UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE

FAKULTA SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD

Institut mezinárodních studií

Veronika Havlíková

Anti-Americanism and Canadian Cultural Policy (1928-1957)

Diplomová práce

Praha 2017

Autor práce: **Veronika Havlíková**
Vedoucí práce: **Mgr. Ing. Magdalena Fiřtová, Ph.D.**

Rok obhajoby: 2017

Bibliografický záznam

HAVLÍKOVÁ, Veronika. *Anti-Americanism and Canadian Cultural Policy (1928-1957).* Praha, 2017. 90 s. Diplomová práce (Mgr.) Univerzita Karlova, Fakulta sociálních věd, Institut mezinárodních studií. Katedra severoamerických studií. Vedoucí diplomové práce Mgr. Ing. Magdalena Fiřtová, Ph.D.

Abstrakt

Tato diplomová práce nazvaná „Antiamerikanismus a kanadská kulturní politika v letech 1928 až 1957“ se zabývá vlivem antiamerikanismu, zapříčiněného strachem z amerikanizace a kulturního pohlcení Spojenými státy, na kulturní politiky kanadské federální vlády v tomto formativním období pro vývoj svébytné kanadské národní identity po rozpadu Britského impéria. Na základě interpretativní obsahové analýzy dvou klíčových vládních dokumentů, takzvané Airdovy komise (1928-1929) a Masseyho komise (1949-1951), práce zkoumá, jaké byly hlavní motivy a faktory ovlivňující vládní intervenci v oblasti kultury a posuzuje jakou roli mezi těmito faktory sehrál antiamerikanismus jako reakce na něco, co bylo vnímáno jako americká kulturní invaze ohrožující vývoj svébytné kanadské kultury. Teoretický rámec práce představuje různá pojetí antiamerikanismu, a především jeho charakteristickou povahu v kanadském prostředí, a dále vymezuje koncept kulturního imperialismu, který nám umožní lépe porozumět kanadské snaze vymezit se proti americkému kulturnímu vlivu ve zkoumaném období.

Abstract

This thesis named “Anti-Americanism and Canadian Cultural Policy (1928-1957)” examines how Canadian federal government cultural policies were influenced by a specific form of anti-Americanism, which reflected concerns over Americanization and cultural absorption by the United States, in this formative period for the development of a distinct national identity during the time of Canada’s colony-to-nation transition. The chosen research design is interpretative content analysis of the reports of two Canadian royal commissions commonly known as the Aird Commission (1928-1929) and the Massey Commission (1949-1951). The aim of this thesis is to identify the main factors

and incentives for a policy of government intervention in the field of culture and to assess the role of anti-Americanism as a response to what was perceived as American cultural invasion that threatened the development of a distinct Canadian culture. The theoretical framework contains a discussion about different forms of anti-Americanism, with emphasis on its unique nature in Canada, and introduces the concept of cultural imperialism which helps us to better understand Canadian opposition to American cultural influences in the examined period.

Klíčová slova

Kanada, USA, kanadsko-americké vztahy, kanadská kulturní politika, Airdova komise, Masseyho komise, antiamerikanismus, kulturní imperialismus

Keywords

Canada, U.S., Canada-U.S. relations, Canadian cultural policy, Aird Commission, Massey Commission, anti-Americanism, cultural imperialism

Rozsah práce: 178 431 znaků

Prohlášení

1. Prohlašuji, že jsem předkládanou práci zpracovala samostatně a použila jen uvedené prameny a literaturu.
2. Prohlašuji, že práce nebyla využita k získání jiného titulu.
3. Souhlasím s tím, aby práce byla zpřístupněna pro studijní a výzkumné účely.

V Praze dne 31. 7. 2017 Veronika Havlíková

Poděkování

Na tomto místě bych ráda poděkovala vedoucí práce Mgr. Ing. Magdaleně Fiřtové, Ph.D. za odborné vedení, trpělivost a ochotu, kterou mi v průběhu zpracování diplomové práce věnovala. Děkuji také své rodině a blízkým za veškerou podporu, které se mi z jejich strany v průběhu psaní dostalo.

Institut mezinárodních studií
Teze diplomové práce

Jméno:
Veronika Havlíková

E-mail:
veronika.havlikova@gmail.com

Semestr:
LS

Akademický rok:
2015/2016 (změna původních tezí odevzdávaných v LS 2013/2014)

Název práce:
Antiamerikanismus a kanadská kulturní politika v letech 1928 až 1957
Anti-Americanism and Canadian Cultural Policy (1928-1957) – práce je psaná v angličtině

Předpokládaný termín ukončení (semestr, školní rok):
LS 2016/2017

Vedoucí diplomového semináře:
prof. PhDr. Svatava Raková, CSc.

Vedoucí práce:
Mgr. Ing. Magdalena Fiřtová, PhD.

V čem se oproti původnímu zadání změnil cíl práce?
Původním cílem práce bylo na základě výzkumu konkrétních kulturních oblastí (literatury, filmu, médií) zjistit, jakým způsobem kanadský antiamerikanismus a hledání národní identity v 50.letech definovaly kanadskou kulturu a kanadsko-americké kulturní vztahy. Práce však prošla od doby zadání výrazným vývojem a změnami. Nyní je cílem práce na základě obsahové analýzy dvou vládních dokumentů (takzvané Airdovy a Masseyho komise) dokázat vliv antiamerikanismu, zapříčiněného strachem z amerikanizace a kulturního pohlcení, na intervence kanadské vlády v oblasti kultury v letech 1928 až 1957.

Jaké změny nastaly v časovém, teritoriálním a věcném vymezení tématu?
Změny nastaly také v časovém vymezení tématu, které je nyní vymezeno založením první zkoumané komise roku 1928 až rokem 1957, kdy došlo k naplnění hlavního doporučení Masseyho komise, čímž bylo založení Kanadské rady pro umění, která představuje důležitý mezník ve vývoji kanadské kulturní politiky.

Jak se proměnila struktura práce (vyjádřete stručným obsahem)?
Struktura práce se proměnila vzhledem ke změně metodologické koncepce práce. Na teoretický úvod bude navazovat obsahová analýza dvou zkoumaných vládních dokumentů.

- 1. kapitola – teoretická základna: antiamerikanismus a kulturní imperialismus
- 2. kapitola – obsahová analýza Airdovy komise
  Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 1928-1929
- 3. kapitola – obsahová analýza Masseyho komise
  Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 1949-1951

Jakým vývojem prošla metodologická koncepce práce?
Metodologická koncepce práce se změnila. Původně měla práce na základě výzkumu několika konkrétních oblastí kanadské kultury (případové studie) zkoumat a hodnotit vliv kanadského anti-amerikanismu na vytváření svébytné kanadské kultury a na podobu kanadsko-amerických kulturních vztahů. Nyní je hlavní metodou, jak již bylo řečeno, obsahová analýza.

Které nové prameny a sekundární literatura byly zpracovány a jak tato skutečnost ovlivnila celek práce?
Canada. Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting. Report. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1929.

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

Brison, Jeffrey. *Rockefeler, Carnegie and Canada: American Philanthropy and the Arts and Letters in Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press - MQUP, 2005.

Granatstein, J. L. *Yankee Go Home?: Canadians and Anti-Americanism*. Toronto: HarperCollins Canada, Limited, 1997.

Hillmer, Norman, and A. Chapnick. *Canadas of the Mind: The Making and Unmaking of Canadian Nationalisms in the Twentieth Century*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press - MQUP, 2007.

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

Mulcahy, Kevin V. "Cultural Imperialism and Cultural Sovereignty: U.S.-Canadian Cultural Relations." In *American Review of Canadian Studies*, Volume 30, Issue 2, 2000.

O'Connor, Brendon, and M. Griffiths. *Anti-Americanism: Comparative perspectives*. Oxford: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2007.

Tippett, Maria. *Making Culture: English Canadian Institutions and the Art before Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Thorner, Thomas. *A Country Nourished on Self-doubt: Documents in Post-confederation Canadian History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Charakterizujte základní proměny práce v době od zadání projektu do odevzdání tezí a pokuste se vyhodnotit, jaký pokrok na práci jste během semestru zaznamenali (v bodech):

- Přesnější časové vymezení tématu
- Výběr teoretické základny práce
- Nové primární zdroje a sekundární literatura

Podpis studenta a datum:

Schváleno:	**Datum**	**Podpis**
Vedoucí práce		
Vedoucí diplomového semináře		

Content

Introduction

The arrival of new technology always means a challenge for the government. It brings about technical questions of regulation and subsidies, but also larger ones about the impact of such technology on people and society in general. This thesis looks at two of such moments in Canadian history: the arrival of radio and television; and examines how the state cultural policies at that time were influenced by anti-Americanism which reflected concerns over Americanization and cultural absorption by the United States. It argues that even though the concept of cultural imperialism was described and adopted in academic discourse much later, it provides a useful framework for analyzing Canadian cultural policies in the 1920s to 1950s and that the phenomena of anti-Americanism and American cultural imperialism contributed to the establishment of institutional framework in the domain of culture.

Canadian culture has always been influenced by the presence of an external "other". First it was its mother country, Britain, then since the 1920s, significant impact of American cultural influences started to play an important role in Canada. This external "threat" provided Canadian culture with a strong incentive to create its own production and government subsidized cultural infrastructure. Canadians worried that the pervasive influence of American mass culture spread through movies, radio, magazines, etc. could threaten the identity of Canadians who would become "Americanized". Canadian concern about its independent identity has long been a basic characteristic of Canada – this specific aspect of Canadian identity can be only understood in relation to the U.S.[1] After the Second World War, when Canada and the U.S. were becoming militarily and economically closer, they seemed to be growing culturally closer as well. However, the notion of anti-Americanism in Canada remained present as one of the aspects how Canadians define themselves – as not-Americans.

This thesis analyzes two Canadian royal commissions: the Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 1928-1929 (the Aird Commission) and the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 1949-1951 (the Massey Commission); both focused on the role of federal government in media and cultural domains. The aim of the thesis is to identify the main factors and incentives for government intervention in the field of culture, assessing the role of anti-Americanism,

[1] John Herd Thompson and Mark Paul Richard, "Canadian History in North American Context," in *Canadian Studies in the New Millennium*, ed. Mark Kasoff and Patrick James (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 53.

caused by the fear of Americanization, cultural absorption and the perception of American cultural invasion, in the commissions' recommendations. As the covered period was also a formative period for Canadian nationhood, we can assume that cultural policies were an essential component of nation-building and well as an opposition to the pervasive influences from south of the border.

The two commissions were chosen based on their importance in the history of Canada's government involvement in the cultural domain. The Aird Commission was first of its kind in the country that dealt with a new media technology. Furthermore, it laid foundations for the establishment of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and thus setting a precedent of state's cultural policy. The Massey Commission is up to this day regarded as a milestone in the development of Canadian cultural policies and thus could not have been omitted from any work dealing with this topic. Among its many important recommendations, that were to play an important role in forming Canadian distinct cultural identity, the commission proposed the creation of the Canada Council, an institution that embodies the distinct Canadian approach to cultural policies: it has served for developing culture domestically but also promoting Canadian culture abroad.

The time period covered by this thesis was chosen based on the importance of the commissions and their recommendations as well as more general nation-building efforts of Canada. After both World Wars, we can observe similar trends of weakening of the British influence and strengthening of the U.S. one. This could be best exemplified by the presence of foreign capital as the war-damaged British economy gave its place to a much stronger U.S. economy. Additionally, after the First World War, Canada had to unite the country again as its population was split over its involvement in the conflict. The process of creating a national narrative and identity was equally important for domestic audience as well as international one in the years following the Second World War. Each of the commissions was also dealing with a specific mass medium – radio and TV – which were seen both as a threat but also an opportunity, especially in the times of Canada's transformation from colony to nation that was happening during those years.

Although this thesis deals with historical events, it touches upon themes relevant to us today. The theme of threat of the new technology for the state has been omnipresent. Nowadays governments all around the world struggle with various challenges linked to the spread of Internet, including questions of anonymity, net neutrality, copyright and more recently fake news. Especially the latter problem illustrates the basic challenge that mass media bring to governments – they question traditional authorities and elites and

threaten their gate-keeping status in the access to information. These challenges also bring about discussions about the role of state in media and culture and the correct setting of boundaries of its involvement, finding the delicate line between benefits of the public service broadcasting and politicization of broadcasting councils. Another phenomenon that this thesis grapples with is that of a cultural hegemony which Canada had to face earlier than the rest of the world. American prevalence in culture came about most significantly in the post-Cold War period and during the 1990s when globalization was unraveling but even today people feel threatened as English confirmed its status of lingua franca and popular U.S. TV series spread faster than ever both legally and illegally thanks to the Internet. Hence, even though the media for spreading information and culture changed dramatically over the last century, the questions they bring about remain essentially the same.

The first chapter of this thesis provides a theoretical framework of anti-Americanism and cultural imperialism. Due to its geographical and lingual proximity, opposition to the U.S. is one of the omnipresent motifs in building the distinct Canadian national identity. Therefore, as this chapter illustrates, anti-Americanism has a specific meaning in the Canadian context and it is not necessarily hostile. Cultural imperialism, often seen as domination of money and size, found its way into academic discourse later but provides useful lens for analyzing the atmosphere in which Canadian cultural policies were formed.

The thesis body consists of two chapters analyzing the selected commissions. Both chapters start with an introduction of the commission and its submitted report, the main findings and recommendations as well as the historical context and reasons for setting up the commission. Then the chapters are divided into sections that analyze the main factors and incentives for the recommendations of government intervention in the field of culture and assessing the factor of anti-Americanism and concerns over Americanization among those. Last part of each chapter focuses on the significance and aftermath of these commissions and implementation of their recommendations.

The chosen research design for this thesis is interpretative content analysis. The thesis is based upon two primary sources – the reports of the Aird and Massey Commissions, which are both subjected to a content analysis with special attention to their unique historical context. The analysis is supplemented by data from Gallup Polls

Canada, which started in 1945, and a rich body of secondary literature. The secondary literature was used for two purposes: firstly, to illustrate the discussions about anti-Americanism and cultural imperialism with special relevance to the Canadian context, and secondly, to highlight the discussions about the commissions and their significance in the development of Canadian cultural policies. The theoretical framework for this thesis introducing the main concepts and relevant literature can be found in the next chapter.

1. Theoretical framework

1.1 Anti-Americanism

Anti-Americanism is a "multifaceted and complex phenomenon,"[2] with immense "variation by country, region and across time."[3] Hence, there exists a wide range of different definitions and typologies of the concept. Paul Hollander, one of the leading scholars on anti-Americanism, says that the "term has been employed to denote a particular mind-set, an attitude of distaste, aversion or intense hostility the roots of which may be found in matters unrelated to the actual qualities or attributes of American society or the foreign policies of the United States."[4] He further defines the term accordingly:

> Anti-Americanism is *a predisposition to hostility* toward the United States and American society, a relentlessly critical impulse toward American social, economic, and political institutions, traditions, and values; it entails an aversion to American culture in particular and its influence abroad, often also contempt for the American national character (or what is presumed to be such a character) and dislike of American people, manner, behavior, dress, and so on; rejection of American foreign policy and a firm belief in the malignity of American influence and presence anywhere in the world.[5]

Alvin Rubinstein and Donald Smith perceive anti-Americanism as "any hostile action or expression that becomes part and parcel of an undifferentiated attack on the foreign policy, society, culture and values of the United States."[6] According to James Ceaser, "Anti-Americanism rests on the singular idea that something associated with the United States, something at the core of American life, is deeply wrong and threatening to the rest of the world."[7] Josef Joffe depicts a virulent anti-Americanism in his definition suggesting that anti-Americanism has the same attributes as other 'anti-ism' (comparing it to anti-Semitism), such as stereotyping, denigration, obsession, demonization, and elimination.[8]

---

[2] Inderjeet Parmar, "Selling Americanism, Combatting Anti-Americanism: The Historical Role of American Foundations," *Anti-Americanism Working Papers*, Centre for Policy Studies, Central European University, 2004, 5-7; cited in Kim Richard Nossal, "Anti-Americanism in Canada," *Anti-Americanism Working Papers* (Central European University, Budapest, 2005), 6.

[3] Brian Bow, Peter J. Katzenstein, Arturo Santa-Cruz, "Anti-Americanism in Canada and Mexico," *American Political Science Association Conference, Chicago* (August 30 – September 2, 2007), 5.

[4] Paul Hollander, *Anti-Americanism: Irrational and Rational* (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2003), xxviii; originally published as Paul Hollander, *Anti-Americanism: Critiques at Homes and Abroad, 1965-1990* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

[5] Ibid., 339.

[6] Alvin Rubinstein and Donald Smith, "Anti-Americanism in the Third World," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 497* (May 1988): 35. Available at SAGE journals.

[7] James W. Ceaser, "A genealogy of anti-Americanism," *The Public Interest* (Summer 2003) [online] accessed July 22, 2017, http://www.thepublicinterest.com/archives/2003summer/article1.html

[8] Josef Joffe, "The Demons of Europe," *Commentary Magazine* 117 (January 2004), 29; in Nossal, "Anti-Americanism in Canada," *Anti-Americanism Working Papers*, 6.

1.1.1 Anti-Americanism in Canada

Canadian anti-Americanism, as both J. L. Granatstein and Kim Richard Nossal exhibit in their works on anti-Americanism in Canada, has a distinct character given its deep historical roots and therefore none of the general definitions of anti-Americanism "completely captures [its] unique nature."[9] Canadian anti-Americanism certainly lacks the attributes of the virulent anti-Americanism, such as intense sentiments of hatred, malevolence or extreme hostility.[10] Its unique nature lies in its historical roots going as far back as the American Revolution. As Seymour Martin Lipset famously wrote: "Americans do not know but Canadians cannot forget that two nations, not one, came out of the American Revolution. The United States is the country of the revolution, Canada of the counterrevolution."[11] The origins of Canadian anti-Americanism thus lie in the rejection of the American Revolution, making Canada "the only political community in the world which exists as the result of a conscious rejection of the United States of America."[12] Frank Underhill, a prominent Canadian historian of an earlier generation (a contemporary to the Aird and Massey commissions), famously proclaimed: "The Canadian is the first anti-American, the model anti-American, the archetypal anti-American, the ideal anti-American as he exists in the mind of God."[13] He also "mused that Americans are benevolently ignorant of Canada, while Canadians are malevolently knowledgeable about the United States."[14] Granatstein argues that a "uniquely Canadian variety of anti-Americanism has played a persistent and central role in Canada's history"[15] and that "Canadian anti-Americanism, just as much as the country's French-English duality, has for two centuries been a central buttress of the national identity."[16]

---

[9] J. L. Granatstein, "Yankee Go Home? Is Canadian Anti-Americanism Dead?," *Behind the Headlines,* Vol. 54. No. 1. (Autumn 1996): 6.

[10] Nossal, "Anti-Americanism in Canada," *Anti-Americanism Working Papers,* 6; see also Bow, Katzenstein, Santa-Cruz, "Anti-Americanism in Canada and Mexico," 26:
"Our first general finding speaks to perhaps the most obvious fact of all – geography. Proximity breeds neither a deep sense of kinship nor a deep hatred. Anti-Americanisms are alive and well in Canada and Mexico, but, compared to those in more distant lands, they are based on a more "common sense" view of the United States, and of Americans."

[11] Seymour Martin Lipset, *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada* (London: Routledge, 1991), 1.

[12] Kim Richard Nossal, "Anti-Americanism in Canada," in *Anti-Americanism: History, Causes, and Themes. Vol. 3: Comparative Perspectives,* ed. Brendon O'Connor (Oxford/ Westport, Conn.: Greenwood World Publishing, 2007), 62.

[13] Quoted in Granatstein, "Yankee Go Home? Is Canadian Anti-Americanism Dead?," 8.

[14] Norman Hillmer, "Are Canadians Anti-American?" *Policy Options* (July 2006) [online] accessed July 22, 2017, http://policyoptions.irpp.org/magazines/border-security/are-canadians-anti-american/

[15] Granatstein, "Yankee Go Home? Is Canadian Anti-Americanism Dead?," 4.

[16] Ibid., 6.

Since Canada and the United States "resemble each other more than either resembles any other nation,"[17] Canadians employ anti-Americanism as "a useful and instinctive device," according to Granatstein, "to differentiate themselves from their neighbours."[18] Differentiation is thus an essential element of Canadian anti-Americanism. Lipset notes that "Canadian have tended to define themselves not in terms of their own national history and traditions but by reference to what they are *not*: Americans. Canadians are the world's oldest and most continuing un-Americans."[19] Blair Fraser remarks: "Without at least a touch of anti-Americanism, Canada would have no reason to exist."[20]

Canadian nationalism and anti-Americanism are sometimes perceived as equivalents, as "interchangeable" positions.[21] Damien-Claude Bélanger observes that among many scholars focused on anti-American sentiment in Canada, "anti-Americanism is viewed as a facet of Canadian nationalism and an expression of the nation's struggle to maintain its sovereignty and distinctiveness.[22] In general terms, Bow, Katzenstein and Santa-Cruz point to the similarities between nationalism and anti-Americanism: "Like nationalism, anti-Americanism contains aspects of both instrumental rationality and social construction. In situations where positive identities of "self" are unavailable, the availability of a powerful, prosperous, culturally omnipresent "other" can provide a social glue that has broad appeal."[23] In the Canadian context, this statement seems to be relevant. As Granatstein, critical of Canadian anti-Americanism, remarked in 1996: "we must begin to understand what makes Canada unique […] anti-Americanism now cannot, indeed could never, provide the glue to hold the nation together."[24]

Anti-Americanism has been also used for political purposes. By stirring up popular anti-American sentiments (mostly employing fear of continentalism and

---

[17] Lipset, Continental Divide, 212.
[18] J.L. Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home?: Canadians and Anti-Americanism* (Toronto: HarperCollins Canada, 1997), 285.
[19] Lipset, *Continental Divide*, 53; see also Frank Underhill, *In Search of Canadian Liberalism* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1960), 222.
[20] Blair Fraser, *The Search for Identity: Canada, 1945-67* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967), 301; cited in Lipset, *Continental Divide*, 53.
[21] With reference to authors: John Warnock, Dallas Cullen, J.D. Jobson, Rodney Schneck, Edna Keeble, Patricia Wood; in Lydia Miljan and Barry Cooper, "The Canadian 'Garrison Mentality' and Anti-Americanism at the CBC," *Calgary Policy Research Centre, The Fraser Institute, Studies in Defence and Foreign Policy*, Number 4 (May 2005), 4-5.
[22] Damien-Claude Bélanger, Prejudice and Pride: Canadian Intellectuals Confront the United States, 1891-1945 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011), 4.
[23] Bow, Katzenstein, Santa-Cruz, "Anti-Americanism in Canada and Mexico," 4.
[24] Granatstein, "Yankee Go Home? Is Canadian Anti-Americanism Dead?," 11.

economic absorption by the powerful neighbor) politicians in various times in history hoped to influence the electoral outcome. The federal elections of 1891 and 1911, both dealt with the issue of "reciprocity", today we would say free trade with the U.S., and both were won by the Conservatives who, with the help of those economic interests that opposed free trade deal, skillfully employed anti-American sentiment based on fear of economic absorption.[25] As Granatstein notes: "anti-Americanism became the key tool in the maintenance of the established political and economic order, as Sir John A. Macdonald demonstrated so effectively in the Reciprocity election of 1891."[26] Similarly, John Diefenbaker won the federal election of 1957 on a decidedly anti-American platform "arguing that the Liberals were too pro-American"[27]and "American investment was too large and threatened a loss of control to the south: 'If the St Laurent government is re-elected,' Diefenbaker proclaimed, 'Canada will become a virtual 49th state of the American union.'"[28]

The fear of American hegemony, Americanization, economic and cultural absorption is one of the key elements of Canadian anti-Americanism. The unique nature of anti-Americanism in Canada "has been historically grounded in a unique variety of concerns about Americanization."[29] Since the American Revolution, Canadians have been worried "about their country being swallowed up by the United States, but the nature of the threat had shifted from physical annexation to economic and cultural absorption."[30] A straightforward definition of Canadian anti-Americanism that is well suited for the purposes of this thesis is provided by W. M. Baker who says: "This is the meaning of anti-Americanism in Canada – opposition to the Americanization of Canada whether in economic, social, cultural or political terms."[31]

---

[25] Nossal, "Anti-Americanism in Canada," in *Anti-Americanism*, 68.
[26] Granatstein, "Yankee Go Home? Is Canadian Anti-Americanism Dead?," 7.
[27] Nossal, "Anti-Americanism in Canada," *Anti-Americanism Working Papers*, 19.
[28] Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home?: Canadians and Anti-Americanism*, 125.
[29] Nossal, "Anti-Americanism in Canada," in *Anti-Americanism*, 62.
[30] Bow, Katzenstein, Santa-Cruz, "Anti-Americanism in Canada and Mexico," 11.
[31] W.M. Baker, "The Anti-American ingredient in Canadian history," *Dalhousie Review* 53 (spring 1973), 58; cited in Granatstein, "Yankee Go Home? Is Canadian Anti-Americanism Dead?," 11.

