

**"IF IT AIN'T ON THE PAGE, IT AIN'T ON THE STAGE":
SCREENWRITING, NATIONAL SPECIFICITY
AND THE ENGLISH-CANADIAN FEATURE FILM**

Janice Kaye, Ph.D.
Rogers Communications Centre
Ryerson University
Toronto, ON
Canada
j.kaye@ryerson.ca

Charles H. Davis, Ph.D.
School of Radio and Television Arts
Faculty of Communication and Design
Rogers Communications Centre
Ryerson University
Toronto, ON
Canada
c5davis@ryerson.ca

11 June 2010

To appear in the *Journal of Screenwriting*

Introduction

Like other film-producing nations, Canada long ago underwent the colonization of its movie landscape by U.S. interests. Canada, though, holds the dubious distinction of having the lowest percentage in the world of its own movies on its own screens (*Focus 2009*) and has only recently produced a movie in English, set in Canada, which made back its production costs theatrically in Canada and was also distributed globally.¹ Canada's share of its own market in 2008 was 1.1% and has often been less.² The Canadian box-office take that year was almost a billion dollars (\$920 million) and all 23 English-language Canadian films combined, with an average budget of \$3 million, garnered only \$8.5 million of it.³ American films took \$815 million and about \$80 million came from other countries' movies.

While other nations also welcome American movies, the Canadian case is extreme. Living next to the most powerful country, Canada occupies – geographically, economically, linguistically and culturally – a position unique in the world. The historical and ongoing predicament of the lack of success of English-Canadian feature films has been variously attributed to similarities to the U.S. in language and culture, lower production budgets, and weaknesses in distribution, exhibition, marketing and "quality." The role of screenwriting, however, is little understood and rarely broached.

In this paper, we argue the importance of screenwriting in understanding national cinemas; show that it has institutional, sociological, and nation-specific dimensions; and

present Canada as an ideal case to begin examining such factors. The first dimension – the institutional – is defined by *auteurism* as well as the collaborative nature of production. The second – the sociological – is greatly affected by exclusionary networks and various levels of discrimination based on such factors as gender, ethnicity/race, age, sexuality and economic class. The nation-specific area pertains to diverse historical, cultural and institutional practices particular or exclusive to the country or region. English-Canada, for instance, experiences a unique and complex cultural policy environment. Moreover, its fractured and regional history is one which has resulted in the production of obsessively performed narratives of national identity, particularly imbricated with Québec, the U.S., Britain and France. Our analysis draws together strands of intersecting disciplines, combining film theory and history with industrial practices, close textual analyses, political economy and nation theory, calling for a more complete picture of the role of screenwriting in national cinemas.

Seeing Invisibility

Academics in some quarters have recently turned their attention to screenwriting. In Britain, Cook and Spicer call the discussion of screenwriting "a notable blind spot in both British cinema and television studies" (2008). The relative invisibility of screenwriting among academics is paralleled by obscurity in the industrial context. Anthropologist Prover calls Hollywood writers' positions "an occupational purgatory somewhere between celebrity and anonymity" and refers to "their virtual invisibility to the general

public” as “the hallmark of Hollywood writers” within the industry as well (1994: 10-11). Froug (1972) notes that writers are considered "a necessary nuisance" in the production process, their importance downgraded after a project has been approved or "greenlit" or, as Mehring puts it, "The screenwriter has always been and continues to be the low person on the totem pole" (1990: 1). Kohn writes that even American screenwriters surrender control to powerful gatekeepers, while the screenplay itself is "often ignored, insulted, cursed, fondled, battered, mutilated, victimized, shelved, piled, shredded, and fed to goats" (Kohn 2000: 491).

A growing body of research on work and labour in the creative industries highlights the occupational dynamics of cultural workers (Deuze, 2007; McKinlay and Smith, 2009). The first comprehensive sociological study of thousands of U.S. screenwriters, commissioned by the Writers Guild of America in 1987, was followed up in 1998 (Bielby & Bielby) and 2009 (WGA), presenting and analyzing data on incomes, genders, ages, races/ ethnicities, and industrial relationships. Because comparable comprehensive information is not available on Canadian writers, in 2008 we conducted interviews with 40 Toronto-based screenwriters contacted mostly through the Writers Guild of Canada. The Guild does not keep records on marital/ family status, age, gender, race/ ethnicity, sexuality or disability, and holds income statistics strictly confidential.

The Institutional Dimension of Screenwriting: *Auteurism* and Collectivity

As the show-business adage has it, regarding the foundational importance of writing for theatre and now for the screen, "If it ain't on the page, it ain't on the stage." Simonton (2005) found that the screenplay constitutes the most important factor in a film's winning an Academy Award®, confirming writing's significance in that arena: "[N]o component of filmmaking is more indicative of aesthetic merit than the screenplay" (95).

Nevertheless, screenwriting and screenwriters have long been effaced in favour of directors and directing, whether or not the director is the writer.

The effacement of the writer has occurred mainly through the two overarching historical and industrial elements of *auteurism* and the collaborative production process, both of which are entrenched in the business of production. The now culturally pervasive *auteur* theory⁴ began showcasing the director in the 1950s and was designed in part to ridicule the stodgy literary period pieces common in French filmmaking and known as the *tradition de qualité*. The strategy resulted in the global trend of the acclaimed "New Waves" of the '50s and '60s, specifically Italian Neo-Realism, the French New Wave, and Britain's New Cinema, all of which affected national cinemas, including Canadian, and which valorized directors as "authors" of a film. In contrast, the screenwriters of silent cinema, who were mostly women, went uncredited on-screen until Canadian writer-producer-director-actor Nell Shipman (*Back to God's Country*, 1919) lobbied for writer credits in a 1912 article (Virta). *Auteurism* thus effectively transferred control from writers to directors.

It is somewhat paradoxical that, while *auteurism* in film valorizes the director over the group, the famously collaborative nature of production elevates the unit over its individuals. The director is therefore contradictorily both a "star" and one of the group. His rise (as Bielby and Bielby prove, directors are overwhelmingly male) then comes at the expense of the screenwriter, the only "above-the-line" player (as opposed to "below-the-line" employees) whose contribution can be minimized as not being part of the visual production process. It became, and remains, journalistic practice to imply that the director is responsible for every aspect of a film, including the story, whereas there can be vastly differing degrees of involvement.⁵ Some directors do, however, give writers their due: Francis Coppola (*The Godfather* movies), also a writer, said:

Throughout my career, whenever I made a film I always put on the title: Mario Puzo's *The Godfather*, or Bram Stoker's *Dracula* – because I always hoped one day I could have a film that was Francis Coppola's. To do that though I had to write the story and the script, because I had no right to say it was mine if someone else had written it – because writing is the most difficult part.

-- AFP, 2009

The writer's position is also paradoxical in that he (as Bielby and Bielby also prove, most U.S. screenwriters are also male) is accorded more visibility for having written the film he directed, but less visibility as a writer because writing itself is devalued in favour of the visuals, i.e. the direction. Direction is viewed as separable from the writing, while writing is contrarily lost in direction, in perception rather than reality.

