

2. Rex (1996:2.6) also sees the concept as ambiguous, assigning it at least two meanings. However, they differ from those discussed here.
3. In this regard it is useful to refer to Rex (1996:2.6), who associates a nation's identity with the way of life of "*dominant groups*" (emphasis added).
4. Rutherford (1978) writes that the Canadian press promoted cultural values for Canada in at least two different 19th century periods.
5. There is evidence that suggests the existence of discriminatory practices (cf. the references in Chapter 1 to the work of Reitz and Breton, also Ray and Moore, 1991).
6. In a heroic act of gracious scholarly cooperation, Professor Neil Nevitte provided from Toronto on one day's notice draft manuscripts of two forthcoming books in which analyses of these data are reported (Nevitte, 1996; Inglehart, Nevitte, and Basanez, 1996).
7. Marjorie Ferguson had already expressed this view earlier when she wrote (1993:49) that "The more compelling story is that *any* distinctively Canadian television and radio survive, given seven decades of American variety, drama, and overspill." If my McGill students are to be believed, though, what makes this material distinctive is its slow pace and poor production values as compared to U.S. material. The more conventional view of critical media scholars that globalization will destroy independent national media is expressed succinctly by Mowlana (1993). Economic conservatives who promote transnational economic integration also anticipate the disappearance of local markets (cf. Blank, 1992).
8. Rutherford (1978:64, 75) implies that Canadian politicians have acted on the assumption that the press has effects. He explains politicians' behavior in two cases as responses to newspaper editorials, the politicians' assumption being that the editorials would be read and their positions accepted by readers.
9. Perhaps uncertainty about media effects is now gone. Recently Page (1996:23) wrote that "(t)he days of belief in 'minimal effects' by the media are over. A large body of evidence now indicates that what appears in print or on the air has a substantial impact..." However, he then urges further research on how the media have their effects and whether they provide or simply convey the stimuli. Even if Page is right about media effects, apparently we still don't know very much about their most important aspects. In this regard I side with Smith (1993[1986]), who questions the concern that the consumption of foreign media materials has hypodermic-like effects that undermine a person's national identity (cf. Ferguson, 1993:53), and writes (74) that "The complex of causes and effects simply stuns the logical processes of the mind: it is impossible to think through the myriad of variables that are contained within the communication process, the totality of human interactions which constitute culture."
10. Mildred Schwartz (1981) earlier had pointed to the more general policy interdependency of the two countries.
11. Vormann interprets the Applebaum-Hebert Report as proposing a much more negative version of this dichotomy. He writes (1991:46) that "(t)he report created a very elitist distinction, where 'bad' films are defined in terms of mass-market values and 'good' films will be good precisely because they are distinctively Canadian," and refers to that aspect of the report as cultural nationalism.
12. Rex (1996:4.5-4.13) distinguishes several types of policy responses to cultural diversity ranging between assimilation and permanent maintenance of cultural differences. He espouses a type that seems to be much