1.1.2 Cultural Anti-Americanism

The aspect of culture is included in various definitions of anti-Americanism. For example, Paul Hollander quoted earlier says that anti-Americanism "entails an aversion to American culture in particular and its influence abroad."[32] In typologies of anti-Americanism presented by authors such as Adam Garfinkle[33] or Moisés Naím[34], we encounter the term *cultural anti-Americanism*, defined as a hostility or contempt of American mass culture, a concern about its influence and related fear of Americanization of local cultures, traditions and mores. Even though these two authors apply their typologies in the context of the 21st century, the concept of cultural anti-Americanism is useful for the purposes of this thesis and we can assume that this type of anti-Americanism will be identified in the analyzed documents. Naím writes: "Cultural anti-Americanism is stirred by the ability of American culture to influence and often displace local cultures. Satellites that beam American television overseas and commercial brands that attract billions of consumers also stoke anxiety and anger about cultural invasion."[35] Canada, due to its proximity to the U.S. and the shared language, faced the challenges of American "cultural invasion" long before the rest of the world. Hence, cultural anti-Americanism would seem to be a natural response to the inflow of American mass culture and the threat of Americanization it brought with it. Cheryl Hudson in her analysis of American popular culture and anti-Americanism also uses the term cultural anti-Americanism and examines its different forms. She relates cultural anti-Americanism, as a negative response to American mass culture, "cultural Americanization" and "cultural standardization and commodification",[36] to the concept of *cultural imperialism*. This thesis takes a similar approach, cultural anti-Americanism is perceived as a reaction to what is often referred to as American cultural imperialism.

---

[32] Hollander, *Anti-Americanism*, 339.

[33] Garfinkle identifies three types of anti-Americanism: *philosophical* (opposition to the U.S. as an idea, to the nature of the American polity, going back to the American Revolution and founding of the U.S.), *cultural*, and *contingent* (dislike of particular policies and personalities in the U.S. administration). See Adam Garfinkle, "Peace Movements and the Adversary Culture," in *Understanding Anti-Americanism: Its Origins and Impact at Home and Abroad*, ed. Paul Hollander (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2004), 317; cited in Nossal, "Anti-Americanism in Canada," in *Anti-Americanism*, 61-62; see also Adam Garfinkle, "Anti-Americanism, U.S. Foreign Policy, and the War on Terrorism," *Hoover Press* (2004), 203.

[34] Naím identifies five "pure" types of anti-Americanism: politico-economic, historical, religious, cultural, and psychological. See Moisés Naím, "Anti-Americanisms: A guide to hating Uncle Sam," *Foreign Policy* (January-February 2002).

[35] Naím, "Anti-Americanisms."

[36] Referring to the theory of Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947). See Cheryl Hudson, "American Popular Culture and Anti-Americanism," in *Anti-Americanism: History, Causes, and Themes. Vol. 1: Causes and Sources*, ed. Brendon O'Connor (Oxford/ Westport, Conn.: Greenwood World Publishing, 2007), 246.

1.2 Cultural Imperialism

The concept of cultural imperialism emerged in the late 1960s (along with other radical criticisms of the 1960s) and was developed mainly by critical communication and media scholars on the left throughout the 1970s "to examine the role that globalizing and corporate-controlled communication and electronic media systems played in establishing and maintaining unequal economic and cultural power relationships between imperial cores and peripheries."[37] Herbert Schiller, who is regarded as the conceptual father of cultural imperialism theory, published his influential works *Mass Communication and American Empire* in 1969 and *Communication and Cultural Domination* in 1976. According to his biographer Richard Maxwell, "Schiller's contribution influenced a new generation of critical scholars in the 1970s."[38] Schiller's main argument can be summarized accordingly: "The coloniality resulting from cultural domination effectively pressures the peripheral world into shaping its values to correspond with those of the hegemon."[39] Schiller's 1976 interpretation of cultural imperialism has become one of the most frequently quoted definitions of the term:

> the concept of cultural imperialism today best describes the sum of processes by which a society is brought into the modern world system and how its dominating stratum is attracted, pressured, forced, and sometimes bribed into shaping social institutions to correspond to, or even promote, the values and structures of the dominating center of the system.[40]

John Tomlinson in his critique of cultural imperialism theory points to the problem of defining the term because as "a generic concept, it refers to a range of broadly similar phenomena."[41] Critical communication theorists developed and worked with various terms relating to the notion of cultural imperialism, such as *media imperialism* (Boyd-Barrett 1977), *structural imperialism* (Galtung 1979), *cultural dependency and domination* (Link 1984), *cultural synchronization* (Hamelink 1983), or *electronic colonialism* (McPhail 1987).[42] Tomlinson identifies four different strands of cultural

---

[37] Tanner Mirrlees, *Global Entertainment Media, Between Cultural Imperialism and Cultural Globalization* (New York and London: Routledge, 2013), 21. – With reference to authors: Boyd-Barrett (1977), Dorfmann and Mattelart (1975), Golding (1977), Hamelink (1983), Mattelart (1979), Murdock and Golding (1977), Schiller (1969, 1976), Smythe (1981), Tunstall (1977).

[38] Richard Maxwell, *Herbert Schiller* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), 29.

[39] Kevin V. Mulcahy, "Identity, Independence, and Imperialism: The Case of Canadian-American Cultural Relations," in *Borders and Bridges: Canada's Policy Relations in North America*, ed. Monica Gattinger and Geoffrey Hale (Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2010), 252.

[40] Herbert Schiller, *Communication and Cultural Domination* (New York: International Arts and Sciences Press, 1976), 9; cited in Maxwell, *Herbert Schiller*, 68-69.

[41] John Tomlinson, *Cultural imperialism: a critical introduction* (London: Continuum, 1991), 2-3.

[42] Livingston A. White, "Reconsidering Cultural Imperialism Theory," *Transnational Broadcasting Studies* Number 6 (Spring/Summer 2001).

imperialism: media imperialism, the discourse of nationality, critique of capitalism and critique of modernity. Cultural imperialism scholars addressed not only "the process of cultural dominance and dependence among nations [… and] the implications of the exploitative nature of the relationship between more powerful and less powerful countries,"[43] but also critically approached the wider phenomenon of modernity and in their critique included what they perceived as negative effects brought by modernity and mass media as well as practices of capitalism, such as consumerism, commodification and commercialization.

The concept of cultural imperialism (or media imperialism – these two terms are often treated as synonyms)[44] was typically associated with the Third World. According to Christine Ogan

> Media imperialism is often described as a process whereby the United States and Western Europe produce most of the media products, make the first profits from domestic sales, and then market the products in Third World countries at costs considerably lower than those the countries would have to bear to produce similar products at home. […] Third World consumers of these media products will be influenced by the values inherent in that content, the values of an alien and predominantly capitalist system.[45]

Even though cultural imperialism theory was defined by leftist scholars and it was an ideologically colored term and its radical line lost its appeal, the term is still used today by authors such as Cheryl Hudson, mentioned in the previous section, to explain the phenomenon of Americanization and American cultural domination. Hudson states:

> The concept of cultural imperialism dominates discussions of the negative impact of American culture on the rest of the world. Proponents of the theory argue that powerful media organisations colonise and dominate the cultural content of the media transmissions in weaker or less developed nations to the detriment of the local cultures […] [and] that American popular culture is ideologically inscribed with American values, and that foreign consumers have no choice but to internalise these values as they are exposed to an endless round of American soap operas, […] movies and other media products.[46]

More importantly, Kevin Mulcahy works with the concept of cultural imperialism in his analysis of U.S.-Canadian cultural relations. Even though Mulcahy focuses mainly on the 1990s (free trade and the cultural exemption), his application of the cultural imperialism theory to the Canadian context is very useful for the purposes of this thesis. He addresses

---

[43] Kevin V. Mulcahy, "Globalization and Culture: the Case of Canada and the United States," *ESSACHES-Journal of Communication Studies,* Vol. 3, No. 1 (2010), 153.
[44] White, "Reconsidering Cultural Imperialism Theory."
[45] Christine Ogan, "Media Imperialism and the Videocassette Recorder: The Case of Turkey," *Journal of Communication,* Vol. 38, No. 2 (Spring 1988): 94.
[46] Hudson, "American Popular Culture and Anti-Americanism," 248.

the issues of dependency, cultural sovereignty, asymmetry (small nation, big neighbor), center-periphery, cultural annexation, cultural protectionism, and overall, the debate over American cultural imperialism and the perceived threats to Canadian cultural sovereignty as well as to a unique Canadian identity.[47] With reference to the 1970s and 1980s authors, he says: "The cultural imperialism thesis, as a tenet of dependency theory, addresses the process whereby a hegemonic power imposes it culture on another nation. […] the free flow of information, mainly from the United States, promotes a system of American global domination instead of mutually beneficial development."[48] Mulcahy remarks that "this is what Canadians speaking from a cultural nationalist perspective have long argued. The flow of mass media cultural products such as film, music, and television encourages an internalization of the superiority of an American world view at the expense of other value systems. One solution is to create more space for Canadian voices."[49]

Overall, the concept of cultural imperialism can help us to better understand the concerns over Americanization, American cultural invasion as well as the fear of cultural absorption and dependency on American culture we expect to find in the analyzed documents. Even though the concept was developed by scholars in the 1970s, we can argue that in the case of Canada the manifestations of American cultural imperialism are evident much earlier than in the rest of the world and that the concept is therefore applicable to Canada in the period examined in this thesis.

---

[47] See Kevin V. Mulcahy, "Cultural Imperialism and Cultural Sovereignty: U.S.-Canadian Cultural Relations," *American Review of Canadian Studies* Vol. 30, No. 2 (Summer 2000); see also Mulcahy, "Identity, Independence, and Imperialism;" Mulcahy, "Globalization and Culture."

[48] Mulcahy, "Identity, Independence, and Imperialism," 252. – Reference to Brewer (1980), Amin (1976).

[49] Ibid., 252.

2. Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 1928-1929

The Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, commonly referred to as the Aird Commission after its chairman John Aird, was the first royal commission on broadcasting in Canada. It was appointed by the federal government under Liberal Prime Minister Mackenzie King in 1928, with terms of reference "to examine into the broadcasting situation in the Dominion of Canada and to make recommendations to the Government as to the future administration, management, control and financing thereof."[50] The object of the commission was to inquire into the situation of radio broadcasting in Canada and to propose a government policy that would ensure that radio broadcasting was "effectively carried on in the interests of Canadian listeners and in the national interests of Canada."[51]

The Report of the Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting was issued in 1929 after a year long inquiries conducted in Canada and in some countries abroad researching the different methods employed in their broadcasting systems. The commission consisted of its chairman John Aird, president of Canadian Bank of Commerce in Toronto, Charles Bowman, editor of "Citizen" from Ottawa, and Augustin Frigon, director of "Ecole Polytechnique" in Montreal. The secretary of the commission was Donald Manson, Chief Inspector of Radio, Department of Marine. The commission held twenty-five public sessions across Canada and received 164 verbal statements at sessions and 124 written statements. There were also conferences held with the provincial authorities. The outcome of their research is a twenty-nine pages long report, consisting of merely nine pages of discussion followed by appendices. Compared to later royal commissions' reports, the Aird Commission's report is very short. Ryan Edwarson notes that the size of the report "testified to the newness of the medium."[52]

Canadian radio broadcasting developed in the 1920s as a private sector. The licensing authority for both radio broadcasting stations and receiving sets was the Department of Marine and Fisheries under the Radiotelegraph Act of 1913. Radio developed as a supplement to the telegraph on land and as a safety device at sea,[53] hence the Department of Marine and Fisheries was responsible for administration of radio

[50] Canada, Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, Report (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1929), 2.
[51] Ibid., 5.
[52] Ryan Edwardson, *Canadian Content: Culture and the Quest for Nationhood* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 43.
[53] Roger Bird, *Documents of Canadian Broadcasting* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1988), 7.

transmission. The first broadcasting license in Canada was awarded in 1919 to the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company. The commercial potential of radio broadcasting was soon recognized and consequently a boom in license applications and station construction followed. As profit-based enterprise, radio stations relied heavily upon advertising as well as "a combination of inexpensive domestic and cheaply obtained American content designed to attract the largest possible listenership."[54]

The Aird Commission was appointed in a response to "a general perception on a need for a higher policy profile by government in respect of broadcasting."[55] In particular, the uncontrolled influx of American programming, prevailing over Canadian content on the airwaves, presented a grave problem that required the government's response. Although American popular culture on air may have been enjoyed by the masses, the cultural elite feared Americanization of Canadian listeners exposed to the predominant American broadcasting. Canadian radio was also facing a threat of being integrated into the American broadcasting system. Some measures against Americanization of the radio were taken even before the Aird Commission. In order to ensure Canadian ownership of the radio, a 1923 amendment to the Radiotelegraph Act gave the right to obtain broadcasting licenses only to British subjects.[56] Michel Filion says: "This measure, which failed in the long run, was a modest effort to prohibit the use of Canadian airwaves by American interests."[57] According to Filion, it also "clearly recognized the threat of Americanization which followed the dismantling of the British empire."[58] Canada had to face the challenge of colony-to-nation transformation and at the same time come to terms with modernity, emerging popular culture, consumerism, and new technologies presenting "abrupt changes in interacting with the world – mass printing replicated and disseminated content on a large scale, film projection challenged one's sense of place, and broadcasting sent programming over vast distances with no regard for physical barriers."[59]

---

[54] Edwardson, *Canadian Content*, 40.
[55] Richard Collins, *Culture, Communication, and National Identity: The Case of Canadian Television* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 52.
[56] Michel Filion, "Radio," in *The Cultural Industries in Canada: Problems, Policies and Prospects*, ed. Michael Dorland (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, 1996), 119; see also Michel Filion, "Canadian Radio Policy," in *Encyclopedia of Radio 3-Volume Set*, ed. Christopher H. Sterling (New York, London: Routledge, 2004), 423.
[57] Filion, "Radio," 119.
[58] Michel Filion, "Broadcasting and Cultural Identity: The Canadian Experience," *Media, Culture and Society* Vol. 18 (1996): 449.
[59] Edwardson, *Canadian Content*, 28.

Canadian nationalism was on the rise after the First World War. The war had a profound effect on both the country's domestic situation and its relations with Britain and the U.S. According to J.L. Granatstein, "Canada's enormous war effort in the Great War had simultaneously spurred and sapped the national will. It had bitterly split French and English Canadians on the issues of support for the war and conscription for the front. And it had left Britain much weaker and created a financial superpower in the United States, a power to which Canada was pulled like a moth to the flame."[60] Canadian conservative philosopher George Grant lamented in 1967 that "between the wars of 1914 and 1939 Canada was allowed to slip into the slough of despond in which its national hope frittered away to the U.S. by Mackenzie King and the Liberal party."[61] Liberal historian and thinker Frank Underhill, on the other hand, supported closer continental relations with the U.S. and abandoning imperial ties with Britain. In 1929, he wrote in the *Canadian Forum* that "those colonially-minded persons who think to save us from the flood of Americanism by appealing to English traditions might as well start a campaign to bring back the horse and buggy."[62] Nevertheless, the First World War caused that foreign investment in Canada quickly moved from Britain to the U.S. and the commercial and financial ties with the U.S. were strengthened. Filion notes that "such a situation of dependency induced the fear of American imperialism, not only in economic terms but also on the cultural plane. … The federal government began to enlarge its activities and put forward its centralizing project: the promotion of *one* Canadian identity by opposition to the more and more influential American popular culture."[63] As Edwardson remarks: "Canadianization was underway."[64] And the Aird Commission was a part of this process.

According to the Aird Commission's survey of conditions of radio broadcasting in Canada, the existing situation of radio service in the hands of mainly local private enterprise was unsatisfactory and could not effectively carry on in the interests of Canadian listeners and of the nation. Among the problems of Canadian broadcasting, as listed in the report, was too much advertising forced upon a listener, insufficient coverage due to crowding of stations into large cities leaving other populated areas with no reception, and vast majority of programs coming from sources outside of Canada.[65]

---

[60] Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home?: Canadians and Anti-Americanism*, 68.
[61] Quoted in Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home?*, 68.
[62] Quoted in Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home?*, 77.
[63] Filion, "Broadcasting and Cultural Identity," 449.
[64] Edwardson, *Canadian Content*, 27.
[65] Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 6.

As part of their research, the commissioners visited several other countries to see how broadcasting can be organized and what different methods can be adopted. Appendix I of the report presents a short description of broadcasting organizations in twenty-six different countries. The commissioners were inclined towards the European model of broadcasting "under government auspices for the purpose of organizing broadcasting on a nation-wide basis in the public interest,"[66] as oposed to the broadcasting system used by the National Broadcasting Company in the United States. The commission particularly praises the broadcasting methods employed by the British Broadcasting Corporation which to a large extent inspires their policy recommendations. The report states: "As a fundamental principle, we believe that any broadcasting organization must be operated on a basis of public service."[67]

The Aird Commission comes to a conclusion that the interests of the listening public and the national interests of Canada "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."[68] Therefore, the commission recommends to create a public radio system, with high-power stations set up to provide radio coverage all across Canada. Furthermore, they propose the establishment of a national broadcasting company called the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Company that would "own and operate all radio broadcasting stations located in the Dominion of Canada."[69] To this end, the commission presents a radical proposal of expropriation of all existing privately owned radio stations. Under their proposed scheme there would be no private broadcasting. The Canadian Radio Broadcasting Company would take over the existing radio stations from private enterprise. Until placing the proposed national radio system in operation, some stations would be selected for provisional service under the proposed national company while "[a]ll remaining stations located or giving a duplication of service in the same area should be closed down."[70]

The Aird Commission strongly believes in the importance of radio broadcasting in promoting national unity and fostering a national spirit. To their minds, the objective of radio broadcasting is not only to provide entertainment but also to serve as an instrument of education and to inform the public on questions of national interest. They

[66] Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 5.
[67] Ibid., 7.
[68] Ibid., 6.
[69] Ibid., 7.
[70] Ibid., 8.

argue that radio broadcasting in Canada can serve the interests of the Canadian public and fully realize its great potential as a medium for promoting the unity of the nation only if it is a public service. For this reason, they recommend a policy of government intervention into broadcasting and introduction of the subsidy by the Dominion Government.

Throughout the document, great emphasis is laid upon the argument of national unity as well as the need for Canadian content on Canadian radio. The two major incentives for the Aird Commission's recommendation of a policy of government intervention into radio broadcasting, the argument for promoting national unity and against the influx of American programming, are further analyzed on the following pages.

2.1 Radio broadcasting as a medium for promoting national unity

> We believe that broadcasting should be considered of such importance in promoting the unity of the nation that a subsidy by the Dominion Government should be regarded as an essential aid to the general advantage of Canada rather than as an expedient to meet any deficit in the cost of maintenance of the service.[71]

One of the main arguments for government intervention into radio broadcasting pronounced by the Aird Commission is that a national public broadcasting service needs to be established in order to be able to effectively promote national unity, to connect the diverse regions of the country, the different parts of the vast territory of the Dominion of Canada. Fostering Canadian national unity is deemed to be a national interest of the utmost importance.

The question of national unity was indeed a pressing issue at the time when the Aird Commission was appointed. The First World War and its aftermath left Canadian society deeply divided. The conscription crisis of 1917 "sparked a clash of nationalisms between the English and French cultural communities."[72] The military service was made compulsory in July 1917 due to high number of casualties in the war and a growing demand for troop reinforcements which the system of voluntary enlistments could not satisfy. Strong opposition against compulsory conscription came from French Canadians who were reluctant to participate in the war effort as they did not share the same emotional attachment to their mother country as English Canadians did towards Britain.[73] The ethnic division between French and English Canada was not, however, the only tension in Canadian society. In the post-war years, Canada experienced rise of regional discontent and class unrest, reflected in the Winnipeg General Strike of 1919. Canadian national unity suffered by the "conflicting demands and expectations that divided city from country and east from west."[74] In view of post-war developments, William Lyon Mackenzie King, leader of the Canadian Liberal Party and Prime Minister of Canada in 1921-1930 and 1935-1948, based his policy on political compromise, balancing national and regional interests, while keeping "his mind and his political purpose firmly fixed on the idea of 'national unity.'"[75]

---

[71] Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 10.
[72] Roger Riendeau, *A Brief History of Canada*, Second Edition (New York: Facts On File, 2007), 238.
[73] Ibid., 242.
[74] Ibid., 250
[75] Robert Bothwell, *Canada and Quebec: One Country, Two Histories*, Revised Edition (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1998), 59.

