THE QUARTERLY of Film Radio and Television

Volume IX • SUMMER, 1955 • *Number 4*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES

Contents

The Cambridge University Educational Film Council

C. DENIS PEGGE

C. DENIS PEGGE was one of the founders of the C.U.E.F.C. and has been its general secretary up to the present year. He has carried out investigations on the film in teaching and has made films in connection with university research and record, as well as independently. His publications include the shooting script *Bombay Riots* and a number of articles on film in *Nature, Sight and Sound,* and the *University Film Journal.* Mr. Pegge is currently engaged in writing a book on the art and psychology of the film.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY may claim to have made an early start in its film activities, and the Cambridge University Educational Film Council has played a pioneering part in what may be termed the film-council movement among British universities. It may equally be said that what has happened at Cambridge is, in a fair measure, representative. Therefore, in giving an account with its history and background of the Cambridge Film Council and in adding some allusion to leading film activities at other academic centers, it is hoped that a general picture of the film in British universities will be conveyed. And let it be said here at the beginning that in British universities the place of the film is at present very much that of a Cinderella—and, at that, an idle Cinderella. The film is not as yet put to all the work it could do, and it is only exceptionally introduced into university curriculum as a subject of study. Nevertheless, film use and even film study are developing in British universities.

The foundation of the Cambridge Film Council followed a period of incubation in the years 1944 to 1947. Although, for many years before this, films had been used for instruction at schools in Great Britain, they were very much less in use for teaching at universities. This disparity—which still continues—may be partly due to a lack of films suitable for teaching at university level. The market for educational films is, in any event, comparatively small. Even should films become extensively used in uni-

versities, the university market would be likely to remain much smaller than the school market since there are vastly more schools than specialized university departments. Because of their traditionally unintellectual and naïve approach, films have in the past provided much more obvious demonstration that they might help in the education of children than help in the teaching of university students. The film has been associated with a superficiality that has adversely prejudiced its use and study at universities. But to go into all the reasons why there should have been up to now a much greater use of films at schools than at universities would be beyond the scope of this article.

In one field other than teaching, the film plays a part at universities that it is not called upon to play at all at schools. The camera and cinematography have from the time of their invention been used as instruments of science—as has been described by Kenneth Macgowan in his article "The Coming of Camera and Projector" in the Fall, 1954, issue of this journal. As early as 1874, the astronomer Pierre Jules César Jannsen photographed the passage of Venus across the face of the sun. Étienne Jules Marey's pioneering work in the study of animal movement occurred in 1892. In order to win a wager about the movement of a galloping horse, Eadweard Muybridge used one of the earliest motion-picture cameras for a scientific purpose.

Outstanding instances of cinematography used for research have occurred at Cambridge. The famous cancer-research films of the late Dr. R. G. Canti resulted from an intimate association between St. Bartholomew's Hospital, London, and the Strangeways Laboratory, Cambridge. Within the University, the late Sir Joseph Barcroft made films of the development of the sheep foetus and other physiological films that are widely known. Sir James Gray, present head of the zoology department, has made constant use of cinematography in his great and long maintained study of animal locomotion. Dr. Arthur Hughes, who is one of the successors in the line of cinematographic investigation begun by Canti and who has used apparatus devised by Canti, has made

films both in the Strangeways Laboratory and in the anatomy department of the University.

Although films made especially for university teaching were virtually nonexistent in 1944, there were by then a large number made for other purposes, such as higher-school education, industrial and military training, industrial advertisement, and general-interest and civil-information films that could contribute to university teaching. For example, films made to teach the operators of welding apparatus could be of use to engineering students; a film on surface tension made for the upper forms of schools, of use to first-year students of physics; the *Secrets of Nature* films of Dr. Percy Smith and Miss Mary Field, of use in botanical teaching; and films like Flaherty's *Moana* and a great many others—with suitable introductions—could contribute to anthropological teaching. Perhaps the existing supply of films particularly allowed a contribution to the teaching of biological subjects and engineering. It might not be possible to take students over a steel mill or down a coal mine in the vicinity of a university, but films could provide a valuable substitute experience.

In 1944, I was placed in charge of the first series of cinema courses offered at Cambridge University, in the department of engineering. These courses consisted of educational-film sessions within the regular timetable of the students. This method of teaching with films through an educational-film session or cinema hour is distinct from the more usual method of using films as an aid, like blackboard diagrams and lantern slides, to illustrate a lecture. In the lecture method, the film remains subsidiary, and the lecturer continues to dominate; whereas, in the cinema hour—although introductions and the setting are important—the film is largely self-explanatory. The cinema hour within the regular timetable of students also differs from the more random showing of films as an extracurricular activity by university societies and the like. Such extra curricular-film showings—which are often educationally very valuable—occur very frequently at British universities at the present time.

The films for the Cambridge engineering cinema courses were chosen systematically and, so far as the available supply allowed, were made to fit in with the whole course of the students' lectures and laboratory work. In 1943, courses for second-year students, in addition to those for first-year students, were inaugurated. In order to find suitable films, I viewed during the first three years about 600 films; and these were carefully selected out of hundreds of others before they were viewed.

At Cambridge, educational-film sessions have subsequently been used in the teaching of students of economics and of geography, as well as very successfully for the teaching of the Russian language; and educational-film sessions occur at other British universities. Nevertheless, the considerable task of sifting out suitable films tends to prevent that rapid extension of the cinema-hour method which might with advantage be made. For this method can make use of films which can valuably contribute to university teaching, although they were not made specifically for this purpose; and, in several subjects besides engineering, there is no lack of such films. But someone—well experienced in the film medium and conversant with a department's curriculum—has to evaluate the films, has to give time and thought to the matter which a university teacher cannot in the ordinary way afford.

During the 1944 period—and earlier in 1943—Dr. G. Kitson Clark used films successfully in teaching short-course cadets at Cambridge. He became, as a result, enthusiastic about the use of films in teaching. Because of the stimulus of the actuality they contributed and the advantageous technique of animated diagrams for illustrating battle campaigns, he believed that much further use could profitably be made of films in university teaching, in his own subject of history.

Within the 1944–47 period, Professor Sir Lawrence Bragg—then head of the Cavendish Laboratory—made with Dr. J. F. Nye the film *Bubble Model of a Metal.* As a result, Sir Lawrence Bragg began to consider the need for better film-making facilities in the University.

In 1945, Dr. G. Kitson Clark convened in Cambridge a general meeting on the subject of university-film use. Under the chairmanship of Dr. G. M. Trevelyan—then Master of Trinity College—this meeting led to the setting up of an informal committee, to the organization of several demonstrations on the use of the film in teaching, and to one or two meetings on the problems of university film making.

All of the above represent the incidents and, in part, the personal accidents leading to the formation of the Cambridge Film Council. Another such chance was the presence in Cambridge during 1946–47 of a dynamic undergraduate Stanley Orwell (then Stanley Oreanu) who attended the film demonstrations which led him to get in touch with Dr. Kitson Clark and myself. Mr. Orwell was to play an energetic and vital part in the early stages of the organization of the Film Council.

At a further general meeting in 1947, the Film Council was founded. This meeting was honored by the presence of the Secretary General of the Faculties and, from outside the University, by representatives from the Federation of Documentary Film Units and the British Film Institute—the latter body fosters the use of the film in all branches of national life, and has subsequently always given the greatest consideration and support to the Cambridge Council.

The Cambridge Film Council's first publication stated its general object: "to promote the use of films in higher education, and for the purpose of academic research." Its "ultimate aim" was "the establishment of a University Film Center which would include adequate facilities for the production, projection, and storage of films."

All faculties and departments of the University are automatically members of the Cambridge Film Council, and are entitled to its services. A general meeting is held each year at which officers (honorary) and committee are elected; the members of the committee are chosen, so far as possible, to provide a fair representation of all the faculties and departments most interested in films.

Both the General Board of the Faculties—that is, the central administration body of the University—and the Cambridge University Press appoint representatives to the committee. A secretarial center has been provided by the department of engineering. The Council submits an annual report to the General Board of the Faculties concerning film problems and needs. A small annual subscription from the University does little more than cover the cost of printing the annual report and a few additional regular items; but it has allowed the Council to carry on.

The functioning of the Council—without the means to develop all the projects it would like to—has been mainly as a center of information, contact, and coördination, bringing together those with similar film problems and establishing relations with outside bodies. It has fostered film activities. Although the Council does not produce films, it has done its best to improve conditions for those who do make films in the University. Some specific services will be mentioned later. First consideration will be given to the Council as a center of information and contact.

When an individual in one university department wants to know how to process his strips of 35-mm. film, the Film Council is able to put him in touch with an individual in another department who has already dealt with that problem and has facilities. Infrequently, a department considers making more use of films or plans educational-film sessions; and the Film Council is able to help that department. If the General Board of the Faculties wants information or advice on such a matter as the storage and preservation of films, the Film Council provides a report on the subject.

To all these—individuals, departments, and the University—information is also given each year by the Film Council's Annual Report of about 2,000 words. This Report gives details, including the whereabouts, of the University's pooled motion-picture equipment. It also indicates how various departments are utilizing films, which is an influence leading to the extension of film use.

The Annual Report is widely distributed outside the University; and, in its turn, the Film Council receives information from other universities through similar publications, correspondence, and so on. The Council provides a channel of relation with outside bodies like the British Film Institute, the British Universities Film Council, the B.B.C. Television Service, and the Pennsylvania Instructional Film Research organization. Sometimes, the makers of an educational or technical film consult the Council—as did the Shell Film Unit in the making of *Stanlow Story,* when the Council arranged film viewings and meetings between the film makers and university specialists.

Another service which the Council performs is the keeping of a register of films made in connection with teaching and research at Cambridge. Up to now, details of 65 films have been collected. More recently, the Council has opened a register of films of record—films having a potential historical value to the University. Knowledge of the films made in Cambridge enables the Council to secure distribution of suitable films through the Scientific Film Library of the British Film Institute. It has also traced down, made detailed recommendations about, and obtained official consideration by the University for the copying and preserving of the valuable films of the late Sir Joseph Barcroft.

A few services that the Council is very glad to have performed have been in the national field. For example, on the Cambridge Film Council's initiative, the British Universities Film Council was founded in 1948, at a conference convened by the British Film Institute and the Scientific Film Association. The B.U.F.C., whose first chairman Dr. G. Kitson Clark was also chairman of the Cambridge Film Council, represents the interests of all British universities, and will be referred to again. Through approaches made in the first instance by the Cambridge Council and carried out by the newly founded B.U.F.C., the system of distributing university films through the Scientific Film Library of the British Film Institute was started. In 1953–54, the Cambridge Film Council collected information about the famous

Canti films, which may contribute toward their eventual national preservation.

The Council has always attached great importance to the establishment of centralized film-making facilities in the University. This object, it will be remembered, was explicitly stated as part of the Council's ultimate aim, and has been reflected in its Annual Reports. For example, the Second Report stated that

> a great many of the films needed for teaching and research will have to be made internally under the direct supervision of University teachers and research workers .... the expensive and highly specialized work of film making is not likely to be adequately performed if it is left simply to the resources of individual departments.

Again, the Fourth Report suggested that within a university there should be an "Institution to provide cinematograph services and to produce films, in the same way as a University Press provides printing services and produces books." What has been envisioned is an institution which, however much it might have to be subsidized at first, might at length be self-supporting or even a source of income to a university in the same way as some university presses are. Because of its research activities and its personnel, a university provides conditions for the making of specialized films not allowed elsewhere.

In its early days, the Council advanced a scheme for the establishment of a centralized university-film unit on a very modest scale. Although this proposal has not as yet borne fruit, the Council has continued to do its best to improve the conditions for individual film makers in the University by putting them in touch with one another, arranging for the distribution and preservation of their films, and making their requirements known. It has also secured the purchase of cameras and other film-making equipment which have been shared by departments.

It is hoped that this account has not seemed a merely partisan one, and that it may have given an idea also of the use of films in teaching and research in British universities generally. There are, of course, variations from university to university. For example,

at Durham University there is a department of photography which provides that university with facilities for cinematography as well as for still photography. But this is an isolated instance. Compared with the use that might—and almost certainly eventually will—be made of films in teaching and research in universities, their use in British universities at present is small; and, on the whole, the result of individual initiative rather than of a consciously pursued university or departmental policy. But there are exceptions, such as the educational-film sessions given in regular timetables at some universities. This mostly individual and scattered film activity in British universities has, for the past eight years or so, been fostered by film councils and committees having a general resemblance to the Cambridge one. At the same time, in the national sphere, the British Universities Film Council has represented the interests of all the local film councils.

The British Universities Film Council—whose present chairman is Dr. Blodwen Lloyd and whose secretary is Dr. C. B. Childs—receives a grant from the British Film Institute as well as subscriptions from its member universities. An important part of its work is the compilation of a catalogue of films suitable for university use. The B.U.F.C. also selects films of university use for distribution by the Scientific Film Library of the British Film Institute. For several years now, it has been responsible for the film programs at the annual gatherings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. In addition, the B.U.F.C. has organized film conferences and schools of film photography.

So far, examples of the use of films in British universities have been given. No example of the study of the film has been provided—either the study of the film as an art critically for its history and achievements or in other aspects as a medium of communication.

In British universities, there is very generally lacking a study of the film from any of those angles—the aesthetic, psychological, sociological, and technical—embraced in the term filmology, for which a diploma course is provided in the University of Paris

and for which degrees are given in some American universities. The few signs in Great Britain of academic attention to the film as an art subject are mainly limited to university extramural and extension courses emanating from London, Cambridge, and other universities; although, very recently, courses on film appreciation have been introduced into the internal curriculum of the drama department of Bristol University. There are, of course, the activities of film societies, of which a number of flourishing examples exist at universities, and with whom the local film councils keep in close touch.

From the educational and sociological angles, one or two film investigations have been carried out at Cambridge and elsewhere. There is nothing in scope or continuation to compare with such integrated research work as has been done within Pennsylvania State University; although, in the psychological department of Reading University, several workers have at various times carried out studies in relation to the film and television.

Without having the knowledge of American universities to make a comparison with assurance, I believe that the universities of Great Britain may at present lag behind those of America chiefly in the study, rather than the use, of the film.

University Thesis Films: A Step Across the Barrier

ERNEST D. ROSE

ERNEST D. ROSE was one of the first students to receive a Master's degree in Motion Pictures from the Theater Arts Department of the University of California, Los Angeles. During the past four years, he has written, produced, or directed a wide variety of non-theatrical films including a series of educational pictures for the U.S. State Department in Iran and a recent documentary on the Mormon Mission in the remote Tonga Island Kingdom of the South Pacific. Mr. Rose is now a member of the faculty of the UCLA Theater Arts Department.

THE STUDENT GRADUATING from a modern university today is in many respects fortunate. Because of the continued expansion of American industry, and advances made in the practical applications of modern science and engineering, many of them will be snapped up by eager business organizations and industrial firms throughout the country. But what of those graduates who have chosen for their careers a field more highly competitive, where there are more eager aspirants than positions available? Somehow, in their years at school they have failed to foresee the inevitable problem, the endless cycle which goes, "Sorry, we can't hire you unless you've had experience." "But, sir, how does one go about acquiring experience if no one will give me that first opportunity?"

At the University of California, Los Angeles, a group of people in the Theater Arts Department are attempting to find an answer to that question. Here, courses leading to a Master's degree are given in the fields of motion pictures, theater, and radio. A practical, if partial, solution to the problem for the motion-picture student has evolved in the form of the "thesis film." This is a concept whereby selected candidates for the Master's degree are offered the opportunity of making a complete film from start to finish. The student may attempt to do the project entirely on his own, or in collaboration with another graduating student. He

may, if he chooses, enlist the aid of other students to act, to assist the cameraman, to help with the lights, or to perform many of the other minor tasks required in the making of a motion picture. Within its schedule of regular activities, the department makes available to him its equipment and facilities.

The primary requirements set down by the staff are (1) that the picture should demonstrate the validity of certain predetermined principles or theories in the process of its production and (2) that it represent essentially the creative effort of that person or persons whose thesis the film is to be. This completed picture, in conjunction with a written account of the project and the problems encountered in making it, serves as a thesis upon which a Master's degree may be granted, once the required academic commitments have been fulfilled. A student going out in search of a position is thus able to carry with him a sample of his work, which, if intelligently handled, is something concrete upon which a potential employer may judge the latent creative ability of the individual.

The thesis film thus takes on a great deal of importance to the university student. Not only does it provide a showcase for his talents, but it affords him an opportunity to experiment with new ideas, to delve into fields which may be financially impractical for the commercial producer. Above all, it offers the student a chance to express on film his particular abilities to their best advantage, free from sponsor's demands or external pressures—a condition which may not present itself again until the person has spent many years working in the field and has established his reputation firmly in the industry.

Because the facilities and resources of the UCLA Motion Picture Division are limited, the staff of the department must select only those students who have exhibited above-average ability in their work. It is a difficult task to choose from among them those who show the most promise for the future. It is equally difficult—and no less important—to try to guide the individual in his choice of subject matter (without restricting his initiative), so that the

opportunity is not wasted on purely commercial film ventures.

Inevitably, some thesis films are never completed. Others drag on indefinitely, and the process of elimination takes its toll of those who would be less likely to succeed in the struggle for survival in the highly competitive field which awaits them after they leave the university.

To illustrate some of the problems faced by the student embarking on a thesis project and to show how the experience acquired during its production proves practical after the student leaves the university, I shall draw upon my own experience. In 1950, I made the first live-action thesis film to be completed at UCLA. The Motion Picture Division was still in its formative stage at that time, and there was little money available for independent projects. Because of the crowded schedule, the equipment and facilities of the department were in use by classes much of the time.

As a result of these factors and, perhaps of greater importance, to prove to myself that I could make a film completely on my own without relying upon the university for assistance, I decided to work alone on the project and shoot the picture entirely on location.

In looking for a subject, I had to consider the financial aspect and the possibility of potential sponsorship of the film by some outside organization. My original idea was to do a filmic portrait of the Los Angeles River, following it from its source in the nearby mountains through the widely varying sections of the city until it finally empties into the ocean some 40 miles to the south. It was to be a poetic approach, using the river as a vehicle to observe the contrasts in the structure of a modern urban society. The secondary theme of flood-control activities along the river bank held possibilities for sponsorship by the local or state commission in charge of the project. But the "arty" nature of the picture was a little too much for them, and besides they had no money for such theoretical ventures.

So I turned to the very real problem of the water supply in

Southern California. Here was one of the fastest-growing areas in the world, located in a semi-arid region and dependent for its survival almost entirely upon water piped into the city from hundreds of miles to the north and east. This in itself was a basically dramatic element; but when considered alongside the fact that people in this man-made oasis were wasting their precious water at an appalling rate, it was apparent that in time a crisis of catastrophic proportion might befall them.

Here was a subject that not only had a message of importance to impart to its audience but that also commanded widespread attention (at least in the Southwestern United States) in civic, business, and industrial circles. In addition, it contained a number of basic dramatic elements, which would enable me to use my creative imagination to its best advantage.

In an effort to secure funds, I communicated with several hundred organizations by mail. But, although the experience was a healthy one for a student, it proved financially disappointing. Everyone who should have been vitally interested in the problem seemed completely detached, and those who were aware of the situation could not take the risk of investing their money in an unknown, unproved quantity. Thus the net result was that, although I received a great deal of encouragement from various organizations (including an offer of assistance from a prominent Arizona congressman, if I would tell the story from that state's point of view), I ended by investing the savings I had accumulated in the Navy during World War II.

Borrowing a camera and some film from the university, I set out to make a picture. The film that resulted was a one-reel documentary called *Liquid Assets,* a product of nine months of effort, during which time I covered over 5,000 miles on location, all within the boundaries of California, and spent more than 1,000 hours actually at work on the picture. The total cost of production, including a six-track dubbing session, was $839. Of this amount, $521 went for actual film purchases and laboratory-processing expenses.

One of the most interesting phases of the film's production was a period of 30 days which I spent working with the Los Angeles Fire Department. I needed some action footage for the climax of my story, so I approached the fire department to see if they had stock scenes of fires that I could use. The captain in charge of their photo section informed me that there was nothing available, but if I would agree to shoot as many actual fire scenes as possible and give them permission to make duplicate prints of anything they could use, he would try to arrange for me to stay at the Hollywood Fire Station until I got what I needed.

So, after signing an agreement releasing the city of all responsibility in case of injury or death, I moved into my new home and got acquainted with the men who were to be my real-life actors. One of the first things I had to do was learn how to slide down the fire pole. Then I was assigned my own helmet and turn-out coat, and soon took my turn along with the rest of the men working in the kitchen at mealtime. After the first few nights, I had mastered the art of jumping out of bed directly into my boots and trousers, pulling up my suspenders, and dashing madly for the nearest pole as the sound of the alarm shattered the silence of the night.

