THE QUARTERLY of Film Radio and Television

(Formerly HOLLYWOOD QUARTERLY)

Volume VI · FALL · *Number 1*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES

Contents

When the editors announced, three months ago, that the *Hollywood Quarterly* was to change its name to *Arts and Communications Quarterly,* they hoped that they had accomplished two purposes: first, that they had removed a geographical association which has always been somewhat misleading, and second, that they had identified the journal with its proper subject matter, the arts of mass communication. The new title, however, soon attracted criticism which could not be ignored. It was, complained one reader, a "cavernous mouthful." Both "arts" and "communications," said another, include a multitude of activities with which the magazine has nothing whatever to do; the title is too vague.

At the risk, therefore, of seeming not to know their own minds, the editors decided to examine their selection once more in the light of the objections that had been raised against it. They found, to their distress, that the new title was in its way as unsatisfactory as the old. And so it is that beginning with the present issue, the *Hollywood Quarterly* will be known instead as *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television.* It is hoped that our readers will find this title neither cumbersome nor ambiguous, and especially that the complications which have marked this period of transition will not obscure the continuity of the journal's form and subject matter.

Drop That Gun!

GORDON MIRAMS

GORDON MIRAMS came to his present position of chief government censor and registrar of films in New Zealand after spending a year and a half with UNESCO in Paris, in the Film Section of the Department of Mass Communications. He is well known in his own country as a film critic and commentator, and is the author of *Speaking Candidly*, a book dealing with the social and entertainment aspects of the cinema.

IN 1948 and again at the end of 1949 the British Board of Film Censors of Great Britain complained to producers in Hollywood about the amount of violence in many of their films, a modified protest on similar lines being made at the same time to British producers. Since then these complaints have been echoed by numerous organizations and individuals. What justification is there for them? My answer would be—"Plenty!" And to back it up I would put forward some rather striking, and probably provocative, findings arrived at as interim results of a comprehensive survey of motion picture content on which I am at present engaged. For example, I would claim: that less than one sixth of English-speaking feature films are free from any display of crime and violence; that one half of all features contain at least one act of murder committed or attempted; that Western melodramas—a type of entertainment frequently given top marks for wholesome tendencies—are nearly twice as "violent" as other types of Hollywood screenplays, the bulk of killing in them being done by "sympathetic" characters.

These findings, and others discussed in this article, are based on an objective analysis of 100 features (70 U.S., 30 non-American) which entered New Zealand in the four months between the end of December, 1949, and the end of April, 1950. They can be supported by statistical evidence and are, I am convinced, reliable. What I am doing is private research and has no official connection with my position as censor and registrar of films in New Zealand. However, it will be appreciated that such a role, requiring the

careful examination of virtually every film coming into the country, offers a uniquely favorable opportunity for studying and charting accurately the patterns of cinema conduct and attitudes. And it also exempts the results of the survey from the suggestion that the material was subject to selection in one form or another likely to produce a preconceived result or to give color to some particular theory. The problem of "sampling," which is usually one of the bugbears of research of this nature, scarcely enters into the present study. As censor, I simply take for personal scrutiny and analysis every film as it comes along; and, by and large, the total product of all American and British studios does come into this country, at the rate of approximately 400 features every year.

It must be stressed that this article does not claim to be anything more than a preliminary and tentative report on the incidence of crime and violence in 100 features which entered New Zealand over a particular period.[1] At the same time, reference to the list of titles suggests that the group of films analyzed not only represents almost the total import of features into New Zealand for that period, but also corresponds closely with the whole feature output of the major American and British studios at approximately the same date. Ultimately I intend that my survey should cover a considerably larger total of films, so permitting a more detailed examination based on a much broader foundation. At this time of writing I have, in fact, nearly finished putting an additional 200 features under the microscope for evidence of crime and violence. I would simply say now that the findings described in this article have so far been sustained by this wider test.

Though certain general inferences have been drawn, it is not the object of this particular study, nor for that matter necessarily of my survey as a whole, to attempt to estimate what are the *effects* on audiences of screen violence, or of any other pattern of movie behavior. Before there can be accurate diagnosis there must often be clinical analysis. It is, indeed, a strongly held belief of mine that

[1] A list of these films will be found on pp. 17–19.

much research into the influence of the cinema on the public is vitiated by a lack of adequate prior analysis of what motion pictures actually contain. Before trying to decide, for instance, what are the effects on children of a regular diet of Western and gangster violence, it is surely essential to analyze the diet to see exactly what its basic ingredients are. Knowing this, it clearly becomes easier to decide whether the diet is liable to prove indigestible or not, and what other results it is likely to have on its consumers. I would go further and suggest that, until this close examination of content is made, it is impossible to reach any reliable conclusions as to what are the particular effects, or even the broad currents of influence, of the cinema on the community.

A study of crime and violence on the contemporary screen is, of course, only one aspect of my whole research effort. But it is an important one; and it is also a field in which the margin of human error is likely to be relatively small, in that the data can be gathered with comparative ease and considerable accuracy. For, after all, an act of murder or mayhem portrayed on the screen is an easily recognizable occurrence: a sock on the jaw is something which, so to speak, hits the observer in the eye. There is not the approximation or guesswork involved which frequently and inevitably enters into, for example, an analysis of the ages or economic status of screen characters.

Striking though some of the figures in this article may appear—and especially those referred to in my opening paragraph—they are in fact conservatively estimated. Wherever possible the screen criminal has been given the benefit of the doubt. For instance, there are dozens of technical traffic violations which are not recorded on my crime sheet. To be included there, a traffic offense would have to be really serious, and even result in actual court proceedings. Similarly, when it comes to "fighting with weapons" and even to murder and homicide in stories of the Western type, I have not attempted to list every instance of gunplay, or every occasion on which a cowboy or Injun bites the dust. To do that,

one would need to run the film in slow motion and to use an adding machine. Consequently, episodes showing killing in war, an Indian attack or massacre, or a gun duel between bandits and the sheriff's posse among the rocks, though they may contain many explicit and often detailed instances of individual slaughter, have not been itemized. They are listed once only as examples of "group violence." Again, much of the homicide which occurs in films might, on a legal interpretation, be correctly called manslaughter, but I have not included such manifestations as "crimes" unless they obviously are such. Thus, killing ostensibly in self-defence or in order to mete out vengeance or rough justice—for example, by the "goodies" in Westerns and in gangster films—has not been treated as culpable homicide or manslaughter.

In my analysis, therefore, a distinction has been made between "crimes" and "acts of violence." For not only would it be unrealistic to brand as "criminal" the type of killing indulged in by cowboy heroes, private detectives, and other sympathetic screen types who so frequently take the law into their own hands, but it also does not seem to me realistic to treat as "crimes" the common assault and battery—the punching on the chin, the brawling and bashing between individuals and groups—which occurs repeatedly in the majority of films.

Taking crime and acts of violence together under one heading, we find that in the 100 films under scrutiny, there was a total of 659 recorded instances of crime and violence: an average of 6.6 per film. Only 14 of the films were entirely free from any display of either crime or violence, which means that 86 per cent had it in some degree. These are figures for both American and non-American films. If, however, one considers only the Hollywood films involved, one finds 550 crimes or acts of violence in 70 such films—an average of 7.8 such acts per film. Only 8 out of the 70 films were completely free of crime and violence (11.4 per cent).

Here I would like to refer to the survey of motion picture content undertaken in 1930–1931 by Dr. Edgar Dale, of Ohio State

University, and a team of observers, and published in 1935 as one of the Payne Fund Studies on Motion Pictures and Youth. To my knowledge this is the only previous research project in any way corresponding with the present one, but because of the obvious difficulties of exactly relating the criteria and methods used in one case with those used in the other, any parallels must be drawn with restraint and with considerable reservations. All the same, the Dale survey does provide certain pegs—admittedly not the most stable ones—on which to hang a few interesting comparisons between the subject matter of movies today and twenty years ago. For example, Dale's survey of 115 Hollywood films revealed that 84 per cent depicted one or more criminal acts, there being an over-all total of 449 crimes and acts of violence, which works out at 3.9 per film. This is exactly half the rate of occurrence (7.8) in my group of Hollywood films—and by what can only be regarded as a freak of mathematics, it is half to the very decimal point. Thus, for what it is worth, an inference may be drawn that, while the number of individual Hollywood films containing some crime and violence is not markedly greater now than two decades ago (88 per cent as compared with 84 per cent), the *intensity* of such manifestations is twice as marked.

So far as non-American films are concerned in my survey, there was, for the 24 British films under present examination, an average of 4.3 criminal and violent acts per film. (Two of the films were of stainless character in this respect.) That leaves a total of six "foreign" films, with a total of six acts of violence (no "crimes" occurred in this group). However, the number of films surveyed in both these non-American categories is as yet too small for any final conclusions to be drawn, though there is an indication—which my further research is substantiating—that Hollywood producers are markedly more interested than other producers in portrayals of lawbreaking and bashing. There were 15 crimes and acts of violence in one American film; 18 such acts in another; and 25 in a third. The highest score for any British film was 11.

Questions which are frequently asked and which are brought into prominence by these figures are: Is an excessive amount of crime and violence shown on the screen? Is violence being exploited by the cinema for its own sake, rather than to meet the legitimate dramatic demands of the plots of screenplays? These are not easy questions to answer, because one has first to ask, "excessive" by what standards? Certainly, to find 25 acts of crime and violence in one comparatively short feature, or even 15 such acts, would appear on the face of it to be a superabundance of bad behavior.

Perhaps some answer to the question can be given by stating that no fewer than 21 of the 100 films under consideration were required by the New Zealand censorship to undergo cutting in order to remove or tone down some of the violent and criminal elements. There is obviously not space here to give a detailed explanation of the criteria of New Zealand censorship. It may be enough to say that there is no formulated or inflexible code of prohibitions; that each film is judged on its own merits; that the censor has wide legal powers to remove anything which, in his opinion, would for any reason be undesirable in the public interest; and that a guiding principle, in this matter of violence, is whether it is being exploited for its own sake rather than for the sake of legitimate dramatic expression. So by these standards—and they are generally regarded as fairly liberal—one film in every five contained gratuitous violence and needed some treatment on that score. I would add that, in the 21 films cut, the excisions mostly represented a toning down or shortening, and still left plenty of bashing and lawbreaking to reach the screen. And, especially with Western films, there is of course a convention of screen violence which censors accept.

Now let us consider crime on its own, independently of violence. In the 70 Hollywood films analyzed, a total of 289 crimes occurred—an average of just over 4 per film. But 18 of these 70 films were free of crime (though not necessarily of violence in some

form), so that the crimes which did occur were compressed into 52 pictures: an average of 5.5 per picture. In the 24 British films under survey, the average of crimes per picture was 2.6, and if one leaves out of account the 5 British films which were altogether clear of crime, the average goes up to 3.3. As stated, there were no crimes portrayed in the 6 "foreign" films; but the sample under analysis is too small for this figure to mean anything conclusive.

However, if one lumps the 100 films together, one finds a total of 353 crimes—an over-all average of 3.5 crimes per picture. Only 29 films could leave the court without a stain on their characters. In other words, 71 per cent showed one or more crimes. In one film there were 12 crimes, in another 16, in a third 17.

What type of crime is most frequently portrayed on the screen? As might be expected, the answer is murder. But it may be a little unexpected to learn from my survey that one half of all the films contained at least one act of murder committed or attempted, and that the murder rate was more than three per film. Specifically, there was a total of 168 murders and attempted murders occurring in 47 films. For what it is worth, here is another comparison with Dr. Dale's findings: Twenty years ago the murder rate was also shown at roughly two per film, but only about one film in three had anything to do with murder then, whereas today murder is found in one film out of two.

Of the 168 murders and attempted murders occurring in the films I have surveyed, 73 of them—or not far short of half the total—took place in 17 Western stories. That is more than 4 per Western, on an average: and it should be noted that much of the killing in Westerns, especially when carried out by "sympathetic" characters, has not been classed as "murder." But I shall return to Westerns later.

Next on the crime sheet for 100 films—but well down on it below murder—is "fighting with weapons" (69 cases), and after that crimes of burglary, theft, embezzlement, and shoplifting (36 cases). Holdups and robbery with violence, including cattle rus-

tling, come next with 15 cases; and after that, with 14 cases noted, come crimes in the category of graft, bribery, official corruption, dereliction of duty, and grossly unprofessional conduct.

Most of the other crimes on the calendar are represented in my analysis of the seamy side of screen behavior—smuggling, piracy, bigamy, baby farming, cruelty to children, kidnaping, jail breaking, forgery, perjury, suicide, treason, sabotage, mutiny, grave robbery, abortion (yes, there were three cases of that), prostitution, and so on. But the incidence of them was so slight compared with the other crimes I have mentioned, especially murder, that little purpose would be served now by giving the exact figures. What I think is most interesting to note is this very fact that they *were* so infrequently portrayed—for if the screen were indeed "holding a mirror up to nature" and presenting a true or even approximate picture of crime in the community, the disproportion would not be nearly so marked. I am, in short, not convinced that we should be ready to find reason for congratulation in the fact that only one single case of prostitution was noted in 100 films as compared with 168 cases of murder and attempted murder. Possibly the screen reflects in this the community's attitude toward the "respectability" of various sorts of crime—as measured by the willingness of the public, the film producers, and, one must add, the censors, to recognize their existence and permit discussion of them. By this standard of measurement, the crime of murder is regarded as being infinitely more respectable and, by implication, much less worthy of condemnation than, say, prostitution or abortion. Is this a proper sense of values for the cinema to foster in society?

But such a consideration aside, what other reasons can be found for this emphasis on violence and the disproportionate emphasis, or rather lack of emphasis, on other kinds of misbehavior—particularly in the realm of sex? Is it because the average person feels himself detached from murder, as something which cannot possibly happen to him; and therefore he can view it with feelings

of clinical detachment combined with those of vicarious excitement? There is undoubtedly something in this explanation.

Nobody is likely to take very seriously the excuse put forward solemnly, if rather diffidently, in the *Hollywood Reporter* of August 21, 1950, when it reported and commented editorially on the suggestion by "one of the most important clubwomen in the country" that the excessive violence in Hollywood films today is just a dirty and deliberate plot by the Reds and "commies" in the movie industry to condition the people of America to gross brutality as it is now practiced in parts of the world under Soviet domination!

May not a better explanation be that censorship is to blame—censorship in the widest sense? I started this survey with no preconceived notions. Yet increasingly I have been forced to the conclusion that there is more than a casual relationship between the rise in the portrayal of violence and the decline in the portrayal of sex in the cinema, with the result that, to reduce the matter to its essentials, we may go so far as to say that the stark act of ending life is treated as being infinitely more suitable for public consideration than any reference to the act of beginning it. As rather striking evidence that the connection between these two screen trends is not purely accidental, there is the fact shown in the New Zealand censor's report for 1950 that out of every ten excisions made in films for a twelve-month period, seven were for reasons of "violence." And of the remaining 30 per cent of cuts made for all reasons other than excessive violence, only half were made on the score of what might very broadly be called "sex"—unduly suggestive scenes or dialogue but including also "coarse expressions." Whereas 97 individual films had to undergo one or more cuts because of violence, only 25 were cut for "sex." One realizes then how astray those people are who equate censorship with sex, and who imagine that this is the chief or only problem which a censor has to face.

As I have hinted, I believe that the main, though not the only, reason why violence is so prominent on the screen today, out-

weighing other elements to such a marked degree, is that society's taboo on sex matters (operating through informal as well as through official censorship) has had the tendency to divert a fundamentally healthy interest in sex into abnormal channels. A stream, damned at one spot, will always seek another course if there is sufficient pressure behind it—and in this case, the film industry's predominant interest in the box office helps to supply the pressure. Overemphasized violence degenerates into sadism—and most psychologists agree that there is a connection between sadism and sex.

I do not want to seem to overstress this relationship, because excess in anything is to be deplored; and it is excess which is the real evil in every aspect of the subject under discussion. The industry went too far once in exploiting sex. There was inevitable reaction from the moralists, and the public was persuaded that fairly rigid censorship (either official, or operating through the Hollywood Production Code) was necessary. Again, it is my personal belief that this reaction also went too far. There was so much clamping down that the industry, seeking another avenue through which to exploit the demand which society always makes for sensation and excitement in some form, has been going to extremes in the glorification of violence—often senseless, atavistic violence which extends far beyond the dramatic requirements of the plots of screenplays.

My comments, of course, are nowhere to be interpreted as advocating that the remedy is more portrayals of prostitution and abortion and similar unsavory topics at the extreme of sex. The discrepancy in this regard has been mentioned solely as being symptomatic of a general social attitude.

To return to our study of case histories. Murder is a crime: other forms of physical violence may or may not be criminal. It would in my opinion be unrealistic, not to say unfair, to many noble heroes of the screen to regard every sock on the jaw, every exchange of blows in a barroom brawl, as a reprehensible act. But because of the repetitive nature of this sort of behavior and its

conditioning influence on audiences—possibly also its callousing effect, leading perhaps to a stage where the violent reaction comes to be accepted as normal and even commendable—an analysis of this variety of screen conduct is called for. I have accordingly separated physical violence into three categories: personal assault and battery; free-for-all fights and barroom brawls; violence on women (notably, the slap in the face).

These combined types of physical violence were seen 259 times in 100 films, an average of 2.6 cases per film. If one takes American films only, the average is 3 per film; and if one considers non-American films it is 1.6, which is just over half the rate for American films.

Taking Westerns separately, we find 70 acts of combined types of physical violence occurring in 17 such screenplays; that is, 4.1 per film. This is almost double the over-all average. A recent official Hollywood analysis of production confirms my own finding that one American feature in every four is of the Western type.

When acts of physical violence are sorted into their three separate categories, it is found that in the 100 films there were 194 acts of personal assault and battery—that is, fisticuffs between man and man, the punch on the jaw, and general rough-and-tumble action. This is an average of just under 2 per film for 100 films. (There were, believe it or not, 26 films which did not contain any displays of this nature.) In 38 per cent of the cases, the hero was one of the characters involved—no peace-loving citizen he! The hero, indeed, was almost twice as liable to be involved as the villain, who figured in only 20 per cent of the cases. And heroines are not all by any means such gentle souls. A surprisingly large percentage engaged in assault and battery—13 per cent of the dear creatures, to be precise. As for Westerns, there were 49 cases of personal assault and battery in 15 such productions—3.3 per film (two Westerns examined were nonviolent to this extent at least).

The second most popular type of physical violence was that inflicted on women, the slap-in-the-face being overwhelmingly the

most frequent manifestation. There were 36 cases of this in 100 films—only 2 of them in British films, but 7 of them in Westerns. And contrary to the popular belief that a good man never lifts his hand against a woman, we find that 13 of these 36 slaps-in-the-face were inflicted by the sympathetic male lead—if you object to calling him a "hero" in this context. Villains, in fact, struck women less than heroes—only 12 times. To even the score a little in the battle of the sexes, let it be recorded that 6 films showed women committing violence on men, by horsewhipping them, punching them, and so on.

The slap-in-the-face for women is an interesting example of the way in which an innovation in Hollywood acquires in time the status of a cliché, becoming a nearly automatic response by a screen character in certain situations. One recalls when it was first introduced as a daring new exploit, hailed by the publicity men as something sensational—"Gable (or was it MacMurray?) Socks Lombard!" Now it has gone the way of all screen innovations, and is almost taken for granted, by directors if not by the censor. In the year 1949–1950, 25 films (including six "trailers") had 30 cuts made in them in New Zealand because the striking of women was shown. Compare this with the fact that only 25 films had 33 cuts made in them for reasons of "sex," and one may be excused for wondering again if there is not some relationship—and also whether, if you must slap a woman, there are not better places to do it than on the face. But in this as in other aspects of New Zealand censorship there is no hard-and-fast rule that all striking of women must be eliminated. It may well be dramatically justified. Indeed, I have noted in my data that 6 of the 13 face slaps administered on women by heroes were sufficiently "provoked"—and therefore were not eliminated by the censor.

Is all this bashing and battering as innocent as it is sometimes alleged to be, and as harmless to the audience as it so often (apparently) is to the screen participants? I believe that a hypothesis worth testing is that the reiteration on the screen of the punch in

the jaw, the slap in the face, the general rough-and-tumble, could have the effect of setting up a behavior pattern which might, in certain circumstances (say, too much to drink), become a sort of conditioned reflex with some types of individual.

It is my experience that screen violence is getting tougher and dirtier as well as more common. Fights are also more prolonged. Much fighting follows, of course, a set pattern, especially in Westerns: it is often as formalized as the steps of a ballet, or swordplay on the stage. Here the censor naturally recognizes that the cinema has conventions, and respects them. On the other hand, the movies, seeking new sensations for their audiences, are forever thinking up and demonstrating new ways of inflicting pain and injury—the stomach punch, the rabbit chop, the kidney punch, the slash-over-the-face-with-a-gunbarrel, the attack with a broken bottle, the holding of the opponent by the arms while somebody slugs him in the stomach, the kick to the head, and so on. This is the sort of material which the censor (at any rate, the censor in New Zealand) is likely to tone down. Furthermore, there is a tendency in films for antiviolence to be explicitly discouraged: characters who at the beginning show reluctance to carry and use guns, or to punch their opponents, are almost without exception treated as being unmanly or stupid, and end by seeing the error of their pacifist ways.

