THE QUARTERLY of Film Radio and Television

(Formerly HOLLYWOOD QUARTERLY)

Volume VII: 1952–1953

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES

Contents

ARTICLES (*Continued*) PAGE

THE QUARTERLY of Film Radio and Television

Volume VII · FALL · *Number 1*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES

Contents

The Challenge of the 242 Channels — Part I

BURTON PAULU

BURTON PAULU, manager of KUOM, the University of Minnesota's educational radio station, was supervisor of the Fund for Adult Education experimental television project at Iowa State College's WOI-TV from June to December, 1951, and is currently serving as a consultant to WOI-TV. Dr. Paulu is an alternate representative for the National Association of Educational Broadcasters on the Joint Committee on Educational Television, and testified before the Federal Communications Commission during the hearings on reservation of television channels for educational use.

The following is the first of a two-part article. Part II will appear in the next issue of the *Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television.*

ON APRIL 14, 1952, the Federal Communications Commission presented education with one of its biggest challenges of recent years: an opportunity to construct 242 educational television stations on channels especially reserved for that purpose. On that date the commission released its long-awaited television allocation plan providing 2,053 new television station assignments for the United States and its dependencies, of which 242 were to be noncommercial educational stations. Never before had educational broadcasting had such a chance. But there was an accompanying challenge: the report also provided that any of these channels not taken up within a year might be lost to commercial television. The situation therefore is critical; the future of educational television may be decided during the next twelve months!

The "Freeze" and the Hearings

In 1945 the Federal Communications Commission set aside 13 channels in the Very High Frequency Band (VHF) for television broadcasting. Channel 1 was later deleted, leaving 12 channels to which 394 station assignments were possible. But when these stations began to go on the air it was discovered that the allocation table had been based on faulty engineering data: interference developed because of insufficient mileage separation between sta-

tions. Therefore in September, 1948, the commission issued its now famous "freeze" order providing that no new or pending applications for television station construction permits would be acted upon until the entire allocation policy had been revised; this had the subsequent effect of limiting to 108 the number of the country's television stations. The commission then proceeded to reëxamine the whole allocation question and to hold extensive hearings which culminated in its Sixth Report and Order of April 14. Many witnesses testified, many briefs were presented and many solutions proposed before the matter of educational reservations was given much attention. For example, almost a year was devoted to color television. Finally, however, the advocates of reservations for education appeared before the commission with their proposals.

By any set of standards the organization and zeal displayed by the educators in the presentation of their case would be impressive; judged against the background of apathy and shortsightedness which had so often characterized their attitude in the early days of radio twenty-five years before, their campaign was incredible. Spearheaded by the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, the supporters of educational reservations set up the Joint Committee on Educational Television and supported it with money raised through public subscription and foundation grants. Since the JCET's seven members were among the country's best-known and most-respected educational groups they provided the new movement with both academic respectability and wise counsel.[1] This group engaged nationally recognized legal and engineering talent to press their case. Under JCET's aegis, 76 witnesses appeared before the commission in support of channel reservations; these included many of the nation's most prominent educators, political leaders, and public figures. The personal appearances of these witnesses were later supplemented by formal

[1] In addition to the already mentioned NAEB, the JCET included the National Education Association of the United States, American Council on Education, National Association of State Universities, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, National Association of Chief State School Officers, and Association for Education by Radio-Television.

statements from 838 colleges, universities, school systems, and public service agencies.

Why did education rally so enthusiastically to the cause of educational television when it had often been so derelict in its attention to radio? And why was there so much support from outside education's ranks? Educators were probably influenced by three factors: (1) they recognized that television has a much greater potential for education than does radio, and therefore wanted to be sure of a chance to use it; (2) they were disappointed with their record in radio and did not want to repeat the same mistakes in television; and (3) they had often been dissatisfied with commercial radio's attitude toward education and public service programming and therefore did not want to be entirely dependent upon the industry for educational television programming. Public support for the movement resulted mainly from dissatisfaction with commercial broadcasting: because many influential people and organizations believed the broadcasting industry had not adequately met the needs of education, they supported this movement for the reservation of educational channels.

The opposition was also well organized. The National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters—the commercial broadcasters' trade association—used its best legal, engineering, and program research talent to present a case against educational reservations, and a number of networks and local stations intervened whenever they felt their interests were at stake. The industry's main motivation was economic: the earning capacity of some television channels is so great that stations have gone on the market at sums varying from one to six million dollars apiece.

The Joint Committee on Educational Television asked the Federal Communications Commission to reserve a number of television channels for the exclusive use of educational organizations intending to do noncommercial educational broadcasting. The reservation principle was basic to their entire case. The number of television channels available is definitely limited, and

once all of them are assigned there can be no more stations. Of course, with or without reservations the educators could compete directly with commercial applicants for station grants, and if successful could broadcast either commercially or noncommercially. But educational organizations cannot draw up plans and raise money as quickly as can commercial operators. Therefore the educators asked to have some channels reserved for educational use. Some of the JCET's witnesses argued that these channels should be held for many years so that institutions slow to realize television's potentialities or unable to obtain funds now could use television at some future date. But whatever the time period involved, all agreed that at least some period of reservation was essential if there were to be more than just a few educational stations.

In support of this principle the JCET brought a well-planned case before the commission. It pointed out that television has tremendous potentialities for education because its combined sight and sound appeals make it a great tool for both in-school use and general adult education. The educators reviewed the results they had achieved with their own radio stations and with visual aids, and reported adversely on many of their attempts to work with commercial broadcasters. NAEB spokesmen reported on their survey of New York City's television programming[2] in order to document the inadequacies of commercial television. The educators also stated that their work required regular broadcast periods over long periods of time—something possible only with their own stations. They submitted reports of their television programming to date over commercial stations, said they were ready to proceed with the construction and operation of their own stations, and submitted plans for financing and programming them. They admitted that television would be expensive, but believed that in the light of public school and higher education budgets and total program resources, adequate money and pro-

[2] For a brief summary of the NAEB surveys of television programming, see "What Television Programming Is Like," by Dallas Smythe, p. 25 of this issue.

grams could be provided by institutions working together if not alone. In addition to serving special interest groups, said the JCET, the educational stations would also offer an excellent supplementary service to commercial television programming.

The JCET then requested that one noncommercial educational service be provided for every part of the United States. There should be at least one educational station in every standard metropolitan area,[8] and one in each of 46 designated nonmetropolitan educational centers (such as Madison, Wisconsin, and Iowa City, Iowa). These stations, said the educators, would be operated on a noncommercial educational basis; there would be no time sales and no advertising, and all support money would come from public or private educational funds.

In opposition to this the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters claimed that only a few of the channels requested would ever be applied for and those which were taken up would not be used effectively, with the result that a great natural resource would be wasted. In any event, said the NARTB, the audiences reached by such stations would be too small to justify any educational reservations. The expense of station operation also was emphasized: few educators—singly or in groups—could afford to construct or program stations. The solution, said NARTB, lay in voluntary coöperation between educators and commercial stations. The record of radio in this respect was declared good rather than bad, and NARTB pledged itself to serve the needs of education through its own programming as well as by making time available to educational institutions.

The general hearings ended on January 31, 1951. In March of the same year the commission issued a preliminary report which proposed among other things that 209 channels be reserved for noncommercial educational use. Of the many comments filed on this report, 349—representing the views of 838 schools, colleges, universities, state departments of education, and other public

[8] In 1950 the Bureau of the Census designated 168 such areas, the population of the smallest being 56,141.

service agencies—supported the principle of educational reservations. It took the commission a whole year to sift through all this material, make its decision, and write its final report.

The FCC Report

The Federal Communication Commission's Sixth Report and Order was adopted on April 11, released to the public on April 14, and took effect June 2, 1952. The official six-volume version is over 600 pages long; even the more convenient edition distributed by one of the television trade journals covers 243 double-column, quarto-sized pages. It is clearly impossible to do justice to the whole report here, but the portions of most direct interest to education are summarized below.

The commission's basic task was to set up the framework for the country's television services for years to come; therefore the reservation of channels for education is only one of the several important policy problems with which the report deals. At the outset it describes and justifies the commission's decision to construct an allocation table assigning channels to the entire country on a city-by-city basis rather than distributing them on a demand basis as some witnesses had urged. The decision to utilize Ultra High Frequency (UHF) channels, and to assign UHF and Very High Frequency (VHF) channels to the same communities is then explained. The UHF band was used, said the commission, in order to provide more stations. This was done in spite of the fact that many broadcasters were hesitant about UHF because UHF stations have less coverage than stations of the same power on VHF, and because the television sets already in use must be equipped with special adaptors before they can receive UHF stations.

Then the report discusses at length the general theories followed in assigning stations to specific channels, after which the decisions on such engineering problems as mileage separation between stations, transmitter power, antenna heights, and the use of directional antennas are explained and justified. Almost half the report is a city-by-city review of the decisions made in con-

tested cases. Then follow the new rules governing television stations, and instructions for submitting applications.

The report provides for 2,053 new stations in 1,291 communities in the United States, its territories and dependencies, of which 242 are to be noncommercial educational stations. These stations are to operate on 82 channels—the 12 VHF channels already in use (numbered 2 through 13), and 70 new UHF channels (14 through 83) not previously used for television broadcasting. A few channels are held in reserve for localities without assignments in the general allocations table.

The 242 noncommercial educational stations make up about 11.5 per cent of the total number available, and represent an increase over the 209 proposed by the commission in its preliminary report of March, 1951.[4] The increases are mainly UHF reservations made at the request of educational authorities in Connecticut, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Washington, and Wisconsin. In several cases, however, the commission changed proposed VHF to UHF reservations because local educational authorities did not show enough interest in the face of opposition to educational reservations from local commercial groups. Of the 242 reservations, 233 are in the continental United States, and the remaining 9 in the territories and dependencies. Of the 233 in this country, 162 are UHF and 71 VHF. In a number of areas where channels are in great demand the report makes few or no educational reservations: one fourth of the country's metropolitan centers are given no reservations; and New York City receives only one. The highly desirable VHF channels are reserved less often in the more populous states with heavy television demands than in the sparsely settled ones where competition for channels is lighter, although there are VHF reservations in Boston, Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, St. Louis, and San Francisco.

[4] This number could be increased further. Provided engineering standards are complied with, a petitioner may request "the assignment of a non-commercial educational channel to a community listed in the [Assignment] Table . . . to which such a channel has not been assigned."

The commission justified its reservations of educational channels mainly by paraphrasing the arguments of the JCET which already have been reviewed. Anticipating objections that the educators' audiences might not be as large as those of commercial stations, the commission stated: "the justification for an educational station should not, in our view, turn simply on account of audience size. The public interest will clearly be served if these stations are used to contribute significantly to the educational process of the nation." The commission rejected proposals that microwave relays and wired circuits for school television be accepted as a substitute for educational stations, on the grounds that the cost would be prohibitive and because "an important part of the educator's effort in television will be in the field of adult education in the home, as well as the provision of after-school programs for children."

To the proposal that, as an alternative to educational stations, commercial broadcasters be required to devote a specific amount of time to educational programs, the report replied that it would be impracticable to enforce such a rule. But the commission emphasized that by making provision for educational stations it did not thereby "relieve commercial licensees from their duty to carry programs which fulfill the educational needs and serve the educational interests of the community in which they operate." That they should do, said the report, whether or not a community had an educational station in operation. Concluding its justification of educational reservations the commission stated: "All things considered, it appears to us that the reservation of channels for non-commercial educational stations, together with continued adherence by commercial stations to the mandate of serving the educational needs of the community, is the best method of achieving the aims of educational television."

Only nonprofit accredited educational organizations may own and operate these stations. The commission expressly denied requests that noncommercial educational stations be licensed to

municipalities. If it had an educational agency eligible under the rules, a municipality as such could not apply for a station, although a municipality without such an educational organization could make an application.

These stations "should be used primarily to serve the education needs of the community, and for the advancement of educational programs." But they need not define the word "education" too narrowly, implied the report: these stations could broadcast "educational, cultural, and entertainment programs," for the general public, or they could present "programs designed for use by schools and school systems in connection with regular school courses, as well as routine and administrative material pertaining thereto."

The report insisted that these stations be operated on a strictly noncommercial basis. Before the educators finally formulated their case some of them had favored asking the commission to set these up as nonprofit educational stations which might sell time to meet operating expenses, although the JCET's formal presentation talked only of noncommercial stations. However, in their briefs the University of Missouri and Bob Jones University asked the commission to authorize limited commercial operation. But their requests were firmly rejected, the commission holding that "achievement of the objective for which special educational reservations have been established—i.e., the establishment of a genuinely educational type of service—would not be furthered by permitting educational institutions to operate in substantially the same manner as commercial applicants though they may choose to call it limited commercial non-profit operation."

The final JCET brief requested that a noncommercial educational station operating on the only VHF channel in a community be allowed to carry commercial network programs until commercial stations were ready to serve the area, but the commission ruled out the proposal on the technical grounds that it had not been made early enough in the proceedings. However, the rules do permit another institution, educational agency, or even

a commercial organization to furnish programs to an educational station, provided "no other consideration than the furnishing of the program is received by the licensee." It is also proper for another station or network to pay the line charges for programs broadcast by an educational station. Furthermore, educational stations may carry network commercial programs from which direct visual and aural sales messages have been deleted, though there is no objection if during such a program the "sponsor's name or product appears . . . on the backdrop or in similar form."

Education's Crucial Year

An educational institution, of course, may operate a commercial station; none of these limitations would then apply. However, it would derive no special privileges from its educational status. First, the institution would have to apply for a commercial channel, competing for it on an equal basis with other applicants if there were more applications than assignments. This might involve protracted and expensive hearings of unpredictable outcome. If successful, the institution would have to operate its station strictly under commercial rules. An educational institution wishing to operate commercially on a channel now reserved for education also would have to proceed exactly as would a commercial organization with the same purpose: after June 2, 1953, it could petition the Federal Communications Commission for the release of any unpreëmpted educational channel; thereafter it would have to compete for that channel on an equal basis with other interested parties.[5] However, an educational organization planning a commercial operation might better apply for a commercial channel than ask for the release of a reserved channel which other institutions in the area might wish to use for noncommercial educational broadcasting.

[5] An educational organization broadcasting on a reserved channel could not at will change its operation from noncommercial to commercial. It first would have to give up the educational channel, and then follow either of the two procedures outlined above to obtain a commercial license. Under no conditions could it make an easy and quick change from noncommercial to commercial operation on a reserved channel.

It should be noted that minimum hours of operation are not specified for educational stations as they are for commercial licensees. The latter must broadcast not less than 12 hours per week during their first eighteen months of operation with progressive increases thereafter up to 28 hours per week. Of course an educational station should be on the air as much as possible; audiences accustomed to commercial television's 12- or 18-hour day will not form the habit of tuning to an educational station which broadcasts only one hour or so per day; furthermore the rules state that "the hours of actual operation . . . shall be taken into consideration in considering the renewal of noncommercial educational television broadcast licenses." This clause at least will help ease the programming load when educational stations first go on the air.

Of great importance is the fact that changes in this table of assignments may be requested one year after the effective date of the Sixth Report and Order. This means that after June 2, 1953, anyone may petition the Federal Communications Commission to convert to commercial use any reserved channel for which no educational organization has made application. It is very likely that if an institution could show it had made considerable progress toward preparing an application for such a channel the commission would extend the time limit somewhat. But in communities where the demand for commercial television channels is great, the commission will be under such pressure to license more stations that, without good evidence of progress toward channel utilization, the educators will be able to obtain few if any extensions.

This is not to say, of course, that a channel will be lost at the end of the year unless an educational station is actually broadcasting on it. It is sufficient if an application for a construction permit has been filed. If such an application were filed at the last possible moment—say on June 2, 1953—it might be granted in about two or three months. Permits will specify a maximum of sixty days in which to begin construction and a maximum of six months thereafter in which to complete it. There is always a good

chance that the commission would extend completion dates for six months or maybe longer, provided the applicant were making reasonable progress and were not merely playing a delaying role. Therefore, institutions applying for construction permits in June, 1953, might have until the summer or fall of 1954 in which to complete construction and begin broadcasting.

Nevertheless the one-year clause is the "joker" in the deck. The arguments with which the commission justifies the 242 reservations lead one to think that it has the interests of education at heart; but the one-year clause raises doubt. How many educational channels can be applied for within a year? Not very many—unless superhuman efforts are made. Can interest be aroused and funds raised within such a period? If legislative groups must provide authorization or vote funds before applications are made, can any action at all be taken? And what about the localities which either do not awaken to the possibilities of educational television soon enough or cannot mobilize their forces within this limited period; are they to be permanently enjoined from using their share of this natural resource? That some limit should be applied is perhaps reasonable—although there is a body of responsible opinion which believes that these reservations should be guaranteed for twenty years or even more, on the assumption that like forests, soil, or mineral resources, educational television channels should be held in trust for a long period. But it does not appear that the one-year limit is to the advantage of the country's best educational interests; five or ten years would be a better period. Of course there is always the chance that if the nation's educational establishment shows enough interest, the reservations may be extended; but one cannot count on that being done. All plans must be made on the assumption that it is this year or never for educational television.[6]

[6] Theoretically an educational organization (or anyone else) could apply for an occupied commercial or educational channel upon the expiration of the license of the station concerned. The FCC would then hold competitive hearings to decide who should get the channel. But possession is nine points of the law, and it is very unrealistic to expect education to obtain any television channels in that way.

Give the Television Code a Chance

ROBERT D. SWEZEY

ROBERT SWEZEY received his law degree from Harvard in 1931 and began his radio career as an attorney for the National Broadcasting Company in New York, after having practiced law in that city as well as in Boston and Washington. He became general counsel and secretary of the American Broadcasting Company in 1942, and two years later vice-president and general manager of the Mutual Broadcasting System. Since 1949 he has been executive vice-president and director of the WDSU Broadcasting Corporation in New Orleans, and at present is also serving as chairman of the Television Board of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters.

IN ITS SHORT and sensationally active career, television has had perhaps a greater impact on the lives and habits of the American people than any other medium of mass communication, and it has inevitably become the subject of considerable public controversy.

There seems to be no general agreement concerning any phase of the new medium and the probable course of its development. Many people are of the opinion that it will supersede radio as the important and ubiquitous air channel for entertainment, education, and advertising. Others believe that the transmission and production costs of television will necessarily, at some juncture, restrict its fullest use and expansion. Some are definitely of the opinion that television can be adequately supported by advertising dollars, while others are no less convinced that some new source of income, such as the collection of subscription fees directly from the owners of television receivers, must be found to supplant or supplement the monies now paid by commercial sponsors under the present system. There are those who praise television as a new and powerful educator and there are those who say it will make gangsters or automatons of our children.

This diversification of views is to be expected in a democracy where people of all classes, occupations, and tastes still have the privilege of forming and expressing individual opinions. These are the opinions of the public, and it is the public that television

serves. When I speak of the *public,* I mean *all* of the public: the part, for example, which thinks wrestling is a great TV spectacle, and the part that abhors it; the part which loves symphonic music, and the part that wants none of it.

The adoption of the television code[1] was a sincere attempt on the part of television broadcasters to improve their service to all of the public. The new industry had grown with unmatched rapidity; it quite naturally suffered from growing pains. Initially there was a dearth of acceptable program material. The television operators around the country had a great deal to learn about production techniques. Pioneer stations operated for many months, and some for several years, with frightening deficits. All of these things contributed to the inadequacies of early television programs. It became increasingly apparent that the industry should establish appropriate standards for its programming, as well as for its ethical and commercial practices.

In approaching this entire problem, one of the principal difficulties the television broadcasters faced was the attempt to ascertain the pertinent basic facts. In what respects, for example, was television programming in various sections of the country inferior? In what particulars were current commercial practices reprehensible? To what things in television did the public object? And to these, what part of the public objected, and how strongly?

It is not always easy to disassociate from sincere criticism the hue and clamor of our routine professional critics—people who have no sympathy with the commercial system of broadcasting, who are riding special hobbies, furthering personal ambitions, or seeking publicity or revenue from snide articles and books. Many see themselves playing a valiant and vocal Saint George to this robust new dragon.

For several months prior to the adoption of the television code, there appeared to be considerable criticism of television program-

[1] To obtain copies of the television code, write to the NARTB-TV, 1771 N Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., enclosing 15 cents per copy.

ming and advertising. In general, however, when analyzed, the criticism came principally within very definite and limited categories: criticism of the content of children's programs and the scheduling of crime and mystery programs of sensational character in periods during which children were likely to view them; advertising of alcoholic beverages; lack of good taste in program material and costumes.

In order to acquaint ourselves more fully with the scope of the problem, the committee which drafted the code requested the Federal Communications Commission to furnish it with an analysis of the complaints the commission had received over a seventy-five-day period regarding television programs and practices. The report submitted to the drafting committee, as of June 22, 1951, reads as follows.

