

Third, Canada's libel laws are particularly rigid, the legal department of the CBC was acutely sensitive to the possibility of law suits. The scope and complexity of the project seemed to warrant the introduction of a third party who would be able to assemble the all-important technical crew and handle the filming. The person selected was Martyn Burke; but the solution became one of the problems. As Rowland sees it, Burke operated on flashes of instinct and inspiration; he made his decisions quickly and wanted immediate results. The slower, more methodical Macadam cast wide nets that were often expensive, time-consuming and not always fruitful. From this basic difference in approach flowed a myriad of disputes, some petty, some grand, that often brought the filming to a screaming halt until cooler heads prevailed.

At least, principal filming was completed on May 17, 1976 and, after a rest and recuperation break of three months, Dubro, Macadam, and Burke returned to Toronto to do battle with the editing. And battle it was, as the threesome could not agree on a basic focus for what was becoming a surfeit of footage. The inexorably approaching deadline only inflamed the quarrels. When Herrndorf finally saw the best version that had been achieved, he was aghast at its length and shapelessness. To the rescue came Richard Nielson — later, of Nielson-Ferns — who was given the position of executive producer with the authority to make binding decisions. Fortunately, both Burke and Macadam respected his ability. Nielson's enthusiasm for the project — which had been rapidly eroding in the others — was a great asset. And finally, he proposed a structural solution to the problem: the project would consist of fourteen, separate, self-contained magazine items spread over two ninety-minute programs. Under his benevolent dictatorship the bickering diminished and the family settled down to work. At one point, before the screening of the show, Burke and Macadam were convinced that the CBC and more particularly Herrndorf, was going to shelve the film because of its volatile content. They set up a plan — never implemented — to steal the work print of *Connections* and safely hide it from bureaucratic mendacity. The CBC later denied any such intent.

The Rowland book raises some interesting questions about the ethicality of this type of program. Is there an irreconcilable, and potentially dangerous conflict of attitude and sensibility between the filmmaker and the journalist? Rowland feels that such a problem was inherent in the 'Biker Connection' sequence, where

the ugly sordidness of the gangs was obscured and softened by Martin Duckworth's lush photography. But then, Macadam was solely in charge of this section, and so, responsible for its look and content. As such he would not be the first director-producer to have become overly enchanted with his subject. If one accepts the premise that society is in a state of war with organized crime, then, does it follow that traditional mores are to be overlooked, as though the enemy were an external one?

Because art involves the manipulation of a material reality — in film, the manipulation of images — many consider the editor to be the only 'artist' in what is a very collaborative process. As more and more people rely on television as their primary source of information, the vital question arises as to who should make the final cut; and based upon what philosophy should those crucial cuts be made?

T.C. Maunder

Tom Maunder is General Manager of Cine Books in Toronto.

The Film Encyclopedia by Ephraim Katz

New York, Thomas Y. Crowell; Toronto, Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1979. \$39.95 hc.

Although motion picture history does not yet go back a century, related literature is already formidable. New York documentary filmmaker Ephraim Katz has just compiled what he and his publisher claim to be "the most comprehensive encyclopedia of world cinema in one volume." This feat not only reflects great self-confidence, but also a lot of time and energy spent on a collating job of monumental proportions.

In his preface, Katz is the first to admit that his claim to comprehensiveness is partially mitigated by certain practicalities. In order to make the book's format manageable, it was necessary to exclude some important material. Thus, there are no photographs, something of an anomaly in a book on visual arts; and there is no discussion of specific films, or film themes. This does limit the value of the encyclopedia, but Katz is justified in saying that to have included these aspects would have required a much greater selectivity and shortening of entries than he would have wished: the result, then, would have been

a work similar in form to Leslie Halliwell's **Filmgoer's Companion**, which suffers from its sacrifice of content for packaging.

The Film Encyclopedia concentrates on the biographical and technical aspects of cinema, and masterfully succeeds. Over 7000 entries are arranged alphabetically into 1,286 double-column pages. Included in the biographical entries are all the major actors, actresses, producers, writers, directors, cinematographers, art directors and editors of the American, British and "International" industries, as well as many lesser-known names. In the majority of cases, complete filmographies are given; and when they aren't, Katz notes that his listing is incomplete. There are essays on the history and development of movies in most countries, with the notable exception, for some reason, of Spain. Canada gets a full column; and if Katz' conclusion — that timidity and mediocrity are the most notable characteristics of our domestic feature industry — riles our newly-cocky producers, it confirms the views of many of our own critics.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the book, aside from the biographical, is the attention Katz devotes to technical terms. Such whimsical terms as "dinky-inky" (a small, low-voltage spotlight) are explained, as are other aspects of gaffer-speak. Trade and industry associations such as IATSE and the MPAA, are among the many other details explained on the actual process of filming, seldom described elsewhere.

Inevitably, in a work of this scope, there are omissions and errors. Some of these are due to faulty information in the sources Katz consulted; e.g., actress Jodie Foster is listed as having been born in New York in 1963, when in fact she was born in Los Angeles in 1962, according to most sources. Only John Willis' **Screen World** lists the 1963 date, and it seems odd that Katz would use it in view of the contradictions from other sources. It also seems odd that he would include entries on Terrence Malick, Paul Schrader and Claudia Weill, but not John Milius, Jonathan Demme and George Romero. However, these qualifications and others like them do not discount the value of Katz' work. **The Film Encyclopedia** is a reference book of value to all persons involved or interested in cinema, and the publication of Ephraim Katz' companion volume, dealing with film from a thematic point of view, is an event to look forward to.

Paul Costabile

*Paul Costabile is a Toronto librarian, collector of soundtracks and other movie memorabilia, and writes the **In Release** column for CineMag.*