Again, the mere fact that screen characters do, so every often, emerge unscathed from the most ruthless exchange of blows—with the thudding impact of each punch registered on the sound track—may in itself be a disquieting factor, because of its possible influence on juveniles and those with juvenile minds. It would be very hard to learn from watching, shall we say, the average Western, that a punch in the teeth delivered with the full weight of the body behind it, sufficient to knock a man half way across a room, can actually be very painful, not to say disfiguring. Or that a barrage of kicks, kidney punches, and rabbit chops is not something from which you are likely to emerge without a hair out of

place and scarcely breathing heavily. Little boys seem to have to learn by experience that punching can be painful; but little boys forget as they grow up, and the cinema helps them to do so. If the cinema shows that crime doesn't pay (and this is questionable), it certainly doesn't show that brawling usually hurts—any more than it teaches the lesson that life is precious and death is permanent.

That the film industry is fully conscious of the appeal of the sort of sensationalism discussed above is evidenced by the regularity with which it is exploited in their publicity. If there is an incident in a film showing a man being punched in the guts, kicked in the teeth, slugged on the head with a gat, knifed in the back, or a woman being slapped in the face or tossed over a balcony, you can bet the censor's scissors that a reproduction of that incident will be included in the "trailer" and will also turn up in the posters and other pictorial publicity.

And so we come to death by violence and what the figures reveal. They show that there were 245 deaths by violence caused or attempted in 100 films (199 caused, 46 attempted). That is 2.45 per film. And from these totals deaths by violence committed by a group have been excluded—for example in warfare, in gun duels among the rocks with the bandits and the sheriff's men falling like leaves, or in Indian attacks and massacres. The deaths recorded are those caused by leading and identifiable characters; deaths which are sufficiently emphasized for their individual occurrence to be noted. It may be worth mentioning that Dale's survey produced an average of less than one death by violence per film. By this test, the incidence is seen as having more than doubled in two decades.

What is perhaps more noteworthy is that 36 per cent of these deaths in my 100 films were caused by "heroes," mostly in the course of bringing criminals to justice or retribution, or in self-defense. (An analysis of crime and punishment on the screen, not attempted here, will almost certainly reveal that justice is mostly

meted out, not by the courts after due process of trial and conviction, but by individuals who, in effect, take the law into their own hands.) Villains are responsible for a slightly smaller percentage of violent deaths than heroes.

The death roll in British films is much smaller than in American ones. If one separates the product of the two countries, one finds 230 violent deaths caused or attempted in 70 Hollywood features (3.2 per film), compared with only 15 in the 24 British films (.6 per film)—five times as many. There were no deaths by violence in the 6 "foreign" films examined.

This enormous disparity is partly but not wholly due to the influence of the Western on the American figures. In 17 Westerns there were 100 deaths by violence caused and attempted (86 caused, 14 attempted)—an average of just under 6 per film. And, remember, this excludes group slaughter. In the American films other than Westerns, the rate of death by violence was 2.45 per film—still a long way ahead of the .6 per film of the British productions, but less than half the death rate for Westerns alone. And who in the Westerns are the agents of death mainly responsible for all this slaughter? Not the "baddies" but the "goodies"—the leading characters who claim our sympathetic interest. They kill or attempt to kill two men to every one on whom the villains draw a bead or a knife (48 to 24).

What are the most favored techniques (other than bare fists in fights) for committing murder and other acts of violence? To an overwhelming degree, the gun (revolver or pistol) is the favored weapon among all characters. It figures 147 times in acts of murder and violence in 100 films, as compared with only 22 occasions on which a knife was the weapon (next to the gun, however, the knife is the most popular lethal weapon on the screen). The gun figured as the weapon on 76 occasions in 17 Westerns—more than 4 times per Western.

Killing by rifles, tommy guns, strangling, swords, and bows and arrows (Redskin or Robin Hood) had some practitioners in my

100 films; but poison, drowning, and hand grenades hardly any. Among the specialists in crime there were just enough disciples of the school of murder by contrived lynching, hooks, running over by car, wire clippers, the blunt instrument, and the did-she-fall-or-was-she-pushed? methods to enable those techniques of actual or attempted bumping off and mayhem to appear in the list and give it variety. But the ubiquitous gun, whether six-shooter in cowboy holster or deadly toy in women's handbags, has put practically all other methods of murder as a screen art out of business. The gun in films is carried almost as a matter of course—as one might carry a cigarette case, and it is produced just about as casually. To judge by Hollywood product, it has become nearly as essential a part of the average American household as an icebox. Should the occasion arise, every householder and nearly every housewife of even the most respectable sort will be found to have a gun concealed in the writing desk or in the dressing table drawer, loaded and ready for business. Is this another triumph for American salesmanship: "A gat in every home—no family should be without one"?

So taking one consideration with another, it becomes pretty clear that the "cult of death," which many critics have discerned as the most marked characteristic of contemporary literature, is just as much a part of the film as of any other form of expression. Perhaps, indeed, it flourishes most abundantly in the film. Making all allowances for the formal and stereotyped pattern of much screen violence and crime—which could arguably be its most disquieting aspect, since it comes to be accepted as normal—and giving due weight to all the familiar arguments about catharsis, escapism, and fictional license, one is still left with a big question mark as to whether the cinema can be as innocent in its influence on social attitudes as its apologists insist. The supporters of capital punishment deplore the lessening regard for the sanctity of human life which they detect in the present generation, and want to retain or bring back the rope as a deterrent—but if there is one place out-

side the battlefield where human life is treated as cheap, it is in our movie theaters. Even the Western film, as I have shown, has been infected with the cult of violence for the sake of violence to an extent which the defenders of this type of entertainment have probably never realized because they have never really analyzed its subject matter. The revelation is a depressing one. In this century of unhitched standards and discredited values, one of the few comfortable absolutes remaining to us seemed to be the Western novel and Western film—until films such as *The Outlaw* and *Duel in the Sun* began to pollute the innocence of the genre with unsavory sex and sadism. Once started, with impetus from the box office, a deteriorating process such as this quickly gathers momentum. Small wonder really that the British Board of Film Censors made their two protests to Hollywood producers. For however liberal and broadminded he may be in this matter of violence, the censor in many countries today must have the feeling of being a rider trying to rein back a horse which is threatening to bolt. If the cinema once got the bit in its teeth, or were completely given its head, there is almost no saying where it would end.

The following are the 100 films examined and registered by New Zealand censorship between the end of December, 1949, and the end of April, 1950, which Mr. Mirams analyzed for crime and violence.

AMERICAN

WESTERNS

The Gal Who Took the West (Universal)
Curtain Call at Cactus Creek (Universal)
The Kid from Texas (Universal)
Comanche Territory (Universal)
Ambush (M-G-M)
She Wore a Yellow Ribbon (R.K.O.)
Indian Agent (R.K.O.)
Riders in the Sky (R.K.O.)
The Rustlers (R.K.O.)
Laramie (Columbia)
Cow Town (Columbia)
The Blazing Trail (Columbia)
Horsemen of the Sierras (Columbia)
Davy Crockett, Indian Scout (United Artists)
The Plunderers (Republic)
Canadian Pacific (20th Cent.-Fox)
Fighting Man of the Plains (20th Cent.-Fox)

COMEDY AND FARCE

The Lady Takes a Sailor (Warner Bros.)
A Kiss for Corliss (United Artists—David Nassour)
Father was a Fullback (20th Cent.-Fox)
Tell It to the Judge (Columbia)
Miss Grant Takes Richmond (Columbia)
Free For All (Universal)
My Friend Irma (Paramount)
The Great Lover (Paramount)

CRIME AND DETECTION

Death in the Doll's House (M-G-M)
Tension (M-G-M)
Chinatown at Midnight (Columbia)
The Reckless Moment (Columbia)
Prison Warden (Columbia)
The Story of Molly X (Universal)
Abandoned (Universal)
The File on Thelma Jordan (Paramount)
The Threat (R.K.O.)
Whirlpool (20th Cent.-Fox)
White Heat (Warner Bros.)
Backfire (Warner Bros.)

MUSICAL

Oh, You Beautiful Doll (20th Cent.-Fox)
On the Town (M-G-M)
My Dream Is Yours (Warner Bros.)
Jolson Sings Again (Columbia)
Red Hot and Blue (Paramount)

SOCIAL DRAMA, ROMANCE, WAR, ADVENTURE, AND MELODRAMA

The Doctor and the Girl (M-G-M)
The Forsyte Saga (M-G-M)
Intruder in the Dust (M-G-M)
Malaya (M-G-M)
The Red Danube (M-G-M)
Interference (R.K.O.)
Holiday Affair (R.K.O.)
Tarzan and the Slave Girl (R.K.O.)
I Married a Communist (R.K.O.)
The Big Wheel (United Artists)
Mrs. Mike (United Artists)
Pinky (20th Cent.-Fox)
Dancing in the Dark (20th Cent.-Fox)
State Department File 649 (20th Cent.-Fox—Film Classics)
Three Came Home (20th Cent.-Fox)
Chain Lightning (Warner Bros.)
Beyond the Forest (Warner Bros.)
Task Force (Warner Bros.)
The Heiress (Paramount)
Captain China (Paramount)
South Sea Sinner (Universal)
Bagdad (Universal)
Sword in the Desert (Universal)
Holiday in Havana (Columbia)
All the King's Men (Columbia)
Tokyo Joe (Columbia)
Barbary Pirate (Columbia)
Sixty Fathoms Deep (Monogram)

BRITISH

Now Barabbas (Rank—de Grunewald)
Diamond City (Rank—Gainsborough)

Madness of the Heart (Rank—Two Cities)
Give Us This Day (Rank—Bronsten)
The Gay Lady (Trottie True) (Rank)
Adam and Evelyne (Rank)
Helter Skelter (Rank—Gainsborough)
Poet's Pub (Rank—Aquila)
A Run for Your Money (Rank—Ealing)
Don't Ever Leave Me (Rank—Triton)
Boys in Brown (Rank—Gainsborough)
The Huggets Abroad (Rank—Gaumont-British)
Marry Me (Rank—Gainsborough)
Christopher Columbus (Rank—Gainsborough)
The Small Back Room (London Films—The Archers)
The Third Man (London Films—Carol Reed)
No Room at the Inn (Associated British Pictures)
Under Capricorn (Transatlantic—Hitchcock)
Paper Orchid (Columbia [British])
Sword of Honour (Butchers)
Mountains O'Mourne (Butchers)
Three Silent Men (Butchers)
Front Line Kids (Butchers)
Night Journey (Butchers)

AUSTRALIAN

Sons of Matthew (Charles Chauvel)

NEW ZEALAND

Journey for Three (N.Z. National Film Unit)

ITALIAN

Four Steps in the Clouds (Blasetti)
Stromboli (Rossellini)

RUSSIAN

The Happy Bride (Mosfilm)
Russian Ballerina (Lenfilm)

The Effectiveness of the Voice of America

FOY KOHLER

FOY KOHLER has been a foreign service officer of the Department of State since 1931, and has held a number of important posts throughout the Near East and in Moscow. In 1945 he was political and liaison officer for the U. S. delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization in San Francisco. Since 1949 he has been chief of the International Broadcasting Division of the Department of State, and director of the Voice of America broadcasts. The article which follows is a speech delivered by Mr. Kohler on May 4, 1951, before the Twenty-First Institute for Education by Radio-Television, at Columbus, Ohio.

IT IS A little hard to reduce to a short talk the topic of my assignment, mainly because of the scale and scope of the Voice of America operation. We are presently broadcasting over a world-wide network of transmitter bases in thirty-three languages. We operate around the clock, sending out in these languages more than eighty separate programs a day, each tailored specifically for the time of day and the attitudes of the target audiences. We process over two million words daily and put more than 350,000 out over the air waves. We are expanding even from these staggering figures. Within a few months we expect to be using fifty languages and broadcasting over a hundred programs daily, about sixty hours of "live" programs, containing over a half million words. The U. S. taxpayer has an investment in facilities already operating or under construction of about $125,000,000. If Congress approves, this will be increased by an additional hundred million within the next couple of years. The cost of programming and operating is presently running at the rate of approximately $25,000,000 per annum and if the new facilities are granted will gradually work up to a high level of about $45,000,000 per year.

Is the taxpayer getting his money's worth? Is the Voice of America effective?

I think the Voice of America operation is certainly one of the

best investments ever made with the taxpayer's money. I think it is effective and I shall try to suggest to you why I am convinced there is ample support for my conclusion. I may say parenthetically that I am neither a radio man nor a propagandist by training and experience. I am, in fact, a professional diplomat—as Congressman Flood recently expressed it, "one of the striped pants boys"—who are supposed to look with a very jaundiced eye on innovations of this kind.

The question of effectiveness of the Voice of America, as I see it, involves really three questions: Are we delivering a clear, strong signal? Are we getting an audience? Indeed, do the possibilities of getting an audience exist? Are we affecting the minds and influencing the actions of our audience in a sense favorable to the interests and aspirations of the American government and the American people?

Are we delivering a clear strong signal? The United States is severely handicapped in international broadcasting by its geographic location. Shortwave radio is, in any event, a medium with severe limitations both in terms of the quality of the signal and of access to the signal by prospective listeners. To overcome these handicaps we have started to ring the world with relay bases which boost the signal to the listeners via both short and medium wave. We are developing overseas program operations. We are doing our best to obtain local relays wherever there is such a possibility. We are pioneering in advanced techniques and superpower, with the collaboration of the best electronic engineering groups in the country. If Congress gives us the necessary financial support, we can deliver an effective radio signal, even through the Soviet jamming.

Are we getting an audience? We are extremely fortunate in that radio, even in relatively backward areas of the world, is an established and fairly highly developed medium of communication. We have available either firm figures or solid estimates on the number of radio receivers which we can reach throughout the

world. We know there are about eighty million receiving sets outside of North America, giving international broadcasters a direct potential audience of over 300 million people, not to mention secondary distribution. And we are able, at comparatively low cost, to promote ever wider distribution of receivers. Within the free world we can apply, with some adaptation, the techniques of quantitative audience surveys so highly developed in the United States. Through these we are able to get an accurate measure of the size, composition, and other characteristics of our audience and of changes in these elements. To do this we use mainly private contractors, notably such organizations as the American Institute of Public Opinion (Gallup Polls) and its overseas affiliates, and the Bureau of Applied Social Research of Columbia University (Kingsley Davis–Paul Lazarsfeld).

I can give you only a few examples of our findings.

We know that in France, where our program is rebroadcast over the French domestic network, our audience has increased constantly and greatly in size during the past few years. We know that over 24 per cent of the adult population of France, or seven million people, are at least occasional listeners to the Voice programs, that on any given weekday we can count on an audience of at least a million people, and that we have nearly three million on Sundays. We know that over half the adult population of that country has heard the Voice of America at some time, and that our problem is to get more and more of them tuning in regularly. We know that this audience includes the better educated and urban residents in greater proportion than their ratio to the total population.

In Germany we know that we have likewise been able to bring more and more Germans to their receivers when we are on the air; that we now have a regular audience numbering over six million in the U. S. Zone alone. Here the audience is characterized by its proportionate accent on youth—which is, I would say, a very good thing.

In Sweden surveys indicate an occasional audience for our English-language broadcast of 15 per cent of the total Swedish population, or over 700,000 people and a regular audience of nearly 100,000, heavily weighted on the side of so-called "opinion leaders" and of youth. The same studies, based on direct sampling and on analysis of the BBC's Swedish audience, made it clear that we could multiply our audience manifold and get their more consistent attention to our story if we broadcast in the Swedish language. We are, accordingly, preparing to do so during the coming fiscal year.

You will recognize that I have been talking about relatively advanced and accessible areas. Unfortunately the job is a lot harder outside Western Europe. In the free areas of Asia and Latin America, we find that our contractors are engaged in an unprecedented pioneering effort. But I am glad to say that they are getting a good reception and coöperation from local authorities and local educational institutions. Consequently, we are gradually acquiring a first collection of firm information about the holdings and distribution of radio receivers, and the attitudes, listening habits, and characteristics of the audiences in these parts of the world.

Behind the Curtain, in the satellite states of Eastern Europe, we have, of course, been unable to make direct surveys. However, we are not without our resources here either. We have firm figures from preslavery days on the distribution of radio sets and sufficient current intelligence to keep these up to date. Research agencies, letters from displaced persons, interrogation of defectors, United States missions—all these sources are surprisingly unanimous in agreeing that we reach about 80 per cent of the radio owners every day, and that the Voice of America, with the assistance of the well-developed grapevine, can deliver an important message to practically the entire population of the satellite states within a matter of hours. Similar sources indicate that there has been a comparably sharpened interest in China since the Communists took over.

The frantic efforts of local stooge governments to combat our efforts confirm these estimates.

In the Soviet Union, in the early days of our Russian-language program, which was inaugurated in February, 1947, all the evidence we could amass at the Embassy in Moscow indicated that the Voice of America must have a regular listening audience of at least ten million people. What the figure is since the Kremlin indicated its disapproval of listening, by undertaking a colossal jamming campaign in April, 1949, nobody really could know. However, our monitoring indicates that we have greatly improved the delivery of our signal since that date; that the Voice can be heard 25 per cent of the time even in Moscow, where the jamming is concentrated, and 60 to 80 per cent of the time outside the capital. Moreover, defectors continue to give us a pattern of widespread listening and the Soviet press and radio contribute additional evidence. Last year an important Soviet journal, *Novyi Mir,* started its review of the current Soviet stage success by saying: " 'The Voice of America!' To millions of Soviet people these words have become synonymous with lying and provocational fictions."

So much for audience measurement.

Now, what is the Voice's impact on the audiences we reach? This question involves even more intangibles in the international field than in the field of domestic radio—and as all of you know there are plenty of intangibles even here at home. It involves questions of the analysis of the content of our programs and their measurement against our communications intentions. It involves ascertaining sample audiences' reaction to specific programs through the panel technique and the use of such devices as the Stanton-Lazarsfeld reaction analyzer. It involves the testing of the level and quality of the language we use in our thirty-odd language programs and audience reaction to specific announcers' voices and method of delivery. For all these purposes we can also use established American methods and techniques and the ser-

vices of objective and experienced American research agencies like International Public Opinion Research, Inc. (Elmo Wilson, Elmo Roper, Joshua Powers), McCann Erickson, the Committee on Communications of the University of Chicago, and the Research Study for Human Relations of New York University. Within the free world tests can be made on the spot in the target countries. For testing programs delivered behind the Iron Curtain, panels of recent defectors are assembled both along the immediate periphery of the Soviet orbit and here in the United States.

I want to say at this point that in a democracy—and in the long run in any regime anywhere—the word and the deed must go together. Pure propaganda at variance with facts may serve to confuse for a while or even to attain immediate tactical objectives. But in the long run false pretentions will out. In fact, it is one of our constant purposes to expose the false pretentions of our opponents. By the same token it is our basic rule to maintain credibility and confidence in the Voice of America, even at the expense of occasional tactical reverses.

In a general way, then, I think it is clear that the Voice of America can take a considerable share of the credit for fostering the growing strength and determination of the free world; for the votes in the United Nations strongly condemning Communist aggression in Korea; for the declining strength of Communism throughout the free world, and particularly in such vital countries as France and Italy.

This is attested by the constantly increasing size and interest of our free-world audience, of which I have spoken. It is reflected in ever-growing demands for our program schedule booklet. This schedule is sent to listeners on written request only, and circulation figures have mounted in the past year from 500,000 to nearly 900,000 copies per issue. General effectiveness is also shown by the steady upward trend of our audience mail. In 1949 we received 126,000 letters from our listeners; in 1950, 230,000. In March of

this year we reached an all-time high of nearly 40,000 letters for one month alone.

Now I realize that these booklets and letters are not scientifically established methods of measurement comparable to our surveys and panel tests, but they are very heart-warming and encouraging. And they do give us valid and sometimes striking examples of audience attitudes and changes therein. I should like to read you a few very random excerpts.

From France: I was climbing the steps to my sixth-floor apartment (slowly as I am 74 years old and suffer from a heart condition); I could hear the Voice of America from every door, even at the sixth floor. I was both proud and happy.

From Indonesia: The more I know about your country and people, the more I get to appreciate America. I am very glad knowing that the Voice of America is able to gratify the desire of all democratic nations, namely, the disclosure of the Soviets behind the Iron Curtain. I exult that you have done many things in order to make clear the meaning of democracy.

From Germany: At the beginning of your broadcasts I used to be rather skeptical and just took them for a mere propaganda trick.... I have changed my mind fundamentally about everything concerning your operation.

From Turkey: Since our brigade went to Korea the interest in and love for the Voice of America have greatly increased. You made us very proud....

From Austria: I followed your deliberation in radio with increasing interest until I finally discovered that formerly I was politically on the wrong road. By means of your broadcast I came to despise the [Communist] path which I had unwittingly begun to travel.

In our programs to the peoples of the captive states our job is a little different. Here the stooge regimes are our enemies and have a tendency to be "more royal than the king." But the people are our long-established friends. We try to give them the assurance that we have not forgotten and will not forget. We try to sustain their hope for eventual freedom and encourage their continued

hostility toward and their resistance to their oppressors. At the same time we must avoid arousing their hopes unduly and thus disillusion them. We must also avoid inviting them to commit suicide by premature rebellion. It is a fine line to draw. We are constantly attacked by extremist *émigré* groups for being either too soft or to hard. Maybe this in itself is a good indication that we are continuing to maintain the right line, but a lot of other more valid evidence indicates this too. Of course, our own people still in those countries are able to give us good advice. Moderate *émigré* groups abroad do likewise. Mail from and interviews with the defectors constantly streaming out into Germany and Austria on the Continent, and into Korea and Hong Kong in the Far East, also support our conclusion that we are hitting the target with satisfactory accuracy. Here, too, I can perhaps best illustrate my point by quoting a couple of samples of the obviously deeply felt words of these interviewees and letter writers.

