THE

QUARTERLY

of Film

Radio and

Television

Contents

Irving Pichel (1891-1954) —

"Wonderful to have had you with us."

At various times during the past quarter century, Irving Pichel gave courses at the University of California while he was busy with work in community theaters or in the motion-picture studios. The last year of his life saw him a full-time faculty member—a happy culmination to a varied life of thoughtful and vital creation. In his last weeks, between spring and autumn terms, he returned to one of his past interests, and directed a film—*Day of Triumph,* dealing with the life of Christ.

Yet full as he made that last year, it could reflect only a part of the activity in the theater arts that had been his whole life since he was a young man. The editors of the *Quarterly* thought it well to ask a few of his friends and fellow workers to put down some comments, long or short, on various periods and various aspects of Irving Pichel's career. Thus, there follow in these pages words from Gilbert Seldes, who reaches back to high-school and Harvard days; from Samuel J. Hume, who carries the story from Professor George Pierce Baker's 47 Workshop through Irving's many years of work in the community and university theater; from Gilmor Brown, Everett Glass, and Nina Moise, who were associated with Irving in theaters where he directed and acted; from Dudley Nichols, who wrote the scripts of certain films that Irving directed; from Paul Muni, who starred in one film *Hudson's Bay;* from Joseph von Sternberg, who directed Irving in his first outstanding part, the prosecuting attorney in the initial filming of Dreiser's *An American Tragedy;* from President Robert Gordon Sproul, who knew Irving in lighter as well as more serious hours of his days in Berkeley; and from Professor Ralph Freud, who knew him in the theater as well as on the faculty of the Theater Arts Department at the University of California, Los Angeles. I will add only three comments to what these people have to say of Irving's broad life.

The first has to do with some of those accidents of fortune that often affect the future of many people. When I was a senior at Harvard in 1910, I met freshman Pichel. His lively mind and happy vitality made me visit him often after I had moved across the Charles River to work in the drama department of the Boston *Transcript.* On one of these visits, I found Irving burning with enthusiasm for Molnar's *Liliom,* which he had read in a German translation. I, too, burned—over what he told me. Some ten years later when Joseph Schildkraut wanted to act for the New York Theatre Guild, I remembered how Irving had talked about the beauties of *Liliom,* which Schildkraut knew well; and I managed to introduce the actor and the play to the directors of the Guild. It was Irving, therefore, through the good graces of fortune, who started a play and an actor on long years of success. It was luck—and again through Irving—that brought me to a Hollywood studio and ultimately to UCLA; he happened to walk into the office of David Selznick at RKO when the latter was desperately looking for what passes as executive talent in Hollywood; within ten days I was on my way to Hollywood. Incidentally, the happenstance that Selznick's wife-to-be had, some years before, sat under Irving in a summer course at UCLA brought Irving to Paramount when Selznick was active there.

Another facet of Irving's career has escaped the attention of the writers in

these pages. This was Irving's interest and success in religious films. During a period when he was—as theatrical folk put it—"between engagements," he made, on a very modest budget, *The Great Commandment,* a film dealing with Christ and the zealots. The remarkable qualities of this picture—in which Irving gave to the speeches of Jesus the finest off-screen voice in all Hollywood—led to the purchase of the film by Darryl Zanuck of Twentieth Century–Fox. Irving was to remake the picture on a larger scale. As producer, I saw the sets and the cast ready for shooting when word came in 1940 of the fall of France, along with serious threats to foreign distribution of costly films. Inevitable retrenchment ended the career of *The Great Commandment.* It did not end, however, the career of Irving Pichel. At Twentieth Century–Fox, he directed a number of films, of which *The Pied Piper,* a tender and amusing, exciting and significant picture of children in war, remains for millions a happy memory.

Finally, I want to recall a fact ignored in most comments on Irving's death. This was his distinction as a writer. As early as 1926, he gave a clear and most useful analysis of playhouse architecture in his book *Modern Theatres.* He wrote often and brilliantly for this *Quarterly* on many aspects of the screen. In the last few years, with all too little time on his hands, he was bringing his wisdom to a book on the working ways of the director. He wrote not nearly enough, and especially in the creative field of playwriting. There, however, he left us one finely imaginative work. Again, he dealt with a religious topic when he wrote, as well as directed, *St. Francis of Assisi* for the Bohemian Club of San Francisco.

All in all, Irving lived a wide and vivid and creative life; and he gave richly and generously to the theater, the screen, and—perhaps most of all—to those who had the good fortune to know him.   KENNETH MACGOWAN

Irving and I met in our sophomore year at the Bedford High School in Pittsburgh. I had been in the city only one year, and my recollection is that Irving was the only friend whose family I met. His father, head of the composing room of the *Gazette,* was a sardonic, amused person whom Irving resembled physically and admired; his mother, one of the kindest people I've ever met, also had firmness of character and a good mind; and his younger sister was handsome and gay and intelligent—qualities I saw in her again the last time we met, which was many years ago.

Our meeting was in 1907. For some reason we both started to learn the whole of *The Merchant of Venice* by heart—we did get most of the first act down before the year was out. The next year, I moved, and Irving and I wrote to one another steadily, and each confirmed the other's resolution to go to Harvard, where we did go and were roommates for the first, second, and fourth years— my brother roomed with me the intervening year. Irving made

friends much faster than I did, and half of the people I knew and liked at college I got to know through him. We took the celebrated "Copey's" writing course together, and both of us infuriated that rather inferior teacher by exercising the option to quit at the end of the first half.

Two events connected with Irving's professional career I recall vividly, though not perhaps accurately enough. In one I had a small part: I suggested to Robert Edmond Jones that a production of *Salome,* following the Beardsley drawings, could be done in a reasonably large college study—and this was done, with Irving playing Herod, I think. In 1913–14, Irving worked with John Craig's Castle Square stock company and played Laertes in *Hamlet.* I recall thinking how superior Irving was vocally—and, it seems to me, in the complex of elements we call presentation.

I lived at the Pichel's house for a few weeks in 1914 while I was on the Pittsburgh *Sun*—I can't recall what Irving was up to at the time. In the last year of the war, returning from Europe, on a beach in Connecticut, I saw Irving and the lovely girl he had just married.

And then he vanished westward. I find it hard to believe, but more than thirty years passed before I saw much of him again. We began where we had left off, as far as instant communication with one another is concerned. I worked briefly at Paramount while he was directing a picture about the OSS (perhaps that was the title). My house, overlooking Los Feliz was on his way, so he drove me to the studio, and I watched him work for about an hour each day—always charmed by his sureness of touch and his gentle pressure to get things done right. After some eighteen months, I returned to the East; and we met when he was producing something in New York or I revisited the West Coast. My daughter, in the theater herself, was enchanted by Irving, as her mother had been; and so was my son.

The last time I heard from Irving was when he wrote me at the beginning of this year, on the death of my wife.

I have put down these details because I suspect that no one else has known Irving so long. These are not the important things he did, but they were things he did with his own physical grace, his agility of body and mind, his huge appreciative spirit—he enjoyed the strangeness of people, the way they talked and moved; he laughed a lot, and some of his heartiest laughter was at himself. I think of his laughter and of his long and expressive hands, gesticulating, and of his eyes lighting up his long handsome face. He was a lovely man to have known.   GILBERT SELDES

I first met "Pich," which is what I always called him, in the autumn of 1912. I had just gone to Harvard as a senior and had the lead in the Harvard Dramatic Club's production of David Carb's prize play *A Friend of the People*. Pich had a small part and appeared in several crowd scenes. I remember him as a tall, rather gangling boy with a shock of black hair and large intelligent dark eyes, an easy smile, and a friendly personality. Early in 1913, the program of Baker's 47 Workshop was launched. I was one of the original group and for the next two years saw a good deal of Pich who acted in a number of the shows under Baker's direction. In the winter of 1914, I think it was, Aline Barnsdall launched what was to be America's great "art theater" and collected in Los Angeles a heterogenous group of actors, decorators, and playwrights to launch the great experiment. She invited me to join them. I was suspicious of the project; besides, I had other engagements. I recommended Pich to her, and she took him, and he went to Los Angeles which was his first trip West. There, he met Violet Wilson and later married her. The Barnsdall group fought like cats and dogs and soon disintegrated.

In the winter of 1915, I was invited to St. Paul to produce a municipal Christmas celebration in the auditorium. I engaged Pich to assist me; and we made quite a show, using the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra and the large Swedish Choral So-

cieties. In the early autumn of 1916, I produced the dedicatory masque (if you can call it that) for the opening of George Booth's beautiful little Greek Theatre at Cranbrook, Michigan, where the important art school is now located. This very beautiful show had been written by Sidney Howard. I took Pich with me to Detroit and Cranbrook to assist in the direction and to play the leading role in the show. Here for the first time, I really had a chance to get to know Pich. We were all camped out on the beautiful estate of George Booth quite close to the theater where we rehearsed during the day and at night by moonlight, swimming in the pool which formed a part of the theater whenever the spirit moved us. Thomas Wood Stevens, with whom I had worked that summer on the Newark Pageant, came out and camped with us as did Billy Merrill, winner of the first McDowell prize play—the first play produced in the 47 Workshop. Living so intimately for a matter of weeks, I got to know Pich. He was a delightful enthusiast, full of ideas, and an easy and convincing talker in support of his ideas and theories. He seemed to me to be strikingly extroverted and made friends easily, assets which were very valuable to me in an assistant.

During the next few years, I did not see much of Pich though we kept in touch by occasional letters. I know that he was, for a time, directing in Detroit and St. Louis, as well as in Santa Barbara at the Lobero Theatre, which was later reconstructed as a result of the show we did there in 1920.

In 1918, I was called to the University of California as a member of the faculty and director of the Greek Theatre. In the spring of 1920, I accepted an invitation from Santa Barbara to produce a pageant and masque called *Primavera,* written by Wallace Rice and designed with no other purpose than to celebrate the beauty of Santa Barbara. The whole thing was a terrific mess when I arrived, and I realized that I must have help. I knew that Pich was working for the Shuberts and was very unhappy with it all. I wired him an offer, and he accepted at once, and came on to

Santa Barbara immediately. We had a lot of people participating in the show—supers, small bits, dance groups, etc. Pich got on well with these people. They liked him, and he could organize, get them into line, and keep them there. He was not given to displays of temperament or temper which is important when working with volunteers. I recall very few times when he did display anger, and then I know I had a feeling he was not as angry as he appeared to be. This pageant was a success with the local audience as all such pageants always are, though Rice's book was pretty God-awful. Later that summer, we did Sidney Howard's Cranbrook masque under a different title in a beautiful setting. During this time in Santa Barbara, we all lived together in an old hotel so that Pich and I were very close during the entire time. At the end of the summer, we returned to Berkeley and did the Howard masque in the Greek Theatre. Pich played the principal role as he had in Detroit and Santa Barbara. He had a very rich and beautiful voice which always attracted comment; and, being highly intelligent, he always delivered lines intelligently. He understood character, and he understood and had strong feeling for theater. He was at his best in certain character parts which he played quite naturally, though he preferred romantic leads.

In the autumn of 1920, I launched the first of the large productions in the Greek Theatre. We did *Henry IV, Parts 1 and 2* and *The Merry Wives,* which was the first time the Falstaff trilogy had been presented consecutively in America. I invited Pich to stay and assist me. This began his association with the Greek Theatre and with Berkeley.

In the late autumn of 1920, we began to produce plays in Wheeler Hall at the University of California, Berkeley. Pich had entire charge of the direction of these plays, as well as of those in the Greek Theatre which we produced every spring and autumn. This arrangement continued until 1924 when I resigned from the University; and the period was a very happy one, crowded with activity of all kinds.

In 1921, I was invited to produce a repertory season in conjunction with the Detroit Symphony Orchestra in their new and very magnificent theater. I took Pich and Gilmor Brown with me to assist in the direction—and, in the case of Gilmor, to play certain parts, such as Bottom in *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* which is the best thing he did in my opinion. As soon as we opened in Detroit, Pich returned to Berkeley to prepare our autumn season there while I remained in Detroit for the season of six weeks. Pichel was good to work with because he never got nervous as a crisis approached and never got panicky. This was most valuable since in many cases we were working with green players.

This, briefly, is a hasty record of our association which was interesting and varied. Pich had never participated in sports and was in no sense an athlete. However, blessed with excellent health, he could stand up to the hardest kind of continuous work, particularly long hours; and in what we were doing, there were no hours, no time clock. He was always cheerful and optimistic, apparently never given to depressions which made him a congenial person to work with. I became very fond of Pich, sharing my confidence with him, and came to count on his advice and assistance in innumerable ways. In these last years, I saw and talked with him on several occasions when he visited Berkeley. I know how eagerly he looked forward to teaching in the Department of Theater Arts at UCLA. His sudden and premature death came as a very great shock, and to me meant the loss of a friend and associate for whom I had a very deep affection.

SAMUEL J. HUME

Irving Pichel, to me, was one of the finest and best-informed actors and directors in America—and a devoted friend. I shall never forget the great assistance he gave us through some of the most difficult periods of the Pasadena Playhouse. When we gave the first production of Eugene O'Neill's great play *Lazarus*

Laughed, he created an outstanding Lazarus. He was for a time
an invaluable member of our staff, and I shall certainly miss his
friendly advice and counsel.

<div align="right">GILMOR BROWN</div>

My association with Irving Pichel dates from our acting to-
gether in a production of *Change,* a play by the Welsh playwright
J. O. Francis, presented at the Toy Theatre in Boston in 1915.
At that time Irving was "a promising young actor," recently from
Professor Baker's 47 Workshop at Harvard. We played the parts
of the two brothers; and, although there was not much family
resemblance between us, we had one strong bond in common—
love of the theater. Because of that common interest, our paths
have crossed several times since that first meeting.

The next time was in 1922 when I came to Berkeley to be asso-
ciated with him and with Sam Hume in the Greek Theatre and
the Wheeler Hall productions on the University campus. For a
couple of seasons, Irving and I alternated in directing these latter
productions, some of which were also presented at a theater in
San Francisco—a valiant but short-lived attempt of Sam Hume
to establish a San Francisco Stage Guild and theater school.

In 1923, Irving left the Wheeler Hall group and organized a
Little Theatre, located at first in a vacant motion-picture house
and ultimately in a small unused church, which—with some sub-
sidy and great enthusiasm—he transformed into what became
well known as the Berkeley Playhouse. In a sense, at that time, it
might have been more accurately called the Pichel Playhouse. As
director, leading actor, chief electrician, and, to a large extent,
producer, Irving was its inspiration, guiding spirit, and hardest
worker. He was nothing short of protean in his manifold activi-
ties. As a result of them, his audience was treated to a series of
distinguished plays, many of which they would have little chance
of seeing elsewhere. *Peer Gynt, He Who Gets Slapped, Doctor
Faustus, All God's Chillun Got Wings, Caesar and Cleopatra,*

Saint Joan, The Great God Brown—to name some of them. In the majority of his productions, Irving played the leading role under his own direction. His wife frequently played opposite him; and they made an excellent team and had an enthusiastic following. As all who knew him can testify, Irving was, as they say, "a born actor," with a saving sense of humor not only in reference to other people but to himself as well. Gifted with an unusually vibrant and mellow voice, appraising dark eyes, and incandescent imagination, he was equally at home in serious drama and broad comedy. Many of his characterizations remain vividly in my memory. If I were to name my favorites, I think they would be his *Oedipus* (in the Greek Theatre), *Peer Gynt,* and especially *All God's Chillun.*

He appeared to be completely confident on the stage, whatever the role. I never heard him suggest that he was at all nervous on an opening night or any other. If occasionally he didn't happen to know all his lines perfectly, he was always able to improvise— which sometimes created the impression that someone else in the cast had fumbled. He never appeared to lose his *sang-froid,* even under somewhat trying circumstances. A couple of examples will illustrate this trait. I remember that, during one performance of *Peer Gynt,* just when Anitra had started her dance, all the stage spotlights went out. Something unexpected had happened to the switchboard. No one understood its workings as well as Irving. He calmly walked off the stage, lit a candle, and crawled around the switchboard for several minutes until the connection was re- paired, while the audience waited in semidarkness and anticipa- tion. When the lights came on, he returned to the stage; and the scene proceeded as if nothing had happened to interrupt it. On another occasion, in the role of He in *He Who Gets Slapped,* Irv- ing was on his knees pouring out his soul to Consuelo (Mrs. Pichel) when one of the spotlights fell from a beam and made a dent in the auditorium floor, lightly grazing, on its way down, the knee of a lady in the front row of the audience. Irving rose from

his knees and stepped down from the stage to inquire if the lady
was hurt. Upon being assured that she was not, he resumed his
previous position, and the scene continued. Anyone who has
directed in a community theater learns to expect various sorts of
crises. Irving met his with equanimity and good humor.

In 1925, having established the Berkeley Playhouse as a unique
institution in the community, he left Berkeley to become director
of the Lobero Theatre in Santa Barbara and thence on to Holly-
wood where his talent as a motion-picture director became widely
known and applauded.

The last time I saw Irving he was directing *Day of Triumph*.
His hair had grown grayer, his face older, but his zest for the
theater remained as young as ever. Little did anyone suspect at
that moment that the final curtain was about to fall—far too soon.

EVERETT GLASS

For more than twenty years, the credit title "Directed by Irving
Pichel" has appeared on motion-picture screens. To most of the
world, Irving Pichel was a picture director. He was that, and a
fine one; but to me, and to others who pioneered in "The Little
Theatre Movement" in America, he was much more.

I first heard of Irving Pichel in 1917, when I was directing for
the Provincetown Players in New York. I overheard a group of
actors talking about an Irving Pichel who had joined a new little
theater group in Los Angeles. They spoke of him as if he were a
very special young man. He was; a fact I came to appreciate when
I met him some three years later in San Francisco, where our
paths began to cross and often meet through our mutual interest
in this new and exciting theater.

The development of community and little theaters all over the
country freed theater lovers from the monopoly of the New York
stage. In this movement, Irving Pichel played a leading role. He
was one of the true pioneers of the new theater on the Pacific

Coast. When we met in San Francisco, he and Sam Hume were
organizing one little theater; Garnet Holme and I were strug-
gling with another. Neither was a spectacular success. His next
move was to the University of California where he taught drama,
directed plays, and acted—this time with spectacular success. His
reputation was assured. While he was at the University of Cali-
fornia, I was directing the Santa Barbara Community Players. At
the end of five years, I resigned; and Irving took my place. From
Santa Barbara he went to the Pasadena Community Playhouse,
where he again served with distinction in a triple capacity as
actor, director, and teacher. I think he enjoyed teaching most.
The last time we met he said to me, "More than anything I would
like to teach again. I would love to do the kind of thing that
Kenneth Macgowan is doing at UCLA." He was a true teacher
of the theater he loved.

Irving Pichel had a rich cultural background. When he be-
came a director in motion pictures, the "live" theater suffered a
real loss. His successful record as a motion-picture director needs
no retelling by me. He brought to films the qualities that made
him a success in the theater. He was a talented man and a man of
great integrity. Above all, he was a warm, generous man, who
gave with grace, the fruits of his talent and experience, to his
fellow workers.

NINA MOISE

I regret to say that it has not been my good fortune to be closely
acquainted with Irving Pichel. I do recall, however, that I never
stopped wondering how a man with his intelligence and good
taste could manage to work compatibly and maintain his integrity
in an environment so utterly devoid of these qualities as the
Hollywood studios. He always was considerate, gentle, and pleas-
ant to work with. The motion-picture industry is certainly the
worse off for his absence.

PAUL MUNI

It is hard to believe that Irving is no longer among us, for he embodied so many fine talents and qualities which seemed inextinguishable—creative vitality, imagination, driving industry, and an ever-youthful, almost boyish, enthusiasm for everything he did and everything he dreamed of doing. His spirit, of course, is alive and joyously with all of us who knew him. A friend, like myself, who has devoted more than a quarter century to film work in Hollywood, was bound to come in contact with Irving innumerable times over the years. Yet, to my regret, we never were in close association, never worked together—unless I may count the collaboration of Irving with Jean Renoir in the shooting of a script titled *Swamp Water* which I wrote many years ago. On several occasions in the early years, I recall, we discussed ambitious ideas for films; but ambitious ideas in the minds of directors and writers have a way of being orphaned by companies which prefer to initiate their own productions. I think of Irving as a generous-hearted and generously gifted man of the theater, possessed of an eager, thoughtful, liberal mind. He had so many gifts for the theater that it must have been difficult to make a choice and focus his energies in one direction—the *making* of films. For the director *is* the maker of films, no matter how much he may be given by the writer and other craftsmen whose manifold talents enter into the creation of every film. Gifted with a magnificent voice, finely articulated and resonant with a full range of emotion, he was the born actor; and it must not have been easy for him to escape confinement to that field.

The one regret of my life is that I failed to see him play Lazarus in the Pasadena Playhouse world première of O'Neill's *Lazarus Laughed*—the only time that great play, to my knowledge, has ever been staged.

