of random incongruities?

It remains to mention the other main ingredient of the film's recipe, introduced about half way through the cooking time, and thereafter sprinkled very liberally. More or less accidentally Elaine orders a pizza, and when the delivery boy arrives with it he finds himself drawn into the bewildering maelstrom that has been going on half the night. All four characters alternately seduce and spurn him, undress him, push him into the bath, throw him downstairs, tip him (and all his pizzas) into the pool, squirm over him, abuse, wheedle, and generally disorient him. Through it all he hangs on in the hope of at least one simple fuck, without any fixin's.

The audience seemed to identify eagerly with this relatively pedestrian consciousness, and to enjoy the TV sit-com humour of a series of dumbdelivery-boy-meets-(horny)-Gracie-Allen jokes. Perhaps this should be taken as an important clue. The humour extracted from the pizza boy is simple stuff, and essentially derived from TV comedy. Markson hasn't introduced a 'normal' consciousness as a perspective from which to view the freaks, but a goofy dope, a Gomer Pyle – in other words, another freak. So the artificial world remains unbroken.

Monkeys is the kind of film which asks to be compared with other films. To stack it up against the big ones: it falls between the intense dramatization of madness by Bergman, who would rely far more on his actors' ability to project complex feeling, and the surreal fantasia of Buñuel, whose anarchic dreams in Discreet Charm are so deadpan that we don't recognize them as dreams until someone wakes up from them. These are mountainous heights to fall between, and where Morley lands is somewhere in the vicinity of Fellini. Monkeys is an extravagantly goodlooking film, full of energy and inventiveness exerted by a talent which perhaps overspends itself on a mirage.

-Robert Fothergill

Only God Knows

In the beginning was the Idea.

Something started the ball rolling. Perhaps it was the old joke: did you hear the one about the priest, the minister and the rabbi...? Perhaps it was simply the title, an innocent expression, "only God knows".



Paul Hecht, John Beck and Gordon Pinsent

All of which sounds like an ad man's dream; great stuff for a publicity campaign (and they've certainly made the best of it). But for a film? It must have been something a little more promising. Perhaps it was the plotline: three men of the cloth steal two hundred thousand dollars from the Mafia, armed only with the best of intentions and the clearest of consciences. Call it comedy. Well, whatever the inspiration, Only God Knows probably was once a great idea. Unfortunately, there's a fairly long route between a great idea and a great or even good film. Someone (was it producer Larry Dane, writer Haskell Gray or director Peter Pearson?) evidently misjudged the distance.

It's a pleasant enough film, but between the tired old Hollywood sight gags, the many and god-awful double entendres and the superficiality of a world where (for example) a man's ability to pronounce Hanukkah properly is sufficient proof that he's not anti-Semitic, there's very little which rises above the level of the Sacred and the Inane. An irreverent story needs an irreverent hand in the telling. Instead, Only God Knows plays everything for the easy but instantly forgettable laugh (very much like a television sitcom) and as a result, one and all involved are quickly reduced to mildly amusing and rather witless caricatures. It's no credit to the Holy Trinity that they finally outfool the Mafia.

As they're presented, Father Hagan (Gordon Pinsent), Reverend Norman (Jack Beck) and Rabbi Sherman (Paul Hecht) are effectively crooks (and lucky crooks, at that) who happen, quite incidentally, to be members of the

clergy. They launch their caper on the shallowest of rationalizations, and although their act is of desperation, they themselves are hardly desperate men. There's the gentle Father, the head of an impressive Church and yet the mastermind and driving force behind a scheme borne in confessional. And there's the hip young Reverend, blue jeans cowboy boots and all, who quotes the Bible with tongue-in-check to those in his flock who would rather be seduced than saved. Not to forget the good Rabbi, the most compassionate of the three, and a man facing divorce as the reward for his dedication.

Together, they run an interfaith drug rehabilitation centre, Junkhouse, and face dispossession along with its young inhabitants because they lack the two hundred thousand dollars needed to pay the bills. While Father Hagan mulls over the problem, the local Don (Louis Tanno), an aging gentleman with exquisite taste in wine and art, is busy coping with a bothersome conscience. In the best Mafia tradition, the two get together and an offer is made: it seems only fitting that the Don's four and a half million dollar fortune, made in the drug trade, should go to Junkhouse in return, of course, for absolution and entrance to Heaven. Hardly an offer to refuse (is there any other kind these days?) but unfortunately it's not made official before the old man inconveniently dies. So the God Squad must steal what's "rightfully theirs". Honourable men that they are, they'll take only the two hundred grand they need.

Although Pinsent, Beck and Hecht seem like quite an acceptable team of comedians, they're not allowed the opportunity to be convincing as clergymen. Their characters are drawn superficially, much in the spirit of "the clothes make the man"; the cassock, collar and cap serve to identify but do nothing to bring the breath of life.

So okay, it's a comedy verging (intentionally or not) towards farce, and perhaps Dane/Gray/Pearson intended the priest the minister and the rabbi simply to be an extension of that old joke. But the laughs are not any smoother or more effective for the lack of real-live characters. In fact, the film moves along at an uncomfortably ceremonial pace as the gags, including an ecumenical "drag" sequence and an improbable car chase through open fields (is this becoming the Pearson trademark? Remember Paperback Hero?) are carefully contrived and then fully and forcefully exploited.

