

Sheridan College

SOURCE: Sheridan Institutional Repository

Faculty Books

School of Communication and Literary Studies

10-2011

Who's on the Home Front? Canadian Masculinity in the NFB's Second World War Series "Canada Carries On"

Michael Brendan Baker

Sheridan College, mike.baker@sheridancollege.ca

Follow this and additional works at: https://source.sheridancollege.ca/fhass_comm_book



Part of the [Film and Media Studies Commons](#)

SOURCE Citation

Baker, Michael Brendan, "Who's on the Home Front? Canadian Masculinity in the NFB's Second World War Series "Canada Carries On"" (2011). *Faculty Books*. 1.

https://source.sheridancollege.ca/fhass_comm_book/1



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](#).

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Communication and Literary Studies at SOURCE: Sheridan Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Books by an authorized administrator of SOURCE: Sheridan Institutional Repository. For more information, please contact source@sheridancollege.ca.



CHAPTER 3

Who's on the Home Front? Canadian Masculinity in the NFB's Second World War Series "Canada Carries On"

MICHAEL BRENDAN BAKER

It is widely accepted, and rightfully so, that the prestige of Canada's documentary tradition is wedded to the success of its Second World War-era film series, *Canada Carries On*. John Grierson, founding commissioner of the National Film Board of Canada, and Stuart Legg, the executive producer of the series (and a British documentarian who had worked with Grierson at the General Post Office Film Unit during the 1930s), shaped *Canada Carries On* in such a way that it became the signpost for Canadian documentaries of the war and immediate postwar eras. Films produced as part of *Canada Carries On* were not exclusively war-themed, but the series was the cornerstone of the NFB's wartime production schedule. The series was intended by Grierson to introduce and explain domestic and international events to Canadian citizens, and the short subjects that comprised the series sought to demonstrate Canada's role in the war effort in the domestic *and* international spheres.¹ As I will argue, the series also clearly demonstrates, in its ways of portraying "who was on the home front," the assumed cultural values about identity, agency, and manliness in the NFB's Canadian nation-building project.

MEN ON THE HOME FRONT

Several films from the *Canada Carries On* series were produced specifically to address the situation on the home front, in direct relation both to events in Europe and to domestic issues related to events overseas. Curiously, an index of the appearance of male figures in those films specifically committed to illustrating wartime (if not war-related) activity on the home front produces a list of characters comprised almost exclusively of men directly involved in the machinery of war. The representations of men in these texts serve to engender a highly constructed and delimited notion of masculinity.



This masculine character is put on display not at the expense of representations of women on the home front—whose contributions to the war effort are ultimately secured within the NFB filmography in Canada Carries On films such as Jane Marsh's *Wings on Her Shoulder* and *Proudly She Marches* (1943)—but at the cost of male characters who exist outside the margins of this overdetermined cinematic space. In the broader context of the destabilization of traditional gender relations by the recruitment of women into the workforce and the uprooting of entire demographic swaths of young men from their traditional patterns of socialization, images of masculinity produced and endorsed by an agency of the federal government—images that engineer a specific type of Canadian male citizen in the young nation's social imaginary at the expense of others—demand our attention.

The exact degree to which Grierson (as commissioner) crafted the NFB's version of masculinity is debatable, but his central role in the production of these films is not. With this in mind, it is an interesting exercise to examine representations of male characters in NFB films circa World War Two in terms of the commissioner's authoritative and authorial role in the production of the films for the Canada Carries On series. The legend of John Grierson has been writ large in numerous texts, and the impact of his personal politics and ideologies on documentary practice in general (and in the Canadian context specifically) is regularly reviewed.² My task is to place close readings of selected films in dialogue with production documents from the era and the historical record as it concerns conscription in Canada in an effort to gauge to what degree the images of masculinity were influenced by the commissioner and to what extent any exclusionary practices impacted on representations of Canadian masculinity in the postwar era of the NFB.