Double Academy Award®-winning American screenwriter William Goldman, who emphasizes collaboration over *auteurism*, claims, "[E]ven if you're involved with the

making of a film, it's damn near impossible to say who is responsible for what" (1983: 102). For instance, a cinematographer is sometimes much more experienced than a director. It has been said that a film is made in the editing room, because editors have ideas about and influence over the order, number and length of scenes. Moreover, the producer or studio might be authorized to step in and take over the picture or demand changes. A production designer's contribution can be as visual as that of a director. It may be the casting director's idea to hire a particular performer. Actors and directors may clash on interpretation and a battle of wills ensue; or an actor may be hired to play a role, but a star could have more influence. It is producers who hire directors, so their input can be significant. A Steven Spielberg movie is seen as a director's movie; a Tom Cruise movie, an actor's movie; one with both is likely to be portrayed as a blockbuster. Whoever is better known usually gets the promotional, journalistic and public credit or blame for the work. That person, however, is not the writer, even if the screenwriter is also a novelist or playwright, such as a Michael Crichton or David Mamet. Names of that stature and their work draw major stars and directors and, in these cases, the writer receives some secondary marketing attention and sometimes adaptation award nominations. A director's movie is seen as part of an oeuvre, but the body of work of a screenwriter who is "only" a screenwriter is rarely acknowledged or examined.⁶

Goldman seems understandably loath to give a director credit for a screenplay unless he, the director, wrote it. Goldman more than intimates that directors receive credit for the storytelling laid out by screenwriters. He even states that, when he first heard about the "*auteur* theory," he thought it a joke and waited for the punchline: "I have never met

another fellow technician, not a single cinematographer or producer or editor, who believes it. I haven't even met a *director* who believes it" (1983: 100). Two decades earlier, writer-director-actor Orson Welles had an even lower opinion of the director's involvement:

There are more bad directors at work than people know, because it's the only profession...in the world where you can be incompetent and go on being successful for 30 years with nobody ever discovering it...I mean utterly and truly incompetent...because the only job that a director can do in a film, of real value, is to do something more than what will happen automatically if the story is put on, if the actors are good...If a director is *something* of a cameraman, *something* of a cutter, *something* of an actor, *something* of a writer, and preferably *completely* a cameraman, *completely* a writer, *completely* an actor, then his contribution is a real one. Otherwise he's simply the man that says, 'Action, cut, take it a little slower, take it a little faster,' and nobody'll ever discover that he doesn't know anything.⁷

The *auteur* innovation from France contributed to the notion that film could be elevated to an art, far from its humble beginnings as a technological marvel and low-brow amusement. The convention has now blurred the borders between art and commerce, "show" and "business," as well as between director and writer.

In France, Truffaut was fighting for directors against writers. Other countries' filmmakers may have developed the writer-director role in response to other kinds of cultural hegemony, such as those imposed on them by their cultural colonizer, be it Australia on New Zealand; the U.K. on Scotland, Ireland and Wales; Japan on Taiwan's early cinema; and the U.S. on almost everybody. There may also be fewer approvals and interventions by financiers and state funding bodies when a single filmmaker both writes and directs. While *auteur* movies have been conceived of as "artistic" but not "commercial" (Simonton, 2005), we would argue that such distinctions and binaries, while generally

accepted, are illusory and ought not to be pursued. Some *auteurs* are commercially successful, others are not; many so-called "artistic" films make money; some so-called "commercial" films are financial failures. One must also refer to the other post-World War II definition of *auteur*, i.e. a director who does not write movies but has a definable and recognizable stylistic or generic body of work (such as Ford, Hitchcock, Hawks, Nicholas Ray, etc.). Scorsese and Coppola are considered *auteurs* even though they do not always write their movies, while Woody Allen always writes his own, some of which make money, many of which do not. Many extremely high-budget movies crash, from *Heaven's Gate* in 1980 to *Norbit* in 2007, to mention only a couple. *The Wizard of Oz* (1939), *It's a Wonderful Life* (1939) and *Citizen Kane* (1941) are high-profile examples of classics which were not box office successes. Furthermore, such international movies as *Slumdog Millionaire* (2008, co-directed by Briton Danny Boyle and India's Loveleen Tandan, and written by Briton Simon Beaufoy from Vikas Swarup's Indian novel; both Boyle, but not Tandan, and Beaufoy won Oscars®), *Chocolat* (2000, directed by Sweden's Lasse Hallström, and written by American Robert Nelson Jacobs who was Oscar®- and BAFTA-nominated for his adaptation of the book by U.K. novelist Joanne Harris). Other international hits include *Amélie* (2001, by veteran French director and second co-writer Jean-Pierre Jeunet, with Guillaume Laurant credited first); *Cinema Paradiso* (1988, BAFTA-winning Italy/France co-pro, directed and co-written by veteran Giuseppe Tornatore and collaborating writer Vanna Paoli); *Life is Beautiful* (1997, Oscar®- and BAFTA-winning Italian feature directed by Roberto Benigni who starred and shares writing credit with frequent collaborator Vincenzo Cerami); *The Full Monty*

(1997, written by the aforementioned Simon Beaufoy who later wrote *Slumdog Millionaire*, and Brit Peter Cattaneo).

All these movies either fly in the face of, or demand re-examination both of the *auteur* theory and the false "artistic" vs. "commercial" dichotomy. Assumptions may exist that a director with a vision can also recognize or write an effective script, which may or may not be the case. Movies which connect with audiences, both emotionally and financially (i.e. at the box office) are not always *auteur* movies; those with separate writers and directors can be and are highly successful on all levels, as the above examples illustrate. When made, these movies had no Hollywood star actors, star directors, imprimatur or Hollywood-level marketing budgets, even if some participants (such as Hallström) may be well known in their home countries. Yet these films found audiences, made international actors well known, earned millions and became recognized worldwide. *Slumdog Millionaire*, for example, began its North American journey to fame and Oscar® as the audience favourite at the 2008 Toronto film festival. Thus in a globalized world, international talent cooperation can be seen as increasingly important; and Canada, with more co-production treaties than any country in the world, is already positioned to take advantage of transnational connections.

The films of most of English Canada's *auteurs*, such as Atom Egoyan, Jeremy Podeswa and Guy Maddin, are touted as award-winning artistic "hits," screen at Cannes and other festivals, but are not successful at the box office. Egoyan's most commercially successful film is the first one he did not write: *Chloe* (2010) has been released in the U.S. and

already recouped US\$3 million of its \$11-million budget. David Cronenberg's two most successful films at the box office (both have almost earned back their budgets theatrically, not counting lucrative secondary windows) are ones he has not written: *Eastern Promises* (2007), a U.K./Canada/ U.S. co-production/co-venture, is by a British screenwriter and has no ostensible Canadian content; *A History of Violence* (2005), is a U.S./German co-production and not "certified Canadian" at all. Cronenberg greatly values the writing; *Playback* reported that he believes that "the ultimate factor in deciding which project to make next will be the script," and notes that *Eastern Promises* screenwriter Steve Knight (*Dirty Pretty Things*) "has the only writing credit on the film...As it should be." Cronenberg also said, "I wish my movies were more commercial...If you're making a movie that costs US\$32 million, which is what *History* cost, or US\$27 million, which *Promises* cost, well, that's a lot of money. So being the resolute Canadian that I am, I take that seriously" (Ayscough, 2007). In other words, the *auteur* function has become blurred. Are Cronenberg and Egoyan *auteurs* when they don't write their films? Maddin writes all his films, which are considered eccentric art films (the budget of *Saddest Music in the World*, 2003, was \$3.5 million CDN and made some \$600,000, then his later faux documentary *My Winnipeg*, 2007, was budgeted at just \$600,000 and earned only \$150,000). Podeswa's latest, *Fugitive Pieces* (2007), cost \$12 million CDN and made \$634,379 US in limited release Paul Gross' *Passchendaele* (2008) made a record \$4.5 million CDN at the Canadian box office, but it cost \$20 million to make.⁸ Are *auteurs* writers, or not writers, or sometimes writers? If the story is the most important factor in a film's success, why are writers marginalized and directors given huge budgets to write and direct movies that fail? While screenwriter Goldman has

claimed, "Nobody knows anything" (1983: 39-41), the relationships are nevertheless complex and varied, and need to be further researched.

The Sociological Dimension of Screenwriting: Exclusion and Discrimination

In theorizing screenwriting as creative labour, Conor emphasizes the importance of widening the discussion of screenwriting from the confines of the art/*auteur* discourse while noting the marginalization of screenwriters:

The liminal status of the screenwriter as an author/artist and the questionable status of the screenplay as literature or art (visible in the rhetoric of the *auteur* theory for example) are important elements of broader arguments for crude marginalization and brutalization of screenwriting but these arguments cannot be viewed in isolation. (2009: 37-8)

Recent research on media workers has shown their often precarious and contingent working conditions, the challenges of developing and managing portfolio careers, and the frequent tensions between the dynamics of creative activity and commerce (Deuze, 2007; McKinlay and Smith, 2009; Simonton, 2005). The types of exclusionary networks and biases documented in other media labour markets (Christopherson, 2008: 2-4) also exist in screenwriting. For instance, the dominant and highest-paid group in U.S. screenwriting remains young white males, with little improvement in inclusion from 1987 to 2008. That situation perpetuates the exclusion of other groups, such as women, older writers (more prevalent and higher paid until younger writers took over in the late '80s) and writers of colour, through discrimination on the bases of gender, age and race/

ethnicity (Bielby & Bielby, 1998, 1987; Bielby, 2009), with work on sexuality and economic class not yet executed.