A woman in Czechoslovakia writes:

> In this atmosphere of oppression the only moment of hope occurs when we hear the Voice of America. Your voice comes to this fiery hell like greetings from a civilized world. . . . We can live our terrible life behind the Iron Curtain and keep on living only if you on the other side of the ocean continue to feed us with the strength of everlasting hope.

In liberated Seoul, after months of Communist occupation, a Korean listener says:

> During those weary and distressing days of my dug-out life, the only hope and comfort have been my listening to your broadcast over the Voice of America. . . . I knew then we would win. Please keep on sending us your messages of hope, strength, encouragement and inspiration. We need them. . . .

In our programs to the Soviet Union, we draw a clear distinction and do our best to drive a wedge between the despotic regime and its enslaved subjects. We appeal to their memories of better days and remind them of their own suppressed historic traditions

and political and literary classics. We stimulate their skepticism about the story being told them by their own rulers, by telling them the other half. We try to clarify the curiosity we know they have about the outer world, and correct the warped and distorted image of that world given them by their Kremlin masters. I think there is strong, perhaps almost conclusive evidence that we are succeeding. Defectors do continue to come out, despite the great dangers they run. We have questioned scores of them and practically all refer to the influence of the Voice's programs on their decisions. Occasionally we have striking demonstrations of our direct influence, such as that of the two Soviet aviators who flew their plane straight out of the Soviet Union a couple of years ago. The unabated efforts of the Kremlin to keep our message out of the Soviet Union by the use of their colossal jamming network is another measure of the Kremlin's own estimate of our effectiveness with the Soviet citizenry. Even better is the constant stream of attacks made on us over the Soviet radio and in the Soviet press. These have gone from a quarterly level of 30-odd full-dress attacks in 1949 to over 100 during the last quarter of 1950. They are so voluminous and so revealing that we have them under constant analysis by the Russian Research Center at Harvard University. Not only do they give us a concept of the extent and composition of our audience, as I have already suggested, but they indicate the themes to which the Kremlin is particularly sensitive and which it feels compelled to try to rebut with its own people. I might mention that they have reacted with special violence to our comparisons of living standards in the Soviet orbit and the outside world; to our campaigns on the question of slave labor; to our demonstration that even minor improvement in living conditions in the Soviet Union proper is matched by a worsening of conditions in the satellites, and to our exposure of the frauds and fallacies of the Stalinist concept of Marxism.

A Russian defector recently wrote us after his arrival in Germany to this effect: "Your Russian broadcasts undermine the

Soviet regime and completely nullify the Communist propaganda behind the Iron Curtain. Your broadcasts are a weapon more powerful than the atom bomb." Now our friend's language is perhaps a bit exaggerated—but this would be understandable in the circumstances. But its obvious conviction and essential message seem to me to confirm Arthur Schlesinger's recent statement that "only the potential disaffection of the Russian people prevents the Kremlin from throwing the world into another global conflict." We propose to keep that potential of disaffection alive and growing.

The Voice of America and Wire Service News

BURTON PAULU

BURTON PAULU, manager of the University of Minnesota's radio station KUOM since 1938, served for eighteen months during World War II with the Office of War Information in London and Luxembourg. His studies of international broadcasting have taken the form of a doctoral dissertation dealing with the history of the Voice of America from 1945 to 1949, and an article on music in psychological warfare (*Music Educator's Journal*, February–March, 1949). He has recently been acting as supervisor of the television discussion project underwritten by the Ford Foundation at Iowa State College.

IT IS A remarkable fact that today—even though the United States and Russia are engaged in world-wide ideological warfare—our Department of State cannot quote the news files of the Associated Press or United Press in its Voice of America broadcasts or other international information activities. Since news is the basic material used in this global contest for the minds of men, we may well ask why two of the three principal American news agencies refuse either to sell or give their services to our Office of International Information, and how this situation came about.

The United States Office of International Information disseminates news abroad in two ways: through its Voice of America broadcasts for general reception, and through distribution by our diplomatic and consular missions to editors, broadcasters, and influential persons both in and out of government. For such activities during World War II the government was able to draw upon all the principal American news services as well as upon some from abroad, including the Associated Press (AP), United Press (UP), and International News Service, the British Reuters, the Belgian Aneta, many American newspapers and magazines, and all types of official government releases. At that time all the American news agencies were willing to supply copy free of charge, but early in 1946 the Associated Press and the United Press announced their intention to discontinue service, paid or free. A few months

ago the AP installed a teletype at the State Department for reference use only, but both AP and UP still refused to allow the department to quote their output publicly. The International News Service, however, has continued to provide service to the Office of International Information.

The AP withdrew its service on January 14, 1946, the UP following suit on February 16. The AP explained its action by saying:

> The Associated Press stands committed to the principles of freedom of access to the news and to the free flow of news throughout the world.
>
> It holds that news thus disseminated by nongovernmental news agencies is essential to the highest development of mankind and to the perpetuation of peace between nations. It recognizes the possibilities of useful purpose served by governments in the maintenance throughout the world of official libraries of information. It applauds the vigorous manner in which the present national administration has advanced the doctrine of press freedom. It holds, however, that governments cannot engage in newscasting without creating the fear of propaganda which necessarily would reflect upon the objectivity of the news service from which such newscasts are prepared.

In its statement the UP declared: "Of course we desire to be completely disassociated from the State Department's propaganda program. Permission to government agencies for use of our dispatches abroad was a wartime measure." It went on to say that it had competed abroad against "government-subsidized and official news agencies," and had come to believe that "no government, no matter how scrupulously careful it may be, can distribute news and not be suspected of spreading propaganda." The agency observed that it already was serving almost a thousand foreign clients in sixty countries, and that its news was available to anyone else who could buy it, including "the commercial shortwave broadcasting systems of this country for broadcasting to listeners abroad." If Congress and the American people wanted "to open an official American agency to distribute news abroad," that was their concern, but the UP would have none of it: "our participa-

tion in any such program," declared the news agency, "would be an historic step—backward."

The decision of the news agencies to withdraw service was the subject of many conferences, but the AP and UP would listen to no compromise proposals. For example, the AP Board of Directors turned down flatly such suggestions as these: the AP edit news for the State Department, with the understanding that it be used exactly as prepared; the government edit the news, specifically attributing to the AP all items taken from its wire; and the government use AP copy, avoiding any reference whatsoever to the AP.

All of this precipitated much public discussion. The case for the government was mainly presented by William Benton, then assistant secretary of state for public affairs, who subsequently became United States senator from Connecticut. Other contributions in the form of public statements, press releases, letters, telegrams, and resolutions came from many sources. State Department supporters included Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville *Courier-Journal,* Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta *Constitution,* and Elmer Davis, the former Office of War Information chief. Opposing the government's position were—among others—Kent Cooper, executive director of the AP, Hugh Baillie, president of the UP, Robert McLean, president of the AP, John Knight, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Carl A. Ackerman, dean of the Columbia University School of Journalism, and the professional journalism fraternity, Sigma Delta Chi.

It was clear from the start that contributing to the action of the news agencies was the traditional prejudice of many newspaper people against all kinds of government information activities. In 1944 the American Society of Newspaper Editors had adopted a resolution declaring that after the war foreign news dissemination by our government should cease, a recommendation echoed by an American Newspaper Publishers Association statement of the

same year. A general reading of many of the statements made by AP and UP supporters while the debate was in progress will show rather clearly that this prejudice was a factor in the controversy.

The news services justified their position partly by claiming that the United States government did not need to distribute news abroad. Much of the world had AP and UP service, they said, with the result that the American story was already being adequately told. But there were good replies to that argument even back in 1946 and 1947 when most of this debate took place—and today such a claim is patently ridiculous. It was pointed out that political and economic barriers excluded American news agencies from certain areas, and in many others—especially the Iron Curtain countries—they could sell only to government news bureaus which usually reprocessed the news to our disadvantage. An American Society of Newspaper Editors report of June, 1945, had stated that the American agencies often sent abroad unbalanced news budgets emphasizing such subjects as crime and Hollywood gossip. Furthermore the news sent abroad was often taken right from the agencies' domestic files, and therefore needed to be supplemented with explanatory background material. Finally it was pointed out that when foreign newspapers did have access to a wide variety of American news they often edited it in such a way as to require corrective material.

A great deal was said about the effect of the government's use of AP and UP dispatches on the agencies' reputations for objectivity; the AP's withdrawal announcement had stated that whenever a government distributes news it creates a "fear of propaganda which necessarily would reflect upon the objectivity of the news service from which such newscasts are prepared." At some times and in some places this argument certainly would have had validity, but should the news agencies have brought it up in support of their action in 1946? Voice of America spokesmen immediately denied that AP and UP would lose prestige by supplying news to our government; they claimed it was rather a case of

the agencies' foreign reputations depending upon the esteem and confidence accorded the United States government abroad. The State Department also insisted that its news processing was necessarily objective because of the pressure of congressional and press opinion, and Secretary Benton invited AP and UP to investigate and see for themselves just how the department edited news.

Critics of AP and UP repeatedly pointed out that the news agencies were inconsistent in withholding news from the United States government while supplying it to Tass in Russia, the British Broadcasting Corporation, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and Radio Rome, as well as to government agencies in Turkey and Spain. They wanted to know why AP and UP should provide news for these other countries—some of whom used it as a basis for bitter attacks against the United States—while refusing to supply it to the United States Office of International Information for its replies. Although the news agencies' case seemed to be very vulnerable on this point they made little or no effort to explain away this apparent inconsistency.

In presenting the government's case Secretary Benton was not content merely to deny the charges or answer the arguments of his opponents; he also carried the fight over into their camp. There were, he said, three unstated reasons which underlay the withdrawal of service: "plain dislike of government"; "fear of competition" from State Department information services; and "the rivalry between the wire services themselves."

Benton dismissed the fear of government competition as unrealistic, although at the time many observers believed that to be an important factor underlying the news agencies' position. The question was whether or not AP and UP would lose foreign clients if they provided the government with news. Those who held that this would not happen argued that, for the most part, the government was broadcasting news direct to listeners rather than supplying it to their newspapers; this part of the debate was an international version of the domestic radio-newspaper debate of

the previous decade. It was also pointed out that, whatever might be the effect of government news dissemination on sales in some parts of the world, many countries could receive uncensored news from America only as a result of our government's international information activities, and that the Department of State therefore needed and deserved the agencies' service.

On the matter of rivalry between AP and UP Benton said:

> One of the main selling points of the UP has been its complete independence of government and of cartel deals. Because of its virtue, as well as its product and its skill in selling, the UP prospered in market after market. It showed the AP its foreign heels. Now, the Associated Press is developing in many new foreign markets. It needs sales arguments and will have them particularly if it can get the jump on the UP. It wants to show that the AP is virtuous, too. The State Department seemed an easy punching bag for a quick sales advantage.

In March, 1946, in response to Benton's invitation, the American Society of Newspaper Editors appointed a committee to investigate the State Department's treatment of news. After a careful study, during which it interviewed spokesmen for government, news agencies, and newspapers, it made a report on December 13, 1946, which was by implication favorable to the government. This report avoided the fundamental issue of whether or not the AP and UP ought to sell news to the State Department, and also withheld judgment as to the objectivity of the department's news releases. But it did declare that the government should supplement the output of private news agencies in many parts of the world.

> The present uncertainties in international relations justify an effort by the United States Government to make its activities and its policies clear to the people of the world through the agency set up in the State Department. Your committee recognizes, however, the dangers inherent in Government dissemination of news and suggests that the society appoint a special committee to review at intervals the work of the State Department agency and make its findings available to the membership.

A subsequent report on Voice of America broadcasts to Russia was made on April 17, 1947, by three members of this same group. Again the conclusions were generally favorable.

> It is the unanimous opinion of the committee that the work is being conscientiously done and that the gentlemen in charge are using skill and resourcefulness in the endeavor to dissipate, as far as their medium allows, the many misconceptions about the United States which are prevalent in Russia. . . . We are convinced . . . that the Russian broadcasts as at present conducted are serving an important purpose.

Thus the weight of much argument and the results of two inquiries would seem to support the position of the United States Department of State in its controversy with the news agencies. But the AP and UP still withhold their news; even though recent international trends have brought more and more general acceptance of the need for international information activities, the only concession made by either news agency has been the placement of an AP printer in the Department of State for reference use by the Voice of America and by the International Press and Publication Division.

What should the verdict be? This observer believes that the Associated Press and United Press had a weak case in 1946 when they withdrew their services, and that today—with the ever-greater need for a vigorous international information program—their position is entirely untenable. To be sure they are entitled to safeguards: if they supply news to the government their material should not be so used as to raise doubts as to their integrity or objectivity. But in times like these the State Department's Office of International Information deserves and should get full coöperation from all those private agencies which are in a position to make substantial contributions to its work.

Work Print: A College English Department and Films

JACK C. ELLIS

JACK C. ELLIS is currently a graduate student in the Communications and Communication Arts program. Teachers College, Columbia University, where he is preparing a doctoral dissertation on the teaching of the film as an art form. He has previously taught at the Western Michigan College of Education at Kalamazoo, Michigan.

ENGLISH teachers have talked quite a little about the motion picture as a new art form[1] and of their responsibility in regard to it.[2] And while we've talked the students have brought movies to the campus in extracurricular film series and film clubs.[3] Courses in the motion picture will, I think, become a part of most college curricula before many more years elapse, but here is an account of what an English instructor, and then an English department, did to speed along the inevitable and to provide solid film fare for a campus and a community in the interim.

Of the five movie houses in the college town all but one was owned by a large and unenlightened chain. They pursued a vicious sort of programming, relying heavily on repeated showings of *Man-Eater of Kumaon* and avoiding even the Hollywood product which had received slight praise for intelligence and taste. (*Mourning Becomes Electra* was canceled to permit a full week's run of *Mother Was a Freshman.*) A solid minority of the townspeople didn't go to "entertainment" movies because of religious scruples, but turned out in hundreds for free public library show-

[1] Allardyce Nicoll, *Film and Theatre* (New York: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1936). Lennox Grey, "Communication and the Arts," in *The Communication of Ideas,* ed. Lyman Bryson (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948). Kenneth Macgowan, "The Film Director's Contribution to the Screen," *College English,* XII (March, 1951), 307–314.

[2] Earl E. Fleischman and Richard Woellhof, "The Motion Picture: A Neglected Liberal Art," *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* XXVIII (April, 1942), 182–185. Herbert Weisinger, "The Motion Picture and the Teacher of English," *College English,* IX (February, 1948), 270–275.

[3] There are frequent showings of the film masterpieces of the last fifty years on the campuses of the University of Chicago, University of Michigan, Michigan State College, University of Wisconsin, and many others.

ings of commercial travelogues. Students attended films on "dates," when there wasn't a dance to go to, but most of them lived within a fifty-mile radius of the college and returned to their small home towns at every opportunity.

Arriving at the college with an M.A. in English and a few months of practice teaching, my rebellion against what I took to be provincialism was immediate and intense. One Sunday afternoon, while talking to friends, I launched into a glowing description of the esoteric student film series on my own university campus—which I had seldom attended. A new friend, who had suffered a year's disappointments at the college and had become chief confidant and supporter of my generally low spirits, asked why I couldn't organize such a series.

The suggestion took: partly because I thought it a way of becoming noticed on campus; partly because a knowledge of films would be a fine new string to add to my bow; and partly because of an altruistic desire to enrich the lives of students, faculty, and townspeople. Some serious reading about films, writing to distributors for catalogues,[4] and questioning other faculty members followed.

A few months later, a night without much sleep, some badly prepared classes, and themes "to be returned next week," produced:

A FILM STUDY PROJECT FOR THE COLLEGE

Objectives

Entertainment (the film itself): The film series would supplement the local theaters (they would in no way conflict—no current U. S. films would be shown) and other local recreational facilities.

They would form a part of the regular campus functions comparable to student forums, assemblies, student plays, dances, and athletic events.

Education (three-minute introductory talks or mimeographed programs

[4] The two most complete sources for names and addresses of distributors proved to be the Manhattan classified phone directory, and "A Directory of 897 16mm Film Libraries," Bulletin 1949, No. 10, compiled by Seerley Reid and obtainable for fifteen cents from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. [The latter has now been enlarged to include 2,002 libraries.—Editor.]

directing attention to a few important facts concerning the production of each film and several elements in the film itself worthy of special consideration): The quality of the films, accompanied by the small amount of orientation, would encourage a critical appreciation of the movies as a mature and distinct artistic medium. The separate elements of film art (photography, editing, dialogue, etc.) would be called to the attention of the audience in relation to particular films of the series.

The audience would gain some knowledge of the history, development, and potentialities of the motion picture through careful selection of films used in each series. The names and contributions of some of the important figures in film art would become familiar as they were mentioned in program notes or introductory talks and repeated in the screen "credits."

The audience would acquire a widened perspective of social history. They would gain an increased knowledge of the social and moral standards, customs, dress, and speech of Americans and Europeans of several decades. They would also be able to see what different peoples at different times have expected and enjoyed as screen entertainment. Many of the movies would deal either implicitly or explicitly with political and social questions (racial and religious tolerance, capitalism and communism, management and labor) and the particular problems of many classes and groups in our own country and abroad. The audience would thus gain new insights into vital issues confronting our generation.

(Here were listed films available on 16 mm., and an outline of the practical problems of a suitable auditorium, projectors and projectionists, and financing.)

Suggested Avenues for Future Growth

A number of film series throughout each year covering many phases of film art could become a permanent institution, kept open to all students interested in this new medium.

The film series could be fitted into (would be a necessary part of, in fact) any courses which consider basic ideas underlying modern society and their treatment in the mass media.[5] The series would also fit into work being done along audio-visual lines in the teacher-training program.

A film study club could be organized for those interested in a more detailed study of the film. The nucleus for such a club would come from the first audiences and the "texts" for study would be films themselves.[6]

[5] A freshman "communication" program was later developed.

[6] This possibility is well worth considering as an alternative to the series described. If series admissions are collected as "membership fees" the formidable 20 per cent federal amusement tax is obviated. Also, the excellent Museum of Modern Art Film Library would then be available to the group, with its low rental of $20 a program. The disadvantages are: restrictions on advertising ("tickets" can't be "sold" and people are hesitant about becoming "members") and on the amount and use of the profits.

Eventually an accredited course in film study might be added to the curriculum to take its place among present courses in the older art forms.

This last section, except for the first paragraph, proved gratuitous, but it outlines a pattern which will be followed in many schools.

When the president had had time to read the prospectus I went in to see him. He listened, said "All right," and sent me to the dean of administration. The dean seemed to understand what I wanted to do, but wasn't sure it fitted into the intricate pattern of faculty-student committees. Apropos of showing, in a conservative community, foreign films made beyond the watchful eye of the Breen Office, he did offer the information that the Folies Bergeres had worn pants when it went to London. I wandered from one committee meeting to another until it became obvious to everyone that I was the only person on campus at all interested in starting such a project; certainly the only one who thought it could be even reasonably successful. So I started to work.

The campus theater, seating about 350, was available on Sunday evenings—chiefly because the college had complied with a request from the Protestant churches that no competing Sunday evening activities be held on campus. Why the administration let me ride through this edict is still not clear to me. The vice-president conceded that there were Catholics and Jews who might better be attending the series than roaming the streets—how much better he thought the series might be for them he didn't go on to say.

Securing a competent projectionist remained an unsolved problem. The dean of men was the official audio-visualist, but he wasn't expected to know about operators. A freshman girl who had threaded a Bell and Howell in high school was finally recruited and saddled with the ancient Ampro, 500-watt bulb, poor lens, and small battered screen of the theater.

The more catalogues that came in reply to my letters, the more confusing the job of programming became. To minimize de-

cisions, as well as correspondence, I selected one distributor with a sizable list of good and reasonably priced films. Several letters and a long distance call landed six films on six Sunday evenings: *Man of Aran,* British, 1934; *Ivan the Terrible,* Russian, 1944; *Murderers Among Us,* German, 1947; *Long Voyage Home,* American, 1941; *Generals Without Buttons,* French, 1938; *The Eternal Mask,* Swiss, 1937.

Publicity was poor and meager since I was working alone. Mimeographed descriptions of the films were tacked to bulletin boards, together with some material sent by the distributor; a mangled interview and a few small notices appeared in the school *Herald* and a single announcement in the local *Gazette;* notices went into faculty and dormitory mail boxes and faculty friends urged their students to attend. Switchboard operators at the Union and the men's dormitory agreed to sell tickets, and the staff of the Public Library helped me with the townspeople. I worried about a possible reaction from the local theater management and the union, but asking their opinion of the series had few advantages over worrying, so I continued to worry.

Sales went slowly and the trauma deepened. Because this was an independent enterprise which would have to support itself or come out of my pay checks, I had decided to sell only series tickets. If the films weren't paid for a few days before the series started they could be canceled and the ticket holders' money refunded. But in my distracted state I didn't realize until six o'clock on the first film evening that there was still a $100 deficit!

