43-50.
- O'Leary, Gratton. "Canada's Political Philosophy," in *Canada: Nation on the March*. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1953.
- Owen, D.R.G. "Science, Scientism and Religion," in *Christianity in an Age of Science*. Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1952.
- Peers, Frank. "The Nationalist Dilemma in Canadian Broadcasting," in Peter Russell, ed. *Nationalism in Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Percival, W.P. "Freedom of Educational Opportunity," *Canadian Geographical Journal* 26(12) (June 1943): 289-296.
- Ross, Murray G. "Man and His Lack of Community," in R.C. Chalmers and John A. Irving, eds., *The Light and the Flame: Modern Knowledge and Religion*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1956, 65-84.
- Saunders, Richard M. "Introduction," in Richard M. Saunders, ed., *Education for Tomorrow*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1946.
- John Stewart, "The Massey Report: Ideological Preparation For War," *National Affairs Monthly* 8(1) (September 1951): 34-53.
- Stratford, Reginald Killmaster, "The Challenge to Science," in G.P. Gilmour, ed., *Canada's Tomorrow*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1954: 67-90.
- Thomson, James S. "The Challenge of Existentialism," in Ralph C. Chalmers and John A. Irving, eds., *Challenge and Response: Modern Ideas and Religion*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1959), 73-90.
- Underhill, Frank. "The Scholar: Man Thinking," in George Whalley, ed., *A Place of Liberty: Essays on the Government of Canadian Universities*. Toronto: Clarke Irwin, 1964, 61-71.
- Vickers, Sir Geoffrey. "The Impact of Automation on Society," in *Automation and Social Change*. Toronto: Government of Ontario, 1963, 41-54.
- Wales, Julia Grace. "Pro, Not Anti: A Principle of Integration," *The New Age* 2(31) (8 August 1940): 9-10.
- Wallace, R.C. "Education in Canada," in R.H. Coats, ed., *Features of Present-Day Canada in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1947.

Westley, William A. "The workers automation wants," *Executive Decision* (February 1959): 56-57.

"Frustrated Artists," *The Printed Word* 183 (December 1949): 4.

"School for Sadism," *Art Digest* 23(15) (1 May 1949).

"The Job Ahead," *Canadian Business* 17(1) (January 1944): 17-18.

"The Little King," *The Printed Word* 183 (December 1949): 3.

**SECONDARY SOURCES****Monographs**

- Adams, Mary Louise. *The Trouble With Normal: Postwar Youth and the Making of Heterosexuality*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Agar, Jon. *Science and Spectacle: The Work of Jodrell Bank in Post-war British Culture*. Amsterdam: Harwood, 1998.
- Avery, Donald. *The Science Of War: Canadian Scientists And Allied Military Technology During The Second World War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Axelrod, Paul. *Making a Middle Class: Student Life in English Canada During the Thirties*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990.
- Aykroyd, Peter. *The Anniversary Compulsion: Canada's Centennial Celebrations, A Model Mega-Anniversary*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1992.
- Azzi, Stephen. *Walter Gordon and the Rise of Canadian Nationalism*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.
- Baritz, Loren. *The Good Life: The Meaning of Success for the American Middle Class*. New York: Knopf, 1989.
- Berger, Carl. *Science, God, and Nature in Victorian Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.
- Berman, Marshall. *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982.
- Berton, Pierre. *1967: The Last Good Year*. Toronto: Doubleday, 1997.
- Bodnar, John E. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Bothwell, Robert, Ian Drummond, and John English. *Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics and Provincialism*, rev. ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.
- Bothwell, Robert, and William Kilbourn. *C.D. Howe: a biography*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979.