THE CANADIAN MALE CARRIES ON: PROTECTORS AND PRODUCERS

Relative to the Canada Carries On productions concerned with Canada's presence on the war front, films focusing on the home front are quite limited in number. Only a half dozen of the over fifty specifically war-themed series entries address domestic activities. *Letter from Aldershot* (Stuart Legg, 1940), *Quebec Path of Conquest* (Raymond Spottiswoode, F.R. Crawley, 1942), *Inside Fighting Canada* (Jane Marsh, 1942), and *Letter from Overseas* (1943) are the primary sources for the domestic imagery under examination. Each of these films acknowledges the domestic sphere of Canada's war effort. However, the limited amount of material addressing the home front necessitates a consideration of several key war front texts in order to appreciate the dynamic nature of the representation of masculinity in the series.

In the Canada Carries On series, indexing the male characters establishes a clear dichotomy in terms of the roles these characters play—roles henceforth labelled *protectors* and *producers*. Given the context of the production

of these films, male characters in the series are primarily soldiers—that is, protectors. On the home front, however, men are depicted working furiously to sustain the war effort, and the result is a small selection of domestic films that underscore the significant role played by merchant sailors, farmers, loggers, and general labourers, as well as the entry of women into the workforce—that is, by producers. The latter classification can be broken down further along the lines of the type of production—industrial, agricultural, mineral extraction. Further reading of these films through this particular lens has clear class-based implications in terms of what type of male character occupies any given producer role. Canadian masculinity as defined by the protector/producer dichotomy in effect excludes those male characters who do not easily fit one of these moulds. Apart from producers, the vast expanse of geographical space between Vancouver and the Atlantic presented in *Canada Carries On* is inhabited mainly by carefree youth, dedicated housewives, or otherwise entirely faceless Canadian citizens.

Inside Fighting Canada is the most representative film of the aforementioned sample, with its stereotypical depictions of fishermen on the east coast, farmers in the prairies, and loggers in British Columbia. It strives to portray Canada as a nation well equipped (in terms of both human and natural resources) to play a prominent role in the Allied war effort. The voice-over commentary in each of these films—performed by series narrator Lorne Greene—invokes Canada's founding myth, citing it as a country "created by men who are not afraid to harness the overwhelming forces of the landscape." Action verbs and Greene's booming baritone demonstrate a power and assuredness that defines the quintessential Canadian man as one fit to conquer nature and enemies alike.³ The film uses a geographical sweep from one coast to the other to structure a narrative that addresses the ways in which Canada's natural resources assist in the war effort. Without much subtlety, this narrative metaphorically links the power of Canadian men in dominating their environment to the strength of Canada as an Allied nation. This formulaic deployment of the man-overcoming-nature allegory characterizes each film in the series concerned with the home front. *Letter from Aldershot* and *Letter from Overseas* are the anomalies in this group, as the content of each of these films does not consist of domestic imagery, but rather training footage, barracks life, social nights and—in the case of the latter—the planning and execution of the Dieppe Raid. In each of these films, however, the framing narrative features the family of a young soldier receiving and reading a letter from overseas in the comfort of their quaint Canadian residence. This simple device bridges the spatial divide between home and abroad and effectively separates the domestic experience of the Second World War from the machinery of war at home and abroad.

Inside Fighting Canada was the source of some controversy on its release, for reasons that speak directly to the issue of subjective reporting as it relates



Figure 9 Still from *Inside Fighting Canada* (1942). The film was the source of some controversy for its subjective reporting and charges of factual inaccuracy.



to the representation of masculinity in Second World War–era Canadian cinema. Ontario Premier Mitchell Hepburn, with the aid of his appointed civil servants on the Ontario Board of Censors, fought an unsuccessful battle all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada to have *Inside Fighting Canada* suspended from exhibition for reasons of political partisanship and factual inaccuracy as it related to voluntary service in Canada.⁴ The story made provincial headlines in December 1942 with a front-page story on Christmas Day in Canada's national newspaper, the *Globe and Mail*, and the release of an official statement by John Grierson after the issue became fodder for editorials in *Globe*, the *Toronto Star*, and the *Winnipeg Free Press*.⁵ The statement chiefly concerned the history of the production (it was solicited by the U.S. government) and explained away the inaccuracies as mistakes and as not politically motivated; today, it also serves as evidence of the authorial control that Grierson exercised over Canada Carries On productions.

