

**NEGOTIATING VALUE:
A CANADIAN PERSPECTIVE ON
THE INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL**

by

Diane Louise Burgess
M.A., University of British Columbia, 2000

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the
School of Communication

© Diane Louise Burgess 2008
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
Fall 2008

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or by other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

NAME Diane Louise Burgess

DEGREE PhD

TITLE OF DISSERTATION: **Negotiating Value: A Canadian
Perspective on the International Film
Festival**

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

CHAIR: Barry Truax, Professor

Catherine Murray
Senior Supervisor
Professor, School of Communication

Zoe Druick
Supervisor
Associate Professor, School of Communication

Alison Beale
Supervisor
Professor, School of Communication

Stuart Poyntz,
Internal Examiner
Assistant Professor, School of Communication

Charles R Acland,
Professor, Communication Studies
Concordia University

DATE: September 18, 2008



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Declaration of Partial Copyright Licence

The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, has granted to Simon Fraser University the right to lend this thesis, project or extended essay to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users.

The author has further granted permission to Simon Fraser University to keep or make a digital copy for use in its circulating collection (currently available to the public at the "Institutional Repository" link of the SFU Library website <www.lib.sfu.ca> at: <<http://ir.lib.sfu.ca/handle/1892/112>>) and, without changing the content, to translate the thesis/project or extended essays, if technically possible, to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation of the digital work.

The author has further agreed that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by either the author or the Dean of Graduate Studies.

It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without the author's written permission.

Permission for public performance, or limited permission for private scholarly use, of any multimedia materials forming part of this work, may have been granted by the author. This information may be found on the separately catalogued multimedia material and in the signed Partial Copyright Licence.

While licensing SFU to permit the above uses, the author retains copyright in the thesis, project or extended essays, including the right to change the work for subsequent purposes, including editing and publishing the work in whole or in part, and licensing other parties, as the author may desire.

The original Partial Copyright Licence attesting to these terms, and signed by this author, may be found in the original bound copy of this work, retained in the Simon Fraser University Archive.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, BC, Canada

ABSTRACT

This dissertation argues that the Toronto and Vancouver International Film Festivals have been undervalued as showcases and in fact these hybrid public-private institutions are catalysts in the global, local and regional articulation of English-Canadian cinema culture. As a threshold to mainstream release and a non-theatrical venue, the festival operates in the gap between the production and consumption of film commodities. Drawing on Pierre Bourdieu's model of the field of cultural production, this gap is re-conceptualized as a productive space structured by the relative positioning of stakeholders engaged in the negotiation of hierarchies of cinematic value. Festival space mediates the interests of international trade, cultural diplomacy and cinephilia, balancing a need for programming autonomy against the intervention of global Hollywood in the political economy of independent cinema. In the Canadian context, the value of national cinema is both a vexatious economic issue in that indigenous films consistently earn less than a 5% domestic box office share and a symbolic one to the extent that lacklustre theatrical performance is seen as an indication of the chronic absence of a popular national cinema. While TIFF endorses public accessibility and an industrial rationale, VIFF situates itself as a community event with a focus on providing an exhibition alternative—both of which are consecrated by urban cultural policy with the development of Bell Lightbox and the Vancouver International Film Centre. Press coverage, festival publications and policy reports provide insight into the field of forces shaping festival buzz and evolving organizational identity in the divergent historical trajectories of these events to embedding as permanent space. Despite a realignment of Canadian Feature Film Policy toward industrial objectives and performance indicators, the value chain from film festival to box office persists as a policy blind spot, reinforcing a split, rather than creative intermixture, of cultural and industrial measures of audience access. This dissertation contends that, through the creation of vibrant local film scenes that connect regional production to the international marketplace and cosmopolitan consumption, Canada's major film festivals play a critical role as intermediaries in cinephilic, governmental *and* industrial struggles to define cinema's symbolic and economic value.

Keywords: film festival; English-Canadian cinema; film policy; cultural value; field theory

Subject Terms: film festivals; motion picture industry -- Government policy -- Canada; motion picture industry -- Canada -- history; motion picture - distribution; cultural industries

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisory committee, Alison Beale, Zoë Druick and Catherine Murray for their insightful comments and generous advice over the course of this project. I'm indebted to Zoë for referring to Canadian cinema as "vexing" at a critical moment in the writing process and to my senior supervisor Catherine for her rigour, leadership and support as I found my voice. Both at the very beginning and during the final stages, portions of this research were presented at Film Studies Association of Canada conferences; and an early draft of the field theory chapter was presented at CRESC's Media Change and Social Theory conference at St. Hugh's College, Oxford. I'm grateful for the feedback and collegiality that I encountered at these events; in addition, I would like to thank the School of Communication and Faculty of Applied Sciences for funding assistance. A CD Nelson Memorial entrance scholarship was instrumental in the early stages of my degree in enabling me to forge a balance between my festival work and my studies. Lastly, I would like to thank Graduate Secretary Denise Vanderwolf, her predecessor Neena Shahani and Monique Cloutier for their invaluable assistance.

My heartfelt thanks goes out to the faculty, staff and students in the Department of Theatre and Film at the University of British Columbia, where I taught several Film Studies courses over the course of my degree. In particular, I would like to acknowledge Brian McIlroy's ongoing mentorship throughout my graduate career. I would also like to thank the Film librarian, Brenda Peterson, for her kernels of research wisdom, Andrew deWaard for the book recommendations, and Sharon McGowan and Zanna Downes for their unwavering encouragement.

On a personal note, I am grateful to the rowing community at the Vancouver Rowing Club for providing much-needed respite during the writing process. I would also like to thank my father, Doug Burgess, for his humour and support, Allison Beda for bingo and the promise of cake and my fellow SFU grad student Natalie Coulter for cheering me across the finish line.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Festival Space: Field Theory, Liminality and the Cultural Intermediary	35
Crossing the Threshold(s) of Festival Space	37
Confronting “Theoretical Theory:” Questions of Method.....	46
Minding the Gap: Charisma and the Cultural Intermediary	59
Autonomy as Illusio(n)	67
Chapter Two: Culture, Commerce and Cosmopolitanism: The Traffic in International Cinema	70
Global Framing of National Cinemas.....	72
Diplomacy: Culture, Commerce, Cosmopolitanism.....	82
Exhibition, Acquisitions and Miramax-ing the Market.....	98
Chapter Three: Connections, Hunches, Timing: Birth of a (Written) Festival	104
Godfather or Prometheus – FoF’s Founding Myth.....	118
VIFF - A World-Class Alternative	133
Chapter Four: Structuring Permanence: From Showcase to Lightbox	146
Junket to Myth-maker – Showcase to Catalyst.....	150
Building a Film Scene	167
Breaking Ground: Real Estate and Cultural Infrastructure.....	172
Chapter Five: Bridging the Gap: Festival Governance, Public Partners and “The Vexing Problem of Distribution”	195
Object of Policy: Festival as Platform or Market(ing)	199
World Class Cinema at Home and Abroad.....	208
Performance Measurement and Irreconcilable Interests.....	217
Postscript: New Policy Directions or Same Vexing Dead-ends?	234
Conclusion: Festivals, Value and the Vexing Problem of National Cinema	241
References	262

INTRODUCTION

For Jean Cocteau: “The Festival is an apolitical no-man’s-land, a microcosm of what the world would be like if people could contact each other directly and speak the same language” (Festival de Cannes, *Festival history*). As an introduction to the history presented on the Festival de Cannes’ official website, this romanticized view suggests that the language of cinema can transcend international boundaries—that the festival constructs an idealized supranational space where national cinemas can mingle for a cosmopolitan audience that is unified through cinephilia. Cocteau’s comments find an easy fit with theoretical explorations of projector, screen and venue and their impact on spectatorship. In his seminal essay “Film and Society: Public Rituals and Private Space,” Dudley Andrew evokes Roland Barthes’ poetic meditation on the pangs of re-entry experienced “En Sortant du cinema” prior to expanding on the varied rituals of cinema spectatorship, particularly in light of the physically dispersed audiences of television. With reference to the conditions of theatrical reception, Andrew points out the inevitability of ecclesiastical analogies in describing a social ritual “wherein the faithful file into a building specially dedicated to transforming them as they stare ahead in silence” (2002, p. 168). This transformative power arguably extends to the films as well given the enduring connection between cinephilia and cinemas even as “revenues from ancillaries often exceed box office itself” (Drake: 2008, p. 81).¹

But, to return to Cocteau, if people are indeed speaking the same language at Cannes, what is the nature of the conversation? Is it about money, the art of cinema, celebrity, or perhaps film’s status as instrument of cultural expression or product of

¹ Drake (2008) discusses theatrical release in relation to “brand-building” for the longer life cycle of films that build revenue across multiple release windows (p. 72). Meanwhile Acland (2008) asserts that the proliferation of non-theatrical screens has strengthened the links between “that more reified temple of the cinephile” and notions of “prestige, exclusivity, and urbanity” (p. 94). In addition, Magder (1993) makes a brief reference to cinema’s ongoing “allure and its status as a premier cultural institution” even as the lines between the domestic film and television industries have become increasingly blurred (p. 245).

(trans)national industry? In Cannes, with its juxtaposition of juried screenings, celebrity junkets and scramble for foreign sales, the divine art of cinema meets the prostitution of the marketplace.² And that is not to understate the issue of political intervention into cultural affairs. While the Festival Web site's official history explains that in 1939 the minister for Public Instruction and the Arts "proposed the creation of an international film event in France" (Festival de Cannes, *Festival history*), it is widely known that this initiative comprised a response to the refusal of the Venice Festival to give its top award to Jean Renoir's *Grand Illusion* the previous year (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, p. 43; McCarthy, 1997, p. 12; Turan, 2002, p. 18). With most accounts focussed on fascist politics and the rising influence of the Nazis, Cannes' first director general Robert Favre Le Bret recalls the importance of restoring to centre stage the art of cinema at "an event where countries could be assured of total equality and total equity" (as cited in Beauchamp & Béhar, p. 43).

Since the origins of the international film festival in Venice, Cannes and Berlin, these events have been utilized by national governments and industry associations to position films in the international marketplace. Thomas Elsaesser refers to festivals as "the Olympics of the show-business economy" (2006, p. 51) and as "a parliament of national cinemas" (2005, p. 88), while also noting the impact of location on the meanings they convey (2005, p. 84). With the Lido and the Riviera as exclusive tourist destinations,³ cultural diplomacy is overlaid with notions of prestigious leisure activities and the mobility of global capital. The post-war launch of the Berlin festival draws attention to the presence of political motives, including in particular the spread of

² Citing the juxtaposition of renowned actors with trashy posters hawking action films, Tim Robbins describes Cannes in terms of "a very strange mixture of the art of film and total prostitution of film" (Turan, 2002, p. 21). In the Foreword to *Variety's* celebration of Cannes' 50th anniversary, Clint Eastwood refers to "the whorehouse of selling" (1997, p. 9).

³ Elsaesser (2005) points out that these venues (and others like San Sebastian and Karlovy Vary) have transformed from aristocratic spas to locations that utilise cultural tourism to expand their seasonal offerings. He dubs them "off-season, on-festival sites" due to the tendency to schedule a film festival on the cusp of high tourist season (p. 84).

Western consumer-capitalist values. Across the international festival circuit, industrial, governmental and cinephilic interests are implicated in the negotiation of aspects of the symbolic and economic value of cinema. As celebrities walk the red carpet at the Palais de Festivals in Cannes, they are promoting not only individual films and their own currency as stars, but also an approach to narrative style as well as an industrial model for filmmaking and cinema-going, all of which are associated with global Hollywood. At the same time, the work of international critics and festival programmers serves to frame production trends, evaluate texts and classify annual cinematic output within salient aesthetic, political and geographical categories.

The negotiation of value that occurs at the international film festival articulates a nexus of global, local and regional concerns. This dissertation provides a Canadian perspective on the international film festival by both examining how the development of major events and permanent facilities in Toronto and Vancouver has been shaped by stakeholder interests and considering whether these hybrid public-private institutions might have a part to play in solving the distribution problems that have long plagued Canadian cinema. In doing so, this dissertation strives to overcome formulations of festival space that segregate theatrical and non-theatrical circuits, in effect splitting the economic and symbolic dimensions of value accumulation. Examinations of the political economy of Hollywood cinema (eg: Miller et al., 2005; Wasko, 2003) associate the festival with marketing—both as a literal marketplace where international rights are bought and sold and as a site for the mediation of commercial value. This type of industrial model collapses the gap between the production and consumption of film commodities in favour of a conceptualization of the festival as a threshold to mainstream release and a venue for the non-theatrical exhibition of films that do not manage to crossover. In addition, a focus on individual film texts and their progression along an industry supply chain reduces the productive space of the festival to little more than a bridge to economic return.

In contrast, discussions of national cinema highlight the international circulation of texts and the accumulation of symbolic value, but, in doing so, tend to locate the festival outside of dominant exhibition circuits, thereby limiting consideration of the industrial potential of these non-theatrical spaces. Citing Bill Nichols' (1994b) description of the festival circuit's "cachet of locally inscribed difference and globally ascribed commonality" (as cited in O'Regan, 1996, p. 61), Tom O'Regan (1996) argues that national cinemas are festival cinemas in that their identities coalesce and are affirmed in the realm of international film style. O'Regan asserts that "the attraction for Australian filmmakers and audiences alike" emerges from the way in which the festival context "naturalizes the local as internationally acceptable," while organizing "an alternative space to the common vernacular of Hollywood" (1996, p. 62). Both Nichols and O'Regan designate festival space as "oppositional" or "principally non-Hollywood"⁴—a formulation that entrenches the conception of festival space as the "space of the 'foreign film' in world cinema markets" (O'Regan, 1996, p. 61) even though Hollywood has always had a presence on the international festival circuit. Charles Acland's (2003) study of commercial cinema-going, *Screen Traffic: Movies, Multiplexes and Global Culture*, similarly reads the history of Canadian film festivals as manifestations of an "expo-mentality" or "orientation to and for the special venue" (p. 193). Drawing an historical connection between the activities of voluntary societies and the emergence of the National Film Board (and an overarching educative agenda), Acland locates Canadian cinema culture in alternate spaces *parallel* to commercial theatrical exhibition and the rise of the megaplex. In grouping festivals with museums, libraries and expositions, he collapses their complex operations with contextual location, leading to the assumption that they structure dispositions "distinct from those of popular

⁴ Nichols (1994b) argues that "Hollywood occupies an oppositional position more than an inspirational one" (p. 74) while O'Regan (1996) states that the film festival circuit "provides a space to one side of the mainstream Hollywood competition" (p. 62).

cinemagoing” (2003, p. 193). As such, Acland reinforces the view that film festivals play a significant role in fostering the core discourses of national cinema but underestimates their synergies with commercial exhibition.

These seemingly divergent perspectives on non-theatrical space as an industrial bridge or as an oppositional cultural arena must be reconciled in order to fully grasp the international festival’s intermediary role in struggles over hierarchies of cinematic value. The festival circuit serves not only as a locus for the articulation of international film style but also as a series of access points to international markets. With the title “Hollywood and the World: Export or Die,” John Trumbour (2008) invokes the postwar declaration of British Board of Trade president (and future Prime Minister) Harold Wilson that “‘Export or die’...applied as much to the film industry as to the nation” (p. 213).⁵ Trumbour notes that this maxim also encapsulates Hollywood’s increasing reliance on overseas markets: Whereas foreign markets provided “approximately 20-40 percent” of revenues in the first half of the 20th Century, the beginning of the 21st Century has seen an inversion of these figures with roughly 60% of revenues comprised of foreign box office receipts (p. 213).⁶ In addition, by the early 2000s the majority of Hollywood features fell under the category of art cinema or niche-market releases. Tom Schatz (2008) cites “three fairly distinct classes of [Hollywood] feature film”—major studio blockbusters and “star vehicles,” with average budgets over \$100 million, “art films, specialty films and other niche-market fare handled by the conglomerates’ indie subsidiaries,” with average budgets of \$40 million, and “specialty films handled by independent producer-distributors” with budgets under \$10 million (and often below \$5 million) (p. 31); he notes that the third category accounts for more than half of the

⁵ Trumbour (2008) references this quote to Thomas Guback’s (1969) seminal examination of the political economy of film in the postwar era, *The International Film Industry: Western Europe and America Since 1945*.

⁶ The figures are attributed to a 2004 Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) assessment of \$15.7 billion in revenues from foreign box office as compared to \$9.54 billion in US box office receipts (as cited in Trumbour, 2008, p. 213).

roughly 500 features released per year in the US.

Hollywood arguably has a major stake in both the marketing reach of the international festival circuit and the cinephilic legitimacy it lends the independent sector. The increasing involvement of the major studio conglomerates in indie filmmaking over the course of the 1990s (Schatz, 2008, pp. 29-30)⁷ positions Hollywood producer-distributors in direct competition with the producer-directors of the type of “specialized” or “art house cinema” that writers like O’Regan tend to equate with “festival cinema” (p. 61); conversely, of course, this situation also raises the interest of national filmmakers aspiring to produce the next indie acquisition. As part of his discussion of Hollywood’s export prowess, Trumbour refers to Donald Sassoon’s delineation of major patterns of trade in cultural commodities. While the US exemplifies the category of “culturally dominant states” able to use the strength of a large domestic market to spur a lucrative export trade (as cited in Trumbour, 2008, p. 211), Canada would likely be grouped with other “culturally dominated states.” Sassoon’s examples in the latter category include Belgium as a nation which provided only “1.3 percent of the films for the local market in 2004” (as cited in Trumbour, 2008, p. 212). In 2007, Canadian theatrical films achieved a 3.2% national market share which is on par with Australia’s 4.0%; in comparison, France’s feature film industry earned a 36.6% share while UK productions garnered 28% of their national market (European Audiovisual Observatory, 2008). It is interesting to note, as further evidence of the involvement of the festival in the commercial aspects of international cinema, that *Focus (World Film Market Trends)* has been published annually by the Marché du Film at the Festival de Cannes since 1998.

In the Canadian context, the negotiation of cinematic value is both an economic issue in that indigenous films consistently earn less than a 5% share of domestic box

⁷ Schatz (2008) describes “two Hollywoods” in the conglomerate era—the subsidiaries and the “true independents”—and notes both a rift over the status of the “indie ethos” and the reality of active creative and economic “cross-fertilization” (pp. 31-35).

office and a symbolic one to the extent that this performance measure indicates the vexing absence of a popular national cinema. Canadian feature film policy measures the health of the indigenous industry in terms of access to theatrical audiences. The 1999 *Report of the Feature Film Advisory Committee (The Road to Success)* drew attention to the sobering reality that “[o]n average, Canadian films capture only 2 to 3% of the box office” (Canadian Heritage, p. iii). This “less than hospitable environment” tempered the economic achievements of the film and television production sector, which “account[ed] for more than 30,000 direct jobs and contribut[ed] \$2.8 billion to Canada’s economy,” and raised concerns that the industry was operating at a competitive disadvantage (p. iii). The committee’s recommendations placed the focus on market performance, arguing that increased resources would serve “to make available films that Canadians and the world will want to watch” (p. iv). With *From Script to Screen* (2000), the focus of national policy shifted “from building an industry to building audiences” and the primary objective of increasing domestic box office share to 5% by 2006 (Canadian Heritage, p. 1).

Although Canadian cinema attained a 5.5% market share in 2005, box office performance differed greatly by linguistic market between 2000 and 2005 with French-language films reaching “an outstanding high of 27% of French-language box office revenues while English-language films earned 1.6%” (Canadian Heritage, 2006, p. 5). It is important to note that discussions of audience absence generally target the shortcomings of the English-language market even though this linguistic/regional distinction is often elided in references to Canadian cinema. The 2006 policy “enhancement,” *Scripts, Screens and Audiences: A New Feature Film Policy for the 21st Century*, “continues to aim at building audiences” (Canadian Heritage, 2006, p. 2). Rather than setting out a new direction, the theme of “Enhancing the Canadian Feature Film Policy” calls for refinements to performance measurement including separate targets for the English- and French-language markets and a means for tracking additional

distribution platforms (pp. 7-8). Domestic box office share dropped to 4.2% in 2006 and even further to 3.2% in 2007, despite an overall increase in national box office revenues (Canadian Film and Television Production Association [CFTPA] & l'Association des producteurs de film et de la television du Québec [APFTQ], 2008, pp. 68-69). Acland (1997) conceptualizes the notion of audience absence in relation to the low percentage of screen time devoted to Canadian cinema and the implications for popular taste (pp. 281-282). He subsequently elaborates that a reliance on screen time to assess a national cinema assumes not only that "visibility in commercial theatres matters" but also that absence from these sites "acts as a barrier to a popular film culture" (2002, p. 11).⁸

Michael Dorland (1998) links the emergence of Canadian film studies to cultural absence and historical amnesia and observes that "the resulting 'history' of Canadian cinema became more often than not one of failure, of opportunities missed, or of betrayals by an ever-expanding cast of 'traitors'" (p. 7). From the perspective of political economy, Manjunath Pendakur (1990) outlines the dependent development of the Canadian feature film industry while Ted Magder (1993) considers the complicity of federal macro-economic policy with these structures of dependency. The framing of national cinema in relation to cultural nationalist anxieties and industrial goals, which are informed by neo-liberalism and an international context of deregulation, in turn influences a persistent rhetorical trope around audience absence. The absent audience evokes an entire ethos that "the recipe for this 'felt' national cultural absence has consisted of one part lost cultural potential, one part manifestos for corrective measures, and two parts self-loathing" (Acland, 1997, p. 281). In my Master's thesis, "Canon Busting? Approaching Contemporary Canadian Cinema," I confirm the impact of this

⁸ Part of Acland's critique involved an examination of shortcomings of "screen time," a measure of access to commercial theatres that doesn't account for details like venue size or whether "anyone is actually in the seats" (2002, p. 11). While screen time was the dominant measure cited during the 1990s in both popular sources like *Take One's* annual survey of Canadian cinema in the Greater Toronto market as well as government reports like *The Road to Success* (Acland, 2002, p. 10), it has since been replaced by references to domestic box office share.

trope of absence on canon formation, noting as an example a Toronto Festival of Festivals panel addressing the “shadow status” of Canadian cinema (Burgess, 2000, p. 3). Zoë Druick picks up on this connection between popularity and “a truly national cinema,” noting that “[i]t is something of a challenge, then, to think about English Canadian cinema as something other than a failed experiment in popular culture or a list of overlooked films” (forthcoming, p. 1).

Distribution remains the key sticking point in the development of a Canadian screen culture--from the inability of production stimuli like the Capital Cost Allowance tax shelter to overcome barriers to market access⁹ to the ongoing state refusal to impose discriminatory box office quotas or levies. The issue of mainstream audience access arguably has attained the status of a defining characteristic of Canadian cinema such that it can be invoked without citation or lengthy explication. In his examination of policy transformations that occurred in the early 1980s with the re-structuring of the CFDC into Telefilm Canada and the launch of the Canadian Broadcast Development Fund, Peter Urquhart (2006) explains that the “shift towards a model that emphasized broadcast over theatrical release would seem on the surface to provide a partial solution to the vexing problem of distribution” (p. 44); specifically, with broadcasting under the jurisdiction of federal policy, television was seen as offering the potential to circumvent the American stranglehold on theatrical exhibition. Urquhart’s use of this particular turn of phrase points to a shared understanding of a defining characteristic of Canadian cinema that confounds policy analysis and delimits film studies discourse. “Vexing” is a preferred descriptor that also pops up in Druick’s discussion of “the vexing questions of Canadian

⁹ Pendakur (1990) notes that the CCA did generate increased production activity, with a peak of 65 certified Canadian films made in 1979 (as compared to 3 in 1974 and 37 in both 1977 and 1978) as well as a sharp rise in average budgets from just over \$500,000 to \$2.6 million in 1979 and \$3.5 million in 1986 (pp. 172-173). However, he proceeds to question the viability of the tax shelter production boom given that many of the films were never released and “more than half of the films were unacceptable to the distributors in terms of commercial potential” (p. 178). Thus, in a high risk industry like theatrical film production, the inability to recoup investment across such a relatively modest production output is exacerbated by problems of market access.

cinema” (forthcoming, p. 1). Acland similarly cites “the vexing concept of national cinema” (2003, p. 193) while Telefilm’s corporate plan mentions the “often-vexing problem [of] how to reach the audience” (2006b, p. 7). These shorthand references capture the confounding complexities of limited access, absence of awareness and popularity; but they also work to set up an irreducible dichotomy between the conception of non-theatrical space as either an alternative venue or merely a gap that must be bridged between production and consumption.

With *Screen Traffic*, Acland shifts attention away from the nationalist framework of cultural absence and toward the study of popular screen culture in Canada; in doing so, he acknowledges the continental and cosmopolitan dimensions of the national cinema-going experience. Druick expands the discussion of audience presence to assert the significance of film festivals as productive sites for civic engagement. Noting that film festivals provide “a public space for engaging with cinema that offers partial relief from the limited palette of mainstream cinemas year round,” Druick argues that they also constitute a non-theatrical “zone where official culture meets popular practice in a genuinely successful way” (p. 10). Rather than defining the dispositions displayed at these parallel locations in opposition to commercial cinema-going, with the negative connotations of industry failure that this implies, Druick argues for a recuperation of the myriad contexts of national culture; in other words, the multiple outcomes of cultural policy help to illuminate the economic, political and cultural contradictions of English-Canadian cinema and its impact on discourses of national (or even cosmopolitan) citizenship. When Druick sets up her examination of non-theatrical exhibition with reference to a policy shift toward considering the performance of Canadian films in non-theatrical markets, her argument points to a disconnect in federal film policy.

Although film festivals are seen as contributing to Telefilm Canada’s corporate objectives of building audiences and industry capacity by providing a venue for the Canadian audiovisual industry (Kelly Sears Consulting Group, 2007b, p. 4), they are not

included in policy delineations of non-theatrical distribution platforms (Telefilm Canada, 2006b, p. 12). This apparent oversight reveals a split perspective on non-theatrical space which may reflect the nationalist origins of festival venues in both international and national contexts. Describing the festival as a mixed zone which blends “the nationalist and industry mandates for Canadian cinema,” Druick references Janet Harbord’s assertion that “the festival remains a crucial showcase for the symbolic capital of the nation” (as cited in Druick, forthcoming, p. 11). Harbord (2002) bases her assessment of the “interdependency of nation and film culture [that] exists at the heart of the festival event” on the combination of the subsidized infrastructure of the festival context and the national significance of film as a cultural product (p. 73). While film is a symbolic and economic asset for the nation “in terms of representation, a production economy [and] tourism” (Harbord, 2002, p. 72), the festival takes its place alongside other state-supported institutions that provide access to cultural products and facilitate training opportunities for creative producers. If the predominant focus is on defining, or marketing, the national film industry at festivals then policy objectives might differ as a result of the perception of the international festival circuit as a space *outside* the film commodity supply chain. But this exclusion of the domestic festival circuit from the supply chain, and thus from consideration as a distribution platform, reinforces the vexing dilemma at the core of Canadian cinema.

Against the backdrop of persistent absence and limited audience access via commercial theatrical exhibition, a vibrant national festival circuit provides opportunities for cultural access and presents additional challenges for federal policymakers. Starting in 2004 with Secor Consulting’s *Analysis of Canada’s Major Film Festivals*, Telefilm Canada embarked on a detailed review of its support of Canadian audiovisual festivals. This review coincided with industry concerns about the governance of the Montreal World Film Festival as well as the realignment of Telefilm’s corporate objectives to stress performance measurement, building industry capacity and efficient and transparent

program administration. According to the *Evaluation of Telefilm's Support to Canadian Audiovisual Festivals: Findings and Recommendations*, funding for domestic festivals “helps to ensure that venues are available for the Canadian audiovisual industry...to promote and show Canadian works, as well as for networking, sales and professional development opportunities” (Kelly Sears Consulting Group, 2007b, p. 8). Over the course of the three fiscal years from 2002-03 to 2004-05, \$8.483 million in financial support was provided to “some 60 events and festivals” (p. 9). The majority of Telefilm’s grants to Canadian festivals are funded through the Canada Showcase Program (replaced in 2008 by the Festivals Performance and Skills and Screens Programs) which is a component of the Canada Feature Film Fund. The total value of these grants increased from \$2.35 million in 2002-2003 to \$2.65 million in 2004-2005 (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 10), accounting for between 2 and 3 percent of the CFFF’s annual expenses.¹⁰ The Secor Report cites 2003 public attendance figures of 250,640 for TIFF and 151,000 for VIFF (2004, p. 42).¹¹ By 2005, TIFF’s attendance had climbed to 286,000 (Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG], 2006) while VIFF continued to report 150,000+, with a \$22,000 rise in ticket sales (VIFF, 2005).

At the same time, during the policy review process it was noted that the demand from existing and new festivals exceeded the program’s budget resources (Secor

¹⁰ It is difficult to ascertain accurate totals for Telefilm’s festival support as the grants are funded through a variety of sources. The *Evaluation of Telefilm's Support to Canadian Audiovisual Festivals: Findings and Recommendations* report lists the Canada New Media Fund and also explains that funds may be transferred from other streams for events that do not fall under the auspices of the Feature Film Fund (ie: television festivals) (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 8). In addition to the Canada Showcase Program, the Feature Film Fund provides assistance to domestic festivals through the Industrial Professional Development Fund (IPDF). It is not clear whether the \$3.7 million allocated for the new Festivals Performance and Skills and Screens programs merely consolidates existing funding streams. Although this total exceeds the level of support previously provided by Canada Showcase and the IPDF combined (< \$3 million), no new funding was announced and the backgrounder indicated that the new Programs did not comprise an effort to cut back festival support.

¹¹ TIFF has separate industry screenings while “freebies” account for 30% VIFF’s total (Secor Consulting, 2004, pp. 42-43). The Secor Report notes that these attendance figures comprise unaudited data provided by the festivals. As Marijke de Valck (2005) explains in her discussion of the International Film Festival Rotterdam, it is necessary to be wary of festival attendance reports as they are known to be “artificially boosted” (p. 98).

Consulting, 2004, p. 4). Over the course of five fiscal years, grants to “smaller festivals” rose from \$891,000 in 2001-2002 to just over \$1.48 million in 2005-2006—an increase from 35.7% to 45.4% of Telefilm’s total commitments to Canadian festivals (Telefilm Canada, 2006a, p. 26). During this same period, TIFF’s grant increased from \$558,000 to \$600,000 (which actually constituted a decline from a 22.4% to 18.3% share of the total) and VIFF’s funding went from \$195,000 to \$325,000 (or from 7.8% to 9.9% of the total).¹² This raises the stakes even further in a highly competitive funding environment as Telefilm seeks to better define its role and perhaps, by extension, to manage an increasingly crowded domestic festival circuit. In addition, with the launch of year-round programming at the Vancouver International Film Centre in late 2005 and the growth of smaller festivals, it becomes critical to navigate the distinction between the cultural provision of audience access (a symbolic measure) and industrial box office (and multiplatform) goals, particularly given that the domestic festival circuit is the only segment of the exhibition market over which the state exerts an influence.

Festival proliferation is certainly not new. Writing over a decade earlier, Nichols (1994b) notes the ubiquity of international film festivals and argues that they are “no longer a peripheral phenomenon leading to the harsh realities of commercial distribution and exhibition” but rather a continuous circuit that sustains “a ‘traffic in cinema’” (p. 68). Using the example of the Toronto International Film Festival’s 1992 retrospective of post-revolutionary Iranian cinema, Nichols explores the impact of the festival context where texts circulate within a “specific system of institutional assumptions, priorities and constraints” that add a “global overlay to more local meanings” (p. 68). Julian Stringer (2003) commences his study of the film festival as “one of the key institutions through which contemporary world cinema is circulated and understood” with the observation that the topic comprises a neglected field of scholarly inquiry (p. 6). It would be

¹² The 2005-2006 fiscal year coincided with the launch of the Vancouver International Film Centre, and thus an increased operating budget for VIFF, which may account for the larger grant.

inaccurate though to suggest that it has been completely overlooked as, inclusive of the numerous anecdotal histories and guidebooks cited by Stringer, the discussion of film festivals is actually quite present across a range of sources.

Instead, the issue seems to emerge from an opening reference to Paul Willemen's comments about the lack of knowledge concerning either a theoretical framework or even "the basic criteria with which to assess festivals" (as cited in Stringer, 2003, p. 1). Willemen (1981) points out that, beyond the marketing of films, festivals host "accredited 'regulators' whose task it is to organise and police the terms on which these products are to be consumed" (p. 96). However, in limiting the category to media, and designating them as dominant in struggles over a festival's cultural policy, he downplays the influence of programmers, juries and audiences in setting and negotiating the terms of the debate. Conversely, Canada's Secor Report underestimates the role of the media by including broadcasters and journalists in the same stakeholder group as other film professionals (p. 3). This classification assumes that the media's expectations are consistent with those of industry workers like directors, producers and distributors. While all of these people do share in common some sort of professional motivation for attending festivals, the media provide commentary on the activities of the stakeholder groups (general public, public sector partners, industry professionals), on the film industry and aesthetic trends and on the festival itself. As such, their objectives exceed the narrowly defined expectations outlined in the Secor Report.

The special role of the media in framing the value negotiations that occur at the festival is addressed by media theorist Daniel Dayan (1997) who posits the existence of a "written festival" that emerges from the print coverage generated by the press and festival publicity. Drawing a comparison to Roland Barthes' work on fashion, he argues that the festival's "systematic dimension" only becomes meaningful through written commentary (Conclusion section, para. 1). As such, in order to study the festival, "one has to look away" from the physical event. Dayan explains that the written festival comprises

“different versions...relying on different sources of legitimacy” as well as “common threads” that combine to “giv[e] voice to the perspectives of [the festival’s] different participants” (Conclusion section, para. 4). Elsaesser concurs that “film festivals are defined not so much by the films they show, but by the print they produce...creating ‘verbal architectures’ that mould the event’s sense of its own significance and sustain its self-importance” (2005, p. 95, citing Dayan). Thus, rather than conforming to Willemsen’s designation of their role as regulators, the media appear to serve a constitutive function through the ordering and dispersal of festival buzz. There is an element of symbolic mediation here as Dayan observes the extent to which “[j]ournalists are posing” through the use of trade jargon, evaluative language that implicates the distinctive taste clusters of their respective readerships and testimonials that offer a portrait of the festival experience (Focusing on Journalists section, para. 2). However, while Dayan views the written festival as an assemblage of the narratives of festival participants (including the journalists themselves), my argument is that it also captures the historical trajectory of an event’s identity. In other words, this written architecture provides the ethnographic traces that allow for an examination of the convergence of stakeholder interests at the festival.

Beyond Elsaesser’s brief musing on “Film Festival Networks,” the international festival tends to be an elusive object as commentary in journals or popular criticism usually focuses on films, cinematic or industry trends or political squabbles arising in response to the specific iteration of the event in question. A notable exception occurs with Nichols’ exploration of the ways in which new cinemas are received on the international film festival circuit. His “Global Image Consumption in the Age of Late Capitalism” elaborates on how the festival circuit inflects the experience of national cinemas, with value ascertained based on relative positioning within “a marketplace of signifiers” (1994b, p. 73), while “Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit” is ultimately more concerned with delineating the formal

characteristics of new Iranian cinema. For Nichols, the traffic of the international festival circuit is complicit with construction of national cinemas. He argues that, even though films are “made locally, within a regional or national context,” the interpretation of sampling of texts assumes that film production bears “a metonymic relation to the nation-state” and “a synecdochic relation to national culture” (1994b, p. 77). Consequently, new or unfamiliar cinemas are read in relation to other national cinemas as part of an evolving repertoire of international film (p. 78).

A more typical approach to festival commentary can be found in examples such as Mark Peranson’s (2004) review “Cannes 2004: Born to Lose” and Robin Wood’s (2004) “Notes on The [2003] Toronto Film Festival.” Peranson, a cinephile with his own magazine on international cinema and a programmer for the Vancouver International Film Festival, perceives the reduced number of art films in Cannes’ 2004 Official Competition along with the award ceremony’s “general spirit of inclusiveness” as a shift toward populist mediocrity (p. 42); indeed, the decision of the jury, chaired by Quentin Tarantino, to award the Palme D’Or to Michael Moore’s *Fahrenheit 9/11* in an American election year seemed to have more to do with politics than art. Meanwhile, Wood, a retired professor and member of *CineAction*’s editorial collective, prefaces his “provisional overview” of films viewed at the 2003 Toronto Festival with a somewhat different take on inclusiveness (p. 62). Overwhelmed by the sheer breadth of selections, all of which are presented in the program guide as meriting attention, he disparages the “festival report” as symptomatic of “our ‘fast food’ culture” in that it lacks the complex (and contextually informed) assessments of textual value that should be the domain of scholarly driven film criticism (p. 62). In each instance, these articles reflect the evaluative judgements of their respective authors in relation to larger debates about cinephilia, popular cinema, film criticism and the role of the international film festival. However, while the complaints of Peranson and Wood could inform an analysis of the cultural politics of the international film festival, their comments are instead a preamble

to festival reviews thereby deferring a detailed discussion of festival dynamics.

Film festivals take centre stage in several book-length histories written by festival insiders. While these accounts are quite informative about certain historical details and provide insight into excellent starting points for further study, they also fall prey to a number of historiographic pitfalls. Cari Beauchamp and Henri Béhar's *Hollywood on the Riviera: The Inside Story of the Cannes Film Festival* offers "a highly anecdotal history that would be comprehensive in an illustrative way" (1992, p. 12) while Brian D. Johnson's *Brave Films Wild Nights: 25 Years of Festival Fever* strives to combine "the story of independent film"--from the discovery of foreign film cultures and indie auteurs to the rising corporate stakes of boutique distribution--with a celebratory chronicle of the Toronto International Film Festival on its silver anniversary (2000, p. 13). These gossip-laden accounts flaunt their authors' insider access to celebrity stories which are often about illicit sex or drugs (preferably both) or heartwarming trivia such as Clint Eastwood's impromptu hospital visit to meet festival director Helga Stephenson's terminally ill mother (Johnson, 2000, p. 225).

Additional histories have been penned by festival founders such as Lory Smith's *Party in a Box: The Story of the Sundance Film Festival*, Forsyth Hardy's *Slightly Mad and Full of Dangers: The Story of the Edinburgh Film Festival* and *Film Festival Confidential* from TIFF co-founder William Marshall. Along with even more insider gossip, these books contribute to a preliminary understanding of the politics of festival governance in terms of the relationship to government agencies, industry players and perceptions of each event's evolving role. As an elaboration of Wood's critique of the summative post-festival report, a key shortcoming of these popular "insider" histories is their tendency to reinforce the mythic status of their respective events at the expense of a detailed consideration of other contextual factors. Instead, the emphasis is placed on discoveries made by programmers, reinforced by juries or audiences and then retroactively enshrined as festival lore. Examples include Steven Soderbergh's Palme

D'Or victory with his low budget indie debut *sex, lies and videotape* which went on to both Oscar and box office success (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, p. 48) and programmer David Overbey's persistent pursuit to secure *Diva* (Beineix) from its reluctant sales agent; an enthusiastic response from the TIFF audience sparked a distributor bidding war that was followed by an art-house launch and a triumphant re-release in France (Johnson, 2000, pp. 77-79). Cannes gets credit for discovering Jim Jarmusch and Wim Wenders while Toronto claims the distinction of introducing Pedro Almodóvar and Krzysztof Kieslowski to North America.

Leaving aside the highly selective and retrospective nature of these lists of canonical contribution, the notion of the festival discovery brings to mind Pierre Bourdieu's comments about the charismatic ideology of artistic creation as "the main obstacle to a rigorous science of the production of the value of cultural goods" (1993, p. 76). Designating festival programmers as "inspired talent-spotters" displaces the question of how value is produced at the film festival by shifting attention away from the source of their authority to consecrate the work (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 77). Or, to re-frame this question at the level of the field of cultural production, what is the role of the film festival in the distribution and exhibition of the film commodity? In Bourdieusian terms, how is the festival positioned in "the struggles for the monopoly of the power to consecrate" (1993, p. 78)? As mentioned earlier, the film festival's discourse of value pertains to both individual texts as well as the dominant critical agenda for international cinema. Thus, the struggles over value that occur on the international festival circuit carry significant implications for the prospects of national cinemas in the global marketplace as well as the changing contours of indie acquisitions.

While such festival histories may offer glimpses of the political and economic forces at play (often refracted through a self-aggrandizing lens), a notable exception can be found with Wolfgang Jacobsen's empirically grounded history, *Berlinale: 50 Years Internationale Filmfestspiele Berlin*. For this weighty tome, Jacobsen compiled

information from the Berlin festival's archives, including letters, official documents and souvenir programs. His credentials as a film historian, department head at the Filmmuseum Berlin and curator of the festival's Retrospective and Homage sections combine insider access with an attention to detail and sober authorial voice that conveys an objective tone; even so, it is interesting to note that he concludes his acknowledgement of festival director Moritz de Hadeln's provision of unrestricted access with the cryptic comment: "I have not presented everything I have read and learned" (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 541). Organized as an annual timeline, with margin notes as a guide to highlights, *Berlinale* incorporates disputes about festival governance such as the disruption of the 1970 Competition following the premiere of Michael Verhoeven's controversial *O.K.* and the 1981 threat of a boycott by West German directors. In reconstructing a narrative of these events, Jacobsen illuminates the motives of various stakeholders and provides insight into policy reform. Following the 1970 crisis, the restructuring of the Berlin festival balanced concerns from national and international industry associations, the curatorial board and government representatives and resulted in the creation of the International Forum of Young Cinema which would run parallel to the Competition (Jacobsen, 2000, pp. 173-174).

A broader perspective on festival politics can be found in Kenneth Turan's *Sundance to Sarajevo: Film Festivals and the World They Made*. Drawing on his experiences travelling to festivals as an accredited journalist, Turan sets out to classify these events according to their primary agenda; his selection spans major festivals like Cannes and obscure gatherings like Midnight Sun with the aim of exploring the diversity of cinematic and festival experience (2002, p. 9). While the "Festivals with Business Agendas" (Cannes, Sundance, ShoWest) have clear links to the commercial aspects of distribution and exhibition, the "Festivals with Aesthetic Agendas" (Pordenone, Lone Pine, Telluride) generally opt for an overarching theme or focus that sets them apart from the international festival circuit; thus, Pordenone is devoted to silent cinema while Lone

Pine limits its screenings to productions shot in the distinctive Alabama Hills, near Los Angeles. It is not entirely clear why Turan deems Telluride to be more aesthetically-driven than other festivals unless his assessment arises from the stubborn resistance of its organizers to capitalize on success and thus relies on a distinction between business and cinephilia. For the “Festivals with Geopolitical Agendas” (FESPACO, Havana, Sarajevo, Midnight Sun), the shared trait is their compensation for the absence of the infrastructure or resources to support regularized exhibition; consequently, in addition to key industry initiatives these events provide the only opportunity for audiences to gather in a theatre setting.

Lastly, Turan examines the failure of the Sarasota French Film Festival, an event that was designed to help French cinema gain access to the American market (2002, p. 160). Although myriad factors from funding to demographics caused the French Film Festival to relocate to Acapulco, the challenge of penetrating the Hollywood-dominated marketplace occupies the bulk of Turan’s discussion which is significant as he otherwise does not engage with this crucial issue facing national cinemas. In the book’s introduction, TIFF’s Chief Executive Officer Piers Handling refers to festivals as “an alternative distribution network” for foreign film (as cited in Turan, 2002, 8), a comment that lends support to Turan’s attribution of festival proliferation to various pressures for options other than those offered by commercial theatres. However, if festival space creates a non-theatrical alternative, how is this reconciled with the objective of bolstering the commercial prospects of the national film industry? And, perhaps a more obvious series of questions relates to Hollywood’s increasing involvement on the international festival circuit; from the acquisition of boutique distributors as a means of accessing the art house market to the launch of summer movies at Cannes and Oscar contenders at TIFF, Hollywood business has become increasingly present at international film festivals over the course of the last twenty years. Turan manages to sidestep these issues by not profiling a festival like TIFF with a hybrid agenda that would not easily fit his model.

This dissertation explores the global, local and regional articulation of the Toronto and Vancouver International Film Festivals in relation to broader industrial, institutional and governmental struggles to define cinema culture in Canada. Both TIFF and VIFF can be considered major international festivals, even though the criteria for making this assessment differ. According to the Secor Report, industry professionals concur that out of “several thousand” events worldwide in 2003, “there are about fifty ‘major’ festivals,” most of which are competitive (2004, p. 17). The International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF – Fédération Internationale des Associations de Producteurs de Films) accredits both competitive and non-competitive international film festivals based upon a series of Regulations that inform a “mutual trust contract” (“International Film Festivals”).¹³ Established in 1933 as a non-profit organization based in Paris (“FIAPF Governance”), FIAPF’s mandate is “to represent the economic, legal and regulatory interests which film and TV production industries in four continents have in common” (“Welcome”). The Federation is governed by an elected General Assembly drawn from its membership of 25 producers’ associations from 22 countries; the General Assembly in turn elects a President and appoints an Executive Committee tasked with strategic and policy planning (“Welcome”). In 2008, FIAPF accredited 38 competitive feature film festivals (the bulk of which were designated as having a specialized focus) and 5 non-competitive feature film festivals.¹⁴ Competitive events (ie: featuring an Official Competition and International Jury) include the Berlinale, Venice’s Biennale, Cannes and the Montreal World Film Festival while TIFF and London are listed as non-competitive. Although festivals accredited as non-competitive usually include juried awards, they are not subject to the requirement of having an international selection of

¹³ The Regulations address “quality and reliability standards” related to organizational resources, official publications, services for international correspondents, support from local industry stakeholders, protection of intellectual property rights and “genuinely international selections of films and competition juries” (FIAPF, “International Film Festivals”).

¹⁴ Totals from FIAPF, “Competitive feature film festivals,” “Competitive specialised feature film festivals” and “Non-competitive feature film festivals.”

competition films and jurors;¹⁵ for example, TIFF has juried awards for Canadian cinema as well as a people's choice award and an International Critics Prize (FIPRESCI, International Federation of Film Critics).

The Secor Report's informal list, which mentions unaccredited Sundance, diverges from that of FIAPF, thereby suggesting that there is no definitive category of major international film festivals. Instead, it seems that, in the absence of a comparable international governing body, FIAPF accreditation carries weight due to the Federation's historical involvement in shaping the international festival circuit. Jacobsen's account of the Berlinale's evolution provides glimpses of FIAPF regulations in action as the festival sought A-list competitive status. Prior to the shift toward programming autonomy (which I examine in Chapter 2), FIAPF played a role in setting selection criteria for national submissions. Jacobsen mentions a regulation arising from the 1954 FIAPF meeting in Madrid which stipulates that "[t]he Fédération cannot recognize any festival which is, in the character of its prizes, the wording of its invitations, or in any other respect in some way politically inclined" (2000, p. 58). As such, the Federation appears to have acted as a de facto cinematic United Nations. Not only could the accreditation regulations assist member associations in planning their international market participation, it also seems clear that FIAPF's actions as an arbiter shaped both programming structure and festival governance on the nascent circuit. In the Canadian context, Telefilm designated four festivals as Major Festivals that would be subject to separate regulatory thresholds. The Canada Showcase Program guidelines recognized the Atlantic Film Festival, the Montreal World Film Festival, the Toronto International Film Festival and the Vancouver International Film Festival for "their long-standing success, the number of titles they showcase, their capacity to attract significant levels of private sector financing and the

¹⁵ The exact distinction between "official awards" like the Palme D'Or, Golden Bear and Golden Lion and other juried awards like TIFF's prize for Best Canadian Feature Film is probably only meaningful to a select group of cinephiles and festival insiders. Generally speaking, the symbolic value of an award reflects the status of the festival rather than an awareness of the prestige conferred by the jury.

economic impact on their respective regions” (Telefilm Canada, 2002, p. 2).

During the policy review process, this hierarchical designation was removed from the guidelines along with the differential funding thresholds it entailed (including lower percentages for both minimum Canadian content and maximum financial assistance). The new Festivals Performance Program (launched in 2008), with its eligibility hurdle of “a minimum of 100,000 in overall attendance at the screening of feature length films,” will once again target large regional festivals, this time as recipients of “predictable core funding” (Telefilm Canada, 2008a, p. 4). The exception here is the Atlantic Film Festival, with 2003 attendance figures of 24,346 (Secor Consulting, 2004, p. 42) indicating that the event will likely have to rely on the regionally-adjudicated Skills and Screens Program for annual support. As such, a regional funding strategy—with one Major Festival under the administrative jurisdiction of each of Telefilm’s four regional offices—has shifted slightly in favour of national performance indicators. Overall, in selecting the TIFF and VIFF for case studies, I have chosen both an internationally recognized major festival and one that satisfies national criteria.

The term “international film festival” requires some additional clarification. The global proliferation of film festivals has not been matched by a suitably variegated taxonomy with the result that the classificatory boundaries of this category have been stretched quite thin. The Secor Report sets out three main types of stakeholders (general public, film professionals, public partners) whose differing expectations provide a framework for analysing the “performance of major film festivals” (2004, p. 3). Within this model, the film festival mediates stakeholder interests by providing access to a range of international films and facilitating myriad networking opportunities related to professional development, industry capacity and cultural diversity. However, this description could be applied to a wide variety of festivals that program international films but demonstrate varying levels of industrial activity. As noted in the *Evaluation of Canada Showcase Program: Summary of Stakeholder Interviews*, industry professionals

refer to smaller local festivals as “cultural events” due to a perceived lack of “any real industrial purpose” (as cited in Kelly Sears, 2007a, p. 10). Key here is the designation of a tier of Canadian festivals as local, which points to limitations in terms of both marketing reach and contribution to the circulation of festival buzz. Film festivals (even those with international programming) can be characterized further by their spatial and temporal positioning relative to global Hollywood’s cyclical release strategies (eg: summer blockbusters, fall awards) and premiere events.¹⁶

In highlighting the negotiation of value, my selection of cases emphasizes the industrial distinction between theatrical and non-theatrical exhibition. As a threshold to commercial release, this split draws attention to the potential convertibility of symbolic capital as well as the intermediary role of the film festival in helping to establish *both* the economic and cultural value of cinema.¹⁷ This focus further influences my selection of the first three A-status film festivals as historical referents of an ideal type of cinephilia. In addition to elaborating a basic framework for understanding the international film festival, it also sets up key differences within the category of major festivals.¹⁸ The Secor Report notes that TIFF is “the largest international non-competitive festival [and] is recognized as a first-rate event for leveraging promotion and boosting a film’s career”

¹⁶ The Secor Report includes a diagram that charts the annual calendar of major film festivals and markets (2004, p. 19). Given the significance of novelty in the sales and marketing of film commodities, certain festivals emerge as premier(e) events due to their status as entry points into the international circuit—and thus also serve as potential launch pads for eventual commercial crossover to mainstream theatrical circuits or ancillary markets. Eligibility regulations entrench the pre-eminence of these events with the result that industry professionals must make strategic decisions in pursuing World and International premiere slots for their new films.

¹⁷ This approach also limits my discussion to feature filmmaking. Thus, I have excluded festivals that satisfy market or format niches such as Hot Docs Canadian International Documentary Festival or Clermont-Ferrand International Short Film Festival, both of which are known for their markets. However, since the target is broadcast sales, these festivals are subject to a different set of policy issues and institutional stakeholders.

¹⁸ In selecting TIFF and VIFF for comparison, I have opted to exclude both older Canadian festivals like Yorkton and the growing third tier of smaller local events—in part due to limitations in industrial impact, governmental support or access to the most recent slate of international features. My selection reflects my overarching interest in the international festival circuit as well as Telefilm’s evolving policy framework. At the same time, this enables me to probe more deeply into the inevitable (and often misleading) comparisons between the Festivals that I encountered while working at VIFF.

(Secor, 2004, p. 17). Co-founder Bill Marshall (2005) makes several references to the festival's distinct status as a public event (eg: pp. 2, 12, 100) with the explanation that "regular filmgoers don't stand a chance in hell of getting into the Cannes Film Festival" (p. 12).¹⁹ Described as "the most important film event in the Canadian West" (Secor, 9), the Vancouver International Film Festival is international in programming scope but can be considered as more of a regional event due to the relative absence of sales activity. VIFF's timing on the festival circuit means that many of the season's new films will have already screened elsewhere with the result that the proportion of world premieres is greatly reduced as is celebrity and media presence; perhaps as a consequence, or potentially to assert a unique identity on the circuit, the festival stresses the quality of its non-mainstream programming. Amongst VIFF's program streams, "Nonfiction Features" is quite popular with local audiences while "Dragons and Tigers" offers "the largest annual exhibition of East Asian films outside Asia" ("About VIFF"), a section that includes numerous international premieres but is not a source of significant sales activity.

My selection of two English-Canadian festivals also raises a critique of the two market model that is becoming increasingly entrenched in federal film policy. The update to Telefilm's 2006-2007 to 2010-2011 Corporate Plan (*From Cinemas to Cell Phones, Priorities 2007-2008*) outlines the implementation of "an asymmetrical approach to the two language markets" that began with industry consultations in 2006 and culminated in revisions to the Canada Feature Film Fund (2007b, p. 5). One of the priorities listed for Canadian Cinema is the establishment of "two sets of realistic, measurable revenue targets to be met by 2010" (p. 5). My intention here is not to ignore or dispute the distinctive context of Quebec cinema, which is evidenced by the comparatively robust box office share attained in the French-language market; over the course of the five-year period from 2003 to 2007, the domestic box office share in the

¹⁹ Johnson (2000) picks up this argument, differentiating TIFF's "civilian audience" (p. 11) from more industry-focussed events like Sundance and Cannes.

French-language market reached a high of 27.0% in 2005 while English-language market share remained consistently below 2% (CFTPA & APFTQ, 2008, p. 70). That the French-language market is essentially co-extensive with a provincial production jurisdiction allows for a relatively uncomplicated movement between analyses of funding mechanisms and outcomes. However, the same logic cannot be applied to English-Canada where the designation of a single national market belies the activities of discrete intra-national production jurisdictions.

Self PortraitS: The Cinemas of Canada since Telefilm (2006), a follow-up to the 1980 anthology *Self Portrait: Essays on the Canadian and Quebec Cinemas*, compiles essays that explore industrial, institutional and aesthetic aspects of regional feature film practices. Editors André Loiselle and Tom McSorley pluralized the title for the new volume (and capitalized the “s” on the cover and title page) as a response to the search for “a collective portrait” of Canadian cinema initiated by 1980 co-editor Piers Handling.²⁰ Loiselle and McSorley further assert that the federal and provincial funding policies of the intervening 20 years--including the declining role of the National Film Board, Telefilm’s opening of regional offices in Vancouver and Halifax and the launch of several provincial funding agencies²¹--“have tended to reinforce regional patterns of production in fiction feature filmmaking” (2006, p. 15). Brenda Longfellow’s contribution, “Surfing the Toronto New Wave: Policy, Paradigm Shifts and Post-Nationalism,” connects the 1980s emergence of a cluster of Ontario writer-directors (including Atom Egoyan, Bruce McDonald and Patricia Rozema) and the revival of English-Canadian art cinema to the provincial and federal policy environment as well as

²⁰ In the “Preface” of the 1980 anthology, Handling “asks whether Canadian cinema does in fact draw ‘a collective portrait that we recognize’ or if it remains an ‘invisible cinema’ that Canadians never see” (as cited in Loiselle & McSorley, 2006, p. 13).

²¹ These include the establishment of Alberta Motion Picture Development Corporation (now the Alberta Film Development Program) in 1981, the Ontario Film Development Corporation (now the Ontario Media Development Corporation) in 1986, British Columbia Film in 1987 and the Manitoba Cultural Industries Development Office (now Manitoba Film and Sound), also in 1987. Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland/Labrador followed suit, launching film development corporations in the late 1980s and early 1990s. (Loiselle and McSorley, 2006, p. 16)

to global economic and cultural flows. In my essay, “Air Bud and Stickgirl Share Leaky Condo: The Changing Landscape of BC Cinema since the 1980s,” I discuss the late 1990s/early 2000s upsurge in indigenous west coast production, dubbed the Pacific New Wave, as the outcome of competitive intra-national funding incentives and continental labour practices. Just as production jurisdictions exceed a nationalist framework, the development of international film festivals in major urban centres suggests that the complexities of English-Canadian cinema culture cannot be subsumed within one box office target. Through case studies of two English-Canadian festivals, this dissertation will further displace unitary conceptions of national cinema in favour of a relational perspective on the international film festival as an institution within a nexus of industrial and cultural interests and at the intersection of local, regional, national and global cinema.

Bourdieu’s conception of the field of cultural production provides a useful guide for approaching the positioning of the film festival as an intermediary in the circulation of international cinema. In *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, Bourdieu contends that the source of artistic value cannot be traced to the actions of particular “influential” individuals or institutions (or some combination thereof) but instead that “it is the field of production, understood as the system of objective relations between these agents or institutions and as the site of the struggles for the monopoly of the power to consecrate, in which the value of works of art and belief in that value are continuously generated” (1993, p. 78). Thus, the “phenomenon” of the festival cannot be reduced to the myriad narratives that form the written festival, as Dayan’s model implies. Instead, the festival itself (as both event and institution) is caught up in what can be best described as “a field of forces...[that] is also a field of struggles” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 30) over hierarchies of cinematic value, and by extension cinema culture. David Hesmondhalgh (2006) argues that the effectiveness of field theory arises both from its emphasis on the interconnectedness of fields, thereby allowing for a comprehensive view of power and society, and its ability to account for degrees of autonomy from the field of

power (pp. 216-217). Interconnectedness in turn suggests networks, flows and interdependence as means to approach the global/local and national/regional definition of film scenes in a manner that recalls Nichols (1994b) discussion of the appraisal of national cinemas on the international festival circuit. My use of field theory as a heuristic device will allow for an investigation of the ways in which the international film festival is structured by the intersection of stakeholder interests. This approach expands on models that either segregate the festival's activities from the interconnectedness of stakeholder interests or sublimate the production of value in shorthand references to defining features like buzz.

Consistent with this view, Elsaesser perceives the festival circuit as “a network (with nodes, flows and exchanges)” whose spatio-temporal dimensions are “the motor” that both drives and sustains European cinema (2005, p. 84). He assigns a cluster of attributes to festivals including “global platform,” “marketplace” (or perhaps “bazaar”), “cultural showcase,” “competitive venue,” and “world body” (interpreted variously as “an ad-hoc United Nations,” “parliament” or “cinematic NGO’s”) (2005, p. 88). It is important to note that, for Elsaesser, these political, cultural, and economic institutional factors coalesce when the festivals are “taken together” as an interconnected circuit (2005, p. 88). He concludes that the festival circuit creates “a self-sustaining, highly self-referential world for the art cinema, the independent cinema and the documentary film” that constitutes an “alternative” to post-Fordist Hollywood (2005, p. 88). While this macro-level model accounts for the circulation of texts and the dynamic interchanges that sustain European cinema, Elsaesser’s model does not address the split between theatrical and non-theatrical space or, more specifically, the political and economic ramifications for regional or national film industries. My approach shifts the focus from the circuit as a whole to individual international festivals in a national (as well as regional) context. Thus, I examine how the international festival is positioned as an intermediary that operates in the gap between cultural production and consumption. In addition, by

narrowing the discussion to specific festivals, I examine how political, economic and cultural interests converge in struggles to define cinema culture in Canada.

Specifically, I draw on Dayan's concept of the written festival to explore the emergent identities of TIFF and VIFF and to analyse their divergent film centre developments. Through the interweaving of perspectives (or competitive position-takings), the written festival presents a historically grounded snapshot of the formation of each festival in relation to stakeholder interests. In setting out to examine the festival as "a social phenomenon of brief duration" (para. 3), Dayan found that his analysis of Sundance amounted to a "story told from various angles" (para. 5) that resembled the "ventriloquy" he observed in the written festival (Conclusion section, para. 4). My assumption then is that looking to each festival's written past reveals the central narrative of the field of forces (and field of struggles) that structured successive iterations in the events' development. Although Elsaesser asserts that buzz exceeds the written festival in that the spread of verbal gossip contributes to more immediate shifts in the energy of festival space (2005, p. 95), my focus is instead on the lingering traces that become an accessible public memory of these events. Festival publications—in particular Web sites due to their broad accessibility—provide further insight into each festival's identity formation and myth-making efforts while policy reports indicate the national concerns of public sector partners as well as the more specifically regional or local constraints that delimit institutional development.

Elsaesser's explanation of how festivals work also draws on Dayan's discussion of the dynamics of the transient community that assembles each year at Sundance—noting in particular the festival's "dispersive energy" in the generation of "buzz" as well as a process of "performative self-confirmation and reflexive self-definition" (2005, pp. 94-95). Buzz points to the role of cultural capital, or the "competence" to appreciate cultural products (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 2), and also symbolic capital, which represents

“prestige” or “authority” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 75);²² Bourdieu links symbolic capital with “consecration,” or the power “to give value,” explaining that it comprises “disavowed” economic or political capital that acts as a redeemable “credit” (1993, 75). Elsaesser cites Liz Czach’s analysis of the accrual of “critical capital” that accompanies selection ““for a prestigious festival”” and is further inflected by a film’s placement within the hierarchical structure of a festival’s programs (2005, p. 97). Czach explains that success on the festival circuit increases the likelihood that a film will “find a place in the history of Canadian cinema” (2004, p. 82)—with the impact that decisions made by programmers “amount to an argument about what defines that field, genre, or national cinema” (p. 85). Brenda Longfellow similarly acknowledges the role of the festival in “bestowing cultural capital,” although her argument references Elsaesser’s comment that “[w]hat competes at festivals are less individual films than film concepts” (2006, p. 175). Longfellow’s discussion of the role of Cannes in focusing international attention on emerging Toronto New Wave directors echoes Elsaesser’s linking of the showcasing of British films at the London Film Festival to the resurgence of a “brand image” for British national cinema (2006, pp. 51-52).

Despite the useful insights that are provided, Elsaesser’s approach tends toward an elaboration of generalizable festival attributes with a result that the circuit exceeds his definition of it in much the same way that the festival’s organizational structure eludes Stringer’s application of the art world rubric. By his own admission, Elsaesser sidesteps the theoretical conceit of systemic properties in favour of the “phenomenon” of the European film festival (2005, p. 83). He suggests that the answer lies “in some version of modern system theory” and credits his “Cinema Europe study group, 2004-2005” for exploring the possibilities (2005, pp. 83, 104n2). Of that study group, Marijke de Valck

²² Bourdieu describes cultural capital in terms of the verbs “voir” and “savoir” in that the capacity to see is a function of one’s available knowledge (1984, pp. 2-3); symbolic capital “is founded on a dialectic of knowledge (*connaissance*) and recognition (*reconnaissance*)” (Johnson, 1993, p. 7, citing Bourdieu, 1990, pp. 22, 111).

utilizes Bruno Latour's actor-network theory in her "preliminary taxonomy of cinephiles" at the Rotterdam festival (IFFR) (2005, p. 103). She refers to the list of six cineophile types²³ in terms of a "multiplex of cinephilia," a metaphor that connects the IFFR's rental of the Pathé multiplex to "a multiplicity of needs" served by the festival (2005, p. 107); commercial and cultural imperatives cross-pollinate here with the rise of indie Hollywood, the professionalization of the festival and the exigencies of federal and municipal support. Although this approach positions the festival within a network of "needs," it focuses on "the manifestations of the social agents involved in the field" (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 30) rather than the production of value. Greater specificity is found with Czach's consideration of the politics of festival programming and Longfellow's text-centred approach to the evolution of national cinema in the context of globalization. Given the tendency of terms like "buzz" to obscure the understanding of how symbolic value is accrued, I find Czach's adaptation of Bourdieu's "cultural capital" (from *Distinction*) to form her term "critical capital" quite interesting. A hybrid of symbolic and cultural capital, Czach's term straddles the gap between production and consumption by indicating that the symbolic credit of prestigious program placement will be redeemed as an aspect of cinephilic competence. As I demonstrate in Chapter 1, the return to Bourdieu for greater explication of concepts like "cultural intermediary" reveals the potential of field theory to illuminate the festival's role in cultural production.

Chapter One examines the status of the film festival at the threshold to mainstream exhibition. The concept of liminality offers a framework for understanding the tension between art and commerce as well as the inversions in the hierarchy of cinematic value that can occur in this threshold space. Bourdieu's work on the field of cultural production is then used to develop a theoretical perspective on festival space that

²³ The six cineophile types are "the lone list-maker" (who, like Andrew Sarris' festival mole, rarely emerges from the theatre), "the highlight seeker" (a cinephilic version of Sarris' moth, only drawn to hot films rather than celebrity events), "the specialist," "the leisure visitor," "the social tourist" and "the [festival] volunteer" (Valck, 2005, pp. 103-105).

can account for struggles over the mediation of symbolic value relative to industry and government interests. Drawing on the Bourdieusian concept of the cultural intermediary, I examine the operation of the international film festival as an intermediary in the gap between production and consumption; interrogating the proliferating activity in this gap is necessary in order to avoid displacing the charismatic ideology of the artist as symbolic creator onto the festival as mediator.²⁴ Lastly, the notion of the festival's autonomy, and its significance to the field's "universe of belief," provides insight into institutional shifts at the festival in response to changing political and economic pressures.

In Chapter Two, I outline the intersecting political, cultural, and industrial interests that converged in the history of the inception of the first three FIAPF-accredited competitive festivals and explore how these forces engage in struggles to define the subject as cosmopolitan, citizen and consumer. Local context is implicated in this international circulation of texts as global cities and elite tourist destinations both affirm and develop their status as cultural and economic hubs by providing a setting for the exclusive pursuit of cinephilia and celebrity. Struggles over programming autonomy impacted organizational changes at Cannes and the Berlinale in the late 1960s and early 1970s while industry consolidation over the course of the 1990s further shifted the role of the festival. Specifically, changes in the political economy of independent cinema have resulted in increased Hollywood interest in the international festival as an economic rather than diplomatic tool.

