John Kramer's

Has Anybody Here Seen Canada?


"Wonderful country, Canada," the American enthuses.

"You get used to it," is the Canadian's sarcastic reply.

That's the first chuckle in Has Anybody Here Seen Canada?, the joint NFB-CBC kaleidoscopic panorama of Canadian films from 1939 to 1953, now being distributed by the NFB after its April television debut.

Director John Kramer and writer Donald Brittain continue to evoke laughs, at times self-conscious ones, as they parade the Canadian past in film across the screen for 90 minutes. It is like entering a time machine, to be whisked back through the cultural past to a time which over half the present population never knew. That itself makes the experience exhilarating.

The film's purpose is more than just a trip down memory lane. The title derives from a mythical director's question on a Hollywood set as he sought clarification about a Canadian subject for his film. It was not necessary to go to Canada, for generally someone had been there and could help him out. The point is that the outsider was creating Canadian myths with almost no knowledge of his subject. Canadians, with no feature film industry of their own, were content to see themselves through the eyes of big brother. Since mythmaking was not the Canadian way, theirs was Hollywood's Canada.

The cameraman of the Canadian Government Motion Picture Bureau, the forerunner of the National Film Board

By the forties, Aunt Emma's thrill of seeing her first live Mountie and Roy Rogers singing about Canada's landscape to Trigger and Bullet were the baneful legacies Hollywood was imprinting upon the consciousness of millions. For decades Canadians and a world of filmgoers laughed at and paid to see this idiocy.

But not all outsiders emasculated the national self-image. In 1939 a different group of mythmakers had arrived to teach the youthful dominion how to recognize the essential qualities that make a diffuse population feel like a nation. Some forward looking politicians had invited documentary pioneer John Grierson from Britain to present a more realistic image of this country, especially on the international scene.

Prime Minister Mackenzie King, whom we see hopelessly inept before a camera, desperately needed some cosmetic. But Grierson and his brilliant team of propagandists had come on a mission, to transplant the documentary idea, to coax a reluctant North America into the world war and to crush the scourgé of fascist aggression and racist poison. Art, Grierson had said, had to be used as a hammer. He created the National Film Board of Canada to drive home the political message.

So, from 1939 to 1945, under the dynamic Scotsman's guidance, Canada became world renown for its 20 minute theatrical shorts, propaganda which was not nationalist but internationalist in tone. Film producer Tom Daly has described the period as one in which there was little place for budding auteurs. "Grierson often told us young Canadians 'You are not at it for your own blue eyes.' Ours was always a sense of working as a team." There were no credits given in wartime Canadian films and their messages promised a brave new postwar world. They insisted that Canada see itself in a world context and feel part of the titanic battle of the century between good and evil.

Grierson's chief lieutenant, Stuart Legg, describes how the NFB propagandists felt as they played a deadly chess match against Nazi propaganda chief Joseph Goebbels. We understand why, for moral reasons, the disastrous Dieppe raid was covered up nearly a year, then sandwiched between trivia about a Canadian Division's washing machine and troops playing soccer.

Unfortunately the film does not spend enough time describing just how NFB propaganda technique worked. Director Kramer wishes he could have devoted more time to this but the subject is so vast, it needs a whole film itself. The brief sequences from the Academy Award winning Churchill's Island demonstrate how rapid film cutting, integrated with Lorne Greene's booming narration and Lucio Agostini's stirring music set a pace which left the viewer nearly breathless.

The subject of the Soviet Union as wartime ally caused the Film Board more grief than was ever anticipated. The word communism was never once used in propaganda and the focus was consistently upon the brave spirit of the Russian people. 'All for one, one for all' was as close as the propagandists came to
interpreting Soviet ideology, which is to say, never. As Legg reasons in the film, Russia was an ally of enormous importance in holding off the main German forces for several years from Western Europe. “We might not approve of their politics,” he explains, “but we approved of their soldiery.” So the NFB propagandists hailed the individual Soviet citizen as being fundamentally the same as his Canadian counterpart. This was enough for closed, petty, anti-Semitic political hacks like Leo Dolan to seize the opportunity to smear the Board as suspect and in need of investigation. His shameful remarks to Ontario Premier Mitch Hepburn indicate how some smalltime Canadian politicians could never grasp the vision of a brave new world of international cooperation that the NFB propagandists were welding to Canadian minds. With the end of the war, the Government of Canada decided to cast its lot with the cold warriors who preferred national rivalries to peaceful internationalism. The era of “political” filmmaking ended with the infamous Gouzenko spy scandal and its far-flung nets of guilt by association.

From 1946 the only feature film industry in Canada which flourished was that of Quebec. Hollywood could not bridge the language barrier, so it left Quebec alone. Thus the Church and Province worked hand in hand to mythologize a love of the land and in the long tradition of propaganda, to propagate the faith. The films of Quebec gave that lucky people the cultural breathing space that English Canada has never enjoyed. Seeing a number of Quebec film clips, the English Canadian realizes that he always has been the invisible man in feature films. As Britain puts it caustically, there were no Canadian heroes, no lovers, no clowns, not even villains. And few seemed to notice or care.

There would be no feature film industry developing in postwar English Canada because Hollywood had a connection in Ottawa — the Government of Canada. The ill-fated Canadian Cooperation Project convinced C.D. Howe to reject the idea of quotas and to accept Hollywood’s promise to use more Canadian references to promote tourism; Lester Pearson would admit publicly Canadian punitiveness, while Louis St. Laurent would go to the Board of Directors of Famous Players when he ceased being Prime Minister. Things had not changed much since the 1930s. It was still Hollywood’s Canada. After describing the politicians’ sell-out, Kramer and Brittain, themselves propagandists favoring a Canadian feature film industry, blame (perhaps unfairly) the Canadian people whom they feel have let the politicians off the hook.

The film ends with the arrival of the all-pervasive light of television and the continuation of big brother’s suffusion of mass culture over the weaker sibling. About the same time, a unique Canadian documentary film style emerged, which concentrated upon portraying the roots and daily particulars of ordinary human beings. Today, the documentary tradition, ever-changing, hence ever-healthy, remains the bellweather of Canadian film. And the institution which sponsors so many of these films, the National Film Board, is 40 years old.

Gary Evans

Allan Moyle’s The Rubber Gun


The counterculture, to use that now anachronistic sounding term, has not been well served by the films which have been made about it. Those negative critics of Easy Rider, such as Robert Fulford and Paul Schrader — whose views were once derided — are now seen to be more correct in their assessment of Peter Fonda and Dennis Hopper’s psychedelic exploits than those who enthused over it. Those pictures that followed in Easy Rider’s wake — Two Lane Blacktop, Ripoff, even Zabriskie Point — are now either forgotten or downgraded. The recent re-evaluation of the sixties and its consequences has not been all that successful in its turn. Hair, for all its charm and nostalgia, is as irrelevant as it ever was. The Big Fix not only exploits its post-Watergate cynicism, it revels in it. Drying Up The Streets, for all its self-conscious sordidness, remains at base a cops and robbers story.

It is in this context that Allan...