Since World War II, I had seen very little of Irving, but it was my impression that his innocent idealism and liberal enthusiasm had compelled him to work, if he was to work at all, on independent films. In the great heresy hunt, it was often the liberal (and

if the American tradition is not liberal, in the deepest sense, then our history has been falsified) who became the temporary victim of self-righteous people who could not see that the liberal is the sturdiest opponent of all that is absolute, blindly dogmatic, unthinking, and intolerant. Irving was one of those shyly brave men who dislike conflict and yet will not back down and abandon their principles to make things easier. He simply set to work in another way, a much harder way than making films with all the aid and equipment one finds in a major studio. This, very likely, is what exhausted his heart and brought untimely death. Yet, hard as it was, it also gave him a freedom of expression which he had not had before, and resulted in what I think is his finest film *Martin Luther,* which will live long after him as a monument to his personality, his integrity, his high-mindedness—his instinctive opposition to whatever was corrupt and powerful. He projected a part of himself into the central character. And fortunately, he also acted a part in this film, so that we may still see him and hear his voice speaking up for his lifelong faith in the freedom and independence of the individual soul . . . R.I.P.   DUDLEY NICHOLS

Irving Pichel was one of the finest human beings I ever met. I lost a good friend.

JOSEF VON STERNBERG

Irving Pichel's full-time association with the faculty of the University of California was regretfully short, from July 1, 1953; but his earlier association with the Little Theatre at Berkeley and his continued interest in student dramatic efforts both at Berkeley and at Los Angeles made him seem to be a member of the family long before that connection became official. If I were to attempt an epitome of his personality, it would not stop with an assessment of his basic contribution to dramatic art in many media fields, important as that was, but would include also his invari-

able friendliness and his likeable human qualities even under the
severe test that golf courses occasionally present.

<div align="right">ROBERT G. SPROUL</div>

I first met Irving Pichel in the spring of 1921 when he, together
with Gilmor Brown and Sam Hume, staged a series of six plays
at the Orchestral Hall in Detroit. Twenty years old at that time
and pretending to be a student at the University of Michigan, I
was eaten alive with the theater and my desire to be a part of it.
Irving, Gilmor, and Hume seemed to me to be doing the sort of
thing I wanted to accomplish in the theater. Their performances
of Wilde, Shaw, and Shakespeare seemed to me to be more im-
portant and satisfying than the Avery Hopwood and John Golden
plays at the local stock company. Since they had come to Detroit
from California, I felt that it must be California which had given
them the opportunity and inspiration I sought for myself. That
fall I came to Los Angeles, and I have stayed here since.

Throughout the thirty-three intervening years, my relation-
ships to Irving Pichel have been varied and always rewarding. As
an actor, I played Brittanicus to his Caesar, and The Reverend
Anderson to his Dick Dudgeon. In these roles, I learned to know
Irving as a kind, understanding, and inspiring stage director. In
1927, I had my first major directing opportunity, when I staged
Tolstoy's *The Living Corpse* with Irving in the leading role. As
director, I became acquainted with Irving as a conscientious,
imaginative, and extremely talented actor with what I still con-
sider one of the most moving and beautiful voices in the Ameri-
can theater.

As a result of our association in the theater, Irving and I de-
veloped a personal friendship which, despite long periods in
which we did not see one another, grew richer with the years, and
which showed me Irving as a warm, generous, pleasant human
being. I can think of no other person with whom I, cursed with

an inbuilt English reserve, was more comfortable in our chance meetings, or more secure in our more extended contacts.

It is a great solace to me that during the past year, Irving and I were more closely related than ever before. As a member of the staff of the department which I head, I found Irving to be, in addition to his great creative gifts, a fine and inspiring teacher. His generosity of time and effort was now directed to the students and to the department which he believed had a great future.

About a month before he passed away, Irving asked me if I would play in the motion picture *Day of Triumph* which he was about to direct. Fortunately, I was free of any university duties at the time, and I consented. I was with Irving on the set for about a week, while he patiently tried to put me at ease before the cameras, and pull out of me a performance of Caiaphas. During the long waits between shots on the set, we talked and played chess. When he was busy, I talked with the other actors, mostly about Irving and how rare it was to find a combination of brilliance and understanding such as his. After the last day of shooting, he said, "Wonderful to have had you with us." Those were his last words to me. If I believed in epitaphs, those are the words I would use about Irving, and I know hundreds of actors, technicians, writers, and students who would join me.

<div align="right">RALPH FREUD</div>

The Coming of Camera and Projector—Part II

_____KENNETH MACGOWAN

KENNETH MACGOWAN, a former producer of plays and films, is a member of the staff of the Department of Theater Arts at the University of California, Los Angeles, and an editor of the *Quarterly*. Part I of the following article appeared in the Fall, 1954, issue of the *Quarterly*. Both parts will be published next year in Mr. Macgowan's book *The Film of Yesterday and Tomorrow*.

More Scientists and an Entertainer

Muybridge won success in London as well as Paris. In 1882, he lectured and showed his moving pictures at a special meeting of the Royal Institution chaired by the Prince of Wales. Unquestionably, his work stimulated others to try their hands at photographing motion. From 1883 to 1886, his methods were imitated or improved upon. At the end of that time, a German, Ottomar Anschütz, produced excellent photographs with a battery of cameras. Like Muybridge, he put his photos on a glass wheel; but, when he showed his device to small groups of customers at the Chicago World's Fair, he illuminated his pictures by the intermittent flashes of light from a Geissler tube at the back.

Other Europeans experimented less successfully with six to sixteen lenses and plates closely grouped in one camera. In 1888, Louis Leprince, a Frenchman working mainly in England, developed a very ingenious machine in which eight lenses made successive images on a band of paper, which was then rolled away while another set of eight lenses did the same to a second strip of paper below the first. Then the same process was repeated. Leprince became the most dramatic figure in the history of the movies when, in 1890, he boarded a French train with his camera-projector, and neither the man nor his machine was ever seen again.

One man escaped the influence of both Marey and Muybridge. This was Émile Reynaud. He had no scientific interest in studying movement. The only pictures he successfully projected were drawings. But he was the first man to entertain an audience in a theater with fiction thrown on a screen. From 1881 to 1889, he developed his Praxinoscope for projecting rows of glass slides; and then he substituted long strips of film. In 1892, Reynaud opened his Théâtre Optique in Paris; and between then and 1900, he entertained about half a million spectators. His machine—which used reels for the first time—drew drawing after drawing between a light and a lens while a mirror reflected them as five- or six-foot images on a translucent screen. The audience, seated on the other side of the screen, saw not only these drawings but also painted backgrounds projected by another lantern. Although Reynaud failed in his attempted use of photographs, he became the first producer and exhibitor of screen fiction.

Film Solves the Problem

After Daguerre's "mirror with a memory" and Talbot's paper negatives, came three great steps in the advancement of photography. They were the wet plate, the dry plate, and film. The dry plate did nothing more for motion-picture experiments than save time and expense in handling. Relatively few exposures could be recorded on one plate. With flexible film, hundreds of pictures— and ultimately thousands—could be taken and shown in rapid succession. An Englishman developed celluloid about 1855; but, although it was used in a few cameras in the middle eighties, it was not successfully adapted to motion-picture photography until 1888 or 1889 when a new but similar plastic took the place of celluloid. Here at last was the perfect medium. The public recognized its importance when it made the phrase "the films" almost as popular as "the movies."

The availability of film put an end to the use of glass and paper, and it speeded up enormously the attempts to devise motion-

picture cameras and projectors. From 1887 to 1897, the experi-
menters and inventors are too numerous to catalogue. Four stand
out as pioneers—the Englishman William Friese-Greene, the
American Thomas Alva Edison, and the Frenchmen Louis and
Auguste Lumière. At the climax of the efforts to achieve success-
ful photography and projection, which was in 1895, two other
Americans Woodville Latham and Thomas Armat made impor-
tant contributions.

Friese-Greene—Tragic Pioneer

The English make a rather good case for William Friese-
Greene as the first designer of a reasonably modern type of
motion-picture camera using strips of paper or film. His results
were somewhat crude, perhaps, and he never pushed his work to
a successful finish. Adversity hounded him. Although he owned
some forty photographic galleries at one time, he landed in
debtor's prison at the end of six years of designing motion-picture
cameras. After twenty years of comparative obscurity, he fell dead
just as he concluded a speech during a public dinner at which
British filmdom honored him. They found only one shilling and
ten pence in his worn old purse. If his end was not so mysterious
and intriguing as Leprince's, it capped a life dramatic enough to
furnish the plot for a British feature film in 1951 called *The
Magic Box*.

As early as 1885, Friese-Greene used celluloid instead of glass.
The material came in thickish sheets, so he cut it into plates to
fit his camera, sensitized them, and then let them drop down from
an upper box to be exposed before the lens—something that had
already been tried with glass plates. This method led nowhere—
unless we can say that it led to his future use of celluloid film in
the way now common to all motion-picture photography and pro-
jection. Within two years, he was taking out a patent on a camera
using strips of "paper or other suitable material"; and, by 1889,

his work suggested that he might have been thinking of celluloid when he used the phrase "other suitable material." He reheated the bulky celluloid of commerce, rolled it thinner, cut it into long strips, and employed it in two different cameras that he used in 1889. We still have negatives of street scenes made in that year with these machines.

Friese-Greene experimented with 3-D in the earlier of the two cameras; and toward the turn of the century, he developed a color process for the movies that was very like the later Kinema-color. He may have used film as early as Edison. When Friese-Greene's camera punched perforations in his strips of paper, he anticipated the American. Apparently with the aid of Evans, he achieved in 1889 smooth intermittent movement of the film by means of something like the all-important "Latham loop," of which you will hear later. If, in the complex conflicts of motion-picture records, we can't say who first invented the motion-picture camera, we can at least recognize this Englishman as one of the most important pioneers.

Edison for Peep Shows, Not Screen

To the picturesque figures in the history of the motion picture—the blind Plateau, the murdered Leprince, the murderer Muybridge, and the ruined Friese-Greene—we must add an equally remarkable American Thomas Alva Edison. He had only three months of formal education, yet he took out more than 1,000 patents during some sixty years of active work. Guiding an ever-growing staff, he perfected—among other things—the incandescent bulb, the electric dynamo, the telegraphic printer, dry batteries and storage batteries, the phonograph, and the motion-picture camera.

The link between Plateau and Edison is highly interesting. Although Plateau was blind, he made a device to see drawings in motion. Although Edison was deafened, he gave a great deal of time to perfecting a talking machine, and when he began to work

on motion pictures, it was only to "illustrate" his phonograph. Here the curious parallel ends. Plateau, like almost all the European experimenters, was dedicated to science. Edison always had his eye on profits.

Yet, oddly enough, Edison missed the financial boat a number of times. When he met with delay in patenting the phonograph disk—his first and final machine used a wax cylinder—he said: "No matter, the disk phonograph will never amount to anything." He refused to spend $150 to patent his motion-picture devices abroad: "It's not worth it." He and his staff learned how to project moving pictures on a screen, but Edison saw no future in that. He concentrated on his Kinetoscope—a peep show, a nickel-in-the-slot machine by which one person at a time looked at fifty feet of film. When his financial partners urged him to develop a projector, the "Wizard of Menlo Park" said:

> No, if we make this screen machine that you are asking for, it will spoil everything. We are making these peep-show machines, and selling a lot of them at a good profit. If we put out a screen machine, there will be a use for maybe about ten in the whole United States. With that many screen machines you could show the pictures to everybody in the country—and then it would be done. Let's not kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

Ironically enough, when within a few years the peep show had worn itself out, press and public hailed in the "Edison Vitascope" a projector designed by another man and credited to the wizard for publicity reasons.

Deaf Edison Foresees the Talkies

Like most inventors, Edison was not uninfluenced by what others had done. Muybridge showed him his photographs and his projecting device early in 1886, and he is said to have suggested that Edison combine motion pictures and the phonograph. In the summer of 1889, Friese-Greene—a little late in the day—made the same suggestion to Edison and sent him blueprints of his

newest camera. When Edison was in Paris in 1889, he met and talked with Marey. In between, probably late in 1887, Edison started one of his staff working on the problem of making talkies. This was a young Englishman named W. K. L. Dickson.

There can be no doubt that Edison's first idea was to devise a way of making talking pictures. In the middle nineties, in his introduction to an article by Dickson and his wife, he began:

In the year 1887, the idea occurred to me that it was possible to devise an instrument which should do for the eye what the phonograph does for the ear, and that by a combination of the two, all motion and sound could be recorded and reproduced simultaneously.

By this time, he sensed that the days of the peep show were numbered, and the screen was to triumph. Still clinging to the talkie idea, the deaf man continued:

The Kinetoscope is only a small model illustrating the present stage of progress but with each succeeding month new possibilities are brought into view. I believe that in coming years by my own work and the work of Dickson, Muybridge [,] Marie [Marey] and others who will doubtless enter the field, that [sic] grand opera can be given at the Metropolitan Opera House at New York without any material change from the original, and with artists and musicians long since dead.

Edison Uses Eastman Film

Because Edison wanted to illustrate his phonograph, he started Dickson on the insuperable task of recording pictures on the same kind of cylinder that his talking machine used. This meant a spiral of tiny photographs. They are sometimes called pin point in size, and sometimes as large as a pin head. Anyway, they had to be seen through a magnifying glass. When they were enlarged to an eighth of an inch on a hollow celluloid cylinder that was lighted intermittently from within, the pictures were far too fuzzy. So Edison gave up imitating the form and movement of his beloved phonograph. Instead he turned to the idea of a long tape,

an idea that men had proposed back in the sixties. At first, Edison
and Dickson used a brand of rather stiff sensitized celluloid that
had been put on the market; but they had no real success until the
Eastman company began, in 1889, to make thin and very flexible
nitrocellulose film for use in its Kodaks. (Incidentally, a clergyman
named Hannibal Goodwin had patented the idea two years be-
fore; and, in 1914, his heirs got $5,000,000 from Eastman as the
result of a law suit.)

Edison saw a sample of the new film, told Dickson to order
$2.50 worth, and left in August, 1889, to see the Paris Exposition
and Étienne Marey. When Edison came back to his laboratory on
October 6, 1889, he was in for two surprises. Dickson had got a
special photographic building put up at a cost of $516.64; and,
using the new film, he showed Edison a talking picture on a
screen. According to the young Englishman,

Mr. Dickson himself stepped out on the screen, raised his hat and
smiled, while uttering the words of greeting, "Good morning, Mr.
Edison, glad to see you back. I hope you are satisfied with the kineto-
phonograph."

Now come a few more confusions and contradictions. As late as
1924, Dickson claimed that he projected pictures in 1888 on a
screen eight by ten feet. At another time, he wrote that for his
1889 demonstration he used "a four-foot screen because of the
restricted size of the room." In the early part of the twentieth
century, when Dickson had left Edison for a rival company, Edi-
son testified in a law suit: "There was no screen." Then, in 1924,
he wrote that he had used a twelve-inch screen to project a motion
picture from his peep-show machine, and that later he projected
from a camera onto a screen five feet square.

The First Efficient Movie Camera

Put aside projection, and there can be no question about what
Edison accomplished with his camera. Besides using film—which
Friese-Greene also used at about the same time—Edison managed

to take forty-six pictures a second, whereas the Englishman claimed twelve but probably took no more than three. Edison's camera accomplished this phenomenal speed through the remarkable perfection of his mechanism and the use of sprockets and perforations in the sides of the film. The idea of perforations wasn't new; but the success of Edison's camera made the size of each frame of picture, as well as the four sprocket holes on each side of each frame, the standard for many, many years. But Edison could take only fifty feet of film on a roll because he devised no way of handling a heavier load.

Where Friese-Greene and others fumbled over the camera, Edison—blessed with a staff and resources—succeeded. Although commercially minded, he was a perfectionist. He insisted on forty-six pictures a second, whereas later men settled for sixteen. He drove his camera by an electric motor; for more than a generation others used a crank. It was so enormously heavy—some say almost a ton—that it couldn't be hand-held. It had to move on wheels.

Peep Show and Film Production

Edison solved the problem of motion-picture photography, but he completely ignored projection. Instead he turned to the making and marketing of a peep-show machine. In his Kinetoscope fifty feet of film joined in a loop, ran continuously just in front of an electric light and just behind a magnifying glass through which the spectator looked. Edison got the effect of intermittent motion through a very narrow slot in a shutter-like disk that revolved forty-six times a second. Though he patented his box in 1891, it lay idle for almost three years. In May, 1893, he exhibited it at the Brooklyn Institute, but he didn't try to sell his machine to showmen until the next year. Then, on April 14, 1894, a battery of Kinetoscopes were installed at 1155 Broadway, New York; and presently, some 400 Kinetoscopes were on display in the larger cities. At first, the spectator paid a quarter for admission, and attendants switched on the Kinetoscopes; but soon, Edison

cut down on man power by developing nickel-in-the-slot machines. Some Kinetoscopes added voices and music.

To provide films for the machines, Edison had to go in for production. When the pictures were microscopic, the comic capers of an employee named Fred Ott sufficed. For the Kinetoscope, Dickson had to find other and more varied material. Ott went on grimacing and sneezing; but he was soon rivaled by an organ-grinder and his monkey, a blacksmith at work, wrestlers, trained bears, and a contortionist. Then Dickson branched out and made shots of Buffalo Bill, Annie Oakley, and Sandow the Strong Man, and comic episodes in barber shops and Chinese laundries.

Early in 1893, Edison spent $637.67 on a studio. It was a strange looking structure covered with tar paper and affectionately called the Black Maria. A large section of the roof could be hauled up so as to let the sun hit the actors, who played against a black background. To keep the sun always full upon them, the whole studio could turn on a circular track. By 1894, when the Kinetoscopes were launched on the amusement world, Edison's accurate bookkeeping showed that he had spent $24,118.04, mostly on invention. Soon production costs began to rise. A new studio went up on the roof of a New York building on Twenty-eighth Street; and, about 1906, Edison spent $100,000 on a glass-roofed studio in the Bronx.

Projectors at Last

Eighteen ninety-four and ninety-five were years of decision. The commercial projector was aborning. How many men were working on it is anybody's guess. Even Edison made a halfhearted effort, for, ignoring Dickson, he set another man to work in a secret laboratory. Edison's Vitascope, which garnered the glory, was wholly designed by an independent inventor, Thomas Armat. Half a dozen men in America, a couple in France, and a couple in England played a part in developing screen projection. But

what some of them did in loose association with one another is badly confused. And there are some mysteries about the dates of first showings.

On the last point, there are reports in two French books—but nowhere else that I know of—that, on February 5, 1894, a Kentuckian named Jean Acmé Le Roy showed a projector privately in the shop of a New York optician; but, after a public showing in New Jersey in February, 1895, the record ends. One American writer quotes a Richmond, Indiana, newspaper of June, 1894, to prove that C. Francis Jenkins privately projected hand-colored films, but another quotes the same paper on the same event in October of the next year. Incidentally, Jenkins, like most other experimenters in projection, started by using Edison films.

The Lathams began that way, but they soon made a different kind of camera and produced their own films. They did this for an odd reason. Like Edison's Kinetoscope, their first projector ran the film continuously, and used a very narrow opening in the shutter in order not to have a fuzzy picture. This method cut down drastically the amount of light that could reach the screen. The Lathams tried to increase the light by using a larger film— one and a half times as wide as Edison's. Thus, early in 1895, when they photographed some boys at play and exhibited the film privately on April 21, they became the first pioneers of what might be called the wide film. No competitor of CinemaScope, their odd-shaped pictures led nowhere.

On the other hand, they made a very important contribution to modern projection. This was the so-called "Latham loop." By a set of extra sprockets that provided a bit of slack in the moving film, they made it possible to use thousand-foot reels. As I have mentioned, only a much smaller amount of footage could be pulled through the projector—or the camera—at a fast speed without tearing the film. The credit for the loop seems to be due to Enoch J. Rector, one of the associates of Major Woodville Latham, a former teacher of chemistry, and his two sons. Friese-

Greene and Evans had developed a film with slack, but they never used thousand-foot rolls.

Armat Solves Projection

By 1894, everyone that wanted to make a motion-picture camera knew how to do it—jerk each frame of film into place behind the lens, open the shutter for as short a time as possible, and jerk the film forward again for a new shot. But nobody seemed to understand how to make a good projector. Then, the next year, came projectors from Jenkins and Armat in America, two men in France, and one or two in England. They all began by using or imitating Edison film, and thus they helped make his 35-mm. width the world standard.

Like the Lathams, Jenkins ran his film continuously; but he used revolving lenses to bring the pictures to what appeared to be a rest. Armat joined Jenkins early in 1894, but got nowhere until he hit on a new and basic idea. This was that the film in the projector—just like the film in the camera—must move intermittently. More than this, Armat realized that each frame of picture must be shown on the screen as long or longer than it was exposed in the camera. Only in that way could there be enough light on the screen to make a large, bright image. Armat developed a loop of his own. Definitely he solved projection.

The Lumières Give the First Public Show

It was through studying Edison's machines that the Europeans were able to develop both cameras and projectors. The brothers Lumières—in French their name means light, lamp, and intelligence—worked backwards from the Kinetoscope, which had no loop and no intermittent film movement. When they got to their camera, they realized that it was not only a camera, but a projector, too, and also a printer. All they had to do was vary the length of time during which the movement of the film halted. In Edison's patent of 1891, he mentioned the idea that his camera could be a projector; but he did nothing about it.

For whatever the priority of presentation may be worth, the Lumières led the field—unless we accept the dubious claims of Le Roy and Jenkins. On March 2, 1895, the Frenchmen projected a film in Paris before the Society for the Encouragement of the Sciences. A reliable authority says that they exhibited their projector publicly in Marseilles in April. There is no question that on December 28, 1895, the Lumières began to show films publicly and successfully in the basement of the Grand Café in Paris. They made their own films instead of using Edison's; and, although they adopted his picture size, they used only one sprocket hole per frame instead of the four in the American's films. Greatly daring—and saving money by daring—they reduced the number of pictures per second from the forty-six of Edison to sixteen, thus setting the standard speed for the silent era.