Chapter Three details the disparate origins of the Toronto and Vancouver International Film Festivals. The initial vision expressed by the events' founders is

²⁴ In my discussion of the film festival's role in mediating the production of cultural value, I have departed somewhat from Bourdieu's definition of cultural intermediaries as workers (although this definition is explored in Chapter One). My attribution of an intermediary role to an institution emerges from the tendency to invoke the festival as a metonym for the negotiations of value that occur in festival space. For example, linking the discovery of Steven Soderbergh to Sundance subsumes the contributions of programmers, festival workers (ranging from administrators to volunteers), audience members, media, and distributors under the overarching umbrella of the myth-making power of the festival—in part, as an example of the branding of the festival, but also as an expression of the contingent connections that arise there.

considered alongside the evolution of each festival's mandate and brand identity. The perceived relationship to industry and local audience is key to both TIFF and VIFF, albeit in divergent ways. While TIFF can be characterized as both an industry event and a public festival, VIFF focuses more on its contributions as a community event and alternative to mainstream exhibition. In Chapter Four, I examine the development of permanent facilities by the Toronto and Vancouver Festivals. On one hand, the architectural vision and programming plans for Toronto's Bell Lightbox and the Vancity Theatre at the Vancouver International Film Centre exemplify the construction of local film scenes that spectacularize each festival's involvement in global, national and local cinema culture. But, at the same time, these facilities comprise a change in the festivals' relationship with the exhibition sector as each institution broadens its mandate from event or intermediary to structure or year-round theatrical exhibitor. Chapter Five examines recent changes in the governance of Canada's major film festivals. Drawing on the policy framework presented in the Secor Report, I explore the delineation of success factors and stakeholder relationships along with the Montreal World Film Festival funding dispute that ensued. Specifically, I consider the changing role of the festivals' key public sector partner as well as the increased institutional autonomy that characterizes the national festival landscape.

Since most of the writing about film festivals carries such a strong authorial imprint, I must acknowledge how my background as a festival programmer has influenced the direction of this research project. The notion of insider access lends mystique to the aura of the festival event and points to the exclusive nature of aspects of the international circuit while anecdotes and agendas tend to displace analyses of festival operation. For this project, I have restricted my focus to data that is part of public record as a means of striking a balance between an insider's insight into festival dynamics and an outsider's perspective on the object of study. The heady inspiration provided by the pursuit of cinephilia and cultural exchange, and elevated by the excesses of the festival

screening marathon, may evoke Jean Cocteau's designation of festival space as a type of magical microcosmic no-man's-land. However, my experiences as a programmer, both while working at VIFF and when travelling to other festivals, more often find accurate reflection in Rosa von Praunheim's cynical musings about the Berlinale:

I love film festivals, especially the many receptions, to which I was often not admitted and in which I imagined one could meet particularly important producers. [...] I am definitely for whipping the makers of bad films, for erecting stocks in front of the Zoo-Palast, even at the risk of someday becoming a victim of my own anger. Otherwise, I love the Festival café, asking foreign guests about their sex life, but I don't like going to the movies which usually cannot be appreciated under such hectic circumstances. (as cited in Jacobsen, 2000, p. 192)

Hierarchies of access play a crucial role in the consecration of texts as stakeholders compete for positioning; and, it almost goes without saying that in this rarefied environment, excess abounds. At the risk of offending Cocteau's vision, film festivals are perhaps better conceptualized in relation to the highly politicized trafficking of cinema, with all of the aesthetic, sexual, commercial and political transactions this entails. Bourdieu's elegant framework for making sense of the underlying power relations that structure these negotiations over the value(s) of cinema culture is the first step in understanding the festival's positioning in the field of cultural production.

CHAPTER ONE

FESTIVAL SPACE: FIELD THEORY, LIMINALITY AND THE CULTURAL INTERMEDIARY

At the 59th Festival de Cannes in 2006, one of the year's big stories was the saturation release of Sony Pictures' *The Da Vinci Code* (Howard, 2006) on the heels of its red carpet screening as the event's opening film (an Out of Competition slot). In spite of lukewarm critical response,¹ the film garnered US\$224 million in its first weekend, opening on over 12,000 screens in 79 countries (S. McCarthy, 2006). A fortnight later, the Palme D'Or was awarded to Ken Loach's historical-political drama about anti-British tensions in 1920s Ireland, *The Wind That Shakes the Barley*, described in *Variety* as an "essentially small-scale pic...likely to reap only modest returns" (Elley, 2006). The film's theatrical launch in the United Kingdom and Ireland occurred a month later followed by a year and a half of international release dates, several of which included festival screenings.² According to the online box office reporting service Box Office Mojo, Loach's film ultimately grossed \$22.8 million worldwide while Howard's brought in \$758.2 million ("Summary [*The Wind that shakes the barley*]" and "Summary [*The Da Vinci code*]"). At first glance, a Hollywood summer blockbuster shares little common ground with an auteur-driven coproduction that was funded through a mix of government sources and television pre-sales;³ there also appears to be no obvious correlation between

¹ Referring to the film as "critically panned," Shawn McCarthy (2006) elaborates that reviewers deemed *The Da Vinci Code* "sluggish and uninspired" (paras. 1, 14). In the *Variety* review, Todd McCarthy (2006) describes the adaptation of Dan Brown's bestseller as "a stodgy, grim thing," noting that "[w]hat one is left with is high-minded lurid material sucked dry by a desperately solemn approach" (paras. 1, 5).

² In June 2006, the film screened at the Sydney Film Festival followed by festival screenings in Croatia and Iceland. The North American premiere was at the 2006 Toronto International Film Festival. A limited U.S. release began in March 2007. ("Release dates") Box Office Mojo lists the U.S. domestic box office at \$135,554 for its weekend opening on 15 screens ("Weekend box office"); with a gradual increase to 50 screens, it appears that a limited platform release was the strategy for this film.

³ *The Wind That Shakes the Barley* is an Ireland-U.K.-Germany-Italy-Spain coproduction with funding from the U.K. Film Council, Irish Film Board and TV3 Ireland and a French sales agent (Pathé). Released by Sony Pictures, *The Da Vinci Code* is a Columbia Pictures and Imagine Entertainment production.

a gala screening at Cannes, critical response, releasing strategies or box office performance. Instead, ascending the red carpeted Palais steps brings creative talent together less for the international festival's initial goal of exchanging diplomatic currency than for the circulation of symbolic capital. In other words, the common denominator in the shared festival language is value.

In this chapter, I will develop a theoretical perspective on festival space and its stakeholders using Pierre Bourdieu's conception of the field of cultural production. Rather than examining the festival's role(s) in the accumulation of value or the circulation of cultural commodities, this approach considers the production of value or, perhaps more accurately, its negotiation. In other words, rather than exploring the festival's position in the cultural industry value chain, my goal is to consider the festival as a productive space in the negotiation of definitions of cinema culture, thereby accounting for the complexities of the festival's relationship to theatrical and non-theatrical exhibition.⁴ Bourdieu defines "the field of production and circulation of symbolic goods...as the system of objective relations among different instances, functionally defined by their role in the division of labour of production, reproduction and diffusion of symbolic goods" (1993, p. 115). As a means to demystify festival space, field theory allows for a relational perspective on the participation of stakeholders in the production of symbolic value. Struggles over hierarchies of value and the power to consecrate texts reveal the intersection of political, economic and cultural interests as well as a shared belief in the stakes of the game. As a starting point in my discussion of the tension between art and commerce, the concept of liminality offers insight into the temporary inversions that occur at the festival; but the notion of multiple thresholds of value ultimately gives way to my argument that the festival comprises a cultural intermediary operating in the gap between production and consumption.

As Bourdieu explains in his discussion of the genesis of the artistic field, it is "the

⁴ In Chapter 5, I examine the use of the value chain model in BC Film's 2003-2004 *Annual Report*.

entire set of agents engaged in the field” – from symbolic creators to curators to collectors to critics – who “participate in the production of the value of the artist and of art” (1993, p. 261). Thus, participants congregate in Cannes where their actions play a role in establishing priorities in the international circulation of cinemas and at the gateway to theatrical distribution. Whether as part of the curated programs or through affiliation to the Marché, films (some still attempting to secure production financing) undergo a complex assessment of cinematic quality, artistic excellence and potential audience reach; in addition, extra-textual elements arising from critical response and celebrity buzz contribute to the relative appeal of the film commodity. These aspects of the production of cultural value suggest links to the significance of marketing as a means of controlling risk in the cultural industries. David Hesmondhalgh examines marketing as a locus of organizational control, noting the example of the increased involvement of marketers in production decisions in 1980s Hollywood (2002, pp. 157-160). He cites Justin Wyatt’s *High Concept* (1994) in which the formula of simplifying narrative to a single core idea is presented as “a major factor in bringing about a decline in the quality of Hollywood cinema during the 1980s and 1990s” (Hesmondhalgh, 2002, p. 159). Although the film festival could be seen as flexible and variegated marketing tool, the issue of over-simplification arises as there is a danger here of reducing value production to a single concept. This formulation also collapses the complexities of festival space by neglecting to consider the differing priorities of stakeholders like industry, government and consumers--not to mention the festival itself as an institution—and their impact on struggles over value.

Crossing the Threshold(s) of Festival Space

These differing priorities point to the dual status of the international film festival as a threshold to mainstream exhibition and a site for the non-theatrical exhibition of films that do not crossover. From an economic perspective, the festival acts as a

launching pad, test screening venue and media junket; but it also presents an alternative space that suspends the conditions of mainstream exhibition—box office does not accrue to the films and the balance of power shifts to programmers and critics as the arbiters of screen space. O'Regan (1996), Nichols (1994b) and Elsaesser (2005) position the festival circuit in opposition to global Hollywood, stressing its symbolic role in the definition of national cinemas within the corpus of international film style. Elsaesser argues that, as a network, the festival circuit plays a systemic role in sustaining European cinema (2005, pp. 83-84), proceeding to perhaps overstate its ability to “[set] the terms for distribution, marketing and exhibition” (p. 88). Taking into account the presence of *The Da Vinci Code* alongside *The Wind That Shakes the Barley* as Official Selections at Cannes, it is difficult to support Elsaesser's conclusion that “film festivals are indeed the opposite of Hollywood” (2005, p. 104).

The Palais' red carpeted steps become a global stage for the celebration of international celebrity while *Variety's* special Cannes' Edition tallies the acquisition activities of both major and minor distributors. A closer look at Elsaesser's terms of reference reveal a series of value judgements regarding cinema as “the seventh art” (2005, p. 95) and the festival's crucial role in delineating cinephilic categories like auteur and national cinema (“the very categories that here concern me”) (p. 83). O'Regan similarly refers to “the common vernacular of Hollywood,” (1996, p. 62) a phrase which conveys its broad reach but also plays on the more pejorative connotations of popular culture when read against the link between the festival circuit and art cinema. This tension between the pursuit of cinephilia and celebrity, embodied in the behaviour of the moles and the moths, exposes a core tension between art and commerce at the international film festival. Although temporary inversions in the hierarchy of cinematic value that occur in this space “betwixt and between” production and consumption suggest the generative potential of the festival to influence definitions of cinema culture, they also point to anxieties over the boundaries of these definitions.

In his review of the 1978 Cannes Film Festival, Andrew Sarris explains that “[f]or the more solemn communicants of the Seventh Art the coming to Cannes in the name of Cinemah is like looking for the Holy Grail in Babylon” (1978, p. 39). As he outlines the characteristics of the Festival’s two main factions, it becomes apparent that the hedonism of the moths, who are drawn to flame of celebrity parties, taints the moles’ earnest search for the latest cinematic masterpieces. Even while Sarris confesses to “becoming more of a moth and less of a mole” as he has gotten older, there is a sense of transgression in this act of disrupting the hierarchy of cultural exchange; in particular, he notes that “fraternization between these two species of festival creature is kept to a minimum” (p. 39). Nevertheless, as the boundaries blur, he admits to an awareness that both the “dedication” and the “decadence” are caused by the same “cinematic virus” (p. 39). Positioned at the threshold between production and distribution, the film festival occupies a nexus of economic and critical interchange that functions to remove the distinctions between “mercantile display and public exhibition” (Zukin, 1991, p. 254). According to Sarris, the “sweetest success a mole can enjoy is the discovery of a ‘masterpiece’ no one else has seen,” whereas for the moths, markers of distinction are linked to “an around-the-clock adventure of seaside lunches, cocktail parties, and gala dinners, all preferably free” (1978, p. 39).

Debates surrounding the perceived cultural purpose of Canada’s major international film festivals demonstrate the tension between the celebration of cinematic achievement and the lure of the cult of celebrity. As locations for negotiating distribution deals, test marketing new films and networking with colleagues, festivals occupy an important position in the value chain of the film commodity. Over the course of its 30+ year history, the Toronto International Film Festival has become “arguably the biggest launch pad for new North American film in the world and, after Cannes, the biggest venue for global movies” (“Toronto film festival,” 2000). Although these references to size encompass the event’s popularity with local audiences, the festival’s stature relies on

A-list actors who capture the focus of the “more than 700 journalists and electronic infotainment media” (“Toronto film festival,” 2000) who descend on Toronto every fall. Consequently, for studios the festival provides a type of “superjunket” that allows for the concentrated marketing of “slightly off-centre” movies to a maximum amount of press in a minimum amount of time (Lacey, 2000). However, an unfortunate side effect of this media frenzy is a decreasing focus on the range and quality of the international films that are included in the programme; in fact, coverage of celebrities supplants sustained film criticism to the extent that publicist Dina Wise states that “[i]f a party is great, the film has potential” (as cited in Gill, 1999, A10).

Anxieties about hierarchies of cultural currency can be seen to inflect the discussion of whether Hollywood has “hijacked” the Toronto festival, situating it in relation to the perceived boundaries between appropriate and inappropriate cultural consumption. For example, Liam Lacey recommends that the Toronto festival “could risk toning the event down in its negotiations with the studios” in order to encourage more space for the best in international cinema (2000). Similarly, Mark Peranson interprets Guy Maddin’s short film *The Heart of the World* as both an overt criticism of TIFF (aka “the heart of the film world”) and “an exhortation towards a new cinema, if not a new *festival*...[that is] less ‘populist’ ...and more outré” (2000, p. 48). In Maddin’s frenetically paced six minute tribute to Soviet agitprop, the impending apocalypse is awaited with either “hedonism” or “religious stoicism.” Ultimately, despite amorous advances from an actor, a mortician, and an evil industrialist whom she must choke in order to regain her freedom, the heroine saves the world by descending to its heart and “creating” cinema. Yet, faced with the economic imperatives of the festival marketplace, there seems to be a need to justify the relative absence of celebrities. For example, despite its prestigious status as the “only major juried festival in Canada” (Hays, 1999, p. C3) the Montreal World Film Festival is perceived as Toronto’s weaker sibling due to a lack of “robust business activity” (Kelly, 1999, p. B4). In fact, following complaints

from the Montreal media concerning the absence of stars, studios and schmoozing, the Quebec minister of culture called for an investigation of the festival by provincial funder SODEC (Société de développement des entreprises culturelles). In a similar vein, a Vancouver Film Festival ad entitled “We love Hollywood! We adore stars!, but...” (2000) cites the festival’s mandate which includes as goals the desire both “to foster art cinema” and “to stimulate the motion picture industry in British Columbia and Canada;” references to healthy attendance figures and government funding further position this ad as a justification of the Festival’s cultural and economic significance, regardless of the absence of celebrities.

Sharon Zukin (1991) discusses the blending of culture and economy in the context of “liminal spaces [that] cross and combine the influence of major institutions” (p. 269). This liminality mediates shifts in relationships of power that occur as markets increasingly infringe upon place. Although markets were initially linked to specific places, the beginnings of modern society saw their meaning change progressively “from a place to a process to a principle of power” (Agnew, 1986, p. 56). As highly visible, socially recognized trading practices began to be displaced by the more incorporeal experiences of commodity exchange, market relations exceeded the boundaries of the marketplace and seeped into the vestiges of everyday life. In her book *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World*, Zukin examines the outcome of shifts in the physical and symbolic landscape that transpired as “place began to internalize market culture” (1991, p. 7). In particular, she focuses on how the liminality of market culture impacts urban spaces as they remain caught in transitional moments that mix the social and the cultural with the commercial.

The concept of liminality can be traced to Franco-Dutch folklorist Arnold van Gennep whose 1908 book *Rites de Passage* explores transitional rituals in terms of three stages. The first stage involves separation from one’s former social role via entry into a location or cultural realm that “clearly demarcates sacred space and time from profane or

secular space” (Turner, 1982, p. 24). This movement is followed by a period of ambiguity or “social limbo” that Gennep refers to as a “margin” or “limen,” which means “threshold” in Latin (Turner, 1982, p. 24). Lastly, there is a stage of incorporation that comprises the subject’s reaggregation into the social world. Anthropologist Victor Turner’s discussions of liminality focus on the intervening transitional stage, although this necessarily encompasses aspects of the first two stages. In other words, Turner concentrates on the “subjunctive” experience of being “betwixt-and-between,” where social roles may be reversed or inverted and alternative possibilities can be contemplated (1984, pp. 20-21); yet, as a transitory condition, liminality invariably includes both the departure from, and the return to, a relatively well-defined social status. Zukin in turn adapts Turner’s conception of liminality to describe the “pervasive experience” of “creative destruction” associated with a (post)industrial market economy (1991, pp. 28-29).

In describing liminality as ubiquitous, Zukin acknowledges that liminal spaces no longer provide opportunities for renewal, but are instead institutionalized in the landscape (1991, p. 41). Although she notes that this conception differs from the framework offered by Turner, Zukin does not address the extent to which the phenomena that she outlines may in fact be more liminoid than liminal in nature. Nick Couldry (2003) explains that the liminoid is “a dispersed form of the liminal, not strictly segregated from the rest of social life and often heavily integrated into commercial organization” (p. 34). He cites the example of sporting events, like the Olympics or the Super Bowl, at which claims of broader social significance are “largely rhetorical” (p. 34). For Turner, the term “liminoid” captures the more ““metaphorical”” nature of “liminal-*like*” processes in contemporary society (as cited in Couldry, 2003, p. 33).⁵ As a threshold to the mainstream theatrical circuit, foreign sales and ancillary markets, the festival positions

⁵ Turner associates liminality with “*compulsory*” participation in ritual in “less complex societies” (as cited in Couldry, 2003, p. 33).

filmmakers and texts “in a brief, socially recognized transition or ‘transaction’” (Zukin, 1991, p. 28). Producers and distributors seek to buy and sell films, while audiences and critics mediate these transactions through their responses. At the same time, both the individual festival event and the international circuit of which it is a part comprise a locus for the negotiation of the participation of national cinemas in the corpus of international film style as well as the interplay between global and local cultures. Thus, the film festival plays host to multiple thresholds and the boundary struggles that ensue.

Turner explains that “[t]he *liminal* phases of tribal society invert but do not usually subvert the *status quo*, the structural form, of society” (1982, p. 41). In adapting the concept of liminality to patterns of social conflict or drama, he charts three phases—from the “initial social breach” through “its widening to become a general crisis” to the resolution “at which point the wider sense of social order is also restored, indeed affirmed” (as cited in Couldry, 2003, p. 32). The film festival appears to conform to this model as it creates a temporary series of reversals in the realm of exhibition without ultimately endangering the institutional structure of the dominant theatrical circuit. Given the economic necessity of obtaining a return on their investments, filmmakers cannot easily discount theatrical release in favour of the cultural benefits of the festival circuit. By the same token though, it is not easy to discount the value of the symbolic capital that can be accumulated on the festival circuit, either as prestige that facilitates market access or as an investment in the currency of the cinephilic categories of art cinema.

Couldry draws a connection between liminality and certain media events that “provide opportunities for underlying conflicts to be expressed or negotiated, including conflict over the underlying inequality of symbolic power on which the media’s authority to narrate those same events is based” (2003, p. 71). In these instances, the media’s ritual space is temporarily disrupted in moments of social (inter)action that contest the structure of this mediated space. The festival is subject to disruptive outbursts such as the

resounding “thumping” of the noisy Palais’ seats that literally announces the early exit of dissatisfied viewers (Turan, 2002, p. 25) or the 1968 protest that halted the Official Competition screenings at Cannes and lead to the creation of the Directors’ Fortnight with its commitment to “edgier fare” (Turan, 2002, p. 19). These momentary irruptions become part of the festival’s cachet in that they reinforce the fundamental antinomy of cinema as a cultural commodity. As a result, liminality’s focus on the disruptive potential of ritualized space limits the consideration of the interconnectedness of stakeholder interests as well as the sense of shared stakes in the value negotiations.

More importantly though, the designation of the festival as a segregated space framed by the “temporary suspension” of ordinary activities privileges an industrial perspective on the circulation of cinema. Agnew explains that the ritualized boundaries of ancient marketplaces functioned “to frame the market within the governing structure of authority and power” (1986, p. 25). In the same way, limiting the discussion to an oppositional perspective on festival space risks subordinating questions of power “to the economic instance and the system of interests which [are] served” (Foucault, 1980, p. 116). The film festival is thereby reduced to a link or bridge between production and theatrical exhibition the complexities of festival space are collapsed to multiple thresholds. Michel Foucault’s comments about “the general functioning of the wheels of power” (1980, p. 116) highlights the significance of posing the question of power in discursive analysis, a problematic which informs the methodological context of his genealogical studies. With field theory, Bourdieu offers a relational perspective on the power to establish the value of works of art (1993, p. 78). In doing so, he breaks with the notion of the artist as sole creator of a symbolic object and instead situates the work within “a universe of belief” which is produced by the (inter)actions of the agents and institutions whose relative power to consecrate comprises the field (1996, p. 229). Thus, material production and its object encounter a range of critical, economic and regulatory measures that contribute to the production of a work’s distinctive value; also, the “system

of dispositions” produced by the field’s structure and functioning works to produce producers and consumers “capable of recognizing the work of art” (Bourdieu, 1996, pp. 228-229).

While this system of dispositions comprises the field’s impact on habitus, the field’s structure is determined by the “network of objective relations between positions [which in turn] subtends and orients the strategies which the occupants of the different positions implement in their struggles to defend or improve their positions (ie: their position-takings)” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 30). Consequently, the concepts of field and habitus are closely inter-related as the position taken by an agent emerges from that individual’s habitus which both characterizes and is characterized by the structure of the field. Bourdieu defines habitus as a system of “durable, transposable *dispositions*, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures” (as cited in R. Johnson, 1993, p. 5). He literally highlights (via italics and a footnote) the semantic flexibility of the word “disposition” which designates not only the “result of an organizing action” but also “a way or being [or] habitual state” and “a predisposition [or] tendency” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 214n1, author’s italics removed), thereby indicating the embodied nature of habitus. In other words, the classificatory action of structuring objective social conditions, experienced as both the result of personal history and present positioning, is incorporated by the subject and in turn exerts a structuring influence on agency, predisposing the subject to generate a classifiable response. This conceptualization moves beyond the structuralist paradigm of the agent as (unconscious) “bearer–*Trager*–of the structure” (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 13) to allow for the active generation of practices and perceptions that do not necessarily reflect a conscious or calculated response so much as a “feel of the game” (p. 14).

Thus, as structured predispositions, habitus can be understood in terms of “the capacity to produce classifiable practices and works, and the capacity to differentiate and appreciate these practices and products” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 170). According to

Bourdieu, the dispositions that comprise habitus are the product of “a particular type of environment” (1977, p. 72) which, in *Distinction*, he links to the “internalization of the division into social classes” (1984, p. 170). However, while the reconstruction of the production of habitus considers “the social trajectory of the class or class fraction [to which] the agent belongs,” it must also examine the evolution of that individual’s asset structure which is measured in terms of changes to both the volume and composition (ie: different types) of capital across multiple generations (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 123). In accounting for variations within supposedly homogeneous groupings, Bourdieu disputes unidimensional models that “reduc[e] the social universe to a continuum of abstract strata,” an approach exemplified by the use of ladder metaphors to explain social mobility (1984, p. 125); specifically, this process of abstraction makes assumptions about capital conversion without paying adequate attention to the relational power struggles that impact variable exchange rates. In sum, the concept of field offers a model for the relational positioning of social agents without falling prey to the mechanistic logic of objectivism, with its focus on “mastery of the code” (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 32), while habitus allows for structured agency that avoids the freewheeling pull of subjectivism. As such, an agent’s dispositions and field position exist in a state of reciprocal interaction (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 265) and “the relationship between positions and *position-takings* is mediated by the dispositions of the agents” in the field (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 62).

Confronting “Theoretical Theory:” Questions of Method

In the opening paragraphs of his 1985 article “The Genesis of the Concepts of Habitus and of Field” Bourdieu explains the aversion to the hermetic world of “theoretical theory,” with its polemical focus on confronting other theories rather than “new objects” (p. 11), that left him to trace the theoretical underpinnings of his methodological approach a posteriori; the ideas presented in this article are further refined and expanded in “Questions of Method,” a chapter in *The Rules of Art: Genesis*

and Structure of the Literary Field (translated into English in 1996 from *Les Règles de l'art*, 1992). Since the concepts of habitus and field emerged from empirical research,⁶ Bourdieu attributes their development to the rejection of a series of methodological alternatives (1985, p. 12), presumably implying that a more theory-driven design would have charted a positive (or perhaps “prophetic”) path, which in his opinion would be better suited for meta-discursive acclaim than empirical verification (p. 11). As mentioned earlier, habitus breaks away from the dichotomy between objectivism and subjectivism, while field similarly rejects the opposing options of a formalist focus on “internal interpretation,” reliant on perceptions of the autonomy of art, and a reductionist approach relying solely on “external explication” (1985, p. 16). From linguist Noam Chomsky he adapts the notion of “*generative grammar*” such that the “creative” agent draws on embodied dispositions rather than universal principles like human nature (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 13). Meanwhile, via a critique of Max Weber’s work on the sociology of religion, Bourdieu shifts his analysis of the intellectual field from a relational view of the interactions among agents (an approach drawn from E. Cassirer’s “relational mode of thinking,” [1985, p. 16]) to a consideration of “the objective relationships between the positions” which in turn structure these interactions (p. 17).

By “Questions of Method,” Bourdieu demonstrates less disdain for the seemingly “insurmountable antinomy” between structure and history, noting instead the potential to overcome this opposition and retain the benefits of both perspectives (1996, p. 205). On one hand, this method can account for a homology between intertextual differentiations of form and the space of positions in the field of cultural production; at this point, he posits the homology as hypothesis (albeit one already confirmed empirically), thereby suggesting a concession to the polemics of theory (1996, p. 205). At the same time,

⁶ Bourdieu first elaborated on the theoretical and methodological framework of the concepts of field and habitus in conjunction with a series of seminars at the Ecole normale supérieure, starting in the 1960s and associated with the empirical study of 19th Century French art and literature (1985, p. 12 n1). For a bibliography of Bourdieu’s works published between 1958 and 1988 see Delsaut. Johnson provides a list of studies that emerged from Bourdieu’s seminars (as cited in Bourdieu, 1993, pp. 268-269, n6).

surmounting antinomies locates change within a historically inflected system of possible positions without overlooking the generative interests (often consciously disinterested) of agents (p. 206). Thus, although Bourdieu acknowledges the rigour of Foucault's "field of strategic possibilities" as a means of analysing the structural interdependence of cultural works, he disputes its restrictive focus on the internal dynamics of the discursive field (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 197). By asserting "the absolute autonomy of the 'field of strategic possibilities,'" Foucault's approach severs the explanation of a work from the "sociological connections" between agents who actualize epistemic relations; for Bourdieu, this is tantamount to a refusal to accept "that there is a history of reason which does not have reason as its (sole) principle" (1996, p. 198).

As he begins to sketch a general theory of fields, Bourdieu returns to the influence of Weber's study of religion and similarly borrows concepts, such as capital and investment, from economics (1985, p. 19). However, in doing so, he rejects a reductionist focus on "material interest and the quest for the maximizing of monetary profit" and suggests instead that "economic theory must probably be seen as a particular instance of the field theory which emerges slowly from generalization to generalization" (p. 20). Thus, rather than accessing "a mere metaphor whose function is purely emblematic" in that it serves to define and confine its object--another criticism of the proclivity of theory to build on borrowed foundations--this approach foregrounds the object of study as the catalyst for the transfer of ideas (1985, p. 19). An intellectual debt to Weber appears to be confirmed and denied simultaneously as Bourdieu strives to foreground the empirical basis of his formulation of the economy of fields. This repudiation of a dialectical progression of analysis raises questions about the unidirectional impulse of polemical thought, suggesting the necessity of re-examining the transfer in order to distinguish between successive generalizations and the observation of general properties; in particular, Bourdieu asserts that exploring the insights and limitations of Weber's model "obliges one to rethink the presuppositions on which

economic theory is based” (1985, p. 20).

Bourdieu ultimately takes his observations on the production of belief full circle to encompass the researcher in the scientific field and thus aims to objectify the empirical viewpoint. While this methodological reflexivity may serve to balance the absolutist pull of objective truth claims against a drift toward relativism (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 208), it also promotes a Herculean research project. Johnson explains that the three levels of a Bourdieusian analysis involve examining the position of a given field within the field of power, the objective structure of agents and possible positions in the field and the habitus of its producers (R. Johnson, 1993, p. 14), all while maintaining a self-reflexive stance in relation to one’s analytical presuppositions (p. 20). The combination of a retrospective delimitation of field and habitus, along with rigorous self-referentiality, risks the hubris of a totalizing vision such that the strengths of field theory may lie in partial applications of the model first elaborated in relation to the literary field. Hesmondhalgh notes that the majority of Bourdieu’s work on cultural production⁷ focuses on the “primarily expressive-aesthetic” activities of literature and art (2006, p. 212). This focus sets up an exploration of the value of cultural goods both in terms of the romantic conception of the artist as creator but also as a measure of a field’s relative autonomy from external pressures; thus, by re-contextualizing the value of creation and creator within the field’s objective structure and considering the extent to which internal dynamics set the agenda for hierarchization, the cultural field grasps both material and symbolic aspects of production.

The field of cultural production occupies a “dominated position” in the field of power in that it is “traversed by the necessity of the fields which encompass [it]: the need for profit, whether economic or political” (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 216). As such, the field of cultural production is characterized by high levels of cultural capital and low levels of

⁷Hesmondhalgh also offers the important clarification that Bourdieu draws on a broad sociological definition of culture that reaches from science and law through to art and music (2006, p. 212).

economic capital. Meanwhile, the field of power, which Bourdieu describes in terms of “economic and political principles of hierarchization” (1993, pp. 37-38) occupies a dominant position in the social space⁸ and thus is marked by high levels of both cultural and economic capital. Therefore, the field of cultural production is “associated with the dominated fraction of the dominant class” (Hesmondhalgh, 2006, p. 214); Hesmondhalgh links this model to Bourdieu’s work on cultural consumption, noting that the dominated fraction of the dominant class makes up for lower levels of economic capital through the accumulation of cultural capital (2006, p. 214). The positioning of the cultural fields within the field of power also can be understood based on the relative degree of heteronomy or autonomy and its impact on principles of hierarchization. At the heteronomous pole, external forces dominate with value placed on commercial success or public recognition while at the autonomous pole economic principles are inverted such that the “*loser takes all*,” a formulation that favours “art for art’s sake” (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 217).

The notion of producing for an audience comprised solely of other cultural producers relies on an agenda set by the internal dynamics of the field measurable as the “power to define its own criteria for the production and evaluation of its products” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 115). These criteria demonstrate a lack of concessions to external forces not only in terms of the development of field-specific norms and values but also as a “disavowal” of commercial interests.⁹ Although autonomy involves independence from market pressures, Bourdieu connects apparently “disinterested” cultural production to the accumulation of symbolic capital, defined as “misrecognized” economic or political capital that acts as a type of “credit” toward potential future profit (1993, p. 75); thus,

⁸ The diagram in *The Rules of Art* (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 124) designates the social space as national (via a parenthetical reference) whereas the more rudimentary model in “The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed” (1993, p. 38) refers to the “field of class relations.”

⁹ A translator’s note explains the use of “*negation, denial and disavowal*” for the French “*dénégation*” as a reference to Freud’s concept of “*verneinung*.” Thus, there is an element of repression in these practices that appear outwardly to function as negations (as cited in Bourdieu, 1993, p. 74).

neither pole is absolute as the convertibility of symbolic capital points to the persistence of interest and heteronomy is mediated by the field's internal structure.

Bourdieu's diagram of the field of cultural production indicates higher levels of symbolic capital at the autonomous pole, with corresponding low levels of economic capital, while the heteronomous pole is characterized by lower levels of symbolic capital and higher levels of economic capital (1996, p. 124). Struggles over whether heteronomous or autonomous principles of hierarchization predominate comprise a fundamental aspect of power relations within the field (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 40). At stake are the ability to control definitions of cultural legitimacy and the power to consecrate both producers and products. In effect, relative autonomy is at the root of these struggles which can create divisions between those richest in field-specific symbolic capital and those least able to resist heteronomous forces; Bourdieu explains that as cultural producers with the least symbolic capital strive to defend their positions, they may find themselves inadvertently aligned with the dominant fraction in the field of power (1993, p. 41). Consequently, conflicting interests impact the internal structure of the field as well as its external boundaries. Within the field, "nothing divides cultural producers more clearly than the relationship they maintain with worldly or *commercial success*" (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 218), a difference marked by the division into the sub-fields of small scale (or restricted) and large scale (or mass) production. In addition, along the vertical axis each sub-field can be further divided "according to the *social and 'cultural' quality* of the public concerned" (as a measure of symbolic and cultural capital) (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 218) with small scale production split between a consecrated and bohemian avant garde and large scale production divided based on whether it targets the bourgeoisie or the masses (Hesmondhalgh, 2006, p. 215).

Yet, Bourdieu clarifies that interpreting these struggles over relative autonomy is less about dividing agents and defining their sub-groups than describing contextual characteristics of the "frontier," such as "conditions of entry" and the extent to which

they are “explicitly codified” (1993, p. 43). This process helps to elaborate the objective structure of the field and its historical trajectory without reducing its relational position-takings to a series of static definitions that in themselves would impose a system of hierarchization. Hesmondhalgh notes the “highly selective” nature of Bourdieu’s work on cultural production, as compared to the breadth of his writing on cultural consumption, to the extent that field theory tends to offer limited insight into the structure and functioning of the heteronomous pole (2006, p. 218). Instead, a focus on the sub-field of restricted production reinforces the significance of autonomy in the evolution of cultural practice. While Bourdieu has written about late 19th Century painting, the institutionalization of anomie and the development of a “pure aesthetic” (assembled as “The Pure Gaze: Essays on Art” in *The Field of Cultural Production*), it is his examination of 19th Century literature (compiled as “Three States of the Field” in *The Rules of Art*) that offers a comprehensive example of the three levels of field analysis.

As a first step in exploring the emergence of an autonomous literary field, which he examines through the contributions of Charles Baudelaire and Gustave Flaubert, Bourdieu embarks on an analysis of the social world and, more specifically, the “structural subordination” of writers in relation to the field of power (1996, p. 48). Cultural producers encountered both the mediating forces of the market, either directly through sales performance or indirectly via employment opportunities, as well as political interventions ranging from censorship to the provision of venue access and the bestowal of honours (Bourdieu, 1996, pp. 49-50). These heteronomous forces influenced individual writers in differing ways depending on their position in the field while simultaneously impacting the possible position-takings that structured the field itself. In addition, Bourdieu cites “the intermediary of the salons” which brought certain writers in contact with the upper class, thereby forging “durable links, based on affinities of lifestyle and value systems” (1996, p. 49). The interactions that occurred at the salons comprised “genuine articulations between the fields” as those in power would strive to

control the nature of literary production while cultural producers would attempt to direct the mediating forces of the field of power (1996, p. 51). A hierarchy of inclusion and exclusion emerged amongst the salons based on the types of writers assembled and whether the salon's high society founder favoured the promotion of literary autonomy (Bourdieu, 1996, pp. 50-53).

Bourdieu further locates literary autonomy with a position-taking that involved the rejection of the seemingly opposed poles of social and bourgeois art. While the category of social art is distinguished by its proximity to the dominated fraction of the field of power, with links to bohemia and later to the realist tendency of the second bohemia (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 73), bourgeois art is characterized by its connections with higher levels of economic capital and the necessity of feedback from a paying audience. By the mid nineteenth century, the increasing influence of the market along with a growing interest in leisure pursuits like theatre "favoured the expansion of a commercial art which was directly subject to audience expectations" (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 71). Thus social and bourgeois artists differed in their associations with the social and political world, as a site of artistic intervention or consecration, which in turn suggests significant differences in the relationship between art and money. In the second section of "Three States of the Field," Bourdieu maps the literary field in the late 19th century based on degrees of consecration and economic profit, noting the differential positions of genres, the bohemia and types of theatre (1996, p. 122). His interpretation highlights a "dualist structure" organized according to the opposition between large-scale and restricted production (1996, p. 121); specifically, this opposition hinges on audience targets, responsiveness to demand and, ultimately, hierarchies of value. Bourdieu explains that the end of the 19th century saw an inverse relationship between peer consecration and commercial success, unlike in the 17th century when the two hierarchies were "almost merged, with those most consecrated among people of letters...being the best provided with pensions and profits" (1996, p. 114).

The notion of a correspondence between higher levels of positive recognition amongst other cultural producers and lower levels of economic success points to a rejection of the values associated with bourgeois art. Indeed, Flaubert's argument that "a work of art [...] is beyond appraisal, has no commercial value, cannot be paid for" asserts the significance of artistic activity as the sole source of a work's meaning while simultaneously "eliminating the bourgeois as a potential customer" (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 81); in other words, according to the logic of Flaubert's comments, refusing to ascribe a price (or basically claiming that a work of art has no exchange value) involves a refusal of the market and the economic laws by which it is governed. "The Market for Symbolic Goods," or the third section of Bourdieu's "Three States of the Field," investigates the seemingly inverse logic by which value is placed on disinterestedness in favour of the accumulation of symbolic capital; however, as mentioned earlier, this disinterest or "denegation" of economic profit acts more as a "long-term investment," whose temporal delay may prove riskier than deriving quick profit by catering to "*pre-existing demand...in pre-established forms*," but remains nonetheless not entirely without interest in the field of power (1996, pp. 142-143).

In addition to a rejection of the profit motive of bourgeois art, the position of "art for art's sake" espoused by Flaubert refused social art's requirement of a political function for literature. Consequently, this struggle within the literary field over the classification of cultural production involved a "double refusal" of opposing poles in favour of a "third position" (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 71); in rejecting proximity to either the dominated and dominant fractions, the purveyors of pure art sought to distance themselves from the forces of the field of power and moved instead towards artistic autonomy. Bourdieu further notes the transgressive implications of "aesthetic detachment" in that it breaks with both the "moral conformism" of bourgeois art, arising from its need for immediate audience approval, and the "ethical complacency" of social art, that can arise from a reductive reverence for "the 'superior virtue of the oppressed'"

(1996, pp. 75-76); yet, he is quick to point out that these refusals set up blurred frontiers rather than divisions. Instead, in their reaction against established positions, distinct groups of writers emerged, often gathering at particular Parisian brasseries (p. 76), and defined their artistic endeavours through difference even though they shared certain characteristics (or perhaps affinities) in common.

In other words, those who opted for the double refusal of “art for art’s sake” did not so much claim an existing position as create one whose potential was contingent upon “the very space of positions already in existence” (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 76). Bourdieu explains that these writers sought to distance themselves from all forms of institutional power, including the trappings of a bourgeois lifestyle, without aligning themselves with the “spontaneous carelessness of the bohemians” (1996, p. 77). Thus, rather than creating a position characterized by an absence or avoidance of rules, gaining literary autonomy involved the ability to set the agenda for cultural production, thereby invoking their own hierarchy of value. Once the space of possibles which structures differential position-takings has been reconstructed, Bourdieu considers dispositional attributes as a final stage in delineating Flaubert’s point of view. For instance, he examines the “social trajectory” of Flaubert’s cohort, noting convergences in class background and education with the impact that the advocates for literary autonomy possess similar amounts of economic and cultural capital (1996, pp. 85-86). Having considered the literary field’s relationship to the field of power, the objective structure of agents’ positions and possible position-takings as well as the habitus of cultural producers, Bourdieu reconstitutes Flaubert’s “artistic *viewpoint*” which is best understood as “the *view from a point* in the artistic space” (1996, p. 87). The result is a historically grounded approach to understanding cultural production that takes into account both the forces implicated in constructions of competing concepts of literary value and the relational influences on the writer as agent, whose strategic (albeit not entirely conscious) choices defy the binary categorizations of structural determinism or unfettered subjectivism.

Even though field theory offers a potentially fruitful model for approaching the complexities of struggles over cultural value, Hesmondhalgh notes “how little Bourdieu has to say about large-scale, ‘heteronomous’ commercial cultural production” with the exception of his work on journalism (2006, p. 217). The publication of *Sur la télévision: Suivi de l’emprise du journalisme* (1996), translated as *On Television and Journalism* (1998), was prompted by privatization in the French broadcasting sector and its subsequent impact on news production. Rodney Benson and Erik Neveu explain that, with these changes occurring in the late 1980s, the increasing commercialism of French media culture provided “a fresh perspective on a classic Anglo-American debate” (2005, p. 2); at the same time, journalism became a key focus of Bourdieu’s research program at the Centre de sociologie européenne (CSE) (Benson & Neveu, 2005, p. 1) with several studies appearing in two special issues of *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* in 1994 and 2000 (Hesmondhalgh, 2006, p. 218). Benson and Neveu assembled work from the CSE, along with newly translated essays by Bourdieu and contributions from American media scholars into *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (2005).

The book includes empirical studies that explore specific applications of field theory in a manner that complements the broad theoretical perspective offered by Bourdieu. For example, Julien Duval undertakes a correspondence analysis of 44 media outlets involved in economic journalism in France in the 1990s. Reminiscent of Bourdieu’s research in *Distinction*, Duval’s mapping of the media space produces a statistical distribution of the media outlets according to interrelated variables (2005, p. 140). Heteronomous links to the economic field and variations in field-specific capital are measured along the horizontal axis while the vertical axis indicates the extent to which the audiovisual media differ in scale and scope from the written press. The resulting distribution organizes economic journalism into three main clusters or poles—the “dominated” alternative press, the “commercially dominant” audiovisual media and the daily and weekly press which are characterized by “a combination of internal legitimacy

and restricted economic autonomy” (Duval, 2005, p. 141). As Duval elaborates on news production and professionalization at each pole, he derives certain generalizable characteristics of this subfield as a means of exploring the relationship between journalism and the economy.

Meanwhile, in another of the book’s studies, Dominique Marchetti identifies several variables that can be used to differentiate between subfields of specialized journalism—ranging from the position of the specialization in the professional hierarchy to the position of the media outlet to aspects of the professional and social trajectories of journalists (2005, pp. 68-75). She also isolates four variables that help to account for the relations “between journalistic specializations and the social spaces which they mediatize” (p. 65). These factors include the degree of control a subspace exercises over its own mediatization (often an issue of restricted access) and the degree of economic “interdependence,” (p. 76). Marchetti mentions, in particular, the involvement of journalists in creating markets for cultural products as well as financial overlap between news coverage and cultural events (ie: owning broadcast rights for an event and then covering it on the news). This type of interpenetration is evident with film festivals with media outlets sponsoring prizes, such as TIFF’s CityTV Award for Best Canadian First Feature Film, or ad space, as with *The Vancouver Sun*’s “Daily Updates” which promote VIFF screenings and provide information about how to purchase tickets. The third variable deals with the tendency for the journalistic field “to impose its own logic [or] an external logic” (Marchetti, 2005, p. 77) in contributing to hierarchies of consecration. Lastly, the fourth variable takes into account “the social characteristics of social actors,” noting as an example “the political journalist turned politician” (p. 78). There are notable areas of proximity or crossover in film festivals with critics working as programmers (eg: Mark Peranson at VIFF, Cameron Bailey at TIFF) or programmers entering academia (Liz Czach, me). In Chapter Four, I examine the inter-relationship of the festival and junket journalism as well as the connections between TIFF, VIFF and Canadian film

studies.

In contrast to the tendency of conventional Bourdieusian approaches to yield “certain *general* dynamics of fields,” Benson embarks on a cross-national comparison of journalism in France and the United States as a means of discerning “the *variable* qualities of fields and field configurations” (2005, p. 86). Although he acknowledges Bourdieu’s appreciation of cross-national differences, Benson argues that “he ended up eliding them” (2005, p. 86), particularly in the area of journalism, with the result that field studies has offered little insight into the “distinctive properties of French journalism” (p. 85); he explains that in *On Television* Bourdieu’s discussion of the specific genesis of the French journalistic field is relegated to a footnote (Benson, 2005, p. 104, n1). Benson strives instead to foreground areas of difference in his comparative analysis and, in doing so, draws interesting conclusions about future directions for field research. He attributes persistent cross-national differences to the influence of political field pressures that “contra Bourdieu [can be] clearly distinguished from economic field constraints” (Benson, 2005, p. 103). Thus, the notion of the heteronomous pull of the field of power, comprised of both political and economic forces, fails to grasp the complex interplay between change and inertia. Benson finds that variable (national) political field pressures, along with “structural-ecological properties, and historical path-dependent processes,” may contribute to the production of “cultural inertia” that places relative limits on changes to the journalistic field (2005, p. 104). In other words, nationally-specific variables may account for resistance to changes that are encouraged by heteronomous economic forces and other structural shifts in the make-up of a field.

As such, due to the structuring influence of state power on the historically contingent path of field development, cross-national comparative research along with a consideration of the political field may yield significant information about field variation. In the book’s introduction, Benson and Neveu note the value of field theory for helping to “situate journalism in its larger systemic environment” by offering the tools for relational

analysis and a historically grounded approach to understanding a field's "semiautonomous institutional logic" (2005, p. 18). They conclude that field theory remains a "work in progress" (p. 19) as new empirical research continues to nudge Bourdieu's theoretical observations in different directions and illuminate the finer details of the trajectories and dynamics of fields. In his own chapter, "Bourdieu, the Frankfurt School, and Cultural Studies: On Some Misunderstandings," Neveu argues for a three-dimensional approach to Bourdieu's sociology of culture. Using the metaphor of a triangle, Neveu divides analytical focus between "a space of production" (field), "the *materiality of images* [and] their *grammar*" (form) and "the *social uses* of various cultural goods" (reception) (2005, pp. 208-209). Adopting a critical perspective, one can then assess the degree to which researchers using field theory place varying emphasis on the poles of field, form or reception; noting the importance of a good fit between research questions and the predominant pole, Neveu proceeds to suggest that *On Television* is concerned overmuch with social fields at the expense of paying "insufficient attention" to reception (2005, p. 210). For the study of film festivals, it is interesting to consider whether exploring them as sites of reception obscures their significant role in the production of cultural value. In particular, it is necessary to examine how the analytical construct of the cultural intermediary impedes the discussion of festival space.

Minding the Gap: Charisma and the Cultural Intermediary

Given its location between production and consumption, the film festival's role in the production of cultural value appears to conform to the occupational category of cultural intermediary. Keith Negus argues that the concept's significance arises from its "emphasis on those workers who come *in-between* creative artists and consumers...forming a point of connection or articulation" (2002, p. 503); meanwhile, David Hesmondhalgh's interpretation implies a more detached positioning that limits the category to cultural commentators who "'mediate' between producers and consumers"

(2006, p. 226). The source of the term “cultural intermediaries” is *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Bourdieu’s empirical study of consumption patterns of the French bourgeoisie, in which he notes the expansion of “all the occupations involving presentation and representation (sales, marketing, advertising, public relations, fashion, decoration and so forth) and in all the institutions providing symbolic goods and services” (1984, p. 359). Although both are critical of the ways in which the term has subsequently been deployed, Negus sees its application as too narrow whereas Hesmondhalgh contends that excessively broad usage demonstrates a misunderstanding of Bourdieu’s original intention.

In his discussion of cultural intermediaries, Negus notes a fundamental contribution to symbolic production as these workers “shape both use values and exchange values...through the various techniques of persuasion and marketing and through the construction of markets” (2002, p. 504). In other words, occupations associated with marketing or promotion help to forge a meaningful link between products and consumers. However, the resulting emphasis on symbolic value restricts the focus to a small group of creative workers due to a reliance on “a narrow and reductionist aesthetic definition of culture” (Negus, 2002, p. 504). Negus questions this exclusive approach to delineating the work of cultural intermediaries and, using the music industry as an example, proceeds to demonstrate how business affairs staff, such as accountants, also contribute to the creative process. Specifically, he contests the perception of accounting data as objective calculations, noting instead that it constitutes historically contingent representations that act as “little more than ‘uncertainty-reducing rituals’” (Negus, 2002, p. 505); thus, the abstract measurement of a project’s economic viability presents an interpretation of symbolic value that gains its explanatory force through its rational assessment of discursively constructed “hard” data. Negus argues that the role of business affairs staff in actions such as negotiating an artist’s contract details and monitoring their economic performance constitutes a more significant and sustained

impact on symbolic production than the initial scouting undertaken by the artist and repertoire (A&R) department (2002, p. 506).

At the same time, considering music industry accountants as cultural intermediaries contradicts the term's hip cachet while simultaneously extending its boundaries beyond "the type of petite bourgeoisie 'class position' implied by Bourdieusian notions" (Negus, 2002, p. 505); this cachet arises from the association of the creative work of cultural intermediaries with the new petite bourgeoisie, a class faction that distinguished itself via a blurring of aesthetic hierarchies as well as a connection to growth of postmodern consumer culture (Negus, 2002, p. 503). Yet, according to Hesmondhalgh, there has been a tendency to conflate the new cultural intermediaries with the entire new petite bourgeoisie even though they comprise only a sub-set of that class (2006, p. 226). Instead, he returns to *Distinction* to assert that Bourdieu intended the term to refer to a new type of mass media professional "the most typical of whom are the producers of cultural programmes on TV and radio or the critics of 'quality' newspapers and magazines and all the writer-journalists and journalist-writers" (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 325); in contrast, Nixon and du Gay state that Bourdieu applied the term as "an inclusive, if not quite a catchall, category" (2002, p. 496). Rather than adding workers like accountants to an already confusing mix, Hesmondhalgh recommends concentrating on "a better specification of the division of labour involved in mediating production and consumption in culture-making organizations" (2006, p. 227).

While he ultimately concedes to a somewhat broadened definition, he also sidesteps a key aspect of Negus' rationale for counting the accountants. Hesmondhalgh cites the work of Bill Ryan (*Making Capital from Culture*, 1992) as exemplary of a more detailed elaboration of the "project team" involved in "the creative stage of bringing cultural goods to market" (2006, p. 227). Inclusive of creative artists, craft workers and managers, such as A&R staff or commissioning editors who mediate between executives and creative personnel, this notion of a project team clearly moves beyond the role of

cultural commentary by shifting focus to symbolic mediation that occurs at the product delivery stage. However, this approach also demonstrates a return to an aesthetic definition of culture with symbolic activities limited to a select group of creative workers. That being said, Negus himself remains unsure about adding occupations to the category of cultural intermediaries, calling the move “unhelpful” despite his earlier arguments to the contrary (2002, p. 508). Instead, his warning that “draw[ing] an artificial boundary around these privileged symbolic practices” neglects their relationship to “a range of intermediary activities” (p. 508) raises some interesting questions about both the authority of cultural intermediaries and the analysis of the space between production and consumption.

In their introduction to a volume of *Cultural Studies* devoted to the topic of cultural intermediaries, Sean Nixon and Paul du Gay refer to an episode from Douglas Adams’ *The Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy* in which a “B-ark” transports an odd assortment of “middle men” duped into fleeing their planet by its more productive factions; the elite intellectual and artistic “achievers” and the material labourers, who would have occupied the A and C arks respectively, devised this elaborate ruse “to rid themselves of the ‘useless third of the population’ employed in knowledge-intensive intermediary positions like television producers, advertising executives or public relations consultants (2002, pp. 495-496). While Adams uses the alphabetical ark hierarchy to satirize the impact and aspirations of the lower middle class (unfortunately in perhaps another conflation of class faction with occupational sub-set), its application to the conceptual category of cultural intermediaries evokes the notion of segregating a portion of the workforce from the field of cultural production. Indeed, much of the debate surrounding the relevance and reach of the term grants cultural intermediaries an active role in articulating production and consumption without addressing how they gain their relative authority to impact symbolic value.

Bourdieu allows cultural intermediaries “a certain amount of cultural authority as

shapers of taste and inculcators of new consumerist dispositions” (Nixon & du Gay, 2002, p. 497) while Mike Featherstone affords them an even greater role as they “actively promote and transmit the intellectuals’ life-style to a larger audience and collude with the intellectuals to legitimate new fields” (1991, p. 144). In contrast, Negus questions the tendency to characterize cultural intermediaries as “active, self-conscious, reflexive and creative,” suggesting that there may be a substantial element of the habitual or routine to their activities (2002, p. 509). Citing the inability of the gatekeeper concept to account for systemic planning by a cultural organization, he argues that it is necessary to consider what conditions might foster either innovative or conservative activities (p. 510). David Wright (2005) returns to Bourdieu for the reminder that the mediation of symbolic value also involves the reproduction of existing hierarchies; thus, there is a tension between “winning a market...and preserving the rarity and difference that is the essence of their social position and power” (p. 111). Responding to Nixon and du Gay’s call for increased rigour in the use of the term “cultural intermediaries” (Wright, 2005, p. 109), Wright offers the results of his empirical study of UK bookshop workers. Although he is “*definitely*” certain that the category does not include accountants (p. 109), he raises the issue of “the myth of the cultural intermediary...when not all aspects of the work of cultural industries require this kind of romanticized conception” (p. 118).

Based on interviews that encompassed floor staff as well as management and executives, Wright finds that bookshop workers distinguish themselves from other retailers based on their involvement with symbolic objects (2005, pp. 114-115). He links their expertise with books to educational background and thus high levels of cultural capital such that being “well read” emerges in terms of a “genuine appreciation of books, as opposed to one informed by commercial imperatives” (p. 115). However, the bookshop worker’s expertise is not reflected in remuneration which instead corresponds with that of their unskilled retail counterparts (Wright, 2005, p. 116). Wright appears to concur with his interviewees’ assessments that symbolic profits justify the pursuit of a

“dream” job which blurs the boundaries of work and leisure, often providing an indulgent break from the “rat race” (2005, p. 117). In fact, these observations underpin Wright’s reference to the “myth of the cultural intermediary” as he argues that bookshop workers are less involved in creative production than in “‘shoring up’ their insecure position as the arbiters of cultural capital by means of keeping legitimization as a thing that is theirs to impart” (2005, p. 119); as such, regardless of a romanticized conception of their labour, bookshop workers actually demonstrate the extent to which the activities of cultural intermediaries can be more conservative than innovative.

Leaving aside the problematic lack of analysis of the political economy of discounted cultural labour in Wright’s discussion, the reference to a romanticized conception of cultural work suggests the displacement of the charismatic ideology of the artist as creator of symbolic meaning onto cultural intermediaries as those “who can proclaim the value of the author” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 77). Even though Wright attributes the perception of mythic status to the bookshop workers, he uses their observations to identify them with definitions that celebrate cultural intermediaries as taste leaders (2005, pp. 109-112); for instance, he traces the emergence of the cultural intermediary as “a pivotal generator of meaning” in the cultural industries, citing Angela McRobbie’s comment (about cultural entrepreneurs) that “the flamboyantly auteur relation to creative work...is now being extended to a much wider section of a highly individuated work force” (as cited in Wright, 2005, p. 110). Yet, as Bourdieu explains, cultural value is produced by “the field of production as a universe of belief which produces the value of the work of art as a *fetish* by producing the belief in the creative power of the artist” (1996, p. 229). Thus, not only is the creative power of cultural intermediaries also a product of the field’s objective relations, conferring auteur status defers analysis of “what creates the authority with which authors authorize” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 76).

Wright incorporates aspects of field theory into his discussion in a way that situates bookshop workers in relation to both the intellectual field and the book industry.

For the former, he notes similarities between the mediating roles of cultural intermediaries and intellectuals, particularly in the balancing of innovation and reproduction necessitated by an insecure position as part of “a ‘dominated fraction of the dominant class’” (Wright, 2005, p. 110). Meanwhile, retail bookselling is governed by the contradictory logics of immediate commercial goals and “the deferred accumulation of cultural capital,” with the latter associated with the autonomy of the literary field (Wright, 2005, p. 113); a brief reference to the complex forces that inform book selection and staff recommendations links the bookshop worker with the field of literary production (p. 116). The economic disinterest of literary appreciation, valorized as a distinguishing attribute of the bookshop worker, signals the relative autonomy of both the literary and intellectual fields. At the same time, this apparent disinterest is a critical aspect of the production of belief as this intermediary acts as “a ‘symbolic banker’ who offers as security all the symbolic capital he [sic] has accumulated” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 77). Bourdieu explains that this “highly euphemized form of publicity” conceals the relationship of the art dealer’s authority to the field of cultural production as a whole (1993, p. 77). Consequently, a focus on the charismatic attributes and contributions risks a conceptual slippage between labour and space that overlooks the source of the power of cultural intermediaries.

In other words, the designation of cultural intermediaries as active, reflexive workers who mediate symbolic meaning in the gap between production and consumption positions them outside the field of cultural production rather than within its boundaries. Wright’s analysis stops short of clarifying the exact orientation of cultural intermediaries with the exception of comments linking the myth of the cultural intermediary to values that emerge in “proximity to the field of cultural production” (2005, p. 118). Citing Nicholas Garnham’s observations about the proliferation of image-based “culture industries” reliant upon marketing, Negus argues that “cultural intermediaries reproduce rather than bridge the distance between production and consumption,” making it

necessary to better “interrogate [these] gaps or spaces” (2002, pp. 509, 508). However, it is also important to avoid segregating the gap in analyses of cultural industries and the production of cultural value. For example, in the case of film festivals, their role in the political economy of the film industry tends to be reduced to an intermediary function as marketing tool. In her account of *How Hollywood Works*, Janet Wasko (2003) includes film festivals as part of a discussion of marketing strategies but makes no mention of them in relation to her chapters on distribution and exhibition. Similarly, in *Global Hollywood 2*, film festivals are tucked into a sub-section on advocacy marketing in a chapter about “Getting the Audience.”

Miller, Covil, McMurria, Maxwell and Wang (2005) designate “marketing festivals,” including Cannes, Berlin, Sundance and Toronto, as “annual trade shows” which provide a venue for producers and distributors to “close any unfinished deals” and engage in advocacy marketing aimed at “generating popular acclaim” (p. 280). This reductive formulation elides the dynamics of the struggle to consecrate textual value as well as the tension between economic and symbolic accumulation characteristic of the field of cultural production. The moniker of trade show gives no indication of the institutional formation of the film festival, implying instead that it is an industry-controlled venue similar in kind to ShoWest, the exhibitors’ trade show organized by the National Association of Theatre Owners. Furthermore, the reference to advocacy marketing isolates the film festival from the chapter’s detailed examination of the conditions of film marketing. Although terminology and examples are drawn from Tiiu Lukk’s book *Movie Marketing: Opening the Picture and Giving it Legs* (1997), her inclusion of information on festival strategies is completely overlooked; for instance, while Miller et al. focus on the costs of marketing *Four Weddings and a Funeral* (Newell, 1994), Lukk also examines the significant role of the Sundance Film Festival in its launch, which in turn impacts the economics of release strategies. Beyond this intermediary role articulating distribution and exhibition, the festival is also implicated in

the global political economy of international cinema. It is surprising that *Global Hollywood 2's* only indexed reference to the Cannes Film Festival involves an assertion made there by India's Minister of Information and Broadcasting about a new generation of domestic talent ready for the world stage (Miller et al., 2005, p. 157); this type of national posturing on a global festival stage should be a hint of the festival circuit's role in the legitimation of national film industries within the corpus of international cinema.

Autonomy as Illusio(n)

Bourdieu uses the term "illusio" to designate "interest in the game and its stakes" (1996, p. 227). In this instance, the role of the festival circuit in struggles over hierarchies of cinematic value and in the recognition of national cinemas points to the operation of field-specific logic along with a shared understanding of its functioning. Bourdieu explains that "collective belief in the game (illusio) and in the sacred value of its stakes is simultaneously the precondition and the product of the very functioning of the game; it is fundamental to the power of consecration" (1996, p. 230). Thus, much like habitus, illusio is not necessarily conscious or calculated but rather shapes and is shaped by the relative positions and position-takings of agents in the field. Habitus enters the equation as it both characterizes and is characterized by the structure of the field with the result that the illusio is "established in the conjunctural relationship between a habitus and a field" (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 228). Distinct from the laws or principles that govern a field, illusio informs the value of field-specific capital, thereby enabling the consecration of cultural products. In struggles over boundary definition, "the fundamental law of the field [is] the principle of vision and division (*nomos*)" which distinguishes *legitimate* art from *non-art* (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 223). The illusio underlies the production of belief in the value of the work of art as well as in the struggle over the dominant system of hierarchization.

Drawing on his predilection for financial metaphors to illuminate the economy of

fields, Bourdieu describes *illusio* in terms of “fiduciary currency” but notes that there is no “ultimate guarantor...outside of the network of relations of exchange” (1996, p. 230). With both *illusio* and *nomos* playing integral roles in field morphology, it can be challenging to locate the subtle distinction between defining principle and shared belief. The concept of definition, as the ascription of meaning and imposition of boundaries, informs Bourdieu’s discussion of *nomos*. For example, in the field of cultural production, art is defined “against ordinary vision and against the mercantile or mercenary ends of those who put themselves into its service,” a definition that distinguishes “the business of art” from “the business of money” (or the *nomos* of the economic field) (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 223). Meanwhile, he characterizes the *illusio* as “the relationship of complicity and connivance which ties every cultivated person to the cultural game” (1996, p. 230). For agents in the cultural field, a shared belief in economic disinterest underwrites symbolic capital and thus informs the production of the value of the work. In other words, the *illusio* involves complicity with the *nomos* that defines *legitimate* artistic practice – at stake is the belief in value accrued in what Bourdieu refers to as “the economic world reversed” (1993, p. 29).

The role of the film festival relates to a perception of artistic autonomy that is key to the *illusio* of the cinematic field. In Chapter Two, I will examine the intersection of governmental and industrial interests in their impact on the festival’s aesthetic autonomy. The first three FIAPF A-status festivals emerged from a convergence of international commerce, foreign policy and art cinema. As the international film festival circuit evolved, it was necessary to balance industry and government involvement while maintaining an appearance of autonomy from these forces. Founded in response to the increasing involvement of the Fascist regime with the governance of the Venice Biennale, the Festival de Cannes built on their successful model and solidified a cosmopolitan image of cinema as a prestigious leisure activity that takes place at a tourist destination. Yet, on one hand, the machinations of state power press international politics

onto the festival stage via the promotion of national cultural identity and links to content regulation (from subsidy to censorship).¹⁰ At the same time, the taint of the marketplace threatens to reduce artistic exchange to a moneymaking venture, thereby undermining the nomos of the cultural field; of course, the irony here is that access to external markets is crucial for a cultural commodity with such a high negative cost.¹¹ As a cultural intermediary, the festival programmer acts as a curator or broker whose actions set the festival apart from a trade show or showcase; indeed, the festival space invests the program with symbolic capital that mediates the cultural value of the films. The autonomy of the film festival, and especially of its programming process, differs from the relative autonomy of the cultural field as a whole, although both strive to access a similar set of meanings. Faced with threats to the field's *illusio*, film festivals have evolved toward increased institutional autonomy in a manner that ultimately secures their role as arbiters of cinematic taste.

¹⁰ For example, in the introductory note for *Dragons and Tigers: The Cinemas of East Asia* at the 17th Vancouver International Film Festival, programmer Tony Rayns cites two Chinese films (Wang Xiaoshuai's *Girl from Vietnam* and Lou Ye's *Don't Be Young*) blocked from festival participation (as cited in Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society, 1998, p. 41).

¹¹ Negative cost refers to "the total cost of producing the film's master negative." David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson note that "in 2001, the average Hollywood negative cost ran about \$50 million." (2004, p. 25).

CHAPTER TWO

CULTURE, COMMERCE AND COSMOPOLITANISM: THE TRAFFIC IN INTERNATIONAL CINEMA

Writing in honour of the 20th anniversary of the Berlinale's International Forum of Young Cinema, German filmmaker Christian Ziewer locates a historical antecedent in the Roman Forum which he argues "wasn't only a place where goods were sold...but also where one met, for private and public purposes, one got upset and took a position, conducted meetings, passed judgements, drew conclusions, intervened" (as cited in Jacobsen, 2000, p. 193). Ziewer's debut feature, *Dear Mother, I'm Doing Fine* (*Liebe Mutter, Mir Geht es Gut*, 1972), with its story of a Berlin factory worker coping with the economic recession of the late 1960s, took its place in the second annual Forum in 1972 alongside films such as Ken Loach's abortion-themed *Family Life* (1971) and Ousmane Sembène's *Emitai* (*The Gods*, 1971), about French oppression in West Africa during World War II (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 196). According to journalist (and future Berlinale Director) Wolf Donner, one now had to choose between the "plush" elegance of the Competition, featuring ceremonies and "stars with bouquets of flowers," and the "politics" of the Forum with its "hippie-look" and atmosphere of informal discussion (as cited in Jacobsen, 2000, p. 195). It was the Zoo-Palast versus the Atelier and the distinction carried clear classificatory implications.

In Chapter One, I examined several frameworks for understanding festival space and its role in the production of cultural value. The chapter began with an examination of the liminal (or more accurately liminoid) aspects of the international film festival as an institution that plays host to multiple thresholds in the negotiation of aesthetic and commercial value. Although the festival can be seen as a ritual space set in opposition to mainstream exhibition practices, the disruptive tension between art and commerce points

to a fundamental antinomy that fuels discourses about both independent and popular cinema—with the impact that the notion of a breach of existing structures is chimeric in comparison to the contained crises of liminality. Bourdieu’s conception of the field of cultural production offered a more solid set of theoretical tools for understanding the interactions of agents and institutions with relative power to influence cultural value. With their role in marketing strategies, film festivals appear to conform to the category of cultural intermediaries. I argued that relegating this mediation of symbolic meaning to the gap between production and consumption serves to displace the charismatic ideology of the artist as creator onto the festival. Instead, a return to Bourdieu’s original conception of the cultural intermediary as implicated in the field of cultural production, and away from interpretations that limit these workers to a bridging or marketing function, allows for a more complex understanding of how the festival operates as a productive space. Lastly, I considered the significance of the perception of artistic autonomy to the collective belief (*illusio*) in the festival’s power to consecrate.