For 30 days and nights, I shared their experiences. To the accompaniment of screaming sirens, I answered the alarms (and false alarms), hung onto the ladders of careening fire trucks, crawled on my stomach through the basements of blazing buildings or across blistering roof tops, all the time grinding out footage of the tragedy that unfolded before my eyes.

The footage I obtained during my experience with the fire department could never have been duplicated on a sound stage. It did much to convince me of the inherent capabilities of "documentary." It also brought home the need for the documentary film maker to understand the people who will bring his story to life on the screen, to see them as human beings, and to share with them their moments of relaxation as well as their struggle for existence. For it is only after you have really come to understand

how and why they act as they do, their inner feelings and motivations, that you can begin to translate these intangible qualities dramatically in the language of film for others to share.

But an even greater value of my experience at the firehouse was the opportunity it afforded me to study the basic elements of human behavior in their purest form. For in the face of crisis or death, the complex pattern of human reactions is somehow stripped of all frills and bared before the human eye in all its nakedness. I shall not dwell further on these learning experiences. They were apparent in almost every phase of the film's production, and they are an integral part of the practical educational process which is brought into focus during the course of such film-making activities.

The picture was edited and shortened, and the narration rewritten to keep a taut pace. Taking full advantage of the unique situation presented in a thesis film, I selected music which I felt contributed most to the mood and pace of the picture, regardless of clearance. Because of the clearance factor, subsequent print sales were limited to the Los Angeles Public School System and the University Extension Film Library. For that reason also, I had to refuse a number of requests for showings on television stations. Even the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power also declined interest in the film in view of the fact that they had their own film-producing organization, and I represented "competition" in an area where there was danger that our respective efforts might be compared.

What then was gained from the production of a thesis film in the face of these seeming failures? Of far more importance than the amount of money returned on my original investment is the fact that *Liquid Assets* served me well in helping establish my career. It succeeded in its purpose of arousing public interest in the problem wherever it was shown. It is today helping make the youth of this area conscious of conservation. In addition, it gave me the first real practical experience I had been able to acquire and the self-assurance of knowledge that I could make a film from

start to finish entirely on my own. It allowed me to try to exploit certain effects with which a sponsor might not have been willing to experiment. But above all, it gave me something tangible to hold under my arm when I started making the rounds of producers and studios looking for a job.

That first big break may not always come immediately. My first job after leaving UCLA with a Master's degree was that of a messenger boy in the mail room of Paramount Studios at a weekly pay of $32. We used to joke about the fact that there were probably more college degrees, proportionately, in the mail room than there were in the front office. But I had a job in the industry, and it taught me a lesson. I learned that the days of the *What Makes Sammy Run* characters have passed from the scene. You can no longer bluff your way up the ladder to a house and swimming pool in Beverly Hills. Paradoxically, neither can you expect to start at the bottom and work very far up the line.

Eventually, the thesis film itself got me my first real opportunity. An industrial film producer from New Orleans happened to see the picture somewhere in Arkansas and hired me sight unseen to take over production responsibilities for his new but fast-growing organization. Again, when Syracuse University was seeking qualified people to form the nucleus of an overseas film unit to make educational films under contract to the State Department, I was one of the few applicants who could show a complete one-man documentary as an example of my work.

One of the wonderful things about a motion picture is that, so long as the subject is timely, it can be shown over and over again, and one of the big advantages of documentary over the entertainment film is that each audience learns something new and important. Also, each time the credit title flashes on the screen a new audience becomes conscious of the producer's existence, whether he is present at the time or halfway around the world. The film is constantly enhancing (or detracting from) his reputation. On more than one occasion, this factor has worked to the advantage of UCLA film-department graduates.

The Theater Arts Department has a policy to have one or two evenings set aside each year to screen films made by students and faculty members. Frequently, a number of Hollywood studio personalities and newspaper film critics attend these showings and become acquainted with the work of graduating students. The thesis film is a perfect showcase for outstanding student talent. A number of these students are thus able to establish valuable contacts in the industry, and a few may eventually find their way into positions there.

But the future of the average film-department graduate lies outside the realm of Hollywood. The total annual output of the entire Hollywood industry in its peak year used to amount to 350 features; since 1950, production has dropped off 25 per cent. The amount of films required by TV alone is more than 10 times that number. Each year, several thousand films are produced by commercial organizations to fill the needs of industry, business, religious organizations, scientific groups, and educators.

In the short period of four years since graduating from the University, I have worked on no less than 17 different pictures. They have varied widely in subject matter and carried me to many distant parts of the world. Many of them, for reason of classification or restrictions, can never be shown to the general public. Others I would not be desirous of showing, because of their heavy commercial flavor. The Master's thesis film, on the other hand, should be something that can be shown with pride at any time to any audience, if its full importance is understood when the student decides on his subject matter. If his choice is wise, and if he pursues his problem to its logical conclusion, he will have come a long way toward crossing the barrier which separates the student from the ranks of the creative film artist.

ALBERTO CAVALCANTI

The following material appeared originally in Spanish in the September, 1953, issue of *Film* and is reprinted here with full permission of Cine Universitario, Montevideo, publishers of *Film*.

A study of the entire European period of Cavalcanti does not appear to exist. The French period is noted in René Jeanne and Charles Ford, *Histoire Encyclopédique du Cinéma* (Paris: Robert Lafont, 1947), I, 279–82. The English period is referred to in Forsyth Hardy, ed., *Grierson on Documentary* (London: Collins, 1946), 83, 95, 111, and 183; and in Michael Balcon, Ernest Lindgren, Forsyth Hardy, and Roger Manvell, *20 Years of British Film: 1925–1945* (London: The Falcon Press Ltd., 1947). The texts by Cavalcanti come from two letters which he wrote to *Sight and Sound* (London, January–March, 1952 and April–June, 1953) and from Alberto Cavalcanti, *Film e Realidade* (São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editora, 1953), 258 pp. This book is not necessarily distinctive, but it is a compilation and adaptation of his writings of different places and periods—important because it reveals Cavalcanti's theories.

I. His Career

EMIR RODRIGUEZ MONEGAL

EMIR RODRIGUEZ MONEGAL teaches literature in several high schools and private schools of Montevideo, Uruguay. During the past twelve years, his articles of literary and motion-picture criticism have appeared in *Marcha* and *Film* of Montevideo, as well as in other foreign publications. Señor Monegal was a judge in the Second Motion Picture Festival of Punta del Este in 1952 and in the Festival of Documentary and Experimental Films in Montevideo in 1954. The translation is by THOMAS CAULFIELD, a student in the Motion Picture Division of the Theater Arts Department of the University of California, Los Angeles. Mr. Caulfield is currently engaged on writing a script for a planned film on some aspect of Mexican culture.

IN THE NINTH CHAPTER of his book *Film and Reality,* Alberto Cavalcanti writes:

Whenever a young enthusiast insists that I see one of his films, which he ingeniously has classified as experimental, my acceptance is always filled with reservations. And, invariably I have come to ask the same question: Experiment of what sort? The producers of those films remind me of young children who, seeing their older brothers comment on their chemistry lessons, supply themselves with an inquiet spirit of investigation and combine in a container vinegar, eau de cologne, gasoline, and at times, for want of another ingredient, they add a certain liquid of personal production. Experiment without definite purpose is not experiment.

Actually, this classification—experimental film—which Cavalcanti seems to use with such moderation, is the one which best describes a large part of his work. Initiated at the end of the silent period into the French *avant-garde,* incorporated into the new British school of documentary, enlarged by several commercial productions in the postwar period, the work of Alberto Cavalcanti is an example of incessant and untiring experimentation. When he inaugurated the series of symphonies of the cities with *Rien que les heures* (1926), when he attempted the poetry of popular themes with *En rade* (1927), when he played with the recently discovered possibilities of the sound film in *Pett and Pott* (1934), when he captured the tense and responsible atmosphere of the first days of the war in London in *The First Days* (1939),

when he incorporated into the commercial cinema a technique of purified *avant-gardism* with *Dead of Night* (1945), Cavalcanti was experimenting. Now in Brazil (where he was born in 1897), Cavalcanti is undertaking a new type of experiment: the organization of chaos—the formation of a national motion-picture industry that will be capable of producing films which reflect the reality of Brazilian life (superficiality or profundity) and which may be, at the same time, of international caliber.

Beneath this eager experimentation, this necessity of always widening the limits of an art in formation, there is something which cannot be explained solely by the hazards of a career in which fate seems compelled to test the man. Each time that Cavalcanti succeeds in settling himself in a style of film making and begins to produce works which strike a balance between an exigent aesthetic conception and the interests of the audience, something crosses his path. In France, it was the invention of sound which uprooted him from his poetic silent films and converted him into a fabricator of vaudeville films, theatrical in style; in England it was the separation of Ealing Studios, which involved him in the filming of more or less prefabricated melodramas. But each one of those falls in commercial production forced Cavalcanti to new effort and a new period. For, from the theatrical productions of the sound film, he was able to move into the documentary group of John Grierson and from cheap melodrama, to the reorganization of the Brazilian film industry. As he indicates in the quoted passage, in the face of his work it has been necessary to ask himself the *raison d'être* of this career, as notable for its productions as for its ups and downs—these series of stages arrived at and abandoned, this experimentation to which his own eagerness and fate have submitted him.

The So-Called Avant-Garde

The first stage occurred in France in the third decade of this century, when the *avant-garde* was arising. Cavalcanti thinks this classification is inadequate:

Completely different personalities do not follow a common orientation. The critics invented the idea that this group formed a school, the *"Avant-Garde."* This idea, like the name, was false. Poetry was one of the dominant factors in these films, as it was in those of Méliès. In unbelievable disorder and disunion, the so-called *avant-garde* was able to enunciate the important fact that the film was a new medium of expression and that, as such, had its own characteristics.

It is precisely that accentuation of the specific qualities of the new medium which gives all the work of the period something in common and which justifies, albeit loosely, its classification as the vanguard. But Cavalcanti, who lived that hour and created some important work in it, was too close not to notice the differing characteristics, not to emphasize them with notable frankness and clarity.

Cavalcanti has grouped the *avant-gardists* in three nuclei, of different tendencies:

The first, which probably gave the movement its name, was formed by those whose principal preoccupation was the making of films which they called "pure." Their recipe was one of childlike simplicity: don't tell any story, don't set up the camera in a normal position, divide each shot into minuscule portions, use a certain number of these upside down, and (finally) "season" everything with a few pieces of negative. A few film libraries still possess the two major victories of the exponents of the "absolute" film: *A quoi rêvent les jeunes films* of the Comte de Beaumont in collaboration with Henri Chomette (brother of René Clair) and the *Ballet Mécanique* of Fernand Léger.

The intermediate group—formed by Renoir, Epstein, Kirsanov, Grémillon, Clair, Autant-Lara, and myself—were interested in telling a story by using to the maximum, with a liberty which the public considered revolutionary, the cinematic means of expression, and by going to extremes in the choice of analogies, comparisons, and metaphors. *La fille de l'eau, Menilmontant, Paris qui dort, Fait divers,* and *En rade* are the most representative films of this group and also of the movement.

When the first two nuclei were already quite active, the third and last was born. It was derived from and officially recognized by the surrealist school, which was composed of Man Ray and Buñuel-Dalí. Two others, Germaine Dulac and Jean Cocteau, were of the same

tendencies; but the surrealists repudiated them with a contempt which was frequently expressed in physical attacks, aggressions, and other kinds of violence. The most notable films of this entire group are *L'étoile de mer, Le chien andalou, La coquille et le clergyman,* and *Le sang d'un poète.*

A Work of Art

The production of Cavalcanti in France comprises some scenic designs (the best: *Feu Mathias Pascal,* 1924–25, for Marcel *L'Herbier*), some silent films, and a few sound films (produced mechanically in commercial studios). Of all this production, in which Cavalcanti acquired a complete mastery of narrative technique, *En rade* stands out as his most successful film and the most imitated one (according to Philippe Hériat). In the history of the French cinema, *En rade* is remembered for the poetry of its development—"a special poetry, but expressed without complacency or bad taste," one critic has said. Its protagonist, the young man who intends to launch himself into the adventure of the sea and leave his sentimental conflicts on land, is clearly an antecedent of Pagnol's *Marius,* which he brought to the cinema at the beginning of the sound period (1931). With *En rade,* Cavalcanti placed himself among the narrators of the populist school who approached commonplace themes in order to express their poetic possibilities. Attention to composition, examination of cinematic syntax, and constant invention of style seem to be the most permanent qualities of the film which occupies for some a particular place in the work of the period.

The success of *En rade* was denatured because of the invention of sound. The cinema retrogressed; it tried to make one hundred per cent talking films; the film seemed converted into canned theater. Cavalcanti was absorbed by a commercial organization for which he produced, until 1934, thirteen films whose stories (as he himself says), "oscillated between the table and the bed, without a single other worry." In spite of what this was worth as training, Cavalcanti could stand no more. He had to touch the bottom in order to rise again to the surface.

Experiments with Sound

One of his French films of the silent period, *Rien que les heures,* had demonstrated his remarkable feeling for the documentary film. Four years after *Nanook* (Robert Flaherty, 1922), this film of Cavalcanti's marked a step forward in the documentary school.

John Grierson has remarked on the importance of *Rien que les heures:* "Paris was cross-sectioned in its contrasts—ugliness and beauty, wealth and poverty, hopes and fears. For the first time the word 'symphony' was used, rather than story." Grierson has also demonstrated the significance of the film as a prototype by comparing it with a later (and more mature) work, *Berlin,* by Walther Ruttmann and Karl Freund (1927). Thus, in spite of the fact that his editing style was not yet perfected, *Rien que les heures* had attracted the attention of Grierson. And in 1934, when Cavalcanti visited him to relate the extreme poverty of his commercial activity in France, Grierson invited him to join the Government Post Office documentary group of which he was in charge.

Cavalcanti encountered in the G.P.O. Film Unit (1933–39) the environment which he needed. The working conditions (Cavalcanti notes) were similar to medieval artisanship; the work was collective, the films of each one were discussed, and all the suggestions were accepted. If a colleague needed help, he found it immediately; yet each unit retained its personality in a spirit of sporting competition.

Since the invention of sound, experimentation with the aesthetic possibilities of sound and music had been a constant preoccupation of Cavalcanti. He could not conceive of thinking only of words or of believing that a talking film was the same as a sound film. Thus it was that his principal technical occupation in the G.P.O. Film Unit was with the sound track. Undoubtedly, the most important film which he directed was *Pett and Pott* which tried to convince the English of that time that the telephone was very important. The story was focused from a satiric angle; and Cavalcanti's most obvious contribution was the fan-

tasy and the lightly surrealistic touches by which he stylized the English middle class. But there was another more important contribution:

> the relation of sound to mute [Grierson has written] was so close that the film was regarded as of historic importance in the development of the sound-film. For certainly no sound-film before depended so little on stage example. The music was written to create the mood of the theme. The sound strip invaded the silent strip and turned a woman's cry into an engine whistle. Recitative was used in the train scene instead of the usual sound of the wheels on the rail. The film illustrated how a commentator—the voice of God in the last instance—might be used effectively even in a story film. Other effects included the joining of a drum and fife band with a domestic quarrel, and the film showed the dramatic point that can be achieved by cutting from one sound sequence to another.

Grierson has synthesized the results of Cavalcanti's experimentation in *Pett and Pott* by noting that three planes of the utilization of sound were established: the plane of the music alone, the plane of the conjunction of music and image, and the plane of the asynchronism of both. In this last field, Cavalcanti has seemed the most revolutionary.

While with the G.P.O. Film Unit, Cavalcanti was associated (as producer and sound supervisor) with other memorable films: *Coal Face* (which he also directed, 1936), about the life of the miners, with poems by W. H. Auden and Montagu Slater and music by Benjamin Britten; *Night Mail* (Harry Watt and Basil Wright, 1936), about mail trains, with a poem by Auden and music by Britten; *North Sea* (Harry Watt, 1938), about radio communications with fishing boats of the North Sea and with music by E. H. Meyer. Apropos of *Night Mail,* the most important of the three because of its fine cinematic form, Cavalcanti has written several revealing pages about his anxieties and the orientation of his experiments:

> The film visuals of *Night Mail* were conceived at the same time as their sound accompaniment. If this had not been done, the noises of the train would have been excessively monotonous. . . . The music and even the words played a small part in the sound track of *Night*

Mail. The preoccupation with sound perspective, the selection of the dominant sounds, and the study of punctuation obtained results which opened wide possibilities for the use of sound in the dramatic film. In fact, perspective, the dominant sounds, and punctuation are the three important factors in the use of sound in the film. In certain instances, it will be possible to put at their side a fourth element, counterpoint.

Social Realism

The English documentary school, through the emphasis which these writings placed on technical elements, could seem to be only a school of aesthetes fascinated by the structure of each frame, by the asynchronism of sound, and by the rhythm of the dominant sounds. Nevertheless, along with this eager experimentation with stylistic and technical elements, the most characteristic thing about the English school is its social focus. In its hands, the film was used for specific social ends; it tried to show the reality of Great Britain through a keen examination of actual conditions: work and nutrition, education and health, communications—these were the themes of its films. To make them, an abundant social observation and a spirit of balanced criticism were necessary. For, despite the fact that these films were subsidized by governmental bureaus, their makers did not consider themselves government employees; and they did not believe themselves obliged to express an elemental propagandistic conformism. Here was criticism expressed in an objective form. They were seeking to make everyone conscious of the real social problems of the community. This single attitude implied a revolution.

Cavalcanti has told of his feeling after seeing the first films of Robert Flaherty, the forerunner of the English documentary school:

> Many of us struggled against the "artistic" film, the literary film, and the theatrical film in the confusion of the *avant-garde* group; and we understood that the solution which we were seeking was there, with all its admirable simplicity, with all the poetry of the true cinematic drama.

This possibility of poetic reality in the documentary film was precisely what attracted Cavalcanti. His *En rade,* on the other hand, had already followed the same line. And if he experimented with technique while in England, it was not because he believed that technique itself was the whole problem, but rather because he wanted to contribute to the renovation of the form to enable it to better express the renovation of viewpoints and themes. Populism, visible in his work since *Rien que les heures,* gave him his greatest opportunities for creation in the English documentary school with his stories of miners, fishermen, railroad men, and lower middle-class workers.

The war, rather than interrupting this orientation, channeled it and gave it a greater diffusion. The government found in the English documentary school the principal instrument for addressing itself immediately to the whole nation. The duties of films were to inform everyone, to explain attitudes and directives, to exhort all to work for the common salvation. In this task, Cavalcanti produced several films (such as *The First Days* and *Men of the Lightships*) which reflected the first attitude of stereotyped resistance in the well-known slogan, "London Can Take It." With the evolution of the war, when England began to take the offensive, the most enduring work of the period was done. But Cavalcanti was then no longer connected with the documentary school. He had been invited by Michael Balcon, Ealing Studios producer, to direct commercial films.

Another Postwar Period

Michael Balcon was one of the first to notice the commercial possibilities of the works filmed by the documentary school. The war had made the public sensitive to the social implications of themes and eager for authentic environments and stories. A new form of dramatic exposition arose from the combination of the documentary film makers and from the talent of Balcon and his ability to scent the orientation of the public taste. Several films produced by Cavalcanti before the cessation of hostilities (for

example, *The Foreman Went to France,* Charles Frend, 1942) demonstrated the facility of telling a fictional story in documentary terms.

The postwar period found Ealing Studios with a new crew in which veterans like Cavalcanti and Harry Watt appeared, surrounded by new men—all full of ideas and aspirations and desirous of testing them. They worked as a team, from the script to the direction and editing, going through all the jobs, learning the business from the inside. In a few years, they formed what today constitute the authors of the boldest and freshest films of the English cinema. But that is another story.

Cavalcanti personally directed three important films for Ealing Studios, although they had different degrees of success. According to what one of its critics has written, *Champagne Charlie* (1944), in which the brilliant T. E. B. Clarke collaborated on the script, was able to capture the charm and essence of the English music hall; Cavalcanti put refined art into the composition of the environment. Another film which demanded a refined composition was *The Life and Adventures of Nicholas Nickleby* (1946) from the novel by Charles Dickens. The screenplay of John Dighton was, so it seems, too respectful of the vast and motley world of the popular novelist; among so many characters and secondary incidents, the spectator got lost. On the other hand, the film had to bear the disadvantageous comparison with two other filmic versions of Dickens: *Great Expectations* (1946) and *Oliver Twist* (1948). In both, the narrative continuity and dramatic intrigue had been preserved essentially without affecting the compressive technique of the film medium. David Lean and Ronald Neame (director and producer) knew how to select with more acumen from Dickens, but they also knew how to better re-create his words in the new medium.