A few weeks behind the Lumières but months ahead of Armat—who didn't demonstrate his projector till August or September, 1896—Robert William Paul and Birt Acres took and exhibited films in England. Like the Lumières, they developed their machines by studying Edison's peep show. There is some confusion, however, about which of the Englishmen was the more responsible, though it was probably Paul.

Dickson and Another Peep Show

Dickson who left Edison and coöperated with the Lathams was, in a curious way, responsible for the death of the Edison Kinetoscope and the introduction of Armat's projector as Edison's Vitascope. Dickson approached a friend with the idea of making and selling riffle books of photographs. This man and a group with whom Dickson became closely associated developed the idea into a new kind of peep show that they called the Mutoscope. Avoiding the patent rights of Edison, they made a camera that took pictures two inches high by two and three-quarters wide, pasted them on pieces of light cardboard, and designed a peep-show machine in which the pictures flipped over rapidly after the customer put a penny—not a nickel—in the slot. It was a sign of the

enterprise of the American Mutoscope Company that it photo-
graphed, all too briefly, the popular star Joseph Jefferson in his
role in the great hit *Rip Van Winkle*. For two or three decades,
Mutoscope machines were to be seen in penny arcades and
amusement parks.

Early in 1896 when the Mutoscope began to outsell the Edison
machine, the men who were distributing the Kinetoscope saw the
end of their business. They heard of Armat's projector, had a
demonstration, and persuaded the Wizard of Menlo Park to man-
ufacture it as the Edison Vitascope. To get Armat to disown his
brain child, they wrote him:

> . . . in order to secure the largest profit in the shortest time it is
> necessary that we attach Mr. Edison's name in some prominent capac-
> ity to this new machine. While Mr. Edison has no desire to pose as
> inventor of this machine, yet we think we can arrange with him for
> the use of his name. . . . We should not of course misrepresent the
> facts to any inquirer, but we think we can use Mr. Edison's name in
> such a manner as to keep within the actual truth and yet get the
> benefit of his prestige. The machine might be made with a place upon
> which we could inscribe the words "Armat Design" or something of
> the kind, and you understand that after we have disposed of our ter-
> ritory and the business is fully established . . . we will then make it
> our business to attach your name to the machine as inventor, and we
> are confident that you will eventually receive the credit which is due
> you.

So, the Edison Vitascope opened at Koster & Bial's Musical Hall
in New York on April 23, 1896. There were dancing girls on the
screen, ocean waves, prize fighters, and a scene from Charles
Hoyt's play *A Milk White Flag*. And there was Armat in the bal-
cony running the projector he had designed. But it was to be
almost thirty years before the reading public knew what he had
contributed to the triumph of the American film.

A Motion-Picture Studio of 1968

_____ALBERT ABRAMSON

ALBERT ABRAMSON has been a teacher in the Los Angeles city-school system, and is now employed as a television engineer with a major network in Hollywood. His article "Television Film Recording and Editing" appeared in the _Journal of the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers._

(Motion-picture technique is undergoing profound technological changes that are far more important than the widening and curving of the screen or the introduction of stereophonic sound. Magnetic tape instead of film is already being used for the recording of the sound track. Experiments in putting the picture itself on tape indicate that this may become common practice even for color. Projectors may, in the future, use tape rather than film. There are electronic cameras, already developed or close to being perfected, that can be substituted for the present film cameras, allowing the director to watch simultaneous takes and edit them on a monitor screen for recording on film and ultimately on tape. This edited product may then be re-edited, and scenes may be retaken before it is projected in theaters or telecast. The author's imaginative preview of a film studio of the future, if and when the new electronic equipment is adopted by the motion-picture industry, forms the last chapter of a book, _Electronic Motion Pictures,_ to be published by the University of California Press.—THE EDITORS)

WHAT WILL THE MOTION PICTURE of the future be like? What will happen to motion-picture techniques and equipment in the next decade or so? What other important changes will have taken place? Considering the technological revolution of the middle fifties, let us project this rate of progress into the next ten or fifteen years. Knowing well the pitfalls of prognostication, let us visit a motion-picture studio of 1968.

When we meet our host for the tour, we ask him first about the output of this studio. He informs us that it is divided into two main categories: live presentations and two types of recorded features. He explains that about 50 per cent of the programs recorded here are produced for home-telecasting purposes. The programs may be comedy or variety, but most likely they are some form of dramatic presentation.

Thirty-five per cent are the immediate "live" programs, which include the following types: newscasts, audience-participation shows, topical items including sporting events—which may be either local or remote in origin—and certain educational features that are best suited for immediate release.

The remaining 15 per cent are being made for large-screen theater use and home-pay television. These are the biggest, most expensive productions made at this studio. Our host advises that one of these films is now in production and that we may visit the set.

As we walk toward Studio Forty-One, we see the usual crowd of players, extras, musicians, and technicians that grace any major studio. When a red "In Production" sign over the door turns green, we open the door to the studio. Since this production is a "fifteen percenter," it will first be seen in the large theaters of the nation. We learn that for a motion picture to play from four to six months in one theater is not unusual. Then, it will be shown in the homes on a subscription basis. This picture is typical of the high-budget, large-cast, grade-A, theater production. It is being made in full color with wide-screen effect, and features directional sound. It has had the best writers, the ablest director, the most resourceful camera and technical crew, and some of the brightest stars assigned to it. The final picture must be of the highest caliber in order to compete with the "fifty percenters" which can be seen free in the homes of the nation.

Approaching the shooting stage, we see that it is being arranged for the next sequence of shots. Lights and sets are being readied, and the cameras are being moved into new positions. At first glance, the latter resemble the old-fashioned cine-cameras; but, on closer scrutiny, we can see that they are full-color, anamorphiscopic, electronic cameras. The anamorphic or image-spreading process is purely electrical. Since it is electronic, two recordings of the same picture will be made—one with the wide-screen effect for theaters and one with the normal-aspect ratio for home television.

There are five cameras on this set alone. Our guide explains that only rarely are more than three or four cameras used on any one sequence, but that spare cameras are kept ready in case of emergency. Each camera is connected to the control room, which is elevated some ten feet above the set. Camera cables are strung from the ceiling by means of special elastic supports, and the floor is free of other cables, or wires.

One of the cameras stands near by, and we begin a close examination. It has only one lens of a special high-speed, variable-focal-length type. For normal use, this one lens covers the same operational field as the old-fashioned lens turret with its battery of four lenses. However, there are special lenses available for wide-angle or telephoto needs. Since this type of camera is almost foolproof in operation, very few controls are in evidence on its back; and most of these are for adjustment of the electronic viewfinder. All the other controls are located on a camera-control unit in the booth. On each side of the camera there is a focusing knob; but remote-focusing, iris control, and operation of the zoom lens or turret rotation (when used) can be manipulated from the control room. Since the cameraman has these aids if needed, he can concentrate on getting the most acceptable picture—from an aesthetic as well as a technical viewpoint—for the director.

The electronic viewfinder, at the rear of the camera, is panchromatic—i.e., shows the scene in full color as it actually appears. It also shows an area some twenty-five per cent larger than the picture that will be recorded. A set of etched lines on the viewfinder shows the area of the picture to be used; and the larger picture is sent to the control room, from where the director can make any visual changes in composition. The video signal is sent to the wide-band magnetic recorders where the signal outside of the etched areas is clipped and discarded.

In addition to the regular studio-type cameras, we see several of the portable (hand-carried) electronic cameras, which are used on almost every production—placed in normally inaccessible locations, mounted on moving vehicles for outdoor scenes, hid-

den in the scene itself, etc. All of this company's newsreel crews are equipped with these handy cameras in order to give on-the-spot coverage for any big event. Most of their pickups are recorded for later presentation.

When we look at a dolly which holds one of the cameras, we see that it has a seat for the cameraman—a feature greatly appreciated by him in the taking of long sequences. This dolly is self-propelled and is fed from the same power cable as the camera; steering is done through the pan head. By means of an ingenious combination of foot pedals and switches, the dolly can be moved as easily as the older pedestal (a special one-man dolly, very flexible and easy to operate, which is used in everyday television production). Since all controls are electric, the dolly is noiseless in operation. Other cameras are mounted on large cranes of the type that have seen so much heavy duty during the past twenty-five years.

On the set, we see an audio technician adjusting sound-pickup devices to all actors who have lines to speak. These devices are miniature microphones, usually concealed in the actor's hair or clothing; and their pickup is relayed by high-frequency to special antennas on top of the control room. Each antenna is tuned to one microphone which is motor-driven to follow its signal. Thus, there are no bulky vehicles with microphone booms to throw unnecessary shadows and clutter up the set. Three magnetic-sound tracks are made of each scene, and the position of the sound depends on the location of the speaker. By following the actor, the antenna will move the sound to its proper track for recording. The audio technician must still mix the various levels properly on the three tracks. In addition, there are other miniature microphones on the set for music, sound effects, etc.; and these are recorded on a fourth track. A fifth, single composite track of all the sound is recorded automatically for use on home telecasts.

As the cast prepares to enact the next sequence of scenes, we enter the control room. A one-shot setup is very rare. All scenes are written as sequences that can be recorded straight through by

using electronic cutting. A sequence is usually one complete action as opposed to a one-shot setup. Sets and props are dressed for sequence shooting and can be taken down as soon as the director *knows* that the sequence has been done to his satisfaction. He knows because he sees the results of each sequence in playback just as soon as it is completed.

We learn that the picture does not have to be shot in its proper order; rather, it is recorded at any convenient time. For instance, the present set represents an office which is used three times in the picture—twice at the beginning and once in the last scene. However, all of these sequences will be shot on the same day's schedule, if possible. The first sequence is shot, and will then be played back; and, if it meets the director's approval, the next sequence is made ready for recording. This will then be recorded and played back. And, the last sequence will be recorded in the same manner.

In the meantime, other sets which will be used in the picture are being readied (or are already ready) for scheduled use. The preproduction planning of each picture has included every detail of set construction, prop availability, and other matters of scheduling and shooting. All the sets of one picture are erected as close as possible to each other. Frequently, outdoor sets are used when a scene cannot be made with electronic background effects. All outdoor shooting is done by means of a special mobile truck with electronic cameras, microphones, and recording units. This truck is often sent to the actual location for recording.

A sequence may be a simple one-camera cut or a complicated scene requiring the use of special mixes, cross dissolves, electronic backgrounds, and image distortions. All transitions are done in the same way as other sequences.

Shooting is about to begin, and we place ourselves in the control room behind the director who is seated in front of a console with six monitor screens—one for each camera on the floor and others for special effects, etc. Seated to the left of the director (as in regular television practice) is his technical director whose job

is to press the proper button at the right time, for he is in complete charge of all technical operations. On the director's right sits an assistant director who is responsible for readying the cameras and special effects that may have to be inserted. Seated in front of the booth and at a lower level are four assistant cameramen, each of whom is in charge of the complete technical operation of one electronic camera. He has control over the visual qualities of his camera. His job is to keep the picture on the monitor screen as perfect as possible. He makes all electrical corrections, matches his cameras to the others for color rendition and scale of tones, and, if need be, sets focus and iris settings for the cameraman.

Thus, the picture that the director sees is the best possible. He can watch the progress of the program without distraction. Every one of the crew is connected by earphones to the control booth; other communication lines go to the special-effects room, recording room, and lighting director.

As our eyes flit from the monitor screens out to the shooting stage, we see each camera prepare to compose its part of the action. Since this particular sequence will start with the opening shot from Camera Two, the directors and cameramen are concentrating on its picture. A few changes are made in camera position and lighting, and the director is satisfied. Then, he checks the initial composition and lighting for the other cameras. The cast have been rehearsed and know their lines. Within a short time, the director will be ready to record. The technical director notifies him that the electronic equipment is functioning perfectly; the recording room calls in to say that it is loaded and prepared for operation; special effects reports that it is waiting to come in on cue. The director calls the cast to their places and reminds them of the nature of the sequence they are about to shoot. After last-minute costume adjustments and make-up checks, the cast is ready for "Action!"

The technical director pushes a button to start the recorders, fades Camera Two from black, and the action begins. Every

movement is apparent on the monitor screens. The assistant director is working with the director from a shooting script which tells when each camera is to be cut into action. Every camera switch is plainly marked; and the assistant director prepares each camera for its next shot. The coördination between all hands is apparent as everything moves along smoothly. Behind the cameras on the floor below, another assistant director is cuing action and guiding the players when necessary. High on three walls of the studio, the dialogue is being flashed on television screens. If someone forgets a line, he knows where to look for instant help.

An assistant director advises the technical director that a special effect is to be inserted into the live action; and, at a given cue, a recorded insert is switched into the sequence. Special effects also has a certain electronic background ready on a preview screen. As one of the cast goes to a window, the electronic background which is "matted" into the window shows another member of the cast driving up in an automobile. In a few seconds, the office door opens, and the recent arrival walks into the room. When the final words are spoken, the cameras fade out, and the cast relaxes for a few minutes.

Since the director seems pleased with the results on his monitor screen, the recorded sequence is probably an effective one; but, now, he is going to check the results. Out on the shooting stage, a large wall screen is lowered opposite the control booth; and, as everyone—including the cast—turns to face it, the entire sequence appears in playback. The director watches each detail, as he looks for possible errors. Apparently he is satisfied with the performance and is now going to record the next series of shots. (If there were any flaws, the whole sequence or any part of it would be re-recorded and edited into the final picture where necessary.)

We leave the director and his crew, as they prepare to record the next sequence which uses the same set, and go into the central recording room to watch the next operation. Here, we meet the recording director who shows us his technical equipment—all of

which is the latest nonvisual, wide-band, magnetic, video-recording apparatus. All pictures are recorded here in full color with directional sound; no developing or processing operations are needed. Near by are the playback machines for immediate screening anywhere in the studio. In addition to all of the latest pictures having been recorded magnetically, most of the early pictures in the vaults have been converted from film to tape by means of these recorders—a necessary step since all of the television "telecine projectors" are in the form of tape playback machines. In addition to some of the large rolls of tape that are used for recording, we see one television-film recorder; and we learn that it is used to make film recordings with which the editors work. All sequences are recorded on tape, but those that must be edited are transferred to film; and this film serves as a work print.

"Why not use the tape for editing?" is the question that comes into our minds, as we move into the editing room. The editor explains that, although tape is the ideal medium for recording and distributing motion pictures, film is more easily handled during the editing process. Film can be run backwards, as well as slower or faster than normal projection speed; also, it can be held for a single frame, and precise frame cuts can be easily made—thus, it serves as a practical work print.

The film editors here follow the standard motion-picture practice. Most of the editing has already been done in the electronic cameras and in the preproduction planning. However, different sequences have to be matched and be put into proper time sequence. Any required special effects are inserted. Notwithstanding the versatility of the electronic cameras, certain effects (such as montage involving reverse action, skip-frame technique, slow-motion or high-speed shots) must be made with film cameras—part of the equipment of special effects. Theoretically, it is possible to create some of these effects through the television-film recorder by manipulating the recorded film—i.e., by double, intermittent, or reverse printing, etc.—but, since this involves the use of optical-printing machines, it has been found more con-

venient to record these shots with ordinary film cameras. These shots are then played into a video-tape-recording machine and inserted in their proper place in the completed picture.

We leave the editing room and go toward the next building, which houses the distribution center. On top of this building, we see many micro-wave reflectors pointing in different directions. From this center, pictures from many other studios are distributed; and we see various rooms marked with the names of different cities of the state. In each city-named room, several tape playback machines are feeding the local pictures into the radio-relays and into special long-distance telephone lines. Most of the theaters in the state can be connected to these rooms. Ordinary mechanical theater-projection equipment—in all but the smallest and most remote theaters in the country—has been replaced by electronic, large-screen television projectors. Complete theater programs from trailers to cartoons are released from centers like this one to all of the subscribing theaters. Each theater buys a complete program; and when ordering, it is customary to specify dates and times for certain pictures. After clearances have been secured, the program is sent by radio-relay or co-axial cable to the theaters. Five or fifty theaters in an area may be receiving the same program. An area may cover the whole state, a county, or just a large city. But no theater is shipped the actual picture tape.

In another room, we observe the handling of the distribution of features to the homes on a pay-television basis. Complete programs are transmitted from here on a subscription basis. These programs may be the same pictures that are transmitted to the theaters. They are in full color but lack the wide-screen and directional-sound features of the theater presentation.

In still other rooms, we see the network feeds for the live and recorded features. This procedure corresponds to standard television practice; and there is also provision for picking programs off the long-distance lines and for transmitting them locally.

As our tour comes to an end, our host explains some of the details of a revolutionary camera that is expected in the near

future. Completely automatic in operation, this camera is entirely free from any connecting cables. It is self-powered and sends its pictures by means of ultra-high frequency. It records both in natural color and with true stereoscopic effect; but, amazingly, it has no glass optical system. Our guide informs us that this new electronic camera uses a method of scanning that is similar to that used by a radar system. This camera sends out an extremely high-frequency beam (as in a radar system) that is played directly on the scene that is being televised. The reflection of this beam is directed back to a small antenna on the front of the camera where it is converted into a television signal. Only a small part of the original beam is reflected back to the camera, but enough returns to create a video signal which is amplified in the usual manner. This reflected beam has much information impressed upon it— such as the size and color of the subject as well as its relative brightness—and it will also relate the distance the object is from the camera. Thus, it will produce stereoscopic images from a single source. As the first camera with an electronic-lens system instead of the usual-glass objectives, all optical losses are avoided. By varying the width of the beam, it is possible to get an almost infinite variety of focal lengths. In addition to having a great depth of field, this camera accomplishes focusing automatically.

Although in the developmental stage, this new camera is expected to be in operational use quite soon. With its introduction, the motion picture will have the ultimate in means for production. It promises absolute faithfulness in pickup, with true colors and true stereoscopic vision. Its automatic features should overcome the last technical obstacle to the making of perfect motion pictures. With its introduction the electronic motion picture should achieve that degree of perfection that men could previously only dream about.

The Work of the British Film Institute

_____DENIS FORMAN

THE "FINE" ARTS, as we call them today, presumably had their upward struggle before they earned the adjective. Since the days of Athens, however, they have enjoyed a distinguished career, adorning the market places of rich states and illuminating the salons of great men. During the more violent moments of history, they survived the storm by sheltering in some cloister or by passing a century or two within an academy of scholars, always emerging punctually, to be welcomed by a new aristocracy and to be reshaped to the taste of the age. Today we accept them as the aristocrats of pleasure; they have a hereditary antiquity of twenty centuries and more; they have distinction; they have the *haut ton.* But as the Edwardian elite replenished their blue blood from the depths of the ladies' chorus, so from time to time have the great and ancient arts admitted to their circle some more vulgar form of amusement, giving to it grace and distinction and at the same time gaining from its freshness and vigor.

To those of us whose life is bound up with the development of cinema, this process has a peculiar fascination. For the newly born medium of film is in the main a type of folk art, brash and vigorous. This is due not so much to its kind, for it is capable of infinite imaginative expression, but to its employment. Be so absurd for a moment as to imagine the response of an Aristoph-

anes or a Sophocles to the film, conceive an *Aeneid* scripted
and directed by Vergil, shorts produced by Horace under the
sponsorship of Maecenas, or consider the superb Technicolor
savagery that Akbar would have had his men produce. Yet owing
to the accident of its mechanical nature, the film was not born
until the industrial age; it had no decent cultural descent; it did
not even emerge from the people; it was thrust in front of the
people by the showman.

The people have never really recovered the initiative. They
accepted the cinema readily but passively; soon it was to become
their favorite indoor entertainment, as the showman developed
it sturdily along his traditional lines, borrowing largely from the
cruder forms of storytelling, drama and mime to exploit its ap-
peal. It was not, however, through any older art that the film
found itself. It became a serious medium only when the experi-
mental artist found in it new dimensions of time and place, new
rhythms and new sensibilities, and when, in the late flowering of
the silent period, he forged these elements into an idiom sus-
ceptible to high artistic expression—an idiom soon to be given
yet another dimension in the form of the sound track.

In the dual recognition of the film as an art and as a mass in-
fluence, the British Film Institute was founded in 1934. In form
it was a nonprofit-making, limited-liability company governed by
a board whose members were appointed by the Lord President of
the Council. In function, it was to fulfill a wide range of purposes.
The older arts had their academies, libraries, and museums, each
with its traditional field of responsibility. The new Institute, in
that it was to collect films for preservation, was something of an
archive; in that it was to promote the study of the art of film, it
was something of an academy; in setting out to raise the standard
of public appreciation, something of an Arts Council; in concern-
ing itself with the social effects of the film, something of a public
welfare body; in promoting the use of film in schools, something

of the formal educationist; in lending and displaying films, it was a public library; and in forming its own membership, a club.

From small beginnings, the Institute, financed from the Sunday Cinematograph Fund (a fund endowed from a percentage of Sunday box-office takings), gradually grew; and as would be expected, it found a center of balance in those functions which proved to be most practicable. Thus, the establishment of the National Film Library in 1935 and the development of the film-society movement in the late thirties were significant landmarks in the course the Institute was destined to take.