- Boyer, Paul. *By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age*. New York: Pantheon, 1985.
- Boyer, Paul. *Fallout: A Historian Reflects on America's Half-Century Encounter with Nuclear Weapons*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1998.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. *Bread and Circuses: Theories of Mass Culture as Social Decay*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983.
- Briggs, Asa. *A History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Brooke, John Hedley. *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Brown, Craig, and Ramsay Cook. *Canada 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.
- Brown, Nicholas. *Governing Prosperity: Social change and social analysis in Australia in the 1950s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Brown, Richard D. *Modernization: The Transformation of American Life, 1600-1865* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1976).
- Burnham, John. *How Superstition Won and Science Lost: Popularizing Science and Health in the United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987.
- Calinescu, Matei. *Faces of Modernity: Avant-Garde, Decadence and Kitsch*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1977.
- Carey, John. *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1880-1939*. London: Faber and Faber, 1992.
- Carter, Paul. *Another Part of the Fifties*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Cavallo, Dominick. *A Fiction of the Past: The Sixties in American History*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Christian, William. *George Grant: A Biography*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- Christie, Nancy, and Michael Gauvreau. *A Full-orbed Christianity: the Protestant Churches and Social Welfare in Canada, 1900-1940*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.

- Collins, Robert. *You Had To Be There: An Intimate Portrait of the Generation That Survived the Depression, Won the War, and Re-invented Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1997.
- Cook, Ramsay. *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.
- Coontz, Stephanie. *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.
- Creighton, Donald Grant. *The Forked Road: Canada, 1939-1957*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.
- Cross, Gary, ed. *Worktowners at Blackpool: Mass-Observation and popular leisure in the 1930s*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Diggins, John Patrick. *The Proud Decades: America in War and Peace, 1941-1960*. New York: Norton, 1988.
- Donaldson, Gary. *Abundance and Anxiety: America, 1945-1960*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997.
- Eksteins, Modris. *The Rites of Spring: the Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age*. Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1989.
- Engelhardt, Tom. *The End of Victory Culture: Cold War America and the Disillusioning of a Generation*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.
- English, John. *Years of Growth, 1948-1967*. Toronto: Grolier, 1986.
- Evans, Gary. *John Grierson and the National Film Board: The Politics of Wartime Propaganda* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985).
- Farber, David. *The Age of Great Dreams: America in the 1960s*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1994.
- Faris, Ron. *The Passionate Educators: Voluntary Associations and the Struggle for Control of Adult Educational Broadcasting in Canada 1919-1952*. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1975.
- Ferguson, Barry. *Remaking Liberalism: The Intellectual Legacy of Adam Shortt, O.D. Skelton, W.C. Clark, and W.A. Mackintosh, 1890-1925*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.
- Finkel, Alvin. *Our Lives: Canada after 1945*. Toronto: J. Lorimer, 1997.
- Fiske, John. *Understanding Popular Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991 [originally published 1989]).

- Foreman, Joel, ed. *The Other Fifties: Interrogating Midcentury American Icons*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1997.
- Francis, R. Douglas, *Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.
- Frick, N. Alice. *Image in the Mind: CBC Radio Drama 1944 to 1954*. Toronto: Canadian Stage and Arts Publications, 1987.
- Fulford, Robert. *This Was Expo*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968.
- Galison, Peter, and Bruce Hevly, eds. *Big Science: the Growth of Large-scale Research*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Gans, Herbert J. *Popular Culture and High Culture*. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Gauvreau, Michael. *The Evangelical Century: College and Creed in English Canada from the Great Revival to the Great Depression*. Montréal and Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991.
- Gilbert, James. *A Cycle of Outrage: America's Reaction to the Juvenile Delinquent in the 1950s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Gilbert, James. *Redeeming Culture: American Religion in Age of Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Giner, Salvador. *Mass Society*. London: Martin Robertson, 1976.
- Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*. New York: Pantheon, 1987.
- Goodall, Peter. *High Culture, Popular Culture: The Long Debate*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1995.
- Gorman, Paul. *Left Intellectuals & Popular Culture in Twentieth-century America*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.
- Granatstein, J.L. *Canada's War: The Politics of the Mackenzie King Government*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Granatstein, J.L. *The Politics of Survival: The Conservative Party of Canada, 1939-1945*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