NATURE OF COMPLAINTS	NUMBER
Advertising of alcoholic beverages	255
Indecency, obscenity, or profanity	221
False or misleading advertising	128
Lotteries and giveaway schemes	107
Crime and horror programs	73
Excessive advertising	47
Requests for more educational programs and classical music	36
News commentators	32
Fortune telling	22
Attacks on religious faiths	21
Refusal to grant broadcast time for the expression of particular points of view	19
Complaints against other types of programs	6
Total	967

Although these protests provide no ground for complacency, their number does not seem staggering when we consider the millions of television viewers.

There have been intimations to the effect that the television code was adopted under threat of government censorship of the

new medium, and to some extent that is true. The introduction and the progress of bills such as the Benton Bill, which provided for the establishment of a citizens' committee to review and make recommendations to the Congress concerning all radio and television programming, certainly gave the broadcasters considerable pause. They sincerely felt that they could foresee in this type of proposed legislation the development of a system of control of radio and television programming which would actually mean the end of freedom of the air, and, by a perfectly logical extension, sound the knell for freedom of the press.

The essentiality of free media of communication has been recognized by Americans since the time of the adoption of the Bill of Rights. The broadcasters of this country are probably as aware as any other group of the absolute truth of the statement that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance, and it seemed to them their obligation to resist as zealously as they could any legislation which attacked, through television, the entire foundation of civic freedoms. Moreover, viewing the situation objectively, the television broadcasters could not see that the excesses or aberrations of the industry were of such magnitude that they could not be perfectly competently dealt with by the industry itself.

In a sense, the few television licensees in existence at the time of the drafting of the television code were trustees and custodians for the thousands who would follow in the development of the industry. They realized that the job of formulating a code could not be easy; any such document had not only to serve present needs, but necessarily to set out patterns which would accommodate a vigorously expanding medium, and also provide machinery reasonably calculated to insure industry observance.

The conception of the code took place in April, 1951, at the annual convention in Chicago of the national trade organization, the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters (NARTB). There members expressed the need for a review of

programming, and directed that a committee be appointed to study the whole area of television program standards and practices.

In June of that year, the study committee called for an all-industry program conference, to report its initial findings and to secure full industry support in determining the dimensions and particulars of its problem. The meeting was held in Washington, D.C., and was attended by 103 television broadcasters representing 65 stations and 4 networks. Among those who addressed the group were Wayne Coy, then chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and Senator Edwin C. Johnson of Colorado, chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. At this meeting the all-industry group, by resolution, authorized the NARTB to supervise the development of an industry code.

The job of drafting a proposed code was detailed to twelve selected, practical television broadcasters.[2] They were all not only practical television broadcasters, but had had long years of experience in radio. Many of them had also had experience in newspapers, motion pictures, or other allied fields.

The committee set out with the idea of formulating some common-sense proposals for self-regulation, with the accent on the affirmative obligations of the television broadcasters to provide sound programming. It drew on the experience of others: it adopted or rephrased language from codes in other industries, in the drafting of some of which committee members had previously actively participated. At the same time, an effort was made, both in the content and in the spirit of the code, adequately to meet the problems unique to television.

The committee held its first meeting in July, 1951, at which time four subcommittees were appointed to handle the mechanics

[2] Robert D. Swezey, WDSU-TV, New Orleans, chairman; Davidson Taylor, National Broadcasting Company; James L. Caddigan, DuMont Television Network; Clair McCollough, WGAL-TV, Lancaster, Pa.; Paul Raibourn, KTLA (TV), Los Angeles; Donald Thornburgh, WCAU-TV, Philadelphia; Harold Hough, WBAP-TV, Fort Worth; Leonard Reinsch, WSB-TV, Atlanta; Henry Slavick, WMCT (TV), Memphis; Walter J. Damm, WTMJ-TV, Milwaukee; Harry Bannister, WWJ-TV, Detroit (now with NBC); James D. Hanrahan, WEWS (TV), Cleveland.

of drafting the code. Each subcommittee had its specific assignment, and each met several times during that summer and fall. Early in September, the preliminary work of the committee was reviewed by the NARTB television board, and at that time suggested revisions were made. The final draft of the proposed code was completed by the full Program Standards Committee meeting in Washington the first week in October, and on October 19 was presented word by word to a Chicago meeting of NARTB television members. Eighty television broadcasters from all parts of the country attended. This group endorsed the proposed code unanimously, with suggestions for minor changes. By resolution, the broadcasters directed the NARTB television board to promulgate the document as a code. On December 6, at a meeting in Washington, the television board promulgated the new television code, to become effective March 1, 1952, thus permitting an interim period during which administrative machinery could be established, and providing an opportunity for stations and networks to become acquainted with the code before it went into operation. Printed copies of the code were distributed widely throughout the industry during this period.

At the time the code was promulgated, I issued a statement to the public, on behalf of the Program Standards Committee, which I quote as expressing the views of the men who drafted the document.

The unanimity with which the nation's telecasters have acted in developing rules for self-regulation should reassure all of those among the public, in the government, and associated with special groups who have expressed concern about the present character and future development of this powerful instrument of communications. Lawyers, doctors, educators, and many other professional groups, older in experience than television broadcasters, have established the traditional practice of professional self-regulation as a means of satisfying public interest obligations. The television broadcasters now have taken action in this pattern. The businesslike manner in which this Code has been written and adopted, the sincerity of all those who have had a hand in

the job, reflect the determination of America's television broadcasters to fulfill the command implicit in the Code's preamble itself—that they represent and manage a "family medium."

I have taken this opportunity to review the actual historical development of the code, because there has been a certain amount of uninformed or vicious comment to the general effect that the code is a haphazard document which was hastily thrown together, without too much rhyme or reason, in a frenzied effort to avoid an immediate legislative threat. It is true that the actual draft of the code was accomplished within a few months, but the drafting was done in a very thorough and painstaking manner, with mature consideration given to every item of substance and phrasing.

With respect to the code itself, the instrument is logically divided into four sections: Preamble; Programming; Advertising; and Rules, and procedures for observance.

The preamble undertakes to express the spirit and purpose of the code, and the general responsibilities of all those engaged in television. In part, the preamble reads as follows.

> Television is seen and heard in every type of American home. These homes include children and adults of all ages, embrace all races and varieties of religious faith, and reach those of every educational background. It is the responsibility of television to bear constantly in mind that the audience is primarily a home audience, and consequently that television's relationship to the viewers is that between guest and host. . . .
>
> Television and all who participate in it are jointly accountable to the American public for respect for the special needs of children, for community responsibility, for the advancement of education and culture, for the acceptability of the program materials chosen, for decency and decorum in production, and for propriety in advertising. This responsibility cannot be discharged by any given group of programs, but can be discharged only through the highest standards of respect for the American home, applied to every moment of every program presented by television.
>
> In order that television programming may best serve the public interest, viewers should be encouraged to make their criticisms and

positive suggestions known to television broadcasters. Parents in particular should be urged to see to it that out of the richness of television fare, the best programs are brought to the attention of their children.[3]

The purpose of the code, as stated in the document, is "cooperatively to maintain a level of television programming which gives full consideration to the educational, informational, cultural, economic, moral, and entertainment needs of the American public to the end that more and more people will be better served."[4]

The length of this article does not permit a full discussion of the various sections of the code. Briefly, the substantive portion of the code sets forth rules of deportment in the various areas of programming; it speaks not only in terms of avoiding improper programming and adhering to decency and good taste in production, but stresses the necessity for each broadcaster's doing an aggressive, affirmative job of sound programming, including his obligation to "provide for reasonable experimentation in the development of programs specifically directed to the advancement of the community's culture and education."[5]

The code also deals at some length with advertising practices, including the acceptability of products and copy.

It invariably happens that when any attempt is made to set forth rules and regulations for the conduct of an industry or other activity, complaints arise in some quarters that such rules and regulations impose harmful restrictions upon the pursuit and development of the activity. I believe some critics of the code have expressed fears that its provisions will in some manner so restrain free creative expression that they will stultify television and prevent it from reaching its full potential as a new dramatic art.

Such reasoning I have been unable to follow. I am not aware that decency and artistic creation are incompatible. I regard it an unwarranted indictment of the creative mind that in order to

[3] *The Television Code of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters*, p. 1.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

make its fullest contribution in the public service, it must work in areas generally considered unwholesome, obscene, or otherwise contrary to accepted moral standards. I fail to see how any fair and objective analysis of the code's provisions can bring an intelligent person to the conclusion that they will impede or obstruct the free exercise of creative ability in television programming.

The latter portions of the code established regulations and procedures for self-policing by the industry. This was probably the most difficult problem with which the drafting committee had to deal. It was continually reminded on all sides that it was all very well for the industry to adopt the most cogent and meritorious standards possible, but that all its work would be completely ineffectual unless some method was devised for assuring reasonable observance of the code provisions.

The problem posed many practical and legal questions. The committee, with the help of Judge Justin Miller, an eminent attorney and jurist and general counsel and chairman of the board of NARTB, and of Mr. Thad Brown, NARTB television director, a lawyer with considerable knowledge and experience in communications law, fully investigated all examples it could find of self-regulatory enforcement procedures. It finally concluded that the most feasible course in all the circumstances was the adoption of a "Seal of Good Practice," which would be issued to television operators subscribing to the code, and which they might continue to use and display so long as they conformed to the provisions of the code.

The code provides for the establishment of a television code review board of five members appointed among the television licensees by the president of NARTB and with the confirmation of the television board of directors. In addition, the chairman of the NARTB board is an ex officio member of the review board. Members of the NARTB television board are not eligible to serve on the review board, but membership in NARTB is required for appointment to the review board. The members serve one-year terms without compensation.

The review board is the group responsible for the administration, interpretation, and enforcement of the code. There are clearly delegated procedures which it must take before charges are preferred to the television board of directors against any code member, but it may prefer such charges, and if it does so, the television board must, under the code provision, render a decision and withdraw the use and display privileges of the code's Seal of Good Practice from the television broadcasters whose action is found in violation of the code. Definite hearing procedures are specifically spelled out to insure the full protection of the rights of parties involved in any complaint.

The first Television Code Review Board[6] was appointed in February of this year. All the members of the initial review board are substantial and reputable people who have had years of experience in the new television industry. Several of them have served in important government positions.

There has been minor press criticism, I understand, to the effect that there is some doubt as to the legality of the observance procedures set forth in the code. Suffice it to say that prior to their adoption, the provisions were carefully reviewed with some of the best communications attorneys in the country, some of whom suggested changes and amendments which were made. The code in its final form has been scrutinized by literally hundreds of competent counsel throughout the country, and so far as I have heard, none has raised any serious question with respect to the legality of any portion of it.

I also understand that there have been intimations that the establishment of the review board might actually assist the television broadcasters to hide and obfuscate the true facts of any complaint, rather than to bring them to light and deal fairly with them. I suppose the only answer one can make to this shocking cynicism is that if the television broadcasters were dishonest and

[6] John E. Fetzer, WKZO-TV, Kalamazoo, chairman; J. Leonard Reinsch, WSB-TV, Atlanta, vice-chairman; Mrs. Scott Bullitt, KING-TV, Seattle; Walter J. Damm, WTMJ-TV, Milwaukee; E. K. Jett, WMAR-TV, Baltimore.

stupid enough to resort to any such tactics, they could not avoid detection and public denunciation, which would be ruinous to an industry so dependent upon its relations with the public.

I can only say that the television code was an honest effort on the part of the industry to set forth appropriate program standards in the public interest, and feasible measures for self-regulation within the industry. None of us has regarded it as a final or perfect document. We have assumed that in all probability it has certain defects which will become apparent in its administration. We have assumed that changes will be made in it to remedy those defects, and also to insure that its provisions will keep abreast of a changing and developing industry. It was for that reason that we included in the code the following provision.

> Because of the new and dynamic aspects inherent in television broadcast, the Television Code, as a living, flexible and continuing document, may be amended from time to time by the Television Board of Directors; provided that said Board is specifically charged with review and reconsideration of the entire Code, its appendices and procedures, at least once a year.[7]

I hope that all of us in television are intelligent enough to recognize and appreciate the value of constructive criticism; I am sure that through its assistance, the code and its administration will be greatly improved. We have no way now of knowing how large and involved adequate regulatory measures may necessarily become, but the present code is a first step in the right direction, and I know I can safely say that changes will be promptly made in the code itself and in its administrative procedures as the need for them is indicated from time to time in the public interest.

We have been encouraged by the great weight of press and trade comment to this general effect: *The television code may well have its weaknesses, but let's at least give it a chance.* I believe Senator Johnson's article in the 46th Anniversary Number of *Variety* magazine presents an excellent treatment of the entire code prob-

[7] *Television Code*, p. 9.

lem. I am grateful to the senator for his endorsement of our efforts. The following is an excerpt from his article.

I firmly believe that the proposed Television Code being considered by the telecasters offers a realistic and workable medium for adjusting whatever deficiencies may develop. Personally, I like it the way it is even if the industry's lawyers are throwing rocks at it. However, it may require some modification, some give and take before it is wholly acceptable, but it deserves every opportunity to be tried out as is on the basis of trial and error. This is the American way. When all is said and done, isn't it the composite character, integrity, and sincerity of the broadcasters and telecasters who have been imbued with the basic fundamentals of propriety and decency to whom we must look for whatever restraints are necessary to be invoked? I have the utmost faith that the majority of broadcasters are built of solid stuff, and I know they will either correct bad programs through a code, or make way for wiser and more prudent men. One cannot legislate honesty. One cannot legislate character and quality. Television deserves the opportunity of expanding without Governmental interference. The American people are entitled to enjoy freedom of expression at its best and the freedom of expression is at its best in radio and television.[8]

The television broadcasters seek no public kudos by reason of their having adopted a code, for in doing so surely they have done no more than their duty. They do ask the coöperation of the public in making the present code, as it may be subsequently changed and amended, a genuine contribution to the betterment of television service.

[8] Senator Edwin C. Johnson, "Will Radio-TV Regulate Itself, or Will Government Take Over the Job?" *Variety*, January 2, 1952, p. 109.

What TV Programming Is Like

DALLAS W. SMYTHE

DALLAS W. SMYTHE is director of studies of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, and research professor, Institute of Communications, University of Illinois. The following article is drawn from a talk delivered by Dr. Smythe before the annual Institute for Education by Radio held at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, in May, 1952.

WHAT CAN YOU say about TV programming in twenty or thirty minutes? If you wish to live up to the stereotype of what an "educator" is like (according to some individuals connected with the industry), you can scathingly denounce the violence and the decolletage, and the escapist nature of most of the programming, and, having thus laid a mortgage on a few headlines in the press, retire into your lair again. Or, if you wish to avoid such sensationalism, you can take a safe and sane course. You can simply restrict yourself to describing the proportions of time devoted by stations to particular classes of programs. This way you don't strike out with controversial arguments. These arguments remain implicit in the organization of your information.

I should like to try to avoid both of the poles of this dilemma and to approach the problem as a social scientist. As such my obligation is to state briefly the policies to which this body of monitoring studies is relevant. This is the context of standards which sets the framework for the studies.

These standards might be expressed around two principles with several subprinciples. One principle is that the industry as a whole, including the sponsors, is responsible for the indirect social consequences of its over-all program policy. This is a responsibility over and above their more readily measured responsibility to their owners to operate profitably. The subprinciples under this first principle are perhaps three in number. First, the industry is fairly to be held accountable for recognizing and serving the unique needs of the many minority audiences which make up the total

audience for TV, and especially the needs of large minority audiences such as those of children and housewives. Second, the industry may fairly be held accountable for using local program talent and resources, including the abilities of the station management as innovators of programs. Third, the industry is responsible for limiting the amount of advertising it broadcasts. This refers to the industry's responsibility to refrain from progressively extending the "trivialization" of our cultural values by permeating programs with indirect and direct advertising.

The second of the major principles relates to our society as a whole. Our society has a responsibility, acting through its Congress and its administrative agencies, to provide an education of its young which passes on to them the enduring cultural values of the past, and which equips them to cope, with the best chance of wise decision-making, with the problems their generations must face. The possible subprinciples under this head are legion, but here are several of the more obvious. First, there is the responsibility of all our means of communications—including within this term the mass media as well as the educational institutions of the country—to maintain and to serve the Miltonian concept of the free market place of ideas. Second, there is the responsibility which we have traditionally placed on our educational institutions to nourish and to transmit from one generation to the next those valuable portions of our culture which lack aggressive commercial exponents. And third, there is what we might call the "nothing-is-too-good-for-the-American-child" tradition. By this I mean the tradition of pride in our educational system. We want the best there is—of health, food, clothes, recreation, and education—for our children. If television is so superb an instrument for communicating with children and their parents in the home (and I am sure it is), then how do we proceed to guarantee the use of TV facilities by our educational system?

These are the chief principles against which the results of TV monitoring studies should be measured. These principles stand soberly founded on our culture and our traditions.

The first NAEB monitoring study was supported by the Joint Committee for Educational Television. Later studies were financed by the Fund for Adult Education of the Ford Foundation. The NAEB has brought to these studies the best professional skills available. We obtained the advice of experts in content analysis from the Universities of Columbus, Chicago, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio State, the University of California (Los Angeles), and the University of Southern California, to single out the principal institutions involved.

Thus far, two studies have been conducted in New York, and one each in Los Angeles and Chicago. The first to be published in form useful to the general reader is the report on Los Angeles TV, published last December and available from the NAEB headquarters office in Urbana. The Chicago and the second New York studies are in the process of publication at this time.[1]

The techniques of content analysis, like the companion techniques of studies of effects, are still not refined enough to go as far as we should like in providing useful answers to the kind of questions which surround these studies. However, we have observed noticeable improvement in the methods used, even within these sixteen months.

Rather than burden you with a description in detail of the procedure and theory of these studies, let me say merely that they have rested basically on the timing and classification of program and advertising material. We set up seventeen broad classes of programs, most of which had subclasses under them. We attempted to define the broad classes of programs in such a way that they in turn might be combined into three groups—the classes of programs primarily devoted to factual information, those most devoted to orientation, and those devoted to entertainment. "Information" programs include general and sports news, weather, information, and domestic programs. "Orientation" programs include public issues, public events, public institutional, personal

[1] A report of the second New York study and a review of the published report of the Los Angeles study appeared in the Summer, 1952, issue of the *Quarterly*.

relations, and religion. The "entertainment" group includes drama, music, variety, quiz, stunts and contests, personalities, sports, fine arts, and dance. My summary here is based on the two New York studies and the Los Angeles study.

What can be said about the broad pattern of TV programming? To say "it's all in fun" would be only a slight overstatement. Entertainment programs dominate TV. Entertainment occupies about three fourths of the program time in both New York and Los Angeles. Information-type programs amount to 19 per cent of total time in both New York studies, and to 24 per cent in Los Angeles. Orientation programs supply only a very minor part of total programming—from 4 per cent in Los Angeles to 7 per cent in the second New York study.

Now let's take a closer look at the entertainment. Drama programs amounted to 33 per cent of both of the 1951 studies in New York and Los Angeles. By this year, however, New York's drama programs amounted to 42 per cent, a quite sharp increase. In both Los Angeles and New York, crime and western drama are a sizable part of all TV: in Los Angeles they amounted to 20 per cent; in New York to 18 per cent in 1951 and 23 per cent in 1952.

Next to drama come variety programs. They provided almost one fifth of total program time in both the 1951 studies. This year, however, New Yorkers receive only about half as many variety programs as they did a year ago; it is down to 11 per cent.

The third most abundant form of entertainment is sports in New York, and music (mostly popular music) in Los Angeles, with between 7 and 9 per cent of total time.

These three types of entertainment programs—drama, variety, and sports in New York, and drama, variety, and music in Los Angeles—together account for almost two thirds (60 per cent) of all program time.

So much for the highlights of the program portions of our studies. Now, what of the advertising? In all three studies we tried but were unable to determine from the position of a television

viewer just which programs were sponsored, and which were sustaining programs. The FCC has rules requiring the identification of sponsored programs. Of course, some programs are identified. But, for many programs, the viewer simply could not know this fact.

We found that primary advertisements, analogous to the "commercial announcements" on aural radio, occupied more time in Los Angeles (13 per cent) than in New York (10 per cent) in 1951, and that this year in New York the figure had dropped to 8 per cent. New York's primary advertisements this year were shorter than last year. The New York stations used less total air time for primary advertising while increasing the average number of primary advertisements per station for the week from 389 to 443. Los Angeles TV stations in 1951 averaged 519 per week.

Our definition of "secondary" advertising runs something like this: Primary advertisements *interrupt* the program material. Secondary advertisements either *accompany* the program material, or, as in shopping and merchandising programs, they *are* the program material. For example, when the children in the studio audience all wear hats which are replicas of dog-food cans, we find secondary advertisements which accompany program material. Even so, in identifying a program as having secondary advertising in it, we have ignored those cases where the secondary advertising is apparent less than 50 per cent of the time. Defined in this way, secondary advertising amounted to 4 per cent of all air time in the first New York study, and to 6 per cent in the Los Angeles study. In the second New York study it rose to 10 per cent.