The overwhelming majority – 37 out of 40 – of the writers who responded to our requests for interviews were white, Canadian-born and of a variety of European backgrounds; 9 of those were Jewish, 2 claimed Lebanese/Irish or Irish/Lebanese extraction (but did not consider themselves Middle Eastern or West Asian), 1 was Franco-Ontarian; and 3 of the 40 were Indo-Canadian or South Asian. Twenty-four were men and 16 women. Some respondents found that some hirers preferred to match writers with socio-demographic audience attributes, i.e. younger white males or women writers for certain genres. Such practices exclude, segregate, limit or marginalize writers not "belonging" to a particular group. Three-quarters had experienced or observed discrimination themselves or knew of others who had, based on gender, age, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation or any other factor. Every woman except one (15 out of 16) had observed gender bias against women. None of the 24 men mentioned gender bias against women, one stated that women were in control of decision-making in the industry (though this is not borne out by fact); some claimed not to be able to speak for those who did experience gender or racial discrimination; and several supported inclusivity. One young woman thought a writer had to be a certain kind of woman to work in the industry — relaxed, easygoing and willing to laugh at herself. She said that, as a woman, “You can’t cause sh**, you have to let people know you won’t cause sh**.” Some have been told whites can’t "write Black" or vice versa. One white woman said she had experienced "reverse racism," i.e. having been told by employers they needed African-Canadian or "ethnic" writers. One young

woman mentioned an openly anti-gay bias in the "writing rooms" (workplaces where TV series writers gather to write collectively), complete with epithets.

Research in Canada as well as the United States has noted the white-male-dominated nature of film and television (WIFT 2004). The percentage of women in the Writers Guild of Canada amounted to only 30.6 per cent of total membership in 2004 (WIFT, 2004: 174-5). While some women we interviewed were able to earn more than \$100,000 CDN, they experienced more gender- and age-based discrimination than did men, were more likely to work in television, and tended to have their careers cut short in their 50s. McCreadie (2005) notes that many women screenwriters, virtually shut out of U.S. feature film, have gone into television, with more control and freedom in their work, but less pay. Christopherson (2009) also observes the huge income gaps between white men and women and minorities, and that the excluded groups are less likely to work in film. More Canadian writers, both men and women, work in television because film is considered a cottage industry where nobody makes much money.

As the latest U.S. study shows, ageism is rife in the industry (D. Bielby, 2009). Our preliminary Canadian interviews seem to support her data, with women's views being that women screenwriters virtually disappear from the scene in their 40s and 50s. Rather than considering ageism discrimination, however, one male respondent in our survey called it just one of the "realities of my business." Men were able to extend their careers into their 70s and even to 80, while most women expected their prospects to dwindle as they aged. The oldest writer took the perspective that racism, ageism and sexism were all problems,

while none of the five men in their 20s had any age concerns. One younger writer expressed fear of marginalization by getting "out of step with time and fashion" and becoming too "peripheral or irrelevant" to be convincing. An older writer said, "You have to ask yourself, 'Am I the only guy in step in this parade?'" Asked a 28-year old writer, "Why would you take advice from a 50-year-old guy on what a 13-year old thinks?" That view evolved since the early 1980s when older writers, who are actually those likely to have teenaged children, had a much larger share of the market and higher incomes than the young men who now have an overwhelming demographic and financial edge. Our preliminary findings show the need for further national screenwriter studies.

The Nation-Specific Dimension of Screenwriting: Audiences, Policies and Identities

The national screen arts of many countries and cultures have been examined by film scholars in the wake of influential texts on issues of nation and postcolonial theory by Anderson (1983), Bhabha (1994, 1990), Naficy (2001), Shohat and Stam (1994), and others. In the field of national cinemas, Schaffer (1988), Elsaesser (1989), Hayward (1993, 2005), Kinder (1993), Chow (1995) and others have explored the cultural specificities of various countries and cultures, including Canada (McGregor, 1985; Harcourt, 1994; Ramsay, 1994; Armatage, et al, 2001; Gittings, 2002), through nation or gender. Incorporating the nation-specific nature of audiences, policies and identities into the consideration of business, social and cultural practices will broaden the investigative perspective of the screen arts.

Countries negotiate, present and understand their national identities and relationships with Hollywood cinema differently. Even though we posed no questions to the screenwriters about the U.S., they all referred to the U.S. in their answers because the American influence on Canada is so significant. In his seminal 1972 article on Canadian film, "Coward, Bully or Clown: The Dream Life of a Younger Brother," Fothergill positions Canada as the younger brother unable to match the sexual prowess and monetary status of the elder brother, the U.S. Having avoided an Oedipal revolution and not effectively separated from their joint parent, Britain, the little brother is a failed loser with an attractive and powerful elder sibling. The concept emerges in film with Americans as cowboys, not only in Fothergill's thesis but in the ensuing three decades (*Eliza's Horoscope*, 1970; *Paperback Hero*, 1973; *The Grey Fox*, 1985; *Gunless*, 2010) overbearing bosses (*Dirty Tricks*, 1979; *Deadline*, 1979; *By Design*, 1981), or attractive sibling-coded relatives (*My American Cousin*, 1985; *American Boyfriends*, 1989; *Perfectly Normal*, 1993). In discussing German cinema, Esaesser refers to "a whole generation of Germans [who] grew up with the schizophrenic experience of watching John Wayne ride through Monument Valley, or Humphrey Bogart wander down those mean streets, while their (German) voices never left the cavernous spaces of the dubbing studio" (1983: 12). Gopalan (2002) has proposed the conventions of the singing and dancing love affairs of India's popular commercial movie industry as a "cinema of interruptions." Like Canadian cinema, Bollywood holds strategies other than "seamless narrative" as paramount. India's cinema, however, was long protected against U.S. incursions and developed its own popular style. Italy, by the same token, had its "White

Telephone" films, France its "*tradition de qualité*" before the New Wave; Australia, Hong Kong, Spain, China and other countries and regions have all had various film movements. National cinemas represent issues in film based on their own complex histories, cultures, problems and goals.

Audiences

The most common and urgent sentiment emerging from the national discourse around Canadian film and television in the last decade is the repetitively stated necessity, for purposes of cultural and national survival, of "telling our own stories." The phrase, regularly reiterated on Canadian stages, radio, television, and in political and cultural debate, is presented as unproblematic. As Anderson's important theory of nation (1983) tells us, nations are "imagined communities," where all citizens cannot know one another and yet believe, often fervently, in tropes and expressions of their kinship, connection or shared identity. Cultural and national identities, however, are not monolithic and can be elusive and in flux. If Canadian movies are in fact "telling our own stories," who is listening? Who is writing? And who are "we"?

With no protection from English-language competition in its own film markets, the Canadian government has tried unsuccessfully over the decades to implement various restrictions, taxes and quotas. In summary of such negotiations, "The Americans have come to know and love us as the country which, given an inch, will take half an inch and go away happy" (Gathercole, 36). In the face of U.S. threats of retaliation in other industries, the government has repeatedly withdrawn from proposed measures. In

contrast, Québec film and TV in French succeed mightily without such protection, most obviously but not exclusively because of the protective linguistic difference.⁹ Movies in English, however, suffer an extreme dearth of attendance, popularity and financial success, almost never recouping at the box office anything close to their production costs.