Official documents and personal memos to film units archived at the NFB illustrate how strongly Grierson shaped the material gathered for the series. Grierson sent highly detailed telegrams to his photographers outlining the images he wanted to include in the Canada Carries On films. His directions, however, often resulted in the misrepresentation of soldiers' experiences. Moreover, the war-themed films of the Canada Carries On series





Figure 10 Still from *Letter from Aldershot*. The shower scene is used as archival evidence in Jose Torrealba's *Open Secrets* (2003), a film examining homosexuality in the Canadian military during the Second World War.

defined Canadian masculinity in very specific terms that favoured direct involvement with the war effort, essentially excluding examples of male characters who remained at home. With regard to the social aspects of military service, Grierson was clear about his expectations of the soldiers' behaviour, telling an NFB representative in England that he required shots of Canadian soldiers "talking with girls in London parks" and giving their opinion on "English food, beer, cigarettes, weather... music halls, [and] girls."⁶ The commissioner also expected to get laughs out of "soldiers darning socks and other domestic problems."⁷ In a telegram dated 18 January 1940, Grierson outlined his demands for the material required to produce *Privates' Lives* (*A Film of the First Canadian Division in Britain*), a proposal that would ultimately become *Letter from Aldershot*:

National Film Board want for earliest possible exhibition in Canada film showing how Canadian troops are getting on. Stop. Wanted personal human film showing individuals from all districts of/in Canada what they are doing in their spare time in barracks and on leave what towns they are near if the censors all what they do in London what girls they go out with etcetera. Stop.⁸

One could argue that Grierson, by giving photographers such rigid guidelines concerning what was noteworthy and of interest to Canadians with regard to the lives of soldiers, intentionally or not was fabricating a mascu-



line character that would have negative connotations when revisited by contemporary viewers. His stereotypically girl-crazy, bar-hopping soldiers narrowly defined both the military lifestyle and the behaviour expected of new recruits in an effort to consolidate the function of these films as propagandistic tools of enlistment and social education.

In *The Colonized Eye*, Joyce Nelson outlines Grierson's mandate for NFB productions as one intended to eschew nationalistic pride in favour of a collectivist view that emphasized ambivalence toward Canada's goals as a young nation.⁹ Nelson contends that Grierson's "editorial internationalism"—the use of footage from a broad range of international film bureaux and news agencies in the *Canada Carries On* and *World In Action* series obscured any clear view of Canada.¹⁰ Personalized and localized views were avoided in the wartime films. That being so, what impact did such a mandate have on a citizenry represented as strictly homogenous and compliant?

EXCLUDED MASCULINITIES IN ENVISIONING CANADIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY

"Where is here?"—Nelson invokes this famous Canadian aphorism coined by Northrop Frye during an examination of the dislocating effect that editorial internationalism has on Canada as a nation and on Canadians as both filmmakers and viewers. If we, like Nelson, consider Frye's question of Canadian national identity in relation to this practice of editorial internationalism and retroactively (perhaps playfully) construct a link between the dislocating effect this compilation practice had on Canadian geography and cultural constructions of masculinity, Frye's "confused nowhere"—representing "boundaryless and restless absences of place"—could metaphorically represent a confused or destabilized Canadian masculinity as authorized only by overdetermined cinematic representations.¹¹ The exclusion of marginal figures—specifically non-protecting and non-producing male characters—is justified by a rigidly controlled representational scheme such as the protector-producer paradigm. In the case of the home front films of the *Canada Carries On* series, this exclusion is so complete that the few images of men in domestic spaces are not men at all, but preschoolers depicted with their mothers as they shop on Main Street, Canada (presumably doing their part to keep the wartime economy chugging along). However, Canada's Conscription Act—a document with a great deal of authority in terms of the impact it had on shaping the nation's demography during times of war—serves as evidence that the producer-protector dichotomy misrepresented the identity of male characters who remained at home yet who played equally significant roles in maintaining Canada's wartime quality of life and development as a young nation.