During the war, there were two notable developments in the field of British films: first, the emergence of a strong indigenous feature-production industry; and secondly, a rapid expansion in the documentary and educational uses of the film. These developments resulted in the formation in 1947 of the British Film Academy as a meeting ground for artists and technicians, in the peacetime continuance of an informational film service through the Central Office of Information, and in the institution of the new National Committee for Visual Aids in Education. The house was setting itself in order; and the Institute, lightened of several borderline responsibilities, could see before it a clearer task, defined by the Radcliffe Committee which considered its affairs in 1948 as "To encourage the development of the art of the film, to promote its use as a record of contemporary life and manners, and to foster public appreciation and study of it from these points of view."

Today the Institute receives, in addition to some £20,000 from the Sunday Cinematograph Fund, a Treasury grant which, together with its own trading turnover, makes up an annual revenue expenditure of £125,000. From this total, the largest net amount is devoted to the National Film Library.

In the field of literature, it is possible for the British Museum to preserve a copy of every published work. Films, however, are

more bulky than books; their expectancy of life is shorter; their storage and maintenance is an expensive and highly technical affair. Hence, since its establishment, the National Film Library has selected for preservation only the more significant films from the spate of current production. The method of selection has been aimed to fulfill three principal objects: to provide a record of contemporary life and manners for the social historian of the future, to survey the development of science and technology, and to preserve for posterity an anthology of films which reflect the development of the art.

The first of these objects entails a wide and judicious selection of material based not so much upon the journalistic value of news as upon the value of events as an interpretation of the age. This intention can be clarified by asking the question: "If you could recall to life the Britain of the eighteenth century, which scenes would most vividly reconstruct the life of the period?" The gardens at Vauxhall, the new manufactories at Birmingham, the interior of a coffeehouse, or a sustained view of Charing Cross would all be candidates at least as strong as the funeral of Queen Anne or the opening of George III's parliament. So today, the backgrounds of fashion, sport, and social life are given their due weight in relation to the events which make headline news. Thus, the History Selection Committee includes a sports journalist and an expert on dress as well as more orthodox historians.

The selection of films important to the development of the art of the cinema is a simpler affair. Great films are an automatic choice, as are any films made by artists of the top rank (actors, directors, and others are allotted gradings which reflect the selector's view of their importance). This, however, is not all; any film which uses a novel technique such as *The Lady in the Lake* or *Rope* would be certain of inclusion. This selection committee is composed mainly of film critics; it includes also film directors, journalists, film historians, and lay members. Already the archive

holds over 20,000 reels of film, to which new titles are added at a rate of 10 or 20 a month.

The National Film Library is not, of course, alone in the field. The Museum of Modern Art in New York and the Cinémathèque Française, to mention but two, carry on similar work in their own countries, and—thanks to the institution in 1938 of the active Federation Internationale des Archives du Film—there is now a high degree of international coördination, which extends beyond the Iron Curtain. The Library is, however, unique in the one respect that it has at Aston Clinton in Buckinghamshire a set of vaults specially constructed for the preservation of films. These vaults, under the supervision of a Technical Officer and a laboratory staff, are kept at carefully controlled levels of temperature and humidity. The staff is mainly engaged, however, in the work of film preservation.

Motion-picture film on a nitrate base is perhaps the most ephemeral material used in any visual art. After twenty to thirty years (although age is no certain yardstick), a complex series of chemical reactions may produce from the nitrate base acidic substances which, if allowed to develop unchecked, will combine to destroy the gelatin emulsion in which the actual picture is recorded. In extreme cases, the film becomes sticky and unfit for projection or further reproduction. Hence, a test has been devised to check the state of all films suspected of instability. A small circle of film is punched out of the reel to be tested and is inserted into a test tube. Since the deterioration of film can be artificially hastened by raising its temperature, the test tube is heated to 134 degrees centigrade. Inside the tube is test paper impregnated with alizarin red dye and moistened with glycerin and water. The volatile acid vapor generated from the hot film has the effect of bleaching the test paper; the result of this test is therefore taken as the time in minutes required for the color change to occur.

The bulk of the films held in the archive are used prints given

by the distributing company on the request of the Selection Committee. Many private collections, however, have been donated to the Library; and these may contain a certain percentage of negatives. The technical quality of the material is important because the archive is not a viewing library in any sense; it is a collection of matrices from which any future viewing prints may be struck.

The mobilization of this vast treasure house will present posterity with a sizeable task. A start, however, has already been made by setting up a Loan Section, which holds viewing prints of those films which no longer hold any reissue value in the commercial sense but which, nevertheless, are of great importance to those interested in the history of films. They include the early work of the Lumière brothers and Méliès; a representative selection from the one-reel period; early westerns; Chaplin two-reelers; the great silent films of Griffith, Eisenstein, and Pudovkin; several examples of the French *avant-garde* school; and, in the sound period, Sternberg's *Blue Angel* and Pabst's *Kameradschaft* from Germany. British film production is well represented and in all there are some 500 films available on 16-mm. and 35-mm. gauges.

Distribution of the collection through the loan of prints had, however, obvious limitations; and, until the National Film Theatre was opened on October 23rd, 1952, the Institute had been in the position of a museum rich in stock but without exhibition space.

The theater is a handsome modern building constructed under the title of The Telecinema for the Festival of Britain 1951, during which it played programs of three-dimensional films and large-screen television. Re-equipped as a repertory theater with 400 seats and complete with club premises, it still retains the stereo equipment; but, more important for its purpose, the projectors on both 16 and 35-mm. gauges can exhibit old films at their proper speed and can adapt their gates to any size of frame.

The opening of the National Film Theatre was hailed by the press with satisfaction—one Sunday newspaper claiming that this was "The screen event of the week, month, year, and probably decade." However that may be, after one year in operation, it is clear that both financially and from the point of view of public support the experiment has been successful. It has brought the Institute into touch with a large new public of members and associates (some 25,000 at the time of writing) who are enrolled on the lines of a theater club.

In arranging programs for the theater, the Institute had three objectives in view: first, to present a steady repertory of the acknowledged masterpieces of the screen; second, to concentrate attention on some theme of contemporary interest or importance in the cinema; and third (in keeping with the traditions of the Telecinema), to demonstrate what was new and experimental. Thus, two nights every week are devoted to a chronological survey of film history under the general title of *Fifty Years of Film;* four nights in each week are given to a series of studies of the work of outstanding directors or actors or else to some decisive trend in the cinema, past or present. In this category under the heading of *World Cinema,* the directors René Clair, Vittorio de Sica, Alfred Hitchcock, and Erich von Stroheim have each been given a season of from six to twelve weeks; the comedians of the silent screen (Chaplin, Buster Keaton, Harold Lloyd, and Harry Langdon) had a long and popular run. Other topics have included a study of changing fashions in male and female film stars, the work of Ealing Studios, and a typical cinema program of thirty years ago. Except for Saturdays, when the theater is thrown open to the public, only members and associates are admitted. Under this arrangement, the theater has built up its own specialized audience while enjoying the full support of the film industry.

Although the theater is a boon to the London film lover, its value to other centers of population is of course negligible. In the

provinces, the work the Theatre is doing in London is carried out
by Film Societies. The rise of the film-society movement in
Britain since the end of the war is something of a phenomenon.
In 1939, there were 18 societies, many of them veterans of seven
or eight years' standing. During the war, new societies sprang up
to serve the special needs of wartime concentrations; many of
these societies died as the population ebbed back into the peace-
time pattern. In 1946, however, there were 48 societies; and since
that date, a sharp but steady rise has brought the number up to
the remarkable figure of 230, serving an audience of perhaps
50,000 people.

In other countries the words film society (or cine club) are
capable of bearing many meanings, covering at one end of the
scale the frankly commercial operation and at the other a coterie
of the intelligentsia. In Britain, a bona fide film society can be
only one thing: a group of people formed into a nonprofit-mak-
ing, nonpolitical association for the purpose of seeing and enjoy-
ing films other than those normally accessible through the box
office.

The purpose and advantages of the nonpolitical clause are
clear, but the definition of nonprofit-making calls perhaps for a
fuller explanation. The intention behind such a restriction is
twofold: first, to ensure that there shall be no competition with
the film industry proper; second, that societies should exist only
for the purpose of seeing and enjoying films unallied to any finan-
cial motive on the part of the promoters. Thus, no officers of a
society can accept any emolument; members must pay their share
by subscribing an annual sum and by booking their tickets in
advance for each performance; and, in the event of a society's
ceasing to function, any surplus funds must be given to another
film society or to somebody working in the same field. This policy
has proved its worth; the film industry, and especially the Kine-
matograph Renters' Society, has been constructively helpful in

its attitude; and among the societies themselves, although finance
is often a worry, it can never become a preoccupation.

The domestic affairs of the movement are controlled by two
Federations, one for Scotland and one for England and Wales.
Much of the credit for the successful realization of the film-society
scheme lies with these two bodies; standing in the background,
however, the Film Institute has provided moral support and from
time to time financial help. The hire of films, too, is organized
for the societies through a central booking agency operated by
the Institute. This unit receives from the society the program
requirements for the season and places the bookings with the
renter of the library concerned, including the distribution sec-
tion of the Institute itself. The service is used by the majority of
societies and in the season 1952–53 the agency passed some 6,500
films through its books. Continental films which have made a
reputation in their country of origin, or which have been screened
in one of London's specialized cinemas, are perhaps the group of
films most in demand; recently, *Golden Marie, Don Camillo,
Kermesse Héroïque,* and *Rashomon* have topped the poll.

The societies themselves fall into three broad groups. First
come the giants with a membership of from 1,200 to 3,000 oper-
ating in big cities and in big cinemas. Their programs are run
usually on Sundays outside cinema opening hours, and they at-
tract an audience comparable to that of regular concert- or play-
goers, which fluctuates in accordance with the appeal of the pro-
gram. Many of them, such as the lively Merseyside society, run
a 16-mm. section too, organized as a study group complete with
courses of lectures; but in the main, the larger societies have only
the loosest sort of organization of membership. Next come the
bulk of the 35-mm. societies; their membership is from as few as
200 up to 1,000. These may be run on much the same lines as the
larger societies, or they may be more or less closely knit round a
central group of enthusiasts for whom the weekly show is as much

an occasion for discussion as a chance of seeing a film. Lastly, there is a smaller 16-mm. society with upward from 80 members, often operating under difficult conditions. These are the societies whose enthusiasm can stand the test of the 16-mm. sound track, the drafty hall, and the more limited choice of films available to them.

The success of the film-society movement has been largely built upon the work of a small band of enthusiasts. Such people as Forsyth Hardy and Margaret Hancock (to mention but two), themselves running flourishing societies, found time to plan and carry through the development into federation with its attendant opportunities for nation-wide participation. Today, the structure of the English federation is again under review; it must develop yet further if it is to take count of the strong regional conscious-ness which is an increasing factor in British life today.

The film-society movement is one of the practical expressions of the Institute's concern to raise the standard of filmgoing from the level of a habit to something more like serious critical appre-ciation. To this end, the Institute also organizes a service of lec-tures and runs courses for the many social and cultural groups interested in the problem. One of these, the annual course now held in conjunction with the Edinburgh Festival, is an event of some note, during which film makers and filmgoers are brought face to face to discuss their many problems of mutual interest; but the Institute has reserved its main effort in this field for the younger generation.

It is of course generally agreed that the best age for teaching critical appreciation of any subject is during the middle and late teens. It is known too that the incidence of filmgoing is at its highest at this age. For the whole mass of the population, it is true to say that when children leave school, if comics are discounted, they largely give up reading books; they do not, however, relin-quish the cinema nor the television screen. The Institute has

always held that the school curriculum should be adjusted to meet this situation and has been greatly heartened by the interest recently shown in film appreciation by Institutes of Education, Teachers Training Colleges, and the like. To give up school time to a study of entertainment films may sound a little quixotic, and indeed the subject is so young as to have no generally used technique of instruction. Some teachers encourage the children to keep maps showing what films are being played at the local cinemas and encourage discussion both as a means to select the most enjoyable film and, afterwards to evaluate its good and bad points. Most instruction is related in this way to the children's cinema-going experience, but some teachers go further and have their pupils produce films themselves. The class will be broken into syndicates; first, to write a script and then, when the best script has been chosen, to prepare for its production. Producer, director, cast, and crew are appointed; and the film is made on two or three free afternoons. Then comes the test of playing it back to the whole class, and if good enough, perhaps to an outside audience. The Institute already has a collection of more than thirty such films, some of them of quite remarkable quality, and mostly stimulated by members of the Society of Film Teachers, a vigorous body, who are the leaders amongst their colleagues in their interest in this latest addition to our school curriculum.

For its own membership, the Institute provides more specialized services. In addition to the National Film Theatre, there is a small cinema theater and a television theater available in the London premises; there is an extensive book library and a stills library of over 60,000 photographs from a wide range of films. For its members, and for the public as well, it provides an information service and publishes two journals: *Sight and Sound*—a miscellany of topical writing upon the film with such well-known contributors as Roger Manvell, Ken Tynan, and Paul Rotha—and the *Monthly Film Bulletin*—a businesslike review of all

current production. The Publications Department (under the general editorship of Gavin Lambert) also produces a series of indexes of the work of well-known directors and a variety of miscellaneous pamphlets. More specialized needs are served by the Scientific Film Association and the British Universities Film Council; and in Scotland, the Institute's sister organization offers a comprehensive service which includes the distribution of educational and informational films. All three bodies receive a grant-in-aid from the Institute.

In this and in other ways, the British Film Institute is tackling its main task of raising the standard of public taste in films.

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, New Mexico Quarterly, Nation, Hudson Review,* and *Films in Review.*

JACQUES TATI, who was so funny a few years ago when he first cinematically invaded America as the bemused postman of *Jour de Fête,* is back and just as funny in *Mr. Hulot's Holiday.* In the new film, which Tati wrote and directed, he appears as a wonderfully eager, considerate, even courtly young man on a holiday at a typical seaside resort. Although his every act dissolves in a degree of catastrophe, he never loses his characteristic enthusiasm or bounce. Tati is always a little unfavorably compared with Charlie Chaplin, which may not be quite fair to him; but there are bases of comparison. His technique is slapstick, his jokes are physical, and his appeal is visual. Although Tati does not have the almost balletic grace that Chaplin has, he does have amazing comic control of his unlikely rangy frame; and he can suddenly make telling looks pass across the almost expressionless boyishness of his face. Very little of Chaplin's sentimentality is apparent, however; but a few shots—such as the one of the boy whose high-pressure-businessman father must stay near the hotel telephone and watch the rest of the vacationers go off on a picnic—indicate that Tati, too, is not beyond creating a lump in the throat.

The chief faults of *Mr. Hulot's Holiday* are its disjointedness and its attempts to milk every possible situation that a vacation at the beach and a galaxy of seaside types can bring about. Whatever unity it has is gained from the personality of Hulot and of the hotel. But the hop-and-skip character of the production puts too much emphasis on the spot gag—the old one, for instance, in which Hulot, under his car, pulls in his feet just in time to miss being run over by a bus and then, seeing the bus tracks, gropes in

consternation at his legs. And, at the same time, there is not enough emphasis on the continuing comic passage which builds laugh on laugh—for example, in a hilarious sequence in which Hulot inadvertently gets mixed up in the receiving line at a funeral. An added English sound track is occasionally useful, but is more often simply annoying; banal vocal comedy, for instance, is unnecessary in a delightful pantomimic bit in which Marguerite Gérard enthusiastically searches out shells and passes them back to her laconic husband, René Lacourt, who tiredly throws them away. These two—always strolling around the resort, she about six steps ahead of him, and always first at the table—are certainly as fine inventions as anything in the picture. It would be good to see Tati make a film that was tightly fashioned in theme and incident, but the minor disappointments in *Mr. Hulot's Holiday* seem quite unimportant in the face of the laughter that it provides.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

In two other comedies this quarter, Eduardo De Filippo's *Side Street Story* and David Lean's *Hobson's Choice,* the humor, although often quite funny, has to fight other elements within the pictures to keep its head high. De Filippo, who helped adapt the scenario from his own play, directed and produced *Side Street Story* and played the starring role (a multiplicity that lifts him out of Tati's class and puts him with the young Orson Welles). Here, De Filippo tries to testify to the endurability of the Italians who live in one dark and dirty block in Naples under the Fascists, the Nazis, and the Americans and the new democracy. His technique is a mixture of the serious and the comic and is similar to that of *The Difficult Years,* which appeared here some years back; but in the latter, he focused on one family and its life under Mussolini and after his overthrow. Here, although the family of Gennaro (De Filippo) is at the center of things, the director tries to encompass most of the street; and he has to show the family under a variety of rules and rulers. The end product is diffuse and badly controlled. Too, the bumbling comic manner of De

Filippo, although occasionally effective, is somehow lost in the violence and the harshness of the serious parts of the film—the involvement of Gennaro's wife in the black market, his son's imprisonment, his daughter's affair with an American soldier, his own forced service in the German army. His best bit, although it is too extended, is his attempt to tell his unlistening neighbors about his harrowing adventures over most of Europe. The film slides into the broadly comic—again playing havoc with the transition—in some scenes; two of the funniest in the picture involve Totó as Pasquale, a man who will do almost anything for a price. In one scene, he pretends to be a corpse laid out for mourning in order to protect the black-market goods hidden beneath the bed; a detective, played well by Carlo Ninchi (an added irony is that he seems to be a detective under all the regimes), attempts to talk Pasquale into admitting that he is alive while an air raid outside slowly brings the sweat to Pasquale's brow. In the other scene, Pasquale agrees to serve a prison term for a black-market operator and then confesses to an American officer who, waxing sentimental about Italy, forgives him and then, announcing musical ambitions, breaks into "The Glory Road," the first number in a long concert that Pasquale must sit through. The excessive sentimentality of the picture's denouement—the softening of Gennaro's wife as a man to whom she has been unkind gives medicine to save her sick child when all her new riches can not find it on the black market—brings still another element to the conglomerate character of the picture. De Filippo is aware that he is mixing so many unlikely ingredients in one film: a restrained English narration that opens and closes the film indicates that all of these things are part of that little Neapolitan street. Although the mixture is not always easy to take, there are enough individual moments of quality in *Side Street Story* to make it a funny and tender film.

* * *

In *Hobson's Choice,* the problem is not quite the same as in *Side Street Story;* here Hobson, played broadly by Charles Laugh-

ton, is not essentially a comic character. Laughton pushes his
wonderfully expressive bulk and face through the part of Hob-
son, ranting, pouting, sneering, roaring with laughter, and some-
times—as in his drunken gambol home from the Moonrakers—
playing at the edge of slapstick. In the face of so much Laughton,
we can believe that Hobson, who drinks too much and tries to
domineer his three daughters, is quite a funny man; but when
delirium tremens sets in—even though a supposedly funny, fluffy
six-foot rat stares at him over the end of his bed—the joke dis-
appears, for Hobson is not Elwood P. Dowd. Brenda de Banzie—
as Hobson's oldest daughter who marries one of her father's boot-
makers over his protest and goes off with her husband to start a
competitive business—and John Mills—as the illiterate, startled
bootmaker—play their parts more quietly. The only broadness
comes in Mills's pre-bed, marriage-night routine, a chestnut
which he makes quite appetizing. As a result, the two young
people, although essentially they are as much caricatures as Hob-
son, become quite touching; whereas, Hobson remains gross and
remarkably unlovable; and the end of the film—when the boot-
maker moves in as the top half of a partnership with the old
man—is simply the end of the film.

<center>*　*　*</center>

The curse of disunity which marks all of the comedies does not
lie over the serious dramas. *Les Mains Sales,* which is in some
ways the best picture of the quarter, is not really a movie at all;
it is a filmed version of Jean-Paul Sartre's play which is done with
taste and subtlety, but with little use of the special advantages of
film. In *Les Mains Sales,* Hugo, the son of a Balkan aristocrat (the
country is fictional), who has become a Communist, is assigned
the job of killing Hoederer, a party leader who is working toward
a coalition with the rightists. The warmth of Hoederer's person-
ality and Hugo's sincere doubts make the killing impossible until
Hugo suspects that Hoederer has cuckolded him with Jessica, his
foolish and attractive wife. The irony of the end—that Hugo is
released from prison to find the party following the program for

which Hoederer has supposedly been killed—is strong enough to overcome the melodrama of Hugo's histrionic willingness to throw away his life. In this one instance, the use of the close-up camera on Hugo, the movie has the advantage over the theater. Despite the variety of political paths that Sartre has found himself on and off in the last few years, the movie is essentially the same as the play—the dilemma of the idealist faced with the untidiness of party maneuvering. The acting, particularly that of Daniel Gelin as Hugo and Pierre Brasseur as Hoederer—the two parts that really matter—is excellent; and the film is consistently absorbing, even during the political discussions which are indicated by the shorthand of subtitles for spectators who have only a nodding acquaintance with French.

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

The problem of political and personal loyalty is also the theme of *So Little Time,* an English movie about a Belgian girl Nicole. She hates the German colonel quartered in her house as a symbol of the force that has invaded her country and killed her father and brothers; but she finds herself falling in love with him. With this film, the problem is not the acceptance of its lush romanticism, which would be quite all right had the film been set during the Franco-Prussian war. The spectator, however, who is less than ten years away from World War II and from the discovered horrors of German concentration camps, may find the German colonel too carefully free from any taint of Nazism. De Filippo's Italians, since they are the average uninformed and uninterested men, are capable of creating sympathy regardless of the rulers of their country; but Colonel Hohensee is a nobleman, a man of rank and substance. His idyllic picture of his Baltic estate brought to my mind not the vision that he intended, but the question of how he held onto it during the thirties and forties without some cooperation with the Nazis, without some share in their guilt. Nicole's colonel becomes one of a troop of historical and fictional German soldiers who are now filling the English and American screens and bookstores, who are becoming new heroes—perhaps

as a result of the current international situation—and who are whitewashed with the word professionalism to free them from any responsibility for the atrocities that Germany committed under Hitler. *So Little Time* has attempted a great deal in trying to tell this particular story in the face of World War II; to the extent that it has succeeded, the credit goes to Maria Schell's sensitive performance as Nicole.