Historically, the quest for national unity is something that characterizes the Dominion of Canada from the time it was formed in 1867. Historian Roger Riendeau explains its genesis as follows:

> Confederation was effectively a marriage of economic and political convenience between partners who had little desire to live together but could not afford to live apart. The reluctance with which the British North American colonies entered into their national partnership foreshadowed the persistence of the regional and cultural discontent that would characterize Canada's development in the last third of the 19th century and throughout the 20th century. Despite the precarious foundation of unity, Canada would manage not only to survive as an independent nation in the shadow of a mighty southern neighbor but also to fulfill the transcontinental ambitions expressed in its motto, adopted from Psalm 72: *A Mari Usque Ad Mare* – 'From Sea to Sea.'[76]

The Aird Commission argues that the "immediate objective [of the proposed national broadcasting company] should be […] to provide good reception over the entire settled region of the country,"[77] it should be able to provide national broadcasting "from coast to coast."[78]

Susan Crean wrote: "At the moment of Confederation it was the transcontinental railway 'from sea to sea' that was seen as the guarantee of the new station's political and economic future. In the 1920s, broadcasting inherited the role; its task: to forge national unity."[79] Significantly, it was the president of the Canadian National Railways (CNR),[80] Henry Thornton, who was one of the first to promote the idea of public radio as a medium for nation-building. "Thornton's dream was the old national dream updated."[81] He believed that broadcasting should be used to serve and bolster the national interest. On the inauguration of the first transcontinental symphony series in 1929, he said: "It is only through nation-wide broadcasts that we shall accomplish what we regard as most important, the encouragement of a feeling of kinship between all parts of the country."[82] The CNR under Thornton's leadership launched a radio broadcasting service in 1924 as one of the very few public broadcasting initiatives in the 1920s. A domestic network of radio stations was developed by the company and created its programs employing Canadian performers for lectures, talks, concerts, and other events. These programs were

[76] Riendeau, *A Brief History of Canada*, 178-179.
[77] Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 7.
[78] Ibid., 8.
[79] Susan M. Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?* (North York, Ont.: General Publishing, 1976), 22.
[80] A railway company founded in 1918 and owned by federal government as a Canadian Crown corporation.
[81] Ibid., 22.
[82] Quoted in Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?*, 22-23.

available for anyone to listen to if they happened to be within range of the CNR's stations.[83]

The great political potential of radio broadcasting and its power to bring the nation together was witnessed by the government first-hand during the celebrations of the Diamond Jubilee of Confederation in 1927 when the first national radio broadcasting was set up, linking privately owned radio stations together to broadcast the celebrations, including Prime Minister Mackenzie King's speech on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of Confederation. King himself described the experience as follows: "On the morning, afternoon, and evening of July 1st, all Canada became for the time being a single assemblage, swayed by a common emotion, within the sound of a single voice. … Hitherto to most Canadian, Ottawa has seemed far off, a mere name to hundreds and thousands of our people, but henceforth all Canadians will stand within the sound of the carillon and within the hearing of speakers on Parliament Hill."[84]

The 1927 Diamond Jubilee of Canadian Confederation stands out as a very important event of the time.[85] Robert Cupido characterized the Diamond Jubilee as "the most ambitious attempt, during this critical period of transition to modernity, to stimulate a new, pan-Canadian sense of national community and private social and political cohesion by exploiting the power of public spectacle and appealing to a mythologized common history."[86] It was recognized that "as a vehicle for national communication, radio could be a great unifying force and a powerful means for political persuasion."[87]

The Aird Commission, most likely reflecting upon the experience of the Diamond Jubilee, proclaims that: "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."[88]

The fact that Canadian geography – Canada's relatively small population scattered over a vast territory, presents considerable obstacles for creating and sustaining of a nation-wide public radio broadcasting service, is addressed in the report with respect to financing of the proposed organization.

> As compared with many of the European countries where the responsibility of broadcasting has been assumed by the Government, Canada has a comparatively

[83] Robert Armstrong, *Broadcasting Policy in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 23.
[84] Quoted in Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?*, 21.
[85] Edwardson, *Canadian Content*, 36.
[86] Robert Cupido, "'Sixty Years of Canadian Progress': The Diamond Jubilee and the Politics of Commemoration," Canadian Issues 20 (1998): 19, cited in Edwardson, *Canadian Content*, 36.
[87] Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?*, 21.
[88] Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 6.

> small population, scattered over a vast tract of country. The large territory requires a greater number of stations while the relatively small population makes it obviously impossible to finance the entire scheme from license fees, if the same are to be kept at a moderate figure.[89]

Intending to follow the European example of public broadcasting, the commissioners suggest that the Dominion Government subsidized the proposed public broadcasting service. This leads us back to the opening quote of this section where the importance of radio broadcasting in "promoting the unity of the nation" is stated as the main incentive for introduction of the subsidy by the Dominion Government. The commission's reasoning behind the proposal of financing the intended broadcasting system from public funds is further explained accordingly:

> [R]adio broadcasting is becoming more and more a public service and in view of its educative value, on broad lines and its importance as a medium for promoting national unity, it appears to us reasonable that a proportion of the expenses of the system should be met out of public funds.[90]

The Aird Commission further suggests that by means of chain broadcasting[91] "an interchange of programs among different parts of the country should be provided as often as may seem desirable, with coast to coast broadcasts of events or features of national interest."[92] The argument for an interchange of programs among different parts of the country certainly fits into the broader notion of how radio broadcasting can be used as a medium for nation-building. Enhancing the connection between different regions of the country through radio can help create a stronger sense of a common nationality, thus fostering national unity. The commissioners stress the educational purpose of radio in this regard and refer to a wider consent among the people according to their inquiry when stating that

> The potentialities of broadcasting as an instrument of education have been impressed upon us; education in the broad sense, not only as it is conducted in the schools and colleges, but in providing entertainment and of informing the public on questions of national interest. Many persons appearing before us have expressed the view that they would like to have an exchange of programs with the different parts of the country.[93]

---

[89] Ibid., 10.
[90] Ibid., 9.
[91] The term chain broadcasting, as defined by the U.S. law, means "simultaneous broadcasting of an identical program by two or more connected stations." Pursuant to 47 USCS § 153 (9), [Title 47. Telegraphs, Telephones, and Radiotelegraphs; Chapter 5. Wire or Radio Communication; General Provisions]. Source: http://definitions.uslegal.com/c/chain-broadcasting/, accessed June 24, 2016.
The Aird Commission in reference to chain broadcasting says that "Chain broadcasting has been stressed as an important feature." (p. 10)
[92] Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 10.
[93] Ibid., 6.

Great emphasis is laid upon questions of national interests and national unity, however, the Aird Commission also advocates provincial interests and suggests that "provincial authorities should be in a position to exercise full control over the programs of the station or stations in their respective areas."[94] The national broadcasting company proposed by the commission is designed so that both national and provincial interests are represented. The report says:

> It is important that the board or governing body of the company should be fully representative of the Dominion and provincial interests so that the closest co-operation among different parts of the country may be maintained. In order that this may be accomplished we would recommend that the governing body or board of the company should be composed of twelve members, three more particularly representing the Dominion and one representing each of the provinces.[95]

Another matter addressed by the Aird Commission is the government regulation of political and religious broadcasts which can be also viewed in connection with the commission's aim to foster national unity. Objectionable and controversial features on the radio could act as a strong divisive element in the nation. There was a number of cases when a controversial political or religious broadcast, such as defamatory comments of one religious group to another or problematic broadcasts of the International Bible Students Association, caused a public outcry in the 1920s. These incidents were in fact another strong incentive for the federal government to appoint the Aird Commission to develop a broadcasting plan for Canada. Some kind of regulation was needed.[96] Regarding religion, the Commission emphasizes "the importance of applying some regulation which would prohibit statements of a controversial nature and debar a speaker making an attack upon the leaders or doctrine of another religion."[97] While allowing broadcasting of political matters, the report suggests that "it should be very carefully restricted under arrangements mutually agreed upon by all political parties concerned."[98]

---

[94] Ibid., 7.
[95] Ibid., 7.
[96] Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?*, 29; see also Collins, *Canadian Television*, 52-53.
[97] Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 11.
[98] Ibid., 11.

2.2 Radio broadcasting and a threat of Americanization

> At present 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.[99]
>
> There has, however, been unanimity on one fundamental question – Canadian radio listeners want Canadian broadcasting.[100]

Even though it is not explicitly stated in the report, the threat of Americanization of Canadian listeners exposed to American radio broadcasting, which predominated in Canada at the time, as well as the threat of Canadian radio stations being affiliated to powerful U.S. networks, were among the main reasons why the commission recommended state intervention into radio broadcasting. The commissioners deemed the establishment of a government-owned and -subsidized national radio company was the only way for Canada to be able to compete with the influx of U.S. programs and provide Canadian broadcasting to all Canadian listeners across the country.

Canadian radio broadcasting suffered from great technological disorganization in the 1920s. Radio stations were owned and operated mainly by local private enterprise and "most of them were small and struggling, lacking the resources necessary for high quality programming or for the thousands of miles of expensive wirelines needed to create networks."[101] This meant that without regulation and state involvement there was no way to secure that all Canadian listeners would have access to Canadian broadcasting. Private radio stations were concentrated in urban areas where they could reach the largest audiences and left the rest of the country with little or no reception. Crean points out that "the distribution of radio transmission power reflected the distribution of Canada's markets. Over half of the power was concentrated in Toronto and Montreal."[102]

Canadian radio stations could not keep up with the amount of technologically superior broadcasting coming from across the border. According to the Aird Commission's research, there were 604 stations licensed by the Federal Radio

---

[99] Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 6.
[100] Ibid., 6.
[101] Mary Vipond, "What's a New Public Broadcaster To Do?: The Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission's Programs in Transnational Context, 1932-1936," *Journal of Radio &Audio Media*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (2013): 296; see also Michael Dewing, "Canadian Broadcasting Policy," Parliament of Canada, Library of Parliament Research Publications, Legal and Social Affairs Division (23 June 2011, revised 6 August 2014), 1.
[102] Crean, *Who's is afraid of Canadian culture?*, 28.

Commission in the U.S. while in Canada the total number of broadcasting licenses granted in 1929 was 71. Crean provides the numbers for comparison of Canadian and U.S. broadcasting power in 1930: "with 70 stations in operation only three (in Montreal, Toronto, and Winnipeg) had as much as 5,000 watts. Further, Canada's total broadcasting power amounted to less than 35,000 watts, or 5 per cent of the combined power of American stations at the time. The entire settled area of Canada was therefore within the range of U.S. stations, while only about 60 per cent of the populace could get Canadian programs on a regular basis."[103]

American influence was apparent from the very start of radio broadcasting in Canada. Richard Collins wrote that "[f]rom the beginning, Canada's broadcasting was shaped by developments south of the border. By 1923, probably 34 radio stations were transmitting in Canada and 556 in the United States, and, as the director of the Radio Services of the Canadian government observed, 'the aster disregards all boundaries.'"[104] The predominance of American broadcasting in Canada is documented in *Macleans's* magazine article from 1924 which stated that "nine-tenths of the radio fans in the Dominion hear three to four times as many United States stations as Canadian. Few fans, no matter in what part of Canada they live, can regularly pick up more than three or four different Canadian stations; any fan with a good set can log a score of American stations."[105] Mary Vipond says that "[w]hile there are no firm figures, scattered evidence suggests that by the late 1920s a majority (perhaps 80%) of Canadians listened regularly to the strong and well-financed American stations streaming effortlessly across the border."[106]

Based on their survey of radio broadcasting in Canada, the public sessions they held and written statements they received, the Aird Commission claims that there has been "unanimity on one fundamental question - Canadian radio listeners want Canadian broadcasting."[107] It is worth noting that this is also one of the most quoted passages of the Aird Commission's report. Given the situation of broadcasting in Canada described above, it is clear that behind this argument is the wish to secure Canadian broadcasting all across the country to give an alternative to preponderant American programs and curb

---

[103] Ibid., 28.
[104] Collins, *Canadian Television*, 52.
[105] Elton Johnson, 'Canada's Radio Consciousness,' *Maclean's*, 15 Oct. 1924, quoted in Crean, *Who's is afraid of Canadian culture?*, 29, and Collins, *Canadian Television*, 52.
[106] Vipond, "What's a New Public Broadcaster To Do?," 296.
[107] Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 6.

their influence on Canadian listeners. To this end, the Aird Commission proposed a system that would ensure that all Canadians can tune into Canadian stations broadcasting Canadian programs, instead of American ones. Without getting into technological details, the report suggests the establishment of seven high-power stations set up across the country "to reach consistently with good results the maximum number of people,"[108]and designed so that eventually they could "provide for two programs being broadcast simultaneously on different wavelengths."[109]

The question of wavelengths is according to the commission's survey highly problematic. They express discontent with the inequitable division of the broadcast band with the United States. The report says:

> We are aware that the question of wavelengths is not one with which we are called upon to deal. But in our survey of the situation in Canada, the inadequacy of wavelengths at present available for broadcasting in this country, namely six "exclusive" and eleven "shared" channels, has been persistently pointed out to us. This has been emphasized as one reason for the present unsatisfactory conditions of broadcasting in Canada. Many have expressed the feeling, with which we fully concur, that Canada's insistence upon a more equitable division of the broadcast band with the United States should not be relinquished.[110]

At that time there was no "effective international agreement on the allocation of channels."[111] Canadian radio broadcasting had only six "exclusive" channels available, whereas other channels had to be shared with American stations, meaning Canadian radio stations were able to broadcast only part of the day and the rest was filled with American content. This could naturally cause distress among those who feared the Americanization of Canadian listeners exposed to American broadcasting on shared channels, in addition to all-American channels reaching the audiences in Canada.

Very important prelude to the public hearings held by the Aird Commission was the commission's visit to the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) in New York, where the commissioners were clearly disturbed when the NBC management bluntly reassured them that they intended to extend service of the same quality as in the U.S. to Canada.[112] Moreover, there was a serious threat that Canadian radio stations would be integrated into a continental (American) structure.[113] By the end of the 1920s, several major Canadian stations had already joined the U.S. networks, most notably Toronto's

---

[108] Ibid., 7.
[109] Ibid., 8.
[110] Ibid., 11.
[111] Crean, *Who's is afraid of Canadian culture?*, 29.
[112] Collins, *Canadian Television*, 53.
[113] Ibid., 53.

CFRB and CKGW and Montréal's CFCF and CKAC, "the most important Canadian commercial stations in terms of coverage"[114] were affiliated to either NBC or CBS. Crean remarks that it "soon became apparent that a commercial system would not provide adequate coverage for Canada's population and that, with the establishment of the CBS and NBC networks with their centralized programs production, the logical outcome would be a continental broadcasting system in which Canada acted as an outlet for syndicated New York programs."[115] As quoted by Collins: "One member of the commission, Charles Bowman, argued that only a national publicly financed system could be genuinely Canadian:

> The drift under private enterprise is tending toward dependence upon United States sources. Contracts are being made between Canadian broadcasting agencies and the more powerful broadcasting interests in the United States. … Privately-owned Canadian broadcasting stations, with nothing like the revenue available to the larger stations in the United States, cannot hope to compete beyond a very limited audience which, in itself, would be insufficient to support broadcasting worthy of Canada. … The cost of equipping Canada with radio stations to compare with the most popular stations in the United States would be more than Canadian radio advertising would support.[116]

On the one hand, there was a very real threat of Americanization of Canadian broadcasting, and on the other hand, as Crean observed, "there was legitimate fear of abuse in a government system, and the commission itself was apprehensive until it investigated the British Broadcasting Corporation in England (which had been established in 1927) and saw at first hand how efficient and effective a public system could be."[117] As mentioned earlier, the Aird Commission's recommendations were to a large extent inspired by the BBC, and there is no doubt they were less concerned about abuse in a government system, than about Canadian broadcasting being controlled by U.S. commercial interests. On the same line of reasoning, Canadian politician M.P.J.S. Woodsworth stated in the House of Commons on May 31, 1928:

> It is only a comparatively short time before these small [Canadian] broadcasting stations will be bought up by big American companies. I may be afraid of handing power to any one government, but I would rather trust our own Canadian government with the control of broadcasting than trust those highly organized private commercial companies in the United States.[118]

---

[114] Filion, "Broadcasting and Cultural Identity," 450-451.
[115] Crean, *Who's is afraid of Canadian culture?*, 23.
[116] Quoted in Collins, *Canadian Television*, 54.
[117] Crean, *Who's is afraid of Canadian culture?*, 30-31.
[118] Quoted in Crean, *Who's is afraid of Canadian culture?*, 30.

The inflow of American culture was certainly not an entirely new phenomenon tied only to radio broadcasting. Vipond remarks that "Canadians had been consuming American popular cultural products for decades before broadcasting was invented. […] At a fundamental level, American popular culture was already a part of Canadian life by the 1920s."[119] She further explains that

> Because of its location and demography, Canada faced the challenge of the transnational inflow of culture, specifically the popular culture of the United States, before any other country in the world. […] Although British-oriented conservative elites wrung their hands, there was little they could do, for principles of free enterprise and a free press discouraged any measures to stem the flood. Moreover, most Canadians would have reacted with hostility to any loss of access to their favorite entertainments. The arrival of radio, a medium that knows no borders, exacerbated the situation.[120]

Canadian nationalists called for state intervention into cultural activities and mass entertainments for decades trying to "pressure on all levels of governments to get more involved in the cultural life on the country."[121] Edwardson remarks that "[t]he first few decades of the twentieth century were awash in calls from nationalistic culturists seeking highbrow Canadian content as a counterweight to the abundance of socially corrosive entertainments."[122] They wanted the state to intervene into radio broadcasting, periodical publishing, film exhibition, and curb the influx of American cultural products promoting American lifestyles in Canadian society which they considered to be a threat "to public – and thus national – morality."[123] Canadian anti-Americanism as a reaction to what Canadian nationalists perceived as American cultural invasion, later frequently referred to as American cultural imperialism, clearly emerged at the time.

In case of radio, Canadians were accustomed to both tuning into U.S. stations and listening to American shows on Canadian stations.[124] The opinion shared by many cultural nationalists, acknowledging the power of this medium to sway audiences, maintained that such amount of American programs in Canadian homes is harmful for the national spirit. This stand is reflected in the significant passage of the Aird Commission's report which says:

> At present 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

---

[119] Vipond, "What's a New Public Broadcaster To Do?," 298.
[120] Ibid., 295-296.
[121] Paul D. Schafer, *Culture and Politics in Canada: Towards a culture for all Canadians* (Markham, Ont.: World Culture Project, 1998), 12.
[122] Edwardson, *Canadian Content*, 10.
[123] Ibid., 10.
[124] Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?*, 29.

> 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.[125]

The Aird Commission takes a very strong stand against commercials on the radio. According to their research into the situation of broadcasting in Canada, too much advertising is forced upon the listener.[126] They distinguish between direct advertising "defined as extolling the merits of some particular article of merchandise or commercial service" and indirect advertising such as "an announcement before and after a program that it was being given by a specified firm" (sponsored programs).[127] They express dislike towards all advertising and claim "[t]he ideal program should probably have advertising, both direct and indirect, entirely eliminated."[128] In their rather idealistic vision they wish to have broadcasting on a self-supporting basis in the future. However, they acknowledge that meantime some kind of advertising is needed as a means of raising revenue to cover the expenses for broadcasting (alongside revenue produced by license fees and a subsidy from the Dominion Government). Therefore, in their proposition they allow indirect advertising which in their opinion has far less objectionable features than direct ads. They emphasize that they are "strongly against any form of broadcasting employing direct advertising"[129] which, in their opinion, should be entirely eliminated. They suggest all programs employing indirect advertising "should be carefully checked to see that no direct advertising or any objectionable feature would be put on the air."[130]

The strong stand against commercialism taken by the Aird Commission can be perceived as an expression of anti-American position as it was the U.S. that pioneered the commercial radio broadcasting. Advertising-funded entertainment in Canada was "drawn largely from (or inspired by) American producers."[131] Edwardson remarks that "The consumerism that satisfied some Canadians, however, left others feeling concerned about the impact of the new entertainments and goods upon national life. Commercialization and commodification seemed to be eroding the liberal humanism, spiritual values, and public virtues deemed essential to national development."[132] The anti-commercialism of

---

[125] Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 6.
[126] Ibid., 6.
[127] Ibid., 10.
[128] Ibid., 10
[129] Ibid., 11
[130] Ibid., 11.
[131] Edwardson, *Canadian Content*, 10.
[132] Ibid., 10.

many Canadian cultural nationalists reflected their anti-American sentiment and overall dislike of American "radio programs of inferior quality (and layered with advertisements)."[133]

Last but not least, the Aird Commission argues that it is crucial to think about the broadcasting policy in view of the upcoming technological advancements. They believe that "the question of the development of broadcasting far beyond its present state, which may include television, is one of great importance and should be closely kept pace with so that the service in Canada would continue equal to that in any other country."[134] Facing the influx of technologically advanced American broadcasting, Canada could not afford to stay behind, especially since the situation could worsen with the arrival of the television. It was crucial that Canada kept pace with the technological developments south of the border.

[133] Ibid., 10.
[134] Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting, 8.

2.3 Significance of the Aird Commission and its aftermath

The Aird Commission stands as an important moment both in the history of Canadian broadcasting and in the formation of Canadian cultural policy in general. The Aird Commission's recommendations regarding cultural governance have significance beyond radio broadcasting. Mary Vipond says: "A new view of the role of the government vis-à-vis culture and the media was thereby implied. Never before had the state been assigned such control over a cultural field."[135] The main recommendation of the report is to create a public broadcasting system – it suggests a policy of government intervention into broadcasting and introduction of the subsidy by the Dominion Government. After a decade of radio broadcasting in the hands of mainly local private enterprise, they present a radical proposal to nationalize Canadian radio broadcasting because they perceive "radio as a *national* medium."[136] As Marc Raboy remarks, "after the Aird Commission, broadcasting policy in Canada became national policy."[137]

Many of the issues addressed in the 1929 Aird Commission's report and during the debate that followed after its publication are still relevant to Canadian broadcasting today:

- The place of public broadcasting in regard to private sector broadcasting services
- The appropriate level and means of financing public broadcasting
- The place of Canadian programs relative to U.S. programs
- The subsidization of Canadian broadcasting and culture in the private sector
- The public service obligations of private sector services
- The regulation of content versus the freedom of expression and the freedom to choose
- Federal authority versus provincial authority over broadcasting [138]

The Aird Commission was the first appointed Canadian royal commission in the cultural sphere. As a part of their survey into the conditions of radio broadcasting in Canada, the commissioners invited public input. As Mike Gasher notes, the Aird Commission "is recognized as the starting point for what has become a convention of public consultation in broadcast policy development."[139] Its significance therefore lies

---

[135] Mary Vipond, *Listening in: The first decade of Canadian broadcasting, 1922 – 1932* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press 1992), 219.
[136] Mike Gasher, "Invoking Public Support for Public Broadcasting: The Aird Commission Revisited," in *Canadian Journal of Communication* Vol 23, No 2 (1998), accessed November 18, 2016, http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1032/938.
[137] Marc Raboy, *Missed opportunities: The story of Canada's broadcasting policy* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992), cited in Gasher, "Invoking Public Support for Public Broadcasting."
[138] Armstrong, *Broadcasting Policy in Canada*, 26.
[139] Gasher, "Invoking Public Support for Public Broadcasting."

also in the way the commission involved the Canadian public in the process of policy formation.

At various points in the report, the Aird Commission strongly emphasizes that they speak on behalf of the Canadian public. Specifically, the commission's claims regarding Canadian content, state ownership, advertising, radio's educational potential and wavelength allotment are all presented as reflecting Canadian public opinion. However, some authors argue that the commission's findings were already predetermined and did not attest to public opinion as much as they claimed. According to Mary Vipond, "the genesis, mandate, and personnel of the Aird commission predetermined its conclusions to an important extent."[140] For example, Charles Bowman, one of the three commissioners, had publicly advocated for a public radio service even prior to his appointment to the commission. Before the public sessions began, the Aird Commission's visit to NBC in New York, where the commissioners learned of the planned extension of American programming to Canada, also played an important role in forming their recommendations. Mike Gasher tests the claims in the Aird Commission's report to speak on behalf of the Canadian public against the public interventions on file in the National Archives of Canada and concludes that especially in the case of nationalization the public interventions were inconclusive. He argues that "the Aird commissioners used the public hearings to legitimize their own commitment to a national, publicly owned broadcast system by depicting public opinion in its final report as consensual when in fact there was considerable division."[141]

The Aird Commission's recommendations were significantly influenced by their research of methods employed in broadcasting systems abroad. Out of the two major models of broadcasting organization: "the U.S. model of competition among stations for audiences and revenue and the European public-service model of state-licensed and –funded monopoly,"[142] the commission opted for the European model. The proposed broadcasting system was particularly inspired by the British BBC model of centralized monopoly.[143] Susan Crean explains the inclination towards public broadcasting system accordingly:

> The difference between public and private broadcasting is more than a matter of who owns the station. It is a question of what the medium is used for. The premise of commercial broadcasting is the sale of broadcast time to advertisers, the sale

[140] Vipond, *The first decade of Canadian broadcasting*, 213.
[141] Gasher, "Invoking Public Support for Public Broadcasting."
[142] Collins, *Canadian Television*, 53.
[143] Ibid., 53.