The film arrived on the very last delivery Saturday afternoon. The projector was working feebly, then not at all for awhile. But by 6:30 Sunday evening the crowd started coming in. My wife, acting as cashier, sold tickets and more tickets. The sickly old Ampro struggled through a battered print of *The Man of Aran* for the seven o'clock performance and gained strength during the second showing at nine. I slept that night. The tickets sold at the door had put us well into the black and we were through one film.

I don't remember a single program of that series which didn't involve worries of one sort or another. But we sold more series tickets on the second Sunday and the projector held together until the fourth. The suspense of Hitchcock's *Foreign Correspondent* (American, 1941, an unavoidable substitute for *Long Voyage Home*) was heightened by the St. Vitus's dance of the image. Another projector had to be borrowed from the Biology Department for the last two evenings. The crowds began to fall off slightly, but the theater remained comfortably filled. The chairman of the French Department had been upset by my choice of a French film, as she continued to be before each series throughout my stay at the college. She seemed to feel that I was maliciously refusing to show *Beauty and the Beast* or *Symphonie Pastorale* (then in 35 mm. first run in New York) in order to misrepresent French cinema. (*Generals Without Buttons* proved to be one of the most popular films of the series.) A German teacher was annoyed that she had to sit through Eisenstein's *Ivan the Terrible* and the Russian language; she had come to see *The Eternal Mask,* in German, but its position in the series had been changed. The dean of women failed to understand that her girls might have gone to the seven o'clock performances, or might even have left at eleven the night that *Foreign Correspondent* ran to eleven twenty on the second showing. The vice-president apparently gave some credit to a rumor that I was forcing all my students to buy tickets. Actually, I was embarrassingly unsuccessful in selling to them. They seemed to feel that the series couldn't be much fun if I had anything to do with it.

But there had been some gratefully received praise. My brief comments before each film, when they weren't apologies for our mechanical difficulties, were designed to clarify the objectives of the series as well as to set the films in their social and artistic contexts. On the last Sunday there were still some 300 to 400 in the audiences and the answers to a questionnaire, which nearly everyone filled out, gave me additional cause for complacency. Two

hundred and thirty-four indicated that they would like to attend another series (158 wanted to see more foreign films; 126 wanted more old U. S. films; 81 more documentaries); 180 indicated an interest in joining a film-study group in order to see and discuss additional films.

The financial success of the series was even more decided. Five hundred and eighty-six series tickets, at a dollar each, had been sold and the net profit came to almost $270.

Total receipts		$586.00
Itemized debits		
Rental for six films	$129.95	
Federal amusement tax	99.62	
Projectionist's fees	35.00	
Janitor's fees	22.95	
Express charges for films	14.35	
Printing cost for tickets	4.80	
Extra projector bulb	4.35	
Postage and stationery	3.18	
Projector repair	1.90	
Long distance phone call	.95	
Total debits	$317.05	$317.05
Net profit		$268.95

But the work and, especially, the responsibility had proved heavy for one person; so, in thinking about more films I consulted the English Department to see if they would be interested in sponsoring future series. At least half the members had looked askance at my film interest and activities. Perhaps they thought of me as a young upstart trying to make changes, and perhaps they were right. Films weren't considered a worthy cause, and there was some distrust, justified I must admit, of the effect on my teaching of so much "extracurricular" work. But the financial success of the series won tolerance at least, and the department voted to sponsor (and receive profits from) subsequent film activities.

In the five series that followed, many changes and refinements

became possible. We had no difficulty in continuing to use the theater on Sunday evenings but the college saw that it could expect rent, $12.50 per evening. The projection had been so inadequate that much of the profit and my effort went into improving it. For the second series we used a projector and operator from the Public Library at $5 an evening. To eliminate this expense the profits from this series, about $110, and my original profits (which the comptroller referred to as Ellis's Film Fund) were invested in a new projector. I learned to operate it and with the help of another member of the staff did all the later projectioning. A 2½-in. lens and 1,000-watt bulb, purchased with profits of the third series, filled the old 8-ft. × 10-ft. theater screen and made a brighter image. And finally we were able to buy a new 9-ft. × 12-ft. screen, which meant that a standard 2-in. lens could be used for an even bigger and brighter image and that a second projector could eventually make change-overs so that no pause for reel change would be necessary. Arc projectors and two large speakers would bring the projection up to that of a commercial theater, but long and careful saving, or a sizable subsidy, will be necessary for their purchase.

Film selection continued to be governed by audience taste and the size of our balance. We did include more expensive films by cutting the number from six for one dollar (twelve and a half cents per program!) to four for a dollar for the second series, and then to three for a dollar for the following series. The newer foreign films remained the most popular so we relied heavily on them.

Series II

Street of Shadows (French, c. 1934, released in the U. S. in 1947)
Torment (Swedish, 1944)
Razzia (German, 1947)
Spring (Russian, 1948)

Series III

Farrebique (French, 1946)
Stone Flower (Russian, 1946)
Revenge (Italian, 1946)

Series IV

Volpone (French, 1947)
Alexander Nevsky (Russian, 1938)
The Roosevelt Story (American, 1947)

Series V

Flesh and Fantasy (American, 1944)
Life in Bloom (Russian, 1947)
Torment (Swedish, 1944)

Series VI

Chaplin Festival (American, 1916–1917 *The Cure, The Floorwalker, The Fireman, The Pawnshop)*
Die Fledermaus (German, 1947)
The Baker's Wife (French, 1938)

Promotion became easier and more effective as our experience increased and the series became a recognized activity. The college *Herald* allowed us more space than we could use. The local *Gazette* accepted sizable articles, placed them well, and listed the films in "Goings on About Town." The two radio stations gave us short plugs when listing social activities. Handmade posters and mimeographed throw-away sheets were scattered about campus and town. Series tickets were regularly on advance sale at the Union and Public Library. Forty-four-cent single admissions for each film were sold at the door. We learned to expect between 300 and 400 people each evening, a gross of $350 to $450 for each series and a modest net of about $100. Our take fell below this only when the publicity had been poor and late, or the films too expensive. Here are two more breakdowns—including untypical expenses: lens, screen.

Series III

Total receipts		$436.39
Itemized debits		
Rental for three films	$130.00	
Federal amusement tax	75.19	
(New 2½ in. lens	57.50)	
Theater rental	37.50	
Janitor's fees	11.90	
Express charges for films	7.42	
New 1600 ft. reel	3.60	
Printing cost for tickets	3.00	
Long distance phone calls	1.92	
New pilot lamp for projector	.30	
Total debits	$328.33	$328.33
Net profit		$108.06

Series VI

Total receipts		$362.40
Itemized debits		
Rental for three films	$106.00	
(New 9 ft. × 12 ft. screen	80.00)	
Federal amusement tax	63.87	
Theater rental	37.50	
Janitor's fees	8.00	
New 1,000-watt projector bulb	7.67	
Express charges for films	5.32	
Printing cost for tickets	3.25	
Total debits	$311.61	$311.61
Net profit		$ 50.79

By the end of the sixth series it was clear that the film evenings had become a "function" on campus and in the community. The English Department had a standing Film Series Committee. Some of the staff members had worked hard and seemed able and willing to go on with the series after I left.[7] Most of the staff had come to

[7] A colleague writes this account of Series VII: "We finally got *The Tawney Pipit, Great Expectations,* and *Brief Encounter,* for which we were to pay... one-half the total admissions receipts. As part of the publicity for the series, we showed *My Little Chickadee* on the first Sunday evening before classes began, free of charge. That was a dud, since we had had

regard this as a worthwhile departmental project: important as a source of income (expenses to conferences and audio-visual equipment for classroom use were partially paid for with the profits); of public relations and prestige value; and a cultural contribution in an art form badly needing the kind of audience discrimination a diet of such films will eventually produce.

Symbolic of this English Department activity might be a remembered scene featuring the department chairman, an elderly Chaucer-Shakespeare scholar, directing traffic in front of the box office: "If you have your tickets, move on inside, please. If you have your tickets, *move on inside!*"

---

too little time to acquaint the students with the free movie. We also had posters made by the new Embosograf process which we put up in the dorms, the Union, the classroom buildings, S——'s [a popular restaurant], the two Y's, and the public library. The *Herald* was very generous with publicity about the pictures, and we were able to have announcements in the little box on the last page of the *Gazette*. We made no serious attempt to sell tickets ahead of time, although the Department announced the series in classes. As to figures: we sold 170 series tickets (for one dollar each), 479 individual tickets (at $.45 each), and took in about $385 total receipts (all figures are approximate). As for expenses: we spent $15 on posters, $185 on film rental (for three films), $37.50 for theatre rent, $20 for janitor service, $65 for federal tax, $15 for projectionist (we used the Public Library projector because our projector went on the fritz), $3 for printing of tickets, $6 for express and postage charges, and $1.50 for miscellaneous repairs. We spent $17.50 on the free movie; no charge for the theatre. At the last count we made about $30 on the series.... We have decided not to run such expensive films again, since our audience simply isn't big enough. Probably the next series... will be made up of $20 items, so that we can build up our bank account for another fling."

Series VIII contained *Pygmalion* (British, 1938), *Carnival in Flanders* (French, 1935), *Adventures of Chico* (American, 1937), and *Rembrandt* (British, 1936).

"The Blue Angel": A Reconsideration

GEOFFREY WAGNER

GEOFFREY WAGNER is a young Englishman now studying at Columbia University, where he is Lydig Fellow in the Faculty of Philosophy. He has contributed to most of the leading literary magazines in England, and has also published a novel, two volumes of poetry, and selections of translations of Baudelaire, Nerval, and Klabund. His second novel is due to appear next year.

PRODUCED IN 1929, the first year of sound films, *The Blue Angel* refused to follow the then popular technique of photographing theater and clung tenaciously to the traditions of the silent picture. This is perhaps the reason why it can be seen again today with such enjoyment, in spite of the fact that its dialogue serves mainly as narrative. For by emphasizing pictorial quality, its director Von Sternberg was forced to employ potentialities of the camera and of natural sound that were far in advance of his time and, in fact, give the picture its greatness. Von Sternberg, still in Berlin at the time, actually shot an English version together with the German, and it was this print that was first shown in England and America—to the film's disadvantage, for the heavy accents of the players proved to be a handicap. But this was not the only obstacle it had to overcome in America. Despite popular acclaim in Paris (where it had to be banned), in England, and in America itself, where in most cities it was allowed to run for only a few days, it was not shown in this country until *Morocco* (1930) had created the inferior American-conceived stereotype of Dietrich which has persisted to the present day and to which, had it not been for her gift for comedy as well as her remarkable personality, she would long ago have succumbed. Recent Dietrich films, like *A Foreign Affair* and *Stage Fright,* show best perhaps how her theatrical presence resists the patina of the mere *femme fatale* which directors like to cast over it.

In *The Blue Angel,* however, Von Sternberg created Dietrich's first, and last, significant role, one that Siegfried Kracauer describes as follows.

Her Lola Lola was a new incarnation of sex. This petty bourgeois tart, with her provocative legs and easy manners, showed an impassivity which incited one to grope behind her callous egoism and cool insolence. That such a secret existed was also intimated by her veiled voice, which, when she sang about her interest in love-making and nothing else, vibrated with nostalgic reminiscences and smoldering hopes.[1]

This, then, was Dietrich's character study before her glamorization into the puppet siren of England and America, the stylized sphinx of the demimonde which, presented with monotonous regularity in film after film, would have subdued a lesser personality to nonentity. But there is something more to the original Dietrich in *The Blue Angel;* there is expressed through her role a penetrating critique of existent social conditions which had been suggested in Heinrich Mann's novel, an exposé of the peculiar vices of German bourgeois society. In an admirable article Richard Griffith points out that "If we had looked harder at *The Blue Angel* in 1931 we might have had some glimpse of Berlin's future."[2] To convey his picture of social decay Von Sternberg made full use of his medium.

In this portrait of a middle-aged professor led to his downfall by a café entertainer, objects, buildings, and landscapes take on a life of their own; everything visible and audible accentuates the theme of the helpless and fatal pursuit of pleasure, the draining away of all social values.

So writes Griffith, and, despite the fact that I cannot recall a single landscape in the picture, his criticism is sound, for the personal theme of *The Blue Angel* foreshadows an impending social disaster. Sadism was about to be unleashed in mass form in Germany and the film is, of course, a study of the spiritual torture and humiliation of a small-town man with whom everyone can readily identify himself. Thus J. Leslie Mitchell ("Lewis Grassic Gib-

[1] *From Caligari to Hitler* (Princeton University Press, 1947), p. 217.
[2] *Saturday Review of Literature,* XXXIII (December 2, 1950), p. 51.

bon," the author of *A Scot's Quair*), in the Introduction to an unacknowledged English translation of the novel,[3] calls the professor "an incarnation of the multitudes that time and circumstance have shaped to dull and foolish lives in civilization's backreaches." In Mann's novel, Rosa Fröhlich (Lola Lola in the film) is even more domineering in her abuse of Dr. Rath than she is in the film, and Von Sternberg was clearly aware of what she stood for; as Dr. Kracauer puts it, he

> deepened this sadistic tendency by making Lola Lola destroy not only Jannings himself but his entire environment. A running motif in the film is the old church clock which chimes a popular German tune devoted to the praise of loyalty and honesty (*Ub' immer Treu und Redlichkeit . . .*)—a tune expressive of Janning's inherited beliefs. In the concluding passage, immediately after Lola Lola's song has faded away, this tune is heard for the last time as the camera shows the dead Jannings. Lola Lola has killed him, and in addition her song has defeated the chimes. [Kracauer's footnote: cf. Kalbus, *Deutsche Filmkunst,* II, 16; Vincent, *Histoire de l'Art Cinématographique,* p. 163.][4]

The bells are first heard by Lola Lola when the professor tells her he is unmarried; they sound again when, in the empty classroom, he puts down the books on his desk, renounces his old life, and takes up the carnation she had given him. The degradation that follows is filled with pathos for a modern audience, which remembers the humiliation that came to the Jews. Professor Rath, the intellectual, over whose bed hangs the sign *"Tue recht und scheue niemand,"* is reduced at last to the *"Zauberlehrling"* of the conjurer, ordered to kneel at the feet of Lola Lola to pull on her stockings, condemned to stand on the stage before an audience of Aryans, to have eggs broken over his pate, and to crow like a cock. From the outset, in fact, the professor is haunted by the figure of the clown in the background, for he, the man of ideals, is himself a clown in the world of *The Blue Angel.* Thus at the beginning, when the professor first enters, the cabaret is shown as chaotic, almost surrealistic, with its whirling clouds, miasmic veils, and

[3] (London: Jarrolds, n.d.)

[4] Kracauer, *op. cit.,* pp. 217–218.

shifting backdrops; at the end, when he is part of it, it is steady, and brutal in its clarity. Everything connected with the professor suggests this interpretation—his favorite pupil called Angst, the mitigation of his masculine nose blowing after meeting Lola Lola, the very nickname Unrath (or excrement), which was later given to the Jews.

Sex and sadism, individual and social, are the main themes of *The Blue Angel,* and the cameraman, Gunther Rittau, develops them with care. The dead bird which, in almost the first words of the film, the professor is told will never sing again, is nevertheless singing again in Lola Lola's boudoir, and sings in the last shot of all in the person of Lola Lola herself. Then for an instant the twelve apostles, in agonized poses of broken stone, file around the great Hamburg church clock, and finally Marlene herself sings the lines which sum up the film—when a man burns in lust, who can find him salvation? And we remember that the professor had ripped the very days off the calendar with Lola Lola's hair curlers—with, as it were, the burning tongs of lust.

But sexual tension carries its corollaries of nostalgia and despair. Ecstasy, by its very nature, cannot endure. Slowly, in contrast to the cabaret scenes, the camera travels back down the empty classroom when Jannings is about to leave it for good. In this last lingering embrace, as it were, the scene tenderly dramatizes the protagonist's loneliness and nostalgia for his past life which, banal though it was, had the irrecoverable gift of innocence. Lola herself, in the final analysis, is not wholly evil; as the mad professor grips her by the throat she asks him what he wants of her. What more can such a woman give? Her predicament, like Jannings's, is in its way pathetic.

Nevertheless, it can be said that the whole of the dramatic construction of *The Blue Angel,* like its photographic composition, is centered on the sex of Lola Lola. All the scenes, the very intrigue of the film itself, radiate from this, have this as their focal point. Thus there is maintained a natural and harmonious thematic bal-

ance which makes the presentation logical and inevitable, and infinitely more gripping than the hypocritical eroticism of later Hollywood productions by the same director. Von Sternberg created his atmosphere with an almost suffocating eroticism of costume to offset cabaret scenes which are, contrary to general opinion, apt to be highly antierotic on the screen; sexiness frequently wages war with eroticism. So it is all the more extraordinary to find serious criticism of the film calling it "a coarse melodrama . . . in bad taste,"[5] and suggesting that its lighting was indebted to *The Docks of New York.*

It is interesting to recall, when one remarks today the sharp sense of cinema shown by the costuming of *The Blue Angel,* how frequently Von Sternberg's women have appeared in feathers, plumes, and ostrich boas. Evelyn Brent's nickname in *Underworld* was, in fact, "Feathers," and in this film, as in others by Von Sternberg, after scenes of great violence, oceans of swansdown would inundate the set. Possibly this tendency originated with Travis Banton, who joined Paramount in 1924 (and put Louise Brooks, in *The Canary Murder Case,* 1929, in a cap of feathers almost identical with Evelyn Brent's); it was he who was responsible for robing the Marlene of *Angel, Morocco, Shanghai Express,* and *Desire,* in all of which someone saw to it, with a well-nigh fetichistic insistence, that the vedette of *The Blue Angel* should come up under a toque of feathers.

But in *The Blue Angel,* as in the Hungarian peasant girl "X-27" of *Dishonoured* (1931), the Marlene of Von Sternberg is literarily described by costume. Lola Lola's blowsy cabaret clothes are an attribute of her character. André Maugé, writing in *Pour Vous* about Von Sternberg's heroines,[6] gives the director great credit for his flair for costumes:

il connaît la valeur d'une robe et ce qu'elle peut apporter à une femme de troublant et de désirable. Il aime la douceur des plumes autour du

[5] Maurice Bardèche and Rover Brasillach, *The History of Motion Pictures,* tr. Iris Barry (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1939), p. 342.

[6] In 1932: quoted in *La Revue du Cinéma* (Automne, 1949), pp. 111–112.

cou, les dessous de dentelle, les pieds cambrés sur les hauts talons absurdes, les longs bas transparents, les jarretières et les jaretelles, tout un érotisme un peu suranné du corsets et de chevilles fines. . . . Tout le monde remarque ces créatures si belles qui vivent, dans les films de Sternberg, les instants les plus tragiques, les plus émouvants de leur existence imaginaire. . . . Hautaines, fatiguées, elles traînent sur les divans, une cigarette aux doigts, croisant haut leur jambes souples, avec sur la figure toutes les marques sans espoir de l'amour.

Yet this interpretation does not apply to the later Dietrich of films which were no more than vehicles for the Anglo-Saxon stereotype. In *The Blue Angel* she is still part of a theme, a theme which works itself out, by the same exaggeration which Jethro Bithell, the historian of modern German literature, recognized in Mann's book. In this she is magnificently assisted by Jannings in his first talking film; one of the few laudatory American reviewers of the time wrote, "He fully conveys the man of routine habits . . . and in his final madness and death he reaches rare heights of tragedy."[7]

In the travesty of Dietrich that has followed this epic, the sting has gone successively out of her characterizations because each of these has been emptied more and more of any social implications (I except *A Foreign Affair* and *Stage Fright* from this). We have seen a puppet whose sins are romantic, upper-class, and superficial, a doll whose world weariness passes for wisdom. In *The Blue Angel* Von Sternberg created a Dietrich whose place in life was classic and tragic, implicated in the whole of society, a character, in fact, of flesh and blood and one with a living message.

[7] *Commonweal,* XIII (December 31, 1930), p. 242.

From Book to Film: The Note of Affirmation

LESTER ASHEIM

LESTER ASHEIM is an assistant professor and dean of students in the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago and teaches courses on popular culture and the mass media of communications. He assisted Dr. Bernard Berelson in the preparation of a volume *The Library's Public* for the Public Library Inquiry, edited *A Forum on the Public Library Inquiry,* is author of the *Report on the Conference on Reading Development* for the American Book Publishers Council and has contributed articles to various professional journals.

This article is based on material adapted from Mr. Asheim's doctoral dissertation, "From Book to Film," submitted at the University of Chicago in 1949.

IN THE preceding article in this series, the moving picture versions of the twenty-four novels in the sample[1] were examined in terms of certain mass-appeal formulas which provide the nonrelevant escape which producers seem to equate with "entertainment." In this, the third in the series, the film makers' use of the "love story" and the "happy ending" for similar purposes will be discussed.

The emphasis upon the love story is a stereotype in layman thinking about the moving picture. "Boy meets girl" has become a catchword in discussions of film plotting, and the incongruous insertion of gratuitous love interest into all kinds of plots is standard material in satires or burlesques on the ways of Hollywood. And as so often happens in popular stereotypes, the idea, while greatly exaggerated, is not without some basis in fact.