*   *   *

If political considerations crowd in to spoil *So Little Time,* they do not crowd in fast enough to save *The Royal Tour of Queen Elizabeth and Philip*—the dullest of several documentaries this quarter—from being a tiresome evening in the theater. One knows the importance of the idea of The Commonwealth to England and, by extension, to the whole of the Western democratic world and the importance of the tour as a symbol of that idea; but such considerations cannot hide the fact that this film is a limp presentation of the symbol. It is little more than a series of newsreel shots interspersed frequently with lovely travelogue bits, particularly the New Zealand landscapes, in CinemaScope. There are, however, endless shots of the cheering crowds, repeated scenes in which the Queen makes basically the same welcoming speech, and heavy documentation of the elaborate celebrations in each new city; but there is little that underlies the human, as against the symbolic, nature of the Queen and Philip; and there is not nearly enough to show the personal, as against the mass, enthusiasm in the countries that are visited. The film should be tremendously popular in the countries that are shown as way stations on this global royal progress, as well as with those admirers of the Royal Family who delight in seeing the Queen under any and all circumstances; but it is a disappointment as a documentary.   *   *   *

Considerably more successful is *The Conquest of Everest,* which explains and records the ascent of the mountain and shows that the triumph was a strange mixture of logistics and human

courage. The photography of Thomas Stobart and George W. Lowe, particularly of the latter who operated on the upper reaches of the mountain, is an achievement in itself and a beautiful one. Louis MacNeice's commentary, which only occasionally dips into heavy rhetoric, complements the photography, dispenses at once information and inspiration, and lets you know how the ascent was accomplished and that it was a feat that deserved accomplishing. The film is unhappily marred by the fact that we never get to see the final reaching of the summit, that we have to accept as a substitute an aerial view of the top of the mountain. Although Hillary and Tenzing had enough on their hands just to reach the summit and could not, like happy people on a picnic, take movies of each other there, yet the letdown does come when we do not get to make the ascent ourselves. The only rectifiable fault in the picture seemed to be in the music which too early attempted the artificial stimulation of an excitement that came naturally in the course of the climb.

* * *

Another interesting documentary, this time not from overseas, but just from over the border, comes from Canada. *The Stratford Adventure,* a forty-minute film, is the story of the Stratford, Ontario, Shakespeare Festival of 1953 from its inception in the mind of Tom Patterson to the successful performances of *Richard III* and *All's Well That Ends Well.* Although we know quite well that the ending is going to be a happy one, director Morten Parker manages to incite anxious anticipation by means of a series of staged shots which carry the festival scheme from the status of crackpot idea to that of full-scale community activity. Gudrun Parker's script, which mixes fact and humor, only occasionally stumbles over its own facility in working Shakespearean quotations into unlikely contexts; but the film, as a whole, is another example of the freshness that sometimes marks documentaries from Canada's National Film Board.

Shakespeare on TV:

An Optimistic Survey

_____MARVIN ROSENBERG

MARVIN ROSENBERG is in the Department of Journalism of the University of California, Berkeley, where he teaches classes in the critical reviewing of film, radio, and television. Prior to his university connection, Mr. Rosenberg was chief of the Siam Section of the State Department's International Broadcasting Division ("Voice of America"). He has had critical essays published in *Philological Quarterly, Studies in Philology, Theatre Notebook,* and *PMLA.*

Four times (at the time of this writing), Shakespeare has had major engagements with television in 1953–1954. Twice, he came off more or less with honor. The best that can be said of the other two times is that the playwright was the victim of technical knockouts.

But this record is better than it sounds. Shakespeare showed, even in defeat, that he is still the champion in any dramatic medium—if properly handled. His work can be made to fit the television screen admirably; and, for modern audiences, it can even gain impact through the intimacy of the new form. It is worth remembering here that in the relatively small theaters for which Shakespeare wrote—even in the outdoor Globe—the audience was pretty close to the action—perhaps even much closer than we used to think, if Leslie Hotson's recent arena-staging theories[1] have any validity. Many scenes, played far forward on the platform—or perhaps centrally at Whitehall—were virtual close-ups. This was especially true when the rapidly succeeding scenes were played in different stage areas, which became for the moment specialized locales cut off from the rest of the acting space. The audience then focused on localized action, something the television camera can do now for viewers. In the close relationship TV establishes, a brilliant clarity can often be given to the music of the verse as well as to its meaning; and the latter can be illumi-

---

[1] "Shakespeare's Arena," *The Sewanee Review,* LXI: 3 (Summer, 1953), 347–361.

nated by subtle, intimate stage business, legitimately suggested by the lines, that sharpens both the stage action and the characterization. Beyond this, scene can follow scene with the speed Shakespeare was working for.

This is what television *can* do. In the last year, it came a long way toward learning how to do it. In the first major undertaking of *Hamlet,* in the spring of 1953, many of the problems of producing Shakespeare in the medium became apparent; and some were solved on the spot. This *Hamlet* was an ambitious production, for television: a two-hour show, with a big-name cast—i.e., Maurice Evans as Hamlet, Sarah Churchill as Ophelia, Joseph Schildkraut as Claudius—and at a cost of many thousands of dollars. If the production was less than consummate—as it was— it was not for lack of effort and investment. It was clearly good enough to have been worth doing, and it taught television a lot.

First of all, there was the question of time. Two hours straight on network television is a fabulous slice of paid-for eternity, at the going video rate; and to ask a sponsor to give us more may be sheer ingratitude. But until more time is available, we are not going to get all of any Shakespearean play in one showing. Some of the lines will have to go. Well, some of the lines had to go in Shakespeare's time. The playwright himself mentioned a playing span that matches television's—"the two hours' traffic of our stage"—and, though we need not take this or other similar contemporary statements literally, it seems very likely that the plays then took some two or three hours. Shakespeare's actors may have spoken a little faster than ours; but it seems most unlikely that they should have spoken *Hamlet* trippingly enough on the tongue to get through the whole play, business and all, in the time allowed. More likely, if the actors had tried, they would have tripped completely over their tongues; and their words would have sounded like gibberish to a representative London audience. Both logic and contemporary evidence suggest that the plays were trimmed for the Elizabethans as customarily—if not as severely—as for our own.

This was not—and is not—necessarily unfortunate. In his best plays, Shakespeare has soft spots that are better excised; and it is often doing him a favor to eliminate them. I have nothing against the purists who like to produce Shakespeare entire, untouched; but, too often, the result is the preservation of stage relics rather than the production of living theater that the playwright would probably have preferred. On the other hand, the plays will take only so much cutting before they are mortally wounded; they bled badly in two of the television presentations I will discuss.

Hamlet came off fairly well in the 108 minutes of actual playing time,[2] though it lost in mood, in character, and even something in plot from the cutting. The fine, sinister mystery of the opening encounter on the battlements was chopped away, and with it the suspense that usually carries through the first court scene and our introduction to the melancholy Hamlet. This early omission seemed the less happy because it was replaced, with no saving of time, by a pantomimed court pageant. Fortinbras and the diplomatic complications springing from his impetuousness were missing—as they frequently are—and were missed, too, to the extent that they removed a foil for Hamlet's contemplative character; thus, the moment was lost when he was to say "How all occasions do inform against me . . ." and harden his resolve to act instead of think. The deleted comedy of silly Osric could be spared; rather less, that of the gravediggers. Many a favorite line here and there had to go in intermittent editing, as well as some of the loveliest poetry—notably the lines on Ophelia's suicide.

The *Hamlet* production also pointed out one of the specific pitfalls of dealing with Shakespearean spectacle on the tiny tele-

[2] We are likely to have commercials always with us, unless we achieve something better through subscriber television. Meanwhile, the paid announcements—at least those shown in the intermissions of the plays discussed here—were not intolerable. They were in reasonable good taste (though the plug for Mother's Day cards seemed to follow hard upon Hamlet's closet scolding of Gertrude) and were little enough to sit through for the privilege of seeing Shakespeare for nothing. (I would guess that the Elizabethans would have been happy to get into the Globe free if it meant only that they had to hear the wares of London tradesmen commended during intermission.)

vision screen. If there is a law about staging for the new medium it seems to be this: on television, background clutter is poison to complex drama, and especially to the plays of Shakespeare with his temptation to elegance. The genius of the medium is its selectivity of focal points for the combined perception of eye and ear; the line of action must be clear; the form of speech, unblurred by visual distraction. In a large theater, the complementary stage movement of a minor character may easily function as an aid to audience focus; but in the television studio this may be as dangerous as a flaring signpost pointing away from the action. Similarly, the appearance behind the actors of scattered backgrounds as conflicting shapes of black and grey—especially when they are in poor perspective (and this is sometimes unavoidable at the present technical level)—confuses the eye and interrupts the eye-ear perception. In the televised *Hamlet* production, there was a praiseworthy attempt, usually successful, to avoid the clutter of action; but there was a less careful attention to elimination of scenic hodgepodge. Each of the palace interiors suggested a kind of old-fashioned drawing room, with tables, chairs, and other paraphernalia; and, in depth shots, these interiors strove hard with the actors for visual attention. Another distraction was the over-all costuming. Snappy, dark, modern uniforms of the military, against the vaguely Victorian-Ruritanian flavor of the ensemble, worked in opposition to the viewers' time orientation.

A device favored by the play's producers (Hallmark Theater) was that of looking at the actors through tricky points of view—from beyond a window, through a fire, etc.—and, although this was an interesting technical novelty, it had the disadvantage of reminding the viewer of what an interesting technical novelty this technical novelty was. Another trick used extensively in *Hamlet* was to end scenes on a long close-up of the face of a character expressing some emotion. This grew to be very painful, particularly when the actor was Schildkraut, a "high-style" man whose frozen agony as he waited for the camera to leave him was

surely as embarrassing to him as it was to the audience. (This trick, as we shall see, was used by the Hallmark company much more infrequently in a second, better Shakespeare show.)

The virtuosity of the television camera is a great temptation to the producer. It can go almost anywhere, at any time; and it can look at people from many angles, including those from which we would never dream of looking at them. But unlike the film camera—which it apes in this capacity—the television camera that follows a live performance can never know if a tricky shot looks merely tricky until the action has been played out. Hence, television demands the most rigorous planning, creative pre-visualization, and clear-cut rehearsal on the part of director and producer; and the whole craft will have to learn from the mistakes of the pioneers. Probably never again will *Hamlet* end on television with a full-screen close-up of the dead hero, if there is even a remote chance that circumstances might cause his eyes— as they did Maurice Evans'—to blink widely and unmistakably under the pitiless stage lights.

Apart from its pioneer excesses, *Hamlet* was a heartening show to watch. It gave a large audience some excellent entertainment and a good taste—if not a full bite—of one of Shakespeare's best plays. It added to the common knowledge of Shakespearean production.

The next televised Shakespearean play, *Othello,* indicated that some lessons had been learned from *Hamlet*—but not enough. This was called a one-hour production, but bits were inevitably lost here and there for commercials and introduction. To consider cramming *Othello* into so brief a period was imprudent— and impudent—enough; but what the cutters did to the play was sheer murder. Even the story line was lost; a narrator tied together the butchered limbs of the tragedy with threads that were borrowed from some hack writer's leftovers. Iago was hardly recognizable, Desdemona barely appeared, and only the merest surfaces of Shakespeare's motivations were communicated. About the editing of this play, the less said the better; and the whole

production could have been passed over with a single, despairing sigh except for some first-rate presentation of what was saved. The action came out cleanly against simple backgrounds of wall and arch forms that let the words and the actors' movements carry the weight of the tragedy. Furniture and other properties were at a functional minimum, so the stage area was left free without looking bare. When depth perspective was needed, a view through an arch provided enough sense of distance and kept the eyes inside the frame of action. The crowd scenes were well handled; groups moving through the viewing area emphasized the central action, but did not distract from it. There were many scenes between two characters in the play, and these were enriched by a sensitive use of business to bring out the humanity of the lines. In two hours or more—and with an Othello more passionate than the star in the TV production—a first-rate job might have been done.

Everything that could have been learned from the two productions already described was completely disregarded in the Orson Welles *King Lear*. This performance went into history as a stern lesson in what not to do with Shakespeare on TV. If director Peter Brook—a highly recommended man from England—had deliberately set out to clutter up the small television screen, he could hardly have succeeded more effectively. From beginning to end, the action was difficult to keep in focus; in an effort to achieve constant depth, the director succeeded mainly in achieving visual confusion. Too many people were too often doing too many things, and the shifting backgrounds kept claiming the eye. There was even confusion as to who was saying what and, beyond this, confusion as to what was said. This was particularly true of the fool, a restless acrobat who tried ineffectively to talk as he bounced.

The production was strangled in its own complexity. Thus, the hovel in the storm had to be an Alfred Hitchcock-type windmill; we saw it first in an obviously phony long shot in an obviously phony storm. And the interior was again Hitchcockian, with slant shots of the windmill competing for attention with the lines. If

there is one place in *Lear* where the audience comprehension de-
mands concentration on the human action, it is in the weird, wild
night scenes after Lear is turned into the storm. Yet in the TV
production, the scene was broken up by the camera into ill-
assorted pieces; and the whole was never brought together. The
only really direct communication in this scene was a brutal inset
showing Gloucester being blinded: an ugly close-up, Grand-
Guignol style, as a brutal thumb dug into Gloucester's eyeballs
and rooted them out.

What made the blinding scene the less acceptable was the cut-
ting which had so abbreviated Gloucester's background that any
parallel between his suffering and Lear's was hard to find; his
experience carried no suggestion of retribution, but was only a
kind of exercise in sadism. The linked pathos he shared with Lear
was diminished. By curiously crude staging, Lear himself was
deprived of the supreme pity he was designed to evoke. Thus, at
the end, Welles came on wailing, dragging behind his murdered
daughter Cordelia by the edge of her skirt. This might have had
its impact in a large theater, as part of a massive stage picture; on
television, it was ludicrous. And this kind of thing happened too
often. The camera would frequently either close-up on Lear's
face when, to understand his stature and his declined status, the
audience needed to see him in context; or it would lose him in a
moving multiplicity of detail when the audience needed to focus
on him.

Lear is a hard play to do, but—despite Lamb—it can be done.
Perhaps the TV production showed how by showing how not to
do it. Another time, there will be less cutting; the story and char-
acters will have a better chance; the subplot will be better inte-
grated with the main one; and the camera will keep the whole in
focus against a clean, clear background. I personally would not
mind seeing Welles in it again, under better auspices. There is a
good deal of the ham in him; but anybody who is fond of the
Elizabethans probably needs a partiality to ham in moderate
amounts; certainly, Lear has to be larger than life-size if any

Shakespearean character does. Welles showed in the first scenes that he had the giant voice the old King needed and the sense of size; and with better direction, in sounder stage pictures, he might have carried the play off.

It is a pleasure to approach the end of this report on a happy note. Maurice Evans returned to television less than a year after his *Hamlet* with a production of *Richard II*—a play that had brought him fame in the legitimate theater. It was good Shakespeare; and, good television. Much had been learned since the earlier production, and the learning showed.

The play was easier to cut in order to fit into almost two hours' time, and it preserved Shakespeare's basic story and characters. Missing was a part that I have always liked: the fine scene where the Duchess of York stands up for her traitor-son Aumerle. The absence of this scene was particularly noticeable because it could so easily have replaced some badly wasted minutes at the beginning of the show where the producers, in an effort to "tie in" the play with something of "popular interest," ran very poor newsreel shots of Elizabeth II's coronation. Except for this poor exchange, I did not mind the deletions here and there; and I felt fortunate to see a competent job done.

Richard II had a good deal of elegance, but this was mainly kept in hand. Except for some visual confusion in the early court conflict between Mowbray and Bolingbroke, where the director seemed impelled to a certain busyness, the action and background were well controlled. In this second Shakespearean production by Hallmark, there were still some tricks that were too obviously tricks—seeing characters through a fire or through the leafy branch of a tree—but these were mercifully few. Gone were the scene endings fixed on agonized faces; interscene action was much smoother. All that really bothered me in the scenery was a massive castle front, so seemingly genuine that I could not help but wonder about its presence in a television theater. (It turned out to be a leftover prop in an old Brooklyn film studio where the play was produced.) I would have been willing to settle for something

much less bulky on the small screen and for less pretentious shots than the distorted perspectives that were made necessary when a horseman sat in the court and parleyed with Richard on the battlements. Still, nothing looked phony about the battlements, and perhaps the general effect contributed to the audience enjoyment. The acting suited the tone of the production: it was competent and controlled. Evans himself did not display the range of anguish that made his stage performance as Richard so memorable; but this was certainly partly from design, from his awareness of how close the audience would be. He knew what he was doing; and, to the end, he carried a show of hope and dignity mixed with despair which suggested that he might somehow outlive his deposition.

This reminds me wistfully of a comment on the production by a California newspaper reviewer. He noted that TV audiences seemed especially to enjoy *Richard II* because the story was unfamiliar to them, and they did not know how it was going to come out. What a luxury—not to know how a Shakespeare play will come out! For those of us too familiar with the canon, it is hard to appreciate the suspense and excitement that a "first time" could have; but the thought is heartening that television, as it comes of age, may bring a first time for all of the plays to thousands of spectators who might never otherwise come to know them.[3]

The plays, since they must be cut, will have to be cut judiciously in order to preserve character, story, and meaning. They must be acted against simple, nondistracting backgrounds that will provide a minimum platform for the lines and the action to emerge in clear outline. The actors must have a knowledge of and respect for the music, significance, and the drama of Shakespeare's language; and they must have a capacity to communicate its essences in the style the intimate new medium demands. Television can do this; and I believe it will.

---

[3] In a generous gesture, the film of Evans' TV *Richard II* has been made available to educational groups in the United States.

Content Analysis of Television Drama Programs

_____SYDNEY W. HEAD

SYDNEY W. HEAD is chairman of the Radio-TV-Film Department and director of Radio-TV at the University of Miami, Florida. He has been actively engaged in the administration of educational-television training and program production since 1949 at Miami. The research reported in this article was done under the direction of Professor Charles Siepmann and with the aid of a Kaltenborn Foundation Fellowship.

CONTENT ANALYSIS of a mass medium of communication neces-
sarily involves a sampling procedure. Even if one could analyze
the total output of a given medium at a given moment, it would
scarcely be feasible to sustain the analysis continuously. Radio
and television offer peculiar difficulties because of the variety of
ways in which programs are originated and distributed as well
as in the volume of output. Neither the radio nor the television
service has ever been analyzed in its totality, even for a short
period of time.[1]

In 1951, the National Association of Educational Broadcasters
began a valuable series of monitoring studies to determine the
content of television. The decision was to base sampling on the
total service offered in selected cities over a week's time. The
first New York study confined itself to topical analysis, i.e., types
of programs. The second study added an analysis of the incidence
of violence in programs—a subject which had aroused consider-
able public interest on the basis of previous, less formal analyses
by other sources.[2] The NAEB analysis involved a tabulation of
all threats and acts of violence occurring in all the programs tele-
cast by all the New York stations in the test week of January 4–10,
1952.

[1] Dallas W. Smythe, "The Content and Effects of Broadcasting," *Fifty-Third Yearbook, Part II, Mass Media and Education* (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Educa-
tion, 1954), 192.
[2] Dallas W. Smythe, *New York Television, January 4–10, 1951, 1952; Monitoring Study Number 4* (Urbana, Ill.: National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 1952).

This sampling procedure, though logical for the general purpose at hand, has certain disadvantages if the object is to identify typical characteristics of the television medium as a whole. For one thing, a very large proportion of the program material consists of films made originally for theatrical exhibition. These do not, of course, reflect the television medium as such, and often do not even reflect the current standards of the theater-film medium. Secondly, most major television programs are scheduled as series on a weekly basis. This means that a sample confined to a single week might select a nontypical member of a program series or include a nontypical one-time program. Thirdly, programs prepared for local consumption only may reflect purely local conditions, both as to audiences and as to stations. Finally, the selection of acts or threats of violence as the one-content item for detailed analysis seems an artificial limitation.

The present writer wished to identify some of the norms generalized in the television service as a contemporary, national medium and attempted to broaden the base of the sample and the analysis in keeping with this objective.[3] Since it was impracticable to analyze the service as a whole, one particular program type, dramatic, was chosen for analysis for a number of reasons. Drama involves the medium fully, in the sense that it is complex enough to stretch the resources of the medium. Drama necessarily deals with social values and attitudes, much of the time on an unconscious level. Drama is a major-program type and is consistently very high in popularity. It lends itself well to sampling procedures. And finally, since drama (as well as general fiction) has been analyzed in other media,[4] it provides both precedents for experimental design and data for comparison.