> of access to mass audiences. […] The Canadian public broadcasting system was created out of a nationalist sentiment that stemmed partly from a distrust of commercialism but also from a realization that broadcasting would have to be regulated if it was going to develop a broad and flexible communications system, capable of serving the diverse interests of all Canadians.[144]

However, Canadian radio broadcasting had already been established on American lines. Private sector radio stations competing for audiences and advertising revenue were already in existence at the time of publication of the Aird Commission's report, therefore, it would be difficult to create a monopoly service similar to BBC.[145] The report included radical thoughts - it recommended expropriation of existing private radio stations and creation of a public broadcasting system under public ownership, however, as Paul Litt remarks: "Over the years, practical considerations constrained both the government and the CBC from embarking on such a program. Private stations already existed, of course, and expropriating them would have created a political fuss."[146]

The publication of the Aird Commission's report was followed by a period of intense debate and lobbying on both sides, for and against the measures proposed by the commission. The public broadcasting service recommended by the commission had much support across the country, however, the Liberal government stalled on legislation in view of the upcoming federal election of 1930 and the Depression to worry about after the stock market crashed on 29 October 1929, which was just six weeks after the Aird Commission's report was published.[147] The Liberal Party lost the elections and Conservatives under the leadership of R.B. Bennett came to power in 1930. Under the Bennet government, the Broadcasting Act of 1932 established the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (CRBC) – the first public broadcasting organization in Canada, which preceded the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) established in 1936. Crean remarks: "The initial response to the Aird Report was generally favourable, but the three-year delay before the Broadcasting Act was passed gave the private broadcasters (in conjunction with U.S. business interests) time to organize some opposition, and resulted in some modification of the Aird plan for full nationalization."[148]

Opposition against the Aird Commission's recommendations naturally came from commercial broadcasters and advertisers whose interests would be severely damaged if

---

[144] Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?*, 23.
[145] Collins, *Canadian Television*, 53.
[146] Paul Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 124.
[147] Armstrong, *Broadcasting Policy in Canada*, 27.
[148] Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?*, 32.

the proposed measures were adopted. Private broadcasters were represented by the Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB), the private sector's industry association, that began a vigorous political campaign against the nationalization of the radio industry. In 1932, the CAB submitted a brief to the Special Committee on Radio Broadcasting "advocating that private ownership be allowed within the public system, and suggesting that government subsidies be used to ensure the extension of services."[149] Several major Canadian stations were affiliated to the U.S. networks. Realizing their interests were jeopardized by the Aird Commission's report, the Americans became directly involved in the lobbying. The president of the Radio Corporation of America, the U.S. most powerful broadcasting enterprise, came to do some private lobbying in Ottawa, while an associate of the Radio Corporation of America Dr. Isaacson was brought in from New York by the CAB "to hold press interviews in which he discredited the BBC, forecasting its impending collapse, and eulogized the U.S. system."[150]

A public pressure group that lobbied for the implementation of the Aird Commission was founded in 1930 by Graham Spry and Alan Plaunt: the Canadian Radio League was organized to mobilize public support for a national broadcasting system in Canada. They quickly became very successful in mobilizing supporters all across the country. "Churches, educational leaders, women's and farmers' groups, both national labour organizations, a majority of the newspapers (the league claimed 50), politicians of all persuasions, a host of prominent citizens, and even some sections of the business community all endorsed public radio."[151] The league's objective was regulation and control under the public broadcasting system rather than expropriation of private stations, which they would rather allow to transmit and serve local interests.[152] In 1932, Graham Spry gave his famous "the State or the United States" speech advocating for national public radio before the Parliamentary Committee on Broadcasting:

> Why are the American interests so interested in the Canadian situation? The reason is clear. In the first place, the American chains have regarded Canada as part of their field and consider Canada as in a state of radio tutelage, without talent, resources or capacity to establish a third chain on this continent … In the second place, if such a Canadian non-commercial chain were constructed, it would seriously weaken the whole advertising basis of American broadcasting. The question before this Committee is whether Canada is to establish a chain that is owned and operated and controlled by Canadians, or whether it is to be owned

[149] Ibid., 32.
[150] Ibid., 33.
[151] Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?*, 33.
[152] Ibid., 34.

> and operated by commercial organizations, associated or controlled by American interests. *The question is, the State or the United States?*[153]

Prime Minister R.B. Bennett advocated for the creation of a public broadcasting system during the House of Commons Debates in May 1932 using the Aird Commission's argument for radio broadcasting as a medium for promoting national unity and fostering national spirit:

> This country must be assured of complete control of broadcasting from Canadian sources, free from foreign interference or influence. Without such control radio broadcasting can never become a great agency for 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.[154]

When his Conservative government established the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (CRBC) in 1932, Bennet reportedly remarked: "Better the state than the States."[155]

The CRBC, Canada's first public broadcaster, was created in order to address the following problems: "the uneven availability of radio signals across Canada, the absence of pan-Canadian or even interprovincial radio networks, the limited amount of Canadian programming, the lack of Canadian venture capital available to finance the start-up of radio stations, and the absence of an independent regulatory agency to supervise private sector stations."[156] However, the CRBC was unable to effectively serve this purpose. It lacked a sufficient budget and it also "proved to be indecisive and reticent about interfering with private enterprise. The Toronto and Montreal stations that had hooked up earlier with U.S. networks were never forced to disaffiliate."[157]

Dissatisfaction with the CRBC inefficiency, vocalized by the Canadian Radio League, led the newly elected Liberal government of 1936 to review the radio broadcasting policy and endorse the Canadian Radio League's proposals for a new government-owned and -operated broadcasting corporation: the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act of 1936 established the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC). The CBC had greater authority and autonomy than the former CRBC, and thus a more workable structure to be able to regulate broadcasting and provide a national service.[158]

---

[153] Quoted in Edward A. Comor, *Media, Structures and Power: The Robert E. Babe Collection* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011), 96-97.
[154] Quoted in Comor, *Media, Structures and Power*, 97.
[155] Quoted in Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home?: Canadians and Anti-Americanism*, 219.
[156] Armstrong, *Broadcasting Policy in Canada*, 28.
[157] Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?*, 35.
[158] Ibid., 35; see also Armstrong, *Broadcasting Policy in Canada*, 29.

However, as Litt remarks: "the CBC never had the resources to develop a national system of its own stations and was able to provide local service and coast-to-coast coverage only by running its programs through private stations."[159] Filion notes that "the CBC, although very commendable in its efforts, had to resort to private stations, foreign production and advertising,"[160] proving the Aird Commission's ambitions unattainable.

Nevertheless, the creation of the CBC was an important precedent for government action in the cultural field thereafter (followed by the establishment of cultural agencies such as the National Film Board, the Canada Council for the Arts, the National Arts Centre, Telefilm Canada, the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission) and "it indicated that the federal government had decided to combat American cultural penetration into Canada by encouraging domestic activity rather than impeding foreign activity."[161] Paul Schafer argues that "perhaps most importantly, [the historic decision to create the CBC] revealed an awareness at the highest political level that cultural problems cannot be solved exclusively by private sector activity, occasional grants, or random public actions. Public sector involvement was needed on a sustained and systematic basis if Canada was to evolve a viable system of cultural development and a dynamic cultural life."[162]

Canadian broadcasting evolved into a hybrid system that combines both public and private elements. Filion characterized Canadian broadcasting accordingly:

> Canadian broadcasting has always been divided between two opposite concepts: a political means devoted to create a national cultural identity or a commercial instrument relegated to make financial profit. But, rather than being antagonistic, these two concepts developed within a common dynamic in the Canadian socio-political context. Airwaves commercialization – generally linked to the *Americanization* process – has always been used to justify the federal hold in broadcasting through such public bodies as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) and the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC).[163]

The crucial role of the cultural elite in the development of Canadian broadcasting is often emphasized. Litt says that "the existing broadcasting system had evolved out of the greatest victory of the cultural elite in the interwar years."**[164]** Cultural elite feared American cultural domination and lobbied, mainly through Canadian Radio League and

---

[159] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 124.
[160] Filion, "Broadcasting and Cultural Identity," 454.
[161] Schafer, *Culture and Politics in* Canada, 15.
[162] Ibid., 15.
[163] Filion, "Broadcasting and Cultural Identity," 447.
[164] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 124.

its nationwide contacts, for implementation of the Aird Commission's recommendations. The debate on cultural policy regarding Canadian radio involved the question of ownership – public sector versus private enterprise, but it also reflected an ideological clash between high culture advocated by the intellectual elite and the emerging popular culture enjoyed by the masses that were in the eyes of the cultural elite "despised for having yielded to the charm of Americanization."[165] Filion notes that "the dominant argument presented the audience as an inert bloc mouldable under the benevolent guidance of an enlightened elite perfectly conscious of its mission in political, moral and cultural terms."[166] Members of the Aird Commission, representing the thoughts of the cultural elite, shared this view and emphasized that the invasion of foreign (American) programming has "a tendency to mould the minds". During the public sessions in Québec City in June 1929, one of the commissioners, Augustin Frigon, said:

> You talk about jazz. I like jazz, but I like good jazz. As a public body we should see that some means are taken to eliminate poor jazz because it is bad for the mentality of the public. Although you would like to satisfy everybody, certain things are better off the air than on. The well-learned should think and do something about it.[167]

The threat of Americanization of Canadian listeners exposed to the prevalent American content on the air played an important part in the creation of Canadian broadcasting system. American broadcasting was despised by Canadian cultural elite for what they see as commercial programs of an inferior quality that would "mould the minds" of Canadians. As Kevin Mulcahy observes, "The CBC, with its bilingual and transcontinental transmissions, was seen as an instrument for cultural uplift and national cohesion, rather than just commercial entertainment. Indeed, frequent references were made to the superiority of Canadian public programming: 'American shows in particular are commercially driven and corrupting the soul and sense of communal identity of Canadians.'"[168]

The late 1920s and early 1930s were the formative years of Canadian broadcasting system. The Aird Commission's report stimulated a national debate on the future of Canadian broadcasting which led to the creation of Canada's first public broadcaster in 1932, initiating "an era of government involvement which ultimately aimed at the

[165] Filion, "Broadcasting and Cultural Identity," 452.
[166] Ibid., 452.
[167] Quoted in Filion, "Broadcasting and Cultural Identity," 452.
[168] Mulcahy, "Cultural Imperialism and Cultural Sovereignty," 195.

Canadianization of mass media."[169] Filion remarks that "this first phase of mass media evolution relates closely to the maturation of Canada as a distinct entity on the North American continent."[170] The main objective of the public broadcaster was to strengthen national unity, to foster national spirit of the young nation, in other words, to develop "a common sense of what it meant to be Canadian."[171]

[169] Filion, "Broadcasting and Cultural Identity," 453.
[170] Ibid., 449.
[171] Vipond, „The Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission in the 1930s," 271.

3. Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 1949-1951

The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, commonly known after its chairman Vincent Massey as the Massey Commission, was appointed by the federal government under Liberal Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent in April 1949. The commission's task was to examine and make recommendations upon organization, methods and policies regarding Canadian broadcasting, federal cultural agencies[172] and activities, federal scholarships and aid to research, relations with UNESCO, and relations of the government and its agencies with voluntary bodies in the cultural field. A year into the inquiry, the Prime Minister, "greatly impressed with the interest which the public has shown in the hearings,"[173] added two more issues for the commission to advise on, namely availability of information about Canada abroad and preservation of historical monuments.

The mandate of the commission covered a broad field of "arts, letters and sciences" within the jurisdiction of the federal government. Even though the word "culture" did not actually appear in the commission's terms of reference, the report says "the public with a natural desire to express in some general way the essential character of our inquiry immediately and instinctively called us the 'Culture Commission'."[174]

The commission consisted of five members. Compared to the Aird Commission, more effort had been made to make the Massey Commission representative of the country. There were three anglophones and two francophones, four men and one woman, and the commissioners were also carefully selected to provide representation of the different regions of the country. Commission's chairman was Vincent Massey, at the time Chancellor of the University of Toronto, but also a known diplomat, philanthropist, arts patron and later Canada's first native-born governor general.[175] The other four commissioners were Arthur Surveyer, a francophone civil engineer from Montreal, as a businessman he represented commercial interests; Norman MacKenzie, President of the University of British Columbia and a native to Nova Scotia, thus informally representing

[172] Federal cultural agencies such as the National Film Board, the National Gallery, the National Museum, the National War Museum, the Public Archives and the Library of Parliament.
[173] Canada, Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, Report (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951), xxi.
[174] Ibid., 6.
[175] Appointed in 1952.

both coastal regions; Georges-Henri Lévesque, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Laval University and a Dominican priest from Quebec; and Hilda Neatby, Professor and Acting Head of the Department of History at the University of Saskatchewan. Anna Upchurch notes that "[f]rom the outset, the Commission's makeup and activities were intended to be inclusive and unifying to ensure participation from the provinces."[176]

The commission is today often referred to as the Massey-Lévesque Commission. It is however, as some authors point out, historically incorrect because Georges-Henri Lévesque never held a status as co-chair of the commission.[177] Paul Litt suggests it is a gesture intended to emphasize the tradition of English-French cooperation in Canadian history, such as the political partnerships of Baldwin and LaFontaine or Macdonald and Cartier.[178] Nevertheless, according to Claude Bissel, Lévesque himself "was the embodiment of the idea of the French-English entente."[179] Robert Sirman describes him as a "social scientist committed to bridging the two solitudes of English- and French-speaking Canadians"[180]

The Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences was issued in June 1951. During the two-year investigation of the state of Canadian cultural institutions and activities, the commission held 114 public hearings throughout the country and received 462 formal submissions from government institutions, professional organizations, voluntary associations, universities, provincial governments, business organizations and private broadcasters, and letters from individual citizens. The commissioners also worked with advisory committees and requested a number of critical studies on specialized topics to be prepared by authorities in the field to help with their research. The information they gathered was almost overwhelming.

The final report has 517 pages. It is divided into two parts – the first presents the commission's general survey of the arts, letters and sciences in Canada, the second introduces its recommendations. Last hundred pages are notes and appendices, including lists of briefs submitted and special studies made at the request of the commission. The

---

[176] Anna Upchurch, "Vincent Massey: Linking cultural policy from Great Britain to Canada," *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (2007), 249.
[177] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 6; see also Robert Sirman, "What would Massey see today? The Massey Commission and its Legacy," Speaking Notes for Robert Sirman, Director and CEO Canada Council for the Arts, *Walter Gordon Symposium, Massey College, University of Toronto* (March 27, 2014), accessed April 24, 2017, https://www.canada.ca/en/news/archive/2014/03/robert-sirman-what-would-massey-see-today-massey-commission-its-legacy.html?=undefined&wbdisable=false
[178] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 6.
[179] Claude Bissel, *The Imperial Canadian: Vincent Massey in Office* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 235.
[180] Sirman, "What would Massey see today?".

report is further structured into sections and chapters addressing different subjects of the commission's mandate. Introductory section of Part I defines the major problems facing cultural development in Canada. Section II, titled "Mass Media," focuses on radio and television broadcasting, film, and the press. Section III, titled "'Voluntary Bodies' and 'Federal Agencies,'" includes chapters on voluntary societies, galleries, museums, libraries, archives, historic sites and monuments, universities, national scholarships, and further examines the role of "The Scholar and the Scientist" and "The Artist and the Writer."[181] Section V focuses on Canadian cultural relations abroad, including relations with UNESCO and the projections of Canada abroad. Part II presents recommendations concerning specific federal agencies and institutions, the universities and systems of scholarships, and concludes with the commission's most renowned proposal to create a new arm's-length body called the Canada Council for the Encouragement of the Arts, Letters, Humanities and Social Sciences[182] "to stimulate and to help voluntary organizations within these fields, to foster Canada's cultural relations abroad, to perform the functions of a national commission for UNESCO, and to devise and administer a system of scholarships."[183]

The commission's broad investigation into the state of Canadian cultural and intellectual life led to unpleasant findings: Canadian culture in the state of anemia, alarming lack of Canadian content in almost every field under review, federal cultural agencies sorely underfunded, universities facing "a financial crisis so grave as to threaten their future usefulness."[184] Overall, the report describes the situation accordingly:

> But the institutions, the movements, the activities we have examined share something more than a purpose; they suffer in common from lack of nourishment. No appraisal of our intellectual or cultural life can leave one complacent or even content. If modern nations were marshalled in the order of the importance which they assign to those things with which this inquiry is concerned, Canada would be found far from the vanguard; she would even be near the end of the procession.[185]

The reasons for the problematic development of Canadian cultural and intellectual life are explained in the introductory chapter titled "The Forces of Geography" – as the main challenges for Canadian cultural development are listed "vast distances, a scattered

---

[181] This chapter examines various artistic disciplines: music, the theatre, ballet, painting, sculpture, architecture and town planning, literature, publishing, folklore, handicrafts, and Indian arts.
[182] Later to become the Canada Council for the Arts that we know today.
[183] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 377.
[184] Ibid., 140-141.
[185] Ibid., 272.

population, our youth as a nation, easy dependence on a huge and generous neighbour."[186] The pervasive American influences are depicted as the greatest threat to the development of a distinct Canadian culture. To overcome "the forces of geography" the commission wants to employ "the force of culture"[187] and recommends a policy of government intervention in the field of culture and federal funding for essentially everything it had under review. In this regard, the report is very straightforward stating: "Good will alone can do little for a starving plant; if the cultural life of Canada is anaemic, it must be nourished, and this will cost money. This is a task for shared effort in all fields of government, federal, provincial and local."[188] Recommendations of the commission are concerned with federal government only and focus on "how the national government may appropriately advance our cultural and intellectual life."[189] The aim of this thesis is not to describe in detail all the commission's findings and recommendations, but to identify the main factors and incentives for the general recommendation of state intervention in the field of culture. A brief overview of the historical context in which the commission operated is needed for us to better understand the motivations behind this ambitious recommendation.

The Second World War and its aftermath had similar yet even more profound effects on Canada as the First World War. Historian Desmond Morton says "Only the United States gained more than Canada from the Second World War. Canada had built the world's third largest navy, the fourth largest air force, and a powerful army. […] Canada had launched the greatest economic boom in its history."[190] Canada's contribution to the war effort and the newly gained prominence on the international scene spurred Canadian nationalism. The postwar period was widely "recognized at the time to be a critical passage in national development, a formative period in which an independent identity could be moulded."[191] The connection to Britain, which weakened after the First World War, continued to decline. In 1947 came into effect the *Canadian Citizenship Act*[192] which reflected Canada's decisive move "from the status of colony to an

[186] Ibid., 272.
[187] This term does not appear in the report, it is used by Karen Finlay. See Karen A. Finlay, *The Force of Culture: Massey and Canadian Sovereignty* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004).
[188] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 272.
[189] Ibid., 272.
[190] Desmond Morton, "Uncle Louis and Golden Age for Canada: A Time of Prosperity at Home and Influence Abroad," *Policy Options*, Vol. 24, No. 06 (June-July 2003): 52.
[191] Paul Litt, "The Massey Commission, Americanization, and Canadian Cultural Nationalism," *Queen's Quarterly*, Vol. 98, No. 2 (Summer 1991): 376.
[192] "Prior to 1947 and the introduction of the first Citizenship Act, there was legally no such thing as Canadian citizenship. Both native-born and naturalized citizens were British subjects." In: Margaret Young,

independent nationhood."[193] However, at the same time Canada was drawn closer to the U.S. According to Litt, "Canadians were deeply ambivalent about the rise of the US to superpower status. On the one hand, the US was a good neighbour, their powerful ally in the past war, and the bulwark of democracy in the international struggle against communism. On the other hand, the US was a colossus whose shadow fell over almost every aspect of Canadian life." Harold Innis, a contemporary Canadian nationalist, famously remarked in 1949 that Canada in a few years' time moved "from colony to nation to colony."[194] Anti-American sentiment and the fear of continentalism[195] was strong among Canadian nationalists who were alarmed by the omnipresent American culture as well as by the increasing influence of American financial capital. U.S. investment in Canada increased rapidly (replacing British investment) – by 1945, "the American share of foreign funds invested in Canada stood at 70 per cent of all foreign investment."[196] Litt characterized the "hopes and fears" of postwar Canadian nationalists accordingly:

> Canadian nationalism in the postwar period, then, was fueled by hope and fear – hope that Canada could seize the moment and ensure its destiny, fear that American influences would smother a new Canadianism in its cradle. Nowhere were these emotions more alive than on questions of culture, the very questions on which national identity and the justification for Canada's existence as an independent nation rested. These hopes and fears were symbolized in the creation of the Massey Commission.[197]

The fact that Canada was "sorely lacking in national culture by the end of the war"[198] presented a serious problem for the young nation and its emerging sense of

---

"Canadian *Citizenship Act* and Current Issues," Government of Canada Publications, *Law and Government Division* (October 1997, revised August 1998), accessed 6 July, 2017, http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection-R/LoPBdP/BP/bp445-e.htm

[193] Eva Mackey, *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), 65.

[194] Andrew Potter, introduction to *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism* (1965), by George Grant (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005), xi.

[195] "The prevalent attitude within English Canada's intellectual and academic community is to dismiss continentalism as an anti-nationalist and indeed menacing doctrine." In: Bélanger, *Prejudice and Pride*, 4.

[196] Jeffrey Brison, *Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Canada: American Philanthropy and the Arts and Letters in Canada* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2005), 5; see also Ramsay Cook, *Canada, Quebec, and the Uses of Nationalism* (Toronto: McClelland/Stewart, 1986), 137:
"Canada set out into a period of massive internal development heavily financed by American direct investment: in 1945 $4.9 billion of American capital were invested in Canada, and that had increased nearly fourfold by 1963."

[197] Litt, "The Massey Commission, Americanization, and Canadian Cultural Nationalism," 377.