The most successful enterprise of this period, and perhaps the most successful of Cavalcanti's whole career, was *Dead of Night*—the work of a team. A story which involved several supernatural episodes, the film had four directors: Charles Crichton, Robert

Hamer, Basil Dearden, and Cavalcanti. To the last fell the most bewildering sequence of the film: that in which the ventriloquist goes crazy and believes that his dummy is alive. Cavalcanti was able to show the conflict of a schizophrenic (masterfully interpreted by Michael Redgrave) with an admirable economy of resources: short scenes filled with sensitivity and a masterful utilization of settings and sound permitted the extraction of a poetic intensity from the sordid and pathetic story (with its horrible overtones of homosexuality).

The separation of Cavalcanti from Ealing Studios coincided with one of his periods of obscurity. He produced several commercial films, one of which stands out for the certainty of its exposition and for the creation of atmosphere—*They Made Me a Fugitive* (1946–47), with Trevor Howard and Sally Gray. But his career seemed interrupted again because of the mediocrity of his opportunities. Then a new possibility arose, a new field for experimentation—Brazil.

Reality and Poetry

In speaking of Jean Vigo—dead when the stature of his talent began to be seen—Cavalcanti has noted that he possessed the knack of finding real poetry in the world of the camera. That poetry is a poetry of reality, according to Cavalcanti. This reflection could be applied to Cavalcanti's own work. Neither the experiments of the German expressionists nor those of the French surrealists interested him; he believed that raw, everyday reality is the material. What the artist must do is convert it into poetry; that is, he must liberate the poetry which reality encloses. That is the key to Cavalcanti's experiments in the silent film, the key to his searchings in the Grierson school, and the reason for his triumph in *Dead of Night.* And, undoubtedly, in this will be found the key to his destiny in Brazil.

Cavalcanti in Brazil

In 1949, invited by Dr. Assis de Chateaubriand and Professor Bardi, Alberto Cavalcanti arrived in São Paulo. The object of

his visit was to give a series of ten lectures on the film at the Museum of Modern Art. The visit became a sojourn; a group of capitalists offered him the position of Head of Production of the Compañía Cinematográfica Vera Cruz, in São Paulo. Alberto Cavalcanti, after having completed two stages in his career in the film industries of France and England, entered the embryonic and disorganized industry of his native land.

The contract was for four years, and the working conditions could not have been better. Cavalcanti was given carte blanche. In 1950, Cavalcanti had to leave the Vera Cruz organization. He had produced two theatrical films—*Caiçara* and *Terra e sempre terra;* two documentaries—*Painel,* about a mural by Portinari, and *Volta redonda* (directed by John Waterhouse), about the steel industry. A projected third film *Angela,* from a story by Hoffmann, had to be abandoned. Tom Payne completed the film, and it was exhibited at the second Film Festival at Punta del Este. According to Cavalcanti, the organization modified the script which he had prepared with Neli Dutra and the dialogue writer, Aníbal Machado. As a matter of fact, this film was the first which Cavalcanti had wanted to produce, the first which he himself had freely chosen.

The rupture with the Vera Cruz company did not signal the end of Cavalcanti's film activity in Brazil. Although the experience caused him to consider a return to Europe, the intervention of President Getulio Vargas stopped him. The president sent for Cavalcanti in order to consult with him about the situation of the national film industry and invited him to organize the Instituto Nacional do Cinema. Cavalcanti accepted, and, surrounded by technicians with whom he had worked in São Paulo and whom he had brought from England, he began to work at the task of laying the foundations of the Instituto. There were four fundamental objectives: (1) the organization of all official film activity and centralization of its diverse activities; (2) the projection of legislation which would impede the piracy of unscrupulous producers, raise the level of production, assure the really national character of the films, and also create good conditions of distri-

bution as well as for the development of the film industry within Brazil itself; (3) the foundation of the National Film Library which would not be only an archive of national cinematographic documents, but which would also constitute a museum of cinema art—the nucleus of a future school; (4) the arrangement of a department of censorship which would proceed, in a rational manner, to classify films according to their true content and their influence. The project was structured and presented to Parliament. The unit which worked with Cavalcanti in its preparation dispersed. The Brazilian producers were interested in the initiative—but to secure commercial advantages.

This period in his work concluded, Cavalcanti dedicated himself to gathering together in the book *Filme e Realidade* the articles and lectures on film which he had given during his intense career. While compiling the book, Cavalcanti convinced himself that all initiative of a collective nature was condemned to failure and that the only adequate response to the chaotic situation of the Brazilian industry would be individual work since the majority of interested persons were content to leave things as they were. Having finished his book, Cavalcanti accepted the offer of the Compañía Maristela to film the comedy: *Simão o caõlho,* with the popular Mesquitinha. This film has had great commercial success, although Cavalcanti himself is the first to recognize its technical limitations and the triviality of its theme, which make foreign showings impossible.

Meanwhile, some friends who were counting on government support, offered Cavalcanti the opportunity to organize a new company, Kino-Filmes S.A. The film chosen to inaugurate the enterprise was *O canto do mar,* inspired by one of his most successful films, *En rade*. The theme had to have an international interest, although its presentation and environment were necessarily local. The adaptation—on which Cavalcanti worked with the young writer José Mauro de Vasconcelos and, for the dialogue, with the dramatist Hermilo Borba Filho—followed the theme of the French picture very freely.

Recife was chosen as the location because of its national char-

acter. The capital of the state of Pernambuco is the third city of Brazil and possesses an enormously rich folklore. Cavalcanti tried to assure a regional character in the film by using local actors and exteriors. To carry out his enterprise, he secured the collaboration of the documentary cinematographer Cyril Arapoff. The ambition to produce a film in which he really believed sustained Cavalcanti against every difficulty, against all the inconveniences of an enterprise until then unknown in Brazil. This ambition, according to what he himself has written, is the vital factor.

II. His Advice to Young Documentary Producers

Don't treat generalized subjects; you can write an article about the mail service, but you must make a film about one single letter.

Don't depart from the principle which states that three fundamental elements exist: the social, the poetic, and the technical.

Don't neglect your script, or count on luck during shooting. When your script is ready, your film is made; then, when you start to shoot, you begin again.

Don't trust in the commentary to tell your story; the visuals and their sound accompaniment must do it. Commentary irritates, and gratuitous commentary irritates even more.

Don't forget that when you are shooting, each shot is part of a sequence and part of the whole; the most beautiful shot, out of place, is worse than the most trivial.

Don't invent camera angles when they are not necessary; unwarranted angles are disturbing and destroy emotion.

Don't abuse a rapid rate of cutting; an accelerated rhythm can be as monotonous as the most pompous largo.

Don't use music excessively; if you do, the audience will cease to hear it.

Don't supercharge the film with synchronized sound; sound is never better than when it is suggestively employed. Complementary sound constitutes the best sound track.

Don't recommend too many optical effects, or make them too complicated. Dissolves and fades form part of the filmic punctuation; they are your commas and periods.

Don't shoot too many close-ups; save them for the climax. In a well-balanced film, they occur naturally; when there are too many, they tend to suffocate and lose all their significance.

Don't hesitate to treat human elements and human relations; human beings can be as beautiful as the other animals, as beautiful as the machines in a landscape.

Don't be vague in your story; a true subject must be told clearly and simply. Nevertheless, clearness and simplicity do not necessarily exclude dramatization.

Don't lose the opportunity to experiment; the prestige of the documentary film has been acquired solely by experimentation. Without experimentation, the documentary loses its value; without experimentation, the documentary ceases to exist.

III. His Film Works

EUROPEAN PERIOD

Designer

Resurrection (1922).
L'Inhumaine (1923–24), together with Mallet-Stevens, Fernand Léger, and Autant-Lara.
La galerie des monstres (1924).
Feu Mathias Pascal (1924–25), produced by Marcel L'Herbier.
L'Inondation (1924), by Louis Delluc.
Le petit monde (1925), by George Pearson.

Director

Le train sans yeux (1925–26), from a novel by Louis Delluc; with Gina Manes and George Charlia.
Rien que les heures (1926), from a story of his own; with Clifford McLaglen and Nina Chouvalowa.
Yvette (1927), from an idea of Guy de Maupassant; with Catherine Hessling and Thomy Bourdelle.
En rade (1927), from his own story; script together with Philippe Hériat and Claude Heymann; with C. Hessling, Nathalie Lissenko, G. Charlia, and Philippe Hériat.

La p'tite Lilie (1927), from his own story; sound version with music by Darius Milhaud; with C. Hessling and Jean Renoir.

La jalousie du Barbouillé (1927), script from a farce by Molière; with Jeanne Helbling and Philippe Hériat.

Le capitaine Fracasse (1928), script based on a novel by Théophile Gauthier; with Pierre Blanchar, Lien Deyers, and Charles Boyer.

Le petit chaperon rouge (1929), from his own story; music by Maurice Jaubert.

Vous verrez la semaine prochaine (1929), with C. Hessling and Jean Renoir.

Toute sa vie (1930), with Marcelle Chantal, Fernand Fabre, and Pierre Richard Willm.

A cançao do berço (1930), Portuguese version of a previous film; with Corina Freire and Raul de Carvalho.

A mi-chemin du ciel (1930), with E. Rivero and Marguerite Moreno.

Les vacances du diable (1930), with Marcelle Chantal, T. Bourdelle, and Pierre Richard Willm.

Dans une ile perdue (1931), story by G. Neveux from *Victory* by Joseph Conrad; with Danièle Parola and Marguerite Moreno.

En lisant le Journal (1932), comic sketch with René Dorin.

Le jour du frotteur (1932), with Gilles and Julien.

Revue Montmartroise (1932), with René Dorin and Paul Colline.

Nous ne ferons jamais de cinéma (1932), with R. Dorin and P. Colline.

Le truc du bresilien (1932), with Robert Arnoux.

Le mari garçon (1932), with Jeanne Cheirel.

Coralie et cie (1933), with Josette Day and Françoise Rosay.

Plaisirs défendus (1933), with Germaine Sablon.

Tour de chant (1933), with Gilles and Julien.

Pett and Pott (1934), G.P.O. production; music by Walter Leigh.

New Rates (1934), G.P.O. production.

Line to Therva Hut (1937), G.P.O. in collaboration with the Swiss government; music by Benjamin Britten.

We Live in Two Worlds (1937), G.P.O. and Swiss; script by Priestly; music by M. Jaubert.

Who Writes to Switzerland (1937), G.P.O. and Swiss.

Message from Genève (1937), G.P.O. and Swiss.

Four Barriers (1937), G.P.O. and Swiss.

Men of the Alps (1939), G.P.O. and Swiss.

Midsummer's Day's Work (1939), G.P.O.; music by Grieg.

Yellow Caesar (1941), Ealing Studios.

Alice in Switzerland (1942), in Gasparcolor; script by Daniel Simond.

Went the Day Well (1942), Ealing-Michael Balcon; from a work by Grahame Greene; with Leslie Banks and Basil Sidney.

Watertight (1943), Ealing-Royal Navy.

Champagne Charlie (1944), Ealing; with Stanley Holloway and Jean Kent.

Dead of Night (1945), Ealing; codirectors: Robert Hamer, Charles Crichton, and Basil Dearden; with Michael Redgrave.

The Life and Adventures of Nicholas Nickleby (1946), Ealing; with Derek Bond and Sir Cedric Hardwicke.

They Made Me a Fugitive (1946–47), with Trevor Howard, Sally Gray, and Griffith Jones.

The First Gentleman (1947), script based on the work of Norman Ginsbury; with Jean Pierre Aumont, Joan Hopkins, and Cecil Parker.

For Them That Trespass (1948), from the novel by Ernest Raymond; with Richard Todd, Patricia Plunkett, and Stephen Murray.

PRODUCER

Calender (1934), *Book Bargain* (1935), *Big Money* (1935), *Rainbow Dance* (1936, Len Lye), *Broadways* (1936), *Coal Face* (1936), *Night Mail* (1936, Watt-Wright), *The Saving of Bill Blewitt* (1937, Watt), *Mony a Pickle* (1937), *N. or N.W.* (1937, Lye), *Happy in the Morning* (1938), *Forty Million People* (1938), *North Sea* (1938, Watt), *Men in Danger* (1938), *The City* (1938), *Speaking from America* 1939, H. Jennings), *Spare Time* (1939, Jennings), *Spring Offensive* (1939, Jennings), *Squadron 992* (1939, Watt), and *The First Days* (1939)—all documentaries for G.P.O.

Men of the Lightships (1940), *Young Veteran* (1941), *The Foreman Went to France* (1941, Charles Frend; editing, Robert Hamer), *Mastery of the Sea* (1941), *Guests of Honour* (1941), *The Big Blockade* (1941, Charles Frend), *Greek Testament* (1942), *Find Six and Strike* (1943), *The Halfway House* (1941, Basil Dearden)—all for Ealing Studios.

EDITOR

Au pays scalp (1931), by the Marquis de Wvrin; music by M. Jaubert.

Film and Reality (1939–42), anthology.

BRAZILIAN PERIOD

PRODUCER

Caiçara (1950), Vera Cruz Studios; director, Adolfo Celi; photography, Chick Fowle; with Eliana Lage, Mario Sergio, and Abilio Pereira de Almeida.

Terra e sempre terra (1950), Vera Cruz Studios; director, Tom Payne;

dialogue, Guillermo de Almeida; photography, Chick Fowle; with Marisa Prado, Eliana Lage, and A. Pereira de Almeida.

Painel (1950), Vera Cruz Studios; director, Lima Barreto; documentary on various works of Portinari.

Volta redonda (1952), director, John Waterhouse; documentary for the government steel industry.

DIRECTOR

Simão, o caõlho (1952), Maristela Production; with Mesquitinha and Carlos Araújo.

O canto do mar (1952–53), Kino Films production; script, Cavalcanti and José Mauro de Vasconcelos; dialogue in collaboration with Hermilo Borba Filho; photography, Cyril Arapoff.

Films from Overseas

GERALD WEALES

GERALD WEALES, a frequent contributor to the *Quarterly,* is a member of the English department at the Newark College of Engineering in New Jersey. Other periodicals in which Mr. Weales has published include *Atlantic Monthly, Commonweal, Films in Review, Hudson Review, Nation,* and *New Mexico Quarterly.*

Gate of Hell AND *Ugetsu,* the two most interesting films on this quarter's screens, are the latest representatives of the postwar revival of the Japanese motion-picture industry, which made its local debut three years ago with the tremendous *Rashomon.* This initial offering was greeted by a surprise and an excitement that have now settled into a quiet expectation of quality. The acting style with its dependence on the broad gesture and the contrasting automatism, so different from the realism of the United States and Europe, caused a great amount of confusion when *Rashomon* first appeared. This surface difference has made many reviewers find something exotic and obscure in the substance of the film, although its central intellectual concern is that familiar problem of the relativity of truth which has been a part of western philosophy at least since Pyrrho. Akutagawa Ryūnosuke, whose stories were the source of *Rashomon,* was a translator of Yeats and Anatole France; so it is not surprising that *Rashomon,* for all the newness of its setting and its acting, should be familiar to an audience schooled only in western literature and art. For all the mechanical differences, it is very much like Luigi Pirandello's *Right You Are.*

The reception of the two new films indicates that reviewers are now ready to accept the films on their own terms and to see that they deal not with the unusual, not with materials that are peculiarly Japanese, but with emotions that are the common property of humanity. Neither *Gate of Hell* nor *Ugetsu* is as good or as satisfying a film as *Rashomon,* but both have superb scenes in them. *Gate of Hell,* set in twelfth-century Japan, is most impres-

sive in its opening scenes, which show the palace revolution that is known as the Heiji Rebellion. The shots here, apparently modeled on pictures from Japanese scrolls, manage to give a sense of panic and confusion with a clarity and a sharpness that the stupendous crowd scenes which form the staple of more familiar historical pictures are never quite able to do. Most of the shots are from above. We look down on long, thin lines of running figures that cut across the geometrical designs of the Japanese buildings and courts of the palace. For the most part, the roofs are in browns and tans that contrast beautifully with the bright colors of the kimonos on the moving figures. Even when we are brought down to the level of the panicky crowds, which must necessarily be done to give variation, the camera work is often imaginative. One shot in particular, in which the background is filled with scurrying people while the camera focuses in front on a scattering of black game cocks, two of which are fighting, seems to sum up the senselessness of the rebellion. The excellent use of color in these opening scenes is indicative, for it is in the pictorial beauty of the film—both the quality of the Eastman Color and the intelligence with which it is handled—that *Gate of Hell* is most impressive.

However, the rebellion scenes are only introductory to the personal story of a samurai whose love for another man's wife ends in the destruction of the woman, who sacrifices herself for her husband, and in the samurai's belated realization of the bestiality to which he has fallen. Reduced to a one-sentence summary, the plot sounds like something off the nineteenth-century stage; and there are moments in the course of the film when it uncomfortably looks that way too. The detachment with which the story is told—one of the characteristics of all the Japanese films so far seen here—makes almost impossible any identification with the protagonists; one remains an observer for whom the appeal lies in an intellectual recognition of the universality of the passions. It is as though the Japanese had achieved the aesthetic distancing that Bertolt Brecht and the other practitioners of epic-realism talk about in the theater, although here there is no need for the

placard paraphernalia insisted on by the western theorists; here there is direct visual communication which mixes movement, apparently in the Nō tradition, with light and shadow and color, the art of the camera. Here, too, the object is understanding and not Brecht's ideal of social action. It is perhaps inevitable, given the necessary separation between action and observer, that the film cannot be continually fascinating; there are certainly dull stretches in *Gate of Hell.* The last scenes, however, which build with such majestic deliberation to that moment when the samurai unknowingly brings his sword down on the head of his beloved, are certainly among the best that cinema has to offer; the painful slowness with which the figures move in the cold, white light of an unbelievable moon communicates a sense of inevitability and of horror. When Richard Rowland reviewed *Rashomon* for the *Quarterly* (Fall, 1952), he compared its casualness in the presentation of a historical period with that in the work of Carl Dreyer. An even more important comparison might be made between the work of Dreyer and that of Teinosuke Kinugasa in this film; I have seen nowhere, outside of *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc,* the kind of absorbing deliberation that marks the last scenes of *Gate of Hell.*

Although the subject of *Ugetsu*—an illustration of the idea that war destroys through the ambitions that it creates—might make it seem more important or more interesting than the *crime passionnel* of *Gate of Hell,* it is in fact less consistently good than either of the other two Japanese pictures. There is one fine sequence, however, in which the potter and his helper, in search of wealth and power, respectively, and their wives are crossing a mist-covered lake to reach the town where they hope to find their goals. As they move hesitantly along, fearing that every shadow may be a pirate boat bringing death, the lake is almost transformed into the whole confused and horrifying world of war, in which perversely they hope to find success. In another scene, an almost realistic one, the potter, on his way to the house of the beautiful ghost that is his reward and punishment, hesitates at a

kimono shop and contemplates which one to buy for his wife; the wife—dirty, harried, shyly smiling—seems to step from the back of the shop and touchingly to hold the various kimonos for the husband to see.

Despite the effectiveness of a few scenes and the excellent acting of Kinuyo Tanaka as the wife and Machiko Kyo, the icy-faced star of all three of the films, *Ugetsu* is not quite successful. It is difficult to say precisely why. Perhaps it is the general confusion that marks the film, but this confusion has relevance to the historical situation. Too, it might be the supernaturalism which allows Lady Wakasa, the ghost, to be the potter's retribution which lacks the sharpness of that which falls to his assistant, whose desire to become a samurai is so great that he unknowingly forces his wife to become a prostitute. More probably, it is the hackneyed use of the child and the ghost of the potter's wife. The ending of *Ugetsu,* like that of *Rashomon,* almost appears to be a negation of what has gone before; but in *Ugetsu* there have been interlarded touches of familiar sentimentality which make the ending expected, if unwanted.

* * *

From India comes a less happy importation *The Tiger and the Flame,* a lush, technicolor historical romance. In it, the Rani Lakshmibai—who will be compared with Joan of Arc for no good reason other than that both of them were fighting women—dies in an unsuccessful attempt to save her beloved Jhansi from the British East India Company. It is almost a mirror image of all those Kiplingesque monstrosities that both the English and American studios seem to like to make, although it certainly isn't nearly as much fun as, say, *Gunga Din.* There is even an India-loving Englishman who corresponds to the loyal, Britain-respecting Indian of our domestic versions. Mehtab, who plays the Rani, is in the heavy-breathing, bad-delivery school of actresses, apparently so necessary to the historical movie, who are represented in this country by Maureen O'Hara and in England by Margaret Lockwood. There is a child star named Baby Shika, who is so tire-

some that I openly longed for Shirley Temple in *Wee Willie Winkie.* If *The Tiger and the Flame* is a fair sample of Indian film making, it is apparent that India is copying the least artistic aspects of American and English films, hewing to the second-rate in plot, treatment, and acting. A comparison of the hectic and noisy battle scenes of *The Flame and the Tiger* with the opening passages of *Gate of Hell* underlines the essential vapidity of the Indian film.

