Seth Feldman

The John P. Robarts Professor
of Canadian Studies

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL ROBARTS LECTURE
5 APRIL 2001

York University, Toronto, Ontario

Professor Seth Feldman, former Dean of Fine Arts, much published writer on Canadian cinema and television, and founder and past President of the Film Studies Association of Canada, is the 2000-2001 Robarts Chair in Canadian Studies. In this capacity, Professor Feldman is conducting a project on *The Triumph of Canadian Cinema*. Its thesis is that Canadian cinema has moved from a long formative period into an era when this country contributes and will continue to contribute work of genuine worth to the international film and television community. The project will include presentations by key Canadian film and television writers, directors, and producers in a series of four panels complemented by public screenings of key work with the makers in attendance.

"Canadian Movies, Eh?"

Perhaps the two questions most frequently asked in Canadian Film Studies are:
have we done well in supporting filmmaking in this country; and have we, in fact done well enough to say that we have finally achieved a national cinema? Then there is a third question that is almost never asked: is a national cinema a desirable goal? My purpose here today is to answer those three questions with the following triple heresy: we've done well by our filmmakers; no, we don't have a national cinema; and it's a good thing we don't.

Heresies complete, I would like to begin the longer answer to those questions by going back a very long way indeed - a quarter of a century ago. In 1976, Joyce Nelson and I were teaching at universities - she at Queen's, I at Western - that had just accepted film studies per se as a legitimate academic pursuit. Going a step further - trying to teach a Canadian film course - tested the tolerance of our respective curriculum committees. Compared to what we were proposing, Canadian literature and Canadian art courses suffered from an embarrassment of riches. Scholarly publishing on Canadian cinema was just beginning to emerge. There were no Canadian film textbooks - something Joyce and I were trying to change by compiling **Canadian Film Reader.**

But there were, at last, films - and this was the exciting part. By the mid-1970s, what was then called The National Film Archive was beginning to strike 16mm distribution prints of classic films. The Canadian Film Institute offered others. The National Film Board began circulating its archival holding. The Canadian Filmmakers Distribution Centre and similar artist run co-ops provided an outlet for the avant-garde. And there were even those heroic distributors who struck and rented 16mm prints of recent Canadian features.

Joyce and I were confident that we were standing on the starting line of a sprint toward international recognition of Canadian films. Our concept of a national cinema was purely quantitative. The many films newly available to us were like so many dots waiting to be connected. Surely, a picture would emerge. We wrote an introduction to **Canadian Film Reader** and, in that introduction, we saw the future as unfolding in one of three ways.

What we thought most likely was that Canadian Cinema would join the parade of the emerging national cinemas that appeared during the 1960s and 1970s: Cuban, Brazilian, Czech, Australian, New German Cinema, to name a few. These nations defined national cinema as a sense of purpose, a common style or attitude. The Cubans had their revolution, the Brazilians their 'tropicalism." The films of Prague spring were linked by their insistence on a wry humanism surviving official repression. The Australians raged against their colonial heritage, while the Germans were acutely aware of being the first post-Nazi generation.

All it took in those countries was some government subsidy and a handful of truly original artists. Canada had those, so it would be only a matter of time before we too used film to define our collective purpose.

But then we thought if, for some reason, Canada couldn't get its act together - or if the rest of the world happened to be looking the other way - well then there might be a quieter, more incremental approach to a national cinema. It would take many years but, one by one, many different films would each contribute small touches of authenticity until we would have something we could call our own. Then we could achieve a definitive national cinema through a carefully argued retrospective.

Finally, we reasoned, if all else failed, then failure itself would provide an identity of sorts. We would/could claim that the Canadian essence was impenetrable - even by the movies. That mere nationhood was too small to contain it. I must take full responsibility for illustrating this point by inserting into our introductory essay E.M. Forester's rebuttal to the very idea of considering India a mere nation:

> India a nation! What an apotheosis! Last comer to the drab nineteenth century sisterhood! Waddling in at this hour of the world to take her seat! She, whose only peer was the Holy Roman Empire, she shall rank with Guatemala and Belgium perhaps! (Feldman and Nelson, x)

As it turned out, there was an apotheosis of sorts, one Joyce and I couldn't predict, because it would be so completely illogical. It was that in the year 2001, despite a level

of production we wouldn't have dared imagine, the triumph of Canadian Cinema would be, for most Canadians, entirely invisible. That there would be a lot of movies made in Canada, a lot of dots but still no picture.