- Granatstein, J.L. *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1986.
- Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich. *In 1926: Living at the Edge of Time*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.
- Hannant, Larry. *The Infernal Machine: Investigating the Loyalty of Canada's Citizens*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- Hebdige, Dick. *Subculture: the Meaning of Style*. London: Methuen, 1979.
- Henriksen, Margot A. *Dr. Strangelove's America: Society and Culture in the Atomic Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Hewison, Robert. *Too Much: Art and Society in the Sixties 1960-75*. London: Methuen, 1986.
- Hewison, Robert. *Under Siege: Literary Life in London, 1939-1945*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977.
- Hilmes, Michelle. *Radio Voices: American Broadcasting, 1922-1952*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Hunt, Leon. *British Low Culture: from Safari Suits to Sexploitation* London: Routledge, 1998.
- Jameson, Sheila. *Chautauqua in Canada*. Calgary: Glenbow/Alberta Institute, 1979.
- Johnson, Paul. *Land Fit for Heroes: The Planning of British Reconstruction, 1916-1919*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Jumonville, Neil. *Critical Crossings: The New York Intellectuals in Postwar America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991.
- Kammen, Michael. *American Culture, American Tastes: Social Change and the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*. New York: Knopf, 1999.
- Kammen, Michael. *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of American Culture*. New York: Knopf, 1991.
- Kammen, Michael. *The Lively Arts: Gilbert Seldes and the Transformation of Cultural Criticism in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.



- Kern, Stephen. *The Culture of Time and Space, 1880-1918*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Kettle, John. *The Big Generation*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1980.
- Klatch, Rebecca E. *A Generation Divided: The New Left, The New Right, and the 1960s*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999.
- Kloppenber, James T. *Uncertain Victory: Social Democracy and Progressivism in European and American Thought, 1870-1920*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Kostash, Myrna. *Long Way From Home: The Story of the Sixties Generation in Canada*. Toronto: J. Lorimer, 1980.
- Kroeber, A. L. and Clyde Kluckhohn, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. New York: Vantage, 1952.
- Kroker, Arthur. *Technology and the Canadian Mind: Innis/McLuhan/Grant*. Montreal: New World Perspectives, 1984.
- LaMarsh, Judy. *Memoirs of a Bird in a Gilded Cage*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1969.
- Lears, Jackson. *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America*. New York: Basic Books, 1994.
- Lears, T.J. Jackson. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920*. New York: Pantheon, 1981.
- LeMahieu, D.L. *A Culture for Democracy: Mass Communication and the Cultivated Mind in Britain Between the Wars*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Levine, Lawrence W. *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Lindsey, George R., ed. *No Day Long Enough: Canadian Science in World War II*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 1997.
- Litt, Paul. *The Muses, The Masses, and the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- Mackey, Eva. *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

- Marchand, Philip. *Marshall McLuhan: The Medium and the Messenger*. New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1989.
- McKay, Ian. *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.
- Meyerowitz, Joanne, ed. *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1994.
- Morgan, Kenneth O. *Consensus and Disunity: The Lloyd George Coalition Government, 1918-1922*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.
- Marchand, Philip. *Marshall McLuhan: The Medium and the Messenger*. New York, Ticknor and Fields, 1989.
- Marks, Lynne. *Revivals and Roller Rinks: Religion, Leisure, and Identity in Late-Nineteenth-Century Small Town Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Marshall, David B. *Secularizing the Faith: Canadian Protestant Clergy and the Crisis of Belief, 1850-1940*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- Marwick, Arthur. *Culture in Britain since 1945*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Marwick, Arthur. *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, c.1958-c.1974*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Mathews, Robin. *Canadian Identity: major forces shaping the life of a people*. Ottawa: Steel Rail, 1988.
- May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1988.
- McKay, Ian. *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.
- Miles, Peter, and Malcolm Smith. *Cinema, Literature and Society: Elite and Mass Culture in Interwar Britain*. London: Croom Helm, 1987.
- Monod, David. *Store Wars: Shopkeepers and The Culture of Mass Marketing, 1890-1939*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Morrison, Theodore. *Chautauqua: A Center for Education, Religion, and the Arts in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

