National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Canada

ANDREW ALLAN, NATHAN COHEN, AND MAVOR MOORE: CULTURAL NATIONALISM AND THE GROWTH OF ENGLISH-CANADIAN DRAMA 1945 TO 1960

by

Carmel Dickson Rothwell

Thesis submitted to
the School of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
M.A. degree in History.

University of Ottawa

ISBN 0-315-95909-6

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

ABSTRACT

ANDREW ALLAN, NATHAN COHEN, AND MAVOR MOORE:

CULTURAL NATIONALISM AND THE GROWTH OF CANADIAN DRAMA

1945 - 1960

Carmel Dickson Rothwell
University of Ottawa, 1993

Supervisor:
Professor Michael Behiels

"Andrew Allan, Nathan Cohen, and Mavor Moore: Cultural Nationalism and the Growth of Canadian Drama 1945 - 1960" is concerned with the texture and substance of English-Canada's cultural life in the decade and a half following World War II. This thesis represents a case study in English-Canadian cultural nationalism by focussing on the views of three cultural nationalists who believed that the creation of a national theatre could establish a unique Canadian identity and national unity. Essentially, the thesis argues that the early enthusiasm of the period for the potential of Canadian drama, and high culture in general, was thwarted by public apathy, an inferiority complex, the failure of the government to act on the recommendations of the Massey Report, and the omnipresence of television which paved the way for the conquest of mass culture and technology. Although the goals of such cultural nationalists as Allan, Cohen, and Moore were not completely fulfilled in the postwar period, their views and opinions are significant because they furthered the cause of cultural advancement by refusing to accept the status quo. Their cultural nationalism demanded professionalism, excellence,

continued progress and self-enlightenment and rejected colonialism, conservatism and the second-rate. Through their values, experiences and opinions, Allan, Cohen and Moore contributed to the cultural maturity of English-Canadian life.

Initially, the hopes of cultural nationalists were substantiated by significant advancements in the cultural community; CBC radio drama attracted international acclaim; the Massey Commission added credibility to the cause of cultural progress and precipitated increased government support for the arts; a Canadian television service was launched in 1952; and in 1953 the Stratford Festival, focussing on Shakespearean drama, opened its doors to the Canadian public. Andrew Allan, Nathan Cohen, and Mavor Moore were encouraged by these accomplishments to hope and search for national unity through the creation of a national theatre. The accomplishments of CBC radio came the closest to realizing their dreams. Their hopes, however, were shortlived. By the end of the 1950's, the early enthusiasm and optimism for the future of Canadian high culture yielded to disillusionment and frustration among the artistic community.

The 1945 - 1960 period is an important period in Canadian cultural history because for the first time culture was recognized as a viable and productive pursuit towards the creation of a unique Canadian identity. By simply articulating their concerns about Canadian culture which were validated by the Massey Commission, cultural nationalists demonstrated that a distinct Canadian culture did exist in spite of the growing influence of the United States.

Canada did have a high culture which was distinct from American mass culture. Three renowned cultural nationalists and critics, Andrew Allan, Nathan Cohen, and Mavor Moore, believed in Canada's cultural potential. By constantly striving for the promotion and progress of Canadian culture, they contributed to Canada's cultural acceptance and prominence on the international stage enjoyed by later generations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The purpose of the present study is to examine the swell of English-Canadian cultural nationalism which characterized the immediate post-World War II era. Between 1945 and 1960, English-Canadians experienced a cultural fervour manifest in landmark developments such as the Massey Commission, the Stratford Festival, the Canada Council, and the inaugeration of a national television service. The optimism generated in the early half of the period for unique expressions of Canadianism, however, was significantly diluted by 1960.

Andrew Allan, Nathan Cohen and Mavor Moore were three cultural nationalists who pinned their hopes for cultural sovereignty and national unity onto the promise of a national theatre in Canada. They hoped that a national theatre manifest on radio, the stage, and television would promote a sense of Canadianism among the public. In charting the hopes, accomplishments and failures of cultural nationalists in the 1945 - 1960 period, this thesis argues that although high culture was marginalized by public apathy, a sense of inferiority, the conquest of television, a lack of further government intervention in the arts, and the continued popularity of American mass culture, the nature of their cultural nationalism contributed to English-Canada's cultural maturity. In promoting English-Canadian culture and the growth of Canadian drama in particular, Allan, Cohen and Moore expected performance excellence, a nationalistic perspective which recognized international trends, cultural duality and the rejection of the status quo.

To narrow the scope of this far-reaching investigation, the views of Allan, Cohen and Moore have been chosen for examination. These three individuals were all involved in the English-Canadian drama industry which includes radio, theatre, and television in the 1945 - 1960 period. Andrew Allan was the Supervisor of Drama for CBC radio from 1943 to 1955. Mavor Moore was a theatrical producer and director for the New Play Society in Toronto, the first director of CBC television, as well as an actor and a frequent contributor to Canadian periodicals. Nathan Cohen, who worked for CBC radio and television, became known during the period as Canada's first national drama critic. He ultimately became the drama critic and entertainment editor for the Toronto Star. I made the decision to focus on these individuals because their names were consistently at the forefront of the literature preoccupied with the state of Canadian culture during the post-World War II period. They held firm beliefs and opinions on the state of English-Canadian culture and why culture was important to Canada's survival as a sovereign state. All three men were cultural nationalists who consistently strove to protect, promote and improve English-Canadian culture.

The time frame of 1945 to 1960 has been selected to represent the post-World War II period. Upon the conclusion of the war in 1945, Canadians turned their attention inward. The "cultural backwardness" of one of the leading nations of the industrialized world became a consuming concern of Canadians. By 1960, however, the cultural and international climate had indelibly changed.

Advances in technology, represented by the pervasiveness of television, had altered the nature and importance of culture. Furthermore, the relative importance of Canada on the international stage had waned as European countries rebounded from the devastation of World War II and as new nations came to the forefront. The views and suggestions of the 1951 Massey Report on the status of Canadian culture, for example, were already anachronistic by the end of the period. This thesis will document the change in the cultural climate throughout the 1945 to 1960 period.

The argument of the thesis is supported through an examination of several primary sources. The major sources include the unpublished papers of both Andrew Allan and Nathan Cohen, radio plays produced by Allan, and a vast array of articles by Cohen and Moore published in several Canadian periodicals. The thesis will focus on the words these men wrote, published and produced. The opinions and feelings they held towards Canadian culture in general, and a national theatre in particular, will be assessed. Government documents such as the Aird Report and the Massey Report have also been used to provide background information and context. The Massey Report in particular has been examined not only to illustrate the cultural fervour of the period but also to illuminate the nature of English-Canadian cultural nationalism.

I was motivated to undertake a study of this material because I am interested in how Canadians have attempted to define themselves and their experiences. The primary vehicle of this

endeavour has been culture. In a country that has been described as a "cultural wasteland," much time and effort has been spent in attempting to cultivate our cultural existence. The 1945 - 1960 period was particularly preoccupied with cultural pursuits. Cultural development progressed in leaps and bounds and was accompanied by excitement and optimism for Canada's potential in the cultural realm. But why did the sense of excitement dissipate into spasms of disillusionment? Was the early excitement for Canadian culture warranted? Why are Canadians still lamenting the lack of a Canadian cultural existence? Do English-speaking Canadians have a cultural heritage? These are some of the questions I asked myself as I searched to narrow the scope of my investigation into Canada's cultural life, and they have guided the evolution of this study.

Further motivations for this investigation include a lack of historical research into Canada's cultural life, and a lack of focus and definition in the body of research that does exist. This study will offer a clear analysis of culture and English-Canadian cultural nationalism by providing clear definitions of these terms and by including historical context.

My approach to this topic differs in many ways from previous efforts. My biases and personal opinions are farther removed from the topic in comparison to those who have addressed cultural issues for a similar time period. I was not born until 1967 - I am not a Baby Boomer! I have no personal recollections of the war, the "golden days of radio," or the introduction of television.

Therefore, my study lacks the personal reminiscences, a sense of nostalgia which was evident in many of the works I have reviewed. By Canada's Centennial year, television was firmly entrenched as the primary cultural experience of ordinary Canadians. I am proof enough of that. While I was growing up in small-town Ontario, my cultural mainfare consisted of being able to "stay up late" on Tuesday nights to watch "Happy Days" and "Laverne and Shirley." Then, of course, on Saturday nights it was a real treat to watch "The Love Boat" and "Fantasy Island"! In addition to my weekly dose of American sitcoms, my cultural life was supplemented by school plays and Christmas Concerts, occasional visits to the Royal Ontario Museum, the CNE, Ontario Place and Blue Jay games. As a teenager, I became a devoted listener of "Toronto's Rock - - Q 107", which played rock 'n roll and farcical morning shows.

Further, by the time I was in grade school, "multi-culturalism" amd "regionalism" were firmly entrenched terms which we were taught to understand and respect. We were introduced to the metric system and the French language had become a prominent element of our curriculum. Pierre Trudeau had been the Prime Minister forever, or so it seemed to me! I had no idea what social protest or a Quiet Revolution was, although I do remember being quite alarmed that Quebec wanted to separate, but they held a referendum and everything was okay.

As an individual, then, who has always taken American television for granted, who was not a part of the social protest and women's movements of the 1960s and 1970s, and who has always

thought of Canada as a multicultural country, with two official languages, I believe I bring a new approach to the study of Canadian cultural nationalism. I feel secure in my identity as a woman and as a Canadian. I do not feel threatened by American culture, although I do wish there was more quality Canadian programming as well as outlets for Canadian talent. I am proud of Canada's multicultural heritage and I respect the differences between our ethnic and religious groups. I believe that it is only by embracing our diversity that we find true unity. And although this is somewhat of a cliche' at this point in our history, the difference is, that I have always accepted our diversity as a self-evident truth and an integral part of the Canadian heritage.

At this point I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Professor Michael Behiels, for his guidance, suggestions and patience. His insight and knowledge have greatly contributed to the evolution and completion of this study. I would also like to thank my family and friends for their continuous support and interest in a seemless never-ending project. A special note of appreciation to my husband and to my eleven-month old daughter, Avery, who learned more about cultural nationalism in the womb, than most people learn in a lifetime!

INTRODUCTION

The following thesis proposes to investigate the sentiments of English-Canadian cultural nationalists in the 1945-1960 era. Andrew Allan, Nathan Cohen and Mavor Moore promoted English Canadian culture to bolster Canada's sagging national identity. The "cultural backwardness" of English Canada was a pervasive assumption at home and abroad in the immediate postwar period. These three men, along with other segments of the cultural community, sought to eradicate this prevalent belief by pursuing the creation of an indigenous national theatre. Their dreams were made possible by advances in technology which linked the country from coast to coast by an extensive broadcasting system. English Canada's national theatre would find expression first on the radio air waves and ultimately through television.

The purpose of this introductory chapter is threefold. First, I would like to offer a brief discussion on the disciplines of cultural and intellectual history. This thesis is concerned not only with the national theatre in Canada manifest through radio, live theatre, and television, but it also addresses the motivating ideas behind cultural artifacts. With this mandate in mind, it is important to begin with a discussion of cultural and intellectual history, and further, how these two fields are related. At the same time, it is hoped that the objectives of the present study will become clear. Second, I will attempt to offer several definitions of culture, nationalism, and cultural nationalism.

Third, I will review several works by Canadian historians on the subject of English Canadian culture and cultural nationalism. In this section, I will discuss not only the thesis and methodological approach of each work, but also how these historians have defined the aforementioned terms. It will become apparent that there is considerable discrepancy among Canadian historians and other members of the historical discipline as to the definition and employment of the term cultural nationalism. Canadian cultural nationalism has taken on a meaning and livelihood of its own.

At this point in the chapter, I will return more specifically to the work at hand, discussing my use of the term cultural nationalism and suggesting new terms of reference. I will further delineate how my approach differs from previous work, and I will attempt to illuminate the recurring themes that characterize the present study and the English-Canadian cultural community during the 1945 - 1960 period.

Two recent review articles on the status of cultural and intellectual history in English Canada provide thorough examinations of the interrelated disciplines. Maria Tippett, in her analysis states: "The study of cultural history, . . . entails both a selfconsciously "performative" dialogue with the text, the object, or whatever form the end product takes - play, poem, musical composition, or painting - and a consideration of the context within which and the process by which the work is created by the artist, received by the "audience" and made part of the

public domain."[1] Tippett further asserts that the cultural artifact must be examined by the historian like an historical event as both are shaped "by circumstance and the intention of its creator, and that it is received, interpreted, and made functional in a society at a given point in time in ways largely determined by the political, economic, and institutional framework of that society."[2] She argues that the character of a play, for example, is largely determined by the same forces affecting a political election, and should be treated as such. The societal impact of a play cannot be ascertained by extracting it from its historical context.

Having determined the methodology of cultural history, Tippett engages in a review of recent scholarship. She discovers that the discipline has been characterized by biographies and monographs dealing with only one form of culture. Few studies have considered literature, the visual arts, music and drama for example, in one work. She further insists that scholars have tended to examine English-Canadian culture only in relation to American culture and that popular culture has been ignored resulting in a "whiggish interpretation of the whole process of cultural activity".[3] Artists and critics have focussed exclusively on "high" culture while snubbing any form of culture described as "popular" and have

---

[1] Maria Tippett, "The Writing of English-Canadian Cultural History, 1970-1985", Canadian Historical Review, LXVII, (1986), 548-549.

[2] Ibid. 549.

[3] Ibid. 555-556.

relegated it to the Americans. Finally, she asserts that most cultural studies have isolated the cultural artifact from the historical context. She dismally concludes that "thus involved in a limited dialogue with the end product, most scholars engaged in English-Canadian cultural studies have failed to fulfill the cultural historians' task."[4]

In "Culture, Intellect, and Context", A. B. McKillop affirms many of Tippett's arguments. McKillop begins by offering an innovative definition of cultural and intellectual history as it has been reflected in the bibliographical index headings of the Canadian Historical Review. He suggests that it has been perceived as a "conceptual residuum, a scholarly junkyard of all sorts of flotsam and jetsam."[5] In other words, the Cultural and Intellectual History listings have been used to house remotely cultural topics which did not fit anywhere else. McKillop continues to jibe by suggesting that the "distinction between cultural criticism (or observation) and cultural history is not one that seems to exist to those who have organized the CHR bibliography."[6] This criticism attests to the fact that cultural and intellectual history are relatively new disciplines. The guidelines are less turgid than in other historical fields. This admission may constitute a disadvantage wherein the literature

---

[4] Ibid. 556.

[5] A. B. McKillop, "Culture, Intellect, and Context", Journal of Canadian Studies, 24, no. 3, (Autumn 1989), 7.

[6] Ibid. 8.

lacks direction and sophistication or it can be perceived as an advantage inviting flexibility and creativity.

McKillop also recognizes the lack of historical context in recent cultural and intellectual scholarship. Unlike Tippett, however, he is not surprised by this trend. He argues that the scholars Tippett addressed were "concerned with text, not context - with the internal significance of paintings, novels, or poems rather than with their social meaning as cultural artifacts."[7] Many of the scholars reviewed by Tippett were not historians. Therefore, McKillop urges more historians to bring their craft to the study of culture and ideas.

McKillop's final significant point is that there has been no serious attempt to "theorize about the nature of culture or about its relationship to matters of ideology or social process."[8] No effort has been made to illustrate the link between culture and ideas. Furthermore, McKillop and Tippett agree that recent scholarship has lacked historical context and that subjects have been narrowly approached.

In The Culture of Western Europe, George Mosse deals with several important issues pertaining to the study of cultural history. He argues that there is an intrinsic connection between culture and thought. This belief originates from his definition of culture. "Culture is defined as a state or habit of mind which is apt to become a way of life intimately linked to the challenges and

---

[7] Ibid. 10.

[8] Ibid. 11.

dilemnas of contemporary society."[9] Mosse continues by extending this definition to its full implications. "True, a state or habit of mind is the product of historical development, but whose mind are we talking about? It is the people themselves who provide their culture's texture, then a historian must also assess their frame of mind. Thus he must deal with popular ideas and practices, with folklore and community sentiment."[10] Therefore, Mosse contends that cultural and intellectual history are inextricably linked. This study adopts, in part, this approach.

Mosse also offers an explanation for the recurring trend in cultural and intellectual history to focus on society's elite. He blatantly suggests that intellectuals "are apt to stand in the forefront of an analysis of cultural history as articulators of a mood, as systematizers of influential ideas, or as critics."[11] Therefore, although cultural and intellectual history may be accused of being elitist, this attribute requires no apology. Intellectuals and those at the forefront of society are significant because they are "a barometer of ideas, voicing them clearly and formulating a mood, making it articulate in his own time and for the future. But even if the intellectual creates a fund of ideas for society, these depend for their effectiveness upon his analysis of the mood, hopes, and needs of the times, or indeed of some

---

[9] George Mosse, The Culture of Western Europe. The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Third Edition, (Boulder and London: Westview Press, Inc., 1988), 2.

[10] Ibid. 3.

[11] Ibid. 5.

future time."[12] The ideas of any intellectual are contingent upon the mindset of the general population. Mosse argues, therefore, that "cultural development does involve an interaction of ideas between intellectuals conscious of what they are about and the general mood of the times."[13] Mosse further defines the "general mood" as the "reactions to the complexities of daily life as well as of images of a better future."[14] It is the interaction between intellectuals and the "general mood" which is paramount to any cultural history and thus, cultural history represents the ideas, opinions and assumptions of all stratums of society.

The study of culture and ideas, then, is a relatively new discipline which has been subjected to the pitfalls of immaturity. Accusations of fragmentation, lack of historical context and superficiality have been voiced. Therefore, the objective of the present study will be to present an anlysis of English-Canadian cultural nationalism as articulated through the general vehicle of drama, including discussions of the institutional, political, economic and social realities of the period which had profound effects on the "cultural national" movement. Finally, the paper will represent a concerted effort to illustrate the link between ideas and the cultural artifact or institution.

Providing definitions to the terms "culture" and "cultural nationalism" is paramount to the task at hand. Recent literature

---

[12] Ibid. 5.

[13] Ibid. 3.

[14] Ibid. 4.

has failed to provide clear, concise definitions to these terms, resulting in widespread ambiguity. In "Canada and American Culture in the 1950s," Jack Bumsted offers three definitions of culture. He makes a clear distinction between "high" and "popular" culture which is of particular concern to the present study. He defines "high" culture as "the training and refining of the moral, intellectual, and aesthetic sensibilities" while popular culture is defined as "less elevating since its fundamental aspirations are merely to entertain and make money."[15] He further contends that in modern society popular culture has been associated with the media.[16] Bumsted borrows "the anthropological meaning" from the linguist, Raymond Gagne. It is "a given people's particular set of preferences, predispositions, attitudes, goals, its particular way of perceiving, feeling, thinking, and reacting to objective reality."[17] Considering that language is our primary vehicle of communication, Gagne adds that "language is the most important vehicle of culture."[18]

Paul Litt also offers several definitions of culture as it was perceived by the Massey Commission. He first makes a distinction

---

[15] J. M. Bumsted, "Canada and American Culture in the 1950s", Bulletin of Canadian Studies, 3-4, (1979-80), 54-55.

[16] Ibid. 54.

[17] Ibid. 54; and Raymond Gagne, "French Canada: The Interrelationship between Culture, Language, and Personality", Canadian History Since Confederation. Essays and Interpretations, Bruce Hodgins and Robert Page, eds., (Georgetown: Irwin-Dorsey Limited, 1972), 526.

[18] Gagne, "French Canada: The Interrelationship between Culture, Language, and Personality", 526.

between social and creative culture. The commission defined culture "in its general, anthropological sense and culture as it referred specifically to the arts, letters, and sciences. In their view, culture in the broad sense encompassed the whole range of common influences and experiences which constituted nothing less than the way of life of a people. It implied an entire social and psychological environment which conditioned the existence of those who shared it."[19] This definition corresponds to Bumsted's anthropological meaning of culture. In reference to the actual 'arts, letters, and sciences', Litt continues; "these conscious creations of humanity reflected and affected the broad culture of their social context, but differed from it inasmuch as they were contrived and selective forms of information, comment, and communication. This distinction between what might be called social culture and creative culture is a familiar one. The commission was interested in encouraging a creative culture that would reflect a unique Canadian social culture."[20] Litt further divides creative culture into high, popular, and mass culture. High culture, which preoccupied the Massey commissioners, was a form of education which "encompassed the refined cultural tradition of the artistic, intellectual, and social elite in Western civilization. It was distinguishable from popular and mass culture by its greater degree of analysis of the human condition and by its

---

[19] Paul Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 83.

[20] Ibid. 84.

emphasis upon quality, as determined by the exacting criteria of a discerning audience, rather than by accessibility or mass appeal." Further, it was associated with "the acquisition of knowledge and insight. Culture involved a process of exploration, reflection, and intellectual growth through which individuals came to know themselves, as well as the nature of their social existence, better."[21] Unlike Bumsted, Litt makes a distinction between popular and mass culture. Popular culture is defined as the "folklore, customs, and pastimes that traditionally existed in close relation to a people's social culture." Massey commissioners appreciated "popular culture in its grassroots forms, for it at least was vibrant, participatory, and directly relevant to the community life of the individual. But mass culture they despised. They believed that its inspiration was purely commercial rather that communal or critical." They further believed that mass culture was "monolithic and menacing" and that it "stultified and then manipulated a gullible public."[22]

Bumsted and Litt's definitions of anthropological and social culture allude to national boundaries or the formations of societies, and they are similar to the definition offered by Mary Vipond in The Mass Media in Canada. She asserts that "culture is the glue that holds any society together, because it is the domain in which the symbols, ideas, myths and attitudes of individuals are formed. Without the bonds formed by culture, a society cannot

---

[21] Ibid. 84.

[22] Ibid. 85.

exist, because culture explains where we have come from, how the world works and where we may go. It is our 'meaning-generating' system."[23] In accordance with the above definitions, and recalling George Mosse's definition of culture, it is possible to conclude that culture is more than just the poem, sculpture, or musical composition. Culture is the idea, assumption, or opinion underlying these forms of expression. When these beliefs are shared by a group of people, societies are formed and perpetuated. The cultural artifact is the outward expression of these shared beliefs. The 'outward expressions' are further divided into high, popular, and mass culture.

In the past, Canadian historians have freely used the term "cultural nationalism," but there has been no concerted attempt to define the term. This oversight has been detrimental to all literature on Canadian cultural nationalism. George Mosse comes the closest to offering a clear definition of cultural nationalism. Beginning by charting the growth of nationalism in nineteenth-century western Europe, he argues that "the more urbanized and industrialized society became, the more people tended to solidify their world through familiar myths and symbols."[24] Furthermore, these symbols "became the self-representation of the nation, the means by which the people represented and indeed worshipped

---

[23] Mary Vipond, The Mass Media in Canada, (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Publishers, 1989), 100.

[24] Mosse, The Culture of Western Europe, 4.

themselves."[25] This movement served to organize and make sense out of a rapidly changing world. "People longed for a beautiful and healthy world where order reigned and which exemplified the continuity of history among the chaotic change of industrializing Europe. The myths and symbols of nationalism fulfilled this longing."[26] Feelings of nationalism led to the creation of nation-states and ultimately progressed to the point of exerting power over other nationalities. Nationalism further sought to maintain the status quo. Mosse contends that "the development of nationalism seemed to lead toward such an end in the name of the dominance of one state over all others and this because its nationalism alone was genuine."[27] Further, "in Europe the climax of this cultural nationalism came only with the totalitarian movements of the twentieth century."[28] Although Mosse does not provide a direct definition of cultural nationalism, he implies that it is the domination of one culture over another linked to race. Such a definition seems contradictory when applied to the multi-national, federal Canadian state which was originally conceived as a union of French- and English-speaking colonies in 1867. In fact, Mosse states in a discussion of Bismarck that "he was a federalist, a position quite incompatible with any kind of

---

[25] Ibid. 4.

[26] Ibid. 67.

[27] Ibid. 69.

[28] Ibid. 69.

cultural nationalism."[29] Cultural nationalism was more conducive to highly centralized states which had the power to promote cultural homogeneity and unity. Yet, the term cultural nationalism has found a recurring place in Canadian historiography. Has Canadian historiography largely focussed on the views of a limited group of individuals who have sought to transform the cultural landscape of Canada into one culture and one language? Or, has cultural nationalism in Canda failed to comply with Mosse's definition? The ensuing discussion will seek to answer these questions.

At this point it is essential to review recent literature on Canadian culture and cultural nationalism. Eleven works by Canadian historians ranging in topic from the Canadian Authors' Association, to the Massey Report to the introduction of television in Canada will be examined. Much of this work is very recent, published after Maria Tippett's 1986 article on the state of Canadian cultural studies. The order of discussion will be roughly chronological pertaining to the subject matter of each work. In this way, the discussion will provide background information on Canada's cultural life prior to and including the 1945 - 1960 period.

Ramsay Cook's "Cultural Nationalism in Canada: An Historical Perspective" is illuminating in its approach to cultural nationalism. It blatantly represents the tendency of Canadian historians to perceive cultural nationalism as a vehicle to

---

[29] Ibid. 81.

differentiate Canada from the United States. The article charts the Americanization of Canada during the twentieth century by documenting the shift from Canadian dependence on Great Britain to the United States. He isolates the year 1926 as the pivotal point. In this year, the Imperial Conference awarded political autonomy to the Canadian government, American investment in Canada first exceeded British investment, and Hauser's book on the Group of Seven promoted Canada as a North American nation.[30] The cultural ties to "Mother England" were beginning to loosen, a process which would climax during the time period under discussion. The Americanization of Canada's economy provided the impetus for the Canadian cultural nationalist movement. To Cook, the ultimate goal of Canadian cultural nationalists was to distinguish Canada from the United States. He argues that "Canadian cultural nationalists want to preserve, or develop, a set of social or cultural values that will guarantee Canadian distinctiveness from the United States. Once that is understood, it is not difficult to comprehend the cultural nationalist's conviction that state intervention, direction and even ownership must be seen as fundamental to the whole process of differentiating Canada from the United States."[31] Cook envisions cultural nationalism as a defensive movement against the impending dominance of American culture. He further argues

---

[30] Ramsay Cook, "Cultural Nationalism in Canada: An Historical Perspective", Canadian Cultural Nationalism. The Fourth Lester B. Pearson Conference on the Canada-United States Relationship, Janice L. Murray, ed., (New York: New York University Press, 1977), 27-29.

[31] Ibid. 17.

that state intervention in the arts remained the primary weapon of cultural nationalists. "It is not merely that the state alone has the resources necessary to finance cultural survival, though that is important; it is also that a statist or socialist approach to culture would in itself be evidence that Canadian culture is different from the free enterprise culture of the United States."[32] According to Cook, although cultural nationalists in Canada advocated state control over culture, the movement was more defensive than aggressive. Cook's article is also significant because it introduces the importance of state intervention in Canadian culture. This remains a recurring theme in the subsequent literature to be reviewed.

The next two articles both address the swell of cultural nationalism during the 1920s. Mary Vipond's "The Canadian Authors' Association in the 1920s: A Case Study in Cultural Nationalism" undertakes "a case study of the Canadian Authors' Association and its critics . . . to help reveal the variety and complexity of national feeling in English-speaking Canada in a decade of transition and soul-searching."[33] By looking at the "activities and ideas of the national leaders of the organization," Vipond charts the transformation of the CAA from a political pressure group to an organization concerned with the promotion of English-

---

[32] Ibid. 17.

[33] Mary Vipond, "The Canadian Authors' Association in the 1920s: A Case Study in Cultural Nationalism", Journal of Canadian Studies, 15, (1980-81), 68.

Canadian culture.[34] The typical member of the CAA was innately conservative and of British origin. Vipond explains that in response to the rapid change of the 1920s, "many Canadians . . . felt a desperate need to form new bonds of unity. Few felt more displaced by the new order than the middle-class Canadians of British heritage whose values had, in the old days, dominated Canadian life."[35] Many of these Canadians were experiencing the unsettling forces of socio-economic change such as urbanization, industrialization and secularization which, according to Mosse, contributed to the growth of nationalism in nineteenth-century western Europe. To these people, literature could supply the myths and symbols necessary to make sense of a rapidly changing world. According to Vipond, literature would "help create and make manifest the Canadian identity" and perhaps more importantly, "help foster a sense of community in Canada."[36] In the search for national unity and a sense of community, the CAA denied the realities of the twentieth century by idealizing small-town, rural life and by admiring the traditional, communal values of French Canada. Further, the group worshipped late nineteenth-century Canadian poets and retained an immense affection for Great Britain.[37]

With an evolving membership from Canadian writers to

---

[34] Ibid. 69.

[35] Ibid. 72.

[36] Ibid. 72.

[37] Ibid. 73.

individuals searching for unity and a sense of community, the mandate of the CAA became the "general encouragement and promotion of Canadian literature."[38] Vipond argues that CAA members believed that Canadian literature was the answer to the lack of a distinct Canadian identity. "In great writing would be expressed and communicated the essence of Canadianism. A Canadian literature would provide the Canadian people with their own myths; without such a literature, the nation's inner life would remain barren."[39] With the single-minded goal of promoting Canadian literature, CAA members lowered their critical standards. Canadian literature was soon celebrated only by virtue of its Canadianism, regardless of its inherent worth.

The CAA inevitably came under attack by a new generation of critics who were more North American in their orientation. They chastized the CAA for its "inherent conservatism" and for its uncritical approach to Canadian literature.[40] With a strong force of oppposition and the onslaught of the Depression and the social protest movements of the 1930s, the CAA quickly lost its importance.

Vipond does not attempt to define cultural nationalism. From her article, however, she perceives it as a conservative movement which promotes Canadian culture to foster a unique Canadian identity based on maintaining the status quo. The status quo is

---

[38] Ibid. 70.

[39] Ibid. 72.

[40] Ibid. 75.

defined as a society based on British, agrarian values. Further, cultural nationalism adopts rather negative undertones in Vipond's study. Her cultural nationalists were so preoccupied with promoting **Canadian** literature that they lost their critical capacity to differentiate between good and bad literature and promoted a "mythical" society far removed from reality.

In an analysis of F. R. Scott, Marlene Shore presents a different approach to the study of cultural nationalism. "'Overtures of an Era Being Born' F. R. Scott: Cultural Nationalism and Social Criticism 1925-1939" traces the evolution of Scott's thought to reveal the "link between this critical form of cultural nationalism and the social protest of the 1930s."[41] Shore defines Scott as a cultural nationalist during the 1920s on the basis of his allegiance to a small group of English-Canadian Montrealers, who reacted against the "sentimentality" of Canadian poetry propagated by the CAA. She suggests that the "McGill Group" provided "a more critical edge" to Canadian culture as they "condemned the prudery and sanctimoniousness of Victorian culture as factors which stultified Canadian culture, and attempted to create a national culture attuned to twentieth century conditions."[42] She further argues that this preoccupation "ultimately caused them to turn their attention toward the root causes of economic and social injustice in the country during the

---

[41] Marlene Shore, " 'Overtures of an Era Being Born' F. R. Scott: Cultural Nationalism and Social Criticism 1925-1939", Journal of Canadian Studies, 15, (1980-81), 32.

[42] Ibid. 32.

1930s."[43]

Triggered by the onslaught of the Depression in 1929, Scott's cultural nationalism inevitably found expression in political criticism through the League for Social Reconstruction (LSR). While discussing his evolution from a cultural nationalist to a socialist, she is careful to stress the continuity in his thought. He remained true to humanist and nationalist principles throughout his career. Scott perceived Canada as a liberal and social, democratic, multi-national state. As the constitutional expert for the LSR during the 1930s, he consistently fought for the rights of the individual and the exercise of Canadian political autonomy. Shore concludes: "in the work of F. R. Scott, the cultural trends of the two decades acquired a theoretical unity. He insisted that narrow patriotism was an anachronism, and that the goal of art and politics must be to cultivate broader human sentiments. Both of these convictions underlay his version of Canadian nationalism and explained his evolution as a socialist."[44]

In comparison to Mary Vipond, Shore portrays cultural nationalism with a "more critical edge". Shore's cultural nationalists were politically centralist, modernist and more open to international trends in politics and in art; they did not accept the status quo but strove to improve the cultural and political life of Canada.

As the title indicates, Making Culture. English-Canadian

---

[43] Ibid. 32.