This is, indeed, what we have today. The films are certainly there. According to the Canadian Film and Television Production Association's **Annual Profile - 2001**, $4.4 billion dollars were spent last year in Canada on film and television productions - up 12% from 1999. Yes, about a third of it was spent on American film and television being shot here. Another third was in a gray area. But $1.8 billion of that money went to film and television that was, to everyone's satisfaction, genuinely Canadian. There are 46,000 Canadian directly employed in film and television and another 73,000 indirect jobs. It is not surprising then that some 466 films, including 113 feature length productions were submitted to the Toronto International Film Festival's Perspective Canada last year.

And there is more to come. On February 10, Trina McQueen, the President of CTV announced a $140 million dollar independent production fund. Less than two weeks later, Heritage Minister Shelia Copps announced a renewal of the Federal Government's $100 million contribution to the Canadian Television Fund.

This money goes to filmmakers whose work ends up on television – a medium that is an essential tool for filmmaking in this country. But there is also a Telefilm Canada fund for theatrical features as well as other Telefilm funds to develop projects, set up international co-productions, market films, even take them to international festivals. There is, in this country, actually a labour shortage in some film production craft areas.

And there are, of course, the films themselves. Since the establishment of the National Film Board in 1939, Canada's documentary tradition has maintained an international stature. Canadian animation also traces it roots to the early years of the Film Board in the person of Norman McLaren. Since that time Canadian animators have not only won Oscars but have broadened their genre to include some of the world's leading practitioners of digital animation and special effects.

Canadian avant-garde film may also trace its roots to McLaren. Since McLaren, the Canadian avant-garde has produced half a century of work that has found a home in the world's academies, cinematheques and museums, the places that define film as fine art. Its stars include: Arthur Lipsett, Joyce Wieland, Michael Snow, Jack Chambers, Bruce Elder and York's own Phillip Hoffman - whose many triumphs are being honoured with a retrospective at this year's Images Film Festival.

And still, we don't have a national cinema. Every year around the time of the Genie Awards or the Perspective Canada retrospective, the media will ask those of us who comment on Canadian film why our recent crop has been such a bust. Why has nobody seen the films honored at the Genies and why are so few of the films screened at Perspective Canada ever seen again? In other words, the inquiring reporter asks, why aren't Canadian films - by which he means feature films - any good?

Those few of us who have seen the films beg to differ. The class of 2000, for instance, included (going from East to West): Allan Moyle's **New Waterford Girl**, Denis Villeneuve's **Maelstrom,** John Greyson's **Law of Enclosures**, Gary Burns' **waydowntown**, and Lynne Stopkewich's **Suspicious River**.

Yes, the reporter replies, but if those films are so good, how come nobody sees them? Why are 95% of our screens showing Hollywood films? And from here, we enter the vale of tears that has left Hollywood movies as real movies and what everyone else does as nothing but an alternative practice.

Hollywood was born into an age of unregulated monopoly capital. It matured with America's rise to power - and rise to globalism. This was reflected in its product. Hollywood monopolized not just the trade in movies but the definition of the medium. Its films always had and still has less to do with their selling of the United States or its values than it does with a recognition of cross-cultural human desire (for narrative, action, sex). Hollywood thrives on the high recognition factor of international stars who are themselves based on international stereotypes: the hero, the goddess, the holy fool, the minstrel.

In the face of this classical Hollywood, national cinemas have succeeded only in proportion to the insularity of their culture (Japan, India, for a time, the Soviet Union) or the depth of both their financial and cultural resources (France, Italy, Germany, Sweden).