Threats to this shared belief in the international film festival as conforming to Cocteau’s vision of an “apolitical no-man’s-land” underlie key moments in the evolution of the festival circuit. The resulting changes to organizational structure (often in the form of diversification) serve to maintain the critical illusion of programming autonomy by rendering these institutions increasingly resilient in response to external pressures. In this chapter, I will focus on the intersecting political, cultural, and industrial interests that converged in the inception of the first three competitive festivals accredited by FIAPF (*Fédération internationale des associations de producteurs de films/International Federation of Film Producers Associations*) and explore how these forces engage in struggles to define the subject as cosmopolitan, citizen and consumer. International festivals form an alternative circuit of exhibition that plays a significant role both in framing national cinemas and in shaping the contours of international art cinema. Local context is implicated in this international circulation of texts as global cities and elite

tourist destinations both affirm and develop their status as cultural and economic hubs by providing a setting for the exclusive pursuit of cinephilia and celebrity. Global Hollywood asserts an industrial presence on the festival circuit through the acquisition of independent art film distributors like Miramax and New Line, in conjunction with growing studio conglomeration during the early 1990s.¹ As a result, the political economy of independent cinema has since largely been subsumed under studio control such that “independent” has become a catchall for art films that are most likely destined for limited or platform theatrical release.

Global Framing of National Cinemas

Discussions of national cinema tend to share the perception of the nation as “an imagined political community” (Anderson, 1991, p. 6) as well as the belief that Hollywood poses the greatest threat to cultural sovereignty. Over time, the boundaries of the nation-state have been reconceptualized to account for flows of global capital, resulting in “various permutations of ‘nation’—‘transnationalism,’ ‘multinationalism,’ ‘national identity,’ ‘internationalism’ and ‘nationalism’”—that stress the “continued, although changing pertinence” of nationally grounded frameworks within film studies (Hjort & MacKenzie, 2000, p. 2). Yet, regardless of changing conceptions of the production and maintenance of discourses of nationhood, cinema culture continues to be organized in relation to dominant exhibition circuits that bind together a particular geographical region; in other words, mainstream theatres, along with their influence on subsequent video distribution, are seen as the key (if not the only) locations that structure the movie going experiences of a nation’s populace. Even though US domestic theatrical box office accounts for less than 15% of total revenues (2003 figures) (76), Philip Drake

¹ Tom Schatz (2008) charts a series of mergers and acquisitions in the entertainment industry that occurred in the early 1990s context of US media deregulation and resulted in six global media oligopolies by 2000 (News Corporation, Sony, Time Warner, Viacom, Disney and General Electric) (pp. 25-27). Contemporaneous with the rise of conglomerate Hollywood was the emergence of an indie art film movement in which the studios subsequently became involved via the launch of their own “indie divisions” and the acquisition of successful independent producer-distributors (pp. 29-30).

(2008) notes that cinema exhibition is “the most significant determinant of [ancillary market] success” (p. 80). He attributes this critical influence to the marketing power of opening weekend performance (as a perceived measure of popularity and the subject of widespread media coverage) (p. 80) with the impact that theatrical market success acts as a “tent-pole” supporting other release windows (p. 77). Similarly, Charles Acland (2008) asserts that, despite the atomizing pull of personalized leisure technologies (like iPods, laptops and cell phones), “contemporary mainstream exhibition is not disappearing” (p. 94).² Instead, as non-theatrical platforms proliferate, “that more reified temple of the cinephile—the movie theatre—is ever more tightly bound up with prestige, exclusivity and urbanity” (Acland, 2008, p. 94). Just as theatrical exhibition retains an influence on movie going culture, it is also significant to recall the role played by international film festivals in perpetuating the classification of cinemas as national.

While Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* has served as a seminal text in debates about national cinema, a perusal of the papers included in Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie’s anthology *Cinema and Nation* (2000) indicates that Michael Billig’s *Banal Nationalism* has also become required reading. For Philip Schlesinger, the main problem with the congruence of social communication theory and film studies arises from an internally directed focus that asserts the significance of national boundaries (2000, p. 24). In other words, a concern with the formation or maintenance of the nation-state involves a perception of the nation as a container for cultural productions which can then be differentiated from those originating outside the socio-cultural group. However, he argues that treating the nation as “singular” (Schlesinger, 2000, p. 25) fails to account for either the “irreducible

² Acland supports this assertion through reference to both the geographic concentration of screens and ownership concentration that consolidates movie theatres into chains (2008, pp. 92-93). Earlier in the article, he also mentions the return of the major studios to exhibition (starting in the mid-1980s) and how this implicated these corporations in “the entire life span of a film” (2008, p. 85). Issues such as the advent of digital distribution platforms and concerns over pirating have sped up the life cycle of the film commodity as it moves from one release window to the next and encouraged saturation releasing into multiple markets at the same time (2008, pp. 95-96).

diversity of cultures within the nation” (p. 28) or the transnational realities of production and reception; these transnational practices include co-productions and location shooting (whether acknowledged or disguised) as well as the prevalence of Hollywood cinema in popular viewing practices. Drawing on a discussion of Deutsch’s theory of nationality, Schlesinger notes the potential for conceiving of ““the nation without a state”” (2000, p. 20) as the premise of unity based on communicative complementarity and efficiency suggests that a nation can be formed separately from the political pursuit of sovereignty.

As an example of a richer understanding of culture and identity, he cites Sorlin’s delineation of Italian national cinema in terms of ““the chain of relations and exchanges which develop in connection with films, in a territory delineated by its economic and juridical policy”” (as cited in Schlesinger, 2000, p. 28). This type of approach dispenses with defining national cinema as a distinctive set of film texts and opts instead for a consideration of the historical conditions of production and reception within a particular national context. However, although both cultural diversity and transcultural experiences are taken into consideration, the structuring influence of the notion of a geographically bound political community continues to be reinforced. It is important to note that Schlesinger’s perception of a postnational environment does not negate the process of linking collective identity to national political spaces. On one hand, his argument seems to suggest that ethnic communities that lack statehood could be viewed as possessing national identity; this could account for discussions of Palestinian filmmaking or Quebec national cinema. But, what seems to be at stake for Schlesinger is a decoupling of hot and banal nationalism that is reminiscent of Paul Willemen’s distinction between nationalism and national specificity. While Billig distinguishes between hot and banal nationalism by highlighting the fact that “[t]he unwaved flag, which is so forgettable, is at least as important as the memorable moments of flag waving” (1995, p. 10), Willemen explains that the concerns of a specific socio-cultural group do not necessarily coincide with the homogenizing and colonizing impulses of nationalist discourse (1994, p. 210).

As such, by drawing a connection between the banalities of nation maintenance and a reduced preoccupation with identity (or perhaps post-nationalist perspective), it is possible to retain the notion of communities characterized by communicative complementarity since “national boundaries have a significant structuring impact on national socio-cultural formations” (Willemen, 1994, p. 210). Andrew Higson takes this position a step further by observing the capacity of national experiences to transcend geopolitical boundaries. In particular, he questions whether collectively shared “rituals of mass communication” emerge within communities that are necessarily national (2000, p. 65). Citing as examples the funeral of Princess Diana, the success of soap operas such as *Coronation Street*, and the international box office performance of films such as *The Full Monty* (Cattaneo, 1997) and *Shakespeare in Love* (Madden, 1998), Higson explores media experiences that could be seen as “enabling the British to imagine themselves as a distinctive national community” (2000, p. 65). The Britishness of these experiences becomes problematic given that the audiences were transnational, responses differed in both scale and scope, and the gatherings themselves were fleeting. Attributing the limiting imagination of the “‘imagined community’ argument” to the perception of “the nation as limited, with finite and meaningful boundaries” (2000, p. 66), Higson proceeds to critique his own 1989 definition of national cinemas as “the product of a tension between ‘home’ and ‘away’” (p. 67).

The transnational nature of British-directed films such as *Evita* (Parker, 1996) and *The English Patient* (Minghella, 1996) supports the challenge of designating a nationally specific cinema culture. While *Evita* tells the story of “an Argentinean legend,” *The English Patient* adapts a Canadian novel by a Sri Lankan-born author that deals with “the contingency of identity” (Higson, 2000, p. 68). In each instance, Higson highlights the connection of these productions to American capital as one of several multi-national components of these transnational films. Yet, he fails to address the extent to which his previous example, the British-produced and British-set film *Shakespeare in Love*, also

fits into the Hollywood system. A United Kingdom/United States co-production, with the participation of American companies Miramax Films, Universal Pictures and Bedford Falls, *Shakespeare in Love* features top-billing for American actress Gwyneth Paltrow and Australian actor Geoffrey Rush. With content and locations as the main markers of Britishness that distinguish the film from the other two examples, it seems as though Higson links national cinema to the nationality of both the director and the subject matter, although he clearly privileges the latter as a defining factor. In addition, the film's box office success can be attributed to the clout of international distributors Miramax, Universal and Alliance Atlantis, while its Academy Award victories can be associated with the powerful Hollywood influence of the Weinstein brothers. Consequently, the shared moment of national pride may have arisen in response to the ability to locate aspects of British identity as part of Hollywood cinema culture; or, to put it another way, perhaps the significance rests with the recognition of national identity and national cinema within transcultural experience.

Ultimately, Higson leaves his unanswered questions concerning the relationship of film culture to the nation-state with the proposition that "the contingent communities that cinema imagines are much more likely to be either local or transnational than national" (2000, p. 73). In a similar vein, Ulf Hedetoft (2000) considers the impact of national context on film spectatorship by examining critical responses in France, Denmark and the United States to the Hollywood blockbuster *Saving Private Ryan* (Spielberg, 1998). Hedetoft draws his arguments from Ella Shohat and Robert Stam's observation that "[p]erception itself is embedded in history. The same filmic images or sounds provoke distinct reverberations for different communities'" (as cited in Hedetoft, 2000, p. 278). Shohat and Stam describe media spectatorship in terms of a "triad plurilogue between texts, readers and communities" (1996, p. 156) such that "spectatorial positions are multiform, fissured, even schizophrenic" (p. 160). Thus, an individual's reading would be affected by their articulation within a variety of discourses that could

include contradictory affiliations with ethnic heritage, global politics and local issues. Hedetoft asserts that the national space, with its history and “bounded national imaginings,” serves as a significant contextualizing influence (2000, p. 278).

Specifically, he cites the role of “mediatic gatekeepers,” such as critics, who contextualize global cinema culture by framing film texts in relation to local concerns (Hedetoft, 2000, p. 279). Although critics may not be intentionally writing from a nationalistic perspective, the audiences for their publications or broadcasts tend to be contained in a national space. Also, national issues may creep into the review given that Hollywood “as a rule, produces national cinema...rooted in American perceptions of man, nature, society and the world” (Hedetoft, 2000, p. 281). Hedetoft’s analysis, which focuses on articles published in each of the three countries, seeks to identify the production of “national thirds.” This notion of thirds refers to a reframing of the film within a “‘third’ national/local dimension, [thereby creating] a new cultural hybrid integrating, at the level of national specificity, two national cultures” through a process of reflexive “bricolage” (Hedetoft, 2000, p. 282). In contrast to Mike Featherstone’s conception of third cultures that occupy a free-floating cosmopolitan space,³ Hedetoft grounds these hybrid meanings within a national context (2000, p. 282). The end result of this mediated plurilogue is a national third that is “more or less alienated from the original product” (Hedetoft, 2000, p. 282). For example, Hedetoft notes that French press coverage of *Saving Private Ryan* offers a “grudging recognition and admiration” of the film’s patriotic message that is couched in a critique of its crudely pretentious “universal moralism” (2000, p. 290). Meanwhile, Danish coverage affirms the film’s “moral dogmatism” but within a “common-sensical...call for moderation” (Hedetoft, 2000, p. 292).

By asserting the nationally-specific inflections of critical responses to global

³ Featherstone (1996) defines “third cultures” as “sets of practices, bodies of knowledge, conventions and lifestyles which have developed in ways which have increasingly become independent of nation-states” (as cited in Hedetoft, 2000, p. 282).

cinema culture, Hedetoft argues that “‘transnational’ need not mean non-national” (2000, p. 285). Higson similarly seeks to retain the relevance of the national for categorizing imagined communities even if the communicative space involved does not correspond to the boundaries of a geo-political territory. As such, both theorists contribute to reformulating an understanding of national cinema that allows the concept to address the realities of international co-production and transcultural experience. At the beginning of his article, Higson notes Stephen Crofts’ criticism that “scholarly work on national cinema often operates from a very limited knowledge of the immense diversity of world cinemas” (as cited in Higson, 2000, p. 63). Higson takes this comment as the starting point for his examination of the productive value of the concept of national cinema; in particular, he assesses his own tendency to adopt a Eurocentric perspective and supports Crofts’ conclusion that “the homogenising myths of national cinema discourse” may be more useful in certain marginalized cultural, political or economic contexts (as cited in Higson, 2000, p. 73). Yet, despite a re-tooling of national cinema to accommodate diverse historical circumstances, Higson, Hedetoft and Schlesinger perpetuate a frame of reference for their arguments that confines cinema culture to mainstream circuits of exhibition.

In each instance, the unacknowledged emphasis is on the theatrical reception of films that either are from the Hollywood system, act as a complement (ie: indie cinema) or compete with its international dominance. When Schlesinger mentions the narrow scope of national cinema discourse, he points to the value of being able to deal with the extent to which “television and video...have substantially displaced the theatrical cinema circuit as a site of consumption” (2000, p. 29). However, expanding historical conceptions of the national audience does not account for the full range of mediatic influences, but instead maintains a focus on popular viewing practices. What gets left out is the impact of film festivals as key sites for non-theatrical screenings. Hedetoft’s discussion of the gatekeeping function of critics can be extrapolated to a consideration of

the role of the festival in framing a film's release. Initial reviews of films, such as those prepared for *Variety*, follow festival screenings while interviews conducted are often held for publication just prior to theatrical release. These connections are particularly significant given the tendency of film festivals to categorize their products in terms of national origin. In other words, the privileging of nationality by programmers may in turn influence the frames of reference adopted by critics.

Although not all festivals group film programs by nation, international film festivals construct cosmopolitan scenes that foster strong profiles for individual national cinemas. The Festival de Cannes consists of parallel programming streams, with separate administrations and budgets—Official Selections, Directors' Fortnight and Critics' Week.⁴ Official Selections includes competitive and non-competitive slots along with Un Certain Régard, a sidebar of non-competition films.⁵ While the overarching programming vision of Cannes' across the separate streams stresses a focus on auteurs, there is also a large international market featuring several national pavilions. Just outside the basement level of the Palais des Festivals, which houses the myriad booths of the Marché, a strip of nationally-funded and flagged pavilions lines the beach perpendicular to the Croisette. In the Canadian context, the Vancouver International Film Festival combines genre-based

⁴ Beauchamp and Béhar also refer to a fourth programming stream, "French Perspectives," a series separated from the Directors' Fortnight "which no longer includes films from French directors" (1992, p. 50). The Cannes' Web site refers to the founding of Perspectives of French Cinema in 1973 (Festival de Cannes, "Festival milestones"). However, this is the extent of references to this section which seems to no longer exist. It is interesting to note the tendency of histories of Toronto and Cannes to either downplay or omit the details of their respective national showcases. Marshall (2005) comments on the disbanding of Perspective Canada but otherwise has almost nothing to say about the section. Meanwhile, B. Johnson (2000) discusses the early involvement of Canadian auteurs at TIFF (McKellar as a theatre manager, Peter Mettler as a driver) and charts their rise to prominence; but, in direct contrast to his examination of the influence of international programmers like David Overbey, Piers Handling and Kay Armatage, he leaves the Perspective Canada programmers out of the history of the series.

⁵ Un Certain Regard was launched by Gilles Jacob in 1978 (Festival de Cannes, "Festival milestones"). As a non-competitive sidebar program, it could include edgier films than those in the Official Selection. This is reminiscent of the 1971 launch of the Berlinale's Forum as a parallel program that would be free of the political constraints faced by the Competition (see Jacobsen, 2000, pp. 174, 186-187). Turan speculates that Un Certain Regard was a response to the success of the Directors' Fortnight (an independent sidebar event known for "discovering" young auteurs like Spike Lee) which had become "a threat to the [official] festival" (2002, p. 20).

programs, such as Non-Fiction Features and Walk on the Wild Side (disbanded in 2002), with national showcases such as Spotlight on France and Canadian Images. Aside from the Asian-focussed Dragons and Tigers series, most of the remaining films are included in Cinema of Our Time grouped by nation of origin. The Toronto International Film Festival also has a Contemporary World Cinema program that presents the “best of current international filmmaking” (2007, “Contemporary World Cinema”). Other program sections create cinephilic categories organized around emerging and established auteurs (Discovery and Masters) or different aesthetic modes (Real to Reel for nonfiction and Visions for experimental work). TIFF has two national showcases for indigenous productions—Canada First and Short Cuts Canada. Even with these diverse programming categories, nation of origin plays a key role in publicizing the festival’s international scope as evidenced by TIFF’s “About the Festival” Web page which notes that the festival “has 19 programmes in which films from 55 countries are screened (2007 figures).”⁶

The issue of textual origin takes an interesting turn with the launch of *The Da Vinci Code* (Howard, 2006) at the 2006 Festival de Cannes. It is not uncommon for distributors to use a high profile festival screening as a marketing tool leading directly into a film’s theatrical release, especially for their more mainstream product. As invitation-only events, usually with celebrity guests in attendance, gala screenings serve as a source of publicity that focuses more on surface appeal than reviewer commentary; at the same time, the breadth of coverage generated (including television hits and the crossover of glitzy photos from the Arts section to the front page) has a favourable cost-benefit ratio when considering the expense of organizing a film’s festival presence as compared to that of purchasing comparably widespread media advertising—although in effect the distributors are basically buying media coverage (albeit indirectly). Cannes

⁶ VIFF similarly outlines its scope in the following quantitative terms: “More than 150,000 people are expected to attend approximately 575 screenings of 350 films from more than 50 countries.” (“About VIFF”)

certainly provides the preeminent red carpet experience with global media exposure well suited to a saturation release. On one hand, it could be argued that the opening night slot draws on the prestige of Official Selection to imbue this ersatz ecclesiastical caper with an art cinema flavour. However, taking into account the previous year's screening of *Star Wars Episode III: Revenge of the Sith* (Lucas, 2005), the programming seems instead to suggest a celebration of populist auteurs, or worse, the Festival's symbiotic dependency on Hollywood celebrity.

Beyond the appeal of cost effective saturation marketing, the festival offers Hollywood films like *The Da Vinci Code* an opportunity to eschew traces of national origin and ascend to the status of global texts. In a manner reminiscent of Nichols' discussion of the festival circuit's addition of "a global overlay" to textual meaning (1994b, p. 68), it is worth considering the extent to which the international context can also work to fetishize transnational space. Thus, rather than inscribing local expression within an evolving pantheon of international art cinema, these films strive to overcome difference, thereby slipping from cosmopolitanism to the myth of the universal film commodity—a product of global industry consumed by a worldwide audience. With a multi-national cast featuring American (Tom Hanks), French (Audrey Tautou) and British (Paul Bettany) talent, shooting locations across France and the UK and content that grapples with the fundamental tenets of Christianity, *The Da Vinci Code* appears to be a transnational text that transcends geopolitical boundaries, as long as one overlooks the economic disparities perpetuated by globalized Hollywood production; from the New International Division of Cultural Labour (NICL) that "permits reterritorialization in the lens of the foreigner" (Miller et al, 2005, pp. 138-139)⁷ to vertical reintegration post-1980, transnational Hollywood marginalizes national industries that are unable to

⁷ Miller et al explore the complexities of the NICL as an aspect of a post-Fordist production model that relies on increased labour outsourcing. The result is "a form of 'peripheral Taylorism,'" wherein skilled labour participates in runaway productions which they do not control (2005, p. 137). In addition, by enabling the presence of runaway productions, national film industries contribute to the domination that their cultural policies otherwise seek to stem (p. 138).

compete.

The “problem” of national origin also comes into play in the 2004 decision to restructure Canadian programming at the Toronto International Film Festival; organizers “retired” Perspective Canada in favour of Canada First! and Short Cuts Canada, two new programs highlighting emerging talent (TIFFG, 2004). The reference to retirement points to an underlying rationale of developmental progression as Canadian cinema shifted from a showcase “created...to support and promote a fledging Canadian film industry” to participation in the “international context” of TIFF’s other programs (TIFFG, 2004). In other words, an established (or perhaps mature) indigenous industry cast off the protective nationalist moniker and took its place amongst the other distinguished national cinemas whose texts help to define international art cinema. At the same time though, this metaphor of maturation suggests that the national showcase can be perceived negatively as a ghetto that excludes Canadian films from being categorized as Contemporary World Cinema, with the further implication that they would not have made the programming cut. This threshold between national and international standing appears to assert the symbolic value of cosmopolitanism alongside the festival’s key classificatory frames of nation and auteur.

Diplomacy: Culture, Commerce, Cosmopolitanism

Citing Hans Kohn’s paradoxical suggestion in *The Idea of Nationalism* (1945) that the “age of nationalism represents the first period of universal history,” Toby Miller postulates that national “enclosure may in fact provide the first prerequisites for internationalism, particularly in terms of the internationalization of commerce” (1993, p. 109). Miller finds areas of confluence between state diplomacy, cultural protectionism and commodity capitalism as he considers the role of international agencies in facilitating fair trade in services. One of his earliest examples is the 1926 International Cinema Conference in Paris, a cultural initiative organized by the League of Nations’

International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation. During the interwar years, the proponents of Film Europe imagined a pan-European “domestic” market within which the ability to achieve economies of scale would enable them “to challenge American distributors for control of that market” (Higson & Maltby, 1999, p. 2). Beyond its role as chief rival, the United States also served as a “positive model” (Higson & Maltby, 1999, p. 15) of a large common market, with accompanying international trade advantages. Kristin Thompson (1985) notes that conference organizers had hoped for the attendance of delegates from the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America (MPPDA) but that the Hays Office’s refusal was consistent with the U.S. decision not to join the League of Nations (pp. 114-115).⁸

Regardless of the professed aims of the organizers, Higson points out that “various film companies took advantage of the [1926] conference to trade show the new season’s films” (1999, p. 124). While not part of the official program, these business-related activities highlight a fundamental tension that emerged between economic and cultural concerns. Higson explains that the official discourse of the conference, which corresponded to that of the League of Nations, stressed a political, cultural and moral conception of “cinema as a public service” that clashed with the profit-motive of the film industry (1999, p. 120). By the subsequent gathering in Berlin in 1928, the League of Nations was no longer involved and the First International Cinema Exhibitors’ Conference was a trade-focussed event (Higson, 1999, p. 125). For Turan, contemporary iterations of the exhibitors’ trade show like ShoWest, the National Association of Theater Owners’ annual gathering in Las Vegas, seem to merit classification as film festivals. This “convention, a film festival if you like,” (Turan, 2002, p. 50) attracts international delegates, Hollywood celebrities and distribution executives; both trade press and

⁸ Regardless of this policy rationale for the MPPDA’s absence, both Thompson and Higson refer to Hays’ attempts to have the conference postponed. In addition, the press argued that the conference was “an anti-American ploy” (Thompson, 1985, p. 114) while American officials “tried to ensure that trade concerns were off the agenda” (Higson, 1999, p. 122).

mainstream media attend to cover preview screenings, some of which comprise advance trailers, of upcoming releases. Although ShoWest acts as a key industry forum, what distinguishes it from other film festivals is the absence of programmers acting as mediatic gatekeepers between distributors and exhibitors. Instead, studios present their slates and receive feedback from “people who have a major stake in a film’s success or failure” (Turan, 2002, p. 54); both peers and public are absent, leaving assessments of each commodity’s value to the retailers, who presumably know their consumers. Overall, this approach evacuates the cultural imperative of the film festival to the extent that the notion of creating an alternative space is supplanted by a mainstream business agenda.

National cinema finds a place at exhibitors’ conventions like ShowCanada, organized by the Motion Picture Theatre Associations of Canada (MPTAC). At the 2006 event, the provincial funding agencies hosted a breakfast for delegates while Telefilm Canada sponsored a panel on Quebec box office success (*Boffo Box-Office—The Quebec Experience—What Really Happened?*) and a Gala Dinner bookended by screenings of two new Canadian films (ShowCanada, 2006). In addition, there are awards for The Best Promotion for a Canadian Film (one each for the English and French markets). Commenting on the 2006 ShoWest convention, Gabriel Snyder explains that “the main commodity being sold at ShoWest this year is moviegoing itself” (2006). And perhaps this struggle to define cinema-going culture is the significant connection between these marketing conventions and film festivals. Snyder focuses on attempts to curb declining theatre admissions via new ad campaigns and a proposal to lift an FCC ban on jamming cell phone signals; one issue at stake is the preservation of the theatrical window in light of the revenue potential of simultaneous DVD/theatrical release strategies. In the Canadian context, Telefilm’s involvement with ShowCanada supports the federal policy goal of growing the audience for national cinema, as evidenced by Executive Director Wayne Clarkson’s comment that “ShowCanada is the prime venue for distributors and exhibitors to get together to promote Canadian movies to Canadian audiences” (Telefilm,

2007, April).

The key distinction between ShowCanada and other film festivals or markets is the presence of theatrical exhibitors; the attendance of both theatre owners and distributors in effect bypasses the intermediary of the film festival, thereby placing the focus firmly on industrial conceptions of audience access. At the film festival, on the other hand, cinephilia and commerce intertwine, with distributors and producers joined instead by a public audience. Telefilm's objectives for festival support bridge national, international and regional concerns by defining the roles of film festivals in a mixture of cultural and industrial terms. The guidelines for the Festivals Performance Fund, which provides performance envelopes to eligible festivals that draw audiences in excess of 100,000 for feature films, refer directly to the Canada Feature Film Fund's audience-building goal by recognizing "festivals that have a distinguished track record in reaching Canadian audiences, showcasing Canadian feature films and contributing to the appreciation and awareness of Canadian film" (Telefilm, 2008a, p. 3). The guidelines for the Skills and Screens Fund are aligned with Telefilm's corporate objective to "build capacity in the industry to succeed at reaching audiences" (2008b, p. 3).⁹ A series of "seven priority areas" elaborates the objective of building capacity in relation to the three key strategies of increasing audience access and awareness, increasing opportunities for foreign sales and/or financing and fostering "new talent and diverse voices through practical training opportunities" (2008b, p. 3); the priority areas basically provide examples like mentorship or networking programs and opportunities targeting Aboriginals and visible minorities as a means to "guide applicants in their applications" (2008b, p. 4).

The structure and language of these new funding guidelines strives for

⁹ Building capacity is the second of three strategic objectives set out in the 2006-2007 to 2010-2011 Corporate Plan (*From Cinemas to Cell Phones*). The first objective is "building audiences" and the third is "strengthening relationships with our clients and partners" (Telefilm Canada, 2006c, pp. 28-30). The third strategic objective appears re-drafted in the Skills and Screens guidelines to read "achieve value for Canadians as an efficient and effective administrator" (Telefilm Canada, 2008b, p. 3).

administrative clarity and transparency while also establishing “expected outcomes,”¹⁰ in keeping with Telefilm’s focus on performance measurement. Although the objectives of building audiences and building capacity point to an industrial thrust for Telefilm’s festival support, the overall framework of federal feature film policy grounds the search for performance indicators in relation to symbolic goals for nation-building. *Scripts, Screens and Audiences* positions federal support for Canadian cinema in relation to “strategic priorities for the audiovisual sector” that include “reaching audiences,” “reflecting ourselves,” “investing in [cultural] excellence,” “harnessing the opportunities of new technologies” and “reaching the world” (Canadian Heritage, 2006, pp. 1-2). Taken together, these goals for Canada’s cultural industries reflect the nationalist drive to forge a distinctive communicative space. In particular, the provision of access is couched in a cultural nationalist vision that harkens back to the rhetoric of the Massey Commission. For example, in Telefilm’s Corporate Plan (*From Cinemas to Cell Phones*, 2006-2007 – 2010-2011), a section on audience development sets a primary goal to “provide increased accessibility for Canadians particularly living in underserved areas to a broad range of Canadian films, TV programs and new media products” (Telefilm, 2006c, p. 19); this goal also includes a stipulation “to introduce Canada’s youth to Canadian audiovisual productions.”

Paul Litt (1992) notes that, although the Commission made no specific recommendations on the development of a feature film industry, the cross-country reach of the NFB’s distribution system drew attention with film (like radio) seen as a “means for the dissemination of traditional high culture” (p. 200). Similarly, Michael Dorland exposes the entanglement of liberal humanist aims with anxieties about commercialization in the *Massey Report*’s chapter on “Films in Canada.” Although cinema was cited as “not only the most potent but also the most alien of the influences

¹⁰ Both Funds set out short-, medium- and long-term expected outcomes that move from the Fund’s specific goals back to reiterating the overarching objectives of the Canada Feature Film Fund and Telefilm. (Telefilm, 2008a & 2008b).

shaping our Canadian life” (as cited in Dorland, 1998, p. 14), he explains that the *Report* offered the “highest praise for the films of the NFB” while distancing itself from the concerns of private producers (p. 15). Thus, the notion of audience access responds to the persistent fear that Canada ““would be nothing but an empty shell without a vigorous and distinctive cultural life”” (as cited in Dorland, 1998, p. 154 n35) while simultaneously positioning the film industry as a tool for forging a national citizenry. Noting that “Canadians benefit from a strong production industry,” the 2006 Canadian Feature Film Policy (*Scripts, Screens and Audiences*) refers to the medium as “one of the most effective forms of cultural expression [that] entertains, educates and enlightens” (Canadian Heritage, 2006, p. 1). The expectation that the products of a commercial film industry would combine entertainment and cultural enrichment points to the lingering effect of the Massey Commission’s lofty aspirations. Popularity is a bit of a paradox here as national cinema competes for the attention of the masses but retains associations with high culture or art cinema via the policy reference to education and enlightenment.

When configured from the perspective of the public’s need to access a diverse range of texts, the audience comprises groups of citizens; but these audience members are also consumers, viewed by industry stakeholders as the means to achieve the domestic box office targets of federal film policy. Thus, film festivals serve to bind the nation’s regions via shared cosmopolitan experiences of cinema-going within a model of cultural pluralism, industrial development and international trade. In other words, fostering the domestic film industry involves promoting the idea of national cinemas that circulate within an international context; or, to return to Miller’s comments, “the rhetoric of cultural difference essentially promotes commodities” (1993, p. 110). The promotion of national cinemas on the international festival circuit was initially the purview of state agencies and national producers associations who would select their country’s official submissions. In 1972, Cannes “implemented the fundamental reform...of films no longer being selected by [their] countries [of origin]” (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, p. 52),

thereby giving the Festival sole authority over programming (Festival de Cannes, *Festival history*). Beauchamp and Béhar explain that American entries had previously been chosen by a committee that included guild representatives and the MPAA; prior to 1962, the MPAA “worked directly with the government to choose the films to be submitted by the United States” (1992, pp. 214-215).

Meanwhile, the circuit itself was overseen by FIAPF (the International Federation of Film Producers Associations). With its base of operations in Paris, FIAPF was founded in 1933 as a non-profit organization that assembled representatives from an international range of national film producers’ associations. Jacobsen explains that FIAPF became involved in the regulation of international film festivals in the 1950s in response to fears that a proliferation of events could saturate the market (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 18). In many ways, FIAPF took on the role of “world body” that Elsaesser attributes to the festival circuit as a whole (2005, p. 88). Elsaesser elaborates (in a parenthetical reference) that the festivals as a group constitute “an ad hoc United Nations, a parliament of national cinemas, or cinematic NGO’s [sic]” (2005, p. 88). This may be intended as a reference to the gatherings of government officials and industry representatives that occur at events on the circuit, allowing opportunities for international cooperation, discussion and/or mobilization in response to issues facing the film industry. However, the evolution of the circuit’s early structural characteristics, including ensuring quality presentation and fostering a spirit of international cooperation, was managed by the Federation’s general assembly. According to the FIAPF Web site, their International Festivals Regulations are “a trust contract between the film business and the festivals who depend on their cooperation for their prestige and economic impact” (*Welcome*). The vague pronoun references in this phrase provide a surprisingly apt encapsulation of the interdependence of festivals and industry (who is depending on whom?) and the power struggles that characterize their relationship.

Jacobsen provides insight into the highly politicized history of festival

programming. For example, the German federal government objected to the selection of Alain Resnais' Holocaust documentary *Night and Fog* (*Nuit et brouillard*, 1955) on the grounds that it violated Article V of the statutes for festivals which prohibited screenings that "injure the feelings of the people of another nation, or interfere with their peaceful co-existence" (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 67); the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Industry and Trade intervened and the film was withdrawn. Article V came into play again that year when the Soviets protested the acceptance of a German entry, *Sky Without Stars* (*Himmel ohne Sterne*, Käutner, 1955) which was subsequently removed from the line-up (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 67). At their 1955 conference, FIAPF granted the Berlinale "A-status," a designation that indicated which festivals would both receive films from their member associations and be allowed to organize an international jury (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 65); Jacobsen notes that "however catchy the term 'A-status' might be, it is nowhere to be found in the actual guidelines of the FIAPF" (2000, p. 65). Prior to 1955, only Cannes and Venice had received A-status even though FIAPF did attempt to convince France and Italy "to negotiate bilaterally on the organization of one single festival [with an international competition] for 1953" (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 35). Despite the prestige and access to national films that A-status provided, there were limits to the influence of FIAPF rulings. Following the 1951 resolution that restricted member associations from submitting to any festivals other than Cannes and Venice, both France and Italy "refused official participation" in the Berlinale but "the producers' associations of both countries permitted their members to send films" (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 19).

The first three A-status international festivals found their origins in a confluence of high art, consumerism and government policy. According to Antonio Maraini, the secretary-general of the Biennale, the Venice film festival was "the first to place cinema alongside the other major arts" (Stone, 1998, p. 95). Launched in 1895, the Venice Biennale began as a municipally-organized international exhibition of fine art and quickly became a "focal point for the established European art world" (Stone, 1998, p.

34). As part of her examination of cultural politics in Fascist Italy, Marla Susan Stone details the nationalization of the Biennale between 1928 and 1931. Alongside a range of organizational and legal reforms that brought the institution under the direct control of the Fascist regime, she notes that the exhibition was “repackaged to attract the new professional and white-collar middle classes” (Stone, 1998, p. 97); Stone links these changes to the administrative acumen of Maraini and the technocratic background of new Biennale president Conte Giuseppe Volpi di Misurata who “stressed the growth of a commercial tourist infrastructure” (1998, p. 38). Thus, the fine art exhibition broadened its audience reach through the addition of more popular cultural forms such as music, poetry and cinema. The Venice Biennale International Film Festival debuted in August, 1932 and proved to be so successful that after the second instalment in 1934 it became an annual event.

Stone argues that expanding the scope of the Biennale program not only tested the boundaries of high art but also served to transform its audience members “from arts connoisseurs to cultural consumers” (1998, p. 98). The notion of “transformation” in her account carries an implication of movement from “expertise” to “accessibility” that evokes Fascist ideology’s populist drive “to ‘move toward the people’” (1998, pp. 98-99). However, rather than a generalized shift in audience behaviour, it seems more likely that increasing the mass appeal of the exhibitions would invoke a hierarchy of cultural competences similar to that which later would afflict the moles and moths. At the same time, the Biennale retained the exclusivity of its high cultural roots through both admission costs that were “twice the normal movie ticket price” (Stone, 1998, p. 107) and the festival’s elite context. Before the opening of the Cinema Palace in 1937, screenings were held on the terrace of the Excelsior Hotel on the Lido, thereby establishing the film festival as “a site of consumption, tourism, and leisure” (Stone, 1998, p. 102). This formula would be replicated in the decision of French organizers to locate their rival international festival in the Mediterranean resort of Cannes, drawing on the Riviera’s

long history as a tourist destination for the aristocracy and a stimulating retreat for renowned artists like Pablo Picasso, Auguste Renoir and F. Scott Fitzgerald; Beauchamp and Béhar note that Biarritz was also under consideration until the municipality of Cannes committed to the construction of the Palais (1992, p. 44).

The decision of the Biennale jury to not give the top award to *Grand Illusion* (*La Grande illusion*, Renoir, 1937) in 1937 is generally cited as the impetus for the organization of the Festival de Cannes. While the involvement of the Fascist regime garners some mention, the complexity and significance of the changes to the festival's structure tend to be downplayed in favour of a focus on the pantheon of international cinema. Turan links Mussolini's control of the festival to a rejection of the Renoir film's "pacifist sentiments" and states that "the French decided that if you wanted something done right you had to do it yourself" (2002, p. 18); Beauchamp and Béhar suggest that "festival officials forbade the Venice jury" from recognizing the film and note the resignations of British and American jurors the following year (1992, p. 43). Making no mention of Fascism, Marshall paints the French as "thoroughly annoyed" (2005, p. 51) as though jealousy rather than international politics sparked the genesis of Cannes. Yet for Stone, that *Grand Illusion* was "prized" (in Official Competition) at all by the Biennale was an inconsistency of "Fascist cultural patronage," meaning that politics did not always trump aesthetics (1998, p. 109). Instead, what differentiates the events of 1937 from typical post-awards' sour grapes are increasingly strained international relations. In 1936, the film festival was separated from the Biennale and granted equivalent legal status as an "ente autonomo" (Stone, 1998, p. 109), a move that effectively "ensure[d] the central government's influence in the institution's internal workings" (p. 37). The resulting untenable diplomatic scenario points to the need for an alternative venue, particularly in light of attempts of Film Europe to forge a common market in the 1920's along with the national structure of industry and government participation on the international festival circuit that began to emerge following the Second World War.

Indeed, of the pre-war cinema powerhouses, France became the most feasible successor as the site to convene the international market.

Thus, Stone's account of changes to the organizational structure of the Venice film festival contextualizes the snub of *Grand Illusion* as an anomaly (rather than a critical turning point) in the evolution of Fascist cultural policy. Downplaying the geopolitics of international trade in favour of textual politics also elides the role of state power in "the constitution of the ethical subject of cultural-capitalist citizenship and the maximizing subject of the free market" (Miller, 1993, p. 38). After all, the launch of the Festival International du Film (which was delayed until 1946 by the War) occurred under the auspices of France's Ministries of Foreign Affairs and National Education as well as the Centre Nationale de la Cinématographie (CNC) (Festival de Cannes, "Festival history"), a structure not altogether dissimilar from the organization of the post-1936 Biennale by the Ministry of Popular Culture, the National Federation of Entertainment Industries and L'Unione Cinematografica Educativa (LUCE; the Union of Educational Cinematography) (Stone, 1998, p. 110)—with the exception, of course, of a divergent perspective on civil society. The origins of the Berlinale in the early 1950's provide a clear example of cultural policy intervention to promote a particular vision of citizenship. In contrast to its counterparts in Cannes and Venice, the Berlin film festival did not start out as an industrial or tourist venture but rather as "an important symbol of West Germany's democratic renewal" (Fehrenbach, 1995, p. 234).

Oscar Martay, a Film Officer of the Information Services Branch of the American High Commission, is credited as the initiator of the Berlinale, purportedly inspired by a visit to the Biennale (Fehrenbach, 1995, p. 237). A few months prior to the first meeting of the organizing committee, Alfred Bauer, who would become the festival's first Director, unsuccessfully lobbied municipal, industry and Allied representatives for the establishment of a film institute and annual festival that would bolster the local economy (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 13). American interests prevailed though, along with an ideological

agenda that positioned the festival as a crucial cultural battleground for Cold War politics. At the opening gala, Mayor Ernst Reuter referred to Berlin as “an oasis of liberty and independence, surrounded by a system of violence and oppression, which uses art for the purpose of propaganda” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 23); in East Berlin, coverage of “West Berlin’s decadent film-facade” critiqued the event’s restrictive Western focus and attributed the poor quality of West German cinema to “the state of affairs of film production in capitalistic countries...with petit-bourgeois and placating sentimentality” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 27). Heide Fehrenbach (1995) notes that American involvement, which included financial contributions and influence over the Berlinale’s programming structure, rankled industry stakeholders who felt that the festival served U.S. foreign policy at their expense.

Already upset with decartelization laws that had weakened the economic foundations of industry along with an “influx of foreign films into their domestic market,” the German film trade association SPIO (Spitzenorganisation der deutschen Filmwirtschaft) declined to participate in the 1951 festival (Fehrenbach, 1995, p. 246); in a letter, they outlined the “crisis of the German film industry, which ‘as a result of the film politics of the Allies, put German film production at a serious disadvantage’” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 18). Bauer also had concerns about attempts to ensure that the festival’s popular reach encompassed the Eastern border areas and West Berlin’s working class communities. Not only were these efforts to “democratize” the festival costly (in terms of both expenditures and industry goodwill), they also undermined the aura of exclusivity that comprised a necessary component of “a distinguished [international] cultural event” (Fehrenbach, 1995, p. 242). Fehrenbach recognizes the irony that these additional screenings were ultimately “marginal to the real hub of activity” in the heart of Berlin where the “public were corralled behind barricades as the ersatz royalty were ushered past” (1995, p. 242). Accreditation by FIAPF as an A-status festival, with its requirement of “political neutrality,” curtailed the more conspicuous aspects of the

Berlinale's political agenda by 1955 (Fehrenbach, 1995, p. 249).

Governmental involvement in the shaping of emergent festival policies brings to mind Toby Miller's discussion of the "training" of "the ethically incomplete subject" and "the politically incomplete public subject" via public policy (1993, p. xi); specifically, Miller cites four types of cultural subject whose "formation [as] cultural citizens" helps to ensure a "sustainable society" (1993, p. xii). The Biennale and Berlinale provide examples of direct intervention to either further or fight the spread of totalitarianism while Cannes, under the guise of neutrality and equality, works to forge the neoliberal citizen-consumer. In addition, despite disparate political aims, festival organizers sought to affirm the status of Venice, Cannes, and Berlin as cosmopolitan global cities. Venice drew on the Biennale's established history as an elite art exhibition while Cannes parlayed an exclusive resort setting into the preeminent hub for international film traffic; lastly, the Berlinale aspired to "revive the former capital's interwar reputation as an important European cultural center" (Fehrenbach, 1995, p. 234). The worldliness of cosmopolitanism carries implications for economic and cultural development, thereby invoking Miller's two other subject types—"the rational consuming subject" and "the national public in need of a dramatological mirror in which to recognize itself" (1993, pp. xi-xii). Ulf Hannerz explains that "[t]he perspective of the cosmopolitan must entail relationships to a plurality of cultures understood as distinctive entities" (1990, p. 239). Ranges of cosmopolitan competence include the aficionado's acute knowledge of aesthetic difference as well as a more generalized "state of readiness" that would enable engagement with an other's cultural space in a meaningful way (Hannerz, 1990, p. 239).

A key insight into the creation of a cosmopolitan film scene comes from a consideration of cosmopolitanism's "narcissistic streak" (Hannerz, 1990, p. 240). If the cosmopolitan "self is constructed in the space where cultures mirror one another" (Hannerz, 1990, p. 240), then the international film festival can be understood in terms of its role in positioning national cinemas in relation to one another such that the continuing

presence of other imagined communities sustains the notion of a distinctive national space. On one hand, the festival provides a space for spectators either to engage with their own varying degrees of cosmopolitan competence or to garner a quick fix of diverse cultural knowledge. Given Schlesinger's discussion of the reductive pressures of singular conceptions of nation, the result may be a search for distinctive traits that undermines cosmopolitanism's appreciation of the complexities of diverse localisms; furthermore, the festival's offer of textually-based knowledge points to a simulated cosmopolitan experience that, for some, may be little more than a consumer fetish. For industry on the other hand, the festival maintains both the bounded territories targeted by cultural policies and the national interchange required in an international marketplace.

However, the festivals' veneer of cosmopolitan worldliness along with the spirit of cooperation that was regulated by FIAPF reached a crisis point that necessitated diversification of the festivals' programming structures. Specifically, the tension between political pressure and artistic freedom sparked changes at the Berlinale and Cannes in the late 1960s. The International Forum of Young Cinema was launched at the 1971 Berlinale as part of a re-structuring plan conceived in the wake of the crisis that halted the 1970 Competition and threatened the integrity of the festival. Following the screening of Michael Verhoeven's *O.K.*, the international jury requested that the selection committee reconfirm the film's eligibility as its story of the rape and murder of a Vietnamese girl at the hands of American soldiers (despite its basis in fact) appeared not to comply with FIAPF requirements that "participating films should 'contribute to the understanding and friendship between the peoples of different nations'" (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 166). Juror Dušan Makavejev, an award-winning film director from Yugoslavia, accused his colleagues of censorship and argued that they had overstepped their mandate which did not extend to evaluating selection criteria (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 167); in his account of the scandal, Verhoeven claims to have discovered that the jury president, American director George Stevens, pressured festival management to "ban" the film

thereby attempting “to act like the long arm of his government in Berlin” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 178). Although Jacobsen suggests that festival director Alfred Bauer may be partly to blame for not quashing rumours about the disqualification of *O.K.* (2000, p. 168), he finds that the common thread in the tangle of official documents and personal reminiscences is that “[i]n principle, [every]one no longer spoke the same language” (2000, p. 165).

Cocteau’s vision of the festival as “an apolitical no-man’s land” (Festival de Cannes, *Festival history*) hit a similar roadblock two years earlier in Cannes. On May 18, 1968, Favre Le Bret officially halted the festival following the disruption of the previous evening’s competition screening of Carlos Saura’s *Peppermint Frappé* (1967). Saura’s film was not the source of the controversy and the director had even attempted to withdraw it from the competition as a gesture of support (Houston, 1997, p. 42); lead actress Geraldine Chaplin recalls that her attempt to reach the stage to stop the screening was thwarted when she was “punched” by Jean-Luc Godard “who had lost his glasses in the scuffle” (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, p. 78). Instead, what was at stake was a growing tension between state power and artistic freedom along with disdain for the elite pretensions of the A-status festivals. The Cannes protesters, including Godard and François Truffaut, had been galvanized earlier in the year by the firing of Henri Langlois, head of the Cinémathèque Française, at the hands of the French Minister of Culture André Malraux; the ensuing outcry encompassed renowned international directors and the MPAA and led to the reinstatement of Langlois but with reduced state support for the Cinémathèque (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, pp. 73-75). As the press conference presided over by the Committee for the Defense of the Cinémathèque spilled over into a protest in the Grande Salle, the aim of showing solidarity with striking workers and students converged with the desire to transform the festival (Houston, 1997, p. 42). The protesters sought to do away with the awards and denounced the presence of celebrities

(Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, pp. 77-78).¹¹

The key outcomes of the events of 1968 were the formation of the French Directors' Guild, which gained representation on the Board of the Cannes Festival, and the creation of the Directors' Fortnight (*La Quinzaine des réalisateurs*), a director-curated sidebar that would run parallel to the Official Selection (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, pp. 80-81).¹² The 1968 Berlinale lacked an inciting incident comparable to the Langlois affair that would have focussed opposition to the festival, thereby leaving the issue of reform to the organizers (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 155); even so, evidence of simmering discontent could be found as director Werner Herzog organized additional screenings of the Competition films in outlying areas so that filmmakers could engage in dialogue with a public audience (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 157). As Jacobsen explains, the challenge of dispensing with the official competition (and thus the awards) arises from the resultant loss of FIAPF A-status and the access to important international films that it provided (2000, p. 156). Thus, the re-structuring of the Berlinale would wait until the crisis of 1970 halted the competition screenings. In addition to the scandal surrounding *O.K.*, a controversy was unfolding around another Carlos Saura film. Spanish authorities refused to release Saura's latest film *El Jardín de las Delicias* (*The Garden of Delights*, 1970) for participation in the Competition while the official entry from Spain, *El Extraño Caso del Doctor Fausto* (Suárez, 1969), which had been rejected by the Festival's selection committee, had to be screened in order to comply with FIAPF regulations (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 172).

Festival organizers were caught between the industrial and political pressures

¹¹ Noting the irony of the situation, Beauchamp and Béhar point out that Godard's calls for solidarity were met with shouts of "millionaire, millionaire" and raised the question of whether such high-profile protesters "weren't fighting to overthrow themselves" (1992, p. 78). Penelope Huston notes that those seeking to disrupt the festival were "in a minority" as some filmmakers still wished to screen their films while hoteliers and shopkeepers attempted to stem the loss of revenue (1997, pp. 43-44).

¹² Houston raises the interesting point that while the creation of the Directors' Fortnight would serve "to avoid possible charges of elitism," it also would hamper any future attempt to halt the event "because an extended festival lacks a center" (1997, p. 44).

arising from FIAPF requirements and a desire to screen ““artistically valuable films”” (Senator Werner Stein, chairman of the board of curators, as cited in Jacobsen, 2000, p. 172). These controversies combined to undermine the cultural authority of the Berlinale while Herzog’s efforts to bring the festival closer to the general public pointed to simmering discontent about the exclusivity of art cinema. The eventual decision to reform the program into the parallel strands of the Competition and the Forum offered a means to balance celebrity glamour with political commitment (to both state and citizenry) while satisfying industrial, civic and cultural interests. Filmmaker Christian Ziewer would later praise the Forum for eschewing “laurels” in favour of “the torch which it ignited twenty years ago...[with which] it will also be able to confront the danger which threatens our film culture: that the glittering lights of the Festival veil the progressing ruin of the cinema landscape” (as cited in Jacobsen, 2000, p. 193). Yet, it is important to acknowledge the illusory nature of this shift toward programming autonomy as the Berlinale reforms emerged from extensive stakeholder consultations; furthermore, when consensus appeared out of reach, the Cannes’ restructuring model was “suggested as a compromise” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 174).

Exhibition, Acquisitions and Miramax-ing the Market

As a cosmopolitan scene, the international film festival serves as a contingent site for addressing the political and marketing aims of (inter)national cinemas. In the interface between Miller’s “rational subject” and “national public,” the cultural subject emerges as a citizen-consumer; the mobilization of state policy in support of the cultural industries blurs the boundaries between citizenship and consumption such that “each shadows the other” (Miller et al, 2005, p. 40). It is interesting to note how this balance shifts in concert with the complexities of Hollywood’s relationship to the festival circuit. For the first International Festival du Film in Cannes, Hollywood sent a “special ‘steamship of stars’” that included Douglas Fairbanks, Norma Shearer, Gary Cooper and

Mae West (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, p. 44); unfortunately, the Festival was cancelled following the opening night gala screening of *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* (Dieterle, 1939) due to the outbreak of the Second World War. When it was re-launched in 1946, Cannes became “one of the many fronts on which the Cold War was fought” (T. McCarthy, 1997, p. 13). For instance, during the 1950s the U.S. Information Agency screened delegate lists in order to ensure that “no disloyal Americans” would be dispatched to this high profile international event (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, p. 214). Similarly, the Berlinale supported the spread of Western values by presenting a showcase of films that appealed to audiences “as consumers, the single shared identity in capitalist mass society” (Fehrenbach, 1995, p. 238); here global citizens are defined as rational consuming subjects.

As a showcase, the international film festival also acts as a wholesale outlet where distributors display their products prior to launch in theatrical and ancillary exhibition markets. Exports are a crucial aspect of the U.S. film industry, accounting for approximately “one-third of its annual income;” Miller et al. note this proportion remained relatively consistent from the 1950s through the 1970s, with the exception of the occasional dip in domestic cinema-going that would drive the figure even higher to close to 50 percent (2005, p. 12). Export income would continue to rise throughout the 1990s, particularly as Hollywood majors began to invest heavily in international exhibition. Acland examines American involvement in the multiplexing of Europe, arguing that it paves the way for “synchronized international releasing strategies” for global film commodities (2003, p. 138). As a result, by 2000, “most ‘star-driven event films’ from Hollywood obtained more revenue overseas than domestically” (Miller et al., 2005, p. 10). In this instance, the international film festival enables the studios to assert their supremacy in the global marketplace as the pre-launch screening of *The Da Vinci Code* clearly uses Cannes’ world stage to display an unmatched economic model. National cinemas cannot hope to duplicate either the production budget of US\$125

million or global opening weekend box office receipts of US\$224 million (“Summary [The Da Vinci Code]”), not to mention the unreported prints and advertising expenditures; the (ir)rational consuming subject has fully morphed into Miller et al.’s global citizen for whom “one dollar [equals] one vote” (2005, p. 331).

Aside from their efforts to drive consumer demand, distributors also look to the film festival for acquisitions. In 1989, Miramax acquired *Cinema Paradiso* (Tornatore, 1988) at Cannes and proceeded to re-edit the film to make it more palatable to American audiences, transforming the Italian box office flop into a successful foreign art house release and Oscar winner (Biskind, 2004, p. 86). That same year, Harvey Weinstein bid US\$1 million to purchase the theatrical and television rights to Steven Soderbergh’s low-budget debut *sex, lies, and videotape* (1989) just after it won the Audience Award at Sundance (Biskind, 2004, p. 65). The release of both films built on Miramax’s evolving pattern of challenging the conventional approach to the art cinema market. Tino Balio explains that “[a]rt films have to be distributed slowly to allow word of mouth and critical praise to build up interest” (1998, p. 64). However, with *Cinema Paradiso* Miramax opted to “experiment” with a wide, rather than platform, release (Biskind, 2004, p. 101); similarly, *sex, lies* was screened in theatres “that [had] never played a specialized movie” and proceeded to gross US \$25 million at the domestic box office (Biskind, 2004, p. 82). Former Miramax distribution executive Jack Foley illuminates the sacrilegious connotations of distributing art films in suburban multiplexes, noting the perception that the pursuit of commercial gain “bastardized them” (as cited in Biskind, 2004, p. 82).

With the critical and commercial success of *sex, lies, Cinema Paradiso*, and *My Left Foot* (Sheridan, 1989), 1989 marked a turning point for Miramax, propelling the company from its marginal position in independent film distribution (Balio, 1998, p. 66). But their unorthodox approach would ultimately disrupt the economy of independent cinema. An aggressive negotiating style along with offers climbing into the multi-million dollar range sparked bidding wars that drove up acquisitions costs. Peter Biskind details

how competitive bidding drove the price of *Shine* (Hicks, 1996) from \$600,000 to \$2 million in the wake of an enthusiastically-received Sundance screening, as compared to early indie successes like *Clerks* that sold for \$227,000 (2004, pp. 224-228). Taking an indie film into wide release would then require the application of a studio approach to marketing that included buying expensive television advertising (for a more immediate return than that provided by the slow burn of word-of-mouth marketing) and striking more prints. The combination of these factors made competition in the indie market increasingly difficult and, according to distributor Bingham Ray “forced out the real, true indie” (as cited in Biskind, 2004, p. 193); as box office potential and marketing costs rose, so did production budgets with celebrities crossing over to expand their artistic range or to revive a dormant career trajectory. And, of course, studios seized the opportunity to capitalize (on) the indie market.

Biskind links Disney’s 1993 buyout of Miramax to the phenomenal performance of *The Crying Game* (Jordan, 1992) and *Like Water for Chocolate* (Arau, 1992) as well as the company’s burgeoning profile with Academy voters (2004, pp. 148-149). The subsequent release of *Pulp Fiction* (Tarantino, 1994), a film which maximized the blend of low production costs, recognizable talent and carefully packaged wide release, broke the indie mold when it crossed the US \$1 million threshold at the box office (Biskind, 2004, p. 189); while the US \$8.5 million budget, along with the Miramax cachet and celebrity cast betray the extent to which these films were no longer truly “independent,” it is important to note that had *Pulp Fiction* been made as a studio film the budget likely would have risen to at least US \$25 million (Biskind, 2004, p. 168). Thus, the growth of the indie market presented an alluring financial model for the major studios. In contrast to their approach of releasing approximately 20 movies a year at an average cost of US \$75 million per feature (Biskind, 2004, p. 193), the smaller scale of indie distribution saw budgets closer to US \$10 million that could recoup production costs in ancillary and foreign sales alone while also generating modest box office receipts; not only was the

cost-return ratio more consistently profitable, the potential for the occasional hit like *Pulp Fiction* promised a certain degree of financial stability in an uncertain business.

Consequently, Balio explains that much like the industry consolidation that followed the breakout success of *And God Created... Woman* (Vadim, 1956) when the studios “absorbed the most talented foreign film-makers” (1998, p. 63), the 1990s saw the art film market “taken over by the Hollywood majors who either created classics divisions or acquired the leading independent art film distributors” (p. 64).

Industry consolidation, rising production budgets and changes to release strategies brought a new corporate ethos to the economy of independent cinema such that “‘independent film’ in the 1990s [became] a euphemism for a small-studio production” (Levy, 1999, p. 505). At the same time, the push to achieve higher box office returns and to maximize crossover appeal (with the aim of finding the next *Pulp Fiction* or *Crying Game*) pulled the international festival circuit deeper into the studios’ marketing plan. In their pre-Disney days, the “ability of the Weinstein brothers to generate free publicity became legendary” (Balio, 1998, p. 66); alongside their strategies for sparking editorial attention, Balio cites Miramax’s practice of riding post-festival award coverage into a film’s release (1998, p. 66). Of course, this type of free publicity is also a boon to a big-budget celebrity vehicle like *The Da Vinci Code* for which the saturation release on 12,000 screens places print costs alone at close to US \$120 million (Harkness, 2006); thus, global coverage of the red carpet by the thousands of accredited media in Cannes presumably helps to reduce advertising expenditures. In addition, the necessity of minimizing risk without sacrificing production innovation points to the growing significance of market research in the indie sector; the marketing savvy underlying Miramax’s efforts extended from the re-cutting of films like *Cinema Paradiso* to their reliance on feedback from test screenings (Biskind, 2004, p. 87).

Marketing’s manipulation of value considers a film’s positioning, playability and marketability (Miller et al., 2005, pp. 271-272); positioning refers to targeting a specific

audience niche, while playability predicts the quality of the fit, and marketability assesses the film's promotional potential. Thus, from a marketing perspective, the audience is perceived "not [as] a locus of demand, but of calculation" (Miller et al., 2005, p. 262), thereby shifting from global citizen-consumer to cultural object. At the international film festival, the moles and the moths find themselves caught up in the lure of cinephilia and celebrity; yet they are also the target of intersecting cultural, industrial and governmental concerns about their roles as citizens, cosmopolitans and consumers. As a space to appraise acquisitions, launch theatrical films, and frame national cinemas in an international marketplace, the festival serves as a site for the negotiation of cinematic value(s). Since the origins of international film festivals in Venice, Cannes and Berlin, the balance of programming power has shifted away from national government and industry associations. In addition, Hollywood's marketing interests have evolved from the spread of Western consumer-capitalist values to an increased role for the festival in the political economy of independent cinema.

The next chapter charts the evolution of the international film festival in the Canadian context. I will examine how the separate (albeit relentlessly compared) identities of the Toronto and Vancouver International Film Festivals contend with intersecting economic, political and cultural concerns. While TIFF's development maintains a focus on industry infrastructure, VIFF retains its founding vision as an exhibition alternative for the community's cinephiles. The divergent historical trajectories of these institutions have been shaped by stakeholder struggles over each event's value as well as each festival's positioning in relation to regional production and national cinema.

CHAPTER THREE

CONNECTIONS, HUNCHES, TIMING: BIRTH OF A (WRITTEN) FESTIVAL

When its organizer Bill Marshall commented, as was reported in the press, that he hoped it would become a tourist attraction like the zoo, he expressed things well. (Tadros, 1978, p. 13)

In honour of their 25th anniversary in 2000, the Toronto International Film Festival commissioned *Preludes*, a series of ten shorts from well-known Canadian filmmakers. Two of the films, Atom Egoyan's *The Line* and Don McKellar's *A Word from the Management*, position the public audience as the focal point in their explorations of festival experience but offer differing perspectives on the concept of buzz. While Egoyan celebrates the random cinephilic conversations that occur in the queue as anticipation builds, McKellar provides a glimpse of the frontline that undercuts the event's convivial atmosphere by revealing the relentless pursuit of insider access. In *The Line*, a lengthy tracking shot of waiting patrons chronicles the Festival's history through changing fashion and festival program covers. With the exception of a couple that peels away to enter a party, the line's energy continues to build with the addition of a velvet rope and the occasional burst of flashbulbs. The chatter becomes cacophonous and jostling accompanies forward motion as the camera halts on a close-up of a hand clicking a counter to 2000. Regardless of audience numbers in *The Line*, there is no indication that access might be denied even though exclusivity is a key aspect of the festival universe. McKellar unearths this darker side of buzz by shifting the perspective to the festival worker who is charged with ensuring that screenings run smoothly, a task that often includes the enforcement of access restrictions.

A Word from the Management begins with an obliquely angled view from the

wings as two presenters dressed in evening attire leave the stage in the ebb of a hearty round of applause. The spotlight is switched off; a stagehand jogs onstage and removes the microphone stand, his actions met with the sound of an isolated derisive cheer. Accompanying a series of eye-level pans across the faces in the audience, McKellar's voice-over monologue recounts an increasing loss of decorum, from queuing for three hours to hiding in bathroom stalls to physically shoving staff aside, as fervent patrons attempted to gain entry to sold-out screenings. His recollections are replete with military metaphors and references to lugging around a cellular the size of an army field phone. Yet, rather than castigating the entire audience, he appears to be singling out the actions of a few bad seeds while the pans speed up and switch direction as though scanning for one particular face. McKellar explains that as a film festival "we brought movies to the people" which indicates that the actual problem at the venues, often sparked by the intrusion of extraneous spectators, was that it left "the patrons irate." This is an interesting word choice given that the term Gold Patrons designated individuals who had contributed \$1,000 to support the Festival (Crean, 1976-1977, p. 40).¹ Thus, it is unclear whether McKellar is referring to the ticket-buying public or the maintenance of an exclusive experience for Festival sponsors. Ultimately, he hopes that all involved have gained "distance and wisdom" and concludes with the sedate observation that "it's only a movie." But he also has made it clear that this is hardly the case.

The people demanding access include relatives of the director, film critic Roger Ebert and Miramax co-founder Harvey Weinstein and the list of problems requiring

¹Marshall refers to the Gold Patrons as pass holders (2005, p. 7) which differs slightly from the connotation of S.M. Crean's decision to list them with corporate sponsors. While festival passes can be seen as a type of fundraising, with increased event access provided in return for donations ranging from cash to products to services, they also can be viewed as part of festival box office returns. In the latter case, purchasing a pass may offer an economical or pragmatic alternative to individual tickets as well as an opportunity to increase one's access to galas or parties. For the festival, certain types of passes can encourage attendance at matinees or promote a specific series. In other words, there are differing streams of thought on the revenue garnered and this distinction is not always made clear, particularly in terms of how it impacts festival governance.

troubleshooting ranges from “the screening late, the tickets lost [to] Diane Keaton lost.” This is obviously not the stuff of quotidian cinema-going experiences. Thomas Elsaesser explains that access restrictions “create a permanent anxiety about missing something important by being out of the loop” (2005, p. 95). He draws on Daniel Dayan’s comments on the unifying power of festival buzz, with its “precise function...to travel from mouth to ear” (1997, para. 8), in order to conclude that this anxiety contributes to a “dispersive energy” in the spreading of buzz that encourages interactions amongst strangers (Elsaesser, 2005, p. 95). While this may be true for the people depicted in *The Line*, it is also the case that actually being in the right place at the right time (and being able to gain entry as in *A Word from the Management*), regardless of whether it is due to privileged access or fortuitous planning, better positions the patron in the hierarchy of knowledge and grants the potential to initiate buzz. Thus, much as festival chatter may create a cohesive experience, the competitive urge to display one’s cultural capital will simultaneously polarize. Attendance at the premiere screening of an unheralded gem or star-studded gala classifies the patron as mole or moth, a distinction that loses its lustre with a failure to gain access.

In *Brave Films, Wild Nights: 25 Years of Festival Fever*, also commissioned to commemorate TIFF’s silver anniversary, film critic Brian D. Johnson recounts some of McKellar’s experiences as a theatre manager in 1989, including run-ins with Canadian film jury chair David Cronenberg and Cineplex Odeon CEO Garth Drabinsky (2000, pp. 181-184). As the Festival progressed, McKellar would switch hats from festival worker to guest as writer and co-star of Bruce McDonald’s debut feature *Roadkill* (1989), the closing night film of Perspective Canada which also was named Best Canadian Film by Cronenberg’s jury (B. Johnson, 2000, p. 182). After citing a series of specific incidents that could easily have inspired the generalized diatribe of *A Word from the Management*, Johnson ends with his own eyewitness account of the future filmmaker’s attempt to clear people out of an oversold screening of *Roger and Me* (Moore, 1989) and notes the

evening's passing similarity to the chaotic 1978 premiere of *In Praise of Older Women* (Kaczender) (2000, p. 184). Indeed, these breaches of cinema-going etiquette not only reflect varying levels of anxiety over restricted access but, as a subject in festival coverage, also help to build interest thus fuelling both the cohesive and competitive aspects of buzz.

Produced by Robert Lantos, *In Praise of Older Women* generated a certain amount of controversy prior to its Opening Night festival screening due to demands from the Ontario Censor Board that part of a sex scene be cut (B. Johnson, 2000, pp. 46-47). According to former Festival Director William Marshall, 2000 tickets were issued for the 1600-seat Elgin theatre based on the assumption that not everyone would attend; unfortunately, the tickets also read "admit two" (2005, p. 21). While hundreds of angry ticket holders were turned away, *The Globe and Mail* reported the next day that part of the crowd "broke past the ushers" and the police were called by Ontario's chief inspector of theatres when the overflow audience would not leave (Green & Scott, 1978). The evening has become part of TIFF lore, in part due to speculation over whether the uncut version was shown² but also as a crisis point in the evolution of a young festival. As the situation began to exceed the organizational capacity of festival staff, key sponsors and Gold Patrons clamoured to gain access as part of the unruly crowd (B. Johnson, 2000, p. 50), leading Marshall to comment facetiously that "we were equal opportunity offenders" (2005, p. 23). The resulting controversy, which played out in press coverage, points to the deeper challenge of maintaining exclusivity while also bringing films to the general public, particularly as the event became increasingly popular.

²*The Globe and Mail* report cites "unofficial whispers" and attributes the following coy comment to Lantos: "If I answer you one way, I am lying. If I answer you another, I might make myself liable for prosecution." (as cited in Green & Scott, 1978). Johnson quotes Marshall's reference to a "three-martini oath" of silence with then Festival Director Wayne Clarkson; he proceeds to note that the uncut version was screened and confirms the details of the intrigue with festival revisionist Martin Heath (2000, p. 51). Meanwhile, in his own festival memoir, Marshall attests that he "never intended to show the censored print of that or any other film at the Festival" (2005, p. 21).