If we add together the time given to primary and secondary advertising, we find that in 1951 New York allotted 14 per cent and Los Angeles 19 per cent of TV air time to advertising of both kinds. In 1952 New York TV advertising amounted to 19 per cent of all air time.

This, briefly, is what the studies revealed so far as TV programming is concerned. What do they tell us about the broad principles

which I said were the framework in which the studies were conceived?

These studies offer a map, if you please, so that he who reads may travel where he wants to go. The meaning of some parts of the map is fairly clear. I offer as one illustration the findings on the amount of advertising and the growing tendency to blend advertising and program material into one substance, often reminiscent of the carnival medicine man. Other illustrations would be the scarcity of local live programming (other than for sports and quiz shows) and the predominance of recorded programming.

Our map also shows us that where not *commercially* valuable, entertainment, information, and orientation are ignored even though the *cultural* value is high. This means you will find few programs presenting the fine arts, the dance, religion, or the literature of this and other countries. These deficiencies are particularly apparent in the field of children's programs where the sponsors' interest in the fast buck results in casting most programs into juvenile versions of programs designed for the general audience. The children's programs even sometimes go the adult programs one better. For instance, in *Howdy-Doody* we find the child studio audience singing or shouting the commercial.

The meaning of some parts of the map is not altogether clear as yet, but with the rapid growth now taking place in communications research there is real hope that these frontiers will soon be explored. For example, take the matter of crime and violence on TV. We are still doing an extensive analysis of the amount, kind, and psychological context of violence found in the second New York study. At this time all I can say about it is that there is reason to suspect that the relation of fictional crime to the real thing is not at all as simple as many of TV's critics make it seem.

But there is another issue that has even wider implications. While there are many fine programs, the bulk of TV fare, as far as we could tell, is stereotyped. Some of you may think this is important. Others may think it is not. But the existence of the stereo-

type can hardly be disputed. Our social scientists tell us that thinking in stereotypes is associated with emotional coldness, cynicism, and a generally destructive and manipulative attitude toward people. And they tell us that these qualities are destructive of the individual's capacity to be and to know himself. We haven't demonstrated in a laboratory that the mass media "cause" these personality traits. But it seems reasonable to assume that with children looking at TV for twenty-four hours a week or more, they will absorb the stereotyped thinking that is imposed on them by program after program. Let's take just one example—interplanetary fiction for children. I don't think it makes any difference that these programs use space ships and ray guns. What does matter is that in these programs the individual is usually a mere shadow who is manipulated by technology and events. He never has to make a human choice. His conscience never has a chance to operate. The primary force in democracy is the making of decisions by individuals who have to live with their consciences. The mass media rightly claim a profound influence on children. Can we hope to develop democratic citizens when their main source of entertainment and ideas neglects to show them how the democratic person operates?

Film Festival at Cannes

CURTIS HARRINGTON

CURTIS HARRINGTON, a graduate of the Theater Arts Department of the University of California, Los Angeles campus, is the author of a number of articles on motion pictures and has produced several experimental films, including *Picnic* and *On the Edge,* which were exhibited this summer at the Venice Film Festival. Mr. Harrington served as the *Quarterly's* correspondent at the Venice festival and at the International Film Festival at Cannes. His report from Venice is scheduled for the Winter issue; the following is his report from Cannes.

THE FIFTH International Film Festival at Cannes brought together a group of the best of recent films from over fifteen different countries. As always it was hoped that, in doing this, some extraordinary film from one of the smaller countries might be discovered and saved, through the resultant publicity and honors, from unfair oblivion—the almost inevitable fate of such a film if its distribution is confined to the country of its origin. Such a discovery was the memorable event of last year's Venice Film Festival; from Japan, a country whose film production has been largely ignored by the Western world for many years, came the brilliant *Rashomon,* a film that, thus called to the attention of the world by winning the grand prize in competition with the best of American, French, and Italian films, has since been playing successfully in all the capitals of the world as well as in many smaller cities. With this example still freshly in mind, a similarly striking revelation was hoped for in Cannes from one of the numerous minor participants: Greece, Norway, Egypt, Belgium, Austria, Argentina, and Mexico. As it turned out, however, the prizes were won, as they most often have been before, by the major film producing countries—France, Italy, and the United States—and the films of the small countries proved to be uniformly lacking in any superior or unusual qualities.

Only Japan and Sweden maintained their already established reputations as producers of fine films. The Japanese selection was awaited with especially keen interest, since it was wondered if

Rashomon had been an exception among Japanese productions, or whether it was instead representative of a general level of quality; but with the showing at Cannes of *The Story of Genji, Waves, In the Tempest,* and *The Man Who Walked on the Tail of a Tiger,* this question was still left partially unanswered—though I believe a limited generalization can still be made upon this and other evidence.

For the most part Japanese films fall into one of two categories: the legend film or the modern film. The legend films are laid in ancient periods of Japanese history; some are fantasies, some elaborate historical sagas, others (like *Rashomon* and *The Story of Genji*) are explorations of human character, abstracted and distilled to their essence because they are placed in a timeless perspective. The modern films are like their occidental counterparts: simply stories of contemporary life enacted in a realistic setting. The quality and originality of a Japanese film seem most often to depend upon the category to which the film belongs. The legend films are treated with taste and originality, the modern films mostly in a stereotyped manner. This was clearly demonstrated by the four films shown at Cannes. The two legend films, *The Story of Genji* and *The Man Who Walked on the Tail of a Tiger,* were both outstanding; the others were quite ordinary.

For its exquisite formal beauty, *The Story of Genji,* with its setting laid in the eighth century, received the award for the best photography and plastic composition. Its story tells of the many love affairs of Genji, the Mikado's favorite son by one of his many concubines. The role of Genji is played by one of Japan's leading and most versatile actors (upon occasion he plays female roles as well as male, and with consummate artistry), Kazuo Hasegawa. Treated with an extraordinarily sensitive feeling for mood and setting—characteristic of the Japanese cinema—the direction of Kosaburo Yoshimura reveals unusual cinematic talent. The images of the film are richly textured, the sound and music (both occidental and oriental) carefully employed to achieve the utmost

effect, and as a whole the film achieves a consistent lyrical quality that is rarely if ever found in the occidental cinema. One feels in such a film the whole wealth of tradition in Japanese art and culture transferred with ease and understanding to the requirements of the new twentieth-century creative medium.

Though of an entirely different nature, *The Man Who Walked on the Tail of a Tiger* also reaffirmed the excellence of the Japanese film. Based upon a famous Noh drama, this tells the story of a group of followers of a young prince who succeeded in smuggling him past a barrier that his evil brother had set up to catch him. The title of the film is a metaphorical summing up of its contents: how the clever minister of the young prince, by disguising himself and the others as a group of Buddhist monks, succeeds in taking them right through the jaws of the tiger, as it were, makes both a suspenseful and amusing story. Directed by Akiro Kurosawa (who did *Rashomon*), the film never departs very far from its theatrical origin; but though it remains primarily a play, it is transferred to the screen with such a fine appreciation of its dramatic values (the acting is uniformly brilliant throughout) that it never once suffers from the lack of the sort of movement and action generally considered to be necessary in a film as opposed to a play.

But if the two legend films displayed once again the superior side of Japanese films, the two modern films demonstrated the Japanese capacity for the ordinary. Both *In the Tempest,* about a mother and her son after the recent war, and *Waves,* a long and complex story of a father-son relationship, adapted from a Japanese novel, were carefully but unimaginatively made. It has been my good fortune to see, upon a previous occasion, one Japanese film with a contemporary, postwar Tokyo setting, that was as imaginatively and sensitively treated as most of the legend films. Finally, as it is true of the production of other countries—and as it is, indeed, true of any art form itself—the quality of product must depend upon the creative talent of the individual artist;

perhaps it is simply that the creators of the Japanese legend films, removed automatically as they are from the necessity of copying existent reality, are permitted the greatest possible freedom to reply to the challenge of their imaginations.

Though falling far short of the high mark set by *Miss Julie,* the grand prize winner of last year's Cannes Festival, this year's Swedish entry, *She Only Danced One Summer,* shown early in the festival, was its first big hit. A less pretentious effort than *Miss Julie,* the film relates a simple story of first love interrupted by sudden tragedy. In comparision with other Swedish films this picture is rather hackneyed, for both its theme, story, and treatment have appeared before. However, it is more than partially redeemed by the freshness of its young actors and the evident sincerity in its treatment. We are moved by the plight of the young couple caught in the constricting atmosphere of a tiny country village. We are not always convinced by some of the more stereotyped characters: the village idiot who is a religious fanatic; the maiden aunt made bitter through sexual frustration; the village pastor who preaches hell-fire and brimstone for sexual transgression; the understanding uncle who befriends the young lovers.

Except for the films of Japan and Sweden, nothing of interest was forthcoming from the small countries. Norway presented *Forced Landing,* a dull and inept account of the parachute landing of a group of Allied aviators during the occupation of Norway, and their adventures in escaping the Germans. Greece was represented by *The Dead City,* a tiresome story of a postwar vendetta between two families, taking place near Sparta. Belgium was responsible for the most confused film of the festival, *The Smuggler's Banquet,* dealing with smuggling activities centering around the Belgian-Dutch-French-German border. Scripted by Charles Spaak, directed by former *avant-garde* and documentary film maker Henri Storck, and photographed by Henri Schufftan—all film workers of noted talent—this was a complete and dismal failure from every point of view. Austria presented the evidently

definitive film version of a play by the Austrian dramatist Karl Schönherr, *She-Devil.* This is an intense, Germanic sex-drama that, transferred to the screen with too much respect for the obviously dating original, seems simply ridiculous; the festival audience almost laughed it off the screen. Curiously enough it has since been awarded the Austrian "Oscar" as the best Austrian film of the year. In the light of this one shudders to think what the average Austrian film must be like.

Egypt was represented by two very mediocre films, *For a Night of Love* and *The Call of the Nile.* The latter tells once again the old, old story of the naïve country boy who leaves his farm to come to the city where he then becomes involved with gangsters and is put in prison. At last he wisely returns to the country. The warning embodied in the story is not very convincingly conveyed, since the style of the film suffers from the worst sort of false Hollywoodiana.

Mexico also presented a kind of film that Hollywood has produced more effectively for a number of years. *The Absent,* directed by Julio Bracho, was a pale and lifeless carbon of *Rebecca,* revealing the Mexican cinema at its worst. Much better was the other Mexican entry, *Climb to Heaven,* a new film by Luis Bunuel. Because of the tenacious originality of his own personality, the films of Bunuel, even when, as in this one, they are basically commercial in their intention, are always of definite interest. The simple story of *Climb to Heaven* is concerned for the most part with a young man's bus trip from a country village to the city to legalize his dying mother's will in order to save her property from the designs of two scheming older brothers. On this framework Bunuel has made a light comedy drama containing several amusing dream sequences that spoof surrealist and Freudian symbolism, with the essentially romantic story treated in a uniquely hard, quite unsentimental manner. Though in no way as powerful as *The Young and the Damned,* nor as original as *Le Chien Andalou* and *L'Age d'Or, Climb to Heaven* must definitely take

its place among the better films of Bunuel. (In recent years Bunuel has directed a number of frankly commercial films in Mexico that are said to be without interest and which he himself does not regard as being of any importance in relation to his other, avowedly sincere and personal work.) *Climb to Heaven* is even of special interest in that it demonstrates how Bunuel's personality can affect a subject that he himself did not conceive, and, from a general point of view, it is a most interesting and illuminating example of how a film director's personality may creatively affect an indifferent scenario.

Judging from the selection of three German films presented at Cannes, it would appear that the German film industry, almost completely destroyed during the war, has regained little as yet but its former technical skill. With the brilliance of their post-World War I cinema (the German classics of the silent cinema are not easily forgotten) it is difficult to reconcile the puerility and emptiness of present German films. It would appear that the Germans have indeed suffered far more than the physical destruction of their cities. Nothing reflects this more quickly than the banality of what seem evidently to be the very best films the Germans (in the Western sector) are now capable of making.

Easily one of the worst films presented at the festival was *The Song of One Night,* a so-called light mystery romance. It tells the story of a young unknown composer suspected of the murder of an older composer whose work he secretly had been doing for several years; at the end it is revealed that the man has not been murdered at all, but had hit his head accidentally in a fall! All ends well, etc. Another German film, *The Heart of the World,* is the long and painstakingly told life story of Berthe de Suttner, the first lady to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. The leading role was played to the hilt by Hilde Krahl, who had already proved her inability earlier in the festival in the Austrian turkey, *She-Devil.* The third of the German entries, *The Last Prescription,* was at least mildly entertaining though undistinguished. It re-

lates the story of a young pharmacist and his family who are put into jeopardy when a morphinomaniac steals a package of morphine from the pharmacy's safe. This is the type of story that only the Germans could be expected to adapt for a film, and ordinarily one would expect it to be treated in the customary heavy and slow style. Instead, the director, Rolf Hansen, manages to maintain a quick pace and to treat the drama always as lightly as the subject permits. The anguish experienced by the dope addict is nicely conveyed by Sybil Werden, prima ballerina of the Munich State Opera, who here plays her first film role, and the photography and décor capture a refreshing spring-like feeling in the baroque atmosphere of southern Germany.

If because of an earlier tradition one looks expectantly for something of interest among the new German films, one's attitude toward the Spanish film is exactly the opposite. There is no tradition of good Spanish films, and probably only the most astute and learned of film historians could recall even one. At Cannes this year the Spanish upheld their former reputation with the most pretentiously foolish film seen at the festival: *Parsifal,* directed by Daniel Mangrane. It stars Ludmilla Tcherina (another ballerina who, despite her appearances in a number of films, has learned absolutely nothing about the art of film acting) and a young Mexican actor named Gustavo Rojo. These "artists" evidently were both imported all the way to Spain to play in this "superproduction." The film was stupidly directed, badly photographed, stiltedly acted; indeed it did not have one saving grace, except, perhaps, a background potpourri of themes from the music of Richard Wagner. Another entry, *Maria Morana,* was a Spanish "musical," photographed in "color" (bilious hues of orange and blue). Unexpected promise was shown only at last, in the one other Spanish film exhibited—*The Uprooted,* directed by Jose Antonio Nieves Conde. The story, the same in theme as the Egyptian film, *The Call of the Nile,* relates the difficulties encountered by a family of country people when they come to the city. We follow

the careers of the mother, father, two sons, and a daughter, who are unprepared for the exigencies of city living. In a convincing manner the oldest son becomes involved with a group of petty gangsters, the younger son runs away, the father finds himself too old and set in his ways to do the only work he can find, in a foundry, and the daughter is seduced by a black-marketeer. When the oldest son is finally killed in a gang fight, the family returns to the country. In style and approach to its subject the film is modeled after the work of the Italian neorealists, which, though borrowed and not given added originality, is a decided stylistic advance over the customary stagy, artificial, quite unconvincing manner of other Spanish films. The characters are well drawn, seldom falling into clichés, and the cruelty and hardness of existence for the poor in the big city (evidently Madrid) is effectively conveyed. The presence of a police state is not actually felt, and no direct solution to the problem is presented—except for the country people to remain where they are. Still the more basic economic problems to be met in the city are strongly suggested, and the fact that such a film has been produced in Spain at all is assuredly an encouraging sign in more than one way.

Of the major participating countries, England presented the most disappointing selection. Neither *Encore* nor *Cry the Beloved Country* displayed any of particular qualities that one has come to look for in the best British films. The former is simply a trifle of light entertainment, executed on a level in keeping with the writing of the Maugham stories, and the latter, unfortunately, despite its evidently noble intentions, is a long-winded, slow-moving, pretentious, and certainly very boring movie of a somewhat better novel. Whatever point the film of *Cry the Beloved Country* seems to be trying to make is quite lost in the arbitrarily artificial presentation of character and in the development of the patently unconvincing situations. Zoltan Korda has furthermore seen fit to direct the whole thing at a snail's pace that lacks all sense of movement and spontaneity.

The United States and France fared much better than England. As American entries, *Viva Zapata* and *Detective Story* were both generally admired; Marlon Brando received the award as the best actor in the former; Lee Grant, in a surprise move by the jury, was named best actress (for her portrayal of the shoplifter) in *Detective Story*. *An American in Paris* was also presented and, as an independent United States entry, Gian Carlo-Menotti's *The Medium*. Menotti's first effort as a film director was given a special prize for the "Film Lyrique." The French critics on the whole found the film a surprisingly successful attempt to create a new form of film-opera, but were a bit put off by the more lurid Grand Guignol aspects of the story. This is similar, of course, to the general American reaction. It was hoped that after winning the "Oscar," *An American in Paris* might garner a similar accolade at Cannes; however, while generally well received (some Frenchmen complained that it was not exactly an accurate portrait of their capital city), it did not even receive the color award, which went instead to a British short, *Animated Genesis*—perhaps as a consolation to a major country otherwise omitted from the awards.

France presented two very light, very entertaining films and one serious, not so entertaining study of the various horrors that surround the present-day practice of capital punishment in France. André Michel's *Trois Femmes,* a kind of French equivalent to the British *Encore,* is a group of three stories by Maupassant, collected together on the pretext that each of the stories reveals a facet of the peculiar capriciousness, calculation, and dignity to be found in the female character, especially the French female character. Two of the stories would not easily pass the standards set by American film censorship. One recounts the method used to get the young wife of a sterile man pregnant after it is discovered that an inheritance of several million francs depends upon her having a baby within a certain length of time; the other reveals the problem of a young lady who has taken six different lovers concurrently and cannot decide which is the father of her child. But

the film is made with a nice sense of drollery and, though it is the first full-length effort of a young director, succeeds often in capturing the special charm of the period, around 1880, in which the stories take place.

For *Fanfan la Tulipe,* a revolutionary cloak-and-sword melodrama, Christian Jacques received the award for the best direction. Primarily through its wonderful vigor and pacing, this film succeeds as a costume melodrama exactly where most efforts of the same type fail: it is full of humor, never for one moment taking itself seriously, and the constant effort is to create a continuously appealing and exciting spectacle. The film is, simply, fun to watch. The other French entry, *We Are All Murderers,* is about as far from the romantic adventures of *Fanfan* as one is liable to get. Here we follow the decidedly lugubrious career of a young man from the slums of Paris during the Occupation; he works with the underground, on whose behalf he has murdered several Germans and collaborators. During the subsequent period of the Liberation, he goes berserk and machine-guns one of his former associates; when finally he is caught he shoots two policemen in a final gesture of madness and defiance. He is put in the death cell where we now learn the varying stories of the other prisoners also condemned to death at the guillotine. A young lawyer attempts to get the young man a reprieve; will he succeed? The film ends with the ringing of a telephone; it is a question to which we, society, must reply. Directed by André Cayatte, who two years ago treated another social problem, that of trial by jury, in *Justice Is Done, We Are All Murderers* suffers primarily, as did the previous film, from a heavy-handedness that defeats its own purpose; yet, a perhaps fortunate fault is that it is so constructed that by judiciously cutting some sequences and scenes (it is far too long just physically) its effect could be strengthened considerably. The material is there; only balance and taste are sometimes lacking.

As a fourth French entry (each country was permitted to show as many as four full-length films) a medium-length film, *The*

Crimson Curtain, based on the famous short story by Barby d'Aurevally, had its premiere during the festival. This is the first directorial effort of a young former film critic, Alexandre Astruc, who shows in the film a fine sense of style and mood. Though there is a perhaps too conscious and mannered use of certain cinematic devices, and a too carefully worked out sense of atmosphere, it is these very qualities, in moderation, that show the originality and promise of the director. Dispensing with dialogue altogether, the film is narrated by the protagonist; the single voice, the sound effects, the music, and a nicely worked out use of narrative movement combine so well that the basic unnaturalness of the lack of dialogue becomes a factor intensifying rather than falsifying the effect of the story, a curious mixture of eroticism and horror. A young officer, quartered in a middle-class home in the country, secretly begins a passionate affair with the family's daughter; one night she inexplicably falls dead in his arms and he is faced with the insurmountable problem of hiding the fact of their relationship. *The Crimson Curtain* was cited for special homage by the Cannes jury as the first work of a young director.

The problem of choosing which films, among recent productions, to represent the respective countries at the festival seems this year to have been a difficult one. The choice is made by a producers' organization within each of the countries and is always accepted without question by the management of the festival. In retrospect it became evident that both the French and the English chose unwisely this year. The French, for instance, could just as well have presented an excellent new film by André Clement, *Forbidden Games,* certainly of greater interest than any of the three full-length films actually shown; and the English had available several recent films of a better and more unusual quality than either *Encore* or *Cry the Beloved Country.* Why, then, when there were alternatives of greater quality, did the English and the French present the films they did (one would like to suspect that the Germans, too, could have presented something better)? The

question is not readily answered; but since the matter was so pointedly brought to everyone's attention, it resulted in a wide discussion, and greater care in choosing the films has been promised for the future by the various selection groups. As it is, the problem seems often to be bound up with the old question of commercialism versus quality; a film is selected only too often because of the commercial success it may be having, rather than because it suggests any standard of quality. Or else, as in the case of *Cry the Beloved Country* and *Parsifal,* pretentiousness of purpose is fatally confused with impressiveness of accomplishment.