Of the twenty-four films in the sample, seventeen, or three quarters of the total group, increased the importance of the love story in relation to the whole over its proportionate importance in the

[1] The twenty-four novel-films are relisted here for the convenience of the reader: *Alice Adams, Anna Karenina, David Copperfield, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, For Whom the Bell Tolls, The Good Earth, The Grapes of Wrath, The House of the Seven Gables, Huckleberry Finn, In This Our Life, Jane Eyre, Kitty Foyle, Les Miserables, The Light That Failed, The Magnificent Ambersons, Main Street (I Married a Doctor), Of Human Bondage, Pride and Prejudice, The Sea Wolf, A Tale of Two Cities, Tom Sawyer, Victory, The Virginian, Wuthering Heights.* The selection of the sample is described in the first article in the series (*Hollywood Quarterly,* Volume V, Number 3).

novel upon which the film was based. Where the novels themselves use the love story as the primary plot line (as in *Jane Eyre*), the film transfers this aspect in expanded form. Where the love story is part of the primary plot but not its major aspect in the book, the film often so arranges the material as to give the romantic aspect the first importance, as in *Alice Adams, Anna Karenina, The Good Earth, Kitty Foyle, I Married a Doctor,* and *Of Human Bondage.* In the case of *In This Our Life,* the love-story plot, secondary in the novel, is selected for the major plot line of the film, while in others—like *For Whom the Bell Tolls, The Magnificent Ambersons, Les Miserables, The Virginian,* and *Victory*—the love story is retained in its secondary plot position, but is given increased importance. Even *Tom Sawyer,* for example, is so written as to give greater comparative importance to the Tom-Becky-Amy triangle. And in two cases—*Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and *The House of the Seven Gables*—love stories are added to the film version for which no precedent exists in the book.

This emphasis upon romantic love is not a characteristic exclusive to the film; it has been typical of popular culture in its several forms ever since the courtly love tradition was introduced into literature. Other writers have remarked upon this,[2] and an examination of popular literature and drama provides a plethora of supporting evidence. As early as 1897, the stage version of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* added love interest without precedent in the novel, and rewrote the murder to make the heroine's father the victim. The latest film version (and the two before it) thus merely retain this convention, and the alteration from the original novel in this instance cannot be assigned to the "Hollywood formula," but to the pressure of the mass preferences, or to the traditional stage form of the story which is in itself shaped by considerations of popular preference.

While the tradition is not exclusively Hollywood's, it cannot

[2] For example, see Leo C. Rosten, *Hollywood: The Movie Colony; The Movie Makers* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1941), p. 357.

be denied that Hollywood utilizes it constantly. Little "touches," for example, are often added to strengthen the importance of the romantic conflict in the film version. In *Jane Eyre,* a bit of stage business is added (in the scene in which the house guests run into the hall after hearing Mason's cry in the night) in which Rochester ironically kisses Blanche's hand while Jane, watching from a distance, mistakes the gesture as sincere and is smitten with jealousy. In *The House of the Seven Gables,* the book portrays Clifford as repulsed by the faded appearance of Hepzibah, whereas in the film he has an added line in which he assures her that for him she has never changed. In *A Tale of Two Cities,* Carton is in Paris without Lucie's knowledge; in the film he is with the Manettes and has a scene in which he personally comforts her. Such changes serve to keep the love story continually in the foreground, and to make romance seem to be the primary concern of the leading characters, no matter what other plot complications face them.

If the hero and heroine are presented as man and wife, the script usually requires that their relation be presented in an atmosphere of what is popularly conceived of as romantic love, even when the book does not so present it.[8] Thus, in the novel, *The Good Earth,* Wang's interest in O-Lan soon fades, and even at her deathbed he can no longer feel any love for her; in the script, the story is rewritten to conform to the occidental pattern of a love marriage, Wang's one infidelity is repudiated, and the death of O-Lan is presented as the parting of two lovers. Similarly, in *Main Street,* Carol soon loses any romantic feeling for Will, and although she respects his ability as a doctor she drifts farther and farther away from him, returning in the end reluctantly to accept and tolerate him without love. In the film version, on the other hand, Carol and Will are deeply in love, neither strays from fidelity, they are parted by misunderstanding and the pressure of small town gossip, but are joyously reconciled when Carol's love proves stronger than her disillusionment with the small town.

[8] The popular appeal of romance is not the only consideration here, of course. The Production Code's insistence upon preserving the sanctity of marriage also has its effect.

An occasional change in characterization or physical appearance is introduced to fortify the romantic aspects of the love story in the film. Heyst, in the book of *Victory,* is bald; he is not in the film. Craig, in *In This Our Life,* has a limp; in the film he does not. Mark, in *Kitty Foyle,* is overdressed, somewhat boorish, balding, and obviously Jewish; in the film he is none of these. In the film version of *Wuthering Heights,* Cathy, Heathcliff, Isabella, and Edgar are all presented as older at the time of their first meeting to make possible the beginning of the romance between Cathy and Edgar, and a more mature resentment on the part of Heathcliff. In *The House of the Seven Gables,* the script writer changes the protagonists from brother and sister to sweetheart cousins in order that a romantic attachment may be portrayed between them, and omits Clifford's imbecility in order to create a conventional romantic hero type. And while the costuming and makeup in *Jane Eyre* attempt to be faithful to the Brontë conception of Jane as plain and undistinguished, a scene is added in which a hanger-on at the inn attempts to force his attention upon her, implying an attractiveness which is at variance with the novel's presentation, if not with the natural appearance of Miss Fontaine.

The tendency to romanticize need not always be exhibited in the film overtly; it exists also in the mind-set of the audience, which is quick to interpret the slightest of hints as evidence of romantic love, and accept it as central to the story even though it does not occupy a central place in the action. Certain filmic conventions are so well established that the average movie-goer accepts a budding romance with no further basis than the exchange of a glance, a close-up of a fluttering eyelid, or an initial indifference between the two name players whose filmic forte is romance.

In *Jane Eyre,* for example, Jane's first interview with Rochester takes place at tea with Mrs. Fairfax and Adele present; in the film it occurs solely between Jane and Rochester. This more informal atmosphere involving only the two leading players is sufficient to endow the scene with the necessary romantic implications even

though the dialogue is taken practically verbatim from the original scene in the novel.

The manner in which the hero and heroine meet is often altered in the films to provide a less conventional and more "romantic" situation. Wolfenstein and Leites[4] discovered the unconventional meeting to occur in a ratio of about three to one in the films they analyzed. Since the films in their sample included examples of romantic comedy, musical comedy, and other light entertainment which traditionally call for the amusing introduction, their finding is interesting but not startling. Although the percentage of unconventional meetings is smaller in the sample films in the present study, the fact that a world-famous classical novel is rewritten in order to provide for some such unconventional meeting between the leading protagonists demonstrates much more significantly the persistence of the pattern in film production.

In seven of the films in the sample, the meeting of the characters, for whom love interest is to be developed, is altered to provide a touch of unconventionality which is not present in the book, and in one—*Kitty Foyle*—the heroine's meeting with each of the two men in the triangle borrows elements from elsewhere in the book to add to the atypical context of the meeting. It is interesting to note in *Kitty Foyle* that the suspense technique employed in the film—which lover will Kitty finally choose?—was probably ineffective for filmgoers of long experience, since the greater unconventionality of Kitty's initial meeting with Mark is a stereotyped indicator that he will be the romantic lead.

Of thirty-one meetings of romantic pairs presented in the twenty-four book-films, sixteen are identical in both versions; ten are revised in the film version to be less conventional than that presented in the novel; three are actually more conventional on the screen than they are in the book; and two differ in the film version from that in the book, but not in the direction of greater unconventionality. While these figures do not reveal as disrespect-

[4] *Movies: A Psychological Study* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950).

ful an attitude toward the source literature as many critics of Hollywood would have predicted (52 per cent are faithful to the book's version of the meeting), the ten films (32 per cent) in which the romance needed "improvement" for screen purposes include such well-known works as *David Copperfield, Of Human Bondage, Jane Eyre,* and *The Virginian.*

Closely allied to the romantic emphasis is the happy solution of the story's conflict. In the motion picture tradition, the "happy ending" is often thought of in terms of the consummation of the love story, even when the romance is not the focal point of attention throughout the development of the plot. Because the final scene is an important one, the one which the audience takes with it as the last memory of the film, the use of that scene for the romantic embrace of the hero and heroine serves to emphasize the importance of the romance even where the action leading up to the denouement does not relate directly to the romantic story.

Twelve of the films in the sample fade out on the familiar embrace of hero and heroine, or some variation of it. But such romantic fade-outs are not necessarily departures from the sense of the novel. Like literature's "they lived happily ever after," the stereotyped embrace represents a familiar summary device for conveying the successful culmination of the romance, and where the novel's ending relates to the happy outcome of the love story, it is a conventional filmic equivalent. However, only seven of the twelve films mentioned above are based on novels which end on a "happy ever after" note; the other five require a change in the original plotting to provide the happy romantic ending for the film. In addition, two of the novels treat the love story in essentially the same manner as the films derived from them, but do not devote their final strategic pages to it; and one does not have the romance which the film invents. Thus 63 per cent of all the films in the sample have a romantic happy ending, and 40 per cent of these (one fourth of the entire sample) require an alteration of the story to accomplish it.

The happy ending, however, is not limited solely to the culmination of the love story. Other goals are sought and other lines of action are followed in many of the novels which reach the screen. That the film version of a favorite novel changes the ending to a happy one is a frequent accusation leveled at film adaptations, and the twenty-four sample films were analyzed on this factor to test the truth of the charge. In the sample, eighteen of the film versions retain the *same kind* of ending as the books upon which they are based; eleven of them are happy (where "happiness" is defined as the attainment of the goal sought by the main protagonist); five, unhappy (failure to attain goal); and two (*A Tale of Two Cities* and *Wuthering Heights*) a combination happy-unhappy, in that the goal is achieved but the main protagonist dies. Three of the films, while retaining the *type* of ending which occurs in the book, alter the details of the action. *The House of the Seven Gables* has a happy ending in both book and film, but the latter adds love interest which the former does not possess. *The Good Earth* ends unhappily in both versions, but the film alters the emphasis to concentrate mainly on the death of O-Lan as an affirmation of Wang's devotion to the land and his love for his wife. The film version of *The Sea Wolf,* through a general alteration in the entire plot structure, presents a happy ending which differs in most of its details from the equally happy ending of the book.

"Happy" and "unhappy" are not, however, completely adequate terms with which to describe the situation which obtains as the story closes. Since our definition may require that an ending be described as happy although both hero and heroine die (*Wuthering Heights*), the "affirmative" and "negative" terminology of Fritz Lang is probably more suitable:

> I think the audience's apparent preference for happy resolutions is more accurately described as a preference for *affirmative resolutions,* as a desire to see dramatised the rightness of its ideals and the *eventual* achievements of its hopes. The death of a hero if he dies for an ac-

ceptable ideal is not a tragedy. The death of a protagonist, if he dies because he lives counter to an ideal, is affirmative.[5]

If we accept Mr. Lang's terms we find that *although unhappy endings are retained by the films in many cases, in no case are negative endings retained.* In *The Good Earth,* for example, the book ends with the death of Wang, while behind his back the sons plan the sale of his land and the disruption of all his hopes and plans; the film, although it ends with the death of O-Lan, and may therefore be said to retain an unhappy ending, presents Wang's family problems as solved, and the spirit of O-Lan as continuing to symbolize the "good earth" and the family's unity with it.

Five of the novels contain endings which are a kind of modified, rather than a definitive, negative, which the films make completely affirmative. Alice Adams, although she loses her chance for romance and faces a future of "dreary obscurity," is reconciled to her position and has learned to adjust to reality. Kitty Foyle, still undecided as the book ends, has a chance for achieving a modified contentment even though her great love is lost to her. *In This Our Life* ends upon Roy's fumbling resolution to carry on and Asa's continuing belief in his fading hopes. *The Grapes of Wrath* points with bitter belligerence to a solution through a united revolt against oppression. Carol's ultimate submission to the small town in *Main Street* is tempered by her hope that her children's generation will have the strength to carry forward her revolt.

Elements of both affirmation and negation are present in all five of these books, but in the film versions the negativism is completely abandoned. In *Alice Adams,* the heroine both learns her lesson and wins her man. In *Kitty Foyle,* Kitty's happy acceptance of Mark is the presage of a happy-ever-after ending. In *In This Our Life,* the death of Stanley solves all problems and serves to reunite Roy and Craig. In *The Grapes of Wrath,* Ma strikes a

[5] "Happily Ever After," *The Penguin Film Review,* V (January, 1948), 28. (Italics are Mr. Lang's.)

note of optimistic reassurance which obviates the necessity of revolt and promises ultimate happiness. *I Married a Doctor* makes the reunion of Will and Carol all-important, and incidentally presents evidence that Carol has triumphed over the small town as well.

The nearest approach to a nonaffirmative ending occurs, by inadvertence, in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* where the unhappy ending is meant to be "affirmative" in Lang's terms because the hero dies for a cause. The film, by failing to clarify the cause and deemphasizing its importance, provides less purpose to Robert Jordan's death than does the book, and thus gives it an air of gratuitous tragedy which falls short of the catharsis which a Lang-type of affirmative ending would provide.

It can be seen from this summary that the happiness or unhappiness of the ending is not really the important factor in relation to the film makers' view of entertainment. What really matters is that nothing be retained in the film which will disturb the audience, and challenge it to think. An unhappy ending may be retained so long as it does not call into question the certainties and assurances with which the audience sustains itself. Strictly speaking, there is a happy ending to the book of *Anna Karenina* in the story of Levin, whereas the film is definitely an unhappy-ending story. Yet of the two versions there is no question as to which would be the more disturbing, the more challenging, and the more provocative to any thinking person.

Just how does the affirmative tone soften the challenge of the novel? What, precisely, is the effect of eliminating the negative emphasis? Why shouldn't the positive approach be a "better" one than the negative, in terms of the individual's philosophical outlook and view of life? For the seven "negative" novels in the sample, the following results are gained by the alteration provided by the film.

If the subject matter of the film is closely related to pressing economic and social problems of our time—as in *The Grapes of*

Wrath—the treatment of the problem is such that the tone of pessimism which pervades the novelist's realistic analysis is altered to permit the conclusion that an ultimate satisfactory solution is not only possible but probable. Thus the book, which is an exhortation to action before it is too late, becomes a film which offers reassurance that no action is required to insure the desired resolution of the issue.

If the leading character possesses a flaw or an inability to cope with the world which leads to unhappiness, the film alters the characterization to make adjustment possible, as in *Victory* or *Alice Adams*. Thus the spectator is encouraged to believe that weaknesses, which he may recognize as his own, will never really stand in the way of his ultimate success. (Where the flaw is one which leads the character to flout the mores of the majority, the unhappy ending is retained, and the punishment becomes in itself an affirmation of the prevailing code, as in *Anna Karenina.*)

Where the ending is indecisive or unresolved, the pattern is made more explicit by presenting an achieved solution to the problem (as in *Kitty Foyle*) or promising its ultimate accomplishment (as in *The Grapes of Wrath*). Thus the audience is assured that its doubts and momentary disappointments are merely preliminary to the working out of an all-pervading purpose designed to gratify its personal desires.

Where the problem relates to such elements within our society as the cause of unhappiness, these elements are conquered (*The Good Earth*), altered (*I Married a Doctor*), or minimized (*The Grapes of Wrath*). In no case is man shown as the helpless victim of social forces beyond his control which operate without apparent meaning; his triumph is usually guaranteed as a logical reward for his own virtue, or at least as the certain result of his own efforts.

It is not the purpose of this study to evaluate the moral rightness of the ideals expressed in the films, nor to prescribe a way of life for the mass audiences who attend them. The elimination of negativism in the motion picture, whether good or bad, is clearly in

keeping with the producers' notion of the purpose of escape entertainment. It diverts the attention from the disappointments, the contradictions, and the disillusionments of reality, and directs it toward a "better" world where meaning and pattern prevail.

That what the filmgoer seeks is precisely this—the pattern—is the belief of at least one student of the cinema, Dr. Franklin Fearing of the Psychology Department of the University of California at Los Angeles. Dr. Fearing objects to the term "escape" to describe the function served by the film. He holds that what the individual seeks is a meaningful pattern for his world, and that the neat solution of problems which have the surface appearance of being real problems serves to instill in the spectator a sense of purpose in life which the contemplation of life about him does not provide.[6] The public's insistence upon "realistic" trappings and its general apathy toward fantasy and the unrealistic serves to support Dr. Fearing's contention that "escape" alone—in the sense of merely getting away from reality—is not the primary function of entertainment for the majority. The distinction between the negative connotation of the term, "escape," and the positive connotation of the phrase, "pattern seeking," is useful. Against it, the alterations introduced into some of the book-films in the sample take on a clearer meaning and purpose, and become something more than mere "prettification" of the original material.

The film version of *The Grapes of Wrath* provides an example of an adaptation which underlines a theme of affirmation which is not in the original novel, and does this not merely by eliminating unpleasantness so as to provide "escape," but by manipulating the original material in such a way as to establish a meaningful and acceptable pattern. Nothing is added for which there is no precedent in the book, no dialogue is invented to restate the theme, and throughout, the incidents and characterization echo those which Steinbeck had originally created. The change in emphasis is accomplished solely through the elimination of certain events, and the alteration of the sequence of action.

[6] In conversation with the writer.

Thus, in the book, the government camp sequences come early, and the Joads are forced to leave the comparative comfort of the camp because of continuing unemployment. From this point the direction of the action may be described as "downward"; the Joads are involved in the squalid conditions of the strikebreaking sequence, Tom kills the deputy and receives the scar that forces him into hiding, Winfield becomes ill from malnutrition, the family is forced to live in a boxcar while working in semislavery in the cotton fields, Rose of Sharon loses her baby, and finally the rains and the flood drive them out even from the meager shelter of the cars to the final scene in which Rose of Sharon gives her breast to the starving man.

In the film, the strikebreaking scenes come early, with the killing of the deputy and the incident of Tom's scar retained. But from that sequence, the action in general moves "upward"; the Joads go to the government camp where the stress is placed upon improved living conditions and the general well-being of those who live there, while no point is made of unemployment. When the Joads leave the camp as the film ends, they are on the way to further employment elsewhere, and although Tom's flight and the loss of Rose of Sharon's baby are retained, the cotton picking, the boxcars, the illness of Winfield, the flood, and the final scene are omitted, and the film ends on a note of promise. Where the book shows the family starting out with great hopes which are continually crushed as they sink lower and lower, the film shows them growing stronger and more assured as they weather their initial disillusionment. Thus it is possible to take dialogue directly from the book but so place it in the sequence of events as to give a key significance to certain sentiments that occur in a different context in the novel. Tom's speech to Ma when he is forced to leave, in which he outlines his inspired destiny, is only slightly condensed from the corresponding scene in the book, and its tone is identical. In the book, however, it is followed by the sequence of the flood and the growing despair of the broken family; in the film, it is the

climactic speech of the film, and is followed only by a single short sequence in which the Joads, with high hopes, go on to their next job, and Ma expresses the summing-up note of the entire film: "We're the people that live. Can't nobody wipe us out. Can't nobody lick us. We'll go on forever, Pa. We're the people." These lines, which end the film on a note of reassurance, occur about half way through the book. While they are true to the characterization of Ma and are the very words Steinbeck gave her, their use at the end of the film leaves a final impression upon the audience that everything is certain to turn out well—a conviction which is not conveyed to the reader of the novel.

In the film version the story has been altered sufficiently to provide an affirmative ending rather than a negative one. But the ending alone is not the only change in the direction of affirmation; the script is rewritten so that the ending provided by it seems to follow the sequence of events naturally. To one unfamiliar with the original novel there are no loose ends or glaring contradictions to indicate that alterations have taken place. Instead a new logic of events has been created which strengthens the note of affirmation and gives it an emotional power that a mere change in the action alone would be insufficient to achieve.

Such alterations, giving a new connotation to the words of the novelist, are a familiar device of film adaptation through which it is possible for the script writer to alter the original material to fit the demands of the mass audience while retaining the tone and the flavor of the novel with words "right out of the book." Frequently these shifts in emphasis are accomplished by transferring the dialogue to a different speaker, so that disapproved sentiments are not spoken by approved characters or are put in a context which alters their significance. In *Main Street,* for example, a local boy who made good returns to Gopher Prairie and mouths some platitudes about the value of the small town which the heroine—and clearly the author—reject. In the film, some of these lines are given to the hero to speak in the next to the last scene, so that they

become a statement of the film's theme, approval of which is indicated by the fact that they are spoken by an approved character to whose point of view the heroine is converted as the film ends. The final effect of the film then, is that the small town is not so bad—a direct reversal of the theme of the novel, although the lines which voice the revised viewpoint come directly from the book. Similarly, in the novel, *Victory,* as Ricardo leads Heyst to the final interview with Jones, there is a flash of lightning and a rumble of thunder. Ricardo (one of the "villains") says, "Ha! it begins . . . let it come. I am in the humour for it!" In the film, the scene is the same, and the lines are repeated verbatim, except that they are given to Heyst (the hero) instead of Ricardo. The effect is to presage the change in characterization which the film introduces to make possible the happy ending. Again the precise words of the book are used, but so placed as to express an idea directly counter to that expressed by the book.

In general, of course, the film does not rely merely upon a transferred speech to alter the emphasis. As can be seen from these examples, the reoriented lines are often placed in juxtaposition to a change in the action—like the happy ending of *Victory*—so that the change in emphasis is more graphically illustrated. In addition, dialogue may be slightly altered to change its meaning, or at least to change its meaning in the altered context. Thus, in *Alice Adams* the script borrows a speech of Mr. Adams from late in the book and inserts it in the scene just prior to the reconciliation of Alice and Arthur Russell. With changes, and in that context, the speech takes on quite a different note. The excerpt below is from Mr. Adams' speech in the book; the italicized portions are those which are omitted from the script.