[198] Zoë Druick, "International Cultural Relations as Factors in Postwar Canadian Cultural Policy: The Relevance of UNESCO for the Massey Commission," *Canadian Journal of Communication,* Vol. 31 (2006), 182; see also Maria Tippett, *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts before the Massey Commission* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990); Philip Massolin, *Canadian Intellectuals, the Tory Tradition, and the Challenge of Modernity, 1939-1970* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001).

national identity. Zoë Druick writes: "Given Canada's increasing profile at an international level, the underdevelopment of her national culture was beginning to become an embarrassment."[199] Cultural nationalists that were calling for higher government involvement in the field of culture for decades[200], finally caught government's attention. "A cultural nationalism that cultivated a unique culture identity was an appropriate capstone for the nation-building process."[201] And therefore government funding to support cultural development in Canada seemed justified. Jody Berland says: "Both popular and government approval for arts subsidies […] emerged from the argument that an independent nation (now deserved on military grounds) required a distinctive culture expressing Canadian experiences and values. This culture must also represent Canada abroad, to help bring Canada into the world of modern advanced nations following World War II."[202] The Massey Commission often refers to other modern nations and how Canada should not fall behind (and it often concludes that Canada does lag behind), nevertheless, the report states: "If, in Canada, the state is to assume an increasing measure of responsibility in these matters [in cultural and intellectual life of the nation], we shall find ourselves in step with most modern nations."[203]

Government's role expanded in many Western democracies in the postwar period under influence of Keynesian ideas and the concept of the welfare state which accented government responsibilities for the well-being of its citizens. The postwar mood of Canada, where "Canadians were coming to expect that the state would play an active role in bringing about the better postwar world everyone anticipated"[204], reflected these wider attitudes and policies of the postwar world which made Canadian federal government more inclined towards the idea of state intervention. The Massey Commission refers to this phenomenon: "Today governments play a part not foreseen a generation ago, in the matters which we are required to review. In most modern states there are ministries of 'fine arts' or of 'cultural affairs'. Some measure of official responsibility in this field is now accepted in all civilized countries whatever political philosophy may prevail."[205]

---

[199] Druick, "International Cultural Relations," 182.
[200] See Schafer, *Culture and Politics in Canada*; Tippett, *Making Culture*; Edwardson, *Canadian Content.*
[201] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 17.
[202] Jody Berland, "Nationalism and the Modernist Legacy: Dialogues with Innis," in *Capital Culture: A Reader on Modernist Legacies, State Institutions, and the Value(s) of Art*, ed. Jody Berland and Shelley Hornstein (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000), 18.
[203] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 273.
[204] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 165.
[205] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 5.

The commission advocates the state intervention in the field of culture, but at the same time is keenly aware of the fact that state intervention invites concern about state control (especially at the time when everybody saw how totalitarian regimes abused culture for propaganda and manipulation of the people). In order to avoid "the dangers inherent in any system of subvention by the central government to the arts and letters and to the culture of the country generally",[206] the commission recommends the proposed Canada Council to be an arm's-length body,[207] financed by government but at the same time having a high degree of independence from government. This model of federal patronage of the arts, letters and sciences was also favored because it seemed to be the answer to a question: "how can this aid be given consistently with our federal structure and in harmony with our diversities?"[208] Federal intervention was a very sensitive issue due to Canada's specifics – the constitutional rights of the provinces[209] and regional diversity of the country.

The following sections will analyze the important themes running through the report that explain and justify the Massey Commission's recommendation of federal government intervention in the field of culture, and increased federal funding for virtually every subject listed in the commission's mandate. Key theme that permeates the report is the fear of Americanization and American cultural invasion. "The forces of geography", presenting the pervasive influences of the powerful southern neighbor as the greatest threat to Canadian cultural development, also warn against easy Canadian dependence on the U.S. (on its cultural output as well as money invested in Canada). Unique Canadian situation thus makes state involvement even more necessary. Other themes, though all related to the U.S one way or the other, include the need to protect and promote democracy using "cultural defences", the accommodation to changes brought by modernity and the fear of negative effects of new technologies, mass media, and mass culture (flowing from the U.S), and the essential role of national culture for Canadian nationhood – state intervention is necessary to support cultural development as the next step in Canadian nation-building, its colony to nation transition, and in order to create distinct Canadian culture in face of the overpowering influence of American mass culture.

---

[206] Ibid., 374.
[207] This model of a semi-independent body is largely based on the British example, the Arts Council of Great Britain and the British Council (the proposed Canada Council was to combine functions of the two).
[208] Ibid., 5.
[209] "To preserve Quebec identity, jurisdictional responsibilities for education had been devolved to the provinces, making federal intervention or funding in arts and education a politically sensitive issue." In: Upchurch, "Vincent Massey," 240.

3.1 Canadian culture in the quest of nation-building

> 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. They are also the foundations of national unity.[210]

A strong argument for government intervention in the field of culture is based on the idea that cultural development is essential to the national life as well as the strength and unity of the nation. Since the commission's survey into Canadian arts, letters and sciences showed that cultural life of Canada was in the state of anemia and cultural institutions and activities suffered from "lack of nourishment,"[211] government support for the arts and culture, nurturing national culture through institutions of the state, was perceived as a necessary step in nation-building of the young nation.

It is important to note that this idea was already contained in the Order in Council, which established the commission. In the preamble to the commission's terms of reference appears Prime Minister St. Laurent's statement:

> That it is desirable that the Canadian people should know as much as possible about their country, its history and traditions; and about their national life and common achievements; [t]hat it is in the national interest to give encouragement to institutions which express national feeling, promote common understanding and add to the variety and richness of Canadian life, rural as well as urban;[212]

Higher government involvement in the cultural life of the nation through federal institutions and activities which contribute to the goals set out by the Prime Minister was intended from the start. Susan Crean points out that "the terms of the Massey Commission make it clear that a decision to introduce a policy of public assistance to academic research and to the arts was a foregone conclusion. But the report of the commission did not divulge why the Liberal government had become interested in the arts, nor did it explain the government's political rationale for moving into this field."[213]

Responding directly to the passage written by St. Laurent, the commission says: "Nothing can so well achieve these high purposes as the subjects which we have had

---

[210] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 271.
[211] Ibid., 272.
[212] Ibid., xi.
[213] Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?*, 127-128.

under review."[214] According to the commission, there are two basic assumptions that underlie its task. First, that there are important "intangible elements" in the life of a nation "which give a nation not only its essential character but its vitality as well […], which may give a community its power to survive."[215] To illustrate this from Canadian history, the report mentions both the French-speaking Canada and "its effective coherence as a living community have come of a loyalty to unseen factors, above all of fidelity to an historic tradition" and the Loyalists coming to British North America living through "the years of danger and hardship by their faithful adherence to a common set of beliefs."[216] Second, and more importantly, the commission states that

> the innumerable institutions, movements and individuals interested in the arts, letters and sciences throughout our country are now forming the national tradition of the future. Through all the complexities and diversities of race, religion, language and geography, the forces which have made Canada a nation and which alone can keep her one are being shaped. These are not to be found in the material sphere alone. Physical links are essential to the unifying process but true unity belongs to the realm of ideas.[217]

As Tom Henighan writes: "It is in a country's interest to support the arts and culture; first, to ensure national survival, but beyond that, as a validation of its history and the life of its people."[218] This statement nicely reflects the commission's reasoning.

The emphasis on cultural development as an essential part of nation-building helped the commission's argument for increased government role in supporting Canadian arts and culture. Every sovereign nation needs its national culture to strengthen the foundations of its national identity and since Canada as a young nation was behind in this respect government support was deemed reasonable, and necessary. From the various cultural expressions described in the report, Canadian painting is singled out as "the most advanced and at the same time as the most immediately communicable expression of the spirit of Canada."[219] Canadian painting indeed already had a reputation in the arts thanks to the painters of the Group of Seven who in the 1920s[220] "had first broken through the barrier of colonial indifference to Canadian art by creating a national school of painting

---

[214] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 272.
[215] Ibid., 4.
[216] Ibid., 4.
[217] Ibid., 4-5.
[218] Tom Henighan, *The Presumption of Culture: Structure, Strategy, and Survival in the Canadian Cultural Landscape* (Raincoast Books, Vancouver, 1996), 140. Cited in Schafer, *Culture and Politics in* Canada, 5.
[219] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 212.
[220] "By the 1920s, with the self-proclaimed nation-building art of the Group of Seven, visual art achieved more widespread validation, and the arts began to figure prominently in ideas about the role of culture." In: Finlay, *The Force of Culture*, 242.

– what was called a 'frankly Canadian' style of painting – based on a direct and expressive portrayal of the Canadian wilderness."[221] Quoting the brief from the Federation of Canadian Artists, the report says:

> The cultivation of the arts is not a luxury but an essential prerequisite to the development of a stable national culture; and for this reason justifies the expenditure of very considerable effort and money.[222]

Government intervention in the field of culture, aimed as a nation-building policy, was interpreted as something distinctly Canadian. As noted by Litt, "the commission's general strategy of state intervention to foster Canadian culture has been described as a typically Canadian form of public policy based in a concern for the national community over untrammelled liberal individualism. As such it is seen as a continuation of the nation-building policies of the nineteenth century – the National Policy adapted to the information age."[223]

The creation of the national broadcasting system in Canada also fitted into this logic. The Massey Commission approves of the existing broadcasting system which, as the report says, "has served the country well in the past and offers the greatest hope of national unity and enlightenment in the future" and therefore they urge that it "be given the power and resources sufficient for its great national responsibilities."[224] The commission names three main objectives of the national broadcasting system in Canada since its inception: "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. Much remains to be done, but the record of the past fourteen years is most encouraging."[225] The CBC was facing two main problems: lack of necessary funds to develop and improve its services, and growing dissatisfaction of the private broadcasters with their status in the existing system.[226] Although the commission appreciates the role of private stations in the national system (with their help the CBC managed to achieve a coverage over ninety per cent of the population[227] and the commission also commends local stations for doing

---

[221] Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?*, 128.
[222] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 209.
[223] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 5; see also Mackey, *The House of Difference*, 65-66.
[224] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 300.
[225] Ibid., 40-41.
[226] Ibid., 27.
[227] Ibid., 26. "The Canadian national broadcasting system is the result of ingenious improvisation to provide speedily an extensive service in a country where adequate coverage is perhaps the most expensive and the most difficult in the world." (p 27)

important work for local communities, especially in isolated areas[228]), it is strictly against any compromise to change the system, emphasizing the important functions of radio as a public service in Canada, both as an instrument for education and as a medium for promoting national unity. The report explains this position as follows:

> Radio has been the greatest single factor in creating and in fostering a sense of national unity. […] Believing as we do that it is an essential instrument for the promotion of unity and of general education in the nation, we cannot accept any suggestions which would impair the principles on which our present national system is based.[229]

The CBC is praised in the report not only for its contribution to a sense of Canadian unity in general, but also for its important role in promoting Canadian culture and encouraging Canadian talent in literature, music and drama (supporting the efforts of Canadian writers, composers and performers), which according to the commission "has undoubtedly led to a greater interest in the arts, to a proper sense of pride, of national unity and of self-confidence."[230] With reference to public opinion, the report says the national system "does much to promote a knowledge and understanding of Canada as a whole, and of every Canadian region, and therefore aids in the development of a truly Canadian cultural life" and that a number of briefs they received "hailed it with enthusiasm, as an important and distinctive national achievement, 'our greatest asset culturally'."[231] Nevertheless, the report does not mention only the accomplishments of the CBC but also its shortcomings. The commission urges that the CBC is granted additional federal funding "to develop and improve its programmes and to increase their Canadian content."[232] Apart from the need to increase Canadian content in general, the commission suggests, for example, that more needs to be done in the case of the encouragement of local talent and regional programming[233] or that broadcasting service for French-speaking Canadian listeners needs to be improved because it lacks behind the service for English-speaking Canadians.[234] The report also states there were "many requests for more information on public and international affairs, more emphasis on the celebration and the meaning of national holidays, more emphasis on Canadian history, including the history of both cultures."[235] All these quotes clearly show the commission's belief in the CBC's essential

[228] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 33.
[229] Ibid., 284.
[230] Ibid., 38.
[231] Ibid., 28.
[232] Ibid., 293-294.
[233] Ibid., 38.
[234] Ibid., 297.
[235] Ibid., 30.

role in nation-building as well as in fostering Canadian arts and culture, especially in face of the omnipresent American mass culture that presented a threat to Canadian identity (as will be discussed later). Supporting national culture is deemed necessary as it would lead to greater national unity and understanding, as shows the following passage:

> But national unity and knowledge of our country are not the only ends to be served. These important purposes are also a means to that "peaceful sharing of the things we cherish", in St. Augustine's phrase cited at the beginning of this volume. We are thus further concerned with radio broadcasting in that it can open to all Canadians new sources of delight in arts, letters, music and the drama. Through a fuller understanding and a heightened enjoyment of these things Canadians become better Canadians because their interests are broadened; they achieve greater unity because they enjoy in common more things, and worthier things.[236]

Another federal cultural agency which is highly commended for its work in promoting national unity is the National Film Board (NFB). The National Film Act of 1939 established the NFB to "advise upon the making and distribution of national films designed to help Canadians in all parts of Canada to understand the ways of living and the problems of Canadians in other parts."[237] The NFB produced documentary films and one of its main goals was to help nation-building. The Massey Report also praises the NFB for the distribution of films to distant rural areas of the country where people "would not otherwise come into touch with the culture of the nation."[238] During the Second World War, the NFB immensely expanded its production[239] and "soon became a major source of domestic and Allied war propaganda."[240] Paul Schafer emphasizes the NFB's great contributions to the war effort as well as to the art of film (particularly documentary) and remarks "who would have guessed that millions of NFB films would been seen each year throughout the world."[241] Filmmaker Robert Lower in his documentary *Shameless Propaganda* (2014), which studies the wartime production of the NFB, makes several interesting observations how the films were used not only to unify Canadians in their war effort but also, in a nation-building effort, to convince Canadians they are great people and portray Canada as a nation they can all belong to. According to Lower, the stories the documentaries told were "not about convincing us to die for our country but rather

---

[236] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 280.
[237] The National Film Act, 1939, Section 9 (a). Cited in Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 50.
[238] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 54.
[239] NFB produced over 500 films during the Second World War, including two propaganda series: *The World in Action* and *Canada Carries On*.
[240] Paul Rutherford, "The Persistence of Britain: The Culture Project in Postwar Canada," in *Canada and the End of Empire*, ed. Phillip Buckner (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005), 196.
[241] Schafer, *Culture and Politics in Canada*, 17.

convincing us we have a country worth dying for."[242] Lower also says the NFB Commissioner John Grierson (responsible for the NFB's immense wartime success) saw documentary as a "hammer to shape society."[243] According to the Massey Commission, "Many Canadians expressed pride in the work of the Film Board considering that, like our national radio service, it is a valuable and distinctive Canadian achievement."[244] The NFB indeed gained a legendary status during the war and documentary is sometimes called "Canada's national art form."[245] As Rutherford remarks: "Out of that [wartime] experience emerged a film and later an audiovisual tradition of opinionated and thoughtful productions, eventually hailed as distinctively Canadian in contrast to the mass entertainment of Hollywood."[246] Since the NFB budget was "drastically cut" after the war, the commission urges that the NFB was granted the necessary funds.[247] The National Film Act was revised in 1950 and rephrased its mandate: "to produce and distribute and to promote the production and distribution of films designed to interpret Canada to Canadians and to other nations."[248]

The projection of Canada abroad,[249] and international cultural relations in general, can be also perceived as a part of the commission's focus on strengthening Canada as a nation through cultural state institutions, not only by fostering national unity, understanding and cultural life at home but also by promoting Canada on the international scene. "Ignorance of Canada in other countries is very widespread"[250] reads the opening line of the chapter. Vincent Massey wrote in 1948:

> Publicity is a normal function of the modern state. […] Publicity is more important to Canada than to most countries. We are a comparatively new arrival on the international scene, and less is known about Canadian life than would be the case if we had been a grown-up member of the family of nations for a longer time. […] Canada has been almost a *terra incognita*. […] The publicity of a country must be largely a governmental matter.[251]

---

[242] Robert Lower, (Filmmaker), *Shameless Propaganda* (2014), National Film Board, Canada, accessed April 24, 2017, https://www.nfb.ca/distribution/film/shameless_propaganda
[243] Ibid.
[244] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 53.
[245] Robert Lower, *Shameless Propaganda* (2014)
[246] Rutherford, "The Persistence of Britain," 197.
[247] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 306-308.
[248] National Film Act, 1950, Section 9. Cited in Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 307.
[249] A phrase used by Vincent Massey already in his book *On Being Canadian* (Toronto: Dent, 1948), 159. In the Massey Report, this phrase is explained as "a metaphor drawn from the cinema and suggests a practice now universal. Nations project themselves on the international screen in various ways." (p 253)
[250] Ibid., 253.
[251] Vincent Massey, *On Being Canadian* (Toronto: Dent, 1948), 159-164.

According to the commission, "All nations now recognize as public responsibilities both the issue of information about themselves and cultural exchanges with other states. Canada is assuming these responsibilities along with her new international importance, and certain departments and agencies of the Federal Government are actively engaged in this task."[252] The commission emphasizes the need for development in representing Canada abroad. Apart from information services – the CBC is regarded as the most important agency in "promoting a knowledge of Canada abroad"[253] through its International Service established in 1944 – the commission is mainly focused on cultural exchanges, which are "valuable from the political point of view in creating a proper understanding of Canada abroad, but are also important [...] in promoting the normal development of Canadian cultural life."[254] The commission accents that "[t]he promotion of international exchanges in the arts, letters and sciences would increase Canadian prestige in other countries."[255] The report repeatedly states that Canada "lags far behind" both the leaders of the western world and even smaller democratic countries with much more limited resources in "this important national activity".[256] Zoë Druick in this context draws attention to "the significance of UNESCO as a legitimizing discourse for national cultural funding in the postwar world"[257] and claims that "[m]any of the final recommendations of the Commission, including the emphasis on the need for Canadian participation in all forms of intellectual and artistic cultural exchange, are completely in line with UNESCO."[258] The proposed arm's-length body, that would eventually become the Canada Council for the Arts, had among its responsibilities listed both "to foster Canada's cultural relations abroad [and] to perform the functions of a national commission for UNESCO."[259]

The question of federal funding for universities, that were in a grave financial crisis, concerned the federal government for some time. It is also sometimes mentioned as one of the most pressing issues (together with the role of the CBC and the need of policies regarding television) that led the Liberal government to establish the Massey

[252] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 253.
[253] Ibid., 256.
[254] Ibid., 261.
[255] Ibid., 262.
[256] Ibid., 265-266.
[257] Zoë Druick, "Remedy and Remediation: The Cultural Theory of the Massey Commission," *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2-3 (2007), 164.
[258] Ibid., 163.
[259] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 377.

Commission in the first place.[260] The domain of education was exclusively under provincial jurisdiction, therefore, the commission had to carefully explain their recommendations of federal intervention. In their argument, the commission stresses, among other things discussed elsewhere, the importance of universities for national strength and unity:

> The universities are provincial institutions; but they are much more than that. […] They also serve the national cause in so many ways, direct and indirect, that theirs must be regarded as the finest of contributions to national strength and unity. [261]

Last but not least, other federal institutions, such as the National Gallery, National Museums, Federal Libraries, Public Records and Archives, or Historic Sites and Monuments, also represent the nation and its prestige and since the commission found these institutions in a sorry state, it emphasized that it is essential they get all the necessary funding. The Massey Commission's recommendations were also instrumental in the establishment of the National Library of Canada in 1953.

[260] Paul Litt, "The Massey Report, fifty years later," *The Beaver*, Vol. 81, No. 3 (June-July 2001)
[261] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 132.

3.2 Culture as a means of protecting democracy

> If we as a nation are concerned with the problem of defence, what, we may ask ourselves, are we defending? We are defending civilization, our share of it, our contribution to it. The things with which our inquiry deals are the elements which give civilization its character and its meaning. It would be paradoxical to defend something which we are unwilling to strengthen and enrich, and which we even allow to decline.[262]

> "Our military defences must be made secure; but our cultural defences equally demand national attention; the two cannot be separated."[263]

A strong theme in the report is the need to protect and promote democracy. Emphasis is placed on the relationship between defense and culture. Government support of cultural development – Canada's "cultural defenses" – is deemed a necessary step to reinforce democracy in the face of "a darkening horizon in the international world,"[264] meaning the beginnings of the Cold War. The commission anticipated that the military defense spending would be a priority due to the recent developments on the international scene, however, it insisted that promoting national culture was equally important in the fight against undemocratic ideologies. The Second World War and the Cold War were strong incentives to define and promote the system of values upon which Western democracies were built. Democracy promotion, a concept designed and advocated by the U.S. and included in its foreign policies (e.g. the Marshall Plan), played important role in the postwar world. To promote a common understanding of the principles of democracy was deemed necessary in Canada as well. For example, the Canadian Citizenship Council expressed a desire that the NFB films, immensely successful during the war, would "help Canadians have a better appreciation of Canada as a nation, a fuller understanding of democracy and the workings and the procedures of democracy."[265] Vincent Massey in his book *On Being Canadian* (1948) wrote that "our peoples need to understand the way of life which they are defending in the war of ideas today so that they can defend it better."[266]

Cultural questions had a great relevance in this regard. The fact that "spiritual traditions need guarding"[267] was clear in the face of the totalitarian regimes of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. The powerful use of propaganda by the totalitarian regimes

---

[262] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 274.
[263] Ibid., 275.
[264] Ibid., 274.
The report never directly mentions Soviet Russia, but the references to the Cold War are clear.
[265] Quoted in Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 203.
[266] Massey, *On Being Canadian*, 48.
[267] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 272.

showed how cultural institutions can be abused to control and manipulate people. During the Second World War, a coalition of Canadian arts groups (later titled the Canadian Conference for the Arts) called for government support of the arts and culture "as a way of protecting democracy."[268] Jody Berland wrote: "The wartime coalition of artists' organizations […] advanced a strategical connection between a cultural policy focused on fine arts and national defence. Their goal was to elevate art's status as professional work, and to win government financial support for art production, on the basis of culture's potential contribution to national morale."[269] The Massey Commission shared this view and used the same rationale in the Cold War context stressing "the paramount importance of strengthening those institutions on which our national morale and our national integrity depend."[270]

The association between culture and defense proved to be a powerful argument for state intervention in the field of culture. Berland argues that "[t]he connection between the arts and national defence – between autonomous art and an autonomous nation – was a fundamental component of postwar reconstruction and continued to lay the rhetorical foundation for cultural policy."[271] She also claims that "[b]oth popular and government approval for arts subsidies were cultivated and won on the basis of a link between cultural patronage and national defence."[272] Similarly, Litt argues that „[t]he Cold War reinforced the [cultural] elite's case for government intervention by making culture appear to be a matter of central importance in the preservation of the democratic state."[273] National defense in the Cold War context meant the protection of democracy. However, as one of the Cold War effects was also that it drove Canada closer to the U.S., Canada's "cultural defences" were needed rather to resist the omnipresent American culture than to fight communism. Addressing the same excerpt from the Massey Report included at the head of this section, Paul Rutherford remarks: "In the cultural context, though, the main enemy seemed not Soviet Russia […] but rather Capitalist America."[274] Similarly, Zoë Druick observes that "the report is also dealing with two international foes simutaneously, both

[268] Dewing, "Canadian Broadcasting Policy," 2.
[269] Berland, "Nationalism and the Modernist Legacy," 21.
[270] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 274-275.
[271] Berland, "Nationalism and the Modernist Legacy," 22.
[272] Ibid., 18.
[273] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 104-105.
[274] Rutherford, "The Persistence of Britain," 199-200.

of which may manifest within Canadian borders: American mass culture and the pernicious ideologies of the Soviet Union."[275]

The argument of national defense appears also in the commission's recommendation for federal funding for universities, national scholarships and scientific research. The report says:

> It is perhaps unnecessary for us to dwell upon the great contribution which Canadian universities made to the defence of our country through the fundamental research work which they undertook during the war, and are continuing in the perilous times in which we live. It is true to say that our very safety depends upon this work of vital national importance which only the universities can do.[276]

> We have already expressed the opinion that the granting of scholarships to young Canadians is in the public interest and therefore is a national duty. The importance to Canada of scientific research, whether for the defence of our country or for the peaceful development of its resources, must surely be self-evident.[277]

Another important theme that permeates the report is the role of voluntary bodies, mostly referred to as voluntary societies in the report, and their contributions to Canadian life. The commission highly values the "fine tradition of the voluntary society which performs work of national importance beyond what government can or will do"[278] and appreciates "the vitality of this tradition" in Canada. In Chapter VI, which is focused specifically on the work of voluntary societies, the commission accents the critical role the voluntary societies have in a democracy:

> The importance of voluntary societies in a democracy needs little emphasis in this generation which knows that their suppression is the first move of a dictatorship; but it is perhaps not fully realized to what extent democracy depends upon their activities.[279]

Assessing this function of voluntary societies in Canada, the commission says: "In our examination of the voluntary societies we were struck by the manner in which they reflect the general processes of democracy, adapted to particular conditions in Canada."[280] The commission is convinced that the work of voluntary societies is essential for a democracy and therefore it is in the state's interest to encourage and support their activities. The report says:

> We consider that the relation of voluntary effort to governmental activity is the focal point of the work of this Commission. Indeed, it would not, we think, be an

[275] Druick, "International Cultural Relations," 181.
[276] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 135.
[277] Ibid., 356.
[278] Ibid., 66.
[279] Ibid., 66.
[280] Ibid., 67.

