

Producers in small countries argue that they cannot afford as expensive productions as the United States because they expect to sell their programs only in a small market as opposed to the much larger American market. In fact, American producers never made films or television programs just for the American market, but for an even larger international market. Hollywood always thought in terms of international sales, while producers in other countries, such as Canada, planned in terms of the domestic market. An interesting question, therefore, is this: Why did producers in small countries not think globally when the example of Hollywood was there?¹¹

This question seems to have a complex answer. While Acheson, Maule and Filleul dismiss the small country argument, they do not show how smaller countries could have countered the American advantage of being an early industry leader, a large producer of film and television programming, and finally a large consumer of these programs. It seems reasonable to assert that the global economic environment creates a different reality for most other countries. The small country argument has been that their producers cannot afford as expensive productions as the United States because the domestic markets in which their programs are sold are more limited. This argument assumes that production expenditure will relate to the size of the domestic market. It also assumes that these expensive productions are required in order to achieve success both at home and perhaps abroad. The argument that smaller countries have been unable to achieve success because of size cannot easily be proven or disproved. What is clear is that no small country, or rather no country but for the United States, has been able to gain a large share of the global market for film. Acheson, Maule and Filleul clearly develop the industry leader argument; however, it seems that the size of the United States market was an important factor in United States success.

Language is a factor in determining the size of the global market. India, for example is a large country, with a relatively large film industry; however, production budgets for Hindi language films, are small relative to American budgets. They are small because there is little export potential for a Hindi film. This is not only a problem for Hindi films, but for non-English language films in general. Selling in the American market is extremely difficult because there is a non-acceptance, or a belief among industry players that control distribution channels of a non-acceptance, of dubbed and sub-titled films in the United States. This constitutes a problem because success in the United States market is not only important because of its market size, but because success there virtually guarantees success in other markets.¹²

Even given the small country and/or language arguments, the reasons for the United States' success are not evident. What is clear is that this overwhelming United States domination

¹¹ Ibid

¹² This success is almost guaranteed because of a global perception that if a film succeeds in the hotly competitive United States market then it is a good marketable film. Also, there remains an admiration in many parts of the world of American products and the American way of life.