It was the Italians who, winning the majority of the prizes (they would have won even more than they did, had the jury been less tactful and more honest), showed by far the best over-all selection. Each long film presented possessed an individual sincerity and distinction, and the two best shorts of the festival, in this critic's estimation, were Francesco Maselli's *Bambini,* an altogether extraordinary poetic study of children caught unawares in secret, imaginative play, and *Young Girls in Flower,* by Gina Luigi Rondi, a wholly charming art film created from paintings of the "Belle Epoque" by Giovanni Boldini. The jury, however, gave the short-length film award to a Dutch film on fishermen, *Throw Out the Nets,* painstakingly done but containing nothing not already captured on film much more skillfully in John Grierson's *Granton Trawler.*

The four Italian full-length features were: *Cops and Robbers,* a comedy by Steno and Monicelli; *Umberto D.,* the newest film of Vittorio de Sica; *The Overcoat,* by Alberto Lattuada; and *Two Pennies' Worth of Hope,* by Renato Castellani. The first is a minor but well-made social comedy starring Toto and Aldo Fabrizi, the two leading Italian film comedians (Fabrizi, the better known of the two in America, will be remembered for his serious portrayal of the priest in *Open City*). The story relates how Fabrizi, a policeman, captures Toto, a small-time swindler, by creating a friendship between their two families. The film becomes

more than just a farce in its suggestion of the tragedy of circumstance in life; it received the award at Cannes for the best original scenario.

Lattuada's *The Overcoat* is a new version of the famous story by Nikolai Gogol. Out of the always serviceable basic story, Lattuada and his scenarists have fashioned an often amusing, often touching, contemporary satirical fantasy. It is a film that fits into what appears to be a new trend in the Italian cinema away from neorealism (the most outstanding example of this having been Di Sica's *Miracle in Milan*). *The Overcoat* tells the story of an insignificant little clerk who finds strength and pride and courage for the first time when he buys a splendid new coat; then when quite suddenly it is stolen from him he dies of sorrow, returning as a ghost to exert from the mayor of the city, as compensation for his loss, a promise to help the poor. Stylistic unevenness and a badly constructed script prevent the combination of realism and fantasy, social comment and wit from blending together with entire success, but the film's sincerity and the numerous moments of imaginative invention serve to minimize the basic weaknesses. It is undoubtedly a transitional work, helping to divorce the Italian cinema from an overly long postwar dependence on what have now become the clichés of the neorealistic style.

Di Sica's latest film is a return—but only in a partial sense—to the realism of *Bicycle Thieves*. *Umberto D.*, personally dedicated to Di Sica's own father, is the pathetic story of an old man who can no longer manage to live on his tiny government pension; when at last he is forced out of his room by a ruthless landlady he attempts to commit suicide. His dog saves him at the last moment, and he decides to try to go on living after all. From this simple plot Di Sica has created an extraordinarily moving portrait of the terrible loneliness that old age can sometimes bring. The film suggests no particular solution, and its conclusion only reaffirms the fundamental will to live possessed by every human being. But despite the sadness that the film primarily invokes, always warmly

human, it has many moments of humor and illumines almost startlingly at times the poetry to be found in the mundane and commonplace. It is in its subtle assemblage of these moments that, avoiding always the lurking danger of bathos, the film succeeds in capturing and holding our entire sympathy. In style, Di Sica shows here a more rigorous control than ever before (far from the crudity of *Shoeshine*), and an attempt toward a sharper stylization of character within a realistic context is clearly evident; the result of all this is causing controversy and discussion wherever the film is shown. Perhaps even more than *Miracle in Milan, Umberto D.* reveals Vittorio de Sica to be a director whose talents have not yet begun to reach exhaustion.

From the day of its showing, toward the middle of the festival, Renato Castellani's *Two Pennies' Worth of Hope* was generally expected to win the grand prize and it did. I mention this to suggest the sureness of its effect, to indicate how clearly it placed itself above the level of most of the other films. However, perhaps for tactful reasons or critical awe, the first award was divided equally between Castellani's extraordinary film and Orson Welles' *Othello*. After several years' shooting, several Desdemonas, and a great deal of advance publicity, the latest work of Mr. Welles has at last been unveiled to the public. Although the two films cannot legitimately be compared to each other, since the subject, aim, and treatment of each are entirely dissimilar, still a discussion of the two provides a cross-illumination of their respective characteristics, including their excellences and faults.

Two Pennies' Worth of Hope succeeds so well on its own self-defined level that fault with it, as such, is difficult to find. The film is yet another example of the transitions that continue to make Italian "neorealism" vital and living, for though it is definitely a work within that tradition the director has created something which goes quite beyond its semblance to the reality from which it is derived. Castellani captures the spiritual essence of a particular regional group in a direct and vital manner. Through a fast

basic rhythm, a choice of colorful but unexaggerated characters, and a simple plot upon which the series of sometimes unlikely but always perfectly inevitable situations are strung, Castellani produces a work of humor, warmth, and technical brilliance. The well-known Italian novelist, Alberto Moravia, writing in *L'Europeo,* summed up the film thusly: "... he [Castellani] knows how to capture certain special characteristics of the magic civilization of the Gulf of Naples: the idyllic chasteness in their concern with love, the light and knowing philosophy of 'how to get along,' the theatrical and almost Grecian quality of life in the public square, the indestructible richness of the heart in spite of the misery of daily life." The animating spirit of *Two Pennies' Worth of Hope* is indeed a combination of these precious elixirs which flow from the human heart: warmth and generosity and understanding.

By obvious contrast, *Othello* is tragedy, and is concerned not with a group, but with the intense passions of one man when he is tricked by another into believing his love to be untrue. Welles has made a striking spectacle, with many moments of startling clarity and dramatic power. But, as in Castellani's film, the primary concern here should be with the heart: Othello's tragedy inspires our pity, our tears. Orson Welles has made a film which impresses us visually, compelling and holding our direct attention at every moment, but he never once succeeds in capturing our hearts. The intimacy of the camera never, other than physically, brings us close to the unfortunate Moor. The sum of the rich and inventive imagery is never more than the beauty of its parts. If the adaptation were from a less famous and tried literary work one's critical attitude might be more lenient; but the very human tragedies of Shakespeare, unlike those, for instance, of Racine, have for their effect an intimate catharsis; unfortunately here we are provided only with the cold formality of the outward pattern.

To the serious admirers of films and their potentialities the general atmosphere of a film festival is often rather disconcerting.

A great emphasis is placed upon the commercial value of the publicity involved, and, as has been pointed out, the quality of many of the films shown is only too often below the caliber of what, at the least, should be fairly expected. Yet the value and necessity of the international film festival remains evident. Last year at Venice *Rashomon* was discovered and given to the world; this year, *Two Pennies' Worth of Hope* was rescued from the danger of comparative obscurity. It is in this assurance of discovery, as long as critical standards of choice can be maintained, that we find our assurance of value.

Films from Overseas

RICHARD ROWLAND

RICHARD ROWLAND was educated at Columbia University and Oxford. He is currently a member of the English Department of Columbia, and a regular contributor of motion picture reviews for the *Quarterly*.

TEN YEARS AGO, to an American, foreign films would have meant films from France, England, Germany, possibly Russia. Now there is no telling where the films shown in New York may come from. Italy stepped in after the war; in the past six months New York has seen films from Mexico, Israel, South Africa, Sweden, Czechoslovakia. These are all filmed in the tradition with which we are familiar. But *Rashomon,* a Japanese film which has had considerable success in several American cities, comes as a distinct surprise; its techniques in acting and telling a story are so new to us that its success is a real tribute to its brilliance. Not, of course, that it is so alien as we might have expected; the music, for instance, turns out to be Ravel's *Bolero,* or something so close to it as makes no difference. And the cliché of the foundling child who brings the film to a rather unexpectedly sentimental ending is not a new device. But otherwise much is unfamiliar.

For instance, a remote historical period is presented with a casualness that suggests that history is no different from life: only Carl Dreyer's two great films have ever done this before. Then there is the acting, which is violently theatrical by our standards. But the film's most unfamiliar quality is its philosophical content; like jesting Pilate, it asks us "What is Truth?"; you may come away without an answer, but you will know more about the subject than you did before. It tells the story of a death in the woods, and it tells it four times: once through the eyes of each of its principals—the dead man, his wife, the bandit who may have killed him, and finally through the eyes of the woodcutter who finds the body.

It is immediately evident that the premises here are not those

of Hollywood cinema. The interest is not in the story as such; it remains, indeed, a puzzle at the end. Nor is the interest in simple character, for we see these characters through a series of glasses, darkly. But that is what the film is about. Which of these stories is the truth? How do we see each other and ourselves? The answer is, of course, that none of them is true: all of them are true. The truth is not accessible to anyone of us, for we are locked in our own personalities which color whatever we see. No moral question can ever be answered from within. The men sheltered in the ruin discussing this crime are wrong when they want to use these contradictory stories to condemn mankind for its wickedness; it is they who are condemned for their simplicity, which believes there is only one answer to a question.

The rich ambiguities of this material are no stranger than its treatment. The camera is used sometimes with great freedom, as it rushes through the forest with the woodcutter or looks through the leaves full into the sun so that the forest and light and air become palpable; at other times it is used with severely stylized restraint, as at the police station, where the audience becomes the jury, as it were, and confronts the witness baldly against an unchanging background of sun-struck courtyard with the other witnesses immobile against a white wall. This formally repeated pattern begins each episode and has odd power to rivet the attention, against which the extravagance and disorder of the forest with its erratic bird cries come as a passionate interruption. The rigidity is daring and brilliant, as is the abandon of the scene in which the dead husband testifies through a medium. The medium is a woman, but the voice which tears its way up through her throat is his voice; her head tosses and her hair flies in a wind—a wind quite obviously not of this world—and the voice breaks out, passionately desirous of justifying itself, asserting its truth before the world.

This is a device, of course, familiar enough to those who have seen or read a Noh play, but that tradition is not necessary to jus-

tify its power here. Nor is the acting of Toshiro Mifune as the bandit necessarily to be judged by alien standards. It is uninhibited and stagy, full of puffing and grunting and eye rolling not seen on an American screen since John Barrymore's death, but it is triumphantly persuasive through its very flamboyance. This bandit becomes a wonderful rogue, a seedy rascal on a heroic scale, and we are soon swept up into a tradition we have abandoned too cheerfully.

The film is not without faults; the sentimentality at the end strikes a false note, and one must confess that the last flashback seems to take a little more time than anyone could possibly want to cover now-familiar ground. But one need know nothing about Japanese art to be able to perceive that here is a film of depth and richness and distinctive style, directed by Akira Kurosawa with sure artistry and real concern for its intellectual content.

One's unfamiliarity with South Africa actually stands more in the way of one's appreciation of *The Magic Garden* than being occidental did with *Rashomon,* though this film was made by Donald Swanson, an Englishman, and is technically quite conventional. It was shot in a small Negro suburb of Johannesburg with the villagers as the cast, and the world it reveals to us is so unfamiliar that we find ourselves watching it with a certain documentary interest which is not helpful to the film itself. It is as if one watched *Cabin in the Sky* as a documentary on the American Negro. *The Magic Garden* is a naïve little miracle play in which a thief steals some money from the church, and in trying to escape with it is forced again and again to hide it; each time he hides it, it is found and does good in some way before he reclaims it. It is used to pay a poor widow's grocery bills; it makes it possible for a young couple to marry; the girl's father pays off the old moneylender with it; and finally it returns miraculously to the church for, one presumes, future good works. This fable is of no real significance; it is constantly interrupted for songs and dances and enchanting, jaunty tunes played on a penny whistle; but always

one is gaping with the wonder of unfamiliarity at the rambling, untidy mud-caked village on the hillside, remembering what one has read in the papers about life in this divided country; this childlike fantasy seems somehow an odd introduction to its world.

This is a pity. The native actors carry off their assignments well. The prim righteousness of the widow, the vaguely prissy sweetness of the priest, the gangling abandon of the penny-whistle man are real enough to deserve a sterner play. Instead we have a slightly Uncle Tom musical comedy, endearing for its very simplicity, handled with only slightly self-conscious charm. But that village and those faces and the formal alien English they speak trouble us slightly because we know they are real, as this lovable myth is not.

On the same program when *The Magic Garden* was shown in New York theaters was another semidocumentary played by amateur actors, a British film called *David,* filmed in Wales with Welsh villagers for the Festival of Britain. The double bill accentuates the dangers of this bastard form, the fictional documentary. Much more art went into *David;* almost nothing came out. There were the Welsh mines, the black villages, the windy hillsides, the rich voices, but there too was a story just not dense enough to carry our interest on, just contrived enough to make us disbelieve in the verities we saw. On film, reality needs art to sound like truth; bad art, however, can only cast doubt upon what the camera records.

Jour de Fête, a French film, like *David* and *The Magic Garden,* was shot in a village with the villagers rounding out the cast. And surely here the villagers were most useful; the passersby dressed in their gala clothes for the big day produce all sorts of laughter supplied by their actuality. But this is not a self-consciously folksy film, nor does it make any documentary claim.

It is instead an extremely inventive farce, telling the story of a provincial postman who, inspired by a film about the American postal service, decides to employ up-to-date methods in his daily rounds. It is as slight a theme as is imaginable, but it is triumphantly comic; partly because the town has been made so substantial

that the Keystone-cop chase of the final episode explodes into laughter of the most satisfying kind; the sheer fantasy of the riderless bicycle and collisions missed by the breadth of a hair seems somehow more exquisite when the shrewd village faces watch from the sidelines.

The film was directed by Jacques Tati, who also plays the leading role. Everyone who has commented on the film has compared Tati to Chaplin, which is flattery so far as his acting goes, for his postman has none of the individuality or universality of Charlie's tramp, nor indeed the delicacy and grace of pantomime. But he relies on pantomime a great deal and as a director he shows some of the fertility of Chaplin. Considering the slightness of *Jour de Fête,* it is beautifully sustained; the parade of village types, the bustling joy of the carnival's arrival, the endless twists of the bicycle ride keep things rolling without pause. But in Charlie Chaplin's films it is a wistful gesture of Charlie's that one remembers most often: here the most memorable bits are both scenes in which Tati does not appear—the above-mentioned riderless bicycle rolling solemnly down the road, and a complicated piece of sound track comedy where Tati off-screen is shaving to an accompaniment of gurgling pipes, knocking boilers, and off-key song. At any rate it is Tati as director who deserves the credit and anyoné so inventive of farcical detail is welcome to the screen where comedy seems to become rarer each year.

The English film, *Murder in the Cathedral,* also uses an amateur actor, if Father John Groser, the Anglican priest who plays Thomas à Becket, may rightly be called an amateur. But there all resemblance to the films discussed above ceases. *Murder in the Cathedral* must be one of the worst films—*qua* film—in years, but its absolute failure is instructive. So has been its reception by the New York critics, who approached it with the most mealy mouthed respect; here obviously was culture, so no one quite had the courage to say that he had been, as surely anyone who sees it must be, bored to death. Well, let it be said: I was bored as few films have ever bored me.

In the past, as a poem, on the stage, on the radio, *Murder in the Cathedral* has impressed and moved me. But in the filming all the virtues of the play have disappeared. Most critics have accused the film of being too literal a photograph of the play; I am not sure that the fault does not lie in the other direction. The glory of Eliot's play is the words; these must be heard and what visual elaboration there is must be closely allied to the words. Instead, again and again visual image distracts and obscures. The First Tempter and Thomas play a chess game, and we become absorbed in the game and forget to listen to the temptation. The words speak of birds circling in the air, and we watch the sea, the film's symbol of time, rolling in. The words speak of a turning in the stairs, and the camera—with a perversity beyond comprehension—shows us a stairway which has no turning. When such irrelevant pictures are not disturbing us, the most banal background music is blasting and shuddering against the words. Sometimes the fault is a failure to conceive the film in realistic dramatic terms. When the knights knock at the door, why should their knocking pause for a long soliloquy by Thomas? When Thomas in his sermon prophesies his own martyrdom, surely the congregation would make some movement of surprise or terror, but in this film the people of Canterbury clearly do not care what happens to Thomas; the camera looks on their blank faces and they are patently extras being paid to stand still, not people hearing an annunciation of the most shattering importance. In the living theater, the audience *is* the congregation and they respond most emphatically.

But these failures to be realistic are balanced by the most infuriatingly literal quality elsewhere; in the New York *Times,* T. S. Eliot himself spoke of the great effort to be historically accurate, which apparently reached the absurd heights of weaving special cloth to duplicate whatever it was the women of Canterbury would have worn. The cathedral was also carefully reconstructed as it would have been in Thomas' day. This all sounds like a parody of Cecil B. DeMille doing research for a Biblical

epic. Few people know what Canterbury Cathedral looked like in 1170; nobody cares when, after all, we know that Becket did not speak in T. S. Eliot's particular sort of verse. Who cares what the women of Canterbury wore when we all know that they did not go around in wailing groups crying, "I have tasted the living lobster," or "I have smelt the incense in the latrine." This is *not* an historical play; it shouldn't pretend to be. The time wasted on such detail only serves to underline the failure to see this in terms of symbolic and poetic drama, to keep the eye and ear engaged on related projects. Much of the film suggests that the cameraman knew nothing about the sound track; he seems merely to have supplied designated lengths of film to keep the screen flickering while the noise goes on.

Mr. Eliot himself must share a good deal of the blame for this catastrophe, for he seems to have worked in very close collaboration with George Hoellering, its producer. He is reported to have recorded the entire text of the play for the actors to study, and in the film he speaks the Fourth Tempter's lines himself in a voice more ecclesiastical than anything Becket himself can summon. Mr. Eliot, then, must have endorsed the almost unforgivable cutting of the knights' apologies at the end. *Murder in the Cathedral* was never a clear play, but the few lines the knights have left serve only to baffle and irritate. Their rationalizing and satirical comment in the play fixed the historical event against a context of the everyday world of brutal politics in a most illuminating way.

The director must probably take the blame for the bungled chorus; it is seen chiefly in individual close-up of blankly pretty tragic masks. One would never have guessed in advance how hard it is to listen to a chorus when one's eyes are focused on *one* woman's lips, which necessarily are never quite absolutely synchronized with the general effect of the chorus; on the stage this does not trouble you for you cannot focus with such deadly attention on any individual.

The play is a short play; the film, when I saw it, lasted two hours

and twenty minutes, 140 of the longest minutes I can remember in the theater. The play still seems to me a noble and distinguished work, imperfect perhaps, but of real power. The film serves to remind us that if you decide to film a poem, you must not forget that in the beginning was the word. It is an odd thing to say, but the film gives the impression that Mr. Eliot and his collaborators have lost faith in his words.

From *Murder in the Cathedral* to *La Ronde* is to turn from a sacred failure to a profane triumph. But it is a triumph New York cannot taste, for the Board of Review has forbidden its exhibition there, with the result that San Francisco and Washington and Los Angeles have been enjoying this delectable film while New York reads about it. It is a film version of Arthur Schnitzler's famous shocker *Reigen,* but the director, Max Ophüls, has brought to it his own particular touch. Schnitzler's play is a particularly brutal analysis of the sex game; it is a series of dialogues in which we watch the ever-changing partners go through the cynical ritual dance which leads up to love's climax. But in Ophüls it has all been sweetened and lightened. Part of the change is due to the device of a narrator, Anton Walbrook, who links the dialogues by a few bitter-sweet comments and a brittle little song while he spins the merry-go-round of love. But more of the change is due to the tenderness with which Ophüls has staged and photographed these conversations; they are airy, slightly sentimental, a sort of *café viennois* of an entertainment. Save for the addition of the entrepreneur, Schnitzler's play is reproduced almost verbatim, but the effect is pure Max Ophüls. The result is not the same commentary on love which Schnitzler wrote, but it is *a* commentary on love, and one whose wit and despair are delicately combined with grace and forgiveness.

It is also a field day for the actors, and a cast of French stars offers a full course in methods and manners of acting. Among the women, Danielle Darrieux stands out for the delicately suppressed knowingness and mirth of her superficially prim young wife.

Among the men, two younger actors take the honors—Daniel Gelin, whose young gentleman combines ineptitude and craft, foolishness and charm in a richly comic bit of acting, and Serge Reggiani, whose brutal soldier has a vitality which is life itself. In the whole cast only Jean-Louis Barrault's baroque posturing strikes the wrong note; he is meant to be stagy, but his particular languid manner seems unhappily out of key with the part and the play.