* * *

From England this quarter comes another of those films, like *Tight Little Island* and *Scotch on the Rocks,* in which English stuffiness and industry is defeated by the patient individuality of the slightly quaint Scotch. However, in *High and Dry,* the defeat is extended to take in a blustery, efficient American. Paul Douglas gives a creditable performance—a more genteel variation on the junk dealer of *Born Yesterday*—and the captain and the crew of the boat, who humanize him, are as charmingly Celtic as we might expect; but the funniest moments in the picture fall to Hubert Gregg, who, as the American's English assistant, gets involved in a happily unlikely poaching episode in his attempts to outwit the Scots.

Another Scottish item, but one not in this recent tradition, is *The Little Kidnappers,* which is set in Nova Scotia at the turn of the century. The title characters are two young boys whose harsh Scottish Presbyterian grandfather will not allow them the luxury of a dog; in their desire for something to play with they carry off a baby which has been carelessly left unwatched by its older sister. The success of the movie lies almost completely in the charm of the boys, Jon Whitely and Vincent Winter; Margaret Thomson, who coached the children, and director Philip Leacock managed to exploit them without quite making the picture cloying and without turning them into precocious little shows-offs. Although there is a potentially serious movie in the unbending righteousness of the old man, who has almost destroyed his daughter and who cannot live in peace with his Dutch neighbors, and in the

relationship of the two children to him, the producers of *The Little Kidnappers* chose not to make it. This film was plainly never intended to be a *Forbidden Games;* all that it wanted to do was warm the heart, which it manages with only occasional moments of strain.

A more standardly English offering is *Turn the Key Softly,* a tiresomely sentimental film about the adventures of three women on their release from Holloway Prison. There are large helpings of heartbreak and hope, and rather more coincidental juxtaposition than even such a potboiler should require. It can best be characterized by its excessive laboring to make capital of a most unprepossessing small dog.

* * *

There are two other films around this quarter that appear to belong to no particular category. One is Luis Buñuel's *The Adventures of Robinson Crusoe,* an English-language picture that was filmed in Mexico. As I recall, Daniel Defoe—that untiring publicist of the rising British middle classes—put his chief emphasis on what we would now call Crusoe's know-how, his ability not only to survive, but to prosper. In the film, we get that side of Crusoe, of course, as we see him move from his ship's sail tent to his heavily built stockade; but Buñuel is chiefly concerned with the man's loneliness before Friday appears and with the relationship that develops between the two men after that event. Dan O'Herlihy, who has to struggle with the difficult leading role, is an accomplished actor, particularly when he has to allow Crusoe's sense of isolation to push him toward madness; when he is playing the dotty Crusoe with his fantastic fur umbrella, he manages to be as pathetic as he is bizarre. Buñuel uses everything that he can to underline the loneliness of the castaway—the sea stretching far away from the shore and a scarecrow clothed in a dress saved from the wreck—but there is inevitably a great amount of repetition. At times the film drags badly, and, although time must have gone slowly for Crusoe on his island, the intention of the director was certainly not communication through boredom. Since it is a

Buñuel picture, there are of course some dream sequences. One, in which Crusoe's father in every possible relation to water appears before a fevered Crusoe who is suffering from thirst, seems as gaudily unnecessary as the dream interpolation in the director's heavily realistic *Los Olvidados*. The other, in which the drunk Crusoe imagines that he hears (but does not see) his dead comrades singing, is much more effective.

* * *

The last film is *Stars of the Russian Ballet,* which is simply a cinematic treatment of three ballets, the familiar *Swan Lake* and two which are not done in this country. One of these is *The Fountain of Bakhchisarai,* a flamboyant something in which a Tartar chieftain carries off a prima ballerina princess, and the other is *The Flames of Paris,* a perfectly preposterous story of the French Revolution which reaches some kind of height when one of the dancers, a Basque girl, is carried in as revolutionary France triumphant, like something out of Delacroix. It is probably dialectically correct, but it is rather funnier than it is supposed to be. When John Martin reviewed the dancing for the New York *Times* he wrote, "Everybody is strong technically, and virtually everybody is an accomplished mime." Their technique may indeed be good, but their sturdiness, which Martin also noticed as characteristic, gives a heaviness to the performances that is graceless compared to the work of the New York City Center Ballet or of Sadler's Wells.

Television and the Future of Documentary

PAUL ROTHA

PAUL ROTHA began in feature films in 1928, and has been a pioneer in British documentary since 1930. He had produced some 250 films by 1948 and had directed, among others, *Contact* (1933), *Shipyard* (1934), *Face of Britain* (1935), *The Fourth Estate* (1940), *World of Plenty* (1943), *Land of Promise* (1945), *A City Speaks* (1946), *The World Is Rich* (1947), *No Resting Place* (1951), and *World Without End* (1952, with Basil Wright). His many publications include *The Film Till Now, Documentary Film,* and *Movie Parade.* A Fellow of the British Film Academy, Mr. Rotha was Head of Documentary at the B.B.C. Television from May, 1953 to May, 1955.

WHEN UNESCO DECIDED to have the first showing of its film *World Without End* on British TV—thereby at one stroke precluding it from being booked into any cinema in the United Kingdom—it did so in the belief that through such a single screening (plus later repeats) the picture would reach a wider and possibly more receptive audience (in the quiet of the home) than via a second-feature commercial cinema release. UNESCO was proved right. Furthermore, the warm and wide reception given to the film by its TV audience quickly stimulated the subsequent non-theatrical release which immediately followed. Many people, having seen the film on their own TV sets, wanted to see it again on a film screen. The makers of *World Without End,* especially the two cameramen whose work is so pictorially fine, had perforce to accept the loss of picture quality on the small home screens and content themselves with the knowledge that the social message of their film—in fact their very impulse for making it at all—would reach a wider and potentially more sympathetic audience by way of more than 4,000,000 TV receivers. If, however, the aim of UNESCO had been to recoup substantial financial returns, this TV distribution by the B.B.C. would obviously not have been considered. Instead, UNESCO would have secured the best deal possible from a commercial renter.

World Without End, like the vast majority of documentaries

over the past twenty-five years—in fact, going back to Flaherty's *Nanook* in 1920—was sponsored. The machinery, and the commercial interests controlling that machinery, of theatrical-film distribution in the United Kingdom and the United States have always been inhospitable to the acceptance of documentaries in the cinemas, at least to the extent of permitting them to earn a return to offset negative cost. As a result, the economics of documentary have relied almost wholly on a need-to-be-served, a purpose-to-be-met—in fact, sponsorship. That is no secret.

But this sponsorship has been different in aim, method, and policy from that of brand-advertising which has paid for countless thousands of publicity films inflicted on wilting cinema audiences down the years. Also, this sponsorship differs from the commercial advertising which inoculates most American TV and which may, indeed, perform the same operation upon British TV next fall. When Standard Oil made possible Flaherty's *Louisiana Story,* the Ceylon Tea Board Basil Wright's *Song of Ceylon,* the G.P.O. Film Unit Harry Watts's *North Sea,* the British Ministry of Information *World of Plenty,* the Manchester City Corporation *A City Speaks,* the British Government *Desert Victory* and *Target for Tonight,* the Roosevelt Administration Lorentz' *The River,* and the U.S. Navy *The Fighting Lady,* the aim was not financial return from going into the picture business.

Recognition of the need for information services and for the good will of intelligent public relations has been made by governments, corporations, industrial organizations, and public-service undertakings in the past twenty-five years. In Britain, following World War II, the Labor Government mishandled its whole information services and made little use of the efficient documentary machinery which had been developed by the Ministry of Information during the war. Later, the Tory Government cut all information services to a thread and dismembered the Crown Film Unit (previously the G.P.O. and E.M.B. Film Units), thus bringing to an end on January 29, 1952, twenty-two years of British Government film making and distribution as a public service. A cornerstone was torn out of British documentary foun-

dations. On the other hand, the newly formed nationalized industries and services grasped the point; and today, both the National Coal Board and the British Transport Commission operate documentary film units and distribution services. Restricted in budget, the U.N. has made some modest use of documentary; and sundry rehabilitation and economic aid bodies, such as E.C.A. and M.S.A., have entered the field. It is fair to say, however, that few documentaries carrying the social purpose of those made in the prewar years—and some even during the war itself (*Children of the City, World of Plenty, Children on Trial*)—have been made in Britain in the past eight years. But there has been an increase in the production of specialized films for industry, science, and the public services at which, as the Venice awards show each year, the British excel.

Documentary has also spread widely in other countries than Britain and America. The fine record of the Canadian National Film Board is well known; and documentary making is carried on, mainly under official auspices, in most of the countries of the British Commonwealth. In Europe, documentary has taken root—often with government help—in Holland, Denmark, Italy, France, Norway, and elsewhere, as the bar at Film House in Edinburgh illustrates when each Film Festival comes up. The picture all round shows the same basic fact: without sponsorship in one form or another, there would have been little documentary film making in the past, or indeed today.

The United Kingdom has now accepted the principle of sponsored TV programs paid for by national advertisers, as distinct from the B.B.C. service paid for out of the public's license fees. The Independent Television Authority has been set up, program suppliers have been announced, and it is expected that British viewers will be receiving programs about fall of this year. Whether documentary television will find a place among this new program material, bearing in mind documentary's dependence on sponsorship to date, is anybody's guess. But here is the place to say something about the B.B.C.'s adoption of the documentary approach in its television service because the Corporation has

been responsible in the past few years for documentary programs on socially important subjects which otherwise would not have been made in Britain.

In retrospect, the B.B.C. began to develop the documentary idea in radio as far back as the mid-thirties when the G.P.O. Film Unit and the old Strand Film Company were making such films as *Cable Ship* and *Cover to Cover* (which incidentally was the first film ever to be televised by the B.B.C. in its entirety; it was sponsored by the National Book Council and was given a commercial distribution as well!). Called "Features," and at first a part of the B.B.C. Drama Department under Val Gielgud, radio documentary was developed very largely through the guidance and stimulus of Lawrence Gilliam, who is still at its head today. It gathered a team of writers and producers who during the war years especially became highly successful in dramatizing creatively in sound the facts, idea, and persons of the contemporary scene. D. G. Bridson's *The End of Mussolini,* Leonard Cottrell's *The Man from Belsen,* Cecil McGivern's programs about radar and Mulberry Harbor, Jenifer Wayne's studies of English justice, and Nesta Pain's scientific subjects, to name only a few, became as well known to the listening public as *Fires Were Started, Western Approaches,* and *Merchant Seamen* were to the cinema-going audience. Their counterpart in the United States was, perhaps, the brilliant documentary programs by Norman Corwin.

One of Gilliam's team was Cecil McGivern who, after a brief spell with films (he had a writer's credit on the David Lean production *Great Expectations* and also worked with the monthly magazine *This Modern Age*), became Controller of Programs of the B.B.C. Television in 1948. Along with his other duties, McGivern guided the very small Documentary Department in TV until, in 1953, a Head of Department was appointed. Its personnel was kept small, and its output was not large when compared with that of other departments; but McGivern continued the traditional documentary policy of producers being their own writers in most cases. He also realized that documentary needs

time for research and for creative writing even in the assembly-line methods of production that a regular TV service demands to meet its day-after-day, night-after-night public commitment.

Recruiting from radio, journalism, and films, the Documentary Department had made a name for itself by 1952 with such programs as *The Course of Justice* series, written by Duncan Ross and produced by Ian Atkins, and programs by Robert Barr and Caryl Doncaster. In particular, these producers developed a form of story-documentary using professional casts and dialogue scenes, linked together with film-continuity passages, in a way not unlike Ealing Studio's adoption of the documentary approach but without its concessions to supposed box-office needs. From the beginning, these programs which tackled real-life subjects of social interest were very well liked by the increasing number of British viewers. Appreciation Index figures, provided by the Viewer Research Department, suggested that the cinema trade had been consistently mistaken in grudging screen space to documentary films. It should also be remarked that, although these programs were acted by professionals, cast lists were not published in the *Radio Times,* as was done for drama; and actors were only given screen credit at the end of a program.

Other producers were switched to the Documentary Department: Norman Swallow, with his *Special Enquiry* series in documentary-journalism style, and John Read, with his series of documentary films about the arts of which he had made *Henry Moore, Grahama Sutherland,* and one about art patronage *Artists Must Live.*

At first thought, it is anomalous that the Documentary Department, which uses so much film, does not have its own film unit. The B.B.C. Television Service, however, is made up of output departments responsible for putting on programs and service departments who provide the technical facilities for so doing, a policy decision made some years back. When it uses film, therefore, the Documentary Department draws on cameramen, editors, and others of the technical staff of the Films Department; but the creative control is vested in the documentary producers.

Today, the department remains small, but its programs, about 35 a year with an average length of 45 minutes each, are extremely well liked without any conscious attempt at "popularization." The average Viewer Appreciation Index figure stays high. To give some idea of the extent of subject coverage, here are some examples of programs transmitted during the eighteen months prior to late 1954. Of the story-documentary type, mostly running 60 minutes, there have been *Return to Living,* dealing with the social problems arising from the release of convicts from jail; *Missing from Home,* dramatizing the work of the missing-persons bureau run by the Salvation Army, the largest organization of its kind in the world; *Poor Man's Lawyer,* showing how the ordinary citizen can obtain free legal aid; *Mock Auction,* the phony tricks played on a gullible public by the wide boys; *Medical Officer of Health,* dealing with a smallpox outbreak in an industrial town in the north of England and how it was controlled and stamped out by the local health authorities; *Seeing Both Sides,* the work of personnel managers in industry; and *Children in Trust,* the ways of child adoption used by the local authorities. New subjects in this style include *The New Canadians* (emigration to Canada), *They Come by Appointment* (a doctor's casebook), and *Sunk Rock,* life on a lighthouse.

Special Enquiry has entered its third series, and every five weeks continues to make a 45-minute investigation, using film and "live" studio inserts. Produced by Norman Swallow, past subjects have included old age, illiteracy, Britain's roads, housing, land subsidence, freak weather, the East-West refugee problem, and the work of UNICEF in Yugoslavia. New programs are about Cyprus, Social Medicine, the Color Bar in Britain and Should Germany Re-arm. Also from producer Swallow comes a series of 45-minute programs, now all on film, under the general title of *The World Is Ours.* Each program takes a world problem, such as food, population, or health and shows what is being done about it by the specialized agencies of the United Nations. The Films Division of the U.N. has given very full coöperation in supplying stock material, and special new footage has been shot to briefs.

Titles to date have been *World Nurse, Hope for the Hungry, Wealth of the Waters, The Waiting People, No Other Way,* and *The Invisible Enemy*. These embraced the work of the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Refugee Office; and future programs will deal with UNESCO, the World Meteorological Office, the World Bank, the International Labor Office, and such great undertakings as the reclamation of the Negev Desert in Israel and the harnessing of the Canadian Arctic.

New documentary films about the arts are *Walter Sickert, Black on White* (British cartoons and caricatures over the past 200 years), and *John Piper*. These films have been produced in association with the Arts Council in Britain (which distributes them nontheatrically after TV use) and with the Educational Radio and Television Center of the United States, which has rights in that country. This represents, perhaps, the first example of coproduction between countries of films designed for television and nontheatrical use.

Lastly, Stephen MacCormack has produced for some time two magazine programs *London Town* and *About Britain* with the well-known commentator Richard Dimbleby. *About Britain* is shortly to become *About Europe*. In addition to this regular output, the department also produces occasional programs, such as those presenting Commander Cousteau and his underwater films, a film compilation to commemorate the work of the late Dr. Massingham. And each year, there is a program about the best films shown at the Edinburgh Festival. Three programs now in hand called *The Projection of Britain* will celebrate 25 years of British documentary films, written by Sir Arthur Elton with extracts from some of the most famous documentaries from *Drifters* in 1929 till today.

From this survey of the Documentary Department's work, it will be recognized, I think, that the B.B.C. Television Service has played a big role in documentary. Few of the subjects given above would have been made and put out to several million citizens in the United Kingdom were it not for the B.B.C.'s adoption

of documentary as an integral part of its public service. It is the more sad to report, therefore, that the B.B.C. has recently decided to disband its Documentary Department as of April 30 of this year. Some of its producers—who have worked as a coöperative team with great pride in their product—have gone, or are about to go, into commercial TV; the few who remain with the B.B.C. will be accommodated in the Talks or Drama Department.

In the main, the British film industry has pursued an ostrich-like noncoöperation attitude toward TV. If a new film should be made available to the B.B.C., such as UNESCO's *World Without End* or Jack Heyer's fine Australian film *Back of Beyond,* no cinema exhibitor would play it. Extracts from old feature films are limited to a very few minutes. But there is a possibility that documentaries made by outside units may well have a TV distribution if the aim is wide-audience coverage and not financial return, although the B.B.C. is precluded by its constitution from accepting any film containing advertising matter.

With the extension of TV throughout the world, however, both by direct hookup as recently arranged between the group of countries forming the European Broadcasting Union and by the exchange of films and filmed programs, a vast new field will be opened up for the documentary movement. Nations may well collaborate to produce magazine programs suitable for international distribution with shared costs of production. Another form of exchange may lie with the dispatch of scripts and filmed sequences to an other country which will re-produce the program with its own "live" sequences in whatever language is appropriate. The B.B.C. series *The World Is Ours* lends itself to this treatment. Whatever method is used, there is no denial that we are about to enter on a most exciting and challenging era of international exchange in television terms, an era in which every type of documentary work can find outlets of a size hitherto impossible. Documentary film making as we have known it from commercial cinema release or specialized distribution will, of course, continue; but television is bound to play an increasingly vital part in documentary's future.

A New "General Line"– for Critics

ERNEST CALLENBACH

ERNEST CALLENBACH has been a student and critic of motion pictures for many years. He has been active in film-society work, has taught classes in film, and recently conducted a weekly film-criticism program over WFMT in Chicago. Mr. Callenbach now lives in San Francisco.

THE CINEMA STILL MEETS offhand disparagement from some scholars. But, generally speaking, it takes little bravado to call the film a new art form—even in the gravest circles. For better or worse, the cinema is no longer merely a contrivance for the commercial debauching of the masses; it is now the subject of solemn aesthetic and social analysis.

Like other mass media which have come into existence in this century, however, the cinema is still bedeviled (especially in America) by an acute shortage of serious critics—not people glad to complain, but skilled professional critics of the sort we look for in the world of literature: men who understand the art as well as or better than many of its practitioners, men who help keep the practitioners up to the mark or denounce them when they produce trash.

Disregarding all the hacks, puffers, and gossipmongers, American critics and students of the movies have so far been largely of two kinds: aesthetically minded ones who don't understand the sociology of the medium and socially minded ones who don't understand motion-picture aesthetics. Neither kind has received much attention from any but a few eccentric producers, and both kinds have mainly worked outside Hollywood.

This last point is important; for in the United States we have paid a heavy price for moving our film-production center away from New York, the cultural center of the country. Geographically and therefore mentally, producers and serious critics have lived in different worlds, rather than in the close and even hothouse atmosphere which film people live in elsewhere. This has

helped widen the misleading and pernicious gulf between "entertainment" and "art" (legacy of a business culture springing from Puritan beginnings); and it has left producers and critics glaring at each other across 3,000 miles of indifferent continent—which insures, so far as is humanly possible, that the producers never hear or read anything the critics say and that the critics develop either supercilious or cynical attitudes toward the producers.

People in the trade have been telling us that these are times of great artistic developments in Hollywood; and, though we must reserve judgment till we see whether the technical upheavals of 3-D and widescreen go more than skin-and-sensation deep, the industry is undergoing profound and far-reaching changes. (This is hardly surprising, since it has never known the type of commercial stability found in the book-publishing or newspaper industries.) Motion-picture theaters are steadily closing; the number of films made for them is constantly declining; big downtown-showcase theaters, "sure-seater" art houses, and drive-ins share what financial reliability remains. In brief, the commercial cinema seems to be edging toward a new economic and industrial pattern reminiscent of the commercial stage.

This general hypothesis that the days of the neighborhood houses and predominantly adolescent audiences are numbered is obviously of fundamental importance; for it will mean, if true, a breakdown of the basic pattern of American production and the opening up of a new range of possibilities (and problems) for every aspect of the industry.

The industry faces the kind of pregnant situation which cries out for the expert services of professional critics—the critics we do not yet have. For a real critic must not only have an insatiable interest in films, the knack of really *seeing* them, and a wide enough experience of them and the world they deal with to give him judgment; he must also educate himself thoroughly in the industrial nature of the film world.