Marshall's "equal opportunity" comment was made in response to an excerpt from film critic Jay Scott's festival wrap:

To state that a festival which had been advertised as egalitarian, democratic and, most of all, 'accessible' was superior to Cannes because 'large policemen' did not cart patrons away from screenings for which they had tickets was to display a stunning lack of sensitivity. If there is anything the Festival of Festivals should avoid becoming, it is the Cannes Film Festival. (Scott, 1978)

Scott's article is otherwise positive and he concurs with another reporter's assessment that "the festival has reached puberty" (1978). Adolescence serves as an apt metaphor as these growing pains comprise a crucial step in asserting TIFF's unique identity, an exercise that occurs largely through the written word. Noting the significant "role of print" generated by both Sundance and those reviewing and reporting on it, Dayan argues that "festivals need constant captioning" (1997, paras. 28-29). He refers to Roland Barthes' observation that fashion becomes meaningful through written commentary that reveals "its systematic dimension" (Dayan, 1997, para. 27). Thus, this process of definition and the delineation of rules transform the myriad events, film screenings and awards into a festival just as clothing is translated into fashion; in other words, acts of consecration, struggles over the hierarchy of cinematic legitimacy and the production of belief are solidified through written coverage. Dayan remarks that he could not reject these reams of information in favour of "the dream of face-to-face Sundance" (1997, para. 30). Elsaesser further explains that the print produced serves "the double function of performative self-confirmation and reflexive self-definition" (2005, p. 95). Consequently, the festival perpetuates its own value as it confers symbolic capital through buzz. In her year-end festival wrap, Connie Tadros recalls the "near-riot scene" at the *In Praise of Older Women* premiere, noting that it "made participating in the festival a social must for many" (1978, p. 13).

On one hand, the notion of a festival that is accessible to the public distinguishes TIFF from Cannes. Scott cites Marshall's reference to the "large policemen" (1978) that

comprise part of a visible security presence that controls entry to the Palais des Festivals. The Festival Guide on the Cannes' Web site explains that as part of France's Vigipirate Plan (for national security) entrances "are carefully monitored with threefold inspections: Festival Badges, electronic detection and verification of bags" (Festival de Cannes, "Festival guide"). While a limited number of screening passes are made available to film students and film clubs through the Cannes Cinéphiles programme, only film industry professionals can apply for a Festival Badge which includes access to the Palais (Festival de Cannes, "Cinephiles Accreditation"). As such, not only is it an invitation-only event, access is hierarchical and regulated. Meanwhile, the 2007 TIFF homepage boasts that theirs is "the largest public film festival in the world with savvy, sophisticated and discerning audiences." This is the third item in a list that defines the Festival acronym. The first provides the literal delineation of "a 10-day event beginning the Thursday after Labour Day in various locations around Toronto" while the second addresses the programming vision of "a platform for the creative and cultural discovery of new cinematic talent, both at home and internationally" (TIFFG, 2007a). Thus, TIFF comprises a triumvirate of locational factors, cinephilic content and public access. Yet, this definition sits under a crawl of celebrity pictures from press conferences and the Red Carpet that is strikingly similar to the strip of awards photos that runs underneath the banner of the 2007 Cannes Web site.

What is left out of the TIFF definition, or perhaps more accurately what is not explicitly acknowledged, is the event's significance as a launching pad for films targeting fall release during the highly competitive pre-awards' season; and this marketing activity draws the much-documented presence of celebrities for Red Carpet premieres. That said, the Web site's history pages note the presence of a significant number of soon-to-be Academy Award nominated films, suggesting a synergy between launch strategies, TIFF's position on the festival circuit and programming prowess (TIFFG.

“History...1990’s”).³ With TIFF as a FIAPF-accredited *non-competitive* festival, the distinction between the symbolic value of awards conferred by an “official [international] jury” (like those at Cannes) and a proposed correlation with the Oscars reinforces TIFF’s populist orientation. At the same time, an a posteriori link to peer-adjudicated Hollywood awards points to a shared logic between TIFF and the mainstream North American film industry regarding hierarchies of consecration. TIFF co-founder Bill Marshall does not really address FIAPF-accreditation in his festival memoir with the exception of a rather vituperative section on the 1977 launch of the Montreal World Film Festival (WFF), one year after the first Festival of Festivals, by “Napoleonic Quebecker” Serge Losique (2005, p. 65). Marshall draws a quick comparison between the two festivals, noting that WFF became a competitive festival and FoF “stayed non-competitive” (p. 66) which suggests that the rivalry between the festivals or their geographical and temporal proximity might serve as an explanation.

In a separate section on awards, Marshall lists an international array of grand prizes ranging from the Palme D’Or at Cannes and Berlin’s Golden Bear to Prague’s Golden Golem and Kalamata’s Golden Olive (2005, pp. 92-93). There is a derisive tone to this quick inventory that implies the declining value of symbolic capital in light of rampant gold-plating. However, the list merely demonstrates that even if the logic of consecration is similar, definitions of prestige vary. For Marshall, since cash prizes are preferable to a “Golden Whatsit” (2005, p. 92), the core issue is really the convertibility of symbolic capital. This offers further evidence of an industry-inflected perspective as a cash prize acknowledges that filmmakers cannot afford to disavow (or defer) their economic interests; that said, even though the award’s symbolic capital may appear less significant, the recognition associated with winning TIFF’s Best Canadian First Feature

³ The post-millennial page goes a step further by positing a causal connection between an enthusiastic festival response and subsequent award recognition – “The Festival’s impact on the Oscars and other awards in 2004 cannot be overstated.” (TIFFG, “History...2000’s”).

Award could boost release prospects or help attract funding for future projects. Marshall appears to disregard the historical relevance of competitive accreditation by FIAPF as a marker of A-status in favour of the international film industry consensus that Sundance, Berlin, Cannes, Venice and Toronto are the “big five” global festivals (2005, p. 65); only Berlin, Cannes and Venice are official competitive events, while Sundance does not have FIAPF accreditation. The designation of a global “big five” points to the significant structuring influence of Hollywood’s entry into the indie cinema market on hierarchies of festival value. The “big five” consists of the three original A-status festivals plus the birthplace of American independent cinema⁴ and the North American gateway to the fall awards’ season.

According to Secor Consulting’s *Analysis of Canada’s Major Film Festivals*, “TIFF is *the* North American stop on the circuits of all industry professionals doing international business” (2004, p. 7). The combination of glitterati, industry and cinephilia suggests the formative influence of Cannes as the model for pre-eminent international festivals like TIFF. It is important to note though that while it may prove useful to consider Cannes as a critical template for understanding the inception and development of TIFF, this comparative approach will not be applicable in all cases. Owen Evans (2007) argues against the “tacit acceptance on the whole that Cannes essentially established the mould of the contemporary film festival” (p. 23). In “Border Exchanges: The Role of the European Film Festival” he considers two A-list events, the Berlinale and Karlovy Vary, that significantly differ from Cannes in their greater support of national or regional cinemas. As examples, Evans cites programming initiatives like the Berlinale’s Perspectives of German Cinema (*Perspektive Deutsches Kino*) and Karlovy Vary’s East of the West—Films in Competition (2007, pp. 24, 30) that contrast Cannes’ European

⁴ The significant role of the Sundance Film Festival in the rise of American independent cinema, through award recognition and (more importantly) the competitive acquisition activities of independent distributors like Miramax, has been explored by Peter Biskind (2004), Lory Smith (1999) and Kenneth Turan (2002).

dimension which he sees as “simply geographical rather than cultural” (p. 23).

Rather than asserting a distinctive regional presence by fostering indigenous cinema, Cannes is seen as predominantly transnational in its focus. Evans makes a strong case for appreciating the variations that exist across the European festival circuit, even between A-list international events. Specifically, he challenges Elsaesser’s tendency to “use Cannes as a synecdoche for all festivals” (Evans, 2007, p. 27). As part of a brief overview of the transition to programming autonomy in the late 1960s and early 1970s, Elsaesser notes that “Cannes set the template for film festivals the world over, which...have largely synchronized their organizational structures and selection procedures” (2005, p. 90). Regardless of the extent to which this assessment captures the broad changes to festival governance that occurred post-1968 (which are discussed in Chapter Two), continuing to view Cannes as an archetype for festival proliferation is akin to the urge to compare national cinemas to Hollywood – an exercise that yields certain general characteristics defined in oppositional terms but overlooks the nuances of intra- and inter-national variations in industrial, juridical and cultural structure. The brevity of Elsaesser’s examination of the history of film festivals in Europe sets the stage for an examination of festival dynamics in broad transnational terms. Ultimately, he is more interested in the circulation of global texts in post-national Europe than cultural exchange between the marginalized industries that make up the category of world cinema.

Yet, there are also limits to the postcolonial perspective adopted by Evans. Using Homi Bhabha’s concept of liminal space, Evans contends that the festival’s combination of mainstream films with art cinema disrupts the boundaries “between the ‘cultural imperialist’ centre (Hollywood) and the ‘colonial’ margins;” in this liminal space, colonizer and colonized interact and there is the potential “to decolonize the mind of the colonized subject” (2007, p. 26). This notion of cultural interchange (occurring on a somewhat more level playing field than that of commercial exhibition) highlights a key goal for festival programmers but begins to sound overly altruistic in the context of

industrial goals that strive to bridge the centre/margin dichotomy. Furthermore, while Evans focuses on the festivals' "drive to find self-expression and to project a unique identity" as a signal of regional diversity (2007, p. 32), it is important to consider the necessity of differentiation for survival on a crowded global circuit marked by unequal access to films, funding and guests. What Evans' model lacks is an appreciation of the exigencies of festival governance whereby the drive to generate buzz contributes to the foregrounding of regional character as part of a festival's unique brand; at the same time, funding requirements and industry partnerships influence the event's cultural initiatives.

These issues are particularly pertinent to the discussion of the Vancouver International Film Festival, an event often defined by its difference and distance from Toronto. VIFF's overarching theme is "Same Planet. Different Worlds." a phrase intended to evoke the festival's cinephilic diversity. While this theme encapsulates an eclectic programming vision and acknowledges disparate national cinemas, festival Director Alan Franey also characterizes it as a "respon[se] to the patterns we've seen with audience attendance" (as cited in Dafoe, 1999). He elaborates that "[p]eople appreciate the opportunity the festival offers to get behind closed doors and to hear the human side of things in other cultures" (as cited in Dafoe, 1999). These observations are in keeping with the first part of festival's stated mandate which is "to encourage the understanding of other nations through the art of cinema" (GVIFFS, 2008). However, the sentiment "same planet, different worlds" ironically also provides an apt assessment of the divergent experiences of VIFF and TIFF. In written coverage of the VIFF, comparative evaluations of the two festivals cast the Toronto festival as the benchmark, thereby often rendering the Vancouver event in defensive or reactionary terms. The comparisons can appear benignly humorous as with Alexandra Gill's analogy of TIFF as "a vacuous sequin-draped starlet [and] Vancouver [as] her brainy sister in horn-rimmed glasses and a black turtleneck" (2004); but as the focus invariably shifts to the relative absence of Hollywood glamour, VIFF is relegated to the status of black sheep, overshadowed by the

successes of its sibling overachiever.

With positioning towards the end of both the annual international and domestic festival circuits, it is reasonable to assume that the majority of film acquisitions have already occurred, leaving Vancouver to focus largely on audience and critical response. Thus, without international celebrities to fuel the theatricality of the scene, VIFF focuses on creating a community of film lovers characterized by refined cinematic tastes and shared transcultural experiences. Yet, a persistent preoccupation with celebrity may indicate an underlying fear that the mortality of the cosmopolitan film scene is inextricably tied to the calibre of its most visible social attributes. Beyond the promotional efforts of international celebrities, visibility also can signal the presence of a vibrant local film industry. In other words, while media coverage of the red carpet contributes to the marketing of upcoming releases and enhances their marketability in the sales arena, it similarly serves to promote the festival and by extension the local film scene. Elsaesser draws a link between the accumulation of symbolic capital and “self-reference,” arguing that “[w]ith every prize it confers, a festival also confirms its own importance, which in turn increases the symbolic value of the prize” (2005, p. 97).

Although Elsaesser invokes the concept of *illusio*, he privileges the festival as the site of the game without fully acknowledging the extent to which the actions of the players are indeed required to “sustain it” (2005, p. 97). A film festival cannot contribute to value addition without establishing its fiduciary position as symbolic banker; or, to put it more plainly, the production of belief relies upon shared trust in the value of the currency. As such, Elsaesser’s attribution of self-reflexivity to the written festival (2005, p. 95) and award conferral (p. 97) extends further to stakeholders whose participation supports both the game and their status as players. Part of the festival’s contribution to stimulating the regional film industry involves the creation of networking opportunities that assemble local, national and international stakeholders. The ability to assemble high calibre guests raises the profile of the festival while simultaneously enabling stakeholders

to reinforce or potentially enhance their own status; local setting is implicated as an industry hub in this recursive value addition – that is, unless the parties are bad.

In a *Canadian Business* article about the buying and selling of films on the international festival circuit, Denis Seguin explains that “there are really two Cannes,” the global stage of the Palais des Festivals’ red carpet and the Marché that is located inside (2005, para. 11). Although anyone can purchase a pass to the Marché, Seguin notes that the “plumpest deals” (para. 11) actually take place in the hotels that line the Croisette; that said, his interviewees include Robert Lantos who was based even further away at the Hotel du Cap, the Côte d’Azur’s “most exclusive hotel” (para. 5) situated approximately 15 kilometres away from Cannes in Cap d’Antibes. For top industry players, press junkets and schmooze spill beyond Cannes’ official marketplace. Similarly, Johanna Schneller cites the Intercontinental and Four Seasons as the “festival headquarter hotels” at which “mega-celebrities” converge during the Toronto International Film Festival (2007). The use of jargon such as “junket,” “buzz” and “schmooze” points to the dual nature of the film festival as a site of business and spectacle. Indeed, these terms appear to trivialize the economic significance of transactions that occur within the guise of a celebratory atmosphere. In an article assessing the 32nd TIFF’s performance as “a center of hot deals,” *Variety* reporters Anne Thompson and Ali Jaafar (2007) cite distributor ThinkFilm’s acquisition of the domestic rights to Helen Hunt’s feature directorial debut *Then She Found Me* (2007) and Stuart Townsend’s docu-drama about the 1999 WTO riots, *Battle in Seattle* (2007), for \$2 million apiece; Miramax also announced their \$5 million acquisition of *Blindness* (Meirelles, 2008), a Canada/Japan/Brazil coproduction which had just finished shooting in Toronto. Even so, Thompson and Jaafar conclude that “the pickings were slim” and the festival’s main achievement was instead as “a launch pad for fall films” noting as an example that “the lavish praise afforded” to *Atonement* (Wright, 2007) “stirred kudos buzz.”

Alexandra Gill (1999) asserts that the “carnival mood and movie-star appearances mask [the] emphasis on promotions” and proceeds to note that “in some respects [the parties] have become more important than the films themselves.” Thus, regardless of whether any actual business is conducted, the spectacle of schmoozing has become an optic for the comparison of international festivals. Gill argues that the VIFF “festivities can’t compare to Toronto, where studios throw lavish, star-studded events and the city explodes with floodlights each night” (2004). Her comments are part of an article examining the attempt of a “splashy piggyback party scene” to take root in Vancouver. Specifically, it was the second iteration of a red carpet cocktail party at CinCin restaurant hosted by Brightlight Pictures with the assistance of Vancouver Film Studios and *NUVO* magazine. As a justification of the glitzy industry celebration, producer Shawn Williams [sic]⁵ asserted that “[t]his is normal in Toronto and it’s going to be normal here too” (Gill, 2004). The previous year passersby were “mystified” by the arrival of stretch limousines transporting an array of “less familiar Canadian actors and directors” (Gill, 2003). In a *Canada Now* feature on “Screen Time,” CBC reporter Marcella Munro (2003) described the gathering crowd as “quiet” and “confused.” When asked who they hoped to see, camera-wielding spectators named Jennifer Lopez and Will Smith. The dissonance of the scene highlights the split between foreign and indigenous production in Vancouver while also drawing attention to the absence of celebrity marketing at the VIFF. By 2004, Gill notes the attendance of a tabloid reporter from *Star* magazine, perhaps an indication that the interest of the paparazzi has been piqued.

However, the Brightlight parties also drew national attention to VIFF’s divergent vision. The first party was organized in conjunction with the festival’s Trade Forum, replacing an industry reception that had been hosted by Rogers, the event’s former

⁵The co-principals of Brightlight Pictures are producers Steve Hegyes and Shawn Williamson. The company’s slate combines indigenous features like *American Venus* (Sweeney, 2007) with service productions like *The Wicker Man* (LaBute, 2006).

sponsor (Gill, 2003). A scheduling conflict with the opening night festivities for the Canadian Images program elicited criticism of the dearth of official festival parties. While dismissive of the burgeoning controversy, festival director Alan Franey took the opportunity to promote an upcoming symposium on Cultural Survival in the Age of Hollywood. He mused to Gill about the fate of arts and culture in a society “so addicted to the cult of personality” and then proceeded to assert that, unlike Cannes and Toronto, “this is not a paparazzi festival” (as cited in Gill, 2003). Several days later in a letter to the editor of *The Globe and Mail*, Franey (2003) sought to redress the promotional gaffe with the equivocal explanation that his criticisms were aimed at “the downsides of ‘celebrity culture’ in general.” Brightlight Pictures withdrew their sponsorship of the Trade Forum and arranged their next red carpet industry party as an independent event (Gill, 2004). Despite the controversy sparked by Gill’s 2003 article, Franey’s comments are consistent with previous expressions of VIFF’s identity. For example, as part of *The Province*’s 1997 pre-festival coverage, Ian Bailey compared Canada’s three major international festivals. Casting VIFF as “a cerebral alternative,” Franey considered “stars...a distraction to a film festival” and explained that Vancouver’s is “‘obviously not a paparazzi festival’” (as cited in Bailey, 1997). Regardless of whether Franey was referencing A-listers like Brad Pitt, his comments remain problematic for a local industry trying to enhance its visibility on an international stage.

At the same time, it is interesting that VIFF has consistently faced the same questions about the absence of Hollywood glamour. Coverage of the festival’s 26th anniversary in 2007 still finds Franey articulating the festival’s difference by arguing against it being “‘a pale imitation’” of TIFF (as cited in Binning, 2007, p. 40). Extending the metaphor of “‘species differentiation’” to both commercial exhibition and a “global festival ecosystem,” he describes VIFF as “‘a complementary opposite’” (as cited in Binning, 2007, p. 40). Yet, this persistent otherness that troubles VIFF as a written festival limits the delineation of its identity to an agenda set by Toronto and Cannes. In

the industry publication *Playback*, Cheryl Binning (2007) writes that “[t]he Vancouver International Film Festival doesn’t have the Hollywood stars like Toronto or the business deals of Cannes, but it has carved out its own unique presence on the film fest circuit” (p.40). However, the ecosystem metaphor does little to define VIFF’s “unique presence” in positive terms. The written coverage does not explore alternative models from the global circuit, such as the International Film Festival Rotterdam whose reputation for “building bridges between Asian cinema and European audiences” (Elsaesser, 2005, p. 85) might provide a more apt frame of reference or a more inclusive set of visible criteria. Aspects of programming such as a focus on the Pacific Rim with the Dragons and Tigers series and awards for Western Canadian cinema present a new take on regional focus. VIFF also highlights documentaries with a large Nonfiction Features program that frequently produces the festival’s most popular film. These programming streams are reminiscent of the three pillars of TIFF’s identity—location, audience and program—but without the same sense of corporate branding, which in turn suggests a lesser degree of control over their own narrative as a written festival. As a means of gaining insight into the emergence of each festival’s identity, the following sections will examine the forces that converged at their inception along with key defining moments in their historical trajectories.

Godfather or Prometheus – FoF’s Founding Myth

The first annual Festival of Festivals was held October 18 to 24, 1976 at the Ontario Place Cinesphere, The New Yorker Theatre and the Harbour Castle Hotel (Marshall, 2005, p. 1). As the event’s original name indicates, programming comprised “the best selections from the top film festivals held each year outside of Canada” (Chesley, 1976, p. 7); in addition, every night a gala party celebrated the film and festival that were being honoured (Frew, 1976, p. 51). In 1994, the same year that Piers Handling became Festival Director, the name was changed to the Toronto International Film

Festival “to acknowledge the city of Toronto and its supportive filmgoers” (TIFFG, “History...1990’s”). This explanation from TIFF’s Web site fits nicely with the aforementioned branding of the event as a public festival through the acronym’s definition. Indeed, as the organization evolved so did its grasp of the notion of corporate profile. By 2000, the threads of TIFF’s historical narrative are unified through media coverage of the 25th anniversary as well as the commissioning of Brian D. Johnson’s book which would be followed a few years later by Marshall’s memoir. There is also a “founders’ trailer,” starring Marshall, Dusty Cohl and Henk van der Kolk that was screened on Opening Night 2000 and is now an “exclusive feature” of the permanent pages on the Web site, included with the pages that chronicle the Festival’s history.⁶

Like TIFF, the Festival de Cannes provides an historical overview on their official Web site (Festival de Cannes, *Festival history*) and consolidates annual award information and festival posters. Their archives menu also has links to complete lists of films, juries, artists, events and clips from the past seven festivals (*Festival archives*). Lastly, a link to “More Archives” provides a bibliography of publications about the festival along with directions for locating administrative and audiovisual archive holdings. Elsaesser notes the extent to which the Festival de Cannes “carefully controls the use of its logo in image and print” with detailed guidelines on the website regarding colour, typeface and the appearance of the palm (2005, pp. 97, 107 n30). His reference to the logo is limited to the Palme d’Or as part of a consideration of the symbolic value of the award. Specifically, Elsaesser briefly invokes Bourdieu’s concept of *illusio* to argue that the seriousness with which the logo’s reproduction is managed indicates that “value addition operates also as another form of self-reference” (2005, p. 97); in other words, conferring prizes confirms the value of the prize itself. However, the Web site’s logotype

⁶ Each annual festival has its own separate Web site which includes “permanent” pages that chronicle the Festival’s history. In contrast to the Vancouver International Film Festival which maintains links to its archived sites back to its 20th anniversary in 2001 (GVIFFS, *Festival archive*), the TIFF pages are only available for the current festival season.

directives apply to official selections from each program section, all of the awards, “filial” organizations like The Marché du Film, The Atelier and The International Village, and Official Partners and Suppliers (Festival de Cannes, “Using our logo”).⁷ Beyond the affirmative power of self-reference, this combination of carefully packaged history and meticulously delineated logotypes recalls Dayan’s “written festival.” If a festival’s identity emerges from the discourse that surrounds it, then controlling the historical narrative suggests the power to set the terms of reference.

While the name change from Festival of Festivals to Toronto International Film Festival may be spun as a nod to the host city and its enthusiastic audiences, it also acknowledged a shift that occurred in programming. As the festival matured and its reputation grew, the programs began to include more world premieres. In a 1994 feature article, Brian D. Johnson explains that the festival “includes the cream of other festivals...[b]ut it also unveils an array of new work...[and] serves as the country’s most significant launchpad for new Canadian movies” (p. 62). For the 20th anniversary the following year, Johnson proclaims that “the Toronto festival serves as the gateway to the North American market” and cites a *New York Times*’ reference to the event as “the North American Cannes” (1995, p. 64). In 2005, 43 percent of the 256 features at the festival were world premieres; this number climbs to 84 percent once international and North American premieres are added (TIFF 2006, July), thus supporting the assessments made by Johnson a decade earlier; in comparison, only 3 percent of 230 features at the 2005 VIFF were world premieres, a figure that climbs to 30 percent with the inclusion of international and North American premieres (2005, September). Marshall cites pragmatic reasons for FoF’s name change, explaining that “the world knows us as ‘the Toronto Film Festival’” (2005, p. 41). At the same time, both Festival of Festivals and its acronym FoF were vague referents on an increasingly crowded global circuit. Toronto

⁷ The highlighting of “distinguishing marks” that can be identified “in case of doubt” implies that one needs to be on the lookout for fakes or forgeries.

International Film Festival is now the event's registered trademark while the website of its French counterpart deems "obsolete" any variations other than Festival de Cannes and the legal name L'Association Française du Festival International du Film ("Using our logo").

The Festival de Cannes was originally known by a portion of its legal name Festival International du Film which translates as The International Film Festival. Referring to the authoritative vagueness of the event's title as both "pretentious" and "justified," Cari Beauchamp and Henri Béhar cite Jay Scott's comment in *The Globe and Mail* that "[m]aking fun of the festival is like throwing spitballs at the Parthenon, no more than a juvenile attempt to deface the timeless with time" (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, p. 22). Marshall taps into this pretension with his confession that he hoped Festival of Festivals would be interpreted to mean "the Godfather of Festivals" (2005, p. 7), suggesting that the nightly homages were more of a bait and switch manoeuvre in TIFF's seemingly inevitable rise to ascendancy; in other words, perhaps the symbolic value of these festivals would accumulate in FoF's favour and the balance of power would shift. At the time however, paying tribute to established festivals appears to have been the main, if not the only way that FoF could be assured of actually booking newer films. The first program included Moscow Grand Prize winner *Dersu Uzala* (Kurosawa, 1975), *Duelle* (Rivette, 1976) from Cannes, *Strongman Ferdinand* (Kluge, 1976) from the Berlinale and *Underground* (de Antonio, 1976) from Edinburgh (Martin, 1976, p. 33). Jan Dawson, former editor of the British Film Institute's *Monthly Bulletin*, organized a series on new German cinema while Barbara Martineau curated the well-received Womanscene (N. Edwards, 1976-1977, p. 34). The festival also incorporated archival screenings such as a Wim Wenders' retrospective, several hand-tinted classics and a mini-marathon of cult favourites from B-movie producer Samuel Z. Arkoff (Frew, 1976, p. 51).

The Globe and Mail film critic Robert Martin points out notable absences from

the first FoF like Bernardo Bertolucci's *1900 (Novecento)*, (1976) and Federico Fellini's *Fellini Casanova* (1976). Organizers also were unable to obtain the only English-language print of André Forcier's *L'eau chaude, l'eau froide* (1976) for the Canada Day program because the Secretary of State's Film Festivals Bureau had opted to send it to the Chicago and London festivals instead (Martin, 1976, p. 33).⁸ These occurrences are not really surprising for a festival that had yet to prove itself as a venue where new films could accumulate symbolic value. At the time, Forcier's film stood a better chance of garnering international critical acclaim, gaining exposure to representatives of foreign markets or possibly winning a prestigious award by travelling abroad to established events on the festival circuit. Martin proceeds to undermine FoF programmer Tony Watts' clarification that "[t]he new films category means not literally new...but new to Canada" (p. 33) with the observations that *Dersu Uzala* (Kurosawa, 1975) had screened in Ottawa earlier that summer and had already won an Academy Award. This mildly derisive tone extends to the topic of guests as Marshall is quoted as saying that "confirmed doesn't mean the same as a hotel reservation" (as cited in Martin, 1976, p. 33). In her wrap article, "Festival of Festivals: Not so damned after all," Natalie Edwards acknowledges the wariness that had greeted Marshall's promises; but, even though celebrities like Martin Scorsese, Jack Nicholson and Wim Wenders did not ultimately attend, she recommends focussing on the cinephilic vitality the event brought to Toronto rather than on its numerous organizational shortcomings (1976-1977, p. 33).

While Martin clearly (and in some instances presciently) doubts the Festival of Festival's ambitious plans, he is particularly sceptical of what appeared to be a "shotgun method" of programming (1976, p. 33). From gala celebrations of international festival hits to late-night screenings of B-movies like *The Little Shop of Horrors* (Corman, 1960) to a series of workshops, it is difficult to discern a cohesive vision holding the disparate

⁸Natalie Edwards mentions the film screening at FoF, without Forcier in attendance, but does not mention whether an English-language print was shown (1976-1977, p. 35).

program sections together. Martin opts for “a wait-and-see attitude” as he anticipates that the festival might yield “a delightful pot pourri or it might turn out to be a dog’s breakfast” (1976, p. 33). Thus, not only did the new festival lack the reputation to guarantee access to the newest films or A-list celebrities but there was also a lack of certainty about its identity or aspirations. Was Marshall hoping to attract the moles or the moths? His comment that “[t]he [Pauline] Kaels, [Rex] Reeds and others will be here. It’s a first-class world festival” (Chesley, 1976, p. 7) is problematic alongside Martin’s assessment that the surfeit of programs “should enable a film fanatic with more stamina than discrimination to see 100 hours of film in one week” (1976, p. 33). Although excess characterizes the festival experience, exclusivity is also a necessary component such that both moles and moths can distinguish their cinematic indulgences.

According to Helga Stephenson, FoF’s executive director from 1987-1993 and Marshall’s wife from 1982-1984, “[Marshall’s] motivations were not to have more Truffaut movies flowing through the system. He wanted to find a platform for his films. He wanted the Canadian industry to grow because he wanted to be part of it” (as cited in B. Johnson, 2000, p. 18). As such, the inspiration for the festival seems to have involved developing Toronto as a location for both production and exhibition. In a 25th anniversary *Toronto Life* feature that the founding festival director considers “the definitive article on TIFF’s beginnings,” David Macfarlane (2000) notes Marshall’s frustration with “the difficulties of getting adequate distribution” and cites a former employee’s description of “a producer who wanted to create a venue to show his movies” (p. 2). Fifteen years earlier, in Sid Adilman’s 10th anniversary story in the *Toronto Star*, Marshall explained that “we really needed something that would make Toronto interesting and well known internationally as a film city” (as cited in Adilman, 1985, Sept., p. C5). From a field theory perspective, an understanding of how these industrial goals were defined can be illuminated by examining the dispositions and combined trajectories of the event’s founders. As the first executive director, Marshall literally became the face of the

Festival of Festivals as his photo accompanied program announcements in publications like *Cinema Canada* (Frew, 1976, p. 51); and, as the voice from the helm, he would be both congratulated and punished for the festival's early performance, leading him to be cast in histories like Brian Johnson's as an "impresario" (2000, pp. 18-19) whose chutzpah and charisma provided the necessary spark for the launch.

Yet, the initial vision for the Festival of Festivals blended Marshall's political savvy with Dusty Cohl's Cannes' connections and Henk van der Kolk's business acumen.⁹ Marshall's political experience included running successful campaigns for Ed Broadbent and Toronto Mayor David Crombie, for whom he subsequently worked as an executive assistant in the early 1970s (Marshall, 2005, p. 11). Prior to that, he co-founded the Film Consortium of Canada with Dutch architect Henk van der Kolk and they produced films for the Ontario education ministry in the late 1960s (B. Johnson, 2000, p. 19). Marshall also co-wrote and produced *Flick* (Taylor, 1970), which was released in the United States as *Dr. Frankenstein on Campus* (B. Johnson, 2000, p. 18). An early recipient of funding from the Canadian Film Development Corporation (CFDC), *Flick* "transplant[s] the legendary story of Frankenstein to the mean streets of Toronto...[in a] flower power send up of the gothic tradition that resembles a cross between a Cinepix soft porn and a hippie exploitation film" ("*Flick* [review]"). Van der Kolk and Marshall's first foray into commercial film production under the auspices of the Film Consortium of Canada was *Outrageous!* (Brenner, 1977), another CFDC-supported project. The cross-dressing comedy about a female impersonator and his schizophrenic roommate screened at the second Festival of Festivals following a market screening in Cannes and North American premiere at Ottawa's FilmExpo (B. Johnson, 2000, pp. 40-41). Marshall credits the promotional efforts of Dusty and Joan Cohl for ensuring full

⁹ Dusty Cohl's background was as a real estate attorney while Henk van der Kolk was Bill Marshall's producing partner at their company, the Film Consortium of Canada. In his memoir, Marshall describes Cohl as "a consummate wheeler-dealer for developers, politicians and media big shots" and van der Kolk as the person who would "man the engine room and keep the ship working" (2005, p. 10).

houses for the Cannes' launch (2000, p. 25).

Of the three founders of the Festival of Festivals, it was lawyer Dusty Cohl who brought an international festival background to the mix. Cohl and his wife Joan apparently stumbled upon the International Film Festival in Cannes completely by chance during a trip to Europe in 1960. Johnson relates the story of the Cohls driving along the French Riviera, happening upon an empty parking space in front of the Carleton and then returning to Cannes eight years later to become regulars on the hotel terrace (B. Johnson, 2000, p. 17). Dubbing the Carleton Hotel "the queen of the Croisette" (1992, p. 135), Beauchamp and Béhar explain that its terrace "has reigned as the place to see and be seen for over fifty years" (p. 136). Sarris adds that even the moles would congregate at the Carleton Café when they ventured outside of the screenings (1978, p. 40). Johnson makes no mention of whether Dusty Cohl ever saw any films at Cannes during the late 1960s or early 1970s and it is unlikely that he would have had access to the Palais. When Marshall recalls the 1976 visit that preceded their inaugural festival, he points out that they "didn't have any credentials," but nevertheless stayed at the Carleton Hotel and schmoozed on its terrace as well as at the Majestic Hotel bar (2005, pp. 3-4).¹⁰ Consequently, Cohl's experience of the International Film Festival most likely only comprised partaking of festival buzz. The relationships that were forged proved instrumental to the fledging Toronto festival as Roger Ebert recalls that "[Cohl] knew that the way to get the festival on the map was to have it covered by the press, and he seemed to have a gift for meeting all of the journalists" (as cited in B. Johnson, 2000, p. 24).

Taken together, the contributions of Cohl, Van der Kolk and Marshall shape a

¹⁰Marshall's recollections may have shifted slightly with the passage of time because the Majestic did not become the preeminent Cannes' gathering place until after the opening of the new Palais des Festivals (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, p. 135). Beauchamp and Béhar note that the new Palais opened in 1983 at its current location overlooking the harbour while the old Palais was located "150 short yards west of the Carleton" (1992, p. 131).

particular perspective on the Festival of Festivals' industrial objectives. Cohl understood the workings of festival buzz along with the necessity of opportunities to schmooze and to "see and be seen." His lack of access to official events at Cannes also may have impacted the desire to create a public festival. On the TIFF Web site Cohl is quoted as stating that "[t]he Festival was first designed to fit the needs and tastes of the filmgoers of this city. Cannes is exclusively enjoyed by the industry or the press. The people in Cannes are not the people who go to watch the films there" (TIFFG, "History...1970's). This focus on Toronto and its resident filmgoers links with Marshall's goal of establishing the city as both a production site and market for the Canadian film industry. Not only would the festival attract international recognition, it would help to assemble an audience and mobilize the local media. Macfarlane draws a connection between Marshall's experience in city politics and an awareness of Toronto's burgeoning multicultural population. Marshall explains that, fifteen years before the advent of speciality cable channels, they could be "guaranteed an audience of new Canadians starved for films from home" (2005, p. 2). At the same time as it satisfied demand for foreign films, festival programming would shape the tastes of an increasingly savvy art cinema audience.

It is important to clarify the extent to which these audience objectives are more commercially than culturally oriented. Although future TIFFG initiatives like Cinematheque Ontario and the Film Reference Library would have an educational component to their mandates,¹¹ it appears that the festival founders were more focussed on industrial development. As producers, Marshall and Van der Kolk were poised to make a transition from government-sponsored films to commercial features like

¹¹Cinematheque Ontario is "dedicated to presenting the history of world cinema on the big screen in carefully curated retrospectives" (TIFFG, "About Cinematheque Ontario"). The Film Reference Library is a research centre that "holds the world's most extensive English language collection of Canadian film-related material plus the unique archival collections of Canada's most esteemed filmmakers" (TIFFG, *The Film Reference Library*).

Outrageous!. Marshall successfully accessed funds for both *Flick* and *Outrageous!* from the Canadian Film Development Corporation, a federal agency established in 1967 to provide a state source of venture capital for feature film production (Pendakur, 1990, p. 148). Yet, Macfarlane asserts that it was “the celebrated period of Canadian tax shelters for film production” that helped to convince Marshall to leave politics and devote his full attention to filmmaking (2000, p. 88). In 1974, the Capital Cost Allowance (CCA) tax deduction was raised to 100 percent for Canadian feature films, sparking a flurry of private investment. Interestingly, Cohl’s purported reason for the lunch meeting at which he and Marshall first discussed the idea of the film festival was to seek advice regarding a client’s interest in investing in a children’s movie called *Pinocchio’s Birthday Party* (Macfarlane, 2000, p. 88).

Pendakur explains that while the increased economic activity generated by the CCA lead to job creation in the film production sector (1990, p. 173), problems of market access remained that undermined the viability of a commercial industry (p. 178). Specifically, American control of distribution and exhibition ensured that studio films had priority thereby exacerbating the uncertainty for Canadian producers in a high-risk industry where only a minority of films would be profitable (Pendakur, 1990, p. 178). Thus, the inception of the Festival of Festivals capitalized on the opportunity to reach an under-served multicultural market while simultaneously striving to establish Toronto as a hub for international film traffic. This interpretation of the impetus for the festival consciously resists the urge to ascribe liberal humanist goals to the founders. Michael Dorland argues that the *Massey Report* (tabled in 1951 by the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences) “accredited the kind of language that would be used for the discussion of cultural problems in the Canadian context and in the discourse on films in particular” (1998, p. 14). Within this discursive framework, Hollywood cinema is seen as an “alien” cultural invader (regardless of public demand for commercial features) and National Film Board documentaries comprise the “only

truly and typically Canadian films” (*Massey Report* cited in Dorland, 1998, p. 15). Paul Litt describes the “philosophical position of the Massey Commission and its supporters” as “liberal humanist” in that it “echoed [Matthew] Arnold’s conviction that high culture was a force for individual liberty through self-enlightenment” (1992, p. 102); this perspective combined with postwar optimism to produce a “high-minded and defensive strain of Canadian cultural nationalism” (Litt, 1992, p. 104).¹²

The Festival of Festivals certainly has played a key role over the years in fostering critical discourse about national cinemas. Under the stewardship of Directors Wayne Clarkson (1979 - 1985) and Piers Handling (1994 - present¹³), both of whom had worked at the Canadian Film Institute, the festival’s identity took on a distinctly cinephilic dimension. Clarkson and Handling share an academic background—both taught film studies at Carleton University and Handling was also an instructor at Queen’s—and their involvement with programming highlights a cross-fertilization with academia that would extend through the curatorial ranks (including, but not limited to, Kay Armatage, Peter Harcourt and Liz Czach). Helga Stephenson, Director from 1987 through 1993, brought public relations expertise to the festival, initially joining the organization as its Director of Communications (B. Johnson, 2000, p. 159). Eventually moving into programming, Stephenson worked closely with Handling on the 1986 *Winds of Change* retrospective of Latin American cinema and he subsequently served as Programming Director during her tenure as Festival Director. Handling explains that “[t]he two of us were great as a team because she looked at things from the producer’s end and I looked at it from the artistic end” (as cited in TIFFG, “History...1990’s). Johnson further notes that while Stephenson brought “new levels of foreign prestige, Hollywood glamour and corporate support,”

¹²In my Master’s thesis, I discuss the source of liberal humanist nationalism in early judgements of the canonical value of Canadian cinema (Burgess, 2000, pp. 16-18).

¹³Piers Handling is also the CEO and Director of the Toronto International Film Festival Group. In 2007, Cameron Bailey became Co-Director of TIFF, replacing Noah Cowan who stepped down to become Artistic Director of Bell Lightbox (Kelly, 2007, December).

Handling “provide[d] the cinematic backbone” with the result that their collaboration “would turn the Toronto festival into a truly international event” (2000, p. 155). At the same time, the combination of their individual strengths helped to cement the festival’s reputation as an event that achieves high industrial and cultural standards; the Secor Report notes TIFF’s ability to attract “influential international industry players” as well as the “prominence given to Canadian cinema and reflection of cultural diversity” (2004, p. 7).

The significance to the festival’s identity of this balancing of cultural and industrial goals is exemplified by Leonard Schein’s brief stint as Director of the Festival of Festivals in 1986. Founder of the Vancouver International Film Festival which he operated for five years, Schein was hired when Clarkson became chairman and CEO of the Ontario Film Development Corporation, but only ran the Festival for one season before being forced to resign by the Board of Directors (Adilman, 1986, September). A couple of months later, Schein joined the programming staff at the Montreal World Film Festival where Serge Losique used his presence to stir up the rivalry between the two events. Immediately following the Toronto festival, Losique disputed the accuracy of their attendance figures and argued that the WFF was “the largest ‘publically attended’ festival on the planet” (B. Bailey, 1986, p. E4); after his job change, Schein supported the contention that FoF’s figures were “inflated” and explained that this was “‘established practice’” (as cited in Adilman, 1986, November). Regardless of the ensuing squabble over attendance reports that appear to have indicated a record year for Toronto (Brownstein, 1986), the quality of the program was not in question. Marshall deemed it “excellent” (2005, p. 33) even though he has titled the chapter “The Lost Year;” Schein’s tenure is not even mentioned in the festival history on the TIFF Web site. The issue seems to have centred on problems with diplomacy, ranging from “personality conflicts”

with staff (Adilman, 1986, November)¹⁴ to comportment on the international circuit. Of particular concern was Schein's appearance in Cannes in "Birkenstocks and wools socks with a baby in a backpack" (B. Johnson, 2000, p. 153). Instead of maintaining the festival's convivial reputation on the Croisette, Marshall explains that the "French found him outré [and] the distributors couldn't find him at all, mainly because he was watching films and hiking" (2000, p. 32).

Whereas Schein's diplomatic missteps cost him his job, an early roadblock encountered by Marshall ultimately promoted cultural nationalism as a key component of the festival's identity. At the last moment, the opening night screening had to be changed from the American film *Bound for Glory* (Ashby, 1976) to the French feature *Cousin, Cousine* (Tacchella, 1975) (Edwards, 1976-1977, p. 34), a substitution that undoubtedly made that evening's gala party in celebration of the New York Film Festival seem rather incongruous (Marshall, 2005, p. 16). A producers' conference also had been planned as a means of both forging connections with "their 'natural partners,' the 'experts (from) down south'" and supporting the Seven Percent Solution (Crean, 1976-1977, p. 40). Devised by the Canadian Association of Motion Picture Producers (CAMPP), of which Marshall was the President, this Solution called for a voluntary levy on foreign revenues (2% from exhibitors and 5% from distributors) to be invested in Canadian production (Marshall, 2005, pp. 15-16). S.M. Crean explains that the American distributors subsequently decided that "their policy of not entering festivals held in the United States applied in Toronto since it was part of the domestic US market" (1976-1977, p. 40). Thus, although it appears that the plan had been to enlist American cooperation in building the Canadian film industry, not only did the studios reject this vision but their disinterest inadvertently worked in the festival's favour. What began as a continental

¹⁴B. Johnson cites a series of things that rankled the staff, including run-ins over film scheduling, access to perks like sponsored alcohol and Schein's tendency to refer to the festival using the personal pronoun "my" rather than the collective "our" (2000, pp. 153-155).

solution became a nationalist rallying cry; and, in the process, another failed intervention in the American-controlled distribution/exhibition sector gave rise to a non-theatrical space that would foster a New Wave of English-Canadian art cinema in the 1980s.

On one hand, the fact that the Festival of Festivals went ahead without the studio films amounted to a rejection of their attempted assertion of power over exhibition in international markets. During the inter-war years the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America (MPPDA) used the boycott as a tactic to pressure national industries that tried to resist or restrict their dominant position (Higson & Maltby, 1999). On the other hand, in terms of the “written festival,” the boycott helped to lend a cultural nationalist tone to the festival’s evolving identity. Natalie Edwards cites the following comment made by Marshall before the festival: “We want foreign producers and distributors to start thinking of Canada as a separate market, not a hyphenated add-on to the U.S. market.” (1976-1977, p. 35). She does not clarify whether the comment was made before or after the decision of the American studios to withhold their films. Either way, in most written accounts, the results were construed as positive rather than as a plan that went awry. Although the absence of certain high profile celebrities like Jack Nicholson was noted, it seems that “their films weren’t even missed” (Edwards, 1976-1977, p. 35) and the boycott ultimately was “a blessing in disguise because it gave the Festival a chance to establish itself independent [sic] of Mother Hollywood” (Crean, 1976-1977, pp. 40-41). In his memoir, Marshall recounts events from a comfortable distance and suggests that thanks to the studios’ miscalculation the Festival of Festivals managed to capitalize on the cultural nationalist zeitgeist (2005, p. 16).

However, in an editorial published in March 1977 after the initial flurry of post-festival coverage had subsided, Gerald Pratley draws attention to certain problems with interpreting the boycott as the response of angered cultural imperialists. Specifically, he points out that festival participation is neither mandatory nor always warranted and that the films in question “were wanted primarily for the greater commercial success of the

festival” (1977, p. 15). From a business perspective, the American distributors likely saw nothing to gain from entering films already “assured of regular exhibition” in a festival that “has not yet proved itself, and is run by people who have yet to establish their credibility” (Pratley, 1977, p. 15). Extrapolating from this argument, it is important to note that these festival screenings potentially could diminish box office returns either by generating a lacklustre response or by depleting a finite local market. Although Pratley mentions that his Stratford International Film Festival “never had any real difficulties obtaining films it wanted from American companies” (1977, p. 15), he does not extend his earlier economic rhetoric to consider the relative stakes of exposing new product at a small festival in southern Ontario as opposed to in a major urban market. Pratley concludes with the assessment that a “true ‘nationalist’...would take pleasure in organizing his festival without asking for the participation of the major American companies” (1977, p. 15). In an editorial published a few months later, Austin Whitten, a member of the Executive of the Canadian Federation of Film Societies, chides Pratley for not sharing the enthusiasm that the Festival of Festivals generates amongst “more mortal beings” (1977, p. 55). Adopting a conciliatory tone, Whitten advocates for the survival of the “brash youngster” alongside renewed support for the “venerated senior” festival (1977, p. 56); the recommendation that federal funding be restored to the Stratford Film Festival provides an interesting context for Pratley’s vituperative critique of Marshall’s inaugural performance as FoF’s Director.¹⁵ Whitten distinguishes between the budgetary exigencies of launching a film festival in a large urban centres and the “special charm” of regional events like Stratford (1977, p. 55). He even goes so far as to suggest that the Festival of Festivals could lend its support to its regional counterpart.

¹⁵ The Stratford Film Festival was cancelled in 1976 (the same year as FoF’s launch) due to a drop in funding from both the federal Festivals Bureau and the provincial government (Chesley, 1976, p. 8).

VIFF - A World-Class Alternative

This type of centre-periphery logic also impacts discussion of VIFF's identity. The inevitable comparisons used to define a new festival limit the frame of reference and, within a national context, tend to map difference in terms of regional inequalities. In a 1997 article in *The Province*, Wayne Clarkson (at that time, head of the Canadian Film Centre) reinforces how important it is that each festival develop a unique identity through a "focus on areas that mark [them] as different from those other (ones)" (as cited in Bailey, 1997, p. B1). He proceeds to note that although VIFF is not "up there with Cannes, Berlin or even Toronto," it is still a "very credible festival given how cluttered the calendar year is" (as cited in Bailey, 1997, p. B1). The implication of Clarkson's assessment is that a top tier of festivals share the characteristic of access to a core group of new films that travel the international circuit. In other words, positioning on this circuit situates a festival within a particular comparative framework that is oriented towards launching theatrical features. A dominant focus on the marketplace is accompanied by the articulation of festival programming with critical writing about industry trends (both commercial and aesthetic). However, this model fails to account for divergent festival identities beyond the notions of unique programming foci and visible markers of business activity.

After Clarkson's comments, the last word is given to Leonard Schein, the founding Director of the Vancouver International Film Festival. Although he engages with the comparative framework, Schein appears to reject it by setting VIFF apart from the "competition for stars and Hollywood premieres" and indicating that "Vancouver overhypes its 'western Canadian Asian thing' (as cited in Bailey, 1997, p. B1). Instead, he argues that "[i]f it's a good film, who cares?" (as cited in Bailey, 1997, p. B1) While this could be interpreted as a rejection of criteria that persistently devalue VIFF due to its position towards the end of the fall circuit, it also suggests an alternative perspective on the festival's intermediary role. Schein's question raises the issue of whether the festival

serves as an intermediary primarily for the industry or the audience; in other words, is the production of value focussed on the film commodity as a step in bridging its passage into the marketplace or is exhibition the target as a means of enhancing selection for cinemagoers? The latter option highlights a distinctively regional role on the international film festival circuit. While this distinction might allow for greater differentiation amongst the events on the circuit, accounting for varying access to resources, it also points to a different founding vision for the cosmopolitan festival.

The current incarnation of the Vancouver International Film Festival began in 1982 as an initiative of Leonard Schein, the owner of the Ridge Theatre. An independent repertory movie house, the Ridge is located in a residential area on Vancouver's west-side. Schein acquired the theatre in 1978, but sold it in 1985 so that he could focus his attention on the burgeoning Vancouver Festival (Godfrey, 1985) and then reacquired it in 2005 with Tom Lightburn as part of his local Festival Cinemas chain (that also includes the Fifth Avenue Cinemas and the Park Cinema) (Pifer, 2006). An article in *The Province* announcing the "First Annual Vancouver International Film Festival" includes a photo of Schein with the caption "...taking a risk" (Walsh, 1982, May 3). Specifically, film critic Michael Walsh notes the financial risk of an independent cinema "mounting its own 18-day-long film festival...[with] a program of 40 features from 17 countries, almost all of them local premieres" (Walsh, 1982, May 3).¹⁶ Yet, Schein was prepared to capitalize on the 20-year success of the Varsity Festival and to draw programming support from the organizers of the Seattle International Film Festival. Every summer, Canadian Odeon Theatres' annual Varsity Festival of International Films presented "a showcase for foreign language and art films already in commercial release but not normally seen in the Vancouver market" (Walsh, 1982, May 13); in his 1983 VIFF coverage, Walsh mentions that there are "no plans for a 21st Festival" (p. D1). He also

¹⁶According to Walsh's coverage of the festival's opening night, the final tally was 38 films from 18 countries (1982, May 13).

explains that the Varsity Festival “inspired” former local theatre manager Dan Ireland to co-found the Seattle Festival with Daryl Macdonald (Walsh, 1983, p. D1).

Overlapping schedules in late May enabled Schein’s first festival to piggyback on the seven-year-old Seattle event, an arrangement that involved “some cost-sharing” as well as mutually enhanced “bargaining power” with distributors (as cited in Walsh, 1982, May 3). In addition to sharing 15 films with the seventh Seattle Festival, eight films were programmed from the 1981 event (Walsh, 1982, May 3).¹⁷ The features in the inaugural VIFF program comprised an eclectic blend of world cinema ranging from Satyajit Ray’s politically themed drama *Ashani Sanket* (*Distant Thunder*, 1973) to the Dutch comedy *High Heels, True Love* (Frank, 1982) to the music documentary *The Last of the Blue Devils* (Picker, 1980); two of the films were Canadian documentaries – Bonnie Sher Klein’s *Not a Love Story: A Film about Pornography* (1981) along with Janis Cole and Holly Dale’s *P4W: Prison for Women* (1981). Guests included author Vito Russo, presenting a lecture with film clips based on *The Celluloid Closet*, and Dutch filmmaker Fons Rademakers, accompanying his historical adaptation *Max Havelaar* (1976) (Walsh, 1982, May 13). The festival was launched by B.C. Tourism Minister Pat Jordan and Australian Consul-General John McFarlane with Bruce Beresford’s football drama *The Club* (1980) as the opening film (Walsh, 1982, May 13).

Coverage of the first VIFF was sparse with Michael Walsh’s article announcing the festival in *The Province* on May 3, 1982 followed by an opening night spread on the front page of the Entertainment Section on May 13, three quarters of which was devoted

¹⁷ The alliance between the two festivals led to a contract which stipulated that “the Seattle festival was to receive 1 per cent of the gross revenue from the fourth to the tenth years of the VFF” (Godfrey & Scott, 1986, p. C1). This contract generated controversy when Schein left Vancouver for Toronto as neither new VIFF Director Hannah Fisher nor the festival’s board knew anything about it. Despite the legal wrangling that ensued over consulting fees, Fisher explained that the two events would continue to work together and to share films (Godfrey & Scott, 1986). Seattle Festival co-director Dan Ireland described a more dependent relationship, noting that “In [VIFF’s] first year, we booked 80 per cent of the films. [Schein’s] sources were our sources.” and that the contract was intended to “pay tribute to Seattle’s help” (as cited in Godfrey & Scott, 1982, p. C1).

to printing the complete schedule. In early May, aside from ongoing coverage of the Falklands War, much of the newspaper's lead section (and especially the front page) focussed local attention on the Vancouver Canucks' first trip to the Stanley Cup Finals. Rather than evaluating Schein's program or continuing with his assessment of the venture's riskiness, Walsh's brief opening day commentary draws attention to the imprecision of calling it the "First" Vancouver International Film Festival. Not only had there already been 11 previous Vancouver International Film Festivals, held between 1958 and 1969, the 7th edition took place at the Ridge in 1964 (Walsh, 1982, May 13). Walsh links the designation of an international film festival to the "sanction of an international governing body based in Paris" (1982, May 13), the International Federation of Film Producers' Association (FIAPF). The second annual Vancouver Film Festival [no "International"] was held at the Vogue Theatre from August 3 to 15, 1959 in conjunction with the Vancouver International Festival of the Arts. The program booklet lists more than 100 films from 25 countries (Vancouver Festival Society, 1959, p. 5) and acknowledges the event's accreditation as "the only recognised festival in the Pacific Northwest, and one of three on the North American continent" (p. 1). The festival's Feature Film category was non-competitive, in keeping with FIAPF regulations (p. 1), while awards were adjudicated in the categories of Documentary, Experimental and Avant Garde, and Children's and Animated Films (p. 3).

Consequently, Walsh positions the 1982 version of the Vancouver International Film Festival in relation to the Varsity Festival as examples of "competing commercial film events" (1982, May 13). Schein's status as an entrepreneur is repeatedly stressed and, a year later, Walsh applauds his efforts in organizing "the most ambitious independently produced movie event ever seen in B.C." (1983, p. D1). Assertions of independence would play a strong role in the evolution of VIFF's identity as a written festival while its roots as an exhibitor's event would become increasingly obscured. The dual nature of the first VIFF emerges in Walsh's observation that the festival was

mounted “without government grant money or the security of belonging to a national theatre chain” (1983, p. D1). This formulation differs from the emergence of the Toronto Festival as part of the international circuit supported by federal funding from the Festivals Bureau; and it also places VIFF outside national circuits of commercial exhibition. For the 1983 festival, Schein incorporated the Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society as “a non-profit, tax-exempt educational and cultural organization” (Walsh, 1983, p. D1). Thus, in its second year, the event began to assume the structural characteristics of a more conventionally defined international film festival.

In 1984, the third annual VIFF received national coverage in *The Globe and Mail*. John Lekich’s article, “Fighting to become a contender,” offers a limited comparison of Canada’s three international film festivals that casts Vancouver as a plucky underdog. Schein comments that his “ultimate goal is eventually to reach the point where we’re not only on par with Toronto’s festival, but number one in Canada” (as cited in Lekich, 1984, p. M8). However, faced with “no government funding whatsoever” and distributors reluctant to consider “Vancouver [as] a big filmgoing city,” VIFF attracted only “a few Canadian premieres...[and] lacks the Hollywood glitter of its Toronto counterpart” (Schein, as cited in Lekich, 1984, p. M8). It is interesting to note the shift in tone and language between Schein’s competitive aspirations for VIFF in 1984 and his 1997 assessment of the event as “a more ‘low-key festival’ than Toronto or Montreal” (as cited in Bailey, 1997, B1). Examination of VIFF’s trajectory through a series of leadership changes in the 1980s exposes this shift as the product of specific decisions regarding the festival’s identity and strategic focus. In 1985, the fourth VIFF program “more than doubled” in size and began with an opening night gala that *Globe and Mail* reporter Stephen Godfrey describes as “both friendly and eccentric” (Godfrey, 1985). The Canadian premiere of *Marlene* (1983), Maximilian Schell’s documentary about Marlene Dietrich, was accompanied by a black-tie gathering that featured card tricks, dancers, female impersonators and a large Valentine which was subsequently forwarded

to the legendary actress' Paris apartment (Godfrey, 1985).

Godfrey's headline "75 Canadian premieres Vancouver film festival leaps into the big leagues" acknowledges that Schein's "whole new approach" was aimed at making VIFF a "world-class film festival" (1985). Similarly, prior to listing notable international guests like Bill Forsyth and Nicholas Roeg, *Cinema Canada* coverage observes that "[w]ith an energetic campaign to prove itself a contender in worldwide film fests, Vancouver has come into its own" ("Forty nations"). Thus, world-class status appears to have been measured by the criteria of premiere screenings and high-profile guests. Having expanded to a month-long schedule, VIFF could take advantage of overlap with the Festival de Cannes; Schein explained that because VIFF continued "for two weeks after Cannes ends, we [would be] able to show films right after they [had] been screened there" (as cited in Godfrey, 1985). Godfrey further elaborates that this fortuitous timing allowed Vancouver to book premieres "months before the east coast film festivals in New York, Montreal and Toronto, all held in the fall." This separation from the fall festivals also may have alleviated comparisons between Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver due to limited direct competition for resources and media attention. Unfortunately, scheduling would not work in VIFF's favour the following year when the event attempted to tie-in with Expo.

On the heels of a successful fourth outing at which the festival doubled in size and generated a \$30,000 profit, Schein sought to mount "the largest non-competitive film festival in the world" during Expo 86 ("Vancouver Film Festival shows \$30,000 profit"). The festival "ballooned to five weeks" and was unsuccessful in its attempt to capitalize on the Expo excitement (Dafoe, 1991). A few weeks before the festival, Schein was hired as the new Director of the Toronto International Film Festival and was replaced in Vancouver by Hannah Fisher. Under Fisher's stewardship, the 1987 festival moved to October to coincide with the Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference. Accordingly, the program included a Cinema of the Commonwealth series which opened

with “the signing of a formal co-production agreement between Canada and New Zealand” (“Critics’ Week, Commonwealth”). Also featured was “the entire Critic’s Week from the Cannes Film Festival” with its coordinator Jean Roy and critics like Roger Ebert (*Chicago Sun-Times*) and Derek Malcolm (*Guardian*) in attendance for a critics’ panel (“Critics’ Week, Commonwealth”). Fisher has been credited with raising the profile of VIFF to “a major international arts affair,” increasing its share of government funding from \$10,000 in 1985 to more than \$500,000 in 1987 (Andrews, 1988) and planning a focus on the Pacific Rim (“Vancouver fest tightens belt”).

Her tenure was cut short though when a Board coup led to her resignation. At the 1988 Annual General Meeting of the Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society, the re-election of four incumbent Board members was challenged by the Vancouver Community Slate under Schein’s leadership. Their campaign brochure criticized rising expenditures and increased administration, arguing that “[w]e want the Festival to keep as its priority Vancouver filmgoers” (as cited in “Palace coup”). A Festival media release, supported by audited reports, announced the elimination of a “previously existing deficit of approximately \$60,000 through increased ticket sales and through fundraising efforts of the board,” with the result that the 6th annual festival “was the most successful in its history” (as cited in “Palace coup”). Although press coverage indicates that the coup itself was a “surprise” (Godfrey, 1988; “Palace coup”), there are allusions to staff turnover, rising costs and a concern among festival members that “events were becoming less accessible to the general public” (Andrews, 1988). Board chairman Crawford Hawkins, who lost his seat in the election, commented afterward that “they want to bring it back to a local event because they’re theatre owners” (as cited in “Palace coup”). Despite the connections of the Vancouver Community Slate to the exhibition sector and their call for festival screenings to return to independent venues like the Ridge, Hollywood and Vancouver East Cinema, Schein did not own interest in these theatres at that time (“Palace coup”).

The three Vancouver Community Slate candidates—Schein, distributor Thomas Lightburn and Dr. Art Hister—were all elected to the festival Board along with “like-minded” Alan Franey (“Palace coup”). Board vice-chair Daryl Duke resigned the next day followed shortly thereafter by Fisher (Andrews, 1988). After an unsuccessful attempt to reinstate Fisher (Andrews, 1988), the new Board appointed Alan Franey as interim director (“Palace coup”), a position that would become permanent. Starting in 1979 Franey worked for Schein as house manager at the Ridge and later became the programmer for the Vancouver East Cinema after it was purchased by his wife, Donna Chisholm (Todd, 1989). He was also director of the Olympic Film Festival in Calgary. In taking the reins of VIFF, Franey was uniquely qualified to bridge the competing visions for the festival, having been involved with the organization from the beginning. In a 2007 *Vancouver Sun* profile written on the occasion of his 20th anniversary as festival director, Franey explains that “[t]here were a few of us who did everything from programming to running the theatres to training the volunteers to writing the program notes” (as cited in Zacharias). An unsuccessful applicant for the position in 1986 (“Vancouver festival names acting head”), Franey served as director of programming during Fisher’s brief tenure.

The 1988 VIFF went ahead in late September “at two-thirds of the originally planned size” (“Vancouver fest tightens belt”) and managed to remain “in the black” with a 24 percent increase in attendance (Todd, 1989). By the following year, *Globe and Mail* film critic Liam Lacey (1989) comments that “[a]fter losing artistic director Hannah Fisher and much of its credibility in 1987 [sic], the Vancouver International Film Festival bounced back to respectability last year with new boss Alan Franey.” Characterized as a cinephile with an appreciation for European art cinema and an avid reader with an admiration for philosophers like Martin Heidegger and Friedrich Nietzsche (Todd, 1989), Franey walks a fine line between the elitist and populist tendencies at the root of the 1988 rift. In 1989, he expressed his desire “to create an event that will enhance the

sophistication of B.C. filmmakers, critics and viewers” (Todd, 1989). Seventeen years later in pre-festival coverage of the 25th VIFF, he recalled a screening at the inaugural festival of the Dutch film *Max Havelaar* (Rademakers, 1976), “about the evils of colonization,” arguing that “[i]t was a perfect film that didn’t get the attention it deserved” (as cited in Beiks, 2006). Franey proceeded to explain his view that the role of the festival is “to fill the gaps in the real world,” in particular by providing access to alternatives to “the dumbed-down discourse we’re subjected to at major venues” (as cited in Beiks, 2006).

Although Franey’s remarks clearly lead in to his subsequent discussion of the potential contributions of the festival’s new year-round facility, the Vancity Theatre at the Vancouver International Film Centre, his perspective on mainstream cinema has remained consistent and corresponds with Schein’s initial focus on programming non-commercial alternatives to Hollywood fare. As such, there appears to be a certain irony to the festival’s claims of a populist vision. *Vancouver Sun* reporter Yvonne Zacharias (2007) summed up the 2007 VIFF program as “an eclectic cinematic feast,” noting that “[m]any of [the films] will have titles, actors and directors that the average Canadian has never heard of.” Yet, returning to some of the more immediate post-coup coverage provides insight into the definition of VIFF as a populist festival. Following the board shake-up and Fisher’s resignation, Schein explained that “he felt the board was out of touch with the membership, and had forgotten its local audience in its determination to become an international and elitist event” (Godfrey, 1988). A few years later Larry Trotter, an employee at Yoka’s Coffee and Honey shop, wrote an open letter to the festival board expressing concern about the 1988 promise of “a return to the idea of a ‘people’s festival’” (Walsh, 1991). The Kitsilano coffee shop was unable to purchase an ad in the festival program guide because large corporate sponsors are granted advertising exclusivity; therefore, Trotter explains that as “a competitor of [VIFF’s] third-largest sponsor, Seattle-based Starbucks, we would be unable to submit our \$385 for a sixth-of-

a-page ad” (as cited in Walsh, 1991).

At issue for Trotter was less Yoka’s loss of advertising than “the price of success,” prompting him to ask the board “[w]hat has happened to our community-based non-profit film festival?” (as cited in Walsh, 1991) In other words, at stake as the festival grew was the connection to its origin as a neighbourhood event. Thus, VIFF’s populist stance can be interpreted as a focus on serving local audiences, regardless of whether the product and its market might be defined in exclusive terms as niche. In a 2007 interview, Franey describes VIFF as “an audience-oriented festival and one that is based on a cultural mandate,” elaborating on the necessity of responding “to the market and demographics of the city” (as cited in Binning, 2007). This formulation is distinct from TIFF’s identity as a public festival with a focus on promoting the accessibility of exclusive cinematic events – in contrast to Cannes where red carpet screenings and world premieres are attended by a select group of accredited industry and media guests. The distinction between VIFF and TIFF could be attributed to whether the fundamental target is exhibition or cinema-going. The choice of words here points to an arbitrary (and perhaps awkward) split with exhibition intended to refer to assembling local audiences while the term cinema-going taps into the public dimension of reception as a stage in adding value to the film commodity. There is, of course, significant overlap as both festivals strive to foster industrial development while satisfying cultural goals.

That said, an emphasis on local audiences and community roots inflects VIFF’s historical narrative, further reinforcing the festival’s regional identity. Following from the initial description of Schein as a “local entrepreneur and independent operator” (Walsh, 1982b), VIFF emerges in written coverage as “a grassroots event” (Dafoe, 1991). Subsisting without federal funding for the first couple of years and at a geographical disadvantage with distributors, the festival’s “self-sufficiency” is touted (Lekich, 1984) as the event continues to grow despite these obstacles. A spirit of volunteerism, or perhaps cultural discount, adds to the cachet of an event that manages to consistently beat the

odds. For instance, a 2007 profile notes that “Franey remembers doing the first program on his kitchen counter with hand lettering, a felt pen and a ruler” (Zacharias, 2007); his subsequent comments about the “power” of “cinema as an art form” draw attention to the festival’s pursuit of a cultural mandate. Similarly, in VIFF’s fourth season, Stephen Godfrey (1985) writes that Schein had “yet to draw a salary” and had “put up \$40,000 of his savings as collateral.” In addition, Schein’s wife, “expecting her first child that day, had left the hospital to attend the [opening] gala” (Godfrey, 1985). Thus, the notion of personal sacrifice contributing value to VIFF extends to implicate family which, in turn, forms another thread in the festival’s “populist” narrative. In contrast to TIFF coverage that details the professional experience and schmoozing acumen of founders Dusty Cohl and Bill Marshall (eg: Macfarlane, 2000), an early profile of Franey outlines his myriad connections to the communities of Greater Vancouver through his education at Douglas College and Simon Fraser University in Burnaby to his migration to Point Grey via Mount Pleasant as well as his involvement with neighbourhood venues like The Ridge and the Vancouver East Cinema (Todd, 1989); the same article also refers to the impact of Franey’s parents on his cinephilia and “composure.”