The prohibition of this film is one of a number of incidents which have become more frequent in New York in recent years and which give real cause for alarm. In 1950, Jewish interests prevented the exhibition of *Oliver Twist,* being more successful than the Negro groups which protested revivals of *The Birth of a Nation.* (A year later *Oliver Twist* was shown in a somewhat abridged version.) Last year Rossellini's gratuitously violent *The Miracle* was withdrawn after Catholic pressure had pushed through a ban. *La Ronde,* a film, for all its preoccupation with sex, so talky and adult that it could corrupt no one who was not already corrupted, has been suppressed rather unobtrusively; more recently a documentary made by the Museum of Natural History has been prohibited. These pictures have nothing in common; each aims at a different audience; each has been suppressed by different pressure groups. But by these standards there are few films which cannot offend someone and few in the end that we will be allowed to see. That this dangerous tendency has caused so little notice is only a sign that we have all accepted the shocking doctrine that disagreement is dangerous, that all opinions are suspect, that the intellect is not to be trusted anyway.[1]

The withholding of *Oliver Twist* has turned the past year into an Alec Guinness festival. His brilliant exercise in the comic-macabre in that film reached us last summer, and has been fol-

[1] Since this was written, the United States Supreme Court has handed down a decision which restores *The Miracle* to New York audiences. This is heartening, but it is a decision which applies only to films accused of "sacrilege" and the threat of the pressure groups remains real.

lowed in rapid succession by *The Lavender Hill Mob* and *The Man in the White Suit.* These two Ealing Studio films show in a sense what a formula these English comedies have become and yet how superior they remain to anything America can produce in comedy. They are thin but dense; the theme has no real substance, but there is great wealth of comic detail. Of the pair, *The Lavender Hill Mob* is the better; here Guinness as a bland employee of the Bank of England makes off with a large quantity of gold bullion, aided and abetted by as amiably feckless a crew of ruffians as has ever been seen. Guinness' odd combination of diffidence and stubbornness is curiously engaging; at the end the audience shows real regret that villainy cannot triumph. This was possible because the film was complete fantasy. *The Man in the White Suit* approaches satire, and, since it then shies off from all the problems it raises, it is not finally so successful. Here Guinness invents a perdurable fabric, and labor and management gang up to keep his invention from the market. The best things here are the satire on science at the start of the film, especially the blub-blub of the retorts in which Guinness brews his new fabric. The extraordinary sounds thus produced become the basis of the funniest musical score I have ever heard—composed by the indefatigable Georges Auric.

Kind Hearts and Coronets had been a dazzling *tour de force* but a fairly shallow one; these three films show with what care Guinness can build and sustain a comic part. There is pathos as well as fun in each of these parts; the characterization is more than nervous tics. Dickensian eccentricity in his hands becomes plausible and documented, as his delicious Herbert Pocket in *Great Expectations* had already suggested. England has contributed no departure in film content or technique in recent years, but with Mr. Guinness and the Ealing Studios we seem to be assured of an endless supply of sprightly, crowded comedy of this humane and peculiarly English type.

TWO VIEWS OF A DIRECTOR—BILLY WILDER

THE EDITORS wish from time to time to publish appraisals of the work of important American film directors. They recognize, in printing Mr. Luft's article about Billy Wilder, that the author's viewpoint is not a wholly objective one but has been formed by his bitter personal experience. For this reason they asked Mr. Wilder's friend and one-time collaborator, Mr. Charles Brackett, for the comment which follows Mr. Luft's article. The two pieces certainly do not say the last word about Mr. Wilder's work, but they point up one distinction he shares with few of his contemporaries—he is one of the rare directors of this cautious day whose work may be called controversial.

I. A Matter of Decadence

HERBERT G. LUFT

HERBERT G. LUFT has been active in Hollywood since 1943 as a film editor, translator, and in studio research and production departments. He is an associate member of the Screen Writers' Guild, drama editor and book reviewer for the Los Angeles B'nai B'rith *Messenger,* and West Coast correspondent for the *National Jewish Post.* Currently he is engaged in the production of television films.

EARLY IN 1929, in Berlin, just before the close of the silent era, a group of motion picture students discovered an outlet for their youthful enthusiasm—away from the theatrical setting of studio-made film. Nothing much happened in the little opus they called *Menschen am Sonntag,* a semidocumentary made for producer Moritz Seeler, but for the first time the camera looked upon real people.

Four middle-class citizens, worn from the week's drab routine, go out to spend a Sunday at Wannsee beach! This bit of simple, rather melancholy reportage became Robert Siodmak's initial chore as director, his assistants being Edgar Ullmer and Fred

Zinnemann, with pioneer Eugene Schuftan handling the camera. The screen story was conceived by twenty-three-year-old Billy Wilder, a journalist from Vienna who had started as a copy boy, then graduated to sports writer before leaving for Berlin to become crime reporter on the *Nachtausgabe*.

Even today, *People on Sunday* still is regarded as one of the finest examples of screen art.

Wilder's career is one of the most fascinating success stories of the cinema. With the rise of Nazism, the young writer goes to Paris where he becomes a full-fledged film director (*Mauvaiso Graine*). Thus, with an actual directing credit to his name, he arrives at the Hollywood scene in 1935. Today, he amuses himself by relating his earlier experience: "I dragged my carcass up and down Hollywood Boulevard, and starved around for a year and a half before I sold two original stories."

In 1938, Wilder collaborated for the first time with Charles Brackett on the screen play of *Bluebeard's Eighth Wife*. He kept on writing with an ever-increasing speed, turning out *Rhythm on the River, Midnight,* and *What a Life!,* the latter based on the Henry Aldrich character. In 1939, Wilder joined Ernst Lubitsch, working with Brackett and Walter Reisch on the screen play of the Greta Garbo picture, *Ninotchka,* which became a sensational success. Then followed a series of craftsmanlike Brackett and Wilder scenarios such as *Arise My Love* (Ray Milland and Claudette Colbert), *Hold Back The Dawn* (Charles Boyer), and *Ball of Fire* (Barbara Stanwyck), all of them dated 1940 to 1941. As a director, Wilder came into his own with *The Major and the Minor* (1942), a mildly amusing comedy with Ginger Rogers.

Still collaborating with Brackett and now functioning as a triple producer-writer-director team, Wilder next presented *Five Graves to Cairo* (1943), a war yarn with Erich von Stroheim portraying Marshal Rommel. It was not until 1944 that Wilder, with *Double Indemnity,* his only co-authorship with Raymond Chandler, established himself as a truly unorthodox film maker.

Between film assignments, Wilder went to Berlin for six months as chief of the motion picture division for the American Information Control. In November, 1945, back in Hollywood, Wilder hit the peak with *The Lost Weekend.* This film brought him recognition as one of our foremost directors. Next on his schedule was the Austrian monarchy—plus Bing Crosby—in *Emperor Waltz,* a lavish Technicolor spectacle.

After his initial prewar films, something changed Wilder's trend. Though he had watched the pulse of Hollywood and had learned the mechanics of successful motion picture making, seemingly without regret he turned from the media of his much hailed Academy Award winner to more and more controversial subjects such as *A Foreign Affair* and *Sunset Boulevard.* It was as if an impetus that could not be restrained was forcing him on and on.

Twenty-two years have passed since Wilder, having discovered the common man on the streets of Berlin, comes forward with another reportage, an item about a fellow newspaperman (which could have had an affinity with his own life?). *Ace in the Hole*[1] unravels the tragedy of an unscrupulous reporter who has skidded to the bottom of the ladder into complete moral and physical disintegration. Given a slight chance to rise once more, this newshound frantically pursues a story to the point of killing a man buried in an underground cave-in. He deliberately delays rescue by bribing the authorities to use outmoded methods simply because it makes better copy and sells more papers while the victim suffers longer. To this end the reporter lies, cheats, and misleads the public, all to build up an unfortuante accident into the day's headline. Here Wilder has conceived a set of characters who appear totally repulsive and whose reactions are never normal. He has accentuated it all by adding a punch-drunk mob, the mere sight of which makes you hate the whole human race. He has lampooned yellow journalism, but has failed to attack the metropolitan scandal sheets who balloon murder cases and obscene bed-

[1] After a few weeks of showing, Paramount renamed the film *The Big Carnival.*

room yarns and actually have created an inexhaustible market for low, gutter reportage. The slant of the theme is worlds apart from the unpretentious approach of *People on Sunday* of 1929.

In an interview, during the production of *Ace in the Hole,* in August, 1950, Wilder stated: "All I try to do is get myself a story, splash it on the screen and get it over with. And I try, for God's sake, to have news in every picture I make! To open up, to unroll a problem is interesting enough. We don't have to know the answer, too." Can it be that Wilder thinks to jar the public loose from its inertia and force it to work out its own problems with something of the fervor of our local tabloid editors?

There's no doubt about it, Wilder makes news in every picture, yet, paradoxically, employs the same technique of ruthless exploitation that he castigates so often on the screen, oversimplifying complex human emotions in order to bring out his utterly cynical viewpoint. One can also note his peculiar flair for a high-pitched, spectacular finish. The hero-villain of *Ace in the Hole,* dying, stabbed with a pair of scissors, pays his debt to society by assuming a self-righteous pose and angrily shouting his confession down from a mountaintop to a throng of thousands. Drama, yes! But an easy deathbed repentance for misdeeds mere confession cannot wipe out.

Another vital parallel is the pronounced kinship of Wilder's characters. The obsessed reporter shows a striking resemblance to Walter Neff, the insurance agent from *Double Indemnity,* who is also killed by his partner in crime, the wife of his victim.

Wilder lashes indifference, yet has displayed the same indifference to enliven his own films. Survivors of Nazi concentration camps whose bones were broken in the dungeons must have been just as deeply hurt by the happy-go-lucky treatment of postwar Germany in *A Foreign Affair,* as Papa Minosa is now in *Ace in the Hole,* discovering that his own son, doomed to suffocate in a mountain trap, has become the involuntary object of a noisily staged fairground merriment.

A Foreign Affair has deserved the distinction of presenting one of the most revolting episodes ever projected onto the screen, namely a love idyl, a rather harmless one on the surface, yet by implication more cruel than a picture showing the furnaces of an extermination center with human ashes still smoldering. The fiendishly devised contrast, a "catch-and-get-me" game played against a room filled with archives of war-crime trials, makes the scene, to people with memories, loathsome. It is in even worse taste than if our screen lovers were to go into a final clinch over the still warm body of a slain rival, because the incident offends not only the sentiments of a few but mocks the torture of untold millions.

While the earlier Wilder in *Arise My Love* castigates the isolationism at the beginning of the European conflict, the later Wilder deals with the aftermath of war with the luxurious cynicism of a sophisticate who has acclimatized himself to the ivory tower of Beverly Hills. Even if Europe's surface looked to him in 1947 as he shows it in *A Foreign Affair,* it is a superficial viewpoint bound to mislead an uncertain public.

There are those who would scold us, saying that we shouldn't take motion pictures too seriously. They forget that films have become the universal language of our age, and that nowadays the screen is accepted as an image of life. I recall that in 1945 a friend (a woman who had just returned from a German concentration camp) wrote me about her most heartbreaking experience. She had wept for the first time in six years, wept when she saw her first movie, a superficial picture others devised while she had been undergoing unspeakable sufferings. To her, the callousness of the world at large seemed more cruel than the atrocities of the enemy.

There is a distinct pattern in the work of Billy Wilder that leads us to conclude that he undoubtedly is amused by the callousness of our time. In *Ninotchka,* the character Bulgaroff asks, "How are things in Moscow?" and Ninotchka answers, "Very good. The last mass trials were a great success. There are going to be fewer but better Russians."

The Lost Weekend, the odyssey of a drunk by Charles Jackson, attributes the hero's alcoholism to his sex frustration. Wilder, who, of course, couldn't touch upon the homosexual angle, seems to be rather amused by the plight of the alcoholic. He portrays him as a gentleman lush who sees himself in a third person and comments with a nasty sense of humor. The director inserts deliberate touches, such as the bat scene, for the mere shock effect. Here as in *Ace in the Hole,* he treats his characters with an obscene, obnoxious witticism, which to a lesser extent is apparent even in the harmless *Emperor Waltz,* a travesty on a bygone world of phony grandeur.

Wilder not only creates news in every picture, but also is on the lookout for off-the-beaten-track titles. *Ace in the Hole* happened to be the title of a novel by Jackson Gregory (Dodd, Mead & Company, 1941) which has no connection with his story. The title of *Five Graves to Cairo* is a hoax in itself. The picture opens by showing us a map revealing that the German Africa Corps in 1945 had five secret ammunition dumps throughout Egypt spelling out the five letters of "Egypt." Wilder, of course, knew that the equivalent German word would make eight letters or eight graves.

A Foreign Affair, an original, clearly mirrors the mark of his unhealthy boulevard witticism. The camera focus on a pile of rubble was not exactly a fitting place for wholesome comedy. There are the ruins of Berlin, but not one word to explain why the city had to be utterly destroyed before the spirit of oppression could be broken. The Nazis are seen as double-crossers, yet drawn with much charm and *noblesse,* living in an atmosphere of comparative ease, with a romantic façade covering up a decade of mass murders. Those praising the guts of the story didn't see the malefic travesty. Our occupation forces appear undisciplined and ill-behaved. It is not funny to see Berlin's citizenry tyrannized by the same clique of Nazis whom we have cursed so often, or to view *frauleins* complacently ruling the destiny of American officers, or

to realize that a huge black-market exists under the very eye of the military government. Undoubtedly, the frivolous slant of the picture helped to increase animosity against America among those who have lived under the yoke of the Nazis.

Sunset Boulevard sets another bad example for this country. It presents a distorted Hollywood setting centering around a secluded mansion wherein it unravels the tragedy of a love-hungry actress who refuses to admit that she has grown old. The heroine is just as superficial as the congresswoman in *A Foreign Affair,* and just as exceptional. The story is that of the melodramatic cliché of silent movies, paraphrase on the pathos of an era it went out to ridicule, except that *Sunset Boulevard* takes its own pathos seriously. Here, as in the flickers of the Pola Negri variety, the aging woman buys herself a lover. This time the gigolo comes in the disguise of a film writer. Only once in a blue moon, if ever, do we find such a scribe.

Wilder's "Hollywood" is ice-cold, calculated theater, far from the American way of thinking, and out of step with the real worries and ideals of the film industry which is still bubbling over with the growing pains and vitality of youth. The decadent atmosphere of *Sunset Boulevard* is only matched by the endless narration of a dead man floating in a swimming pool. The picture flays some of the finest creators of the silent screen, such as Erich von Stroheim, Buster Keaton, and H. B. Warner, who in their days showed a more intelligent approach in creating well-rounded characters than do some of today's top-notch boys. As in *Ace in the Hole,* Wilder, master of systematically developed sensationalism, again tops everything with his bombastic finish. The murderess of *Sunset Boulevard* walks into the spotlights for a final close-up, with the camera grinding on, Hedda Hopper reporting—and the story ending in repulsive pandemonium.

All in all, Billy Wilder's later pictures are of a shockingly deteriorating nature. Other film makers have portrayed mass hysteria in *Fury, Ox-Bow Incident,* and *The Well* more honestly and

more realistically, yet with a deeper belief in the innate decency of man. But Wilder has picked out exceptional characters with no redeeming features whatsoever and presents them to us as average Americans. His heroes have no integrity and expect none from anyone else. Like many Germans, Wilder depicts only the weaknesses and shortcomings of the American people, ridicules their habits, but never senses the strikingly salubrious strength of this vibrantly young republic. He says in an interview on the *Ace in the Hole* set: "We are a nation of hecklers, the most hard-boiled, undisciplined people in the world." Is he referring to his particular Hollywood?

Wilder, who has spent his years in America in a metropolitan atmosphere and, according to his own humorous account, sold his first two stories to a producer in Lucey's restroom, has evidently never been in touch with the "average" American, nor met those who create the physical and cultural wealth of this country. He hasn't seen Americans as they are, or as they should be, but as he—perhaps against his will—was indoctrinated to conceive the "Yankee" when he was still abroad. Subconsciously, he has accepted the cartoon characterization of the uncivilized, unconcerned weakling, the savage of the Wild West who loves only money and owes allegiance to none. To him, evidently, as with the philosophers of the Third Reich, Americans are a frightening array of ruthless, perverse, and criminal elements.

The America of Billy Wilder is not the America I found when I came to this country after having lived in Nazi Germany for six years. I had gone through the concentration camp of Dachau and through the earlier phase of World War II in England. For me—as for the vast majority of newcomers—America has meant a symbol of freedom, not a hoax. If these United States were as decadent and corrupt as Wilder would lead us to believe they are, this country never could have risen to such a position of strength and moral leadership in the world of today.

One can only conclude that Wilder's world is more continental

than American. He portrays Americans as if they were demoralized Europeans uprooted between two world wars. The earlier German-made films (*Caligari, Mabuse, Waxworks*), masterpieces as such, dealt with the same mixture of Old World fears and arrogance, with violence and the sickness of the mind.

Somewhere, somehow, like so many other Hollywoodians, Wilder seems to have lost his human heart on the way to the top. Billy Wilder, a man of original ideas, has the makings of a great film writer and director, if he would lift his talents into a higher sphere of truthful interpretation and moral responsibility. But what he seems to want is sensationalism at any price. Perhaps he will give us a different answer with *Stalag 17*.

II. A Matter of Humor

CHARLES BRACKETT

CHARLES BRACKETT, formerly a novelist and drama critic of the *New Yorker*, has written and produced many notable films, often in association with Billy Wilder. Among their pictures were *Ninotchka, Hold Back the Dawn, The Major and the Minor, The Lost Weekend, A Foreign Affair,* and *Sunset Boulevard.* Mr. Brackett is president of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

I READ Mr. Herbert G. Luft's article about Billy Wilder with a certain fascination. It is like reading an essay about Van Gogh by someone who is color blind. No, more than that—this appraiser of Van Gogh is made actively ill by the painter's favorite color.

Mr. Luft not only doesn't like a joke, he *detests* a joke. This is a limitation of nature to which one should be charitable. Certainly Mr. Luft's tragic experience in a concentration camp should cause one to overlook it. But in choosing Wilder for his subject, Mr. Luft has thrust his deficiency on the reader in a way that cannot be ignored.

Predominant among Billy Wilder's qualities is humor—a fantastically American sense of humor. It was the outstanding trait

than American. He portrays Americans as if they were demoralized Europeans uprooted between two world wars. The earlier German-made films (*Caligari, Mabuse, Waxworks*), masterpieces as such, dealt with the same mixture of Old World fears and arrogance, with violence and the sickness of the mind.

Somewhere, somehow, like so many other Hollywoodians, Wilder seems to have lost his human heart on the way to the top. Billy Wilder, a man of original ideas, has the makings of a great film writer and director, if he would lift his talents into a higher sphere of truthful interpretation and moral responsibility. But what he seems to want is sensationalism at any price. Perhaps he will give us a different answer with *Stalag 17*.

II. A Matter of Humor

CHARLES BRACKETT

CHARLES BRACKETT, formerly a novelist and drama critic of the *New Yorker*, has written and produced many notable films, often in association with Billy Wilder. Among their pictures were *Ninotchka, Hold Back the Dawn, The Major and the Minor, The Lost Weekend, A Foreign Affair,* and *Sunset Boulevard.* Mr. Brackett is president of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

I READ Mr. Herbert G. Luft's article about Billy Wilder with a certain fascination. It is like reading an essay about Van Gogh by someone who is color blind. No, more than that—this appraiser of Van Gogh is made actively ill by the painter's favorite color.

Mr. Luft not only doesn't like a joke, he *detests* a joke. This is a limitation of nature to which one should be charitable. Certainly Mr. Luft's tragic experience in a concentration camp should cause one to overlook it. But in choosing Wilder for his subject, Mr. Luft has thrust his deficiency on the reader in a way that cannot be ignored.

Predominant among Billy Wilder's qualities is humor—a fantastically American sense of humor. It was the outstanding trait

of the young man with whom I started to work some seventeen years ago. He was sassy and brash and often unwise, but he had a fine, salutary laugh. Also, he was in love with America as I have seen few people in love with it. I mention this because one of Mr. Luft's theses is a belief that Wilder fails to appreciate, and dislikes, America.

Now let us observe the conduct of Mr. Luft when he happens on a joke. He shudders first, then he begins to weigh it on sociological and ethical scales—and, alas, those scales aren't working very well. Take, for instance, the line from *Ninotchka* which he views with horror.

Ninotchka, reporting solemnly on her native land, says, "The mass trials have been a great success. In future there will be fewer but better Russians." This happens to be a line tossed into the script by Ernst Lubitsch, but I spring to its defense with ardor, as would Billy Wilder. Could a single sentence better compress the inhuman Russian point of view? Could that point of view be held up to ridicule in a healthier way?

The indifference-to-America thesis runs into some difficulty when our essayist reviews *Arise My Love* and *Hold Back the Dawn.*

Arise My Love was a comedy with serious undertones and was decried by every America-Firster as warmongering and jingoistic. In it there were tender and adoring references to America—and I can testify that they were put in by Billy Wilder. In those simpler days I took my country's virtues very much for granted.