The cinema is an art-industry, if you wish, but an industry nonetheless. It behaves like one in all essential respects, and the

critic who is worth his salt must understand how this affects the different parts of the creative process. Grierson has understood it, for example, and that is why his writing is like a breath of very cool and fresh air. But few working critics bother to examine the artistic consequences of the industry's tendency to vertical integration of production, distribution, and exhibition—although this is of crucial importance in determining the nature of the film product. Few study the industry's development of an elaborate division of labor (managerial and operative, administrative and creative) with crucial consequences for each individual picture. And only a few are aware, as part of their daily critical set of mind, that the industry's operations are in many respects conducted on exactly the same lines as those of the auto or fountain-pen industries. Some critics even parade their ignorance of these factors as part of their critical attitude. But letting critics who do not have a thorough grasp of all these things pretend to enlighten us on cinematic subjects is like listening to astronomers who assume the sun revolves around the earth.

Of course, it is easier (and more genteel) to deal with films as books are habitually dealt with—as if they sprang fully printed from the hand of the author, with no agents, editors, and publishers in between and no society round about. But the hazards of this critical policy are very great, since in the cinema we are dealing not only with more businessmen than in publishing, but with businessmen incomparably better organized, and with no cultural tradition to restrain them. Clearly then, critics must cease prattling of artistic prowess in the cinema as if it were the work of attic geniuses. If we wish to interpret and criticize films accurately and sensibly, we must face up squarely to the conditions of the industrial world in which they are manufactured and distributed—just as the better critics already face up to the general social context in which films appear.

An argument sometimes advanced against this proposed extension of a critic's responsibilities is that we should leave the industry to fight its own battles and concern ourselves only with the

results. But this view presupposes an idyllic, old-fashioned kind of isolation from society which nobody has ever imagined the cinema to possess. It also presupposes that the public should not take a legitimate interest in conflicts and problems within the industry—which is like saying that the public should ignore what goes on in the operation of a power company or transit line. For the public is very substantially affected by the workings of the movie industry; and the only interests served by concealing its workings are presumably the interests of those who fear publicity because they benefit from ignorance and passivity. Finally, what social justification does a critic have, indeed, unless to encourage with every means at his disposal the production of better films for the public to enjoy?

Now all this leads, I submit, to the necessity for serious critics resident in or near Hollywood—in the industry, but not of it. Metropolitan movie editors make occasional trips to Hollywood; serious critics have sojourned there periodically; but there has never been a group of critics who actually remained on the grounds long enough to establish a tradition. So we don't have much to go on; we don't even know why it is that there are no critics in Hollywood at present—whether the place destroys the aspirants who go there; whether it frightens others from ever coming; or whether, more simply, serious critics find Hollywood too dull to bear or too lacking in the miscellaneous kinds of work critics must do to support themselves.

At any rate, if the cinema is to amount to anything aesthetically—as it amounts to less and less financially, and as it swings somewhat into the economic and therefore the aesthetic orbit of television—we need critics willing and eager to gain the kind of detailed understanding that went into Lillian Ross's *Picture*. We need critics who understand audience-surveying techniques, which will enable them to make sense of the research studies relevant to the movies and also to make authoritative mincemeat of the pitiful surveys undertaken by producers as a means of "testing" new pictures. We need critics who deal in the artistic merits

of films and the reasons behind them, to counterbalance the Hollywood infestation of writers who deal only in the real or mythical private lives of stars. We need critics who can examine firsthand and at leisure the befuddlement of means and ends, the sickly overripe cynicism of Hollywood. We need critics who will find out whatever has to be said and say it; for trenchant, no-holds-barred criticism is not only in order, but long overdue. Otherwise, as the familiar industrial pattern dissolves away, the cinema will find itself in a permanent Slough of Despond.

If we get this kind of critic—even just a very few of them—the intellectual life of the film world will speed up as it should in times of change. And if new production possibilities are explored—for example, in making films for children, films for the art-house circuit, films for unions, and similar specialized audiences—we might even find ourselves in the kind of creative ferment that characterized the *avant-garde* in France and Germany or the documentary movement in England.

Looking forward to some such development, the spread of film criticism and film study should be encouraged; for a mass art like the cinema cannot rise far above the tastes of its audiences. Critics should learn new ways of reaching people: through radio talks and film-society meetings and, perhaps in time, through educational-television programs—the ideal medium for the critic, since he can show excerpts from the films he discusses. If they are academically inclined, critics can often provide courses through adult-education centers, drama schools, colleges, and universities. And the critic, wherever he lives, should cultivate contacts with producing personnel in the branches and offshoots of both the 35-mm. and 16-mm. industries.

This program (or "general line") is unlikely to prove popular with very many working newspaper reviewers, who mostly conceive that they have a job to do and are already doing it. I doubt if there is much hope of converting them; but we can, and should expect a higher standard from new critics entering the field. Who knows? Perhaps they should all be condemned to at least a year

of servitude and study in Hollywood; then, at least, they would be able to advance beyond our present alternatives of exalting the tycoons through silence or railing at them in the name of art. With luck, we might get a whole new generation of critics willing and able to confront the industry with no fear of being turned to stone. Such critics would be able to smash our comfortable state of ignorance mercilessly; they would probe behind the façades to the studios themselves and behind the studio people to the sources and methods of control. Without such critics to lead the way, the rest of us must remain dupes—as sensitive or clever as you please, but still dupes—taken in by the dark powers, the men who run things in the industry.

The Financing of Independent Feature Films

TERRY B. SANDERS

TERRY B. SANDERS is a graduate student and teaching assistant in the Motion Picture Division of the Department of Theater Arts, University of California, Los Angeles. With his brother Denis Sanders, he has produced the documentary *Subject: Narcotics* and the dramatic film *A Time Out of War*—the latter of which was presented on "Omnibus" (C.B.S.-TV), won first prize in its class at the Venice Film Festival, 1954, was given the Screen Directors Guild Intercollegiate Award, and was voted the best two-reel subject by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. The author wishes to express his gratitude to Jules C. Goldstone for his aid in the preparation of this article.

ALTHOUGH INDEPENDENTLY PRODUCED motion pictures are of great importance in the film industry—comprising approximately one third of all United States feature-film production during the past ten years[1]—few people, even within the business, have a clear conception of the unique methods of financing involved in these ventures. Literature on the subject, if not nonexistent, is extremely sparse; those who understand the field best have gained their knowledge through experience which has frequently been very bitter. The ignorance, semiknowledge, and general confusion concerning motion-picture finance is due in part to the complexity of the subject and in part to the reluctance of businessmen in the film industry to reveal publicly the details of their transactions.

The financing of independent feature films is not a subject which can be discussed in scientific or absolute terms; recourse to general statements, approximations, and qualifying phrases, such as "in most cases," is unavoidable. The designation "independent feature film" is, in itself, somewhat indefinite; but it will be used here to refer to those films of feature length produced by comparatively small organizations which are financed individually (picture by picture), as opposed to films produced by

[1] Jack Alicoate, ed., *The 1954 Film Daily Year Book* (New York: The Film Daily, 1954), 125.

large companies (M-G-M, Warner Bros., Paramount, Twentieth Century-Fox, Columbia, Universal, and RKO) operating upon capital raised on a corporate basis. Each financing arrangement involving an independent feature film is a separate, individual deal, subject to various refinements through bargaining. Moreover, such elements as national economic conditions, public film tastes, foreign marketing conditions, government regulations, court decisions, and tax and banking policies greatly affect the general financing situation and lead to at least year-to-year variations. Nevertheless, although no two financing arrangements are precisely alike, all have certain characteristics in common; and there exists at least a certain established pattern which serves as a basis for negotiation. This general pattern, and the elements and parties involved, will be discussed here.

The Monetary Elements

In general, three categories of money are involved in the financing of independent feature films. They are mainly differentiated by the degree of risk attached to them and must usually be obtained from sources independent of each other. The nomenclature for these types of money is not entirely logical but, since it is fairly widely accepted in the motion-picture industry, it will be used here. The three categories are known as "first money," "second money," and "completion money."

First money.—First money is so termed because, of the three categories of money financing a film, it is the first to be repaid. However, it is usually the last money to be raised by the producing group. First money finances about 60 per cent of the film, and is practically always loaned by a bank at a straight 6 per cent interest rate. For a film not to bring in enough return to repay this loan is unusual. First money entails the minimum possible risk and gets a minimum return.

Second money.—Second money—often referred to as "risk" money—in effect, finances the film. Once it is obtained, the producing group usually has little trouble in raising the first money.

Second money—so-called because it is paid off second, after the bank loan—supplies the remaining 40 per cent of the budget needed to finance the film. Because many films fail to make enough money to return their cost, and because the second money does not begin to be repaid until the entire bank loan has been liquidated, a relatively great risk is involved in putting up this capital. To compensate for this, the second-money (or risk-capital) group, which receives nominal interest (2 or 3 per cent, if any at all), usually demands 50 per cent of the film's net profit in return for putting up a majority of the second money. The producing group usually raises the remaining amount of second money needed, either in the form of cash or deferments. Deferments may be the director's or the actors' salaries or film laboratory costs, full payment of which is postponed at least until the first money has been paid off. The artists and technicians under such an arrangement take a considerable amount of risk; and, in return, they will demand a percentage of the film's net profit in addition to their salaries. If the producing group has made use of deferments in raising its share of the second money, these percentages will come out of its share of the profits.

The second money (as cash and deferment agreements, if any) must be deposited at the bank which has loaned the first money. This is the bank's guarantee against financing the film for more than 60 per cent if the budget has been overestimated or padded. If the production comes in under budget, the money that is left over goes immediately toward repaying the bank's loan.

Completion money.—Generally, first and second money (including deferments) make up 100 per cent of the budget. However, a film will frequently run over budget and require added money for completion. Since an unfinished motion picture is totally worthless, the bank and the risk-capital group (if it is not itself guaranteeing completion) protect themselves by requiring assurance that the film will be finished. This assurance or guarantee to supply the extra money required to finish a film is known as completion money or a completion bond. Completion money may

be in the form of a guarantee signed by a financially responsible person (which means that if necessary he would be able to repay the full amount owing to the bank) or actual cash in escrow. Some banks require a cash deposit along with the completion agreement equal to 15 per cent of the budget.[2]

Completion-money arrangements vary greatly. When the guarantor is a personal friend of the producer or when the producer himself is financially responsible, no fee or percentages are involved. Usually, however, the completion-money group will demand a share of the producer's profits (which may range from 5 to 15 per cent) and, sometimes, a fee besides. If completion money is used, there is usually a provision that, for each $10,000 or $20,000 used, an added percentage of the net profit—perhaps 1 or 2 per cent—is given over to the completion group. This compensation is necessary since any completion money spent is not usually repaid until after the first and second money.

The Interested Groups

Many individuals and groups are usually involved in the financing of an independent feature film. Most commonly, they are the producing group, the bank, the risk-capital group, the deferred-money group, the completion-money group, and the distribution company. Each is after a profit; and each attempts to protect its investment, if possible, through guarantees or, if a certain amount of risk must be accepted, through the most favorable terms it can secure. Out of the producing group's successful bargaining and negotiating with the other groups, the final financing arrangement emerges.

The producing group.—The producing group in the independent film field may be a large, long-established organization, such as the one headed by Samuel Goldwyn, or it may consist only of an individual or group of individuals with an idea in the form of a script and little else in the way of experience or financial assets to recommend it. However, the producing group which has

[2] Herbert T. Silverberg, "Indie Legal Procedure Outlined by Film Attorney," *Hollywood Reporter* (April 27, 1950), 6

a record of financially successful films will, of course, be able to raise capital relatively easily and at terms favorable to itself. On the other hand, the unknown or previously unsuccessful producing group will generally find financial backing difficult to obtain. If the financing is finally obtained, it will be at terms which take away most of the ownership of the film. As has been previously stated, the producing group usually puts up a share of the second money and sometimes guarantees completion of the film.

The bank.—A number of banks lend money for partial financing of independent films. They receive 5 to 6 per cent interest in comparison to 2 or 3 per cent on loans of comparable size to other industries.[3] According to Herbert L. Golden of the Bankers Trust Company, "If you lend money to the independent, the only thing you have as security for your money is the picture which he is going to make. You don't have anything else."[4] But the bank takes little risk. In effect, it secures the loan by rarely financing a film for more than 60 per cent of its budget, by demanding evidence of a satisfactory distribution agreement, by estimating the potential box-office draw of the cast, by securing assurance that the film will be completed, by having first claim on income from the film, and by holding a lien on the story rights and completed film.

After having sustained large losses in recent years through financing motion pictures, a few banks require all loans to be fully secured by bond or collateral. Since few producers can afford a loan on these terms, such stringent requirements are actually these particular banks' indirect way of saying that they are not financing films any longer. Nevertheless, advancing first money for independent films has long been, and continues to be, a profitable and relatively safe business for the few banks which specialize in this field.

The risk-capital group.—The people who put up the risk capital are financial speculators. If the film fails—returning, let us say,

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] "Television and Motion-Picture Prospects," *Commercial and Financial Chronicle,* 177 (May 7, 1953), 38.

only first money—they lose every dollar they invested; on the other hand, if the film is a financial success, they may make back many times their investment. Usually, the investors who put up the risk capital will take about 50 per cent of the profits—always contingent entirely on the individual deal.

The deferred-money group.—The talent or technical service which defers its fee or salary becomes, in effect, a direct investor in the film. Under such an arrangement, a director whose fee is $75,000 for a certain film may take $10,000 in cash and defer $65,000 until after the first or second money has been paid off. Since this is a distinct gamble, he will demand, perhaps, 10 per cent of the net profit. If the film does not return its negative cost (the final, actual cost of the film), he will receive neither the deferred portion of his fee nor, of course, any money from his part ownership of the film.

The people who frequently defer a portion of their fees or salaries include the producer himself, the writer, the director, the actors, the director of photography, the music composer, and the film-processing laboratory. Certain of these people—notably the actors and the cameraman—must, however, receive a basic minimum salary prescribed by their guilds or unions.

The completion-money group.—Various persons may put up the required assurance that a film will be finished. Certain financial speculators specialize in these guarantees; and in return, they try to get as large a share of the profits as they possibly can. Their share, as has been stated, may range anywhere from 5 to 15 per cent, plus a penalty percentage if the film goes over budget. In order to avoid the usually large demands of an outside speculator, the producer will often try to supply the guarantee himself; or, if he cannot, he will find some financially responsible friend or relative to do it. Occasionally, the risk-capital group will also guarantee completion.

The distribution company.—The function of the distributor includes the leasing of the film to exhibitors, the arranging for play dates, the delivering, and the collecting of film rentals or per-

centages of the exhibitors' takes. For distributing a film in the United States, the usual charge is a straight 30 per cent of the gross (money received from exhibitors, not the money paid in at the box office); abroad, the distribution charge is higher, usually 35 to 40 per cent. The distributor advances the cost of prints and advertising, which on a million-dollar film might come to $250,000. He takes little risk, however, since the print-advertising costs are paid off even before the bank's first-money loan.

The distributor can be directly involved in the financing of a film in two ways. First, unless the loan is fully guaranteed, a bank will not put up first money until it has assurance that the film will get satisfactory distribution. Thus, the distributor, by agreeing beforehand to release the film, puts up, in effect, a portion of the security which the bank or first money lender demands.

Second, the distributing company may put up the necessary risk capital for a film, and also the completion guarantee. At the present time, most of the major film companies are involved in financing independent films which they also release through their distributing organizations.

These, then, are the groups that are generally involved in the financing of an independent film. Although one group will often take on a number of functions, and thus eliminate the necessity for some of the other groups, the pattern remains more or less the same. If one individual puts up both the second money and the completion agreement, he will usually exact separate percentages of the ownership of the film for the separate functions he performs. It remains, now, to see how all of these elements are integrated in the financing of an independent feature film.

Financing Procedure

How does the independent producer actually go about arranging the financing of a film? There is certainly no set pattern, especially since, as far as cost, independent films may run anywhere from $50,000 to $1,500,000 and more; but a generalized procedure can be outlined. The producer starts with a script or a story

to which he has obtained the motion-picture rights. He makes out a tentative budget. He approaches certain actors to see if they are interested in the film. He approaches certain directors. He begins the difficult task of finding a person to back the film—a person who will put up most of the second money. He also tries to find someone who will guarantee the completion of the film. He shows the script, and whatever tentative cast and director agreements he has, to a distributing organization and tries to get a release commitment. If and when he has all these elements, he takes evidence of them, together with the script and a final budget, to the bank and asks for the first money. The bank will examine everything; and, if all is satisfactory, it will loan the sum. The second money and, if necessary, the completion money is deposited at the bank; and shooting on the film can commence.

Herbert L. Golden puts forth an example:

> The producer, in his role of financial promoter, is generally forced to put on quite a show. He comes to us at the bank and says, "I have Gregory Peck, I have second money, I have completion money, I have William Wyler to direct, and I have a great script. If you will put first money in, I can go ahead."
>
> We act like we believe him at least partially, although we know actually he hasn't got all of those elements. We know that as soon as he leaves us he is going to go to Gregory Peck's agent and say, "I have Bankers Trust Company to put up first money if you come in. I have a great script and a great director"; then, he goes to Wyler and he says, "If you will come in I have Bankers Trust and I have Gregory Peck." Thus, he goes around the circle. Everybody knows what he is doing. Everybody knows he has nothing but an idea. He tries to pull all the strings in, and, gradually, the successful producer finally gets everybody into a room, and he finds he does have all those people.[5] [Mr. Golden omitted the important distribution factor.]

A more concrete example is the experience of a certain producing group in its first independent film venture, which, as it turned out, was extremely successful financially. The members of this group started with a script which they budgeted at the unusually low figure of $80,000. Of this sum, $10,000—represent-

[5] *Op. cit.*, 37.

ing the fees of the writer, director, and producers—was deferred. The remaining $70,000 was needed in cash. After approaching many people, they finally found an investor who liked the script and agreed to finance the film. The arrangement was that he would guarantee 50 per cent of a $40,000 bank loan. The producers would guarantee the other 50 per cent. Of the $30,000 second money still needed, the investor would put up half and the producing group the other half. The producing group, through a financially responsible relative, obtained the completion bond. The profits of the film were divided equally between the producing group and the investor. The film had neither stars nor a prior distribution agreement, and the producers had no established reputation in the field, since it was their first film; but, because the loan was fully secured, the bank was willing to advance the money. The producers had, between themselves, enough money for the guarantee and their half of the second money.

After the success of the first film, these producers were able to raise capital for their second film—budgeted at $300,000—with relative ease.

The Paying Back of Monies

Whether or not an investor in an independent feature film will recoup his money often depends upon the precedence which his investment takes when returns begin coming in. This factor—the order in which the various parties involved are paid back—is of the utmost importance and forms the basis for the entire system of motion-picture finance. The general pattern follows.

When money comes in at the box office, the exhibitors, first of all, extract their share. What remains is known as the gross of the film and is collected by the distributor. The distributor begins taking his 30 per cent fee immediately from the time the first dollar comes in. This is a constant charge which continues throughout the release of the film. The remaining 70 per cent of the gross is first applied toward paying back the print and ad-

vertising costs, which the distributor has advanced. When the entire cost has been repaid, the 70 per cent is next applied toward paying back the first-money loan plus the usual 6 per cent interest. When the first money lender has been completely paid, the 70 per cent goes toward repaying the second money. Payments of deferred salaries and completion-money debts usually come after the second money, but sometimes they are paid back *pari passu.* This means that payments on these debts are made concurrently with the second money and in amounts commensurate with the proportion of the total debt that they represent. When all debts have been repaid, the 70 per cent of the gross becomes profit, to be divided in accordance with whatever the initial arrangement happened to be.

There are innumerable subtleties and refinements in financing arrangements involving independent feature films; but these must, necessarily, remain untouched by this article. Moreover, the general principles and procedures outlined here are not always significant in every financing deal. What has been presented is a simplification of the general example; it is a basic foundation and a point of departure.

Portrait of a First-Run Audience

DALLAS W. SMYTHE, JOHN R. GREGORY,
ALVIN OSTRIN, OLIVER P. COLVIN,
and WILLIAM MORONEY

DALLAS W. SMYTHE is Research Professor of Communications at the University of Illinois and Chief of Economics and Statistics Division, Federal Communications Commission. JOHN R. GREGORY and OLIVER P. COLVIN are graduate students at the University of Illinois. ALVIN OSTRIN is employed in a Chicago advertising agency as an assistant radio- and television-business administrator. WILLIAM MORONEY is an officer at the Westover Air Force Base where he is in charge of the Statistical Services Division.

KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT MOTION-PICTURE PATRONS are like seems particularly relevant in view of their declining numbers in the past few years. The present article continues a series begun in 1953 when a report was made on the composition and tastes of an art-theater audience in Champaign, Illinois.[1] The audience studied here is that of a leading first-run theater, also in Champaign-Urbana. Field work for this study, as for the first one, was completed prior to the availability of television service or either 3-D or Cinerama.

The Rialto Theatre, whose audience is here considered, is one of three theaters which customarily show first-run films. Locally owned, it has a seating capacity of 1,000 and has consistently followed a single-feature policy. The university community in which the Rialto is located has a population of about 62,000 including 14,000 students.