- Morton, Desmond, and Glenn Wright. *Winning the Second Battle: Canadian Veterans and the Return to Civilian Life, 1915-1930*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Mosse, George. *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Mukerji, Chandra. *A Fragile Power: Scientists and the State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Mukerji, Chandra and Michael Schudson. *Rethinking Popular Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Nelson, Elizabeth. *The British Counter Culture, 1966-73: A Study of the Underground Press*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989.
- Nicholson, Bruce. *Hi, Ho, Come to the Fair: Tales of the New York World's Fair of 1964-1965*. Huntington Beach, CA: Pelagian Press, 1989.
- Nolan, Brian. *King's War: Mackenzie King and the Politics of War, 1939-1945*. Toronto: Random House, 1988.
- O'Neill, William L. *American High: The Years of Confidence, 1945-1960*. New York: Free Press, 1986.
- Ostry, Bernard. *The Cultural Connection: An Essay on Culture and Government Policy in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.
- Owram, Doug. *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby Boom Generation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Owram, Doug. *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.
- Parr, Joy. *Domestic Goods: The Material, the Moral and the Economic in the Postwar Years*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- Patterson, Graeme. *History and Communications: Harold Innis, Marshall McLuhan, the Interpretation of History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Patterson, Tom, with Allan Gould. *First Stage: the Making of the Stratford Festival*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1987.
- Peers, Frank. *The Politics of Canadian Broadcasting, 1920-1951*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

- Peers, Frank. *The Public Eye: Television and the Politics of Canadian Broadcasting, 1952-1968*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
- Peiss, Kathy. *Cheap Amusements: Working-Class Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the Century New York*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.
- Pells, Richard. *Not Like Us: How Europeans Have Loved, Hated, and Transformed American Culture Since World War II*. New York: Basic Books, 1997.
- Pells, Richard. *Radical Visions and American Dreams: Culture and Social Thought in the Depression Years*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1984.
- Pells, Richard. *The Liberal Mind in a Conservative Age: American Intellectuals in the 1940s and 1950s*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1989.
- Pettigrew, John, and Jamie Portman. *Stratford: The First Thirty Years*. Toronto: MacMillan, 1985.
- Raboy, Marc. *Missed Opportunities: The Story of Canada's Broadcasting Policy*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990.
- Radway, Janice. *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Remembering the Future: the New York World's Fair from 1939-1964*. New York: Rizzoli, 1989.
- Reuben, Julie A. *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Ricard, François. *The Lyric Generation: The Life and Times of the Baby Boomers*. trans. Donald Winkler, Toronto: Stoddart, 1994. [first published as *La generation lyrique: essai sur la vie et l'oeuvre des premiers-nés du baby-boom*. Montreal: Boreal, 1992.]
- Rosenberg, Charles E. *No Other Gods: On Science and American Social Thought*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. [originally published 1976]
- Rosenzweig, Roy. *Eight Hours For What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City 1870-1920*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Ross, Andrew. *No Respect: Intellectuals and Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Roszak, Theodore. *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and its Youthful Opposition*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995 [originally published 1969].

- Rubin, Joan Shelley. *The Making of Middlebrow Culture*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Rutherford, Paul. *When Television Was Young: Primetime Canada, 1952-1967*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Rydell, Robert W. *World of Fairs: The Century of Progress Expositions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Scannell, Paddy. *A Social History of British Broadcasting, 1922-1939: Serving the Nation*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Scannell, Paddy. *Radio, Television and Modern Life: A Phenomenological Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- Scotchie, Joseph. *Barbarians in the Saddle: an Intellectual Biography of Richard M. Weaver*. New Brunswick, NJ, Transaction, 1997.
- Schorske, Carl E. *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*. New York: Vintage Books, 1981.
- Selman, Gordon. *Adult Education in Canada: Historical Essays*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing, 1995.
- Slater, David. *War, Finance and Reconstruction: The Role of Canada's Department of Finance 1939-1946*. Ottawa: Department of Finance, 1995.
- Smith, Alice Kimball. *A Peril and a Hope: The Scientists' Movement in America, 1945-1947*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Smith, Allan. *Canada: An American Nation?: Essays on Continentalism, Identity and the Canadian Frame of Mind*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.
- Smulyan, Susan. *Selling Radio: The Commercialization of American Broadcasting, 1920-1934* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994).
- Steigerwald, David. *The Sixties and the End of Modern America*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Stewart, Andrew, and William Hull. *Canadian Television Policy and the Board of Broadcast Governors*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1994.
- Struthers, James. *No Fault of Their Own: Unemployment and the Canadian Welfare State, 1914-1941*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.
- Taylor, Charles. *The Malaise of Modernity*. Toronto: CBC/Anansi, 1991.