Aside from an independent spirit and homespun charm, which *Province* reporter Michael Walsh (1991) describes as “homebody cosy,” VIFF’s relative lack of resources serves both as a point of comparison with the Montreal and Toronto festivals and as a source of pride. In 10th anniversary coverage, Franey explained that “[w]e don’t have the power base that Toronto and Montreal enjoy...although to put it in perspective, we’re still larger than any American film festival” (Dafoe, 1991); six years later, Ian Bailey (1997) notes in *The Province* that “[t]he boss of Vancouver’s annual film festival has no problem running third among Canada’s major film festivals.” Even though Schein’s aspirations for VIFF to be “number one in Canada” (Lekich, 1984) fell by the wayside, national coverage proclaimed that VIFF “thrives without big hype [or] big stars” (Lacey, 1989). This focus on non-mainstream programming drew attention and even offered a

basis for positive assessments of the festival. In a 1992 *Vancouver Sun* article, “Quirky, independent-minded spirit sets fest apart,” Hester Riches concludes that while “autograph hounds might be disappointed” by the absence of major celebrities “true movie-lovers” will appreciate the “eclectic and interesting lineup.” Similarly, in *The Globe and Mail*, Alexander Gill (2002) makes the significant observation that VIFF features “obscure directors [cineastes have] never heard of before (but probably will some day),” thereby highlighting the festival’s contribution to defining world cinema. Unfortunately though, unlike TIFF, Vancouver has not consolidated its brand identity or re-written its own history from the polished perspective of hindsight.

Instead, the Web sites for each annual festival dating back to the 20th VIFF in 2001 are archived as a “VIFF by year” list accompanied by thumbnail photos of the program guide cover images (GVIFFS, *Festival archive*). VIFF’s archive Web pages also include a summary of their awards history and a searchable online database of film listings from 2002 - 2006. In contrast, TIFF’s historical overview cites subsequent successes like Academy Award nominations or distribution deals such that their programming appears to have strong predictive value which cannot be easily contested by examining the contextual information provided on annual sites. The absence of written history on VIFF’s Web site could be attributed to an ongoing comparative lack of resources or, perhaps ironically, to the Festival’s populist identity as an event that eschews master narratives. However, if the optic of comparison places TIFF and Cannes as benchmarks, VIFF remains a perpetual underdog as long as there is a resistance to forging an alternative brand identity. In other words, as each event contributes reams of information to the evolution of the written festival, those that bypass the significance of historiography to brand creation miss the opportunity of forging a comparative framework that might assert different criteria for success. The next chapter explores the interrelationship between festival space and national cinema through the evolution of film scenes and the development of permanent festival facilities in both Toronto and

Vancouver. While the Festivals have served as catalysts for an increased volume of critical writing about Canadian cinema, growth in their local production sectors promotes a post-nationalist perspective. The resultant film scenes spectacularize each festival's involvement in global, national and local cinema culture but in divergent ways. Although both Bell Lightbox and the Vancouver International Film Centre emerge from the confluence of real estate development, urban policy and cultural infrastructure, TIFF has begun to re-frame its corporate brand in global terms whereas VIFF remains locked into a municipally-defined role.

CHAPTER FOUR

STRUCTURING PERMANENCE: FROM SHOWCASE TO LIGHTBOX

Imagine a temple to the moving image, potent and appealing, a public place crowning a truly vibrant entertainment neighbourhood....The art of the moving image needs a light box and our Canadian films need a catalyst from which they can exert their influence on North American and international markets. (TIFFG, *Vision*, Intro page)¹

As an annual event positioned on a global circuit, the international film festival asserts a seasonal rhythm. From spring in Cannes through autumn in Toronto and winter in Sundance, the major festivals occupy distinctive times on the calendar. On one hand, the timing of the international festivals finds synchronicity with cyclical film release schedules that range from the fall pre-awards season (in anticipation of the Golden Globes and Academy Awards in the new year) to the spring theatrical launches of art house titles striving to capitalize on the lull that precedes the summer blockbusters. Buzz builds across the tiers of world, international and local premieres and is bolstered by the accumulation of accolades, only to disperse in anticipation of a new festival season replete with fresh discoveries. On the other hand, these release cycles attempt to grasp the lasting cultural value of trends in world cinema and global cinema culture. Programming aims to capture the cinematic zeitgeist in categories such as Cannes' authoritative Official Selection, VIFF's catchall Cinema of Our Time or TIFF's avant garde Visions. National or regional filmmaking practices take centre stage in program sections like VIFF's Dragons and Tigers: The Cinemas of East Asia or TIFF's two indigenous showcases Canada First and Short Cuts Canada.

Beyond the role of media coverage in delineating a festival's "systematic

¹ This quote is taken from the first page of the Bell Lightbox vision statement which is divided into five sub-sections—Intro, Vision, Conception, Potential, and Impact.

dimension,” Dayan’s (1997) concept of the written festival can be extended to consider the commentary incited by the event’s programming. In other words, alongside the discursive construction of festival space, there are also contributions to broader debates about cinema. Programmer essays draw attention to significant films and suggest emerging patterns of aesthetic or industry development. In “Charting the Course of the Pacific New Wave,” I note the role of festival programmers in defining a burst of neo-realist indigenous filmmaking that cropped up in Vancouver in the late 1990s (Burgess, 2003). First cited by Cori Howard in a *National Post* article about “an unprecedented six BC fiction features in the [1999] Canadian Images program,” the term was picked up by programmer Ken Anderlini and subsequently explored by *Georgia Straight* critic Ken Eisner the following year (Burgess, 2003, p. 29). This pattern is reminiscent of the way in which “festival programmers tossed around the notion of ‘new Canadian cinema’ in the late 1980s as they attempted to provide a name for what they saw” (Burgess, 2003, p. 33). Cameron Bailey (2000) details the origins of this contemporary English-Canadian critical mass in “Standing in the Kitchen All Night: A Secret History of the Toronto New Wave,” in which he posits the festival’s 1984 launch of Perspective Canada as “Ground Zero...giving the city a Sundance, in the same year Sundance starts up” (p. 11). Several years later, filmmaker Bruce McDonald’s editorial manifesto in the 1988 “Outlaw Edition” of *Cinema Canada* proclaimed that Toronto’s independent sector was “paving the ground for the creation of the new Canadian Feature Film” (as cited in Bailey, 2000, p. 6).

A further example of the cross-pollination of programming and film criticism can be found in Bill Nichols’ two 1994 articles about TIFF’s 1992 retrospective on post-revolutionary Iranian cinema. While the opportunity to review a concentrated selection of Iranian films enables a discussion of the movement’s broader aesthetic characteristics, Nichols’ observations about how the international festival circuit inflects the experience of national cinemas both informs and reinforces TIFF’s role as cultural intermediary.

Thus, his articles comprise part of TIFF's written festival, albeit from a greater temporal distance than most seasonal coverage, while also contributing to debates about the definition of world cinema. Aside from the provision of annual snapshots of national film industries or curated retrospectives, the festival's individual films can spark commentary as did Mark Peranson's interpretation of Guy Maddin's *The Heart of the World* (2000) which was critical of TIFF's populist orientation. The lure of celebrity receives a different response from columnist Dominick Dunne in his *Vanity Fair* post-Cannes "Diary." Dunne (2006) chides critics (concurring with an assessment of them as "jet-lagged" and "hung-over") for the "cruel booing that greeted two of the major American films," *The Da Vinci Code* (Howard, 2006) and *Marie Antoinette* (Coppola, 2006). He insinuates that celebrities like Tom Hanks will be disinclined to return to the Riviera due to this negative reception and goes on to point out that "we Americans don't boo foreign pictures" at Tribeca, Sundance or the New York Film Festival. Given that many of the "jet-lagged" critics must have been American, Dunne's jingoism is mildly confusing. His subsequent reference to an encounter with entrepreneur and hotelier Mohamed Al Fayed at the Ritz in Paris contextualizes Dunne's comments in relation to notions of access and exclusive encounters with both celebrities and (albeit indirectly) royalty—the implication being that he hobnobs with both. With his detailed description of the lavish *Vanity Fair* party that had to be moved indoors due to inclement weather in Cap d'Antibes, Dunne's diary appears to say little about Cannes' 2006 Official Selections.

Yet, Dunne's assessment of negative critical response as a sign of poor comportment actually does offer insight into the tension between cinephilia and the marketing campaigns of global Hollywood. While celebrity attendance at Cannes generates international infotainment coverage, the disruptive response of critics at the press screenings contests the value of this symbolic capital. It also reveals a struggle over the autonomy of the subfield of entertainment journalism from the economic logic of

marketing. However, based on the aphorism that “all press is good press,” even a report of critics “booing” *The Da Vinci Code* and *Marie Antoinette* raises awareness of the films, prompting audience members to display their cultural capital. There is a potential for inversion here if readers deem film festival critics incapable of appreciating the populist pleasures of mainstream cinema. These position-takings, as manifestations of the field of forces, structure the production of cultural value while, in its intermediary role, the international film festival balances transience and permanence. Seasonal release strategies and annual programming place the focus on novelty and discovery in response to the task of classifying and codifying each year’s cinematic output while the resultant codes, along with the discursive production that comprises the written festival, leave lasting traces that impact the cinematic field. In the previous chapter, I explored the inception and historical trajectory of the Toronto and Vancouver International Film Festivals, paying particular attention to the convergence of interests that shaped each event’s brand identity. I examined press coverage as a source of information about TIFF and VIFF as written festivals with divergent historical narratives. Specifically, an orientation towards either exhibition or industry as a primary target corresponds to the interests of the festival founders and subsequent executive directors. At the same time, these differing perspectives contest the usefulness of a single comparative framework for understanding the international film festival.

In this chapter, I will examine the recent development of permanent exhibition facilities by two of Canada’s major international festivals. After providing a brief historical context for the construction of festival scenes, I will detail how the building projects undertaken by TIFF and VIFF emerged from a confluence of cultural policy, architectural vision and urban revitalization; lastly, I will return to the festival’s myth-making function as a catalyst for national cinema. Both Toronto’s Bell Lightbox and the Vancouver International Film Centre mark a shift towards year-round programming. TIFF already had built a recurrent presence on the local arts calendar throughout the year

with initiatives such as Reel Talk, a monthly series that combines screenings with discussions led by critics or industry professionals, Canada's Top Ten, an annual screening series selected by a nationwide panel, and Sprockets Toronto International Film Festival for Children, all of which operate (along with TIFF) under the auspices of the Toronto International Film Festival Group (TIFFG).² The Vancouver International Film Festival is operated by the Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society (GVIFFS). Unlike the umbrella organization created by the TIFFG, GVIFFS is just the festival's registered name under the jurisdiction of The Society Act of British Columbia. The inclusion of VIFF's mandate on the VIFC's Web site along with the fact that the Film Centre does not have a separate Programming or Operations Manager indicates that the Society's organizational structure is largely undifferentiated; the VIFC also shares VIFF's logo. As the TIFFG cultivates an urban arts scene, contributes to national cultural infrastructure (a source of federal funding for Bell Lightbox), and congregates international cinema and tourist traffic, there is a clear aspiration to the global status expressed in its vision "to lead the world in creative and cultural discovery through the moving image."³ Meanwhile VIFF's venture into bricks and mortar remains anchored in local concerns. While the impact of the TIFFG's programming strategy for Bell Lightbox remains to be seen, year-round programming at the Vancity Theatre at the Vancouver International Film Centre is already underway.

Junket to Myth-maker – Showcase to Catalyst

As discussed in Chapter Three, a festival's identity emerges in relation to a "written festival" (Dayan, 1997) that implicates journalists in the systematic delineation

² The Toronto International Film Festival Group, a "charitable, not-for-profit, cultural organization" was formed in 1994 (the same year that the original festival name was officially changed) as "the umbrella organization of the Festival, Cinematheque Ontario and the Film Reference Library." The latter two organizations had previously comprised the Ontario Film Institute and were subsumed under the Festival of Festivals' management in 1990. (TIFFG, "TIFFG History – The Nineties") The TIFFG's initiatives also include the Canadian Film Encyclopedia, Film Circuit, Reel Learning and the Student Film Showcase.

³ TIFFG's vision statement is included in the footer for the Web sites of its programming initiatives. (eg: "Bell Lightbox – *Vision*")

of a festival's attributes, stakeholder struggles, the dispersal of buzz—and thus the negotiations over cinematic value that occur in festival space. An examination of the historical trajectory of the written festival in the Canadian context demonstrates the articulation of an increasingly post-nationalist conception of national cinema. TIFF founder Dusty Cohl commented that “in 1976, nobody was reporting on Cannes in the Toronto papers. There was no reference point for the local media to gauge what we were trying to do” (TIFFG, “History...1970's). Marshall has also mentioned the absence of Canadian press at Cannes in 1976, noting though that the Toronto press and the CBC did attend the following year (2005, p. 4). Thus, the emergence of Canadian events on the global circuit impacted local and national coverage of the international film festival scene. Martin (1976) makes a brief reference to the comparatively small number of films slated for the New York International Film Festival (18 vs. FoF's planned 100) as a means of highlighting the wanton ambition of “Toronto's first major international film festival,” but otherwise does not contextualize the upcoming Festival of Festivals in relation to other events or the growing international circuit. A perusal of entries in the “Festivals and Awards” section of Loren Lerner's Canadian cinema bibliography shows that festival reports prior to the mid-1970s tended to be limited to lists of films, events and awards (1997, pp. 267-269); a notable exception is Gerald Pratley's “In and Out of Cinema” column in the fall 1966 issue of *Canadian Cinematography* that compares international festivals held that year in Montreal and Vancouver (Lerner, 1997, p. 267 entry 3309). *Cinema Canada's* festival listings, penned in the mid-1970s by Stephen Chesley, are included at the front of the publication with other snippets of film news. Commentary creeps in with Chesley's account of the controversy surrounding the 1976 cancellation of the Stratford Film Festival and the irony of the concurrent scheduling of the Canadian Film Awards screenings and the first Festival of Festivals (8).

With the launch of Montreal's World Film Festival the following year *Cinema Canada's* coverage shifts to feature articles that review and compare the two events,

feeding the perceived rivalry between Montreal and Toronto. These articles set a framework for defining and evaluating Canada's first two major international film festivals. Assessment criteria focus on the newness and diversity of programming selections as a means of attracting business activity (Tadros, 1977, p. 24) and the ability of the festival to appeal to a large cross-section of public, industry and media (Tadros, 1982, p. 13). Indicators of success include a robust market, strong attendance figures, appearances by international guests and great parties. In other words, the festivals were judged, particularly in these early articles, more by their ancillary activities and the experiences that were created than by the actual screenings of the films in their programs. As such, these contributions to the emergence of the written festival in Canada measured the ability of each international film festival to serve its intermediary function in the production of cinematic value. For example, two *Cinema Canada* articles, one from 1982 entitled "Echoes from the festivals" (Tadros) and another a year later called "Festival fever: Candid comment on the Montreal and Toronto fests," feature comments from guests of both events, ranging from critics John Harkness (Toronto's *Now* magazine) and Gerald Peary (Boston *Globe*) to distributors Linda Beath (United Artists Classics) and James Byerley (Home Box Office) to photographer Ron Levine.

Among their insights was the observation that business activity appeared to be shifting away from the organized marketplace in Montreal to Toronto, where filmmaker attendance was strong as was the emphasis on "the hoopla and the glitter" (Tadros, 1982, p. 15). In addition, a recurring theme across the commentaries involves a tendency to distinguish between "a consumer-oriented" Festival of Festivals (Tadros, 1982, p. 16) and the World Film Festival where "audiences seem more seriously interested in the films than in the surrounding media event" ("Festival fever," 1983, p. 18). Five years later, Greg Klymkiw (1988) takes a much lighter approach to rating the events in "Immovable fests: The race for world class excellence between Montreal's World Film Festival and Toronto's Festival of Festivals." Maintaining the cinephilia/populist split, he gives

Montreal top marks for its “guaranteed orgy of movie-viewing” but ranks Toronto higher for “largest selection and most accessible English-language product;” FoF’s Helga Stephenson wins as “best-dressed festival director” while Serge Losique at the WFF outranks her for flamboyance (Klymkiw, 1988, p. 16). Of course, the contest ends in a tie with a tongue-in-cheek plea from Klymkiw to “stop the bickering” (p. 17). By this point, with both festivals well-entrenched, it appears that the drive for differentiation had calmed, even if the press continued to re-visit the rivalry as an inevitable component of the events’ co-existence.

After this period, coverage in *Cinema Canada* begins to shift away from an examination of festival morphology and towards an engagement with program content and the cinematic issues that it raised. In particular, following the launch of Perspective Canada in 1984 annual festival coverage in publications like *Cinema Canada*, *Maclean’s*, *The Globe and Mail* and later *Playback* examines the year’s cinematic output as a meaning of measuring the relative health of the national film industry. Before Perspective Canada settled into a format devoted exclusively to new Canadian cinema, it was accompanied by the Northern Lights retrospective of over 200 films divided amongst six program streams (The Ten Best, Eyes Write, Bordercrossings, Buried Treasures, Experiments, and Late Nights, Great Nights) (“Fest of Fests,” 1984, p. 27).⁴ *Cinema Canada* published a Special Issue in November with articles analysing aspects of the retrospective. For example, in “Seeing eye-to-I: Notes on Canadian identity,” Michael Dorland (1984) parlays the ad slogan ““Two hundred answers to the question of Canadian identity”” into an exploration of national “eye-dentity” that considers whether the rediscovery of a richly varied cinematic past will serve as “an authentic cultural turning point” (pp. 15-16). The festival also organized the publication of *Take Two: A Tribute to*

⁴Subsequent archival Canadian screenings at TIFF took the form of single screenings for Canadian Open Vault or retrospectives devoted to individual filmmakers like Jean-Pierre Lefebvre, Peter Mettler or Michel Brault; the latter tend to be accompanied by monographs published to coincide with event. The first of these publications, *The Shape of Rage: The Films of David Cronenberg* (1983) was edited by Piers Handling for the David Cronenberg retrospective.

Film in Canada to coincide with the retrospective; edited by Seth Feldman, this book takes up the project started with the *Canadian Film Reader* (which Feldman co-edited with Joyce Nelson), a 1977 anthology that set the framework for “understanding Canadian film as a ‘national cinema’” (Dorland, 1998, p. 6).⁵

This increase in the volume of critical writing about both national cinema and its circulation in an international festival context arguably contributed to building audiences and generating market activity in a way that brought to fruition the founders’ vision of a fertile environment for Canadian cinema. The irony that the retrospective actually demonstrated the perseverance of Canadian filmmakers regardless of inhospitable conditions suggests that the key here involves identity consolidation and recognition -- perhaps as a type of “written” national cinema that emerges from the “written festival.” With the shift from listing titles in news capsules to writing feature articles and annual reviews for both popular and trade publications, entertainment journalists became increasingly specialized in their coverage of the festival circuit. The links between festivals and junket journalism, a publicity practice which involves studios covering the costs of interviewers travelling to promotional screenings in New York or Los Angeles, are noted by B. Johnson (2000, p. 33). The negative implication is that junkets interfere with the journalistic ethos of impartiality, giving the appearance that first-class trips and perks are being used to purchase positive press. Johnson notes that Marshall and Cohl drew on the junket model as the “festival provided plane tickets and hotel rooms for most of the international journalists who came the first year” (2000, p. 34). While the promotion of the new festival was critical, this calculated move to re-create the schmooze-filled atmosphere of Cannes displayed a prescient understanding of the significant role of the media in building a film scene.

⁵ Dorland (1998) examines the implications of Feldman and Nelson’s decision to frame Canada’s heterogeneous filmmaking practices in relation to the concept of “national cinema” that held sway in international film scholarship, noting in particular that it granted English-Canadian film scholars “a more intellectually ennobling mantle...[as] ‘nation builders’” (p. 6).

Another intriguing angle is added to the relationship between journalists and the festival with Brian Linehan's admission that he considered information obtained on the junket circuit about upcoming studio releases as "doing reconnaissance for the festival" (as cited in B. Johnson, 2000, p. 34). As such, it would be reductive to assume that the junkets merely serve to fuel film publicity and the written festival. Instead, the interconnections between festivals and the specialized entertainment journalists who travel the circuit suggest multiple levels of information exchange that influence hierarchies of cinematic value. The notion of festival programmers as "inspired talent spotters" (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 77) is supplanted by the reality of interactions with journalists and industry stakeholders as buzz builds from one event to the next; and belief in the value of a film commodity is inflected by exclusive access and specialized knowledge. Although a world premiere screening belies the autonomy of the film festival as an intermediary in the gap between production and exhibition, the perception of aesthetic excellence as the programmer's sole guiding principle is crucial to the festival's *illusio*; in other words, the production of cultural value of the film commodity relies on a shared belief in the festival programmer as symbolic banker.

The international film festival concentrates this dramatic potential into an annual flurry of screenings accompanied by extra-textual events like media conferences, red carpets and parties. The resulting film scene serves as a locus for the display of relative position-takings in the cinematic field and the struggle to define hierarchies of value. As a setting, the film scene draws on the international festival circuit to establish its general parameters while its specific characteristics emerge in relation to local space. Janine Marchessault (2001) explains that "scenes make the city visible in particular kinds of ways often linked to tourism and leisure" (p. 68), noting as an example the impact of the Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF) "on the international image of Toronto as a cosmopolitan city bringing in thousands of international guests and press each year" (p. 72). With reference to Johnson's *Brave Films Wild Nights*, she pinpoints a shift from the

Festival of Festivals' initial role as a "conduit" for films that premiered elsewhere to TIFF's subsequent involvement in the creation of a Toronto film scene (Marchessault, 2001, p. 72). The inception and growth of the Perspective Canada program in the mid-1980s coincided with the first features of several directors, including Atom Egoyan (*Next of Kin*, 1984), Patricia Rozema (*I've Heard the Mermaids Singing*, 1987) and later Bruce McDonald⁶ (*Roadkill*, 1989), whose works comprise the foundations of the Toronto New Wave. While Geoff Pevere (1995) asserts that the launch of Perspective Canada placed Canadian films "possibly for the first time in the country's history, under the instant and intensive scrutiny of both the national and international press" (p. 12), Brenda Longfellow (2006) takes this formulation a step further and posits 1987 as the watershed year (p. 170).

Several events occurred in 1987 that demonstrate what Longfellow refers to as "the role of the international festival apparatus in bestowing cultural capital and in generating a niche market for art cinema" (2006, p. 171). Patricia Rozema's debut feature, *I've Heard the Mermaids Singing*, won the Prix de la Jeunesse at the Festival de Cannes, opened the Festival of Festivals and proceeded to "gross more than 5 million dollars," an impressive return on its \$350,000 budget (Longfellow, 2006, p. 181). That same year, Egoyan's second feature, *Family Viewing* (1987), won the Toronto-City Award for Best Canadian Feature Film at FoF and also "was blessed with the imprimatur of European cultural capital" when Wim Wenders gave his prize money to the young director at the Montreal World Film Festival (Longfellow, 2006, p. 170). There is an interplay of local and global forces here as award recognition from the international festival circuit (and one of its auteurs) is echoed in the conferral of symbolic capital on the home front via prestige positioning and favourable critical response. Longfellow

⁶ Bruce McDonald's involvement with the Toronto New Wave films preceded his directorial debut as he edited Egoyan's *Family Viewing* (1987). Citing Cameron Bailey's "Standing in the Kitchen All Night," André Loiselle (2002) argues that Don McKellar is "at the centre" of this movement as "the one who 'knits this group together'" through his involvement in several of their projects as a writer and actor (p. 256).

credits the Cannes' successes of Rozema, Egoyan and McKellar (all of whom have won major awards there) with "facilitat[ing] their entry into international markets" which in turn cast them as the "new ideal-typical model of [Canadian] feature film" (2006, pp. 176-177). With Toronto New Wave cinema as the archetype for an indigenous English-Canadian art cinema, TIFF assumes a central position as the setting for a national film scene.

This elision of intra-national difference also occurs when Longfellow draws a parallel between 1964 and 1987, suggesting that the latter comprises "a second 'beginning of a beginning'" (2006, p. 170). Her comments refer to Peter Harcourt's seminal essay "1964: The Beginning of a Beginning," published in the 1980 version of the *Self Portrait* anthology; Longfellow's "Surfing the Toronto New Wave: Policy, Paradigm Shifts and Post-Nationalism" appears in *Self Portraits*, a new collection that explores Canadian cinema after the 1984 creation of Telefilm. Harcourt (1980) compares two features that emerged from the direct cinema movement at the National Film Board--*Nobody Waved Goodbye* (Owen, 1964) and *Le Chat dans le sac* (Groulx, 1964)--and considers whether their similarities unify Quebec and English-Canadian feature filmmaking under the rubric of Canadian cinema or their differences necessitate a two cinemas model (p. 76). Longfellow apparently opts for the latter as she notes the subsequent "flourishing of a national art cinema in Quebec" while English-Canadian production was "dominated by the effluent of the capital cost allowance" (2006, p. 169). As such, her designation of a second beginning in 1987 refers to a renewed potential for the development of an English-Canadian art cinema even though the new archetypical model reflects "the dissolution of a left nationalist consensus" as well as the expansion of "international flows of cultural and economic influence" (Longfellow, 2006, pp. 187, 171). The Toronto New Wave films split from the traditions of national allegory, exemplified by the 1964 features of Owen and Groulx, in favour of aesthetic concerns and an internationalist connection to European art cinema (Longfellow, 2006, p. 188)—

marking a revival of art cinema in English-Canada.

In other words, despite (or perhaps because of) the centrifugal forces of globalization, including supranational market relations and what Longfellow characterizes as “a new transnational imaginary” (2006, p. 194), a centre for English-Canadian cinema holds. Specifically, the Toronto International Film Festival, as both the dominant connection to the international festival circuit and a wellspring of local talent, becomes the centre for a national film scene. As a second beginning, the Toronto New Wave definitely reinvigorated English-Canadian cinema (much as the successes of 1964 sparked the first beginning); but, the resulting singular narrative carries a nationalist undertone that positions Longfellow’s argument as more post-national than post-nationalist (as her article’s title claims). Longfellow does consider aspects of local context such as the role of provincial policy through the 1986 founding of the Ontario Film Development Corporation (OFDC) as well as the impact of the local artistic community that coalesced at the Liaison of Independent Filmmakers of Toronto (LIFT). However, as policy discourse and the national media (Longfellow, 2006, p. 199 n24) proceeded to describe internationally acclaimed Toronto New Wave auteurs as “key exemplars of the viability and vision of the state funding system” (p. 181), the result is the definition of an English-Canadian art cinema that harkens back to Harcourt’s two nations/cinemas model. Nevertheless, this approach does not preclude discussion of the contribution of subsequent developments in other provincial production jurisdictions.

In contrast to the nationalist leanings of Longfellow’s assertions about Toronto filmmaking, when Jim Leach (2006) revisits 1964 to elaborate on the “beginnings” of a commercial industry in *Film in Canada*, he strives to displace the narrow focus of the Canadian film studies canon on the tradition of documentary realism. He expands on Harcourt’s frame of reference to incorporate low budget features like *The Mask* (Roffman, 1961), *A tout prendre* (Jutra, 1963) and *Sweet Substitute* (Kent, 1964) along with more mainstream titles like *The Luck of Ginger Coffey* (Kershner, 1964) and *La Vie*

heureuse de Léopold Z (Carle, 1965). In broadening the scope of what should be counted amongst the new forays into features, Leach's inclusion of these films sparks the recognition of the range of aesthetic interests, from horror to subjective exploration to jazz-inflected youth culture, while also displacing the NFB as the institutional centre for national cinema. Although his selection cross linguistic boundaries, Leach avoids a wholesale rejection of the two cinemas model, insisting instead that the complexities of national identity defy conceptual coherence and concurring with Tom O'Regan's assessment of national cinema as "a messy affair" (Leach, 2006, p. 8). Lastly, Leach partially attributes his revisioning to Michael Spencer, the first Director of the Canadian Film Development Corporation, who asserts that commercial successes like *Leopold Z* "gave momentum to the campaign that led to the creation of the CFDC" (as cited in Leach, 2006, p. 26).

While this expanded delineation of what actually constituted the beginnings of "new Canadian cinema" (Leach, 2006, p. 26) reveals the often contradictory forces at play in the Canadian film industry, Leach's text-centred approach points more toward a post-modernist paradigm of decentred national identity rather than a post-nationalist understanding of Canada's diverse production contexts. As such, Leach's interests lie more with the aesthetic and thematic preoccupations of canon formation than with the political economy of the feature film industry. The notion of a multiplicity of beginnings takes a different turn with the emergence of an indigenous narrative feature filmmaking sector on the west coast starting in the late 1990s. Several of Longfellow's observations are echoed in my essay "Air Bud and Stickgirl Share Leaky Condo: The Changing Landscape of B.C. Cinema since the 1980s." The Pacific New Wave, which I ultimately conclude might be more accurately described as the Vancouver New Wave (Burgess, 2006, p. 160), recalls earlier developments in Toronto in that this burst of production activity drew on an industrial infrastructure generated by the commercial sector (both television and foreign location production), a conducive provincial policy environment

and a creative community hub (in this case at the University of British Columbia).

Recognition on the festival circuit, in the form of cultural capital, also played a significant role in fostering the reputation of these west coast auteurs, thereby demonstrating that “scenes are defined in relation to other scenes” (Burgess, 2003, p. 33). In 2001, Bruce Sweeney’s third feature *Last Wedding* became the first BC film to open the Toronto Festival, a prestige slot that confirmed the director’s ascension to “A-list” status (Peranson, cited in Burgess, 2003, p. 30). Noting the presence of five additional BC films in TIFF’s program, Mark Peranson suggests an analogy to “the flowering of filmmakers in Ontario in the 1980s” (as cited in Burgess, 2003, 30). Peranson’s comments in an article entitled “Riding the Pacific New Wave” were made “from the national platform of the *Globe and Mail*” (Burgess, 2006, p. 151) while photo coverage of the western Canadian presence at TIFF was included in the *Vancouver Province* (Spaner, cited in Burgess, 2003, p. 33). The overall implication here is that the films and filmmakers of the Pacific New Wave gained legitimacy via their exposure at “Canada’s pre-eminent film scene” (Burgess, 2003, p. 33). Of course these films also were feted at the Vancouver Film Festival with *rollercoaster* (Smith, 1999) and *Protection* (Spangler, 2000) selected to open the Canadian Images program and with Bruce Sweeney (*Dirty*) and Ross Weber (*No More Monkeys Jumpin’ on the Bed*) winning the Best Emerging Western Canadian Director awards in 1998 and 2000 respectively. But higher profile recognition would not be garnered until 2001 when *Last Wedding* was VIFF’s Closing Gala screening, a few weeks after the film opened TIFF.

Another moment of symmetry between the national and regional film scenes occurred ten years earlier at the 1991 Toronto Festival when Atom Egoyan gave his \$25,000 award for *The Adjuster* to Vancouver director John Pozer for his debut feature *The Grocer’s Wife*; this act had the impact of “paying forward” Wenders’ 1987 gesture, not only in terms of cash support but also as a bestowal of cultural capital, this time from a “progenitor of Ontario’s New Wave” (Burgess, 2006, p. 151). Thus, while film scenes

articulate global and local flows of art cinema culture, there appears to be a national/regional dimension to scene definition as well. Just as recognition at Cannes positioned Toronto New Wave films as the “new ideal-typical model” of English Canadian cinema, attention at TIFF positions Vancouver filmmakers within national cinema culture. Similar then to the way in which provincial support has been used to leverage federal funding,⁷ a regional film scene can leverage symbolic capital at a national level; but, there is also an interchange of value as the regional festival enhances local participation in a national film scene.

VIFF showcases national cinema for a regional audiences and, due to scheduling proximity to TIFF on the circuit, Vancouver cinephiles are able to partake in buzz that has not yet subsided. Geographical inequities, such as “the relative marginalization of BC’s film industry vis à vis the concentration of production companies, distributors and resources within the central Canadian triangle of Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa” (Burgess, 2006, p. 137) as well as the province’s smaller relative stake in national production expenditures,⁸ position Vancouver on the periphery of the Canadian film scene. However, it would be limiting to conceptualize VIFF in terms of a core-periphery relationship to TIFF as Stringer’s spatial model of the international festival circuit might suggest (2001, p. 138). Instead, VIFF’s large Asian cinema program also draws links to October’s Pusan International Film Festival just as British Columbia Film’s initiatives include attendance at the annual Hong Kong Film Market (BC Film, 2007, p. 3).

Consequently, mapping “the transfer of value between and within distinct geographic localities” (Stringer, 2001, p. 138), or between festivals and film scenes, may exceed Stringer’s “two-tiered system” of specialized little festivals and big survey

⁷ In my examination of policy support for indigenous production in BC, I note the impact of the principle of leveraging on equity investment in feature films. According to BC Film’s 2002/03 Annual Report, “[e]very dollar invested by British Columbia Film triggered \$6.63 from the Canada Feature Film Fund.” (as cited in Burgess, 2006, p. 140).

⁸ In 2006/2007, BC-based producers accounted for 20% of Canadian production volume, as compared to Ontario’s 31% and Quebec’s 38% (CFTPA & APFTQ, 2008, p. 32).

festivals (p. 141). As specific international film festivals make a distinctive range of connections to other national and global events, it becomes difficult to conceive of a manageable version of Stringer's hierarchical allegory for the spatial development of world film culture. Festival centres Bell Lightbox and the VIFC thus cannot be reduced to the construction of competing film scenes. Although Stringer's argument about competing global cities falls short of capturing the complexities of the relationship between TIFF and VIFF, his appraisal of the decline of the national (2001, p. 138) provides insight into both TIFF's re-branding as a global film centre and changes to the structure of the Festival's Canadian programming. In 2004, Perspective Canada was replaced by two new program sections—Canada First, which recognizes feature filmmakers "making their inaugural appearance" at TIFF, and Short Cuts Canada, for films under 50 minutes in length (TIFFG, 2007b); all other Canadian films programmed at the festival are mixed in with international films in categories like Masters, Contemporary World Cinema and Special Presentations. The re-visioning of TIFF's Canadian programming crosses a gamut of these issues, from program revitalization to the recognition of an internationalist focus (or perhaps post-nationalist orientation) of Canadian cinema. Programming categories emerge and evolve in response to international filmmaking trends as a means to maintain salient classifications that in turn serve to market the program sections. There is also a process of revitalization here as programming distinctions need to renew their symbolic currency both to capture innovations and to convey the cinematic zeitgeist. Elsaesser elaborates that festival programming extends beyond classification and "weeding out" to involve "supporting, selecting, celebrating and rewarding—in short...adding value and cultural capital" (2005, p. 96).

In "Film Festivals, Programming and the Building of a National Cinema," Liz Czach (2004), a former programmer for TIFF's Perspective Canada section, examines how "distinctions are determined through [a] film's placement within the festival

structure” (p. 82). She adapts Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital into the term “‘critical capital’ to refer to the value that a film accrues through its success in the festival circuit” (p. 82). Czach is not clear exactly how critical capital differs from symbolic capital with the exception that she attributes the distinction attained through the mere act of festival selection to the likelihood that a film may attain canonical status—thereby suggesting a link through her choice of terminology to the discourses of film criticism. Her analysis of the challenges facing Perspective Canada right before it was disbanded draws on Ruby Rich’s assertion that “any hint of agenda—political, national, or otherwise—within film selection...is seen as interfering with the magical and utterly unsubstantiated notion of quality” (as cited in Czach, 2004, p. 83). The selection of films for a national showcase suggests the necessity of confronting issues such as the diversity of the nation’s annual cinematic output with the impact that criteria beyond aesthetic quality are seen to enter into programming decisions (Czach, 2004, p. 84). This means that, as a form of showcase, national programs (much like other regionally-defined sections) can be perceived as “ghettos for underperforming work” (Czach, 2004, p. 83). At the same time, ascending to higher levels of program distinction within the festival (like Masters or Galas) involves placement outside of Perspective Canada which in turn lessens the potential for higher profile films to draw attention to newcomers in the national showcase. A further implication of attaining increased program distinction is that having a subsequent film included in Perspective Canada suggests a downgrade in status; leaving the program for a prestigious Gala slot is clearly an honour, while returning a few years later implies that the new film just isn’t as good.

Czach notes that “a large number of Canadian films were programmed outside of the Perspective Canada series” in 2003 (the final year of Perspective Canada) and wonders whether this “broader integration [might] signal the successful assimilation of Canadian film into world cinema” (2004, p. 83). Her argument is reminiscent of the way in which Hollywood blockbusters like *The Da Vinci Code* ascend to the status of global

texts at Cannes. Although broader integration suggests that the films are strong enough to screen alongside their international peers, this value assessment is troubling as it exacerbates the perception of Canada First as a ghetto. If the only criterion for inclusion is being a first-time attendee, the appeal of the program is limited to the potential to discover new talent; unfortunately, the stigma of a national showcase easily could dampen the appeal if there is any perception of relaxed conditions for entry. Given that dispersal throughout the festival's program sections makes it more difficult to examine an annual snapshot of Canadian cinema, it seems that what is really at stake here is a post-nationalist vision that refutes (or at the very least downplays) the classificatory value of "Canadian-ness." On the Bell Lightbox Web site, the Toronto International Film Festival Group is described as "the people who define film in Canada" (TIFFG, *Vision*, Vision page) and perhaps this is the culmination of the TIFFG's history of "raising the profile of Canada on the world stage...and catalyzing the art and economy of film" (TIFFG, *Vision*, Intro page). The persistent perception of TIFF as *the* national film scene was exemplified during the controversy surrounding the absence of the Academy Award nominated film *Juno* (Reitman, 2007) from the Genie Award nominations, ostensibly because it does not qualify as a Canadian production. Listed alongside the nationality of the director and stars and the Vancouver shooting location, the justifications of the film's claim to Canadian-ness included its premiere at the Toronto International Film Festival (Lewis, 2008)--suggesting an interesting slippage between global and national.

While this situation offers evidence of TIFF's brand power, it is interesting to note that the TIFFG had to launch a public awareness campaign in conjunction with their plans for the Bell Lightbox development (TIFFG, 2004). Specifically, this campaign was designed to respond to research, conducted for the TIFFG by Northstar Research Partners, which found a low level of public awareness about the Group's year-round programming initiatives. Using the "positioning statement...: 'Move Yourself -- Film Festivals. Film Access. Film Education.'" and enlisting Canadian directors like David

Cronenberg, Atom Egoyan and Deepa Mehta, the Group's programs and status as a not-for-profit cultural institution were promoted by print and broadcast media as well as on billboards and transit shelters (TIFFG, 2004). A section at the end of the media release which acknowledges several media outlets suggests that the campaign received sponsorship assistance. Perhaps the next iteration of TIFFG myth-making, TIFF CEO Piers Handling described Bell Lightbox in a 2006 interview as "the next step for the organization...[that] will move us from being a 10-day film festival to the position of having a year-round impact" (Monk, 2008); thus, the re-branding that accompanies the new film centre also involves re-framing the festival's historical narrative to suggest that the event's mandate had not already been expanded. The same article positions the VIFC as "alternative cinema's only hope of finding an audience outside the festival circuit" (Monk, 2008). This formulation suggests that the 175-seat Vancity Theatre may have more in common with the microcinema model of exhibition.

Rebecca M. Alvin (2007) explains that microcinemas have claimed the role that was once the domain of the repertory cinema in seeking to assemble audiences "who wish to rekindle the magic of discovering small films on big screens amid likeminded cinephiles" (para. 7). The rise of home entertainment options along with the increasingly blurred boundaries between mainstream and independent cinema have altered the landscape of art cinema. Audiences have grown for "crossover films" while concurrent budget increases make "programming risks increasingly difficult for exhibitors across the board" (Alvin, 2007, para. 4). Alvin contextualizes the history of microcinema exhibition in relation both to Parisian film societies from the 1920s and Amos Vogel's Cinema 16 which brought experimental films to wider audiences. Although microcinema tends to refer to makeshift venues that present non-narrative films, their anti-commercial sentiment and communal spirit have since be translated to the exhibition of what might formerly have been considered art house fare. Thus, as Franey lauds the VIFC's role in "social cohesion and community building" by extending the "'festival experience'...into

an all-year activity” (as cited in Monk, 2008), the microcinema model appears also to apply. The VIFC’s programming mission statement concludes with the observation that “the world needs more non-theatrical microcinemas!” (GVIFFS, “Mission”), citing them as a “sustainable” alternative to the high costs associated with theatrical exhibition.

In *Sure Seaters*, Barbara Wilinsky (2001) discusses the emergence of the art house cinema using the symbolic economy framework. While this approach provides insight into the construction of a hierarchy of exhibition contexts, there’s a certain awkwardness to the notion of “disavowing’ economic interests” in order to “gain a foothold” in the film industry (Bourdieu, 1993, as cited in Wilinsky, 2001, p. 34), particularly given the complexities of Hollywood involvement with this niche market; in addition, as Wilinsky points out, the art house exhibitor is “not attempt[ing] to alter the basic principle of the U.S. film industry...[namely] commercial capitalism” but rather “to support the discursive separation between commercial entertainment and art” (p. 34). The international film festival offers an interesting variation on the art house model. A financial structure that relies on government and sponsor support enables the operation of a consecrated exhibition circuit focussed on the pursuit of symbolic profit. While box office receipts accrue to the festival, films are instead assessed in terms of popular and critical response; indeed, the complex passholder structure of most festivals means that attendance at screenings is measured in terms of house capacity rather than ticket sales. Distributors who are wary of sacrificing financial returns in a regional market may charge for film rental but these fees tend to decrease or to disappear at the most prestigious market festivals. There is an interesting balance here between aesthetic priorities, which could be associated with the autonomy of art cinema from commercial interests, and the ability to convert symbolic capital by crossing over to theatrical or ancillary markets. Indeed, successful crossover serves to legitimate the festival’s role as symbolic banker, capable of highlighting texts that possess high degrees of artistic merit and commercial potential. Yet, as Bell Lightbox and the VIFC enter the art house markets, the festivals’

relationships to stakeholders stand to be altered.

Building a Film Scene

The pursuit of permanent facilities, in and of itself, should not be seen as a late stage in the maturation of the international film festival. In fact, Beauchamp and Béhar explain that it was the pledge “to build a permanent film palace for the festival” that led to the city of Cannes being selected over Biarritz (1992, p. 44). Although the Palais des Festivals was not fully completed in time for the festival’s post-war re-launch in 1946, the venue did open the following year and the tradition of climbing its red-carpeted steps began two years later in 1949⁹ (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, pp. 130-131). After attendance rose “from 600 the first year to 10,000 in 1970,” the Palais was expanded; and, when attendance doubled again a decade later, a new \$60 million Palais was built overlooking the harbour (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, p. 131). The process of building a film centre touches upon several key aspects of political economy and festival governance, as exemplified by the Berlinale’s move to Potsdamer Platz in 2000 for their 50th anniversary. Jacobsen (2000) chronicles the details surrounding the decision, noting that it was ultimately private sector partners that stepped in when the city and federal governments “had neither the money nor the will to invest in the building of a real Festival center” (p. 536); the comparison to Cannes and Venice, both of which had “their own palace and generous public funding,” informs his lingering assessment that it was the governments’ “duty” to support a building project that had been the dream (in varying incarnations) of successive Berlinale directors since the 1960s (p. 536).

It was in the 1990s though when it became particularly evident that the Berlinale “was handicapped in its location...[because] it had not succeeded in establishing its own independent Festival center” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 442). Jacobsen explains that, in 1994, the Film Market’s location was jeopardy due to operational changes at the Kunsthalle that

⁹ The festival was not held in 1948. Beauchamp and Béhar mention that a storm blew the roof off of the Palais on the closing day of the 1947 festival (1992, p. 131).

would precipitate higher rental costs; budgetary limitations also necessitated short-term seasonal rentals rather than the more stable option of an annual lease (p. 442). As such, it was becoming increasingly difficult for the Market to remain competitive with rival international events despite robust sales activity of “between 30 and 40 million dollars” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 442). One possible solution involved the planned refurbishment of the festival’s historic centre at the Zoo Palast (including the construction of new facilities) which had been approved in a 1992 Senate resolution but subsequently encountered repeated funding delays (Jacobsen, 2000, pp. 442, 476). This solution was further hampered by “friendly pressure” from investors in the new developments at Potsdamer Platz who “were looking for additional cultural and international flair for their architectural centers” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 476). Both Sony and Daimler-Benz had large construction projects at what would become “the heart of reborn Berlin” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 535). Thus, private interests would assist with much-needed cultural infrastructure in exchange for the symbolic capital that the venerated Berlinale would bring to the site – ultimately resulting in the re-branding of both the city centre and the festival.¹⁰

However, over the course of the late 1990s, the path to completion was marred by deficiencies in the proposal from Daimler-Benz Interservices (debis) that ranged from spatial provisions for the film depot and seating capacity for the Panorama and the Forum sections to technical standards for Competition venues (Jacobsen, 2000, pp. 489-490). Jacobsen mentions pressure from FIAPF and the MPAA to ensure that re-location would “involve improvements for the Festival, if the Berlinale did not want to jeopardize its ‘A-status’” (2000, p. 489). At the same time though, refusing the proposal to re-locate would have presented problems for the Berlinale’s future due to the pending expiry in 2010 of the Zoo Palast’s lease as well as the venue’s aging technology (Jacobsen, 2000,

¹⁰ Jacobsen explains that the Berlinale set about “redefining our corporate identity...[including] plans on how to mark the presence of the Festival at its new locations.” Part of examining the event’s new organization involved rationalizing the geographical layout of facilities in order “to make the Festival-goer feel at home right from the beginning.” (2000, p. 537)

p. 490). The political stakes of deal were high for the Berlinale and its competing program constituencies, the city of Berlin and Berlin Festivals Ltd., the organization which oversees the festival's contract. In 1999, the year before the move to Potsdamer Platz, Festivals Ltd. director Ulrich Eckhardt described "a 'historic turning point' for the Berlinale" and the need for the Festival "to communicate its international appeal more vividly" (as cited in Jacobsen, 2000, p. 522). Similar to the synergy of film-related experiences planned for Bell Lightbox, Berlin's new festival centre brought together a cinemathèque, museum and the German Film and Television Academy (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 522). This convergence of programming initiatives in a revitalized city centre, when considered alongside a critic's parting assessment of the old Berlinale as "'a bit out of fashion'" (as cited in Jacobsen, 2000, p. 523), points to the significance of festivals as an instrument of urban renewal.

Similarly, other festivals have established strong connections to urban locations that become official sites for the festival experience. In addition to screenings in Kitsilano at The Ridge, VIFF has long been associated with the downtown Granville Street corridor. Starting with Hannah Fisher's efforts "to set up a Festival Village using several theatres on Granville Mall" (Allison, 1986), venues have included repertory houses like the Caprice, Paradise and Vogue as well as multiplexes like Vancouver Centre, the Capitol 6 and Granville 7. The closing of the majority of these downtown theatres over the course of the 1990s (with some, like the Caprice, re-opening as nightclubs) has been cited as the impetus for the construction of the Vancouver International Film Centre (VIFC) (Monk, 2001). Katherine Monk (2001) elaborates that the planned development carried "hopes of revitalizing the south downtown core and bringing the fragmented local film scene together under one roof." Meanwhile, TIFF already had its own Festival Village in the mid-1980s, which may have served as a contemporaneous inspiration for Fisher's vision. Blaine Allan (1988) recalls the annual transformation of Yorkville Village via the temporary reassignment of the tourist street

signs, the hanging of lamppost banners and the presentation of film-themed window displays (pp. 813-814). Describing the Festival of Festivals as “an event that plays itself out on surfaces” (p. 813), Allan explains that retail store displays featuring “tangles of 35 millimetre film scattered around stylishly dressed mannequins” (p. 814) lacked specific referents just as the lettering “Genevieve Bujold” on one window was essentially “an empty invocation of a celebrity name” (p. 814). He links it all to brand marketing, noting that Labatt’s sponsorship of the audience award uses films “to sell beer,” and ultimately argues that “the Festival sells the city” (Allan, 1988, p. 814).

Toronto’s Festival Centre, dubbed Bell Lightbox in recognition of its founding corporate sponsor, will be located in the entertainment district at the corner of King and John Streets and is slated to be open in time for the September 2010 festival (TIFFG, *Frequently asked questions*). This new headquarters shifts TIFF away from Yorkville, an area of the city that combines its history as a “bohemian cultural centre” with the arrival of upscale retail and trendy eateries that accompanied its gentrification (“Yorkville, Toronto”).¹¹ The 2003 announcement of the design concept for Bell Lightbox stresses the synergy between the festival, its host city and the site of the new headquarters. A description of the surrounding area as “the heart of downtown Toronto’s buzzing entertainment district” recurs in the Overview release as does an emphasis on both cultural diversity and a social space for cinephilic exchange (TIFFG, 2003, *Design concept*). These links are elaborated further in the “Architects’ Statement” which defines the Festival Centre as “a microcosm of Toronto as a creative, multi-cultural city.” Architectural firm Kuwabara Payne McKenna Blumberg (KPMB) presents a design concept that “creates a multitude of meeting places for cinephiles,” including an outdoor

¹¹ Although the Wikipedia page suggests that TIFF’s celebrity attendees have already relocated to the trendy clubs in the entertainment district, a fall 2007 TIFF profile in *O: The Oprah Magazine* suggests that Yorkville’s significance is not likely to abate. The one-page overview, entitled “The Place to be: Toronto. Festival Pass,” focuses largely on shopping, dining and accommodations in Yorkville (Rothbaum, p. 66). In addition, with the Intercontinental Hotel located in the area, it is more likely that the Festival’s footprint in downtown Toronto will merely expand.

café and canopied entranceway that contributes to an arcade as “a generous zone for pedestrian movement;” atop the canopy, a wrap-around balcony provides a vantage point on the bustling activity below on King Street (TIFFG, 2003, *Architects’ statement*).

Similarly, the design of the Vancouver International Film Centre incorporates a “dramatic three-storey, fully wired glass atrium lobby area (which functions as a multipurpose gallery, second screen and exhibition space)” (Gill, 2005). For both the Toronto and Vancouver facilities, visibility comprises a central dynamic of the design with the result that these spaces allow for interaction as well as display.

In their Architects’ Statement, KPMB relates their design concept to cinema’s fundamental technological properties of “light, movement and shadow,” particularly in relation to the “human figure” (TIFFG, 2003, *Architects’ statement*). Within the atrium, the movement of cinephiles between storeys and venues “creates opportunities in which the body can be seen in silhouette against translucent surfaces [while balconies allow film-goers to be figuratively part of the King Street façade” (TIFFG, 2003, *Architects’ statement*). Architectural references also can be found in images associated with the 25th VIFF; with the opening of the Vancouver International Film Centre just prior to the 24th festival in 2005, the silver anniversary marked the venue’s first full year of operation. Reminiscent of the VIFC’s open-concept atrium, the cover photograph of the souvenir program guide (which also serves as the poster image each year) depicts a lone figure descending a staircase as seen through canted squares of bevelled glass, the frames of which fragment the view of her legs and feet (VIFF, 2006). The guide’s introductory pages feature multiple shots of the Film Centre’s distinctive multi-storey glassed atrium (VIFF, 2006, pp. 5, 11, 23) along with the interior view from the staircase overlooking the spacious setting for the new “Industry Hours,” a series of nightly cocktail receptions (p. 25). As this high angle perspective shows, the networking of Industry Hour attendees will position them both as active participants and as part of the Centre’s dynamic figurative display.

The inherent theatricality of these Film Centre spaces evokes Alan Blum's characterization of a scene as a site that provides "an occasion for seeing" such that "[s]eeing and being seen is done at the scene" (2001, p. 14). Janine Marchessault further argues that "[s]cenes give citizens a sense of agency both as spectators and as 'players'" (2001, p. 68). Through their attendance at festival screenings and events, spectators deploy a range of competences that mark them as fans, aficionados or cosmopolitans and, in doing so, participate in shaping the cultural value of the film commodity. Their knowledge of global cinema culture and acknowledgment of the relative value of its symbolic currency supports the transformation of festival space into a local film scene. In her article "Film Scenes: Paris, New York, Toronto," Marchessault (2001) explores a variety of scenic forms from Gustave Flaubert's Paris (as inflected by his visit to Cairo) to Andy Warhol's New York to Toronto's art and film scenes, noting how each implicates the city. The experience of the city as a material setting for cultural exchange, artistic practice and everyday life, transforms urban space into a unique local place. Consequently, even though cities "like people, have identities [that are] shifting, relational and historical," their scenes also reveal the unifying threads that combine to form a "rhapsodic history of 'the city'" (Marchessault, 2001, p. 73). Citing Siegfried Kracauer's *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality* (1970), Marchessault describes cinema as "the art of the city...[in that] it reproduces the *flâneur's* 'susceptibility to the transient real-life phenomena'" wherein "the 'flux' of the setting" possesses "the opportunity of drama" (p. 59).

Breaking Ground: Real Estate and Cultural Infrastructure

With links to real estate and the revitalization of the downtown core, VIFC and Bell Lightbox provide models for the development of permanent festival facilities that are integrated within an active urban landscape. These similarities are also evident in each project's architectural vision and desired contribution to the city's cultural infrastructure.

However, a comparison of the planned facilities reveals pronounced differences in scale and scope that mark the TIFFG's aspirations as global and VIFF's as local. The groundbreaking ceremonies demonstrate the divergent paths these projects took. On April 23, 2007, the TIFFG co-presented an official groundbreaking ceremony with the King and John Festival Corporation at the Fairmont Royal York Hotel in Toronto. Speakers included TIFFG Director and CEO Piers Handling, President and CEO of Bell Canada Enterprises Michael Sabia, Heritage Minister Bev Oda, Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty, and filmmakers Atom Egoyan and Deepa Mehta, both members of the TIFFG's Artists' Committee (TIFFG, 2007, April 24).¹² Thus, the ceremony recognized key corporate and government funding partners as well as internationally renowned Canadian filmmakers. Hosts filmmaker/actor Don McKellar and CBC radio personality Sook-Yin Lee, both with ties to Canadian cinema, radio and television, enhanced the sense that the event was more of a ceremony than a media conference. The official groundbreaking was followed in August by the announcement of the Bell Lightbox name and logo (TIFFG, 2007, August 27) and then in September by the design presentation. This final event combined a presentation by lead architect Bruce Kuwabara with a screening of Chris Marker's photo-montage *La Jetée* (1964) as a means of highlighting the connection between narrative innovation and "designing a space that celebrates the wonder of the moving image" (TIFFG, 2007, August 27).

Kuwabara has been the design partner for several "Cultural Renaissance" projects in Toronto, including the Gardiner Museum and the National Ballet School (a joint venture with Goldsmith, Borgal & Company Ltd. Architects), which was awarded a Governor General's Gold Medal for Architecture (KPMB's 10th) (KPMB, "Bruce Kuwabara"). Toronto's "Cultural Renaissance" was precipitated by the May 2002 announcement of \$233 million in federal and provincial capital investments pledged to

¹² Additional speakers were TIFFG Chair Allen Karp, TIFFG Vice Chair/Chair Elect Paul Atkinson, Design Architect Bruce Kuwabara, Senior Vice-President of The Daniels Corporation Tom Dutton and Ivan Reitman.

the infrastructure projects of seven major cultural institutions.¹³ A year later, the planned Toronto Film Festival Centre joined the list and these projects were lauded as “icons of urban regeneration through culture” in the new municipal *Culture Plan for the Creative City* (Culture Division, 2003, p. 5). Meric S. Gertler (2004) explains that “creative cities have become the key locus for the creation of economic value by supporting innovation, resilience and quality enhancement” (p. 1). The adjective “creative” refers both to qualities of an urban environment that nurture innovative workers and to growing involvement in the creative industries. Hans Mommaas (2004) further notes the connection between “global/local cultural industries” and the ability of a creative city to “adjust itself permanently to changing conditions in the global economy” (pp. 520-521). The attendance of corporate partners, government officials and cultural producers at the Bell Lightbox groundbreaking ceremony highlights the economic synergies of Toronto’s creative city strategy. Urban renewal also factors in as Gertler notes a 1996 municipal regulatory change that contributed to the revitalization of “two older industrial precincts in the inner city known as ‘the Kings’ (the King-Spadina and King-Parliament neighbourhoods)” that would become the Entertainment District (2004, p. 9). Gertler attributes the success of this local policy initiative to an approach to zoning that focused on “the character of built form” (ie: height, density, setback) rather than “types of uses permitted” (p. 9); the underlying premise was that a less restrictive (or prescriptive) regulatory framework would allow for a broader mix of residential and commercial uses.

Mommaas considers cultural clustering, or mixed zones of cultural activity, as representative of “a more fine-tuned policy, also aimed at creating spaces, quarters and milieus for cultural production and creativity” (2004, p. 508). He questions whether this framework for urban development supplants a “proper” arts strategy with the “exploit[ation of] culture for the sake of a recentralized ‘landscape of consumption,’

¹³ The recipients include the Canadian Opera Company, the National Ballet School, the Royal Ontario Museum, the Art Gallery of Ontario, Roy Thompson Hall, the Royal Conservatory of Music and the Gardiner Museum of Ceramic Art (Culture Division, 2003, pp. 11-12).

catering for new middle-class consumers” or whether it demonstrates a “new, more complex interaction between culture and the economy” (Mommaas, 2004, pp. 508-509). The key issue here involves the notion of a fundamental antagonism between artistic autonomy and market forces—and Mommaas does wonder about the fate of “l’exception culturelle.” As I concluded in Chapter One, although the perception of cinephilic autonomy is fundamental to the production of value that occurs on the festival circuit, this shared belief (*illusio*) belies the governmental and industrial interests that structure festival space; in Chapter Two, I examined the implication of culture, commerce and cosmopolitanism in struggles over hierarchies of cinematic value. The development of a festival scene exemplifies cultural clustering strategies in its positioning within a landscape of consumption as well as in the creation of an “autonomous” intermediary space for the production of cultural value. As such, vexing questions about the symbolic value of English-Canadian cinema culture can be targeted by policy initiatives in these mixed spaces of cultural production and consumption.

The creative city model draws its resonance from narratives of renewal in which inner-city industrial zones are transformed into post-industrial spaces. Gertler charts the conventional arc of derelict warehouse districts serving as affordable live/work neighbourhoods for creative producers, gaining a bohemian cachet and subsequently attracting up-market retailers and developers (2004, pp. 5-6). Even though the economic and cultural revitalization of “the Kings” has already resulted in a gentrified Entertainment District, branded with the trademarked slogan “A Great Night Out” (www.thedistrict.ca), the Bell Lightbox development is still contextualized in relation to themes of renewal and a (literal) return to one’s roots. According to the historical background provided at the groundbreaking ceremony, the capital campaign to fund Bell Lightbox was launched once the TIFFG had joined forces with the King and John Festival Corporation (KJFC) as the project’s co-developers (TIFFG, 2007, April 24). KJFC comprises a joint venture between the Reitman family and The Daniels

Corporation. “Celebrated Hollywood-based filmmaker” Ivan Reitman and his sisters, Agi Mandel and Susan Michaels, contributed land at the corner of King and John streets that used to be the location of their parents’ family business, Farb’s Car Wash (KJFC, “Co-creators”).¹⁴ The TIFFFG backgrounder on the Reitman elders reads like the premise for a generic “immigrant-made-good” film: Touched by the Holocaust and later the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia, Clara and Leslie Reitman fled to Canada on a coal barge with their young son Ivan; through perseverance and entrepreneurial pluck the couple rose from factory work to real estate, eventually acquiring the car wash business in 1969 (TIFFFG, 2003, *The Reitman family*). While much of this history will be chronicled on a lobby plaque, their role at King and John will be commemorated cinematically in a short film, produced by the TIFFFG and directed by Ivan Reitman, viewable by visitors online and on screens at Bell Lightbox (TIFFFG, 2008, January 11).

According to the Festival Tower website, John Daniels never met Leslie Reitman but he “shared his vision” for shaping Toronto’s urban landscape (KJFC, “Co-creators”). From his role as a senior executive at Cadillac Fairview to his current position as the Chairman of The Daniels Corporation, his involvement in real estate development includes both “commercial mega-projects” like the Eaton Centre and the Toronto Dominion Centre, planned communities like Mississauga’s Erin Mills and high rise condominiums like NY Towers (TIFFFG, 2003, *The Daniels Corporation*).¹⁵ In addition,

¹⁴ References to Ivan Reitman’s connections to Hollywood evoke the interesting history of a producer/director whose career path began in Canada with genre films (*Cannibal Girls*, 1973; *Meatballs*, 1979) made during the tax shelter boom and continued south of the border (*Ghostbusters*, 1984; *Kindergarten Cop*, 1990). Jennifer Vanderburgh (2003) examines the perception of *Ghostbusters* as a Hollywood film at the time of its release even though it satisfied the minimum requirements of the Canadian content point system (which awards points based on whether key creative roles are filled by Canadians). Although the film would have been disqualified by industrial provisions that required financial return to the Canadian film industry, she notes that the film was not seen as “a hybrid in the popular press” (p. 84). Vanderburgh’s article coincides with Peter Urquhart’s (2003) examination of the extent to which a cultural nationalist bias in Canadian film criticism functioned to render popular films (like those of the tax shelter era) invisible within the canon. As such, in a serendipitous coincidence, Ivan Reitman became a significant contributor to the TIFFFG’s cultural initiatives just as Canadian film scholars were revisiting the cultural significance of 1970s industrial initiatives.

¹⁵ “At the height of its construction,” NY Towers, located at Bayview and Sheppard, was “the largest residential construction site in Canada.”

Daniels had an impact on the development of Toronto's festival scene. While at Cadillac Fairview in 1975, John Daniels and his colleague Ephraim Diamond contributed \$25,000 in seed money to Bill Marshall, Dusty Cohl and Henk Van der Kolk for the launch of the Festival of Festivals (TIFFG, 2003, *The Daniels Corporation*). Over 25 years later, The Daniels Corporation teamed up with the Reitman siblings in response to the TIFFG's call for proposals with the idea for a residential condominium tower perched atop the festival's new home. As co-developers of the Festival Centre, KJFC sold the land to TIFFG for "well below market value" and also donated "construction management fees" for the building of Bell Lightbox (TIFFG, *Frequently asked questions*). Thus, the TIFFG will not be considered a tenant. Instead, under "a reciprocal operating agreement" TIFFG owns the 150,000 square foot Bell Lightbox building while KJFC sells condos in the 42-storey Festival Tower above and owns and operates the parking garage and a two-level restaurant/bar (TIFFG, *Frequently asked questions*).

The value of KJFC's donation of land and management fees has been estimated at \$22 million, although the exact amount cannot be determined until construction has been completed. Recognition for this gift includes the aforementioned film and permanent plaque for the Reitmans and naming rights for the John and Myrna Daniels Lobby on the second floor; there is also a vague reference in the press release to recognition in the main floor lobby for The Daniels Corporation (TIFFG, 2008, January 11). The Bell Lightbox Web site mentions "a separate sponsorship package" for the KJFC partners which suggests that there are likely additional perks, perhaps related to the TIFFG's myriad programming initiatives (TIFFG, *Frequently asked questions*). Most importantly though, the city of Toronto allowed the TIFFG to grant naming rights for the city block where Bell Lightbox will be located such that "Reitman Square" becomes part of its permanent address. Drawing a link between the Reitman family heritage—both in terms of the parents' history and the siblings' gift of land—and Toronto's urban identity, City Councillor Adam Vaughan commented that "[t]his speaks to the heart of what our city is:

a place where people from around the world come to find a better future and in doing so, giving [sic] Toronto the gift of a better future too” (as cited in TIFFFG, 2008, January 11). The language here resonates with the conception of Bell Lightbox as “a landmark destination for the moving image” (TIFFFG, *Vision*, Intro page).

The resonance carries a step further evoking the history of the international festival as a hub for traffic in cinema, where films accumulate value at the same time as they reinforce the festival’s status as symbolic banker. While these mutually reflective notions of urban diversity and cinematic cosmopolitanism emerge as over-determined marketing tools for Bell Lightbox (itself an over-determined reference to the process of illuminating images), there also appears to be an extension of the festival’s illusion to the spaces it inhabits; in other words, for stakeholders invested in the production of cultural value and sharing a belief in the festival’s intermediary role, the ephemeral space of festival transactions becomes a locus of struggle. Thus, the process of defining the festival centre as a permanent facility involves the articulation of stakeholder positions relative to struggles over cultural value. This is further exemplified in the vision for Festival Tower which applies the model of the festival attendee to prospective homeowners. Dubbed “Toronto’s hippest address,” Festival Tower combines luxury condominium living (including the Tower Club’s spa and fitness amenities, lounge and private screening room) with exclusive member benefits at Bell Lightbox (KJFC, 2003, *Festival Tower*). The juxtaposition of leisure amenities with fashionable condo living and the festival context invokes a class distinction reminiscent of the original connection between the aristocracy, spa resorts and film festivals—such that Festival Tower offers a 21st century urban version located in the foremost destination of the global city. Ivan Reitman’s assessment of the residences as “the perfect home away from his home in California,” lends celebrity cachet to the development while also insinuating that he could be your neighbour (KJFC, 2003, *Festival Tower*). This is an ironic twist on the creative city strategy of “carving out and protecting live-work spaces for artists” (Gertler,

2004, p. 10) since it is unlikely that a Canadian filmmaker working in indigenous feature filmmaking could afford a luxury condo. At the same time, it suggests the industrial orientation of Toronto as a global creative city or truly post-national creative milieu.

Described as a “completely unique connection to Bell Lightbox,” perks for condo owners at Festival Tower include VIP access to the launch events, a three year membership, a limited number of passes to media events and closed-circuit television access to programming feeds like press conferences (KJFC, “Your Bell Lightbox”). In addition, exclusive screenings will be programmed for residents at both Bell Lightbox and the Tower Cinema, with guests in attendance. Residents will also receive a package of tickets to TIFF screenings pre-selected by the Festival Director as well as the opportunity to purchase a “Festival Experience Pass” Director’s Edition (a passholder designation not available to the general public) (KJFC, “Your Bell Lightbox”). This combination of privileged access and free tickets is reminiscent of a sponsorship recognition package. Consequently, as Bell Lightbox creates a permanent year-round space for TIFFG programming, Festival Tower similarly enables festivalgoers to take up permanent residence directly above all of the action. According to the Festival Tower Web site, design elements of the building’s entrance such as lighting from the second floor restaurant canopy and a colonnade along King Street will “amplif[y] the sense that coming home is an ‘event’” (KJFC, “Festival Tower Entrance”). One of the “Frequently Asked Questions” on the Bell Lightbox Web site inquires about comparable film centres and lists the response that “Bell Lightbox is a unique destination and unlike any other film centre in the world” (TIFFG, *Frequently asked questions*). Although this may be an accurate assessment of the scale of the construction project and scope of planned programming initiatives, the development of a festival centre in conjunction with residential real estate is not unique to Toronto.