[44] Ibid. 40.

Institutions and the Arts Before the Massey Commission, Maria Tippett focuses on Canada's cultural life before the Massey Report and the Canada Council. In fact, her study is motivated by her disagreement with the assumption that Canada's cultural life began with the Massey Commission. In a related article published prior to the book, "The Making of English-Canadian Culture, 1900-1939: The External Influences," she studies the outside influences that helped to shape, promote and define Canadian culture. She argues that Canadian culture in the first few decades of the twentieth century was "richly-textured, diversified, and spontaneous" and far from parochial.[45] She believes that Canadian culture flourished by associating with foreign influences.

> Whether, then, English-Canada's cultural activity was influenced by imitating foreign models, affiliating with foreign organizations, associating with movements based abroad, or taking up residence outside the country, the process was a very important factor in its making for it ensured that work would not be provincial and narrow and able to do no more than meet the standards of a small and closed community. By moving it onto the international stage, that process at once fostered the growth of cultural activity in English-Canada, giving it a quality and finish it would not otherwise have had.[46]

She ultimately argues that "agencies such as the Canada Council have not . . . created a Canadian cultural life "de novo"; they have simply made easier what men and women were doing long

---

[45] Maria Tippett, "The Making of English-Canadian Culture, 1900-1939: The External Influences", Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies Lecture Series, (Toronto: York University Press, 1988), 12.

[46] Ibid. 15.

before."[47]

In Making Culture, Tippett elaborates on the earlier essay which comprises a chapter of the book. She concentrates on the cultural infrastructures of the early twentieth century, the cultural "educators," public and private patronage, and of course, the external influences on cultural development. She contends that the cultural activity during the first few decades of the twentieth century produced 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 concerned with the task of post-war reconstruction."[48] The result was the appointment of the Royal Commission on the National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences in 1949. The federal government was responding to Canada's cultural reality rather than creating a cultural existence. When the state adopted a more active role in the promotion of Canadian culture, however, the amateur faded into the role of cultural consumer and professional standards intensified. Cultural activity continued to flourish. Tippett argues that the Canada Council, instituted in 1957, "was a product, as much as it

---

[47] Ibid. 16.

[48] Maria Tippett, Making Culture. English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts Before the Massey Commission, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), xi, preface.

was a creator, of a distinguished history of cultural activism."[49] Making Culture dispels the myth of Canada's cultural existence beginning in the aftermath of the Second World War.

In her M. A. thesis, "The Massey Report and the Intellectuals: Tory Cultural Nationalism in Ontario in the 1950s," Erna Buffie presents an innovative study of the conservative sentiments that characterized the decade. The thesis proposes to provide "an examination of the philosophical and ideological convictions of those who supported the cause of cultural nationalism."[50] In particular, she proposes to examine the "debates on the preservation and promotion of Canadian culture . . . in relation to the Massey Report" pertaining to "the possibility of a national philosophy of education and a Canadian idiom in Literature."[51] A secondary mandate of the study is to "explain why a certain segment of the Anglo-Canadian cultural elite, despite individual differences, supported the cause of cultural nationalism."[52] The thesis suffers, however, from the lack of a comprehensive definition of cultural nationalism and of how "tory cultural nationalism" differs from other forms of nationalism.

Buffie argues that members of the intelligentsia were united by their common fear of the commercialization of Canadian culture,

---

[49] Ibid. 187.

[50] Erna Buffie, "The Massey Report and the Intellectuals: Tory Cultural Nationalism in Ontario in the 1950s", M. A. Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1982, abstract.

[51] Ibid. Abstract.

[52] Ibid. Abstract.

epitomized by the intrusion of American popular culture into Canada. She contends that "they agreed that the best form of defense . . . was the preservation and promotion of a unique national culture - one grounded in the best traditions and values of Canada and of Western civilization as a whole."[53] Depicting cultural nationalism as a defense against American mass culture is an approach first introduced in the discussion of Ramsay Cook's work. In "defending" Canadian culture, these intellectuals, represented by the Massey Commissioners, were "profoundly conservative" and feared modernity in its extreme.[54] In American popular culture, they envisioned decaying moral values and a degenerative social order. Therefore, they were concerned with promoting "high" culture which "entailed the training of the moral, intellectual and aesthetic sensibilities of Canadians" and they deliberately ignored popular culture which they associated with the United States.[55] Buffie asserts that "it is the Canadian cultural tradition which the report represented and sought to protect, which provided the basis for Anglo-Canadian cultural nationalism in the decade of the fifties."[56] The cultural tradition that bound the intelligentsia was perceived as innately conservative and tied to Canada's British heritage:

> almost without exception, these intellectuals maintained

---

[53] Ibid. 4.

[54] Ibid. 7, 8.

[55] Ibid. 9.

[56] Ibid. 18.

> that the Canadian way of life could be preserved if Canadian culture developed in accordance with the historical experience and traditions of the nation. . . . they stressed a vision of Canada as a society with a healthy respect for tradition, continuity and compromise. They emphasized the essential conservatism of Canadian political and social traditions, the nation's peaceful development as a bi-cultural nation and its valuable connections with the enduring cultural values of Great Britain.[57]

This vision of Canada, expressed in the Massey Report, united the "tory cultural nationalist" movement of the 1950s.

In the final section of her thesis, Buffie turns to the political ramifications of the cultural nationalism of the decade. She suggests that the " 'new conservatism' was . . . an expression of the sentiments that led to the defeat of the Liberals in 1957, and again in 1958."[58] She extends this argument by suggesting that the defeat of the Conservatives in 1963 also signalled the defeat of the "new conservative nationalism".[59] She ends her discussion with a focus on George Grant and his book, Lament For a Nation. Unfortunately, she appears to have gotten too "bogged down" in his views and her study ends on a disappointing note. She finally contends that the cultural nationalism of the 1950s gave way to an economic nationalism in subsequent decades, but she does not explain how or why this shift occurred.[60]

Buffie's cultural nationalists were innately conservative.

---

[57] Ibid. 234.

[58] Ibid. 237.

[59] Ibid. 238.

[60] Ibid. 245.

Faced with the mass-produced culture of the United States, and rapid advances in communications technology, they sought to protect and preserve the cultural status quo. In protecting what they believed were distinctive Canadian values, they attempted to preserve their own status in society as opinion-makers and barometers of artistic taste.

In The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, Paul Litt provides an insightful analysis of the Massey Commission. In comparision to Buffie, Litt provides a more detailed discussion of the commission and he does not perceive the cultural elite as inherently conservative. In his introduction, he discusses the notorious portrayal of the Massey Commission in Canadian historiography and, therefore, he proposes to present "the commission in its historical context" to offer "an opportunity to judge how much it can bear of the symbolic freight that has been heaped upon it over the years. At the same time it may serve both as a case study in Canadian cultural nationalism and as a window on some overlooked features of Canadian society at the mid-point of the twentieth century."[61] In fulfilling his mandate, Litt provides in-depth discussions of the Massey commissioners and their values, the bases of support and opposition faced by the commission, the report's specific recommendations and its implementation and impact on Canadian society.

Litt argues that it is inappropriate to label the Massey Commission as the embodiment of conservativism. Instead, he

---

[61] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 6.

contends that the values and philosophical vision embraced by the commissioners were 'liberal humanist'.

> If liberalism is associated exclusively with free enterprise and scientific inquiry, then the label would not fit. But it is precisely because it equated free enterprise with monopoly capitalism and scientific inquiry with technological tyranny that the culture lobby opposed them. However much business and technology had been perceived as forces for freedom in the past, their responsibility for mass culture made them appear more as threats to individual liberty than its champions at present. As an alternative, the cultural elite echoed Arnold's conviction that high culture was a force for individual liberty through self-enlightenment. This position was conservative inasmuch as they sought to 'conserve' traditional high culture, but it was the liberal humanist values in that tradition that were stressed, and they were offered not as a path of retreat into the past but as a guide for progress into the future.[62]

Coherent with this philosophy, the cultural elite's attachment to "liberal economic principles" prevented the commission from criticizing capitalism which had created the "cultural conditions they abhorred." Its only alternative was to "offer high culture as a counterweight, a source of values which defined political freedom in human rather than scientific or capitalistic terms."[63] The Massey Commission offered high culture as a solution to the problems facing postwar Canada.

An awareness of the ills of modern society was accompanied by a wave of optimism for Canada's future in the postwar world. Litt suggests that "it was not surprising that the liberal humanism of the cultural elite would become intertwined with the nationalist

---

[62] Ibid. 102.

[63] Ibid. 102 - 103.

assumptions and ambitions that ran throughout the country in the postwar period."[64] He argues that the cultural elite adopted postwar nationalism to popularize their mandate of edifying the masses through high culture. "Liberal humanism requited cultural nationalism's desire for identity with a set of moral values and aesthetic standards that were coherent enough to serve as a basis for national unity and distinct enough from those of American mass culture to provide a unique Canadian identity. From nationalism, on the other hand, liberal humanism gained what it most sorely lacked: popularity."[65] The liberal humanist creed also contributed a set of moral values to the cause of nationalism in the quest to elucidate a unique Canadian identity. Both philosophies bolstered the other's cause and together, cultural nationalism became a powerful movement in postwar Canada. The Massey Commission was a vehicle of this movement.

Litt concludes his study by arguing that many of the commission's recommendations were never adopted and, therefore, its contribution to our cultural heritage must be questioned. He contends that "its real significance . . . lies . . . in the general impact it had upon the attitudes of the public and the policies of the government. It helped usher in a new age in which a conscious and coordinated government cultural policy came to be expected."[66] He further questions whether this change in attitude

---

[64] Ibid. 104.

[65] Ibid. 108.

[66] Ibid. 247.

is attributable to the commission or to the "changing times of which the commission itself was simply a reflection."[67] The state, for example, was already becoming more interventionist when the commission was appointed.

Throughout his study, Litt consistently stresses the tension between elitism and nationalism which comprised Canadian cultural nationalism. It is this tension which he ultimately envisions at the root of the commission's questionable impact.

> Their enterprise continually bumped up against the fact that high culture was not very amenable to popularization. Patriotic Canadians would support the idea of state-sponsored high culture, but that did not mean they were interested in personally sampling the goods. The commissioners were unwilling to debase high culture in order to popularize it, but neither would they force it down people's throats. In the end, their liberal democratic consciences ensured that their elitist dream of edifying the masses would never be realized.[68]

In addition, popular culture became increasingly acceptable by the end of the period further negating the accomplishments of the commission. "Their cause would . . . lose much of its urgency in ensuing decades. As their worst fears about mass culture failed to materialize, a wide variety of cultural activities won greater acceptance as vibrant expressions of modern life."[69] Although popular culture became more tolerable, state-sponsored high culture "would enjoy an increasingly affluent future" thereby differentiating Canadian culture from the mass culture of the

---

[67] Ibid. 247 - 248.

[68] Ibid. 252 - 253.

[69] Ibid. 253.

United States which the Massey Commissioners had feared. In comparison to the American cultural elite, its Canadian counterpart "proved to be closer to power and more successful in getting a political response to its concerns. Its conception of Canadian culture was true insofar as it became a self-fulfilling prophecy."[70]

Paul Litt introduces a new element to the historiography of cultural nationalism by making a clear distinction between the cultural elite as represented by the Massey Commissioners and nationalists. As the two groups joined forces in the postwar period, the discrepancy in their outlooks created a vibrant cultural nationalism. Litt contends; "The amalgam of cultural elitism and nationalism that constituted Canadian cultural nationalism was not, however, without its internal tensions. The popular appeal and Canadian emphasis which nationalism demanded sometimes threatened the critical standards and cosmopolitan outlook of the cultural elite." He further suggests that "the elite leadership of the cultural lobby, however, feared that emphasizing nationalism over cultural excellence would breed an inferior and parochial culture in Canada."[71] Although Litt does not suggest it, it is possible that the two philosophies provided a check on the other, thereby creating a cultural nationalism that was neither parochial nor patronizing. Through his approach, Litt portrays cultural nationalism as a more popular movement and not

---

[70] Ibid. 254.

[71] Ibid. 109 - 110.

only as a vehicle of the cultural elite. In contrast to Buffie, he also argues that the cultural nationalists of the 1950s were more interested in progress and Canada's future than in maintaining the status quo.

Jack Bumsted's "Canada and American Culture in the 1950s," focuses on the failure of Canadians to impede the process of American domination over popular culture. He argues, "however much Canada in the 1950s may have witnessed a resurgence and flowering of high culture associated with such landmarks as the Massey Commission and the formation of the Canada Council, it also failed dismally to prevent the United States from gaining a veritable stranglehold within Canada over popular culture."[72] He attributes the failure to the American monopoly on popular culture which "had no competition", and to Canada's traditional leadership which disdained any form of mass culture.[73] By focusing exclusively on "high" culture, Canadian intellectuals and Massey Commissioners paved the way for complete American domination over popular culture. As a result, Bumsted contends that the intellectuals of the 1950s "sought the Canadian identity in other places".[74]

Bumsted illustrates the Americanization of popular culture by focusing on the Canadian Cooperation Project between Hollywood and the Canadian government which agreed to "publicize" Canada in its movies, and the National Film Board which accepted its role as the

---

[72] Bumsted, "Canada and American Culture in the 1950s", 55.

[73] Ibid. 58-59.

[74] Ibid. 60.

"maker of high-quality, educational short subjects on Canadian themes."[75] The ineffectiveness of Canadian radio and television to counter the weight of American broadcasting is amply documented by Bumsted. The result was a virtual absence of an entertainment industry in Canada, further illustrated by the fate of the National Hockey League which had become dominated by American money.[76] Through his examples, Bumsted concludes that "what was significant about Canada and American culture in the 1950s was that Canadians did not act. Whether action would have made any difference is a hypothetical question which, - fortunately historians need not deal."[77] Bumsted's concentration on the failure of Canadian popular culture to emerge during a decade recognized for cultural advances serves as a sobering reminder of the restraints on Canadian cultural sovereignty.

Perhaps the greatest symbol of Canada's cultural maturity during the 1950's was the incorporation of the Canada Council in 1957. The brainchild of the Massey Report, the Canada Council soon became the benefactor of high culture in Canada. In "Culture and Scholarship: The First Ten Years of the Canada Council," Jack Granatstein details the origins of the Council and he argues that it significantly stimulated the arts after its inception. According to Granatstein, before 1957 the "arts were undefined and

---

[75] Ibid. 60-63.

[76] Ibid. 70-72.

[77] Ibid. 72.

parochial."[78] Almost immediately after the creation of the Council, however, "theatre companies blossomed across the country, orchestras improved mightily, and artists left their garrets at last."[79] Although he concedes that the growth cannot be attributable entirely to the Canada Council, he maintains that it was the Council that "more than anything else deserves credit for starting Canada on the road to artistic maturity."[80] Granatstein's argument is in direct opposition to Tippett's views in Making Culture. Furthermore, Granatstein makes no attempt to suggest the Council's impact on popular culture. Clearly, the Council was meant to perpetuate the idea of small "c" conservative culture reflected in the Massey Report. Granatstein illustrates his thesis through an examination of the Council's effect on the National Ballet, university education and scholarships. The Council indisputably played a positive role in promoting high culture in Canada. He concludes that "there can be no doubt that the Council succeeded in its mandate. The growth of the arts, the increase in scholarship, the survival and development of companies such as the National Ballet were proof of that."[81]

The final two studies to be reviewed are recent analyses of popular culture in Canada. When Bumsted wrote his article more

---

[78] J. L. Granatstein, "Culture and Scholarship: The First Ten Years of the Canada Council", Canadian Historical Review, 65, no. 4, (Dec. 1984), 454.

[79] Ibid. 454.

[80] Ibid. 454.

[81] Ibid. 474.

than ten years ago, little attention had been paid to the development of mass culture. This oversight is beginning to be rectified.

Mary Vipond has provided a thorough survey of the mass media in The Mass Media in Canada, published in 1989. By focusing on the growth of communications technology, she explains how the mass media in Canada evolved. She argues that "the current state of our mass media, largely Canadian-owned but filled with American content, can best be understood as the product of tensions within and between these two Canadian idea systems, the myth of communications and the ideology of liberal individualism."[82] Beginning with the CPR in the late nineteenth century, Canadians have adopted the assumption that communication is essential to our survival. As a result, Canada has developed one of the largest national communication networks in the world. But, with little money and deeply ingrained beliefs in free enterprise and freedom of speech, "media-distribution systems in Canada have been impelled to expand much more rapidly than the capacity to fill those systems with Canadian content."[83] Therefore, Vipond asserts that "Canada has found itself in the anomolous position of having one of the most highly developed mass-media systems in the world, which serves to a considerable extent as a conduit for the distribution of non-Canadian cultural goods."[84] Such is the fate of the mass media and

---

[82] Vipond, The Mass Media in Canada, xi, introduction.

[83] Ibid. 181.

[84] Ibid. xi, introduction.

popular culture in Canada. The goal of Vipond's book is to "analyze how these fundamental contradictions have moulded our mass media into their present form."[85]

Through her discussion of the contradictory myths and assumptions that have molded the mass media, Vipond discovers that while the cultural "industries" have prospered, the "culture" has consistently suffered.[86] She concludes her study on a discouraging note, yet she is quick to offer advice. She argues that the time has come to re-evaluate the assumptions which have governed the growth of Canada's cultural industries. She urges the government to intervene more effectively, and she implores us "imaginatively to seek the right balance between cultural needs and economic realities."[87]

Finally, we turn to a discussion of Paul Rutherford's work on the growth of television within Canada. His exhaustive study, When Television Was Young: Primetime Canada 1952-1967, relates "the rise of television and its emergence as the most potent source of mass culture in modern society."[88] His book is divided into "three distinct subjects": one, "the career of the noble experiment of a national television service (francophone and anglophone, public and private)"; two, "the art of television"; and three, "what happens

---

[85] Ibid. xii, introduction.

[86] Ibid. 179.

[87] Ibid. 184.

[88] Paul Rutherford, When Television Was Young: Primetime Canada 1952-1967, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 4.

to a society when a new medium of communications enters the picture?"[89] In dealing with these three subjects, the book is divided into three parts. The first part deals with the "Structures" of television which includes a discussion of the "economics, institutions, and personnel of television."[90] The second part turns to the "content of television" and the third part, consisting of the first and last chapter, assesses the "effects of television".[91] Further, throughout his analysis he particularly stresses "primetime viewing" and CBC programming in both French and English.[92]

Ending his study in roughly 1967, Rutherford concludes that by the end of this decade, the cultural significance of television had already climaxed. "For what gave it such an impact was the commonality of the experience, the fact that so many different kinds of people were sitting in front of their TV sets to watch the same shows during the course of an evening."[93] By the end of the 1960s the "common experience" was being impinged by the rise of private television, new provincial channels, the PBS in the United States, cable tv, satellite dishes, pay tv, multiple sets in each home and VCRs.[94] The experience of television ultimately changed

---

[89] Ibid. 5-6.

[90] Ibid. 7.

[91] Ibid. 6-7.

[92] Ibid. 8.

[93] Ibid. 482.

[94] Ibid. 482.

during the 1970s and 1980s.

Through a focus on television, and particularly on what ordinary people watched on television, Rutherford avoids the issue of cultural nationalism. Cultural nationalists, as portrayed in Canadian historiography, disdained the commercialism of television. Rutherford only suggests that he does not "sympathize . . . with the typical views of highbrows or cultural nationalists . . . about the baneful influences of TV."[95] One gets the impression that to Rutherford, a cultural nationalist is dedicated only to the perpetuation of "high" culture and therefore oblivious to the influence and effects of television. As the present study will illustrate, not all cultural nationalists felt threatened by the power and pervasiveness of popular culture.

These studies on Canadian cultural nationalism have, for the most part, utilized competing and contradictory definitions of the term. The cultural nationalist has been depicted as an indiscriminant promoter of Canadian culture who proclaims the virtues of all Canadian culture. Rather than applying the term "cultural nationalist" to characters such as members of the CAA during the 1920s, they will be labelled "cultural boosters" instead. CAA members were so single-minded in their promotion of Canadian culture that they lost their capacity to be critical about Canadian literature. Preoccupied with fulfilling their own, immediate self-interests, they inevitably hindered the growth and development of Canadian culture. The cultural nationalist has been

---

[95] Ibid. 9.

portrayed as someone with "a more critical edge" as well.[96] It is proposed here that cultural nationalists are not afraid to attack the status quo to improve our cultural life. Not all cultural nationalists are conservative but many seek progress and betterment. Cultural nationalism has been further associated with an anti-American movement which seeks to defend and protect Canadian cultural sovereignty. Cultural nationalism, however, cannot be an entirely negative movement. Constantly worrying about the threat of American dominance runs contrary to the creative impulse. Anti-Americanism is definitely an important component of Canadian cultural nationalism, but it is a positive, pro-Canadian movement as well. Cultural nationalism has been portrayed also as a union of nationalists and the cultural elite. Litt argues that the liberal humanism of the Massey Commissioners embraced the postwar nationalism to popularize its mandate of promoting high culture as the panacea for social problems and the lack of a unique Canadian identity. The resulting cultural nationalism was neither conservative nor provincial. Finally, while Canadian cultural nationalists advocate an autonomous national culture, there is no indication among recent literature that they advocate the promotion of a homogeneous culture. Although cultural nationalists have supported the creation of an identifiable Canadian culture, they have not, for example, advocated the dissipation of French-Canadian culture. This tendency is unique to Canadian cultural nationalists, who for the most part, respect and even promote, the

---

[96] Shore, " 'Overtures of an Era Being Born' ", 32.

cultural duality of our nation as something distinguishing us from the Americans. Although this admission contradicts Mosse's definition of cultural nationalism, I do not believe that it warrants a denial of the term.

In its association with anti-Americanism and cultural boosterism, the term cultural nationalism has adopted rather negative undertones. The present study offers a more positive account of cultural nationalism in Canada. For the purpose of this study, Canadian cultural nationalism can be defined as a movement which seeks to promote the cultural identity of a diverse society through the support of indigenous cultural expression. Cultural nationalists want our culture to be recognized as **Canadian.** Inherent to this movement is the desire to improve upon our cultural existence rather than to accept the status quo.

As the definitions of cultural nationalism have varied, the study of Canadian culture and cultural nationalism has been approached from several different angles. One of the more consistent approaches was to focus on the views of an individual or on a specific group of people. A further tendency was to study the infrastructures or institutions of the cultural industry. A third trend was to analyse the effects of American influence on Canada's culture. All these tendencies will find a place in the present study.

One difference, however, is that I propose to look at the views of three individuals who belonged to English-speaking Canada's cultural life during the post-World War II era. Allan,

Cohen and Moore did not sit on Commissions and assess the status or value of Canadian culture. Rather, they worked daily in their respective professions. Their work shaped the character of Canadian culture during the decade and a half following World War II. In effect, Allan, Cohen, and Moore represent the fusion of nationalism and the cultural elite's liberal humanism described by Paul Litt in his recent study of the Massey Commission. Not completely belonging to the cultural elite, these three men subscribed to many of the values embodied by the Massey Commission: humanism, progress, individual freedom, and self-enlightenment, and yet, their views and opinions were unabashedly nationalistic. Further, by focusing on the general field of drama, this thesis will discuss radio, live theatre and television, and, therefore, both "high" and popular culture will be examined. By studying them together, this thesis will illustrate that the distinction between "high" and popular culture became increasingly blurred by the end of the 1950s even as the two fields pulled further apart. The present study will also discuss the infrastructures of cultural development during the 1945 - 1960 period, such as the CBC, the Massey Commission and landmark developments such as the Stratford Festival, the introduction of television and the Canada Council. In addition, the post-war socio-economic conditions and Canada's international status will be evaluated and their impact on the cultural scene will be assessed.

As is so often the case in studies of Canadian history, especially Canadian culture, it is important to make a distinction

between French- and English-speaking Canada. The views, opinions and cultural artifacts discussed in this thesis are reflections of English-Canada largely emanating from the greater Toronto region. Limited by time, space, and resources, my thesis is restricted to the geographical and cultural region of southern Ontario. This declaration is not to admit that a comprehensive study of **Canadian** culture is impossible. I strongly feel that dividing Canada into French and English Canada are artificial divisions which serve to restrict our creativity and potential. Although I am battling convention, I feel more comfortable with the term "Canadian" culture which embraces the richness and diversity of the many different cultures which have created Canada. Dividing Canada into French and English Canada represents a disservice to the hundreds of ethnic groups which have molded and contributed to English-Canadian and French-Canadian culture. Although I recognize that "Quebec" is different, with a different set of circumstances, I still believe that it is possible to provide a study of Canadian culture. While I suspect that cultural nationalism is something quite different in Quebec than in Southern Ontario, or for that matter, in other geographical regions of Canada, it would still be insightful and thought-provoking to broaden the base of research. We will learn more about ourselves and about our country if we stop treating "Canada" as a collection of isolated, self-enclosed regions. Canada **is** a collection of diverse regions, but, in recognizing this fact, we must not lose sight of the fact that we are also one country.

The structure of the present thesis is what I call "chronologically by theme." The first chapter offers an essential discussion of Canada and its cultural community during the decades prior to 1945 and the second chapter provides a biographical discussion of the three men under study. In subsequent chapters, a particular event or cultural institution has been coupled with a theme which gained primacy at that time or that was particularly relevant to that institution. For example, Chapter 3 is entitled "CBC Radio and the Canadian Identity"; Chapter 4, "Canadian Theatre and the Public Inferiority Complex"; Chapter 5, "The Massey Report and the Importance of the Arts to Canada"; and Chapter 6 is entitled "Television in Canada: Hope and Disillusionment". The views of Allan, Cohen and Moore towards these institutions have been considered in tandem rather than in isolation. It is hoped that in this way a more comprehensive picture of the contemporary attitudes and opinions on Canadian culture during the 1945 - 1960 period will be achieved. Ultimately, this thesis will argue that the wave of cultural nationalism experienced in the immediate post-war period was undermined by the technological advances and public apathy of the period. Radio and live theatre were marginalized as television came to the forefront of our culture and mass media industries. As this process occurred, a note of disillusionment crept into cultural nationalist rhetoric and the enthusiasm of the immediate postwar period abated. The nature of Allan, Cohen, and Moore's cultural nationalism, however, persisted and contributed to further cultural development. They took Canadian culture seriously

and expected the artistic community and the public to do so as well. As the argument progresses, this thesis also hopes to offer an accurate portrayal of the English-Canadian cultural community during the 1945 - 1960 period. The aspirations, opinions, setbacks and accomplishments of those who worked in Canada's cultural industries will be illustrated. Finally, this thesis hopes to illuminate the character of the cultural infrastructures established in the 1945 - 1960 period which have determined our cultural life for the past generation.

CHAPTER 1 SETTING THE STAGE

Canada's cultural life between 1919 and 1945 was dynamic, exciting and diversified. Sparked by the promise of independence from Britain after the conclusion of hostilities in 1919, English-speaking Canadians pursued the creation of a unique English-Canadian culture to reflect the nation's new importance on the international stage. A similar pattern was repeated and intensified after 1945. The search for a unique English-Canadian identity was also stimulated by desires to differentiate the English-Canadian community from the cohesive French-Canadian culture which it admired and from the pervasive American culture to the South. In discussing the growth of English Canada's cultural life, several competing and contradictory themes characterize the period. Canada's cultural development was marked by a process of nationalization, Americanization, and internationalization. These three trends were facilitated by a revolution in communications technology which ushered in the age of mass electronic media, thereby necessitating a distinction between culture and entertainment. In other words, the debate between "high" and "popular" culture was introduced. The following discussion of Canada's cultural life between the two World Wars will attempt to elucidate the nature of these contradictory themes and it will suggest that such a blend of influences was only possible, and particularly suited, to the Canadian experience. Finally, this chapter will argue that despite these contradictory influences, the overriding concern of cultural enthusiasts during the inter-war

period was to promote cultural expressions of Canadianism.

With the conclusion of hostilities in 1919, there was a general feeling of optimism, particularly among the intellectual and artistic communities in Canada. These sentiments were unique to Canadians who did not experience the disillusionment and cynicism prevalent in Britain and the United States sparked by the atrocities of warfare.[1] Instead, there was a prevalent assumption that Canada had "come of age" as a nation, throwing off the yoke of British colonialism. With this assumption grew the awareness that Canada severely lacked the cultural trappings of nationhood. John Thompson argues that "the only attribute of full-grown nationhood that post-war Canada appeared to (English-Canada's intellectual community) to lack was a culture that could reflect this new national status and demonstrate to Canadians and the world, that Canada had left behind her unlettered adolescence, and entered a more refined adulthood."[2] Vipond reinforces this view by suggesting that many Canadians "were deeply concerned that this status was meaningless if Canadians remained colonial and imitative with respect to the culture, myths and symbols of other countries."[3] Therefore, an elite core of Canadians initiated the arduous process of stimulating a unique English-Canadian culture

---

[1] John Herd Thompson with Allen Seager, Canada 1922-1939. Decades of Discord, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1985), 161.

[2] Ibid. 158.

[3] Mary Vipond, "The Canadian Author's Association in the 1920s: A Case Study in Cultural Nationalism", Journal of Canadian Studies, 15, (1980-81), 68.

to reflect Canada's new status in the world. Their efforts paid off. The 1920s witnessed the accomplishments of the Group of Seven which promoted nationalism through their paintings of the central Canadian landscape. The efforts of the Canadian Author's Association to encourage Canadian literature also bore fruit. National organizations were founded and national competitions were inaugerated. For the first time, cultural producers and consumers abandoned the imitation and adulation of British culture and focused instead, on reproducing and renewing their own cultural heritage. As English-speaking Canadians witnessed the nationalization of their culture, however, the nation also moved closer to its powerful, southern neighbour. In "Cultural Nationalism in Canada: An Historical Perspective," Cook charts the process of Americanization during the inter-war period. As previously discussed in the Introduction, he isolates the year 1926 to represent the turning point in the withdrawal from "Empire-Commonwealth" into "fortress North America".[4] 1926 was the year Hauser's book on the Group of Seven was published. Cook argues that his book legitimized the nationalism embodied by the Group's painting. "What F. E. Hauser did was to provide the Group with one of the elements necessary to any nationalist movement: a history."[5] As Canadians were exerting their nationalism by moving

---

[4] Ramsay Cook, "Cultural Nationalism in Canada: An Historical Perspective", Canadian Cultural Nationalism. The Fourth Lester B. Pearson Conference on the Canada-United States Relationship, Janice L. Murray, ed., (New York: New York University Press, 1977), 27.

[5] Ibid. 29.

away from Great Britain, they were simultaneously moving closer to the United States.

While the innovative painting of the Group of Seven personified the North Americanization of Canadian culture during the 1920s, other cultural sectors experienced similar outbursts of creativity. A large demand among the public for Canadian writers was particularly evident in the postwar period. Thompson states that in comparison to pre-1914 "more Canadian novels, stories, non-fiction, and poems were written, published, and read" constituting a "Canadiana revival."[6] Thompson further suggests that "cultural nationalism served as a literary common denominator in the inter-war period."[7] The painting and literature of the 1920s, then, was characterized by expressions of nationalism. This movement was intensified with the formation of the Canadian Author's Association in 1920-21.

The Canadian Author's Association's original mandate was to serve as a trades guild for Canadian writers.[8] It acted as a pressure group to protect the interests of Canadian writers in Ottawa against the publishers' and printers' lobbies. Of particular concern to the writers were the licensing clauses of the new Copyright Act about to be passed by Parliament. The clauses permitted Canadian publishers to print the work of a Canadian author without permission if that work had been printed first in

---

[6] Thompson, Decades of Discord, 166.

[7] Ibid. 165.

[8] Vipond, "The Canadian Author's Association", 69.

another country. Other authors, however, were protected by the Berne Convention on international copyrighting to which Canada adhered.[9]

The Association soon lost its initial pragmatism as the organization became a loose conglomeration of individuals with an interest in Canadian culture. Local chapters of the CAA were spread across the country. French-speaking authors also found a place within the confines of the CAA. As the membership of the group evolved, it adopted a second mandate; the "general encouragement and promotion of Canadian literature."[10] English- and French-speaking literature was equally promoted. The Association believed that Canadian literature could be the answer to the lack of a Canadian identity. "In great writing would be expressed and communicated the essence of Canadianism. A Canadian literature would provide the Canadian people with their own myths; without such a literature, the nation's inner life would remain barren."[11] In this noble ambition, however, the CAA became too severe in its Canadianism and increasingly anti-American. CAA members constantly lamented the massive importation of American books, magazines and newspapers and "particularly bemoaned the anti-British tone, the immorality and the materialism of American popular literature."[12] In fact, American popular culture was

---

[9] Ibid. 68.