- Tippett, Maria. *Art at the Service of War: Canada, Art, and the Great War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.
- Tippett, Maria. *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts Before the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Tourney, Christopher P. *Conjuring Science: Scientific Symbols and Cultural Meanings in American Life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1996.
- Vance, Jonathan F. *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning, and the First World War*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997.
- Verzuh, Ron. *Underground Times: Canada's Flower-Child Revolutionaries*. Toronto: Deneau, 1989.
- Vipond, Mary. *Listening In: The First Decade of Canadian Broadcasting, 1922-1932*. Montreal and Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992.
- Walden, Keith. *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Weir, E. Austin. *The Struggle for National Broadcasting in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965.
- Whitaker, Reginald. *The Government Party: Organizing and Financing the Liberal Party of Canada, 1930-1958*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- Whitaker, Reg, and Gary Marcuse. *Cold War Canada: The Making of a National Insecurity State, 1945-1957*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.
- Whitfield, Stephen J. *The Culture of the Cold War*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.
- Williams, Raymond. *Communications*. Third edition. London: Penguin, 1976.
- Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society, 1780-1950*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1958.
- Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. London: Fontana/Croom Helm, 1976.
- Wilson, Isabel. *Citizens' Forum: 'Canada's National Platform'*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980.
- Woodcock, George. *Strange Bedfellows: The State and The Arts in Canada*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1985.

Young, Walter. *Anatomy of a Party: The National CCF, 1932-1961*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

**Articles and Parts of Books**

- Browne, Ray B. "Popular Culture: Notes Toward a Definition," in George H. Lewis, ed. *Side-Saddle on the Golden Calf: Social Structure and Popular Culture in America*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear, 1972, 5-11.
- Campbell, Sandra. "From Romantic History to Communications Theory: Lorne Pierce as Publisher of C.W. Jefferys and Harold Innis," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 30(3) (Fall 1995): 91-116.
- Christie, Nancy. "Sacred Sex: The United Church and the Privatization of the Family in Post-war Canada," in Christie, ed., *Households of Faith: Family, Religion and Social Change in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, forthcoming.
- Collins, John B. "'Design in Industry' Exhibition, National Gallery of Canada, 1946: Turning Bombers into Lounge Chairs," *Material History Bulletin* 27 (Spring 1988): 27-38.
- Cook, Ramsay. "Cultural Nationalism in Canada: An Historical Perspective," in Janice L. Murray, ed., *Canadian Cultural Nationalism: The Fourth Lester B. Pearson Conference on the Canada-U.S. Relationship*. New York: New York University Press, 1977, 15-44.
- Charney, Leo and Vanessa R. Schwartz, "Introduction," in Charney and Schwartz, eds., *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Crunden, Robert M. "Introduction," in Robert M. Crunden, ed., *The Superfluous Men: Conservative Critics of American Culture, 1900-1945*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1977, xi-xx.
- Friesen, Gerald. "Adult Education and Union Education: Aspects of English-Canadian Cultural History in the 20th Century," *Labour/Le Travail* 34 (Fall 1994): 163-188.
- Granatstein, J.L. "Culture and Scholarship: The First Ten Years of the Canada Council," *Canadian Historical Review* 65(4) (September 1984): 441-474.
- Greenspan, Louis. "The Unravelling of Liberalism," in Arthur Davis, ed., *George Grant and the Subversion of Modernity: Art, Philosophy, Politics, Religion and Education*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996, 201-219.
- Greer, Allan. "Canadian History: Ancient And Modern," *Canadian Historical Review* 77 (December 1996): 575-590.