> exaggeration to say that the democratic form of government is made practicable through the work of voluntary organizations which in matters of national importance complement governmental activity and not infrequently initiate projects which subsequently are taken over by the state.[281]

According to Robert Sirman, "The Massey Report's recommendation to create the Canada Council is largely a provocation to Government to better support the work of voluntary societies – and by extension, democracy."[282] Sirman also notes that the report's view of the role of voluntary societies in a democracy sounds very much like Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, especially the argument "that a critical underpinning for the practice of democracy in the United States is the way Americans voluntarily come together to get things done, and how this practice is scalable from the smallest village to the nation as a whole."[283]

Last but not least, a topic related to this section is the Massey Commission's emphasis on the important connection between culture and education. The commissioners believed that culture, to be exact high culture – not mass culture, was a form of education which led to individual self-improvement. The introductory section of the report includes a statement: "Culture is that part of education which enriches the mind and refines the taste. It is the development of the intelligence through the arts, letters and sciences."[284] Paul Litt, who in his study of the Massey Commission describes its ideology as "liberal humanism," argues that "[t]o promote high culture was to defend the liberal democratic civilization of the West. It was only through the type of education provided by high culture that the individual could become an aware and responsible democratic citizen."[285] Litt remarks that "the intelligent and responsible citizenry [was] deemed necessary to make mass democracy work."[286] The commission's recommendation to create an arts funding agency as well as the recommended federal funding for universities follow this logic. The commission also accents the important function of mass media to provide information and education, and thus create a well-informed citizenry that is essential for a democracy. Both radio broadcasting and film contain these references:

> Radio in any democratic country has three main functions: to inform, to educate and to entertain. […] We fully believe in the educational importance of radio in

---

[281] Ibid., 73.
[282] Sirman, "What would Massey see today?"
[283] Ibid.
[284] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 7.
[285] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 212.
[286] Ibid., 94; see also Litt, "The Massey Report, fifty years later."

> a democratic state, where everything depends on the intelligent and well-informed co-operation of the ordinary citizen.[287]

> In a democratic state, national effort in war and national unity in peace are maintained only by the informed conviction of its citizens. No democratic government can afford to neglect at any time a means of public information so far-reaching and so persuasive as the film.[288]

The power of mass media to persuade the masses and wider concerns about the ill effects of mass culture will be discussed in the next section. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning here the concern shared by many western intellectuals at the time that mass culture undermines democracy. The successful use of propaganda and mass persuasion by the totalitarian regimes was only made possible by exploitation of the mass media. The worry about mass culture in western societies stemmed from the belief that "the marriage of advertising and mass media that propelled the North American consumer economy had fostered similar persuasive techniques" [289] as totalitarian propaganda. As Litt writes: "Psychology was employed to sell soap operas through appeals to the subconscious. Critical faculties were lulled by reducing the cultural content […] The result? A dull-witted, credulous citizenry, a population incapable of playing the active and responsible political role required of the electorate in a vital liberal democracy."[290] This concern was clearly reflected in the Massey Report in its negative attitude towards mass culture in general and its emphasis on the connection between education and culture and on the important function of mass media to provide information and education as showed in the excerpts above.

[287] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 299.
[288] Ibid., 310.
[289] Litt, "The Massey Commission, Americanization, and Canadian Cultural Nationalism," 382.
[290] Ibid., 382.

3.3 New technologies, perils of modernity and concerns about mass culture

> All civilized societies strive for a common good, including not only material but intellectual and moral elements. If the Federal Government is to renounce its right to associate itself with other social groups, public and private, in the general education of Canadian citizens, it denies its intellectual and moral purpose, the complete conception of the common good is lost, and Canada, as such, becomes a materialistic society.[291]
>
> The tidal wave of technology can be more damaging to us than to countries with older cultural traditions possessing firmer bulwarks against these contemporary perils.[292]
>
> The fact that there is a tendency to spend increasing leisure in gazing and listening or in aimless motoring has been presented to us as a growing threat to culture and even to intelligent behaviour.[293]

The Massey Commission's concerns about the dramatic changes brought by modernity, "new problems which we share with all modern states,"[294] in particular concerns about the negative effects of new technology are expressed throughout the report. The new threats coming with modernity include standardization, materialism, excessive commercialism, consumerism, passive leisure and conformity. In the words of Paul Rutherford: "Running through the Report was a fear of the onset of a purely 'materialistic society,' the rise of 'mass' man, and the decline of the West into a debased state of passivity and conformity."[295] Mass culture disseminated extensively through the mass media shaped by the new technologies is often portrayed in the report as downright harmful to an individual and society as such. The commission clearly fears that new technology imperils culture and to avoid the potential dangers, or at least to mitigate the losses[296], recommends federal funding of Canadian cultural development. State intervention in mass media is deemed necessary to ensure its great powers are used for a good purpose, such as to promote national unity and understanding, to inform the public on important issues, and to foster general education and Canadian cultural expression.

---

[291] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 8.
[292] Ibid., 272.
[293] Ibid., 69-70.
[294] Ibid., 272.
[295] Rutherford, "The Persistence of Britain," 199.
[296] Zoë Druick points to Massey Commission's "overarching melancholy about the losses precipitated by modern technologies and modern media—loss of community, of pervasive amateur culture, of clear-cut values and traditions tied to European culture and religion—is met with a kind of resolve about how to mitigate these losses with bold decisions about national funding for media and culture." In: Druick, "Remedy and Remediation," 171.

The introduction of the chapter on mass media includes passages that express a nostalgic sentiment about the past times when "the cultural life of most communities centred about the church, the school, the local library and the local newspaper."[297] The accommodation to modernity is depicted rather negatively, using an expressive language in many passages in this part the report. For example, the last paragraph of the introduction to mass media (which also contains remarks showing the commission's overall negative perception of mass culture) states:

> The hollow voice of a loudspeaker would have echoed strangely in these surroundings, and the clicking of a television set would have dismayed a family accustomed to look only at the family portaits [*sic*] with their tranquil expressions. Nowadays, opera has a rival in "soap opera", and perhaps a "pin-up girl" grins from the exact place on the wall where used to hang the portrait of a shy young woman of twenty, of whom they used to say: *"Qui est-ce? Mais vous savez bien que c'est le portrait de grand'mère.*[298]

The commission acknowledges the positive effects of mass media, but is also cautious about the negative aspects such as passive entertainment.

> The radio, the film, the weekly periodical have brought pleasure and instruction to remote and lonely places in this country, and undoubtedly have added greatly to the variety of our enjoyment. In the great plenty that now is ours, there is some danger that we may forget that music and drama and letters call for more than passive pleasure on our part; in this new world of television, of radio and of documentary films, it will be unfortunate if we hear no more our choir and our organist in valiant and diligent practice of the Messiah, making together a gracious music that reaches us faintly but with great sweetness across the quiet of an early winter night.[299]

The fear that new technology would replace the cultural practices before its arrival is one aspect, second is that the social changes brought by new technologies in the fields of communication and culture would make interactions automatic and impersonal.

> The telephone was the first step; the gramophone and the radio followed closely; before that, communication was on a voluntary and personal basis; it became automatic, easy and impersonal. Culture, too, came to lean heavily on the machine.[300]

Zoë Druick argues that "the report embodied a seeming contradiction, condemning technology's deleterious effects, while simultaneously promoting its institutionalization in Canadian life."[301]

---

[297] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 19.
[298] Ibid., 22.
[299] Ibid., 20.
[300] Ibid., 21.
[301] Druick, "Remedy and Remediation," 162.

The discussion about the role of the state in regards to broadcasting that started in the 1920s intensified with the arrival of television, a new form of broadcasting that was expected to soon become even more powerful than radio, which as the report says already had "enormous powers to debase and to elevate public understanding and public taste."[302] The report discusses the two alternative models of broadcasting organization, the U.S. model of competition between commercial stations and the public-service model of Great Britain and France. The former according to the report views broadcasting "primarily as a means of entertainment, a by-product of the advertising business," the latter regards radio broadcasting as

> a social influence too potent and too perilous to be ignored by the state which, in modern times, increasingly has assumed responsibility for the welfare of its citizens. This second view of radio operation assumes that this medium of communication is a public trust to be used for the benefit of society, in the education and the enlightenment as well as for the entertainment of its members.[303]

The cautious approach of the commission to the powers of mass media is clearly depicted here. Same as the Aird Commission two decades earlier, the Massey Commission sides with the public-service model and fully supports the existing national broadcasting system accustomed to Canada's needs, disregarding the private broadcasters' efforts to dismantle the control of CBC, arguing that:

> The principal grievance of the private broadcasters is based, it seems to us, on a false assumption that broadcasting in Canada is an industry. Broadcasting in Canada, in our view, is a public service directed and controlled in the public interest by a body responsible to Parliament.[304]

The belief that television would have a profound impact on society was widespread among western intellectuals since the inception of this medium. The first forms of television were invented during the interwar years, however, "the last and final birth of television," as it is often said, occurred after the Second World War. "Families had accumulated savings during the war years, and were eager to purchase homes, cars and other luxuries denied them during the war. Television sets were soon added to the 'must have' list. The explosion of sets into the American marketplace occurred in 1948-1949."[305] The arrival of television sparked debate among western intellectuals about the social effects of this new powerful and popular, yet unpredictable, medium. One of the

---

[302] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 284.
[303] Ibid., 276.
[304] Ibid., 283.
[305] Television History - The First 75 Years, "Television Facts and Statistics - 1939 to 2000," accessed July 1, 2017. http://www.tvhistory.tv/facts-stats.htm.

concerns was that it brings conformity. Conformity first comes with industrialization and the birth of the consumer society, mass producing the same products, clothing, etc. for people to buy and desire. The ideal of the middle class in western societies (and especially in the U.S.) is commonly associated with consumerism, materialism and conformity. Television that quickly becomes a part of people's homes shows "the ideal" how people should look like, what they should aspire to, and therefore brings legitimate concerns not only about conformity it brings, but its immense power to influence people in general.

The Massey Commission shares these contemporary concerns about the social effects of television. The report says: "The combined influences of sight, sound and motion are intensified when received in the quiet of a home. There is little doubt that television is becoming as popular as it is persuasive."[306] The commissioners accent its "unpredictability" and "power to influence people" several times in the report and therefore take a very cautious approach to this new medium and strongly advise that "direction and control of television broadcasting in Canada continue to be vested in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation."[307] The argument for keeping television under nationally controlled system is based on two main assumptions. First, that it is essential to avoid the potential dangers and "abuses" of television, such as excessive commercialization[308] (a phenomenon associated with the broadcasting business south of the border) or "the danger of encouraging passivity in the viewer."[309] The report quotes concerns expressed by T. S. Eliot in his letter to *The Times* of London in 1950 regarding what he saw upon his visit to the U.S.[310] as potentially harmful social effects of "the television habit," especially to the mental, moral and physical health of young children; hence Eliot urges that Britain "investigated its consequences for American society and took counsel with informed American opinion about possible safeguards and limitations."[311] The commission praises the British model of television broadcasting, that the BBC recognized its educational function as well as "moral and cultural responsibilities" and offered a variety of programs "designed not only to entertain but to

---

[306] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 42.
[307] Ibid., 303.
[308] With reference to radio broadcasting, the report says: "A general cause of complaint was that commercialism, even though it has not gone so far as in the United States, is becoming excessive. There were many requests that the C.B.C. reduce the time allotted to commercial programmes; several organizations were inclined to think that the C.B.C. should leave the commercial field altogether." (p 34)
[309] Ibid., 49.
[310] In the U.S., television had already become a "habitual form of entertainment" in many households, according to Eliot, more so than in Britain at the time.
[311] T. S. Eliot, A letter to the editor, *The Times*, December 20, 1950; cited in Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 413.

instruct, whether through drama, opera, ballet and music, or through lectures and commentaries."[312] Second, the commission emphasizes that it is important to make sure this new important means of communication benefits Canadians and positively contribute to Canadian life:

> If Canadian radio and films have done so much already to bring Canadians together in sympathy and understanding, it is easy to imagine how much could be done through television as a supplement to both. Television also offers intellectual possibilities in adult education and in family entertainment which, if they cannot be exactly forecast, must not be ignored. As with radio, the Canadian problem is to make the best possible use of this new medium, within the limitations imposed by Canadian conditions and by costs.[313]

In Canada, television was, in the words of the report, "in the proverbially happy position of having as yet no history,"[314] however, American television programs were already available to Canadians. The report states that about 25,000 Canadians[315] owned television sets at the time and that "the number will no doubt increase very rapidly here just as it has in the United States. It seems necessary, therefore, in our interests, to provide Canadian television programmes with national coverage as soon as possible."[316] In 1948, the Board of Governors of the CBC issued a public statement concerning television broadcasting in Canada, which mentioned the problems that need to be faced, e.g. high costs or availability of the U.S. programs, and "recommended developing television in the national interest by following the policy already established in radio broadcasting."[317] The Massey Commission concurs with this statement and further recommends:

> That the capital costs of the national television broadcasting system be provided from public money by parliamentary grants.[318]
>
> That the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation exercise a strict control over all television stations in Canada in order to avoid excessive commercialism and to encourage Canadian content and the use of Canadian talent.[319]

Paul Rutherford notes that even begore the Massey Commission formulated its recommendations, "the CBC's masters had already begun to implement a vision of television that fitted the Massey agenda. The government had turned over the making of

---

[312] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 48.
[313] Ibid., 49.
[314] Ibid., 44.
[315] Population in Canada according to 1951 census was 14,009,129. Source: "Factors in the growth of population, 1951 to 1961," *Statistics Canada, Canada Year Book, 1967*, accessed July 2, 2017, https://www65.statcan.gc.ca/acyb02/1967/acyb02_19670184002-eng.htm
[316] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 302.
[317] Ibid., 44.
[318] Ibid., 304.
[319] Ibid., 305.

Canadian TV to the CBC back in 1949, even before the Report arrived, and a service began, first in Montreal and Toronto, in September 1952."[320] The commission correctly predicted the rapid increase in television sets in Canadian homes, a trend that was to be expected following the U.S. example. According to Canadian Gallup polls, by 1956, 63 % of Canadians had a TV set in their homes, and when asked upon their opinion about the influence of TV on family life, 66.7 % answered it has a good influence, in particular, mentioning its educational benefits 32.6 %, entertaining 20.6 %, or that it keeps family together 24.6 %.[321] By 1957, it was already 68.2 %, and when asked upon activities done in the evening, in order to "find out how the average Canadian spends his spare time," 55.3 % replied watched TV, whereas the popularity of radio declined to 15.1 % (other activities included reading 16.9 %, visiting friends 13.1 %, watching sports events 3.3 %, or going to movie or theatre 2.9 %).[322] These polls illustrate the expected overwhelming popularity of television in the years following the Massey Commission, as well as maybe not so obvious fact that many Canadians shared the commission's view that television has an important educational, not only entertaining, function.

> The statement that the C.B.C. often underestimates public taste appears more than once, and the demand already mentioned, that national radio be used as an instrument of education and culture came from every section of the country.[323]

The commission often uses reference to public opinion to support its argument, such as in this example. To some extent, the polls cited above verify the commission's reference to public opinion on this particular case.

In the introduction of the commission's mandate, the report says: "Our task was opportune by reason of certain characteristics of modern life. One of these is the increase in leisure."[324] The commission's concerns about "passive entertainment" were already introduced in the previous paragraphs. The polls show that television indeed quickly became one of the most popular sources of entertainment in people's spare time. The third excerpt from the Massey Report included at the head of this section presenting "passive entertainment" as a "threat to culture and even to intelligent behaviour" explain the commission's emphasis on educational and cultural functions of mass media. It is also

---

[320] Rutherford, "The Persistence of Britain," 201.
[321] 1956: March (# 247). Documentation (ascii). The Canadian Institute of Public Opinion (CIPO). *Gallup Canada, Inc.* The Carleton University Social Science Data Archives. Accessed May 20, 2017. https://library.carleton.ca/find/data/gallup-canada
[322] 1957: December (# 263), September (# 260). Documentation (ascii). The Canadian Institute of Public Opinion (CIPO). *Gallup Canada, Inc.* The Carleton University Social Science Data Archives.
[323] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 36.
[324] Ibid., 5.

worth mentioning that this except comes from the section on the voluntary societies, which are commended, besides their important role in a democracy analysed in the previous section, for their "attempts to cope with the problem of 'passive entertainment'" because they "by their nature require at least some participation from all their members."[325]

Another negative aspect associated with modernity that is specifically mentioned in the report is standardization. Canadian diversity is in this context considered to be a very important element of Canadian ability to resist standardization.

> In all our travels we were impressed by differences of tradition and atmosphere in regions such as the Atlantic Provinces, the Prairies and British Columbia. The very existence of these differences contributes vastly to "the variety and richness of Canadian life" and promises a healthy resistance to the standardization which is so great a peril of modern civilization. There is nothing in this antagonistic to a Canadian spirit.[326]

Karen Finlay in this context points to the implication that to resist standardization and conformity means also to resist "American cultural imperialism"[327] as these phenomena are associated with the development in the U.S. Finlay also mentions that according to Massey regional and ethnic diversity were important sources of Canadian sovereignty, although at first he "identified sectionalism as the major obstacle to national identity, […] as the threat of American influence mounted, he increasingly stressed Canada's diverse ethnic and regional character in the campaign to resist conformism and imperialism."[328] Eva Mackey writes that "in the early days of Canadian nation-building, the nationalists' need to differentiate from *external* 'others' – in the case of Massey, the USA – resulted in constantly re-worked, flexible and contradictory inclusions and exclusions of *internal* 'others'."[329]

The concern about mass culture emanating from the U.S. and its potentially harmful and dangerous effects, already touched upon in the previous section, runs through the report. "Soap operas" are repeatedly mentioned as a negative example of mass culture production "guilty of melodramatic exaggeration, unreality, and an excessive use of commonplace and stereotyped forms. […] [Concluding that] false values and unreal emotionalism can only be harmful."[330] The same negative assessment applies to

---

[325] Ibid., 69-70.
[326] Ibid., 11.
[327] Finlay, *The Force of Culture*, 242.
[328] Ibid., 242.
[329] Mackey, *The House of Difference*, 65.
[330] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 35.

children's comic books or the "crime" and "horror" programs that are also described as "positively harmful."[331] The negative perception of mass culture reflected the commission's wider attitudes towards low culture versus high culture. Needless to say, the commission advocated for federal patronage supporting the arts and culture in Canada (i.e. high culture). The concerns about mass culture were widespread among contemporary intellectuals not only in Canada,[332] but naturally also in the U.S. which was leading the way in consumption of mass culture. As a concluding thought, Rutherford characterizes the battle between the high culture and the low culture accordingly:

> One of the longest, ongoing battles in Western civilization, at least since the late middle ages, had been the effort of the custodians of high culture to suppress the low. The arrival of the new technologies of cinema, radio, and television, however, had seemingly swung the balance against authority. In the fevered minds of some champions, not just McLuhan but New York's Dwight Macdonald or the doyen of the Frankfurt School, Theodor Adorno, the final battle for the soul of humanity was already under way.[333]

[331] Ibid., 18.
[332] Harold Innis was a renowned communication theorist, also known for his strong anti-Americanism, that influenced others, such as Donald Creighton. Or Marshall McLuhan, at the time yet unknown, in 1951 published his denunciation of popular culture, a book called *The Mechanical Bride*.
[333] Rutherford, "The Persistence of Britain," 195-196.

3.4 Cultural nationalism and the perception of American cultural invasion

> [O]ur population stretches in a narrow and not even continuous ribbon along our frontier--fourteen millions along a five thousand mile front. In meeting influences from across the border as pervasive as they are friendly, we have not even the advantages of what soldiers call defence in depth.[334]

> [O]ur use of American institutions, or our lazy, even abject, imitation of them has caused an uncritical acceptance of ideas and assumptions which are alien to our tradition.[335]

> For years we Canadians have been flooded with American moving pictures, American radio programs, American magazines, American books. Something should be done before the Canadian viewpoint is lost entirely. We have become unsure of anything Canadian in concept, just because it is Canadian and therefore unheralded and unknown.[336]

The fear of Americanization permeates the report and, as already stated, the pervasive American influences are singled out as the greatest threat to Canadian cultural development. To be able to withstand these pervasive influences and to be able to create a distinct Canadian culture, federal government intervention and increased federal funding is deemed essential. The introductory chapter titled "The Forces of Geography" is an extended warning against overpowering American influences and "the very present danger of permanent dependence"[337] on American cultural output as well as on a financial capital flowing from the U.S. through various American foundations and institutions. Using carefully worded polite phrases, first, the commission acknowledges that "[f]rom these influences, pervasive and friendly as they are, much that is valuable has come to us,"[338] however, then the commission argues that "American generosity" comes at a price and is not always good for Canadians and 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" and concludes with alarming remark that Canada "would be nothing but an empty shell without a vigorous and distinctive cultural life."[339] Moreover, many of the negative aspects coming with modernity described in the previous section

[334] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 13.
[335] Ibid., 15.
[336] Canadian Authors Association. Vancouver Branch. [Brief to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences]. Vancouver: s.n., 1949.
[337] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 18.
[338] Ibid., 13.
[339] Ibid., 18.

are associated with the U.S. as the main engine of the development of mass media, aggressive commercialism and mass culture production. Mass culture is thus perceived as something that invaded Canada from the U.S. A clear implication contained in the report is the desire to counter the domination of American mass culture (considered to be decidedly low culture) by proposing federal patronage for promoting the development of high culture as a distinct Canadian national culture.