[10] Ibid. 70.

[11] Ibid. 72.

[12] Ibid. 72.

perceived as the primary threat to the Canadian identity.[13] On the other side of the association's anti-Americanism were pro-British sentiments. The members were inherently conservative and traditional. Interestingly, the sentiments embodied by the CAA were not new to the Canadian experience. The Canada First Movement of the 1870s also embraced anti-Americanism and imperialistic values in pursuit of a "New Nationality." The Canada First Movement, however, also advocated militarism, homogeneity and ultimately, it entered politics. The movement was shortlived as it succumbed to vagueness, confusion and contradictions in its policies.[14] Returning to the significance of the CAA, Vipond argues that "they were nostalgic about Canada's British past, uncertain about its future and they saw in the United States a triple threat - for the United States was not only liberal and non-British, but it was the very personification of the future."[15]

To combat the American menace, the CAA promoted all Canadian literature single-mindedly, regardless of its inherent worth. It definitely advocated the policy of "Canada First." The annual Canadian Book Week, sponsored by the CAA, for example, encouraged the buying and reading of Canadian books. Schools held literary competitions, book stores sponsored author-signing events, and

---

[13] Ibid. 74.

[14] For more information see David P. Gagan, "Canada First", Journal of Canadian Studies, 4-5, (Nov. 1970), 36-44; and D. R. Farrell, "The Canada First Movement and Canadian Political Thought", Journal of Canadian Studies, 4-5. (Nov. 1969), 16-26.

[15] Vipond, "The Canadian Author's Association", 74.

Canadian periodicals reviewed Canadian books exclusively.[16] This event particularly came under fire by the CAA's critics. Led by a small group of young poets centered in Montreal, the "McGill Group" denounced the CAA's uncritical approach to Canadian literature. They accused the CAA of promoting commercialism at the expense of art and for its "stylistic and moral conservatism".[17] Such an approach, the group argued, would be detrimental to Canadian literature in the end. Despite the conflict surrounding the uncritical versus the critical approach to Canadian literature, Vipond is quick to point out that both groups held the same ultimate goal; the development of Canadian literature and culture.[18] This aspiration unified the cultural community during the inter-war period.

In the performing arts sector of the cultural community, nationalism was less prevalent, although there were significant attempts to Canadianize the theatre. The Trans-Canada Theatre Society was established and a Little Theatre Movement flourished during the 1920s. By 1930 there were approximately 1800 amateur theatre groups in existence and in 1933 the Dominion Drama Festival was created. These accomplishments provided crucial outlets for such Canadian playwrights as Merrill Denison and Gwen Pharis Ringwood.[19]

---

[16] Ibid. 71.

[17] Ibid. 75.

[18] Ibid. 75.

[19] Thompson, Decades of Discord, 169-171.

At the beginning of this century, other sectors of the artistic community did not experience the same wave of nationalism due to the fact that they had become Americanized before they had had a chance to grow. The film industry offers an appropriate example of this occurrence. Hollywood rapidly became the "world" centre for movie production immediately after the conclusion of the First World War. While there was no lack of artistic talent in Canada, Canadians could not keep pace with the Americans economically. As a result, Canada became a willing domain of Hollywood's "domestic box-office."[20] Sports suffered the same fate. By the middle of the 1920s, American baseball's World Series had become "Canada's greatest 'national' sporting event."[21] Furthermore, Canada's 'National' Hockey League had been transformed by American money. The first American franchise was granted to Boston in 1924 and by the time the 1926-27 season opened "Canada's game had been transformed into a continental commercial spectacle."[22] On the positive side, sports became an effective nationalizing tool during the 1920s as national championships were created in curling, skiing, golf, badminton, and basketball.[23] Culturally, Canada was becoming a more unified nation; simultaneously, Canada was becoming more Americanized. Thompson suggests that "sports illustrates the Canadian cultural conundrum

---

[20] Ibid. 176.

[21] Ibid. 187.

[22] Ibid. 187-189.

[23] Ibid. 190.

of the inter-war period. American peaceful penetration of Canada seemed to be proceeding at an unprecedented rate as Canadian children "bowed down to Babe Ruth" and professional hockey became continentalized."[24]

The process of a spreading national consciousness coupled with American infiltration is best illustrated by the radio industry. As Canada developed the communications hardware to link the country from coast to coast, American programming flooded the airwaves. During the First World War, radio played an important role in the victory. The breakthroughs used to perfect the new technology during wartime served to stimulate the growth of radio as a commercial industry during the 1920s. Initially, the regulation of radio in Canada fell to the Department of Marine and Fisheries which had controlled it during the war. After 1919, the radio industry operated in conjunction with such other businesses as the newspaper to deem the venture economically feasible. As the cost of operation and commercial revenue increased during the decade, however, radio quickly became a viable industry of its own.[25] By 1929, radio had become an important fixture in the daily lives of Canadians. In 1923 there were fewer than 10 000 sets, but by 1929 there were 297 000 licensed sets in Canada. While the construction of radio transmission hardware progressed, however, the production of original Canadian programming had taken the backseat. American

---

[24] Ibid. 190.

[25] Michael Nolan, "An Infant Industry: Canadian Private Radio, 1919-36", Canadian Historical Review, 70, (1989), 499, 501.

programming easily filled the void. Not only was it easily accessible but it was also of superior quality. By the end of the 1920s, an estimated 80% of programs listened to in Canada were of American origin. This trend would intensify in subsequent decades to become a prominent characteristic of the Canadian broadcasting system. The lag between content and hardware was largely due to the hesitation of private entrepreneurs and politicians, as the government oscillated between following the private commercial model of the United States or the public non-commercial model of Great Britain. Alarmed by these figures, however, the government finally appointed the Aird Commission in 1928, which concluded that broadcasting should be controlled by a national public monopoly. Unfortunately, this advice was precluded by the Depression and a compromise form of legislation was delayed until 1932.[26]

The Aird Commission is significant, not only because many of its recommendations were adopted by the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act in 1932, but also because it set the tone of debate between public and private broadcasters that would continue unabated for several decades. It also provided a model for future Royal Commissions. Although the Aird Report commended private enterprise "for its effort to provide entertainment for the benefit of the public with no direct return of revenue," the Report recognized the threat of Americanization and argued that broadcasting had a much

---

[26] Thompson, Decades of Discord, 180-183.

higher potential than mere entertainment.[27]

> At present time the majority of programs heard are from sources outside of Canada. It has been emphasized to us that the continued reception of these has a tendency to mould the minds of the young people in the home to ideals and opinions that are not Canadian. In a country of the vast geographical dimensions of Canada, broadcasting will undoubtedly become a great force in fostering a national spirit and interpreting national citizenship.[28]

To meet the requirements of nationalism, the Report concluded that "these interests can be adequately served only by some form of public ownership, operation and control behind which is the national power and prestige of the whole public of the Dominion of Canada."[29] From this early date, then, the idea that a national broadcasting system was essential to Canada's survival as a sovereign nation was firmly established in the public psyche. Furthermore, in subsequent government reports and commissions public broadcasting would continue to be associated with national unity while private broadcasting would consistently be linked to American entertainment.

Roger Bird makes an important point when he suggests that the composition of a Royal Commission lends itself to a public policy conclusion. He explains that "the Aird Commission had tended to hear from the organized intellectual, social or financial elite. By its very nature, a royal commission attracts the opinions of

---

[27] Report of the Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, printed in Roger Bird, ed., Documents of Canadian Broadcasting, (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1988), 43.

[28] Ibid. 43.

[29] Ibid. 44.

committed public spirits among citizens, corporations and clubs. Many not heard from by the commission were at home, happily listening to music and comedy shows on the US stations."[30] This observation could be applied to the Massey Report in 1951 as well.

The debate between public and private broadcasting gathered steam in the years preceding the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act of 1932. The interests of both sides were focused and organized with the creation of the Canadian Radio League (CRL) and the Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB). Formed in 1926, the CAB served to "advance the interests of the privately owned, commercial stations."[31] In 1930. Graham Spry and Alan Plaunt established the CRL "to lobby for a public network to serve broad, national, cultural purposes."[32] The CRL believed that a publicly-owned national broadcasting system would promote a Canadian identity and would protect this identity from American commercialism.[33] In the spring of 1931, the Canadian Forum magazine provided a public arena for a national debate between the two groups. In March 1931, J. M. Gibbon, a public relations manager for the CPR and a member of the CAB, published an article in the Forum entitled "Radio as a Fine

---

[30] Bird, ed., Documents, 57.

[31] Ibid. 57.

[32] Ibid. 57.

[33] Robert Fortner, "Signification and Legitimacy in Public Policy Debates: The Canadian Public and the Politics of Language in Canadian Broadcasting Development", Journal of Canadian Studies, 23, (Winter 1988-89), 102.

Art." He attacked the intellectual snobbery of the CRL by suggesting that when "anyone on this side of the Atlantic sets out to eliminate advertising from the air, he would deprive more than half of the population of what they want, so as to provide intellectual solace for few."[34] He further warned that "the danger of Government monopoly is the temptation it provides for political patronage."[35] To Graham Spry, who responded in the following issue, the debate was clear, and the solution simple: "shall the radio be subordinated to narrowly advertising purposes, or shall the Canadian people through their responsible instruments of government ensure that the fullest potentialities of this agency of communication be developed to serve the broadest Canadian purposes?"[36] Spry vehemently argued that radio broadcasting could be an effective nationalizing tool in Canada: "There is no agency of human communication which could so effectively unite Canadian to Canadian and realize the aspirations of Confederation, as radio broadcasting. It is the greatest Canadianizing instrument to our hands, and its cultural influence . . . is equally important."[37] Because of its potential power, Spry believed that radio was "too great, too valuable, too dangerous to be left in irresponsible

---

[34] J. M. Gibbon, "Radio as a Fine Art", Canadian Forum, March 1931, printed in Bird, ed., Documents, 60.

[35] Ibid. 61.

[36] Graham Spry, "The Canadian Broadcasting Issue", Canadian Forum, April 1931, printed in Bird, ed., Documents, 64.

[37] Ibid. 64.

hands and devoted to narrow purposes."[38] To Spry, the "irresponsible hands" belonged to the private broadcasters. Because of the closeness and power of the United States, Spry concluded with his famous ultimatum, "the State or the United States."[39]

The debate continued until 1932 when both sides won a partial victory. The Canadian government finally passed legislation creating the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (CRBC) in 1932. In the House of Commons in May of 1932, Prime Minister Bennett outlined three reasons why the House should support the Bill which would create the CRBC. Echoes of Spry permeate his speech. To begin with, he argued that

> this country must be assured of complete Canadian control of broadcasting from Canadian sources, free from foreign interference or influence. Without such control radio broadcasting can never become a great agency for the communication of matters of national concern and for the diffusion of national thought and ideals, and without such control it can never be the agency by which national consciousness may be fostered and sustained and national unity still further strengthened.

Secondly, he suggested that "no other scheme than that of public ownership can ensure to the people of this country, without regard to class or place, equal enjoyment of the benefits and pleasures of radio broadcasting." Lastly, he responded to Quebec's recent questioning of federal jurisdiction over broadcasting by arguing that "the use of the air . . . that lies over the soil or land of Canada is a natural resource over which we have complete

---

[38] Ibid. 64.

[39] Ibid. 65.

jurisdiction under recent decision of the privy council. . . . I cannot think any government would be warranted in leaving the air to private exploitation and not reserving it for development for the use of the people."[40] Essentially, Bennett continued the argument that a public system of broadcasting would reinforce and develop national unity and that it alone could provide an equality of distribution over a diverse geographical and socio-economic nation. If a private broadcasting system was adopted Canadians would not equally reap the benefits of radio. Because radio was perceived as a natural resource, every Canadian had a right to enjoy it. Bennett and his government believed that only a public system of broadcasting could fulfill these needs.

In hesitating to react immediately upon the recommendations of the Aird Report, Bennett's government enabled private broadcasters to establish a viable and extensive network of radio broadcasting before 1932. Although the CRBC did not attempt to replace the privately owned stations as the Aird Report had suggested, it was empowered to regulate all private stations. It had the power to grant or refuse licenses to private stations and it could force CRBC-produced programs onto the private networks in the name of

---

[40] Prime Minister Richard Bennett, Debates of the House of Commons, May 18, 1932, printed in Bird, ed., Documents, 112-113.

After the publication of the Aird Report, the Quebec government challenged federal jurisdiction over radio. The issue was brought before the Supreme Court on June 30, 1931. The Court ruled in favour of the federal government. The decision was appealed to the Privy Council of Great Britain, which also found in favour of the federal government.

national interest.[41] Michael Nolan suggests that although the CAB opposed the nationalization of radio, "it did not object to federal regulation nor did it oppose a government body operating a separate broadcasting service."[42] Therefore, with the creation of the CRBC, the private broadcasters were far from defeated. Despite the debate over public versus private broadcasting during the previous decade, Canada ended up with a mixed system of broadcasting based on compromise between public and private broadcasters. The Aird Report's recommendation of an exclusively public-owned broadcasting network was never implemented.

The CRBC was doomed from the beginning by a lack of funding and poor organization. The result was that private stations flourished and in 1936 the CRBC was reorganized into the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC).[43] The CBC was given more power to conduct its own affairs and it was provided with a more reliable source of funding. Now, radio license fees would go directly to the Corporation instead of being subjected first to parliamentary review. The new act also clarified the relationship between the CBC and the private stations. Bird suggests that this recognition was "another indication of how permanent a place (private stations) had achieved in the system."[44] The pattern of mixed broadcasting

---

[41] Bird, ed., Documents, 115.

[42] Nolan, "An Infant Industry", 503.

[43] Mary Vipond, The Mass Media in Canada, (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Publishers, 1989), 41.

[44] Bird, ed., Documents, 143.

in Canada was firmly established. Fortner argues that although the idea of state control during the 1930s was a worthy idea, it was doomed by a system of mixed broadcasting and by the public's preference for cheaper, imported American programs. He affirms;

> state control in pursuit of an ethical purpose was surely a noble idea in 1930s Canada. But the problem was that public taste had already been nurtured by the U. S. networks - Canadians would hear American programs regardless of what the government did - and governmental efforts to assert Canadian authority over the airwaves were hampered by this continuing presence, by its failure to follow the Aird Commission's requirement for complete nationalization and by its own post-1932 bid for audiences through the importing of American programs.[45]

Total state control over broadcasting in Canada was virtually impossible to achieve after 1932. Although it might have been possible a decade earlier, the government had waited too long to formulate and implement a decisive policy on Canadian broadcasting.

As World War II approached, Canadians were engulfed by American popular culture through Canada's mixed broadcasting system and through American periodicals and magazines. This tendency would increase with the introduction of television. Despite the alarmist tendencies of an elite minority, however, most Canadians were secure enough in their Canadianism to resist the urge to abandon the Union Jack for the Stars and Stripes. Thompson argues that most Canadians continued to believe that Canadian "British-derived" institutions were superior and that American society was

---

[45] Fortner, "Signification and Legitimacy", 102.

generally "immoral, violent and materialistic." Much of the American mass culture that made its way daily in to Canada served to enforce these negative stereotypes.[46] The sense of Canadian moral superiority over the United States was beginning to enter the public mind.

In addition to American mass culture, an indigenous culture began to flourish in Canada. Most of the advances were accomplished in the traditional realm of culture or "high" culture. The universities and amateur theatre and dance companies created a culture which was "richly-textured, diversified, and spontaneous".[47] Accompanied by the nationalization and Americanization of Canadian popular culture during the inter-war period, Canadian "high" culture was becoming more cosmopolitan as international influences were being felt and sought by the artistic community. Maria Tippett argues that Canadian artists, through their dependence on international organizations, prizes, scholarships, and publishing houses, were acknowledging that culture was not confined to national boundaries: Canadian artists were not only conceding the "sometimes inadequate character of English Canada's own cultural institutions and the sense of inferiority which made outside approval a condition of acceptance

---

[46] Thompson, Decades of Discord, 191.

[47] Maria Tippett, The Making of English-Canadian Culture, 1900-1939: External Influences, Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies Lecture Series, (Toronto: York University, 1988), 2.
Also see Maria Tippett, Making Culture. English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts before the Massey Commission, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).

at home. He or she was also demonstrating that the setting of standards, the exchanging of ideas, the winning of reputations, and even the earning of one's livelihood had become an international matter."[48] For various reasons, Canadian culture was not parochial and close-minded. According to Tippett, "it developed in ways that kept it from being provincial and narrow and able to do no more that meet the standards of a small and closed community. Moving onto the international stage at once fostered the growth of cultural activity in English Canada and gave it a quality and a finish it would not otherwise have had."[49] To its credit, Canadian culture did not ignore international influences even as it was experiencing an awakening national consciousness. This curious blend of national, American and international influences on the cultural community during the inter-war period contributed to its dynamic and intriguing nature. This was particularly characteristic of English-Canadian culture. After the Second World War, Canada's culture would continue to flourish under new circumstances as the government began to play a more concrete role in cultural affairs.

The founding of the CRBC and the CBC during the 1930s created important precedents for the future of Canadian cultural development. The Canadian government had taken the initiative in promoting the Canadian identity. This was a responsibility that could no longer be denied. It also solidified Canada's dependence

---

[48] Tippett, Making Culture, 136.

[49] Ibid. 141.

on communications technology in achieving this goal. More specifically, the introduction and prevalence of radio introduced the ongoing debate between popular and high culture. Nolan suggests that the debate between public and private broadcasting was closely connected to this controversy. Popular culture was associated with private broadcasting and high culture with public broadcasting. "Yet the radio debate did not revolve soley around the origins of Canadian broadcasting; . . . . Instead, what seems to have been at work here was an attempt on the part of cultural nationalists to distinguish sharply between high and low culture, and to delineate cultural uplift from mass entertainment."[50] This debate achieved prominence because radio technology introduced a form of mass culture "beyond the reach of cultural elites who hoped to control and shape it."[51] The problem was that although radio had the power to distribute "high culture," it was "compromised by a popular predilection for entertainment".[52] The Canadian Radio League's successful attempts to associate high culture with Canada and mass entertainment with the United States, led many to accept Spry's declaration that the future of broadcasting rested with "the State or the United States."[53] These sentiments culminated with the creation of the CRBC in 1932, but because a mixed system of broadcasting continued to thrive, the debate between high and

---

[50] Nolan, ""An Infant Industry", 517.

[51] Ibid. 518.

[52] Ibid. 518.

[53] Ibid. 518.

popular culture persevered. High and popular culture continued to be associated with Canadian/British and American culture respectively. The fears of cultural elites only intensified, as evidenced through the Massey Report, with the introduction of television and the continuing prevalence of the mass media. In fact, Jack Bumstead suggests that by the early 1950s most Canadians had accepted American domination over popular culture and therefore looked for the Canadian identity elsewhere.[54] The debate raged, however, in the immediate postwar period.

The experiences of the inter-war period paved the way for the cultural advances after 1945. The CRBC and the CBC perpetuated a system of mixed broadcasting and set a precedent of government intervention in cultural matters. American popular culture flooded Canadian outlets and it carved a significant niche for itself in Canada. Cultural producers sought international acceptance, patronage and guidance, thereby introducing a cosmopolitan element into Canadian "high" culture. The trends and accomplishments of the inter-war period would be intensified after 1945.

World War II triggered another watershed in cultural development. Canada emerged from the war wih a new international status in a world which had become increasingly interdependent as symbolized by the United Nations, NATO and GATT. Simultaneously, Canada became further tied to the United States. These trends were exacerbated by the Cold War and the necessity of defense. Closer

---

[54] Jack Bumsted, "Canada and American Culture in the 1950s", Bulletin of Canadian Studies, 3-4, (1979-80), 60.

economic and political ties between the world's democratic countries were reflected and facilitated by a continued revolution in communications technology which had profound effects on culture. Culture became more cosmopolitan and internationalized in the ensuing decades. The effects of this trend on Canadian culture were particularly dramatic and unique as Canadian culture was still in its adolescence. Canadian culture found that it must become internationalized before it had had the chance to be nationalized.

Post-1945 witnessed a massive emigration from rural areas to urban centres and an impressive expansion of the middle class. S. D. Clark discusses this process in "The Post Second World War Canadian Society". From a sociological perspective, he argues that the war stimulated a "transformation of the country's class stucture almost overnight."[55] This was accomplished by the creation of a large body of highly skilled labourers and soldiers to meet the demands of modern warfare. The demand did not subside in 1945, the result being a "great upward socio-economic movement of Canadian people" between 1945 and 1960.[56] The new affluence of Canadian society meant increased demand for higher education and more time for leisure activities. The general improvement in the level of education after the war definitely contributed to the

---

[55] S. D. Clark, "The Post Second World War Canadian Society", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 12, no. 1, (1975), 29.

[56] Ibid. 29.

cultural advances in the postwar period.[57]

Canadians during the 1945 - 1960 period, then, were better educated and more prosperous than they had previously been. Bothwell and his colleagues argue that the effects of this prosperity were most evident in the cultural sector.[58] The general assumption was that cultural enthusiasts were beginning with a "blank slate" in their efforts to stimulate cultural activity. Bothwell relates a story which illustrates the prevalent assumption concerning the state of Canadian culture.

> George Bernard Shaw refused to visit Canada lest he die of intellectual starvation in a land of primitive ruffians. Shaw's comments were an exaggerated reflection of a common view of Canadian development. Canada was a coarse-grained adolescent still clearing the land, lacking the leisure and taste for refinement.[59]

Canadians were eager to dispel this myth after the war. Post-World War II Canadians had a strong and confident sense of identity in themselves and in their country.[60] Through the development of Canadian culture, they hoped to reflect a positive and strong image to the rest of the world. The cultural activity of the post-World War II era is illustrated in the Massey Report, the founding of the Stratford Festival and the inaugeration of the Canada Council. Not only were private patrons and enthusiasts involved in the cultural

---

[57] Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond, John English, Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics, and Provincialism, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), 168.

[58] Ibid. 165.

[59] Ibid. 165.

[60] Wayne E. Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen. The Making of a Critic, (Toronto: Lester and Orpen Limited, 1977), 104.

outburst, but the Canadian government took an active and positive interest in determining the cultural pattern of our country, reinforcing an important precedent set during the 1930s.

The sense of enthusiasm for Canada's future and, in particular, Canadian culture was illustrated time and again in numerous volumes published throughout the 1950s celebrating the advances of Canadian culture. The general sentiment was that Canada was finally emerging from its cultural wasteland. In The Arts in Canada. A Stock-Taking at Mid-Century, the editor, Malcolm Ross, suggests that this is a "propitious moment for such a stock-taking. For Canadians are sufficiently concerned with the state of the arts to have called forth the Canada Council - a fact which surely does suggest a coming of age and at least the beginnings of wisdom." [61] He further postulates that this volume will attempt to "discover new patterns" to illuminate the "promising elements in our culture".[62] Such a mandate held the ultimate goal of isolating unique expressions of Canadianism.

Although postwar enthusiasm for Canadian culture was largely overstated, Canadians did have reason to believe that their country was experiencing a cultural renaissance. The accomplishments of the radio industry lent weight to this assumption. In the years immediately following the Second World War, Canada experienced what

---

[61] Malcolm Ross, ed., The Arts in Canada. A Stock-Taking at Mid-Century, (Canada: The MacMillan Company of Canada Limited, 1958), 2.

[62] Ibid. 2.

is now recognized as the "Golden Age of Radio."[63] By 1950, almost all Canadian homes had a radio and the CBC offered integrated and exciting programming which the public voraciously consumed.[64] The CBC was expected to educate and entertain the Canadian public while ingraining a sense of nationalism in its audience. Throughout the period under discussion, the CBC was strongly linked to the promotion and protection of the Canadian indentity.

---

[63] Vipond, The Mass Media in Canada, 41.

[64] Ibid. 39.

CHAPTER 2 THE PLAYERS

Andrew Allan, Mavor Moore and Nathan Cohen were three dynamic and interesting individuals who greatly contributed to the growth of Canadian culture in the post World War II era. In the ensuing chapters, their ideas, thoughts and responses to Canadian culture will be illustrated and appraised. First, it is important to discuss who these men were and why their opinions are important.

Andrew Allan was born in Arbroath, Scotland on August 11, 1907. The son of a Presbyterian minister, he spent his childhood with his parents and younger brother in Scotland, Australia and the United States. The Allans made one last move to Canada in time for Andrew's seventeenth birthday, and it was Canada that he eventually called home.[1] Within the spectre of his somewhat unsettled childhood, music and literature remained important mainstays of his upbringing. The importance of culture in enhancing the pleasure and satisfaction of daily living was consistently stressed by Allan's parents. At an early age, then, he was imbued with the assumption that culture was a necessity of life.

Although Allan did not come to Canada until his teenage years, he quickly developed an attachment to his adopted country. He recalls the following incident in A Self-Portrait which foreshadows

---

[1] For an interesting and amusing account of Allan's childhood see his posthumously published autobiography A Self-Portrait, (Toronto: Macmillan, 1974). The book also covers Allan's days with CBC radio and is full of insightful comments on the state of Canadian culture in the post World War II era. The following biographical information has been taken from the above work unless otherwise stated.

his eventual attachment to Canada. "When I was twelve years old in Boston, and had for some hours been engrossed in a book about Canada, I came in to announce to the family that, when I grew up, I was going to live in Canada."[2] Five years later, the family moved to Peterborough, Ontario. After twenty years in the country, Allan's sense of Canadianism was solidified in the winter of 1951/1952 when he travelled to England for an extended vacation: "An agony of homesickness came over me that winter. I realized, at last, that I was a Canadian. The venerable paths of England were very dear; but I longed for some wild land, for some trails to blaze."[3] Canada alone offered this opportunity. Allan affirmed his Canadianism in 1967 during a radio broadcast. "Not a Canadian by birth, I was born in the same country John A. Macdonald was born in. And I feel every bit as Canadian as he did - ."[4]

After he finished high school in Peterborough, Allan entered the University of Toronto. His years at the university were marked by his association with the undergraduate daily, the Varsity. He began as a reporter and was promoted to Drama Editor and finally to Editor. Unfortunately, he never completed his degree due to the vicissitudes of the Depression in 1929; he had to find a job. He began working full time as a reporter for the Peterborough Examiner where he had worked during his summer holidays.

When his family moved to Toronto in the early 1930s, Allan

---

[2] Ibid. 49.

[3] Ibid. 121.

[4] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, vol. 14, Assignment, June 30, 1967.

acted on a whim and auditioned as an announcer for CFRB radio. He was offered the position, and his career in radio began. It was here that he first began "throwing together" radio dramas at a time when the announcer had virtual control over every aspect of production. Growing restless after a few years, however, he left for England in 1938 where he became employed by several advertising agencies to produce commercial radio programs. He was quickly gaining invaluable experience in the art of radio drama production, a new and exciting field of artistic expression. His sojourn in England was interrupted by the outbreak of war in 1939. He and his father, who had been on a visit to Scotland, were returning to Canada aboard the Athenia when the ship came under enemy fire and sank. Allan was one of the few survivors; his father was not so fortunate. This episode remained a black spot in Allan's life and an enduring scar he bore the rest of his life.

Once back in Canada, Allan moved to Vancouver where he began to work for the CBC drama department. He regarded this stage of his career as his formative years full of excitement and inspired by mission:

> The first thing I found in Vancouver was a group of young actors who were chafing for a chance. But a kind of play completely unlike anything that was being done was obviously needed for them. The old habit of reading stage plays out loud was not good enough; and the audience was right to ignore them. We began writing our own plays. We began to encourage new writers. "Baker's Dozen" was the climax of this. And we found an audience that had been waiting for it.[5]

Allan further defined the enthusiasm triggered by the experiment of

---

[5] Allan, A Self-Portrait, 98.

radio drama production. "The work we were in was intoxicating. Every new show was an adventure. Despite the war and the draining away of our young men, the adventure went on."[6] The sense of excitement was created by the groundbreaking nature of the endeavour. Such new and young writers as Fletcher Markle, author of the "Baker's Dozen" series, and Lister Sinclair were receiving an unprecedented opportunity to create novel and experimental radio plays. The nature of the programs produced and the themes tackled will be dealt with in greater detail in the following chapter.

Throughout his career, Allan continued to encourage writers to experiment with new means of expression. To Allan, the writer was the central creative force in any production. This dedication was influenced perhaps by his association with Ira Dilworth, at this time head of the Pacific Region of the CBC: "it was under his influence that I discovered in radio the perfect stage for the Word. In the Vancouver years we were able to explore the possibilities of this in the kind of atmosphere both free and critical."[7] Allan continued; "(the CBC brass) could not understand the importance (Dilworth) placed on the creative act in broadcasting. They could not understand his love and his concern for those who performed the act. Without this, communication becomes maudlin and turgid. With it, communication becomes a glory."[8] After he left Vancouver, Allan continued to show his

---

[6] Ibid. 100.

[7] Ibid. 96.

[8] Ibid. 97.

respect for Dilworth by emulating many of the attributes he admired.

In the spring of 1943, Allan became restless again, travelling to Toronto and Ottawa. In the fall of 1943, his roamings were terminated when the CBC summoned him to Toronto to become the new Supervisor of Drama. He was given the mandate to "devise some new kind of radio drama series for Sunday nights."[9] The result was "Stage 44" which went on the air January 23, 1944. For twelve years, "Stage" was heard every Sunday night across Canada during the fall to spring season.[10] It was this series that made Allan's reputation as the premier radio drama producer in North America.

Over the next decade, "Stage" became an extremely popular program which contributed to the cultural development of the nation. The overwhelming success was due perhaps to a method Allan never failed to employ.

> My idea of being "definitive" (which I had been told we must be) was to give the 'writers' their head - to let them write what they wanted to write, and in the way they wanted to write it. The subtitle on the early "Stages" was a "report on the state of radio writing in Canada" - looking for writers of the "same ilk" as Fletcher Markle. In twelve seasons we found over seventy of them - all, I think, but two of them Canadian.[11]

As a result of his dedication to the author's word, keeping the

---

[9] Ibid. 100.

[10] The "Stage" series changed its name every year, adopting the year of production. "Stage 44", for example, was followed by "Stage 45" and so on. Throughout the literature, the series is often referred to as "Stages" or "Stage" or "Stage 51", for example.

[11] Ibid. 106-107.

series on the air was not always an easy task. Allan admitted that "it called for all the low cunning I possessed. One of the tricks was to follow an especially dangerous piece with something bland, to allow a cooling-off period."[12] He was not adverse to controversy, but his prime responsibility was to keep the series on the air to provide writers with an outlet they so desperately needed. This task became increasingly difficult as the series gained in popularity:

> popularity has its liabilities. Having more listeners means you are subject to more pressure-groups. This is inhibiting; you grow cautious. Every once in awhile, if you can summon the adrenalin, you must do something startling to remind yourself what you are really 'there' for.[13]

In 1947, the series shifted from half-hour slots to a one-hour format. This change allowed for further experimentation as adaptations as well as originals became mainstays on the program. Allan himself became a consistent contributor with the adaptation of classical plays and the creation of several original works.

"Stage" was soon recognized as an effective tool of Canadian nationalism. It attacked Canadians' sense of isolationism by uniting the country for at least one hour every week. In his biography of Nathan Cohen, Wayne Edmonstone recognized the importance of "Stage" to Canadian culture.

> During the war years, when the Dominion Drama Festival lay dormant, events occurred which were to have a more immediate effect on Canadian cultural life than the rather mandarin-oriented Festival was ever to achieve,

---

[12] Ibid. 108.

[13] Ibid. 111.

> and those events centred around the exposure of millions of Canadians to the relatively new medium of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporations's radio network - and the work of a young actor, writer, and director, Andrew Allan.[14]

He further suggested that "Stage" served a nationalizing purpose: "Allan's radio dramas reached into the most out-of-the-way and culture-starved areas of Canada from coast to coast; and his regular repertory company of actors who performed them became known nationally as distinctive voices, if not distinctive personalities in the Hollywood sense."[15] "Stage" not only linked the country but also promoted national expression through the creation of national celebrities.