You think you're going to be pushed right up against the wall; you can't see any way out, or any hope at all; *you think you're gone*—and then something you never counted on turns up; and *while maybe you never do get back to where you used to be, yet somehow* you kind of *squirm* [squeeze] out *of being right spang against the wall.* You keep on going—*maybe you can't go much, but you do go a little.*

As can be seen, the film omits just enough of the speech to eliminate any hint that the success of the outcome will be modified in any way; as altered, the speech becomes consistent with the happy ending which the film has added, even though it is a speech out of the book rather than a scriptwriter's invention.

When it is well done, this careful reworking of the material, retaining in so far as possible characteristic speech and action from the novel, results in a consistent organization leading logically to the changes. The note of affirmation does not appear as an appended afterthought, but as an integral part of the construction of the plot, arising out of the inner logic of the situation. As a result, the complete film can present a unity and sense of pattern which is artistically satisfying, and can avoid the "tacked-on" effect which would result from inexpert tampering with the source novel. To one to whom the idea and the theme of the original are important, however, this artistic excellence is in itself a fault, for the audience that knows only the film and not the book is presented with a "falsified" interpretation which leaves no clues that would permit it to reconstruct the original "truth."

NOTE.—This is the third of four articles based on material from Mr. Asheim's dissertation "From Book to Film." The concluding article will appear in a forthcoming issue.

Film Music of the Quarter

LAWRENCE MORTON

LAWRENCE MORTON is an arranger and composer of music for film and radio. He has recently been appointed music critic of *Frontier*.

AN AMERICAN watching *Wonderful Times* is likely to get the feeling that he is turning the pages of someone else's family album. He recognizes how closely the album resembles his own, but all the characters seem merely funny to him while those in his own album are not only funny but dear. Or he may feel that he is looking at one of those newfangled azimuthal maps which ridiculously places the U.S.A. somewhere out there beyond the confines of what is after all a minor continent.

Wonderful Times was made in the American Zone of West Germany. Following the technique of *The March of Time,* it assembles clips out of newsreels and old films to tell the story of how, since the century began, wonderful times were regularly promised the German people by their rulers, and just as regularly dissipated by the catastrophes of war or depression. Politics and diplomacy, science and invention, entertainment and the arts, fashions and customs—all are reviewed in shots of the principal actors in the events. A thread of narrative, together with gratuitous bits of analysis and philosophy and preachment, is provided by a character who emerges from a page of a family album, grows old with the film, and ends it, from the vantage point of a rubble heap in postwar Berlin, with solemn reflections induced at once by his memories and by the sight of a group of little children symbolically building the world of tomorrow out of the rubble.

The music track, credited to Werner Eisbrenner, is interesting from two points of view, historical and theatrical. Although it would be an exaggeration to call it a history of film music, it does recall many of the musical fashions that accompanied the development of films themselves. The repertoire ranges from the "hur-

ries" of the early motion-picture piano anthologies to the commercial modernism of present-day scoring, and there are some wonderfully exciting and authentic examples of European jazz from the 'twenties. The quality of the sound has just as wide a range, from the scratchy surfaces of early phonograph records (probably dubbed in on the present track) to the smooth recording of today. Unfortunately, the repertoire and the recorded sound do not always match. The piano music for the silent films, though probably authentic in itself, is too polished in performance, too slick, too well recorded, and sometimes touched up with unconscious modernisms. The big production number, "Sunday in Berlin," attempts to capture the flavor of half a century ago, tries to sound dated; but both the rhythm and the orchestration betray the modernity of the song and its arrangement. (Or is it possible that the modern German ear considers this the currently fashionable way of presenting a pop tune?)

As theater music, some of the score was interesting because of its humor. In the French silent movie about the faithless wife, the husband's pursuit of his spouse and her lover through the sewers was accompanied by the theme from *The Third Man*. This is the broadest kind of musical humor, and even Benjamin Britten stooped to it in his opera, *Albert Herring*, where he quoted a passage from *Tristan*. But the device is less effective in the theater, it seems to me, than at a party in one's own living room. More subtle was the musical cueing of Ferdinand of Bulgaria's visit to Berlin and of Hindenburg's birthday party. Both were diplomatic-military events with profound but hidden significance for millions of people. There was a grim humor in the way an atmosphere of gentility was conveyed by innocuous "potted palms" music, a solo fiddle intoning a *valse lente* off-screen.

The concluding music denies the purpose of the whole film. The narrator's long meditation on good and evil is accompanied by the kind of music that might appropriately end a radio presentation of a comedy-drama and usher in the announcer's plug for

hygiene or breakfast food. The condition of peace, it was once pointed out by Donald Ferguson, might accurately be described by music of the order of the "Air" from Bach's *Suite in D* (but not in the popular transcription "for the G string"). The effort required to achieve peace might be described by something like Beethoven's *Ninth.* It may be that men have failed to win peace because instead of striving with Beethoven to reach Bach's goal, they are content to trim their efforts to the scale of Eisbrenner's end-title music.

Wonderful Times does not deserve in itself this much attention. But its clumsy effort and paste-pot technique suggest the usefulness of the tongue-in-cheek approach to film music. This is especially true, it seems to me, in connection with the last two Chaplin films that have been shown, *Monsieur Verdoux* and *City Lights.* Funny as these pictures are, they leave an audience with the feeling that the humor constantly crosses over into areas of profound thought and feeling where all simplicities are complex and all complexities are apparently insoluble.[1] But this is not true of Chaplin's music. It is quite bald and literal. Chaplin seems to find in music only its gestural meaning and its surface emotion. Hence it seldom rises above cue catching and sentimentality, and except for the elegance of performance that nearly all music gets on sound stages nowadays, there is little to distinguish a Chaplin score from what theater organists used to provide for the silent comedies. And the more of this elegant sound you hear, the more you realize that it really belongs in a Gable-Grable romance. The boulevard music in *Verdoux,* for instance, would be appropriate in any film with a Parisian setting, and the train music is just as generalized. The only kind of wit and humor that Chaplin recognizes is the quotation of familiar themes in incongruous circumstances: in *The Great Dictator* he used a Brahms *Hungarian Dance* for the shaving scene and a fragment of *Lohengrin* for his bubble dance. Eisbrenner's quote of *The Third Man* is of the same order. But this is

[1] Jacques B. Brunius wrote an illuminating discussion of this ambiguity in *Monsieur Verdoux* in *Horizon,* XVII (March, 1948), 166–178.

really a literary, not musical, humor. True musical wit is in Stravinsky's *Circus Polka,* where the quotations of Schubert seem almost to be demanded by the rhythm and character of the music.

Stylistic parody, on the order of the "potted palm" music in *Wonderful Times,* has been slightly cultivated in Hollywood, though not by Chaplin, who ought to be its past master. Two instances, which I have cited frequently before, come again to mind: Friedhofer's parody of the concerto grosso style in *The Bishop's Wife,* and Raksin's pseudo-Handelian music for the amusing scene in the King's antechamber in *Forever Amber.* Irony of this kind is at the very core of Chaplin's picture making, but it never finds its way into his music. I would attribute its absence to the naïveté of his musical tastes. He seems to be unaware of the cultivation of wit by contemporary composers, the wit of the misplaced accent, the unsymmetrical phrase, the comically distorted harmony, or the purposeful misuse of an instrument. Such devices were not, to be sure, invented by our contemporaries. They were common in Haydn's finales and were developed into a critical method in Mozart's *Musical Joke.* Much of Stravinsky's post-*Sacre* music and even Walton's *Facade* merely revive an old tradition. And it is in this tradition that Chaplin ought to be finding his own musical methodology. It is ironic that Eisbrenner, in *Wonderful Times,* should have stumbled accidentally into procedures that Chaplin seems not even yet to be aware of.

Film Music on Records (As of July, 1951)

Compiled by GERALD PRATLEY

GERALD PRATLEY has been with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation since 1946 and at present is a film commentator and writer for Canada's national radio system. He has recently started a new series of *Music from the Films* broadcast weekly over the CBS's Trans-Canada network. In addition to his work on films, he is director of both the Toronto Film Society and the Canadian Film Institute. He also contributes reviews to *The Critic* and *Canadian Film News.*

THIS COMPILATION does not include recordings of concert ballads, popular songs, or any other kind of songs which were composed for films. Neither does it include music used in film scores but not written specially for them.

Some of the pieces of music listed have been recorded by several orchestras. Where this is the case only the most important recording is mentioned. This is either taken from the sound track; played by the same orchestra as in the film; conducted by the composer; or closest to the original score. Information about alternative recordings can usually be found in record catalogues.

KEY TO RECORD NUMBERS

American and *Canadian*	*English*
ALCO	BRUNswick
CAPitol	CAPitol LCT
COLumbia MM, ML, MX, M, D, C	COLumbia DX, LX, DB, FB
Concert Hall CH	DECca K & F
DECca, DECca A & DECca DA	His Master's Voice (HMV)
LONdon & LONdon T	PARLOphone
MERcury	
MGM	
VICtor	

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

(The titles given in brackets are the original names of the films.)

ABADY, Temple

All Over the Town (1949)
"Operetta" **10″——FM 55**
Royal Philharmonic—John Hollingsworth

Dear Mr. Prohack (1948)
"Opening Titles," "Passed to You" **10″——FM 79**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Miranda (1948)
"Opening Titles," "3 M.5" **10″——FM 9**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Woman in the Hall (1947)
"Opening Titles" **10″——FM 22**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

ADDINSELL, Richard

Blithe Spirit (1945)
"Prelude and Waltz" **12″——COL 7441-M; C12021; DX 1186**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

One Woman's Story [*The Passionate Friends*] (1949)
"Selection from the Score" **12″——COL DX1551**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

"Prelude and Mountain Music," "Mountain Music Variations" **10″——FM 45–46**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

Suicide Squadron [*Dangerous Moonlight*] (1941)
"Warsaw Concerto"
12″——COL 7409-M; C12014; DX 1062; ML2092
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson
Louis Kentner (piano)

ALWYN, William

Captain Boycott (1947)
"Opening Titles," "Waltz" **10″——FM 10**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

Cure for Love, The (1949)
"Theme" **10″——HMV B9879**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson
Sidney Crook (piano)

Desert Victory (1943)
"March: Desert Victory" **10″——COL DB2140**
H.M. Grenadier Guards Band

History of Mr. Polly, The (1949)
"Hunting Scene," "The Potwell Inn," "Wedding Scene," "Cycling" **10″——FM 53–54**
Royal Philharmonic—Muir Mathieson

Madeleine (1949)
"Waltz and Strathspey" **10″——FM 100**
Royal Philharmonic—Muir Mathieson

Magnet, The (1951)
"Prelude" **10″——FM 101**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

Notorious Gentleman, The [*The Rake's Progress*] (1946)
"Calypso Music" **12″——DEC K1544; LON T.5054**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson
(No. 2 in the Decca series "Music from the Films")

October Man, The (1947)
"Opening Titles," "Bus Crash" **10″——FM 15**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Rocking Horse Winner, The (1949)
"There Must Be More Money," "Paul's Last Ride" **10″——FM 87–88**
Royal Philharmonic—Muir Mathieson

ARNOLD, Malcolm

Women in Our Time (1949)
"Machines," "Montage: Peace and War" **10″——FM 37**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

AURIC, Georges

Another Shore (1948)
"Prelude," "The Ladder" **10″——FM 41**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

Passport to Pimlico (1949)
"The Siege of Burgundy" **10″——FM 61**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

Spider and the Fly, The (1949)
"Juggler's Waltz" **10″——FM 85**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Tight Little Island [*Whisky Galore*] (1949)
"Prelude" **10″——FM 64**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

BATH, Hubert

Love Story (1944)

"Cornish Rhapsody"

12"——COL 7440-M; C12017; DX1171; ML 2092

London Symphony—Hubert Bath

Harriet Cohen (piano)

Rhodes of Africa (1936)

"March: Empire Builders" **10"——COL FB2830**

Gaumont-British Symphony—Louis Levy

BAX, Sir Arnold

Oliver Twist (1948)

"The Oliver Theme," "The Pickpocketing," "The Chase," "Fagin's Romp," "Finale"

2 12"——COL MX-330; DX1516–17; ML 2092

Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

Harriet Cohen (piano)

"Fagin's Romp," "Finale" **10"——FM 27–28**

Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

Malta, G. C. (1943)

"Quiet Interlude," "Gay March" **12"——LON T.5054**

London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

BERNERS, Lord

Nicholas Nickleby (1946)

Incidental Music from the Film: "Nicholas and Madeline," "Kate at the Mantalinis," "Ralph Nickleby," "Miss la Creevy," "Kate & Frank," "Mr. Squeers," "The Cheeryble Brothers," "Death of Smike," "Mr. Crumbles," "The Hampton Inn," "The Wedding" **12"——COL DX1362**

Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

BLISS, Arthur

Christopher Columbus (1949)

"The Voyage Begins," "Return to Spain" **10"——FM 67–68**

Royal Philharmonic—Muir Mathieson

Men of Two Worlds (1946)

"Baraza" **12"——DEC K1174**

National Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Eileen Joyce (piano) and Male Chorus

(No. 1 in the Decca series "Music from the Films")

Things to Come (1935)
"Ballet for Children," "Pestilence," "Attack," "The World in Ruins" **3 12"——DEC K810–11 & K817**
London Symphony—Arthur Bliss
"March," "Epilogue"
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

BRIDGEWATER, Leslie

Train of Events (1949)
"Piano Concerto" **10"——FM 77**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving
Irene Kohler (piano)

BRITTEN, Benjamin

Instruments of the Orchestra (1946)
"The Young Person's Guide to the Orchestra" (Variations and Fugue on a Theme of Purcell, Op. 34)
3 12"——COL MM703; ML-4197; D192; DX1307–8–9
1—Themes: Full Orchestra; Woodwind; Brass; Strings; Percussion; Full Orchestra Variations; Flutes and Piccolo; Oboes
2—Variations: Clarinets; Bassoons; Violins (First and Second); Violas
3—Variations: 'Cellos; Double Basses; Harp
4—Variations: Horns, Trumpets, Trombones; Bass Tuba; Percussion
5—Fugue
Liverpool Philharmonic—Sir Malcolm Sargent

Village Harvest (1945)
"Irish Reel" **12"——DEC K874**
Charles Brill Orchestra

BRODSZKY, Nicholas

Carnival (1946)
"Intermezzo" **10"——COL DB2225**
Two Cities Symphony—Charles Williams

Way to the Stars (1945)
"Themes" **10"——COL DB2180**
Two Cities Symphony—Charles Williams

BURN, Wilfrid

Fools Rush In (1949)
"Themes" **10"——FM 60**
Orchestra conducted by Wilfrid Burn

BYRD, Bretton

Look Before You Love (1948)
"Themes" **10″——FM 47**
Orchestra conducted by Bretton Byrd

Tony Draws a Horse (1950)
"Prelude" **10″——FM 96**
Orchestra conducted by Bretton Byrd

CARWITHIN, Doreen

Harvest from the Wilderness (1948)
"Dance Music," "Native Quarters" **10″——FM 38**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Boys in Brown (1950)
"Overture" **10″——FM 86**
London Symphony—John Hollingsworth

CHAGRIN, Francis

Helter Skelter (1949)
"Spring Song," "End Titles" **10″——FM 74**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Last Holiday (1950)
"The Beggar Theme" **10″——COL DB2702**
Charles Williams and his Concert Orchestra

COLLINS, Anthony

Odette (1950)
"The Saga of Odette" **12″——COL DX1688**
Charles Williams and his Concert Orchestra

COPLAND, Aaron

Our Town (1940)
Three Pieces from the Score: "Story of Our Town," "Conversation at the Soda Fountain," "Resting Place on the Hill"
12″—CH A2, CH C51
Leo Smith (piano)

COWARD, Noel

Astonished Heart, The (1950)
"Symphonic Suite" **12″——HMV C3953**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

"Themes" **10″——FM 89–90**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

DAVIE, Cedric Thorpe

Brothers, The (1947)
"Rowing Contest" **10″——FM 19–20**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Snowbound (1948)
"Opening Titles," "Chalet" **10″——FM 11**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

EASDALE, Brian

Black Narcissus (1947)
"The Mad Scene" **10″——FM 18**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Red Shoes, The (1948)
"Ballet Music," "Prelude"
2 12″ COL MX-328; ML 2083; DX1597–8
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson
"Ballet" **10″——FM 13**
Royal Philharmonic—Sir Thomas Beecham
"Bougainvillea" **10″——FM 14**
Ted Heath and his Orchestra

ELLIS, Vivian

Piccadilly Incident (1946)
"Piccadilly Incident" **12″——DEC K1559**
Louis Levy and his Concert Orchestra
Henry Bronkhurst (piano)

FRANKEL, Benjamin

Amazing Mr. Beecham, The [*Chiltern Hundreds*] (1949)
"Election March" **10″——FM 81**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

Dulcimer Street [*London Belongs to Me*] (1949)
"The Petition Procession" **10″——FM 32**
Royal Philharmonic—Muir Mathieson

Gay Lady, The [*Trottie True*] (1949)
"Trottie's Coach Riding through the Park" **10″——FM 72**
Royal Philharmonic—Muir Mathieson

Girl in the Painting, The [*Portrait from Life*] (1948)
"Prelude," "A Present" **10″——FM 42**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Salt to the Devil [*Give Us This Day*] (1949)
"Dramatic Hysteria" **10″——FM-82**
London Symphony—Benjamin Frankel

Sleeping Car to Trieste (1948)
"Sleeping Car Train," "Waltz" **10″——FM 35**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

So Long at the Fair (1950)
"Carriage and Pair," "Long Forgotten Melody"
12″——COL DX1688
Charles Williams and his Concert Orchestra

GOEHR, Walter

Great Expectations (1947)
"Estella," "Great Expectations Waltz" **12″——DEC K1596**
London Symphony—Walter Goehr

Stop Press Girl (1949)
"Clocks" **10″——FM 66**
Orchestra conducted by Walter Goehr

GRAY, Allan

Life and Death of Colonel Blimp (1943)
"Commando Patrol" **10″——DEC F8364**
RAF Dance Orchestra—Jimmie Miller

Madness of the Heart (1949)
"Paul and Lydia," "Farandol" **10″——FM 69**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Mr. Perrin and Mr. Traill (1948)
"Proposal" **10″——FM 30**
London Symphony—John Hollingsworth

Reluctant Widow, The (1950)
"Love Themes" **10″——FM 94**
Orchestra conducted by Norman DelMar

Stairway to Heaven [*A Matter of Life and Death*] (1946)
"Prelude" **12″——COL 72708-D; DX1320**
Queen's Hall Light Orchestra—Charles Williams

This Man Is Mine [also titled *Millie, Phoebe and Bill*] (1946)
"Prelude" **12″——COL 72708-D; DX 1320**
Queen's Hall Light Orchestra—Charles Williams

GREEN, Philip

Ha' Penny Breeze (1950)
"Theme Music" **12"——COL DX1724**
Philip Green and his Orchestra

Murder without Crime (1950)
"Song of Soho" **12"——COL DX1702**
Orchestra conducted by Philip Green
William McGuffie (piano)

GREENWOOD, John

Broken Journey (1948)
"Opening Titles" **10"——FM 12**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

Eureka Stockade (1949)
"Prelude," "Fight in the Stockade" **10"——FM 49**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

Hungry Hill (1947)
"Waltz into Jig" **12"——DEC K1579**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson
(No. 4 in the Decca series "Music from the Films")

Nine Men (1943)
"March: Eighth Army" (by Eric Coates) **10"——COL DB2140**
H. M. Grenadier Guards Band

Trio [*Sanatorium*] (1950)
"Love Scene" **10"——FM 99**
Royal Philharmonic—Muir Mathieson

GRUN, Bernard

Blind Goddess, The (1948)
"Prelude" **10"——FM 29**
Philharmonia Orchestra—John Hollingsworth

HOPKINS, Anthony

It's Hard to Be Good (1948)
"Montage: Honeymoon" **10"——FM 39**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Vice Versa (1945)
"Montage: Travel," "Fuzzie Wuzzies," "Merry Wives of Windsor"
2 10"——FM 7–8 & 16
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson
"Opening Titles"
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Vote for Huggett (1949)
"Election Fight," "Finale" **10″——FM 50**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

IRELAND, John

Overlanders, The (1946)
"Overlanders" **12″——DEC K1602 and LON T.5055**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson
(No. 5 in the Decca series "Music from the Films")

IRVING, Ernest

Bitter Springs [also titled *Savage Justice*] (1950)
"Kangaroo Theme" **10″——FM 104**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

IRVING, Robert

Floodtide (1949)
"Prelude," "The Yacht" **10″——FM 56**
London Symphony—Robert Irving

JACOB, Gordon

Esther Waters (1948)
"Derby Day 1886" **10″——FM 34**
Royal Philharmonic—Muir Mathieson

JAUBERT, Maurice

Carnet de Bal, Le (1937)
"Valse Grise" **10″——COL DB1767**
Symphony Orchestra—Cariven

KARAS, Anton

Third Man, The (1949)
"The Third Man Theme,"[1] "Cafe Mozart Waltz"
10″——LON 536; DEC F9235
Anton Karas (zither)

LUCAS, Leighton

Target for Tonight (1941)
"March: Freihausen, Here We Come" **10″——HMV RAF 11**
Central Band of the RAF

[1] In England "The Third Man Theme" was called "Harry Lime Theme."

