



with total sales in 1974 of \$4,733,355,000 and profits of \$40,179,000.

The book is a valuable resource tool and has a nice gossipy edge. Since he plans two more volumes, it may also provide Mr. Newman with a life's work. By the time he finishes the third, the first should be ripe for revision.

The Canadian Film in Focus

Inner Views: Ten Canadian Film-Makers. John Hofsess. McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited, \$8.95.

Some Canadians resent Hollywood's traditional domination of North American films without analyzing why it came about. Critic John Hofsess believes it was inevitable, though once, for a golden moment, Canada produced mass audience films which held their own.

"In the entertainment section . . . of *The Ottawa Journal*, February 17, 1923, advertisements of two new silent films, one American, the other Canadian, dominate the page. D. W. Griffith's *Orphans of the Storm*, a fictionalized account of the French Revolution, had the edge in show business pizzazz. . . . In an equally large advertisement, *Glengarry School Days* boasts in bold type that it is 'Another Wonderful All-Canadian Picture!' Both did excellent business. In 1923 it was still possible for Canadian movies to play "in major theatres . . . [to be] promoted with substantial advertising budgets, and [to hold] their own against all competitors for a

sizeable share of the market."

This equality of opportunity was not prolonged. Talking pictures, colour and the Depression killed the Canadians, and this was "due more to inevitability than error," Hofsess believes. "The cost of ever changing technology made it impossible for a small country's capitalists to compete."

Now, Hofsess says, costs have stabilized, television, not movies, is the primary mass medium, and it is possible and sometimes profitable to make films aimed at limited audiences.

"Whenever a medium has passed its peak as a mass medium serving a large, homogeneous audience, it becomes a *multiple-minority medium* catering to the specialized interests of many different, small groups. . . . there must be sizeable minorities who have become conscious of themselves as distinct groups and desire the articulation of their 'separate culture.'"

What are these minorities? By Hofsess' definition they include both obvious and less obvious ones. Blacks are a well-defined group and there is a flourishing black-oriented film industry in the US. Hard-core pornographic homosexual and heterosexual films also cater to minorities. The black-oriented films gross millions and so do *Deep Throat*, *The Devil in Miss Jones* and *Boys in the Sand*.

Canadians are a minority in the frame of the North American continent. French-speaking Canadians are a minority within a minority. Can Canadians then have a viable film industry? French Canada does and its minority status is reinforced by the language barrier. The rest of Canada does not—not quite. Films such as *Going Down The Road* have attracted respectable numbers of people at home though they made little or (for the original investors) no money.

Hofsess says this unfortunate circumstance is caused by a lack of alienation. "Until such time as the word *Canadian* means *barrier*—the way that *black*, *Québécois*, *Jew*, *feminist*, *gay*, et al. mean barrier—there will be no thriving film culture here."