The fear of dependence on "American generosity" is a strong theme – the words *dependence* and *generosity* appear in high frequency in the chapter on "The Forces of Geography". On the one hand, the commission acknowledges that Canada is "deeply indebted to American generosity"[340] and expresses gratitude to the financial aid[341] received from American philanthropic foundations, such as the Carnegie Corporation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation or the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

> Through their generosity countless individuals have enjoyed opportunities for creative work or for further cultivation of their particular field of study. Applied with wisdom and imagination, these gifts have helped Canadians to live their own life and to develop a better Canadianism. […] Many institutions in Canada essential to the equipment of a modern nation could not have been established or maintained without money provided from the United States.[342]

On the other hand, the commission sharply points to the fact that there are also negative consequences of American generosity and Canada's easy dependence on it. The strongest case is made in reference to education, the grave crisis of Canadian universities and the loss of Canadian talent to the south. The report says:

> Canada has […] paid a heavy price for this easy dependence on charity and especially on American charity. First, many of our best students, on completing their studies at American institutions, accept positions there and do not return. […] In consideration of American generosity in educating her citizens Canada "sells down south" as many as 2,500 professional men and women in a year. Moreover, Canada by her too great dependence on American fellowships for advanced study, particularly in the humanities and social studies, has starved her own universities which lack not only money but the community of scholarship essential to the best work.[343]

---

[340] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 13. Such as: "gifts of money spent in Canada, grants offered to Canadians for study abroad, the free enjoyment of all the facilities of many institutions which we cannot afford, and the importation of many valuable things which we could not easily produce for ourselves." (p 13)

[341] Detailed expenditures of the Carnegie Corporation (which has spent $7,346,188 in Canada since 1911) and the Rockefeller Foundation ($11,817,707 since 1914) are included in Appendix V of the report.

[342] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 13.

[343] Ibid., 14.

The "impoverishment" of Canadian universities is thus by implication explained as the negative effect of American generosity. The report quotes the brief of the National Conference of Canadian Universities which remarks that "American generosity has blinded our eyes to our own necessities."[344] Similar concern applies to the excessive use of American educational material for higher education, but also textbooks, maps, pictures, etc. for younger students and children – "with an emphasis and direction appropriate for American children but unsuitable for Canadian" – as a result Canadian children know about the significance of July 4, but cannot explain that of July 1.[345] The report says that "the uncritical use of American training institutions […] has certainly tended to make our educational systems less Canadian, less suited to our traditions […] The problem of text books just mentioned shows how American imports may harm as well as help us. But this is only part of the larger problem of vast cultural importations."[346]

The perceptions of American cultural invasion throughout the report are negative, there is no doubt about that. However, the commissioners use very carefully worded language, perhaps not to insult the good neighbor with overt anti-Americanism (as will be discussed a little later). Same as in the case of American philanthropy, the commission starts with acknowledgement that American cultural import can be valuable to Canada, saying "we benefit from vast importations of what might be familiarly called the American cultural output"[347] or, though there is already the big "but", "[e]very intelligent Canadian acknowledges his debt to the United States for excellent films, radio programmes and periodicals. But the price may be excessive. […] our national radio which carries the Sunday symphony from New York also carries the soap-opera. In the periodical press we receive indeed many admirable American journals but also a flood of others much less admirable […] threatening to submerge completely our national product" and continues with a quotation of a brief strongly worded "against the invasion of the Canadian press by one of the most detestable products of the American press,"[348] referring to pulp magazines. The same concern is expressed with reference to Canadian literature which needs protection "against the deluge of the less worthy American publications. These, we are told, threaten our national values, corrupt our literary taste

[344] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 14-15.
[345] Ibid., 16.
[346] Ibid., 16-17.
[347] Ibid., 14.
[348] Ibid., 17.

and endanger the livelihood of our writers."[349] The message here is clear, American high culture is a valuable import to Canada and "not seen as a threat to Canadian nationality."[350] However, American mass culture is identified as a danger – harmful to an individual as well as to cultural development in Canada in general. In Jeffrey Brison's words, "the greatest threat to Canada's emerging cultural sovereignty – the villain that threatened the final stages of Canada's emergence as an independent nation – was an American-centred mass culture."[351] For this reason, the commission recommends that some measures are taken to suppress the "positively harmful" mass culture that even their American intellectual counterparts severely criticized. The report says:

> The American invasion by film, radio and periodical is formidable. Much of what comes to us is good […] It has, however, been represented to us that many of the radio programmes have in fact no particular application to Canada or to Canadian conditions and that some of them, including certain children's programmes of the "crime" and "horror" type, are positively harmful. […] we in Canada should take measures to avoid in our radio, and in our television, at least those aspects of American broadcasting which have provoked in the United States the most outspoken and the sharpest opposition.[352]

In the case of crime comics, the state did intervene a few years later. As Rutherford writes: "Canada had some protection against the rush of the 'low.' There was in place a long-standing system of prevention that operated through movie censorship, customs officials, and obscenity laws. Indeed, in 1955, crime comics, mostly from the United States, were banned as an especially toxic threat to the moral health of children and adolescents."[353] According to Canadian Gallup poll from 1953, the public opinion approved of this motion. To a question: "Do you think that comic books are harmful to children or not?" 57.8 % answered harmful and 30.8 % not harmful.[354]

Since the feared and despised American mass culture was easily disseminated through the mass media to Canada (and the new medium of television could be well expected to become a new powerful source of Americanization), the commission emphasizes the importance of the role of the national broadcasting system in Canada. The commission draws parallels between the CBC and the NFB, both hailed as a distinctive national achievement and a great cultural asset for Canada, and both established to fight

---

[349] Ibid, 225.
[350] Litt, "The Massey Commission, Americanization, and Canadian Cultural Nationalism," 383.
[351] Jeffrey Brison, *Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Canada: American Philanthropy and the Arts and Letters in Canada* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2005), 6.
[352] Ibid., 18.
[353] Rutherford, "The Persistence of Britain," 196.
[354] 1953: November (# 233). Documentation (ascii). The Canadian Institute of Public Opinion (CIPO). *Gallup Canada, Inc.* The Carleton University Social Science Data Archives.

American cultural hegemony in broadcasting and in film, and, as mentioned in case of radio in the report, out of fear of "cultural annexation" by the U.S.[355] According to the commission, "only a national organization protects the nation from excessive commercialization and Americanization."[356]

State intervention to promote Canadian cultural development challenged by the overpowering American influences was deemed important both in the case of mass media, especially broadcasting, and in supporting Canadian arts and high culture as a distinct national culture. The negative influences of American culture on Canada were most powerful through mass media. The commission seemed to realize that mass media indeed had the greatest impact and planned on using "cultural defenses" against American mass culture by strengthening the national broadcasting system and providing federal funding needed to increase Canadian content. Crean argues that in the commission's view:

> broadcasting stood in the main line of fire and consequently its report spent some time reviewing the needs and objectives of the national broadcasting system. The arts, however, were not thought to be in jeopardy. With their primary affiliation to the European scene, the threat of U.S. domination seemed pretty remote. […] the commissioners saw the arts as an antidote to the commercialism of American culture seeping into Canada's media. If broadcasting was in the forefront of Canada's cultural defence, the arts could be their reinforcement from behind.[357]

The notion that mass culture was something that invaded Canada from the U.S. was shared among Canadian cultural nationalists.[358] One of the few dissenting voices was that of historian Frank Underhill who in his review of the Massey Report wrote:

> These so-called "alien" American influences are not alien at all; they are just the natural forces that operate in the conditions of twentieth-century civilization. It is mass consumption and the North American environment which produce these phenomena, not some sinister influence in the United States.[359]

Underhill also criticized the Massey Commission for "what he perceive[d] as misplaced anti-Americanism in the report."[360] Contrary to Underhill, another contemporary thinker Harold Innis, referred approvingly to the Massey Report in his 1952 reflection on it, titled "The Strategy of Culture". Innis, known for his strong anti-Americanism, wrote:

> We are indeed fighting for our lives ... The jackals of communications systems are constantly on the alert to destroy every vestige of sentiment toward Great Britain, holding it of no advantage if it threatens the omnipotence of American commercialism. This is to strike at the heart of cultural life in Canada. The pride

[355] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 24.
[356] Ibid., 58.
[357] Crean, *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?,* 128.
[358] Litt, "The Massey Commission, Americanization, and Canadian Cultural Nationalism," 381.
[359] Quoted in Litt, "The Massey Commission, Americanization, and Canadian Cultural Nationalism," 381.
[360] Druick, "Remedy and Remediation," 165.

> taken in improving our status in the British Commonwealth of Nations has made it difficult for us to realize that our status on the North American continent is on the verge of disappearing ... We can only survive by taking persistent action at strategic points against American imperialism in all its attractive guises.[361]

Nevertheless, the commission carefully avoided any expression of such overt anti-Americanism. This can also be seen in the selection of the briefs that the commission quoted directly in the report. Litt who studied all the submissions received by the commission says: "Concern about Americanization was rampant in the submissions to the Massey Commission. Cultural organizations which appeared before the commission during its hearings across the country invariably blamed American cultural imperialism for Canada's problems in developing its own culture."[362] This concern is strongly expressed in the report, however, refraining from using overtly anti-American language. But at the same time, hostility towards mass culture does permeate the report. And mass culture is associated with the U.S. In contrast, British institutions are described as an example Canada would do well to follow. As Rutherford observes:

> The political situation of the times prevented any bold expression of either anglophilia or anti-Americanism […] But the commission's biases were apparent. British commentators, such as Lord Keynes or T.S. Eliot, and British institutions – notably the BBC, the Arts Council, and its companion for promoting British culture abroad, the British Council – were approved, even honoured. By contrast the United States was identified as the source of 'passive entertainment,' of soap operas 'guilty of melodramatic exaggeration,' of movies that spread a false view of Canada, of 'harmful' comic books, and above all of a 'strident' advertising that debased cultural output if not the culture itself.[363]

Thus, it can be argued that, even though the commission was cautiously diplomatic, anti-Americanism as a reaction to American cultural invasion, specifically the invasion of American mass culture and commercialism, is clearly present in the report.

---

[361] Harold Innis, *The Strategy of Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952), 19-20; cited in Rutherford, "The Persistence of Britain," 200. See also Alison Beale, "Harold Innis and Canadian cultural policy in the 1940s," in *Continuum: The Australian Journal of Media & Culture*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1993: *Dependency/space/policy*, ed. Brian Shoesmith & Ian Angus. Accessed July 16, 2017. http://wwwmcc.murdoch.edu.au/readingroom/7.1/Beale.html

[362] Litt, "The Massey Commission, Americanization, and Canadian Cultural Nationalism," 377.

[363] Rutherford, "The Persistence of Britain," 199.

3.5 Significance of the Massey Commission and its aftermath

The Massey Commission is one of the most well-known and influential of Canadian royal commissions. Historians have frequently described it with metaphors such as "cornerstone", "turning point", "fountainhead", or "founding myth" of Canadian cultural policy.[364] Finlay claims the Massey Report is "widely recognized as the single most important document in the history of Canadian cultural policy."[365] Brison observes that it "has been accorded an almost mythological status in the history of Canada's quest for cultural sovereignty."[366] According to Litt, the commission "has long been associated with the dawn of a new era in Canadian cultural affairs. It issued the first clear warning about the dangers of dependence upon American culture in the postwar world and proposed a deliberate and coordinated strategy for state-sponsored Canadian cultural development."[367] The overall strategy was to provide federal funding for Canadian cultural and intellectual institutions (including universities), and thus strengthening the federal government's role in fostering and protecting Canadian culture, dangerously susceptible to American influence. Rutherford remarks that the "report legitimized the belief that the state must become a major player in the cultural life of the country."[368]

Even though it took a considerable amount of time before some of its major recommendations were implemented by the government (the Canada Council in 1957), or that some other recommendations were later overturned (policies regarding the CBC), it is widely regarded as one of the most effective commissions with immense transforming effect and a profound impact on Canadian cultural development.[369] Litt argues that "the real significance of the Massey Commission lies less in the fate of its major initiatives than in the general impact it had upon the attitudes of the public and the policies of the government."[370] Brison notes that the Massey Report became a "source of cultural policies pursued by successive federal governments years, even decades, after its submission," and thus its recommendations "left a powerful legacy."[371]

---

[364] Brison, *Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Canada*, 3; see also Litt, "The Massey Report, fifty years later."
[365] Finlay, *The Force of Culture*, 211.
[366] Brison, *Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Canada*, 3.
[367] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 3.
[368] Paul Rutherford, "Made in America: The Problem of Mass Culture in Canada," in *The Beaver Bites Back?: American Popular Culture in Canada*, ed. David H. Flaherty, Frank E. Manning (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993), 273.
[369] See Schafer, *Culture and Politics in* Canada, 19; Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 245; Bissel, *The Imperial Canadian*, 233.
[370] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 247.
[371] Brison, *Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Canada*, 4.

The commission examined and made recommendations upon a vast array of subjects. Sirman remarks that "[w]hat is most striking today is the extraordinary breadth of the Commission's original mandate. […] The scope of the enquiry was unprecedented in Canada, and has never been repeated."[372] Litt comments on the commission's original mandate in a different light saying the Massey Commission "became a celebrated chapter in Canadian cultural history through a broad and imaginative interpretation of its mandate," which it had turned into "a crusade for Canadian cultural nationalism."[373]

The work of the commissioners did not end with the publication of their awaited landmark report. Together with the cultural lobby deeply interested in the report's outcome, their "main focus was on generating enough publicity to sway public opinion and impress the government so that new policies could be initiated."[374] Unlike other King's Printer publications, the Massey Report indeed sparked interest from the general public. The report "made the front page in Canadian newspapers from coast to coast" and the press hailed it as a national "best-seller."[375] It is worth mentioning that the report was very well-written[376] and readable, something one would perhaps not expect from a government publication. According to Litt, the report's success lied in "fusing culture with Canadian nationalism. Culture was one thing; but national pride, Canadian identity, and international prestige were something else again."[377] Nevertheless, commenting on the role of the press in the publicity of the report, Litt claims that "the fact that editorials responded to the report's patriotic appeals did not mean they went along with its assumptions about the incompatibility of Canadian and American culture. Most played down this aspect of the report, preferring to be pro-Canadian without being anti-American."[378]

To appeal to the general public, the commission tried to avoid the stigma of cultural elitism by "the careful cultivation in the report of a democratic tone"[379] and rejecting the claim that they want to dictate standards in taste: "nothing was further from our minds than the thought of suggesting standards in taste from some cultural

---

[372] Sirman, "What would Massey see today?"
[373] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 3.
[374] Ibid., 248.
[375] Ibid., 223.
[376] Even its opponent Underhill appreciates that: "The Report is very well written. It is a pleasure to read a document written by individuals who evidently recognize a good sentence when they see it in a brief and know enough to quote it, and who also know how to write good sentences themselves." Underhill in Druick, "Remedy and Remediation," 165.
[377] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 226.
[378] Ibid., 226.
[379] Bissel, *The Imperial Canadian*, 234.

stratosphere."[380] Nevertheless, the commission's hostility to mass culture and its belief in the edifying role of culture clearly show otherwise. As quoted earlier, the report says: "Culture is that part of education which enriches the mind and refines the taste. It is the development of the intelligence through the arts, letters and sciences."[381] The emphasis on the connection between culture and education reflects not only the commission's elitism, but perhaps more importantly its nationalism. The importance of shared culture and education in the development of a sense of national identity is a strong theme in most theories of nationalism.[382] Since American influences on both Canadian culture and education were too strong, Canadian "imagined community" was in danger of being Americanized. Litt argues that Canadian nationalism and elitism shared a common enemy: the invasion of American mass culture as a foreign and unedifying force, and that the Massey Commission "exploited contemporary nationalist aspirations by offering a coherent vision of a superior national identity."[383] According to Mulcahy, "For the members of the Massey Commission and its disciples, opposition to U.S. mass culture was the basis of a Canadian cultural identity."[384]

The recommendations regarding broadcasting policies, federal funding for universities and the creation of the Canada Council are generally considered to be the most important as well as the most controversial proposals the commission made.[385] Other recommendations including the establishment of the National Library (founded in 1953), better administration and funding for federal cultural institutions such as galleries, museums, libraries, archives, or historic sites and monuments, and Canada's relations abroad (though this agenda was a part of the Canada Council's many responsibilities) were important as well, however, they did not provoke much discussion or criticism because they lacked the controversial aspect of the first three issues mentioned.

Broadcasting policies, as expected, were a contentious issue. Private broadcasters wanted to change the existing national broadcasting system and criticized the CBC for

---

[380] Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 5.
[381] Ibid., 7.
[382] See Ernest Gellner, *Nations and nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined communities: reflection on the origin and spread of nationalism* (1983) 2nd rev. ed. (London: Verso, 1991); Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
[383] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*, 250-251.
[384] Kevin V. Mulcahy, "Comparing Cultural Patronage: Traditions and Trends," in *The Arts in a New Millennium: Research and the Arts Sector*, ed. Valerie B. Morris and David B. Pankratz (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2003), 101.
[385] Bissel, *The Imperial Canadian*, 231.

being both "cop and competitor" [386] – mandated both to regulate and to produce within the national system. However, the Massey Commission dismissed their criticism and "argued that the private sector acted as a profit-seeking vehicle for American programs and did not invest in Canadian talent – an allegation confirmed by every study from 1929 onwards."[387] The commission fully supported the existing national broadcasting system, emphasized its public-service role, and recommended that television broadcasting followed the same rules as radio. The recommendations with respect to broadcasting were among the first to be accepted and implemented by the federal government. Collins wrote:

> television has been feared as an agency of 'continentalization' and reduction of cultural standards, both adverse outcomes stemming from Canadian's consumption of television from the United States. The intensity of these fears (of which the threat of 'continentalization' is probably most important) is proportional to the attractiveness of American television to Canadian viewers.[388]

The public demanded "more choice and more American programs."[389] According to opinion polls conducted in 1957, 46.4 % preferred U.S. TV shows and only 17.8 % thought Canadian shows were better (others did not see much difference or had no opinion).[390] The Massey Commission's recommendations were overturned when a "new broadcasting act in 1958 stripped the CBC of its regulatory authority over the privates and of its monopoly control over television."[391]

The recommendations regarding financial aid to the universities were the first to be implemented.[392] As mentioned earlier, the financial crisis of Canadian universities was one of the strongest incentives for the federal government to establish the Massey Commission in the first place (together with the need to define policies regarding television). The question of federal funding for universities was problematic due to the fact that education belonged exclusively to provincial jurisdiction and therefore federal intervention was a sensitive issue. Particularly in the case of Quebec where commission's recommendations sparked a heated debate about federal interference into provincial affairs. Nevertheless, "the general consensus in English Canada was that constitutional

---

[386] Collins, *Canadian Television*, 59. – Collins notes that for the Massey Commission, "the CBC's faults were those of being too soft a cop and too quiet a competitor." (p 60)
[387] Berland, "Nationalism and the Modernist Legacy," 21.
[388] Collins, *Canadian Television*, 43.
[389] Rutherford, "The Persistence of Britain," 202.
[390] 1957: September (# 260): Documentation (ascii). The Canadian Institute of Public Opinion (CIPO). *Gallup Canada, Inc.* The Carleton University Social Science Data Archives.
[391] Rutherford, "The Persistence of Britain," 202.
[392] Bissel, *The Imperial Canadian*, 232.

scruples were inconsequential when such an emergency existed,"[393] and therefore they approved of federal funding for universities.

The implementation of the commission's most renowned proposal to create the Canada Council for the Encouragement of the Arts, Letters, Humanities and Social Sciences, "an initiative that had lain at the heart of the report's strategy for national cultural development,"[394] did not happen until 1957. In his famous initial response to the Canada Council proposal, St. Laurent doubtfully remarked: "Funding ballet dancers?"[395] Among the reasons why the Liberal government was slow to follow this recommendation, Litt mentions that "[i]t was too novel an idea – its purposes too exclusively cultural – to warrant the prompt action accorded broadcasting and university funding."[396] Schafer notes that the delay in decision about the new arm's-length council is understandable because to accept the responsibility for supporting individuals and cultural organizations outside government meant it would "open up a whole new era in governmental and political involvement in the cultural life of the country, but also it would establish a precedent future governments would be expected to honour."[397] Yet, this was, Schafer adds, "exactly what the federal government was being pressured to do by the cultural community and committed individuals and institutions across the country.[398]

It is quite interesting given the alleged publicity of the Massey Report that in Canadian Gallup poll from January 1957 to a question: "Do you happen to have heard or read anything about the Canada Arts Council?" 76.2 % answered no, and only 23.6 % yes.[399] On the other hand the same poll shows that public opinion approved of government support of the arts. Explaining that "The Canada Arts Council is to be established with government funds to give financial encouragement where needed, to Canadian arts – things like painting, music, the ballet and so on;" the questionnaire asks: "Do you approve, or disapprove of this plan?" and 61.9 % approves, only 14.2 % disapproves, and 20.3 % has no opinion.[400] Among the reasons for approval are listed: "artist. talent should be helped", "to develop Canadian art", "lack of arts in Canada", or "benefit the

[393] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission,* 230.
[394] Ibid., 238.
[395] Morton, "Uncle Louis and Golden Age for Canada," 55.
[396] Litt, *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission,* 238.
[397] Schafer, *Culture and Politics in Canada*, 21.
[398] Ibid., 21.
[399] 1957: January (# 255). Documentation (ascii). The Canadian Institute of Public Opinion (CIPO). Gallup Canada, Inc. The Carleton University Social Science Data Archives.
[400] Ibid.

country".[401] This seems to disprove the claims of some authors that the Massey Commission reflected only the opinion of the cultural elite.

The proposed Canada Council was not, however, only about supporting the arts. Following the commission's recommendations, the original Canada Council was established in 1957 with a mandate "to foster and promote the study and enjoyment of, and the production of, works in the arts, humanities and social sciences in Canada."[402] The main inspiration for the Canada Council, repeatedly referred to in the Massey Report, was the Arts Council of Great Britain, recognizing government responsibility to sponsor high culture (theatre, ballet, opera, and the fine arts) and presenting the arm's-length model of state support for culture, as well as the British Council with respect to promoting national culture abroad. However, as Jeffrey Brison observes, the commission was also influenced by American philanthropic foundations and inspired by the American model of the research councils.[403] Brison argues that "the new system of public patronage for the arts and letters in Canada, which came into being in the 1950s and has since symbolized Canadian resistance to an American culture, was the culmination of a grand collaboration between […] Canadian elite and American foundations. […] Canadian model of state support for arts and letters represents not a rejection of the American model of private philanthropy but adaptation of that model."[404] Upchurch notes that the council "as it was first established was a hybrid of the private foundation model prevalent in the United States and the arm's-length model of government support in Great Britain."[405]

Nevertheless, this does not exclude the interpretation that one of the main reasons for the emerging Canadian cultural policy was the fear of Americanization and American cultural hegemony. Litt states that "the Commission believed that government subsidies were required to offset the market dominance of American culture. […] the perception of an American cultural invasion was largely responsible for the creation of the Canadian government's first conscious and comprehensive cultural policy."[406] According to Mackey, "The sense of danger to Canadian culture was palpable, and increased state funding was explicitly channeled towards developing Canadian culture to protect against US cultural imperialism."[407]

---

[401] Ibid.
[402] Quoted in Schafer, *Culture and Politics in Canada*, 21.
[403] Brison, *Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Canada*, 177.
[404] Ibid., 202.
[405] Upchurch, "Vincent Massey," 241.
[406] Litt, "The Massey Commission, Americanization, and Canadian Cultural Nationalism," 379.
[407] Mackey, *The House of Difference*, 67.