MATHIEU, André

Whispering City (1947)
"Quebec Concerto" **10″——COL DB2526**
Charles Williams and his Concert Orchestra
Arthur Dulay (piano)

MAY, Hans

Warning to Wantons (1949)
"Forest Glade," "Prelude" **10″——FM 48**
Orchestra conducted by Hans May

MELACHRINO, George

Dark Secret (1950)
"Theme Waltz" **10″——HMV B9805**
The Melachrino Strings

No Orchids for Miss Blandish (1948)
"Introduction," "Song of the Orchid," "Danse d'Extase"
12″——HMV C3736
The Melachrino Orchestra

Story of Shirley Yorke, The (1950)
"Portrait of a Lady" **10″——HMV B9678**
The Melachrino Strings

Woman to Woman (1947)
"Vision d'Amour" **10″——HMV B9535**
The Melachrino Strings

NEWMAN, Alfred

All About Eve (1950)
"Themes" **12″——MER MG 20037**
Alfred Newman and the Hollywood Symphony
(No. 2 in selection "Motion Picture Music")

Captain from Castile (1947)
"Prelude," "Pedro De Vargas," "Captain from Castile," "Catana, the Young Peasant Girl," "The Lady Luisa," "Juan, the Adventurer," "Wonders of the New World," "The Magic Ring," "Fears of Persecution," "The Compassionate Priest," "Fulfillment in the New World" **3 10″——MER A-69; MER MG-20005**
Twentieth Century-Fox Studio Orchestra—Newman

How Green Was My Valley (1941)
"Themes" **10″——MER 1150**
Alfred Newman and his Symphony Orchestra

Letter to Three Wives, A (1948)
"Themes" **12″——MER MG 20037**
Alfred Newman and the Hollywood Symphony
(No. 6 in selection "Motion Picture Music")

Pinky (1949)
"Themes" **12″——MER MG 20037**
Alfred Newman and the Hollywood Symphony
(No. 3 in selection "Motion Picture Music")

Razor's Edge, The (1946)
"Theme" **12″——MER MG 20037**
Alfred Newman and the Hollywood Symphony
(No. 4 in selection "Motion Picture Music")

Song of Bernadette (1943)
"Prelude," "Scherzo and Pastorale," "The Grotto," "The Wild Rose Bush," "The Song of Bernadette," "The Vision," "The Sadness of Bernadette," "Her Persecution," "The Miracle and Her Pilgrimage to Lourdes," "Farewell of all Farewells," "Antoine's Devotion," "Not for Me Flows the Spring," "Bernadette's Affliction," "You Are Now in Heaven and on Earth O Bernadette,"
"Arise My Love" **4 10″——DEC DA 365**
Alfred Newman and his Concert Orchestra
"Theme" **12″——MER MG 20037**
Alfred Newman and the Hollywood Symphony
(No. 5 in selection "Motion Picture Music")

Street Scene (1931)
"Sentimental Rhapsody" **10″——MER 1150**
Alfred Newman and his Symphony Orchestra

Wuthering Heights (1939)
"Cathy" **12″——MER MG 20037**
Alfred Newman and the Hollywood Symphony
(No. 1 in selection "Motion Picture Music")

PAKEMAN, Kenneth

Boy, a Girl and a Bike, A (1949)
"The Championship Race" **10″——FM 63**
London Symphony—John Hollingsworth

PARKER, Clifton

Blanche Fury (1947)
"Opening Titles," "Blanche Riding," "Fire Sequence," "Blanche Leaves the Drawing Room" **10″——FM 5–6**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

Blue Lagoon (1949)
"The Island" **10″——FM 57-58**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Raider, The [*Western Approaches*] (1945)
"Seascape" **12″——DEC K1544**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson
(No. 2 in the Decca series "Music from the Films")

PROKOFIEV, Serge

Alexander Nevsky (1939)
Alexander Nevsky Cantata, Op. 78: "Russia Under the Mongolian Yoke," "Song of Alexander Nevsky," "The Crusaders in Pskov," "Arise, Ye Russian People," "The Battle on the Ice," "Field of the Dead," "Alexander's Entry into Pskov"
5 12″——COL MM-580; D141; LX977-81; ML 4247
Philadelphia Orchestra—Eugene Ormandy
Jennie Tourel (mezzo-soprano) and the Westminster Choir
(John Finley Williamson, conductor)

Czar Wants to Sleep, The [*Lieutenant Kije*] (1934)
Suite, Lieutenant Kije, Op. 60: "Birth of Kije," "Romance," "Kije's Wedding," "Troika," "Burial of Kije"
3 12″——VIC DM-459
Boston Symphony—Serge Koussevitzky

RAKSIN, David

Forever Amber (1947)
"Amber," "The King's Mistress," "Whitefriar's Music," "The Idyll at Chiverton Cottage," "The Great Fire of London," "Forever Amber" **3 10″——VIC P-197**
Twentieth Century-Fox Studio Orchestra—Raksin

Laura (1944)
"Themes" **12″——VIC 11-8808**
Janssen Symphony of Los Angeles—Werner Janssen

RAWSTHORNE, Alan

Saraband [*Saraband for Dead Lovers*] (1948)
"Prelude" **10″——FM 31**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

ROTA, Nino

Glass Mountain, The (1949)
"Legend of the Glass Mountain," "Song of the Mountains"
10″——HMV B9765
Melachrino Orchestra—George Melachrino

Hidden Room, The [*Obsession*] (1950)
"Theme" **10″——PARLO R3264**
Sidney Torch and his Orchestra

ROZSA, Miklos

Jungle Book, The (1942)
"Music for the Film" **3 12″——VIC M-905**
Victor Concert Orchestra—Miklos Rozsa with Sabu (narrator)

Lost Weekend, The (1945)
"Theme" **12″——VIC 46–0000**
Al Goodman and his Concert Orchestra
Vladimir Sokoloff (piano), Irving Prager (violin)

Lydia (1941)
"Theme" **12″——VIC 46–0003**
Henri René and his Concert Orchestra

Madame Bovary (1949)
"Madame Bovary's Waltz," "Prelude and Romance," "Torment and Passepied" **2 10″——MGM 43**
MGM Symphony Orchestra—Miklos Rozsa

Red House, The (1947)
"Prelude," "Retribution," "Screams in the Night," "The Forest" **2 10″——CAP CB48**
Symphony Orchestra—Miklos Rozsa

Spellbound (1946)
"Theme" **12″——VIC 28–0404**
Al Goodman and his Concert Orchestra
Irving Prager (violin)
"Excerpts from the Score" **10″——REM LP-1**
Symphony Orchestra—Miklos Rozsa

SHAW, Artie

Second Chorus (1940)
"Concerto for Clarinet" **12″——VIC 36383; HMV C3231**
Artie Shaw and his Orchestra

SHUKEN, Leo

Fabulous Dorseys, The (1947)
"The Dorsey Concerto" **12″——VIC 46–0009**
Orchestra conducted by Louis Forbes
Tommy Dorsey (trombone), Jimmy Dorsey (alto saxophone)

SPOLIANSKY, Mischa

Adam and Evelyn (1949)
"A Trip Round London" **10"——FM 65**
Royal Philharmonic—Muir Mathieson

Idol of Paris (1948)
"Dedication," "Illusion and Themes" **12"——COL DX1458**
Queen's Hall Light Orchestra—Sidney Torch
Mischa Spoliansky (piano)

That Dangerous Age (1949)
"Song of Capri" **10"——COL DB2564**
Queen's Hall Light Orchestra—Sidney Torch

Wanted for Murder (1946)
"Voice in the Night" **12"——COL 72709-D; DX 1264**
Queen's Hall Light Orchestra—Charles Williams
Eric Harrison (piano)

STEINER, Max

Four Wives (1939)
"Symphonie Moderne" (on a theme by M. Rabinowitsch)
12"——VIC 11-8311
Janssen Symphony of Los Angeles—Werner Janssen

Gone with the Wind (1939)
"Themes" **12"——VIC 28-0419**
Al Goodman and his Concert Orchestra

Informer, The (1935)
"Extracts from the Score"
12"——CAP P-255 and KCF250; LCT 6005
Orchestra conducted by Max Steiner
(No. 3 in selection "Music by Max Steiner")

Now Voyager (1942)
"Extracts from the Score"
12"——CAP P-255 and KCF250; LCT 6005
Orchestra conducted by Max Steiner
(No. 2 in selection "Music by Max Steiner")

Since You Went Away (1944)
"Extracts from the Score"
12"——CAP P-255 and KCF250; LCT 6005
Orchestra conducted by Max Steiner
(No. 1 in selection "Music by Max Steiner")

STEVENS, Bernard

Once a Jolly Swagman (1948)

"The Rider's March," "Montage: Rise to Fame" **10″——FM 40**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

Upturned Glass, The (1947)

"Final Suicide Scene" **10″——FM 17**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

STEVENS, Leith

Destination Moon (1950)

"Music from the Film" **10″——COL CL-6151**
(No orchestra designated)

TANSMAN, Alexander

Flesh and Fantasy (1943)

"Scherzo" **12″——VIC 11-8808**
Janssen Symphony of Los Angeles—Werner Janssen

THOMSON, Virgil

Louisiana Story (1948)

Orchestral Suite from the Film: "Pastoral," "Chorale," "Passacaglia," "Fugue" **12″——COL ML 2087; MX 329**
Philadelphia Orchestra—Eugene Ormandy

Plough That Broke the Plains, The (1936)

Excerpts from the Film Score: "Prologue," "Grass," "Cattle," "Blues," "Drought," "Devastation" **2 12″——VIC DM-1116**
Hollywood Bowl Symphony—Leopold Stokowski

TIOMKIN, Dimitri

Duel in the Sun (1946)

Excerpts from the Film Score: "Rio Grande," "Orizaba," "On the Trail to Spanish Bit," "Rendezvous," "Prairie Sky," "Trek to the Sun," "Duel at Squaw's Head," "Passional," "Love Eternal" **4 10″——VIC DM-1083**
Boston "Pops" Orchestra—Arthur Fiedler

"Spanish Bit," "Prairie Sky" **HMV B9556**
Boston "Pops" Orchestra—Arthur Fiedler

VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, Ralph

Invaders, The [49th Parallel] (1941)

"Theme from the Prelude" **10″——HMV B9879**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

"Epilogue" **12″——LON T.5053**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Loves of Joanna Godden, The (1947)

Incidental Music from the Film: "Romney Marsh," "Joanna Godden," "Sheepshearing," "Work on the Farm," "The Fair," "Martin Drowned at Dungeness," "Ellen and Harry Trevor," "Adoption of the Motherless Lamb," "Burning of the Sheep," "Reunion" **12"——COL 72710-D; DX1377**

Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

Scott of the Antarctic (1948)

"Prologue," "Pony March," "Penguins," "Climbing the Glacier," "The Return," "Blizzard," "Final Music" **12"——HMV C3834**

Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

"Two Antarctic Scenes," "Dog Teams on the Ice" **10"——FM 43–44**

Philharmonia Orchestra—Ernest Irving

WALTON, William

Hamlet (1948)

Excerpts: **3 12"——VIC DM-1273; HMV C3755–6–7; LCT-5**

"O, That This Too Too Solid Flesh," "To Be or Not To Be"

Sir Laurence Olivier

"Speak the Speech"

Sir Laurence Olivier and Harcourt Williams

"The Play Scene"

Sir Laurence Olivier

"How Long Hast Thou Been Grave Maker"

Sir Laurence Olivier and Stanley Holloway

"Funeral March"

Orchestra only

All (except "How Long Hast Thou Been Grave Maker") with the Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

"Duel Scene," "Soliloquy" **10"——FM 1–2**

"Entry of the Court," "Players Scene," "Where Is My Mother," "Follow That Lord" **10"——FM 3–4**

Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

Henry V (1945)

"Death of Falstaff," "Touch Her Soft Lips and Part" **12"——HMV C3480**

Philharmonia Strong Orchestra—William Walton

Excerpts: **4 12"——VIC DM-1128; HMV C3583–86**

"London 1600: Globe Theatre"

Orchestra and Chorus

"First Chorus Speech," "Once More Unto the Breach"
Laurence Olivier and Orchestra

"Now Entertain Conjecture of a Time"
Laurence Olivier and Orchestra

"Night Before the Battle," "Upon the King"
Laurence Olivier

"St. Crispin's Day"
Laurence Olivier and Orchestra

"The Battle of Agincourt"
Orchestra

"The Battle of Agincourt (Part 2)," "Burgundy's Speech"
Laurence Olivier and Orchestra

"Last Chorus Speech—Madrigal," "Agincourt Song"
Laurence Olivier, Orchestra and Chorus
All with the Philharmonia Orchestra and Chorus—William Walton

Spitfire [First of the Few] (1942)
"Spitfire Prelude and Fugue" **12"——HMV C3359**
Halle Orchestra—William Walton
Laurence Turner (violin)

WARD, Edward

Phantom of the Opera (1943)
"Lullaby of the Bells" **10"——LON 121**
Mantovani and his Orchestra

WARRACK, Guy

Theirs Is the Glory (1946)
"March: Men of Arnhem" **12"——DEC K1571**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson
(No. 3 in the Decca series "Music from the Films")

WAXMAN, Franz

Paradine Case, The (1948)
"Thematic Material" **2 10"——ALCO A 10**
Symphony Orchestra conducted by Franz Waxman
Edward Rebner (piano)

WHYTE, Ian

Bonnie Prince Charlie (1948)
"Flora and Charles Theme" **12"——GB-KALEE T10938**
London Films Symphony—Dr. Hubert Clifford

WILKINSON, Arthur

Calendar, The (1948)
"The Ascot Gold Cup" **10″——FM 25**
Philharmonia Orchestra—Muir Mathieson

It's Not Cricket (1949)
"Love Scene to Music" **10″——FM 62**
London Symphony—John Hollingsworth

Perfect Woman, The (1949)
"Prelude" **10″——FM 70**
Philharmonia Orchestra—John Hollingsworth

Once Upon a Dream (1949)
"Carol's Dream" **10″——FM 51–52**
London Symphony—John Hollingsworth

Weaker Sex, The (1948)
"Montage: Victory Parade," "London Scene" **10″——FM 33**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

WILLIAMS, Charles

Flesh and Blood (1951)
"Through the Years" **COL DB2836**
Charles Williams and his Concert Orchestra

Naughty Arlette [*The Romantic Age*] (1949)
"Themes" **10″——FM 83**
Orchestra conducted by Charles Williams

Night Has Eyes, The (1946)
"Night Has Eyes" **10″——COL DB2272**
Queen's Hall Light Orchestra—Charles Williams

Silk Noose, The [*Noose*] (1948)
"Incidental Music" **12″——COL DX1518**
Charles Williams and his Concert Orchestra

While I Live (1948) [reissued as *The Dream of Olwen*]
"Incidental Music" **12″——COL 72688-D; DX1433**
Charles Williams and his Concert Orchestra
Arthur Dulay (piano)

WILLIAMSON, Lambert

Cardboard Cavalier (1949)
"The Russian Dancing Master" **10″——FM 59**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Edge of the World (1937)
"The Last Walk" **12″——DEC K1579**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson
(No. 4 in the Decca series "Music from the Films")

They Were Not Divided (1950)
"March of the Tanks" **10″——FM 93**
London Symphony—Muir Mathieson

Woman Hater (1948)
"People in Love," "Dinner at Lady Datchett's" **10″——FM 36**
Royal Philharmonic—John Hollingsworth

WOOLDRIDGE, John

Woman in Question, The (1950)
"Romantic Interlude" **10″——FM 98**
Philharmonia Orchestra—John Wooldridge

YOUNG, Victor

And the Angels Sing (1944)
"Concerto Theme" **10″——CAP 10068**
Orchestra conducted by Paul Weston
Diana Lynn (piano)

For Whom the Bell Tolls (1943)
"The Massacre and Love Theme," "Pablo's Gypsy Cave," "The Earth Moved (Love Theme)," "Pilar's Warning," "Maria's Tale of Horror," "Roberto's Farewell" **3 10″——DEC A 360; DL-8008**
Victor Young and his Concert Orchestra

Golden Earrings (1947)
"Prelude," "Escape and Lament," "By the River," "Gypsy Camp," "Love Theme and Gypsy Dance," "Finale"
3 10″——DEC DA 644; DL-8008
Victor Young and his Concert Orchestra

Love Letters (1945)
"Love Letters" **10″——DEC 23468**
Victor Young and his Concert Orchestra

Samson and Delilah (1950)
"Samson's Call," "Miriam and the Dance to Dagon," "The Valley of Zorah," "The Feather Dance," "Delilah's Theme," "Blind Samson," "The Philistine's March," "Delilah's Remorse," "The Feast Dance," "Bacchanale," "Delilah's Harp," "Samson and Delilah" **4 10″——DEC DA 747; DL-6007; BRUN LA8517**
The Paramount Symphony Orchestra—Victor Young

Uninvited, The (1944)
"Stella by Starlight" **10"——DEC 23468**
Victor Young and his Concert Orchestra

All film music listed in this compilation is to be found under the name of the composer. Where the name of the film is known, but not the name of the composer, the following index will provide the information.

INDEX

Esther Waters
Jacob
Eureka Stockade
Greenwood

Fabulous Dorseys, The
Shuken
First of the Few
See *Spitfire*
Flesh and Blood
Williams
Flesh and Fantasy
Tansman
Floodtide
Irving
Fools Rush In
Burn
For Whom the Bell Tolls
Young
Forever Amber
Raksin
49th Parallel
See *The Invaders*
Four Wives
Steiner

Gay Lady, The
Frankel
Girl in the Painting, The
Frankel
Give Us This Day
See *Salt to the Devil*
Glass Mountain
Rota
Golden Earrings
Young
Gone With the Wind
Steiner
Great Expectations
Goehr

Hamlet
Walton
Ha' Penny Breeze
Green
Harvest from the Wilderness
Carwithin
Helter Skelter
Chagrin
Henry V
Walton
Hidden Room
See *Obsession*
History of Mr. Polly
Alwyn
How Green Was My Valley
Newman
Hungry Hill
Greenwood

Idol of Paris
Spoliansky
Informer, The
Steiner
Instruments of the Orchestra
Britten
Invaders, The
Vaughan Williams
It's Hard To Be Good
Hopkins
It's Not Cricket
Wilkinson

Jungle Book, The
Rozsa

Last Holiday
Chagrin
Laura
Raksin
Letter to Three Wives, A
Newman
Lieutenant Kije
See *The Czar Wants to Sleep*
Life and Death of Colonel Blimp
Gray
London Belongs to Me
See *Dulcimer Street*
Look Before You Love
Byrd
Lost Weekend
Rozsa
Louisiana Story
Thomson
Love Letters
Young
Love Story
Bath
Loves of Joanna Godden
Vaughan Williams
Lydia
Rozsa

Madame Bovary
Rozsa
Madeleine
Alwyn
Madness of the Heart
Gray
Magnet
Alwyn
Malta, G. C.
Bax
Matter of Life and Death, A
See *Stairway to Heaven*
Men of Two Worlds
Bliss
Millie, Phoebe and Bill
See *This Man Is Mine*
Miranda
Abady
Mr. Perrin and Mr. Traill
Gray
Murder Without Crime
Green

Naughty Arlette
See *The Romantic Age*
Nicholas Nickleby
Berners
Night Has Eyes, The
Williams
Nine Men
Greenwood
No Orchids for Miss Blandish
Melachrino
Noose
See *The Silk Noose*
Notorious Gentleman, The
Alwyn
Now Voyager
Steiner

Obsession
See *The Hidden Room*
October Man, The
Alwyn
Odette
Collins
Oliver Twist
Bax
Once a Jolly Swagman
Stevens
Once Upon a Dream
Wilkinson
One Woman's Story
Addinsell
Our Town
Copland
Overlanders, The
Ireland

Paradine Case, The
Waxman
Passionate Friends, The
See *One Woman's Story*
Passport to Pimlico
Auric
Perfect Woman, The
Wilkinson
Phantom of the Opera
Ward
Piccadilly Incident
Ellis
Pinky
Newman
Plough That Broke the Plains
Thomson
Portrait from Life
See *The Girl in the Painting*

Raider, The
Parker
Rake's Progress, The
See *The Notorious Gentleman*
Razor's Edge, The
Newman
Red House, The
Rozsa
Red Shoes, The
Easdale
Reluctant Widow, The
Gray
Rhodes of Africa
Bath
Rocking Horse Winner, The
Alwyn
Romantic Age, The
Williams

Salt to the Devil
Frankel
Samson and Delilah
Young

Sanatorium
See *Trio*
Saraband
Rawsthorne
Saraband for Dead Lovers
See *Saraband*
Savage Justice
See *Bitter Springs*
Scott of the Antarctic
Vaughan Williams
Second Chorus
Shaw
Silk Noose, The
Williams
Since You Went Away
Steiner
Sleeping Car to Trieste
Frankel
Snowbound
Davie
So Long at the Fair
Frankel
Song of Bernadette
Newman
Spellbound
Rozsa
Spider and the Fly
Auric
Spitfire
Walton
Stairway to Heaven
Gray
Stop Press Girl
Goehr
Story of Shirley Yorke
Melachrino
Street Scene
Newman
Suicide Squadron
Addinsell

Target for Tonight
Lucas
That Dangerous Age
Spoliansky
Theirs Is the Glory
Warrack
They Were Not Divided
Williamson
Things to Come
Bliss
Third Man, The
Karas
This Man Is Mine
Gray
Tight Little Island
Auric
Tony Draws a Horse
Byrd
Train of Events
Bridgewater
Trio
Greenwood
Trottie True
See *The Gay Lady*

Uninvited, The
Young
Upturned Glass, The
Stevens

Vice Versa
Hopkins
Village Harvest
Britten
Vote for Huggett
Hopkins

Wanted for Murder
Spoliansky
Warning to Wantons
May
Way to the Stars
Brodszky
Weaker Sex, The
Wilkinson
Western Approaches
See *The Raider*
While I Live
Williams
Whiskey Galore
See *Tight Little Island*
Whispering City
Mathieu
Woman Hater
Williamson
Woman in the Hall
Abady

Woman in Question
Wooldridge
Woman to Woman
Melachrino
Women in Our Time
Arnold
Wuthering Heights
Newman

Young Person's Guide to the Orchestra
See *Instruments of the Orchestra*

French Film Publications (August 1944–December 1948)

A Preliminary List to a Basic Bibliography—Part III

ALEXIS N. VORONTZOFF

ALEXIS N. VORONTZOFF was a French film student at the Institut de Filmologie before joining the Films and Visual Information Division of UNESCO, in Paris, as research assistant. He contributed "Bibliographie du Cinéma" to *Annuaire du Cinéma, 1948* and *Le Tout Cinéma, 1950*. This concludes the bibliography which has appeared in Volume V, Numbers 2 and 4, of the *Hollywood Quarterly*.