From 2001 through 2008, Telefilm Canada (the Crown Corporation which is the main funding body of the cinematic arts, now acting and credited as a producer) funded 254 feature-length films in English, including certified Canadian-only feature films, both fiction and documentary; treated co-productions – Canada has treaties with 53 countries; and co-ventures (productions with countries with whom Canada does not have a co-production treaty), the latter two categories qualifying as "certified Canadian" through a point system (www.telefilm.ca). Telefilm has established a goal of 5% of Canadian screens for Canadian movies. That number was reached only once, in 2005, but occurred only because of the success of French-language films. English-language films still languish in the range of 0.8% (2003) to 1.7% (2006). In contrast, Québec-made movies in French earned \$17.4 million at the French-language box-office for a 13.8% share. In 2005, 11 features made at least \$1 million, and the market share soared to 27% (CFTPA *Profile 2009*: 74). English-Canadian audiences have, in the words of Hollywood mogul Samuel Goldwyn, "stayed away in droves" (en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Samuel_Goldwyn) from Canadian movies in English, and Canadian movies in French are rarely if ever subtitled and distributed in English-Canada. What accounts for such a lack of success for English-Canada films? Various reasons cited earlier include deficits in exhibition, distribution, marketing and "quality." Until some recent institutional initiatives, such as

the Writer's First program in Telefilm's Feature Film Fund, begun in 2000 and now under review,¹⁰ and the Training Gaps Analysis (CHRC, 2009) in showrunning, little attention has been paid to the importance of screenwriting.

In 2003, veteran Canadian movie producer Peter O'Brian said, "When a bunch of Canadians get in a room to talk about making a Canadian movie in English, the entertainment factor goes out the window." Screenwriters told him they do not want to tell stories the way Americans do (Kaye, 2003). Canadian films indeed have not adhered until recently to what is sometimes called "narrative transparency," the type of storytelling seen to be accessible and comprehensible to general audiences. Narrative transparency contributes powerfully to the competitive advantage of Hollywood's business model (Olson, 1999). Bordwell prefers to define classical narration as "a particular configuration of normalized options for representing the fabula [story] and for manipulating the possibilities of syuzhet [plot] and style" (1985: 157). Whether intentional or not, Canadian filmmakers have, overall, evolved an unconventional, non-Hollywood narrative method. Monk notes the preponderance of what she calls "fractured" or "fragmented" narrative, sexual repression, family issues, and lack of closure (2001: 288). Kaye discusses the obsessively Canadian storytelling and calls its dislocations "narrativus interruptus," relating them through Butler's "performativity" theory to certain thorny issues of gendered national identity in film (2007). Few Canadian movies escape such narrative tensions and ruptures, which include discrete plot segments, incomprehensible or slim storylines, new characters introduced late or for no apparent reason, loose plots threads; unlikable, undeveloped and unmotivated

protagonists (noted as silent losers by Feldman), lack of conflict or strong antagonist, lack of character names or conversely the presence of female naming, lack of foreshadowing and suspense, unmotivated violence, lack of developed sub-plots, lack of cohesive or coherent character development, lack of classical structure and pacing, little suturing, slow or extremely fast pacing, ensemble- rather than star-based casting, and few happy endings. The stories tend to stall or break down, genres are combined unsuccessfully if not randomly, and movies often concentrate on factors other than plot, character and visual pleasure. Close textual analyses reveal **distinct and repeated tropes and patterns** (Kaye 2007).

In the Tax-Shelter Era of the late 1970s and early '80s, the lack of craft training and experience were well known in the industry and acknowledged in the media. In 1977, critic Knelman wrote of the period when Toronto and Canada became known as "Hollywood North" for making unsuccessful, large-budget movies with Canadian producers, second-string American stars and expatriate Canadians: "The scripts were inadequate because we had no trained screenwriters, and money was given to people who had almost no preparation for making movies" (98). A quarter-century later, critic Howell noted, "Most of the films on Canada's Top Ten [critics list] don't hold to conventional three-act narratives...There isn't a popcorn flick amongst the lot...Handling [former head of the Toronto International Film Festival] believes that Canadians want to see more Canadian films, but they need encouragement and access."

The notion of a waiting Canadian public is popular in the discourse of "telling our own stories" and one supported by some studies. In 1998, an Angus Reid survey of 1,501 Canadians showed that 73% wanted Canadian movies to be available on Canadian screens. An Ekos survey the next year found that 80% of Canadians believed in government arts and culture funding and 92% considered "attending a performance of a Canadian artist or seeing a Canadian film" important to their "sense of belonging." One director-writer interviewed agreed that "Canadians are desperate to see Canadian films," but "[t]here's a barrier to get Canadians to see Canadian films because of bitter experience," i.e. having seen and not liked or understood them. He continued, "A film is simply a sentence: it has a subject, object and predicate...A Canadian film has no verb...You have to start at the grass roots so people understand the name of the game – story and plot. Without the conflict, there's no place to go...The proof is borne out in the success of the films."

While the Canadians polled may want, or say they want, to see Canadian films, they in fact do not go to see them. One survey showed that a film's country of origin mattered little, cited by just 21% of respondents. A much more significant element of influence was story, cited by 69%, followed by word-of-mouth at 62%. Only 7% in any age group felt strongly that "the stories in Canadian movies relate to them" (Decima, 2005: 24, 62-3).

It seems that, as far as the Canadian movie-going public is concerned, "we" are not successfully "telling our own stories."

Another contributing factor may be the proverbial "brain drain" of high-level writers and potential mentors who move to the U.S. One successful Toronto writer-producer lamented, "Sadly, I'm the best we've got." More than 10% (approximately 200) of the 1,885 Writers Guild of Canada members live in Los Angeles (WGC, 2008), and many writers who achieved initial success in Canada (Paul Haggis, David Shore, Lionel Chetwynd, Joe Wiesenfeld, Graham Yost, Donald Martin) write in L.A. for American, and therefore Canadian, consumption. Only recently have Canadian writers in L.A. been approached to write Canadian material (Martin wrote the 2008 Céline Dion bio-pic which aired on CBC).

Cultural Policy

Problems with Canadian film are sometimes attributed to the nebulous "quality" of films. Some observers, like Globerman, see the film business as a meritocracy, assuming the filmmaking "cream" will rise to the top (1991). Gasher directly refutes Globerman with arguments about Canadian specificity and the complexity of power relations (1992). Canada, for instance, remits its box-office receipts to a foreign country — the U.S., which has long considered it part of the American film industry's "North American" or "domestic" market. Canada's cultural policy is extremely influential in decisions about what does and does not get made.

Cultural policy is so influential that Canadian academic film and television history has been written largely through its lens and the failures of government policy proposed by a series of Secretaries of State across the decades well documented elsewhere (Gathercole, 1983; Magder, 1990; Raboy, 1990; Pendakur, 1990; Posner, 1993; Dorland, 1998; Magder and Burstyn, 2001; Raboy & Shtern, 2010).¹¹ The screenwriters interviewed expressed the maddening necessity of government funding described by some as a "necessary evil," and a few would rather do without the funds at all than deal with the agencies. They also expressed concerns about "quality," as well as gatekeeper ineffectiveness, lack of competitiveness, negative effects of regional funding, and international irrelevance. Almost every writer (37 out of 40) spoke about a lack of vision, courage, script-reading knowledge, or recognition of or respect for writers, on the part of bureaucrats, executives or producers. Twenty-eight out of 40 expressed a negative view of Canadian competition in the marketplace, using the words "can't compete," "competitive," "uncommercial" or "engage" and almost half (19 out of 40) deemed the screenwriting or the products mediocre, using the words "mediocrity," "mediocracy" (sic), "boring," "crap," "parochial," "no story sense" or lack of "standards." They blamed abrupt regulatory changes; outdated or undefined cultural or national imperatives; and uncertainty about fund requirements, resulting in a substantial lack of control. Eight mentioned Canada's place in world cinema and TV as insignificant or irrelevant. A significant percentage (10 out of 40) thought Canadians should nevertheless be doing work that is "not American," not blockbusters or not "imitating" Hollywood. They talked at greater length about cultural policy, institutions and Canadian specificity than any

other subject, although most of the questions were about their habits, personal background, surroundings and city.