In his autobiography, Allan indicated the significance of "Stage" to national aspirations. Travelling to Vancouver on the CPR in the early 1950s, he was fed up with keeping "Stage" on the air, and had begun a letter of resignation to CBC management. A girl beside him on the train recognized him and initiated the following conversation.

> You're the reason I'm here . . . . We live on a farm, away up north of Edmonton . . . . We're just plain people, I guess. We haven't got any books to speak of, or pictures, or music, or anything. But I have a little radio in my room. Every Sunday night I go up there to listen to your plays. All week I wait for that time. It's wonderful. It's a whole new world for me. I began to read books because of your plays - all kinds of books I never thought I'd be interested in. And now I'm on my way to Vancouver to stay with my aunt - and in the fall I'm starting at the university. And it's all because of you and your plays. What do you think of that?
>
> What I thought of that was too deep to be said. But what

---

[14] Wayne Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen. The Making of a Critic, (Toronto: Lester and Orpen Limited, 1977), 59.

[15] Ibid. 61.

> I did about it was to go to my compartment and tear up the draft of the letter. We had seven more years of "Stages" after that.[16]

In the post-world war II era, "Stage" played a strong role in the nationalization of Canadian culture by providing a unified cultural experience to metropolitan and remote areas alike.

To his colleagues, Allan was both a highly feared and a highly respected man. In Image in the Mind, Alice Frick recounts several anecdotes about the actors and actresses who worked for Allan. Frick was National Script Editor at the CBC during the period under discussion and an invaluable assistant to Allan. Aileen Seaton, a regular actress for the CBC during this time, recalled that

> he was very demanding. He was not cold, no, but he could be terrifying if you weren't working up to his standard, which automatically became your standard. . . . In radio one should never think of the thousands of listeners. One played to one ear, and the ear in the studio automatically became the ear of Andrew Allan, just through the glass. You always played with one eye on him to see how it was going. And you could get great waves of encouragement through that glass, which was very important.[17]

Another actress, Barbara Kelly, paints a more negative picture of Allan. The enormous respect his actors held for him and the power he exerted in the studio is still apparent.

> For all my admiration for this man, who was my introduction to radio, he ruined performing . . . on radio for me, because he would not accept one single error . . . I found him an unbelievably hard and nasty task-master . . . He would not allow me as a performer to contribute anything other than what the writer wanted to

---

[16] Allan, Self-Portrait, 116.

[17] N. Alice Frick, Image in the Mind. CBC Radio Drama 1944 to 1954, (Toronto: Canadian Stage & Arts Publications Ltd., 1987), 25.

> say, so I became . . . just a vehicle . . . just an instrument, a voice, through which the writer was interpreted . . . In that sense, he diminished me as an actor. But for writers he was absolutely invaluable. His real interest was with the English language and drama; that's what he really cared about . . . the conveying of ideas through drama. The script was sacred to him.[18]

She also attested to the importance Allan placed on the script, and his devotion to "the Word", as discussed previously.

An actor, John Bethune, remarked on Allan's enormous breadth of knowledge which he used to illuminate the social and political climate of a piece he was producing.

> He was well-versed in the classics, and it was incredible working for him. In the famous gatherings on Saturday mornings . . . Andrew would give a small lecture, particularly if we were doing a period or costume piece. And he would discuss costumes of the period, the various figures who were important, the politics of the day and what was going on. And by the time you got up to the microphone, to read this script you'd never seen before, you were already transferred back into that period,; you had all the back-ground. It was an immense asset to any actor.[19]

Finally, a teen-aged actress at the height of CBC radio drama fame, Toby Robins, described the sense of power Allan exerted in radio drama circles. He

> held your career in his hand. . . . And he wanted perfection. With that strain I was terrified. Andrew was god. Even now, whenever I go into a radio drama studio here, I see Andrew standing there. We used to focus on his face to see if he was pleased or wasn't pleased, when the scene finished. I still have that trembling feeling I had then.[20]

---

[18] Ibid. 29.

[19] Ibid. 23.

[20] Ibid. 30.

Allan was clearly a powerful man who exacted fear and admiration from his co-workers. In her biography of her father, Bronwyn Drainie corraborates these sentiments. She suggests that

> Andrew Allan was clearly a martinet and a tyrant. His methods terrified most of the actors and all of the actresses who worked for him. If he made a mistake in casting, he would never remove the miscast actor in mid-rehearsal, although the hapless performer probably longed for a reprieve. Instead he would continually interrupt the actor with ice-cold line readings and corrections that would reduce the victim to jelly and create waves of embarrassment among the other actors.[21]

Drainie admits, however, that Allan was also

> a brilliant director who enriched the life of every actor who worked for him. . . . His knowledge and enthusiasm for history and literature seemed boundless and each production of a classical play or adaptation would become a seminar on the entire cultural and political landscape that surrounded the work itself. With the new Canadian works, he had a sure feeling for honesty and authenticity and would brook no empty rhetoric or false sentimentality in the scripts he produced.[22]

Allan was a professional. He expected perfection and professionalism from his colleagues. He would not accept the second-rate or the mediocre in his radio productions. Herein lies his greatest contribution to Canadian drama. In a country which consistently downplays its cultural achievements and expects "the best" only in other countries, Allan demanded first-rate performances. He succeeded in creating a world-class troupe of Canadian actors and writers.

Two of Allan's prolific writers, Lister Sinclair and Len

---

[21] Bronwyn Drainie, Living the Part. John Drainie and the Cost of Canadian Stardom, (Toronto: Macmillan, 1988), 56.

[22] Ibid. 56-57.

Peterson, also commented on and respected the contribution Allan made to Canadian culture. In a 1950 article, Sinclair observed: "Canada stands in the world today at the very top of the difficult field of radio drama . . . . And this achievement is due to Andrew more than to any other single person."[23] Len Peterson noted: "No one else through his influence has made a greater contribution to Canadian culture than you."[24] Allan was clearly a highly respected individual who was recognized by his contemporaries for his contribution to Canadian culture.

Allan left "Stage" at the end of the 1955 season. His resignation was sadly observed. In a letter from Marjorie Leete, dated May 2, 1955, she related much of the sentiment spurred by Allan's impending departure. "I listened to your speech last night, with a lump in my throat. The Stage Series has meant so much to so many people I feel that you in it, have been responsible for sowing the seeds of appreciation for real standards in drama and those seeds have sprouted healthily - - even blossomed - - in so many directions."[25] But Allan had come to a point in his career where he believed he could no longer continue in the same capacity. "I had come - with many others - to a crossroad as implacabe as any that confronted Peer Gynt. As young men, we had entered a young

---

[23] Lister Sinclair, "Andrew Allan"' Canadian Forum, XXX, no. 352, (May, 1950), 35.

[24] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 2. to Andrew Allan from Len Peterson, May 22, 1951.

[25] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 2, to Andrew Allan from Marjorie Leete, May 2, 1955.

medium. It had seemed our lives were made for us. But suddenly the young medium had grown old. Television had descended."[26]

The introduction of television in Canada marked a turning point in Allan's life and precipitated the onset of his disillusionment. Although he dabbled in the production of "live" TV drama for a couple of years, he returned to radio working on a series of documentaries. Radio was his true medium. In fact, he found that television was hostile to his creative talent. "I had spent a dozen years learning the skills needed for radio drama, and I didn't feel I had that kind of time for television. Also, I found not being able to control script material vastly inhibiting. The style of a show is its body; the content is its soul."[27] In 1961, he returned to "Stage" and in October, 1962, he took early retirement from the CBC. It was at this time that his second marriage was also ending. Faced with two failed marriages and the disillusionment spawned by the overwhelming presence of television, he reached a low point in his life, finding consolation only in alcohol. He had become a "television casualty."[28]

Despite the upheaval in his personal life, Allan remained a highly sought celebrity in cultural circles. His correspondence during the late 1950s and the 1960s is filled with requests to deliver speeches and conduct workshops to cultural organizations. There are also numerous requests from aspiring actors for auditions

---

[26] Allan, A Self-Portrait, 124.

[27] Ibid. 130.

[28] Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen, 138.

and from writers to read their scripts. In November, 1962, he received a request to become an "Honorary Sponsor" for the newly formed Trent University in his "hometown" of Peterborough.[29] In December of the same year the Banff School of Fine Arts invited him to teach a course during the summer of 1963 in "playwriting, radio and television writing."[30] In the summer of 1963, he accepted a position as director of summer operations for the Shaw Festival; at the same time he became an Editorial Consultant for Drama and member of the Board of Directors for Performing Arts magazine.[31] Throughout this period he remained busy, though consistently plagued by financial troubles. His correspondence of this period is filled with requests for payment and the settling of outstanding accounts.

Only in 1967 was Allan able to break from the chains of despair and begin anew a rewarding life. He found his fulfillment by returning to CBC radio where he became a popular radio essayist on a variety of series. Jack Peach described Allan's transformation. "I don't mean to be too gushy, but . . . I think it's wonderful that you have brushed aside the bogeys that plagued you for so long and that you're back where you belong, behind the microphone . . . . I really do feel each of your Tuesday

---

[29] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 3, to Andrew Allan from the Director and Chairman of Honorary Sponsors Committee of Trent University, November 18, 1962.

[30] Ibid., to Andrew Allan from the Banff School of Fine Arts, December 10, 1962.

[31] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 3.

Assignments to be an absolute gem. It's such a joy to hear you at your finest, using our wonderful language the way only you do."[32] In the Assignment and Gerussi series, Allan created insightful, thought-provoking and satirical essays on current events and personal opinions. His most popular themes included the onslaught of technology, Canadian history, and the destruction of the English language. Allan continued in this capacity until his death on January 14, 1974.

Mavor Moore was born into a respected Torontonian family on March 8, 1919. He was the son of Dora Mavor Moore, actress and founder of the New Play Society of Toronto, and Francis John Moore. His grandfather was James Mavor, an important nineteenth century economist. Largely due to the efforts of his mother, Moore was exposed to the arts at an early age, and his life was devoted to the promotion of culture in Canada.

Throughout his professional life, his mother served as a powerful role model of cultural advancement. During the 1920s and 1930s, Dora Mavor Moore lectured and directed hundreds of plays at various churches and schools, including the Margaret Eaton School of Literature and Expression and the Univerity of Toronto's Department of Extension. In 1930 she directed the Hart House Touring Players and from 1938 to 1941 she directed her own company known as the "Village Players", which toured Shakespeare to the schools under the Board of Education. The Village Players became

---

[32] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 4, to Andrew Allan from Jack Peach, January 23, 1969.

the precursor of the New Play Society formed in 1946. Performing Shakespeare was her first love, producing twenty-two Shakespearean plays between 1931 and 1951. She also promoted indigenous talent, however, through the Village Players and later through the New Play Society.[33]

After Mavor Moore's graduation from the University of Toronto in 1941 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Philosophy and English, he embarked upon a diverse and exciting career as a producer, director, writer, poet and actor. His talents found expression in a variety of mediums; television, radio, the stage and print. From 1941 to 1942 he served as a CBC Feature Producer and from 1944 to 1945 worked for the CBC International Service. At this time, he also served in the Canadian Army Intelligence unit as a Captain. After the war, between 1946 and 1952, Moore worked with his mother and the New Play Society, producing and directing over fifty plays. The NPS produced and performed classic plays from every nation as well as original Canadian works written by novelists such as Morley Callaghan and Mazo de la Roche and by many of the playwrights producing material for CBC "Stage". During ten seasons, the NPS produced seventy-two plays of which fourty-seven were originals.[34] The New Play Society was considered an important element in the cultural nationalism of the post-war period. As Nathan Cohen observed, "word of mouth spread the message that here was something

---

[33] David Gardner, "Dora Mavor Moore (1888 - 1979)", Theatre History in Canada, 1, no. 1, (Spring 1980), 6.

[34] Ibid. 9.

special, a company with a mission and the will to carry it out . . . . There was passion in the NPS, an artistic focus, and elated rage for identity."[35] Moore was an important contributor to this excitement and mission. In 1948, the New Play Society scored a commercial success with "Spring Thaw," an annual satirical revue of Canadian life which "blissfully satirized the Canadian scene" for almost twenty-five years. "Spring Thaw", hastily slapped together when an adaptation of Hugh MacLennan's Two Solitudes was not ready on time, became an annual event in the cultural life of Canada.[36]

Throughout the 1950s, Moore remained a prolific contributor to the advancement of Canadian culture. He became the first director of CBC television from 1950 to 1954 and he was on the first Board of Governors of the Stratford Festival. He also remained a prolific contributor to Canadian periodicals. In 1957 he became the Art Editor of a new periodical, the Canadian Commentator. In 1959 he became drama critic and columnist for the Toronto Telegram. During an important period in Canadian cultural life, then, he remained at the forefront of cultural and artistic expression.

Nathan Cohen was born on April 16, 1923 in Sydney, Nova Scotia. His parents were Jewish immigrants who had come to Canada from Eastern Europe. His father, a grocer, was a learned man who eventually founded a synogogue in Sydney and then in Los Angeles. Cohen was raised in an atmosphere which stressed the importance of

---

[35] Nathan Cohen, "Theatre Today. English Canada", Tamarack Review, no.13, (Autumn 1959), 30.

[36] Gardner, "Dora Mavor Moore", 9.

education and culture.[37]

Cohen entered Mount Allison University in the liberal arts program in the fall of 1939. He quickly became an avid staff member of the student newspaper, the Argosy Weekly and by 1942 he was managing editor. Under his tutelage, the publication became more a "newspaper" than a collection of student anecdotes and upcoming events. Even as an undergraduate, Cohen was not afraid of controversy. He exercised his editorial opinion by blatantly attacking the federal government and the progress of the war. In one issue, he remarked that the Canadian government's approach to the war was "timid, stumbling and ineffectual, although always sincere".[38] He further suggested that "the three Canadian parties are singularly unfortunate in their leaders."[39] It was also at this time that he ventured into his first exercise in literary criticism. Writing about the poetry of Charles Bruce, a Mount Allison alumnus, he stated that "Canadian poetry is a nebulous thing. In some ways it is similar to a woman a friend once described to me. Beautiful, yes. Talented, he wasn't sure. But she thrived on uncomprising (sic) adoration . . . ."[40] He further suggested that "Canadian poets at one time scorned all critical

---

[37] Unless otherwise stated, all biographical information has been taken from Wayne E. Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen. The Making of a Critic, (Toronto: Lester and Orpen Limited, 1977).

[38] PAC, Nathan Cohen Papers, MG31 D27, Cohen, "Conscription For or Against", in Argosy Weekly, January 31, 1942.

[39] Ibid.

[40] PAC, Nathan Cohen Papers, MG31 D27, Cohen, "Charles Bruce - A Mount A Poet", in Argosy Weekly, December, 1941.

advice, and created a crippled maladjusted literature from which only Lampman escaped."[41] Apparently referring to the cultural boosterism of the 1920s associated with the Canadian Authors' Association, he would not make the same mistake throughout his career.

During his undergraduate years, Cohen was also a fervent member of the drama and debating clubs. In a profile of the Editor-In-Chief during his senior year, Cohen was recognized for his dramatic and oratorical accomplishments. He was described as an individual who "likes to talk, isn't overly modest, hates gossip columns, and thinks Hedy Lamarr is perfect."[42] Much of the foundation for Cohen's career in drama criticism was solidified at this time.

In his senior year, Christmas 1941, a fire erupted in the men's dormitory. It was a terrible tragedy with many fatalities. Cohen luckily escaped, but his health was affected for the rest of his life. Upon graduation from Mount Allison in 1942, he entered Osgoode Hall Law School in Toronto but due to poor health he returned to Nova Scotia. For the next several years, he dabbled in labour journalism working for the Glace Bay Gazette, a paper for the United Mine Workers of America. Edmonstone suggests that "labour journalism in particular must have appealed to Cohen as it gave him scope to exercise his still-developing social

---

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid. March 7, 1942.

conscience."[43] He further explains that Cohen left the paper in 1945 due to the fact that "the Gazette simply wasn't radical enough; for his growing distaste for political liberalism had been reinforced by his exposure to the left wing of the labour movement and he was rapidly moving towards Marxism."[44] Following his departure from the paper, Cohen briefly became a member of the Communist Party before leaving as a "disillusioned socialist." Between 1946 and 1948, he wrote for a variety of Jewish periodicals, including Wochenblatt, New Voice, and the Canadian Jewish Weekly. At this time he began to review "art" and he ultimately made the decision that this career was the path he would pursue.

It was during these early years that Cohen developed his distinctive writing style. According to Edmonstone, he continued to include an element of political criticism in his writing and consistently displayed a sympathy for socialism even after leaving the Communist Party. The second tenet of his style included an emphasis on the "big picture." Cohen did not only "review" plays; he wrote about the theatre in general; the conditions affecting theatre and the background in which plays were being written and produced. He further insisted on the national versus the local viewpoint but he rejected "spurious nationalism which concentrated on superficial Canadian characteristics of geography or nomenclature and insisted that a genuinely Canadian theatre would

---

[43] Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen, 26.

[44] Ibid. 27.

only be possible through the depth and quality of plays and productions."[45] Cohen refused to coddle Canadian culture; he exacted the same standards he would apply to a play from London or New York.

In June 1947, Cohen married Gloria Brontman and in 1948 he joined the CBC and began appearing on "Across the Footlights" and "CJBC Views the Shows." It was his exposure on the latter program that made his reputation, and he quickly became a household name in Toronto and eventually throughout the country. Edmonstone suggests that his popularity resulted from the fact that he was in the right place at the right time due to the cultural climate created by the CBC. "With CBC radio building a mass audience across the country, and in a manner which was highly conscious of its cultural mandate, the figure of the critic - as character, in the sense of a highly distinctive personality, was already a popular one in broadcast circles."[46] Cohen easily fulfilled this role.

During the early stage of his career, Cohen developed a definite sense of his role as critic. He felt that it was his responsibility to encourage the growth of a national theatre in Canada. In 1948, he wrote:

> Now a drama critic must do more than just examine play structure and performance . . . he must also search for subject values and explain to the audience what the author of a play wants to say and how well he has made his point.
>
> Here in Canada he has additional duties. The first is to encourage the embryonic legitimate theatre which

---

[45] Ibid. 101.

[46] Ibid. 160.

> has to fight against public apathy and amateur resentment. The second is even more important. We have no body of drama . . . indeed we have no drama whatsoever. That's natural enough. Ours is a young and culturally divided land without a dynamic and homogenous past.[47]

Although he never clearly stated the "second" task of the drama critic, one can infer from his ramblings that the second task was to encourage national unity while promoting the growth of a national theatre. Throughout his career, Cohen never lost sight of the role he had defined for himself. He continued to work for the creation of a unique Canadian theatre which he believed could have a unifying effect on the country. At the same time, he applied international standards to all creative works. While he promoted Canadian culture, he refused to protect it. With this single-minded goal, he adopted a somewhat abrasive and unforgiving style which would make him both feared and respected. In response to the suggestion that he could be too severe, he replied:

> I don't propose to play along with the barbarous custom of turning drama criticism into social page reportage. I want to see the little theatre movement with higher standards than have hitherto been shown. I think the way to get it is by discussing errors and weaknesses as well as the virtues, but not by magnifying the latter at the expense of the former.[48]

He was not a man to mince words. He exacted the same standards from amateur groups in Saskatoon as professional troupes from New York City. Although his technique could appear cruel, his ultimate goal was admirable.

---

[47] Cohen in Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen, 107.

[48] Ibid. 108.

Bronwyn Drainie suggests that Cohen's approach to dramatic criticism was inconsistent and contradictory.

> Cohen bogged down early in his career in this quagmire of Canadian identity: sometimes he insisted that Canadian theatre was part of world theatre and must be judged by tough international standards or none at all; at other times he berated Canadian authors for not drawing on their geographic and cultural roots in creating plays. He confused the issue even further by his politcal convictions.[49]

It is unclear, however, why an author could not draw on his geographic and cultural roots to produce a truly Canadian play and still be judged by international standards.

In 1950, Cohen founded his own shortlived magazine, The Critic, and he eventually began working in television for the CBC program "Fighting Words". Between 1956 and 1958 he held the position of Story Editor for the Department of Drama at the CBC and in 1959 he moved to the Toronto Star where he became drama critic and later, entertainment editor. It was during his foray at the Star that Cohen solidified his reputation as Canada's first national drama critic. Provided with a travel budget by the paper, he began travelling to review plays across Canada. He also travelled to the United States, Europe and the Far East reviewing international developments in the arts. During this time, he remained a prolific writer, contributing to such periodicals as Saturday Night, Queen's Quarterly, and the Canadian Forum.

Cohen's contribution to the growth of a national theatre was also recognized by his contemporaries. Andrew Allan broadcast an

---

[49] Drainie, Living the Part, 136.

essay on CBC radio to commemorate Cohen's death. He reinforced the suggestion that Cohen was Canada's first national drama critic.

> As a critic of theatre his voice was heard in all ten provinces - and his opinion was feared. His standards were exacting, and he applied them equally wherever he went . . . . He was the only Canadian critic whose presence was felt from coast to coast. He gave the Canadian theatre a sense of community; he made it a parish. He bore a high-priestly name, and he lived up to it.[50]

Len Peterson recalled negative feelings towards Cohen although he still recognized his contribution to dramatic criticism.

> Cohen had the kind of pomposity that culture people like so he was able to attract attention to what Canadian artists were doing. He definitely moved criticism a step up in this country, but he was often merciless and cruel in individual reviews. He was an intelligent guy, if only his goddam ego hadn't always got in the way.[51]

In his autobiography, Robert Fulford, who worked with Cohen at the Star, also paints an undesirable picture of Cohen. Fulford relates that Cohen was prone to gross exaggerations of the truth. He offers an explanation for this quirk in Cohen's personality.

> Nathan was not a liar, really; he was what the English used to call a romancer - he improved his stories, sometimes changing them beyond recognition. A poor shopkeeper's son from Cape Breton who had made his way to the head of a difficult profession, he was still unsatisfied, and given to dreaming of distant offers, tantalizing alternate futures. He told his friends, including me, what 'should' have happened to him, and I think that at the time of telling he believed every word.[52]

Fulford's opinion of Cohen the critic remained undiminished.

---

[50] Allan, Self-Portrait, 164.

[51] Quoted in Drainie, Living the Part, 157.

[52] Robert Fulford, The Best Seat in the House. Memoirs of a Lucky Man, (Toronto: Collins Publishers, 1988), 131.

"There was no question however, of his authority in the theatre - actors, directors, and producers bitterly resented his criticism, but recognized that he knew what he was talking about . . . . he became the first national theatre critic in Canadian history."[53] Cohen's professional reputation was undisputed.

In ailing health, Cohen continued to work until his death on March 26, 1971. Throughout his impressive career, he continued to work incessantly for the standards he had set for himself. But, as his career advanced he became increasingly disillusioned with the prospects of Canadian theatre and with the future of Canada. Although such occasions were rare, in 1967, for example, he could still invoke enthusiasm for Canada's future as a unified nation. In an eloquent statement of his own Canadianism, he continued to see hope for unity in Canada on the eve of its one hundredth birthday.

> I have always seen myself simply as a Canadian - and it has always bothered me that so few of us genuinely feel that way . . . and have regional rather than national loyalties. This regionalism has been a handicap to our evolution and unification in any true sense - and it is the essence of the Canadian structure. So it is only by finding ways and means to unite our regional and national loyalties that we can achieve a true nationhood. . . . Part of the solution is for those of us who are commentators, opinion makers, to be more forceful in our Canadianism, not to apologize for it, and to work unceasingly for good will among our various peoples and for the expression of genuine national feeling in our literary and performing arts. We have an exciting history. We need to see that history dramatized, and dramatized both colourfully and accurately. We need to have more imaginative awareness among our own artists of what's happening in the country now. We need acting and dancing and opera companies to play on a circuit that

---

[53] Ibid. 126.

> will expose them to people all the way from St. John's, Newfoundland to the Northwest Territories. We have lasted 100 years. That's encouraging. We can become a truly unified state with a voice the world will know and welcome. That's something to work for. In a demagogue's hands patriotism can be vulgarized and prostituted. But patriotism is one of the noblest emotions people can experience - and I hope in this second century we are entering every one of us will feel an upsurge of pride and exultation and deem it an honour and privilege to be Canadian. As indeed, and with all my heart - I do.[54]

Cohen believed that Canadian unity could be achieved through the promotion of a national culture. This is not to imply, however, that he advocated the promotion of a homogeneous culture. He continued to respect the diversity of Canadians as an integral part of our heritage. The promotion of Canadian culture was the consistent theme in a career that spanned three decades.

The ensuing discussion on the pattern of Canada's cultural existence from 1945 - 1960 will focus on the views of these three individuals. They were not distinguished cultural patrons or crafty politicians. Rather, they were three men who worked daily in the cultural industry, united by their belief that culture was important to Canada's survival as an independent nation. Although their opinions and methods for achieving their common goal frequently differed, they consistently argued that culture had the potential to unify a diverse nation.

---

[54] Quoted in Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen, 4.

CHAPTER 3 CBC RADIO AND THE CANADIAN IDENTITY

It is no coincidence that Allan, Cohen and Moore all worked for the CBC at some point in their careers. In the first three decades of the corporation's existence, it remained the seat of Canada's cultural life. In theatrical circles, there were always positions available for actors, writers, and directors, but if one wanted to earn a living at such endeavours, the CBC offered the only alternative. The following chapter will attempt to highlight the cultural significance of the CBC to post-world war II Canadians and further, to illustrate how and why the hopes for a Canadian identity were inextricably linked to the fortunes of the CBC. Cultural nationalists firmly believed that the CBC had the power to instill unity and a sense of identity in its audience.

To accomplish this task, this chapter will discuss the popularity and "glory days" of CBC radio while offering a content analysis of drama produced on CBC "Stage." It will further discuss the aspirations of those who believed that the radio alone could provide Canada with a national theatre. Finally, it will endeavour to offer a more in-depth analysis of the "Canadian identity" the CBC was attempting to emulate.

In 1932 and 1936, the CBC had been given the mandate to encourage national unity. Like the Canadian Pacific Railway, radio was expected to bind the nation together "to annihilate distance and bring people in isolated areas into the mainstream of cultural,

economic, and political life."[1] It was further expected to guard Canadian culture against American domination by instilling Canadian values through national programming.[2] From the beginning, then, the CBC shouldered a heavy burden, and this responsibility made it a vital and exciting centre of cultural development. In a letter to Andrew Allan from a co-worker, the sense of mission shared by CBC employees was pronounced: "Looking at your letter again, I see the words which describe what is missing . . . the Cause, the working together with friends for things that seem good, to feel a pattern emerge in all the work."[3] Alternately, this "Cause" contributed to the vitality and dynamism of CBC programming. The excitement was intensified in the general sense of optimism which emerged from Canada's participation in World War II and in the economic prosperity of the period. Mavor Moore reflected on this sentiment in 1959: "World War II brought with it a burgeoning awareness of nationhood and - more important - a recognition of the opportunity presented by our situation, in terms of both natural and human resources to contribute something new and different to

---

[1] Robert S. Fortner, "Signification and Legitimacy in Public Policy Debates: The Canadian Public and the Politics of Language in Canadian Broadcasting Development", Journal of Canadian Studies, 23, (Winter 1988-89), 94. This view is also found in Mary Vipond, The Mass Media in Canada, (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Publishers, 1989), 43; and Paul Rutherford, When Television Was Young: Primetime Canada 1952-1967, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 12.

[2] Michael Nolan, "An Infant Industry: Canadian Private Radio, 1919-1936", Canadian Historical Review, 70, (1989), 497. See also Rutherford, Primetime Canada, 18.

[3] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 2, letter to Andrew Allan from Alan, December 31, 1951.

the world's culture."[4] In the immediate postwar years, Canadians shared a vision of national maturity in the economic, international and cultural realms. Canada was ready to give of itself to the rest of the world. Culturally, the CBC led the way.

By the end of the 1950s the Corporation had lost its vitality due to the market conditions under which it was forced to operate and the spread of inexpensive, American popular culture. One of the problems was that although the 1929 Aird Commission had advised that the government completely take over Canadian broadcasting, the advice was never followed.[5] The result was the growth of both public and private broadcasting in Canada. As a public corporation, the CBC was subjected to the whim of politicians for funding. Such uncertainty was not conducive to creativity and innovation. Further, the amount of money appropriated by Parliament to the CBC was never enough to meet expenses, and so, the Corporation was forced to compete with the private sector for advertising revenue. As early as 1957, Moore commented on the fate of the CBC: "Parliament has already made the same mistake in regard to the CBC, wherein the production of programs (surely its main function) is now seriously hamstrung by fatuous internal regulations. Efficiency has been bought at the cost of initiative - so that if the Corporation is to die off, it may do so in the

---

[4] Mavor Moore, "Theatre: Some Backsliding", Saturday Night, 74, no. 18, (August 29, 1959).

[5] Mary Vipond, The Mass Media in Canada, (Toronto; James Lorimer, 1989), 40.

best of health."[6] Public broadcasters found themselves competing with imported American programs which were "geared to the presumed mass taste."[7] Competition was fierce as American programs remained highly popular throughout the 1950s. The result was the gradual disintegration of experimentation and originality in the area of high-brow programming.

Despite the financial uncertainty and competition from private stations that imported cheaper and popular American programs, radio became the most popular of all mass media in the years immediately following World War II. During a ten-year period, the CBC produced first-rate dramatic productions that spoke to Canadians as Canadians. CBC radio filled a void for those who were searching for a Canadian voice. By literally linking the country from coast to coast and by sensitively addressing many of the social problems Canadians confronted, CBC radio served as a focal point for cultural nationalists. More than that, though, ordinary Canadians tuned in to CBC radio because it offered good, entertaining, and informative programming. Subsequently, the early 1950s became recognized as the "golden age" of radio, particularly for the CBC.[8] Looking back from the vantage point of 1969, Gus Kristjanson reflected; "I think to many of us the era of the early Sunday Night Stages still ranks as the golden days of CBC Broadcasting. At the

---

[6] Mavor Moore, "What Will the Council Counsel?" Canadian Commentator, 1, no. 1, (January, 1957), 8.

[7] Rutherford, Primetime Canada, 13.

[8] Ibid. 12.

time we thought it was because it perhaps heralded a new era or something. One wonders now if it represented really the final flowering of an old era."[9] Radio's glory days inevitably ceded to the onslaught of television and the beginning of a new era in mass communications.

At this point it is important to examine a variety of the radio plays which were broadcast on CBC "Stage." The intent of this section is to explain why "Stage" was so popular in the post-World War II era. Further, by focusing on the content of the plays, this section will illustrate the "Canadian voice" and values that cultural nationalists perceived as the answer to Canadian unity. Six plays which chronologically span the series have been chosen for discussion; they are among the more popular and memorable productions by frequent contributors to the CBC, and all were produced by Andrew Allan.

Written and produced in 1942, Allan's own "All the Bright Company" explores the struggle between nature and civilization and, topically, the impact of war on society. Written from the perspective of 1942, the play recalls an event from the summer of 1914 at Manitou Point in Northern Ontario where several Torontonians have escaped the city's heat. Allan is quick to show his sympathy with nature rather than the city lights of man's "civilization," Manitou Point being the antithesis of Toronto. Charlie declares: "I'm a big man up here. I don't want to

---

[9] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 4, letter from Gus Kristjanson to Andrew Allan, February 4, 1969.

remember I'm just a cog in the machine down in Toronto."[10] Toronto represents technology, reason and routine, and the wilderness of Manitou Point is illogical and spiritual. Only in the wilderness could one believe in the Algonquin Legend of the Manitou. It was rumoured that thunder could awake the spirit of the Manitou who had the power to take many shapes and usually appeared as a "fearsome beast."[11]

The story gathers momentum as an impending storm approaches. At the height of the storm, Jack is awakened to an eerie vision which lights up the raging sky. "I was caught up, and saw the armies of destruction ride across the clouds at midnight on the storm."[12] At this point, it is revealed that the storm and Jack's vision occurred on August 4, 1914, the eve of World War I. Jack continues to envision his destiny. "I felt like a man caught in a pitiless current. I felt as if every action I should make had been ordained for me . . . that only my soul was my own."[13] Through Jack's vision, Allan suggests that war is destined to happen, and although it is brutal and self-defeating, it can be survived if one embraces a spiritual existence. In the preface to the play, Howard Fink concurs: "The play expresses the dilemna of war: it appears

---

[10] Andrew Allan, "All the Bright Company", in Howard Fink and John Jackson, eds., All the Bright Company. Radio Drama Produced by Andrew Allan, (Toronto: CBC Enterprises, & Kingston: Quarry Press, 1987), 7.