Presse-Radio-Film. Rapport de la Commission des besoins techniques aprés enquête dans douze pays devastés par la guerre. Paris: UNESCO, 1947. 194 pp. An English edition of this work is available.

Presse-Radio-Film. Rapport de la Commission des besoins techniques après enquête dans dix-sept pays. Paris: UNESCO, 1948. 344 + vi pp. An English edition of this work is available.

Presse-Radio-Film. Rapport de la Commission des besoins techniques publié en 1947 après enquête dans douze pays. Premier supplément. Paris: UNESCO, 1948. 40 pp.

Procès Verbal de la réunion du 11 Avril 1945. Paris: Comité International pour la Diffusion Artistique, Littéraire et Scientifique par le Cinématographe, 1945. 12 pp.

Prudhommeau. *Le Cinema éducatif et l'avenir*. Paris: Union Française Universitaire. 12 pp.

Recueil de scénarios pour l'amateur cinéaste. Paris: Société Française Pathé Baby, 1948. 39 pp.

Regards sur le cinéma, le théâtre, la radio, la littérature, les revues, les magazines pour enfants, etc. Lyon: Office Familial de Documentation Artistique, 1945. 72 pp.

Régent, Roger. *Cinéma de France*. Paris: Editions Bellefaye, 1948. 302 pp.

Regnier, Jean. *La Technique du dessin animé*. Paris: Nouvelles Editions Film et Technique, 1947. 28 pp.

Répertoire de la Cinématographie Française. Versailles: Edition M. Court. 100 pp.

Répertoire général illustré des films, 1945. Lyon: Editions Presse Lyonnaise, 1945. 419 pp.

Répertoire général illustré des films, 1947. Lyon: Editions Penser Vrai, 1947. 580 pp.

Répertoire général illustré des films, 1948–1949. Paris: Editions Penser Vrai, 1948. 448 pp.

Emile Reynaud, Peintre de Films, 1844–1918. Paris: Office Français d'Edition, 1945. 77 pp. The text comprises articles by three contributors.

Rouquier, Georges. *Album de Farrebique.* Paris: Editions Fortuny, 1947. 101 pp.

Roy, Jean. *Hollywood en pantoufles.* Preface by F. Chalais. Paris: Au blé qui lève, 1947. xvi + 227 pp.

Ruszkowski, André. *Cinéma, Art nouveau.* Lyon: Editions Penser Vrai, 1946. 64 pp.

Sadoul, Georges. *Histoire Générale du Cinéma, Volume I: Invention du Cinéma, 1832–1897.* Paris: Editions Denoël, 1946. 362 pp.

———. *Histoire Générale du Cinéma, Volume I: Invention du cinema, 1832–1897.* Paris: Editions Denoël, 1948. 438 pp.

This volume is an illustrated, revised, and corrected edition of the preceding work.

———. *Histoire Générale du Cinéma, Volume II: les Pionniers du Cinéma de Méliès à Pathé, 1897–1909.* Paris: Editions Denoël, 1947. 626 pp.

———. *Le Cinéma: Son art, sa technique, son économie.* Paris: La Bibliothèque Française, 1948. 222 pp.

Simonet, Roger. *Cent ans d'image.* Paris: Calmann Lévy Editeur, 1947. 287 pp.

Syndicat des travailleurs de l'industrie du film et le syndicat des techniciens de la production proposent une réorganisation immédiate de l'industrie du cinéma français. Paris: Imprimerie Drivon. 16 pp.

Tassel, G., and P. Thevenard. *Le Cinéma scientifique français.* Preface by Jean Painlevé. Paris: Editions de la Jeune Parque, 1948. xiv + 214 pp.

Tissier, Jean, *Sans maquillage.* Paris: Flammarion Editeur, 1945. 221 pp.

Tout Cinema, Année 1946 (Le). Paris: Editions Guilhamou. 1410 pp.

Vedrès, Nicole. *Images du cinéma français.* Foreword by Paul Eluard. Paris: Editions du Chêne, 1945. 150 pp.

Vérités sur le cinéma français. Paris: Editions Modernes. 48 pp.

This includes articles by fourteen contributors.

Véry, Pierre. *La Chartreuse de Parme, d'après le roman de Stendhal.* Paris: Editions SELF, 1948. 171 pp.

Vingtième anniversaire du film parlant. Paris: Warner Bros. 32 pp.

Vingt-quatre images à la seconde. Paris: Imprimerie Draeger, 1947. 32 pp.

Vivié, Jean. *Traité Général de Technique du Cinéma, Volume I: Historique et développement de la technique cinématographique.* Paris: Editions Bureau de Presse et d'Informations, 1946. 137 + i + xxxiii pp.

———. *Guide de l'opérateur de projection sonore.* Paris: Centre National du Cinéma, 1947. 113 pp. and 17 plates.

Books and Journals of the Quarter

Book Editor, FRANKLIN FEARING

BOOKS

ALTHOUGH most of us have heard that the film industry in India is the second largest in the world, few in the West know anything about its product, its organization, or its audience. *The Indian Film* by Panna Shah (Motion Picture Society of India, Sandhurst Building, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4) fills this vacuum. It is a full-dress study of the industry, its production and distribution methods, its audience, and the kinds of films it produces. There are chapters on the history of the Indian film, on Indian film stars, and Indian film censorship regulations which, incidentally, seem to be even more rigorous than our own and equally confused as to purpose and application. There are penetrating discussions of the content of Indian films, Indian fan magazines, and Indian film audiences.

But Dr. Shah gives us considerably more than the statistics of production, distribution, and the like. She is basically concerned with (if you will excuse the phrase) the social significance of films not only in India but in the world. She raises such questions as: "What sort of impact does the content of motion pictures have on the audience?" "What are the psychological needs of the audience?" "Why do they go to the pictures?" and is not put off with the "entertainment" and "escapism" clichés. She is, to be sure, faced with the lamentable fact that this gigantic industry in India and elsewhere knows practically nothing about its product or why people use it. In dealing with the crucial problem of impact, Dr. Shah makes all possible use of available literature, and if she leans somewhat too heavily on the dated Payne studies of the early 'thirties, she may be excused because of the dearth of later investigations. She is, it should be noted, a severe critic of the home product. A depressing picture is presented of an industry apparently un-

aware of its responsibilities, of films that are artificial and stereotyped ("the lovers always walk on the same river bank, run over the same artificial bridge and sing under the same man-made moon"), and shown in badly ventilated, bug-ridden houses.

This reviewer was interested to discover some of the ways in which Indian films differ from the Western product. All Indian pictures regardless of type contain songs, a large number (too many, Dr. Shah believes) are concerned with subjects from Indian mythology, dance sequences appear frequently, humor is not an integral part of the plots, and censorship regulations prohibit kissing on the screen.

This book is significant not only because it is the first comprehensive study in English of a non-Western film industry, but because the author sees the subject in its social context. *The Indian Film* was a doctoral dissertation in the Department of Sociology at the University of Bombay. It is very readable, nevertheless.

Books on every phase of film making, radio, and TV production continue to appear. They expound every aspect of the technologies of these most technological of the arts. They are written for people with a wide variety of interests—the layman who wants to know "something" about film and radio techniques, the amateur movie maker, and the student in professional training. These books obviously fill a need and, with few exceptions, do a competent job. In fact, they tell the reader almost everything he wants to know about movies, or radio, except what movies and radio are about, what their effects are, or why people go to them. Of course, it may be argued that there isn't much data on these points. But there are problems and research methodologies, and a growing body of data all of which might interest the amateur or the student who wants to be a professional. As a matter of fact, the problems of impact as distinct from the problems of gagetry are the primary research target of the several agencies of the government concerned with the utilization of radio and film for purposes of communication. Currently, their major research is explicitly designed

to reveal the complicated and subtle relationships between films and people. The technicians of this research will have to be trained in the techniques of analysis of human relations as well as the techniques of making movies.

Two books for which the foregoing is not an altogether fair introduction reflect the diversified types of audience to which discussions of these topics appeal.

Film-Making from Script to Screen, by Andrew Buchanan (Phoenix House, Ltd., 38 William IV Street, Charing Cross, London, 1951), is a much simplified, nontechnical exposition of the subject. There are chapters on camera use, directing, and cutting. The second half of the book is concerned with the applications of the principles to specific subjects. These include "Filming a Village," "Filming a Town," "Filming a Hospital," and "Filming Your Own Views." A good deal of information seems to be packed into the book's 160 pages. As the cover blurb suggests it should be of interest to the movie-goer who wants background on film making and to the amateur seeking to achieve professional standards.

Film and Its Techniques, by Raymond Spottiswoode (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California, 1951), is a wholly different sort of book. It is a comprehensive presentation that covers everything from studio organization to the details of the magnetic recording of sound on film. Included are discussions of the camera, cutting, animation, developing, and printing of films, color, sound, recording, lighting, and "things to come." The last is devoted to TV and film. Nothing seems to be omitted. There is, for example, the form of legal waiver which the manager of a film unit on location should obtain from bystanders whose faces may appear in individual shots, and the long sections on sound and color are introduced by concise expositions of the physics of sound and light. The author's grasp of these complex technologies is impressive. This erudition underscores his statement that although the film industry, especially in America, has exploited the myth of its technical progress, actually its record is

far from spectacular as compared, say, with contemporary advances in physics and antibiotics.

Considering the technicalities of the subject, the style is remarkably clear and readable. Special note should be made of the large number of interesting and frequently amusing line drawings which illustrate the text. Credit for these goes to M. Jean-Paul Ladouceur. There is a bibliography and a thousand-word glossary of film terms.

Mr. Spottiswoode states that his purpose is to start the newcomer well on his professional way. He will be well along indeed if he masters the contents of this book. The author's well-known *Grammar of the Film* has recently been reprinted by the University of California Press. Together these books probably constitute the most comprehensive treatment of film theory and technique yet to appear.

Whether he is called "Charlot," "Carlino," "Carlos," or "Charlie," the moving image of the little man in the baggy pants with the slender cane and indestructible derby hat has probably been seen and identified by more people than any other man living or dead. Any book about this figure called by Gilbert Seldes the "one universal man of modern times" is automatically important. A definitive study would be a major contribution to a half dozen fields in the arts, humanities, and sciences. Is *Charlie Chaplin,* by Theodore Huff (Henry Schuman, New York, 1951), such a book? For this reviewer the answer is a qualified no. Mr. Huff has done an exhaustive job of research. There is a complete chronological index of the Chaplin films with plots, casts, and credit lists. The text contains a running account of the detailed circumstances surrounding the production of most of the films as well as Chaplin's various political and amorous adventures or misadventures. There is even an appendix in which appear thumbnail biographies of all Chaplin's professional associates past and present. It all adds up to a 350-page book containing more authoritative information about Charles Chaplin than has ever before been gathered in one place,

but in some curious way, except for the fact that his name appears in every paragraph, Chaplin himself doesn't seem to be in the book. It is as if the author had never met his subject and had been forced to depend on secondary sources for his information. Evidently Mr. Huff found his subject baffling enough. It is significant that on page two he finds it necessary to refer to the "enigmatic" and "inexplicable" aspects of Chaplin's life, and to his "multifaceted" and "complex" personality and "non-conformistic," "individualistic," and "anarchistic" behavior. Such a person is not easy to write about, especially if he is alive. Nevertheless the book is a useful and interesting contribution to film literature. It is useful as a reliable source of information about Chaplin films especially in his early period, and it will be a joy to those nostalgic middle-aged persons who as youngsters never missed a Chaplin film.

In *The History of the British Film, 1914–1918* (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London, 1950), Rachael Low continues the series in which two previous volumes covering the periods 1896–1906 and 1906–1914 have already appeared. This series is published under the joint auspices of the British Film Institute and the British Film Academy. The present volume is divided into two parts, one of which deals with the industry, its organization, regulation, and distribution problems, the other with the films produced during the period covered. One interesting chapter is devoted to a detailed analysis of two films—*Jane Shore* and *The Vicar of Wakefield*—chosen as examples of films of the period. There are several appendices, one of which is devoted to an analysis of the equipment, space, staff, and film-processing facilities of British film studios. A second and third present detailed synopses of film scripts and a fourth contains a list, with production credits, lengths, and dates, of all fiction films produced between August, 1914, and December, 1918, on which sufficiently reliable information was available to make their inclusion useful for reference purposes. Approximately 500 films appear on this list. The pres-

ent volume, like the others, is a scholarly and interesting contribution to film history. The text of this and the previous volumes is the basis of a thesis accepted by the University of London for the doctorate in philosophy.

The Craftsmanship of the One-Act Play, by Percival Wilde (Crown Publishers, Inc., 419 Fourth Avenue, New York, 1951), contains a section on the one-act play for television. This section was written in collaboration with Thomas H. Hutchinson and is based on the thesis that the writer versed in the one-act technique can write acceptably for TV, provided, of course, that he is aware of some of the technical requirements of the latter. One wonders if the same statements were not made regarding writing for the theater and films when the latter were new. Mr. Wilde's book is a new and augmented edition of a standard work which first appeared in 1922. This book is widely used as a text, but its lively, unpretentious style recommends it to any reader interested in the subject.

The problems of language and semantics continue to fascinate both the layman and professional student of communications. Two small books before us discuss these esoteric matters authoritatively and nontechnically. *Language and Society,* by M. M. Lewis (Social Science Publishers, 1966 Broadway, New York, 1948), of which this is a somewhat belated notice, is a lively discussion of the vast changes in human society brought about and portended by the development of modern communication technologies, especially the instantaneous transmission of human speech and writing. There are sections on language and politics, language and group consciousness, and language and social conflict. The author is director of the Institute of Education at University College, Nottingham. *Words and Their Use,* by Stephen Ullman (Philosophical Library, Inc., 15 East 40th Street, New York, 1951), is considerably more restricted in scope. It is primarily concerned with language and meaning and the influence of words on human thinking and action. The author is professor of

Romance Philology and General Linguistics at the University of Glasgow. Both these books are free of the cultist flavor which is characteristic of many books in "general" semantics. Both are concerned with language and the world crisis, and succeed in making a difficult subject not only intelligible but even exciting.

JOURNALS, RESEARCH, ETC.

Frank Capra is the subject of Number 3 in the new series of *Indexes* devoted to critical studies of important film directors published by the British Film Institute (164 Shaftesbury Avenue, London, W.C.2). Each of the Capra films, beginning with *Fultah Fisher's Boarding House* in 1923, is analyzed, and there is a brief biographical introduction. Richard Griffiths is the analyst for this study and Gavin Lambert is the general editor of the series.

There is increasing recognition that ideas may be as potent as bullets in affecting the behavior of men. But ideas, unlike bullets, can't be fired at people, they must be *communicated.* This involves a lot of knotty problems and tedious research. It may be that we shall have to give up our simple faith in the magic of "propaganda," "salesmanship," and "advertising." In wartime these matters come under the general heading of psychological warfare which, we have discovered, involves considerably more than dropping leaflets on the enemy. These remarks are by way of an introduction to an extremely interesting article entitled "Rearming with Ideas," by George E. Taylor, in the current (Spring, 1951) issue of the *Virginia Quarterly.*

Germane to these problems are articles in two recent issues of the *News Letter* ("bringing information to the teacher about the radio, the press, and the motion picture") published by the Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, Columbus. They are both by the editor of the *Letter,* Edgar Dale. One (March, 1951, Number 6) is called "Communication as Participation" and deals with the barriers to communication. Dr. Dale implies that even when ideas are "good" or "sound" and their presentation

Romance Philology and General Linguistics at the University of Glasgow. Both these books are free of the cultist flavor which is characteristic of many books in "general" semantics. Both are concerned with language and the world crisis, and succeed in making a difficult subject not only intelligible but even exciting.

JOURNALS, RESEARCH, ETC.

Frank Capra is the subject of Number 3 in the new series of *Indexes* devoted to critical studies of important film directors published by the British Film Institute (164 Shaftesbury Avenue, London, W.C.2). Each of the Capra films, beginning with *Fultah Fisher's Boarding House* in 1923, is analyzed, and there is a brief biographical introduction. Richard Griffiths is the analyst for this study and Gavin Lambert is the general editor of the series.

There is increasing recognition that ideas may be as potent as bullets in affecting the behavior of men. But ideas, unlike bullets, can't be fired at people, they must be *communicated.* This involves a lot of knotty problems and tedious research. It may be that we shall have to give up our simple faith in the magic of "propaganda," "salesmanship," and "advertising." In wartime these matters come under the general heading of psychological warfare which, we have discovered, involves considerably more than dropping leaflets on the enemy. These remarks are by way of an introduction to an extremely interesting article entitled "Rearming with Ideas," by George E. Taylor, in the current (Spring, 1951) issue of the *Virginia Quarterly.*

Germane to these problems are articles in two recent issues of the *News Letter* ("bringing information to the teacher about the radio, the press, and the motion picture") published by the Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, Columbus. They are both by the editor of the *Letter,* Edgar Dale. One (March, 1951, Number 6) is called "Communication as Participation" and deals with the barriers to communication. Dr. Dale implies that even when ideas are "good" or "sound" and their presentation

and and media technically adequate, communication is not guaranteed. This, it seems, is a two-way process.

The second piece (February, 1951, Number 5) is concerned with the Great Debate now in progress which doesn't concern the U. S. foreign policy, but the reservation of TV channels for educational broadcasting. This debate is before the FCC and the issues are sharply and firmly drawn. "Unless," says Dr. Dale, "these channels are now reserved for educational use, we must forever abandon hopes of having any significant number of TV educational stations in this country." He thinks it is no preliminary skirmish, but the final struggle to insure education's future stake in the mass media.

A *Manual on Audio-Visual Aids for Jewish Education,* by Esther L. Berg and Florence B. Freedman (American Association for Jewish Education, 1776 Broadway, New York 19), has just been issued. The various types of aids—lantern slides, filmstrips, films, radio, recordings—are discussed and their use in a variety of teaching situations are discussed. Specific suggestions are presented for the use of such aids in teaching the Hebrew language, for a unit on Israel and a unit on Purim.

In the *Journal of Applied Psychology* (February, 1951), in a paper entitled "The Role of 'cutting' in the Perception of the Motion Picture," H. D. Goldberg reports the results of a neat little experiment which demonstrates the *gestalt* principle that the meaning of the whole determines the meaning of the parts. Two films were used which had identical sequences at the beginning and end but different interpolated scenes. The end sequence in both was a woman screaming. In one film nearly all the subjects (92 per cent) perceived this as fear, and in the second a significantly smaller percentage perceived it as fear, and a substantial proportion perceived other emotions. To some this will seem to be a demonstration of the obvious. To the psychologist it suggests possibilities of experimental research on a whole series of problems related to the factors underlying the communication of meaning.

Four doctoral dissertations reporting results of experimental researches on various communications problems have been completed at the University of California (Los Angeles campus). These researches were done in the Department of Psychology under the general direction of Professor Franklin Fearing.

In "A Psychological Study of Motion Picture Audience Behavior," Nicholas Rose reports the results of an analysis of audience behavior based on a series of infrared photographs taken at preselected points during exposure to a comedy film entitled "The Life of Riley." The audience was stratified with respect to occupations represented in the film. The laughing and smiling behavior of individuals in the audience as recorded in the photographs was studied and there were follow-up field interviews of selected subjects. This is the first reported study involving the infrared technique for recording audience behavior.

Daniel M. Wilner in "Attitude as a Determinant of Perception in the Mass Media of Communication: Reactions to the Motion Picture, *Home of the Brave*" is concerned with the effects of attitudes toward ethnic minorities, in this case Negroes, on the perception of film content depicting the problems of such minorities.

William C. Schutz in the "Theory and Methodology of Content Analysis" reviews and evaluates the techniques for determining reliability and validity of content analyses as applied not only to communication but to symbolic material in general.

Luelyne B. Doscher in "An Experiment in Human Communication: Frames of Reference, the Audience and the Impact of a Radio Drama" studied how individuals with known social-psychological frames of reference perceive and recall the thematic content of a radio drama.