The following questions seemed most significant to ask concerning this theater: What kind of people attend a first-run theater in a medium-sized Midwest city? How do their choices of particular films get made? What motives lead to the decision to attend the theater on a given day? How often do these people attend movies? What picture did they like best in the past year? What are their attitudes toward short-subject films? And, because

[1] Dallas W. Smythe, Parker B. Lusk, and Charles A. Lewis, "Portrait of an Art-Theater Audience," *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television,* VIII (Fall, 1953), 28–50.

this theater has firmly refused either to sell popcorn or to permit its consumption on the premises, how do the patrons feel about this policy?

The Sample and Study Procedure

During a three-week period in March and April, 1953, personal interviews were conducted with 869 patrons of the Rialto Theatre. Because the Rialto changes its features once a week, three different films were shown during the period of the study.

The first film, offered during the week of March 23–30 inclusive, was the serious drama *Come Back Little Sheba.* Feminine lead Shirley Booth was awarded the Academy Award as the best actress of the year just a few days prior to *Sheba's* opening, and this undoubtedly had a decided effect on attendance. During the week of April 7–13, the musical comedy *She's Back on Brodway* was shown. The following week, the comedy *Off Limits,* starring Bob Hope and Mickey Rooney, was featured. These three productions (a serious drama, a musical, and a comedy) are typical of the films shown at the Rialto.

In order that the interviewees could verbalize freely in their answers, interviewers recorded answers to open-end questions on printed questionnaires instead of showing check lists to respondents. Interviews were conducted in the theater lobby. A strict probability sample was not feasible. Because the flow of patrons tended to concentrate at particular hours, interviewing of a random sample presented formidable obstacles. If there was no queue at the door, it was not possible to hold every nth patron for the four or five minutes required for the interview. Every nth patron was interviewed when queues existed. To compensate for interviews lost when no queues existed, every nth patron was interviewed on leaving the showing for which no queues existed. In this way, quotas were filled which had been determined from theater experience with the size of audience for particular time segments of particular days of the week. Measures of sampling error are therefore not ascertainable. In general, the following analysis

regards as insignificant apparent differences amounting to less than 20 per cent of the given values.

Total adult attendance at the three pictures was over 33,330. Because this figure included all ticket purchasers over 12 years of age, and since none under 14 were queried by the interviewers, the sample was somewhat larger than 2.6 per cent.

What Kind of People Attend a First-Run Theater?

The townspeople outnumber the gownspeople (university faculty and students) by a ratio of almost three to two in the Champaign-Urbana,[2] first-run theater audience (see Table 1). Regardless of whether they are townspeople or gownspeople, the regular patrons of the first-run theater outnumber the casuals by a slight margin.

TABLE 1

FIRST-RUN AUDIENCE COMPOSITION

(N = 869)

(Per cent)

	Regulars			Casuals			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Gown	14.0	4.3	18.3	18.8	5.2	24.0	32.8	9.5	42.3
Town	15.9	18.8	34.7	12.1	10.9	23.0	28.0	29.7	57.7
Total	29.9	23.1	53.0	30.9	16.1	47.0	60.8	39.2	100.0

A third, but not surprising, feature of this theater's audience is that males outnumber females by a ratio of over three to two, reflecting the preponderance of males in the university population (where the ratio is nearly three to one). The over-all male preponderance is established in the gown portion of the audience—males outnumber females by a three and a half to one ratio. Within the town group, the females slightly outnumber the males.

The largest social group in the first-run theater audience is composed of regular customers from the town; this group provides 34.7 per cent of all patrons. Of these, slightly over half are

[2] Based on the questions, "What, if any, theater in Champaign-Urbana do you attend most regularly?" and "What is your occupation?"

females. The smallest social group representation is from regular patrons from the university; they are less than one fifth of all patrons. Within this least-common social group, the three to one ratio of university males to university females is closely followed. Middle positions are taken by the two casual groups—casual

TABLE 2

OTHER SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FIRST-RUN AUDIENCE
(N = 869)

Marital status	*Per cent*
Single	43.5
Married	55.0
No answer	1.5
	100.0
Age	
14–20	33.2
21–30	43.3
31–45	15.0
Over 45	8.0
No answer	.5
	100.0
Educational level	
0–6 years	.6
7–8 years	2.9
9–11 years	12.4
12 years	22.6
13–15 years	45.0
16 or more	15.8
No answer	.7
	100.0

townspeople (23 per cent) and casual gownspeople (24 per cent). Women outnumber men by a very slight margin in the former group; whereas, men predominate with three fourths of the latter.

The first-run theater's audience, like those in previous studies, is predominantly young (see Table 2)—less than one-tenth are over 45, over three fourths are no more than 30 years old, and one-third are younger than 21.

The popular impression that the first-run theater audience lacks formal education is not valid for Champaign-Urbana. Three fifths of this first-run theater audience have at least one year of college education; whereas, one-sixth have completed college studies or have done graduate work. If one sets aside the 42.3

per cent of the audience which comprises the university students and faculty, the fact remains that almost one fifth of the entire audience consists of townspeople with some- or full-college education. An expression of the number of college-trained townspeople in the audience (18.5 per cent of the total) in relation to the total of the townspeople segment of the audience (57.7 per cent) seems to indicate that almost one third *of the townspeople* in the audience have experienced one or more years of college training.

How Often Do First-Run Theater Patrons Go to Movies?

The great bulk of all first-run theater patrons are frequent movie-goers. (See Table 3). Almost three fourths of them (72 per

TABLE 3
MOVIE ATTENDANCE OF THE FIRST-RUN AUDIENCE
(Per cent)

Frequency	Total (N = 869)	Regulars 460	Casuals 409	Town 501	Gown 368
Twice a week or more	34.2	38.2	29.7	37.9	29.0
Once a week	37.8	37.2	38.3	33.3	43.8
Twice or three times a month	13.8	13.3	14.4	11.4	17.1
Once a month	7.8	6.5	9.3	9.4	5.7
Less than once a month	6.4	4.8	8.3	8.0	4.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

cent) attend some theater once a week or oftener.[3] More than one-third go twice or oftener each week, and almost two-fifths attend once a week. The remaining 28 per cent are evenly divided between those who go two or three times a month and those who go once a month or even less often.

As might be expected, the customers who say they regularly attend the Rialto Theatre are also heavier movie consumers than those who say they go occasionally. Of the regular Rialto patrons, 75.4 per cent attend some movie once a week or oftener; of the casual patrons, only 68.0 per cent go to a movie this often. To put it precisely: of all occasional movie-goers (once a month or less frequently) who attend the first-run theater, 58 per cent are

[3] Based on the question, "How often do you attend the movies?"

casual customers of this theater; whereas, 42 per cent go to it regularly, if infrequently.

If the "movie habit" is defined as attendance once a week or oftener, no significant difference exists in the proportion which have the movie habit of the town as against the gown segments of the first-run house (about 72 per cent in both cases). For moderate customers (two or three times a month), significant differences do appear. Thus, proportionately more of the gown customers (17 per cent) are moderately frequent movie-goers than of the town customers (11 per cent). The opposite is true of light-frequency movie-goers (once or less a month). Of the town patrons of the Rialto Theatre, 17 per cent attend any movie once a month or less often, but only 10 per cent of the gown patrons do the same.

Why Do Patrons Say They Choose a First-Run Theater?

There are two aspects to this question: the source of information regarding when and where the picture is being shown and the individual basis for selecting a particular film.

The most frequently mentioned source of information about a particular picture playing on a particular date are advertisements in the university and the two local daily newspapers. Word-of-mouth publicity was mentioned by only 11 per cent and previews of the picture by 10 per cent of the respondents.

As might be expected, previews are more important to regular patrons of this first-run theater than to casual attenders. The town-gown breakdown shows that the local newspapers are more important to the townspeople than is the campus paper. On the other hand, the campus daily is nearly 15 times as important as a source of information to the gown group as it is to the town group. Word-of-mouth—mentioned by three times as large a proportion of gownspeople as of townspeople—is also an important source of information to the university people, which is undoubtedly a reflection of their tighter-knit social groups.

After having learned *what* was playing, the underlying motivational background for the patrons' choice of a particular movie

is revealed when their answers[4] are examined. The most common reason for choosing a particular movie is "liked the stars," as mentioned by nearly one fifth of the audience. Recommendations of friends and a preference for a particular type of picture are named as factors about the same number of times, 15.3 and 15.0 per cent, respectively. Fourth in importance is that the picture had won Academy awards. Over all, reviews by newspaper and magazine critics are of negligible weight in motivating the first-run theater audience.

The motivational profiles of the groups which make up the first-run theater audience can be picked out. Regular, as compared to casual, patrons are distinguished by their marked taste for the stars in the pictures and for the "type of picture" shown. Regulars are also significantly more subject to the influence of motion-picture advertising than are the casuals. In short, regular first-run patrons in contrast to those who are casual customers seem to conform in their movie-going motivation to the commercial policy of the major film producers and exhibitors. This policy as manifested by the patrons revolves around three elements: the star system, the development of well-defined types of formulas for pictures, and the use of stereotypical patterns of advertising to support both the star system, the formula plots, and to "cue" the customer to his accustomed movie fare. This patron profile fits neatly the style of character direction described as "other-directed" by David Riesman and his associates.[5]

By contrast, the profile of the casual patron's motivation in some respects resembles the "inner-directed" character style. Casuals are much less habituated to the stars, the type of picture, and the advertising than the regulars. They are also almost twice as likely as the regulars to refer to movie reviews by newspaper or magazine critics as being among the reasons for choosing a certain picture.[6] That casual patrons at the choice point are more reflective and self-conscious appears also from the fact that twice as

[4] Based on the question, "Why did you choose to see this movie?"

[5] *The Lonely Crowd* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950).

[6] The absolute importance of movie reviews, however, is small for both groups, suggesting that even for the casuals the inner-direction implied is weak.

high a proportion of them (as compared to regulars) report that they felt like going to a movie and this picture appeared to be the "best in town." That casuals have less stereotypical choice processes is also suggested by the fact that the proportion of them giving diverse reasons is twice as high as for regulars. The casual group, in addition to these inner-directeds, also includes (to a greater extent than the regular group) inarticulate or motiveless persons who could verbalize no reason for selecting a movie.

The motivation profile of the town-gown segments of the first-run audience shows this demarcation between other- and inner-directeds as much as does the regular-casual level of analysis. The commercial-policy reasons (stars, type of picture, and advertising) are substantially more often mentioned by the town than by the gown group. Conversely, the gownspeople more often refer to magazine and newspaper reviews, the "best in town" comparative shopping reason, and the catchall of "other" reasons. The gown-group tendency toward the inner-directed character style is leavened by a strong element of other direction through the process of peer-group taste formation. "Word-of-mouth" was the reason most often given by the gown group (22 per cent), and was given more than twice as often by them as by the town group.

As was previously mentioned, Shirley Booth received the Academy Award for her part in *Come Back Little Sheba,* one of the three films shown during the interview period at the first-run theater. This attraction was sufficiently powerful that "picture won awards" was a reason given by 11 per cent of the total audience of all three films. It is particularly interesting to note that this drawing power of award movies prevailed through the regular and casual, as well as the town and gown groups.

What Are the Movie Tastes of a First-Run Theater Audience?

Because the type of film seems to be of such importance to many of the first-run patrons, we turn to an analysis of the taste patterns of the first-run audience.[7] In evaluating this material (see Table 4), it is to be remembered that categories of films could

[7] The questions asked were "If you moved to a town which had no movies, what type would you miss the most?" and "What kind of movie don't you care about?"

not be mutually exclusive because of the open-ended questioning technique employed. There is also a presumptive fuzziness (in the psychological and semantic sense of validity) in the meaning of names given the program types by the respondents.

TABLE 4

TYPES OF MOVIES MOST LIKED AND DISLIKED BY PATRONS OF FIRST-RUN THEATER
(N = 869)
(Per cent*)

	Total (869)	Regulars (460)	Casuals (409)	Town (501)	Gown (368)
LIKED					
Musical	31.4	36.2	26.0	34.8	27.6
Comedy	19.0	19.6	18.4	19.2	18.7
Serious drama	16.6	17.4	15.7	14.2	19.8
Western	7.0	7.2	6.9	8.6	4.9
Mystery	5.6	4.8	6.6	4.3	7.1
Action	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.2
Romance	3.0	4.8	1.0	3.8	1.9
Historical	1.8	2.0	1.7	2.0	1.6
Foreign	1.4	.2	2.7	.8	2.2
Slapstick	.2	.0	.2	.0	.3
None	8.4	5.7	11.5	8.8	7.9
All	3.6	2.2	5.1	3.6	3.5
Other	5.0	4.6	5.4	3.2	7.3
DISLIKED					
Western	31.9	33.3	30.4	24.2	37.0
Mystery	12.4	14.1	10.5	13.6	10.9
Musical	12.9	13.0	12.7	12.2	13.9
Serious drama	12.0	12.2	11.8	13.4	10.1
Romance	5.2	4.6	5.9	5.4	5.0
Slapstick	5.2	3.7	6.8	4.6	6.0
Comedy	3.8	3.3	4.4	4.2	3.3
Action	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.8	3.0
Foreign	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.4	1.9
Other	7.0	6.7	7.3	7.4	6.5
None	9.7	8.7	10.8	10.4	9.0

* Due to multiple mentions, percentages total more than 100.

For the entire first-run audience, the "comedy syndrome" (musical, comedy, and slapstick) is most liked in more than half of the choices. In contrast, the "serious syndrome" (serious drama, romance, and historical) is mentioned only one fifth of the time (21.4 per cent), and the "action syndrome" (western, mystery,

and action) is mentioned little more than one sixth of the time (17.2 per cent). Of single classes of pictures, the most popular is musical (31.4 per cent), half again as popular as the second-place favorite comedy (19.0 per cent), with serious drama in third place (16.6 per cent). None of the other single classes is half as popular as serious drama.

If the first-run audience likes chiefly to laugh, it most dislikes what we have called the action syndrome—almost half (47.8 per cent) mention these classes as least cared for. The comedy syndrome and the serious syndrome are least liked by one fifth of the audience (21.9 per cent and 17.2 per cent, respectively). Westerns are the most-disliked single class of film, being mentioned as disliked by one third of the audience. Mystery, musical, and serious drama are also disliked, but by much smaller fractions of the audience (12.4, 12.9, and 12.0 per cent, respectively). Foreign films are mentioned as desirable and undesirable scarcely at all, and then as often one as the other. Apparently almost one in ten of the first-run audience is unable to verbalize a class of movie highly valued; whereas, about one customer in 25 undiscriminatingly likes all classes of films superlatively, and one in 100 likes none very much. One in ten was unable to think of a class of film most disliked.

The regular and casual patrons are separated by sharp differences in their feature-film tastes. Significantly, more of the regulars name film classes in the comedy syndrome as most liked (55.8 per cent) than do the casuals (44.6 per cent). Likewise, more regulars value highly the film classes in the serious syndrome (23,2 per cent) than do casuals (18.4 per cent). Both the regulars and casuals mention as best liked film classes in the action syndrome (16.6 per cent and 18.1 per cent, respectively). Of specific picture classes, both regular and casual patrons most often name musical as best liked, and regulars more often like them than casual patrons (36.2 per cent as against 26.0 per cent). No significant differences mark the relative popularity of the remaining classes as between regular and casual patrons with the sole exception

of romance which is best liked by 4.8 per cent of the regulars but by only 1 per cent of the casuals.

Among types of pictures most disliked, the regular group of patrons name the action syndrome more often than do the casuals (50.9 as against 44.3 per cent). Insignificant differences mark the degree of dislike of the comedy syndrome and the serious syndrome as between the regular and casual patron. Westerns are the single class of picture most often mentioned as disliked by both groups.

The town-gown taste profiles show interesting similarities and contrasts as against the regular-casual profiles. Like the regulars, the town group is more likely (53 per cent) to express preference for pictures in the comedy syndrome than are the casuals and gownspeople (45.6 per cent). The gown group, however, is a bit more apt to like the serious syndrome (23.3 per cent) than is the town group (20 per cent); whereas, the regulars prefer this type of picture more often than do the casuals. The gown group is more likely to dislike the action-syndrome pictures than the townspeople (50.9 per cent *versus* 41.6 per cent); whereas, the regulars dislike these picture classes oftener than do the casuals. As far as single classes of pictures are concerned, townspeople, as well as regulars, like musical more than do gownspeople and casuals (34.8 as against 26.6 per cent for gownspeople). This is the most-popular class of picture, however, even for the gown group. Discrepancies in taste are revealed in a comparison of town and gown views on two classes of pictures: serious drama and westerns. Serious drama is mentioned as most liked by 19.8 per cent of the gown and by only 14.2 per cent of the town group; whereas, the same class is most disliked by 13.4 per cent of the town and 10.1 per cent of the gown group. The reverse relation exists for westerns. Of the town group, 8.6 per cent most like them, but the same is true of only 4.9 per cent of the gownspeople. Almost two fifths (37 per cent) of the gown group most dislike westerns, and this is true of 24.2 per cent of the townspeople.

Whatever the source of the divergent taste patterns in different audience segments, the fact is abundantly clear from Table

4 that the first-run theater audience is far from monolithic in its taste pattern. The five most often mentioned classes of movies that the first-run patrons like most are musical, comedy, serious drama, western, and mystery. The five classes of films most often disliked are western, musical, mystery, serious drama, and romance. Four of the five classes appear as both most liked and most disliked. Audiences, we should remember, are composed of many different and often largely conflicting taste and interest groups.

What Pictures Were Most Enjoyed in Past Year?

Some confirmation and some modification of the preceding analysis of the taste patterns of the Rialto audience is provided when we examine the answers to the question, "In the past year what film did you enjoy most?" The movies most enjoyed in the past year are probably more a function of what Hollywood happened to do outstanding work on, rather than of the usual tastes of the audience. It is not surprising to note that *The Greatest Show on Earth, High Noon,* and *Come Back Little Sheba* head the list. Of greater interest is the relation between the favorite pictures and the audience-taste standards.

It will be recalled that the most-popular class of movie, by a wide margin, is what we have called the comedy syndrome; whereas, less than half as often the first-run audience names classes we have called collectively the serious syndrome; and the action syndrome is in a weak third place. In contrast to this overt standard of usual taste, what do we find the favorites to be?

We have roughly classified the twenty films named by 1 per cent or more of the audience, as follows:

Serious drama:	*Come Back Little Sheba*
	Above and Beyond
	Snows of Kilamanjaro
	Because of You
	A Streetcar Named Desire
Historical:	*Quo Vadis*
	Ivanhoe
Musical:	*American in Paris*
	Hans Christian Andersen
	Call Me Madam
	With a Song in My Heart

Romance:	*The Quiet Man*
	Limelight
Mystery:	*I Confess*
	Detective Story
Comedy:	*Road to Bali*
	The Stooge
	Four Poster
Western:	*High Noon*
Action:	*The Greatest Show on Earth*

If these are related to our syndromes, we find that the Rialto audience selects as its favorite pictures in a given year nine films in the serious syndrome, seven in the comedy syndrome, and four in the action syndrome. Evidently either Hollywood's best efforts were out of line with local tastes or else the verbally articulatable tastes were out of line with the audience's behavior.

Significant differences between the taste profiles of the regular and casual groups were noted earlier, with the former emphasizing its preferences for comedy and serious material and undervaluing action material. The ten most frequently mentioned films for these two groups show no such differences. The top-ten pictures for the regulars include five in the serious syndrome (*Sheba, Above and Beyond, Ivanhoe, Quo Vadis,* and *Because of You*). For the casual patrons, six of the top ten are in the same syndrome (*The Quiet Man, Sheba, Quo Vadis, Limelight, Above and Beyond,* and *Ivanhoe*). Three of the ten for the regular group are in the action syndrome and two for the casuals—*The Greatest Show on Earth* and *High Noon* for both groups and *I Confess* for the regulars. The comedy syndrome is represented by two in each group—*American in Paris* and *Call Me Madam* for the regulars and *Four Poster* and *American in Paris* for the casuals.

Similarly for the town and gown dichotomy, verbalized tastes indicate that the former are more partial to the comedy and action syndromes and less partial to the serious syndrome than the latter. As far as favorite pictures for the year go, the town group elects six serious-syndrome films out of its top ten (*Above and Beyond, Ivanhoe, Sheba, Because of You, The Quiet Man,*

and *Quo Vadis*) as against five for the gown group (*Sheba, Quo Vadis, Limelight, The Quiet Man,* and *Above and Beyond*). Action-syndrome films number three of the top ten for the town group and two for the gownspeople. Comedy-syndrome pictures are three of the first ten for the gown group (*Four Poster, American in Paris,* and *Call Me Madam*) and only one for the town group (*Road to Bali*).