Likely as not though, someone had a great time developing Only God Knows from that mysterious idea. There's a hint (just a hint) of a rare and spontaneous spirit which might well have infected the entire film. But it's easy to get carried away. There are times like that; one joke leads to another and before it's all over, well. ... Perhaps they might just be better forgotten. But God help us if there's a film to be found in every old joke.

The Visitor

So, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has yet to be convinced. All along, the powers-that-be have been reluctant to recognize Canadian films. Now that they have (at least the summer series, **Canadian Cinema** is a step in the right direction), it's obvious that they've still very little respect for the films as anything other than filler between commercials. And equally obvious that this country's film industry may have won a small battle for Corporation recognition, but they're still losing the war.

Consider The Visitor. Not that it was any more thoughtlessly handled than the others in the series, (in that respect, Mon Oncle Antoine suffered much more) but this was, in effect, the film's "first-run" showing east of the Rockies. It deserved better.

The Visitor is a film of moods, a chilling and fascinating study in the psychology of Time, weaving the immediate present and the carefully preserved and beautifully evoked turn-ofthe-century past around a kind of Canadian Victorian romance. As the "visitor", Pia Shandel portrays a young history student whose interest in the past, specifically Calgary of the early 1900's, has ceased to be a simple matter of academics. A growing obsession drives her to spend three mid-winter weeks in an empty old mansion, all in the name of research. After a restless first night's sleep, she awakens into the strange olde world of her daydreams. Triggered by the appearance of a mysterious young man (Eric Peterson) who claims to be the master of the house in his parent's absence, the romantic reverie begins. And slowly turns into a nightmare, full of the psychological ambiguities so characteristic of the troubled world in which Paul Almond's heroines seem to find themselves.

Unlike an Almond film though, The Visitor remains coherent in its direction, even as its realities become increasingly

confused. Throughout, the old house is the one continuing reality and director John Wright uses it effectively, richly visualizing the warmth and atmosphere that the young woman so passionately wished to experience. (Could Wright have felt the same obsession? What better way to indulge it than to make a film.) Its imposing presence gives the film a theatrical air; the two young people, in the process of getting to know one another and adjusting to the strange situation, often work to it in the blocked movements of the stage.

In these same ponderous moments, they pass the time with some fairly contrived philosophic conversation about the meaning of life and other such related matters. Thankfully, it's offered (presumably at Wright's prompting) with a collective non-committal



Eric Peterson in "The Visitor"

shrug, as if the questions are just too weighty to be rewarded with an answer. So why worry? Wright even includes a short poem by Robert Service, Just Think: "... Your life is but a little beat/Within the heart of Time " A comfortable and reassuring thought. But as irrelevant and half baked as it may seem (and perhaps it's wrong to think of it in terms of present day cynicism), the polite conversation does serve to deepen the tension, simply by delaying the inevitable. Only as the visitor becomes completely involved in this past society, and feels the coldness of the people who know nothing of her dilemma (and may not even exist outside of her imagination, there's always that unresolved uncertainty), does the tension find a final release. The visitor proves to be less than the perfect guest.

Unfortunately, the dream world of The Visitor is no match for the harsher dream world of commercial television. Perhaps the National Film Board was right when it, among others, voiced reservations about the successful transition from large screen to small. The transition has been uncomfortable, and never more than in the hands of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

- Mark Miller

About rape and recent releases

If there are any indicators of the present state of our collective consciousness as English-Canadians, surely the recent works of our artists would have to be classified as such. As a firm believer that films, whether popular or artful in design, are among the most colourful and valuable expressions of this country's culture, I also hold that the creators of film are no lesser artists than those who choose to apply oil paint to canvas, rather than light to celluloid.

A glance at five recent titles is almost alarming in its clarity of message. Read together, The Hard Part Begins, Why Rock the Boat?, Only God Knows, Monkeys in the Attic (a tale of exploding dreams), and 125 Rooms of Comfort cannot fail to conjure up obvious concerns of our collective journey, circa three-quarters of the way through this century. Comfort was originally entitled The Adventures of Johnny Cannuck, and the Canadian content of the message is, as a notable criminal once used to say, perfectly clear. Especially if applied to our perplexed feature industry.

Having seen all except the last, the thematic connection one soon discovers is rape - both the mind and body fuck varieties. John Lynch's Hard Part foists upon our consciousness yet another tale of a Canadian loser, in the grand tradition of Goin' Down the Road, but missing Shebib's ballsy ambience. Bradley and McGrath are back in wellplayed supporting roles, but Donnelly Rhodes' fucked-over country and western singer lead is weak compared to Rip Torn's in Payday. As is Nancy-Belle Fuller's country belle in comparison with the lady whose voice was dubbed in for her songs. Nevertheless, the critics all flocked to praise this film with surprising enthusiasm. Cinépix is handling the distribution, on this low-budget rendering of small town Canadian life, also dealing with how country culture is being replaced by rock culture in most parts.

John Howe's Why Rock the Boat? is a period comedy set in the forties, but its explorations of socialism vs. capitalism, male vs. female, honesty vs. corruption, and sex vs. love are as contemporary in concern as what to do if another depression comes. Its major theme is seduction, a mild form of rape: Stu Gillard's bumbling cub reporter is being