The subject of regional funding came up, even though no particular question was posed. Rather than competing for the same production dollars and tax credits, several screenwriters (7 of the 40) preferred Toronto as a single strong production centre, the third-largest after Los Angeles and New York, to the perceived fragmentation and dilution of regionalism. One older writer-director with U.S. experience offered, "We have an especial curse of regionalism. A film industry in Regina? Are you f***ing kidding me?" He believed that once creative people are spread out, the whole structure weakens. "Why are we pitting these regions against each other?" he asked. "The U.S. doesn't suffer from this kind of regionalism." He noted that shooting *Lonesome Dove* in Calgary does not create a film business or careers there, adding, "They didn't move the industry to Utah to create the myth of the Western just because it was shot there."

Regionalism, though, has been a factor in Canadian cinema since its inception. In the silent era, important filmmaking centers sprang up in small towns as far-flung as Brandon, Manitoba and Trenton, Ontario. The first use of the new technology was as a government-funded tool to attract European immigrants to the west. The Canadian Pacific Railway and American production companies were involved in shooting films for this nation-building project (Morris, 1978: 30-38, 64-82). Fairness to the regions has thus emerged as a Canadian value or convention and Telefilm, with several regional offices, spreads the federal money around its four offices – the "Western Region," the Atlantic Region, Québec, and the "Ontario and Nunavut" region. The ongoing denial of Toronto

as the centre of English-language filmmaking in Canada could be extrapolated and analyzed in terms of Toronto's "placelessness" on screen (Matheson, 2004).

Few writers interviewed were yet concerned about Internet copyright policy or authorship which traditionally lead to remuneration; they regarded such issues as being of concern only to writers already making a great deal of money on famously successful American shows. They cited reasons of uncertainty and the developmental state of the Internet, as well as confidence that writers and content would always be required, no matter the delivery system. (These views may change as digital copyright laws get enacted.) A few were already working on the Web, creating content of various kinds and thinking multi-platform. Because their WGA contract operates as a buyout, they would generate no further income for their work if it were streamed online, because producers hold the copyright. Increasingly, however, the manner in which writers network may change in the wake of such Web-based companies as www.inktip.com, which puts screenwriters in direct contact with those in a position to hire them. Furthermore, if Canadian movies were available online and there were still few takers, it would become harder to argue access as the problem.

Telefilm Canada last year began yet another change in policy direction for Canadian film and television. At the 2009 CFTPA annual conference, then-Telefilm head Wayne Clarkson cited a report examining how European countries support their film industries, including video-on-demand and the Internet. He reported that U.K. viewers watch an average of 78 films year, and only three in cinemas. "It is not about box office," he said.

"It is about Canadian audiences, whatever the platform." While Clarkson, by his remarks, seems concerned only with Canadian audiences, one producer took a broader approach: "We can't just make movies for Canada. We're going for an English-language movie that looks like an American movie...that can travel around the world." Other panellists suggested that any new models or legislation would need to address non-traditional distribution and marketing options, and that fewer and higher-budget Canadian movies be made. *Playback* reported "that 'money' stopped being a dirty word, even among the most artsy in attendance, and the word 'audience' was heard regularly...All seem to agree that the law must reflect the rapidly changing broadcasting landscape so Canada can compete both at home and on the global stage." There was also talk of the need to revise both the Broadcasting Act and the rules for co-production treaties with an eye toward global distribution.¹²

In wondering why Canada's films are not more successful, Denmark-based researchers Vang and Chaminade suggest using industrial strategies to leverage success in producing "runaways," asking "how to facilitate the spillovers into the local industry supporting the development of an indigenous industry" (2007, 413). Foreign location production, however, not only will not translate into the writing or directing of Canadian movies, but was not intended to do so. It is considered an economic boon to regions. "Runaways" engage below-the-line labour only, while the American above-the-line talent retain the major creative and financial decisions (Davis and Kaye, 2010).

The Canadian industry is not only still young but also exists in a young country.

Canada's thorny industrial problems in film are compounded by complex historical relationships. Its fractured and wounded history is inextricably linked to aspects of national identity which themselves spill over into its movies.

Identities: The "Two Solitudes" and Canadian Coming-of-Age

In the face of all other possibilities and stated policy goals, Canadian movies are thinly disguised and repetitive performances of nation.

Harcourt has noted:

If we are Nationalists and believe in ourselves as Canadians, the American product really is the enemy – both in the cinemas and on television: not because it is bad in itself (which it obviously isn't) but because by monopolizing our screens it has colonized our imaginations, offering its product as if it were our own...when we don't find those qualities in our own films, we tend to think of them as inferior (1977: p. 165).

A new sense of national identity emerged with Expo '67 (the World's Fair in Montreal) and (Prime Minister Pierre) Trudeau's long tenure and helped galvanize the creation of the Canadian Film Development Corporation (CFDC), the forerunner of Telefilm, to fund feature films. Movie culture until then had come from somewhere else – Hollywood, which Miller, et al, call "an invitation to replication and domination, an invitation both desired and disavowed" (*Global Hollywood* 2001: 1). Canada is the embodiment of that contradictory invitation. Harcourt has suggested that Canada itself is, to an even greater extent than many other countries, a postmodern nation, maintaining that Canada is perhaps "an unfinished text," even "insufficiently imagined" (1994: 5-26).

Canada's national narratives, chief among them the "Two Solitudes" of English and French Canada, may still be insufficiently imagined. The Two Solitudes¹³ and the resulting animosity between the two groups, stem from the 1759 Battle of the Plains of Abraham in Québec, marking the "founding" of what would become Canada. The ongoing conflicts between the two cultures and languages have been acted out, usually indirectly and unacknowledged, in Canadian movies. Some results have been filmic themes of family dysfunction, siblings or sibling-coded characters and twins, plus outright or subtextual incest (Monk, 2001; Kaye, 2007). Cinematic representations of Britain and France in parental roles, Québec as brother, sister, cousin or lover, and the U.S. in a position of power or authority appear almost compulsively. Such complex recurring representations are expressed performatively, to use Butler's word (1993). In other words, Canada's historical national problems have played out obsessively onscreen and in familial and often Freudian terms (Kaye, 2007). This is true even when considering the more recent diasporic filmmaking of such *auteurs* as Deepa Mehta (*Sam and Me*, 1991), Mina Shum (*Double Happiness*, 1994) and Charles Officer (*Nurse.Fighter.Boy*, 2008) – all coming-of-age films.

Further to Fothergill's thesis of Freudian siblings, an inordinate number of movies took up the most prevalent genre in the history of Canadian filmmaking – the coming-of-age.

In describing *Who Has Seen the Wind* (1977), Harcourt in 1978) called the film

a distinguished example of what is really a Canadian genre: films that create the world through the eyes of a young child...If we extend the age to take in adolescents, then the list of films is enormous — in

terms of richness and productivity, virtually the Canadian equivalent of the American Western! (2002: 64).

He by no means overstates the case, which stretches even further when women protagonists are included. The sibling and incest themes begin with *Explosion* (the first movie in English funded by the CFDC in 1967)¹⁴ and the jealousy and sexual desires of two border-crossing brothers; it continues with Caroline's two lovers and her father in *Waiting for Caroline* (1967), the mother and son in *Angela* (1976), the brother and sister in *Summer's Children* (1976), the cousins in Chabrol's *Blood Relatives* (1978),¹⁵ the brother and sister and mother in *The Wars* (1980), the aunt and nephew in *Alligator Shoes* (1982), the twin brothers in Cronenberg's *Dead Ringers* (1988), the brother and sister in *Blood* (2004), the daughter and dead father in *Marion Bridge* (2004), and the mother and son in Maddin's *Brand Upon the Brain!* (2007), to mention a few.¹⁶ Furthermore, young women protagonists were often used to stand in for the nation: *Wendy* (1966), *Waiting for Caroline* (1967),¹⁷ *Madeleine Is...* (1970), and *Eliza's Horoscope* (1970), all avoiding the American heroic male model and at the same time representing difficult aspects of a young country's "growing up." In addition to the plethora of films seeing the world through a coming-of-age lens, there are entire groups of films featuring blindness, fetishistic limb amputations, bilingual female naming, frustrated artists and intellectuals, and cultural or sexual anxiety leading to madness – all ways of acting out various dimensions of Canadian identity. One film from the Tax-Shelter Era deals particularly with a Canadian screenwriter, highly successful in the U.S., whose life falls apart when he tries to write Canadian movies (Kaye 2007).