Conscription in Canada provided exemptions for a limited number of non-medical categories, from judges and clergymen to university professors,



schoolteachers, and the only sons of widows.¹² All but the last group could be labelled intelligentsia—a category often associated with cowardice during this era and that heightened suspicions about men exempted on the basis on these fields of employment. The existence of these exemptions (and common sense) confirms that male characters outside the restrictive limits of the producer–protector dichotomy remained in the domestic sphere for the producers of the *Canada Carries On* to present to the Canadian public in the context of the series mandate. Yet none of the war-themed films expressly acknowledge the contributions made by male characters working in these fields during wartime. Again, only those individuals directly involved in the manufacture of military equipment or the broader infrastructure of war receive attention. Apart from timid figures in lab coats calibrating equipment in munitions plants, adult males aligned with the intelligentsia are invisible. This suggests that men remaining on the home front whose roles did not conform to the conception of masculinity embodied by producers and protectors were excluded in lieu of images that advanced a notion of Canadian masculinity built upon strength, collective spirit, and—obviously enough—unambiguous heterosexuality.

As war-time documents intended to mobilize support for government action (by making concrete the issues—as defined by the Allies—deemed central to winning both the physical and the ideological war, and by serving as tools of public education), the *Canada Carries On* series could not risk any sort of ambiguity, be it in regard to the Allied position on the war or the character of the men committed to fighting that war. Working backwards from Tom Waugh's analysis of the cultural reflection of geopolitical insecurities in Canadian cinema of the 1950s, the *Canada Carries On* series can be understood as initiating a project of securing gender through processes of representation that denied the existence of male figures outside the predefined roles of protector and producer. Accepting the binary construction of masculinity introduced here—either a soldier on the warfront or a labourer at home—the image of Canadian masculinity presented in *Canada Carries On* is quickly supplanted by the Cold War's iconic businessman-consumer. Interestingly, the only non-uniformed, non-labouring male characters over the age of twenty from *Inside Fighting Canada* are several businessmen trapped in a sea of soldiers parading down an overcrowded city street. The only other images of male characters of any age existing outside the protector–producer paradigm are two young boys playing in a sandbox under their mothers' supervision. If it is the Cold War that ultimately shakes gender roles from their secured positions with the return of men to a workforce that has been “infiltrated” by women, we can look to the NFB's wartime series to understand how these roles were secured in the first place, through a process of denial—not necessarily of the feminine, but perhaps a denial of the effeminate.

These anxieties fully manifest themselves in the NFB's postwar corpus



of psychosocial “issue films” such as *Is It A Woman’s World?* (Don Haldane, 1956) and *Howard* (Don Haldane, 1957), films that Waugh discusses at length in his recent work, *The Romance of Transgression in Canada: Queering Sexualities, Nations, Cinemas*. And it is the denial and the silence surrounding these marginalized masculinities that exist outside of the protector–producer paradigm in the war era that connects them to a postwar manifestation. Waugh invokes Michel Foucault when declaring that “silences in cultural imaginaries are a familiar problem.”¹³ Foucault argues:

Silence itself—the things one declines to say, or is forbidden to name, the discretion that is required between different speakers—is less the absolute limit of discourse, the other side from which it is separated by a strict boundary, than an element that functions alongside the things said, with them and in relation to them within overall strategies. There is no division to be made between what one says and what one does not say; we must try to determine the different ways of not saying such things.¹⁴

Adopting Foucault’s interpretation of silence and absence in cultural histories, we should consider that it is what *Canada Carries On* *does not say* about those male characters remaining on the home front during the Second World War that determined the space within which marginalized male figures established themselves in the Canadian imaginary and contributed to Canada’s wartime socio-economic and cultural life.