Another pre-condition was a history of local filmmaking strong enough to create an expectation of continuity. The more films you could put on the screen despite the Hollywood onslaught, the greater your possibility of continuing to make them.

Canada, particularly English Canada, was characterized neither by its insularity nor, at least for the first half of the twentieth century, the depth of its cultural resources. There were, as Peter Morris so ably illustrated in his landmark study, **Embattled Shadows**, sporadic attempts at feature filmmaking. They are all good stories of the Pierre Burton variety. But added together, they never equaled even the promise, much less the foundations of a national cinema.

Early Canadian film failed first because Hollywood continued to raise the ante for film production. In the beginning, anyone with a movie camera could shoot a five or ten minute melodrama and compete for the world's attention. After 1915, though, the highly capitalized, studio made feature films - full of expensive stars and high production values - became the gold standard of the industry.

Secondly, Hollywood has, from one end of Canadian film history to the other, controlled our theatres - originally because it owned most of them and, later, because Canadian theatre owners would agree to almost anything in order to assure access to Hollywood releases.

Our government could have, or at least could have tried, to alter this behaviour with the stroke of a pen. Yet every effort to lobby for disincentives to Hollywood domination of film distribution and exhibition - no matter how foolhardy or wise, how half-hearted or determined - has failed. . In 1976, Sandra Gathercole writing on behalf of the Council of Canadian Filmmakers, stated quite plainly:

> One hundred and four countries discriminate against Hollywood films - usually in the form of quota restrictions on exhibition and a tax or levy on American box office revenues. Canada is not among the 104 countries, but remains the only film producing country without any form of protection for its own films, in their own market. Compared with this problem, the others pale into growing pains. (Gathercole, 364)

In the years since Gathercole wrote, the only change in this situation has been that fewer nations have been able to maintain any kind of protectionist measures against Hollywood cinema. Part of this has to do with the global climate of free trade. The other part is Hollywood's relentless global hype and Hollywood's arm twisting (aided, from time to time, by American government muscle).

In Canada's case, another factor has been the lack of any discernable desire to establish a film industry. It is only in the last half century that we have, in any meaningful way, demonstrated that we wanted one. Once we made that decision, we found ourselves bargaining with Hollywood every step of the way. In fact, as I am going to now argue, we bargained not with one Hollywood but with three, possibly four, manifestations of it.

And I would like to argue here, that we have not always bargained badly. This too is a bit of an heretical thought. In much of the scholarly writing on Canadian cinema, it is an article of faith that Canada is habitually, and even somewhat perversely, the author of its own misfortune. The Federal Government, according to this line, has not only failed to support Canadian feature filmmakers but has connived to provide an advantage to American interests. And because film is an exercise in industrial strategy as well as culture, our capitulation to the Americans is both symptomatic of our overall industrial dependence and a kind of foot in the door for a broader cultural colonialism.

This, for example, is what Manjunath Pendakur writes in the conclusion of book, **Canadian Dreams and American Control**:

> Despite the powerful U.S. threats to bring Canada to its knees, the imperial link could have been broken but for the fact that it has such powerful allies in Canada. The Canadian state, through its various apparatuses, arbitrates the powerful and vested interests, often siding with one faction and then with another. In the long run, however, such mediation is an attempt to preserve capitalism itself and keeps intact the deeply entrenched international capital in Canada's economy. National cultural autonomy is inevitably tied to those long-term institutional agendas. (276)

Pendakur's book is largely a history of the horror stories that prove his thesis. Of these, the mother of all sellouts, or so received wisdom would have us believe, is the Canadian Cooperation Project.

In 1948, C.D. Howe's bureaucrats were worried about those sectors of the economy that were creating a large balance of trade deficit, so worried that they began questioning whether the Americans should continue to maintain their monopoly on the feature film in Canada. Their concern alarmed the Motion Picture Export Association of America. The MPEAA came to Ottawa with a proposal: Canada would do nothing. In exchange for that, the nation would be mentioned in Hollywood films - the villain fleeing to Canada rather than across the Rio Grande - that sort of thing. The Hollywood studios would screen Canadian travelogues in their theatres. The Americans implied that they would shoot vast numbers of Hollywood films on location north of the border. They shot 13 between 1948 and 1955 - of the approximately 3000 features Hollywood made during this period.