"Did state intervention work in protecting Canadian culture?" Granatstein's answer to this question he poses, forty years later from the establishment of the Canada Council, is both yes and no. He says: "Canadians are ever more American in their popular tastes and attitudes, in their reading matter, in their movie-going and television-watching, and in the books and magazines they read. Nonetheless, […] Canadian theatre, art, music, dance, and literature thrive, greatly assisted by government grants and subsidies. Still, no sector of Canadian life today is more overtly nationalist and anti-American than the arts. In culture, the weather along the Canadian-American border is always stormy."[408]

[408] Granatstein, *Yankee Go Home?: Canadians and Anti-Americanism*, 220.

Conclusion

This thesis analyzed two Canadian royal commissions focused on the role of federal government in media and cultural policies. Its aim was to identify the main factors and incentives for government intervention in the field of culture, assessing the role of anti-Americanism and American cultural imperialism among those. It illustrated that cultural policies were embedded in the nation-building efforts at that time and that a specific form of anti-Americanism and opposition to American mass culture by the elites played a crucial role in the final recommendations of the commissions. The commissions also set a precedent of the institutional answer to the arrival of new technologies thus justifying the state's involvement in the field of arts and culture. This thesis investigated these notions by providing a theoretical framework of anti-Americanism and cultural imperialism and tracing the elements of these concepts in the reports of the two commissions in the subsequent two chapters.

It is important to bear in mind that independent Canadian national identity was being formed during this period and it was not immune to more general geopolitical trends taking place. The importance of the British empire was steadily declining while the U.S. was gaining a more prominent role. To a certain extent, the Canadian identity thus must have been built not only in opposition to its colonial heritage (though cultural affinity of Canadian elites to Britain remained strong and the British cultural institutions inspired many of the commissions' recommendations), but also in the opposition to the powerful influences from the U.S. Cultural domain seems like a rational choice for establishing sovereign and distinct identity as other Canadian values (such as democracy, which was also to be defended by culture in the Cold War context as illustrated in section 3.2) were shared between the two countries. The multifaceted Canadian anti-Americanism presented in this thesis is useful also nowadays as it challenges the usual preconceptions about this term and provides a possible toolbox for forming one's national identity in the face of a friendly yet omnipresent force.

In the Canadian context, anti-Americanism did not mean hatred towards everything American, but rather an opposition to a cultural hegemony that could undermine the fragile national identity if it was not countered. Anti-Americanism is thus present as a defense against American cultural imperialism. Although the concept of cultural imperialism was defined only in the 1960s and 1970s, this thesis showed that in Canada we can trace it back to the 1950s and even the 1920s when it was associated with

the unregulated spread of mass media and the inflow of American mass culture. This finding is consistent with the fact that both radio and TV were reliant on technologies limiting their geographical reach, an aspect that has changed dramatically with the nascent of satellite TV and Internet, allowing the U.S. to spread its culture worldwide.

The answer to the perceived danger of Americanization and cultural absorption in both of the commissions is an institutional one and they both recommend establishing agencies and organizations on the federal level. This was necessary due to the "Forces of Geography" - namely a vast territory and scattered population facing the pervasive influences from across the border, but could also be seen as a decisive not-American solution to the problem inspired by similar initiatives in Europe. However, as illustrated in the Massey Commission discussions, some argued that its recommendations were hybrid in the way they built upon the experience of private U.S. foundations supporting high culture. This only illustrates how nuanced anti-Americanism must have been as high culture coming from the U.S. was not seen as a threat but there was a strong opposition to American mass culture.

Through the analysis of the two commissions we can clearly see the development of anti-Americanism in Canadian cultural policies. The most obvious distinction lies in the fact that the Aird Commission never mentions the U.S. explicitly, whereas in the Massey Commission, the threat of Americanization of Canadian minds as well as dependence on American cultural output and financial capital is expressly stated. This does not come as a surprise given that after the Second World War the British influence was further declining while the U.S. economy and culture were gaining prominence and Canada's continental ties with the U.S. grew stronger. Although neither of the commissions attacks the U.S. directly (any expression of overt anti-Americanism would not even be expected from an official government document), there is a strong anti-American feeling present in the discourse against mass culture, seen as a predominant part of the U.S. culture. It can thus be argued that attempts to regulate radio and TV broadcasting are actions limiting the influence of the U.S. and other negative qualities associated with it, such as commercialism, conformity and standardization.

Although the U.S. is not once expressly mentioned in the Aird Commission, anti-Americanism is implicitly present in the critique of the fact that the majority of programs was coming from outside of Canada as well as in its strong opposition to commercialism. The Aird Commission thus aims to protect the Canadian cultural sphere from the influences of the prevalent foreign content spread by radio. Given the geographical

realities, the U.S. was the only real foreign power that could have had a significant share in Canadian broadcasting (due to technical limitations of radio waves and the technical infrastructure associated with it) and therefore any attempt to regulate this type of media equals countering the U.S. influence. Additionally, from the perspective of Canadian cultural elites, the new media and technologies were to have an important educational and nation-building function.

In the Massey Commission, a fear of dependence and cultural absorption by the U.S. is strongly present and serves as a motivation for establishing an all-encompassing government policy in cultural and educational domains. Overreliance and dependence on U.S. financial capital, cultural and education materials being imported to Canada could have threatened the foundations of the emerging sovereign nation and in fact this was already happening as was shown by the example of the knowledge about and importance of the 1st and 4th July in Canadian schools. Additionally, similarly to the Aird Commission, TV (as the new medium it deals with) was perceived with caution as it was expected to further spread American mass culture, but same as radio it could also serve as an important medium for promoting national unity and fostering Canadian culture. The fear of Americanization and American cultural invasion is clearly pronounced in the findings of the Massey Commission, which is partially caused by the sheer breadth of issues this commission dealt with but also by the rising influence of the U.S. in the world. This global aspect of the U.S. influence forced Canada to also project itself and its distinctiveness abroad (an aspect that was not present in the Aird Commission), thus adding another layer of anti-Americanism to its cultural policies.

Nowadays, technologies are faster and cross borders with an unprecedented ease. We are witnessing numerous debates on Internet regulation as well as attempts to use it for cultural and educational purposes. This thesis has shown that some of the motivations in creating cultural policies are found outside the cultural and technical domain, namely in international relations. Even though the technologies that Aird and Massey Commissions dealt with are no longer modern and their importance is slowly declining, they serve as an excellent example of dealing with nation-building ambitions by federal cultural policies. A natural follow-up to this work would be an examination of current debates on public service broadcasting and Internet regulation in Canada, both of which could illustrate the development of anti-Americanism in the Canadian society as well as the current understanding of national identity and its cohesion with arts and culture.

Souhrn

Tato diplomová práce se věnuje analýze hlavních motivů a faktorů pro zavedení vládních intervencí v oblasti kultury v Kanadě v letech 1928-1957 se zvláštním přihlédnutím k roli antiamerikanismu pro argumentaci použitou v soudobých vládních dokumentech. Pro tento účel využívá teoretických konceptů antiamerikanismu a kulturního imperialismu, které aplikuje v interpretativní obsahové analýze dvou, pro vývoj kanadských kulturních politik zásadních, dokumentů, takzvané Airdovy komise (1928-1929) a Masseyho komise (1949-1951).

První část práce se věnuje kritickému zhodnocení konceptu antiamerikanismu a identifikaci jeho zvláštní formy poplatné soudobé kanadské vládní rétorice. Tento specifický typ antiamerikanismu, vyznačující se odporem k americké populární kultuře zprostředkované především masovými médii a strachem z kulturního pohlcení silnějším sousedem je identifikován jako „kulturní antiamerikanismus“. Pro lepší pochopení tohoto typu antiamerikanismu je následně představen teoretický koncept (amerického) kulturního imperialismu, který, ač vznikl až na přelomu 60. a 70. let, dobře vystihuje složitou kulturní situaci, ve které se ocitl mladší a menší ze dvou severoamerických sousedů v období vzniku a rozvoje zásadních nástrojů masové komunikace – radiového a televizního vysílání.

Jádro práce potom tvoří samotná obsahová analýza dvou královských komisí: *The Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting*, 1928-1929 (Airdovy komise) a *The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences*, 1949-1951 (Masseyho komise).

Na základě podrobné obsahové analýzy zmíněných dokumentů autorka dochází k závěru, že v argumentaci obou komisí se mezi hlavními motivy pro intervence v oblasti kultury objevuje strach z kulturního pohlcení a výrazný odpor k hodnotám neseným americkou masovou kulturou. V Airdově komisi, věnující se pouze radiovému vysílání, je strach z amerického vlivu na domácí kulturu zmiňován pouze implicitně, nicméně je přesto zjevný. V Masseyho komisi, věnující se širšímu spektru kulturních oblastí, je pak na mnoha místech americký vliv kritizován zcela explicitně. Lze tedy konstatovat, že nejenže byl kulturní antiamerikanismus přítomen v obou vládních dokumentech a jeho vliv na argumentaci pro vládní intervence s rozvojem technologií masové komunikace v průběhu času stoupal. V této souvislosti je nutno mít na paměti historický kontext, kdy po pádu britského impéria přebírá Amerika dominantní roli ve světě.

Bibliography

Primary sources

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

Canada. Royal Commission on Radio Broadcasting. Report. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1929.

Canadian Authors Association. Vancouver Branch. [Brief to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences]. Vancouver: s.n., 1949.

Canadian Institute of Public Opinion (CIPO). *Gallup Canada, Inc*. The Carleton University Social Science Data Archives. Accessed May 20, 2017. https://library.carleton.ca/find/data/gallup-canada

Documentation (ascii):

1945: May #142; June #143

1949: May #186; May #187; June #188; June #189; July #191

1951: August #212; September #213; October #214; November #214a

1953: May #227; July #228; July #229; July #230; August #231; November #233

1954: March #235; July #237; November #239

1955: February #241; July #243; September #244; November #245

1956: March #247; May #248k; July #250; September #251k; October #252; November #254

1957: January #255; March #256; May #257; May #258; July #259; September #260; October #262; December #263

The data were collected by Gallup Canada, Inc. Dictionary and preparation and data cleaning were done by Carleton University Library Data Services, under the auspices of the National Archives of Canada. These organizations provided the data but cannot be held responsible for the analyses or interpretations presented, nor for any problems with the data.

Dewing, Michael. "Canadian Broadcasting Policy." *Parliament of Canada, Library of Parliament Research Publications, Legal and Social Affairs Division*. 23 June 2011, revised 6 August 2014. https://lop.parl.ca/content/lop/researchpublications/2011-39-e.htm

"Factors in the growth of population, 1951 to 1961." *Statistics Canada, Canada Year Book, 1967*. Accessed July 2, 2017. https://www65.statcan.gc.ca/acyb02/1967/acyb02_19670184002-eng.htm

Young, Margaret. "Canadian *Citizenship Act* and Current Issues." *Government of Canada Publications, Law and Government Division*. October 1997, revised August 1998. Accessed 6 July, 2017. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection-R/LoPBdP/BP/bp445-e.htm

Secondary sources

Books

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined communities: reflection on the origin and spread of nationalism* (1983) 2nd rev. ed. London: Verso, 1991.

Armstrong, Robert. *Broadcasting Policy in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Bélanger, Damien-Claude. *Prejudice and Pride: Canadian Intellectuals Confront the United States, 1891-1945.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

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

Bissel, Claude. *The Imperial Canadian: Vincent Massey in Office*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Bothwell, Robert. *Canada and Quebec: One Country, Two Histories*. Revised Edition. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1998.

Brison, Jeffrey. *Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Canada: American Philanthropy and the Arts and Letters in Canada.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2005.

Collins, Richard. *Culture, Communication, and National Identity: The Case of Canadian Television*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Comor, Edward A. *Media, Structures and Power: The Robert E. Babe Collection*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Cook, Ramsay. *Canada, Quebec, and the Uses of Nationalism*. Toronto: McClelland/Stewart, 1986.

Cook, Ramsay. *The Maple Leaf Forever: Essays on Nationalism and Politics in Canada*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1971.

Crean, Susan M. *Who's afraid of Canadian culture?* North York, Ont.: General Publishing, 1976.

Creighton, Donald. *Canada's First Century 1867-1967*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1970.

Edwardson, Ryan. *Canadian Content: Culture and the Quest for Nationhood*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Finlay, Karen. *The Force of Culture: Massey and Canadian Sovereignty*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.

Granatstein, J.L. *Yankee Go Home?: Canadians and Anti-Americanism.* Toronto: HarperCollins Canada, 1997.

Grant, George. *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism* (1965). [Introduction by Andrew Potter]. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005.

Hillmer, Norman, and Adam Chapnick. *Canadas of the Mind: The Making and Unmaking of Canadian Nationalisms in the Twentieth Century.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2007.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Hollander, Paul. *Anti-Americanism: Irrational and Rational.* New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2003. Originally published: Paul Hollander, *Anti-Americanism: Critiques at Homes and Abroad, 1965-1990*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Jones, David T., and David Kilgour. *Uneasy Neighbo(u)rs: Canada, the USA and the Dynamics of State, Industry and Culture*. Mississauga, Ontario: John Wiley & Sons Canada, 2007.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*. London: Routledge, 1991.

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

Mackey, Eva. *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada.* London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

Massey, Vincent. *On Being Canadian.* Toronto: Dent, 1948.

Massolin, Philip. *Canadian Intellectuals, the Tory Tradition, and the Challenge of Modernity, 1939-1970*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Maxwell, Richard. *Herbert Schiller.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.

Mirrlees, Tanner. *Global Entertainment Media: Between Cultural Imperialism and Cultural Globalization.* New York and London: Routledge, 2013).

O'Connor, Brendon, eds. *Anti-Americanism: History, Causes, and Themes.* 4 vols. Oxford/ Westport, Conn.: Greenwood World Publishing, 2007.

Riendeau, Roger. *A Brief History of Canada*. Second Edition. New York: Facts On File, 2007.

Schafer, Paul D. *Culture and Politics in Canada: Towards a culture for all Canadians.* Markham, Ont.: World Culture Project, 1998.

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

Thompson, John Herd, and Stephen J. Randall. *Canada and the United States: Ambivalent Allies.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2002.

Tomlinson, John. *Cultural imperialism: a critical introduction*. London: Continuum, 1991.

Underhill, Frank. *In Search of Canadian Liberalism.* Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1960.

Vipond, Mary. *Listening in: The first decade of Canadian broadcasting, 1922-1932*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992.

Chapters in edited collections

Berland, Jody. "Nationalism and the Modernist Legacy: Dialogues with Innis." In *Capital Culture: A Reader on Modernist Legacies, State Institutions, and the Value(s) of Art*, edited by Jody Berland and Shelley Hornstein, 14-38. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.

Filion, Michel. "Canadian Radio Policy." In *Encyclopedia of Radio 3-Volume Set*, edited by Christopher H. Sterling, 418-430. New York, London: Routledge, 2004.

Filion, Michel. "Radio." In *The Cultural Industries in Canada: Problems, Policies and Prospects*, edited by Michael Dorland, 118-142. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, 1996.

Garfinkle, Adam. "Anti-Americanism, U.S. Foreign Policy, and the War on Terrorism." In *A Practical Guide to Winning the War on Terrorism*, edited by Adam Garfinkle, 195-218. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2004.

Holman, Andrew, and Robert Thacker. "Literary and Popular Culture." In *Canadian Studies in the New Millennium*, edited by Mark Kasoff and Patrick James, 125-164. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Hudson, Cheryl. "American Popular Culture and Anti-Americanism." In *Anti-Americanism: History, Causes, and Themes. Vol. 1: Causes and Sources*, edited by Brendon O'Connor, 239-262. Oxford/ Westport, Conn.: Greenwood World Publishing, 2007.

Katzenstein, Peter J., and Robert O. Keohane. "Varieties of Anti-Americanism: A Framework for Analysis." In *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*, edited by Peter J. Katzenstein and Robert O. Keohane, 9-38. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.

Mulcahy, Kevin V. "Comparing Cultural Patronage: Traditions and Trends." In *The Arts in a New Millennium: Research and the Arts Sector*, edited by Valerie B. Morris and David B. Pankratz, 95-108. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2003.

Mulcahy, Kevin V. “Identity, Independence, and Imperialism: The Case of Canadian-American Cultural Relations.” In *Borders and Bridges: Canada’s Policy Relations in North America*, edited by Monica Gattinger and Geoffrey Hale, 248–266. Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Nossal, Kim Richard. “Anti-Americanism in Canada.” In *Anti-Americanism: History, Causes, and Themes. Vol. 3: Comparative Perspectives*, edited by Brendon O'Connor, 59-76. Oxford/ Westport, Conn.: Greenwood World Publishing, 2007.

Rutherford, Paul. “Made in America: The Problem of Mass Culture in Canada.” In *The Beaver Bites Back?: American Popular Culture in Canada*, edited by David H. Flaherty, Frank E. Manning, 260-280. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

Rutherford, Paul. “The Persistence of Britain: The Culture Project in Postwar Canada.” In *Canada and the End of Empire*, edited by Phillip Buckner, 195-205. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005.

Thompson, John Herd, and Mark Paul Richard. “Canadian History in North American Context.” In *Canadian Studies in the New Millennium*, edited by Mark Kasoff and Patrick James, 37-64. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Vipond, Mary. “The Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission in the 1930s: How Canada’s First Public Broadcaster Negotiated ‘Britishness’.” In *Canada and the British World: Culture, Migration, and Identity*, edited by Phillip Buckner, 270-287. Vancouver: UBC Press, The University of British Columbia, 2006.

Journal articles and research papers

Beale, Alison. “Harold Innis and Canadian cultural policy in the 1940s.” *Continuum: The Australian Journal of Media & Culture*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1993: *Dependency/space/policy*, ed. Brian Shoesmith & Ian Angus. [online] Accessed July 16, 2017. http://wwwmcc.murdoch.edu.au/readingroom/7.1/Beale.html

Bow, Brian, Peter J. Katzenstein, and Arturo Santa-Cruz. “Anti-Americanism in Canada and Mexico.” Paper presented at *American Political Science Association Conference, Chicago* (August 30 – September 2, 2007).

Ceaser, James W. “A genealogy of anti-Americanism.” *The Public Interest* (Summer 2003) [online] Accessed July 22, 2017. http://www.thepublicinterest.com/archives/2003summer/article1.html

Druick, Zoë. “International Cultural Relations as Factors in Postwar Canadian Cultural Policy: The Relevance of UNESCO for the Massey Commission.” *Canadian Journal of Communication,* Vol. 31 (2006): 177-195.

Druick, Zoë. “Remedy and Remediation: The Cultural Theory of the Massey Commission.” *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2-3 (2007): 159-174.

Filion, Michel. “Broadcasting and Cultural Identity: The Canadian Experience.” *Media, Culture and Society* Vol. 18 (1996): 447-467.

Gasher, Mike. “Invoking Public Support for Public Broadcasting: The Aird Commission Revisited.“ *Canadian Journal of Communication,* Vol. 23, No. 2 (1998). [online] Accessed November 18, 2016. http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1032/938.

Granatstein, J. L. “Yankee Go Home? Is Canadian Anti-Americanism Dead?“ *Behind the Headlines,* Vol. 54, No. 1 (Autumn 1996): 4-11.

Hillmer, Norman. “Are Canadians Anti-American?” *Policy Options* (July 2006) [online] Accessed July 22, 2017. http://policyoptions.irpp.org/magazines/border-security/are-canadians-anti-american/

Litt, Paul. “The Massey Commission, Americanization, and Canadian Cultural Nationalism.” *Queen's Quarterly*, Vol. 98, No. 2 (Summer 1991): 375-385.

Litt, Paul. “The Massey Report, fifty years later.” *The Beaver*, Vol. 81, No. 3 (June-July 2001): 6-7.

Miljan, Lydia, and Barry Cooper. “The Canadian ‘Garrison Mentality’ and Anti-Americanism at the CBC.” *Calgary Policy Research Centre, The Fraser Institute, Studies in Defence and Foreign Policy,* Number 4 (May 2005): 1-18.

Morton, Desmond. “Uncle Louis and Golden Age for Canada: A Time of Prosperity at Home and Influence Abroad.” *Policy Options*, Vol. 24, No. 06 (June-July 2003): 51-56.

Mulcahy, Kevin V. “Cultural Imperialism and Cultural Sovereignty: U.S.-Canadian Cultural Relations.“ *American Review of Canadian Studies* Vol. 30, No. 2 (Summer 2000): 181-206.

Mulcahy, Kevin V. “Globalization and Culture: the Case of Canada and the United States,” *ESSACHES- Journal of Communication Studies,* Vol. 3, No. 1 (2010): 151-161.

Naím, Moisés. “Anti-Americanisms: A guide to hating Uncle Sam.” *Foreign Policy* (January-February 2002). [online version: November 17, 2009] Accessed July 20, 2017. foreignpolicy.com/2009/11/17/anti-americanisms/

Nossal, Kim Richard. “Anti-Americanism in Canada.” *Anti-Americanism Working Papers.* Central European University, Budapest, 2005.

Ogan, Christine. “Media Imperialism and the Videocassette Recorder: The Case of Turkey.” *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (Spring 1988): 93-106.

Rubinstein, Alvin, and Donald Smith. “Anti-Americanism in the Third World.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 497* (May 1988): 35-45.

Upchurch, Anna. “Vincent Massey: Linking cultural policy from Great Britain to Canada.” *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (2007): 239-254.

Vipond, Mary. “The Beginnings of Public Broadcasting in Canada: The CRBC, 1932-1936.“ *Canadian Journal of Communication* Vol 19, No 2 (1994). [online] Accessed December 5, 2016. http://cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/806/712

Vipond, Mary. “What’s a New Public Broadcaster To Do?: The Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission’s Programs in Transnational Context, 1932-1936.” *Journal of Radio & Audio Media,* Vol. 20, No. 2 (2013): 295-310.

White, Livingston A. “Reconsidering Cultural Imperialism Theory.” *Transnational Broadcasting Studies,* No. 6 (Spring/Summer 2001). [online] Accessed July 20, 2017. http://tbsjournal.arabmediasociety.com/Archives/Spring01/white.html

Other sources

Lower, Robert. (Filmmaker). *Shameless Propaganda* (2014). National Film Board. Canada. Accessed April 24, 2017. https://www.nfb.ca/distribution/film/shameless_propaganda

Pursuant to 47 USCS § 153 (9), [Title 47. Telegraphs, Telephones, and Radiotelegraphs; Chapter 5. Wire or Radio Communication; General Provisions]. Source: http://definitions.uslegal.com/c/chain-broadcasting/ Accessed June 24, 2016.

Sirman, Robert. “What would Massey see today? The Massey Commission and its Legacy.” Speaking Notes for Robert Sirman, Director and CEO Canada Council for the Arts, *Walter Gordon Symposium, Massey College, University of Toronto* (March 27, 2014). Accessed April 24, 2017. https://www.canada.ca/en/news/archive/2014/03/robert-sirman-what-would-massey-see-today-massey-commission-its-legacy.html?=undefined&wbdisable=false

Television History - The First 75 Years. “Television Facts and Statistics - 1939 to 2000.” Accessed July 1, 2017. http://www.tvhistory.tv/facts-stats.htm.