Gender hegemony through queer exclusion is at the heart of the matter Waugh investigates, but it is the more basic issue of exclusion at the expense of male characters outside the producer–protector dichotomy that undermines the NFB’s wartime representation of masculinity. There was, it seems, a prohibition on the depiction of exempted males in the war-themed entries of *Canada Carries On*, and it is precisely the absence of male characters on the Canadian home front in these films and the silence that surrounds this absence that should become an issue for examination. Does the fey male librarian bachelor appear from nowhere in a postwar Canada and its cinematic imaginary, or can we safely assume that he existed on the home front, albeit off-screen and excluded from view? Grierson and company’s propaganda damages the Canadian self-image through a one-sided, idealized portrayal of masculinity. But if war and national identity are entwined, it is foolish to think that any perceived vulnerabilities would be left on display for discriminating eyes.

Images of homosocial behaviour in the *Canada Carries On* films serve to challenge the NFB’s notion of wartime Canadian masculinity. Loosely defined, homosocial spaces are aligned with the sympathetic identification of male protagonists and crypto homoeroticism by way of a “nostalgic longing for all-male

public spheres.”¹⁵ Conversely, these spheres are depicted as the conduit for “infection”—that is, for marital break-up, addiction, and promiscuity. While nothing so graphic is captured in *Canada Carries On*, the reliance on male-dominated spaces of social interaction to establish and portray the good life of young Canadian soldiers invites such subversive readings. A shower scene in *Letter from Aldershot* features a platoon of naked men rushing toward the camera—all while narrator Lorne Greene takes on the character of a young soldier and declares in the first person that it is “the best moment of the day.” It is a deliriously camp moment, to be sure, and read against the grain of the film’s overarching message, it retroactively suggests that queer representation in the war-era films is not entirely hidden from view. Jose Torre-alba’s 2003 NFB-produced film *Open Secrets* (2003) examines homosexuality in the Canadian military during the Second World War and thus formally initiates the on-screen revelation of this hitherto unacknowledged socio-sexual realm of Canadian masculinity.

Ironically enough, it is precisely this homosocial sphere of downtime on the war front that constitutes the central thrust of *Letter from Aldershot*’s function as a recruitment tool. While it was the mandate of the NFB to explain Canada to Canadians, the war series had another function that was, for a time, far more significant. Films concerning the lives of soldiers abroad were employed as recruiting films for those at home. The military was keenly aware that you could never turn a regular citizen into a soldier with the thirty-day recruitment program used by the Canadian Armed Forces at the time, so they would instead sell young men on the *idea* of life as a soldier to ensure they remained committed to training.¹⁶ The target of this appeal was “the young proletarian and farm-boy cannon-fodder that [will be] lured by group showers and the nightlife in London.”¹⁷ If the films reviewed here are any indication, it was the assurance that the conveniences of domestic life would not be sacrificed abroad (accompanied by the perks of being far away from home) that proved to be the favoured strategy of recruiters at the Non-Permanent Active Militia (NPAM—known as the Canada Army Reserve after 1940), the group responsible for enlisting young men in advance of Mackenzie King’s plebiscite on the conscription issue.

Images of domesticity appear within a rigorously structured framework that is careful to balance the shadowy realities of military service with the perks that make enrolment appear to be a few steps shy of a relaxing vacation abroad. The result is a recurring rhetorical trope that paints the motivation for Grierson’s telegraphed demands with a shadowy hue: the infantilization of the young recruit for the purpose of leveraging the appeal of life in the military. This device is also visible in recruitment films from outside the *Canada Carries On* series, often produced expressly for the Canadian Army. Among these commissioned films, *13th Platoon* (Julian Roffman, 1942) is noteworthy for the way that class difference and the infantilization



Figure 11 Still from *Letter from Overseas*. Scenes of domesticity distinguish barracks life from fighting on the front.