As Pendakur summarizes the Canadian Cooperation Project:

> The outcome of the CCP, a public relations scheme, was continuation of the American control of the Canadian film market. The MPEAA silenced its critics effectively with full cooperation of the government. The Canadian government supported the project and made it a success. (Pendakur, 140-141)

More important than critiques of the Canadian Cooperation Project as it was enacted half a century ago, is the impression that it served as a model for undermining later attempts to create a feature film industry. Ironically, the Americans filming in Canada today are fulfilling the promise they implied in the original CCP bargain. And, thanks to our current regime of public subsidy, they are doing so to a much greater advantage than they would have had then, i.e. before Canadian government subsidies. In fact, today the Americans are doing better than Canadian companies shooting in Canada (their greater resources that allowing them to qualify for more matching funds)

There is an element of truth then to both the CCP story and the thesis it was the harbinger of things to come. But it may also be true that there is a different way to read these outcomes. We should remember that, at the time, there was very little in the way of a feature film industry to protect from the Americans. In negotiating the Canadian Cooperation Project in 1948, C. D. Howe bargained away something he didn't have. What he got in return was the benefit of not irritating a major sector within his principal trading partner. That could be cashed in when discussing other sectors.

What the CPP also did was to raise the issue of Candian cinema - and to raise it within a growing awareness of the need to subsidize a locally produced culture. Within a year of the CCP deal, the St. Laurent government had committed to both the founding of CBC television and the inquiry that would become the Massey-Levesque Report of 1951.

Conversely, the CCP came at a moment slightly before the Federal Government had in place the principles for any large scale funding of the arts. In this context, the support it might have been able to provide for the film industry would not likely have made a difference. It would have required a quantitative leap of a qualitative scale (e.g. the move from the relatively inexpensive CBC radio to the vastly more complex and expensive radio and television service) to establish a feature film industry.

Even after the establishment of a more aggressive cultural funding program in the early 1950s, are argument might well have been made that any levels of funding Ottawa could provide would be far less important to the future of a feature film industry than would be established patterns of film distribution and audience expectation. A case in point is the flourishing in Quebec of a modest feature film during this period. Some 19 French language features were made in Quebec between 1944 and 1953 by Renaissance Films and Quebec Productions. They were not only produced locally but, as Pierre Veronneau argues, ably reflected the "highly moralistic with curiously sado-masochistic" nation of pre-Quiet Revolution Quebec. (Veronneau, 62)

As it was, the Canadian Cooperation Project had no effect on the commercial success of these films. Made before and after the deal, they were not dependent on government support but on a lack of competition from the temporarily disabled industry in France. When the French once again started exporting large numbers of films to Quebec and when French language television became available, the feature film industry quickly disappeared. It is not likely that any feasible amount of federal subsidy - even if Duplesis had permitted it - would have made a lasting difference.

The difference that was to be made would come from the fact that Hollywood itself would soon change. In retrospect, the mistake of the Canadian Cooperation Project was less Howe's assessment of the situation he actually faced than it was his failure to foresee a rapidly developing second era of Hollywood's history. The ink was hardly dry on the CCP deal when the Hollywood studios were forced to divest themselves of their theatre chains and were simultaneously humiliated by American Red baiting. Between 1945 and 1960, television and shifting demographics cut American movie attendance in half. During this same period, changes to cinema technologies and styles made it possible to create feature films outside the studio system. In the late 1950s, New Wave cinemas began to emerge. In the 1960s, increasing attention was paid to the practices of documentary and avant-garde filmmaking. Foreign language films (very much a minority taste since the end of the silent period) were more generally accepted.

Hollywood lost its monopoly on the definition of cinema. From a single, dominant practice, cinema was, in the 1960s, redefined as the struggle for its own meaning. It became a kind of Canada.