Taking up Atwood's concept of the negative in *Survival* (1972: 35), Monk says Canadian movies take up "negative space" (2001: 92, 89-109), which Leach (6) had seen as an "absence." Canadian movies and Canadian identity are often described as "not American," "not British," "not French." "There is always something 'missing' in Canadian movies," as Monk puts it. The "something missing" is partly the First Nations component of Canadian history, plus the immigrant and diaspora experiences, left until recently outside the duality of the Two Solitudes. While First Nations, Métis, Inuit and multicultural immigrant populations have all variously been called a "Third Solitude" in the media since 2006, the aboriginal nations might more correctly be seen as the "First Solitude" and the real foundation of Canada (Saul, 2008). Since the 1990s, screenwriters have increasingly explored a "thirdspace of identity," to use Naficy's phrase for the space of the "other." It is ironic and perhaps fitting then that one of the first high-earning Canadian movies would be neither in French nor in English but in Inuktitut – *Atanarjuat: The Fast Runner* (2001), an Inuit myth based on oral legend. It made \$US 3,786,801 at the U.S. box office (to January 24, 2003) and is estimated to have cost \$CDN 1,960,000 to produce (www.imdb). Its unconventional story unfolds in conventional narrative ways which could account for some of its popularity. Paul Apak Angilirq wrote *Atanarjuat*, directed in his fiction debut by Inuit filmmaker Zacharias Kunuk and produced by Norman Cohn (the first producer credit for the American-born, formerly New York- and Montreal-based Cohn, who has spent most of his life in the North). Cohn (also the cinematographer) has an additional writer credit, as do Kunuk, Herve Paniaq and Paulousie Qulitalik, but the input of veteran story consultant Anne Frank, an experienced

producer herself and now a Telefilm development executive, may have been key. There is much work to be done on "who did what" in the areas of story and script.¹⁸

The only two movies to confront the Two Solitudes head-on were the unsuccessful *Two Solitudes* (1979) from the McLennan novel, and the bilingual *Bon Cop, Bad Cop* (2006), the highest-grossing Canadian movie ever (\$12,578,327 at the Canadian box-office), playing on the English and French linguistic and cultural stereotypes of two police detectives at odds on a murder case. The tagline is, "Shoot first, translate later." In an article titled "Language no barrier," the *Toronto Star* contextualized it as "the ultimate Canadian buddy movie." The two actors were "so in sync during a Toronto interview...they were finishing each other's sentences." Star/co-writer Huard, well-known in Québec and unknown in the ROC ("Rest of Canada"), noted simply, "I thought maybe what we have in common is actually our differences."¹⁹ There is no explicit talk of the Two Solitudes which clearly define the movie, perhaps because the concept is so nationally internalized or obvious to Canadians that it seems redundant even to mention it. Because the public would perceive a movie about Canadian history or identity as boring and/ or educational, actor Feore persistently downplayed its "Canadianness" in interviews, calling it "not Canadian in its attitude, in its style" and "not Canadian in the sense that it's going to be any good for you." He went on, "Stuff's going to blow up. There will be naked people. We're going to swear a whole lot. And people will die. Apart from your tax dollars I can see very little Canadian about it. On the other hand, it's shot on our street corners, it really speaks to us."²⁰ The desire to be Canadian and not-boring is evident. Although *Bon Cop, Bad Cop* arguably has narrative problems as well,

its direct address to the Two Solitudes appealed to many Canadians, and particularly to Québécois; it cost \$8 million to make and has reaped \$12,671,300 US worldwide (though not released in the U.S.), \$10.7 million CDN in Canada and \$9.4 million of that in Québec. It had four writers (Leila Basen and Alex Epstein as "writers," lead actor Patrick Huard as writer of the "scenario," and producer Kevin Tierney as writer of the "script"), none of whom was the director (Erik Canuel).

Conclusion

The three dimensions explored here – institutional, sociological and nation-specific – influence screenwriting and screenwriters. Issues which are global, such as the *auteur* theory, the general marginalization of the screenwriting function when separated from directing, the influence of government policy, and the histories of various kinds of colonization, help illustrate some of the nationally specific aspects underlying the film business/es. In the case of Canada, the particularities of a fractured regional history have resulted in certain obstacles and patterns which emerge in the movies themselves. The compounded national, cultural and social factors discussed here begin to explain how and why the country's screen arts and industry have been hampered in maturing, touted as artistic and nationally important, but ultimately invisible to its imagined audiences. While the tastes of Canadian moviegoers have been willingly and perhaps sometimes unwittingly colonized, most still value some kind of Canadian difference, resulting in both welcome mats and stop signs for the cultural colonizer. The creative workers of a country so close

to the U.S. might learn to harness linguistic and cultural similarities in order to make a difference in movies, as Canada has in comedy, documentary and children's television, while incorporating, referencing or appreciating and including any aspects of international cinema they may deem worthwhile or significant. Will Canadian writers be able to come up with dramatic stories which depict Canadian locations, express Canadian values, and connect with audiences? Will they be able to get such movies funded and produced? Will Canada take its place as a successful and influential country for the screen arts? It remains a daunting but perhaps not impossible task for Canadian screenwriters and policymakers to address and overcome complex and interwoven institutional, sociological and national problems and write themselves a new narrative.

Acknowledgement

Portions of the research supported here were supported with a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) on "Innovation and Creativity in City-Regions." This support is gratefully acknowledged.

References

Abah, Adedayo Ladigbolu (2009). "Popular culture and social change in Africa: the case of the Nigerian video industry," *Media, Culture & Society*, 0163443709339456; 31; 731. Sage: <http://mcs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/31/5/731>.

AFP (2009). "Coppola gets personal in Cannes with premiere." AFP, ca.news.yahoo.com/s/AFP/090514. May 14.

Anderson, Benedict (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition. London, New York: Verso.

Armatage, Kay, Kass Banning, Brenda Longfellow and Janine Marchessault (1999). *Gendering the Nation: Canadian Women's Cinema*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press.

Atwood, Margaret (1972). *Survival*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press Ltd.

Ayscough, Suzan (2007). "A producer's dream: on time and under budget," *Playback*, September 3.

Ayscough, Suzan (2009). "Passchendaele heads for the home market," *Playback*, February 23.

Bailey, Patricia (2009). "Dolan makes a Kill-ing," *Playback*. Brunico Publications, May 22.

Bhabha, Homi K. ed. (1990) *Nation and Narration*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge Classics.

Bielby, Denise D. (2009). "Gender Inequality in Culture Industries: Women and Men Writers in Film and Television." *Science Direct. Sociologie du travail* 51, 237-252.

Bielby, Denise D. and William T. Bielby (2002). "Hollywood Dreams, Harsh Realities: Writing for Film and Television," *Contexts*, 1 (4).

Bielby, D. D. and W. T. Bielby (1996). "Women and Men in Film: Gender Inequality Among Writers in a Culture Industry," *Gender and Society* 10 (3).

Bielby, William T. and Denise D. Bielby (1994). "All Hits are Flukes": Institutionalized Decision Making and the Rhetoric of Network Prime-time Program Development," *The American Journal of Sociology* 99: 1287-1313.