[11] Ibid. 8.

[12] Ibid. 14.

[13] Ibid. 16.

as destiny, it offers greatness; but it maims and kills; can it be avoided? Allan answers, perhaps not - but it can be dealt with and survived if life is built around spirituality, imagination, and nature."[14] Although Jack is killed in the Great War, his widow Sylvia, whom he met at Manitou Point on the morning following the storm, continues to visit Manitou Point every summer. She and their son survive. Jack and Sylvia represent the values associated with nature; spirituality, imagination and faith. George, who represents city values, also narrates the play. He suggests in reference to the storm that "perhaps it's necessary. Perhaps it's nature's way of making a necessary adjustment. Perhaps human beings have to go through the fire and storm every so often, to burn away the dross. To bring us back to sanity - to realize what are the important things after all - what is noble and brave."[15] Allan suggests that the same may apply to war. Nature, for Allan, is still more powerful than man as well as the civilization and war he has created.

"All the Bright Company" provides valuable insight into Allan's own character. He was not adept at masking his own views and opinions. The play, a vehicle of his own beliefs, affirms his preoccupation with the First World War as a major turning point in modern history. In the play, George states that 1914 "was the end of the old world".[16] Allan himself believed that pre-1914

---

[14] Ibid. 4.

[15] Ibid. 13.

[16] Ibid. 16.

Victorian and Edwardian periods constituted a gentler and kinder time to which he felt more akin than to his own generation. The play also affirms Allan's mistrust of modern technology as a force of good and his own disdain of materialism. Technology was associated with war, death, and suffering, and materialism was an inevitable product of technology. And yet, although the play was written at the lowest point of the Second World War, there remains an element of hope in Allan's play. Except for Jack, Allan's characters survive, and life goes on.

While Allan headed the CBC Drama Department in Vancouver, the success of the "Baker's Dozen," a thirteen-part series of original works by Fletcher Markle, solidified both Markle's and his own career. Howard Fink comments on the importance of the series. "What Markle provided for Allan was an imaginative new form of script, once and for all free of the limiting requirements of visual drama, and taking full advantage of the sound medium to recreate the tension and excitement of good theatre."[17] Several young writers were beginning to write plays especially suited for the medium of radio; this formula proved more successful than reading stage plays over the air.

"Brainstorm Between Opening and Closing Announcements," broadcast in October, 1942, one of the plays in the Baker's Dozen series, imitated and satirized the process of radio broadcasting. Identified as surrealist by Markle himself, who opens the play by

---

[17] Howard Fink, preface to Fletcher Markle, "Brainstorm Between Opening and Closing Announcements", in Fink and Jackson, eds., All the Bright Company, 21.

explaining the parameters of surrealism, the play conforms to his definition by flitting illogically from image to image. The action begins when the radio is turned off and the listener enters a dream-like state characterized by the rapid succession of symbols epitomizing the commercialism of radio such as the cash register, contestants and a parrot who is the Quiz Master of a game show. The Surrealist, who, in effect, narrates the dream, observes; "then you saw the audience, pouring out of the open drawer. Squinting, you could see each one of them was clutching a momento of the occasion - a little clay effigy of the sponsor."[18] The sponsor attained god-like stature.

Suddenly the dial of the radio begins to turn, as the listener hears bits of monologues from a literary critic, cooking expert, exercise instructor, and laughter before the radio is abruptly turned off.

The dream-like sequence then turns to the creation of the newscaster, a primary element of the radio airwaves.

> To the first voice, you knew it was only necessary to add a dash of quibble, a hint of choplogic, a soupcon of circumlocution and you would have your commentator, sublimating the news with the views. You knew he would come, that the clever aerial artist, walking the tightwire of probabilities with an umbrella of facts, balancing on one foot while he tries to keep the other out of his mouth. You knew he would come, someone eager to pick up your mind to be pressed. And he did.[19]

The dream-play ends in outer space, high above the earth, which has been consumed in a ball of fire. "The great, fat, wingless

---

[18] Ibid. 28.

[19] Ibid. 37.

moth of earth battered on below you. But you could see on its body ugly red patches of mange. They spread too quickly for mange, you noticed, and must be fire. The moth was on fire, you saw flaunting the Sun. What's the Sun got that it hasn't got, you asked yourself, given time and mad, mad people?"[20] The earth had gone too far by tempting the Sun and not accepting its own limitations.

> You were alone now. All alone. Radio is unseen. But you had seen it. You had heard its idiot-tale, with its sound and fury, and now it was heard no more. You were not asleep. You were not awake. You were tired, bored, and unhappy. Automatically, you reached over and turned your radio back on again.[21]

Ironically, with all the arrogance only humans can muster, the listener chooses to learn nothing from his "brainstorm." The mindlessness of radio is confirmed.

While Markle's play mimics the process of radio broadcasting by portraying fleeting images and snatches of a distorted reality, it also satirizes the medium and criticizes its shortcomings as a commercial and superficial form of entertainment. Yet, the play elevates the medium through its experimental and straightforward analysis of an important cultural force in modern society. After the "Baker's Dozen", radio drama in Canada would never be the same; the series set a new standard. The standard rejected sentimentality, predictability, and the status quo, embraced innovation and realism, and advocated straightforward examinations of modern society while retaining all the elements of good theatre:

---

[20] Ibid. 37.

[21] Ibid. 38.

excitement, suspense, and tension. Many of the plays which followed on CBC "Stage" fit the formula and remain important elements of Canada's literary heritage.

One of the most controversial plays produced by Allan for CBC "Stage" was "Hilda Morgan" by Lister Sinclair. Broadcast in May, 1949, the play sensitively deals with illegitimacy. The play particularly challenges contemporary morality by presenting the issue in less than black and white terms. The issue of illegitimacy outraged many listeners who wrote angry letters to the CBC, members of parliament, and the Prime Minister.[22] Howard Fink suggests, however, that there was another body of listeners who increasingly during the post-World War II period sympathized with Hilda Morgan. He argues: "a secular humanism had penetrated the minds of the middle class following World War II. It was expressed in the push toward the welfare state, Canadian participation in international organizations, and a growing openness and honesty in interpersonal relations. These values opposed the rigidity of Victorian morality and it is this conflict which is at the centre of "Hilda Morgan"."[23] Not only does "Hilda Morgan" address the issue of illegitimacy, but it also deals with the larger issue of the disintegration of one set of moral values and the beginning of a new moral order and the conflict created when these two visions coincide.

The central character of the story is, of course, Hilda

---

[22] Fink and Jackson, eds., All the Bright Company, 69.

[23] Ibid. 69.

Morgan. When Hilda discovers she is pregnant, she immediately informs the child's father, David Temple. Hilda is a school teacher and David works in his father's business. Both are educated, mature and planned to marry before they learned of the pregnancy. The complication occurs when David is killed in a car accident on his way to Hilda's home where they were planning to tell her mother of their immediate marriage plans.

After the funeral, Hilda tells her family of her pregnancy. Her sister Ruth argues that Hilda must have an abortion to avoid scandal. Her mother advocates two possible solutions: Hilda should either be packed off to have the baby and then give it up for adoption, or quickly find herself another husband; the obnoxious salesman Wally conveniently represents the final solution. Hilda chooses her own path, leaving to live with David's parents and have the child.

Sinclair effectively illuminates the hypocrisy of a society which condones a double standard between men and women: it is socially acceptable for men to play the field while women are divided into two categories, those you fool around with and those you marry. Wally declares early in the story that "there is one thing I'm certainly sure of, all right, I'd venture to say that I pretty well know the girlies. Practice makes perfect."[24] He later admits, "course I'm married now to a real sweet little girl, and what she doesn't know won't hurt her, I mean about the others.

---

[24] Lister Sinclair, "Hilda Morgan", in Fink and Jackson, eds., All the Bright Company, 72.

Like I say, there's the ones to settle down with, and the ones to settle up with. But you never know which is which till its too late. If then."[25] While it was socially acceptable for men to "play the field" before marriage, women who did so were scorned.

Ruth's reaction to her sister's pregnancy represents the ugliness of putting a concern for reputation above human kindness. Ruth's only concern is how a family "scandal" will affect her husband's career at the bank. She offers her savings to Hilda to cover the expense of an abortion, not to help Hilda, but to help herself.

Mrs. Morgan's response to her daughther's predicament is similarly hypocritical. A professed Christian woman, Mrs. Morgan cannot find it in her heart to forgive her daughter and give her the love and support she needs. Her concern is not with Hilda but with "what the neighbours will think" and who will support her when Hilda can no longer work.

Hilda cuts through her family's false pretensions and concerns by declaring:

> everybody else thinks of duty and morality and neighbours, until the human beings are covered up with noble abstractions. And when the human beings are covered up, people can be as cruel and thoughtless as they like without hurting their consciences. Well, I can't help them; I can't play fair. I can only think of the people: David, and Mrs. Temple, and me, and the baby.[26]

In the emerging moral order, human kindness and compassion override

---

[25] Ibid. 101.

[26] Ibid. 100-101.

duty and reputation. The consequence of the clash between the two visions is the disintegration of the Morgan family and the subsequent effects on the unborn child who will perhaps be deprived of the love and care of Hilda's family.

Although the play ends on an unfortunate note, the listener is left with a sense of hope because Hilda chooses her own future; she refuses to be coerced into accepting someone else's will. Therefore, the play ends by hinting at a new role for women in society. Hilda triumphantly declares: "don't be mislead Wally. Women are as hard as rocks; that's why they find it so difficult to live together. We're only the weaker sex when it comes to weight-lifting."[27] The listener does not feel sorry for Hilda, she is a strong woman, who will continue to have a satisfying and productive life while providing a stable home for her child.

Another controversial play in the history of "Stage" was "A Man With A Bucket of Ashes" by Len Peterson. Broadcast in 1952 at the height of the Cold War, the play addresses the loss of faith in God, and society's alienation from Christian principles. The action takes place at a logging camp on the west coast in the midst of an impending flood. The central character, David Clough, a tired, unfulfilled, old man, travels from one job to the next with his second family, his bitter old wife Edna and their five-year-old son Michael, who is the only bright spot in Clough's dissatisfied life. After the death of his first family in a fire, much of his life has been consumed by his quest to discover God's will. "I lost my

---

[27] Ibid. 101.

whole family in one night. We was livin' in a shack. I came home from work: the bedsteads and the stove all that was left. Tess and three of the youngsters burned to . . . . Second oldest girl got out, but she died later. . . . The only way it made sense, the fire: God was testin' me."[28]

Exhausted from sleepless nights working on the dike to prevent a flood, Clough enters a somewhat delirious state: he babbles that if anything happened to Michael, he would not believe in God. In a horrifying display of foreshadowing, Clough suggests: "if God, the god we've made terrible again, demanded you, I'd stand up to him, put you behind me and defy him. Even if he said, "I'll not destroy Baldock if Dave Clough will give up his son", I'd say, "No"."[29] With this declaration he falls into a troubled sleep where he is visited by a dream. When he awakes, he says to Michael, "don't know what we're 'posed to do, but we gotta go's far's we can up along the river to a rock - salvation . . . !"[30] The tension builds when he returns without Michael.

Clough's state of delirium intensifies. Finally, he reveals Michael's whereabouts. His revelation depicts a merciless God.

> God said, "Dave Clough, take your son and lift him up on this white rock." I did. And God said, "You are fond of the boy?" And I said, "Yes, Lord, I love him above everything." "Above your God?" I was afraid then. . . .
> God said, "Lay the boy down, Dave Clough." I didn't

---

[28] Len Peterson, "A Man With A Bucket of Ashes", in Fink and Jackson eds., All the Bright Company, 146.

[29] Ibid. 148.

[30] Ibid. 149.

> budge. "Do you fear God, Dave Clough?" "I do, Lord God." "Then lay the boy down, so I can be a living god again." "Will this save Baldock from the flood, Lord God?" "Lay the boy down, Dave Clough." God was all around. I took hold of Michael and laid him on the rock, and he said, "Offer him up, " and the chisel was in my hand. I flung it out into the river, but it hit a branch and bounced back on the rock beside me. God said, "Dave Clough, you must sacrifice your son if I'm to be a god among men!" I picked up the chisel, and Michael shouted, "Daddy, Daddy!" and I killed him.[31]

Unlike the biblical parallel of Abraham, Clough tried to resist God's will; therefore, God did not spare Michael as he had saved Isaac and his father Abraham from a similar fate. There is no hope in Peterson's updated version of this biblical story. The brutal and terrifying image of a father killing his young, defenceless son no doubt shocked the audience. This shock and remorse intensify in the closing scenes of the play, for although the water begins to recede, Peterson still offers no hope or redemption. The only purpose Clough can determine is that he serves as a warning from God. "I am a warning from him, to remind you, all of you, that he is a living and terrible god."[32] There is no hope. Clough continues; "I tell ya, I'm more horrified than any of you. Oh, my son, Michael! I don't feel saved, I don't feel blessed, only a great emptiness and weight. But there must be a meaning. Why did God - ? I been tussling with it all this - it just gets heavier - thicker - a fog I can't grab hold of anything in."[33] At this point in the play, it is revealed that on the night his first family was

---

[31] Ibid. 152.

[32] Ibid. 158.

[33] Ibid. 160.

killed in the fire, Clough had left a bucket of ashes on the back stoop. It is suggested that he has carried the guilt around with him all these years as symbolized through the bucket of ashes. After the intervening years, Clough cannot make sense of his family's death any more than he can make sense of Michael's.

The question of the meaning of death and sacrifice which Clough has been struggling with is broadened in the closing segments of the play. A fellow-logger Balla, believes that the killing he witnessed in the Second World War was no worse than Clough killing his son. When Balla suggests that "maybe your god's dead," Clough replies, "No. But so far away . . . . We're on our own. Alone. And the way of God is - is . . . ."[34] With this closing remark, Clough throws himself into the river.

"Man With a Bucket of Ashes" was a controversial and gripping play which explores the loss of faith in a society which has been ravaged by war. Peterson's straightforward analysis of society's alienation from God no doubt disturbed a large portion of the audience, but it also invited them to come to terms with a recurring trend of their time.

One of the most successful adaptations on CBC "Stage" was "Mr. Arcularis", originally written by Conrad Aiken and adapted by Gerald Noxon. "Mr. Arcularis" was rebroadcast for "Stage 53" to mark the series' ninth anniversary and the beginning of the tenth year of production. Noxon wrote the play at Aiken's home in the summer of 1948, and Howard Fink observes that his adaptation "is

---

[34] Ibid. 168.

the most satisfying of the three dramatizations: the most dramatic, and the most faithful of all to the spirit and substance of Aiken's original story."[35]

The play is a fascinating examination of the journey towards death. The action opens in a student medical laboratory where the doctor/professor is performing a delicate and risky operation on Arcularis. The action shifts to an ocean liner where Arcularis is found to be taking a voyage to recuperate from his operation. On the first day of the voyage, he meets a young woman, Clarice, who reminds him of his mother. She remains his companion throughout the journey. The First Steward reveals that there is a corpse aboard bound for Ireland and the Second Steward discovers that he has lost his keys. Arcularis begins to complain incessantly of the cold. The stage is set.

During the night, Arcularis starts to have horrible nightmares and bouts of sleep-walking. He constantly wakes up standing outside his stateroom door. The dreams are characterized by ice, frost, and bitter cold. When he tells the ship's doctor of his recurring ordeal, the doctor suggests that he must be worried about something. Another passenger on the ship, Reverend Mordant, suggests that he is feeling guilty.

On the third night, Clarice observes Arcularis as he sleep-walks. She later informs him that he dropped a bunch of keys and the Captain discovers that someone has been entering the pantries

---

[35] Fink and Jackson, eds., All the Bright Company, 206.

and staterooms nightly.[36] Arcularis continues to complain of the cold. The tension increases.

At dinner the following evening, Arcularis is annoyed at the tune he keeps hearing, "Cavalleria Rusticana." He tells Clarice that the melody reminds him of his mother, who had an affair with his uncle. The young Arcularis had discovered their secret and spied on them. "My mother's face with love in her eyes, the scene in the garden, the tune . . . they've haunted my all my life."[37] Clarice responds , "but you're not to blame. Don't you see it's simply because you loved her."[38] Perhaps this childhood incident constitutes the sense of guilt identified by Mordant as the cause of his sleep-walking.

Arcularis has the dream again. "It was the same . . . the same dream of going round a star, Polaris. Betelgeuse. The same terrible coldness and helplessness. And that awful whistling curve."[39] When he awoke, "I was at the bottom of the stairway that leads down from the pantries to the hold, past the refrigerating plant. It was dark and I was crawling on my hands and knees . . . crawling on my hands and knees . . . . I know. And so do you. Once more and I'll be looking down into it. And then I will see .

---

[36] Gerald Noxon, "Mr. Arcularis", in Fink and Jackson, eds., All the Bright Company, 223-224.

[37] Ibid. 226.

[38] Ibid. 226.

[39] Ibid. 228.

. . myself."[40] The Second Steward, who had followed Arcularis on his sleep-walking expedition, adds that he found Arcularis beating on the coffin with his fists.[41]

On the following day, the Captain approaches Arcularis about the lost keys and he is irrationally defensive: "You think it was my fault. You think my spying drove them to it. You think I was to blame for what happened."[42] Once he recovers from his delusion, he explains to the Captain the death of his mother and uncle. As a boy, he had blamed himself for their deaths, and carried the guilt with him throughout his life.

On the final evening of the voyage, as he and Clarice are dining, Arcularis take us into the dream.

> The same as before . . . just the same . . . the long, magnificent delirious swoop of dizziness . . . the Great Circle . . . the swift pathway to Arcturus. All as before but now infinitely more rapid. Never have I had such speed . . . . Forward into the untrodden. Courage old man. In no time, we'll be back to Clarice, back to Mother. If only I don't wake . . . if only I needn't wake . . . if only I don't wake in that . . . in that . . . time and space . . . somewhere or nowhere . . . cold and dark . . . that music sobbing among the palms; if a lonely . . . if only . . . the coffers of the poor . . . not coffers, not coffers, but light delight, supreme white and brightness, and above all whirling lightness, whirling lightness above all . . . and freezing . . . freezing . . . freezing . . . "[43]

The scene abruptly shifts back to the medical laboratory where the patient is pronounced dead. Arcularis had never left the operating

---

[40] Ibid. 228.

[41] Ibid. 229.

[42] Ibid. 230.

[43] Ibid. 232.

table. The journey had all been a dream; the fleeting and final dream of a dying man. One of the students ironically observes, "What do you mean, poor devil? We've all got it coming to us, haven't we? He was lucky. He died under anaesthetic. He didn't feel a thing."[44] The other student responds, "Didn't he? I wonder."[45] And, of course, the listener knows what Arcularis had experienced in the moments before death.

It is only after the play that the audience can grasp its full significance. The listener had been privy to the dying thoughts of a human being. In the space of minutes or even seconds, Arcularis had faced the demons that haunted him throughout his lifetime. Noxon suggests through the atmosphere of gaiety and celebration in the final scene, however, that Arcularis had come to terms with his ghosts and died at peace with himself.

The final play to be examined was also the most notorious in the history of CBC "Stage". "The Investigator" by Reuben Ship satirizes the American communist witch hunt led by Senator Joseph McCarthy in the early 1950s. When it was broadcast in 1954 to mark the final broadcast of the season, the McCarthy hearings had been prominently broadcast on television. Not only McCarthy's name, but his voice and interrogation techniques had become household knowledge. The timing for Ship's play could not have been more perfect. When John Drainie took to the mike as the unnamed "Investigator," there was no mistaking who he was.

---

[44] Ibid. 232.

[45] Ibid. 232.

Fink reveals that Reuben Ship was a casualty of McCarthy's witch hunt. Although a Canadian, Ship had established a successful writing career in the United States until he came under suspicion of McCarthy's committee. No longer able to find work, he returned to Canada. "The Investigator" represented a "just literary revenge, a prime example of the power of satire to comment on forbidden subjects."[46] Fink also suggests that the CBC's broadcast of "The Investigator" affirmed Canada's artistic freedom. "That such a program was even possible in Canada attests to the relative freedom Allan enjoyed in expressing sometimes - unpopular opinions on current issues."[47] The conservatism of the 1950s was stronger in the United States, and Canada remained a comparative oasis of artistic freedom.

"The Investigator" also takes the form of a dream. The action begins when the Investigator is in a fatal plane crash. He finds himself "Up Here" where he is given a number at the Main Gate and must complete an application for permanent entry. He is informed that he must first be investigated by the "Permanent Investigating Committeee on Permanent Entry". If he is rejected, he would be deported to "Down There."[48] Characteristically, the Investigator refuses to be investigated by a committee which "for all I know,

---

[46] Fink and Jackson, eds., All the Bright Company, 238.

[47] Ibid. 238.

[48] Reuben Ship, "The Investigator", in Fink and Jackson, eds., All the Bright Company, 244.

may be completely unqualified to pass judgement on me."[49] He demands a list of tribunal members and alternates so he may approve or disapprove. He further informs the Gatekeeper that "your refusal to even consider it might be construed wrongly, and might lead to speculation that certain members of your committee fear that their impartiality might be challenged."[50] His methods were recognizeable.

The Investigator soon learns that there is a conspiracy against the Gatekeeper who is also Chairman of the Committee. The Committee members, famous investigators themselves, Titus Oates, Torquemada (Inquisitor-General of the Spanish Inquisition), Mr. Cotton Mather, Baron George Jeffreys (the Hanging Judge of the Bloody Assizes) fear an infiltration of "Up Here" from "Down There" and they suspect the Gatekeeper. Oates, comparing "Down There" to a communist nation, reflects on their mission. "It is our high purpose to awaken the apathetic multitudes to the imminent danger of an attack from within by this Foreign Power, which has never renounced its goal of complete domination."[51] The Committee members were waiting until they found a suitable replacement for the Gatekeeper. They believed they had found the right person in the Investigator. Therefore, the Investigator pledges to "dedicate myself to the task of bringing to light the facts of this monstrous conspiracy that threatens our way of life "Up Here." I shall

---

[49] Ibid. 244.

[50] Ibid. 245.

[51] Ibid. 246.

pursue this objective relentlessly disregarding all attempts at intimidation by persons in high places who may be implicated by these facts; and I shall not cease until I have fixed the blame for a thousand years of treason."[52] The "Inquisition" begins.

The Gatekeeper soon resigns after being subjected to the Investigator's tactics, and the Investigator becomes Chairman of the Committee. He reopens certain cases of liberal and revolutionary thinkers who are brought before the Committee and forced to defend their beliefs. Socrates, Thomas Jefferson, John Milton, William Lyon Mackenzie, Voltaire, Martin Luther, Victor Hugo and Abraham Lincoln are all deported to "Down There" on the charge of subversion. Several "Karl Marx's" are also brought before the Committee but all claim to be the wrong Karl Marx. Therefore, all men with the name Karl Marx are deported.

During the investigations, paranoia begins to permeate "Up Here." The musicians, Wagner, Bach and Beethoven, exclude Chopin from their quartette because of his revolutionary tendencies. Not wanting to be assciated with a subversive, they invite Otto Schmink to join their group. When Galileo is denied access to his lab, his research is taken over by one Professor Schmink. The Poets Circle ban Shelley and replace him with Otto Schmink. The persecution continues until Otto Schmink is finally deported to "Down There."

The Devil demands an end to the Investigations because they are causing too much upheaval "Down There" and the Investigator subpoenas "the Chief." At this point, the members of the Committee

---

[52] Ibid. 247.

turn against the Investigator. He has gone too far. The Investigator becomes hysterical, screaming "there is no one so high as to be immune from investigation . . . I am the Chief! I am the Chief!"[53]

The scene quickly shifts. The Gatekeeper is back on the job. Martin, leading the Investigator who is "babbling incoherently," hopes that this will be the last deportation.[54] But for the first time, the Devil refuses the new recruit. There is only one option.

The scene abruptly shifts again to a hospital room. The Investigator, who has lost his mind, is the only survivor of a plane crash. Inexplicably, although the plane crashed at the top of the mountain, the Investigator is found wandering at the foot of the mountain. The only explanation, offered in the closing line of the play, is that it was "an act of God."[55] The observation could not have been more accurate.

The plays presented on CBC "Stage" were fine indeed, exciting and tension-filled, without being sentimental, preachy, or predictable. They held the listener's (or reader's) rapt attention while addressing important issues such as illegitimacy and the loss of faith. Freedom of speech, spiritualism, and self-enlightenment were promoted while humanistic values were stressed over a future based on science, technology and duty. Many of these original works boasted Canadian settings and characters that Canadians could

---

[53] Ibid. 265.

[54] Ibid. 266.

[55] Ibid. 267.

identify with. Satire remained an important technique. Perhaps the most important characteristic of the series, whether the play was an original or an adaptation of a classical work, was that it respected the intelligence and imagination of its audience. CBC "Stage" did not cater to the "Lowest Common Denominator." It recognized that listeners were capable of drawing their own conclusions and forming their own opinions on issues which affected their lives. In this way, "Stage" benefitted Canadians by providing an alternate in entertainment programming. It went against the norm which was already gaining a foothold in the North American mind. CBC radio was different: it offered what many nationalists believed was a unique Canadian voice and, therefore, it offered the promise of cultural unity.

The "golden days" at CBC radio, then, remained experimental and driven largely because many recognized that the CBC was at the vanguard of promoting Canadian unity. In 1951, Nathan Cohen acknowledged the intrinsic importance of the CBC: "The CBC has been a catalytic force in the forging of a Canadian consciousness."[56] Mavor Moore further reiterated the sentiment. "(The CBC) has since been regarded by many as the strongest unifying influence in the country, whether or not one admires its programs."[57] "Stage" was an important element of the English-Canadian cultural consciousness in the postwar period.

---

[56] Quoted in Wayne E. Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen. The Making of a Critic. (Toronto: Lester and Orpen Limited, 1977), 191.

[57] Mavor Moore, "Where Canadian Television is Headed", Saturday Night, (May 26, 1956), 10.

The integrity and value of CBC "Stage" was further recognized by contemporaries at home and abroad. In 1948, Ralph Novek argued that the material produced on "Stage" was innovative and exciting. "Many of the taboos which had long served to stifle radio drama were enthusiastically violated: such topics as racial discrimination, economic injustice, war and fascism were discussed boldly and with elan."[58] The series did not address "safe" topics which affirmed the status quo. Often, however, the recognition first came from abroad. Allan relates the following experience which occurred at the Radio Institute of the University of Wisconsin in the summer of 1947. "It was with a mixture of embarrassment and natural satisfaction that I was able to hear from the lips of these outstanding authorities that the Sunday night Stages of the CBC are considered the most important, valuable, and expert drama broadcasts in North America."[59] CBC "Stage" was heard and widely respected for its pioneering work in the field of radio drama.

In addition to establishing a Canadian voice, "Stage" united the country by supplying good theatre to people who might not otherwise have the chance. It also provided an outlet for Canadian talent and the series quickly became recognized as a "Canadian

---

[58] Ralph Novek, "Drama", Northern Review, 2, no. 2, (July - August, 1948), 30.

[59] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 25, untitled and incomplete essay by Andrew Allan, 1947.

Sunday-night institution."[60] Allan described the cultural impact of the program.

> People remote from cities, without the opportunity of ever seeing a play, became through 'the Stages' aware of a new world of interest. They had their taste whetted for theatre. Actors had a chance to strengthen their skills. Authors had a chance to exercise in the dramatic form.[61]

In offering an outlet for Canadian talent and by encouraging interest in Canadian art, "Stage" laboured towards a national theatre. Allan acknowledged the ultimate goal of the series: "Although I hope we were too shy to say it out loud, what we wanted was a national theatre for Canada: and in a country of our size and population only radio could provide it."[62] Outside commentators also recognized that radio alone could provide this service. Novek reiterated Allan's comments explaining that radio drama in Canada was unique.

> It is a peculiar paradox of Canadian culture that the only hope for the establishment of a national theatre in this country lies in the medium of radio. Peculiar in the sense that while elsewhere the stage has been a source of talent for radio, in Canada, where there exists no theatrical tradition except on a limited, regional scale, radio has had to develop its own playwrights, actors, directors and technicians, and in doing so has given us the nearest approach to a national drama this country has ever had.[63]

In Canada, radio came to the forefront before live theatre had

---

[60] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 25, titled essay by Andrew Allan, " 'The Stages' in Early Stages", written in approximately 1961.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Novek, "Drama", 29.

gained a foothold. Radio became the stimulus for the creation of a national theatre rather than the theatre providing talent, ideas and techniques to radio as in the United States and England. In fact, many believed that a national theatre was possible in Canada only through radio. Not bound by theatrical tradition, Canadian radio tended to be innovative and experimental. In 1959, Moore commented that "CBC radio drama gave us in effect our first national theatre."[64]

"Stage" played a paramount role in fostering Canadian talent during the 1940s and 1950s. The series consistently produced original works by Canadian dramatists and after 1947 when the format was lengthened to an hour, the program began to include adaptations of classical plays. Although Allan believed that the new format provided more flexibility and room for experimentation, Novek argued that the program soon relied too heavily on adaptations. "But this year especially, instead of original work, fresh and enthusiastic, we have had feeble imitations, clever compromises, almost anything but the real thing."[65] Despite Novek's criticism, the series continued to provide an outlet for aspiring Canadian playwrights. Novek suggested that the writers were "young, socially conscious and imaginative."[66] He further acknowledged several writers. "Outstanding among the writers for the "Stage" series have been Fletcher Markle, who is presently

---

[64] Moore, "Theatre: Some Backsliding".

[65] Novek, "Drama", 31.

[66] Ibid. 30.

working for the Columbus Broadcasting System, Lister Sinclair, Len Petersen, and more recently Joseph Schull."[67] Many playwrights got their breaks writing for "Stage", and several actors such as Lorne Greene and John Drainie made their reputations on the series. Throughout the 1950s, live theatre in Canada drew from this large pool of talent which was created by the radio industry.

During the postwar era, then, CBC radio promoted national unity by providing a national outlet for expressions of Canadianism. Contemporaries consciously strove towards this goal, and they believed it had been achieved by the early 1950s. It is important to discuss, however, what contemporaries perceived as the Canadian identity. In other words, what was the nature of the "Canadianism" emanating from the CBC?

Allan, Cohen, and Moore, who all worked for the CBC at some point in their careers, articulated specific views on the Canadian identity. Allan perceived the Canadian identity in terms of the nation's history. In a January 1968 broadcast, he remembered the birthday of Sir John A. Macdonald and argued that if Macdonald had been born in the United States, his birthday would be a national holiday to commemorate Confederation which he engineered in 1867. "The sound of exploding gunpowder on July 1st, 1867, did not speak war or bloody revolution; it was the sound of jubilant fireworks and saluting canon. The cries were not those of young men in agony on the barricades; they were the happy cries of children playing in

---

[67] Ibid. 30.

the parks."[68] The union of Canada was based on consensus, and Allan considered this quite an accomplishment in an age of rampant and violent nationalism: "John A. didn't think much of heroics. But neither did his people - the Canadians. . . . Perhaps it is inevitable that we don't keep his birthday as a national holiday. We would be embarrassed: so would he."[69] In Allan's opinion Canadians were also less prone to the narrow-mindedness of their American cousins. "Although a poet might help us toward the "myth proclaiming utopia" (a part of the American habit of mind), we must be warned that such myths can lead to that "my-country-right-or-wrong" attitude which is so dangerous an affectation of simplicity."[70] To Allan, the Canadian outlook was reflected in the constitution. "Because "Peace, Order, and Good Government" are solid, they needn't be stolid; they are commodities that ensure us at home and make us useful abroad. They celebrate the past as they illuminate the future."[71] In Allan's opinion, Canadians were dependable, peaceful, unprepossessing, and modest. Further, his views on the Canadian identity were rooted in his perception of the history of the country; he firmly believed that Canadians did not appreciate their country's history and were largely ignorant of its rich heritage. Informing the public on the rich and complex

---

[68] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 14, "Assignment", January 9, 1968.