- Grossberg, Lawrence, ed. "On postmodernism and articulation: an interview with Stuart Hall," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10(2) (1986): 45-60.
- Hales, Peter B. "The Atomic Sublime," *American Studies* 32(1) (1991): 5-31.
- Hardy, H. Forsyth. "Democracy as a Fighting Faith," in *John Grierson and the NFB*. Toronto: ECW, 1984, 86-94.
- Jasen, Patricia. "Romanticism, Modernity, and the Evolution of Tourism on the Niagara Frontier, 1790-1850," *Canadian Historical Review* 72(3) (September 1991): 283-318.
- Johnston, Russell, "The Early Trials of Protestant Radio," *Canadian Historical Review* 75(3) (September 1994): 376-402.
- Kitchen, Brigitte. "The Marsh Report Revisited," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 21(2) (Summer 1986): 38-48.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul. "Introduction," in Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White, eds., *Mass Culture Revisited*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971: vii-ix.
- Lears, T.J. Jackson. "A Matter of Taste," in Lary May, ed., *Recasting America: Culture and Politics in the Age of the Cold War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989, 38-57.
- Levine, Lawrence W. "The Folklore of Industrial Society: Popular Culture and Its Audiences," *American Historical Review* 97(5) (December 1992): 1369-1399.
- Mackenzie, Hector. "The White Paper on Reconstruction and Canada's Postwar Trade Policy," in Greg Donaghy, ed. *Uncertain Horizons: Canadians and Their World in 1945*. Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, 1997.
- Marchand, Roland, and Michael L. Smith, "Corporate Science on Display," in Ronald G. Walters, ed. *Scientific Authority and Twentieth Century America*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997, 148-182.
- Marshall, Dominique. "Reconstruction Politics, the Canadian Welfare State and the Ambiguity of Children's Rights, 1940-1950" in Greg Donaghy, ed. *Uncertain Horizons: Canadians and Their World in 1945*. Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, 1997, 261-283.
- May, Lary. "Making the American Consensus: The Narrative of Conversion and Subversion in World War II Films," in Lewis A. Erenberg and Susan E. Hirsch, eds., *The War in American Culture: Society and Consciousness During World War II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996, 71-102.

- McInnis, Peter S. "Planning Prosperity: Canadians Debate Postwar Reconstruction," in Greg Donaghy, ed. *Uncertain Horizons: Canadians and Their World in 1945*. Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, 1997.
- McKay, Ian. "History and the Tourist Gaze: The Politics of Commemoration in Nova Scotia, 1935-1964," *Acadiensis* 22(2) (Spring 1993): 102-138.
- McKay, Ian. "Introduction: All That Is Solid Melts into Air," in Ian McKay, ed., *The Challenge of Modernity: A Reader on Post-Confederation History*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1992.
- McKenzie, Francine. "Canada and the Reconstruction of Postwar Trade, 1943-1945," in Greg Donaghy, ed. *Uncertain Horizons: Canadians and Their World in 1945*. Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, 1997, 135-164.
- McKillop, A.B. "Culture, Intellect, and Context," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 24(3) (Fall 1989): 7-31.
- McKillop, A.B. "Nationalism, Identity and Canadian Intellectual History," in McKillop, *Contours of Canadian Thought*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Nord, David Paul. "An Economic Perspective on Formula in Popular Culture," *Journal of American Culture* 3 (Spring 1980).
- Norris, Ken. "The Beginnings of Canadian Modernism," *Canadian Poetry* 11 (Fall-Winter 1982).
- Persky, Joel. "The Innescence of Marshall McLuhan," *Journal of Canadian Culture* 1(2) (Fall 1984): 3-14.
- Persky, Joel. "The Media Writings of Harold Adams Innis," *Journal of Canadian Culture* 2(1) (Spring 1985): 79-87.
- Radway, Janice. "The Scandal of the Middlebrow: The Book-of-the-Month Club, Class Fracture, and Cultural Authority," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 89(4) (Fall 1990): 703-736.
- Robinson, Daniel, and David Kimmel. "The Queer Career of Homosexual Security Vetting in Cold War Canada," *Canadian Historical Review* 75 September 1994): 319-345.
- Rubin, Joan Shelley. "Self, Culture, and Self Culture in Modern America: The Early History of the Book-of-the-Month Club," *Journal of American History* 71(4) (March 1985): 782-806.