    [3] See Sydney W. Head, *Television and Social Norms: An Analysis of the Social Content of a Sample of Television Dramas* (Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1952).
    [4] The most relevant related studies, methodologically speaking, are Edgar Dale, *The Content of Motion Pictures* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1935); Dorothy B. Jones, "Quantitative Analysis of Motion-Picture Content," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, VI (Fall, 1942), 411-428; Rudolf Arnheim, "The World of the Daytime Serial," in Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Frank N. Stanton, eds., *Radio Research, 1942-1943* (New York: Duell, Sloan and

Again in the interests of securing a typical sample, the study was limited to regularly scheduled network programs, since these are distributed nationally on a continuing basis and may therefore be expected to reflect norms generalized throughout most of our culture. As finally delimited, the programs in the universe to be sampled were defined as *network-distributed drama series complete in each episode[5] and prepared specifically for television.*

A thirteen-week test period was selected, falling in the months of March, April, and May, 1952—a period of schedule stability, following the disruptions of the major holidays and preceding the summer hiatus. The sample was stratified in terms of program-series, but randomly selected within series. The theoretical expectation was four plays chosen at random from each weekly series on the air during the test period. In other words, each weekly dramatic series (as delimited) would be represented by an equal number of plays, but the particular plays from each series would be chosen at random. The viewing schedule for the particular plays was set up in advance by the use of a random-number table.

Sixty-four relevant program-series were on the air at some time during the test period. Some departures from the sample design were caused by changes in scheduling, the dropping and adding of series during the test period, and by the scheduling of some series fortnightly instead of weekly. The 64 program-series would theoretically have yielded a sample of 256 programs; but, because of the foregoing exceptions, the actual sample consisted of 209

Pearce, 1944), 34–85; Bernard Berelson and Patricia J. Salter, "Majority and Minority Americans: an Analysis of Magazine Fiction," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, X (Summer, 1946), 168–190; Donald V. McGranahan and Ivor Wayne, "German and American Traits Reflected in Popular Drama," *Human Relations*, I (1948), 429–455; Patricke Johns-Heine and Hans H. Gerth, "Values in Mass Periodical Fiction, 1921–1940," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XIII (Spring, 1949), 105–113.

[5] This eliminates serial dramas, or soap operas, which offer special problems for the content analyst, since the number of episodes constituting a complete drama is indeterminate. However, the serial drama is less important in television than in radio. At a point during the test period, only seven of 67 television dramatic series were of the soap-opera type; whereas, in the same period, there were 34 radio soap operas on the air, representing 17 per cent of the total radio dramas.

programs, which is 31 per cent of the total universe, as delimited, for the test period which was March, April, and May of 1952.

In the third NAEB New York monitoring study,[6] which took place January 4–10, 1953, some of the limitations of the previous NAEB studies were recognized. Accordingly, a separate analysis was made of 86 "indigenous" plays, i.e., plays prepared specifically for television. These were subjected to analysis in terms of character "stereotyping," and utilized many of the dimensions of analysis employed in the present study. However, *all* plays telecast in New York during the test week were included, which means that there is relatively little correspondence between the universes of the two studies. Of the 86 plays analyzed in the NAEB study, only 31 were from series included in the present study. The difference is due more to the inclusion of nonnetwork programs and serial dramas than to changes in programming in the intervening months. The findings of the two studies are roughly parallel. However, the significance of the many differences in detail is moot, since they could have been caused by differences in coding procedure and definitions (the two studies were entirely independent), in time, and in sampling method.

Procedure

Prior to setting up the actual sample, a pretest, utilizing four independent observers, was run on a group of 39 representative programs. On the basis of this test, content definitions and observational procedures were revised and sharpened. A code-book was prepared which described the operations to be performed, the criteria to be used in making decisions on content classifications, the indicators (concrete occurrences of criteria of classification) to be used, and special rules covering particular situations.

After a period of practice and training, the coder (observer-classifier) was ready to begin. With code sheet at hand, he viewed

---

[6] Dallas W. Smythe, *Three Years of New York Television, 1951–1953, January 4–10; Monitoring Study Number 6* (Urbana, Ill.: National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 1953).

a designated telecast on a home receiver. During the program, the coder made such entries in the code sheet as might be feasible. However, since most of the decisions depended on viewing the entire program, the coder learned to make the necessary quick notes as the program went on and transferred the information to the code sheet at the end. Coding was entirely on the basis of what "gets through" on a first viewing. No opportunity was provided for re-viewing or examining scripts.

Each content item was counted separately and given equal weight for each occurrence. Each program was treated as unique; hence, a "running character," which appeared in each of the four sample programs for a particular series (such as Lucy in "I Love Lucy"), was tabulated independently for each program.

The content dimensions used may be roughly classified into four groups: (1) interaction dimensions, which encompass the dynamics of the play as a whole unit; (2) temporal-physical dimensions, which have to do with locale and period; (3) character dimensions, which have to do with character traits; and (4) behavioral dimensions, which have to do with specific actions of the characters. The resulting data enable one to describe content in quantitative terms without, however, making any assumptions about the effects of content. Such a description permits one to say with some exactness how literally the dramas reflect the facts and the values of actual society, as well as to establish norms for the fictional society that is collectively depicted by the plays. This comparison is not made with any expectation either that the plays will or should reflect reality with any degree of fidelity. On the contrary, that the mass media are selective[7] has already been established. However, the object of quantitative description is to make possible the identification of the characteristic screening effect which a mass medium has on content. Society itself gives us a constant stimulus; whereas, the content of the mass media are conceived as differentiated responses.

---

[7] See Muzafer Sherif and S. Stansfeld Sargent, "Ego-Involvement and the Mass Media," *Journal of Social Issues,* III (Summer, 1947), 16.

The data of the study are based on the observations of a single coder. Reliability of his decisions was estimated by checking eight typical content categories against the decisions of an independent observer in a special sample of 20 programs. This test involved from 20 to 103 observations in the several categories. The agreement between the observers varied from 100 per cent in identification of the protagonist to 62 per cent in identification of the emotional intensity with which acts of crime and violence were depicted. On the less subjective categories, agreement was 90 per cent or better.

General Description of Content

Most of the plays take place in the present (82 per cent), in the United States (88 per cent), and in a city (76 per cent). Foreign settings are mostly European; no plays take place on the continents of Asia or Africa. Eighty-nine per cent of the plays are classified by type in four major categories: crime-detection-adventure (37 per cent), situation comedy (22 per cent), general drama (20 per cent), and children's drama (11 per cent). Love, history-biography, and social-political problems are infrequent categories. The most frequent theme is morality (44 per cent of the plays), i.e., conflicts involving conventional moral standards. Only 13 per cent of the plays result in unqualified failure for the protagonist.

Comparison of the distribution of identically defined themes in the TV sample and in groups of popular German and American stage plays for the year 1927[8] shows a significant intracultural correlation (Table 1). The numbers of plays in seven theme categories were compared on the basis of Spearman's rank-difference correlation method. The coefficient of correlation for the U.S. stage plays and TV plays is plus 0.69; whereas, that for German stage plays and the U.S. TV plays is minus 0.21. The outstanding difference between the U.S. stage plays and the television plays is that the love theme is much more frequent in the former.

[8] McGranahan and Wayne, *op. cit.,* 436.

In terms of outcomes, a marked similarity is observable between U.S. stage plays, television plays, and feature films, though there appears to be less ambiguity in the outcomes of TV plays (Table 2).

TABLE 1

THEMES OF STAGE PLAYS AND TELEVISION PLAYS COMPARED

Theme	German Stage Plays*		U. S. Stage Plays*		TV Plays	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Love.........................	14	31	27	60	41	20
Morality.....................	4	9	16	36	91	44
Idealism......................	20	44	2	4	15	7
Power........................	15	33	1	2	6	3
Outcast......................	8	18	0	0	15	7
Career.......................	4	9	5	11	3	1
Not classified.................	1	2	6	13	38	18

* Data on stage plays from McGranahan and Wayne, *op. cit.*, 436. There were 45 plays in each of their samples, but the totals exceed this number because the authors permitted multiple coding when more than one theme was present in a play. The television plays are single coded because their brevity usually produces only one basic theme; in the few instances where more than one such theme was present, the most prominent theme only was coded.

TABLE 2

OUTCOMES OF STAGE PLAYS, FEATURE FILMS, AND TV PLAYS COMPARED

Outcome for Protagonist	Per cent of 45 German Stage Plays*	Per cent of 45 U. S. Stage Plays*	Per cent of 100 Feature Films†	Per cent or 209 TV Plays
Unqualified success.......	40	67	61	75
Ambiguous.............	33	24	29	11
Unqualified failure.......	27	9	10	13

* Stage-play data from McGranahan and Wayne, *op. cit.*, 437. The authors categorized outcomes as "happy," "ambiguous," "tragic or unhappy." The categories "qualified success" and "qualified failure" of the present study have been assimilated to their ambiguous category. In 4 per cent of the cases in the McGranahan and Wayne study, the judges reached no agreement; these cases have been added to the ambiguous category in the table.
† Data on films from Jones, *op. cit.*, 423. She categorized outcomes in terms of "fulfillment of wants." In the table, her 14 per cent "partial fulfillment" and 15 per cent "unclear" have been combined in the ambiguous category.

Characteristics of the Population

The fictional society under examination consists of 1,763 individuals. Detailed analysis is confined primarily to the 1,023 characters classified as major (58 per cent of the total). Of the major characters, 68 per cent are males, which is similar to the proportion of the sexes among film characters as reported by Jones, 67

per cent of which were males.[9] Age is judged in terms of social rather than chronological criteria, using categories developed by Jones for the analysis of motion pictures.[10] Again, the similarity between the television population and the film population is marked: 53 per cent of the major TV characters are classified as independent adult, while 60 per cent of the film characters are so classified by Jones.[11]

Of the part of the television population having indentifiable occupations (75 per cent of the total), 17 per cent are engaged in police and protective work and 17 per cent in professional crime. Housewives (11 per cent) and the professions (10 per cent) account for the next two largest groups. When occupations are ranked by social level, 46 per cent of the major characters fall in the upper three of seven social ranks when professional criminals are excluded.[12] Social class itself is judged on the criteria of occupation and source of income converted into numerical equivalents by a method based on Warner's "Index of Social Characteristics."[13] Professional criminals (even if using a legitimate occupation as a cover) are eliminated from the tabulations on social class. Of the 602 remaining classifiable major characters, 85 per cent fall in the middle and upper categories, with only 15 per cent classified as lower class. A relatively large number of salient characters are either *declassé* or ambiguous as to class—for instance, 26 per cent of the protagonists and 20 per cent of the antagonists are unidentifiable as to class.

Characters are classified according to ethical status and affective status. The former refers to the behavior of the character with reference to conventional norms of morality. A character who violates such norms is classified as bad. Affective status refers to the polarity of the character with respect to the viewer's sym-

[9] *Op. cit.,* 417
[10] *Ibid.,* 418.
[11] *Loc. cit.*
[12] Ranking according to the method used by W. Lloyd Warner, *et al., Social Class in America* (Chicago: Research Associates, 1949), 41.
[13] *Ibid.,* 39–41 *et passim.*

pathies. Approximately equal numbers of major characters are coded good (74 per cent) and sympathetic (76 per cent). Goodness goes with sympathy and badness with nonsympathy 90 per cent of the time, thus establishing norms for the coincidence of ethical and affective status. Of deviant cases, badness goes with sympathy a little more frequently than goodness with nonsympathy (6 and 4 per cent of the total, respectively).

Deviations involving the combination of badness with sympathy are of particular interest. Most of this group are psychologically rationalized; e.g., a sympathetic character commits a moral transgression under the pressure of extraordinary emotional drive. In only 12 cases (1 per cent of the total) is a character presented as bad and at the same time sympathetic without some justifying rationale. Eight of these are criminals who are frankly presented as charming and attractive characters, and four are criminals who are presented with sympathetic humor.

Characters most emphasized are those classed as protagonists and antagonists. Each play, by definition, must have an individual protagonist; an antagonist, however, may be nonpersonalized— i.e., an aspect of the protagonist's self or of the protagonist's situation. Nonpersonalized antagonists (NPA's) occur in 41 per cent of the plays. Most of them (63 per cent) are aspects of the protagonist's self, such as a character weakness or foible. Fortuitous circumstances account for 27 per cent of the NPA's. In only 10 per cent of the cases are NPA's aspects of the social situation. Of the three types, the last is the most sophisticated. Conflicts based on personal traits, such as obsessive fear or comic stupidity, or conflicts based on arbitrarily imposed physical circumstances are relatively easy to invent, depict, and resolve; but conflicts which grow out of the dynamics of social interaction tend to be more firmly rooted in reality and hence more difficult to reduce effectively to dramatic format. NPA's never occur in children's plays, which invariably offer a clean-cut conflict between a good-sympathetic protagonist and a bad-nonsympathetic antagonist.

NPA's are also rare in crime-detection plays (9 per cent). They are most frequent in situation comedies (82 per cent).

Personalized antagonists tend to be older than protagonists, with 25 per cent of the protagonists classified as older than independent adult and with 44 per cent of the antagonists so classified (Table 3). There is a high proportion of professional criminals among the antagonists as a group. Similarly, police and protective workers predominate as protagonists.

TABLE 3
OCCUPATIONS OF PROTAGONISTS AND ANTAGONISTS

Occupational Group	Per cent of Total in Occupational Group	
	Protagonists	Antagonists
Police and protective................................	24	1
Housewives..	12	5
White-collar workers................................	10	5
Professions..	10	4
Military personnel..................................	7	2
Professional criminals...............................	7	70
All others classified................................	30	13
Total..	100	100

Behavioral Data

Acts of aggression and moral transgression number 711, the mean number per play being 3.72. The crime-aggression index for children's plays is highest (7.6), which is higher even than that for crime-detection plays (5.1). General drama (1.8) and situation comedy (0.8) are low in the incidence of such behavior. The most common act is battery, which accounts for 15 per cent of the total. Other acts almost as frequent are homicide, pointing a deadly weapon, aggravated assault, and fraud. If acts most often committed by good characters can be called most approved and those most often committed by bad characters as least approved, the most approved acts are firing and pointing deadly weapons and battery; whereas, the least approved acts are drug and sex offenses, theft, and homicide.

Violent acts predominate (56 per cent), with firearms involved in nearly half (46 per cent) of all the plays. Homicides occur 110 times, with emphasis on the killer rather than the victim: 90 per cent of the killers but only 58 per cent of the victims are major characters. Consumption of liquor, coded separately from the preceding acts, occurs 67 times; and the most frequent motive is social custom (67 per cent of total occurrences).

Professional criminals receive great emphasis. Seventy-two per cent of them are major characters, but only 56 per cent of the noncriminal characters are major. Furthermore, 26 per cent of the protagonists and antagonists are professional criminals, though criminals constitute only 13 per cent of the total population. Plays featuring criminals tend to be disassociated from family life. Sixty-two per cent of the plays include criminal characters. Of these plays, 38 per cent utilize family relationships as salient plot elements. By contrast, 54 per cent of the plays which have no criminal characters do contain family relationships as salient plot elements.

Ethnic Deviants

Because of the belief that prejudice is taught and reinforced by the unfavorable stereotypes found in mass literature, considerable interest has attached to the way in which ethnic deviants are depicted in various media.[14] Ethnic deviants occur in U.S. settings in 29 per cent of the TV plays sampled. The question arises whether these characters are discriminated against in being depicted as having worse jobs and lower social standing or in receiving less sympathy and attention than ethnic normals.[15] In terms of occupation, the deviants (in proportion to their total number) are markedly more often engaged in domestic and other service work and in small proprietorship than nondeviants; on

---

[14] A review of the literature is found in Donald V. McGranahan, "Content Analysis of the Mass Media of Communication," in Marie Jahoda, *et al., Research Methods in Social Relations, with Especial Reference to Prejudice* (New York: Dryden Press, 1951).

[15] An ethnic deviant is defined, for purposes of the study, as a nonwhite character or one obviously of nonnative American stock.

the other hand, the deviants are markedly less often engaged in police and protective work and white-collar jobs (Table 4). In terms of affective and ethical status, deviants are presented favorably. For instance, only two out of 56 Negroes are depicted as bad; and only four, as unsympathetic. As a group, major ethnic deviants in U.S. settings are depicted as unsympathetic 21 per cent of the time, as compared with 24 per cent for the rest of the major

TABLE 4

PROPORTIONATE NUMBERS OF ETHNIC DEVIANTS AND NONDEVIANTS
ENGAGED IN CERTAIN OCCUPATIONS

Occupational Group	Deviants		Nondeviants	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Police and protective..............	9	5	223	16
Professional crime...............	19	11	204	14
Professions.....................	11	6	122	9
Domestic and service.............	22	13	85	6
White collar....................	2	1	80	6
Small proprietors................	13	7	35	2
Business executives..............	2	1	42	3
Unskilled labor..................	4	2	30	2
Creative........................	1	1	37	3
All others......................	92	53	543	39
Total......................	175	100	1,403	100

characters. Differential treatment becomes noticeable, however, when ethnic deviants are compared with nondeviants in terms of social class (Table 5). Whereas only 3 per cent of the former are coded upper-class, 16 per cent of the latter are so classified. It is noteworthy that proportionately twice as many of the ethnic deviants are ambiguous as to social class as are the nondeviants.

Ninety per cent of the major TV characters are classified as ethnically nondeviant. This proportion is similar to that found by Berelson and Salter for magazine-fiction characters (84 per cent)[16] and by Jones for motion-picture characters (81 per cent).[17]

[16] Op. cit., 172.
[17] Op. cit., 418.

Religion

Religion plays a very minor part in the TV dramas. Content referring to religion occurs in only 10 per cent of the plays, and most of these references are incidental. In only five plays is religion a major element, and every one of these plays occurred during the Easter season. In 17 instances, specific faiths are identified: Protestantism, nine times; Catholicism, three times; Judaism, three times; and primitive Christianity, twice.

TABLE 5

MAJOR ETHNIC DEVIANTS AND NONDEVIANTS COMPARED AS TO SOCIAL CLASS
(ISC SCORES)

Social class	Ethnic Deviants		Nondeviants	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Upper........................	4	3	146	16
Middle.......................	15	13	327	36
Lower........................	26	23	84	9
Criminals.....................	17	15	143	16
Unknown......................	52	46	209	23
Total....................	114	100	909	100

Group Relationships

Characters are brought together in plays usually as the result of some group-social relationship. They come into contact because of occupational, family, neighborhood, class, and other such groupings. Intragroup relationships occur more frequently than do intergroup ones. Among the former, the most frequent are occupational, familial, and neighborhood relationships. Among intergroup relationships, the most frequent are occupational, familial, and national. Eighty-three per cent of all group relationships are connected with occupations, family, and neighborhood. Groupings based on national, social class, ethnic, political, and religious relationships occur but rarely. For the characters to be depicted as having no group relationships whatever is also very uncommon.

Fiction and Reality: Objective Norms

How closely does the fictional society of television dramas mirror the real society of their environment? As far as the objective facts of society are concerned, the television dramas obviously introduce gross distortions. For instance, the distribution of the real population in terms of age is relatively flat between the ages of ten and forty-four; the curve rises at ages below and drops at ages above this range. The largest real age group is the youngest group. This is entirely at variance with the age distribution of the fictional population, which is concentrated with 82 per cent in the middle part of the range. Occupations provide another sharp contrast: operatives, craftsmen, and farmers occur very infrequently in the fictional population; but in the real population these categories of workers constitute 46 per cent of the total. The real population is relatively evenly distributed through nine major occupational categories used by the U. S. Bureau of the Census; whereas, 72 per cent of the fictional population is concentrated in only three of these categories. Again, in terms of social class in most real communities, the lowest is the largest and the upper class is the smallest; whereas, precisely the opposite is true of the fictional community of television drama. The crimes emphasized in the dramas are relatively infrequent in real life. Homicide constitutes 14 per cent of the crimes in the television society; but, in 1951, only 0.65 per cent of the crimes reported to the police were classified as homicide. In real life, rape is more frequent than homicide; but this crime does not occur at all in the dramas. On the other hand, breaking and entering constituted over 20 per cent of the crimes reported to the police in 1951; but only 10 per cent of the crimes that occur in the plays are of this type.

Death and injury to the person are prominent items of content in the plays, but death and illness from natural causes are virtually nonexistent. Only five characters—of which three are

minor—out of 1,763 die natural deaths. The subject of birth is avoided altogether except for one instance of pregnancy. Only one character suffers a serious physical illness, though 12 characters do have serious mental illnesses. In short, the crucial events of every real life—birth, health failure, and natural death—are almost completely ignored in the dramas.

Fiction and Reality: Subjective Norms

Although the objectively measurable demographic norms of the fictional population differ widely from those of the real population, it does not necessarily follow that the more subjective norms of the two populations are equally dissimilar. Indeed, the very distortions of fact seem to represent an expression of values, wishes, and needs.

Male dominance, for instance, may be no more extreme in the plays than it is in real society. Ours is said to be a youth culture,[18] so that the emphasis on the most active age group in the plays is to be expected. The occupations which are least represented in the plays are the unglamorous, routine ones to which a large part of the real population is condemned.

The prevalence of crime and violence in the television plays has been the subject of much concern.[19] But the difference between the amount of criminal behavior depicted in the plays and the amount reported in official statistics is by no means as great as appears on the surface. In point of fact, full and accurate data on actual crime are not obtainable.[20] Wallenstein and Wyle found that 99 per cent of a New York group of supposedly normal (i.e., noncriminal) people had committed one or more of 49 offenses serious enough to draw a one-year jail sentence. They conclude

---

[18] See Talcott Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States," *American Sociological Review*, VII (October, 1942), 604–616.