And so Guy Roberge had a problem. He was Commissioner of the National Film Board that, in the 1950s, had played no small role in the invention of alternative cinemas - most notably cinema verite. However, his problem was not so much that as it was a certain tendency his filmmakers began displaying in the early 1960s - that of violating the NFB's

mandate by planning, shooting and releasing feature films. They were creating a Canadian new wave (or worse, two almost entirely independent new waves - one Anglophone, one Francophone).

At the same time, Nat Taylor, then an executive at Famous Players Canada, had become something of focal point for a growing number of would be feature filmmakers in the private sector. Together with Michael Spencer, Roberge and Taylor successfully petitioned the Secretary of State to establish a committee, chaired by Roberge, to study the possibility of a federally financed feature film fund. In 1964, the idea in principle won cabinet approval. It then took three years to draft and pass the legislation - and to fend off - or as it turned out, to partially fend off - determined Hollywood lobbyists. It wasn't until 1968 that the CFDC actually began spending its $10 million allocation.

It was a heady moment - though not without its problems. The CFDC was, for one thing, grossly underfunded, its budget equal to perhaps three average Hollywood features of the time. Worse still, the idea was that this $10 million was to be handed out as loans that would be repaid after the immediate success of the films they seeded. That was another way of saying that there would not be another $10 million forthcoming. When the original fund did indeed run dry - its unrealistic expectations unmet - the initial optimism around starting a film industry began to dissipate. Still, more money was put in the pot. Additional subsidies came in the form of tax incentives. Provincial and even some municipal governments set up programs of their own.

Still, there seemed to be no breakthrough film, no follow-ups to the few critical successes funded by the CFDC in the 1970s. Film bureaucrats, entrepreneurs and their creative accountants were doing much better than the small number of relatively inexperienced writers, directors and actors. It was easier to make money on film projects than on films. There was nothing in the crop of CFDC films - and certainly nothing in the CFDC's enabling legislation - to threaten Hollywood's control of the nation's threatres.

In addition, the CFDC operated under a basic contradiction. As Ted Magdar writes in his book, **Canada's Hollywood**:

> Success was to be measured by two criteria simultaneously: CFDC backed films would have to show a profit and they would have to contribute to the articulation of a Canadian cultural identity. It would become quickly apparent that these two objectives were not necessarily mutually compatible. (Magdar, 131)

Even this was a rather optimistic understanding of the problems faced by the new feature film industry. There were at least two more potential objectives added once the practice of feature filmmaking began - neither of them especially compatible with profitability and national identity.

The first of these was a desire to make personal films, films that would have nothing to do with anything recognizably Canadian - other than the fact that people (with all their

possible quirks and contradictions) lived here. The second potential objective of feature filmmaking was all too Canadian. Those were the films highlighting the growing separatist aspirations in Quebec, work entirely antithetical to the CFDC's nation building mandate.

Yet it was the CFDC's response to the differing aspirations of its clients that, in the end, yielded an outcome more important than its many shortcomings. Faced with these conflicting demands, the agency was forced to define itself either as a state or a public cinema agency. The National Film Board and the CBC had been conceived as state enterprises - that is, they were mandated a task of nation building from which, prior to the late 1960s, they seldom strayed. Grierson, quite famously, had custom tailored the Board's films to national policy objectives - even if, on occasion, he also had to invent the government's line. In the late 1960s, both the NFB and the CBC fought running battles with their separatist employees.

A state feature film agency would, in the same way, actively oppose any digression from its official twin mandate of making money while enhancing the national image. It would commission work in what it saw as the State's best financial or political interests, a kind of socialist realism in quasi-capitalist guise. On the other hand, a public cinema would facilitate the work of the most deserving filmmakers.