Hold Back the Dawn, which came a year or two later, was certainly a bouquet laid at the feet of America by two people who loved it dearly.

Mr. Luft brushes aside *The Major and the Minor* as inconsiderable (though I can assure him it filled countless theaters with the lovely and important sound of laughter), and comes to *The Lost Weekend.* Here, for Pete's sake, he finds Wilder at the peak of comicality—poking fun at the infirmities of a hopeless alcoholic!

This interpretation defeats me. The very core of *The Lost Weekend* was its insistence that a drunk is not the comedy figure he had usually been on the screen, but a tragically sick man. Throughout the script, Don Birnam, the protagonist, was treated with the compassionate respect any sick man commands. Mr. Luft seems to think the bat-mouse hallucination was interjected by us, or rather by Wilder, as a prize boff. If he will glance at Charles Jackson's novel, he will find it exactly as it was played—a scene of utter terror. Incidentally, the Freudian significance of the scene is that the mouse (representing man himself) is being destroyed by the bat (the winged mouse—man with imagination; in Don Birnam's case, the frustrated writer).

Now we come to *A Foreign Affair,* which, according to Mr. Luft, "clearly mirrors the mark of Billy Wilder's unhealthy boulevard wit." That picture played in the great rubble pile of Berlin. It is a city which most of us in America had regarded with loathing, horror, and dread for the ten preceding years. The war is concluded, and now over its debris are swarming exuberant young Americans—young men whose desires and delights are strong in them, thank God. There's larceny in their hearts, and fun in them and health in them. Does Mr. Luft want a glimpse of the truth about those young men? No. It evokes that horrid sound of laughter. He wants an explanation of why the city had had to be utterly destroyed. That was something the audience knew, and we saw no point in boring them with it again.

The Berlin woman, played by Marlene Dietrich, was such a complete heavy that some humanization of her character became necessary. Therefore she was given a scene which explained what made her tick. I suppose that is what makes Mr. Luft describe her as "drawn with much charm and *noblesse.*" About the audience's reaction to her, I can only report that she ended by going to a labor camp, amid the delighted laughter of American audiences. Apparently to Mr. Luft it was a wistful and romantic exit.

In his criticism of *Sunset Boulevard,* Mr. Luft points out that

the heroine was "exceptional." Really? Wasn't she just the average woman who once earned fifteen thousand dollars a week and had thirty million fans in love with her? Of course she was exceptional! She was also tragic. Perhaps we should have told about her with a more audible lump in our throats. We thought it effective to suppress the pitying sounds and let the audience find the pity for themselves.

Now in Mr. Luft's article comes a sentence which I have to quote and analyze. "Wilder's Hollywood is ice-cold, calculated theater, out of step with the real ideals of the film industry, which is still bubbling over with the growing pains of vitality and youth." Is that true? Even if you block that metaphor, is it true? The exact purpose of the young girl in the picture—the sympathetic character—was to embody the ideals of the town, the passion for truth on the screen, the passion for good pictures.

Again I quote: "The picture flays some of the finest creators of the silent screen—Erich von Stroheim, Buster Keaton, H. B. Warner. . . ." Flays them? It merely records that time, which flays us all mercilessly, has not spared them. If they had not been great, that fact would have had no dramatic significance.

To answer another charge of Mr. Luft's, certainly there was sensationalism in the ending of the picture. People like Norma Desmond fade out with a bang, not a whimper.

I come to *Ace in the Hole,* a picture with which I had no connection. It told the story of a ruthless heel. No one was asked to like or admire him. The story of his using the victim of an accident to rebuild his shattered career was not a pretty one, nor was it presented as what *any* newspaper man would do under the circumstances, but it did point up certain cynical qualities in the press and certain appalling habits of behavior in crowds who gather to watch events charged with misery. It was in the vein of American self-criticism which has been a major current in our national literature since the days of *The Octopus* and *The Pit* and *The Jungle.* Because he was born in Austria, is Billy Wilder to be excluded from that vigorous and important trend? I don't think so.

There's Still No Business Like It

IN THE FALL, 1951, issue, the *Quarterly* printed an article by Jay Gordon, "There's Really No Business Like Show Business," which questioned the effectiveness of motion picture advertising practices. Among other things, Mr. Gordon criticized the tendency to overlook advertising professionals, to play up sex and violence even if neither has much to do with the film, and to crowd billboards with full lists of credits lost to the passing motorist. Mr. Gordon suggested that larger audiences might result from better advertising, based on honest presentation of the content of films and on methods proved successful for other types of products.

Reactions from Hollywood's writers, producers, and others have been curiously mixed. The following are excerpts from some of the letters received in reply to a request for comments.

I think Mr. Gordon has a fine and unusual understanding of the subject, and, for the most part, I couldn't agree with him more. My slight differences with him have to do with his advocacy of institutional advertising, which I think is meaningless in our industry—that is, if I understand his use of the words "institutional advertising" correctly. . . . Each picture is a new product and, roughly, Hollywood has to sell something over four hundred new products a year—and herein lies the difficulty. Lucky Strike, Kaiser-Frazer cars, or Coca-Cola can plug away at the one trade name day in and day out for fifty-two weeks a year, and these products are available day in and day out fifty-two weeks a year which makes for a different proposition than selling a picture which is available for a very limited time in any given area.

Again I congratulate Mr. Gordon on his fine piece and hope it receives wide circulation in our industry.

WILLIAM PERLBERG

It is an interesting and helpful piece.

JEAN HERSHOLT

I quite agree with the author that there is evidence that the motion picture industry's advertising policies could well be re-examined and

modernized. Personally, however, I should go further—much further. I believe that the various units of the industry should combine their resources to effectuate a large-scale, amply financed, public relations campaign, embracing not only ideas such as those advanced by Mr. Gordon, but all phases of public relations in as many fields as practicable, including the political. I think it is time that the motion picture industry stopped dodging and ducking, with an occasional counterpunch. I think we should get off the defensive and hit out in a forthright and positive and big campaign to tell the story of an industry that is the greatest medium of mass entertainment the world has ever known, and certainly need not be ashamed of saying so.

WILLIAM H. WRIGHT

I was fascinated by Jay Gordon's article. . . . I am asking our Publicity Department and Sales Department to read this and to give me some indication of the impression it made on them.

SOL LESSER

I think it is an excellent article and I couldn't agree with Mr. Gordon more heartily.

VALENTINE DAVIES

Mr. Gordon's comments on the absurdity of film advertising are completely sound in my view. I have had my eye on these ads since 1931 and can see no difference in the dishonesty and vulgarity of the average ad and indeed no difference in its content during a period in which the *medium,* the film, changed so radically. Of course each film should be advertised "in a manner harmonious to plot, content, and action." Where I disagree is with Mr. Gordon's plea for not advertising the star but the directors, producers, and companies. This seems to me sheer madness. These are businessmen, the least glamorous hence least "saleable" of all God's creatures. And why advertise screen writers? Can we not humble ourselves, not before outsiders but before ourselves, and admit that we are hacks because we have no control over our work and are bossed about and put up with it?

So there I would part company with your author excepting for one important new phenomenon arisen in the industry in the last few years, the producer-director-writer. Such a man need not be a hack. He can be a creative artist. He may even be worth advertising. You are familiar with the early Shakespeare quartos, in some of which the

writer was not even accorded his initials on the title page, let alone the use of his name, that is to say, "screen credit." It is obvious from these first quartos that whatever this beginner wrote, the men who corresponded to our producers and directors pulled it about and changed it about. Later on, however, the title pages and texts show Shakespeare becoming what corresponds to a triple-threat man in Hollywood—producer-writer-director—and as such he *deserved* advertising, if there were any advertising. But was his name ever box-office, as that of Burbage was? Perhaps.

JOHN L. BALDERSON

Gordon complains at great length that the industry doesn't rely on "advertising professionals." A phone call or two would have acquainted him with the fact that all of the industry's national advertising (and a great deal of the regional-exhibitor advertising) is worked out by and placed through the nation's top advertising agencies, including firms like J. Walter Thompson and Buchanan and Company. Either he didn't make his point clear—or he has egg all over his face. . . .

I agree with the comment about "honesty" and even the overemphasis on the "female bosom and the unclad limb." But flip through any magazine, scan the ads prepared by advertising agencies for the widest range of products and note how many other industries use sex for selling. . . . I could go through the article paragraph by paragraph. But, in sum, I found this a poor advertisement for the *Quarterly* because of error and ignorance in unhappy combination.

INDUSTRY OBSERVER

I found Mr. Gordon's article very absorbing reading. Much, if not all that he says, merits serious consideration by the industry.

SAM ENGEL

You are right as rain in thinking that I would be interested in Mr. Gordon's article and I filed it under the economics of the movies in preparation for a brief chapter in the new and still untitled Lively Arts which I am doing for Knopf for 1953. As for comment, I think Mr. Gordon exposes the weaknesses of movie promotion, but his imaginary film about the Philippines is the pay-off. The poster he describes is exactly right and I am afraid will keep the audience away

so that in the end it would be said either that the picture should never have been made at all, or should have been publicized for elements it did not contain.

On a smaller scale *Streetcar* and *A Place in the Sun* and *The Marrying Kind* are all being publicized slightly off the exact beam and while this may cause a little resentment, a lot of people are seeing good pictures.

GILBERT SELDES

Thank you very much for letting me see Jay Gordon's piece. It makes sense to me. As you yourself know, studio people argue about this all the time, but the answer from the exploitation and advertising departments is that we don't know what we're talking about. How would we like it, they demand, if they tried to tell us how to make pictures? This is a line that so far we have found no answer to.

I'm sure that nine-tenths of moving picture advertising is utterly useless, except in the actual printing of the name of the picture on a piece of white paper, and that probably half of it discourages people who might want to see that particular picture. I don't suppose anybody in the world has a higher respect for sex than I have, but I still don't believe it is the solution to every picture that is offered to the public. But the faith that those advertising fellows have in it awes even me. You may remember the story of the rube character in the olden days who was supposed to have gone back again and again to look at one of the first of the silents showing an automobile beating an express train across the tracks in the confident expectation that some day that train was going to smack that car. It's the same still with the advertising boys. They are confident that this entire country is made up of rube characters who are going to go back again and again with the expectation of some day seeing a man and a woman actually in bed together, a spectacle that I do not anticipate seeing in our lifetime. Sometimes I wish that the people of this country had as much faith in and devotion to our flag as our advertising departments have in their belief in this possibility.

I agree almost one hundred per cent with what Mr. Gordon says on this subject, but I'm not the head of a studio and I have no authority to alter this approach to advertising. And in addition to that, I am too old and tired to become a reformer of any kind.

NUNNALLY JOHNSON

I've read "There's Really No Business Like Show Business." The article written by Jay E. Gordon, who describes himself as "a free-lance move critic," (!) is a revealing one. It largely reveals, however, that the author has only the sketchiest knowledge of his subject. Mr. Gordon's approach to the problems of selling a motion picture, as well as his apparent ignorance of present-day methods of so doing hardly entitle him to a reply, except that his off-base arguments have been given some circulation and therefore might create serious misapprehensions among others whose knowledge of show business is equally incomplete.

In the first place, Mr. Gordon takes the producers to task for relying on studio publicity departments in promoting films. This is an argument that is hard to analyze, since these same studio publicity departments have, over the comparatively short period of twenty-five years, completely revolutionized the general concept of publicity and public relations and have paved the path toward bringing glamour to industry and individuals and products—a path that has since been well traveled by almost every exploiter of services or products in every field.

These selfsame studio publicity departments, dismissed by Mr. Gordon in one sentence, have made pictures and people famed the world over on a scale never before accomplished by any advertising agency or public relations firm in the whole history of exploitation.

The men and women employed in the studio publicity departments are experts—that's why they're hired and that's why studios pay them salaries considerably in excess of those paid people in similar positions in advertising agencies. The fact that American motion pictures are famous the world over is due in no small part to the efforts and ideas of these same experts, whom Mr. Gordon dismisses so lightly.

He also seems completely unaware of the fact that advertising agencies—the biggest and best in the business—*are* employed by the motion picture studios to prepare the advertising campaigns on each motion picture. Therefore, the faults found in motion picture advertising by Mr. Gordon can be traced directly to the advertising agencies which he proclaims as a cure-all!

He claims that movie advertising is dishonest and that advertising agencies do not create dishonest ads. How does this jibe with the fact that every advertisement prepared for a major motion picture for the past fifteen years has been prepared by an advertising agency?

The remainder of his ideas are equally naïve and unsupported by

fact. He seems to suffer under the delusion that a "pressbook" is the sole contribution made by a publicity department to the sale of a motion picture. How wrong he is! In actuality, a pressbook is merely a printed guide sent to exhibitors showing them how to sell the picture, and including a number of stock stories which they can give to the newspapers along with their advertisments, which also are included in the pressbook.

To use the pressbook as a sole example of the work done by a publicity department is about as sensible as using a visitor's guide to Washington as an example of all the work done by the United States government.

Furthermore, far from being "hackneyed handbooks," many of these pressbooks represent dynamic and original approaches to the problems of selling motion pictures. I can only assume that Mr. Gordon has read few pressbooks lately on major motion pictures. If he cares to read some, I have a few handy that would provide considerable inspiration for some of the "experts" from eastern advertising agencies.

Mr. Gordon's ideas on how to sell a movie are too ridiculous to deserve comment. Suffice to say that if any producer were foolish enough to follow his advice, he would suffer the financial disaster his folly would deserve.

Mr. Gordon points out that no motion picture advertisements are included in the *Commercial Art Annual* as proof of his contention that picture advertisements are insufficient. These annuals, made up by arty eastern advertising men, wouldn't admit a motion picture advertisement on general principles, no matter how effective it was. Let me point out the advertisements on *The Champion,* on *Bend of the River,* those that Foote, Cone, and Belding did on *The Blue Veil* and *Clash by Night* for us, the advertisements on *The Greatest Show on Earth, David and Bathsheba, An American in Paris, Streetcar Named Desire,* and *A Place in the Sun* as advertisements which, dollar for dollar, outdrew probably any contained in the *Commercial Art Annual.*

I'll not argue that there aren't motion picture advertisments which are gross, stupid, in bad taste, misleading, and downright untrue. But these are not the majority. The faults of these advertisements lie largely with the advertising agencies which prepared them, the self-same experts lauded as infallible by Mr. Gordon.

Mr. Gordon seemingly looks upon the motion picture business as

a decaying enterprise that is doddering toward its grave. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In fact, good pictures today are doing better business than ever before in the history of show business. The pictures doing the best business are those which are properly sold.

In every case, the pictures getting the greatest sales campaigns—*The Greatest Show on Earth, An American in Paris, Pride of St. Louis,* and *Singing in the Rain*—are ones where the campaigns have been carefully planned by coöperative meetings between a creative producer, studio publicity and advertising men, and the advertising agency. All three intellects are needed to create a good sales campaign on a motion picture.

In Hollywood today, ballyhoo doesn't mean circus parades and hairbrained stunts—necessarily. On *Clash by Night* the publicity campaign has been aimed at all levels, from the intellectual to the pure entertainment seeker. The personal appearance tours planned for the stars, the producers, the writer, and the director will hit every walk of life—and every section of the country's newspapers.

Hollywood is alive and receptive to the problems of selling a picture today, against the increased competition of television. Our experience shows one fact predominant: a good picture, properly sold, will return its makers more profit than ever before thought possible; a bad picture, no matter how well it is sold, will not return a penny.

JERRY WALD

The Film Gains a Dimension

JACK HOWARD

JACK HOWARD is a graduate journalism student at the University of California, Los Angeles campus. Before returning for graduate studies, he worked for a time as a reporter on an Ohio daily newspaper and as an editor on a short-lived English-language daily newspaper in Germany. He is a political science and journalism graduate of the Berkeley campus of the university.

WHAT IS probably the only film of its kind ever produced in the United States has just been completed by a graduate theater arts student at the University of California, Los Angeles campus. The film, entitled *A Place to Live,* is Harry L. Cooper's master's thesis and represents active coöperation between the Psychology and Theater Arts departments of the university in an effort to develop a multipurpose film.

Basically, the subject of this film is the so-called racial or ethnic tensions as illustrated in a student housing situation. The subject of tension is, of course, of prime interest to the social scientist concerned with human relations, and is a major area of research. At the same time, social tensions resulting from ethnic or racial discrimination are a prime concern of educators and citizens of good will who recognize in them a major threat to our democratic way of life. Thus, at the outset the film deals with content material which has potential uses both for educators and for social scientists.

The film is unique because it provides material for two methods of utilizing motion pictures, the two approaches mentioned above. In the first place, it tells a particular story of racial prejudice and discrimination and thus is suitable as subject material for discussion groups concerned with this problem. Second, the film is so constructed that it can be used for psychological research in the field of social perception of ethnic differences. There have been documentary films dealing with group conflict, and there have been testing films, too, but in the opinion of University of Cali-

fornia research experts,[1] *A Place to Live* is the first film which is capable of both functions—instruction and research.

Fundamentally the problem that faced Mr. Cooper was that the film had to be dramatic, had to be capable of holding its audience, yet at the same time, had to have a sufficient degree of ambiguity to guarantee that the audience would project itself into the story. This projection, or role-taking, is present in all films and drama to varying degrees. But, for research, the ambiguity must be sufficient to force the audience into identifying itself with, or assuming a role in, the presentation before it.

This concept of ambiguity is known to anyone who has ever watched the sky and tried to describe clouds as animals, or letters, or some other object. The psychological use of ambiguity is illustrated by two persons sitting side by side looking at the same cloud. One sees a bear, the other sees a house. The identical stimulus material—a cloud—is ambiguous enough so that two persons will identify it as two entirely different objects. Because the material is the same in both, the responses of the individuals give psychologists information about their personalities. This is also, of course, the principle of the Rorschach ink blots.

In *A Place to Live,* success in achieving ambiguity without losing dramatic effect may be laid in part to use of the subjective camera, or camera-eye, technique. This involves the camera as a person in the drama, as a participant. The technique necessitates an unseen narrator because the camera, as a person, has thoughts and makes comments. Other parties in the drama speak to the camera, face it when talking, and in every way make it appear that the camera—and by easy projection, the audience—is an active participant in the action, rather than merely an observer of it.

Thus, because the central figure in the film is not seen by the audience until the end, and the narration representing this character gives no clue to his identity, members of the audience are

[1] These include Prof. Franklin Fearing, of the Department of Psychology, who was a consultant to both Mr. Cooper and the writer of this article, and Daniel Wilner, who was actively associated with Mr. Cooper in the production of the film.

forced to construct their own explanations of why certain things happen to him. And this activity—projection, role-taking—is the key to use of the film for psychological research. *A Place to Live* produces in the audience identification and projections which reveal most clearly the kinds of social perception of the viewers. With the essential identification of a major character left to their own imaginations, members of the audience react necessarily within the framework of their own ethnic prejudices, beliefs, and inclinations. The film becomes a mirror to the personalities of the viewers. Because it is a controlled stimulus material, the varying responses of the audiences to which it is shown accurately reveal individual differences in degree of ethnic prejudice. Social perception—the way individuals perceive others in a human relations situation—thus becomes subject to measurement and observation.

In format and production the film is unpretentious. The plot is simple and immediate: a late registering student ("the camera"—we are not told anything about him nor do we see him) is having difficulty finding a room. A note on a campus bulletin board directs him to a certain address. There he finds, in version *A,* a Negro student and a white student, or in version *B,* two white students, sharing a room with a third white student who is a dominant personality. The late registering student is given various excuses by the roomers, and after a flare-up develops between two of them and their dominant roommate, the late registrant leaves.

At this point in the *A* version, the applicant is identified as white, and the version ends. Version *B,* however, continues with the room applicant identified either as a Negro or as a Jew. The endings in the respective versions consist of a monologue as the rejected student walks away from the house.

The usefulness of this film for discussion purposes is obvious. It has been pointed out that discussions on ethnic discrimination by persons of good intentions too often degenerate into generalities and abstractions. The valuable service of *A Place to Live* in this respect is that it presents a living situation on which the discussion can be focused.

There are many techniques of using this film as discussion material. The film could be stopped at any point just before the room applicant is identified and the audience asked to explain why he was rejected. In such a manner members of the audience can informally explore their own prejudices by projecting themselves into the action on the screen.

The uses of this film in research will differ, of course, according to the various hypotheses which the researcher hopes to test. Its most obvious use would be the determination of intensity of prejudice in an individual or the amount of prejudice in a population. It would be used, as are all projection devices, as occasions on which individuals unconsciously reveal their underlying beliefs and attitudes. At various points the film might be interrupted and the audience asked questions designed to force the viewer to project himself into the filmed situation, also testing recall.