The Vancouver International Film Centre offers a different financial and urban policy model of the pooling of public and private resources to build cultural facilities in

the downtown core. In contrast to the hybrid business/philanthropic co-venture between TIFFG and KJFC that lead to Bell Lightbox and Festival Tower, Vancouver's permanent festival centre emerged from municipal cultural policy with the relationship between the Greater Vancouver Film Festival Society and real estate developer Amacon-Onni, mediated by the city's Office of Cultural Affairs. As part of their Official Development Plan, the City of Vancouver "permits developers to increase their on-site density in new construction in exchange for providing a public amenity of a social, recreational or cultural nature" (Harvey, 2001, p. 3). Under the Amenity Bonusing Program, the increase in allowable floor space ratio is equivalent to the value of the completed amenity space plus the prepayment of its operating costs for 20 years (Harvey, 2001, p. 3). In use since 1975, this program is responsible for securing facilities for Pacific Cinecentre,¹⁶ the Alliance for Arts & Culture and the Contemporary Art Gallery (Harvey, 2001, p. 6). As explained in the Administrative Report on the Amenity Bonus Proposal for 1133 Seymour Street (VIFC's eventual street address would be 1181 Seymour), bonusing provides a mechanism to achieve cultural policy objectives "in the downtown where real estate costs are prohibitive for both the non-profit sector and the City" (Harvey, 2001, p. 6). Specifically, the costs for a "stand alone film centre downtown" were estimated at \$3.5 million, not including the land (Harvey, 2001, p. 6).

Real estate developers Amacon and the Onni Group applied to the city as Amacon-Onni Management Inc.¹⁷ for a density bonus to construct the Brava condominium towers and VIFC. While both companies have been quite active in Vancouver's residential real estate market, Amacon is currently pre-selling units in a

¹⁶ Operated by the Pacific Cinematheque and Cineworks, the Pacific Cinecentre was "originally intended as a bonused facility but on completion, the developer went bankrupt and the City acquired the Cinecentre strata lot." (Harvey, 1998, p. 3). This information is included in an Administrative Report to the Standing Committee on City Services & Budgets that examines the cost of upgrades to city-owned facilities. The Report expresses concern that the financially troubled developer may not have completed the Pacific Cinecentre to code.

¹⁷ The applicant is cited as Amacon-Onni Management Inc. in the city's 2001 Administrative Report (Harvey) but named in media coverage (eg: Edwards, 2003) and on the current VIFC Web site (www.vifc.org) as Amacon-Onni.

condo complex named after former Vancouver lead planner Larry Beasley; Amacon set up a scholarship in Beasley's name for UBC planning students "in lieu of residual naming payments" (Boddy, 2008). In exchange for the 13,700 sq. ft. film centre and prepaid operating allowance, Amacon-Onni received a bonus floor space ratio of 8.76:1 (up from the permitted 5.0 FSR) or 120,000 sq. ft. which allowed them to build a second condo tower on the site at the corner of Seymour and Davie streets (Harvey, 2001, p. 4).¹⁸ The bonused amenity space is leased to the city "until demolition of the development" for the "nominal rent of \$1 per annum" (Harvey, 2001, Appendix D). The city subsequently subleases the space, with the stipulation that it be operated as a non-profit film centre, to the Vancouver International Film Festival, also for the "nominal rent of \$1 per annum" and for an initial term of 20 years (Harvey, 2001, Appendix D).¹⁹ The sublease requires VIFF to contribute to an endowment held in trust by the City from which the interest will be used to cover operating costs after the end of the initial 20 year term (thus taking over from Amacon-Onni's endowment). This sublease-endowment operational framework evokes Mommaas' observation of changing financial regimes characterized by a movement "beyond conventional subsidy-based coalitions, towards hybrid public-private models, based on a mixture of resources and management relations" (2004, p. 515). Although these hybrid models carry the potential to general sustainable cultural clusters, there are also challenges to managing mixed funding sources for a public amenity space.

In an interview for *The Vancouver Sun*, Alan Franey noted that payments into this endowment amount to \$100,000 per year, basically replacing the \$80,000 that the Festival paid annually to rent its previous office space on Homer Street (Andrews, 2005). An article written by Tom Charity (2005) just prior to the 24th VIFF hints at the myriad

¹⁸ The initial proposal was valued at 151,000 sq. ft. which exceeded what the site could accommodate. As a result, adjustments had to be made, including an agreement by VIFF to assume the costs of the cinema's projection equipment and screen.

¹⁹ Technically the sub-tenant is the Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society (GVIFFS), which operates the VIFF. However, the city's Administrative Report does not make this distinction, referring instead to the VIFF. This may be due to the fact that VIFF lacks the complex corporate structure of the TIFFG such that GVIFFS and VIFF basically comprise the same referent.

challenges of completing a film centre “designed from scratch, pitched to corporate sponsors, overseen by city bureaucrats and ultimately justified to the tax-payers.” He proceeds to mention construction delays that pushed occupancy of the offices to late July with access to the theatre not permitted until the end of August, less than a month before the start of the festival. Although Tom Charity appears to insinuate that the Amenity Bonus Program has contributed to VIFF’s enslavement to several different masters, he does not probe this notion in depth as the focus of his article is the city’s “moratorium on corporate sponsorship of public buildings—specifically, permanent exterior signage” (Charity, 2005). For the VIFC, the issue at hand was their inability to fulfill a sponsorship agreement with Vancity because recognition of naming-rights would violate a sign bylaw restricting third-party advertising (Andrews, 2005). Two years earlier, the announcement of Vancity’s sponsorship of the VIFC’s theatre did not disclose the value of the deal (Dinoff, 2003) but, in the midst of the signage controversy, Charity (2005) cites \$800,000 while Andrews offers the less precise “almost \$1 million.” The potential risk to arts sponsorship was expressed in a comment from Helen Redfern, executive director of the Alliance for Arts & Culture who explained that “[w]ith corporate funding, the lead gift is often a naming gift, and that is a significant piece [in project funding]” (as cited in Andrews, 2005).

The moratorium on proposals related to the naming of buildings owned or leased by the City, and extending to appeals about signage, coincided with the Council’s “development of a comprehensive naming policy” (Medland, 2006, p. 3). The resulting policy report on “Naming Rights and Commemorative Naming Policies, Civic Community Facilities” (Medland, 2006) notes that the Vancouver International Film Festival Society did not report a request for naming (which was a requirement under 2004 policy); instead the Society “concluded a contract directly and have erected signage on the new civic amenity facility which honour the commitments they made to their donor but which are contrary to the [new] draft policy” (p. 10). Nevertheless, the report

proposes withholding enforcement against the exterior signage at Vancity Theatre and the Westcoast Energy Hall at the Orpheum Theatre; in both instances, the naming of the rooms is deemed consistent with the new policy guidelines (pp. 10-11). During the consultation process, the committee encountered “a very strong sentiment to protect public space and keep it free from private interests” with the impact that their recommendations place several limitations on corporate naming including the stipulations of “no logo presence and [being] limited mostly to interior spaces” (Medland, 2006, p. 4).

While these new guidelines could hamper the type of public-private funding partnerships required to sustain bonus amenities like the VIFC, they are not the only wrinkle caused by Vancouver’s reliance on the density mechanism. Trevor Boddy (2008) argues that the exchange of increased density for arts facilities “do[es] not create low-cost housing or work spaces for individual artists.” Although the Amenity Bonus Program enables certain non-profit organizations to secure locations in the prohibitively expensive downtown core, the trade-off fuels Vancouver’s condo development boom. Boddy (2008) notes the irony of galleries and artists “cleared off their Homer Street locale” for “The Beasley” and cites a similar forced exodus from a development site at Main and Prior. This irony gains a sharper focus in relation to Boddy’s earlier examination of the 1991 Downtown Plan and Larry Beasley’s “‘Living First’ strategy” which favoured residential re-zoning with the impact that Vancouver has let “the rhetoric of real estate supplant the craft and consciousness of city building” (2006, p. 22). Of particular interest here is Boddy’s assessment of “the relatively easy reception higher-density housing was receiving...as long as it was accompanied by significant public benefits” (2006, p. 21). Thus, analysis of Vancouver’s film centre is implicated in debates about urban planning and cultural policy, especially as they pertain to public/private/non-profit co-ventures and the designation and uses of public space.

This contrasts the marketing rhetoric of inclusiveness and attraction that surrounds Bell Lightbox. In other words, even though both projects combine cultural

(re)vitalization of the downtown core with gentrification, their strategic positioning is strongly inflected by their divergent development models. Seemingly untroubled by the transgression of boundaries between public and private capital and the cultural spaces they co-fund, Bell Lightbox's identity is actually enhanced by the exclusive member benefits offered to residents of Festival Tower. Much like the festival world depicted by Atom Egoyan in *The Line*, the pervasive atmosphere of excitement experienced at a star-studded film scene is not interrupted by any indication of potential barriers to access. Conversely, as a subtenant of the City of Vancouver (and not an owner of their facilities like the TIFFG), the Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society remains tied to a locally defined public service remit. The terms of the sublease stipulate that the film centre be operated "for the benefit of the citizens of Vancouver and the Vancouver professional film making community...to the satisfaction of the City" (Harvey, 2001, Appendix D); the venue also must be made available for third party use by local non-profit cultural organizations "at rates to be approved by the City." These requirements anchor the VIFC and its programming initiatives in a local vision while also indicating that the Society is accountable to the Office of Cultural Affairs.

Furthermore, unlike the TIFFG, the GVIFFS does not act as an umbrella organization for other local non-profit groups like the Pacific Cinematheque and the First Weekend Club. As result, VIFC programming and public events are characterized by an ad hoc collaborative approach rather than the overarching integrated strategy which can be achieved by the TIFFG. This raises issues such as how to manage potential overlap in the mandates of the Cinematheque and the VIFC as well as how to approach collaborative programming without diminishing either of these geographically proximate screening locations. As such, a less integrated model reduces the VIFC's distinctive brand profile as a film centre (given the presence of other local venues doing similar things) while also pointing to questions about the reliability of revenue streams. For example, the First Weekend Club's Canada Screens series (a nationally-focussed version

of TIFFG's Reel Talk) re-located from the VIFC to Cinema 319 for its 2008 season (First Weekend Club, "Introducing"). Thus, a collaborative approach could give way to competition between small organizations struggling for a foothold in the publically-funded cultural arena. All of these elements conspire to keep the VIFC's aspirations relatively modest as opportunities for growth might be limited by more than the size of their bonused amenity space. That said, the recognition of VIFC's planned film scene as much more intimate in scale than Bell Lightbox's "landmark destination" is reflected in a land use assessment that "the screening room, with a capacity of 170 seats is unlikely to attract high impact crowds" (Harvey, 2001, p. 4).

This local focus is expressed in the GVIFFS's stated vision for the Vancity Theatre and VIFC as "an exciting new centre of excellence for Vancouver's film lovers, both for filmmakers and cinephiles;" the statement proceeds to note that the facility "marries the art of film with emerging new technologies" thereby enabling the Society "to broaden its public, cultural and educational mandate" (GVIFFS, "About"). The three-storey podium building includes permanent offices for the VIFF and three main facilities—the theatre, atrium and production office—which are available for rent. With a capacity of 175, the Vancity Theatre accommodates multiple screening formats and its front of house design, which includes a stage and ample space for podium setup, makes it a "flexible, multi-use" venue (GVIFFS, "Facilities"). A separate page listing the technical specifications of the theatre's projection and sound equipment reinforces the VIFC's commitment to state-of-the-art moving image technologies. The entrance lobby area expands into a three-storey glass atrium which incorporates gallery space, a projection wall along with lounge and/or café seating. Finally, there is a 650 square foot office or meeting space on the second floor, adjacent to the theatre balcony. Facility rental options include discounted rates for "registered non-profit groups and charities as well as independently financed filmmakers" in order to satisfy the VIFC's civic mandate (GVIFFS, "Rental – Rates and Policies").

In contrast to the VIFC's modest 13,700 square feet, Bell Lightbox's five-storey podium building of 150,000 square feet will house five cinemas (with a total capacity of over 1,300 seats), two galleries, three learning studios, a reference library, archive and retail store. Described as "a technological showcase...a museum, an exhibit hall [and] a place to learn," Bell Lightbox arguably combines a complete range of cinephilic possibilities "all under one roof" (TIFFG, *Vision*, Vision page). The Web site augments this functional view with a series of metaphors, perhaps as riffs on the role of light boxes in rendering images visible or as an initial stab at myth-making. "A temple to the moving image" recalls the use of ecclesiastical analogies to refer to the public ritual of cinema-going (Andrew, 2002) while the notion of "a welcoming vessel for the cinematic soul of our nation" takes the spiritual dimension of TIFFG's latest Promethean venture a step further (TIFFG, *Vision*, Vision page). As the Bell Lightbox Web site fuels anticipation for the upcoming launch in 2010, four of the five "Vision" pages (excluding the Intro) also prompt participation by providing a link to the contact information for inquiries about philanthropic gifts or sponsorship opportunities; while the Intro page concludes with the phrase "Just imagine Bell Lightbox," the subsequent pages shift from thought to action with the final words "To make a gift that lasts forever, please click here" (TIFFG, *Vision*).

The Funding page similarly encourages individuals to "give a lasting legacy" (TIFFG, *Funding*). The language of this page, with its "invitation to participate" and use of the personal pronoun "you," suggests an appeal to the average festival-goer visiting the Web site—especially since the Bell Lightbox Major Gift Committee presumably is already in the process of soliciting corporate donations (TIFFG, *Funding*).²⁰ Consequently, this

²⁰ The 42-member Major Gifts Committee includes CEOs from media and entertainment (Jay Switzer, CHUM Limited; Paul Godfrey, The Toronto Blue Jays) and high-ranking members of the legal, business and financial communities (Michael Badham, partner at Deloitte & Touche LLP; Greg Steers, Vice President, National Bank Financial; Gary D. Reamey, Principal, Canada, Edward Jones). Ex-Officio members include Galen G. Weston, Executive Chairman of Loblaw Cos. Ltd. while the Honorary Committee Chair is Robert Lantos. (TIFFG, "Bell Lightbox Major Gift Committee")

call for “entrepreneurial and philanthropic passion” addresses the citizen as a private donor rather than as a taxpayer whose contribution has already been tallied as part of the project’s public sector revenue. In contrast to the framing of the VIFC’s vision statement in relation to its status as a public cultural amenity, the benefits of Bell Lightbox are consistently articulated in terms of economic impact. References to cinema as an art form with broad cross-cultural appeal merely support the definition of Bell Lightbox as a “global landmark” that will serve as an international tourist destination, resulting in an economic impact of over \$200 million for the city of Toronto (TIFFG, *Vision*, Impact page; TIFFG, *Funding*). A note about demand which mentions that “Canadian movie attendance has more than doubled in the last decade (now 114 million)”²¹ also sidesteps engagement with the Festival’s rich cultural heritage, opting instead for numerical evidence, consistent with TIFF’s founding vision which was rooted in an industrial conception of international cinema. Furthermore, with almost two-thirds of the capital campaign’s planned revenue coming from the private sector, the predominance of economic measures seems almost justified.

By January 2008, the TIFFG had raised \$137 million or two-thirds of the campaign total of \$196 million (TIFFG, 2008, January 11). This \$196 million fundraising target is divided into \$129 million for project capital, \$23 million for endowment and \$44 million for operating expenses (TIFFG, *Funding*). The TIFFG endowment fund splits into the three streams of artistic development (for exhibitions, monographs and research), collections (for archives and preservation), and learning (for

²¹ Acland (2003) notes that cinema attendance data do not support arguments about the “death of cinema.” Instead, “[t]he combined U.S. and Canadian admissions for 1997 were the highest since 1966” (p. 72). However, with Canadian admissions in the early 1990s at just over 70 million (Acland: 2003, p. 74), attendance has not doubled as the Bell Lightbox citation of 114 million argues. The issue here may be a slip between attendance and box office as a 2003 *Playback* article states that “Canadian box office returns have more than doubled since 1995” (Dinoff, 2003). Also, circumstances have changed somewhat with attendance dropping by 4.6% to 118.2 million in 2003/2004, “halting an upward trend of more than a decade.” (Statistics Canada, 2005). In 2006, a modest 1.9% increase brought admissions to 102.9 million (“Movie attendance rises”). Overall, in the first decade of the 21st Century, Canadian movie attendance has not been as healthy as the Bell Lightbox Web site suggests.

courses, camps and workshops). Highlighted as “the most ambitious area of growth at TIFFFG over the next four years,” youth and adult learning initiatives recently became the focus of two new Co-Directors of Learning (TIFFFG, 2008, February 12). This restructuring streamlines several TIFFFG programs by placing the Sprockets Toronto International Film Festival for Children and Reel Talk under the supervision of co-directors Allen Braude and Elizabeth Muskala while also establishing their role in planning “key family programming and youth learning areas” for Bell Lightbox (TIFFFG, 2008, February 12). The learning studios that will host “visual literacy camps, hands-on workshops and film appreciation” are included on the list of naming opportunities that offer recognition for major donors (TIFFFG, *Funding*). Similarly, the VIFC continues to promote naming opportunities for interior spaces “available for corporate branding” and also offers seat naming (via commemorative brass plaque) as a gift option (GVIFFS, “Sponsorship”). However, unlike the Bell Lightbox campaign, the VIFC fundraising appears to focus solely on facilities without including the longer-term support mechanism of endowment contributions (beyond their own payments into the 20-year operating trust fund with the City).²²

The Bell Lightbox fundraising target of \$196 million includes \$50 million from the public sector and \$146 million from the private sector (TIFFFG, *Funding*). Of the \$87 million already raised from private sources, “Leadership Gifts” of \$1 million or greater have been received from VISA, NBC Universal Canada, CIBC, the Copyright Collective of Canada, the Brian Linehan Charitable Foundation, the Allan Slaight Family and, of course, KJFC. Slightly higher than KJFC’s estimated contribution of \$22 million are the \$25 million capital donations from the federal and provincial governments and the founding sponsorship from Bell, all of which merit the designation of Leadership

²² There is no indication on the Web site of other modes of sponsorship of the VIFC—beyond in kind donations such as the lobby furniture from EQ3 and naming opportunities. Aside from increased fundraising options, the Bell Lightbox approach of citing endowment streams serves as a signal of institutional longevity while also allowing for the enhancement and marketing of the TIFFFG’s programming initiatives.

Partners; the City of Toronto also receives a note of “special thanks” alongside the Leadership Partners’ logos (TIFFG, *Funding*). No dollar figure is provided for Bell Canada’s founding sponsor status which is instead described as “an innovative marketing alliance” and “one of the largest private sector investments in a cultural organization in Canadian history.” (TIFFG, 2007, April 24). In addition to naming rights for the festival centre, the deal made Bell the TIFFG’s exclusive telecom sponsor and “preferred supplier” from 2006 through 2018, with an option to extend until 2023 (TIFFG, 2005, September 11). With the announcement of the Bell sponsorship on the Opening Night of the 2005 TIFF, the capital campaign was deemed a “true partnership between public and private funders” following on the heels of the \$50 million in public money pledged earlier in the year (TIFFG, 2005, September 11).

The announcement of \$25 million from Premier Dalton McGuinty’s Ontario Liberal government was followed approximately six weeks later by \$25 million in support from the federal Liberals. Linked to initiatives designed to foster collaboration between multiple levels of government, the federal funding was designated as an investment in infrastructure (TIFFG, 2005, April 26). Specifically, this contribution is managed under the Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund which has previously been used for joint Canada-Ontario commitments to “infrastructure modernization and improvement projects at cultural institutions” like the Royal Ontario Museum, the Art Gallery of Ontario and the Royal Conservatory of Music (TIFFG, 2005, April 26). The funding announcement also references the New Deal for Cities and Communities, which draws on federal gas tax revenues to support municipal infrastructure projects. In response to the Ontario government support, Piers Handling stressed “the reputation of Toronto as a world-class urban centre for the arts, and as an international epicentre for cinema,”-- language that would later inform the vision statements on the Bell Lightbox Web site (TIFFG, 2005, March 4). For the media release about the federal funding, comments are split between Minister of State John Godfrey (Infrastructure and Communities) who

mentions “cultural sustainability,” Minister Liza Frulla (Heritage) who cites TIFFFG’s contributions to “a thriving arts and culture scene” and Minister Joe Volpe (Citizenship and Immigration) who touts Toronto as “a modern, world-class city with an international reputation for culture,” largely echoing Handling’s earlier remarks (TIFFG, 2005, April 26). It is interesting to note that this media release offers a rare example of Handling connecting the vision for Bell Lightbox to “the growth and celebration of *Canadian* and international cinema” (TIFFG, 2005, April 26, [emphasis added]).

The national increasingly has been supplanted by references to the global in descriptions of Bell Lightbox. Although the introductory page advances the argument that “Canadian films need a catalyst from which they can exert their influence on North American and international markets” (TIFFG, *Vision*, Intro page) the facility is subsequently positioned as a gathering place for “local and international film communities” (TIFFG, *Vision*, Potential page) and a destination for “international tourists” (TIFFG, *Vision*, Impact page). In other words, even though Bell Lightbox connects Canadian cinema to the global marketplace (an intriguing elision of the festival’s role as conduit), this film centre ultimately articulates local and international interests while leaving intra-national relations out of the equation. The Funding page raises the notion of a generational shift with the birth of the TIFFFG attributed to the support of a “first generation of film lovers” and the future of Bell Lightbox placed in the hands “a new generation of passionate supporters” (TIFFG, *Funding*). This invocation of a maturational pattern for a festival and its affiliated cinephiles, when combined with the aforementioned shift in language from a national to global frame of reference, finds a slightly different resonance with Julian Stringer’s argument about historical changes to the international festival circuit. In particular, the global proliferation of festivals since the 1980s along with the changing role of cities vis a vis transnational financial and communication networks leads Stringer to conclude that “it is cities which now act as the nodal points on this circuit, not national film industries” (2001, p. 138). Stringer turns his

attention to the spatial logic of the festival circuit and posits the individual events as modular public spheres implicated in the negotiation of power relationships between geographic locations (p. 138). Thus, he perceives the circuit as “a metaphor for the geographically uneven development that characterizes the world of international film culture” (2001, p. 137).

Yet, the rise of competing global cities proves insufficient as an explanatory device for the distinctions between the film centre developments in Toronto and Vancouver. While the Bell Lightbox Web site cites “research visits to key destinations—London, Paris, Berlin, Montreal, Los Angeles, New York” (TIFFG, *Vision*, Impact page), the VIFC amenity proposal draws a comparison with “*Ex Centris*, a film centre in Montreal” (Harvey, 2001, p.7). A five-storey “cultural complex” founded by Daniel Langlois, *Ex-Centris* houses digital production and post-production facilities, the offices of the Festival du Nouveau Cinéma and three cinemas (outfitted for both film and digital projection) whose goal is “to give the public a high-quality alternative to traditional movie theatres and mainstream films” (*ExCentris*).²³ Like *Ex-Centris*, the VIFC focuses on serving a local community of cinephiles; but this does not preclude VIFF’s status as a major international film festival. Instead, there appears to be a distinction between a local film scene that facilitates access to world cinema and one that aspires to broader industrial goals. There may also be a shifting frame of reference as Alexandra Gill’s coverage of the 2005 VIFC launch mentions the Frank Gehry-designed building for La Cinémathèque Française, which opened contemporaneously in Paris (2005, p. R3), while Katherine Monk’s 2006 festival coverage links VIFC and Bell Lightbox to the British Film Institute’s plans to develop “a world-class film centre” (p. D21).

What distinguishes Bell Lightbox and the VIFC from the Palais and Potsdamer Platz is the move into exhibition through year-round programming. Rather than

²³ Daniel Langlois was Chairman of the Board of the Festival du Nouveau Cinéma from 1999 - 2004 (Festival Nouveau Cinéma, “History”).

locational continuity, or even dodging mortality, what is at stake here is a shift in rhythm as the festivals expand beyond event programming and enter the market of art house exhibition. Aside from practical issues related to venue rentals or changing technologies, there is a sense that a film scene must adapt and evolve in order to maintain its relevance as a site of cinephilic discovery. Blum links scene mortality to “the history of cities” (2001, p. 11) just as Marchessault perceives “TIFF’s success as a festival in terms of its ability to carve a mythology out of and into Toronto” (2001, p. 72). In addition to the patterns created by seasonal releases of new films and longer-term cycles of cinematic innovation, the festival itself must undergo periodic renewal. Blum also contextualizes mortality as a “crucial interpretive site” and “object of fascination” as the “inexorable fate of scenes, their volatility and ephemerality, confirms their inevitable link to fad and fashion” (2001, p. 11). As such, Bell Lightbox, with its myriad points of connectivity that extend beyond TIFF as well as its new focus on learning and youth outreach, strives less for renewal than for immortality. It seems fitting then that the myth-making symptom of buzz known as “festival fever” would find permanence in conjunction with the infrastructural renaissance of an arts sector that gives a “great city an image of its soul” (Culture Division, 2003, p. 4). This spirit of cultural vibrancy is cast in material terms as part of a *Culture Plan for the Creative City* (2003) that ultimately strives to secure the transformation of Toronto from a place where inhabitants once “laboured with their hands” to a global centre for people who “work with their minds” (Culture Division, 2003, pp. 8-9).

Toronto’s *Culture Plan* (2003) sets out a strategy “to use its arts, culture and heritage assets to position itself as a Creative City, a global cultural capital” (p. 4). The reference to “assets” draws attention to the double meaning of “cultural capital” as both locational referent and marker of distinction. Yet, the dominant interpretation is of culture as capital with the focus placed on the labour pool of Toronto’s knowledge-based industries (ranging from film and television production to biomedical research), the size

of the local market (“the third largest English-language theatre market in the world”) and the impact of cultural events like TIFF which “injected \$67 million into the local economy” in 2002 (Culture Division, 2003, p. 9). Offering a somewhat different model of the creative city, the *Culture Plan for Vancouver 2008-2018* expresses as its “core vision...to develop, enlighten, enhance and promote arts, culture and cultural diversity in the City of Vancouver to the benefit of our citizens, our creative community, our business sector and our visitors” (Creative City, 2008, p. 6). Charles Landry draws a distinction between “cultural development” and “culture and development,” noting the link between fostering the arts and the broader notion of “a culture of creativity” that extends throughout an urban environment (2005, pp. 234-235). In contrast to Toronto’s strategic emphasis on economic renewal and a detailed investment plan that implicates all levels of government, Vancouver’s *Culture Plan* deals more with ideation, offering a “conceptual model” of a renewal cycle that includes “engagement and participation,” “vitality,” “capacity and quality” and “awareness and recognition” (Creative City, 2008, p. 7).²⁴

It is the contingently local visions of these cultural development strategies that provide insight into the context of the film centres in Toronto and Vancouver. Indeed, to return to Stringer’s spatial logic, the negotiation of power relationships across the festival circuit offers an incomplete view without a consideration of the positioning of individual events in relation to local or regional interests. As a “landmark destination,” the plan for Bell Lightbox emphasizes “the creation of synergies between culture, leisure and tourism” that Mommaas connects to “the ambiance, the quality and the symbolic value of a place” (2004, p. 519). More than mere “ambiance” or “decor” though (Mommaas, 2004, p. 519), the symbolic value of Bell Lightbox contributes to the branding of TIFFG

²⁴ The Creative City Web site includes details of a series of additional reviews—addressing grants, public art, cultural facilities and cultural tourism—that comprise stages in the implementation of Vancouver’s Culture Plan (“Culture Plan—Phase 1”). It is interesting to note the relative absence of references to the creative industries as “economic engines of growth” (Landry, 2005, p. 235). This suggests a greater focus on indigenous artistic production than on the involvement of BC’s labour force in global creative industries via foreign location production (or the service sector of the film industry).

as a global cinematic hub, with the convergence of symbolic, cultural and economic capital that entails. Where Toronto's *Culture Plan* sees workers, Vancouver's Creative City is inhabited by citizens. The multiple references to public space, neighbourhoods and communities focus on the "cultural ecosystem" of "one of the most livable cities in the world" (Creative City, 2008, p. 6).

As a significantly more modest project than Bell Lightbox, the VIFC takes its place in the local ecosystem with a public service remit that positions the facility less as a tourist destination than as part of the city's cultural fabric. Boddy's critique of the lack of social inclusiveness fostered by amenity bonusing in the downtown core invites commentary on the VIFC's gentrified surroundings. It is important to remember though that since the Festival's origins at the Ridge Theatre in the affluent neighbourhood of Kitsilano, VIFF's "community" roots have always been skewed towards an up-market art house audience. The intention here is not to delineate mutually exclusive versions of the creative city (as there are clear areas of overlap) but instead to show that, for both Bell Lightbox and the VIFC, municipal cultural strategies inflect the discourse that surrounds and structures these hybrid public-private cultural institutions. In the next chapter, I will return to issues facing English-Canadian "national" cinema via an examination of federal feature film policy and support for domestic festivals. Starting in 2004, Telefilm set out to (re)define its role as a public sector stakeholder and to realign its support mechanisms in relation to the corporation's performance measurement framework. A fundamental split between audience access and audience building relegates non-theatrical venues to a blind spot in Telefilm's multiplatform distribution environment. In addition, a funding controversy in Montreal reveals the relative autonomy that film festivals have attained as cultural institutions.

CHAPTER FIVE
BRIDGING THE GAP:
FESTIVAL GOVERNANCE, PUBLIC PARTNERS AND
“THE VEXING PROBLEM OF DISTRIBUTION”

The international film festival facilitates access for industry professionals, members of the media and cinephiles to a range of international films. In the Canadian context, the role of this non-theatrical space appears to be shifting with the construction of permanent facilities and the concurrent expansion of programming mandates to include year-round initiatives. In Chapter Four, I analysed Bell Lightbox and the Vancouver International Film Centre (VIFC) as divergent models of co-ventures in downtown real estate and cultural infrastructure. Built as a bonus amenity in exchange for increased condo density, the VIFC is governed by a municipal sub-lease that carries a local community service remit requiring the ad hoc collaboration of the non-profit arts sector. Bell Lightbox is owned by the Toronto International Film Festival Group as the result of a hybrid philanthropic/business partnership with the King and John Festival Corporation and, once completed in 2010, will house the TIFFFG’s affiliated program initiatives. While the designs of both facilities foreground the visibility and theatricality of a gentrified cosmopolitan festival scene, the vision for Bell Lightbox re-brands TIFF as a landmark destination in a global creative city. Over the course of the chapter, I charted the relationship of local film scenes to regional and national aspects of English-Canadian cinema, noting the tension between nationalist traces and a post-nationalist orientation in its classification.

In this chapter, I will investigate the changing role of the international festival’s key public-sector partner. Starting in 2004 with Secor Consulting’s *Analysis of Canada’s Major Film Festivals*, Telefilm Canada embarked on a comprehensive review of support

for domestic audiovisual festivals. Consisting of a series of consultancy reports and culminating in the 2008 launch of the Festivals Performance and Skills and Screens Funds, which replaced the Canada Showcase program, the review responded to concerns over the governance of the Montreal World Film Festival as well as the realignment of Telefilm's support mechanisms with the two primary corporate objectives of building audiences and industry capacity; a third strategic objective that calls for "strengthening relationships with our clients and partners" refers to the ongoing elaboration of a "performance measurement culture" (Telefilm, 2006c, p. 30) that continues to reframe federal feature film policy in industrial terms. These reports shed light on the re-positioning of Telefilm from festival sponsor to arbiter of the domestic circuit. In addition, a persistent split between festival and industry performance measures relegates domestic festival audiences to a position of absence in a manner that recalls Acland's discussion of screen time (2002, pp. 10-11). An examination of federal film policy's 21st Century understanding of audience access yields critical insights into performance measurement while raising challenges for the international film festival centre as a non-theatrical exhibition venue for Canadian cinema.

In an article about bricks and mortar developments in Toronto, Vancouver and London, CanWest News film critic Katherine Monk (2006) proposes that "[t]he film centre ideal may be alternative cinema's only hope of finding an audience outside the festival circuit" (p. D21). At the root of her argument is a concern about the fate of the shared "theatrical film experience" in the context of the atomizing effects of digital platforms and the narrow focus of mainstream cinemas on commercial imperatives (p. D21). In other words, the issue is not so much the target of reaching an audience, which presumably could be achieved through ancillary platforms, but rather the implications of assembling one. The resulting "theatrical film experience" combines the social element of communal viewing with a mode of presentation that encompasses the apparatus,

setting and film itself as a medium. There is a sense then of preserving the history of cinema-going culture, although Monk acknowledges the “elitist baggage” that might accompany such claims to artistic legitimacy (2006, p. D21).¹ TIFFFG CEO Piers Handling connects ““the incredible profile of the festival”” to the conception of ““a global centre for film,”” while citing The Louvre in support of his assertion that “[e]very other art form has a well-defined home”” (as cited in Monk, 2006, p. D21).²

Notions of ““social cohesion and community building”” inform GVIFFS Director Alan Franey’s conception of the film centre’s cultural mandate (as cited in Monk, 2006, p. D21). Specifically, he refers to ““an erosion of the cinematic experience”” in light of digital platforms like DVD and notes the potential for the film centre to ““provide the added value by allowing the encounter between the filmmaker and the audience.”” There is some slippage in Franey’s comments between the theatrical venue, art cinema and networking opportunities which are available at the festival but would not necessarily translate to the centre’s “ordinary” screenings. What is clear though is Franey’s vision of the film centre’s role in providing big screen access to a greater range of international cinema than is currently available in mainstream theatres. He explains that ““there are too many festivals in the world right now, but that’s because they’ve taken on the role of regular theatres...They’re providing access to the big screen that many movies wouldn’t get otherwise”” (as cited in Monk, 2006, p. D21). It is not a new occurrence for festivals to serve as a non-theatrical venue in the circulation of international art cinema. In many

¹ See Haidee Wasson’s *Museum Movies: The Museum of Modern Art and the Birth of Art Cinema* (2005) in which she examines “the pairing of such a popular and spectacular amusement with the comparatively elite and sacral space of the museum” (p. 1). Although Wasson’s focus is on the mid-1930s and 1940s, with the establishment of MoMA’s Film Library in 1935, her discussion illuminates discourses of cinematic value and the impact of the museum as a cultural institution on the experience of viewing and exhibiting archival films.

² The exact wording in Monk’s article: ““We have a wealth of resources,’ says Handling. ‘We also have the incredible profile of the festival...This will be a global centre for film. Why not? The visual arts have The Louvre. Every other art form has a well-defined home. Why shouldn’t we have Festival Centre for film?’” (Monk, 2006, p. D21) The publication of the article in 2006 precedes the naming of TIFFFG’s film centre as Bell Lightbox.

cases, and this is especially true for emerging directors and nonfiction, films are unlikely to crossover to mainstream theatrical circuits. But Franey's assessment of festival proliferation must be contextualized as a response to the megaplex boom that started in the 1990s following the return of major studios to the exhibition sector.³ Acland explains that instead of "lead[ing] to a wider slate of film titles," the construction of double-digit screen venues resulted in both fewer theatres and more start times for the same films (2008, pp. 85-86).⁴ The return of vertical integration exacerbates the limited options in Canada's highly concentrated theatrical market where "two chains control over half the screens" (Acland, 2008, p. 93).

If festivals (and subsequently their film centres) proliferate in order to fill this gap in the exhibition sector, their intermediary role changes. Questions thus arise about the convertibility of their symbolic capital. In policy studies, the issue forms in relation to notions of dependency including Manjunath Pendakur's exploration of perceived failures in the development of a commercial feature film industry; in particular, he highlights how the core problem of market access has undermined the viability of economic initiatives like the Capital Cost Allowance tax shelter in the later 1970s (1990, pp. 178-179). Ted Magder considers the economic, political and cultural contours of dependency, noting how the influence of macro-economic policy precluded "discriminatory measures that would reduce Hollywood's control over Canadian screens" (1993, p. 241). The framing of national cinema in relation to cultural nationalist anxieties and industrial goals that are informed by neo-liberalism and an international context of deregulation in turn influences

³ The VIFC's Mission statement refers to the dominant presence of "globalized popular culture" in mainstream theatres, asserting that "the costs and 'bottom line' have become too high for the sustainable theatrical exhibition of most good films" (GVIFFS, "Mission and Scope"). The assessment of cinematic quality reinforces an elitist edge to the VIFC's cinephilic aspirations. In Chapter Three, I discussed the tension between elitism and populism in VIFF's institutional history; the two tend to be equated in VIFF's narrative with the provision of access to cinephiles (with elitism linked to the more exclusive aspects of the global film industry and celebrity culture).

⁴ Acland explores the megaplex phenomenon in more detail in *Screen Traffic: Movies, Multiplexes and Global Culture* (2003).

a persistent rhetorical trope around audience absence in Canadian film studies. Charles Acland (2002) critiques the reliance on screen time, with its standardized measurement of access to mainstream commercial theatres, as an indicator of the status of national cinema. Ultimately, unreconciled policy interpretations of audience building as a cultural objective or industrial performance measure create blind spots regarding the potential connections that could be made. Overcoming these dichotomies would provide a fuller picture of the festival's role in the film industry value chain while also exploring how these hybrid public/private organizations might serve the interests of a multiplatform marketplace.

Object of Policy: Festival as Platform or Market(ing)

In 2000, the Canadian Feature Film Policy (CFFP) guidelines, *From Script to Screen*, set an overall objective “to capture 5% of the domestic box office in five years” (Canadian Heritage, p. 1).⁵ Following a 2005 Standing Committee review, the Department of Canadian Heritage released *Scripts, Screens and Audiences: A New Feature Film Policy for the 21st Century* (2006). While the evaluation process found that the CFFP had been largely successful in meeting its goals, particularly with Canadian films reaching a 5.5% box office share in 2005, the new guidelines set out several improvements designed “to enhance its effectiveness” (Canadian Heritage, 2006, p. 5). Mitigating this self-congratulatory finding, the English-language market, which only achieved a 1.6% share (p. 5), is acknowledged as a “key concern” in Heritage Minister Bev Oda’s cover letter to the Chair of the Standing Committee. Yet, reliance on the measure of box office share is out of step with changes outlined in Telefilm’s Corporate

⁵The overall performance target cited in *From Script to Screen* includes two parts: “to capture 5% of the domestic box office in five years and to increase audiences for Canadian feature films abroad” (Canadian Heritage, 2000, p. 1). However, the international portion of this goal appears to have been overshadowed by the focus on building national audiences. The 2006 *Scripts, Screens and Audiences* summary of the 2000 CFFP only mentions the first half of the initial performance target (Canadian Heritage, 2006, p. 3).

Plan (2006-2007 to 2010-2011) which recognize the declining relevance of box office as an indication of audience reach. *From Cinemas to Cell Phones* sets out a multiplatform strategy that considers a broader range of distribution platforms (Telefilm, 2006c, pp. 6-7) and, in the case of cinema, seeks to expand targets and data collection to devise “a more comprehensive picture” of domestic audiences (p. 16). The subsequent *Scripts, Screens and Audiences* endorses a Standing Committee recommendation that performance measurement be adjusted to account for “the viewing of Canadian films in the many non-theatrical contexts where films may be watched” with a similar reference to the need to measure across “a variety of distribution platforms” (Canadian Heritage, 2006, p. 8).

A distribution platform is defined as “the means by which content providers connect with their audience and deliver the content they have bought or made” (Telefilm, 2006c, p. 6). Examples range from conventional media outlets like radio, television, newspapers and movie theatres to newer digital technologies like the World Wide Web, iPods and cell phones. A key attribute of the newer platforms is a shared “digital heritage” which results in the elimination of the link to specific reception (or playback) devices and blurs business boundaries (Telefilm, 2006c, p. 6). Of course, what is really at stake in this multiplatform environment is the necessity to adapt patterns of regulatory influence along the industry supply chain as distribution channels slip beyond the jurisdictional boundaries of existing federal policies. A line diagram in *From Cinemas to Cell Phones* provides a list of these distribution platforms (in individual boxes) as the connections between content and audiences; the platform list resembles a ladder, with arrows at both ends to anticipate the creation of additional rungs (Telefilm, 2006c, p. 12).

Scripts, Screens and Audiences uses similar examples to outline the “challenges and opportunities” presented by a multiplatform marketplace in which “Canadians are accessing cultural content in an increasing number of ways” (Canadian Heritage, 2006, p.

6). The section on improving performance measurement cites the *Canadian Film and Music Opinion Study* (2005) finding that “going to the cinema is no longer the way that the majority of Canadians watch movies” (as cited in Canadian Heritage, 2006, p. 8). This study, prepared by Decima Research for the Department of Heritage, measured both how often and where Canadians access movies using the following categories: conventional or specialty television, movie channel, rent movies, watch movie from personal collection, theatre or drive-in, video-on-demand service, download movies from the Internet (Decima, 2005, p. 16). The findings indicate that, although “80% [of Canadians] ‘go to the movies’ at least once a year, only 6% go once a week” (Decima, 2005, p. 16). In comparison, 54% watch movies on television, 29% rent movies and 22% watch movies from their own personal collection at least once a week; only video-on-demand (3%) and internet downloading (2%) had lower weekly viewing figures than theatrical venues.

Although these categories cover a range of sources and technologies, the festival is not included and there is no attempt at venue differentiation (ie: mainstream exhibitors, cinemathèques) for theatrical viewing, with the exception of drive-ins. The “theatre” category remains vague in a subsequent series of findings that measure respondents’ awareness and viewing of a list of Canadian films; through a series of questions that incorporated both English- and French-Canadian titles, respondents were asked if they had heard of a particular film and, if so, whether they had seen it and where (Decima, 2005, p. 45). In addition to the limited selection of viewing contexts (TV, DVD/Video or theatre), there is also no consideration of whether respondents’ familiarity with Canadian cinema may have been influenced by festival coverage. For instance, respondents could have been asked to indicate how they heard about the films and/or whether they had encountered festival coverage. As part of his discussion of the relevance of box office in a multiplatform marketplace, *New York Times* critic A.O. Scott (2005) observes that “a

film's initial run can be the seed of a longer process of cultural absorption and audience exposure, which bears fruit in DVD sales and rentals, as audiences go back to catch up on what they've missed." Given the *Canadian Film and Music Opinion Study's* finding that "English films are more likely to be first seen through other channels" (Decima, 2005, p. 54), the festival's role in generating awareness could provide a significant supplement to limited screen time in mainstream theatres. By the same token though, rather than the notion of playing catch-up via ancillary markets, the relatively low English-Canadian box office share might instead fit with the *Study's* observation that "[p]eople are waiting longer to watch the English movies, possibly because awareness of these movies is lower" (Decima, 2005, p. 54).

The data appear to support the latter contention with a "significant difference between Quebec and the rest of Canada across all movies" (Decima, 2005, p. 44). The commentary attributes a linguistic component to this finding (with no broader speculation as to its source or significance) as "Quebec residents are much more aware of French language movies than those residing in the rest of Canada are aware of the English language movies" (Decima, 2005, p. 44); for example, over 80% of Quebec respondents had heard of *La Grande séduction* (85%), *Les Boys III* (84%) and *Séraphin: Un homme et son péché* (90%) while less than 70% of respondents in the rest of Canada had heard of *Men with Brooms* (68%), *Resident Evil: Apocalypse* (59%) and *Bollywood/Hollywood* (54%) (Decima, 2005, p. 44). Furthermore, the films with the highest overall levels of awareness—*Men with Brooms*, *Resident Evil* and *Mambo Italiano*—are genre films that did not screen on the Canadian festival circuit. Even so, the data do not preclude a promotional role for the festival as *Bollywood/Hollywood* received a prestigious gala screening slot at both TIFF and VIFF. Despite the puzzling exclusion of film festivals as a distribution platform in this survey, Telefilm's multiplatform strategy does recognize the importance of market synergies. Specifically, the strategy seeks to coordinate

multiple platforms, including those like the Web that contribute limited revenue but boost content profile, as a means “to build a total audience that satisfies a project’s business goals” (Telefilm, 2006c, p. 8).

Telefilm’s Corporate Plan (2006-07 to 2010-11) does make the connection between film festivals and creating awareness for Canadian cinema; but, the inclusion of this material in a section on Audience Development (Telefilm, 2006c, p. 19) rather than as part of the overview of Canadian Cinema (pp. 16-18) points to a business model approach that maintains a sharp division between consumption and production. The Canadian Cinema section focuses on national and international market access in terms of box office performance, with a reference to expanding its performance measurement targets to ancillary markets and digital platforms. Marketing is discussed in relation to quality and competitiveness of CFFP-funded features, with the recommendation of strengthening Canadian content at ShowCanada, the annual exhibitors’ trade show (Telefilm, 2006c, p. 18). In contrast, Audience Development, which also raises the issue of designing strategies for festival participation (p. 19), is grouped with Talent Development and Financing and Sales under the heading of “Building the Industry” (pp. 19-21). This grouping is consistent with *From Script to Screen*’s designation of a Complementary Activities Program aimed at increasing “the national and international profile of Canadian films” (Canadian Heritage, 2000, p. 8). Along with domestic and foreign festivals, Complementary Activities lists “alternative distribution networks” as part of the effort to “ensure that Canadian films reach more Canadians in every corner of the country” (Canadian Heritage, 2000, p. 8). The implication is that improved access achieves the cultural nationalist goal of binding together the nation’s symbolic space, such that the overarching goal here is to reach citizens rather than consumers.

A similar separation into industrial and cultural categories is made in Telefilm’s Performance Measurement Framework. The strategic objective for building audiences

for Film is to have “[g]reater numbers of Canadians enjoy distinctive Canadian films in Canadian theatres” while for Festivals and Awards it is that “Canadian cultural products are promoted to audiences in Canada” (Telefilm, 2006c, p. 28). This division likely emerges in part from the Canadian Feature Film Policy’s industrial conceptualization of a commodity supply chain from producer to consumer. *From Script to Screen* describes a “comprehensive script to screen approach” (Canadian Heritage, 2000, p. 1) which in *Scripts, Screens and Audiences* is referred to as “a supply chain continuum from creator to audience” (Canadian Heritage, 2006, p. 1). The policy shift in 2000 “from building an industry to building audiences” (Canadian Heritage, 2000, p. 1) and then to “Enhancing the Canadian Feature Film Policy” in 2006 entrenches a focus on industrial development that is informed by the evolution of a “performance-based approach to funding” (Canadian Heritage, 2000, p. 1). On one hand, the delineation of different performance indicators for Festivals and for Film yields a fragmented picture of the viewing of Canadian cinema. At the same time, it both limits the potential of a multiplatform strategy to address all channels for building audiences and sets up challenges for approaching the film centre as an exhibitor.

For the film centre, taking on the role of an exhibitor differs from the festival’s intermediary role in mediating the symbolic value of films that may be pre-release, pre-canonical, seeking ancillary or foreign market sales or striving to accumulate critical acclaim that triggers investment in future projects. This difference hinges on issues of economic return and can be conceptualized in relation to the festival’s position in the film commodity’s value chain. For example, a chart in the 2003/2004 British Columbia Film *Activity Report* displays the agency’s funding support for the feature-length documentary *The Corporation* (Achbar, Abbott, 2003) at each stage of the industry value chain (BC Film, 2004, p. 8). The stages are Training, Script Development, Production & Post-Production, Marketing & Distribution and Exhibition, marking a progression “from script

to screen,”⁶ (p. 8). While these stages are listed from left to right forming a horizontal axis, the chart also demonstrates a temporal organization along its vertical axis such that the value chain does not represent a simple linear progression. Instead, although project support begins in 1998 with the producers’ participation in a Professional Development Workshop (Training) along with the concurrent start of the Script Development process, and ends in 2004 with both national and international (U.S. and Australia) theatrical release dates, there is additional Training assistance in 2002 via a Kick Start award; this funding from BC Film’s Partnerships in Training stream, which supports above-the-line talent, was received after two more years of development financing (in 1999 and 2000) and the start of principal photography in 2000 (BC Film, 2004, p. 8).

The Marketing & Distribution column includes three separate trips for the documentary’s producers to the Toronto Documentary Forum (TDF), the industry component of Hot Docs Canadian International Documentary Festival—once to pitch the project in 2000 and then twice as TDF Observers in 2001 and 2003. However, the film’s world premiere at the 2003 Toronto International Film Festival is listed under Exhibition rather than Marketing and Distribution even though the subsequent category description for the exhibition phase refers to release platforms like movie theatres, television and DVD as “vehicles for commercial success” (BC Film, 2004, p. 9). Since “economic viability” is also addressed in Marketing & Distribution, the defining factor for the final stage in the value chain appears to involve the “Exhibition of a *finished production*” (BC Film, 2004, p. 9 [emphasis added]). The apparent misapplication of these categories to *The Corporation* highlights the challenge of locating the festival on the value chain. Pitching and networking at the TDF can contribute key elements of financing while also

⁶ This word choice is likely intended to echo federal feature film policy, which at that time had been outlined by The Department of Canadian Heritage in *From Script to Screen: New Policy Directions for Canadian Feature Film* (2000). The title refers to a “comprehensive...approach to funding” that includes assistance via the Canada Feature Film Fund for “screenwriting, production, marketing and other promotional activities” (Canadian Heritage, 2000, p. 3).

working to build an industry and media profile for the project. This latter aspect of accumulating symbolic currency similarly characterizes the TIFF premiere screening. Initially conceived (and funded) as a multi-part television documentary, *The Corporation* received financing support to strike a theatrical release print after accruing critical acclaim and several awards on the festival circuit including an Audience Award at Sundance and a Special Jury Award at the prestigious Amsterdam International Documentary Festival (IDFA) (“Awards”).⁷

Thus, in this particular instance, the international film festival served as a crucial location for the mediation of the value of *The Corporation* as a film commodity rather than as an end point in the value chain. The TIFF screening could be cited under Marketing & Distribution as a step *preceding* the film’s box office revenue of \$3.8 million (BC Film, 2004, p. 8);⁸ this relies primarily on an economic assessment though as the *Activity Report* Note also cites audience and critical awards garnered on the festival circuit, presumably as further evidence of the film’s successes at the Exhibition stage. Consequently, the positioning of the film festival in the value chain tends to fall back on a dichotomy between industrial and cultural value rather than grasping the complexities of this productive space. Return on investment, whether in economic or symbolic capital, is the desired outcome of the value chain’s progression; but the two are caught up in the competing interests of festival stakeholders. In addition, it is important to remember that the film festival does not have a direct financial stake in a film’s performance; although box office forms a portion of the revenue of these non-profit organizations, the risk is spread across approximately 300 films. It could be argued that there is an indirect financial stake given that a film’s success helps to boost the festival’s status (as evidence of a wise programming investment) and may also attract increased stakeholder activity

⁷ A full award listing can be found at http://www.thecorporation.com/index.cfm?page_id=6

⁸ The figure of \$3.8 million includes box office receipts from Canada, the US and Australia as of September 2004. The BC Film *Activity Report* notes that the film had yet to be released in several additional foreign markets including the United Kingdom and France (2004, p. 8).

(from industry, media and cinephiles) at future events. If this is indeed the case, then the process by which the festival secures its return on investment requires that the screening event not be the final destination in the film industry value chain.

The proliferation of festivals as a type of alternative exhibition circuit further highlights the problem of viability. Following his remark on the excessive number of festivals worldwide and their role in addressing accessibility shortfalls in the exhibition sector, Franey wonders about the sustainability of the marketplace as “many festivals are struggling to become viable” (as cited in Monk, 2006, p. D21). This financial strain has also been felt by Telefilm with “the demands from existing program participants, as well as new festivals, outstripping the available budget resources” (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 5). Internal re-structuring at the Crown Corporation resulted in the 2006 creation of an Industrial Development Operations (IDO) unit focussed on the key corporate objective “of building the capacity of a competitive, sustainable Canadian audiovisual industry” (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 4). The new department consolidated all of Telefilm’s audience development, training and capacity building initiatives and realigned them with the Corporation’s industry goals (Telefilm, 2007b, p. 11). While the Corporate Plan Update (2007-08) contextualizes the IDO launch as a response to “the proliferation of distribution platforms, the challenges in international markets and the limited resources available to Telefilm” (Telefilm, 2007b, p. 11), it stands out more as an effort to streamline operations in accordance with measurable performance indicators. At the same time, these re-structuring efforts suggest a process of (re)affirming Telefilm’s ongoing relevance, and thus need for continued federal support, in a changing media environment. With the re-framing of federal festival support in industrial terms occurring contemporaneously with the development of international film centres in Toronto and Vancouver, it is clear that the Canadian festival landscape is entering a new phase.

World Class Cinema at Home and Abroad

Topping the list of findings in the *Evaluation of Telefilm's Support to Canadian Audiovisual Festivals* is the observation that the "Program objectives are overly broad and diffuse" (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 2). The *Evaluation* report explains that festivals have evolved into hybrid events that blur the previously discrete boundaries of industry trade shows, markets and festivals, which were originally limited to the exhibition of films, "often in a competitive context" (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 5). With designations that are no longer "uniquely descriptive of the activities which may take place...nor of the purposes served by the event," festivals now bring together stakeholders with "different, although overlapping, interests" (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 5). Thus, faced with a proliferation of festivals of varying size and scope, Telefilm must "tightly focus their support programs" unless they "wish to indiscriminately encourage all of these activities and types of events" (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 6). This assessment places the onus on Telefilm to define the structural attributes of domestic festivals and to establish priorities for measuring event value, thereby bringing order to the circuit. It is difficult to tell from the report's brief overview whether it is intended to provide a history of the emergence of Canadian festivals or to trace film festival evolution from its international origins. Although the Marché du Film was not officially launched until a series of screenings for buyers was held in 1961, Beauchamp and Béhar note that sales activity had taken place at Cannes since the first festivals and that "preproduction deals were discussed in *Variety* as early as 1957" (1992, p. 89). On the domestic front, Toronto's Festival of Festivals included an industry component from the beginning with "informal seminars" in 1976 and a Trade Forum a few years later (TIFFG, "TIFFG History – The Seventies").

Since the international film festival appears to have been a hybrid event from the beginning, perhaps the *Evaluation* report's overview offers a Canadian perspective intended to correspond with growing federal involvement in the feature film industry.

Prior to the launch of the Festival of Festivals, the second Vancouver Film Festival in 1959 was a FIAPF-accredited competitive event comprised solely of screenings and thus a better fit with the notion of a straightforward trajectory toward hybrid festivals. A quick perusal of the historical context shows that festivals developed contemporaneously with the emerging feature film industry. As part of his examination of the emergence of Canadian feature film policy, Michael Dorland details the ways in which the lobbying efforts of the Association of Motion Picture Producers and Laboratories of Canada (AMPPLC) and the National Film Board of Canada influenced the debate about state involvement in a privately controlled feature film industry. Of interest here is the timing of the AMPPLC brief, tabled to the government as a draft in 1958 and then presented in revised form a year later (Dorland, 1998, p. 59), in relation to the formation of the Interdepartmental Committee on the Possible Development of Feature Film Production in Canada (1964-65), which in turn recommended the formation of the Canadian Film Development Corporation (CFDC) (p. 113).

Dorland links the creation of the AMPPLC's Industry Development Committee in 1958 to the beginnings of film policy research on the development of national film industries⁹ (Dorland, 1998, p. 52). In addition, the previous six years (1952-7) saw the growth of a private production industry to service the television sector (Dorland, 1998, p. 62). Thus, in the decade and a half that preceded the passing of the CFDC Act in 1967, an industrial discourse about feature film production blossomed alongside (and intertwined with) the cultural nationalist discourse about federal cultural policy that was fostered by the Massey Commission. This time period also witnessed the rise and fall of several film festivals. Launched in 1958, the same year as the Vancouver Film Festival,

⁹ Dorland explains that the IDC turned to the NFB to conduct research on government legislation in other countries. Although the NFB was a member of the AMPPLC, it was not a member of the IDC which would ultimately produce a brief that was "singularly hostile" to the institution that had gathered the information (Dorland, 1998, p. 52).

the Stratford International Film Festival ran until 1961 and then was revived ten years later under the stewardship of Gerald Pratley and the Ontario Film Institute (Todd, 1997, pp. 1431, 1435). In 1960, Pierre Juneau, Guy Côté and Rock Demers organized the Festival international du film de Montréal which lasted until 1967 (Todd, 1997, p. 1431); a competitive Festival du cinéma canadien was added in 1963 which awarded the Palmarès du film canadien (pp. 1432, 1434). Several years later in 1971, Claude Chamberlan and Dimitri Eipides, from the Coopérative des cinéastes indépendants, started Montreal's Festival international du cinéma en 16mm which would eventually become the Festival international du nouveau cinéma et de la vidéo in 1984 (Todd, 1997, p. 1435).¹⁰ The predecessor to the Genies, the Canadian Film Awards began in 1949 and combined public screenings with the presentation of juried awards. In an article commemorating the Awards, inaugural CFA juror Gerald Pratley recalls the presence of Liberal M.P. Robert Winters at Ottawa's Little Elgin theatre with the exclamation that "[i]t was considered quite an achievement in those days to be able to persuade a politician to attend a film event!" (Pratley, 1989, p. 22). He notes that the following year the awards were presented by Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent and then in 1951 "real' glamour came to the CFA with the arrival of Mary Pickford and her husband, Buddy Rogers" (Pratley, 1989, p. 22).

Faced with the issue of potential over-crowding on the fall festival calendar, it seemed that federal funding decisions might play a role in establishing priorities for Canadian events. In 1976, a *Cinema Canada* headline proclaimed "Festival Fever Takes Hold of Toronto" as scheduling overlap between the CFA and the first Festival of Festivals generated competition over moviegoers' "time, loyalty and entrance tickets" (Tadros, 1976, p. 9). Brian D. Johnson writes that Bill Marshall's plans for the Festival of Festivals generated a "turf war with the local custodians of Canadian film" (Marshall

¹⁰ The founders' names are misspelled by Todd as "Claude Chamberland and Dmitri Epides" (1997, p. 1435).

referred to it as “a huge donnybrook with all the entrenched interests”), including the CFA and the Ontario Film Institute (2000, p. 21). Pratley reportedly returned from Cannes that year to discover that the Stratford Film Festival had been cancelled as a result of a drop in funding from both the federal Festivals Bureau and the provincial government (Chesley, 1976).¹¹ Chesley speculates that “Stratford had been considered less than necessary in the scheme of things, mainly because of its relatively small attendance and disregard for Canadian films” (1976, p. 8). In his discussion of the initial funding of FoF, Marshall writes that “the federal government told us the Festivals Bureau’s job was to place Quebec films in international festivals abroad” (2005, pp. 1-2). This comment references the relative absence of English-Canadian cinema at that time (Marshall, 2005, p. 8) and may also reflect some lingering animosity toward the rivalry that arose between the Montreal and Toronto festivals.

What is significant though, despite Marshall’s obvious embellishments, is the extent to which his recollections draw attention to uncertainty regarding the federal government’s role in funding Canadian international festivals (as opposed to promoting Canadian participation overseas at international festivals). Marshall proceeds to note “regular battles” with Michael Spencer, head of the Canadian Film Development Corporation, about following the Moscow-Karlovy Vary model and holding the Toronto and Montreal festivals in alternate years (2005, p. 4). After the launch of Montreal’s World Film Festival in 1977, critics joined in the debate over whether two world class festivals was one too many. While *Cinema Canada*’s Connie Tadros argued that “[t]wo festivals can only water each other down” (1977, p. 24), *Maclean’s* Joan Fox concluded that “[d]uplication is our historical habit and geographical necessity” (1977, p. 71). In a

¹¹ According to Chesley’s *Cinema Canada* news capsule, the funding shortfall was complicated by the creation of a new provincial Culture portfolio. Previously funded by Tourism, the Festival found itself caught between two branches. Challenges for the Festival were further exacerbated by the death of Stratford general manager William Wylie, who had been a strong supporter of the event’s film component. (Chesley, 1976, p. 8)

Cinema Canada editorial, film professor and broadcaster Clive Denton considered the “doubt as to whether Canada should have two officially supported festivals in one summer” as evidence of a “nervously divided country” as well as “a debasement of the original 1930s festival idea” (1977, p. 27); beyond the issue of anxiety over Quebec separatism, Denton argued that festival proliferation, which was already underway in Europe, undermined the notion that “film enthusiasts were actually supposed to *travel* to the main events” and instead creates a series of locally supported gatherings (p. 27). Jean Lefebvre, the former head of Telefilm’s Festivals Bureau, explained that “‘in the beginning, the intention—to the extent that there was one—was to have at most one or two international festivals in the entire country’” (as cited in “Canada’s many festivals,” p. 42). However, by that time, Canada already hosted “roughly one-tenth of all the film festivals in the world” and the Bureau’s ad hoc “‘first-come, first-served’” granting structure failed to make a positive contribution to the debates over what the domestic circuit should look like (p. 42).

In contrast to the anxieties over the evolution of the domestic circuit and the lack of a clear festivals policy, coverage of festival participation overseas demonstrates greater clarity in the nationalist articulation of goals for industrial development. Connie Tadros explains that at Cannes “one gets a sense of ‘Canadian films’ and...one can judge by the sales and the reception if ‘Canadian films’ are doing well or not by international standards” (1976, p. 37). In a 1976 article entitled “Why go to Cannes in the first place?” Tadros notes that the Secretary of State’s Festivals Bureau sent 20 people to the festival in 1975 and rented a theatre for market screenings of 15 films (p. 37). She argues that not only does this approach offer a better showcase than the Canadian Film Awards but also that the annual gathering in Cannes of over 200 Canadian film professionals results in the temporary disappearance of regional differences. In other words, prior to the launch of the Festival of Festivals, the identity of the Canadian film industry coalesced as a national

subset of an international film scene. Producer David Perlmutter concurs that “[t]he efforts taken by the Canadian government...have, to a great extent, lifted the cloud of provincialism under which many Canadian producers have had to operate” (1976, p. 39). But, beyond building an international industry profile and creating networking opportunities, Perlmutter attributes the significance of the Cannes’ market screenings for Canadian films to the fact that “95% of an average film’s income potential is outside Canada, with almost 50% outside North America” (p. 39).

Ten years later, as the Festival of Festivals prepared to celebrate its 10th anniversary, Jacqueline Brodie, former assistant director of the Festivals Bureau, described Cannes as “the symbol of success in cinema” (1985, p. 14) and also observed that 1985 seemed to be “The year of the ministers” (p. 15). The Minister of Communications of Canada and the Minister of Cultural Affairs of Quebec were in attendance along with Ministers of Culture from West Germany and France and MPAA President Jack Valenti (Brodie, 1985, p. 15). The list of Canadian government officials and dignitaries did not end there. With two Canadian features amongst the official selections (Ted Kotcheff’s *Joshua Then and Now* and Lewis Furey’s *Night Magic*), additional guests included the Canadian Ambassador to France, the Agent General of Ontario to France, Spain and Italy, the assistant deputy minister for Cultural Affairs of the Department of Communications and the Director-Cultural Advisor of the Quebec Delegation in Paris (Brodie, 1985, p. 15). Telefilm Canada had three offices at the Carleton Hotel—an interview room, marketing office and an information centre run by the Festivals Bureau (Brodie, 1985, p. 14); a nearby office was shared by the Ontario Film and Video Office and the Alberta Motion Picture Development Corporation, both of whom were promoting their indigenous and service production sectors (Brodie, 1985, p. 15). These promotional initiatives were pre-cursors to Canada Pavilion and Perspective Canada which now combine to fulfill Telefilm’s dual role as facilitator for international

sales and as de facto national cinema diplomat. At the same time, Perspective Canada maintains government involvement in programming but in a location parallel to the official festival selections.

Canada Pavilion, which was started in 2002, provides “the Canadian delegation with an essential gathering place and business centre for conducting meetings with the international community” (Telefilm Canada, 2007, May 3). Located in the International Village, a strip of large white tents set up along the beach parallel to the Palais (and perpendicular to the Croisette), Canada Pavilion serves as a reception site, message centre and meeting hub for Canadian delegates.¹² In 2007, the Pavilion’s funding partners included Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, the Department of Canadian Heritage – Trade Routes program, the Canadian Film and Television Production Association (CFTPA) and eight provincial agencies (Telefilm, 2007, May 3).¹³ Meanwhile, Quebec’s SODEC, not listed amongst the Pavilion funders, partnered with Telefilm to “officially introduce 10 Canadian Anglophone and Francophone producers” as part of the Marché du Film’s Producers’ Network (Telefilm, 2007, May 3). As part of its role in creating a locus for networking, Canada Pavilion hosts invitation-only events such as cocktails with producers, distributors and sales agents from the U.K., Australia and New Zealand and Brazil in 2007 (Telefilm, 2007c) or Producer Breakfasts in 2005 (Telefilm, 2005, “Perspective Canada”). These events are publicized in a Telefilm Canada brochure that also highlights films selected to screen at the festival and the Perspective Canada series at the Marché du Film.

Picking up the program name that was no longer being used by TIFF, the

¹² A pass to the Marché is required to access the International Village. Cannes continues to allow Canadian film professionals to overcome regional barriers: During my visit to Cannes in 2005 as a programmer from the Vancouver International Film Festival, I met numerous industry stakeholders from across Canada (some for the first time face-to-face) with whom the majority of previous interactions had been via telephone or email.

¹³ Specifically: the Ontario Media Development Corporation, British Columbia Film, Manitoba Film and Sound, Alberta Film, New Brunswick Film, the Newfoundland and Labrador Film Development Corporation, the Nova Scotia Film Development Corporation and SaskFilm.

Perspective Canada showcase began as a sales initiative at the 2006 Berlinale that featured “recent Canadian films curated by top international festival directors and programmers” (Telefilm, 2006d). The screenings at the Berlin Film Festival’s European Film Market served as a pilot program in advance of the official launch of Perspective Canada at the 2006 Marché du Film at Cannes (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 3). The thirteen films that garnered “prime spots on the official Market screening schedule” and targeted promotion via inserts in the Festival’s daily industry journals (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 3) were selected based on the following four criteria: Each must have received production support from Telefilm, been completed within nine months of Cannes and been neither released nor presented in more than one international market; lastly, the selections had to comprise equal representation of the Quebec and English-Canadian production sectors (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 22). These eligibility criteria along with the description of the Perspective Canada program as a representative sampling of stylistic, regional and (with reference to distributors) corporate diversity (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 22) evoke more than a passing resemblance to the showcase’s namesake.