[69] Ibid.

[70] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 14, "Assignment", June 30, 1967.

[71] Ibid.

history of Canada remained a personal mission throughout his creative life.

Cohen concurred with Allan on the nature of the Canadian character although with more negative undertones. Experiencing a recurrent bout of disillusionment concerning the state of Canadian cultural development, Cohen wrote in 1954;

> As a matter of fact, the pressures against the arts ever becoming creative in English-speaking Canada are quite formidable: our whole way of life shows that. We are psychologically married to the principles of caution and conciliation. Extremism and originality form no part of our character. We agree not to disagree, and are disturbed when friction does occur. We mistrust the impulsive and the non-conformist. We commit ourselves to the second best and the second rate because that seems the safe, the moderate way.
>
> And though we deny it, we take a certain pride in our lack of colourful leaders, our solemn and plodding state rituals, our beef and potatoes manners.[72]

In deriding the unimpetuous and unambitious sides of the Canadian character, he was lamenting the state of Canadian culture. He believed Canadians were too quick to accept the second-best, thereby denying their potential in establishing a vibrant cultural life in Canada.

Cohen further perceived the Canadian identity within a North American context. He observed that the British hold on the Canadian psyche had loosened after the First World War, but the bonds had all but snapped during the 1950s. During the 1945 - 1960 period, Canadians increasingly looked south of the border for their cultural fare and artistic inspiration. Cohen suggested that the disillusionment many artists felt while working in Europe was due

---

[72] Nathan Cohen in Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen, 219.

to the fact that Canadians are fundamentally North American. "Socially and psychologically, the Canadian is a North American, and his chief service to the English scene lies in the expression of North American associations and attitudes."[73] To Cohen, the artist could no longer move comfortably from "colony" to "Mother England" as some persisted to believe. Canada was a North American nation and artistic expression must reflect this reality.

Moore also recognized the duality of influences impinging on the Canadian character. "Is it then the case that the Canadian is indistinguishable: so North American he blends with the American landscape, so English under the skin he can become every inch an Englishman with a touch of make-up?"[74] Moore answered his own question by suggesting that "under and behind and around the superficial lack of a definable Canadian personality, there has always been a stubborn streak of indigenous creativity."[75] He acknowledged the diverse nature of the Canadian character as well by suggesting that "this country is no melting-pot: it is a salad in which each separate item retains its own relish."[76] He respected the diversity of the Canadian population. In fact, during the 1945 - 1960 period, multiculturalism remained a strong,

---

[73] Nathan Cohen, "Canada's Homesick Expatriates", Saturday Night, (November 24, 1956), 11.

[74] Mavor Moore, "Theatre in English-Speaking Canada", in The Arts in Canada. A Stock-Taking at Mid-Century, Malcolm Ross, ed., (Canada: The MacMillan Company of Canada Limited, 1958), 70.

[75] Ibid. 70.

[76] Mavor Moore, "Snobs at Stratford", Canadian Commentator, 1. no. 9, (September, 1957), 7.

underlying element of Canadian nationalism. In discussing nationalism and cultural unity, Allan, Moore, and Cohen never advocated a homogeneous culture. Each recognized that Canada's culture was multi-hued and diverse.

That this admission was virtually automatic stems from the English-French duality of Canada's past. From the beginning, any discussion of the "Canadian identity" has immediately included English- and French-speaking factions. Further, English-speaking Canadians had long respected and admired French-Canadians' cultural heritage. It was generally accepted that French-speaking Canadians had a secure identity and culture which could be held up as a model to the rest of Canada. Allan suggested that French-speaking Canada had a weapon against Americanization which other Canadians should enable them to use without bitterness. "They see us as Bush League Americans. And the French Canadians don't want to be Bush League Americans. If they can't be Big League Canadians, they're going to get out of the league and found their own circuit. They have a language and a culture with which to resist the drag of North American Sameness: and they're going to use their language and culture to do just that."[77] Unfortunately, English Canada did not have a linguistic barrier to wield against the Americanization of the continent.

The above views of the Canadian character coupled with the Canadianism inherent to "Stage" productions, creates a portrait of

---

[77] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 14, "Gerussi", December 4, 1967.

the Canadian identity supported by the CBC. It consisted of a modest, reliable, open-minded nature, a concern for social issues, progress and human values in an age of technology and an acceptance of diversity, multi-culturalism, and Canada's role as a North American nation. This identity included a desire to be distinct from the British and American influences which shaped it's development.

CBC radio played a strong role in the cultural consciousness of the 1945 - 1960 period. It provided an important outlet for Canadian talent and a common cultural experience for all Canadians. Most importantly, the CBC was at the forefront of articulating a Canadian voice through the creation of a national theatre on the radio airwaves.

CHAPTER 4 CANADIAN THEATRE: THE PUBLIC INFERIORITY COMPLEX AND THE SEARCH FOR AN INDIGENOUS PRODUCT

In the decade and a half following the conclusion of the Second World War, theatre in Canada experienced what was at the time recognized as a "mini-renaissance" in artistic expression.[1] Stimulated by postwar optimism and advancement in the radio industry, the period was also characterized by the growth of amateur theatre groups, and the inaugeration of the Stratford Festival in 1953. Unfortunately, this prolific period was accompanied by a sense of inferiority among the cultural community and the wider public. By the end of the 1950s, the enthusiasm generated for the growth of an indigenous Canadian theatre had abated into spasms of disillusionment and frustration. This chapter proposes to examine the pattern of theatrical growth and decline which was accompanied by a climate of cultural self-doubt. Why theatre is considered important in Canada is also addressed.

The debate over the creation of a Canadian national theatre was not new to the post-World War II period. In a 1929 article, Canadian playwright Merrill Denison recognized that "a belief in the possibility, or desirability, of a Canadian drama seems to have sprung partly from the national consciousness born of the war."[2] He stated, however, that "the possibilities of a native theatre are

---

[1] Wayne E. Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen. The Making of a Critic, (Toronto: Lester & Orpen, 1977), 62. Edmonstone notes that this "mini-renaissance apparently (began) in 1947".

[2] Merrill Denison, "Nationalism and Drama", reprinted in Canadian Theatre Review, 8, (Fall, 1975), 75.

nil."[3] Nor did Denison lament this fact. Rather, he argued that Canada was not ready to support a national theatre: "Personally, I can see no need of one. Until the national intentions of Canada are greatly clarified, the theatre would at best be an artificial graft supported with as great travail of the spirit and the purse as a native orange industry."[4]

Fuelled by the nationalism springing from the Second World War, the quest for a national theatre was revived. Many people placed their hopes for the creation of a national theatre in CBC radio, and with its impressive accomplishments hopes for a national 'live' theatre on the stage persisted. Although theatrical advances were evident, Mavor Moore could still remark in 1950: "I know of no country, including Afghanistan and Tibet, where the dramatic arts and artists are in such low estate as in Canada; and if we take into consideration the population of Canada; and its importance in the modern world, any other nation's relative philistinism pales into obscurity."[5] Canadians had a long way to go in the quest for a national theatre. Moore placed the blame for this dilemma on the shoulders of the public. He blatantly accused the Canadian public of succumbing to an innate inferiority complex in cultural pursuits. He argued that this dismal situation was largely the result of the Canadian public's perception of the

---

[3] Ibid. 77.

[4] Ibid. 78.

[5] Mavor Moore, "The Canadian Theatre", The Canadian Forum, XXX, no. 355, (August, 1950), 110.

artist and the arts: "my experience in Canada, from schooldays up, has been that concern with the creative arts stamps one as a lightweight, or queer, or both. And concern with the drama (that most basic, graphic, and revealing of the arts), above all marks one as removed from the sphere of practical life, almost to idiocy."[6] He continued:

> Almost any of us, workers in the Canadian theatre, are regarded by the Canadian public at large as "amateurs"; yet in London and New York - the very world centres of theatrical activity in our language - we are accepted as accomplished professionals, as has been proven time and again by those of us who wished to do so. Meanwhile we see third-rate American artists accepted blindly as professionals in our own cities and towns. It is not the Canadian artist who is not good enough; it is the Canadian public which is not good enough for the artist.[7]

Nathan Cohen also recognized the Canadian public's inferiority complex in the arts. In an article discussing Canadian artists who had emigrated to England, Cohen illuminated the chilly atmosphere many of them encountered at home.

> The majority made the decision to pack up and cross the Atlantic, not for a visit but for good, with the utmost reluctance; they were moved by a sense of frustration and non-fulfillment; they felt they had to get away. Some believed they had gone as far locally as circumstances allowed; if they remained they would stagnate. Others were discouraged by the lack of opportunity. . . . Still others resented their inferior social status; they wanted to move to an environment where their profession did not have to be apologized for or explained away. Some were attracted by the cultural superiority of English life.[8]

---

[6] Ibid. 108.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Nathan Cohen, "Canada's Homesick Expatriates", Saturday Night, (November 24, 1956), 10.

Yet he did not blame the public for the poor state of Canadian theatre as did Moore. As a critic, he believed that Canadian artists did not produce enough quality material for a public that was anxious to receive it.

Lloyd Bochner, a Canadian actor, also commented on the Canadian inferiority complex. Quoted in Bronwyn Drainie's biography of her father, Bochner implied that the artistic community was prone to a sense of inferiority as well. "The 'If-you're-so-good-why-are-you-still-here?' attitude permeated every nook and cranny of the Toronto artistic community." Drainie suggested that "this was true, in spite of a decade of unprecedented success in Canadian radio. The colonial mindset dies hard, if in fact it ever does."[9] With no theatrical tradition in Canada, and confronted with models of theatrical success and tradition in England, Europe and the United States, theatre-goers and dramatists were particularly prone to intervals of self-doubt. Despite this affliction, significant developments in Canadian theatre were made in the decade and a half following the Second World War.

One of the notable accomplishments of the period was the inaugeration of Dora Mavor Moore's New Play Society on October 5, 1946. The NPS was the first Canadian professional company to perform indigenous works as well as international classics. During ten seasons, seventy-two plays were produced, of which fourty-seven

---

[9] Bronwyn Drainie, Living the Part. John Drainie and the Dilemna of Canadian Stardom, (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1988), 239.

were originals.[10] Many of the original works were contributed by writers who had got their professional breaks with CBC "Stage." The close association between radio and theatre was quickly established in the postwar period.

The importance of the NPS began to wane in the early 1950s when Mavor Moore left the folds of his mother's company for television in 1952, and when the Stratford Festival began in 1953. Not only did interest in the NPS begin to decline, but acting and administrative personnel were lost to the new endeavours.[11] Led by John Drainie, a group of actors formed the Jupiter Theatre in 1951. Its creation posed a further drain on the NPS. The Jupiter was a "non-profit organization chartered by the Canadian government to establish a permanent Canadian professional theatre."[12] Successful radio actors wished to maintain outlets for live performances on the stage. The goals of the Jupiter were "to promote Canadian plays, to bring plays of high calibre from abroad for the first time and to build a theatre of quality, using the best actors, directors, artists and technicians available."[13] The mood of optimism and promise for the future was clearly evident in the Jupiter's mandate.

During this same period, summer stock and amateur theatre

---

[10] David Gardner, "Dora Mavor Moore (1888 - 1979)", Theatre History in Canada, 1, no. 1, (Spring 1980), 6, 9.

[11] Ibid. 10.

[12] Drainie, Living the Part, 151.

[13] Ibid. 151.

groups flourished. The enthusiasm was heightened by the publication of the Massey Report in 1951. Finally, the Stratford Festival was inaugerated in 1953. The wave of nationalism engendered by the Massey Commission and the indigenous theatrical activity of the preceding decade paradoxically climaxed in the establishment of a Festival devoted to Shakespearean drama and a British style of acting. Although the Festival succeeded in advancing an element of professionalism in Canadian theatre, providing an outlet for Canadian talent, and arousing interest in theatre among the general public, it also had detrimental effects which will be discussed later in the chapter. At this point, it is enough to say that the decade following 1945 witnessed a "mini-renaissance" in theatrical activity. For the first time, Canadian artists were discovering national outlets for their creative talents and the public was becoming increasingly aware of the theatre as a leisure activity. By 1959, Cohen conceded that improvement in Canada's theatrical climate had occurred. "Twelve years ago, for a Canadian mounted and enacted show to run a whole week, to a total of fifteen hundred people, was an occasion of magnitude."[14] This success, however, was commonplace by the end of the decade.

If Cohen and Moore seemed preoccupied with the status of Canadian theatre, it was because both believed that a national theatre was important to Canadian unity and because the theatre

---

[14] Nathan Cohen, "Theatre Today: English Canada", Tamarack Review, no. 13, (Autumn 1959), 25.

served as a reflection of society. In 1947, Cohen observed the significance of theatre to national unity.

> We would like to see some original Canadian plays . . . that reflect the Canadian scene with animation and courage, interpreting life in this country, showing the relations of people, plays that find their roots in what is going on and leave their audiences entertained, disturbed, more informed when they go out than when they came in; plays capable of moving people to thought and action.[15]

He argued that Canada needed the production of original plays to elucidate the unique Canadian experience. Theatre could be of value as "a mirror and critic of the moods, times, idioms, paradoxes, virtues, and inadequacies of life on a thinly-populated, four thousand mile sub-Arctic strip."[16] In this way, theatre would become important to the daily lives of Canadians.

Cohen also defined a Canadian play. He suggested that it was not enough to be written by a Canadian or to have a Canadian setting. In a critique of Morley Callaghan's To Tell The Truth, he offered the following definition:

> It's this motif, this quest for companionship which, in my opinion makes To Tell The Truth a Canadian play. In a way I suppose, a Canadian play is simply a play written by a Canadian. That's true in a formal sense, but it isn't the whole truth. For a play to be Canadian it must also bespeak a frame of mind - a way of thinking and acting - peculiar to us alone. This gives it identity and distinguishes it from something written by an American, or a Briton, or a Norwegian. It isn't the setting that's important. What really counts, I suggest, is a mixture of national and personal temperment within the author, and the reflection of that temperment inside

---

[15] Nathan Cohen in Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen, 73.

[16] Cohen, "Theatre Today", Tamarack Review, 24.

the play.[17]

Truly Canadian plays reflected the Canadian experience and enhanced the quality of life. Moore concurred with this definition. In his discussion of Canadian playwrights Lister Sinclair and Robertson Davies, he suggested that they had provided Canadians with material that they could not experience elsewhere: "I do not mean that they have narrowed their purview to the Canadian scene, but rather that they have looked at the world from this time and this place."[18] To Moore, Sinclair and Davies were Canadian playwrights, not because their stories were based in Canada, but because they brought a Canadian frame of mind to their writing.

In the same article, Moore contended that in identifying "the stubborn native streak . . . . satire has been our strongest vein".[19] He asserted that satirical plays were successful in Canada because they were particularly suited to the Canadian experience. Moore explained this preference by reminding Canadians of their colonial past: "For satire has all along been our most effective form of self-defence against the very British and American culture we borrowed and were sometimes swamped by."[20] The popularity of Moore's "Spring Thaw," a satirical revue of Canadian life performed by the NPS, can be explained in the same terms.

---

[17] Cohen in Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen, 120.

[18] Mavor Moore, "Theatre in English-Speaking Canada", in The Arts in Canada. A Stock-Taking at Mid-Century, Malcolm Ross, ed., (Canada: The MacMillan Company of Canada Limited, 1958), 72.

[19] Ibid. 72.

[20] Ibid. 72.

"Spring Thaw" offered an experience to theatre-goers they could not get elsewhere.[21] It was important to Moore that Canadian playwrights continue to promote their own viewpoint and realize their creative impulses.

> This love-hate, then, this borrowing-while-we-spit-in-your-eye, seems to me the most insistent theme in our theatre. And if it smacks a little of adolescence, if we see ourselves bringing up father and mother, the office is none the less important and peculiarly suited to us as members of both families. It is as necessary for Britain and America as it is for us. For only by insisting on our own fresh viewpoint and acting upon our own judgement can we earn whatever recognition others may afford us, and whatever thanks they will owe us, in the theatre as in politics or elsewhere.[22]

Although Canadian theatre was just beginning to exert itself in the years immediately proceeding the Second World War, both Moore and Cohen had very specific ideas on what theatre could accomplish in Canada and the direction Canadian theatre was heading.

Cohen and Moore's critique of the development and purpose of Canadian theatre during the 1950s was accompanied by more specific commentary on the growth of Canadian theatre. In a reflective article of 1959, Cohen discussed the "cultural groundswell, the start of a feeling, the beginnings of a rude and scattered irrigation of a hitherto sterile world", which roughly began in 1947.[23] 1947 was significant because it represented the first full year of production for the New Play Society. To Cohen, the

---

[21] Mavor Moore, "A Theatre for Canada", University of Toronto Quarterly, 26, (1956-57), 13.

[22] Moore, "Theatre in English-Speaking Canada", 72.

[23] Nathan Cohen, "Theatre Today", 32.

founding represented "the beginnings of a vital, indigenous English-language theatre for Canada," for the NPS recognized that a sense of Canadianism must pervade the Canadian theatre: "the need for a Canadian orientation was innate in the NPS, partly because of the Moore's temperment, and also because the breezes of a belated nationalism were at last rustling through the tiny world of our arts."[24] Although Cohen suggested that some of the original NPS productions such as Lister Sinclair's "Man in the Blue Moon" and Andrew Allan's "Narrow Passage" "were utterly worthless," he acknowledged that some valuable lessons were being learned through the NPS experience.[25] "The point began to take hold that plays dealing with the life around them, and with the circumstances which nourished and inhibit it, were essential to their quest, for it was only through such plays that the style they were trying to uncover could find its real vocabulary, a style which would be peculiar to them and Canadian audiences would recognize as belonging to this country."[26]

The growth of summer theatre across Canada built on the excitement generated by the NPS. Soon a recognizeable movement could be detected with a clear and noble mandate.

> It was a conscious groping after style, a disorganized but conscious attempt to make use of inner resources, impulses, and homegrown attitudes chiefly by young people born and raised in Canada, or who had spent their formative years here. To put it negatively, these people

---

[24] Ibid. 28 - 29.

[25] Ibid. 29.

[26] Ibid. 31-32.

> simply didn't want to reproduce American and British plays according to American and British models. They wanted to put their own stamp on them. To put it positively, theirs was a teamwork approach in which the mainspring of attack was a resolve to realize the author's intention in the light of their Canadian experience.[27]

Ironically, the culmination of this nationalistic movement was the founding of the Shakespearean Festival in Stratford, Ontario. Moore argued, however, that the Festival was important to Canada's cultural development because it reflected the "blend of old-world tradition and new-world insolence" which comprised the Canadian landscape . . . . "the astonishing amalgam of skilled European craftsmanship with Canadian enthusiasm which distinguished the Festival from the beginning has resulted by now in a homogeneity which makes it difficult to separate them, so infected has one become by the other. And yet it is their interplay which gives the mixture its rare excitement, and the Festival an importance beyond a midsummer frolic."[28] In this way, the Festival was uniquely Canadian. Although Moore recognized the importance of the Festival to Canadian theatre, he also envisioned the potential harm the Festival represented:

> But those who have the heavy responsibility of plotting the growth of the Stratford Festival in coming years must continue to be aware of this source of their power and success: they must never reduce their venture to the putting on of plays or concerts or exhibitions, however fine, and forget that the Festival's real achievement is that it has become a nexus of our real lives. In this way - and I suspect in this way only -will the Festival

---

[27] Ibid. 31.

[28] Mavor Moore, "Snobs at Statford", Canadian Commentator, 1, no. 9, (September, 1957), 7.

> make the contribution of which it is capable to our country, our times and as a result to the world.[29]

In a separate article, Moore elaborated on the same theme, with a continuing note of caution to Festival organizers.

> By merely copying our elders we shall be throwing away our dearest advantage, and inevitably ending up second best. The increasing use of non-Canadians and very new Canadians in the company can be an asset in so far as it helps to maintain a high standard of performance; but in so far as it tends to minimize the difference between what we can do and what is already done elsewhere, to negate the freshness of the Canadian approach and to drive those with stronger roots to other activity, it works against the long-range interest of the Festival.[30]

Moore was concerned that the Stratford Festival invited conservatism by promoting a traditional style of acting and canon of literature rather than encouraging new forms of expression. Moore firmly believed that Canada'cultural growth must look to the future and not to the past. He further suggested in reference to the Canadian content of the Festival's productions that "the fundamental elements that went to form the movement in the first place are now being slighted."[31] Canadian artists were no closer to assuming key Festival positions of performance and production because of Tyrone Guthrie's reliance on imported talent. By 1959, Moore was clear in his condemnation of the Festival. "But sheer activity and presentational polish alone do not constitute progress and in many departments we have backslid since the 1940s. The

---

[29] Ibid. 8.

[30] Moore, "Theatre in English-Speaking Canada", 75.

[31] Ibid. 74.

emphasis given to the classics and to an acquired British style of performing them at Stratford has been . . . a brake on efforts toward the production of native plays and a native style of acting."[32] Ultimately, Moore argued that the Festival had been detrimental to Canadian theatre during the 1950s.

Cohen also recognized the initial impact of the Festival on Canadian theatre. He admitted that the Festival served to "give our theatre a much-needed push" by sparking a "spurt of activity" represented by the 1954 opening of the Crest Theatre in Toronto.[33] In an article on Tyrone Guthrie, he further acknowledged that "during his 3-year tenure, the Festival has grown into a vested national interest and a major holiday attraction drawing visitors from all over North America. It has given birth to the Canadian Players . . . . It has stimulated public interest too, though as yet not deeply, in a native professional theatre."[34] While the Festival quickly became a public attraction, it had not contributed to legitimate Canadian theatre: "if the hero-worship of Mr. Guthrie is understandable, the supplementary notion that his method of staging is the only sound one holds out great dangers for the Festival's artistic future."[35] Further, Cohen contended that "there is no such thing as a distinctive Canadian style of doing

---

[32] Mavor Moore, "Theatre: Some Backsliding", Saturday Night, 74, no. 18, (August 29, 1959).

[33] Cohen, "Theatre Today", Tamarack Review, 34.

[34] Nathan Cohen, "Theatre Notes. Tyrone Guthrie. A Minority Report", Queen's Quarterly, 62, (1955-56), 423.

[35] Ibid. 424.

Shakespeare, and won't be for a long time."[36] By 1956, Canadians were no closer to the attainment of a national Canadian theatre. The Festival had contributed only to the superficial popularity of theatre-going. In 1959, Cohen reiterated his belief that with its emphasis on British theatre "Stratford had made theatre respectable, it had not made it popular, only popular as a social event. For another, the impact of Stratford as a circus was to convince people in the theatre that the drive to a Canadian character was so much rubbish."[37] To Cohen, the Stratford Festival marked the end of a viable movement towards a national Canadian theatre. He concluded, "above all else the proselytizing and nationalistic feeling, which envisioned theatre in Canada as both a social and artistic medium, coming together, synthesizing, wavered and died."[38] Like Moore, Cohen was quick to express his frustration and disillusionment over the prospects of a national theatre. Although the Festival had failed to live up to its initial promise, he still envisioned some hope for the future.

> The theatre must create a place for itself that will gain it devotion and respect. In Canada this it has failed to do. It may be that being such a small country, the idea of a theatre of our own was always an illusion. Or it may be that a later, a more principled, less easily influenced generation of actors and writers will rekindle the flame. Still, one cannot help wondering what our theatre might have become if the Stratford miracle had not occurred - that miracle which has been such a

---

[36] Ibid. 425.

[37] Cohen, "Theatre Today", Tamarack Review, 35.

[38] Ibid. 35.

blight.[39]

In addition to the mixed blessing of the Stratford Festival, cultural boosterism and the Canadian inferiority complex largely account for the failure of Canadian theatre during the 1950s. According to Moore,

> the case for a distinctly Canadian culture has been kissed half to death by preciosity and chauvanism: by those who limit culture to the hot-house variety, and those who find the entire catalogue of human virtues singularly Canadian. . . . ? This twin longing for both self-approbation and approval by the Board of Experts From Out of Town has caused m u c h schizophrenia. . . .[40]

In keeping with the cultural inferiority complex, the public looked for international recognition before patronizing a Canadian cultural event. Only once a play, for example, received foreign attention would it be deemed worthwhile by a Canadian audience. Moore argued that Canadian theatre would never be taken seriously until Canadians themselves took it seriously by seeking their own means of expression: "New Yorkers and Londoners consider us hicks (when they do) precisely because we meekly accept the worst they have to offer as holy writ. . . . The styles we have so much admired and copied will already be out of date, probably retired by a new style from some country which had the wit to recognize and believe in its own."[41] In 1956, he had referred to this tendency

---

[39] Ibid. 37.

[40] Moore, "A Theatre for Canada", 2.

[41] Ibid. 14.

as the "national psychosis."[42] Although theatre was particularly characterized by the "inferiority complex," radio did not escape its debilitating clutches. Allan also understood that Canadians experienced periods of self-doubt and external approval-seeking. In applauding the "great deal of good work" accomplished at the CBC in Toronto, he remarked that it is "amazing in a country that likes to belittle its own talent until it has been honoured elsewhere."[43]

To combat this national predisposition, Moore offered several solutions. First, he suggested that while the Canadian theatre must devise its own forms of expression, it must also develop its own measurement of aesthetic value. "The upshot of this borrowing the cultural yardstick along with the culture is that whatever it does not measure is presumed to be not worth measuring . . . without our own yardstick, we surrender our rights along with our responsibilities and enter a new period of colonialism, our tastes dictated by others more sure of theirs than we of ours."[44] He further suggested that the quest for a national theatre could be achieved by considering international models of cultural growth.

> The cure for, it seems to me, lies not in retreating into hermitlike contemplation of the national navel, but in even wider acquaintance with the theatre of the world, wherein we may see the remarkable things being achieved by other (and even smaller) countries which have the sense to build their art on what they do best and not on what others do better.
>
> If we wish to have a theatre which is original in

---

[42] Mavor Moore, "Where Canadian Television is Headed", Saturday Night, (May 26, 1956), 10.

[43] Andrew Allan, Self-Portrait, 131.

[44] Moore, "Where Canadian Television is Headed", 8.

> any sense of the word, the way is to express relentlessly our own point of view, enriching it with aids from everywhere but submitting to it no one set of spectacles prescribed for elsewhere.[45]

His nationalistic solutions to Canadian cultural backwardness were not provincial; his criticisms and advice were cloaked in the cosmopolitanism and interdependence of the nuclear age. He recognized that the route to international acclaim in cultural pursuits was through the cultivation of local and authentic values of a particular people in a particular place. Only in this way was it possible for Canada and Canadians to reach a universal audience and to enrich the culture of the world.

The 1945 - 1960 period in Canada witnessed a "mini-renaissance" in theatrical activity. The accomplishments of the NPS, the opening of the Jupiter Theatre and the growth of summer stock and amateur theatre troupes all contributed to the enthusiasm generated over the prospects of Canadian theatre. Cultural nationalists and critics, Allan, Cohen, and Moore, took theatre seriously by expecting high quality performances which looked to the world from a Canadian frame of mind. They believed that indigenous theatre would promote unity by providing national outlets for expressions of Canadianism. The accomplishments of Canadian theatre were minimized, however, by an inferiority complex among the public and artistic community. This inferiority perhaps contributed to the greatest 'national' theatrical achievement of the 1950s; the creation of the Stratford Festival in 1953 dedicated

---

[45] Mavor Moore, "Theatre: Some Backsliding",

to Shakespearean drama. The Festival inevitably proved detrimental to the growth of authentic Canadian theatre. Despite the disillusionment spawned by the failure and irony of Canadian theatre during 1945 - 1960, cultural nationalists continued to hope for the creation of a national theatre.

CHAPTER 5 THE MASSEY REPORT AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ARTS TO CANADA

The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences was appointed in 1949 under the veteran guidance of Vincent Massey. A former ambassador to Great Britain, Massey was a noted anglophile and a patron of the arts in Canada. The Commission symbolized the government's recognition that the arts, or the lack of a dynamic artistic community, was a growing preoccupation in a country that was one of the leading nations of the industrialized world, and furthermore, that the promotion of the arts was an important endeavour. In many ways, the Commission's 1951 Report represented both a culmination of the excitement generated in postwar Canada and the beginning of an increased awareness among the public that the arts were important to the nation's development.

This chapter aims to provide insight into the nature of the Report; its mandate, conclusions, and recommendations will be discussed as well as the values it embodied and sought to promote. The values and beliefs shared by Allan, Cohen and Moore will be compared to the value system promoted by the Massey Commission. In the final section of the chapter, the Report's reception among the public and artistic community will be addressed.

In the years prior to the Report's publication, such commentators on the state of the arts in Canada as Mavor Moore and Nathan Cohen had argued that the promotion of the arts was an important factor of Canada's growth. The Report served to

legitimize their ongoing concerns. In 1950 Moore wrote; "I believe the creations of the human mind to be as important as the conduct of human affairs. In fact, I wonder to what end the latter are carried on at all, if not to make the former possible."[1] Moore continued, "my fellow-Canadians disagree with me, and demonstrate their disagreement daily by placing the conduct of affairs so far above creative achievements that one is allowed to smother the other."[2] The development of the creative faculties was becoming increasingly important to a small but significant number of Canadians. The Massey Report addressed their concerns and created an atmosphere of optimism and enthusiasm among artistic circles and the general public that Canada's cultural life was bound to improve. This enthusiasm was perhaps the Report's greatest achievement. For the first time, Canadian artists and critics believed that their efforts were not in vain. The optimism for the future of Canadian culture characterized the first half of the decade.

In 1949, St. Laurent's Liberal government responded to the growing concerns of the cultural community and appointed the Royal Commission for National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. The actual motivation behind the Commission, however, was neither noble nor dramatic. Minister of Defence, Brooke Claxton, who was firmly committed to the promotion of the arts,

---

[1] Mavor Moore, "The Canadian Theatre", The Canadian Forum, XXX, no. 355, (August 1950), 108.

[2] Ibid. 108.

recommended that his government devise a clear policy on cultural development. Tippett suggests that his recommendation was acknowledged because of the political threat posed by the CCF, which was making gains in Ontario and at the federal level among the artistic and intellectual communities.[3] She argues; "changing domestic and external realities, political necessity, and a concern to find one of the country's few cultural patrons worthy employment in Canada combined to move St. Laurent, who was not particularly interested in the arts and fearful of treading on Quebec's toes, in the direction of accepting Claxton's recommendation."[4] The appointment of Massey and his fellow commissioners in 1949 reflected the geographical and ideological considerations of the government.

Massey was considered the perfect choice for Chairman of the Royal Commission. Although sixty-one at the time of his appointment, he had been an amateur actor in his youth and he had remained an important patron of culture throughout his diplomatic career. He had been on the boards of a variety of cultural institutions including the Royal Ontario Museum and the National Gallery. As the Canadian Minister to the United States from 1926 - 1930 and High Commissioner to London from 1935 - 1946, he had acquired "ample first-hand exposure to the two nations that most

---

[3] The Co-operativew Commonwealth Federation (CCF) was the precursor of the New Democratic Party (NDP). Maria Tippett, Making Culture. English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts Before the Massey Commission, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 182.

[4] Ibid. 183.

influenced Canadian cultural life."[5] He was also a Liberal, and members of the Liberal government had him in mind for the post of the next Governor General. It was deemed advantageous to keep him busy in Canada until the time of appointment.[6]

Massey was joined on the commission by members of the cultural/intellectual elite. At fifty-five, Norman Mackenzie fulfilled several functions of the commission. As President of the University of British Columbia and former President of the University of New Brunswick and a native of Nova Scotia, he represented both coasts. He had also been a President of the National Conference of Canadian Universities from 1946 - 1948 and, therefore, was knowledgeable on the issue of federal funding for universities. Litt describes Mackenzie as no "stranger to high culture" but as more of a populist "both in his cultural preferences and his political instincts."[7]

Arthur Surveyor was chosen by St. Laurent to represent Quebec. At seventy-one years of age, Surveyor was a well-known partner of a leading civil engineering firm in eastern Canada. He was a francophone businessman from Montreal with strong ties to the English community. He represented technology and was expected to provide technical expertise on the issue of broadcasting. Although he was primarily a businessman, he held a Ph.d., and was on the

---

[5] Paul Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 29.

[6] Ibid. 30.