Judging by the product, it was the self-definition of the CFDC as a public cinema agency that won the day. The film focusing on personal angst was funded with some regularity. As early as 1973, Robert Fothergill, who had been both seeing these films and reviewing scripts for the CFDC, wrote:

> What then is the version of *la condition canadienne* reflected to us by our feature films? It is the depiction, through many different scenarios, of the radical inadequacy of the male protagonist - his moral failure, especially and most visibly, in his relationship with women. One film after another is like a recurring dream, which takes its shape from the dreamer's guilty consciousness of his own essential impotence. (Fothergill, 235-236)

Construing the Canadian male as "coward, bully or clown" to use Fothergill's terms was probably not the vision of nation building the CFDC's founders had in mind. Nor was the rather astonishing freedom given to Quebec separatist filmmakers during the period between the October Crisis of 1970 and the election of Rene Levesque's PQ Government in 1976. The same federal government that proclaimed the War Measures Act funded what must be among the most stirring condemnations of it, Michel Brault's 1974 film, **Les Ordres**.

Thus, the culture that subsidized by the CFDC (and, eventually, the NFB and CBC) could be not only a culture of diversity, despair or even self-indulgence but, when artistically or journalistically justified, a culture antithetical to the ideal of a single nation. This was true not only of Quebec filmmakers but of an increasing number of divergent voices.

The CFDC as sponsor of a public - rather than a state - cinema was addressing exactly the dilemma Joyce Zemans identified five years ago in her Robarts Lecture on Canadian Cultural policy as a whole:

> If cultural democracy has been a central element in the development of national cultural strategies, cultural heterogeneity is at the root of the essential paradox that is Canada. It is both the defining character of the Canadian experience and the reason that Canada is so difficult to define. The contestation of identities in an increasingly diverse country represents an essential challenge to the establishment of any fixed notion of identity and to the conventional notion of unity. (Zemans, 19)

What the CFDC accomplished is even more impressive in the context of what was happening in the world cinema of the mid-1970s: the beginning of a third phase in Hollywood's history. Just as Joyce and I were thinking that our newly discovered Canadian cinema was another nail in Hollywood's coffin, Hollywood rose from the grave.

Recapitalized by numerous takeovers and successfully meshed with television, the studios were making a comeback. The new look Hollywood styled and packaged itself in the past tense becoming, if I must use the term, a postmodern - if not the original postmodern - endeavour. It was an aesthetic of quotation - Hollywood quoting itself: stars, genre films, and sequels. To go to the movies in the new multi-plexs, was to buy into an experience, a heritage moment, the evocation of a great and traditional spectacle writ large.

The production of these films was neither centralized nor de-centralized but entirely opportunistic. Distribution would be handled by a few large corporate entities backed by vast amounts of international capital. Production could be done however it made sense - within the studios, by independent companies or one shot deals put together for a single film. There was little that couldn't be contracted out.

Nor was the product itself strictly defined as a theatrical film. The Hollywood movie going experience sold souvenirs. Prime time recent movies, and in the 1980s, the growth of cable tv and home video, made feature films into ubiquitously accessible antiques, the Hollywood equivalent of Coca Cola Classic.

This mid-1970s creation of Hollywood Classic put Canada at a disadvantage in that we still had very little in the way of movie experience to bottle. We had neither the past spectacles to quote nor the first run blockbuster potential with which to quote it. There were few formulas, few defined genres, or hits big enough to justify a sequel. As was the case in 1948, we were once again out of synch. No sooner had we created Canadian and Quebec new waves, then new waves - or new wavism itself - was swept aside in favour of Hollywood Classic.

What Canada could and did do was to retreat into a kind of second tier. It became adept at hosting the festivals in which the remnants of new waves lived. The great

retrospective Joyce Nelson and I had envisioned, the one that would tie together the loose ends of our cinema, indeed happened at the Toronto Film Festival in 1984. It continues to happen every year at Perspective Canada - when for ten days or so in Toronto, we attend the spectacle of a national cinema. Similar cinematic Brigadoons are staged at other festivals around the country.

We have also sorted out an old adage in the film industry: that the problem with film as an art is that it is a business and the problem with film as a business is that it is an art. Canada has solved both problems by divorcing the business from the art. The Americans bring the business of cinema; we fund the less lucrative, more artistic films, through a combination of industry subsidies and arts council grants.