When pressed for an explanation of the qualities in the favorite films which appealed to the audience members,[8] they responded with such terms as story, acting, realism, photography, and the like. It would be naïve to assume that these terms have any uniform meaning or are valid reflections even of the respondents' inner attitudes toward pictures. On the contrary, one is justified in assuming that these terms are largely colored by the respondent's perceptions of what was appropriate to his role in the interview situation.

Story, acting, music, star, and realism are, in that order, most frequently mentioned by the group as a whole. Acting is the most frequently mentioned desirable quality in the favorite film for the gown group, and story is the one most prominent in the town group. Indeed, acting is mentioned half again as often by the gown as by the town group. Music, realism, unusualness, photography, and script are all more commonly referred to by the gownspeople than by the townspeople. We take this to reflect the modish values prized by the intellectuals as compared to the nonacademic community. In contrast, it may be noted that humor—a more plebian quality—is mentioned half again as often by the town as the gown group.

What Are the Attitudes of First-Run Patrons toward Foreign Films?

When first-run patrons are asked directly just how they feel about foreign pictures,[9] it appears that a greater proportion likes than dislikes foreign movies. Slightly less than one fifth of the respondents express no preference either way.

[8] The question asked was "What about this film appealed to you most?"
[9] The questions asked were "How do you feel about foreign films?" and "Why?"

Foreign films are most liked by the casual and gown groups, with 54.4 and 59.7 per cent, respectively. Slightly more people in the town and regular classifications are neutral on the subject than are the casuals and gownspeople. This may reflect a taste for foreign movies in the more-sophisticated segments of the population. Those who like foreign pictures give as their reasons: realism (21.8 per cent), the fact that they are different (18.8 per cent), and acting ability (14.4 per cent).

A strong preference for realism is expressed by over one fourth of the gown group; whereas, less than 15 per cent of the townspeople give this answer. Almost three times as many townspeople as gown members are unable to verbalize their reasons for liking foreign films. It is interesting to note that the most-superficial aspect of the foreign films, setting, is given as a reason for liking these films by 7.8 per cent of the town group as compared with less than 1 per cent of the gown group.

The language barrier is the greatest single factor causing dislike of foreign films. Over one fifth of the patrons disliking such movies give this as their reason. It seems as though first-run moviegoers are better able to verbalize their likes than their dislikes. Only one twelfth of the liking group but more than one tenth of the disliking group give no reason. The townspeople are less able to verbalize reasons than gownspeople.

How Do First-Run Patrons Feel about Short Subjects?

Because this first-run theater follows the policy of showing short subjects to supplement its feature film, the patrons interviewed were asked to name the most-liked and most-disliked type.[10]

Sports subjects seem to be the most popular among all groups with the greatest popularity among regulars and gownspeople and the least among casuals and townspeople. Evidently sports are most popular among the university students.

Striking attitudes were displayed toward cartoons. They are

[10] Based on the questions, "What type of short subjects do you enjoy most on a theater program?" and "What type of short subject do you dislike most?"

the second most-popular over-all short subject. Almost a third of the gown respondents say they like cartoons more than any other type of short subject as compared to only 17.6 per cent of the town group. Interestingly, the casual patrons show about the same margin of preference for cartoons as compared with the regular patrons.

Newsreels, the third most-popular short, are liked by about one person in eight. Among townspeople, they are liked by about one in seven, as compared with one in ten among the university group.

Travelogues are by far the most cordially disliked type of short subject, particularly among the gownspeople. Over one fifth of all patrons interviewed express a dislike for travelogues. Only 15 per cent of the town members most dislike travelogues. Dance bands and comedies are other shorts significantly disliked by the entire sample. Townspeople are easier to please with short subjects than are gownspeople. Over two fifths of the townspeople dislike none of the short-subject fare offered; whereas, 18.5 per cent of the gown group can mention no short which they dislike.

Short-subject tastes again illustrate the pluralistic nature of movie audiences. Thus, comedies are most liked by 12.7 per cent and most disliked by 7.6 per cent of the first-run audience. In rank order, comedies are *simultaneously* the fourth best-liked and the third most-disliked short subject. Likewise, newsreels are the third best-liked and the sixth most-disliked short subject.

Does the Sale of Popcorn Affect First-Run Patrons' Attendance?

In one specific aspect, this first-run theater is unique. It does not sell popcorn and does not allow it to be brought into the theater. Does this theater's popcorn policy have any effect on the patrons' attendance? Would the audience buy popcorn if it were sold at this theater?

In general, the respondents seem to favor the existing policy, but almost as many are indifferent to the policy as favor it.[11] The

[11] The questions asked were "The Rialto Theatre doesn't sell popcorn or allow any to be brought into the theater. How do you feel about this policy?" and "Does it influence your attendance here?" and "If popcorn were sold here, would you purchase it?"

two older groups, the regulars and townspeople, are more strongly in favor of the policy than are the gown and casual segments. The younger casual and gown groups are fairly evenly divided on this question with about a third of each group in favor of the policy, against it, or just neutral.

Whether the audience approves or disapproves the popcorn policy makes little difference in their attendance. Almost nine tenths of the audience say it does not affect their attendance. The remainder are about equally divided between the 6 per cent who consider the popcorn policy a deterrent and the 6 per cent who feel it encourages attendance. As between the audience segments, the town and regular groups are most negative toward the policy. Gownspeople and casuals preponderantly consider it a desirable policy.

The question of whether the sale of popcorn would be profitable at this theater was not within the realm of an audience study. Other factors, including management, sales, and cleaning expenses, would have to be taken into account in dealing with such a question. But one thing is sure: About six out of every ten of the patrons interviewed would purchase popcorn if it were sold at this theater. Less than two fifths of the respondents say they would not purchase popcorn even if it were sold.

Summary

In a three-week period in the spring of 1953, a sample of almost 3 per cent of the audience of the leading first-run theater in Champaign-Urbana, Illinois, was studied. Patrons from the town outnumber those from the gown (university faculty and students) in this audience by a ratio of about three to two. Slightly more than half of this audience regularly attend this theater. Sixty per cent of the respondents are males, a large proportion of whom come from the gown group; in the town group, females slightly outnumber males. The largest social group (one-third) in this audience are regular customers from the town. The audience is primarily a young one: over three-fourths of the patrons are less than 30 years old; one-third are less than 21. Married couples con-

stitute more than half of the total. As far as educational background is concerned, excluding the 42 per cent of the audience comprising university students and faculty, almost one-fifth of the audience consists of townspeople with some- or full-college education.

The first-run theater audience has the movie habit. More than one-third attend some theater at least twice a week, and another two-fifths attend once a week. Those who regularly attend the Rialto Theatre are also heavier consumers of movies than those who are casual patrons of this theater.

Advertisements in the local and university newspapers are the chief sources of information utilized by the patrons of this theater. Word-of-mouth publicity is considerably less significant.

The most important underlying reason for choosing a particular movie at this first-run theater is a liking for the stars appearing in it. Recommendations of friends and a preference for the type of picture are reasons which tied for second place. The winning of an Academy award is the fourth most-important reason for choosing a picture. Reviews by magazine and newspaper critics are of negligible importance in motivating the first-run audience. Possible evidence for other-directed character types may be found in the tendency of regular patrons to conform to the industry-policy emphasis on the star system, well-defined patterns for picture stories, and stereotypical advertising practices. More-reflective and self-conscious choice processes appear in the reasons given by the casual patrons, suggestive of either an inner-directed style, or possibly of an other-directed style operating in an academic-culture stratum.

The taste profile of the first-run theater audience is dominated by the preference for comedy mixed with music—with more than half of the audience selecting this type of program. Pictures grouped together as serious are mentioned only one fifth of the time; whereas, pictures in the action syndrome are named barely one sixth of the time as best liked. At the same time, the action-syndrome pictures are selected as most disliked by almost half the audience. Of specific classes, westerns are most disliked; whereas,

foreign films are mentioned as either desirable or undesirable scarcely at all. The pluralistic nature of first-run audience-taste profiles is perhaps best summarized in the fact that four of the five classes of pictures named as best liked also are named as among the five classes most disliked: western, musical, mystery, and serious drama. When confronted with the categorical question of how they feel about foreign pictures, the first-run patrons appear to like rather than dislike them, but by a narrow margin (43 as against 38 per cent). The gown group in the audience favors foreign pictures by a wide margin; whereas, the town group preponderantly dislikes them.

The individual pictures named as being most enjoyed in the past year are *The Greatest Show on Earth, High Noon,* and *Come Back Little Sheba.* Interestingly, no single picture is named by more than 10 per cent of the total audience, and altogether more than 120 pictures are named by the sample of 869 persons. The twenty most-often named pictures, when roughly classified by content fall into the following structure: nine in the serious syndrome, seven in the comedy syndrome, and four in the action syndrome. This hardly agrees with the audience's expressed usual preference for comedy fare, primarily.

By a wide margin, sports are the short subject best liked by the first-run audience. Cartoons rank as second best liked, followed by newsreels and comedies.

The taste profiles of major segments in the first-run audience appear more fuzzily than those for the art-house audience. In choosing a picture to attend, the regulars are more influenced by the identity of the stars appearing in the picture, by the type of picture, and by advertising than are the casuals. Their consciously verbalized preference is for pictures in the comedy syndrome to a greater degree than for the casuals. They also prefer pictures in the serious syndrome more than do the casuals. The profile seems to add up to one of predominantly middle-class taste, with other-directed behavior organized within the values fostered by the motion-picture industry—e.g., the star system, the formula picture, and persistent advertising.

The casual group is about evenly divided as between town and gown components, with sex composition roughly comparable to that of the respective universes. Casuals attend movies less often. They are less assimilated to the industry-value structure, preferring a picture more often than do the regulars simply because it seems to be the best in town, and has received good reviews, or for a variety of miscellaneous reasons. Their taste is less marked for comedy-syndrome pictures and more for foreign pictures than is true of the regular group. They also say they dislike action-syndrome pictures less than do regulars. When one examines the titles of pictures best liked in the preceding year, it appears that the casual group is more interested than the regulars in films of a more-subtle, urbane type, and less attracted by the more-conventional formula pictures. All told, however, while the profile has suggestions of an inner-directed behavior style organized within the framework of intellectual-class values, the image which appears is, if anything, more blurred than for the regular group. Certainly the casuals at the first-run theater are less homogeneous in movie tastes than the major portion of the art-house audience.

Japanese Film Periodicals

JOSEPH L. ANDERSON

JOSEPH L. ANDERSON has worked in American documentary and TV films as director, writer, editor, and technical director. His many articles on films have appeared in such American, British, French, Japanese, German, Korean, and Italian periodicals as *Films in Review,* Los Angeles *Times, Sight and Sound, Positif, Eiga Hyoron, Far East Film News,* and *Sin Heong Wha.*

THE MANY CINEMATIC SURPRISES that Japan has to offer are not confined to making pictures that win prizes at international film festivals. Nor are the surprises restricted to the equally fine films not seen outside the home islands or to the fact that Japan, with over 345 features produced in 1954, has one of the world's largest motion-picture industries.

Japan has an abundance of movie lovers of all kinds whose infatuations range from the aesthete's to the common film fan's. Their collective interest, in addition to making the domestic industry self-supporting, has produced a really amazing variety of film literature, which finds its primary expression in the publication of numerous magazines devoted to all levels of film taste. When viewed as part of the gigantic Japanese publishing world, however, these many motion-picture periodicals add only a small bit in making the Japanese language second to English in printing the greatest number of magazine titles of all kinds.

It is therefore almost impossible to keep track of the seemingly infinite number of magazines printed in Japan. Any survey of them will contain unavoidable omissions, a situation further complicated by the chaotic nature of the nation's publishing business. Magazines are constantly appearing, disappearing, and reappearing. There is no Audit Bureau of Circulation to collect basic data. Circulations are closely guarded figures. Advertising rates have their foundation more in faith and prestige-giving abilities.

Japan's film periodicals naturally follow the basic character-

istics of the country's other types of magazines. Most rely on bookstores and newsstands for the bulk of their sales, and these outlets in turn carry a tremendous selection. Mail subscriptions are available; but they offer no reduction in price, only the guarantee that a subscriber will receive each issue. Prices range from 30 to 180 yen (8 to 50 cents) per copy. Except for pictorial publications, Japanese magazines print their text on pulp and semipulp stock. However, for their more important photographs, they include glossy paper sections with letterpress half tones or incorporate several pages of gravure-process reproductions.

Any survey of Japanese motion-picture periodicals must be led by *Eiga Hyoron* (*The Film Crit* [sic]).[1] Not only is it the nucleus around which much of Japan's serious film journalism has grown, but it is also one of the oldest and best motion-picture magazines in any language. It was founded in 1926 by the pioneer film critic Hiroshige Terazaki, who devoted his entire life to building the magazine. Although its finances are still unstable, nearly every important critic and many top movie makers now contribute articles. With a circulation of over 10,000, this monthly has a more permeating influence in Japanese film circles than its foreign counterparts have in their respective environments.

Every month, *Eiga Hyoron* carries the complete script of a current picture, and occasionally two. Usually these are domestic scripts, but recently it printed translations of Brasetti's *Altri Tempi* and de Santis' *No Peace under the Olive Trees.* In each issue, the month's six or seven most important indigenous and imported films are extensively reviewed together with the month's most important book on films. In 1954, these book reviews included Quigley's *New Screen Techniques,* Seaton's *Eisenstein,*

[1] Many magazines have both Japanese and English names. When such is the case, I have listed the Japanese name in the usual italics and followed it with the English version enclosed in parenthesis and also printed in italics. (These alternate English names are not necessarily precise translations of the original.) If a magazine has only a Japanese name, the English that follows in parenthesis is my own translation. To indicate that it is such, it is not printed in italics. In still other instances, certain publications have only English names. When this occurs, the English name stands alone in italics. English names, whether they are the sole name or are used in conjunction with a Japanese name, are usually the only English words found in a magazine.

and Reisz's *Techniques of Film Editing*. The past year also saw an entire issue devoted to Italian films, a special section on French opinions of motion picture-television rivalry, new Japanese translations of Pudovkin and Eisenstein, an illustrated review of motion-picture advertising art, and a comprehensive study of American film musicals. Much space is given to exploring the works and lives of individual Japanese and foreign directors. It is too bad that the language barrier prevents wider dissemination of this publication. Non-Japanese cineasts should definitely be more familiar with it.

Scenario, published monthly by the Japanese Scenarists Association, is not so much a writing trade organ as it is a journal of criticism, aimed at the further development of Japanese film scripting. Each issue contains three or four scripts, occasionally including a few from pictures in production or still in the planning stage. Although a majority of established scenarists belong to the association, it is constantly on the look for new talent. The association, through *Scenario,* holds annual contests for both the best produced and unproduced scripts. In addition to scripts, the magazine carries articles on film writing as well as more general pieces. A monthly feature is a biographical sketch of either a Japanese or foreign film writer.

This magazine makes frequent use of a widespread Japanese journalistic institution "the discussion meeting," which is a printed transcription of an extended discussion among several authorities. This type of symposium is found in every kind of Japanese publication. The theory behind it is that persons do not always have time to write something special for publication but that they can spare a few hours to discuss their views with others. The result is seldom idle chatter because the participants come armed with notes on points they wish to make, and careful editing keeps remarks pertinent. Recent discussion meetings transcribed in *Scenario* had Japan's top writers discussing "Happy Endings," "The Scenarists of the Shochiku Motion Picture Company" (one of the top studios), and "Different Methods for Writing Scripts."

With a seldom met bimonthly production schedule and a circulation of a little over 3,500, the publishers of *Eiga Bunka* (Film Culture) hope to find their major audience among the members of Japan's many cinema study groups. The chief goal of the magazine is an elevation of the level of film criticism, and its main focus is on domestically produced pictures. It is published by an organization connected with Kyoto University, and thus is also interesting because it covers a different climate of opinion than that found in Tokyo. However, as one third of Japan's studios are located in Kyoto (Tokyo has the remainder), *Eiga Bunka* remains close to the industry. Even though it is under a collective editorship, it is largely the personal organ of Taihei Imamura whose article "Japanese Art and the Animated Cartoon" appeared in the Spring, 1953, issue of the *Quarterly*. Imamura is Japan's, perhaps the world's, most prolific writer on film subjects. Few motion-picture magazines in Japan appear without some piece by him. *Eiga Bunka* abounds not only with his articles but also with advertisements for the books on film which he turns out at the rate of one or two a year.

In addition to occasionally attracting top names in the industry, among the more interesting features of the monthly *Eiga Geijutsu* (Film Art) are its perceptive reviews written by lay readers. Since its recent resumption of publication—it ran into financial difficulties—*Eiga Geijutsu* has given special emphasis to iconographic studies of the works of various directors. Wyler, Hitchcock, and Cluzot have been the most important so far. However, the editors of this magazine, like many other Japanese critics, sometimes reveal curious aesthetic standards. For instance, *Eiga Geijutsu* has published articles by name writers who have considered Pascal's *Androcles and the Lion* and the Elizabeth Taylor-Victorio Gassman opus *Rhapsody* significant motion-picture achievements.

Kinema Jumpo (*Motion Picture Times*) is a curious hybrid. It not only possesses characteristics of both aesthetic and better fan magazines but also carries trade news and articles on educational

and documentary films. First printed in 1919, it is Japan's oldest active motion-picture periodical. Throughout its rugged history, it has ceased publication several times; during World War II, it was out of business for the duration. Now a biweekly on solid ground, it has just passed its 925th issue.

Its usual 140 to 180 octavo pages also makes *Kinema Jumpo,* the country's most copy-laden film magazine. And, as if this were not enough, it publishes occasional book-size supplements. In 1955, these have already included a large *Who's Who in the Japanese Motion Picture Industry* and an illustrated *Encyclopedia of the Italian Cinema.*

This magazine's regular features include correspondence columns from Hollywood and other production centers, credits and essential data on all films in production and on release, current reviews, film business surveys, and a script or two from recent pictures. Under its scholarly department, it recently carried a full-length, almost definitive study of Elia Kazan.

The monthly *Nihon Eiga* (Japanese Films), which went out of business last year, was a magazine with many faces. Sometimes it appeared as a publication with critical standards of real depth. More often, it seemed to aim only at politically angled stuff of any kind, including saccharine star-personality pieces written from a Marxist point of view. Insight into one reason for its various editorial gyrations can be gained by noting that it was the outgrowth of another defunct publication, *Sobieto Eiga* (Soviet Films). Although primarily an organ of the few extreme left wing groups, it made important contributions through many excellent, straight studies of film acting. Japan's cinema has many fine actors; and they show little hesitation, ignoring both time and place, when offered a chance to explain their techniques and acting philosophies.

Much more to the left was *Chosen Eiga* (Korean Films), published by a front organization, the Korean Motion Picture People's Group Resident in Japan. Although the magazine's format indicated that it was to be a regular periodical, it turned out

to be a one-shot affair, apparently designed for the sole purpose of publicizing the release in Japan of the North Korean film *Defenders of the Fatherland.* Entirely written in Japanese, its contents were restricted to the activities of the North Korea People's Democratic Republic National Motion Picture Studio.

Other publications in the aesthetic field include several edited by local film societies for national circulation. Two of the more important are *Cine Arts,* sponsored by the Motion Picture Department and Film Society of Yamaguchi University, and *Eiga* (Motion Pictures) backed by the Modern Film Art Association of Tokyo. These, however, seldom exceed three-dozen pages and appear only on a now-and-then basis.

Published film scripts are hard to come by in English-speaking countries, but in Japan they are numerous. More than 120 different scripts appear in public print every year, most making their appearance in periodicals rather than books. Printed versions of Japanese film scripts are usually taken from manuscripts, but very few translations of foreign works are made from copies which come directly from their authors' typewriters. With few exceptions, translations are either based on the postproduction scripts that accompany imported films (to aid subtitle writers) or are obtained by lifting everything, foot by foot, from a moviola study of a print of the finished product.

In addition to magazines which carry scripts as merely one section of their over-all contents, there are periodicals which confine each of their issues entirely to one film, printing its script and assorted articles on the production itself. Of these publications, *The Motion Picture Library* was, until recently, the most important. Now defunct, its back issues contain *The Treasure of Sierra Madre, The Philadelphia Story, Jane Eyre,* and *Miracle on 34th Street.* In order to give a full idea of a film's contents, the dialogue in its original language was carried side-by-side with the fully translated script. Each issue of the *Library* was prefaced with an essay on the completed production together with a critical evaluation of the film's director and his work.

The Motion Picture Library has now been superseded by *Eiwa Taiyaku Scenario Series* (English-Japanese Parallel Text Scenario Series). Similar in format to its dead rival, the latter shows greater interest in English-language teaching than in motion pictures. The scripts in *Eiwa Taiyaku* are published with the slogans: "Living English from the Movies! Examination Passing English from the Movies!" In business for the past three years, among its 50 titles are *The Tales of Hoffman, Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs, The Naked City, Gone with the Wind, The Quiet Man, Europe 1951, The Third Man, Roman Holiday,* and the recent *A Star Is Born.* Each issue is accompanied by brief notes on the film, but many more pages are filled with pedantic English lessons.