- Bielby, D. D. and Bielby, W. T. (1993). "The Hollywood 'Graylist'? Age, Experience, and Access to Employment for Television Writers," in Muriel G. Cantor and Cheryl Zollars (eds.), *Current Research on Occupations and Professions (Creators of Culture)*, Volume 8. Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.
- Bielby, W. T. and Bielby, D. D. (1987). "The 1987 Hollywood Writers' Report: A Survey of Ethnic, Gender, and Age Employment Practices." Los Angeles: Writers Guild of America, west.
- Bordwell, David (1985). *Narration in the Fiction Film*. London: Routledge; U.S: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Butler, Judith (1993). *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York and London: Routledge.
- CBC/Radio Canada (2008). *Great Success, Greater Challenges*. Ottawa: Annual Report 2008-9.
- Carver, Deborah and Benoit Dubois (2009). *Training Gaps Analysis: Showrunners in Canadian Television*. Halifax: Carver Consulting for the Cultural Human Resources Council (CHRC), January 30.
- Canadian Film and Television Production Association (CFTPA & APFTQ) (2010). "Profile 2009." "An Economic Report on the Canadian Film and Television Production Industry." In conjunction with the Department of Canadian Heritage. Production facts and figures prepared by Nordicity Group Ltd. www.cftpa.ca
- Caves, Richard (2000). *Creative Industries: Contracts Between Art and Commerce*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Chow, Rey (1995). *Primitive Passions: Visuality, Sexuality, Ethnography, and Contemporary Chinese Cinema*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Conference Board of Canada (2008). "The Economic Footprint of Canada's Creative Economy," *Compendium of Research Papers: The International Forum on the Creative Economy*. In collaboration with Canadian Heritage, August. pp 22-29.
- Conor, Bridget (2009). "Everybody's a Writer: Theorising Screenwriting as Creative Labour," *Journal of Screenwriting*, Vol.1, No. 1, September, pp 27-43. Intellect Books Ltd.
- Cook, John R., and Andrew Spicer (2008). "Introduction," *Journal of British Cinema and Television* 5(2): pp 213-222.

Christopherson, Susan (2009). "Working in the Creative Economy: Risk, Adaptation, and the Persistence of Exclusionary Networks," in *Creative Labour*, McKinlay, Alan and Chris Smith, eds. Basingstoke, England: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Davis, Charles H. and Janice Kaye (2010). "International Production Outsourcing and the Development of Indigenous Film and Television Capabilities: The Case of Canada. *Locating Migrating Media*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield. In press.

Davis, Charles H., Florin Vladica, and Irene Berkowitz (2008). "Business Capabilities of Small Entrepreneurial Media Firms: Independent Production of Children's Television in Canada," *Journal of Media Business Studies* 5(1): 9-39.

Deuze, Mark (2007). *Media Work*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity.

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

Elsaesser, Thomas (1989). *New German Cinema: A History*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

European Audiovisual Observatory. *Focus 2009: World Film Market Trends* (2010). Cannes Film Festival.

Feldman, Seth and Joyce Nelson, eds. (1977). *Canadian Film Reader*. Toronto: P. Martin Associates.

Fetherling, Douglas, ed (1988). *Documents in Canadian Film*. Peterborough, Ontario and Lewiston, N.Y: Broadview Press Ltd.

Fothergill, Robert (1972). "Coward, Bully or Clown: The Dream-Life of a Younger Brother." In *Canadian Film Reader*, Feldman and Nelson, eds.

Froug, William. (1972). *The Screenwriter Looks at the Screenwriter*. New York: Macmillan.

Gasher, Mike (1992). "The Myth of Meritocracy: Ignoring the Political Economy of the Canadian Film Industry." *Canadian Journal of Communication*, Vol. 17, No. 3.

Gathercole, Sandra (1984). "The Best Film Policy This Country Never Had." In *Take Two*, Feldman, ed. pp. 36-46.

Gittings, Christopher E. (2002) *Canadian National Cinema: Ideology, Difference and Representation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Globerman, Steven (1991). "Foreign Ownership of Feature Film Distribution and the Canadian Film Industry," *Canadian Journal of Communication*, Vol 16, No 2.

- Goldman, William (1983). *Adventures in the Screen Trade: A Personal View of Hollywood and Screenwriting*. New York: Warner Books, Inc.
- Gopalan, Lalitha (2002). *Cinema of Interruptions: Action Genres in Contemporary Indian Cinema*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Harcourt, Peter (1993). "The Canadian Nation: An Unfinished Text," *Canadian Journal of Film Studies*, Volume 2 Nos. 2-3.
- Harcourt, Peter (1977). *Movies and Mythologies: Towards A National Cinema*. Toronto: CBC Publications.
- Hayward, Susan (1993, 2005). *French National Cinema*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Hjort, Mette and Duncan Petrie, eds (2007). *The Cinema of Small Nations*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Howell, Peter (2003). "Jury picks our Top 10 films," *The Toronto Star*, January 22, 2003, F2.
- Kaye, Janice (2003). "Hollywood North," *Take One*. (Sept-Dec. No. 43, 2003).
- Kaye, Janice (2007). *Certain Tendencies in Canadian Cinema: Temporary Insanity and the National Tax-Shelter Masquerade*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Southern California School of Cinema-Television.
- Kinder, Marsha (1993). *Blood Cinema: The Reconstruction of National Identity in Spain*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Knelman, Martin (1977). *This Is Where We Came In*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Kohn, Nathaniel (1999). "Standpoint: Disappearing Authors: A Postmodern Perspective on the Practice of Writing for the Screen." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 43 (3), Summer. pp. 443-9.
- Kohn, Nathaniel (2000). "The Screenplay as Postmodern Literary Exemplar: Authorial Distraction, Disappearance, Dissolution," *Qualitative Inquiry* 6(4): 489-510.
- Kurosawa, Fuyuki (2003). "Finding Godot? Bringing Popular Culture into Canadian Political Economy." In *Changing Canada: Political Economy as Transformation*, eds. Clement and Vosko. pp 467-492.
- Leach, Jim (2002). "The Reel Nation: Image and Reality in Contemporary Canadian Cinema," The Martin Walsh Memorial Lecture, *Canadian Journal of Film Studies*, Volume 11, No. 2, Fall.

- Levine, Elana (2009). "National Television, Global Market: Canada's *Degrassi: The Next Generation*," *Media, Culture and Society*, Volume 31, No. 4, July 2009.
<http://mcs.sagepub.com>
- Loiselle, André and Tom McSorley, eds (2006). *Self-Portraits: The Cinemas of Canada Since Telefilm*. Ottawa: Canadian Film Institute.
- Magder, Ted (1993). *Canada's Hollywood: The Canadian State and Feature Films*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Magder, Ted and Jonathan Burston (2001). "Whose Hollywood? Changing Forms and Relations inside the North American Entertainment Economy." In *Continental Order? Integrating North America for Cybercapitalism*, Vincent Mosco, Dan Schiller eds.
- Matheson, Sarah (2004). "Projecting Placelessness: Industrial Television and the 'Authentic' Canadian City." In *Contracting Out Hollywood: Runaway Productions and Foreign Location Shooting*. Greg Elmer and Mike Gasher, eds. Boulder: Rowan and Littlefield (117-139).
- McCreadie, Marsha (2005). *Women Screenwriters Today: Their Lives and Words*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Publishers.
- McGregor, Gaile (1985). *The Wacousta Syndrome: Explorations in the Canadian Langscape* (sic). Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press.
- McKinlay, Alan, and Chris Smith (2009). *Creative Labour: Working in the Creative Industries*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McQueen, Trina (2003). "Dramatic Choices: A report on Canadian English-language drama." Ottawa: CRTC and Telefilm Canada.
- McSorley, Tom (2006). "The Centre Cannot Hold: The Cinema of Atlantic Canada." In *Self-Portraits*, Loiselle and McSorley, eds.
- Mehring, Margaret (1990). *The Screenplay: A Blend of Film Form and Content*. Boston: Focal Press.
- Melnyk, George (2004). *One Hundred Years of Canadian Cinema*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Miller, Toby, Nitin Govil, John McMurria, Richard Maxwell, and Ting Yang (2008). *Global Hollywood 2*. London: British Film Institute.
- Miller, Toby, ed (2009). *The Contemporary Hollywood Reader*. U.K., U.S., Canada: Routledge.

Monk, Katherine (2001). *Weird Sex & Snowshoes and Other Canadian Film Phenomena*. Vancouver: Raincoast Books.

Morris, Peter (1978). *Embattled Shadows: A History of Canadian Cinema 1895-1939*. Montreal & Kingston; London, Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Naficy, Hamid (2001). *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*. Princeton University Press.