of young recruits and officers alike are represented in spaces coded as homosocial.¹⁸ The aforementioned shower sequence in *Letter from Aldershot* is mirrored by a similar segment in *Letter from Overseas*. In it, soldiers are found splashing playfully in a pond while another serviceman, laundering uniforms in a specialized facility nearby, executes his duties while the narrator Greene waxes enthusiastically about the conveniences of modern living as it exists on the battlefield (in fact, he boasts that many of the home appliance technologies far exceed anything “mom” is using back home). Similar scenes play themselves out in dining halls and social clubs in this and other films, almost completely in denial of the grim realities of the front line. In fact, in each of these films there seems to be a deliberate buffer between the viewer and war imagery—these sequences of domestic life on the war front are formulaically inserted so as to play themselves out with a relaxed air in advance of the brief shock of the battle scenes, which disappear from the narrative just as quickly as they arrive.

But any reconsideration of *Canada Carries On* is not about the absence or sidelong presence of queer masculinity in the NFB’s wartime productions. In returning to this material, I seek to understand the implications and ramifications of these representations of masculinity in films intended for public education by a federal institution. While we need not go so far as to say

that the NFB's construction of masculinity in *Canada Carries On* was the mandate of Grierson and Grierson alone, Nelson's central thesis contends that these films smack of a conservatism rooted in one man's individual vision. Drawing upon Bruce Elder's examination of Grierson's project as one that demanded that documentary be "socially effective" and contain "realistic imagery"—the emphasis here should be on the word *realistic*—far more problematic than the commissioner's ideological zeal is what these images of reality say about a male citizenry that is only allowed to assert itself on the battlefield.¹⁹ Proto-feminist views that arose during the Cold War, however, would quickly redefine masculinity along terms of sensitivity, expressiveness, creativity, and tenderness—the character of the modern "sissy" emerges, to use Waugh's shorthand.²⁰

PROTO-FEMINIST CANADIAN MASCULINITY AND THE POETIC TURN

In the *Canada Carries On* series, several decidedly non-war-themed films illustrate how exempted males are conceived of and represented within the cinematic space of the NFB. The Québécois ethnography film *Alexis Tremblay: Habitant* (Jane Marsh, 1943) and selections from the series on fine art and agriculture are particularly germane to the present discussion and represent opportunities for further consideration of the producer-protector dichotomy in the whole of the *Canada Carries On* series. In the art and agriculture films, the sensitivity, expressiveness, creativity, and tenderness considered to be signs of weakness in the war-themed films are offered as central to uniquely Canadian identity. *Canadian Landscape* (F.R. Crawley, 1941), *Iceland on the Prairies* (F.R. Crawley, 1941), *Painters of Quebec* (F.R. Crawley, 1944), and *West Wind* (Graham McInnes, 1944) are the strongest illustrations of the art films, while *Battle of the Harvests* (James Beveridge, 1942) and *Hands for the Harvest* (Stanley Jackson, 1944) address how men of all ages are involved in the agricultural domain of wartime Canada. There is a poetic quality to these works that echoes the humanism of Humphrey Jennings's films for the GPO (films that Grierson openly disliked) and that foreshadows the humanist tone that the postwar NFB would establish in the *Perspective* and *Candid Eye* series, thereby gaining international recognition.²¹ This postwar corpus also marks a decisive shift from the macho posturing institutionalized by the NFB via Lorne Greene's trademark bellow as Stanley Jackson's mellifluous tone becomes the standard for the Board's voice-over commentary. Overall, it is the art series, select agricultural films, and the work of female directors such as Gundrun Bjerring Parker (*Before They Are Six*, 1943) that point toward the postwar manifestation of destabilized Canadian masculinities in productions of the NFB. *Canada Carries On*, under the direction of Grierson, offers a version of Canadian masculinity in practice that



could be said to have died with the end of the war and Grierson's subsequent departure. At the very least, the series is a fascinating repository of images charting a young nation's negotiation of its own identity, a self-image dependent on a clearly delineated brand of masculinity intended to reinforce the notion that Canada is able to fulfill its responsibility to the Allied effort.