Another test might be concerned with the way in which the viewers perceive the role of the authority figure in the film—that is, Harding—the dominant roommate who so vigorously rejects the unseen applicant. According as the subjects perceive the ambiguous situation, Harding may be viewed as a sympathetic or unsympathetic figure. Also, of course, the viewers will unconsciously make certain assumptions about the characteristics of the unseen applicant, again within the framework of their own prejudices and attitudes.

That the producer of the film anticipated these applications is shown by the fact that one psychology researcher at the university,[2] who acted as a consultant to Mr. Cooper, had carried out an investigation in which he showed the effects of prejudices and attitudes on the audience's perception of a Hollywood feature film also concerned with ethnic tensions—*The Home of the Brave.*

The key factors in the applicability of *A Place to Live* to psychological research are its unstructured or ambiguous characteristic (the subjective camera) on the one hand, and the fact that

[2] Dr. Daniel Wilner.

the film deals with a concrete presentation of a particular set of human relations. These factors also contribute to use of the film for discussion purposes; they are the *sine qua non* for research.

The concreteness and reality of the situation are heightened by frank language. There is not much in the way of euphemistic discussion of ethnic prejudices. Here, for example, is the monologue of the narrator as the applicant walks away from the house. He has been identified as Jewish.

NARRATOR: So I'm not their kind . . . they think I'm different. But am I different? They treat me differently when I want a job. Fill out the application. Name and religion—Goldberg, Jewish. (*A job application blank appears on the screen.*) Education and ability—what do they want to know that for? You want to go into a profession, but the policy is keep the quotas down and the Jews out. . . . They tell you to stick to your own and then they call you clannish. (*Picture of for-rent sign—"White Gentile." Picture of "restricted" country club sign.*) They restrict your living place, your recreation, your chances of achievement. And always they qualify what they think of you. (*Different close-up shots of individuals as the narrator says:*) "He's that nice Jewish fellow." "That clever Jewish boy." "That rich Jew." "That Jew liberal." "That red Jew." "Dirty Jew." "Loud Jew." "Damned Jew kike." They look at you differently, they treat you differently, and therefore they tell you—you won't fit in. What can you do?

Dialogue such as this can provide a sharp stimulus to a discussion group, can give members of the group a good many leads. For example, they could explore whether the rejected applicant for the room should have reacted in such a bitter fashion, whether he should instead have sought to avoid situations which might give rise to ethnic discrimination. The prime necessity for discussion-use of the film is obviously an able leader who can focus the questions and opinions so that some sort of organized reaction develops. The many possibilities for discussion are apparent.

Here is a sample of the script which establishes the two relatively sympathetic characters in the apartment. Notice how even before we meet Harding, the authority figure, his character is established by means of neatness and disorder. Notice also that although we do not see the narrator, we hear his voice as he speaks

to the others and, where his lines are preceded by "Thought-voice," as he reflects on the situation.

EXTERIOR: BELL
Tilt up to door. It is opened by Osborne. He is a nice-looking, uncombed boy of twenty-five.

SOUND OF DOORBELL

OSBORNE: Yes?

NARRATOR: Is this the house where some students have an apartment? I'm looking for a fellow named Osborne.

OSBORNE: Well, I'm Bob Osborne. What can I do for you?

EXT: OSBORNE
Medium shot.

NARRATOR (*Thought-voice*): You tell him your name. You heard there was room for one more here. This is a lucky break; the housing situation is very poor for late registrants.

OSBORNE: I'm afraid that's a mistake about us having a room.

NARRATOR: Oh?

OSBORNE: We did have another man here, but when he left, we decided it had been too crowded.

NARRATOR: Is that the final word? How about a temporary deal? I don't have a place to stay tonight.

Osborne opens the door.

OSBORNE: Well. Come on in. I'll show you what we've got.

INTERIOR: HALLWAY
Follow Osborne down hall, to door of apartment. Osborne opens door and walks in.

We're really hard up for space.

NARRATOR (*Thought-voice*): *He's* hard up.

INT: ONE-ROOM APARTMENT
Follow Osborne in. He points to table with books, paper, beer bottles on it.

OSBORNE: Well, this is it. This is the dining room.

He points to a bed at right.

Here's where Harding sleeps—over here.

Gestures toward sink and stove.

This is the kitchen. We do all our own cooking.

Points screen left.
Pan left.

INT: BATHROOM DOOR

Close-up of drawing on door.

INT: OSBORNE'S DESK

Papers and books in great disorder.
Tilt down to old chair with clothes on it.

INT: OSBORNE:

He gets up and walks to bathroom.

INT: OSBORNE:

Closer shot. Raps on bathroom door. Steps aside. Door starts to open.

INT: ELLIOT ("A" VERSION, NEGRO; "B," WHITE)

Comes out of bathroom drying face with towel. Looks at camera, then at Osborne.

INT: ELLIOT'S FEET

He stumbles on an old shoe, kicks it aside.

INT: OSBORNE AND ELLIOT

Osborne ad libs, introduces Narrator, and explains his predicament.

Elliot walks off right and sits on bed. Osborne looks over at Harding's bed.

INT: ELLIOT

Turns and looks over at Harding's bed.

INT: HARDING'S BED AND DESK

Pan over bed right to desk. Bed is neat, made up. Desk has books squared away, a good blotter.

And there's the john—now occupied.

That's where I work.

NARRATOR (*Thought-voice*): It's no palace. But it would do. Most anything would.

OSBORNE: I know you're in a tough spot. But four in a little place like this just doesn't work out.

Just a second. Maybe Clarke Elliot has some ideas.

NARRATOR (*Thought-voice*): This is Clarke Elliot. Very interesting.

ELLIOT (*to Osborne*): I don't know. There'll be the old complications, you realize. It might work, but—

OSBORNE: But Harding won't think so.

ELLIOT: Harding's just different, that's all.

OSBORNE: Let's face it.

NARRATOR (*Thought-voice*): Harding *is* different. What's with this Harding?

INT: ELLIOT

Throws towel down.

ELLIOT: Well, I'm willing to take a chance.

Punches bed.

Here's a bed—a pretty good bed—

INT: ELLIOT'S ARM PUNCHING BED

INT: ELLIOT

Looks at camera.

And here's a guy who can use it.

NARRATOR (*Thought-voice*): Hurray.

Elliot gets up.

INT: OSBORNE AND ELLIOT

Elliot turns as Osborne walks in.

OSBORNE: Still, Harding has a say in the matter.

NARRATOR (*Thought-voice*): Oh-o. There's the fellow in the woodpile.

OSBORNE: What do you think we ought to do?

ELLIOT: We can't decide without Harding, of course.

Elliot turns and looks off right.

INT: CLOCK

Close-up. Almost 3 o'clock.

OSBORNE (*to camera*): Harding's a funny guy—a good man, mind you, but with ideas about studying and housekeeping.

INT: OSBORNE

Sits down in armchair.

The following portion of the script is the climax where the various personalities are clearly identified. The drama here forces the audience, through the subjective camera, to participate, to project. Note that only at the end of this portion is the narrator identified; up to this point the audience has no key whatsoever to the identity of the room applicant.

INT: HARDING

He comes in. He wears a coat, shirt, and tie. Reasonably serious in demeanor. He carries books over to desk. Looks up at camera. Then to Osborne.

SOUND OF DOOR OPENING

NARRATOR (*Thought-voice*): This is the fearful Harding.

INT: HARDING AND OSBORNE
Osborne walks in, ad libs the situation.
Harding knits his brows; there is little warmth on his face, real concern. He definitely does not want a fourth man in the place.

NARRATOR (*Thought-voice*): Doesn't look too good, does it? What sort of appeal do you make to a man like this?
OSBORNE: He's been looking pretty hard and had no luck at all.

INT: HARDING
Medium close-up.

HARDING (*to camera*): Have you tried the YMCA? I understand they're still operating.
NARRATOR: The housing office said they were full.
HARDING: How do you stand, Elliot?

INT: ELLIOT
Walks in from sink.

ELLIOT: What the hell, you can't let him sleep in the street.

INT: HARDING AND OSBORNE
Reaction by Harding.
INT: ELLIOT
Medium close-up.

We're not that exclusive.
HARDING: Exclusiveness isn't the point at all and you know it.
OSBORNE: What is the point?

INT: HARDING
Walks across room.

HARDING: Look at the place. Probably a room for an elder daughter twenty years ago. Simply because the landlady put four beds in here doesn't mean four men can get along together in it. I thought we settled this before. I'm against the whole proposition. And that's that.

INT: HARDING, ELLIOT, OSBORNE. Osborne and Elliot walk in, arguing with Harding.

NARRATOR (*Thought-voice*): So here's what you've been waiting for. Now you can go. He didn't take long to come right out with it. These other guys act really disappointed in him. You wonder should you stop

	them. They're putting on such a good show. (*To others*) Look here. I don't want to start any trouble.
INT: OSBORNE, HARDING, ELLIOT. They turn to camera.	OSBORNE: Forget it. This has been coming for a while anyway. It's getting tough to live here with all the rules laid down.
	ELLIOT (*appeasing, to Harding*): When the semester gets going, we're away from the place most of the day anyhow. What difference does it make?
	HARDING (*to Osborne*): Maybe you're right; it has been coming—
Camera backs toward door.	NARRATOR: I'm going to have to move along. Thanks anyhow. I'd like to check the other possibilities before dark—
INT: ELLIOT AND HARDING Elliot walks toward the camera. Harding walks away.	
INT: ELLIOT AND NARRATOR Over Elliot's shoulder. Narrator is white.	(*Thought-voice*: What other possibilities?)
	ELLIOT: Listen, I'll tell you what— if you don't find anything, you can come back this evening.
Narrator leaves.	NARRATOR: Sure . . .

The potentialities of this film are enormous, but as yet no steps have been made to utilize them. One national organization fighting ethnic discrimination has investigated using the film for discussion groups. Also under study is the possibility of using the film in psychology classes for testing as well as for exploring prejudices and other preconceptions.

It is scarcely surprising that this film has not been put to immediate use, because, as has been pointed out, it has no precedent, and new tools for learning are accepted warily. Nevertheless, those who have seen and studied *A Place to Live,* believe it may mark the first significant step in the wider utilization of the motion picture medium.

A Bibliography for the Quarter

Book Editor, FRANKLIN FEARING

BOOKS

IF ANYONE thinks the subject of communication is dull he should read *Is Anybody Listening?* by William H. Whyte, Jr., and the Editors of *Fortune* (Simon and Schuster, New York, 1952, $3.00). It's the sharpest, shrewdest—and wittiest—book on the subject that has come to this reviewer's desk in a long time. It is really a book about American business, its folkways, its ethics, and, on occasion, if we can judge from the report of the editors of *Fortune,* its colossal fatuousness. The sense of this fatuousness is conveyed by the disturbing question raised in the title itself—a question, according to Mr. Whyte, which increasingly haunts those who speak for American Big Business. A quote from the dust cover blurb tells the story of the purposes and surprising ramifications of Mr. Whyte's inquiries.

> The editors of *Fortune* set out to discover how and why American business stammers when it talks to human beings, and their first finding showed that few people were really listening to the gobbledeygook with which business has been carrying on its vast Free Enterprise campaign. Careful analysis of the language of business, the anatomy of the office grapevine, how executives write memoranda, and how we try to communicate our way of life to foreigners turned up a lot of charlatanry, some colossal waste, and a ripe insult to the intelligence of human beings.

As the study dug deeper it even turned up the executive's wife, or, rather, the problem in the social system of management of the wife-of-the-executive-who-is-on-the-way-up-but-has-not-arrived, and the result is one of the best chapters in the book.

One of Mr. Whyte's major theses is that the great enemy of communication is the illusion of it. The communicator *believes* he is talking to others when he is only talking to himself. In a

chapter appropriately called "The Great Divide" it is shown that in international communications as well as in business, in fact, in any situation where the techniques of persuasion are used, those who talk do not know how to listen. And when they talk, too frequently they speak not to people but to stereotypes created in their own minds.

Communication is not an end in itself and the technicians of communication have social responsibilities, as Merton has shown in *Mass Persuasion*. Mr. Whyte properly draws a sharp line between responsible social scientists and the cult of social engineering. Although the social engineers have invented the "strangest language ever penned by man," it is not their language that concerns him so much as it is the assumption that confuses conformity with normality, and ascribes the uncertainties and conflicts that confront us merely to "blocks" in the communications flow. The distinction here is between responsible science and a machine for engineering mediocrity. Was our failure to stop Hitler in time, he asks, due to "faulty communication" or lack of moral courage? We need, says Mr. Whyte:

> to find ways of making this bewildering society of ours run more smoothly and we need all the illumination social science can give us to do it. But we need something more. Lest man become an ethical eunuch, his autonomy sacrificed for the harmony of the group, a new respect for the individual must be kindled. A revival of the humanities, perhaps, a conscious effort by large institutions to accommodate dissent—possible approaches to a problem so fundamental cannot easily be worked.

These suggestions, though doubtless meritorious, seem somewhat timid considering the size of the problem.

In *Is Anybody Listening?* the author speculates about the basis for the business man's current, almost compulsive, preoccupation with communication problems and suggests that having lost much of his former status and dignity in the community, he is endeavoring to find satisfactions in a sense of greater participation with his

employees via communication. For this, and, in fact, for many of the problems so pungently raised by Mr. Whyte, a recent book called *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character,* by David Riesman in collaboration with Reuel Denney and Nathan Glazer (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1950, $4.00), provides a theoretical frame of reference. This book is about character—those "patterned uniformities of learned response" that distinguish men in different regions, groups, classes, and historical periods—how it is formed, how it is related to other social phenomena, and how it is reflected in and utilizes the media of communication. It is a basic assumption of the book that the character type which predominates in a particular historic period will depend primarily on what phase of the curve of population growth and decline a given society happens to be in. It is assumed that all the factors that determine the ratio between the number of births and deaths—conditions of livelihood, survival chances, the ratio between the supply and demand for human beings—influence the "typical" character patterns of that society.

Three "ideal" character types are distinguished, two of which are especially important in understanding the American social character. The "inner-directeds" are those persons whose basic character structure is determined early in life by their elders. These persist into adult life and provide the standards by which the individual behaves. The "other-directeds" are, in contrast, the product of their peers. "In adult life [the other-directed] continues to respond to these peers, not only with overt conformity, as do people in all times and places, but also in a deeper sense, in the very quality of his feeling." "Yet," continues Mr. Riesman, "he remains a lonely member of the crowd because he never comes really close to the others or to himself; his inner-directed predecessor was lonely too, but in a different way; his chief company being the ancestors within—the parents whom he had internalized."

While the conformity patterns of Americans of an earlier gen-

eration were inner-directed, middle-class urban American society today is typically other-directed. The individual's contemporaries, either as known to him directly or through the mass media of communication, determine the goals for which he strives and the manner of striving. For him, conformity results not from inner discipline or drill, but from his sensitivity to the wishes and actions of others. And the consequences are reflected in every phase of his social life; the books that he writes and reads, the patterns of his interpersonal relationships (*vide* the behavior of the business man as described in *Is Anybody Listening?*), his leisure-time activities, food and sex interests, and political behavior.

Character typing is a tricky and elusive business, and the evidence to support a particular typology must of necessity be *selected.* The dangers of such a method of social analysis are obvious, and Mr. Riesman and his collaborators as knowledgeable social scientists must be fully aware of them. Although the basic assumptions will require much additional testing before acceptance, they have produced a challenging book full of penetrating insights. Theirs is a type of study in the tradition of Veblen's *Theory of the Leisure Class,* and they specifically acknowledge their debt to Erich Fromm's *Escape From Freedom.* The book's special contribution to the literature of communication lies in its interpretations of the role and function of the mass media in society.

The Great Pan was the son of Hermes and an unknown mother, and was worshipped by the primitive Arcadians. He was the presiding deity of the woodlands, a symbol of fertility and the untrammeled joy of living. Although full of pranks and tricks, when enraged he was capable of inspiring extreme terror, a fact etymologically reflected in the English word "panic." Robert Payne, in *The Great God Pan* (Hermitage House, New York, 1952, $3.75), develops the thesis that the myth of Pan is projected into the modern world in various forms—the clown, the medieval Feast of Fools, the Commedia dell'Arte, in Pierrot, Punch, Harlequin—and the little figure with a fragile cane, baggy pants, and derby

hat that the contemporary world knows as "Charlie." There is an extraordinarily extensive literature about Charles Chaplin, and the books continue to appear. Two recent ones have been discussed in this department. The present work is different from these in that it is not about Charles Chaplin, but Charlie the clown and what his pictures signify. Charlie as a character is endlessly complex, "never a tramp, never a fool, but resembles most of all a god who has unaccountably found himself on this earth, and having concealed his godlike nakedness with the first clothes he was able to find and wandered unheedingly into the world's traffic, discovers that the world is completely inexplicable and obeys laws he will not even attempt to understand." He is an archetype and exists in his own right along with such great fictional figures as Don Quixote, Micawber, and Pickwick.

Although there are many similarities in the myths and folklore of various peoples and cultures, the specialists are not agreed this reflects historical continuity or even a common "human nature." The thesis that it does has great plausibility, especially for the layman, and when systematically and sensitively applied, can make many things, especially in literature and art, fall into a pattern and hence become meaningful. The apparent similarities between the folk art and literature in ancient Greece and the contemporary film lend themselves readily to such interpretations. To identify the common factor in the worship of Pan in ancient Greece, the Commedia dell'Arte, the "delight makers" in certain Indian festivals in the American southwest, and the character created in such films as *The Gold Rush, City Lights, The Kid,* and *Monsieur Verdoux,* requires the assumption not only of archetypes, but a universal symbolism and a human nature with universal traits. The risk of oversimplification in such interpretations is very great, and almost certainly a mystical rather than critical acceptance of the reality of the archetypes and universals is demanded. Mr. Payne makes a plausible and interesting but perhaps not wholly convincing case for his interpretations. He displays an extraordi-

nary knowledge of the Chaplin films, and he writes with the enthusiasm of a dedicated Chaplin fan. In fact, he overwrites. His prose is distinctly purplish and sometimes repetitious. But the student of Chaplin will read this book with interest. *The Great God Pan* and Huff's *Charlie Chaplin* together constitute a fairly comprehensive analysis of a great creative artist.

The ways in which social or cultural phenomena are interrelated is the subject in one way or another of all the social sciences. In *The Lonely Crowd* a variety of complex phenomena are related to ideal character types which in turn are said to be dependent on the position of a society on the curve of population growth or decline. Two recent books are concerned with the relationship between the media of communication and the rise and fall of civilizations. Harold A. Innis in *Empire and Communications* (Oxford University Press, 480 University Avenue, Toronto 2, Canada, 1950, $2.50) and *The Bias of Communication* (University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada, 1951, $4.50) develops the broad conception that in every age the monopolies of knowledge acquired by particular groups or classes are associated with their control of the media of communication. When new media are developed a shift in the controls occurs with a consequent shift in the cultural patterns of a society. This implies a close relation between the physical media and those who control them, and the content of communication. Professor Innis traces the waxing and waning of the civilizations of ancient Egypt, Babylonia, and Greece, as well as modern societies, as related to communications by means of clay, papyrus, parchment, paper, and radio. The profound effects of the various types of media are reflected in political systems, ideologies and, in fact, in every department of culture. This is the "bias" of communication. The breadth of the author's scholarship as well as the intrinsic interest of his basic theory make these books important contributions to communications literature.

Shots in the Dark, edited by Edgar Anstey, Roger Manvell,

Ernest Lindgren, and Paul Rotha (Allan Wingate, Ltd., 12 Beauchamp Place, London, S.W. 3, 1952), is a collection of British film criticisms selected by an editorial committee appointed by the British branch of the International Federation of Film Critics. The project was initiated because it was thought that a valuable service would be rendered both to criticism and to international understanding if the film critics of each country could have some knowledge of the film criticism in other countries. The period covered is from January, 1949, to February, 1950, and some twenty-five films are represented in the reviews, usually three or four for each film. The films are highly varied both in type and country of origin. They include *The Passionate Friends, The Treasure of Sierra Madre, Joan of Arc, Germany Year Zero, Louisiana Story, Intruder in the Dust, The Miracle, Jour De Fête, Rocketship X-M, Sunset Boulevard, All About Eve, Samson and Delilah,* and *A Walk in the Sun.* This project should have been initiated sooner and it is to be hoped that it will not lapse.

Alice Evans Field in *Hollywood, U.S.A., from Script to Screen* (Vantage Press, Inc., New York, 1952) has written an unpretentious little book that will tell a lot of people what they want to know about Hollywood. The interest in Hollywood of that portion of "the public" that goes on conducted tours through the studios and buys the maps hawked on major boulevards in Los Angeles showing the locations of the film stars' homes is continuous and intense. This interest isn't limited to the low-brows, as anyone knows who lives in the area and is reputed to have studio "connections." The visiting high-brow also desires intensely to meet a star and see a movie being made, under special auspices, of course. Mrs. Field's book will be interesting reading for all these people. It is very easy to call such a book superficial. There is much very significant information which is omitted, and it is doubtful if the book is a "comprehensive Baedeker to the film industry" as the dust jacket suggests, but it does tell a lot about the making of movies, and tells it in a highly readable manner. There are

chapters on the producer, writing the script, casting, set design, directing, the camera, film music, and the animated film. There is a list of Academy Awards and a glossary of terms. Mrs. Field was director of the Public Service Department of the Motion Picture Association for many years.