Olson, Scott Robert (1999). *Hollywood Planet. Global Media and the Competitive Advantage of Narrative Transparency*. Mahway, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

Playback. "Hot Sheet," February 9-15, 2009.

Prover, Jorja (1994). *No One Knows Their Names: Screenwriters in Hollywood*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Ramsay, Christine (1993). "Canadian Narrative Cinema from the Margins: 'The Nation' and Masculinity in *Goin' Down the Road*." *Canadian Journal of Film Studies*. Vol. 2, No. 2-3.

Saul, John Ralston (2008). *A Fair Country: Telling Truths About Canada*. Penguin Group (Canada).

Schaffer, Kay (1988). *Women and the Bush: Forces of Desire in the Australian Cultural Tradition*. Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

www.screenville.blogspot.com, 2005 World Cinema Stats.

Simonton, Dean Keith (2005). "Film as Art versus Film as Business: Differential Correlates of Screenplay Characteristics," *Empirical Studies of the Arts* 23(2): 93-117.

Spencer, Michael and Suzan Ayscough (2003). *Hollywood North: Creating the Canadian Motion Picture Industry*, Montreal: Cantos.

Strauss, Marise. *Playback*. February 18, 2009.

Strauss, Marise. "Green Goes to Toronto," *Playback*. Apr 26, 2007.

Telefilm Canada (2010). www.telefilm.gc.ca/uploads/fonds_prog/writer's_first

Truffaut, François (1953). "La politique des auteurs," *Cahiers du cinéma* no. 25, July 1953.

Urquhart, Peter (2003). "You Should Know Something – *Anything* – About This Movie. You Paid for It." *Canadian Journal of Film Studies*. Volume 12, No. 2, Autumn.

Vang, Jan and Cristina Chaminade (2007). "Cultural Clusters, Global-Local Linkages and Spillovers: Theoretical and Empirical Insights from an Exploratory Study of Toronto's Film Cluster," *Industry & Innovation*, Taylor and Francis Journals, vol. 14(4), pages 401-420.

Virta, Alan (2010). "Nell Shipman: A Biographical Sketch." library.boisestate.edu/Special/FindingAids/fa81bio.htm

Walker, Susan. "Language no barrier," *Toronto Star*. August 16, 2006.

White, Jerry (2006). "A Typically Canadian Cinema: Filmmaking in Alberta, its Institutions and Authors." In *Self-Portraits*, Loiselle and McSorley, eds.

Writers Guild of America, West (2009). *Rewriting an All-Too-Familiar Story? The 2009 Hollywood Writers Report*. UCLA: report prepared by D.M. Hunt for the Writers Guild of America, West.

WIFT (2004). *Frame Work: Employment in Canadian Screen-Based Media — A National Profile*. Toronto: Women in Film and Television.

¹ *Away From Her* (2006) cost \$4 million CDN to produce, made back \$4,548,331 at the Canadian box office alone, and garnered \$15,830,046 worldwide (<http://www.the-numbers.com/movies/2007>). The multi-award-winner starred two Canadians and one Briton and was written and directed by Canadian Sarah Polley.

² In contrast to Canada's 1.1% share, India's 2008 share of its own market was 90.5%, Egypt's 85%, China's 61%, Turkey's 60%, Japan's 59.5%, France's 45.4%, Thailand's 45%, South Korea's 42.1%, Denmark's 33%, the U.K.'s 31%, Italy's 29.3%, Germany's 26.6%, Russia's 25.5%, Poland's 25.4%, Tunisia's 15%, Israel's 14%, Spain's 13.3%, Iceland's 10.5%, Sweden's 9.2%, Mexico's 7%, and Australia's 3.8%. Only Ireland's share was less than English-Canada's, at 0.9%, the same as Canada's in 2007 (*Focus 2009: World Film Market Trends*). In Nigeria, the high-volume video-films of "Nollywood" are extremely popular with the citizenry, with average budgets of just \$5,000 to \$10,000 and a \$250-million industry second in size only to India's in number of films (Abah 2009).

³ More than half (\$4,421,568) came from the Paul Gross war epic *Passchendaele* (<http://www.the-numbers.com/movies/2008>), leaving the other 22 features to share the remainder.

⁴ The now-entrenched theory was articulated by François Truffaut and a group of young French filmmaking colleagues in 1954 and brought to North American prominence by the *Village Voice* film critic Andrew Sarris in 1968.

⁵ Some critical outlets, such as *Metro Daily*, which calls itself "the world's largest newspaper," regularly list the director, actors and other information above the movie review, but not the writer.

⁶ *Auteurism* plays out quite differently in writer-driven American television, with the writer as the controlling creative visionary, or "television auteur" (Newcomb and Alley, 1983). In television, the uncredited showrunner function is that of a high-level and experienced writer. Canada has only recently accorded writers, instead of non-writer producers, the function of running the show.

⁷ Interview with Canadian filmmaker Allan King, *Close-Up: Orson Welles*, CBC, 1960.

⁸ www.imdb.com

⁹ Québec TV shows can draw two million or one-third of the province's population. A few English-Canadian drama, comedy and reality series (*Flashpoint* on CTV; *The Rick Mercer Report* and *Dragons' Den* on CBC) have begun to get one-to-two million from the whole country. Canadian television is now only 60% American (in prime-time and 40% overall).

¹⁰ Writer's First "is intended to develop and retain a pool of creative, talented and experienced screenwriters, and to produce a bank of Canadian feature film scripts with strong box-office potential. The program encourages creative renewal and professional development while seeking to ensure that Canada's cultural, linguistic and regional diversity is reflected in the resulting films." www.telefilm.gc.ca

¹¹ The regulation of television, on the other hand, ensures that more Canadian-produced programming is available to consumers. Despite the high number of American imports, Canadian TV series have been building towards higher ratings and U.S. sales with shows which adhere closer to classic American dramatic television form while showcasing Canadian locales and often, it can be argued, values (*Flashpoint* on CTV, and *Heartland*, *Being Erica* and *Republic of Doyle* on CBC).

¹² <http://www.playbackonline.ca/articles/daily/20090220/prime.html> 2/23/2009.

¹³ Hugh MacLennan's classic Canadian novel *Two Solitudes* took the phrase from German poet Rilke. About a young bilingual Québécois struggling to write a novel about his Canadian cultural identity, the book added cultural weight to the coming-of-age theme explored for the next 60 years. There was even an unsuccessful movie of the same name in the Tax-Shelter Era.

¹⁴ That said, one must consider the likely influence of the 1947 *Bush Pilot*, a Canada/U.S. venture shot in Canada's bush, in which two half-brothers vie for the same woman.

¹⁵ From the *www.imdb.com* review: "A prime cause of this film's failure is its very disjointed screenplay..." The original screenplay by Jim Osborne was nominated for a Genie Award in 1980.

¹⁶ There may be just as many in Québécois film, including *Isabel* (1968), *Rachel & Gaetan* (2004), *La Coupure* (2006) among many others.

¹⁷ The on-screen text is explicit: *Waiting for Caroline* is about a beautiful, baffling, irritating, confused, contradictory, complex woman. What could be more interesting, in fiction if not in fact? You may find Caroline, the character and the film, poignant and pitiful. Or you may find her and it exasperating, even shocking. I just wanted to remind you that Caroline does represent an aspect of our diverse Canadian life — woman who has not yet found herself, her values, her maturity and the film should be viewed in the context of the type of life it represents. It is a film for adults."

¹⁸ The next movie by Kunuk and Cohn, *The Journals of Knud Rasmussen*, who co-produced and co-directed, is credited to seven "Inuktitut dialogue" writers but has no story or script credits. The 2006 Denmark co-pro did not open widely anywhere and some reviews actually cited narrative lack. The novelty of a "First Solitude" Inuit setting does not in itself ensure a successful story or film.

¹⁹ Susan Walker, Toronto Star, August 16, 2006, Entertainment section. The "action comedy topped records for a first-weekend box office gross in Québec, at \$1.4 million. It came in at 17 on the North American box office tally. By yesterday, receipts were nearing \$4 million, for a movie that cost \$8 million to make."

²⁰ Ibid.