[7] Ibid. 32.

National Research Council from 1942 - 1948 and was therefore expected to provide information on national scholarship schemes. Surveyor was also considered a "multi-purpose commissioner."[8]

Hilda Neatby was a 'surprise' appointment. Not only was she a woman, but she was only forty-four years of age. She was, however, an historian which the commission needed and she was bilingual. At the time of her appointment she was acting head of the Department of History at the University of Saskatchewan, and, therefore, she represented the prairies. Litt suggests that her appointment was interesting because it reflected the assumption that the arts are "feminine". A token woman commissioner was not politically necessary in 1949. Women dominated local cultural associations and it was felt that a woman would be beneficial to relate to this segment of the public.[9]

The final commissioner was Father Georges-Henri Levesque. The forty-six year old Dominican Priest was a good friend of St. Laurent and the founder and dean of the faculty of social sciences at the Universite~ Laval. More importantly, he was an articulate opponent of Premier Duplessis and it was believed that he had "enough prestige and credibility to offset some of the premier's influence."[10] Opposition was anticipated from Duplessis' Quebec government prior to the commission's appointment.

The commission was a cohesive group with similar opinions,

---

[8] Ibid. 33.

[9] Ibid. 33 - 34.

[10] Ibid. 35.

values and experience which represented the cultural elite in Canada. All the commissioners held post-graduate degrees and all but Surveyor had held university teaching posts. All were involved with national voluntary associations which had gained prominence in the interwar period and most had been involved with federal cultural institutions. Through their network of associations, most of the commissioners were "friends-of-government insiders" who shared the same values and concern for a national culture. As members of the cultural elite, Litt suggests that this group valued "nationalism, a belief in cultivating democracy through education, and a faith in government intervention under expert guidance."[11] Based on their similarities, Litt further argues that "these commissioners were unlikely to deviate far from the government's way of thinking."[12] Erna Buffie suggests that the commission was "dominated by the sentiments of a group which might be described as an eastern-Canadian anglophone intelligentsia; which despite the often marked differences in approach advocated the defence of tradition; the preservation of a community in Canada bound together by more elevated ideals than the pursuit of profit or even enlightened self-interest, and which exhibited a profound distrust, if not open hostility to things American."[13] Paul Rutherford adds that with the appointment of the Royal Commission "the ivory tower

---

[11] Ibid. 22.

[12] Ibid. 35.

[13] Erna Buffie, "The Massey Report and the Intellectuals: Tory Cultural Nationalism in Ontario in the 1950s", M.A. Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1982, 49.

was in charge."[14] With the commission firmly established, the cultural elite set out to transform Canada's cultural landscape. Litt contends that the "Massey Commission gave (the cultural elite) a cause to fight for and a national forum in which to voice its concerns. The commission had mobilized a constituency that would generate interest in its report and maintain political pressure for government action in cultural affairs. In the process the commission itself was transformed from a stolid official investigation into something of a national crusade. The highbrows were on the march."[15]

As discussed in the introduction, Litt describes the value-system of the Massey Commission as 'liberal humanist'. The Commissioners associated free enterprise and scientific inquiry with mass culture which they perceived as a threat to individual liberty. They did, however, subscribe to liberal economic principles which prevented them from attacking capitalism which had created mass culture. Therefore, they believed that high culture posed an alternative to promote individualism through self-enlightenment. Humanist values were stressed to guide society into the future rather than to preserve the past. Litt argues that the commissioners were 'conservative' only in the sense of preserving high culture.[16] Coherent with this philosophy, the commission

---

[14] Paul Rutherford, When Television Was Young: Primetime Canada 1952-1967, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 14.

[15] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 55.

[16] Ibid. 102.

displayed intellectual elitism, anti-Americanism and pro-British sentiments and values.

The elitist values of the Commission were masked by a fusion of liberal humanism and postwar nationalism. It succeeded in popularizing its agenda by portraying mass culture not only as a threat to individual liberty but as a threat to the Canadian identity and national unity. Mass culture was then associated exclusively with the United States. High culture, on the other hand, was linked to Canadian cultural development. Litt argues that "nationalism and elitism merged in an alliance aimed at developing a Canadian culture opposed to the invasion of 'American' mass culture. The commissioners exploited contemporary nationalist aspirations by offering a coherent vision of a superior national identity. By brandishing the flag they made the cause of high culture both less recognizeable and more attractive to the ordinary Canadian."[17] Further, in an age of cold war, the high versus mass culture debate became a potent issue parallelling democracy versus communism. Litt suggests that "the abstract conception of high culture versus mass culture was overlaid with a good versus evil, humanism versus technology, liberal versus authoritarian dichotomy."[18] In postwar Canada, the promotion of high culture became an issue of national sovereignty.

Allan, Cohen, and Moore shared many of the traits of liberal humanism. Most significantly, they stressed the importance

---

[17] Ibid. 251.

[18] Ibid. 252.

of human values in an age of science and technology and they sought social progress through the advancement of English-Canadian drama. Like the Massey commissioners, they looked to the state to further the cause of Canadian culture and they associated mass culture with the United States. They each differ in important ways as well. Although the plays Allan produced were liberal-minded and promoted continued progress, on a personal level he displayed a definite predilection for the past. In this respect, Allan's cultural nationalism was more consistent to the view promoted by Buffie in her thesis on tory cultural nationalism during the 1950s. Cohen, on the other hand, consistently displayed leftist leanings after a flirtation with the communist party in his youth. As members of the cultural industry, all three were less elitist and did not feel as threatened by popular culture. Moore was most consistent to the philosophy of liberal humanism. He continually sought improvement of society and cultural advancement by upholding values of freedom of expression, the free exchange of ideas between different cultures, and progress based on human development. In addition to subscribing to many of the tenets of liberal humanism, Allan, Cohen, and Moore were vocal nationalists who attempted to strengthen national unity and a sense of identity through the promotion of Canadian drama. Therefore, they demonstrate the fusion of liberal humanist values and postwar nationalism which was perpetrated by the Massey Commission.

The collective fear of modernity was a symptom of the commission's value system. Buffie argues that Hilda Neatby shared

George Grant's mistrust of modernity: "For both, the possibility of Canada and a Canadian culture was contingent upon the preservation of a way of life that they associated with the best traditions of Western civilization. It was also contingent upon a rejection of modernity, in so far as modernity was synonymous with materialism, a rejection of the contemplative tradition, loss of faith in a transcendant order and a naive belief in the power of science and technology to guarantee human progress."[19] These beliefs were manifest in the anti-American rhetoric of the Report. The Commission consistently associated the popular culture of the United States with the sentiments it feared: modernity, materialism, commercialism, and progress based only on science and technology. On the other hand, British, as well as French-Catholic culture, was associated with the values the Commission hoped to promote and strengthen through Canadian culture: tradition, liberty, and spiritualism. These values permeate the pages of the Report and underlie the recommendations to invigorate Canada's cultural life. Buffie suggests that the Report represented "a profoundly conservative view of society, one still strongly rooted in the British traditions of the Canadian past and a philosophical tradition which viewed the mind and spiritual values as fundamental to life as a whole."[20] Although Litt disagrees with Buffie on the inherent conservatism of the Report, he does agree that the cultural elite promoted humanistic values and not a society based

---

[19] Buffie, "The Masssey Report and the Intellectuals", 119.

[20] Ibid. 30.

on technology and materialism. In associating its value system with high culture, he argues that the Massey Commission served as an influential vehicle of the cultural elite's agenda.

> The Massey Commission offered high culture as a panacea for the ills of modernity. This appealed to members of the culture lobby because it ennobled their cultural interests and cast them as savior of the Canadian nation, if not Western civilization as a whole. As their concerns gained publicity through the commission's hearings, the cause gained an intellectual and moral dimension that extended its appeal beyond its organized supporters. The commissioners were happy to make their commission a vehicle for the articulation and popularization of views that made high culture seem critical to the future of liberal democracy. Nothing invigorates a cause more than a conviction of righteousness.[21]

With the cultural elite firmly in charge, the Royal Commission on the National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences set out to study and report on the state of the arts in Canada. The Commission defined 'the arts' as "human assets . . . what might be called in a broad sense spiritual resources, which are less tangible but whose importance needs no emphasis."[22] The Report further justified its task: "it is the intangibles which give a nation not only its essential character but its vitality as well. What may seem unimportant or even irrelevant under the pressures of daily life may well be the thing which ensures, which may give a community its power to survive."[23] The arts were essential to western, industrialized nations. More specifically, the Report

---

[21] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 103.

[22] Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 1951, 4.

[23] Ibid. 4.

maintained that the arts enhanced achievement in other fields.

> The work with which we have been entrusted is concerned with nothing less than the spiritual foundations of our national life. Canadian achievement in every field depends mainly on the quality of the Canadian mind and spirit. This quality is determined by what Canadians think, and think about; by the books they read, the pictures they see and the programmes they hear. These things, whether we call them arts and letters or use other words to describe them, we believe to lie at the roots of our life as a nation.[24]

The survival of the Canadian nation as a viable and productive member of the industrialized world hinged on the commission's recommendations, or, so the commissioners wanted the public to believe.

In addition to culture safeguarding the Canadian state, the arts had the potential to unify a disparate nation. The Report subscribed to the two-nation concept of Confederation; Canada represented the peaceful union of two founding cultures; the French and the English. "(The arts) are also the foundations of our national unity. We thought it deeply significant to hear repeatedly from representatives of the two Canadian cultures expressions of hope and of confidence that in our common cultivation of the things of the mind, Canadians - French and English-speaking - can find true "Canadianism"."[25] In supporting the two-nation theory of Confederation, however, the Commission effectively ignored Canada's diverse ethno-cultural reality.

The mandate was to be achieved by travelling across Canada

---

[24] Ibid. 271.

[25] Ibid. 271.

listening to petitions and representations from any loosely-defined cultural organization that wished to be heard. In this way, the Report would be representative of the views and wishes of ordinary Canadians. In the end, the commission received 473 representations from 1200 witnesses in 114 public sessions in 16 cities throughout a twelve month period in which the commissioners travelled over 10 000 miles.[26] By 1951, the Commission believed that its task had been accomplished.

> We are however, struck by the fact that those who appeared before us, whether representing one of the arts, the sciences, labour or the farm, spoke to us primarily as Canadians deeply interested in the entire scope of the vast enquiry which we ventured to undertake; in the hundreds of briefs which we received and in the thousands of pages of evidence which we gathered, we believe we have heard the voice of Canada. We should like to think that we have recorded and reproduced this voice as clearly and as honestly as it came to us throughout our country and from so many of our fellow-citizens.[27]

Litt concludes, however, that the claim of the Report's representativeness was "hogwash."[28] The commission typically heard only from the leadership of cultural organizations whose opinions did not necessarily represent the 'rank and file.'

The Report was divided into two parts. The first section, a survey of the existing state of Canadian culture, including art galleries, museums, libraries, universities and radio broadcasting, confirmed that Canada did have an active cultural life; the situation was bleak, but not hopeless. The first section also

---

[26] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 207.

[27] Report. 268.

[28] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 53.

discussed suggestions derived from the public hearings. The second section offered concrete recommendations to improve Canada's cultural life. The Report suggested two main points of attack: the involvement of the general population in cultural events and the subsidization of cultural institutions and events by the federal government: "the first must be of course, the will of our people to enrich and to quicken their cultural and intellectual life; our inquiry has made clear that this will is earnest and widespread among our fellow-citizens. The second essential is money. If we in Canada are to have a more plentiful and better cultural fare, we must pay for it."[29] Time and again, the Report proposed the infusion of money into museums, art galleries, universities, and other cultural institutions to improve service and to create new services.

The Report's suggestion to strengthen national cultural institutions with federal money was made with the hope of bolstering their "national influence to the fullest extent possible in their fields."[30] Litt suggests that "plans for tours and aid from centralized institutions were proposed, not with the idea of creating a monolithic and centralizing national culture, but as supplements and encouragements to local cultural activity."[31] Taking culture to the people would invite increased involvement of the public in cultural endeavours. Litt further explains that the

---

[29] Report, 272.

[30] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 187.

[31] Ibid. 201.

commissioners' desire to spread culture to as many Canadians as possible avoided being elitist because of the cultural elite's specific blend of nationalism and elitism. "But any such authoritarian tendencies were checked by other values. As always, nationalism offset elitism with the notion that a genuine Canadian culture identity could only emerge from the grass-roots. This led to a balancing of elitist standards with provisions for local expression."[32] Consequently, the Report suggested that there must be a shared effort of subsidization among all three levels of government.

The commissioners proffered Great Britain as a model of state intervention in the arts as opposed to private sponsorship in the United States made possible by personal and corporate wealth.[33] By looking to the government to protect and promote Canadian culture, the Report upheld the tradition of state intervention in Canada and it effectively formulated a cultural policy which differentiated Canada from the United States. Furthermore, the Commission believed that only a government-sponsored cultural policy could protect Canadian culture from the commercialism it abhorred in the United States. Rutherford affirms this point by suggesting that "the answer, or so the Massey Report had outlined, was a made-in Canada culture. That would insulate, better yet inoculate, the Canadian people against the perils of vulgarization a' la

---

[32] Ibid. 202.

[33] Report, 272-273.

America."[34] One of the specific ways to achieve this goal was through the support of public broadcasting. Consequently, the Report suggested that income to support the arts should come from general taxation and that the CBC should be funded by statutory grants from the government rather than parliamentary appropriations.[35] In this way, parliament would not have to vote on funds for the Corporation, and this practice would lend a more secure financial basis to the CBC thereby keeping political whim from the expression of creative impulse. This advice, however, was never taken.

The Massey commission gained acceptance for the principle of government aid for the arts by following the lead of cultural nationalists and associating cultural development with national survival. Litt reports that "numerous briefs emphasized that the development of a national identity was impeded by foreign mass culture and that national unity and international prestige suffered as a consequence. In this way, nationalism was used to invoke the state's sense of responsibility for its own jurisdiction and survival. The idea of the nation had to be backed by the strength of the state; government aid was required if Canadian culture was to flourish."[36]

The ultimate brainchild of the Report was a recommendation to create an umbrella organization to divert funds to the promotion of

---

[34] Rutherford, Primetime Canada, 16.

[35] Report, 294-295.

[36] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 173.

cultural activity. A proposed arts council would guide cultural development with federal money without involving the federal government too directly in cultural affairs. In an age of cold war, it was essential that the commission's recommendations not appear too authoritarian. In fact, the commissioners, themselves, would not have accepted any proposal which would have crossed the line of dictatorship. As a result, Litt suggests that "suspended somewhere between government and the people and belonging wholly to neither, the arts council proposal was the bureaucratic embodiment of the cultural elite and its liberal humanist principles."[37] The commissioners' ambitions were realized with the creation of the Canada Council in 1957. Granatstein reports that the Act which created the Council "enjoined the new body to 'foster and promote the study and enjoyment of, and the production of works in the arts, humanities, and social sciences'."[38]

In the pages of suggestions and specific recommendations to improve Canada's cultural life, a consistent theme of elitism and anti-Americanism pervaded the Report. As discussed previously, "high" culture was associated with Great Britain and Canada's future whereas mass or popular culture was associated with the United States. The Report lamented the influence of the United States on Canadian culture and saw the "vast cultural importations"

---

[37] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 185.

[38] J. L. Granatstein, "Culture and Scholarship: The First Ten Years of the Canada Council", Canadian Historical Review, 65, (1984), 445.

as the cause of Canada's cultural void.[39] "Culturally we have feasted on the bounty of our neighbours, and then we ask plaintively what is wrong with our progress in the arts."[40] Leaning on the cultural imports of our neighbour, our artistic progress had been marginalized. The Report was careful once again, however, to avoid sounding repressive.

> American influences on Canadian life to say the least, are impressive. There should be no thought of interfering with the liberty of all Canadians to enjoy them. Cultural exchanges are excellent in themselves. They widen the choice of the consumer and provide stimulating competition for the producer. It cannot be denied, however, that a vast and disproportionate amount of material coming from a single alien source may stifle rather than stimulate our own creative effort and, passively accepted without any standard of comparison, this may weaken critical faculties.[41]

Litt concurs that "overt anti-Americanism was muffled, but the message that American cultural imperialism was a threat to Canadian nationhood still came through loud and clear."[42]

The theme of anti-Americanism was most evident in discussions of broadcasting which became the most important issue of the commission's work. Considering the statistics of American programs on Canadian airwaves, this was not surprising. The commissioners viewed the broadcasting giant to the South with disdain and mistrust as the primary perpetrator of mass culture and as the cause of mass culture's popularity in Canada. Essentially, the

---

[39] Report. 17.

[40] Ibid. 15.

[41] Ibid. 18.

[42] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 212.

Commissioners argued that American television and radio were "commerical enterprise(s), an advertising industry" with "programmes of inferior cultural standards" which underestimated the intelligence of their audience.[43] The private broadcasters in Canada were the agents of this debasement. If Canadian broadcasting was spared excessive American influence, the cultural elite believed that the public would naturally choose expressions of high culture. Contingent upon these sentiments was the Report's ardent protection and support of the CBC which remained the bulwark of Canadianism throughout the post-World War II period. Not only could the CBC protect Canadian interests against American influence but it alone could improve public taste to accept the virtues of high culture.[44] Mary Vipond argues that the Commission's support for the CBC represented an elitist perspective: "The Massey Commission's firm belief in the CBC as the savior of the Canadian national tradition was a culmination of thirty years of debate among the nationalist elite about the role of the mass media in Canada."[45] Litt suggests, however, that the Massey Commission's support for the CBC was based on its views of education which focussed on the individual rather than the masses. "The fundamental justification for public broadcasting was to be found

---

[43] Report. 47.

[44] Litt, The Muses, The Masses, and the Massey Commission, 131.

[45] Mary Vipond, The Mass Media in Canada, (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Publishers, 1989), 46.

in the educational purposes of the cultural elite."[46] Regardless of the rationale, the Report argued that the CBC was fulfilling it's mandate.

> The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is in general performing its duty satisfactorily, sometimes even admirably, in providing appropriate and varied programmes; less admirably does it exercise its responsibilities of control. The national system, however, has constantly kept in view its three objectives for broadcasting in Canada: an adequate coverage of the entire population, opportunities for Canadian talent, and for Canadian self-expression generally, and successful resistance to the absorption of Canada into the general cultural pattern of the United States.[47]

In meeting this mandate, the CBC had stimulated the growth of national unity. "Canadian sectionalism is not yet a thing of the past, but it is certain that the energetic efforts of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in providing special regional programmes and informative talks, and in introducing a great variety of Canadians to their fellow-citizens, have done much to bring us nearer together. From Vancouver Island to Newfoundland and from the Mackenzie River to the border, Canadians have been given a new consciousness of their unity and of their diversity."[48] Considering the heavy responsibility of the CBC, the Commission could not accept any proposal that would jeopardize the positive effects of the Corporation. Further, the Commissioners did not refrain from declaring their intention: "we cannot accept any suggestions which would impair the principles on which our present

---

[46] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 133.

[47] Report, 40.

[48] Ibid. 280.

national system is based."[49] Therefore, the CBC was not subjected to recommendations for improvement or change; the Report reaffirmed the CBC's original mandate and praised the Corporation for past and present achievements.

The publication of the Report caused a stir in the artistic community in specific as well as in the country as a whole. After the Massey Report was tabled in the House of Commons on June 1, 1951, it made the front page of newspapers nationwide. Litt suggests that most editors did not dispute "the fundamental premise that culture, and high culture at that, was an essential concern for contemporary Canada" because of "the report's success in fusing culture with Canadian nationalism."[50] Bothwell adds that it was "greeted with acclaim by most of the Canadian artistic and intellectual community," with the exception of University of Toronto professor Frank Underhill, who opposed the Report's identification of mass culture with the United States.[51] Underhill argued that "mass culture was an inevitable concomitant of modern democracy and not some peculiar 'American' evil."[52] He believed that Canada was just as 'American' as the United States and that mass culture did not pose a threat to Canada. Although he did not endorse the private broadcasters lobby, he supported their views

---

[49] Ibid. 284.

[50] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 225-226.

[51] Bothwell, Canada Since 1945, 167.

[52] Ibid. 167.

that "Canada would find itself only through confident and unfettered interaction with the rest of the world."[53] In addition to the obvious opposition of the private broadcasters, the Quebec government of Maurice Duplessis also resisted the commission on the grounds that it encroached on the province's control over culture and education.[54] French-Canadian opinion, in general, however, was remarkably supportive of the commission. Compared to English-Canadians, French-Canadians recognized the importance of high culture and broadcasting to protect Canadian cultural interests from American mass culture. Almost two-thirds of the briefs received from French-Canadian groups did not even question the legitimacy of the commission and they were satisfied that the final Report did not overstep provincial powers.[55] Despite some opposition, the Report was met with a positive response from most segments of the population and, in fact, it caused a lot of excitement in the summer of 1951. Writing to her boss Andrew Allan, who was in England at the time of the Report's publication, his assistant recognized the excitement the document had aroused: "It has caused quite a stir here and some people feel that it is the dawn of a new hope."[56] The most consistent response to the document was definitely one of hope for the future of Canadian

---

[53] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 227.

[54] Bothwell, Canada Since 1945, 167.

[55] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 74, 228.

[56] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 2, letter to Allan from Alice, June 15, 1951.

culture. The enthusiasm found in another letter to Allan from a Canadian playwright, Ted Allan, who had been considering leaving Canada at the time the Report was published was quite contagious. The Massey Report justified his decision to stay in Canada.

> I am not leaving Canada. Not for the present. I have decided not to go to England - - - certainly not this year. Why have I changed my mind? I think for a variety of reasons but the Massey Report, strange as this may sound . . . seems to be the most important reason. It's detailed survey of our cultural life - - - it's detailed attack on American influences - - - it's exciting presentation of the hunger of our people for the work of our artists, musicians, writers, etc. - - - has done something to me and for me. It was exactly what I needed. I think it is exactly what you need. . . . For the first time perhaps I was able to understand the whys of our cultural backwardness - - - the whys of the influences from the United States. But - - - and this is what is exciting to me - - - thousands of fellow-Canadians, perhaps millions, share my feelings about the American influences, about the need for our own cultural expressions. Certainly this is the overwhelming point made by the Massey Report.[57]

The Report generated a sense of hope and promise for the future that Canadian culture was not as deficient as many suspected and that the situation would improve with time. And, most importantly, the government and the general population recognized that the arts were important to Canadian life. For artists such as Ted Allan, this recognition was essential to their self-confidence; for the first time, he felt needed and appreciated by his countrymen, and this perception persuaded him to stay in Canada.

Despite the initial wave of enthusiasm heightened by the government's immediate action in the areas of television

---

[57] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 2, letter to Andrew Allan from Ted Allan, June 11, 1951.

broadcasting and federal funding for universities, Litt reports that "the commotion subsided quickly, and thereafter it became very difficult to get the government to take decisive steps on any of the commission's other recommendations."[58] Two years after the Report's publication, only twelve of its one hundred and fourty six recommendations had been implemented.[59]

Cohen and Moore's response to the Report represented a less immediate and sustained reaction to the commission. True to his critical tendencies, Nathan Cohen lamented the downfalls of the Commission, but his critique had positive elements as well. Among his criticisms, he included the fact that the Report was not as definitive as it could have been. "Considered in its entirety, the Massey Report is by no means as complete a picture of the Canadian cultural scene as it should be. Its handling of certain fundamental questions is wholly inadequate; many of its proposals are ambiguous, a few are meaningless."[60] Unfortunately, he did not elaborate on the "fundamental questions" the Report failed to address thoroughly. He did argue that the Report did not discuss the issue of unity between French and English speaking Canadians: "the report has remarkably little to say about the particular problems of French Canada. Nor is there anything really concrete said about bringing our English and French speaking cultural elements into closer and more positive proximity, although the

---

[58] Litt, The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission, 243.

[59] Ibid. 237.

[60] Cohen in Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen, 185.

absence of any true social and intellectual reciprocity between our two main national groupings is a heavy stumbling block to Canadian cultural expression."[61] He also censured the Commission for its failure to propose a greater budget for the CBC and for the limited authority it would allow a proposed Canadian Arts Council.[62] Not as committed to capitalism as the Massey commissioners, Cohen advocated increased centralized control over the direction of Canadian culture.

Cohen's legitimate criticisms were accompanied by praise for the Massey Commission. Interestingly, he defended the Commission against claims that it was composed of intellectual snobs, a view that was circulated by some newspapers.

> Readers were given the impression that the document was put together by 'cultural snobs'and 'longhairs' eager to foist their 'highbrow' ideas on the Canadian public. If we are to take the anti-Massey Report propagandizing seriously, the adult Canadian is thoroughly incapable of mature thought and perception, and has no wish to understand and more comprehensively experience the world he lives in. He is, on the contrary, an unthinking slug, responsive only to the most elementary, preferably the most vulgar, forms of sensory and intellectual stimulation. The 'impractical' intellectuals, in contrast, respect the individual Canadian's intelligence, and do not treat him as mentally incompetent.[63]

Cohen agreed with the commissioners that individual Canadians could make their own decisions to improve their cultural diet and would naturally prefer intellectually stimulating forms of culture if given the opportunity. After the initial fanfare, Cohen further

---

[61] Ibid. 185-186.

[62] Ibid. 188.

[63] Ibid. 185.

argued that the newspapers had "truncated, minimized and garbled the report's actual contents" and had disproportionately "concentrated on the Commission's fears that Canada is becoming an American cultural (and by implication economic) colony."[64] Although he agreed that the threat of Americanization was very real, he argued that the report was more than anti-American: "The report is pro-Canadian. It's driving impulse is the fostering of a national culture, worthy of our status in the international family and our own industrial and intellectual potential, embodying all that is best from other lands and peoples, shaped and recast to satisfy the highest and best Canadian urgings and aspirations - a culture that has deep roots in our own soil and brings our vineyards to a rich and remunerative flowering."[65] Cohen continued his praise by suggesting that "the report represents a milestone in our history and is, actually, 'a Canadian declaration of social self-sufficiency and cultural independence'."[66]

If the Massey Report legitimized artistic pursuits, commentators proceeded to caution that one could not expect the instantaneous arrival of Canadian culture. Cohen warned that Canadians must resist the urge to "bypass the apprentice stage of culture and metamorphose overnight, from an instant, quick-frozen

---

[64] Ibid. 185.

[65] Ibid. 190.

[66] Ibid. 188.

state, as it were, into a full-fledged artistic maturity."[67] He further lamented that too many prominent Canadians had fallen into this trap: "Why do S. Morgan-Powell of the Montreal Star and William Arthur Deacon of the Toronto Globe and Mail still come forward periodically to announce - with a fanfare of trumpets - that Canadian culture has at last come of age?"[68] He argued that this tendency was due to "their acute desire to gain glory for Canada. Some of our intellectuals long for all mankind to become aware of Canadian genius, such as it is, and to render it honour".[69] Cohen firmly believed that creating a myth of Canadian artistic maturity served only to diminish the opportunity for sincere cultural growth. He was firmly committed to further progress in the arts rather than the maintenance of the status quo.

In 1957, the Canada Council was finally created. Initially, Mavor Moore held firm reservations on the potential effectiveness of the Council. He warned, "the real danger is that the 'safe' way will be taken - that is, grants will be made only to elder and respectable institutions and individuals, many of whom . . . are so rigidly traditional that they repress the genuinely fresh impulses among us that will eventually count."[70] He further argued that 'normal' business practices could not be applied to the creative

---

[67] Nathan Cohen, "Theatre Today: English Canada", Tamarack Review, no. 13, (Autumn 1959), 33.

[68] Cohen in Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen, 118.

[69] Ibid. 118.

[70] Mavor Moore, "What Will the Council Counsel?", Canadian Commentator, 1, no. 1, (January, 1957), 8.

arts. "(Imagination) is on the one hand of enormous value and on the other priceless. You cannot order it up, nor indeed order it down. But money is better spent (and thus in the end more efficiently spent) cultivating vital imagination in any of its odd habitats than in solidifying the hothouses of mediocrity."[71] He concluded that Canada "whose greatness lies in its potential future . . . will be better served by gambling on that future than by shoring up the present or embalming the past. We need a council made up not of cautious pillars of society but of shrewd gamblers."[72] Like Cohen, Moore did not believe in maintaining the status quo. He consistently sought **progress** in the arts, not simply **promotion** of the arts. In this way, he was a true cultural nationalist. As a result, he feared that the recommendations of the Massey Report sought only to perpetrate the status quo. In 1959, however, Moore praised the Council and reaffirmed his devotion to progress: "Above all, the creation of the Canada Council, endowed with national funds for the support of the arts, has made possible work of an uneconomic nature essential to our further progress."[73]

Perhaps one of Moore's greatest contributions to the cultural community during the 1945 - 1960 period was his optimism and enthusiasm for Canada's future in cultural pursuits. Although he

---

[71] Ibid. 8.

[72] Ibid. 9.

[73] Mavor Moore, "Theatre: Some Backsliding", Saturday Night, 74, no. 18, (August 29, 1959).

proclaimed in 1957 that the arts in Canada were still in a scarce state of affairs, he continued to envision hope and, in fact, saw Canada's lack of culture as a potential for good. "We look in the mirror and there is nothing there. Some sceptics have even suggested we have no mirror - that is, none or few of the arts reflective of our character, as these arts have reflected the character of other nations, past and present. We own the world's most famous blank face."[74] Yet, he continued to find a cause for hope in the situation.

> Much breath and ink are spent in controversy about the real nature of the face, most of it about as profitable as sorting maple leaves in a high wind. It serves only to obscure the paramount issue: that face is also a 'tabula rasa', and it is perhaps the most propitious on this distracted globe. Therefore the pattern that emerges on it, whether by accident or design, is of considerable consequence not only to ourselves but to our fellow men.
>
> The importance of the Canadian pattern to the rest of the world remains, perhaps, to be demonstrated decisively, but its importance to Canada is now being generally if belatedly recognized.[75]

Moore held a profound belief in the importance of Canadian cultural development to the rest of the world. He firmly believed that Canada had a valuable contribution to make to the world's culture.

With less of an international perspective, Andrew Allan also believed that Canadian culture was a vital concern. In a 1967 radio broadcast, he still urged the importance of cultural development and argued that sectionalism was adverse to cultural

---

[74] Mavor Moore, "A Theatre for Canada", University of Toronto Quarterly, 26, (1956-57), 1.

[75] Ibid. 1.

gains.

> Our problem is to discover what values we have that are beyond the bread-and-butter level . . . and to do this in an atmosphere of refinement, restraint, and artistry. If we and our provincial leaders think we can do this by setting regional economic demand against regional economic demand, we've got another think (sic) coming. . . .
>
> Immigrants who hang on to their own cultures because they find no distinctive culture in English Canada, may be forgiven if they find us like stunned survivors of a Grey Cup debauch. This way fragmentation lies.
>
> Let us make no mistake about it: cultural affairs are no luxury, but Canada's lifeline to survival.[76]

A decade and a half after the publication of the Massey Report, Allan continued to encourage a distinctive and unified English-Canadian culture.

Cohen, Moore and Allan's comments on the importance of culture to Canada's growth and development were certainly more acceptable to the general public after the publication of the Massey Report. The Report succeeded in creating an atmosphere of acceptance for cultural endeavours in a country which was perceived as a "cultural wasteland" in the years immediately proceeding 1945. The values embodied in the Report were also closely linked to the values supported by Allan, Cohen and Moore which have been discussed throughout the course of this study. This chapter has particularly illustrated the link between cultural elitism and nationalism as described by Paul Litt. Allan, Cohen and Moore represented the union of liberal humanism and nationalism which gained prominence after 1945.

---

[76] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 14, "Gerussi", December 4, 1967.

The publication of the Massey Report in 1951 heralded a new era of cultural activity in Canada. For the first time, public officials recognized that the arts were important to national growth and the government took responsibility for this development. Further, the Report set a precedent of government intervention in the arts; a policy which protected and differentiated Canadian culture from the United States. Offical recognition generated enthusiasm in the cultural community itself; hopes for the creation of a national theatre were revived. Recurring bouts of inferiority and cultural boosterism coupled with the Massey Commission's failure to advance more of its recommendations led to tarnished hopes and growing disillusionment by the end of the decade. The awareness that culture was important to Canadian growth, however, persisted long after 1951. Cultural nationalists continued to advocate further progress in the arts to define and confirm the Canadian identity.