Although critical magazines play a relatively larger role in Japan's film world than in America's, its fan magazines are nowhere near as predominant. Theirs contain such expected items as candid shots of stars, studio gossip, and personality pieces; but they never step beyond the bounds of good taste or pry into anyone's private life. Even more important, although they are aimed at persons who lack a serious interest in the cinema, they do not cater to that moron level to which American fan magazines appeal.

Japanese fan publications often contain film reviews of considerable critical interest. Some, instead of inviting fan letters, print reviews of films which their readers send in. All display production stills prominently, including numerous ones taken inside Hollywood studios but never made public on the American side of the Pacific. Among their more frequent and significant articles are those with "how it is done" angles which show, for instance, how a few words of the script require complicated preparations before the shot is finally viewed in a theater. Their interest in personalities extends beyond actors to include directors, writers, and technicians. Interestingly enough, the better quality fan publications sell the most copies, even though the circulation of the largest does not exceed 140,000. Because fan magazines usually confine their coverage to either domestic or foreign fields,

a company often prints two publications, one concerned with Japanese pictures whereas the other, billed as its "sister magazine," is focused on American and European films.

The monthly *Screen* is the top publication among those interested in foreign films, and it is held in fairly high regard even by professional critics. Although *Screen* leaves much American material to be covered by others, it offers especially wide pictorial spreads on Europeans films. Foremost among its written material is a section occupied by a comprehensive study of a current outstanding picture.

Kindai Eiga (*Modern Movies*) is the sister publication of *Screen,* and therefore is interested in Japanese films. Its most prominent characteristics are the monthly sections it prints on some particular phase of indigenous production such as "Film Musicals," "Shooting on Location," and "Preparation for Acting Careers."

In competition with *Kindai Eiga* for top position among domestically oriented publications is the monthly *Eiga Fan* (Movie Fan). This magazine carries frequent discussion meetings with leading actors, directors, and scenarists as well as film histories of a quality that rivals work appearing in the aesthetic journals.

Eiga no Tomo (*Friend of Movies*), a monthly founded in 1931, differs from its rival *Screen* by primarily focusing on American pictures. It is a sister publication of *Eiga Fan.* The more serious articles in *Eiga no Tomo* have included "The World of Screen Writers" revealing the specific problems faced by scenarists as opposed to those writing in other media; "The CinemaScope Story" explaining in detail how the new process has changed production techniques (Japan has a rapidly increasing number of CinemaScope-equipped theaters); "Hitchcock Makes a 3-D Film" telling of the director's experiences with *Dial M for Murder;* and "Dubbing the Japanese Version of Disney's *Dumbo.*" Another outstanding feature, now past its 50th installment, is "Best Film Flashbacks" which each month presents a full résumé and critique of American and European cinematic landmarks.

Other fan magazines, of lesser circulation and greater perversity, are closer to the American conception of fan publications. In this category are found *Star Story, Star,* and *Eiga Story* (Movie Story).

Since June of last year, *Shukan Eiga* (Weekly Movies) has attempted to find a market for a small, combination domestic-foreign film-fan weekly. As part of a recent attempt to widen its audience in two directions, it now incorporates a small amount of trade news together with articles on other kinds of entertainment.

With a circulation of 8,000, Japan's leading trade journal, *Eiga Jiho* (*Cinema Times*), occupies a place somewhat similar to that held by the *Motion Picture Herald* in the United States. Although it made its first appearance only three years ago, this monthly has rapidly become the voice of the business end of the industry. In addition to such usual trade items as a week-by-week tabulation of grosses at the nation's top 300 theaters (there are over 3,950), a guide to new films, listings of release dates and circuit bookings, and capsule reviews predicting the box-office prospects of new features, *Eiga Jiho* contains many articles of wider interest. In it, films are frequently reviewed not only for their commercial prospects but also with a discerning critical eye. During 1954, a few of its more prominent pieces were a discussion meeting on the troubles of movie salesmen, full reportage of the first Southeast Asian Film Festival, and a survey of the problems of foreign film importation.

Competing with *Eiga Jiho* for the trade-news market is *Kogyokai* (Performance), an older publication but one which, due to poorer editing, now offers little rivalry. Generally, however, its attempted coverage and format are similar to that of *Eiga Jiho.*

The only periodical in this survey which is not printed in Japanese is *Far East Film News,* an American-edited English-language trade weekly which is similar in quality and jargon to its stateside counterparts. Interlaced with its principal concentration on American film distribution in Asia are many production items from the various national film industries found throughout the

Orient. Much of its space is given to weekly listings of key-theater grosses in the major cities of Asia.

The technical aspects of Japanese production are covered by *Eiga Gijutsu* (*Motion Picture Engineering*), a monthly backed by the Motion Picture Engineering Society of Japan. First published in 1947, *Eiga Gijutsu* contains quite a bit of information despite its small size. Some of its regular features are reports on new developments in production equipment and techniques, a personal column called "Working in the Studios," technical criticisms of newly released Japanese pictures, official listings of film credits, and many snapshots of units at work. It carries a table of contents in English. Recently this magazine printed a very detailed survey of standards for television films and translations of Dr. Henri Chretien's articles on CinemaScope. The latter have become required reading in technician circles following announcements by several studios that they are about to launch CinemaScope productions.

Eisha (*The Projectionist's Magazine*) is a monthly published by the All Japan Projectionists League with the aid of the Japan Projection Equipment Association. It contains such particulars as details of new projection equipment (including 16-mm.), charts of the total footage of all new releases, and detailed reports on every theater fire in Japan. Most of the magazine, however, is filled with reports of the various regional activities of the Projectionists League which, despite its name, is in reality an organization of theater managers. In the Japanese publishing world, *Eisha* occupies a somewhat enviable position in that half of its pages are filled with advertising. Most of Japan's magazines are lucky if they sell 10 per cent of their space.

Coverage of nontheatrical activity falls principally on *Shichokaku Kyoiku* (*Audio Visual Education*). This 8,000 circulation monthly, sponsored by the Japanese Film Education Association, covers the news of Japan's large 16-mm. industry (several major theatrical motion-picture companies have impressive educational and documentary branches). It publishes scenarios of top edu-

cational pictures and listings of the extensive school-oriented radio programs broadcast over national networks. *Shichokaku Kyoiku* is, of course, interested in all kinds of audio-visual media—educational motion pictures, 16-mm. prints of 35-mm. theatrical films, slides, radio, television, phonograph records, and kamishibai. The last, which literally means paper play, is a modern audio-visual medium based on a long established Japanese custom. For hundreds of years, itinerant candy sellers have been peddling cheap sweets and simple entertainment to small children. After the candy is sold, the children gather around and the kamishibai man recites fairy tales or adventure stories, furnishing his own crude sound effects. As his narrative proceeds, he shows drawings which illustrate the high points. Educational kamishibai substitutes more appropriate subject matter and eliminates the candy.

Shikaku Kyoiku Shiryo (Visual Education Materials) was recently initiated by the Japan Film Education Institute to vie with *Shichokaku Kyoiku*. As yet, it is much smaller than the older publication both in size and circulation. Its scope is somewhat more restricted also; for, as its name suggests, it is interested solely in visual media. The only issue that I was able to see was primarily devoted to that univeral problem among educators, the effect of theatrical motion pictures upon school children.

Bunka Eiga (Cultural Films) was another new monthly in the 16-mm. field, having made its first and last appearance during the past year. It died during the financial plague that hit the Japanese publishing world in the summer of 1954. *Bunka Eiga* differed from the two preceding magazines in that it was not too interested in movies for school use. Most of its articles were addressed to film users in commerce, industry, and television; but evidently not enough were sufficiently interested to support a magazine of such narrow specialization.

Eiga Shimpo (Film News), on the other hand, is concerned largely with the production side of 16-mm. Despite its restricted size and irregular publication schedule, this magazine offers wide coverage of national as well as foreign 16-mm. activities.

In addition to all of the aforementioned regular periodicals, there are other publications of miscellaneous description about motion pictures. For instance, at a cost ranging from four to ten cents, printed programs can be purchased at almost every theater. These programs are frequently a worth-while guide to a picture for they offer complete cast and staff credits, background information on the film, a synopsis, and a fairly thorough but necessarily favorable review.

To aid in the publicizing of their products, distributors of both domestic and foreign films often publish their own fan magazines which they sell or give away. As is to be expected, their material is confined to the company's interests; and their pages are filled entirely with ephemeral matter.

Besides magazines which specialize in motion pictures, there are a number, particularly pictorial publications, which encompass the entertainment arts in general. Outstanding among these is the quarterly *Eiga to Engei* (Motion Pictures and the Performing Arts) which is published by the magazine division of *Asahi Shimbun,* Japan's largest newspaper. As such, it reflects the persistently high editorial quality of all *Asahi* publications. Back copies of *Eiga to Engei* make a very valuable illustrated encyclopedia of Japanese theatrical arts.

Of the pictorials aimed at a lower intellectual level, *Geino Gaho* (*Entertainment Picture News*) is currently the most successful. Foreign and Japanese film items take up most of its pages; but it also covers musical reviews, stage drama, girls' operetta, radio, television, and music. This three-year-old monthly maintains unusually high standards of reproduction; some of its color plates are quite remarkable. Unfortunately, this technical excellence is not matched by the quality of its contents.

The weekly *Asahi Geino Shimbun* (Asahi Entertainment Newspaper)—despite its name, it has no relation to *Asahi Shimbun*—once held the popular heights now occupied by *Geino Gaho.* Although aimed principally at a fan audience, some of its articles are tinged with trade news. It is no longer as well printed or as

fat as its rivals; but nevertheless, it offers the most complete horizontal coverage of the entertainment field. On its pages can be found news of films, modern drama, classical theater (Kabuki and Nō), girls' operetta, puppet plays, music (all varieties), records, dance (traditional and Western), vaudeville, burlesque, radio, television, and sports.

Other pictorials are *Gaho Kindai Eiga* (Illustrated Modern Movies), *Eiga Joho* (Movie Report), *Sande Eiga* (Sunday movies), and *Sekai Geino Gaho* (World Entertainment Picture News). The first three, their seemingly restrictive names notwithstanding, are focused on the entertainment arts in general. The formats of all four are similar to those described above.

Of course, interest in films is not confined only to those publications that come within the scope of this survey. In Japanese magazines of every kind, from the intellectual-political journals down to those published for first-grade school children, one can find something about films. Particularly obsessed are the so-called "mass circulation" magazines. The best selling *Heibon* (Mediocrity), with the peak circulation of over 1,500,000, gives one third of its space to the entertainment arts; and on those pages, the doings of the film world and its inhabitants predominate.

No doubt one must look far to find a comparable aggregate of film periodical literature. As Japanese authors write 98 per cent of all material appearing in these publications, it is even more important to note that Japan's motion-picture criticism and scholarship can readily compare in quality to the country's best film productions. On the other hand, if there is one ubiquitous weakness in their writing on the cinema, it is the lack of adequate research facilities and the resultant overdependence on secondary sources. This is particularly noticeable in writing on foreign films. In a way, this fault is partially compensated for by writers who look closely at the pictures that come their way and pull their information from what they see and hear on the screen rather than what they read on the outside. With the recent establishment of a national organization which is going to collect cinema

source material both on film and on paper somewhat along the lines of the Museum of Modern Art's Film Library, writers will be able to build their works on firmer ground. Most likely we have not heard the last of any of Japan's motion-picture activities.

A Bibliography for the Quarter

Book Editor, FRANKLIN FEARING

In the Foreword to *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication* (University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1954, $6.00), Editor Wilbur Schramm states that the volume originated in the United States Information Agency's need for a book of "background materials which could be used in training some of the agency's new employees in the field of research and evaluation." Parenthetically, it may be noted that, if current critics are to be believed, the USIA was and is sadly in need of such background. Nevertheless, it is refreshing to discover that the results of studies in one of the liveliest fields of research in current social science are seen as relevant to the problems of international communication. But, as Mr. Schramm notes, the problems of international communication are not essentially different from those of any other kind. We must, he says, understand how meaning is transferred, how opinion and attitudes are shaped, and how all of this is related to the individual in his particular social and cultural milieu. In *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication,* he has assembled and reprinted a large number of articles which had appeared in a variety of social-science journals and books dealing with diverse phases of mass communications. The authors—a representative group of researchers in this field—include such names as Bernard Berelson, Paul Lazarsfeld, Hadley Cantril, Robert Merton, and Harold Lasswell. It is inevitable that they should express widely divergent theoretical points of view, use different terminologies, and have originally written for a variety of audiences.

For a collection of this type to be useful, several requirements must be met. In the first place, the contributions must be arranged in some sort of meaningful and coherent design. There must be some sort of verbal cement supplied by the author to hold the parts together. And it is desirable that a general conceptual frame-

work or theory be provided within which the articles may be understood. In regard to the first requirement, Mr. Schramm has provided a pattern which greatly enhances the value of the papers. They are grouped under the following headings: The Process of Communication, The Primary Effect—Attention, The Effects of Different Channels, Getting the Meaning Understood, Modifying Attitudes and Opinions, Effects in Terms of Groups, and Special Problems of Achieving an Effect with International Communication. To meet the second requirement, the editor has given each section a brief introduction in which he has endeavored to show the relation of the articles to each other, and their bearing on the major theme of the book. He has not been too successful in this; but it is difficult to reconcile such basically different, but not necessarily antagonistic, theoretical orientations as those of Krech and Crutchfield and, say, Doob or Hovland. For a general theoretical framework, Mr. Schramm has included his own "How Communication Works" as the introductory article. Here is given a clear and concise statement of the so-called "information theory" of communication. This is essentially an engineering approach; and, although fruitful for certain communication problems, this reviewer does not find it particularly useful for the problems with which most of the articles in the present volume are concerned.

Probably no two persons would completely agree as to what should be included in a collection such as this. Somewhat to his surprise, this reviewer finds himself in agreement with most of Mr. Schramm's selections, especially the articles in the section on getting the meaning understood. Even here, however, it seems odd that some of the current material on ethnolinguistics or psycholinguistics has not been included. Such material would have been particularly relevant to the subheading "Communication to Another Culture."

All in all, *The Process and Effect of Mass Communication* is an excellent collection, and is recommended to the reader who wants to know how specialists talk about and conduct research on mass

communications. It should also be valuable as a textbook for courses in communication and propaganda. An excellent bibliography of 100 titles is included.

* * *

Language Meaning and Maturity (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1954, $4.00) is also a collection of articles which have appeared elsewhere, but they cover a much narrower range than those in the previous volume. Editor S. I. Hayakawa is also editor of *ETC,* the quarterly journal of general semantics, and author of the well-known *Language in Thought and Action.* Most of the articles in the present volume appeared originally in *ETC.* The collection is extraordinarily interesting both in subject matter and authors. Anatol Rapaport (Associate Editor of *ETC*), Irving Lee, Carl Rogers, F. R. Roethlieberger, Alfred Korzybski, Wendell Johnson, Felix Cohen, Benjamin Whorf, Charles Morris, and Gregory Bateson are some of the contributors. Section headings indicate the range of topics covered: Problems of Communication, Problems of Education, The Semantic Environment, The Relation of Language and Thought, and Insights and Exploration. Integrating the material in this volume is a comparatively simple task—the articles are all concerned with the role of language and other symbols in human communication and behavior. This field has come to be called General Semantics, and over it the impressive shadow of the late Alfred Korzybski looms large. As Hayakawa notes in the Foreword, the examination of language, the reactions to language, and the assumptions underlying language have become major interests to specialists in a variety of fields in the present century. That the significance of these studies has occasionally been somewhat obscured by the label "general semantics" with its somewhat cultish overtones should not blind us to their basic importance. *Language Meaning and Maturity* is a representative collection of articles in this field, and will be of interest to anyone concerned with language as a medium of communication.

Speaking of language, this is the place to give somewhat belated attention to John B. Carroll's important and informative *The Study of Language* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1953, $4.75). This book deals in a reasonably untechnical manner with a subject that bears the formidable technical label "psycholinguistics." Broadly (and oversimply) defined, this subject is concerned with all the relations between language, thought, expression, and behavior—which means, of course, that it is concerned with human communication. Numerous disciplines contribute to it, especially Social Psychology, Social Anthropology, Linguistics, and Sociology. Among the more lively problems which currently concern investigators in this field are those which stem from a series of papers published more than ten years ago by Benjamin Whorf. On the basis of his studies of certain Indian languages, he has proposed the thesis that language, rather than merely expressing ideas, not only actually shapes them but determines how the individual experiences his world. If this thesis is established, it may, as Carroll notes, turn out to be a sort of Copernican revolution not only in the field of language study but in the whole field of the study of human society. Professor Carroll's little book is in the nature of a survey of the history, scope, problems, and present state of language study and communication. The author is a psychologist in the Department of Education of Harvard University.

* * *

In the Introduction to *Know Your Reader* (Hermitage House, New York, 1954, $2.95), the authors George R. Klare and Byron Buck make it clear that reading their book won't make anyone a writer. For that it is necessary to possess a "monk's self-discipline, a messiah's ability to accept criticism, a masochist's love of drudgery—and a little talent." But they do believe that their book will help the professional writer to communicate more effectively by providing him with the results of recent studies on readability and reader interests. They especially try to show the writer how to apply to his own product the various yardsticks (developed by

Rudolph Flesch and others) for measuring meaning to readers with varying levels of intellectual equipment. How well they have succeeded remains to be reported by the professionals who use the book. The style is simple and direct, the suggestions concrete and specific, and the intent is clearly to be practically helpful without condescension. There is a useful bibliography of 194 titles. This is the sixth volume in the Professional Writers Library, established in 1951 and edited by Gorham Munson.

* * *

Television Program Production by Carroll O'Meara (Ronald Press, New York, 1955, $5.00) is designed as a comprehensive manual "for those planning a career in the program side of the industry and as a reference work for those already active in the field." If the chapter headings fulfill their promise, "comprehensive" is the word. There are chapters on station personnel, studio equipment, operation of TV cameras, use of music, lighting, special props, make-up, script requirements, production of various types of programs, recording, kinescope and tape, writing commercials, censorship, and, of course, the inevitable glossary of terms. The author was former producer-director for the N.B.C.-TV in Hollywood and New York.

* * *

We have before us another spate of dictionaries, all published this year by the Philosophical Library, 15 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y. The *Concise Dictionary of Ancient History* ($6.00) begins with Aahhotep, "name of two Egyptian queens," and ends with Zygantes, "a people of Libya." The period covered is from the beginning of recorded history to the fall of Rome. The *Dictionary of American Proverbs* ($6.00) is edited by David Kin with a Preface by Mark Van Doren. The *Concise Dictionary of American Grammar and Usage* ($4.50) is edited by Robert C. Whitford, Professor of English at Pratt Institute, and James R. Foster, Professor of English at Long Island University. It lists and defines words which may require clarification because they are commonly misused, have several meanings, are new, or are used on different

cultural levels. In addition to definitions, pronunciations and levels of use are given. In the same alphabetical listing are the basic elements of grammar and rhetoric. The *Dictionary of Last Words* ($5.00) is compiled by Edward S. Le Comte. These exit lines are alphabetized by the names of the speakers.

* * *

We have received three listings of audio-visual materials that are distributed free to educational institutions. All are paper bound and published by the Educators Progress Service, Randolph, Wisconsin. *Educators Guide to Free Tapes, Scripts and Transcriptions* (First edition, 1955, $4.75) is compiled and edited by Walter A. Wittich, Director, Bureau of Audio-Visual Instruction, University of Wisconsin, and Gertie L. Hanson, formerly Director Radio Workshop, Wisconsin State College. It lists 375 tapes, 88 scripts, and 29 transcriptions. In addition to the title, the *Guide* describes the content of each tape or transcription, gives its running time, date of release, name of distributor, conditions of loan, and offers suggestions regarding its use. The items are indexed by subject, by title, and by source. *Educators Guide to Free Films* (14th annual edition, 1954, $6.00) is compiled by John W. Diffor, Visual-Education Director, Public Schools, Randolph, Wisconsin, Mary Foley Horkheimer, and John Guy Fowlkes, Dean, School of Education, University of Wisconsin. Information on each entry includes length of film, date of release, terms of loan, probable availability, and address of the distributor. This is a 566-page volume listing 2,982 titles. There are title, subject, and source indices. *Educators Guide to Free Slide Films* (6th edition, 1954, $5.00) is compiled by Mary F. Horkheimer and John W. Diffor. Seven hundred and eight titles are listed with information regarding content, number of frames, running time, and conditions of loan. There are subject, title, and source indices.