- Rutherford, Paul. "Made in America: The Problem of Mass Culture in Canada," in David H. Flaherty and Frank E. Manning, eds., *The Beaver Bites Back?: American Popular Culture in Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University, 1993: 260-280.
- Siomopoulous, Anna. "Entertaining ethics: Technology, mass culture and American intellectuals of the 1930s," *Film History* 11(1) (1999): 45-54.
- Slater, David. "Colour the Future Bright: The *White Paper*, the Green Book and the 1945-1946 Dominion-Provincial Conference on Reconstruction," in Greg Donaghy, ed. *Uncertain Horizons: Canadians and Their World in 1945*. Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, 1997, 191-208.
- Strong-Boag, Veronica. "'Their Side of the Story': Women's Voices from Ontario Suburbs, 1945-60," in Joy Parr, ed., *A Diversity of Women: Ontario, 1945-1980*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- Susman, Warren I. "Culture and Commitment," in *Culture As History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century*. (New York: Pantheon, 1984, 184-210.
- Tippett, Maria. "The Making of English-Canadian Culture, 1900-1939: The External Influences," paper delivered 28 April 1987, York University. Toronto: ECW Press, 1988.
- Tiratsoo, Nick. "Limits of Americanisation: The United States Productivity Gospel in Britain," in Becky Conekin, Frank Mort and Chris Waters, eds., *Moments of Modernity: Reconstructing Britain, 1945-1964*. London and New York: Rivers Oram Press, 1999).
- Vipond, Mary. "The Nationalist Network: English Canada's Intellectuals and Artists in the 1920s," *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* V (Spring 1980): 32-52.
- Welton, Michael. "An Authentic Instrument of the Democratic Process": the intellectual origins of the Canadian Citizens' Forum," *Studies in the Education of Adults* 18(1) (April 1986): 35-49.
- Westbrook, Robert B. "Fighting for the American Family: Private Interests and Political Obligation in World War II," in Lears and Fox, eds., *The Power of Culture: Critical Essays in American History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993, 195-221.
- Wilson, Jeremy. "The Impact of Communications Developments on British Columbia Electoral Patterns, 1903-1975," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 13(3) (September 1980): 509-535.

**Theses, Dissertations and Unpublished Works**

- Ambrose, Linda McGuire. "The Canadian Youth Commission: Planning for Youth and Social Welfare in the Postwar Era." unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Waterloo, 1992.
- Armstrong, David P. "Corbett's House: The Origins of the Canadian Association for Adult Education and its Development during the Directorship of E.A. Corbett, 1936-1951." unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Toronto, 1968.
- Baillargeon, Philippe J. "The CBC and the Cold War Mentality, 1946-1952." unpublished M.A. thesis, Carleton University, 1987.
- Davies, Helen. "The Politics of Participation: A Study of Canada's Centennial Celebration." unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Manitoba, 1999.
- Ehrhardt, George R. "Descendants of Prometheus: Popular Science Writing in the United States, 1915-1948." unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1993.
- Faris, Ronald L. "Adult Education for Social Action or Enlightenment?: An Assessment of the Development of the Canadian Association for Adult Education and its Radio Forums from 1935-1952." unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1971.
- Groome, Margaret. "Canada's Stratford Festival, 1953-1967: Hegemony, Commodity, Institution." unpublished PhD dissertation, McGill University, 1988.
- Kicksee, Richard Gordon. "'Scaled Down To Size': Contested Liberal Commonsense and the Negotiation of 'Indian Participation' in the Canadian Centennial Celebrations and Expo '67, 1963-1967." unpublished M.A. thesis, Queen's University, 1995.
- Korinek, Valerie Joyce. "Roughing It In Suburbia: Reading *Chatelaine* Magazine, 1950-1969." unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1996.
- Litt, Paul. "The Donnish Inquisition: The Massey Commission and the Campaign for State-Sponsored Cultural Nationalism in Canada, 1949-1951." unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1990.
- Napoli, Philip Foster. "Empire of the Middle: Radio and the Emergence of an Electronic Society." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1998.
- Skinner, David. "A System Divided: A Political Economy of Canadian Broadcasting." unpublished PhD dissertation, Simon Fraser University, 1997.

- Young, William R. "Making the Truth Graphic: The Canadian Government's Home Front Information Structure and Programmes." unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1978.