Another aspect of the second tier also made a small impact on Hollywood Classic. With the transformation of the CFDC into Telefilm in 1983, the bulk of Federal subsidy went either to feature films with a guaranteed television window or to Canadian television drama.

Television now serves as the theatrical exposure Canadian cinema has never been able to achieve. Television, mostly CBC, continues to provide an outlet for Canadian filmmakers. It may yet be, as Ken Finkleman suggested to us, a potentially viable means of creating and distributing work by emerging talents (the exact strategy used to create the New German cinema).

The downside of a reliance on television distribution keeps Canadian features in their second tier position. Compared to Hollywood films, our films as simulations without originals, work that recalls a successful theatrical release that never happened.

Nevertheless, Canada has, with some awkwardness, played pretty good catch up. We have responded and generally responded well to the historical contexts of cinema in which we found ourselves. When we were out of synch, we reacted with some creativity to the abrupt changes from each of those historical moments to the next. We made the right decision in moving from the expressed mandate of a state cinema to a de facto mandate of public filmmaking. We got smarter about distributing films and we patiently created elements of the infrastructure needed to maintain a quality industry.

Yet these arguments from historical context do not entirely answer the question: why is this public cinema not equivalent to a national cinema? Does it follow from Joyce Zemans' observation that our diversity is our collective expression?

It does and it doesn't.

It does for those who can conceive of the Canadian cinema experience in no other way.
In book, **So Close to the State/s,** Michael Dorland links this perspective to what he calls "scholarly forms of knowledge." Toward the beginning of his book, Dorland credits Joyce Nelson and I, along with other academic "pioneers" of positing Canadian cinema this way:

> Canadian cinema, however defined, was located in the ideal state, and in that sense, constituted an essential but underacknowledged dimension of statehood, or national identity. Although the actual state may have been reluctant or ambivalent in seeing matters in the same light, it was nonetheless, or so the proponents of a Canadian national cinema believed, at least open to the argument. In this sense, Canadian film studies can be seen as an *attempted* conversation with the state in the form of a discourse between intellectual or scholarly forms of knowledge and those forms of knowledge of which the state power is comprised. (Dorland, 19)

Having said this, Dorland then goes on to show why being called a Canadian film studies "pioneer" is not so much of a compliment after all. While we were attempting a conversation with "those forms of knowledge, of which the state power is comprised," it is not altogether clear to him that those forms of knowledge were interested in talking to us.

According to Dorland, government had its own agenda. Here he draws upon Foucault's concept of governmentality, which he summarizes as "a process of the limitless practices of administrative rationality." (146) Dorland then argues that the state rhetoric of film administration in Canada has been in the service of an inevitable goal that, from the outset had little to do with the connection that our other discourse was trying to make between cinema practice and national identity.

> ….what was being attempted, though it was never articulated as such, was nothing less than negotiating the passage from *the pre-captialist artisanal economy of film production*, as it had developed either within or on the margins of the audio visual production institutions of the state, to greater or lesser degrees of integration into the circuits of exchange of the international capitalist economy of audiovisual production or, as it has also been termed, entertainment software. (Dorland, 146)

It is the autonomy of an individual film as a product in the global marketplace rather than its coherence to a national ideal that in fact determines its success and thus, for those administering film policy, its legitimacy.

Dorland may not be happy about it, but his conclusion points to a public cinema shaped by a global marketplace. In doing so, it reflects Hollywood's most recent metamorphosis. The last dirty trick Hollywood will play on the aspirations of other filmmakers may well be its own disappearance - at least the disappearance of anything like the Hollywood currently dogging us.

This is, also what Ana Lopez concludes when writing about her native Mexican cinema trying to face up to Hollywood.