CHAPTER 6 TELEVISION IN CANADA: HOPE AND DISILLUSIONMENT

Television was officially introduced in Canada in 1952. Several years prior to the CBC's first broadcast, however, many Canadians were exposed to American programming. As a result, by the end of the 1940s there was a growing sentiment that something must be done to define television's role in Canada. The governing Liberals came under increasing pressure to fulfill this goal. Television was perceived as an extension of radio and, therefore, it was relegated to the CBC. The race was on to provide Canadians with a national television service before it fell too far behind American broadcasting.[1]

The final chapter will explore television's astronomical rise in Canada, as well as the fears and hopes accompanying its ascent. The role of the mass media in general, will also be discussed. The views of Allan, Cohen, and Moore towards the greatest cultural force of our generation will be particularly illuminated. Their optimism and disillusionment are indicative of the cultural climate between 1945 and 1960.

Television was immediately placed under public control at the CBC because of the widespread belief that private broadcasters would succumb to the same commercialism and vulgarity cultural nationalists abhorred in American radio. In 1951 Nathan Cohen wrote; the "Massey Commission, fearful that Canadian telecasters

---

[1] Paul Rutherford, When Television Was Young: Primetime Canada 1952-1967, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 18.

will, if left to their own resources, exhibit the same lack of taste and sensibility as their American colleagues, would like to see TV made at once a ward of the wise men of the CBC, with no private stations to receive licenses until a national CBC-TV system begins transmitting."[2] This was exactly what happened. The 1930s debate between public and private broadcasters was essentially the same in the 1950s, though now the subject was television. Seen as an extension of radio, CBC television was expected to provide the same unifying experience. But, there was a difference. As Cohen pointed out, when the CBC adopted television it entered the entertainment business.

> When the CBC went into television it moved into a vacuum: entertainment had to be created virtually as an act of spontaneous combustion. It was not a task the CBC wanted. In radio the Corporation conceived itself as an institution dedicated to public service and the support first and foremost of serious cultural efforts.[3]

This new orientation demanded serious policy review and alteration as the CBC found itself entering the field of popular culture. In addition, CBC policymakers faced a formidable obstacle in carrying out their mandate: the huge expense required to implement a national television service. In the 1949-1950 season, the budget of the CBC had been 8.2 million dollars which was primarily covered by the two-dollar-and-fifty- cent license fee for listeners.[4] The

---

[2] Nathan Cohen, "Television and the Massey Report: TV Will Creep in on Soft-Soled Shoes", Saturday Night, 66, no. 38 (June 26, 1951), 11.

[3] Nathan Cohen, "Television and the Canadian Theatre", Queen's Quarterly, 64, (1957-58), 7.

[4] Rutherford, Primetime Canada, 42.

estimated cost of establishing similar services for television, however, was between 35 and 50 million dollars.[5] To raise revenue, CBC officials knew they would be forced to compete for advertising dollars. Competition would invite a degree of commercialism into their work, which the Massey Commissioners and other highbrows feared.[6] CBC policymakers were placed in a compromising position.

The experience of television was also vastly different from the artist's perspective. Drainie reports that the new medium represented a loss of creative control for the actor.

> Suddenly, in a television studio, the actor was no longer the centre. He was simply one of an extraordinarily complex series of elements, many of them mechanical or technological, that combined to create a unified visual and aural experience for the viewer. Those elements were being juggled out of the actor's view and hearing by the director in the control room. And it was impossible to figure out where the audience was when three cameras were all trained on the actors from different angles. In the middle of a performer's best passage, the director could well be choosing to shoot the back of his head or a tight close-up of his mouth or hands or a sustained reaction shot of his listener's face. No matter how compelling his performance, the actor had lost control of his relationship with the audience.[7]

Perhaps more importantly, the introduction of television signalled the end of the CBC family. "A large problem for the actors . . . was that the sense of family they had had at CBC radio had

---

[5] Cohen, "Soft-Soled Shoes", 11.

[6] Ibid. 11.

[7] Bronwyn Drainie, Living the Part. John Drainie and the Dilemma of Canadian Stardom, (Toronto: Macmillan, 1988), 183.

disappeared overnight."[8] Television dramatically changed the orientation and character of the CBC.

Despite the obstacles faced by CBC bureaucrats and artists, television was too powerful a medium to be ignored. In 1958, Moore reflected:

> Television, which combines the impact of so many of the arts - the visual effectiveness of the graphic and theatrical arts, the simultaneity of radio, the intimacy of literature - with a distribution that pales all else, is too powerful a mass medium to be used against the public interest, and since (so far) the control of a very few channels gives control over distribution, all parties in the Canadian Parliament have held this to be self-evident and inescapable: if we are to have Canadian broadcasting we must pay for it out of our own pockets, and we cannot afford not to have it.[9]

The potential of the mass medium represented a strong motivating force and the introduction of Canadian television in 1952 was a major accomplishment. By 1958 Moore reported that Canada's television network was the second largest in the world. He further noted that "96% of Canadian homes are furnished with radio sets; 63% (after five years of operation) with television sets, and that the fourty-five extant public and private television stations reach over 80% of our entire population, 55% of their schedule is Canadian produced, and sets in the average household are viewed for a staggering 4 1/2 to 5 hours every day."[10] By 1960 there were fourty-seven television stations in Canada, of which

---

[8] Ibid. 186.

[9] Mavor Moore, "Radio and Television", in The Arts in Canada. A Stock-Taking at Mid-Century, Malcolm Ross, ed., (Toronto: Macmillan, 1958), 119.

[10] Ibid. 116.

nine were CBC stations and the rest privately-owned CBC affiliates. The system was linked by a fifty million dollar "coast-to-coast relay system".[11] Paul Rutherford suggests that by 1960 "primetime viewing had become the single most common cultural experience of Canadians".[12] In addition to the sheer numbers of productions, the content of CBC television reached considerable acclaim during its early years. Cohen confessed that "the accomplishments of CBC television drama are prodigious. On the production level CBC play's are vastly superior to anything England offers, and at their best of the same high calibre as that done in the United States."[13] He further observed that "what is really noteworthy is the CBC's ability to produce as many variety shows as it does as well as it does".[14] The introduction of television in Canada was an astronomical feat.

The total conquest of television in less than a decade is an example and a result of the pervasiveness of mass media and technology, which have come to characterize modern civilization. Television's potential control over the daily lives of the population was overwhelming. This potential engendered fear and a hope for the future effects of television. Rutherford touches on this theme: the "worship of technology" which was pervasive in

---

[11] Mary Vipond, Mass Media in Canada, (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1989), 49.

[12] Rutherford, Primetime Canada, 8.

[13] Cohen, "Television and the Canadian Theatre", 8.

[14] Ibid. 8.

postwar North America was accompanied by "a worry about the effects of the new marvels. The trouble was that no one, not even those who disdained television, could escape its influence."[15] Indicative of this duality was the repeated cliche' of the time that "television had as much potential for good as for evil."[16] If entrusted to the publicly owned CBC, television's potential for good could be realized. At the same time, television could be easily vulgarized if it fell to the "wrong hands". These sentiments added fuel to the public versus private broadcasting debate introduced with the growth of radio.

The nature of the Canadian mass media is unique in the western industrialized world, combining public and private broadcasting systems to deal effectively with the facts of our national life. In the case of radio and television, the public broadcasting system was established to combat a strong American influence. It was widely believed that private broadcasters would sacrifice quality, Canadian programs for popular but commercial American broadcasts. The publicly owned CBC, however, would foster a sense of Canadianism and unity. As Vipond suggests, in Canada the mass media have been allotted this additional task.

> The mass media have been assigned two main political tasks in western countries: the implantation of the values of good citizenship and the dissemination of the news, opinions and debate necessary to the proper functioning of a democratic government. These two goals however, are not necessarily always congruent. In Canada, for example, governments have looked to the mass

---

[15] Rutherford, Primetime Canada, 20.

[16] Ibid. 21.

> media to help create and express a sense of unity and identity to weld together a vast and disparate nation.[17]

Like radio before it, television was expected to fulfill goals of national unity. Miller reflects on the lofty expectations for CBC television. "By the end of its first fifteen years of existence, CBC television was expected to contribute to national unity, strengthen our sense of identity, provide a regional balance, show a cross-section of Canadian culture, present controversial issues in a comprehensive and balanced way, strengthen our cultural fabric and serve as a patron to the arts".[18]

In addition to displaying a commitment to public broadcasting, Canada is a western nation that subscribes to the values of a free market economy and freedom of the press. Private stations, therefore, were permitted to compete for a share of the market and the government refrained from interfering with mass mediums. "The belief," concludes Vipond, "that the press should be immune from government intervention seems to have resulted in control by an economic elite whose interests sometimes run contrary to those of Canadian society and the Canadian state."[19] Such is the predicament of the Canadian compromise. This dissension compares to the conflict inherent to the philosophy of liberal humanism described by Paul Litt. Liberal humanists were committed to

---

[17] Vipond, The Mass Media in Canada, 145.

[18] Mary Jane Miller, "Canadian Television Drama 1952-1970: Canada's National Theatre", Theatre History in Canada, 5-6, (1984-85), 65.

[19] Vipond, The Mass Media in Canada, 145.

liberal ethics of freedom of speech, free enterprise and individual liberty but they were also dedicated to humanist values which they believed were jeopardized by capitalism and mass culture. Therefore, such liberal humanists as the Massey commissioners advocated a degree of state control over culture but their continued commitment to liberalism prevented them from supporting complete public ownership.

The dilemma between profit versus cultural uplift or mass culture versus high culture has been complicated by the fact that the line between culture and mass media has become blurred. The mass media, and particularly television, represent the vehicle through which much of our culture is transmitted to the public. "High" culture, then, has been transformed into popular culture by means of its dissemination. Vipond suggests that "cultural goods created by individuals or groups are carried to audiences by means of mass-manufactured instruments. This juxtaposition of cultural and economic functions lies at the root of many of the difficulties in coming to terms with the role of the mass media in our society."[20] In return for greater distribution, culture has been forced to succumb to ethics of the marketplace and in the process, culture has been subordinated. As Vipond reports, advertisers have become the real purchasers of cultural goods: "They choose to buy those they believe . . . will bring with them the most and the most contented, consumers. In a very real way, what the advertisers are

---

[20] Ibid. 71.

purchasing is not the cultural product but the audience."[21] In this way, culture has become secondary to "higher" economic considerations and has been profoundly effected by the nature of our mass media. The result of this trend has been the massive importation of American programming. To illustrate this fact, consider that in 1979 Canadian commercial broadcasters spent 30% of programming budgets on foreign programs, but from this 30% they generated 69% of advertising revenue.[22] Therefore, the profits made on American programming are used to "cross-subsidize" Canadian programming. "All the economic incentives lie in the direction of spending as little as possible on Canadian content; the result is low-budget shows with low audience appeal and therefore low ad revenue."[23] It is a vicious cycle which is frustrating to Canadian cultural producers. In this way, the mass media have marginalized culture and necessitated the distinction between high culture and mass entertainment. Culture, therefore, has been polarized into two distinct categories. Simultaneously, the distinction between high and mass culture has become clouded by cultural expression through mass mediums. The new advances in technology would not facilitate the growth of Canadian high culture as the Massey commissioners had hoped.

With the dawn of television in 1952, Allan, Cohen and Moore responded to its arrival in different and similar ways. For Allan,

---

[21] Ibid. 72.

[22] Ibid. 74.

[23] Ibid. 75.

television signalled the end of the golden era of radio. Upon his resignation in 1955 as Supervisor of Drama for the CBC, he illuminated the emotional turmoil he was experiencing. "I had come - with many others - to a crossroads as implacable as any that confronted Peer Gynt. As young men, we had entered a young medium. It had seemed our lives were made for us. But suddenly the young medium had grown old. Television had descended."[24] Coupled with problems in his personal life, Allan experienced several years of doubt and soul-searching, until he returned to radio in the mid-1960s. Even at this time, Allan betrayed his misgivings about the electronic age as exemplified by television. In discussing the advent of computers which had provided the "rapid dissemination of information" making us a "global village", he suggested that "wonder has been abolished".[25] In a later broadcast he scorned a future based on communications and information.

> In the era we are supposed to be leaving to enter the promised new one, communications have scarcely been marked by clarity, and the beauty that grows from clarity. It has been the era of the explosive word and the foggy idea. At this moment there is more information available to more people than ever before in history. But there is no sign that we have present the wisdom that makes the information useful - or even safe. We have never had so much talk and we have never been so tongue-tied.[26]

Allan was critical of a future that he did not understand, or, did

---

[24] Andrew Allan, A Self-Portrait, (Toronto: Macmillan, 1974), 124.

[25] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 14, "Assignment", June 2, 1967.

[26] PAC, Andrew Allan Papers, v. 14, "Assignment", December 3, 1968.

not want to understand. He was satisfied with the medium of radio and he did not wish to explore the possibilities of other, more powerful, mass mediums.

Cohen shared Allan's disdain for television although he initially envisioned television as a force of good. In 1951, he wrote that it would be possible in a few years to "gauge television's real potentialities as a means of making Canadians more communicative about themselves, to themselves."[27] He firmly believed that television had the potential to be a positive force. At the same time, however, he stated that television would not have as great of an impact as others anticipated. "Canadian TV promises to enter inauspiciously and, after the first excitement, will make only a moderate impression on the Canadian cultural and entertainment topography."[28] Cohen's underestimation of the medium may explain his initial optimism. By 1958, he was singing a different note. In an article addressing the effects of television on live theatre, he concluded that "the view of television as a catalyst on behalf of the theatre rested on a majestic fallacy."[29] Further, he lamented that "all the things said to television's discredit are true. Except a journalistic form, it is a talent-devouring, artistically-debilitating medium. It will cripple the actor and atrophy the writer if they stay with it too long."[30]

---

[27] Cohen, "Soft-Soled Shoes", 36.

[28] Ibid. 36.

[29] Cohen, "Television and the Canadian Theatre", 7.

[30] Ibid. 11.

Edmonstone observes that Cohen came to perceive television as the ultimate threat to the growth of Canadian culture. "And television, although it had consolidated Cohen's reputation as a critic, also utlimately became the final nail in the coffin of a distinctively Canadian theatre as envisioned by Cohen."[31] At the same time, however, Cohen showed a new respect for the power of television: "Since it alone offers help for any continuous theatrical activity and expression, its dangers must be minimized, its advantages explored to the uttermost limits and sustained as long as possible."[32]

Of the three men, Moore was the most optimistic about television's potential to continue the national experiment begun by radio. Contrary to Cohen, he argued that television had served to stimulate theatrical activity throughout the country.

> The federal government, until then unwilling to give direct support to the theatre, had now not only the chance but the mandate to develop Canadian talent; thus was born a typical Canadian compromise, the close co-operation of the living and mechanical theatres. Television is now performing the same competitive-co-operative function, making possible far more theatrical activity than it destroys. . . . in the space of time since radio grew up and television began to grow, there has been a notable increase in all our theatrical activity.[33]

Moore's opinions correspond with Miller's, who argues that "television drama has fostered the quickening growth of Canadian

---

[31] Wayne Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen. The Making of a Critic, (Toronto: Lester & Orpen, 1977), 231.

[32] Cohen in Edmonstone, Nathan Cohen, 11.

[33] Moore, "Theatre in English-Speaking Canada", in The Arts In Canada, 71.

theatre."[34] While Moore acknowledged the benefits of television, he did not refrain from criticism. He consistently warned that there was a real danger of Canadian television succumbing to one of two extremes: "The case for a distinctively Canadian television service has been kissed half to death by preciosity and chauvanism: by those who would limit culture to the hot-house variety, and those who would describe as wondrously Canadian every virtue admired by mankind in general."[35] He also warned that "there is a real danger here that Canadian programs will become known not for their immediacy and relevancy to our life but for their colossal grey dullness."[36] Creativity and inspiration must be the guideposts for future television development: only then would its benefits be fully realized. Moore continued to hope that television would be an agent of high culture and therefore, he perceived the greatest threats to Canadian television as commercialization and Americanization. He further argued that if business ethics governed the cultural industry, the Canadian artist might as well emigrate to be better paid for his efforts.

> The most persuasive of magnets, for both Canadian and newcomers, has always been the challenge of fresh and exciting programmes, made possible by our unique system.
>
> All the pressures which I have suggested - the tendency of commercialism to seek out the safe Lowest Common Denominator, the wish of pressure-groups to prettify their own image, the too successful attempts of others to avoid embarrassing controversy, the

---

[34] Miller, "Canadian Television Drama 1952-1970", 52.

[35] Mavor Moore, "Where Canadian Television is Headed", Saturday Night, (May 26, 1956), 10.

[36] Ibid. 12.

> predilection of a large segment of the audience for American shows and the consequent imitation of them - are all helping to kill the Goose that Lays the Golden Eggs . . . For it is clear enough to the artist that if he is to surrender to these pressures he might as well be getting better paid for his surrender - elsewhere.[37]

The lure of comfortable mediocrity and financial remuneration could be combatted with two weapons: "The first is our ability to talk to each other as Canadians about things Canadian . . . . The other is to develop a style or styles recognizeably our own, providing not only ourselves but the whole world with a new and vital article."[38] To Moore, the cause was not lost. His views on television and the revolution in communications technology in general remained inherently optimistic throughout this period. Unlike Allan, he was not threatened by the new advances in technology that were changing the pattern of everyday life and, more specifically, the world of communications and culture. His lack of alarm, however, did not reflect ignorance: "The borderline between fiction and fact, between dream and reality, becomes vaguer at the very same time as the difference between them becomes more easily demonstrable. And as the comprehended universe expands the consequent effects on man become psychologically more complicated. So that in both areas of his artistic perception and expression, Nature and Himself, man is launched into a new era."[39] Although he recognized that a new era in communications technology had begun

---

[37] Moore, "Radio and Television", in The Arts in Canada, 123.

[38] Ibid. 123.

[39] Mavor Moore, "What Sputnik has Done to the Arts", Canadian Commentator, 2, no. 1 (January 1958), 1.

where "communications will have become so massive, so expensive and so overpowering that conditioning a whole world will be entirely practical," he did not lose faith: "This prospect need not frighten us if our artists keep their wits about them and grow with the times. It will be disastrous if they cling, like neurotic children, to their old toys."[40] Considering the imminence of such an age, he argued that the artist would become increasingly important, "as science leads us into an ever greater universe, art becomes not less but more important: it does us no good to know how to get someplace unless we know and care where we want to go, and what we want to do when we get there."[41] In accordance with the philosophy of liberal humanism, Moore consistently stressed the importance of man in an age that was becoming increasingly technological and scientific.

Although Moore was a humanist, he did not feel threatened by technological advance. He embraced the future and argued that Canadian broadcasters and artists had a legitimate contribution to make to the world's culture. In 1956, he reflected: "What matters is not that we are Canadian, but that 'because' we are Canadian we have a rare chance to contribute new ideas, techniques and methods to a world crying for them. We shall betray ourselves and humanity if we allow our wagon to get hitched to the glittering European past, the glittering American present, or any other nag than our

---

[40] Ibid. 2.

[41] Ibid. 2.

own glittering future."[42] Two years later his hope for the future was undiminished: "If we are able to hold at bay the forces which would anchor us to provincial mediocrity, or push us into timid counterfeiting, we shall be in a rare position to call the tune for the future of television everywhere. If we can so enrich ourselves and the world, the Canadian system of broadcasting, that curious hybrid, will have justified itself."[43]

Canadians greeted the introduction of television in 1952 with a mixture of hope, fear, awe and indifference. It was hoped that television would cement national unity and it was feared that its potential would pervert cultural standards and promote Americanization. The responses of Allan, Cohen and Moore to television's arrival in Canada illuminate the complexity of the powerful new medium. By the end of the decade television had completely hijacked other dramatic pursuits and represented the cultural mainfare of most Canadians. It soon became clear that television would not become the sole purveyor of high culture as cultural elites had hoped. Popular culture and American mass culture continued to thrive on private stations and on the CBC well into the next decade.

---

[42] Moore, "Where Canadian Television is Headed", 12.

[43] Moore, "Radio and Television", in The Arts in Canada, 124.

CONCLUSION

The experiences of cultural nationalists in the 1945 - 1960 period were both fulfilling and disappointing. The accomplishments of radio, government support for the arts, and the debut of the Stratford Festival all contributed to the growth of a national theatre both on the air and on the stage. Allan, Cohen and Moore actively pursued the creation of a national theatre. They believed that drama could reflect the nation and its values: a sparsely-populated, bicultural country with ties to both England and the United States which was coming of age culturally and internationally in an age of interdependence combined with values of cultural pluralism, humanism, social tolerance, self-enlightenment and progress. By reflecting the Canadian reality they argued that a national theatre would encourage further expressions of Canadianism and advance national unity and cultural identity. CBC radio's "Stage", broadcast across the country from 1944 to 1955 under the guidance of Andrew Allan, came the closest to providing a national theatre by maintaining outlets for Canadian talent and encouraging a Canadian voice by dealing with sensitive topics pertinent to the post-World War II period. Limited to smaller geographical regions, live theatre met with less success. At the beginning of the period, however, significant advances were made with the growth of amateur and professional theatre groups, and particularly with the onset of the Stratford Festival in 1953.

The publication of the Massey Report in 1951 encouraged these endeavours and created an atmosphere of enthusiasm for the future of Canadian culture.

Improvements in English-Canada's cultural life were curbed by an inferiority complex which led to public apathy and artistic self-doubt. The failure of the Massey Report to capitalize on more of its recommendations also contributed to the growing disillusionment. The onslaught of television in 1952 and its rapid ascent further transformed Canada's cultural landscape. Television sapped artistic talent and funding from radio and live theatre and subsequently, the emphasis of cultural nationalists shifted to the new medium. Hopes for national unity through the promotion of high culture were temporarily placed with television until it became evident that the new medium had predominantly succumbed to commercialization and Americanization.

In the space of approximately fifteen years, Canadians witnessed dramatic change in Canadian culture. A precedent of government intervention in the arts was firmly established with the Massey Commission from 1949 to 1951. More significantly, the Canada Council was established in 1957 to divert funds to cultural endeavours. The professional artist now came to the forefront while the amateur became a cultural consumer. Radio enjoyed considerable acclaim and experienced its "glory days." By the end of the period, however, radio had been marginalized by the omnipotence of television which quickly became the most frequent cultural pursuit of many Canadians. This trend intensified during

the 1960s. Perhaps the most significant development was that most Canadians, and, indeed, the Canadian government, recognized that culture was an important element of Canadian life. Cultural nationalists went further and argued that the arts were important to national sovereignty and identity. Although such cultural nationalists as Andrew Allan, Nathan Cohen and Mavor Moore were largely disappointed in the postwar period, they advanced the cause of English-Canadian culture by treating Canadian artists and culture with respect and by demanding first-rate performances which rejected provincialism, sentimentality, and the status quo. By refusing to accept the mediocre, Allan, Cohen and Moore contributed to the progress of English-Canadian culture.

Such an important era in Canada's cultural life deserves considerable attention from the historical discipline. This thesis has been primarily concerned with what three individuals thought about culture, and particularly drama, during the 1945 - 1960 period and what they believed the pursuit of a national theatre could accomplish in English-Canada. There are many fascinating questions still to be explored from the historical perspective. Each of the topics dealt with in this thesis, CBC radio drama, the Stratford Festival, amateur and professional theatre groups, the Canada Council, the beginning of Canadian television and the plights of public and private broadcasters deserve a more detailed analysis. On the other hand, a study of this nature could benefit from a more general approach including an examination of all forms of culture emanating from both English and French Canada.

Throughout the research and writing of this thesis, several intriguing questions came to the forefront which also deserve investigation. Has the mandate of public broadcasting justified itself; or, has it really contributed to national unity? What forces motivated private broadcasters? What were the politics behind the creation of a Shakespearean Festival at the height of nationalism triggered by the Massey Report? Considering the rapid rise of television, who promoted its development in Canada?

The most interesting question is whether or not a national culture is essential to our survival as a sovereign state? Allan, Cohen, and Moore all argued that the cultivation of the arts was a necessary task to ensure the nation's survival and differentiate us from the Americans. If every magazine we read, every television show we watch, and every play we see are American, with American textbooks in the schools, and American commercials on television and radio, would we cease to be Canadian? It is an important question which is just as important now as it was in the 1945 - 1960 period. Perhaps the most satisfying answer, is that, in spite of ourselves, and as a result of our constant soul-searching, Canadian culture has developed and become something quite unique in the western world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Unpublished Papers

Allan, Andrew Papers - PAC.

Cohen, Nathan Papers - PAC.

Published Papers

Allan, Andrew. A Self-Portrait. Toronto: Macmillan, 1974.

Bird, Roger. Ed. Documents of Canadian Broadcasting. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1988.

Cohen, Nathan. "Television and the Massey Report: TV Will Creep in on Soft-Soled Shoes". Saturday Night. 66, no. 8 (June 26, 1951), 11, 36.

----------. "Theatre Notes. Tyrone Guthrie. A Minority Report". Queen's Quarterly. 62 (1955-56), 423-426.

----------. "Tamburlaine: Shadow Over Stratford". Saturday Night. 71 (March-December, 1956), 9-10.

----------. "Bridey Murphy: A Grubby Hoax". Saturday Night. (April 28, 1956), 11-12.

----------. "Summer Theatre Troubles". Saturday Night. (July 21, 1956), 15-16.

----------. "Canada's Homesick Expatriates". Saturday Night. (November 24, 1956), 10-12.

----------. "Television and the Canadian Theatre". Queen's Quarterly. 64 (1957-58), 1-11.

----------. "Theatre Today: English Canada". Tamarack Review. no. 13 (Autumn 1959), 24-37.

----------. "In View". Saturday Night. 79, no. 4 (April, 1964), 7-8.

----------. "In View". Saturday Night. 80 (February, 1965), 6-7.

----------. "Stratford After Fifteen Years". Queen's Quarterly. 75 (1968), 35-61.

Denison, Merrill. "Nationalism and Drama". Canadian Theatre Review. 8 (Fall, 1975), 74-78.

Fink, Howard and John Jackson. Eds. All the Bright Company. Radio Drama Produced by Andrew Allan. Toronto: CBC Enterprises, and Kingston: Quarry Press, 1987.

Fulford, Robert. Best Seat in the House. Memoirs of a Lucky Man. Toronto: Collins, 1988.

Moore, Mavor. "The Canadian Theatre". The Canadian Forum. XXX, no. 355 (August 1950), 108,110.

----------. "Where Canadian Television is Headed". Saturday Night. (May 26, 1956), 10-12.

----------. "A Theatre for Canada". University of Toronto Quarterly. 26 (1956-57), 1-16.

----------. "What Will the Council Counsel?". Canadian Commentator. 1, no. 1 (January, 1957), 8-9.

----------. "United We Fall". Canadian Commentator. 1, no. 9 (September, 1957), 4-5.

----------. "Snobs at Stratford". Canadian Commentator. 1, no. 9 (September, 1957), 7-8.

----------. "Who Killed Agatha Christie? The Snobbery of the Critics." Canadian Commentator. 1. no. 10 (October, 1957), 6-7.

----------. "What Sputnik Has Done to the Arts". Canadian Commentator. 2, no. 1 (January, 1958), 1-2.

----------. "Theatre in English-Speaking Canada". In The Arts in Canada. A Stock-Taking at Mid-Century. Malcolm Ross. Ed. Canada: The MacMillan Company of Canada Limited, 1958. 68-76.

----------. "Radio and Television". In The Arts in Canada. A Stock-Taking at Mid-Century. Malcolm Ross, Ed. Canada: Macmillan, 1958. 116-124.

----------. "Theatre: Some Backsliding". Saturday Night. 74, no. 18 (August 29, 1959).

Novek, Ralph. "Drama". Northern Review. 2, no. 2 (July - August, 1948), 29 - 33.

Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 1951.

Ross, Malcolm. Ed. The Arts in Canada. A Stock-Taking at Mid-Century. Toronto: Macmillan, 1958.

Sinclair, Lister. "Andrew Allan". Canadian Forum. XXX, no. 352 (May, 1950), 35.

Secondary Sources

Books

Ball, John and Richard Plant. A Bibliography of Canadian Theatre History. 1583-1975. Toronto: The Playwrights Co-op., 1976.

Bothwell, Robert, Ian Drummond, and John English. Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics, and Provincialism. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Drainie, Bronwyn. Living the Part. John Drainie and the Dilemna of Canadian Stardom. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1988.

Edmonstone, Wayne E. Nathan Cohen. The Making of a Critic. Toronto: Lester and Orpen Limited, 1977.

Frick, N. Alice. Image in the Mind. CBC Radio Drama 1944-1954. Toronto: Canadian Stage & Arts Publications Ltd., 1987.

Klinck, Carl F. Ed. Literary History of Canada. Canadian Literature in English. Second Edition. Volume Two. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Litt, Paul. The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

Mosse, George L. The Culture of Western Europe. The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Third Edition. Boulder & London: Westview Press, 1988.

New, William H. Ed. Dramatists in Canada. Selected Essays. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1972.

Rubin, Don. Creeping Towards a Culture. The Theatre in English Canada Since 1945. Guelph: Alive Press, 1974.

Rutherford, Paul. When Television Was Young: Primetime Canada 1952-1967. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Thompson, John Herd with Allen Seager. Canada 1922-1939. Decades of Discord. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1985.

Tippett, Maria. The Making of English-Canadian Culture, 1900-1939: External Influences. Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies Lecture Series. Toronto: York University, 1988.

----------. Making Culture. English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts before the Massey Commission. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Vipond, Mary. The Mass Media in Canada. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Publishers, 1989.

Articles

Bumsted, J. M. "Canada and American Culture in the 1950s". Bulletin of Canadian Studies. 3-4 (1979-80), 54-74.

Clark, S. D. "The Post Second World War Canadian Society". Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology. 12, no.1, (1975), 25-32.

Cook, Ramsay. "Cultural Nationalism in Canada: An Historical Perspective". Canadian Cultural Nationalism. The Fourth Lester B. Pearson Conference on the Canada-United States Relationship. Janice L. Murray. Ed. New York: New York University Press, 1977.

Fortner, Robert S. "Signification and Legitimacy in Public Policy Debates: The Canadian Public and the Politics of Language in Canadian Broadcasting Development". Journal of Canadian Studies. 23 (Winter 1988-89), 82-108.

Gagne, Raymond. "French Canada: The Interrelationship between Culture, Language, and Personality". Canadian History Since Confederation. Essays and Interpretations. Bruce Hodgins and Robert Page, Eds. Georgetown: Irwin-Dorsey Limited, 1972. 521-540.

Gardner, David. "Dora Mavor Moore (1888-1979)", Theatre History in Canada. 1, no. 1 (Spring 1980), 5-11.

Granatstein, J. L. "Culture and Scholarship: The First Ten Years of the Canada Council". Canadian Historical Review. 65, no. 4 (Dec. 1984), 441-474.

McCaughna, David. "Nathan Cohen. In Retrospect". Canadian Theatre Review. 8 (Fall 1975), 27-36.

McKillop, A. B. "Culture, Intellect, and Context". Journal of Canadian Studies. 24 (1989), 7-31.

Miller, Mary Jane. "Canadian Television Drama 1952-1970: Canada's National Theatre". Theatre History in Canada. 5 - 6 (1984-85), 51-71.

Nolan, Michael. "An Infant Industry: Canadian Private Radio, 1919-36". Canadian Historical Review. 70 (1989), 496-518.

Shore, Marlene. " "Overtures of an Era Being Born" F. R. Scott: Cultural Nationalism and Social Criticism 1925-1939". Journal of Canadian Studies. 15 (1980-81), 31-42.

Stuart, Ron. "Theatre in Canada. An Historical Perspective". Canadian Theatre Review. 5 (Winter 1975), 6-15.

Tippett, Maria. "The Writing of English-Canadian Cultural History, 1970-1985". Canadian Historical Review. 67 (1986), 548-561.

Vipond, Mary. "The Canadian Author's Association in the 1920s: A Case Study in Cultural Nationalism". Journal of Canadian Studies. 15 (1980-81), 68-79.

Theses

Buffie, Erna. "The Massey Report and the Intellectuals: Tory Cultural Nationalism in Ontario in the 1950s". M. A. Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1982.