Assembling a mini-snapshot of a national film industry’s recent output harkens back to a programming model that stands in contradistinction to the shift of international festival programs to an autonomous selection process. It points to a re-structuring of government involvement on the international circuit, in a space parallel to the official selections, and also can be viewed as a re-assertion of a self-defined national presence. Although Cannes switched final authority to festival programmers in 1972, the Canadian Bureau of Festivals continued to pre-select films for submission. A 1977 *Cinema Canada* news capsule lists the jurors for five days of pre-selection screenings for Cannes and “other competitions;” the 11 person jury included representatives from the producers’ associations and directors’ guilds in English-Canada and Quebec, Canada Council, the Department of External Affairs, the CFDC, the Film Commissioner’s Office, the

Festivals Bureau and two critics chosen by the Secretary of State (Chesley, 1977, p. 14). The Festivals and Markets Bureau, which is now part of the Montreal offices of Telefilm Canada, still organizes pre-selection screenings for programmers from major international festivals like Berlin, Cannes, Venice, Pusan, Karlovy Vary and Sundance but only acts as a facilitator (Telefilm, “Telefilm Canada’s Calls for Entries”). At the same time though, the positioning of Telefilm’s Perspective Canada within the official market has a historical precedent in the development of the European Film Market in Berlin. The European Film Market evolved out of the Film Fair which was established as part of a series of programming reforms undertaken by the Berlinale in 1965. In response to political entanglements that threatened the selection criterion of “artistic value,”¹⁴ the festival was divided into three sections—the Competition, an Information Show for non-competing official selections and a Representational Show or Film Fair that included films “selected by delegates and producers of the various [participating] nations” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 133).

While the relegation of national contributions to a public Film Fair helped to strengthen the perceived aesthetic autonomy of festival programming, the creation of a Perspective Canada program conversely suggests an added level of distinction amongst all of the films on offer at the European Film Market and the Marché du Film at Cannes. According to Telefilm’s *International Festivals & Markets 2006-2007 Report*, the 2006 Marché du Film consisted of 1,500 screenings held over the course of 11 days with

¹⁴ Jacobsen (2000) details several 1964 programming decisions that placed festival director Alfred Bauer at odds with officials in Sweden and Germany (pp. 123-126). For example, *491* (Sjöman) was submitted by the Swedish Producers’ Association and the Swedish Film Institute despite the fact that the national censor had deemed it “‘unsuitable’ for showing to the general public” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 123). Church officials in Germany protested the selection and the film was eventually disqualified based on “closed showings” at Cannes that technically violated the Berlinale’s eligibility requirements regarding international premieres (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 126). The reforms also sought autonomy for the Festival so that films could be invited from socialist countries (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 128). In response to the selection reforms, the Federal Minister of the Interior expressed concern regarding “the importance of the Festival with respect to foreign policy and the film industry, fearing diplomatic discontent if a film from another country was rejected” (Jacobsen, 2000, p. 133).

10,000 attendees from more than 80 countries (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 22). Not only do the Perspective Canada criteria ensure that buyers will encounter films that have had limited market exposure, thus foregrounding the notion of gaining first access to new product, but the Telefilm Canada brand also implies that these films have already met certain guidelines for cinematic quality and market viability in order to merit funding. As such, the selection of a smaller group of films from Canada's overall annual production output helps to provide a focal point for the Canadian presence in the marketplace, which can be utilized further for promotional goals and performance measurement. For the launch at Cannes in 2006, the program was pitched to journalists and media coverage was measured, including both a qualitative assessment of newsworthiness and a quantitative listing of notable coverage¹⁵ (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 23). With Telefilm's objective of implementing a comprehensive performance measurement framework (Telefilm, 2007b, p. 15), Perspective Canada offers a discrete package for tracking the Corporation's involvement from script to screen. Of the 13 titles screened at the 2006 Marché, "four were either sold or in negotiations to be sold...[and t]he total value of these deals was more than \$288,000" (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 22).

Performance Measurement and Irreconcilable Interests

In addition to the European Film Market and the Marché du Film, the *International Festivals & Markets 2006-2007 Report* measured sales activities at MIPTV (the International Television Programme Market), E3 (the Electronic Entertainment Expo) and MIPCOM (the International Film and Programme Market for Television, Video, Cable and Satellite). While Telefilm contributed \$966,576 to these five major international markets in 2006, a total which climbs to over \$1.2 million with the inclusion

¹⁵ The *Report* notes that despite an overall positive impression, many journalists either felt the program wasn't newsworthy or wanted to wait until after the festival to assess the results. Notable coverage included announcements in *Variety* and on CBC radio and a feature in *Le Journal de Montréal* on the sales of *Maurice Richard (The Rocket)*, Binamé. (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 23)

of staff salaries, companies reported “almost \$64 million in sales and likely sales and an additional \$40 million in completed or likely pre-sales” (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 3). According to the *Report*’s investment analysis, “for every dollar committed to international markets, Canadian companies reported \$5.11 worth of completed sales” with the return on investment reaching 1 to 100 if likely sales are included (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 7).¹⁶ But how would a comparable performance baseline be established for domestic festivals? Through three main programs—Canada Showcase, the Industrial Professional Development Fund (IPDF) and the Sectoral Awareness Component of the Canada New Media Fund—Telefilm provided just over \$8.5 million in support to 60 events and festivals between 2002 and 2005 (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 9). How might return on investment be calculated based on these figures? Although the international markets data stresses sales activity, it also assesses client satisfaction through participant ratings of each market and its value. Participants ranked Canada Pavilion’s amenities and services, the value of the market relative to the cost of attendance and their overall impression of the event (Telefilm, 2007, March, pp. 11-12).

This approach to measuring intangible aspects of a market’s value suggests that performance indicators for festivals can be derived in relation to the interests of stakeholders. For example, while the European Film Market scored an average of 7.7 out of 10 for value and 23% of participants felt it was the top international market (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 12), MIPCOM is clearly the industry favourite, receiving an overall satisfaction rating of 8.5 and 53% of participants felt “it was the best market of its kind when it came to meeting their needs” (p. 31). By contrast, while the Marché du Film was highly ranked as a site for professional development (8.2) and networking with existing contacts (8.1) and new ones (7.8), participants gave it a low ranking as a place to acquire titles for distribution (5.4) (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 26). For festivals, a series of

¹⁶ The findings note that “86 companies reported successful sales activity and 43 companies reported likely or completed pre-sales” but do not indicate whether these figures overlap (Telefilm, 2007, March, p. 3).

consultants' reports undertaken as part of Telefilm's comprehensive policy review provides insight into both a comparative evaluation of "best practices" and a delineation of success factors. Generally speaking, the reports place significance on international status, national relevance and industrial return. *Best Practices in Festival Funding* (Drisdell Consulting, 2006) begins by drawing a distinction between "major international events such as the Cannes Film Festival, the Toronto International Film Festival, Berlin International Film Festival, Venice and Sundance...[that] attract world attention" and "a multitude of events run throughout the year, targeted at international, national, regional and even local audiences and filmmakers" (p. 2).

Similar criteria of value position TIFF as an exemplar in Secor Consulting's *Analysis of Canada's Major Film Festivals* (2004). It is described as having "achieved the highest degree of organizational maturity," as "a prime example of an event that rallies both the professional communities of its region and the general public," and as an event that "attracts influential international industry players" (Secor, 2004, pp. 6-7). Thus, to a certain extent, TIFF stands apart from other Canadian festivals largely due to its ability to assemble local, regional, national and international stakeholders; but, the Festival is simultaneously set up in its national context as an institutional benchmark. The *Best Practices* report recommends that funding support be stratified to two different "levels of event"—those of "national or regional relevance" and "local, culturally specific and emerging events" (Drisdell, 2006, p. 20). The key difference between the support structures involves the movement of national and regional events to a triennial funding model based on a combination of "standardized reporting for a set of performance measures" and the predictive value of past performance (as opposed to annual event proposals) (Drisdell, 2006, p. 20). In addition, these events would be subject to a "fair warning policy" that allows for a progressive reduction of support if objectives are not

being met (Drisdell, 2006, p. 3)¹⁷ whereas smaller and emerging events would face a time limit on their funding eligibility (p. 20).¹⁸

The *Evaluation of Telefilm's Support to Canadian Audiovisual Festivals* (Kelly Sears Consulting, 2007b) also includes a small section on international festival support programs which draws attention to a two tier approach used in the U.K. and Australia. Specifically, this approach “effectively separates festival support into two tracks,” one which targets “industrially-oriented venues [used] by industry professionals” and another which focuses on audience access to “alternatives to mainstream commercial audiovisual fare” (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 16). Taken together, these processes rationalize funding support by classifying festivals in terms of strata or tracks that set up dichotomies of audience access vs. industrial development and national/regional reach vs. local focus. The implication of this classificatory framework is a rearticulation of the apparent incompatibility of cultural and industrial objectives. As such, the component parts of the festival's roles of fostering the film industry and providing access to Canadian cinema are positioned on opposing sides of a policy divide. This limits the potential to conceptualize the festival as an alternative distribution platform for national cinema. Not only is access separated from industry but regional and national reach are prioritized over local focus for sustained funding. Major festivals also would have to contend with standardized performance measures that seek to quantify their impact, an issue designated as “requiring further examination” at the end of the *Evaluation* report (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 21).

Before addressing this conceptualization of success factors and stakeholder interests, there is one further policy anomaly worth noting. *Best Practices* provides an

¹⁷ The Canada Council employs a fair warning policy modelled on one used by the Australian Arts Council (Drisdell, 2006, p. 3).

¹⁸ Based on programs used by the Canada Council, the City of Montreal and the Australian Film Commission, the rationale here is that funding would be project-specific and that, over time, these events would be sustainable or “graduate to another fund” (Drisdell, 2006, p. 3).

overview of existing funding sources for Canadian festivals, beginning with the observation that the 54 events supported by Canada Showcase in 2004-2005 accessed 21 different federal programs, almost 40 provincial programs and more than 25 municipal sources (Drisdell, 2006, p. 7). At the federal level, the three main sources of support are linked to the Department of Canadian Heritage—Arts Presentation Canada, Annual Assistance to Media Arts Festivals which is administered by the Canada Council for the Arts and the three programs administered by Telefilm Canada. What sets Arts Presentation Canada and CCA’s Media Arts Festivals fund apart is “their requirement that festivals pay artists for the right to screen their works” (Drisdell, 2006, p. 7). The payment of artists’ fees indicates that eligible events are more likely to be “culturally-specific” (p. 7) which is also consistent with the CCA’s focus on supporting independent artists and media arts collectives (Canada Council, *Media Arts*). Consequently, most major festivals are excluded from accessing these sources (p. 8), a viewpoint which is reinforced in a summary of interviews with producers, distributors and directors. Included in *Evaluation of Canada Showcase Program: Summary of Stakeholder Interviews* (Kelly Sears Consulting Group, 2007a) is the shared assessment that “the smaller festivals (category 3) are more cultural events and don’t serve any real industrial purpose” (p. 10). The three categories that emerged from interviews with film industry professionals are “(1) TIFF, (2) large regional festivals, and (3) all others” (Kelly Sears, 2007a, p. 10).

Following on this differentiation of three levels of festivals of cultural interest and those with industry potential, the industry professionals felt that “Telefilm’s role should be to support industry” (Kelly Sears, 2007a, p. 11). Yet, they also argued that “Telefilm’s role should be to get the public out,” both as a function of the Corporation’s audience-building mandate and in recognition of festivals as “an important platform to raise awareness of film” (p. 11). The implication is that the audience is conceived in

industrial terms, although the notion of raising awareness points more to the festival's role in mediating symbolic value. In the absence of artists' fees or a formalized structure for paying film rentals, the characterization of major festivals positions them between production and consumption on the commodity supply chain. This is further reinforced by the Canada Showcase program objectives which strive to "encourage opportunities to celebrate, showcase and market Canadian works at festivals that are international, national or regional in scope" (Telefilm, 2006b, p. 2). According to their Corporate Plan, "Telefilm believes that the extent to which Canadians watch and use the products it helps finance is the key measure of success in meeting its mandate" (Telefilm, 2006c, p. 25 as cited in Kelly Sears, 2007a, p. 13). This quote precedes the recommendations advanced in the *Summary of Stakeholder Interviews* report, thereby contextualizing the designation of audience measurement as a "critical factor in evaluating festival support" (Kelly Sears, 2007a, p. 13) as separate from the Canada Feature Film Fund's domestic audience target.

As a result, there is a disconnect in the Canada Showcase objectives which indicate that the program "plays an important role" in achieving the 5% domestic box office target by assisting festivals that contribute to "the promotion and presentation of Canadian works" (Telefilm 2006b, p. 1). However, that specific role remains undefined and is not actually addressed by performance measures which instead evaluate the festivals themselves. Thus, the bridge from film festival to box office persists as a policy blind spot. Instead, the tacit assumption appears to be that increasing the profile of Canadian cinema builds audiences; but, without a clearer understanding of how festivals increase demand for Canadian films or impact other distribution platforms, it seems that the program objectives actually remain trapped in the previous federal policy aim of building a national film industry. Taking into account changes in the guidelines regarding Canadian content, Telefilm's domestic festival support could be seen as having

evolved into a role of sustaining the profile of Canadian cinema in the context of the circulation of world cinema on the international festival circuit. Canada Showcase's "primary goal...is to increase awareness of high quality Canadian works at Canadian festivals" (Telefilm, 2006b, p. 2). The criteria for evaluating the Canadian content of an event's programming include a focus on "recent productions (maximum two years old)" with Canadian distribution rights held by Canadian distributors and/or producers; thirdly, the films "must be screened under the best possible conditions available to the festival" (ie: favourable time slots and venues) (p. 4).

These criteria are retained from an earlier version of Canada Showcase that outlines a more stringent approach to measuring a festival's presentation of Canadian content. The 2002-2003¹⁹ program evaluation grid considers whether the festival has "dedicated categories or programs," hires an experienced full-time publicist and actively promotes its Canadian programming (Telefilm, 2002, p. 7). The section on performance reporting requests data on the admissions and box office receipts for Canadian titles in relation to overall event totals for public attendance (Telefilm, 2002, p. 8). Another major difference in the older policy involves the establishment of minimum Canadian content requirements of 20% for major festivals (a category that included TIFF, VIFF and the Atlantic Film Festival) and 25% for other applicants (p. 3). In order to calculate these percentages, a formula accounts for both the number of titles and their running times to present a proportional average of Canadian content relative to the total number and length of all titles in the festival (p. 3). According to the Secor Report, the proportion of Canadian films shown at the major festivals in 2003 ranged from 18% at TIFF to 33% at

¹⁹ These guidelines appear to have been in effect during the initial stages of the review of Canada Showcase. An amendment dated September 21, 2004 explains that the guidelines "are currently under revision" (p. 1). The amendment provides a "modified" list of recognized major festivals that excludes the World Film Festival and indicates that certain clauses are "non-applicable to the organization of a film event in Montreal due to the call for proposals issued September 7, 2004" (p. 1). The 2007-2008 guidelines mention the ongoing "independent nation-wide evaluation" of Telefilm's support for audiovisual festivals and maintains a moratorium on both increases to core funding and new applications "during the transition period" (p. 1).

VIFF and 50% at the Atlantic Film Festival; however, on the basis of proportional minutes, VIFF drops to 20% while TIFF rises to 27% and AFF remains in the lead with 59% (Secor, 2004, p. 38). The relevance of the proportional minutes of Canadian content is unclear, except perhaps as a means of differentiating between film formats (ie: shorts and features); otherwise, the implication is that it is favourable to program longer Canadian films.

It is interesting to note that the minimum Canadian content percentages are still cited in the 2007 *Evaluation* report, along with a recommendation that Canadian content numbers (ie: CAVCO certification) be supplied to confirm national origin (Kelly Sears, 2007b, pp. 19-20). The removal of the quantitative Canadian content criteria from the Canada Showcase evaluation grid coincides with the disbanding of Perspective Canada at TIFF, perhaps signalling an acknowledgement of the changing contours of national cinema programming—such that prestigious slots matter more than a carefully-bounded national showcase; if the timing is indeed more than coincidental, it also confirms the use of TIFF as a benchmark for the evaluation of major Canadian festivals. While the shift away from minimum thresholds and packaging requirements for national content to a consideration of overall profile might be in keeping with the policy switch from building an industry to building audiences, another change to the assessment criteria reflects a re-framing of Telefilm's role in the process. The 2002-2003 evaluation grid devotes 10% of the applicant's score to the "recognition of Telefilm Canada...as outlined in a visibility plan" (Telefilm, 2002, p. 8). This means that "Telefilm branding" is one of the objectives of the Corporation's funding support for domestic festivals (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 2); in other words, along with the "primary goal...to increase awareness of high quality Canadian works" (Telefilm 2006b, p. 2), an unstated aim of Canada Showcase is to ensure public awareness of the federal government's role as a cultural investor.

To a certain extent then, Canada Showcase acts as a festival sponsor with a

financial contribution made in exchange for advertising space and logo placement. As part of the examination of festival support in other countries, *Best Practices* notes that “most assistance is in the form of sponsorship and does not necessarily fall within the parameters of a set programme” (Drisdell, 2006, p. 14). The connotations of this support model are clearly negative as the subsequent overview refers to France’s multiple initiatives from different programs as having “[n]o set criteria” while Germany has “[n]o set policies for film festival support, though it supports the Berlin Film Festival” (Drisdell, 2006, p. 18). Thus, a reliance on sponsorship arrangements corresponds with limited formalized policy development such that there is “no common strategy” and “very little policy direction” (p. 14). The *Evaluation* report is critical of the inclusion of “branding and visibility” as a program objective for Canada Showcase (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 18). The recommendations for program design include the stipulation that the procedure for applicant assessment be changed such that “while festivals are obliged to recognize Telefilm’s support, such recognition is not a criteria used for evaluation” (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 19). While the same section about “recognition” occurs in both the 2002-2003 and 2006-2007 general program guidelines with the requirement of a “plan for dealing with sponsors’ acknowledgement” (Telefilm, 2002, p. 6; Telefilm, 2006b, p. 5),²⁰ the criteria have been removed from the 2006-2007 evaluation grid. This means that while funding acknowledgement is still required, attention will be directed at measuring the outcomes of funding support rather than the visibility of the sponsor, thus placing the focus more directly on the CFFF’s primary audience building goal.

Prior to the internal restructuring that resulted in the creation of an Industry Development department, Canada Showcase was administered by Telefilm’s Communications Department (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 1), a model that reinforced the

²⁰ The only change to the wording of this section involves the removal of the clause “in both official languages” from a sentence about public recognition of Telefilm’s support in “all advertising, promotional and program materials” (Telefilm, 2006b, p. 6).

program's re-doubled role of promoting Canadian cinema and corporate branding. With the reformulation of the evaluation grid, Telefilm has re-positioned itself as arbiter of the domestic festival circuit, taking up the role that the Corporation's Festivals Bureau had been chided for shirking back in the 1980s ("Canada's many festivals"). On one hand, the ongoing refinement of policy objectives and eligibility criteria to reflect a sharper focus on industrial goals creates a two-tiered system of international/national/regional events (Telefilm, 2006b, p. 2) and those that are culturally-specific or locally-focussed. At the same time, although the Secor Report positions public partners as one of three main stakeholder groups, Telefilm's use of the resulting success factor model further positions the Corporation as the overseer of everyone's interests. For their *Analysis of Canada's Major Film Festivals*, Secor Consulting (2004) set out "to identify a certain number of success factors—corresponding to the expectations of the festivals' different partners and clienteles—and to make a summary diagnosis of these events in relation to the criteria" (p. 3). In addition to the aforementioned category of public partners, the other two types of festival stakeholders are film professionals and the general public.

In order to measure festival performance in relation to the expectations of these groups, the Report explains that "it is important that they be clearly differentiated" (Secor, 2004, p. 3). A subsequent diagram positions three circles, containing a list of each group's expectations, around a box marked "film festival" that includes items like resources, systems, relations and organization; arrows flow in both directions between the festival and stakeholders but not between the groups (p. 3). While the general public²¹ expects quality programming, ambiance or atmosphere and value for their money, industry professionals also desire program quality (but more for professional goals like

²¹ Aside from the focus groups with Montreal audiences, the general public was not surveyed for the Secor Report. The study's methodological approach included interviews with national and foreign industry professionals and festival management (Secor, 2004, p. 12). The focus groups were used to compensate for a lack of information on the World Film Festival (p. 15) whose management refused to participate (p. 2). The focus group discussion topics did address programming, cost and atmosphere (p. 15). Other than that, the Report states that "attendance remains the best measure of a festival's appeal and popularity" (p. 4).

“writ[ing] reviews” or “mak[ing] discoveries”) as well as opportunities to network, make deals and launch projects (Secor, 2004, p. 4). The public agencies that support festivals have a longer list of expectations and the subsequent explanation of their success factors exceeds what is provided for the other two stakeholder groups combined. From cultural diversity (defined as “diverse cinematic voices”) and the promotion of national cinema to audience building and community involvement to economic impact and sound governance (Secor, 2004, p. 3), the success factors for public partners encompass cultural objectives for the film sector and the need to ensure that funds are allocated to quality organizations (p. 5). As a result, there is some overlap with the success factors of the other stakeholder groups. For instance, cultural diversity affects program quality while the promotion of national cinema implicates industry professionals, as does economic impact.

Although the intent is to delineate the differing interests of stakeholder groups, success factors like audience building, economic impact and sound governance set public sector partners above the other two groups. The language of the Secor Report subtly reflects this hierarchy as the general public and industry professionals are described in terms of their attendance and use of the festival’s resources whereas public partners “use various mechanisms to encourage the staging, success and publicizing of these events” (p. 4); in other words, public agencies are seen as playing an active role in facilitating festivals which implies a level of control. Furthermore, the discussion of the government’s film sector objectives incorporates stakeholder involvement or the “capacity to rally and involve the local community, the business world, public partners and, especially, film industry professionals” (Secor, 2004, p. 5). This meta-role, which seems to include public partners rallying their own participation in the film sector (most likely via partnerships between levels of government), subsumes all of the differing stakeholder expectations within one overarching set of success factors. Given the study’s

objective “to provide public partners...with an analytical framework that will allow them to evaluate the impact of their film festival investments” (Secor, 2004, p. 12), it is not surprising that the delineation of success factors is skewed through the lens of the broad interests of government agencies.

The revised Canada Showcase evaluation grid for assessing funding applicants allocates 100 points across three main categories—impact of the event (40 points), governance structure (30 points) and overall merit of the event (30 points) (Telefilm, 2006b, pp. 6-7). The event’s impact is divided further into cultural, professional and community objectives which correspond roughly to the stakeholder expectations outlined in the Secor Report. The standards for assessing professional impact match up with the success factors for industry professionals and the reference to the “projected professional impact of the festival” (Telefilm, 2006b, p. 6) suggests the potential to chart more fully aspects of the value chain (as with the earlier BC Film example of *The Corporation*). In addition, the criteria of “quality,” “relevance” and “involvement” for forum attendees are reminiscent of the performance indicators used in the *International Festivals & Markets Report*. Audience building continues to be classified as a cultural goal while the general public’s expectations not only are split between cultural and community impact but also are blended with the public partners’ success factors. Such fragmentation makes the connection to the 5% box office target unclear, particularly with only ¼ of the event impact score devoted to industry objectives. It also mistakenly perpetuates broad and diffuse public sector goals.

Discussion of governance structure picks up three of the four “strategic elements,” financial situation, operational management and governance that were analysed for each major festival as part of the Secor Report (p. 12). This allows for a standardized and comparative view of organizational structure, business strategy and financial performance, an approach that favours TIFF as a national benchmark but that could

generate a separate model for regional events like VIFF. The fourth strategic element, “positioning” (p. 12), seems to inform the evaluative section on the overall merit of the event. Three of the four points invoke the competitive balance of the international festival circuit as it is addressed in the Secor Report’s overview of the international context for major festivals and markets. The significance of positioning on an increasingly crowded international circuit relies on event focus as a means to develop a niche (p. 17) and “activity diversification” as an organizational strategy to ensure fiscal stability (p. 19) while “dates are a decisive factor” as industry professionals must “plan their year around well-established seasons and circuits in order to maximize their time in line with each event’s potential” (p. 18). The delineation of “overall merit” considers the local, national and international ramifications of festival positioning in relation to “originality and distinctiveness,” “complementarity” and the ability “to enhance and diversify the roster of film events” (Telefilm, 2006b, p. 7).

With 60% of the Canada Showcase evaluation grid focussed on governance structure and positioning, success factors garner less than half of the points while the interests of public sector partners appear to reach beyond overseeing stakeholders’ expectations. Instead, the weighting of the assessment criteria suggests that Telefilm may be attempting to stand in for FIAPF in monitoring the Canadian festival circuit. After the Montreal World Film Festival’s accreditation lapsed in late 2002,²² TIFF became Canada’s “only accredited event;” and since “no American event belongs to the Federation,”²³ FIAPF remains focussed almost exclusively on Europe and Asia (Secor,

²² In a *Globe and Mail* article, “Montreal film fest absent its A-list status,” James Adams (2003) notes the lack of clarity as to whether the accreditation was “withdrawn” at the request of World Film Festival organizers who felt the ranking “was of no use” or denied by FIAPF because the event’s 2003 dates were set without their approval. In 2003, the dates of the Montreal festival were set to overlap with those of Venice and Toronto.

²³ FIAPF lists the AFI Los Angeles International Film Festival as an accredited competitive specialised feature film festival (FIAPF, “Competitive specialised feature film festivals”). In the mid-1980s, AFI Fest took over FILMEX (Los Angeles Film Exposition), which launched in 1971, making it the “longest running film festival in Los Angeles” (AFIFEST, “General information”). This minor oversight does not alter the Secor Report’s assessment of FIAPF as predominantly focused on Europe and Asia.

2004, p. 17). Yet, aside from Telefilm's potential role as domestic festival arbiter, there is a separate question as to whether the assessment of governance structure makes a fundamental error in overestimating the festivals' reliance on, and accountability to, the federal funding agency. In terms of their legal status, Canada's major festivals are non-profit corporations, which means they "must demonstrate a high level of transparency and effective governance," as well as "independent organizations that do not report directly to public authorities" (Secor, 2004, p. 21); in contrast, the Festival de Cannes operates under the auspices of the Ministries of Culture and Foreign Affairs while the Berlinale is a division of the German Ministry of Culture (Secor, 2004, p. 21). Consequently, for Canadian festivals, their fiduciary duty is overseen by a board of directors while a public/private funding structure makes them selectively answerable to multiple stakeholders.

With the Secor Report, specific attention was directed toward the Montreal World Film Festival. According to the announcement that accompanied the release of the study, Telefilm and SODEC commissioned Secor Consulting to analyse the success factors of Canada's four major festivals "[o]n the basis of a shared wish to critically assess Montréal's World Film Festival" (Telefilm, 2004). A Background Report that was prepared for the Minister of Heritage in 2006 offers a slightly less accusatory perspective by contextualizing the Secor study in relation to corporate planning that was aimed at "optimizing the impact of [Telefilm's] funding activities" (Telefilm, 2006a, p. 5) and thus included a reassessment of Canada Showcase (p. 6). In addition, as noted in the Background Report, the 2002-2003 Canada Showcase guidelines stipulate that festival funding is "conditional on Telefilm's right to 'audit all accounts and records of the applicant to ensure that funds provided were used for the purposes intended'" (Telefilm, 2006a, p. 6). However, as mentioned earlier, the Montreal World Film Festival management and Chair of the Board refused to participate in the study (Secor, 2004, p. 2)

and, during the same period, disrupted an audit of their books by Richter & Associés (Telefilm, 2006a, p. 7). The Secor Report observes that the WFF management is “overtly criticized by the local industry” for a “lack of openness and generosity” (Secor, 2004, p. 8) while foreign professionals “cite flaws in the quality of the hospitality and overall organization” (p. 9). As for public partner expectations, the Festival’s “organization and its governance” fell short, mostly due to “a lack of transparency” but also because of a lack of evolution in its financial structure which was deemed to have relied disproportionately on public funding in comparison to the other three major festivals (Secor, 2004, p. 9).

Based on the Richter audit, over \$125,000 in funding was withheld from the 2004 WFF as a partial reimbursement of funds for the 2003 event (Telefilm, 2006a, p. 11). Shortly thereafter, Telefilm and SODEC issued a Call for Proposals that would re-direct their funding support to a film event in Montreal that would “ensure Canadian cinema ‘a national and international platform...that offers the best in terms of programming, promotion, and business development, including sales and coproduction’” (Telefilm, 2006a, p. 14). Four proposals were submitted and the Background Report details the ensuing selection process that resulted in funding approval for l’Equipe Spectra, a firm previously known for organizing Montreal’s jazz festival (pp. 16-24).²⁴ The Spectra proposal was mandated by a group of 18 high-ranking industry professionals (referred to in the Background Report as “Regroupement”) that included François Macerola, Denise Robert, Christian Larouche and Victor Loewy and an endorsement from NFB Chair and Government Film Commissioner Jacques Bensimon (p. 16). Meanwhile, in December of 2004, the World Film Festival filed a lawsuit in Quebec Superior Court “alleging that its

²⁴ Although the process initially had favoured a proposal from the Festival de Nouveau Cinéma (FNC) (Telefilm, 2006a, p. 17), the applicants were asked to re-submit more fully developed proposals (p. 19) at which time Spectra stood out for “organizational expertise” while FNC was recognized for “in-depth knowledge of the industry” (p. 21). After an attempted strategic alliance with Spectra was rejected by the FNC board causing Board Chair Daniel Langlois to join the Regroupement board, the Spectra proposal was approved (p. 24).

reputation had been unjustly besmirched” (Telefilm, 2006a, p. 3) and seeking \$2.5 million in damages. In 2005, WFF also filed in Federal Court for a judicial review of the Call for Proposals and the decision to select one of the proposals.

It is interesting to note that these events coincided with other international examples of public sector intervention into festival governance. In April 2005, the Greek Ministry of Culture removed the president and artistic director of the Thessaloniki International Film Festival from their posts as part of “sweeping changes to state subsidised film institutions” that followed the election of a new Conservative government (Grivas, 2005). That same year, the firing of the director and program manager of the Buenos Aires International Film Festival by the city government sparked an international protest that included a petition written by French filmmaker Claire Denis and *Cahier du Cinéma* editor Jean-Michel Frodon (Peranson, 2005, p. 5). Thus, the issues of festival accountability, government control and programming autonomy undoubtedly were topics of discussion for those directly involved with the international festival circuit. At the same time, given that the complexities of the WFF controversy would not be illuminated more fully until the following year when the federal government “asked for a detailed report on the way funding from the federal cultural agency was funnelled to a fledgling film festival” (“Federal government wants inquiry”),²⁵ it appeared that the ultimate objective was to unseat WFF Director Serge Losique.

Therefore, as the 2005 festival season unfolded, “[t]he conventional wisdom was that, after Telefilm Canada and SODEC yanked their funding from the WFF, it would fold” (Hays, 2005). But this did not happen and instead the fall of 2006 saw three international film festivals in Montreal within an 8-week period—WFF, FNC and the new Montreal International Film Festival; Losique sued over naming rights (Hays, 2005)

²⁵ Even then, information was limited somewhat when the Background Report was released because the ongoing litigation and inclusion of confidential details relating to third parties (including TIFFF) necessitated that large sections of text be blacked out (Telefilm, 2006a, p. 3).

and Spectra's event became known as the New Montreal FilmFest. *Playback* reported that filmmakers were confused regarding which festival would provide their work with the best possible public and media exposure (Hays, 2005). Industry concerns about the New FilmFest spread as distributor New Line withdrew the closing night film (*Domino*, Scott, 2005), noting that "no talent was set to accompany the film to Montreal" and "there was no point screening the pic...so far in advance of its commercial launch" (Kelly, 2005). The *Variety* article proceeded to mention "near-empty cinemas" and to quote public squabbles between the festival's president and program director over the event's organizational shortcomings (Kelly, 2005). On closing night, the festival apologized for the poor attendance and admitted that "'this edition did not measure up to expectations'" (as cited in Seguin, 2005). *Screen Daily* noted "gleeful competition among Montreal journalists trying to find cinemas with the fewest paying customers" (Seguin, 2005). Five months later, the New FilmFest folded with L'Equipe Spectra president Alain Simard explaining that "'we wanted at all costs to avoid having Montreal again project an incoherent image internationally with the holding of various competing festivals'" (as cited in Hays, 2006).

In a 2007 *Globe and Mail* article about WFF's "stormy two-year hiatus," James Adams (2007) summarized that "SODEC and Telefilm together pulled more than \$1-million in investments from the World Film Festival in 2005 and essentially redirected that money, along with an additional \$750,000, to what turned out to be the ill-fated New Montreal FilmFest." The outcomes of this intervention into festival governance provide insight into the complex blend of stakeholder interests that sustains these events.

Although the Secor Report provides an adequate model for analysing success factors, it frames the festival's operational structure mostly from the perspective of public sector partners. The contributions of Telefilm's review of domestic festival support need to be interpreted in relation to two key timing issues. The launches of TIFF and WFF occurred

after the evolution of programming autonomy on the international circuit, which set the stage for the development of a hybrid private/public governance structure within independent non-profit organizations. As a result, major Canadian festivals are best understood in terms of a relational perspective on stakeholder struggles, as no one group predominates. In addition, the impetus behind Telefilm's attempt to re-define its role from sponsor to arbiter probably had more to do with the perceived need to rein in a major festival run amok than with the realignment of strategic objectives vis a vis the Corporate Plan. The Background Report prepared for the Minister of Heritage points to the alleged mismanagement of government funding (even though most of the details are blacked out for confidentiality reasons), a scenario that was exacerbated by the intervention of Telefilm and SODEC; the untenable festival traffic jam and the failure of the new event selected for funding provide little positive support for Telefilm's initial efforts to take a proactive role with the domestic circuit. Consequently, the shoring up of festival policy and the direction taken with the new guidelines have to be read against the Montreal festival funding debacle.

Postscript: New Policy Directions or Same Vexing Dead-ends?

The media are a key oversight of Secor's stakeholder model as the "written festival" plays a significant role in establishing the symbolic contours of festival space and channelling an event's dispersive energy—including spreading the word about the state of Montreal fall festival scene. In 2007, the Montreal World Film Festival celebrated its 31st anniversary by declaring that "everything is back to normal" (as cited in Adams, 2007). Adams explains that SODEC contributed \$270,000, Telefilm returned as an investor with a modest commitment to subtitle 12 films, major distributors like Seville Pictures "restored relations," FIAPF A-status was restored, "Losique quietly dropped the \$2.5 million lawsuit" and the Festival seemed to have "regained the lustre it had in the late 1970s and early 1980s as Canada's premiere film fete." A couple of

months later, Telefilm announced that additional financing of up to \$249,000 would be provided for the 31st WFF (Telefilm, 2007, October 1). According to Telefilm's official statement, "negotiations between the two parties featured extended discussions concerning the WFF meeting the Corporation's terms and conditions, including the immediate implementation of measures to enhance corporate governance and strengthen financial controls" (Telefilm, 2007, October 1). This listing of the WFF's health indicators, including the return of its lustre, indicates that the balance of stakeholder interests appears to have been restored. At the same time though, this resolution is also consistent with the assessment that stakeholder responses in interviews concerning Canada Showcase "were filtered through a lens of self-interest" (Kelly Sears, 2007a, p. 12). Indeed, the apparent revitalization of WFF resulted less from a revised consensus amongst stakeholder groups than a new structure of objective relations between self-interested agents struggling over competitive position-takings in the field.

Faced with the proliferation of festivals on the domestic circuit, it is important to consider the impact of these seemingly irreconcilable interests. A key finding of the study of stakeholder interviews relates to the "disparity between how festival professionals perceive their events, and how film industry professionals—producers, directors, distributors—perceive events" (Kelly Sears, 2007a, p. 2). While festival directors share a common view that their events provide valuable exposure and instrumental professional opportunities (p. 6), industry stakeholders provide a "more nuanced" (p. 9) perspective. Although regional events like VIFF and the Atlantic Film Festival can be useful, depending on release schedules or specific forum sessions, TIFF comprises "a world-class event" of a size and scope that make it "a platform for 'virtually anything'" (Kelly Sears, 2007a, p. 9). Opinions diverge on the topic of audience access with the opportunity to obtain feedback (p. 9) balanced against the concern that festivals "deplete the audience for Canadian film without providing financial benefits to producers

or distributors” (p. 10). At the same time, it is characterized as ““a bit of a false audience [because] people who go to film festivals are not typical moviegoers, they are enthusiasts”” (p. 9). For the catchall third category of “smaller festivals,” participation is seen as increasingly “burdensome in terms of time, money and overhead.” As a result, given the recommendation that “[a]udiences should be a critical factor in evaluating festival support” (Kelly Sears, 2007a, p. 3), it is necessary to clarify how the audience is being defined and by whom. Is it a “false audience” of cinephiles or a valuable promotional tool or a lost portion of commercial revenue? How does the issue of access to a diverse range of cultural products factor into the mix? Finally, for the sake of Telefilm’s primary objective of audience building, how does all of this impact domestic market share?

The question of whether (or how) festival support builds domestic audiences for Canadian cinema is a vexing one that remains unresolved in Telefilm’s new funding guidelines. In 2008, Canada Showcase was replaced by two new programs—the Festivals Performance Program and the Skills and Screens Program. The combination of a nationally-administered performance-based component with a regional selective component mirrors the re-structuring of feature film funding in 2000. The allocation of a portion of the Feature Film Fund into performance envelopes which would be used to reward box office success raised concerns for the fate of auteur filmmaking in Canada. Urquhart cites a 2004 quote from acclaimed actor Sarah Polley—“I don’t think the answer to making our films more accessible is to make dumber, more commercial movies””—as an example of a typical critique of the impact of market criteria on cinematic value (2006, p. 50). He deems Polley’s comment emblematic of “a stubborn divide in the discourse surrounding the Canadian cinema between art and commerce, phoney though this divide may be in practice” (p. 50); that year’s critical and box office success, *Les invasions barbares* (Arcand, 2004) is used to counter Polley’s claim.

Longfellow (2006) observes that the 2000 Feature Film Fund guidelines “aligned federal cultural priorities with developments in the global political economy of the film industry” (such as concentrated ownership and vertical integration) that had intensified the stakes in international market competition (p. 195). These evaluations provide interesting insight into the application of the performance envelope model to domestic festivals.

The Festivals Performance Fund targets events that “achieve a minimum of 100,000 in overall attendance at the screening of feature length films” (Telefilm, 2008a, p. 4). Additional eligibility criteria relate to fiscal stability, sound governance and ownership (ie: nationally owned and operated). For eligible festivals, the performance envelopes will be calculated according to the following weighted criteria: “the festival’s ability to generate total feature film audience attendance” (20%), “the number of Canadian feature films programmed” (20%), “the festival’s ability to generate revenues” (20%) and “the festival’s historical level of funding...from Canada Showcase” (40%) (Telefilm, 2008a, p. 5). Over time, the intention is to reduce the historical weighting in favour of an increased focus on assembling Canadian audiences for Canadian feature films. The performance envelope model places the bulk of its emphasis on market success and eliminates elements from the Canada Showcase evaluation grid that addressed aspects of cultural impact, such as “program quality and calibre,” and of community impact through the “enhancement of the existing local cinematic menu” (Telefilm, 2008a, p. 6). A mirroring of Polley’s comment would invoke a fear of the “dumbing down” of the festival or perhaps the conviction that the lure of celebrity will trump an eclectic programming vision. As discussed in Chapter Two, some might argue that TIFF has already been dumbed down in its populist pursuit of celebrity culture; but that assessment proves to be both stubbornly simplistic and indicative of a phoney divide at the heart of the international festival’s cachet.

Instead, the implication is that the “predictable core funding” set as a policy

outcome (Telefilm, 2008a, p. 4) will accrue on a multi-year basis to the major film festivals, in keeping with a recommendation noted in the Stakeholder Interviews (Kelly Sears, 2007a). A consideration of Longfellow's perspective suggests that festival support is being aligned with a dominant vision of benchmark festivals like TIFF as the drivers of policy. It also points to a model for sustainability (in the generation of revenue) that reaches into a broader vision for urban cultural infrastructure. The lingering impact of the WFF funding controversy can be seen in the inclusion of a "Fair Warning Policy" that allows for the stepped withdrawal of support, from a 10% reduction in the first year to a 50% reduction in the second and program ineligibility by the third (Telefilm, 2008a, p. 6). The progressive withdrawal of support is triggered by the failure to achieve the "minimum audience threshold of 100,000." While public attendance was not the issue with the Montreal World Film Festival, the lack of an exit clause made it difficult for Telefilm to withdraw funding without an extensive audit; the Secor Report findings also marshalled support for arguments about the WFF's shortcomings.

As a complement to the audience-focus of Festivals Performance, the Skills and Screens Program targets the objective of building industry capacity. Funding support is determined through an annual competition held in each of Telefilm's four regional offices. The evaluation criteria, which do not stipulate relative weighting, include a business plan aligned with Telefilm's strategic objectives and the region's "unique needs," fiscal stability and "track records" of the event and team (Telefilm, 2008b, p. 6). The business plan also must contribute to one or more of the seven priority areas outlined as an elaboration of the corporate objectives (p. 4). The first priority is to "increase audience awareness and diversification" while the subsequent areas refer to examples like mentorship programs, networking, skills development initiatives, increased opportunities for culturally diverse creative workers and improved "access to international partnerships" (p. 4). These priority areas are filtered through the lens of three key

strategies identified to achieve the objective of building capacity—increased “awareness and accessibility of Canadian talent and content to audiences at home and abroad,” “foreign sales and financing opportunities” and “practical training opportunities” for “new talent and diverse voices” (p. 3). Although there are cultural elements to these strategies and priorities, the predominant focus on aspects of professional development indicates that the intent is to support a regional tier of festivals. Of the three levels of festivals identified by industry stakeholders during the Canada Showcase review—TIFF, regional events and local cultural events—the third category was defined by the lack of professional opportunities, which suggests that these festivals will have to look elsewhere for public support (ie: Canada Council). Finally, it is interesting to note that “Visibility” returns to the evaluation grid, making impact on the profile of Telefilm (albeit couched in language stressing “its financial support to the industry”) once again a criterion for festival support.

The new guidelines make Telefilm look less like an arbiter when compared to Canada Showcase’s 60% weighting of the evaluation grid toward issues of governance and merit. The selective nature of the Skills and Screens competitive application allows for some discretion in influencing the development of the domestic festival circuit; but the sense of regulatory panic inspired by the WFF controversy has subsided. With \$2.5 million set aside for the selective component, as compared to \$1.2 million for the performance envelopes, Skills and Screens takes up almost 70% of the funds allocated for domestic festival support (Telefilm, “Questions and Answers”). Taken alongside the concentration on industrial outcomes, this suggests that Telefilm policy reflects a conceptualization of regional festivals as intermediaries in the industry value chain. For the major festivals, the implications are less clear. Popularity as a signal of event value points to Telefilm’s stated “[belief] that the extent to which Canadians watch and use the products it helps finance is the key measure of success in meeting its mandate” (Telefilm,

2006c, p. 26). But it also raises the spectre of market share without reconciling the split between theatrical and non-theatrical audiences. There is no explanation of how audiences in excess of 100,000 contribute to the primary audience-building goal of the Canada Feature Film Policy, which is measured as industrial market share. Faced with the proliferation of non-theatrical venues, including the investment of major festivals like VIFF and TIFF in bricks and mortar, there is a missed opportunity here to consider what role these alternative sites are playing in solving the distribution problems that have long plagued Canadian cinema—especially given that the festival circuit is the one area of distribution that federal regulators can (and already) influence. Ultimately, the federal policy review resulted in a re-packaging of the same vexing anomalies rather than an evolved perspective on Canada's multiplatform environment.

CONCLUSION
FESTIVALS, VALUE AND
THE VEXING PROBLEM OF NATIONAL CINEMA

Through these written narratives of two major Canadian festivals, I have examined the development of distinct regional events whose differences exceed simple comparisons of their size or scope. Disparate founding visions place these festivals on opposing sides of an industry/audience divide with the Festival of Festivals launched as a showcase celebrating the best of the international circuit, in hopes of drawing industry players to Toronto, and VIFF started as the entrepreneurial venture of a local repertory theatre owner, seeking to provide an alternative to mainstream exhibition. Although the disparity is not as straightforward as the dichotomy suggests, TIFF can be seen as attracting the moths while VIFF favours the moles. As discussed in Chapter Two, Andrew Sarris differentiates between how the celebrity limelight draws the moths while the darkened theatre is home to the more cinephilic moles, even though both groups generate and enjoy festival buzz. There is a centre-periphery aspect to the divergent paths of TIFF and VIFF given Toronto's status as the domestic production centre, with proximity to the headquarters of industry stakeholders and policymakers.

The festivals' historical trajectories likely were inflected as well by the emergence of a national film scene at TIFF contrasted by the timing of VIFF toward the end of the fall festival calendar. In the evitable media comparisons of the two festivals, VIFF's commitment to non-mainstream fare is often discounted as evidence of the event's failure to attract international celebrities for red carpet premieres—a value judgement that privileges industrial criteria and the newsworthiness of that which attracts the moths. As a written festival, VIFF's identity reflects its community roots; and, an attempt to raise the Vancouver festival's international profile, with the rising administrative costs and

reduced public accessibility that that would have entailed, was met with accusations of elitism, resulting in a board takeover led by festival founder Leonard Schein who had returned from TIFF and central Canada. During his brief stint as Director of the Toronto Festival, Schein's presence appeared to disrupt the balance of cultural and industrial goals that informed the Festival of Festival's evolving identity. Increased celebrity attendance, corporate restructuring and a public relations drive that included tight control of the festival's master narrative would subsequently transform the Toronto International Film Festival into a premiere event (in multiple senses of the term).

Even though it is an industry hub and gateway to the North American market, TIFF proclaims its status as "the largest public film festival in the world," with the implication that anyone can step past the velvet ropes to join the party (TIFF, *TIFFG Year-round*). At the same time, in dubbing itself "The People's Festival," TIFF sets up its impressive potential as a marketing tool. In the TIFFG's 2006 Annual Report, a cover shot of the "The People's Festival" issue of the *Festival Daily* accompanies a list of "Facts" that begins with the program statistics noting "352 films from 61 countries" and that 91% of features screened were premieres (p. 29). The list proceeds to document 1,372 festival guests (including government and industry delegates), 1,030 members of the press, 340,840 total admissions (public and industry) and then concludes with a reference to over 2.35 million Web site hits (p. 29). These numbers point to an impressive capacity to catalyze attention for the latest crop of international cinema. In comparison, the Secor Report notes that VIFF accredited 186 journalists in 2003, only 20 of whom were foreign (2004, p. 45). VIFF presents itself as a venue for the pursuit of cosmopolitan cinephilia, encapsulated by the phrase "Same Planet. Different Worlds." Through the universal language of cinema, audiences can experience diverse cultures and encounter a more eclectic range of fiction and nonfiction filmmaking than can be found on mainstream screens. This vision evokes Bill Nichols' (1994b) description of the experience of new cinemas in the festival context of the traffic of international film style.

Much like Nichols' model, "Same Planet. Different Worlds." also functions to brand VIFF as an oppositional or non-Hollywood space.

Although the differentiation of the Vancouver and Toronto festivals does demonstrate what Stringer refers to as the negotiation of power relations between geographic locations, the case studies show that the evolution of these two international festivals cannot merely be reduced to this type of spatial logic. Stringer conceptualizes the festival circuit as "an allegorization of space and its power relations [that] operates through the transfer of value between and within distinct geographic localities" (2001, p. 138). Mapping the circuit in terms of the geographic inequalities of international film culture assumes that the complexities of the uneven distribution of symbolic, economic and cultural capital can be subsumed within a single overarching hierarchy of value. This approach downplays the existence of *hierarchies* of value as industrial, governmental and cinephilic stakeholders struggle over multiple definitions of cultural authority. Rather than competing national (or international) film scenes, the contingent histories of film festivals are more fully captured by their articulation within a web of local, regional, national and international interests. For example, these factors inflected the design of permanent festival facilities, both of which are linked to real estate developments in their respective downtown cores. The Vancouver International Film Centre comprises a civic cultural amenity with a public service remit that requires the coordination of an atomized local non-profit arts sector. With partial federal funding as a contribution to national cultural infrastructure, Bell Lightbox is being positioned as a landmark destination in a global city.

In providing a Canadian perspective on the international film festival, I have examined the negotiation of value, both as a defining characteristic of the productive aspects of this intermediary space and as a vexing aspect of the distinction between theatrical and non-theatrical exhibition. The problem of audience access is a fundamental issue for Canadian cinema. In 2007, Canadian films garnered 3.2% of the total domestic

box office revenues (down from an all-time high of 5.5% in 2005), as compared to an 88.9% share for American films and 7.8% for other foreign films (CFTPA & APFTQ, 2008, p. 68). Thus, it is an economic issue in that indigenous films earned only \$28 million of the \$858 million collected at Canadian theatres (p. 68) as well as a symbolic one given that these figures are seen to indicate the relative absence of a distinct nationally popular cinema culture. As a discursive construct in federal feature film policy, the national audience appears doubly defined as both a public joined through their consumption of cultural texts and a market targeted by industry initiatives. These two configurations, which relate to the symbolic and economic value of national cinema, are not mutually exclusive especially when it comes to the pursuit of a vibrant national film industry. However, the film festival's location in the gap between production and consumption means that economic return for the film commodity is deferred in favour of symbolic gain—with the impact that these non-theatrical sites maintain a split perspective on the audience as public and as marketing tool. In federal policy, this division emerges as a fundamental split between cultural and industrial objectives that creates blind spots regarding the operation of the film industry value chain and the festival's role in audience building.

With *Scripts, Screens and Audiences*, feature film policy strengthened its focus on the industrial objective of building a national audience and continued its shift towards a performance-based approach by calling for more nuanced measurements of domestic market share that consider ancillary distribution platforms as well as Canada's two distinct language markets. In 2007, Canadian films accounted for 16.2% of the total box office of the French-language market as compared to a 0.9% share of the English-language box office (CFTPA & APFTQ, 2008, p. 70). Between 2002 and 2007, the French-language market share ranged from a low of 12.5% in 2002 to a high of 27% in 2005 while the English-language market share hovered consistently between 1 and 2 percent with a low of 0.8% in 2003 and a high of 1.7% in 2006 (p. 70). Consequently,

references to the vexing problem of Canadian cinema invoke the failure of *English-Canadian* films to gain more than a minor toehold in their domestic linguistic market. The perception of success remains tied to theatrical box office performance and relies on a two market model that positions Quebec cinema¹ as economically and culturally superior. While the co-extensive boundaries of the French-language market and provincial production jurisdiction provide for a relatively straightforward correspondence of support mechanisms and performance indicators, this model results in a reductive nationalist conception of English-Canadian cinema. At the same time, the potential development of a popular national cinema is thwarted by the structure of a highly concentrated exhibition sector. In Canada, more than half of the theatrical screens are controlled by two chains, Cineplex Galaxy and Empire (Acland, 2008, p. 93).² Charles Acland (2003) explains that ownership concentration, the rise of the megaplex and global saturation releases have resulted in the presence of “a short-lived but massively visible core of new texts” (p. 160) on theatrical circuits. As such, he observes that popular cinema-going culture in Canada “produces participation in cinematic cosmopolitanism, displaying degrees of immersion into international cultural life” (p. 194); however, despite the global dimensions of this screen traffic, what is ultimately produced is continental immersion in Hollywood cinema culture.

¹ According to *Profile 2008*, “these markets are not province specific” in that the data capture films exhibited in English or French (whether that’s a film’s original language or it has been dubbed or subtitled) regardless of the location of the theatre (CFTPA & APFTQ, 2008, p. 70). That said, it is also noted that “only Quebec and New Brunswick are captured at this point in time” for the French-language market (p. 70). According to data collected from CAVCO, New Brunswick has contributed 0% to the annual volume of Canadian theatrical production (measured in \$ millions) since 2001/2002 (CFTPA & APFTQ, 2008, p. 64). Thus, given that Quebec is the centre for French-language Canadian production, there is an easy slippage between market and production jurisdiction that equates French-Canadian film with Quebec cinema.

² Acland (2003) chronicles the mergers, expansion efforts and building investments that have shaped a Canadian exhibition sector that has consistently been dominated by a small number of chains (pp. 170-177). In 1998, the dominant two chains were Famous Players, a subsidiary of Viacom, owned by the then ninth-ranking American chain National Amusements, and Cineplex Odeon which had recently merged with Sony’s Loew’s Theatres (pp. 170-171). In 2005, the two largest Canadian chains merged when Cineplex Galaxy acquired Famous Players, requiring the divestiture of 35 theatres most of which were subsequently acquired by Empire (Acland, 2008, pp. 92-93).

As further evidence of the comparatively poor box office share garnered by English-Canadian cinema, *Profile 2008* reviews that massively visible core of texts, looking for Canadian titles amongst each linguistic market's top ten. Whereas the French-language top ten list included three indigenous titles, a bullet point highlights the fact that "[i]n the English-language market, there were no Canadian films ranked among the top ten films in 2007" (CFTPA & APFTQ, 2008, p. 71). The fourth highest grossing French-language film (and thus also the top grossing Canadian film) in 2007 was *Les 3 P'tits cochons*, the directorial debut of Patrick Huard who is best known in English-Canada as the co-star of *Bon Cop, Bad Cop* (Canuel, 2006); both films were presented with the Golden Reel, for highest domestic box office, in successive years at the Genie Awards. As a marker of textual value, the Golden Reel has a checkered history having been awarded to films as disparate as *Le Déclin de l'empire américain* (Arcand, 1986), *Resident Evil: Apocalypse* (Witt, 2004) and *Porky's* (Clark, 1982) (Academy of Canadian Cinema & Television). These films range from a Quebecois auteur's critically-acclaimed Academy Award nominee to a service production that passes as American to a sex comedy that is the oft-cited exemplar of the cultural failings of the tax shelter era; in other words, domestic box office success subsumes differences in genre, production mode and critical value in favour of the criterion of popularity.

Earlier in the *Profile 2008* report, a discussion of Canadian theatrical production lauds two internationally acclaimed films, David Cronenberg's *Eastern Promises* and Sarah Polley's *Away from Her*, as "the bright spots for Canada's English-language cinema in 2007" with the caveat that neither "represented the type of audience blockbuster required to move the box-office-share needle in any significant way" (CFTPA & APFTQ, 2008, p. 8). Both films received Oscar nominations and won multiple Genie Awards (7 for *Eastern Promises* and 6 for *Away from Her* plus the Claude Jutra Award for best debut feature); Julie Christie won a Golden Globe for her performance in Polley's film while Cronenberg picked up the People's Choice Award at

the 2007 Toronto International Film Festival. Domestic receipts of \$2.9 million for *Eastern Promises* and \$1.4 million for *Away from Her* placed these films at the top of the box office list for Canadian films in the English-language market and ahead of the third highest grossing Canadian film in the French-language market (*Ma fille mon ange*, \$2.6 million), while the front-runner *Les 3 P'tits cochons* earned \$4.5 million in the French-language market (CFTPA & APFTQ, 2008, p. 71). It is important to note that the other top grossing films in both linguistic markets were American with no other foreign films challenging *Transformers* (\$27.2 million) or *Harry Potter et l'ordre du Phénix* (\$5.8 million) for the highest ranking. Nevertheless, the implication of the *Profile 2008* summary is that the achievements of English-Canadian cinema in 2007 are tarnished by the inability of these films to crack the top ten box office hits in their domestic market.

This economic assessment fails to account for the canonical value of *Away from Her* and *Eastern Promises*. Both share strong connections to the Toronto film scene while demonstrating the international articulation of English-Canadian cinema. Prior to directing her first feature, Sarah Polley was probably most widely known for her acting roles on Canadian television, notably in *Road to Avonlea* (1990-1996), and in the American indie film *Go* (Liman, 1999), which premiered at Sundance as the follow-up to Doug Liman's debut indie hit *Swingers* (1996). Polley's involvement in the Toronto film scene included performances in *Exotica* (Egoyan, 1994), *The Sweet Hereafter* (Egoyan, 1997) and *Last Night* (McKellar, 1998). In Chapter Four, I discussed Atom Egoyan's central role in the Toronto New Wave as well as his acknowledgement of Vancouver filmmaker John Pozer's debut *The Grocer's Wife* (1991). Egoyan served as the Executive Producer of *Away from Her*, which had its world premiere as a Gala at TIFF and then, several months later, had a Gala screening at Sundance. David Cronenberg, on the other hand, has had a somewhat more complicated relationship with the Canadian film canon. William Beard (2002) recounts the director's status as "a ritual enemy in the culture wars [that enveloped] English-Canadian cinema" in the mid- to late-1970s (p.

144); specifically, Cronenberg's work in the low-brow horror genre rankled cultural nationalists who had higher aesthetic expectations for publically-funded cinema.³ Nevertheless, in 1983, Cronenberg's early work was the subject of a Festival of Festivals' retrospective—noted for squabbles with the Ontario Censor Board over cuts to *The Brood* (1979) (B. Johnson, 2000, p. 83).

The timing of FoF's Cronenberg retrospective is quite interesting in that it preceded the large Northern Lights retrospective⁴ that launched Perspective Canada and also coincided with the release of *Videodrome* (1983). Beard notes the pivotal role of *Videodrome* both as “the dividing point between nasty, messy, early Cronenberg and more mainstream middle Cronenberg” and as the source of the director's first Genie (2000, p. 152). Cronenberg has since been recuperated into the Canadian film canon, arguably less for mainstream “middle” films like *The Fly* (1986) than for international coproductions like *Spider* (2002); he even directed one of the short Preludes (*Camera*, 2000) made in celebration of TIFF's 25th anniversary. Although symbolic profit is more difficult to track than box office performance, the impact of festival consecration hardly seems incidental; and the same can be said for the importance of Toronto's film scene in cultivating indigenous talent. In mapping the value of these films to English-Canadian cinema, *Away from Her* stands as the grown child of the Toronto New Wave while *Eastern Promises* (a violent thriller about the Russian mafia, set in London, and starring two American actors) exemplifies the globalized “economic and cultural flows of products and influences” described by Longfellow (2006, p. 187); Cronenberg's film further stands to benefit should the “dissolution of a left nationalist consensus” (Longfellow, 2006, p. 187) help to relax the historically rigid boundaries of the national

³ Beard refers to the 1975 scandal regarding the Canadian Film Development Corporation's funding of *Shiver's*, “a cheap horror movie that featured slimy, crawling sex-parasites” (2002, p. 144). The cultural nationalist rallying cry was sounded by Robert Fulford (writing as Marshall Delaney) in “You Should Know How Bad This Movie Is—You Paid for It” (*Saturday Night*, September, 1975).

⁴ The Northern Lights retrospective of Canadian cinema was actually delayed by a year due to a funding shortfall (“Fest of Fest postpones Cdn retro”).

film canon.

In May 2008, the Opening Film of the Festival de Cannes, screening In Competition, was *Blindness* (Fernando Meirelles), a Canada/Brazil/Japan coproduction adapted for the screen by Don McKellar and featuring an international cast that includes Julianne Moore, Sandra Oh and Gael García Bernal. While McKellar's work as a writer and actor positions him at the centre of the Toronto New Wave (Loiselle, 2002, p. 256)⁵ and his feature debut *Last Night* (1998) won the Prix de la Jeunesse at Cannes, Oh's theatrical film debut was her lead role in *Double Happiness* (1994) which was directed by Pacific New Wave-r Mina Shum. In many ways, Meirelles' *Blindness* could be considered the culmination of what Brenda Longfellow dubbed the "second 'beginning of a beginning'" for English Canadian art cinema (2006, p. 170). In terms of both content and industry context, this tripartite coproduction, with distribution rights held by Miramax Films (U.S.) and Focus Features International, represents an internationalist orientation, displays the results of an industrial re-framing of cultural policy objectives and has been recognized by the predominant mediator of symbolic value for international art cinema.

However, in a year's time, will "Profile 2009" sum up the film's contribution to Canadian cinema as a percentage of national box office revenues thereby reducing its significance to a parochial measure of popularity in the domestic theatrical market? For this dissertation, I argue that an exclusively empirical model for measuring the international film festival's role in the film commodity value chain actually suppresses the contribution of the festival. The example of BC Film's charting of the stages of *The Corporation*'s progression from producer training through to exhibition of the completed work (as cited in Chapter 5) provides a useful framework for approaching the interplay between symbolic and economic value as well as the contributions of multiple festivals

⁵ Loiselle cites Cameron Bailey's argument that "McKellar is the one who 'knits this group together,' who is 'the most important to this group as a group'" (2002, p. 256).

on the international circuit. The documentary's producers attended the Toronto Documentary Forum at Hot Docs three times (once to pitch, twice as observers) prior to the film's world premiere at the 2003 TIFF; then, *The Corporation* proceeded to win "over 20 critical and popular awards" on the international festival circuit, received federal and provincial funding to support a theatrical release (BC Film, 2004, p. 8) and went on to become "the highest-grossing Canadian documentary of all time" (Vlessing, 2005).

But it would be problematic to assume that additional data collection might allow for an a priori assessment of the impact of festival participation. Prior to the delineation of the film and television industry value chain, the BC Film *Activity Report* outlines the characteristics of creative products, noting the difficulty of predicting either demand or commercial success (BC Film, 2004, p. 7). David Hesmondhalgh similarly addresses the issues of risk and unpredictability, citing Nicholas Garnham's (1990) work on the volatility of audiences' use of cultural commodities and Ronald Bettig's (1996) assessment that "of the 350 or so films released in the USA at the time of his study, only 10 or so will be box-office hits" (as cited in Hesmondhalgh, 2002, p. 18). More importantly, attempting to map the convertibility of symbolic capital limits the festival's intermediary role to that of a bridge to conventional distribution platforms—which has the impact of collapsing the gap between production and consumption.

At its root, the vexing problem of Canadian cinema reflects a shared belief that the core issue is popularity, understood in economic terms as a measure of access to mainstream distribution platforms. As such, this shorthand reference conceals a value judgement about the desired location(s) of national cinema. When Acland attributes "the development of a lively and important circuit of film festivals" to the "expo-mentality" of Canadian cinema (2003, p. 193), he draws a clear separation between these non-theatrical sites and the realm of commercial exhibition. This not only precludes a consideration of the flows of films and audience members between the circuits, it also situates Canadian cinema outside popular cinema-going culture, relegating it once again to a position of

absence. As such, Acland's focus on commercial exhibition limits the discussion to only one dimension of Canadian cinema culture—one that largely excludes nationally produced films. According to *Profile 2008*, 112 of the 629 films that played at Canadian theatres in 2007 were Canadian (CFTPA & APFTQ, 2008, p. 58).

It would be useful for the data to indicate which of these films also screened at domestic festivals and which went directly into theatrical release, as well as how many films did not crossover to mainstream exhibition circuits. Since the smaller local festivals are seen as lacking the professional opportunities of the larger regional events, and since festival participation can infringe on commercial release (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 10), it is necessary to consider the extent to which these non-theatrical sites also act as distribution platforms. They provide access to films *and* build audiences for Canadian cinema, fulfilling cultural and industrial policy objectives—especially since patrons likely are not aware that their festival box office dollars do not contribute directly to a film's return on investment. For these smaller festivals, their relegation to a third (“cultural”) tier along with the realignment of Telefilm's support mechanisms towards industry objectives suggests that these events soon may be segregated onto an arts council funding track—potentially dropping off of Telefilm's performance measurement radar entirely. However, the rapid proliferation of local festivals points to changing dynamics in Canada's exhibition sector in light of the increased concentration of mainstream cinema chains. Reduced funding to this sector may in fact exacerbate the vexing problem of Canadian distribution. With the development of permanent exhibition facilities by the Toronto and Vancouver International Film Festivals, a model may emerge to provide alternatives to the mainstream vs. non-theatrical divide as well as much-needed refinements to how these categories are defined. Unlike the NFB's approach to non-theatrical distribution, which stressed an educative role for cinema that

was closely tied to state funding,⁶ the film centre involves the entry of cultural entrepreneurs into the commercial theatrical marketplace bringing with them the festival's unique ties to international art cinema, regional production and governmental support.

A shift in the balance of political involvement and industrial intervention in festival space serves to further reinforce an overarching focus on the convertibility of symbolic capital while also inflecting the struggles over hierarchies of cinematic value. The rise of Conglomerate Hollywood during the 1990s, which enveloped the contemporaneous rise of the indie film movement, has increasingly implicated the international festival circuit as a part of the studios' marketing strategies. Tom Schatz (2008) asserts that by the early 2000s the Big Six conglomerates were "almost assured of turning a profit" on blockbuster releases due to their "well-integrated media entertainment divisions" (p. 36). These synergies with ancillary platforms like cable and DVD are critical as the "massive marketing costs" associated with global releasing strategies contribute to the status of theatrical exhibition as a "loss leader" (Schatz, 2008, p. 37).⁷ Philip Drake (2008) further notes that the concentrated media spend for theatrical launch points to a process of "brand-building" aimed at generating revenues across the life cycle of a film commodity (p. 72). Saturation releases of summer blockbusters like *The Da Vinci Code* (Howard, 2006), *Star Wars: Episode III - Revenge of the Sith* (Lucas, 2005) and *Indiana Jones and the Kingdom of the Crystal Skull* (Spielberg, 2008) draw on the promotional clout of a Cannes' red carpet gala to secure worldwide media coverage; conversely, these films bring star power to the festival, drawing the attention of a wide range of infotainment media. The Festival de Cannes'

⁶ See Druick (2007) for a detailed examination of the NFB's non-theatrical film circuits and their links to voluntary societies and post-war film councils. Acland (2003) also discusses the educative disposition fostered by the NFB's approach to cinema culture (pp. 192–193).

⁷ Schatz notes that "the Big Six grossed \$7.4 billion in worldwide box-office receipts, but marketing costs of \$9.6 billion resulted in net losses of \$2.2 billion in the worldwide theatrical sector." Yet, the conglomerates earned net profits in the television and DVD/video sectors of \$16 billion and \$14 billion, respectively (2008, p. 37).

cachet as an exclusive (and excessive) destination for cinephilia and celebrity sets the scene for an ideal super-junket. At the same time though, for lower budget films, the indie brand that emerged from acquisition success stories on the festival circuit in the 1980s and 1990s has been transformed by the infiltration of global Hollywood into the art house niche.