> In a global universe, 'facing up to' Hollywood has become an increasingly amorphous project. The extreme globalization of film production has made the idea of national cinemas more problematic than ever before. Alongside the eternal desire to use the medium to address national history and cultural values, all producers of national cinemas are also aware that much greater profits and prestige are to be found in a reconfigured international film market now driven by 'global' tastes. (Lopez, 434)

Lopez provides numerous examples of Latin American films that have succeeded in the United States before concluding:

> These multiple and diverse 'border crossings' point to the fact that film production, despite the continued financial hegemony of the Hollywood machine, has become as deterritorialized, diasporic and transnational as the rest of our world. (Lopez, 434-435)

Canada then may well lose this national treasure - the spectre of a culturally imperialistic American industry - the relentless antagonist, the litany of betrayal and outrageously unjust defeats that cements a unified people. And with that loss, I can now state with some confidence that one of three things will happen.

The first and most likely is that we continue our bifurcated discourse on Canadian cinema - the scholars positing a national unity that those actually making the films and administering film policy blissfully disregard. This bifurcation itself argues against a unified Canadian cinema. So does the great asterisk of Canadian national cinema, the cinema of Quebec. Quebec's filmmakers have long since replaced their overt political stance with a kind of aggressive normalcy. They depict a nation "as if" it were already sovereign - while the rest of us act "as if" it weren't.

In this first scenario, gender conscious, native and multi-cultural cinemas in Canada continue down the path chartered by Quebec. Regional ideologies (Cowboyism in Alberta, New Yorkism in Southern Ontario) manifest their north-south identities. Documentary, animation and the avant-garde work in isolation. And the umbrella of a national cinema continues to be stretched.

The second scenario takes us in the opposite direction. We accept Canadian cinema entirely within the context of globalism. Like the Mexicans, we realize that the internationalized Hollywood is as likely to distribute our films as to suppress them - so long as they are commercially viable. We celebrate Alliance/Atlantis as our contribution to the international network of major distributors. Then we go further and understand Canadian cinema as Canadians in the world: Deepa Mehta making films in and about India or, in retrospect, Norman Jewison. Our globalism also extends to a universality of concern within cinema itself. As observers and commentators, we acknowledge all film practices: shorts, the avant-garde and the documentary and beyond that to multimedia

productions. We find Canadian cinema in the many digital effects that Alias has designed for Hollywood productions.

The third, and so far most nebulous scenario, is a synthesis of the national and global understandings. There may be, after all a unifying strand to the Canadian experience, something between the commitment to diversity and the pragmatic collectivism that empowers the essential decency of Canadian life. We find this third option behind the move toward a public cinema and, for that matter, our assumption of an entitlement to cinema itself.

It is too early to say how the third option will express itself. Perhaps, in the end, it will be clearer to foreign audiences than to those of us who take its underlying sensibility for granted. But I think what we will be able to see running through much of the future of Canadian cinema is a certain nostalgia - not for a national identity that worked particularly well but perhaps for the naivete that believed it could.

Sources

Canadian Film and Television Production Association. **Annual Profile – 2001**. Ottawa: CFTPA, 2001.

Canadian Film Reader. Edited by Seth Feldman and Joyce Nelson. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Limited, 1977.

Dorland, Michael. **So Close to the State/s: The Emergence of Canadian Feature Film Policy**. Toronto : University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Fothergill, Robert. "Coward, Bully or Clown; The Dream Life of a Younger Brother" in **Canadian Film Reader**.

Gathercole, Sandra. "Statement from the Council of Canadian Filmmakers" in **Canadian Film Reader**.

Lopez, Ana M. "Facing Up to Hollywood" in **Reinventing Film Studies**. Edited by Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Magder, Ted. **Canada's Hollywood: The Canadian State and Feature Films.** Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Morris, Peter. **Embattled Shadows: A History of Canadian Cinema, 1895-1939.** Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978.

Pendakur, Manjunath. **Canadian Dreams and American Control: The Political Economy of the Canadian Film Industry**. Detroit : Wayne State University Press, 1990.

Veronneau, Pierre. "The First Wave of Quebec Feature Films, 1944-1953 in **Self-Portrait; Essays in Canadian and Quebec Cinemas.** Edited by Pierre Veronneau and Piers Handling. Ottawa: Canadian Film Institute, 1980.

Zemans, Joyce. **Where is Here? Canadian Cultural Policy in a Globalized World**. Toronto: Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies, 1996.