[19] For instance, see House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee, *Hearings on H.Res.278: Investigation of Radio and Television Programs*, June 3, 4, 26; September 16, 17, 24–26; December 3–5, 1952 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1952).

[20] James S. Wallenstein and Clement J. Wyle, "Our Law-Abiding Law Breakers," *Probation*, XXV (April, 1947), 107.

that "unlawful behavior, far from being an abnormal social or
psychological manifestation, is in truth a very common phenom-
enon."[21] There is, moreover, a large class of crimes which Suther-
land has dubbed "white-collar crimes"—defined as crimes "com-
mitted by a person of respectability and high social status in the
course of his occupation."[22] Sutherland shows that this type of
crime is very common and that it is probably not essentially dif-
ferent in its psychological implications from the less "respect-
able" crimes which are reported to the police. Since it is an
arbitrary rule in television that "crime does not pay," the plays
necessarily deal with the types of crimes which in fact less fre-
quently do pay.

Our society has an urban orientation; hence it is not surprising
that the television plays emphasize urban rather than rural set-
tings. Interestingly enough, the plays which account for most of
the rural settings are laid in the never-never land of the cowboy
stories which do not pretend to deal with rural life realistically.
A subjective impression is that, although rural settings and char-
acters are never presented with any degree of realism, urban set-
tings and characters are often presented with a remarkably high
degree of realism. New York brownstones are lovingly re-created
in all their dingy detail, and the casting files are combed for au-
thentic urban-character types.

Two types of plays account for over half of the sample: the
crime-detection-intrigue and the situation-comedy types. Differ-
ent as these two seem on the surface, there may be a similarity in
the dynamics of their appeal. Both types, of course, are popular
from the commercial point of view because they are relatively
easy and inexpensive to produce and because the connectedness
of such a series has a valuable audience-building effect. But these
reasons alone cannot account for the predominance of these play-
types; obviously, they must also have a high degree of accept-
ability for audiences.

---

[21] *Ibid.*
[22] Edwin H. Sutherland, *White Collar Crime* (New York: Dryden Press, 1949), 9.

If theories concerning the prevalence of culturally induced aggression potentials in our society are correct,[23] the crime-detection-intrigue type and the situation-comedy type may be answering a similar social need. The suggestion has been made that the former type of fiction serves a psychological need in supplying sadistic and masochistic satisfactions.[24] First, the audience identifies itself with the criminal; later, with the avenging hero, who becomes "an Ego Ideal, with the primitive wish-fulfilling characteristics of a superman."[25] It is noteworthy that the activities of the criminal in the plays are often the major subject matter in the earliest part of the story; later, the hero occupies the foreground and often takes over the same kind of aggressive behavior previously associated with the criminal. Another characteristic of the hero is what might be called his "free-floating" nature— i.e., he does not usually belong to the milieu out of which the story grows, but is imported from the outside. The original protagonist, the person who has been wronged or otherwise set in opposition to the criminal, recedes into the background; and the substitute protagonist moves in as champion. The classic example, of course, is "The Lone Ranger," a mysterious, masked figure whom nobody knows, but who always appears at the crucial moment to take over the fight in the name of justice and morality. He is the perfect "Ego Ideal": ordinary people are helpless before the machinations of villainy; only a champion of supernal powers can lead the weak supporters of justice to triumph. As a result of the displacement of the original protagonist by a champion, the emphasis in the struggle tends to shift focus from the success of the protagonist's cause to the failure of the antagonist's cause.[26]

Although so much less given to violence and crime, situation

[23] See Talcott Parsons, "Certain Primary Sources and Patterns of Aggression in the Social Structure of the Western World," *Psychiatry*, X (1947), 167–181.

[24] Ernest Boll, "Social Causation in the English Novel of the Armistic Interval," *Psychiatry*, IX (November, 1946), 310.

[25] Leopold Bellak, "On the Psychology of Detective Stories and Related Problems," *Psychoanalytic Review*, XXXII (October, 1945), 404.

[26] See David Riesman, *et al.*, *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), 104.

comedies may have a somewhat comparable function. The role of
the situation-comedy protagonist appears to be that of the tradi-
tional fool in literature, who represents "the values that are re-
jected by the group, causes that are lost, incompetence, failure,
and fiasco."[27] This concept explains why the situation comedies
often end in failure for the protagonist. The social function of the
foolish protagonists of the situation comedies is to provide a
"cathartic symbol for aggression in the form of wit."[28]

The reciprocal of television situation comedy might be defined
as satire. Situation comedy reinforces group values and ridicules
the nonconformist; satire tends to do the opposite. Satire of any
kind is almost totally absent from the television plays; when satire
does tentatively appear, it invariably softens into sentimentality
and loses its cutting edge.

Conclusions

If the content of a mass medium is conceived of as being socially
reflective, its relationship to cultural environment can be ex-
amined both on the level of objective, demographic norms and
on the level of subjective-value norms. On the former level, tele-
vision differs grossly from reality; but, on the level of values, that
difference may in itself be symptomatic of a close adherence to
value norms. Television, as a medium, appears to be highly re-
sponsive to the conventional, conservative values. The few in-
stances of nonconformity which came to light in this survey are
readily explicable as being not typical of television as a medium.
For instance, one play aroused so much criticism that kinescope
repeat performances were cancelled. The play was *The Last Mile,*
an adaptation from the stage play of the same name, which con-
tained an unsympathetic characterization of a minister. Although
such a characterization is readily tolerated by the stage as a me-
dium, it proved unacceptable on television.

---

[27] Orrin E. Klapp, "The Fool as a Social Type," *American Journal of Sociology*, LV
(September, 1949), 157.

[28] *Ibid.*, 161.

This conformist character of the medium suggests that critics who plead for a maturer level of artistry on commercial television are bound to be disappointed in most of its product. An artistic medium which is confined to existing values, which dares not criticize (note the absence of satire), and which is hedged in by a variety of taboos is not hospitable to the creative artist. On this basis, in part, the American Civil Liberties Union opposes the television code of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. This document is essentially an attempt to codify socially accepted values. But, as the ACLU points out, the arbitrary definition of acceptable subject matter automatically eliminates much that, in other media, has proved of artistic merit.[29]

On the other hand, critics of commercial television who fear its immediate social effects may be unduly alarmed. The evidence indicates that, far from subverting the accepted conservative values of society, television reflects them with almost slavish fidelity. To be sure, *"what* is reflected may be distasteful to many; for example violence. It is necessary to remember that violence, hostility, and conflict are the common, not exceptional, characteristics of contemporary society."[30] Yet, there may be a more remote danger to society in this. It does not appear that television, this most pervasive and intimate of the mass media, will often lend its support to the unorthodox. As conserver of the *status quo,* it will add tremendously to cultural inertia. In an age of accelerated social change, this rigidity may prove disadvantageous. Communication has been described as "the cement which gives cohesion to social groups"; without mass communication, the intricate mechanism of modern societies could not function.[31]

---

[29] See the testimony of Herbert Levy, staff counsel of the ACLU, in Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee, *op. cit.,* 317–332.

[30] Franklin Fearing, "Social Impact of the Mass Media of Communication," *Fifty-Third Yearbook, Part II, Mass Media and Education* (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1954), 183.

[31] Fred S. Siebert, "The Role of Mass Communication in American Society," *Fifty-Third Yearbook, Part II, Mass Media and Education* (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1954), 1.

The cement metaphor is perhaps unfortunate, since it suggests a hardening of the social structure into a monolith that is incapable of adapting to internal and external stresses. But if the trend toward static conformity is not countered through some of the influential channels of communication, the cement metaphor might prove all too apt.

Film Music on Records

_____Compiled by GERALD PRATLEY

GERALD PRATLEY is a film commentator for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, for whom he writes and produces the weekly programs "The Movie Scene" and "Music from the Films." A frequent contributor to the _Quarterly_, Mr. Pratley presented compilations of film music on records in the Fall, 1951, Fall, 1952, and Winter, 1953, issues of the _Quarterly_. Here, he brings the compilation up to date as of July, 1954.

CONTENTS

The JARO FM are sound-track recordings issued by the J. Arthur Rank Organization, but are not available commercially.

Many of the pieces of music listed have been recorded by several orchestras; in such instances, only the most important recording is mentioned. This is taken from the sound track, is played by the same orchestra as in the film, is conducted by the composer, or is closest to the original score. Information about alternative recordings may be found in record catalogues. A second orchestra is given in cases where the first named may not be available overseas or in North America.

Not listed are songs written for motion pictures—unless they formed part of the background score—or scores based on existing music.

Original film titles are given in brackets.

All American record numbers apply to Canadian pressings except where stated in the case of Columbia.

* Included in "Cinema Rhapsodies."

** Included in "Hollywood Rhapsodies."

† Included in "Love Themes from Motion Pictures."

Recordings Listed for the First Time

ADDISON, John
> _High and Dry_ [_Maggie, The_] (1954)
>> "Song of 'The Maggie' "
>>>   10"——English PARLOPHONE R3827 (78 rpm)
>>>   Sidney Torch and his Orchestra
> _Man Between, The_ (1953)
>>   "Theme"   10"——American LONDON 1389 (78 rpm)
>>   7"——American LONDON 45-1389 (45 rpm)
>>   10"——English DECCA F10208 (78 rpm)
>>   Cyril Stapleton and his Orchestra

ALWYN, William
    Man with a Million [Million Pound Note, The] (1953)
        "Theme"   10″——English **JARO FM144 (78 rpm)**
            Orchestra conducted by Muir Mathieson
    Rainbow Jacket, The (1954)
        "Romance," "The Lingfield Race"
                          10″——English **JARO FM150 (78 rpm)**
            Orchestra conducted by Dock Mathieson
    Seekers, The (1954)
        "Dance of Death"   10″——English **JARO FM149 (78 rpm)**
          Choir and Orchestra conducted by Muir Mathieson

AMFITHEATROF, Daniele
    Lost Moment, The (1947)
      **"Lost Moment"
                    12″——American **DECCA DL8060 (33⅓ rpm)**
           7″——American **DECCA ED2133 (45 rpm Extended Play)**
           Victor Young and his Singing Strings

BASSMAN, George
    Joe Louis Story, The (1953)
        "Theme," "The Fighter Is Born," "Brown Bomber," "Denuncia-
        tion," "Marva," "Reunion and Parting," "Good Luck, Champ"
                    10″——American **MGM E221 (33⅓ rpm)**
         2 7″——American **MGM X-221 (45 rpm Extended Play)**
          George Bassman and his Orchestra
          (See also Winter, 1953, compilation)

BLISS, Arthur
    Welcome the Queen (1954)
        March "Welcome the Queen"
                    12″——English **COLUMBIA DX1912 (78 rpm)**
          Philharmonia Orchestra—Arthur Bliss

CARR, Michael
    Front Page Story (1953)
        "Theme"   10″——English **HMV B10616 (78 rpm)**
          The Melachrino Strings

CHAPLIN, Charles
    Modern Times (1936)
        "Smile"   10″——American **LONDON 1487 (78 rpm)**
             7″——American **LONDON 45-1487 (45 rpm)**
            10″——English **DECCA F10354 (78 rpm)**
         Frank Chacksfield and his Orchestra

CICOGNINI, Alessandro
  Indiscretion of an American Wife [Stazione Termini] (1952)
    "Terminal Station," "The Meeting," "Rendezvous," "Search—
      Near Accident," "Deserted Car," "Decision," "Parting"
              10"——American COLUMBIA CL6277 (33⅓ rpm)
            Orchestra conducted by Franco Ferrara

            (Recorded from the sound track)

DREJAC and GIRAUD
  Under Paris Skies [Sous le Ciel de Paris] (1951)
    "Under Paris Skies"
                10"——American COLUMBIA 40100 (78 rpm)
                 7"——American COLUMBIA 4-40100 (45 rpm)
                10"——Canadian COLUMBIA C2309 (78 rpm)
                 7"——Canadian COLUMBIA 4-2309 (45 rpm)
                10"——English PHILIPS PB246 (78 rpm)
            Mitch Miller and his Orchestra and Chorus

DUNING, George
  Miss Sadie Thompson (1953)
    "The 23rd Psalm" (mood music)
                10"——American MERCURY MG25181 (33⅓ rpm)
      2 7"——American MERCURY EP2-3147 (45 rpm Extended Play)
    Columbia Studio Orchestra and Chorus directed by Morris Stoloff
   (Recorded from the sound track; dialogue spoken by Rita Hayworth
     and José Ferrer; included in selection of songs from the film, by
                  Lester Lee and Ned Washington)

DUPREE
  Song of the Land (1953)
    "Song of the Land," "Flight of the Albatross"
                    10"——American MGM 30838 (78 rpm)
                     7"——American MGM K30838 (45 rpm)
            George Tzipine and his Paris Symphony Orchestra
                 (Recorded from the sound track)

FINE, Sylvia
  Knock on Wood (1954)
    "End of Spring" (theme for ballet suite)
                10"——American DECCA DL 5527 (33⅓ rpm)
      7"——American DECCA ED2141 (45 rpm Extended Play)
            Victor Young and his Singing Strings
    (Included in selection of songs "Knock on Wood" from the film)

FRANKEL, Benjamin

    Love Lottery, The (1954)

        "It May Be You"

                10″——English PARLOPHONE R3831 (78 rpm)

                7″——English PARLOPHONE MSP6085 (45 rpm)

        Ron Goodwin and his Concert Orchestra

    Up to His Neck (1954)

        "Theme"   10″——English JARO FM151 (78 rpm)

        Orchestra conducted by Muir Mathieson

FRIEDHOFER, Hugo

    Island in the Sky (1953)

        "Themes"   10″——American DECCA DL7029 (33⅓ rpm)

        Orchestra directed by Emil Newman

    (Recorded from the sound track; narration edited by W. Lloyd
      Young; narrated by John Wayne; see under Emil Newman)

GREEN, Philip

    Conflict of Wings (1954)

        "Sally"   10″——English PARLOPHONE R3862 (78 rpm)

        Philip Green and his Orchestra

    Park Plaza 605 (1953)

        "The Park Plaza"

                10″——English PARLOPHONE R3797 (78 rpm)

        Philip Green and his Orchestra

LOPEZ, Francis

    Violettes Imperiales (1952)

        "Elaine"   10″——American VICTOR 20-5405 (78 rpm)

                7″——American VICTOR 47-5405 (45 rpm)

                10″——English HMV B10569 (78 rpm)

  Henri René (musette accordian), Hugo Winterhalter, and Orchestra

MANCINI, Henry

    Glenn Miller Story, The (1953)

        "Love Theme"   10″——American DECCA 28988 (78 rpm)

                7″——American DECCA 9-28988 (45 rpm)

             10″——English BRUNSWICK 05250 (78 rpm)

         **12″——American DECCA DL8060 (33⅓ rpm)

      **7″—American DECCA ED2132 (45 rpm Extended Play)

        Victor Young and his Singing Strings

MANSON, Edward
    Little Fugitive, The (1953)
      "Joey's Theme," "Coney Island"
                10″——American COLUMBIA 40122 (78 rpm)
                7″——American COLUMBIA 4-40122 (45 rpm)
                10″——Canadian COLUMBIA C2331 (78 rpm)
          Norman Leyden's Orchestra
          Eddy Manson (harmonica)
      "The Story of *The Little Fugitive*"
                10″——American COLUMBIA 48003 (78 rpm)
                7″——American COLUMBIA 4-48003 (45 rpm)
                10″——Canadian COLUMBIA C2342 (78 rpm)
          Norman Leyden's Orchestra
     Eddy Manson (harmonica) and Richie Andrusco (narration)

MELACHRINO, George
    Eight O'Clock Walk (1954)
      "All My Life"   10″——English HMV B10608 (78 rpm)
              10″——American VICTOR 20-5579 (78 rpm)
              7″——American VICTOR 47-5579 (45 rpm)
         The Melachrino Strings

MONTGOMERY, Bruce
    Little Kidnappers, The [*Kidnappers, The*] (1953)
      "Nova Scotia Rhapsody"   10″——English JARO FM145 (78 rpm)
        Orchestra conducted by Muir Mathieson

NEWMAN, Alfred
    Hurricane, The (1937)
      "Moon of Manakoora" 10″——American MGM 30120 (78 rpm)
                7″——American MGM K-30120 (45 rpm)
        David Rose and his Orchestra

    (Note: Clifford McCarty, author of *Film Composers in America,* states that the song "Moon of Manakoora" was originally a secondary theme written by Newman for *Mr. Robinson Crusoe* (1932) and called " 'Saturday's' Theme." The composer used the same theme as part of his score for *The Hurricane,* and later it was arranged as a popular song under its present title "Moon of Manakoora." The orchestral treatment of this theme by David Rose is very similar to the original, and its proper title is actually " 'Saturday's' Theme," from *Mr. Robinson Crusoe.*)

    Robe, The (1953)
      "Prelude, The Robe," "The Slave Market—Entrance of Cali-
      gula," "Farewell to Diana," "Palm Sunday," "The Carriage of
      the Cross," "The Crucifixion," "Marcellus Returns to Capri,"
      "The Village of Cana," "The Song of the Resurrection,"

(Carole Richards, alto soloist), "Miriam," "The Redemption of Marcellus," "Lament for Justus," "The Big Fisherman," "The Catacombs," "The Rescue of Demetrius," "The Miracle," "The Better Kingdom"

          12"——American DECCA DL9012 (33⅓ rpm)
  4 7"——American DECCA ED 901 (45 rpm Extended Play)
          12"——English BRUNSWICK LAT8031 (33⅓ rpm)

"Love Theme" (Marcellus Returns to Capri) and "Village of Cana"   10"——American DECCA 28902 (78 rpm)
                    7"——American DECCA 9-28902 (45 rpm)
                    10"——English BRUNSWICK 05236 (78 rpm)
          Hollywood Symphony Orchestra—Alfred Newman

Snows of Kilimanjaro, The (1952)
    "Love Is Cynthia" (English pressing is titled "Blue Mountain")
                    10"——American VICTOR 20-5133 (78 rpm)
                    7"——American VICTOR 47-5133 (45 rpm)
                    10"——English HMV B10644 (78 rpm)
                    7"——English HMV 7M189 (45 rpm)
          Benny Carter and his Orchestra

NEWMAN, Emil
    Island in the Sky (1953)
        "Theme" and "Family Theme" (with Herbert Spencer)
                    10"——American DECCA 28903 (78 rpm)
                    7"——American DECCA 9-28903 (45 rpm)
          Emil Newman and his Orchestra
    (Recorded from the sound track; see under Hugo Friedhofer,
        who incorporated these two themes into the main score)

PARYS, Georges van
    Night Beauties [Les Belles de Nuit] (1953)
        "Theme"   10"——English PHILIPS PB149 (78 rpm)
          Geraldo and his New Concert Orchestra

ROEMHELD, Heinz
    Moonlighter, The (1953)
        "The Moonlighter Song"
                    10"——American DECCA 28947 (78 rpm)
                    7"——American DECCA 9-28947 (45 rpm)
              **12"——American DECCA DL8060 (33⅓ rpm)
      **7"——American DECCA ED2132 (45 rpm Extended Play)
          Victor Young and his Singing Strings

ROZSA, Miklos

> *Julius Caesar* (1953)
>> Narration and music recorded from the sound track. Dialogue spoken by Marlon Brando, James Mason, John Gielgud, Louis Calhern, Edmond O'Brien, Greer Garson, and Deborah Kerr. Commentary spoken by John Houseman.
>>
>> 12″——American MGM E3033 (33⅓ rpm)
>> 3 7″——American MGM K-204 (45 rpm Extended Play)
>> 12″——English MGM C751 (33⅓ rpm)
>>
>> MGM Symphony Orchestra—Miklos Rozsa

SHOSTAKOVICH, Dimitri

> *Golden Mountains* (1932)
>> "Waltz Theme" 12″——American COLUMBIA 12881 (78 rpm)
>> Philharmonic-Symphony Orchestra of New York—Efrem Kurtz
>>
>> 10″——Russian USSR 13266 (78 rpm)
>> Uriev's Orchestra

SHUKEN, Leo

> *Belle Le Grande* (1951)
>> **"Spring Madness"
>>
>> 12″——American DECCA DL 8060 (33⅓ rpm)
>> 7″——American DECCA ED2132 (45 rpm Extended Play)
>> Victor Young and his Singing Strings

SKINNER, Frank

> *Magnificent Obsession* (1954)
>> Music from the film, incorporating themes by Chopin, Beethoven, Johann Strauss
>>
>> 12″——American DECCA DL8078 (33⅓ rpm)
>> 3 7″——American DECCA ED815 (45 rpm Extended Play)
>> Universal-International Orchestra and Chorus—Joseph Gershenson
>> (Recorded from the sound track)
>
>> "Magnificent Obsession"   10″——American DECCA 29207 (78 rpm)
>> 7″——American DECCA 9-29207 (45 rpm)
>> Victor Young and his Singing Strings

SMITH, Paul

> *Living Desert, The* (1953)
>> "The Desert," "Mud Pots," "Desert Tortoise," "Millepede," "Skinny and the Gila Monster," "Scorpion Square Dance,"

Sidewinder and the Kangaroo Rat," "Burrowing Snake" (Harlequin), "Roadrunner," "Wasp and the Tarantula," "Awakening and Finale"

7"——American VICTOR ERAS 1 (45 rpm Extended Play)
Orchestra conducted by Paul Smith

