

serve such a purpose. For instance, David Lean's *A Passage to India* and the television mini-series *Jewel in the Crown*, both 1984 releases, are not Indian interpretations of British colonial rule but Western ones.

These films, made with American audiences in mind, may reinforce the idea that what comes out of the West is still the best. When Attenborough's *Gandhi* was released in India in 1983, the attitude that Western filmmakers are far superior to Indians found expression in many newspapers and magazines. Victor Banerjee, who played the lead role in *A Passage to India*, was noted to have said that once he was contracted by David Lean to play that role invitations to all types of important cultural meetings started to arrive at his door.

There are many in the former colonies who have an inferiority complex about their own culture and are awed by the "accomplishments" of the West—from designer jeans to movies to space shuttles. By subscribing to the ideology of world-class film, a nation's policymakers in effect choose to reinforce the servile mentality. Canada is no exception to this rule. Pierre Berton, the noted Canadian author and filmmaker, observed:

I think that there is . . . a real failure of nerve here, and it's the old Canadian failure of nerves, the feeling that unless we're like the Americans, unless we ape the American filmmakers, we ain't going to make it. And this runs through the whole cultural and financial scene. There hasn't been a major Canadian epic that I know of, based on a Canadian historical subject, or a Canadian contemporary subject, that's been a success that hasn't been made by an American, including the Gouzenko spy case, which was totally an American film.<sup>38</sup>

The present cultural policy in Canada does not appear to support what Berton and many others in Canada want, but rather it produces pictures such as *Porky's*. The servility reinforced by the ideology of world-class film found expression at the First Annual Academy of Canadian Cinema Awards, held in 1980. Having won the Best Actress Award for her role in *Meatballs*, Kate Lynch made the following observations on Canadian cinema's internationalization:

I must also admit to feeling a bit awkward. Please understand, I'm very proud of my work in the film, but somehow the Royal Alex, \$35 a seat, Mr. Ettrog's statuette, national television coverage—it's a tough act to really feel at home in all this for having played "Roxanne" in *Meatballs*, and I think that this award is as much a tribute to the fact of a Canadian actress in a leading role in a feature film as it is an award to me personally. And so I feel a bit awkward all alone in the spotlight and I'd like to share that, the spotlight and the awkwardness, with all the good Canadian actresses who did not land a leading role in a feature film.<sup>39</sup>

While Kate Lynch specifically referred to the unequal distribution of jobs to Canadian workers under the tax shelter and drew enthusiastic applause from the audience at the award ceremony, Christopher Plummer, who has played leading roles in several Hollywood imitations, voiced support for the internationalization of Canadian film. He declared that Canadians should realize that landing a lead role in a Canadian film was just the "luck of the draw," and he went on to state, "[As] soon as we in Canada realize that we're all gypsies, nationality has absolutely nothing to do with it. . . . And the sooner we can put ourselves in the same running as everybody else instead of the best Canadian, the best Samothracian—we're just the best actor, the best actress or the best nothing, or the best loser, it doesn't matter."<sup>40</sup> These remarks clearly identify the branch plant mentality that pervades a section of the Canadian film industry. The historic, cultural, geographic, and other specificity that gives a people their identity is a problem for those who want to create audiences around the world with similar tastes and preferences. It is not without opposition, however, as pointed out by Norman Jewison, the noted Canadian filmmaker, who stated, "The important thing is that you have got to make films out of your own heart, out of your own mind, out of your own dreams. And we have got to get to the situation where we can supply our artists and our talented people with the way to do that and without them being sucked into New York, Paris, London, and Hollywood, where they'll give the money to make their own dreams."<sup>41</sup> As a Canadian, who left the country twenty years ago for London and Hollywood when there were no opportunities to make films in Canada, and with more than twenty films to his credit, Jewison knows whereof he speaks. He has had to package someone else's dreams for a long time. The industrial model pursued by Canada's policymakers via the tax shelter whereby writers, producers, directors and other creative people train in the Hollywood style of production and aspire for the same symbols of success sets up a strong gravitational pull from the United States, the center of global commercial culture. Canada, in this mode of development, is not only a reservoir of films for the American markets but also a good source of trained talent.

We will examine how the producers who packaged film projects with international mass audiences in mind fared in the marketplace and what benefits accrued to Canada, if any, from those films in the next chapter.