From an industry perspective, the cultural and economic synergies surrounding the production of *Blindness* point to a “Miramaxing” of Canadian cinema—that is, until one recalls that Miramax is now a subsidiary of The Walt Disney Company and that NBC Universal owns Focus Features, which grew out of the 2002 takeover of independent producer/distributor Good Machine. It is important to remember that the transnational push to achieve international economies of scale in independent production may in turn encounter the re-territorializing thrust of global Hollywood. In contrast to the Weinstein brothers’ initial forays to Cannes, which included the aggressive acquisition of the US rights for *I’ve Heard the Mermaids Singing* (Rozema, 1987) for US\$350,000 (which exceeded the film’s CDN\$350,000 production budget) (Posner, 1993, p. 16), the business of independent cinema has become much more expensive and is now handled largely by the specialty branches of American studios. For instance, at the 2008 Festival de Cannes, the North American rights for *Two Lovers* (Gray, 2008), a film deemed to “need a slow fall film fest word-of-mouth build” are set at \$2-3 million (p. 22) while the same rights for Steven Soderbergh’s two Spanish language Che Guevara films (*The Argentine* and *Guerilla*), with their combined production budget of \$61.5 million, are estimated to be worth \$8-10 million (McClintock and Thompson, 2008, p. 1). According to a cover story in *Variety* (Daily Cannes edition) about sluggish sales activity at the Festival, the pair of Soderbergh films “epitomizes the dilemma studio speciality arms and indie distrib[utors] are finding themselves in”—a risk averse environment generated by an over-abundance of product and low box office receipts for specialty titles that were released the previous fall (McClintock and Thompson, 2008, p. 22).

Despite this apparent interpenetration of global Hollywood, independent art cinema and the international festival circuit, it is important to remember that, since the origins of the international film festival in Venice, Cannes and Berlin, these events always have served as a key site for addressing the political and marketing aims of national cinemas. But they also always have been a location for the celebration of cinema as an art form and cinephilia as a prestigious leisure pursuit. In Chapter Two, I examined the confluence of high art, consumerism and government policy that informed the origins of the first three A-status festivals. The Venice Festival debuted in 1932 as part the Biennale, an international exhibition of fine art that began in 1895 and was revamped to include popular cultural forms after being nationalized by Mussolini's Fascist regime. In 1939, Hollywood sent a "steamship of stars" to the first International Festival de Film in Cannes (Beauchamp & Béhar, 1992, p. 44)—a move that not only affirmed a role for Hollywood glamour in the cinephilic celebrations but also prefigured the positioning of Cannes as a cultural front in the Cold War. Over the course of the late 1960s and early 1970s, the major festivals asserted autonomy over programming decisions that previously had involved individual film-producing nations (including the United States) pre-selecting their official entries. In addition, Cannes and the Berlinale expanded their program streams to balance the competing pressures of international diplomacy, cinephilia and celebrity, an approach that would later be mirrored in the diversification of festival ventures like those of the Toronto International Film Festival Group.⁸

⁸ The *Secor Report* notes that an organizational model based on activity diversification (ie: the inclusion of a market component, cinemathèque or other year-round program initiatives) allows for greater stability "while making the actual festivals more autonomous (through revenue diversification, theatre control, etc.)" (Secor, 2004, p. 20). From a programming perspective, the creation of additional categories allows for more prestige slots (eg: Galas and Special Presentations) as well as the differentiation of aesthetic innovators and emerging directors into discrete marketable packages (eg: TIFF's Vanguard and Discovery sections). Following the protest that halted the Cannes Competition screenings in 1968, the expansion of the selections and addition of the Directors' Fortnight would help "to avoid possible charges of elitism and dissent from filmmakers who might feel left out;" but it also would become "more difficult to call a halt to a modern festival, because an extended festival lacks a center" (Houston, 1997, p. 44).

Aside from increased organizational stability, what appears to be at stake here is a perceived connection between cinephilia, festival space and artistic autonomy that is fostered via the re-balancing of stakeholder interests. With reference to Ruby Rich's discussion of curating and the "worship of taste," Liz Czach explains that "any hint of agenda—political, national, or otherwise—within film selection...is seen as interfering with the magical and utterly unsubstantiated notion of quality" (2004, pp. 83-84). Czach limits her focus to the inevitable politics (of canon formation and taste) that frame programming decisions as an argument over the definition of a particular genre or national cinema—in effect positioning the festival programmer as a "symbolic banker" (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 77). This dissertation broadens the analysis to consider the "field of forces" (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 30) that structures industrial, institutional and governmental struggles to define cinema culture. The value of cinema is negotiated in relation to competing logics regarding what constitutes success in the field, from issues of textual classification to assessments of actual and potential worth (ie: the sale of rights vs. various forms of acclaim) in the international marketplace. These struggles over value extend to festival itself as stakeholders, including festival organizers themselves, seek to define the overarching logic of festival space.

Although the international film festival stands at the threshold between production and theatrical exhibition, a focus on liminality overlooks the negotiation of hierarchies of cinematic value that occur on the international circuit; this includes the process of defining national cinemas in the context of global filmmaking trends. In addition, the idea of a network of festivals contributing to the circulation of international cinema—comprising texts as well as "film concepts, film ideas, sales angles" (Elsaesser, 2006, p. 51)—falls short of grasping the productive operation of festival space as constituted by the position-takings of interested stakeholders. Elsaesser's reference to the reliance of European cinema upon the international film festival as a network "with nodes, flows and exchanges" (2005, p. 84) suggests that festival itself acts as little more than a conduit for

the multi-directional movement of cinema between national, regional or local markets. The designation of the space of the international festival circuit as “non-Hollywood” (O’Regan, 1996, p. 61), “oppositional” (Nichols, 1994b, p. 74) or “alternative” (Elsaesser, 2005, p. 88) really only applies to the creation of a non-theatrical exhibition platform that does not operate according to the economic logic of the marketplace. The extent to which these labels are deployed actually reveals more about the interests of national(ist) film criticism or evaluations of cinephilic quality (as with VIFF’s identity) than it does about festival morphology.

Ultimately, these frameworks fail to fully implicate the festival in the production of the symbolic value of the film commodity. My use of the field of production as an heuristic tools allows for a relational perspective on “the ensemble of agents and institutions which participate in the production of the value of the work via the production of the belief of the value of art in general and in the distinctive value of this or that work of art” (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 229). Rather than acting as a bridge or conduit to other distribution platforms, the festival operates as a cultural intermediary, mediating symbolic value while perpetuating the “‘charismatic’ ideology which is the ultimate basis of belief in the value of a work of art” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 76). Much like the Parisian literary salons of Flaubert’s era which brought together selected writers and members of the upper class (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 49), the international film festival assembles stakeholders, with varying degrees of power to consecrate cinematic texts, in a touristic setting that imbues their (trans)actions with an aura of exclusivity, celebration and rarefied leisure.

Designations like “schmoozing” and “buzz” help to conceal the mechanics of the accumulation of symbolic value as does the casting of programmers as “inspired talent spotters” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 77)--all in service of the myth-making associated with both the written festival and the historical narratives of national cinemas. As such, the shift toward a permanent space with its attendant organizational stability also can be

understood in terms of the shoring up of an illusion of relative autonomy from economic and political interests in order to enhance the festival's position as a symbolic banker in the cultural economy of international cinema. However, since feature filmmaking would be located in the sub-field of large scale production, "worldly or *commercial* success" (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 218) remains a goal of these cultural producers such that any appearance of temporary "disinterest" or "disavowal" on the festival circuit is indeed illusory.

Relative heteronomy provides a useful means for approaching the classification of tiers of film festivals in the Canadian context. According to the *Evaluation of Canada Showcase: Summary of Stakeholder Interviews*, industry professionals differentiate between festivals based on their ability to offer a "broad array of potential benefits, such as networking, professional development, press coverage and audience exposure" (Kelly Sears, 2007a, p. 2). The value of local festivals is limited to audience exposure while larger regional festivals provide a range of benefits (depending upon specific events and release strategies) and TIFF stands alone as an event of unparalleled size and scope (pp. 9-10). Similarly, both *Best Practices in Festival Funding* and the *Evaluation of Telefilm's Support to Canadian Audiovisual Festivals* distinguish between national/regional events and those that are more local or culturally-specific in focus; the former demonstrate a stronger industry orientation whereas the latter merely provide an alternative to mainstream fare. These classifications evaluate festivals in terms of the degree to which they are structured by external forces; in other words, levels of stakeholder interest and the potential to convert symbolic capital are seen to increase a festival's value. At the same time, these divisions correspond to the policy dichotomy between cultural access and industrial objectives. As a stakeholder group, the public is served at all levels of this festival hierarchy. However, without the dispersive energy generated by activities of the moles and the moths, these events begin to resemble alternative art houses such that their proliferation points to a need to reconsider non-

theatrical exhibition as a distribution platform.

For the larger regional events, the *Canada Showcase* designation of four major film festivals has given way to “overly broad and diffuse” program objectives (Kelly Sears, 2007b, p. 2) with no overarching strategy for festival support. The current realignment of *Feature Film Policy* toward enhanced performance measurement of a script to screen to audience supply chain favours the industrial orientation of regional/national festivals at the expense of acknowledging how audience members are doubly defined as citizen-consumers.⁹ Furthermore, without a more complex delineation of the industry value chain and multiplatform environment, this approach threatens to collapse the international festival’s dual role as intermediary and non-theatrical venue. Despite these policy blind spots, the Toronto International Film Festival emerges as a benchmark in the *Secor Report*. Cited by study participants as a “prime example of an event that rallies both the professional communities of its region and the general public, which attends in droves and sees the festival as a great party” (Secor, 2004, p. 6), TIFF manages to meet cultural and industrial objectives while satisfying all stakeholder groups. Dubbed “the most important film event in the Canadian West” (Secor, 2004, p. 9), the Vancouver International Film Festival receives high praise for its regional popularity with the general public and for “the prominent place it reserves for filmmakers (over a third of all industry participants), especially the many Canadian directors invited each year” (Secor, 2004, p. 10). VIFF’s industry component is assessed as “[s]maller than its Toronto counterpart” (p. 9) while the only “negative” for the professional community is

⁹ In the June 2008 guidelines for the Canada Feature Film Policy, the performance envelope calculation includes the measurement of Adjusted Box Office. As a supplement to Gross Canadian Box Office, this category accounts for children’s films (due to the “ticket price differential” p. 21), higher levels of Canadian content, and festivals and awards. In order “to acknowledge critical acclaim and excellence,” box office figures are adjusted based on screenings and awards at selected international and Canadian festivals (providing a 5% bonus up to maximum of 20%) (Telefilm, 2008, June, p. 22). For the Canadian festivals, only the four major regional events are included and the bonus only applies to awards. While this bonus offers some recognition of the convertibility of symbolic capital garnered at film festivals, it does not consider the reach of smaller festivals on the domestic circuit. As such, the box office adjustment has less to do with the actual size of the audience than with the perceived value of festival exposure—once again relegating festival audiences to a position of relative absence.

that “the [Toronto] festival suffers from its own success, in that some find it too large, which can make meetings difficult or impair the visibility of smaller companies” (p. 7).

The relative autonomy these film festivals have attained as cultural institutions cannot be underestimated. At this late stage in their organizational development, Canada’s major film festivals possess sufficiently diversified institutional structures to withstand the efforts of government funding agencies to act as arbiters of the national circuit. The example of the Montreal World Film Festival funding controversy, with the withdrawal and later reinstatement of support by Telefilm and SODEC, shows that their operation cannot be subverted by one of the three main stakeholder groups. The media may in fact have more strength as an arbiter (albeit indirectly) on the festival circuit as the spread of controversy and/or buzz can make festival participation prohibitively risky or potentially unpalatable. Given their significant role in defining and evaluating a festival’s identity, the media’s relationship to the festival is more elaborate than is suggested in the Secor Report’s tripartite model of the general public, film professionals and public partners. For this dissertation, I drew on Daniel Dayan’s concept of the “written festival” (1997) as a window on the systematic dimensions of festival space. Press coverage provided an historical snapshot of the evolution of each festival’s identity by capturing buzz as well as the differing perspectives of stakeholders. But journalists are not a neutral conduit for the festival’s written architecture for they too have a professional stake in the circulation of cultural capital. In Chapter Four, I discussed the interconnections between festivals and specialized entertainment journalists who utilize the festival’s junket circuit both to perform programming reconnaissance and to shore up their professional subfield. Although the media spread buzz and, in doing so, encapsulate a shared memory of the event, they are also stakeholders in the struggles to define and influence hierarchies of value.

The continued interest of stakeholder groups is required to maintain both the illusio and symbolic power of festivals. As such, sponsorship by public partners remains

an important component of these hybrid public/private institutions. The international film festival occupies a unique position in the gap between production and consumption as a productive site for the global, local and regional articulation of both economic and symbolic aspects of cinematic value. In order to seek new answers to the vexing problem of Canadian national cinema, it is necessary both to re-examine policy blind spots and to reconsider what biases these shorthand references help to conceal. The Secor Report, as a reactive measure aimed at enforcing festival accountability and a proactive tool that proposed a model of stakeholder expectations and festival success factors, points to a potential role for public-sector partners. Although Telefilm proved to be an ineffective arbiter of the domestic circuit, its policy planning and research efforts could fill significant gaps in industry data. While the competitive nature of the festival circuit likely precludes the development of a national festivals association (equivalent to the CFTPA or FIAPF), public partners could take a leadership role.

A post-nationalist approach to the international film festival is required not only to understand the accumulation of textual value but also to map the local, regional, national and international dimensions of the traffic in cinema. Discussions of the globalized flows of cultural and economic influence that impact production (Longfellow, 2006) and the continental structure of popular cinema-going (Acland, 2003) highlight the growing presence of an internationalist orientation in Canadian film studies; however, English-Canadian national cinema remains a structuring presence or absence in each of these models. Meanwhile, as Harbord (2002) has argued, Stringer's delineation of the de-nationalization of the international festival circuit in favour of competing global cities proves problematic for addressing the activities of a state-subsidized indigenous film industry and cultural infrastructure. Since their origins in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the Toronto and Vancouver International Film Festivals have played an instrumental role as both showcases and catalysts in the development of vibrant local film scenes. In the early 2000s, the design and construction of permanent festival centres set up an

interchange between federal feature film policy and municipal strategies for the creative city that confirms the insufficiency of a singular conception of the market for English Canadian cinema.

Film festivals, as contingent sites of civic engagement with cosmopolitan cinema culture, offer a paradoxical response to the “vexing” problem of accessing the Canadian audience. In her examination of the “complex relationship between culture, citizenship, and marketplace” (p. 3), Zoë Druick notes “the significance of the non-theatrical [from the National Film Board’s mobile cinema strategy to festivals] in Canadian exhibition history” (p. 1). She navigates the thornier aspects of reconciling industrial and cultural measures of popularity through a focus on multiple contexts for the formation of Canadian publics. With the emergence of the film festival centre as a hybrid public-private cultural enterprise *in the theatrical exhibition sector*, there is further potential for a creative intermixture of the symbolic and economic performance indicators for cultural access and audience building. In part, this involves the changing value of the audience (now that their attendance counts as box office revenue), the assertion of a cosmopolitan alternative to the narrow slate of the mainstream megaplexes and the immediate convertibility of symbolic capital. But ultimately, what is at stake is the expansion of the productive capacity of the international film festival with the advent of year-round programming initiatives. From a Canadian perspective, the global, local and regional articulation of the Toronto and Vancouver International Film Festivals mediates the “branding” of national cinema, thereby playing a critical role in its circulation in a multiplatform environment. Through the creation of vibrant local film scenes that connect regional production to the international marketplace and cosmopolitan consumption, the festival acts as a catalyst in the negotiation of competing paradigms of cinematic value. These major festivals may not hold the holy grail of increased box office share, but they do create productive sites that engage cinephilic, industrial and governmental interests in the definition of English-Canadian cinema culture.

REFERENCES

- Academy of Canadian Cinema & Television. (n.d.). Golden Reel Award. In *Canada's awards database*. Retrieved from <http://www.academy.ca/hist/history.cfm?catid=29&awyear=0&winonly=1&awards=1&rtype=4&curstep=4&submit.x=38&submit.y=10>
- Acland, C.R. (1997). Popular film in Canada: Revisiting the absent audience. In D. Taras, & B. Rasporich (Eds.), *A passion for identity: An introduction to Canadian studies* (Third ed., pp. 281-296). Scarborough: ITP Nelson.
- Acland, C.R. (2002). Screen space, screen time, and Canadian film exhibition. In W. Beard, & J. White (Eds.), *North of everything: English-Canadian cinema since 1980* (pp. 2-18). Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Acland, C.R. (2003). *Screen traffic: Movies, multiplexes, and global culture*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Acland, C.R. (2008). Theatrical exhibition: Accelerated cinema. In P. McDonald, & J. Wasko (Eds.), *The contemporary Hollywood film industry* (pp. 83-105). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Adams, J. (2003, June 18). Montreal film fest absent its A-list status. *The Globe and Mail*, Retrieved from www.globeandmail.com
- Adams, J. (2007, August 25). 'Everything is back to normal;' after a stormy two-year hiatus, two of the festival's most important sponsors are back on board. *The Globe and Mail*, p. R10. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Adilman, S. (1985, September 5). Film festival's founders debate who got idea first. *Toronto Star*, p. C5. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 474554681).
- Adilman, S. (1986, November 12). Film festival's board and former director clash over attendance. *Toronto Star*, p. B1.
- Adilman, S. (1986, September 25). Film festival boss resigns. *Toronto Star*, p. H1.
- AFI FEST. (n.d.). General information. In *Festival information*. Retrieved from <http://www.afi.com/onscreen/afifest/2007/att-gi.aspx>
- Agnew, J. (1986). The threshold of exchange. In *Worlds apart: The market and the theater in Anglo-American thought, 1550-1750* (pp. 17-56). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Allan, B. (1988). The Festival of Festivals in the Toronto of Torontos. *Queen's Quarterly*, 95(4), 813-823.
- Allison, K. (1986, September). Vancouver's 5th International Film Festival. Triumph of the will. *Cinema Canada*, (133) 43.
- Alvin, R. M. (2007). A night at the movies: From art house to "microcinema". *Cineaste*, 32(3), 4-7. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (2nd ed.). London: Verso.
- Andrew, D. (2002). Film and society: Public rituals and private space. In I. R. Hark (Ed.), *Exhibition: The film reader* (pp. 161-171). London: Routledge.
- Andrews, M. (1988, April 22). Festival split brought Fisher's resignation. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. D1. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 171495481).
- Andrews, M. (2005, August 18). Theatre stuck in name game with council. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. D7. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 884587651).
- Avrich, B. (Director). (2000). *Founders trailer*. Retrieved from Toronto International Film Festival Web site: <http://tiff08.ca/aboutthefestival/festivalinfo/founderstrailer/default.aspx>
- Awards. (n.d.). In *The Corporation, a film by Mark Achbar, Jennifer Abbott & Joel Bakan*. Retrieved from http://www.thecorporation.com/index.cfm?page_id=6
- Bailey, B. (1986, September 20). Movie fests both claim top attendance figures. *The Gazette* [Montreal], p. E4.
- Bailey, C. (2000, Summer). Standing in the kitchen all night: A secret history of the Toronto New Wave. *Take One*, 9(28) 6-11.
- Bailey, I. (1997, September 17). No. 3 but thinking big: Vancouver's film festival sees itself as cerebral reply to Toronto's flash. *The Province* [Vancouver], p. B1. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 233628481).
- Balio, T. (1998). The art film market in the new Hollywood. In G. Nowell-Smith, & S. Ricci (Eds.), *Hollywood and Europe: Economics, culture, national identity: 1945-95* (pp. 63-73). London: BFI Publishing.

- Bart, P., Gaydos, S., & Saperstein, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Cannes: Fifty years of sun, sex & celluloid. Behind the scenes at the world's most famous film festival*. New York: Miramax Books, Hyperion.
- Beauchamp, C., & Béhar, H. (1992). *Hollywood on the Riviera: The inside story of the Cannes Film Festival*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Beiks, I. (2006, September 18). Looking back and facing forward director sees new challenges as fest hits 25. *Playback: Canada's Broadcast and Production Journal*, 18. Retrieved from CBCA Complete database (ProQuest Document ID: 1167979031).
- Benson, R. (2005). Mapping field variation: Journalism in France and the United States. In R. Benson, & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the journalistic field* (pp. 85-112). Cambridge: Polity.
- Benson, R., & Neveu, E. (2005). Introduction: Field theory as a work in progress. In R. Benson, & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the journalistic field* (pp. 1-25). Cambridge: Polity.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Binning, C. (2007, September 17). VIFF finds place in global festival "ecosystem". *Playback: Canada's Broadcast and Production Journal*, 40. Retrieved from CBCA Complete database (ProQuest Document ID: 1340382601).
- Biskind, P. (2004). *Down and dirty pictures: Miramax, Sundance, and the rise of independent film*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Blum, A. (2001). Scenes. *Public*, 23, 7-35.
- Boddy, T. (2006, August). Downtown's last resort. *The Canadian Architect*, 51(8) 20-22. Retrieved from CBCA Complete database (ProQuest Document ID: 1128535481).
- Boddy, T. (2008, March 14). Condo boom pushing out city's creatives: Artists are being squeezed out of the very spaces where culture is created and new businesses are grown. *The Globe and Mail*, p. S6. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database.
- Bordwell, D., & Thompson, K. (2004). *Film art: An introduction* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. (R. Nice Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. (R. Nice Trans.). London: Routledge.

- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The genesis of the concepts of habitus and of field. (C. Newman, Trans.). *Sociocriticism*, 2. 11-24.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. (R. Nice Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature* (R. Johnson, Ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The rules of art: Genesis and structure of the literary field*. (S. Emanuel Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- British Columbia Film. (2004). *Activity report 2003/04*. Vancouver: Author.
- British Columbia Film. (2007). *Annual activity report 2006/2007*. Retrieved from <http://www.bcfilm.bc.ca/annreport.php>
- Brodie, J. (1985, July/August). Implacable and fatal. *Cinema Canada* (120-121), pp. 14-19.
- Brownstein, B. (1986, November 4). Fest scoops Toronto's ex-director. *The Gazette* [Montreal], p. F5.
- Burgess, D. (2000). *Canon busting? Approaching contemporary Canadian cinema*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of British Columbia.
- Burgess, D. (2003). Charting the course of the Pacific New Wave. *CineAction*, (61), 29-33.
- Burgess, D. (2006). Air Bud and Stickgirl share leaky condo: The changing landscape of B.C. cinema. In A. Loiselle, & T. McSorley (Eds.), *Self-portraits: The cinemas of Canada since Telefilm* (pp. 129-165). Ottawa: The Canadian Film Institute.
- Canada Council for the Arts. (n.d.). *Media arts*. Retrieved from <http://www.canadacouncil.ca/mediaarts/>
- Canada's many festivals search for a clear policy from Telefilm. (1984, December). *Cinema Canada*, (113) 42-43, 49.
- Canadian Film and Television Production Association (CFTPA), & l'Association des producteurs de films et de television du Quebec (APFTQ). (2008). *2008 profile. An economic report on the Canadian film and television industry*. Ottawa: CFTPA.
- Canadian Heritage. (1999). *The road to success: Report of the feature film advisory committee*. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.

- Canadian Heritage. (2000). *From script to screen: New policy directions for Canadian feature film*. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- Canadian Heritage. (2006). *Enhancing the Canadian Feature Film Policy. Scripts, screens and audiences: A new feature film policy for the 21st century* (Government of Canada Response to the Report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage). Retrieved from <http://www.pch.gc.ca.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/pc-ch/sujets-subjects/arts-culture/film-video/pubs/2006-02/English.pdf>
- Charity, T. (2005, September 17). VIFF's new digs shine (at last). *The Vancouver Sun*, p. D1. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 898164971).
- Chesley, S. (1976, August). Festivals. *Cinema Canada*, (30) 8-9.
- Chesley, S. (1976, June-July). Festivals. *Cinema Canada* (29), p. 7.
- Chesley, S. (1977, February). Cannes pre-selection. *Cinema Canada* (34-35), p. 14.
- Couldry, N. (2003). *Media rituals: A critical approach*. London: Routledge.
- Crean, S. M. (1976-1977, Dec/Jan). Toronto's festivals. *Cinema Canada*, (33) 37-41.
- Creative City Task Force, City of Vancouver. (2008). *Creative city: Culture plan for Vancouver 2008-2018*. Retrieved from http://vancouver.ca/creativecity/pdf/CulturePlan2008_%202018.pdf
- Creative City, City of Vancouver. (2008, June 25). Culture plan: Phase 1 implementation. In *The Creative City Initiative*. Retrieved from <http://vancouver.ca/creativecity/index.htm>
- Critic's week, Commonwealth come to Vancouver Fest. (1987, October). *Cinema Canada*, (145) 72, 74.
- Culture Division, City of Toronto. (2003). *Culture plan for the creative city*. Retrieved from http://www.toronto.ca/culture/brochures/2003_cultureplan.pdf
- Czach, L. (2004). Film festivals, programming, and the building of a national cinema. *The Moving Image*, 4(1), 76-88.
- Dafoe, C. (1991, October 7). Politics plays big part in festival film. 'Vancouver is a very political city,' says the Director of the Vancouver International Film Festival, Alan Franey, who gingerly steers a course between elitism and populism. *The Globe and Mail*, p. C1. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 1102438021).

- Dafoe, C. (1999, September 10). Vancouver festival covers world of difference. *The Globe and Mail*, p. A15. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 1121504161).
- Davidson, S. (2004, August 2). Failing grades for Montreal film festival. *Playback: Canada's Broadcast and Production Journal*, 2. Retrieved from CBCA Complete database (ProQuest Document ID: 676007941).
- Dayan, D. (1997). In quest of a festival. *National Forum*, 77(4), 41-47. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.
- Decima Research. (2005, July). *Canadian film and music opinion study*. Retrieved from the Canadian Heritage Web site: http://www.pch.gc.ca/pc-ch/sujets-subjects/arts-culture/film-video/pubs_e.cfm
- Denton, C. (1977, November). Festival reflections. *Cinema Canada* (42), p. 27.
- Dinoff, D. (2003, June 23). CFC's short film fest discovers the truth about head. *Playback: Canada's Broadcast and Production Journal*, 15. Retrieved from CBCA Complete database.
- Dinoff, D. (2003, May 12). Canadian movie attendance and BO rise. *Playback: Canada's Broadcast and Production Journal*, Retrieved from <http://www.playbackonline.ca/articles/magazine/20030512/bo.html>
- Dorland, M. (1984, November). Seeing eye-to-I: Notes on Canadian identity. *Cinema Canada*, (112) 14-16.
- Dorland, M. (1998). *So close to the State/s: The emergence of Canadian feature film policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Drake, P. (2008). Distribution and marketing in contemporary Hollywood. In P. McDonald, & J. Wasko (Eds.), *The contemporary Hollywood film industry* (pp. 63-82). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Drisdell Consulting. (2006, May 8). *Best practices in festival funding. A report for Telefilm Canada*. Retrieved March 2008 from www.telefilm.gc.ca
- Druick, Z. (2007). *Projecting Canada: Government policy and documentary film at the National Film Board of Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Druick, Z. (forthcoming). Cosmopolitans and losers: Notes on recent developments in English-Canadian cinema. In B. Beaty, & R. Sullivan (Eds.), *How Canadians communicate*. Edmonton: Athabasca University Press.

- Dunne, D. (2006, August). A Riviera row. *Vanity Fair*, (552) 90. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Duval, J. (2005). Economic journalism in France. In R. Benson, & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the journalistic field* (pp. 135-155). Cambridge: Polity.
- Eastwood, C. (1997). Foreword: There's no place like Cannes. In P. Bart, S. Gaydos & P. Saperstein (Eds.), *Cannes: Fifty years of sun, sex & celluloid. Behind the scenes at the world's most famous film festival* (p. 9). New York: Miramax Books, Hyperion.
- Edwards, I. (2003, February 3). Vancouver International Film Centre breaks ground. *Playback: Canada's Broadcast and Production Journal*, 17(10) 4. Retrieved from CBCA Complete database (ProQuest Document ID: 509799521).
- Edwards, N. (1976-1977, Dec/Jan). Festival of festivals: Not so damned after all. *Cinema Canada*, (33) 33-35.
- Egoyan, A. (Director). (2000). *The line* [short film]. Canada: Toronto International Film Festival Group.
- Elley, D. (2006, May 18). *The wind that shakes the barley* [review]. *Variety*. Retrieved from <http://www.variety.com/review/VE1117930548>
- Elsaesser, T. (2005). Film festival networks: The new topographies of cinema in Europe. *European cinema: Face to face with Hollywood* (pp. 82-107). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Elsaesser, T. (2006). Images for sale: The "New" British Cinema. In L. D. Friedman (Ed.), *Fires were started: British cinema and Thatcherism* (2nd ed., pp. 45-57). London: Wallflower Press.
- European Audiovisual Observatory. (2008). *Focus 2008 world film market trends*. Cannes: Marché du film, Festival de Cannes. Retrieved from http://www.obs.coe.int/online_publication/reports/focus2008.html
- Evans, O. (2007). Border exchanges: The role of the European film festival. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 15(1), 23-33.
- Ex-Centris. (n.d.). *Information*. Retrieved March, 2008, from <http://www.ex-centris.com/?l=en>
- Featherstone, M. (1991). *Consumer culture and postmodernism*. London: Sage.
- Federal government wants inquiry into funding of Montreal film festivals. (2006, March 10). *Canadian Press NewsWire*. Retrieved from CBCA Complete database.

- Fédération internationale des associations de producteurs des films [FIAPF]. (n.d.).
FIAPF governance. In *FIAPF Members & Links*. Retrieved from http://www.fiapf.org/members_governance.asp
- Fédération internationale des associations de producteurs de films [FIAPF]. (n.d.).
International film festivals. Retrieved from <http://www.fiapf.org/intfilmfestivals.asp>
- Fédération internationale des associations de producteurs des films [FIAPF]. (n.d.).
Welcome [home page]. Retrieved from <http://www.fiapf.org/>
- Fehrenbach, H. (1995). *Cinema in democratizing Germany: Reconstructing national identity after Hitler*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Fest of Fest postpones Cdn retro. (1982, May). *Cinema Canada* (84), p. 20.
- Fest of Fests looks to Canada. (1984, July-August). *Cinema Canada* (109), p. 27.
- Festival de Cannes. (2007). *Festival de Cannes*. [2007 homepage]. Retrieved June, 2007, from <http://www.festival-cannes.fr/index.php/en>
- Festival de Cannes. (n.d.) Cinephiles accreditation. In *Accreditation*. Retrieved June, 2007 from the Festival de Cannes Web site: <http://www.festival-cannes.fr/en/festivalServices/cinephilesAccreditation.html>
- Festival de Cannes. (n.d.). *Festival archives*. Retrieved from <http://www.festival-cannes.fr/en/archivesPage.html>
- Festival de Cannes. (n.d.). Festival guide. In *Festival services*. Retrieved June, 2007 from <http://www.festival-cannes.fr/en/festivalServices/festivalGuideTips>
- Festival de Cannes. (n.d.). *Festival history*. Retrieved from <http://www.festival-cannes.fr/en/about/festivalHistory.html>
- Festival de Cannes. (n.d.). Festival milestones, In *About the festival - Festival history*. Retrieved from <http://www.festival-cannes.fr/en/festivalHistory/milestones.html>
- Festival de Cannes. (n.d.). Using our logo. In *About the festival*. Retrieved from <http://www.festival-cannes.fr/en/about/graphicChart.html>
- Festival du Nouveau Cinéma. (n.d.) History 1971 – 2004. In *History*. Retrieved from http://www.nouveaucinema.ca/EN/index.php?module_b=corpo_equipe.html&module_a=corpo_historique.html&img=
- Festival fever: Candid comment on the Montreal and Toronto fests. (1983, November). *Cinema Canada* (101), pp. 17-20.

- First Weekend Club. (n.d.). Introducing... In *Canada screens*. Retrieved March, 2008, from <http://www.firstweekendclub.ca/canada-screens.html>
- Flick [review]. In *Canuxploitation! Your complete guide to Canadian B-film*. Retrieved from <http://www.canuxploitation.com/review/flick.html>
- Forty nations at Vancouver festival. (1985, May). *Cinema Canada*, (118) 55.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. (C. Gordon, L Marshall, J Mepham & K Soper, Trans.). (pp. 109-133). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fox, J. (1977, October 3). A tale of two festivals. *Maclean's*, 90 (20), pp. 70-71.
- Franey, A. (2003, October 4). Not those celebrities [Letter to the Editor]. *The Globe and Mail*, pp. A22. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Frew, G. (1976, October). Festival of festivals. *Cinema Canada* (31), p. 51.
- Gertler, M. S. (2004). *Creative cities: What are they for, how do they work, and how do we build them?* Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks. Retrieved from <http://www.cprn.ca/doc.cfm?doc=1083&l=en>
- Gill, A. (1999, September 9). Festival parties are serious business for film schmoozers. *The Globe and Mail*, p. A10.
- Gill, A. (2002, September 27). The good, the bad and the indie; Vancouver film-festival organizers are proudly presenting obscure movies alongside the mainstream crowd-pleasers. *The Globe and Mail*, p. R10. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Gill, A. (2003, September 30). Brightlight's big party; A Vancouver film company rolled out the red carpets in a quest to up the festival's glamour quotient. *The Globe and Mail*, p. R3. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Gill, A. (2004, September 23). Taking a cue from TIFF, VIFF gets set to party. *The Globe and Mail*, p. R3. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Gill, A. (2005, September 25). VIFF launches new era; with a lush new centre to call home, the Vancouver International Film Festival is keen to provide alternatives to commercial movie blockbusters. *The Globe and Mail*, p. R3. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Godfrey, S. (1985, May 11). 75 Canadian premieres Vancouver film festival leaps into big leagues. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.

- Godfrey, S. (1988, April 22). Hannah Fisher steps down as director. Resignation surprises film festival. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Godfrey, S., & Scott, J. (1986, May 16). Contract comes as a surprise to Vancouver festival. *The Globe and Mail*, p. C1. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society [GVIFFS]. (2007). About. In *Vancity Theatre | Vancouver International Film Centre*. Retrieved March 12, 2008, from <http://www.vifc.org/about/about.htm>
- Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society [GVIFFS]. (2008). *About VIFF*. Retrieved from <http://www.viff.org/08home/about.htm>
- Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society [GVIFFS]. (n.d.). Facilities. In *Vancity Theatre | Vancouver International Film Centre*. Retrieved March 12, 2008, from <http://www.vifc.org/facilities/facilities.html>
- Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society [GVIFFS]. (n.d.). *Festival archive*. Retrieved from <http://www.viff.org/archive.htm>
- Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society [GVIFFS]. (n.d.). Mission and scope of programming. In *About*. Retrieved from the Vancity Theatre | Vancouver International Film Centre Web site: <http://www.vifc.org/about/mission.htm>
- Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society [GVIFFS]. (n.d.). Rental - rates and policies. In *Vancity Theatre | Vancouver International Film Centre*. Retrieved March, 2008, from <http://www.vifc.org/rental/rates.html>
- Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society [GVIFFS]. (2007). Sponsorship. In *Vancity Theatre | Vancouver International Film Centre*. Retrieved March, 2008, from <http://www.vifc.org/about/sponsorship.html>
- Green, R., & Scott, J. (1978, September 15). Hisses, mob's cry of fraud open Toronto film festival. *The Globe and Mail*, p. P1. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 1107340191).
- Grivas, A. (2005, April 1). Angelopoulos replaced as Thessaloniki President. *Screen Daily*, Retrieved from <http://www.screendaily.com/print.asp?storyid=21537>
- Harbord, J. (2002). *Film cultures*. London: Sage.
- Harcourt, P. (1980). 1964: The beginning of a beginning. In P. Handling & under the direction of P. Veronneau (Eds.), *Self portrait: Essays on the Canadian and Québec cinemas* (M. Hecquet, A Vidal Trans.). (pp. 64-76). Ottawa: Canadian Film Institute.

- Hardy, F. (1992). *Slightly mad and full of dangers: The story of the Edinburgh Film Festival*. Edinburgh: Ramsay Head Press.
- Harkness, J. (2006, May 18). *Da Vinci code, mission impossible* and the box office problem. *Now* [Online Edition]. Retrieved from <http://www.nowtoronto.com/minisites/cannes/2006/>
- Harvey, S. (1998, July 21). *1998 capital budget: City-owned cultural facilities* [Administrative Report to: Standing Committee on City Services & Budgets. CC File No. 1602]. City of Vancouver.
- Harvey, S. (2001, September 4). *Amenity bonus proposal - 1133 Seymour Street* [Administrative Report. RTS. No. 02114]. City of Vancouver.
- Hays, M. (1999, September 3). A tale of duelling film festivals. *The Globe and Mail*, p. C3.
- Hays, M. (2005, May 23). Montreal fest confusion spreads to filmmakers. *Playback: Canada's Broadcast and Production Journal*, 2. Retrieved from CBCA Complete database (ProQuest Document ID: 867701671).
- Hays, M. (2006, February 20). Curtains for new Montreal FilmFest. *Playback: Canada's Broadcast and Production Journal*, 2. Retrieved from CBCA Complete database (ProQuest Document ID: 991792881).
- Hedetoft, U. (2000). Contemporary cinema: Between cultural globalisation and national interpretation. In M. Hjort, & S. MacKenzie (Eds.), *Cinema & nation* (pp. 278-297). London: Routledge.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2002). *The cultural industries*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2006). Bourdieu, the media and cultural production. *Media, Culture & Society*, 28(2), 211-231.
- Higson, A. (1999). Cultural policy and industrial practice: Film Europe and the international film congresses of the 1920s. In A. Higson, & R. Maltby (Eds.), *"Film Europe" and "Film America: Cinema, commerce and cultural exchange 1920-1939* (pp. 117-131). Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Higson, A. (2000). The limiting imagination of national cinema. In M. Hjort, & S. MacKenzie (Eds.), *Cinema & nation* (pp. 63-74). London: Routledge.
- Higson, A., & Maltby, R. (1999). "Film Europe" and "Film America:" An introduction. In A. Higson, & R. Maltby (Eds.), *"Film Europe" and "Film America: Cinema, commerce and cultural exchange 1920-1939* (pp. 1-31). Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

- Hjort, M., & Mackenzie, S. (2000). Introduction. In M. Hjort, & S. MacKenzie (Eds.), *Cinema & nation* (pp. 1-16). London: Routledge.
- Houston, P. (1997). Barricade '68. The day they seized the celluloid. In P. Bart, S. Gaydos & P. Saperstein (Eds.), *Cannes: Fifty years of sun, sex & celluloid. Behind the scenes at the world's most famous film festival* (pp. 42-44). New York: Miramax Books, Hyperion.
- Howard, R. (Director). (2006). *The Da Vinci code* [motion picture]. USA: Columbia Pictures.
- Internet Movie Database, The (IMDb). (n.d.). Release dates. In *The wind that shakes the barley*. Retrieved from <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0460989/releaseinfo>
- Jacobsen, W. (2000). *Berlinale: 50 years Internationale Filmfestspiele Berlin*. Berlin: Filmmuseum.
- Johnson, B. D. (1994, September 19). A festival for fall. *Maclean's*, 107(38) 62-65. Retrieved from CBCA Complete database (ProQuest Document ID: 1707428).
- Johnson, B. D. (1995, September 11). A tale of two festivals. *Maclean's*, 108(37) 64-66. Retrieved from CBCA Complete database (ProQuest Document ID: 6969146).
- Johnson, B. D. (2000). *Brave films wild nights: 25 years of festival fever*. Toronto: Random House Canada.
- Johnson, R. (1993). Editor's introduction: Pierre Bourdieu on art, literature and culture. In P. Bourdieu, *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature* (R. Johnson, Ed.) (pp. 1-25). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kelly Sears Consulting Group. (2007a, April 12). *Evaluation of Canada Showcase program: Summary of stakeholder interviews* [Prepared for Telefilm Canada]. Retrieved March 2008 from www.telefilm.gc.ca
- Kelly Sears Consulting Group. (2007b). *Evaluation of Telefilm's support to Canadian audiovisual festivals: Findings and recommendations* [Prepared for Telefilm Canada]. Retrieved March 2008 from www.telefilm.gc.ca
- Kelly, B. (1999, August 30). No media meltdown this year. *The Gazette* [Montreal]. pp. B4, B7.
- Kelly, B. (2005, September 21). *Pride* steps up as new Montreal closer. *Variety*. Retrieved from <http://www.variety.com/story.asp?l=story&a=VR1117929436&c=19>

- Kelly, B. (2007, December 19). Cowan leaves Toronto fest post: Co-director moves to A.D. of festival's headquarters. *Variety*, Retrieved from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117978003.html>
- King & John Festival Corporation [KJFC]. (2003, September 9). *Festival Tower condominiums...Toronto's hippest address* [press release].
- King and John Festival Corporation. (n.d). Co-creators. In *Team*. Retrieved from the Festival Tower Web site: <http://www.festivaltower.com/index2.html>
- King and John Festival Corporation. (n.d.). Festival tower entrance. In *Welcome Home*. Retrieved from the Festival Tower Web site: <http://www.festivaltower.com/index2.html>
- King and John Festival Corporation. (n.d.). Your Bell Lightbox. Perks, privileges and passes. In *Your Bell Lightbox Connection*. Retrieved from the Festival Tower Web site: <http://www.festivaltower.com/index2.html>
- Klymkiw, G. (1988, November). Immovable fests. *Cinema Canada* (157), pp. 16-17.
- Kuwabara, Payne, McKenna, Blumberg Architects. (n.d.). Bruce Kuwabara. In *People*. Retrieved from <http://www.kpmb.com/index.asp?navid=15&fid1=35&fid2=1&offset=0>
- Lacey, L. (1989, October 2). Film festival thrives without big hype, big stars. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Lacey, L. (2000, September 18). Has Hollywood hijacked our festival? *The Globe and Mail*, p. R3. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Landry, C. (2005). London as a creative city. In J. Hartley (Ed.), *Creative industries* (pp. 233-243). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Leach, J. (2006). *Film in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lekich, J. (1984, May 2). Fighting to become a contender. *The Globe and Mail*, p. M8. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 1098987071).
- Lerner, L. (1997). Festivals and awards / festivals et prix. *Canadian film and video: A bibliography and guide to the literature, V1* (pp. 267-405). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Levy, E. (1999). *Cinema of outsiders: The rise of American independent film*. New York: New York University Press.

- Lewis, N. (2008, February 29). Juno not Canadian enough for Genie. Award rules leave out popular films. *Calgary Herald*, p. C1. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand Major Dailies database (ProQuest Document ID: 1437667391).
- Litt, P. (1992). *The muses, the masses and the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Loach, K. (Director). (2006). *The wind that shakes the barley* [motion picture]. UK: Pathé International.
- Loiselle, A. (2002). The radically moderate Canadian: Don McKellar's cinematic persona. In W. Beard, & J. White (Eds.), *North of everything: English-Canadian cinema since 1980* (pp. 256-269). Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Loiselle, A., & McSorley, T. (2006). Introduction. In A. Loiselle, & T. McSorley (Eds.), *Self-portraits: The cinemas of Canada since Telefilm* (pp. 13-26). Ottawa: The Canadian Film Institute.
- Longfellow, B. (2006). Surfing the Toronto New Wave: Policy, paradigm shifts and post-nationalism. In A. Loiselle, & T. McSorley (Eds.), *Self-portraits: The cinemas of Canada since Telefilm* (pp. 167-200). Ottawa: The Canadian Film Institute.
- Macfarlane, D. (2000, September). The big bang: It happened 25 years ago at a Yorkville restaurant. Two guys sat down to lunch and before the cheque arrives, a film festival was born. *Toronto Life*, 34(14) 88. Retrieved from CBCA Reference database (ProQuest Document ID: 375995131).
- Maddin, G. (Director). (2000). *The heart of the world* [short film]. Canada: Toronto International Film Festival Group.
- Magder, T. (1993). *Canada's Hollywood: The Canadian state and feature films*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Marchessault, J. (2001). Film scenes: Paris, New York, Toronto. *Public*, 23, 59-75.
- Marchetti, D. (2005). Subfields of specialized journalism. In R. Benson, & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the journalistic field* (pp. 64-84). Cambridge: Polity.
- Marshall, W. (2005). *Film festival confidential*. Toronto: McArthur & Company.
- Martin, R. (1976, September 18). Toronto's film festival: Will the smorgasbord prove indigestible? *The Globe and Mail*, pp. 33. Retrieved from *Globe and Mail* Canada's Heritage from 1844 database.
- McCarthy, S. (2006, May 23). *Da Vinci* seen leading film faithful back: Industry bets on end to box office drought. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20060523.wxrmovies23/BNStory/Business/home#>

- McCarthy, T. (1997). Introduction: Why Cannes shines brightest. In P. Bart, S. Gaydos & P. Saperstein (Eds.), *Cannes: Fifty years of sun, sex & celluloid. Behind the scenes at the world's most famous film festival* (pp. 11-17). New York: Miramax Books, Hyperion.
- McCarthy, T. (2006, May 16). *The Da Vinci code* [review]. *Variety*. Retrieved from <http://www.variety.com/review/VE1117930534>
- McClintock, P., & Thompson, A. (2008, May 22). Empty shopping bags: American buyers find little to tempt them in Cannes. *Variety (Cannes Daily)*, 1, 22. Retrieved from <http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=festivals&jump=cannes&id=pdf>
- McKellar, D. (Director). (2000). *A word from the management* [short film]. Canada: Toronto International Film Festival Group.
- Medland, C. (2006, September 25). *Naming rights and commemorative naming policies, civic community facilities* [Policy Report for Standing Committee on City Services and Budgets, RTS No. 5428]. City of Vancouver.
- Miller, T. (1993). *The well-tempered self: Citizenship, culture, and the postmodern subject*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Miller, T., Covil, N., McMurria, J., Maxwell, R., & Wang, T. (2005). *Global Hollywood 2*. London: British Film Institute.
- Mommaas, H. (2004). Cultural clusters and the post-industrial city: Towards the remapping of urban cultural policy. *Urban Studies*, 41(3), 507-532. DOI: 10.1080/0042098042000178663.
- Monk, K. (2001, September 22). Council approves new Vancouver film centre. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. B4.
- Monk, K. (2006, September 28). Home of its own. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. D21. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand Major Dailies database (ProQuest Document ID: 1137786571).
- Movie attendance rises in Canada: StatsCan. (2008, June 10). *The Vancouver Sun*, Retrieved from <http://www.canada.com/vancouvernews/story.html?id=5f07b3de-d9f0-430e-bb9f-fbbcfa51531d&k=85804>
- Munro, M. (Reporter). (2003, October 1). Screen time. On *Canada Now* [television broadcast]. Vancouver: CBC Television.

- Negus, K. (2002). The work of cultural intermediaries and the enduring distance between production and consumption. *Cultural Studies*, 16(4), 501-515.
- Neveu, E. (2005). Bourdieu, the Frankfurt School, and cultural studies: On some misunderstandings. In R. Benson, & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the journalistic field* (pp. 195-213). Cambridge: Polity.
- Nichols, B. (1994a). Discovering form, inferring meaning: New cinemas and the film festival circuit. *Film Quarterly*, 47(3), 16-29.
- Nichols, B. (1994b). Global image consumption in the age of late capitalism. *East-West Film Journal*, 8(1), 68-85.
- Nixon, S., & Gay, P. d. (2002). Who needs cultural intermediaries? *Cultural Studies*, 16(4), 495-500.
- O'Regan, T. (1996). *Australian national cinema*. New York: Routledge.
- Palace coup by Schein in Vancouver. (1988, May). *Cinema Canada*, (152) 50, 58.
- Pendakur, M. (1990). *Canadian dreams and American control: The political economy of the Canadian film industry*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Peranson, M. (2000). A festival crucifixion: *The heart of the world*. *Cinema Scope*, 2(4), 45-46.
- Peranson, M. (2004, Summer). Cannes 2004: Born to lose. *Cinema Scope*, 19, 40-43.
- Peranson, M. (2005, Winter). Editor's note. *Cinema Scope*, (21) 5.
- Perlmutter, D. (1976, May). ...To show films. *Cinema Canada*, (28) 38-39.
- Pevere, G. (1995). Middle of nowhere: Ontario movies after 1980. *Post Script*, 15(1), 9-22.
- Posner, M. (1993). *Canadian dreams: The making and marketing of independent films*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.
- Pratley, G. (1977, March). In and out of the movies. *Cinema Canada*, (36) 15.
- Pratley, G. (1989, Feb/Mar). Canadian film awards -- a memoir. *Cinema Canada*, (160) 22.
- Riches, H. (1992, September 19). Quirky, independent-minded spirit sets fest apart. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. E16. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 182684301).

- Rothbaum, R. (2007, September). The place to be: Toronto. Festival pass. *O the Oprah Magazine*, 66.
- Sarris, A. (1978, June 12, 1978). Catch as catch Cannes: The moles and the moths. *The Village Voice*, pp. 39-40.
- Schatz, T. (2008). The studio system and conglomerate Hollywood. In P. McDonald, & J. Wasko (Eds.), *The contemporary Hollywood film industry* (pp. 13-42). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Schlesinger, P. (2000). The sociological scope of "national cinema". In M. Hjort, & S. MacKenzie (Eds.), *Cinema & nation* (pp. 19-31). London: Routledge.
- Scott, A. O. (2005, January 21). The invasion of the midsize movie. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com.
- Scott, J. (1978, September 25). A "wild" film festival reaches puberty in its third year. *The Globe and Mail*, p. P13. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 1107382261).
- Secor Consulting. (2004). *Analysis of Canada's major film festivals* [Report prepared for Telefilm Canada and the Société de développement des entreprises culturelles (SODEC)]. Retrieved from <http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/01/173.asp>
- Seguin, D. (2005, August 29). The screen machine. *Canadian Business*, 78(17) 34-37. Retrieved from Academic Search Elite database.
- Seguin, D. (2005, September 26). New Montreal FilmFest apologises for poor audience turnout. *Screen Daily*, Retrieved from <http://www.screendaily.com/print.asp?storyid=23497>
- Shohat, E., & Stam, R. (1996). From the imperial family to the transnational imaginary: Media spectatorship in the age of globalization. In R. Wilson, & W. Dissanayake (Eds.), *Global/local: Cultural production and the transnational imaginary* (pp. 145-172). Durham: Duke University Press.
- ShowCanada. (2006). Schedule. In *Vancouver 2006*. Retrieved July, 2006, from the ShowCanada Web site at www.showcanada.ca
- Smith, L. (1999). *Party in a box: The story of the Sundance Film Festival*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs-Smith, Publisher.
- Snyder, G. (2006, March 19). Exhibs suit up for combat. *Variety*. Retrieved from www.variety.com.

- Statistics Canada. (2005, June 2). Movie theatres and drive-ins. *The Daily*, Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/050628/d050628b.htm>
- Stone, M. S. (1998). *The patron state: Culture & politics in Fascist Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Stringer, J. (2001). Global cities and the international film festival economy. In M. Schiel, & T. Fitzmaurice (Eds.), *Cinema and the city: Film and urban societies in a global context* (pp. 134-144). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Stringer, J. (2003). *Regarding film festivals*. Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.
- Summary. (n.d.) In *Movies: The Da Vinci code*. Retrieved from the Box Office Mojo Web site: <http://www.boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=davincicode.htm>
- Summary. (n.d.) In *Movies: The wind that shakes the barley*. Retrieved from the Box Office Mojo Web site: <http://www.boxofficemojo.com/movies/?page=main&id=windthatshakesbarley.htm>
- Tadros, C. (1976, May). Why go to Cannes in the first place? *Cinema Canada*, (28) 36-37.
- Tadros, C. (1976, November). Festival fever takes hold of Toronto. *Cinema Canada*, (32) 9.
- Tadros, C. (1977, November). The Festival game. *Cinema Canada* (42), p. 24.
- Tadros, C. (1978, Nov/Dec). Some opening remarks. *Cinema Canada*, (51) 13-14.
- Tadros, C. (1982, October). Echoes from the festivals. *Cinema Canada* (89), pp. 13-16.
- Telefilm Canada. (2002). *Canada Showcase guidelines for 2002-2003*. Retrieved February, 2005, from www.telefilm.gc.ca
- Telefilm Canada. (2004, July 27). *Analysis of Canada's major film festivals: Telefilm Canada and SODEC (Société de développement des entreprises culturelles) release SECOR study* [news release]. Retrieved from www.telefilm.gc.ca/07/783.asp
- Telefilm Canada. (2005). Perspective Canada: 58th Cannes Film Festival. In *Promotional brochures* [Festivals]. Retrieved from <http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/05/516.asp>
- Telefilm Canada. (2006, February 1). *A big year for Canadian cinema at the 2006 Berlin International Film Festival -- Opening film, 14 selections and new Perspective Canada screenings* [press release]. Retrieved from http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/Communiques/rel_648.asp

- Telefilm Canada. (2006a). *Background report: Review of the selection criteria and process for a film event in Montreal* (Prepared for The Honourable Bev Oda, Minister of Canadian Heritage). Retrieved from http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/document/en/07/background_report.pdf
- Telefilm Canada. (2006b). *Canada Showcase guidelines for 2006-2007*. Retrieved June, 2006, from www.telefilm.gc.ca
- Telefilm Canada. (2006c). *From cinemas to cell phones: Telefilm Canada responds to the multiplatform challenge (Corporate Plan 2006-2007 | 2010-2011)*. Retrieved from http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/document/en/01/17/Corporate_plan_2006-2007_to_2010-2011.pdf
- Telefilm Canada. (2007, April 23). *Telefilm Canada at ShowCanada 2007. Partnering for audiences with Canadian distributors and exhibitors* [press release]. Retrieved from http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/communiques/rel_794.asp
- Telefilm Canada. (2007, March). *International festivals & markets 2006-2007 report*. Retrieved from <http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/01/173.asp>
- Telefilm Canada. (2007, May 3). *Telefilm Canada salutes the Canadian films and artists in the limelight at the 60th Cannes Film Festival* [press release]. Retrieved from http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/data/Communiques/rel_799.asp
- Telefilm Canada. (2007, October 1). *Official statement from Telefilm Canada regarding an agreement reached with the Montreal World Film Festival* [press release]. Retrieved from http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/Communiques/rel_842.asp
- Telefilm Canada. (2007a). *Canada Showcase guidelines for 2007-2008*. Retrieved June, 2007, from www.telefilm.gc.ca
- Telefilm Canada. (2007b). *From cinemas to cell phones: Telefilm Canada responds to the multiplatform challenge. Priorities 2007-2008. (Corporate Plan 2006-2007 | 2010-2011, Update)*. Retrieved from http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/document/en/01/17/Corporate_Plan_ENG.pdf
- Telefilm Canada. (2007c). *Perspective Canada Cannes 2007*. In *Promotional brochures [Festivals]*. Retrieved from <http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/05/516.asp>
- Telefilm Canada. (2008, June). *Canada Feature Film Fund: Guidelines. Production program for English-language productions*. Retrieved from http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/03/311.asp?fond_id=1
- Telefilm Canada. (2008a). *Canada Feature Film Fund: Festivals Performance Program guidelines 2008-2009*. Retrieved from http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/03/311.asp?doc_id=87&fond_id=1

- Telefilm Canada. (2008b). *Skills and Screens Program guidelines 2008-2009*. Retrieved from http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/03/311.asp?doc_id=87&fond_id=1
- Telefilm Canada. (n.d.). Questions and answers. In *Festivals Performance Program / Skills and screens Programs*. Retrieved from http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/03/311.asp?doc_id=87&fond_id=1
- Telefilm Canada. (n.d.). Telefilm Canada's calls for entries. Navigating the international festival circuit. In *Festivals and Markets*. Retrieved from <http://www.telefilm.gc.ca/05/519.asp>
- Thompson, A., & Jaafar, A. (2007, September 13). Toronto film fest hot, deals not. Fest a success as launch pad for fall films. *Variety*. Retrieved from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117971957.html>
- Thompson, K. (1985). *Exporting entertainment: America in the world film market 1907-1934*. London: British Film Institute.
- Todd, D. (1989, January 14). Film festival boss doesn't want to impose his tastes. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. E3. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 172064201).
- Todd, R. (1997). Chronology of the Canadian film industry, 1893-1989 [Appendix]. In Loren Lerner (Ed.), *Canadian film and video: A bibliography and guide to the literature, V2* (pp. 1423-1444). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Toronto film festival will see stars. (2000, September 8). *The Vancouver Sun*, p. F1.
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2003, September 9). *Architects' statement: Festival centre--A meeting place for cinephiles in Toronto* [press release].
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2003, September 9). *Design concept of Festival Centre & Festival Tower unveiled* [press release].
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2003, September 9). *The Daniels Corporation* [backgrounder #5].
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2003, September 9). *The Reitman Family* [backgrounder #4].
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2004, June 3). *New Canadian programmes to spotlight emerging talent at the Toronto International Film Festival* [press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.tiffg.ca/mediacentre/viewrelease.aspx?recordId=78>

- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2004, October 14). *Canadian filmmakers behind Festival Group's comprehensive public-awareness campaign* [press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.tiffg.ca/mediacentre/viewrelease.aspx?recordId=174>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2005, April 26). *Cultural infrastructure to benefit Greater Toronto area: Canada sets aside \$25 million for festival centre* [press release]. Retrieved from http://belllightbox.ca/news/news_detail.aspx?Id=211
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2005, March 4). *Provincial government supports Toronto International Film Festival Group's Festival Centre with \$25 million contribution* [press release]. Retrieved from http://belllightbox.ca/news/news_detail.aspx?Id=193
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2005, September 11). *Bell joins TIFFG centre stage with opening night announcement of innovative marketing alliance for festival centre*. Retrieved from http://belllightbox.ca/news/news_detail.aspx?Id=297
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2006). *Annual report*. Retrieved from <http://www.tiffg.ca/content/aboutus/annualreport.aspx>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2006, July 6). *The Toronto International Film Festival...* [backgrounder]. Retrieved from <http://www.tiffg.ca/mediacentre/viewbackgrounder.aspx?recordId=24>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2007, April 24). *Groundbreaking ceremony for Bell Festival Centre (working title) celebrates landmark occasion for TIFFG* [press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.tiffg.ca/mediacentre/viewrelease.aspx?recordId=433>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2007, August 27). *Presenting Bell Lightbox: Toronto International Film Festival Group and Bell announce new name and logo* [press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.tiffg.ca/mediacentre/viewrelease.aspx?recordId=433>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2007a). *Toronto International Film Festival* [2007 home page]. Retrieved June, 2007, from <http://www.tiff07.ca/>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2007b) *Films & schedules*. Retrieved from the 2007 Toronto International Film Festival Web site: <http://www.tiff07.ca/filmsandschedules/>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2007c). *About the festival*. Retrieved May 2008 from <http://www.tiff07.ca/aboutthefestival/default.aspx>

- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2008, February 12). *New co-directors of learning at the Toronto International Film Festival Group announced* [press release]. Retrieved from http://www.belllightbox.ca/news/news_detail.aspx?id=536
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (2008, January 11). *Toronto International Film Festival Group acknowledges \$22 million gift with unique naming rights city block to be named "Reitman Square."* [press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.tiffg.ca/mediacentre/viewrelease.aspx?recordId=519>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.). About Cinematheque Ontario. In *Toronto International Film Festival Group presents Cinematheque Ontario*. Retrieved from <http://cinemathequeontario.ca/about.aspx>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.). Bell Lightbox Major Gift Committee. In *Players*. Retrieved from the Bell Lightbox Web site: <http://www.belllightbox.ca/players/campaign.aspx>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from the Bell Lightbox Web site: <http://www.belllightbox.ca/faq/default.aspx>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.). *Funding*. Retrieved from the Bell Lightbox Web site: <http://www.belllightbox.ca/funding/default.aspx>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.). History of the Toronto International Film Festival, 1970's. In *Festival Info*. Retrieved from the 2007 Toronto International Film Festival Web site: <http://www.tiff07.ca/festivalinfo/festivalflashback/history70s/>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.). History of the Toronto International Film Festival, 1990's. In *Festival Info*. Retrieved from the 2007 Toronto International Film Festival Web site: <http://www.tiff07.ca/festivalinfo/festivalflashback/history90s/>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.). History of the Toronto International Film Festival, 2000's. In *Festival Info*. Retrieved from the 2007 Toronto International Film Festival Web site: <http://www.tiff07.ca/festivalinfo/festivalflashback/history00s/>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.). *The Film Reference Library*. Retrieved from the Film Reference Library Web site: <http://filmreferencelibrary.ca/>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.). *TIFFG year-round*. Retrieved from the 2007 Toronto International Film Festival Web site: <http://www.tiff07.ca/industry/tiffyearround/>

- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.) Toronto International Film Festival Group history - The Nineties. In *About Us*. Retrieved from <http://www.tiffg.ca/content/aboutus/nineties.aspx>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.) Toronto International Film Festival Group history - The Seventies. In *About Us*. Retrieved from <http://www.tiffg.ca/content/aboutus/seventies.aspx>
- Toronto International Film Festival Group [TIFFG]. (n.d.) *Vision*. Retrieved from the Bell Lightbox Web site: <http://www.belllightbox.ca/vision/default.aspx>
- Trumpbour, J. (2008). Hollywood and the world: Export or die. In P. McDonald, & J. Wasko (Eds.), *The contemporary Hollywood film industry* (pp. 209-219). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Turan, K. (2002). *Sundance to Sarajevo: Film festivals and the world they made*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Turner, V. (1982). Liminal to liminoid, in play, flow, and ritual: An essay in comparative symbology. *From ritual to theatre: The human seriousness of play* (pp. 20-60). New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.
- Turner, V. (1984). Liminality and the performative genres. In J. J. MacAloon (Ed.), *Rite, drama, festival, spectacle: Rehearsals toward a theory of cultural performance* (pp. 19-41). Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Urquhart, P. (2003). You should know something--*anything*--about this movie. You paid for it. *Canadian Journal of Film Studies*, 12(2), 64-80.
- Urquhart, P. (2006). Film policy/film history: From the Canadian Film Development Corporation to Telefilm Canada. In A. Loiselle, & T. McSorley (Eds.), *Self-portraits: The cinemas of Canada since Telefilm* (pp. 29-54). Ottawa: The Canadian Film Institute.
- Valck, M. de. (2005). Drowning in popcorn at the International Film Festival Rotterdam? The festival as a multiplex of cinephilia. In M. d. Valck, & M. Hagen (Eds.), *Cinephilia: Movies, love and memory* (pp. 97-109). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Vancouver fest tightens belt. (1988, June). *Cinema Canada*, (153) 34.
- Vancouver festival names acting head. (1988, April 27). *The Globe and Mail*, Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Vancouver Festival Society, The. (1959). *Vancouver Film Festival* [programme guide]. Vancouver: Author.

- Vancouver film festival shows \$30,000 profit.(1985, June 12). *The Globe and Mail*, pp. S7. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic database.
- Vancouver International Film Festival. (1998). *17th Vancouver International Film Festival* [souvenir program]. Vancouver: Author.
- Vancouver International Film Festival. (2000, September 15). We love Hollywood! We adore stars!, but... [advertisement]. In *The Vancouver Sun*.
- Vancouver International Film Festival. (2005, October 18). *24th Vancouver International Film Festival breaks records* [press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.viff.org/viff05/e-media/mediareleases12.html>
- Vancouver International Film Festival. (2005, September, 7). *24th annual VIFF announces full line-up of films and events* [press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.viff.org/viff05/e-media/docs/8VIFF05PC.pdf>
- Vancouver International Film Festival. (2006). *VIFF no. 25* [souvenir guide]. Vancouver: Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society.
- Vancouver International Film Festival. (n.d.). About VIFF | General Information. In *About VIFF*. Retrieved from <http://www.viff.org/08home/about.htm>
- Vanderburgh, J. (2003). Ghostbusted! Popular perceptions of English-Canadian cinema. *Canadian Journal of Film Studies*, 12(2), 81-98.
- Walsh, M. (1982, May 13). Ridge's curtain goes up tonight on new film festival. *The Province* [Vancouver], p. C1.
- Walsh, M. (1982, May 3). Independent Ridge plans 40-feature film festival. *The Province* [Vancouver], p. B5.
- Walsh, M. (1983, May 13). Ridge's film fest growing. *The Province* [Vancouver], p. D1.
- Walsh, M. (1991, October 11). Is festival too big? Friendly giant has lost some of its soul. *The Province*, p. B6. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 238070351).
- Wasko, J. (2003). *How Hollywood works*. London: Sage.
- Wasson, H. (2005). *Museum movies: The Museum of Modern Art and the birth of art cinema*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weekend box office. (n.d.) In *Movies: The wind that shakes the barley*. Retrieved from the Box Office Mojo Web site: <http://www.boxofficemojo.com/movies/?page=weekend&id=windthatshakesthebarley.htm>

- Whitten, A. (1977, Summer). Opinions: In and outs of the festivals. *Cinema Canada*, (38-39) 55-56.
- Wilinsky, B. (2001). *Sure seaters: The emergence of art house cinema*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Willemen, P. (1981). Pesaro: The limitations and strengths of a cultural policy. *Framework*, 15, 96-98.
- Willemen, P. (1994). The national. *Looks and frictions: Essays in cultural studies and film theory* (pp. 206-219). London: British Film Institute.
- Winch, D. (1988, August 28). Film festivals have become latest big-city status symbol. *The Gazette* [Montreal], p. D3. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 161729731).
- Wood, R. (2004). Notes on the Toronto Film Festival. *CineAction*, 63, 62-65.
- Wright, D. (2005). Mediating production and consumption: Cultural capital and "cultural workers". *British Journal of Sociology*, 56(1), 105-121. Retrieved from Academic Search Elite database.
- Yorkville, Toronto. (n.d.). Retrieved August 15 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yorkville,_Toronto
- Zacharias, Y. (2007, October 8). Director guides VIFF through the ages; Festival Director Alan Franey has brought his lifelong love for film to VIFF since the first curtains went up. *The Vancouver Sun*, p. C1. Retrieved from Canadian Newsstand database (ProQuest Document ID: 1362215801).
- Zukin, S. (1991). *Landscapes of power: From Detroit to Disney World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.