STEINER, Max
So Big (1953)
"Selena's Waltz"   10"——American DECCA 28947 (78 rpm)
7"——American DECCA 9-28947 (45 rpm)
**12"——American DECCA DL8060 (33⅓ rpm)
**7"——American DECCA ED2131 (45 rpm Extended Play)
Victor Young and his Singing Strings

STEVENS, Leith
Wild One, The (1953)
"The Wild One," "Lonely Way," "Beetle," "Blues for Brando,"
"Hotshoe," "Windswept," "Scramble," "Chino"
10"——American DECCA DL5515 (33⅓ rpm)
2 7"——American DECCA ED633 (45 rpm Extended Play)
Leith Stevens' All Stars

STYNE, Jule
Three Coins in the Fountain (1954)
"Three Coins in the Fountain"
10"——American CAPITOL C1336 (78 rpm)
7"——American CAPITOL F-1336 (45 rpm)
10"——English CAPITOL CL14120 (78 rpm)
Orchestra conducted by Nelson Riddle
Frank Sinatra (vocal refrain)
(Lyrics by Sammy Cahn)

SUKMAN, Harry
Gog (1954)
**"Nightfall"   12"——American DECCA DL8060 (33⅓ rpm)
7"——American DECCA ED 2131 (45 rpm Extended Play)
Victor Young and his Singing Strings

TIOMKIN, Dimitri
Blowing Wild (1953)
"The Ballad of Black Gold"
10"——American COLUMBIA 40079 (78 rpm)
7"——American COLUMBIA 4-40079 (45 rpm)
10"——Canadian COLUMBIA C2281 (78 rpm)

7″——Canadian COLUMBIA 4-2281 (45 rpm)
10″——English PHILIPS PB207 (78 rpm)
Orchestra and Chorus directed by Mitch Miller
Frankie Laine (vocal refrain)
Carl Fischer (piano)
(Lyrics by Paul Francis Webster)

Dial M for Murder (1954)
"Theme"   10″——American CORAL 61211 (78 rpm)
7″——American CORAL 9-61211 (45 rpm)
Dimitri Tiomkin and his Orchestra

High and the Mighty, The (1954)
"Theme"   10″——American CORAL 61211 (78 rpm)
7″——American CORAL 9-61211 (45 rpm)
Dimitri Tiomkin and his Orchestra

Take the High Ground (1953)
"Julie"   10″——American CAPITOL C1213 (78 rpm)
7″——American CAPITOL F-1213 (45 rpm)
10″——English CAPITOL CL13988 (78 rpm)
Les Baxter and his Orchestra and Chorus
(Lyrics by Ned Washington)

VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, Ralph
Scott of the Antartic (1948)
"Sinfonia Antartica" 12″——English HMV ALP1102 (33⅓ rpm)
Halle Orchestra and Choir—Sir John Barbirolli
Margaret Ritchie (soprano)
(Based on themes from the film)
(See also Fall, 1951, compilation)

WELLS, Robert
From Here to Eternity (1953)
"From Here to Eternity" (with Fred Karger)
10″——American LONDON 1391 (78 rpm)
7″——American LONDON 45-1391 (45 rpm)
10″——English DECCA F10209 (78 rpm)
Stanley Black and his Orchestra
"Re-enlistment Blues" (with James Jones)
10″——American VICTOR 20-5466 (78 rpm)
7″——American VICTOR 47-5466 (45 rpm)
10″——English HMV B10607 (78 rpm)
Buddy Morrow and his Orchestra
Frankie Lester (vocal refrain)

YOUNG, Victor
> *Jubilee Trail* (1954)
>> "Jubilee Trail"   10"——American DECCA 29027 (78 rpm)
>>   7"——American DECCA 9-29027 (45 rpm)
>>   10"——English BRUNSWICK 05280 (78 rpm)
>>   **12"——American DECCA DL8060 (33⅓ rpm)
>>   **7"——American DECCA ED2132 (45 rpm Extended Play)
>>   Victor Young and his Singing Strings
>
> *Perilous Journey, A* (1953)
>> **"Bon Soir"   12"——American DECCA DL8060 (33⅓ rpm)
>>   7"——American DECCA ED 2133 (45 rpm Extended Play)
>>   Victor Young and his Singing Strings
>
> *Searching Wind, The* (1946)
>> "Theme"   10"——American DECCA 27455 (78 rpm)
>>   7"——American DECCA 9-27455 (45 rpm)
>>   Victor Young and his Orchestra
>>   Tommy Dorsey (trombone)

New Recordings of Scores Previously Listed

ROTA, Nina
> *Something Money Can't Buy* (1952)
>> "Such Is My Love for You"
>>> 7"——American MERCURY 1-3081 (45 rpm Extended Play)
>>> Richard Hayman and his Orchestra
>>> (Included in selection "Film Favorites")

ROZSA, Miklos
> *Quo Vadis* (1951)
>> Quo Vadis Suite: "Ave Caesar—March," "Romanza Arabesque,"
>> "Quo Vadis, Domine!"
>>>   10"——American CAPITOL L454 (33⅓ rpm)
>>>   10"——English CAPITOL LC6636 (33⅓ rpm)
>>>   12"——American CAPITOL P456 (33⅓ rpm)
>>   Frankland State Orchestra of Nurnberg—Erich Kloss
>
> *Spellbound* (1946)
>> "Spellbound Concerto"
>>>   12"——American CAPITOL L453 (33⅓ rpm)
>>>   12"——English CAPITOL CCL7505 (33⅓ rpm)
>>>   12"——American CAPITOL P456 (33⅓ rpm)
>>   Frankland State Orchestra of Nurnberg—Erich Kloss

American Recordings Previously Listed—Now Available in England

(Note: For details of orchestras and scores, please refer to previous listings. *The Moulin Rouge, The Bad and the Beautiful,* and *Ruby Gentry* themes were previously listed as available in England on 78 rpm. They are included here as part of LP selections.)

AMFITHEATROF, Daniele
    Salome (1953) (with George Duning)
                    10″——BRUNSWICK LA8604 (33⅓ rpm)

AURIC, Georges
    Moulin Rouge (1952) 12″——BRUNSWICK LAT8029 (33⅓ rpm)

BASSMAN, George
    Joe Louis Story, The (1953)   10″——MGM 707 (78 rpm)
                                    7″——MGM SP1069 (45 rpm)

DUNING, George
    Salome (1953) (with Amfitheatrof)
                    10″——BRUNSWICK LA8604 (33⅓ rpm)

FRIEDHOFER, Hugo
    †*Best Years of Our Lives, The* (1946)
                    10″——BRUNSWICK LA8672 (33⅓ rpm)

GILBERT, Herschel Burke
    Moon Is Blue, The (1953)   10″——HMV B10617 (78 rpm)
                                  7″——HMV 7M177 (45 rpm)

KAPER, Bronislau
    †*Invitation* (1952)   10″—BRUNSWICK LA8672 (33⅓ rpm)

KORNGOLD, Erich Wolfgang
    †*Private Lives of Elizabeth and Essex, The* (1939)
                    10″——BRUNSWICK LA8672 (33⅓ rpm)

PROKOFIEV, Serge
    Czar Wants to Sleep, The [*Lieutenant Kije*] (1934)
                          12″——NIXA WLP5091 (33⅓ rpm)
              Vienna Symphony—Scherchen

RAKSIN, David
    Bad and the Beautiful, The (1953)
                12″——BRUNSWICK LAT8029 (33⅓ rpm)

ROEMHELD, Heinz
    Ruby Gentry (1952) 12″——BRUNSWICK LAT8029 (33⅓ rpm)

SCHWARTZ, Arthur
   Band Wagon, The (1953)
      "The Girl Hunt Ballet"   2 10"——MGM 688-9 (78 rpm)
     (Also included in selection of songs from *The Band Wagon*
           on 12"——MGM C752 (33⅓ rpm))

SPOLIANSKY, Mischa
   Melba (1953)   12"——BRUNSWICK LAT8029 (33⅓ rpm)

TIOMKIN, Dimitri
   Return to Paradise (1953)
          10"——BRUNSWICK LA8619 (33⅓ rpm)

WAXMAN, Franz
   †*Place in the Sun, A* (1951)
          10"——BRUNSWICK LA8672 (33⅓ rpm)

YOUNG, Victor
   Forever Female (1953) 12"——BRUNSWICK LAT8029 (33⅓ rpm)
   †*My Foolish Heart* (1950)
          10"——BRUNSWICK LA8672 (33⅓ rpm)
   Shane (1953)
      "The Call of the Far-Away Hills"
          12"——BRUNSWICK LAT8029 (33⅓ rpm)
      "Eyes of Blue"   10"——ORIOLE CB1218 (78 rpm)
   Something to Live For (1951)
          12"——BRUNSWICK LAT8029 (33⅓ rpm)
   Star, The (1952)   12"——BRUNSWICK LAT8029 (33⅓ rpm)
   Thunderbirds (1945)   12"——BRUNSWICK LAT8029 (33⅓ rpm)

Scores Previously Listed—Now Available on Long-Play

PROKOFIEV, Serge
   Czar Wants to Sleep, The [Lieutenant Kije] (1934)
     Suite, Lieutenant Kije, Op. 60: "Birth of Kije," "Romance,"
     "Kije's Wedding," "Troika," "Burial of Kije"
          12"——American VICTOR LCT1144 (33⅓ rpm)
        Boston Symphony—Serge Koussevitzky

ROZSA, Miklos
   Red House, The (1947)
     "Prelude," "Retribution," "Screams in the Night," "The Forest"
          10"——American CAPITOL L453 (33⅓ rpm)
          10"——English CAPITOL CCL7505 (33⅓ rpm)
          12"——American CAPITOL P456 (33⅓ rpm)
        Symphony Orchestra—Miklos Rozsa

Miscellaneous

VIVALDI, Antonio

 Golden Coach, The (1953)

   Music from the works of Vivaldi and songs from the *Commedia dell'Arte* (arranged by Gino Marinuzzi, Jr.)

      12"——**American MGM E3111 (33⅓ rpm)**

      Rome Symphony Orchestra—Marinuzzi, Jr.

        (Recorded from the sound track)

Index

All *Recordings Listed for the First Time* in this compilation are to be found under the name of the composer. Where the name of the film is known, but not the name of the composer, this index will provide the information.

A Bibliography for the Quarter

_____*Book Editor,* FRANKLIN FEARING

As RUDOLPH ARNHEIM SAYS in the introduction to his *Art and Visual Perception* (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1954, $10.00), art is in danger of being drowned in talk—especially, it may be added, by psychological talk. There are large numbers of books and articles on the psychology "of" art and artists. But there have been few, if any, in which a psychologist has dealt with the psychological processes which are central to the experience and creation of art. Arnheim is referring to this when he observes that *all* seeing is in the realm of the psychologist and that a discussion of the processes of creating and experiencing art is impossible without talking psychology. Accordingly, psychology—by which Arnheim means the science of mind in all its manifestations—is not merely an approach to art experience and creativity; it is the substance of art itself. But much of the psychologizing about art is amateurish or uninformed. For example, firmly embedded in the *credo* of many of those who write or talk about it is the belief that art is uniquely a matter of feeling and emotion—and not just the feelings and emotions of everyday life, but some sort of inexpressible, transcendental thrill that is mysteriously inspired from above. Professor Arnheim comments rather acidly on this "psychology" as "either homemade or left over from theories of the past and mostly below the standards of our present knowledge."

Arnheim's general purpose is to consider art from the viewpoint of contemporary psychology, and especially from the kind of psychological thinking derived from the Gestalt theory—a way of thinking about reality which makes the artist "feel at home." This is true because the artist, more than most people, is aware of the unified and integrated character of our experience; and he

knows that this unity may not be understood by breaking it down into its parts. More importantly, perhaps, this thinking approaches art in terms of cognition and perception, rather than feeling and emotion. Arnheim insists on the essential identity between the perceiving of the artist and all perceiving. The perception of a Rembrandt painting and the perceptions of the artist who painted it may differ in complexity, but not in kind, from my perception of a streetcar. Each represents a striving after unity as a basis for mastering reality, and each is a creative act. The artist brings to his perceiving special training and possesses skills which enable him to communicate his experience in a particular medium. He must have what Arnheim calls a "truly creative grasp of reality" but Arnheim also insists that all grasping of reality is truly creative. This is a principle of perception which is heavily documented by current psychological research. In bringing the experience as well as the creation of art within this context, Arnheim justifies his book's subtitle *The Psychology of the Creative Eye.*

It is impossible to review here all the ramifications and applications of these principles in the field of the visual arts. There are chapters on balance, shape, form, space, light, color, and movement; and a chapter on expression, which deals extensively with the physiognomic properties of visual experience, is especially illuminating. An extensive bibliography completes the book.

This well-written, scholarly volume is a basic contribution to our understanding of all aspects of the perception and creation of visual art. It is beautifully illustrated and printed, but why was the decision made to put it between covers measuring eight and one-half by eleven and one-quarter inches? Although the book is handsome to look at, it is extremely awkward to handle. The publishers should include a bookrack with each volume.

The author is a member of the Psychology Faculty at Sarah Lawrence College and Visiting Professor in Psychology on the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research. He is

known to all students of films as the author of *Film,* and has made numerous research contributions in the fields of film and radio.

* * *

In *Individualism Reconsidered* (The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1954, $6.00), David Reisman continues his exploration of the implications of the thesis first expounded in *The Lonely Crowd.* This thesis, it will be recalled, states that men in contemporary society fall into two main character types which Reisman calls "inner-directed" and "other-directed." Individuals of the first type have achieved a core of values and goals, perhaps implanted in early life, from which they derive inner strength and which guide their behavior. In the second type, the individual's goals and values are primarily derived from the outside, from his fellows. He seeks approval and guidance from others, and is psychologically dependent on others for whatever meaning life has. He never resists authority or makes independent judgments. Reisman believes the other-directed person to be the prevailing character type of present-day society.

The thirty-odd essays which constitute the present volume—they appeared originally in a variety of places—are grouped under eight captions which include: "Individualism and Its Context," "Marginality, Minorities, and Freedom," "Culture: Popular and Unpopular," "Veblen and the Business Culture," "Freud and Psychoanalysis," "Totalitarianism," and "Problems of Method in the Social Sciences."

In these essays, Reisman orients his discussion of a wide range of human situations and institutions from the viewpoint of his original hypothesis. He feels that the strong drift toward an other-directed type of society should be resisted. In what he terms "groupism," he sees a tendency toward a dangerous kind of conformity. Individualism, he believes, should be reconsidered; we must, he says, give every encouragement to people to develop their private selves. This, of course, means a multi-valued rather than a single-valued society.

In this theoretical context, Reisman discusses the various forms of popular culture including the mass media of communication. There are essays on listening to popular music, movies and movie audiences, attitudes towards leisure, recreation and recreationists, and the "amateur" sport of college football. Reisman's views of these activities is neither condescending nor contemptuous. He has, indeed, some caustic things to say about those humanists who detest TV and radio, opinion polls (about which they are usually abysmally ignorant), Hollywood movies (except, of course, the art films), swing music, etc. "English and Art departments," he notes, "in some universities remain refuges for those who judge culture entirely by its traditionally packaged products, such as poetry and easel painting, and dismiss all new forms as base and 'commercial'." They miss, he says, "a lot."

Reisman's ideas about movie audiences are also unorthodox. He rejects the notion that older people stay away from movies because the latter are not sufficiently "adult." On the contrary, he suspects that movies are too mature and move too fast for older people to catch on to or catch up with. The term "escape," so beloved by the would-be intellectual critic of the mass media, Reisman finds ambiguous. Its use, he says, "may be a way of playing down the revolutionary or insubordinate role of the media for one's children, or the lower strata, or even the childlike or less responsible parts of oneself."

The essays in *Individualism Reconsidered* are not especially easy reading, but they contain exciting, and for some, annoying ideas. With some editing, the text would have been improved, especially in the matter of citations to literature, for the author has an annoying habit of referring to the work of others without giving a complete citation. There were five such incomplete references in as many pages in one of the essays.

Author Reisman was trained in the law and was once law clerk to the late Justice Brandeis; at present, he is Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Chicago.

*   *   *

In the preface to his *An Introduction to the Theatre* (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1954, $4.50), Frank M. Whiting says that he intends to put into a single volume a comprehensive view of the theater, so that the beginning student may see the subject as a whole before beginning a detailed study. In this reviewer's opinion, the author has succeeded to a remarkable degree. In a little over three hundred pages, the author has included a brief history of the theater beginning with the Greeks, sections on acting, directing, costuming and make-up, theater architecture, scene design, stage lighting, and the theater as a profession. Almost automatically, one expects to say that such extensive coverage in so few pages must be obviously superficial. Undoubtedly, some specialists in the various areas covered may find it so; but to this reader it seems like an extraordinarily competent job. Although the author calls it a textbook, it doesn't read like one. The style is lively without being journalistic; the illustrations are excellent, and there is a carefully selected bibliography.

Probably, everyone who reads *An Introduction to the Theatre* will wonder why some particular topic was not covered. However, it seems regrettable that some space was not devoted to what satisfactions the audience derive from watching a play. Chapter one begins with some startling statistical comparisons between the size of the mass audience of TV, movies, and radio and that of the "legitimate" theater. We learn that on a given day some eight million attend the movies, eighty million listen to the radio, and forty-five million watch TV; whereas, only about sixty-five thousand go to the theater. Why these differences? What does the theater do for its patrons that the mass media do not do? Without data, even speculations about these problems by a professional would have been interesting. In this connection, it would also have been of interest to point out some of the parallels of the audiences in Shakespeare's theater and the mass audience for films. The studies of Harbage and others on Shakespeare's audience furnish some beginning data for such a project.

The author is Professor of Speech and Theater Arts and Direc-
tor of the University Theater at the University of Minnesota.

*   *   *

From those who present research data in scientific papers to the
harassed lady writing a paper for her club, almost everyone sooner
or later wants to make graphic pictures to illustrate his points.
Calvin F. Schmid, in *Handbook of Graphic Presentation* (The
Ronald Press, 15 East 26th Street, New York 10, 1954, $6.00),
meets the needs of these various people admirably. A practical,
nontechnical presentation of a subject that can be unbelievably
technical, this volume is amply illustrated with an adequate in-
dex. The author is Director, Office of Population Research and
Professor of Sociology, University of Washington.

*   *   *

Film Technique and Film Acting, containing V. I. Pudovkin's
two classic essays, has been reissued by the British Book Centre,
Inc. (122 East 55th Street, New York 22, 1954, $4.50). With the
exception of twenty-four illustrations, the present volume is an
exact duplicate of the book published by Lear in 1949, and is
printed apparently, from the same plates. The translator of these
essays is Ivor Montagu, and the introduction is by Lewis Jacobs.
Oddly, the present printing contains no reference to the earlier
edition; and the illustrations, which are confined to the section
on film acting, consist exclusively of pictures of various actors in
Russian film roles.

*   *   *

The Film Council of America has celebrated the thirtieth
anniversary of the 16-mm. film by printing a volume of essays
which summarize the past and anticipate the future of this me-
dium. Twenty-three specialists have contributed articles to *Sixty
Years of 16-MM. Film, 1923–1983* (Film Council of America, 600
Davis Street, Evanston, Illinois, 1954, no price), covering many
aspects of the 16-mm. film as an educational medium. There are
papers on equipment, on production and distribution, on the

uses of 16-mm. films in public schools, industry, churches, public libraries, state, federal and local governments, on world trade in educational films, on the theatrical 16-mm. film, and on evaluation and testing. Competently written, the volume, as a whole, affords an excellent survey of the subject. But, it seems a pity that so little attention was given to research methodology and findings in this area. With the exception of the excellent paper by Nicholas Rose on audience research, only incidental references are made to research literature in the film field.

* * *

A surprising, as well as psychologically and socially interesting, development in the field of mass communication is the extraordinary rise of science fiction. It has attracted the interests of a highly competent group of professionals who devote themselves almost exclusively to this form of fiction writing, and it has acquired a huge audience. There are magazines devoted exclusively to science fiction, and numerous anthologies have appeared. From its earliest beginnings in *Gulliver's Travels,* through Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* and the phantasies of H. G. Wells, down to the current stories of Robert Heinlein, Ray Bradbury, Isaac Asimov, and others, it is clear that this form of writing has not been merely an outlet for a particular kind of bizarre imagination; rather, it has been the vehicle for the expression of serious, occasionally acid, social comment.

All this is reflected in *Stories of Scientific Imagination* (Oxford Book Company, New York, 1954, no price given). The editor of this small collection is Joseph Gallant who is Chairman, English Department, Theodore Roosevelt High School, New York City. In his interesting preface, he states that science fiction expresses the mythology of our industrial, scientific culture. In the more mature examples of this type of fiction, he believes that the "various traditional aspects of literature may be found: sound narrative structure, psychological analysis, imaginative realization of human experience, exploration of social and historic prob-

lems, satire, fantasy, and stylistic power." Hence, their reading
may serve valid educational purposes. The nine stories in his col-
lection are intended for reading in high-school classes, and each
story is followed by a list of provocative questions.

<center>*   *   *</center>

The British Broadcasting Corporation has issued *British
Broadcasting, A Bibliography* (Broadcasting House, 35 Maryle-
bone High Street, London W 1, 1954, one shilling) which is an
excellent compilation covering books published in Britain on
sound and TV. There is also a list of articles in monthly and quar-
terly periodicals, the more important debates in Parliament con-
cerning the BBC, and all official publications relating to the BBC.
Each entry is briefly annotated, and there is an author index.