NOTES

- 1 The success of *Canada Carries On* prompted the reassignment of several films to a companion program, *World In Action*, which United Artists distributed on an international scale. *World In Action* concerned itself with subjects that demonstrated Canada's role in the war on broader, international terms and in turn explained international issues and policies to Canadians. For this reason, these films featured less of a uniquely Canadian character and spoke in terms that were more general. A complete listing of films produced for both series is available in Peter Morris, ed., *The National Film Board of Canada: The War Years* (Ottawa: Canadian Film Archives, 1965), 20–23, 27–28. For a close reading of the successful *Canada Carries On / World In Action* film *Churchill's Island* (Stuart Legg, 1941), see Michael Brendan Baker, "Churchill's Island," in *24 Frames: The Cinema of Canada*, ed. Jerry White (London: Wallflower Press, 2006), 23–32.
- 2 For example, Peter Morris, "Re-thinking Grierson: The Ideology of John Grierson," in *History on/and/in Film*, ed. T. O'Regan and B. Shoemith (Perth: History and Film Association of Australia, 1987), 20–30; and Brian Winston, *Claiming the Real: The Griersonian Documentary and Its Legitimations* (London: British Film Institute, 1995).
- 3 For a brief consideration of the structure of these voice-over commentaries in relation to image, see Ernst Borneman, "Documentary Films: World War II," in *Canadian Film Reader*, ed. Seth Feldman and Joyce Nelson (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1977), 48–57.
- 4 For a brief summary of Hepburn's efforts and a history of this era of film exhibition in Ontario, see Wyndham Wise, "History of Ontario's Film Industry, 1896 to 1985," *Take One* 9, no. 28 (Summer 2000): 20.
- 5 "Statement on *Inside Fighting Canada* by John Grierson, Government Film Commissioner, in answer to a statement by the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario," National Film Board of Canada Archives, file no. 304-1-33 (13 April 2004).
- 6 Grierson outlined his expectations for the material in a telegram addressed to "Golightly" dated 24 January 1940. NFB Archives, file no. 0122 (13 April 2004).
- 7 *Ibid.*
- 8 *Ibid.*
- 9 Joyce Nelson, *The Colonized Eye: Rethinking the Grierson Legend* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1988), 69–70.
- 10 The term "editorial internationalism," used by Nelson in *The Colonized Eye*, is a recurring reference, among other histories of Grierson's NFB, to the previously cited Borneman text in which he explains a compilation process involving footage from film bureaux around the world. *Ibid.*, 54–55.
- 11 *Ibid.*, 72.
- 12 J.L. Granatstein and J. Mackay Hitsman, *Broken Promises: A History of Conscription in Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1977), 146–47.
- 13 Thomas Waugh, *The Romance of Transgression: Queering Sexualities, Nations, Cinemas* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill–Queen's University Press, 2006), 41.





- 14 Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* (New York: Vintage Books, [1976]1990), 27.
- 15 Waugh, *The Romance of Transgression*, 37.
- 16 Granatstein and Hitsman discuss the role of the National Resources Mobilization Act (NRMA) and the recruitment of NPAM. Granatstein and Hitsman, *Broken Promises*, 142–47.
- 17 I must thank Tom Waugh for this succinct (and saucy) analysis of the film's ideal audience. Personal communication with the author, 23 August 2008.
- 18 In *13th Platoon*, a young officer attempts to win over the hardened, working-class men of his platoon. Moulded in the fashion of his British-born and university-educated superiors, the baby-faced officer – referred to as “just another ninety day wonder” by the soldiers – tries to win over his men on a personal level in an attempt to overcome the stereotype that he is a “pussy-footer” suited only to “fight in a truck, not on his feet.”
- 19 Bruce Elder, *Image and Identity: Reflections on Canadian Film and Culture* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1989), 89.
- 20 Waugh, *The Romance of Transgression*, 28–47.
- 21 For a brief illustration of this lineage, see Peter Harcourt, “The Innocent Eye,” in *Canadian Film Reader*, ed. Seth Feldman and Joyce Nelson (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1977), 86–94.