What is a public? When does it have an opinion? What kinds of communications affect it? The liveliest and most informative discussion of these questions that has appeared in a long time is found in Curtis MacDougall's *Understanding Public Opinion* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1952). The author is professor of journalism and possesses a doctorate in sociology. This happy combination of skills should and does result in both erudition and writing facility. The author is committed to the view that public opinion, as well as other social phenomena, doesn't just *happen.* It is *caused,* and the layman, the newspaper man, or anyone else concerned with the social scene is inevitably concerned with the question "why." This, of course, is not exactly a new idea, but Professor MacDougall has succeeded in making its discussion exciting. There are chapters on opinion polling (and why polls are sometimes unreliable), propaganda and its detection, American culture and public opinion, prejudice, and mental epidemics. The third part is devoted to the public-opinion media. These include language, the arts (radio, stage, and screen), the church, education, and the press. The fact that it is a textbook shouldn't prevent anybody from reading it. The author is a member of the faculty of the School of Journalism in Northwestern University.

Broadcasting: Radio and Television by Henry L. Ewbank and Sherman P. Lawton (Harper and Brothers, New York, 1952, $4.50) is an unusually compact, well-written textbook by two experienced radio professionals and college teachers of radio. There are chapters on the mechanics of broadcasting, government controls, planning the broadcast schedule, preparing the program, directing, and methods of audience measurement. There are glossaries of TV and radio terms and an extensive selected bibliog-

raphy. At the end of each chapter there are exercises, special assignments, and lists of selected readings. The book is weakest in its discussions of methods of evaluation. There is no reference whatever to content analysis as a method, and the presentation of the methods and results of effects analysis is disappointingly brief. This is a pity since research methodology and results in these areas would seem to be especially important in the training of the professional broadcaster. While he may not himself be expected to conduct studies in these fields, he should know something about how such studies are done and the theory from which they proceed. Dr. Ewbank is chairman of the University of Wisconsin Radio Committee and the state Radio Council. Dr. Lawton is the author of texts on radio speech and radio drama and has produced many radio and TV programs. At present he is at the University of Oklahoma.

The editors of *New World Writing* (New American Library, 501 Madison Avenue, New York, 1952, 50 cents) state that it is their intention "to provide a friendly medium through which new, promising, genuine and vigorous talent may be communicated to a wide and receptive audience, and also to provide an instrument for serious letters and criticism." The present volume is added to the list of Mentor books, a list already favorably known for its reprints in thirty-five-cent editions of many important books. The present collection is an anthology of current literature and criticism. The selections are sufficiently varied to justify the claim to be a representative cross section of serious contemporary writing. Included are such items as a first chapter from a forthcoming novel by Christopher Isherwood, an essay on the Negro in American literature by Alain Locke, a short play by Tennessee Williams, and a poem by Thomas Merton. For those interested in the mass media of communication there is an extraordinarily interesting analysis of a frequently neglected mass medium, the "whodunit" (total sale last year, 66,000,000 copies) by Charles J. Rolo entitled "Simenon and Spillane: The Metaphysics of Murder for the Millions."

The third series of *Best American Plays* edited with an Introduction by John Gassner (Crown Publishers, New York, 1952, $4.50) covers the period 1945–1951. Included in the present volume are *Death of a Salesman, Medea, Detective Story, A Streetcar Named Desire, Billy Budd, The Member of the Wedding, State of the Union, The Autumn Garden, The Iceman Cometh, Bell, Book, and Candle, Mister Roberts, Anne of the Thousand Days, Come Back, Little Sheba, All My Sons, Darkness at Noon, The Moon is Blue,* and *Summer and Smoke.*

There may be a place for a dictionary of theatrical terms, but for this reviewer *The Theatre Dictionary* by Wilfred Granville (Philosophical Library, 15 East 40th Street, New York, 1952, $5.00) does not fill it. While many of the terms are true theatrical jargon and properly belong in such a dictionary, it is difficult to understand why such words as "playgoer, earnest" ("a serious-minded stage 'fan' "), or "plot" ("the main story of the drama"), or "playwright" ("an author of plays; a dramatist") should be included. The author has an annoying habit of including with his definitions thumbnail homilies on manners and morals. In the definition of "dress circle" we are informed that it is "regrettable" that so few people now "dress" for the theater, and in the definition for "playing down to the troops" we are informed that it is an "impertinent and insulting technique." These are doubtless admirable sentiments, but only Dr. Johnson was permitted to express personal comment in a dictionary, and that in the 18th century.

JOURNALS, RESEARCH, ETC.

The *Documentation and Information Bulletin* published by the European Broadcasting Union (Volume 3, No. 12, March, 1952), in addition to the various statistical, technical, and program summaries of radio in the nations of the world, contains three important articles. One, entitled "Reflections on the Correlation of Copyright with the Rights Known as *'Droits Voisins,'* " by G. Straschnov, discusses the problem of the relationship between

The third series of *Best American Plays* edited with an Introduction by John Gassner (Crown Publishers, New York, 1952, $4.50) covers the period 1945–1951. Included in the present volume are *Death of a Salesman, Medea, Detective Story, A Streetcar Named Desire, Billy Budd, The Member of the Wedding, State of the Union, The Autumn Garden, The Iceman Cometh, Bell, Book, and Candle, Mister Roberts, Anne of the Thousand Days, Come Back, Little Sheba, All My Sons, Darkness at Noon, The Moon is Blue,* and *Summer and Smoke.*

There may be a place for a dictionary of theatrical terms, but for this reviewer *The Theatre Dictionary* by Wilfred Granville (Philosophical Library, 15 East 40th Street, New York, 1952, $5.00) does not fill it. While many of the terms are true theatrical jargon and properly belong in such a dictionary, it is difficult to understand why such words as "playgoer, earnest" ("a serious-minded stage 'fan' "), or "plot" ("the main story of the drama"), or "playwright" ("an author of plays; a dramatist") should be included. The author has an annoying habit of including with his definitions thumbnail homilies on manners and morals. In the definition of "dress circle" we are informed that it is "regrettable" that so few people now "dress" for the theater, and in the definition for "playing down to the troops" we are informed that it is an "impertinent and insulting technique." These are doubtless admirable sentiments, but only Dr. Johnson was permitted to express personal comment in a dictionary, and that in the 18th century.

JOURNALS, RESEARCH, ETC.

The *Documentation and Information Bulletin* published by the European Broadcasting Union (Volume 3, No. 12, March, 1952), in addition to the various statistical, technical, and program summaries of radio in the nations of the world, contains three important articles. One, entitled "Reflections on the Correlation of Copyright with the Rights Known as *'Droits Voisins,'* " by G. Straschnov, discusses the problem of the relationship between

copyright and the rights of performers, record manufacturers, and broadcasting organizations. The second, by L. Conturie, describes the "Pierre Bourdan" studio center of the *Radiodiffusion et Télévision Françaises,* and the third, by Robin Wood, officer in charge of Radio Australia, discusses the activities of the Australian Broadcasting Commissions. The editor of the *Bulletin* is Léo Wallenborn, 37, Quai Wilson, Genève.

The Entertainment Film for Juvenile Audiences by Henri Storck is one of the series of studies on specific problems of mass communication issued by UNESCO (distributed by the Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y., $1.25). The present study contains chapters on the needs of the juvenile audience, the influence of films on children, the special problems in production, and the criteria for selection of films for children. There is a useful list of films produced for juvenile audiences. While this study contains much interesting and useful material, especially in connection with the list of films for children produced in various countries, it is unfortunate that it makes little use of the results of the more recent American studies in this field.

The Statistical Service of UNESCO has issued a nineteen-page statistical summary entitled *Production of Motion Pictures in Selected Countries, 1930–1950.* The countries covered include, besides the U.S.A., the United Kingdom, France, Sweden, Mexico, Italy, Germany, Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, Japan, Turkey, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Portugal, and the U.S.S.R.

The latest study in the British Film Institute's *New Index Series* is by Peter Noble and deals with the English director, Anthony Asquith. Mr. Asquith's directorial career extends from 1926 to the present and includes such important contemporary films as *The Winslow Boy* and *The Browning Version.* Mr. Gavin Lambert is general editor of the series, which may be obtained from the Institute, 164 Shaftesbury Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

The School of Library Service, Columbia University, has made an important contribution to the communications field in its re-

cently issued *Classification for Communications Materials* (1952, $2.00). In the foreword Dr. Robert D. Leigh notes that there

> are insistent practical reasons for trying to encompass the subject matter of communication with a workable system of classification. At our universities, scholarly workers from the organized disciplines of Sociology, Social Psychology, Anthropology, Political Science, Economics, History, Library Science, Education, Journalism, Literature and Languages are increasingly seeking library materials in the communications field as each discipline defines it. The materials themselves have been accumulating at a rapid rate, especially since the turn of the present century when in rapid succession the newer media of mass communication made their appearance, creating a veritable communications revolution. Under existing classification schemes communications materials find some resting place, but the result, often, is juxtaposition with irrelevant subject matters rather than coherent classification.

A graduate student, Mr. Jay W. Stein, undertook the classification with the assistance of members of the staff of the School of Library Service.

The Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois has issued *Building Audiences for Educational Radio Programs* (Urbana, Illinois, 1951), by C. H. Sandage. Subtitled *An Experiment in Audience Promotion,* it deals with two important questions: can audiences for educational radio programs be increased by means of promotion, and what kinds of promotion are most effective? A panel consisting of 647 individuals from 359 families living in Champaign County, Illinois, furnished the data for the study. Certain types of promotion of specific programs broadcast over Station WILL were tested for the effects on the size of the listening audience as reported by the panel. Some of the important conclusions were: (1) most persons are potential listeners to educational programs; (2) careful and systematic promotion of educational programs substantially increases both the number of listeners and amount of listening; (3) distribution of direct-mail promotional material was more effective than distribu-

tion through other channels; (4) more college-trained than non-college-trained persons usually listen to educational broadcasts, but promotion can increase the audience of noncollege trained; and (5) the usual audience for educational programs is composed of a disproportionate (to the total population) number of persons in the 40-or-over age category. The author criticizes educational broadcasters for their failure adequately to inform potential listeners of their programs.

Film Music on Records

Compiled by GERALD PRATLEY

GERALD PRATLEY is a film commentator and writer for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and has just completed a series of programs on Canadian music and its composers. In the Fall, 1951, issue of the *Quarterly*, Mr. Pratley presented a compilation of film music on records as of July, 1951. Here he brings the compilation up to date as of July, 1952.

KEY TO RECORD NUMBERS

American and *Canadian*

CAPitol L, P
COLumbia, ML
DECca DL
MERcury
MGM
POLYmusic
VICtor
WESTminster

English

CAPitol LC, CTL
DECca LXT, AX
His Master's Voice (HMV)
PARLOphone
MGM

New Zealand

TANZA

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

ADDINSELL, Richard

Encore (1951)
"The Ant and the Grasshopper"
"Winter Cruise" and "Gigolo and Gigolette" **10″——FM 124–125**
Orchestra conducted by Muir Mathieson

Highly Dangerous (1950)
"Prelude" **10″——FM 106**
Orchestra conducted by Muir Mathieson

ADDISON, John

High Treason (1951)
"Stage Band" **10″——FM 121**
Novelty Orchestra—John Addison

Pool of London (1951)
"Shipping Movement" **10″——FM 109**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

ALWYN, William

Night Without Stars (1951)
"Montage" **10″——FM 111**
Orchestra conducted by Muir Mathieson

AURIC, Georges

Lavender Hill Mob, The (1951)
"Prelude," "Stealing the Van" **10″——FM 117**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

CELE, Willard

Magic Garden, The (1951)
"Pennywhistle Blues" **10″——MGM 11206A**
Buddy De Franco and his Quartet
(This is a free improvisation on the original theme)

CLIFFORD, Hubert

Dark Man, The (1951)
"Main Theme" **10″——FM 107**
Orchestra conducted by Hubert Clifford

COPLAND, Aaron

Red Pony, The (1949)
"Children's Suite" **10″——DEC DL 9616**
The Little Orchestra Society—Thomas Scherman

DAVIE, Cedric Thorpe

Great Adventure, The [*Adventurers, The*]
"Death at Dawn" **10″——FM 110**
Orchestra conducted by Muir Mathieson

FRANKEL, Benjamin

Clouded Yellow, The (1950)
"Piano Theme in the Modern Style" **10″——FM 105**
Piano solo and orchestral variation

Importance of Being Earnest, The (1952)
"Can-Can Melody" **10″——FM 127**
Orchestra conducted by the composer

Island Rescue [*Appointment with Venus*] (1951)
"Escape from the Island" **10″——FM 123**
Orchestra conducted by the composer

Man in the White Suit, The (1951)
"Prelude," "The Guggle Triumphant" **10″——FM 118**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

(NOTE.—The "Guggle Glub Gurgle," by Mary Habberfield, has been recorded from the sound track and incorporated into "The White Suit Samba" on PARLO R3435 by Jack Parnell and his Rhythm.)

GERHARD, Roberto

Secret People, The (1952)
"Ballet" **10″——FM 115–116**

GOMEZ, Vicente

Blood and Sand (1941)

"Sangre y Arena," "Verde Luna," "Chi Qui Chi," "Romance de Amor," "Torero," "Pirate" **10″——DEC A-265, DL 5380**

Vicente Gomez Quintet
Vocal choruses by Graciela Parraga

GUEST, Val

Penny Princess (1952)

"It's a Fine, Fine Night" **10″——FM 126**

Male Chorus and Orchestra—Philip Martell

KAPER, Bronislau

Invitation (1952)

"Invitation" **10″——DEC 27965**

Victor Young and his Singing Strings
Ray Turner (piano)

LILBURN, Douglas

Journey for Three (1948)

"Title Music," "Leaving the Hermitage," "Climbing the Glacier," "Skiing on Mount Cook," "Hospital Sequence," "Race Meeting," "Visit to the Farm," "Mackenzie Country"

4 10″——TANZA CL2-3

National Symphony Orchestra of the New Zealand Broadcasting Service

MARTIN, Hugh

Grandma Moses (1951)

"Grandma Moses Suite" **10″——COL ML-2185**

Orchestra conducted by Daniel Saidenburg

(NOTE.—This suite has been developed and orchestrated by Alec Wilder.)

NEWMAN, Alfred

Royal Scandal, A (1945)

"Overture" **12″——MER MG 20036**

Hollywood Bowl—Alfred Newman

NORTH, Alex

Streetcar Named Desire, A (1951)

Selection of the original music from the film: "Streetcar," "Four Deuces," "Belle Reve," "Blanche," "Della Robia Blue," "Flores para los Muertos," "Mania," "Lust," "Soliloquy and Redemption" **10″——CAP-L 289; LC 6542**

Orchestra conducted by Ray Heindorf

RAWSTHORNE, Alan

Ivory Hunter [*Where No Vultures Fly*] (1951)

"Prelude," "Vultures" **10″——FM 119**

Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

ROEMHELD, Heinz

Valentino (1951)

"Valentino Tango" **10″——DEC 27511**

The Castilians, directed by Victor Young

ROTA, Nino

Valley of Eagles (1951)

"Scandinavian Landscape" **10″——FM 122**

Orchestra conducted by Muir Mathieson

ROZSA, Miklos

Crisis (1950)

"Village Square," "Revolution March" **10″——MGM 10756**

Guitar solos by Vicente Gomez

Quo Vadis (1951)

"Quo Vadis Prelude" (lyrics: Hugh Gray), "Assyrian Dance," "Lygia," "Roman Bacchanal," "Siciliana Antica," "Hymn of the Vestal Virgins" (lyrics: Hugh Gray), "Hail Nero, Triumphant March," "Jesu, Lord" (lyrics: Hugh Gray), "Chariot Chase," "Invocation to Venus" (lyrics: Hugh Gray; Marina Berti, contralto), "Petronius' Meditation and Death," "Miracle," "Finale" (lyrics: Hugh Gray)

Orchestra and chorus conducted by Miklos Rozsa

(Recorded in England)

4 10″——MGM 103; LP E-103; K-103; 460–61 (Eng)

SPOLIANSKY, Mischa

Happy Go Lovely (1951)

"One Two Three," "Would You" **10″——HMV B10116**

With dialogue by Vera-Ellen and David Niven

(Recorded from the sound track)

STRAUS, Oscar

Der Reigen [*La Ronde*] (1950)

"Reigen" ("La ronde de l'amour") Walzer

10″——PARLO DPW48

Berliner Symphoniker—Walter Liebe

"La ronde de l'amour" (words: Louis Decreux)

10″——PARLO R3423 & DPW37

Anton Walbrook with Vienna Bohemian Orchestra

THOMSON, Virgil

Louisiana Story (1948)

"Acadian Songs and Dances" **12"——DEC DL 9616**

The Little Orchestra Society—Thomas Scherman

WOOLDRIDGE, John

Blackmailed (1951)

"Roof-top Chase" **10"——FM 108**

Philharmonia Orchestra—John Wooldridge

NEW RECORDINGS OF SCORES PREVIOUSLY LISTED

COPLAND, Aaron

Our Town (1940)

"Music from the Film Score" **10"—DEC DL 7527**

The Little Orchestra Society—Thomas Scherman

JAUBERT, Maurice

Carnet de Bal, Le (1937)

"Valse Grise" **10"——PARLO R3488**

Sidney Torch and his Orchestra

PROKOVIEV, 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"——CAP P 8149 & CTL 7017

French National Symphony—Roger Désormière

Royal Philharmonic—Kurtz **12"——COL ML 4482**

Vienna Symphony—Scherchen **12"——WEST 5091**

THOMSON, Virgil

Plow That Broke the Plains, The (1936)

"Orchestral Suite" **10"——DEC DL 7527**

The Little Orchestra Society—Thomas Scherman

SCORES PREVIOUSLY LISTED—NOW AVAILABLE ON LONG-PLAY

ROZSA, Miklos

Lost Weekend and *Spellbound* "Themes" **12"——VIC LPT-1008**

Al Goodman and his Orchestra

(Included in selection "Theme Music from Great Motion Pictures")

STEINER, Max

Gone with the Wind "Themes" **12"——VIC LPT-1008**
Al Goodman and his Orchestra
(Included in selection "Theme Music from Great Motion Pictures")

TIOMKIN, Dimitri

Duel in the Sun "Selection from the Score" **12"——VIC LPT-1008**
Al Goodman and his Orchestra
(Included in selection "Theme Music from Great Motion Pictures")

WAXMAN, Franz

Place in the Sun, A (1951)
"A Place in the Sun" **10"——DEC 28115**
Victor Young and his Orchestra

YOUNG, Victor

Greatest Show on Earth, The (1951)
"The Greatest Show on Earth," "Be a Jumping Jack"
10"——VIC P 333; WP3018; LPM-3018
Paramount Studio Band—Irvin Talbot

Love Letters, "Love Letters"
Uninvited, The, "Stella by Starlight" **10"——DEC DL-5136**
Victor Young and his Concert Orchestra
(Included in selection "Music by Victor Young")

Title Changes

Additional title changes of English films in the United States. (New title is listed first followed by original title. For details of scores, see original compilation.)

BATH, Hubert

A Lady Surrenders (Love Story)

BLISS, Arthur

Kisenga, Man of Africa (Men of Two Worlds)

SPOLIANSKY, Mischa

If This Be Sin (That Dangerous Age)

STEVENS, Bernard

Maniacs on Wheels (Once a Jolly Swagman)

Correction to Original Compilation

Under *Trio* (John Greenwood) the title *Sanatorium* should not be thought of as the original title. *Sanatorium* is one of the three stories which make up *Trio*.

Miscellaneous

MENOTTI, Gian-Carlo

The Medium (1951)

A musical drama in 2 acts. **2 12″——MER MGL7**

Symphony Orchestra of Rome Radio Italiana
Conducted by Thomas Schippers
Marie Powers (contralto), Anna Maria Alberghetti (soprano),
Beverly Dame (soprano), Belva Kibler (soprano),
Donald Morgan (baritone), and Leo Coleman
(Recorded from the sound track of the motion picture version)

MUSIC OF INDIA

The River (1951)

Music of India. **12″——POLY PRLP 5003**

(Recorded from the sound track)

OFFENBACH, Jacques

Tales of Hoffman (1951)

A comic opera in 3 acts with prologue and epilogue.

3 12″——LON LLPA.4; DEC LXT2582–4; AX 497–511

Royal Philharmonic Orchestra—Sir Thomas Beecham
Famous soloists with the Sadler's Wells Chorus
(Recorded from the sound track of the motion picture version)

INDEX